

Sentence_Identification_in_Noise .docx

by Author Author

Submission date: 21-Jul-2020 09:14AM (UTC+0530)

Submission ID: 1360248592

File name: Sentence_Identification_in_Noise.docx (53.04K)

Word count: 2084

Character count: 10880

Sentence Identification in Noise: Effect of Signal to Noise Ratio and Audio-Visual

Modality

Background

Persons with hearing loss show poor performance in speech perception in noise, even with a hearing aid or cochlear implant. This is attributed to suprathreshold auditory skills which are usually indicated as distortion factor (Apeksha & Kumar, 2017; Phatak, Yoon, Gooler, & Allen, 2009). Speech perception in noise tests are valid tools in the assessment of the distortion factor(Phatak et al., 2009). Such standardised tests use a variety of stimuli ranging from monosyllables to sentences, presented with different types of noiseslike wideband noise and multi-talker babble.

In real life, listening to speech in the presence of noise is a common scenario. Several studies throw light on the effect of noise on masking speech signals(Miller, 1947; Miller & Nicely, 1955). Studies using smaller speech segments like consonants or vowels to understand speech perception in noise provided crucial information on the role of such segments in speech perception in degraded conditions(Gelfand, 2004).Sentences were also widely used as stimuli in literature. Most of such studies focused on the development and validation of clinical tests, or the utilisation of such tests to understand the effectiveness of management options like hearing aid as they provide more approximation to real-life situation (Theunissen, Swanepoel, & Hanekom, 2009).

Integration of information from multiple sensory modalities by the brain is vital in speech perception. Of the different modalities, the importance of visual information in perceiving speech during degraded conditions is thoroughly discussed in the literature(Balan & Maruthy, 2018; Kristin J. Van Engen, Zilong Xie, 2017; Lalonde & Werner, 2019). The variables related to the influence of both sentences and noise in visual speech perception

25 have also been studied using sentence identification in noise tasks (Helfer & Freyman, 2005).
26 However, there is a dearth of such studies using sentences in Indian languages. Hence ¹² the
27 present study aimed to check the effect of SNRs on sentence identification presented across
28 modalities (i.e. Auditory only, Audio-visual, and Visual only).

29 **Material and Methods**

30 *Participants*

31 A total of 41 young individuals (⁴ 9 males and 32 females) in the age range of 17-35
32 years (mean age of 22.07 years) participated in the study. Based on a structured interview, it
33 was verified that none of them reported any ¹³ difficulty in understanding speech in noise in
34 daily listening conditions. All the participants' ³ pure-tone air conduction thresholds were
35 within 15 dB HL for all octave frequencies ranging from 250 Hz to 8 kHz in both the ears.
36 ⁵ The participants were native speakers of Kannada (a language spoken in the south Indian
37 state of Karnataka) with a minimum educational qualification of secondary school
38 examination. The visual acuity of the participants was normal or corrected (6/6). Written
39 ⁷ informed consent was obtained from all the participants before the participation and the
40 method adhered to the ethical guidelines prescribed by the ethical committee for research at
41 the [Institute name removed to ensure double-blind review](Venkatesan, 2009).

42 *Stimuli/Material*

43 Seven standardised sentence lists from the Kannada sentence lists developed by
44 Geetha, Shivaraju, Kumar, Manjula, and Pavan (2014) were adopted for the study. In each
45 sentence list, there were ten sentences, each with four keywords, hence, making 40 keywords
46 per list. All the sentences were both audio and video recorded in a sound-treated, well-lit room
47 from a native Kannada speaker with clinically normal speech. The video recording of the

48 stimuli was done using a Sony HD professional video camera fixed on a tripod at zero degree
49 azimuth focussed to speaker's face. Each stimulus was initiated and ended with a mouth
50 closed position as neutral face. The speaker was instructed to utter each stimulus for at least
51 three times with the same duration, natural intonation, clear pronunciation, least eye blinks
52 and head movements. As to ensure good clarity for auditory portions of the stimuli while
53 video recording, a simultaneous audio recording of stimuli was done using Adobe Audition
54 (version 3) software with Motu Microbook II sound card interface with a sampling frequency
55 of 44100 Hz. The good clarity auditory stimuli were digitised and normalised. The auditory
56 stimuli were mixed with speech noise to generate 0 dB SNR, -5 dB SNR, and -10 dB SNR
57 conditions using MATLAB 2014 (Mathworks Inc., Natick, MA, USA). The auditory stimuli
58 with speech noise were synced with the video counterparts of the stimuli to create audio-
59 visual (AV) condition. The audio signal was then extracted from the synced videotaped
60 stimuli using Adobe Premiere Pro CC to create auditory only (AO), visual only (VO)
61 conditions.

