The Effect of Hearing Protection Devices on Speech Intelligibility of Persian Employees

Mina Karami
Hamadan University of Medical Sciences School of Public Health
Mohsen Aliabadi (✉ mohsen.aliabadi@umsha.ac.ir)
State University of New York Upstate Medical University https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7896-1379
Rostam Golmohammadi
Hamadan University of Medical Sciences School of Public Health
Morteza Hamidi Nahrani
Hamadan University of Medical Sciences School of Public Health

Research note

Keywords: noise reduction rating, speech intelligibility, hearing protection devices, work environment

Posted Date: July 20th, 2020

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-42838/v1

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published on November 11th, 2020. See the published version at https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-020-05374-x.

Abstract

Objective

This study aimed to investigate the effect of hearing protection devices (HPDs) on speech intelligibility in Persian work environments. Three current earmuffs and three earplugs and one of the prototype of molded earplug were tested on 15 male subjects which were randomly selected. The noise reduction of HPDs was measured based on the Real Ear attenuation at Threshold (REAT) method. Speech intelligibilities during using HPDs were determined based on the speech discrimination score (SDS). Data were analyzed using SPSS, version 22.

Results

The actual to nominal noise reduction rating values were from 47–84% for HPDs. The earmuffs show higher ratios of actual to nominal noise reduction compared with the earplugs. At two signal to noise ratios, no significant differences were observed in in speech intelligibility using HPDs ($p > 0.05$). However, at S/N = 0, the speech intelligibility descriptively has been improved by using common earmuffs up to 9.07%. There was a significant difference up to 21.27% in speech intelligibility for proposed molded earplugs at S/N = 0($p < 0.05$). It is concluded that, if the trend of signal to noise ratio is positive, the HPDs will reduce the ability to understand speech.

Introduction

Given that conversation in the work environment is a means of communication, the presence of background noises or noises close to the frequencies of conversation, especially in office environments, can disrupt communication between employees and even interference the conversation [1, 2]. The use of hearing protection devices (HPDs) can affect employees' speech intelligibility in noisy environments. Furthermore, the acoustic data of HPDs is one of the significant challenges for occupational health experts to assess the exposure levels of employees to noise. The amount of nominal noise reduction rating(NRR) of these devices, which is generally provided by the manufacturing companies in the identification card of these pieces of equipment, is mostly different compared to their actual noise reduction rating [3, 4, 5]. Among some methods disclosed for determining HPDs noise reduction, Berger et al. proposed the Real-ear attenuation at threshold (REAT) hearing threshold method as the best and most accurate method based on the individuals' subjective responses [6, 7, 8].

Previous studies showed that, the irregular use of HPDs in work environments can be due to difficulty in communication. For employees, communication with colleagues and also hearing signals from the equipment and devices is of great importance [9, 10, 11]. Nelisse et al. determined that only 64% of employees in that environment used HPDs, and only 20% used them consistently during full shifts. Some the main reasons why employees did not use hearing protectors consistently were loss of their performance, lack of comfort, and interference in conversations with colleagues [12]. Hasahimito et al.

revealed that a decrease in the noise reduction rates of hearing protectors cannot be considered as a factor for improving speech intelligibility [13]. Fernandes et al. showed that at the lowest background noise levels (60 and 70 dBA), HPDs reduced speech intelligibility while the background noise levels were approximately between 80 and 90 decibels and the signal to noise ratio (0, -5, and − 10 decibels), HPDs improved speech intelligibility [14].

In developing countries, occupational health experts also reported that unreliable data of HPDs are considered the main challenge to achieve an efficient hearing conservation program [4].The consequences of hearing protectors on verbal communication and speech intelligibility are of great importance in typical office work environments. Less attention has been paid about the speech intelligibility result from using HPDs in Persian office work environments. This study aimed to investigate the effect of hearing protection devices on speech intelligibility of Persian employees in the simulated office noise emission.

