1. INTRODUCTION

Speech produced in noise differs from speech produced in quiet. The Lombard Effect is the reflex by which talkers increase their vocal effort as environmental noise increases [1]. Other speech differences include increased fundamental frequency (F0) [2], word duration [3], and high-frequency energy [4]. Although the Lombard Effect is well-documented, standardized tests of speech intelligibility in noise usually use speech materials recorded in quiet, with background noise added later. However, word recognition in noise is significantly better for speech materials produced in noise than for materials produced in quiet, even when vocal level differences are removed [4].

Older adults, even if they have audiometric thresholds within clinically normal limits, often have more trouble than younger adults understanding speech in noise [5]. The intelligibility advantage seen when listeners are tested with speech produced in conditions matched to the listening condition may be even greater for older than for younger adults. The main purpose of the present study was to investigate age-related differences in the extent to which results of speech intelligibility testing might be improved if more ecologically appropriate spoken versions of materials were used. Another purpose was to examine the possible acoustical explanations for any differences in intelligibility.

2. METHOD

2.1 Participants

Participants were 16 younger adults (mean age = 19.9 years, SD = 1.7) and 16 older adults (mean age = 69.0 years, SD = 4.1). All participants spoke English as a first language, and had pure-tone audiometric thresholds of ≤25 dB HL at frequencies from .25 to 3 kHz in the test ear. The vocabulary scores on the Mill Hill test were 13/20 (SD = 2) for the younger and 16/20 (SD = 3) for the older group.

2.2 Stimuli

The stimuli used were the eight sentence lists of the SPIN-R test. Each list contains 25 low-context and 25 high-context sentences. List 1 of the original SPIN-R recordings was used [6]. A new male talker (DF) with similar F0 and speaking rate as the original SPIN-R talker recorded the eight lists in different speaking environments. Based on measurements for sentences in List 1, the average F0 was 121.7 Hz for DF and 120.5 Hz for the original talker. The average speaking rate was 4.3 syllables/sec for both talkers. List 1 was spoken by DF in quiet without headphones, and Lists 2, 7 and 8 were spoken in quiet while DF wore headphones (Sennheiser HD265 Linear). DF was instructed to “speak normally” for Lists 1 and 2, to “speak clearly” for List 7, and to “speak loudly” for List 8. Lists 3 to 6 were spoken while DF heard noise presented over headphones: Lists 3 and 5 were spoken in speech spectrum noise at 62 and 66 dB SPL, respectively; Lists 4 and 6 were spoken in multitalker babble at 62 and 66 dB SPL, respectively. All sentences were digitized at 24 kHz, low-pass filtered at 6 kHz, and matched on RMS level.

2.3 Experiment procedure

Each participant was tested on the eight lists (eight talking conditions), with list order counterbalanced. Sentences were presented monaurally under TDH-50P earphones at 50 dB SL (relative to participant’s average pure-tone threshold for 0.5, 1, and 2 kHz). Each sentence was presented with corresponding files of multi-talker babble at 0 dB S:N. Participants were instructed to report the last word of every sentence. There were no time constraints on responding, and guessing was encouraged.

2.4 Acoustical analysis procedure

Several acoustical measures were taken of the stimuli, using the PRAAT speech analysis program [7]. For every sentence, the time boundaries of target words and their phonemes were marked. A script was then used to generate measures of duration, F0, and intensity for each target word, as well as F1, F2 for the vowel in the word.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Word identification

Figure 1 shows the performance of younger and older adults. In general, words were identified better in the high-context than low-context conditions. Younger adults correctly identified more words in noise than older adults, especially in the low-context condition. Both age groups found the new talker to be more intelligible than the original one. Word identification was best for talking conditions with louder noise environments (conditions 4 and 6), when the type of noise in the talking environment matched that of the listening environment (conditions 3 and 4), and when the talker was instructed to “speak loudly” (condition 8).

This description was confirmed by an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with age as a between-subjects factor, and talking condition and context as within-subjects factors.
There were main effects of age, \( F(1,30) = 17.03, p < 0.001 \), context, \( F(1,30) = 531.02, p < 0.001 \), and talking condition, \( F(7,210) = 173.99, p < 0.001 \). Performance in all conditions with the new talker was better than with the original talker, and performance in the set of conditions 3, 6, 4 and 8 was equivalent, but better than in all other conditions \( (p = 0.05) \). There were significant interactions of age and talking condition, \( F(7,210) = 3.260, p < 0.01 \), and age and context, \( F(1,30) = 24.83, p < 0.001 \), with age-related differences in part for the between-talker differences. For DF, words produced more high-frequency energy, which may account for the between-talker differences. For DF, words spoken in noise were more intelligible than words spoken in quiet, but they do not differ significantly in duration, \( F_0 \) or intensity. However, as shown in Fig. 2, DF produced more high-frequency energy, which may account in part for the between-talker differences. For DF, words spoken in noise were more intelligible than words spoken in quiet, but they do not differ significantly in duration, \( F_0 \) or intensity. However, words spoken “loudly” had greater \( F_0 \) and intensity compared to words spoken “normally” in quiet, which may explain their greater intelligibility in noise. A combination of acoustic cues may be needed to explain the pattern of results.
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