62 *Procedure*

63 The participants were made to sit in a well-lit, quiet room. The prepared stimuli stored
64 in the Lenovo laptop (running on Windows 10 OS, Intel(R) i3-2370M CPU) were presented
65 through calibrated headphone (Sennheiser HD 569) at 75 dB SPL in all conditions except VO.
66 The participants underwent sentence identification task at three SNRs (0dB, -5 dB, and 10
67 dB) across three modalities (AO, VO and AV conditions) resulting in seven conditions. The
68 stimuli for each modality and the SNR conditions wererandomisedto avoid order effect using
69 paradigm software (version 2.5.0.68). In each condition, separate lists of 10 sentences were
70 used to avoid familiarisation effect. Hence, each participant had to repeat the sentence heard

71 for 70 stimuli presentation (10 sentences * 7 conditions).⁹ After each sentence presentation, the
72 participant had to repeat verbatim. The responses were voice recorded for offline scoring.

73 *Data Analysis*

74 Each keyword identified correctly in the sentence was given a score of 1 and each
75 keyword wrongly identified was given a score of 0. The maximum score achievable in each
76 stimulus condition was 40. The raw scores of each of the seven conditions were used to
77 calculate the visual gain (VG) and auditory gain (AG) across the SNR conditions (Sumbly &
78 Pollack, 1954). The AG was calculated as the absolute difference between the raw scores of
79 AV condition and VO condition [AG=AV-VO]. Similarly, VG was obtained from the
80 absolute difference of raw scores for AV and AO conditions [VG=AV-AO].

81 The mean, median, and standard deviation of raw scores were estimated. The
82 Shapiro-Wilk test was done on raw scores to check the normalcy of scores across
83 conditions. The data were not normally distributed across each condition, and hence, non-
84 parametric statistics were done. Friedman test was used to check the effect of modality and
85 SNR on sentence identification. The data were further analysed using the Wilcoxon signed-
86 rank test to check the pairwise significance.

87 **Results**

88 Descriptive statistics of sentence identification score, AG, and VG at three SNRs and
89 across three modalities are given in table 1. The scores improved as the SNR became better in
90 AO and AV modalities.

91 *Table 1: Mean, median and standard deviation (SD) of sentence identification scores,*
 92 *auditory gain (AG), and visual gain (VG) at each SNR across modalities*

Modality/ Gain	SNR	Mean	Median	SD
AO	-10 dB	3.88	2.00	4.595
	-5 dB	27.20	27.00	6.165
	0 dB	38.24	38.00	1.625
AV	-10 dB	17.22	16.00	8.572
	-5 dB	35.68	37.00	3.189
	0 dB	39.15	39.00	1.216
VO	Visual	4.41	4.00	3.486
AG	-10 dB	12.80	12.00	7.557
	-5 dB	31.27	32.00	3.735
	0 dB	34.73	35.00	3.529
VG	-10 dB	13.34	13.00	8.092
	-5 dB	8.49	8.00	5.192
	0 dB	.90	1.00	1.497

93

94 The sentence identification scores were compared between modality and SNR
 95 conditions using the Friedman test. There was a significant difference found between
 96 modality and SNR conditions($\chi^2(6) = 234.98, p < 0.01$);. The data were further analysed using
 97 the Wilcoxon signed-rank test to check the pairwise significance. The results are shown in
 98 table2. The sentence identification scores are significantly higher for 0dB SNR condition
 99 compared to -5dB and -10 dB SNR conditions in both AO and AV modalities. Similarly, a
 100 significantly higher score was obtained for -5dB SNR condition compared to -10dB SNR
 101 condition.

102 *Table 2: Comparison of sentence identification score between different SNRs within each*
 103 *modality*

Modality	SNR	Z	p-value
AO	-5 dB vs -10 dB	-5.58	0.00
	0 dB vs -10 dB	-5.59	0.00
	0 dB vs -5 dB	-5.58	0.00
AV	-5 dB vs -10 dB	-5.58	0.00
	0 dB vs -10 dB	-5.58	0.00

0 dB vs -5 dB	-5.40	0.00
---------------	-------	------

104

105 Table 3 represents the comparison of the sentence identification score at each SNR
 106 across modalities. Sentence identification scores were significantly higher for AV conditions
 107 compared to AO at all SNRs. The scores were also significantly higher for AV compared to
 108 VO condition. The comparisons between AO and VO conditions showed that sentence
 109 identification scores were higher for AO compared to VO at all SNRs except at -10 dB SNR.

110 Table 3: Comparison of speech identification scores at each SNRs across modalities

SNR	Modality	Z	p-value
-10 dB	AO vs AV	-5.44	0.00
	AO vs VO	-1.43	0.15
	AV vs VO	-5.58	0.00
-5 dB	AO vs AV	-5.48	0.00
	AO vs VO	-5.58	0.00
	AV vs VO	-5.58	0.00
0 dB	AO vs AV	-3.28	0.00
	AO vs VO	-5.59	0.00
	AV vs VO	-5.59	0.00

111

112 Friedman test and Wilcoxon signed-rank test were done for AG and VG comparison
 113 also. Friedman test results revealed a significant difference across conditions ($\chi^2(5) = 178.26$,
 114 $p < 0.01$) and the results of the Wilcoxon signed-rank test is given in table 4. The AG showed
 115 a higher mean value in better SNRs compared to poorer SNRs. On the other hand, VG
 116 showed a reduction in mean value as the SNR improves. When a comparison (depicted in
 117 table 5) was made between AG and VG at each SNR, AG showed a significantly higher value
 118 compared to VG except at -10 dB SNR.

119 Table 4: Comparison of auditory gain and visual gain between different SNRs within each
 120 modality

Modality	SNR	Z	p-value
AG	-5 dB vs -10 dB	-5.58	0.00

	0 dB vs -10 dB	-5.58	0.00
	0 dB vs -5 dB	-5.40	0.00
	-5 dB vs -10 dB	-2.68	0.01
VG	0 dB vs -10 dB	-5.42	0.00
	0 dB vs -5 dB	-5.41	0.00

121

122 *Table 5: Comparison of auditory gain and visual gain at each SNRs across modalities*

SNR	Modality	Z	p-value
-10 dB	AG vs VG	-1.43	0.15
-5 dB	AG vs VG	-5.58	0.00
0 dB	AG vs VG	-5.59	0.00

123

124 Discussion

125 The sentence identification scores improve as the SNR improves in both AO and AV
 126 modes. At favourable SNRs, the best scores were observed in AV modality followed by AO
 127 and least in VO. As the noise reduces, the consonant confusions caused by masking noise
 128 was reduced and this resulted in an improvement in sentence identification scores. In AO
 129 condition, the growth was drastic (i.e. 3% becomes 38%). However, in the AV condition, the
 130 reduction of sentence identification scores is comparatively lower as the SNR worsens. This
 131 indicates the effectiveness of utilising visual cues for perceiving speech in noise. Earlier
 132 studies have also shown that the dependency on visual cues increases as the auditory cues
 133 become more degraded (Munhall, Kroos, Jozan, & Vatikiotis-Bateson, 2004; Pilling &
 134 Thomas, 2011; Tye-Murray, Sommers, & Spehar, 2007a, 2007b). Sentence identification
 135 score in VO condition is weakest and almost comparable to the score in AV at -10dB SNR.
 136 This may be due to the adverse SNR; the listener could utilise only visual cues present in the
 137 speech signal.

138 Deduction of AG and VG provides vital information on the relative role of auditory
139 and visual modality contribution to speech perception in the presence of noise. Auditory gain
140 reduces as the SNR reduces, whereas, visual gain increases with SNR reduction. This was
141 expected because when SNR worsens listeners depend more on visual cues to perceive
142 speech effectively (Stacey, Kitterick, Morris, & Sumner, 2016). At -10dB SNR, AG and VG
143 were comparable, and it may be because of the ceiling effect in visual cues utilisation. At
144 favourable SNRs the VG is lesser, because dependence on visual cues is minimal; the cues
145 from auditory modality alone are enough to perceive speech in such situations. These
146 findings on VG agree with the study by Balan and Maruthy (2018).

147 **Conclusion**

148 The findings of the current study serve the following purposes. The visual cues have a
149 critical role in the speech perception especially in degraded listening conditions even in
150 young normal hearing individuals. The AG and VG measures also strengthen this
151 assumption. As the effectiveness of visual cue is proved in normal hearing individuals,
152 speech perception training using AV modality would be considered for individuals with
153 hearing disorders like ANSD or APD. However, more research on the efficacy of AV speech
154 training is required for such conclusions.

155 **Acknowledgments**

156 The authors would like to thank the Directors of [Institute names removed to ensure
157 double-blind review] for the support. The authors would also like to extend their gratitude to all
158 subjects who participated in the study.

159 **Conflict of Interest:** NIL

160 **Source of Funding:** Department of Science and Technology project fund.

Sentence_Identification_in_Noise.docx

ORIGINALITY REPORT

6%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

3%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to Southampton Solent University Student Paper	1%
2	Submitted to All India Institute of Speech & Hearing Student Paper	1%
3	scholarsarchive.byu.edu Internet Source	1%
4	extrahealthy.co.uk Internet Source	1%
5	Divya Seth, Santosh Maruthy. "Effect of phonological and morphological factors on speech disfluencies of Kannada speaking preschool children who stutter", Journal of Fluency Disorders, 2019 Publication	1%
6	ebcj.mums.ac.ir Internet Source	<1%
7	Connie Keintz. "Utilization of visual information and listener strategies in intelligibility impairment	<1%

related to bilateral facial paresis", International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 2011

Publication

8

www.mdpi.com

Internet Source

<1%

9

Submitted to University of Southampton

Student Paper

<1%

10

Earl Johnson, Todd Ricketts, Benjamin Hornsby. "The effect of extending high-frequency bandwidth on the Acceptable Noise Level (ANL) of hearing-impaired listeners", International Journal of Audiology, 2009

Publication

<1%

11

Submitted to University of Canterbury

Student Paper

<1%

12

Sin-Young Park, Hack-Youn Kim, Juhui Choe. "Application of an Electric Field Refrigeration System on Pork Loin during Dry Aging", Food Science of Animal Resources, 2019

Publication

<1%

13

Vijaya Kumar Narne, C. S. Vanaja. "Perception of speech with envelope enhancement in individuals with auditory neuropathy and simulated loss of temporal modulation processing", International Journal of Audiology, 2009

Publication

<1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On