Methods

The Subject Population

In this experimental study, 15 male students of Hamadan University of Medical Sciences with an age range of 18–30 years were randomly selected. Pure tone audiometry was performed for selecting subjects with normal hearing. As shown in Fig. 1, three common commercial earmuff and three earplug models (one foam formable and two 3-flange premolded) with technical specifications from reliable international manufacturers used in the Iranian's work environments were examined. A prototype of the proposed molded earplug designed based on subjects' ear shape and size was also tested. After careful examination of the ear canal and tympanic membrane of each participants by the study partner audiologist, the initial ear mold is made using soft material. Next, the molded earplug is made from it in lab. This earplug was made of silicone. A ceramic filter is inside the molded earplug so that it can produce special channel to allow transmit normal conversation. Inclusion criteria for participating in the study included having normal hearing and vision along with Persian native language.

Experiment procedure

In each experiment session, based on REAT method, hearing threshold of subjects was measured by a reference noise with and without a protective earphone for 40 minutes. Next, speech discrimination score (SDS) of subjects with and without a protective earphone was measured at two signal to noise (S/N) ratio for 30 minutes. As mentioned, based on the REAT method, pure tone audiometery was performed to measure a person's hearing threshold with and without a protective earphone [15]. In this way, based on insertion loss of HPDs in one octave band frequency spectrum, the actual values of the noise reduction rating (NRR) were calculated [16].

The values of sound attenuation used for calculation of the NRR were determined in accordance with ANSI S3.19-1974 [17, 18]. In next step, the ambient background noise was fixed at 70 dB, using speakers (Pejvak Ava CO). Two signal to noise (S/N) ratios 0 and + 5 were considered to relatively resemble noise emission in office work environment. The speech levels of Persian world were adjusted based on these signal to noise (S/N) ratios. Participants sat in a chair two meter away from the noise emission speakers and avoided any movement during the measurement, as well as talking and making noise.

Speech intelligibility was measured based on the speech discrimination score and using a real two-channel audiometer (Piano model; Inventis CO). According to ISO 8253-3 standard, using a reliable and accurate list of one-syllable Persian words (25 words), the subjects are asked to repeat the words played from the speaker in the room environment. Then, the percentage of correctly repeated words is determined [19]. For speech audiometry, the speech of Persian word from a suitable speaker with normal and clear speech with no particular accent was recorded. The speaker maintained the clarity, and natural speed of sound, and avoided emphasizing words during record of speech [20].

Statistical analysis

The data were analyzed after compiling with SPSS statistical software version 22. Data normality was tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. In cases where the distribution of variables was normal, the student's t-test was used as a dependent sample. Significant levels for all tests were considered less than 0.05.

Results

The results showed that the actual to nominal NRR ratio is about 47 to 84%. In current study, the real to nominal NRR for earplugs was in the range of 47 to 76%, and for earmuffs, it was in the range of 74 to 84%. The studied earmuffs show higher ratios of actual to nominal noise reduction compared with the earplugs. Actual NRR for a proposed prototype earplug were 12.5 dB which were comparable with the real data of the other studied traditional earplugs.

The subjects' speech ineligibility in no background noise, S/N = 0 and S/N = + 5 conditions were 98.00 ± 1.20, 62.93 ± 2.90 and 72.00 + 2.70 respectively. There was a significant difference between the subjects' speech ineligibility without earphones in these mentioned conditions ($p < 0.05$). A significant correlation is observed between the speech intelligibility in these two signal to noise conditions ($r = 0.79$ and $p < 0.05$). Table 1 shows subjects' speech intelligibility with and without earphones at S/N = 0. The paired sample T-test showed that there was a significant difference in speech intelligibility for molded filtered earplugs ($p < 0.05$), however, no significant differences were observed in other HPDs ($p > 0.05$). However, the speech intelligibility descriptively has been improved by using some common earmuffs up to 9.07%. The common earplugs have intangible effect on speech intelligibility. However, the proposed molded earplugs could increase the speech intelligibility up to 21.27%.

Table 1
The subjects' speech intelligibility with and without HPDs at S/N = 0

HPDs types	With HPDs (%)	Without HPDs (%)	p -value	Difference (%)
Earplug A1	63.20 ± 1.30	62.93 ± 2.90	0.71	0.27
Earplug A2	63.47 ± 6.30	62.93 ± 2.90	0.86	0.54
Earplug A3	63.98 ± 4.80	62.93 ± 2.90	0.88	1.05
Earmuff B1	64.00 ± 3.70	62.93 ± 2.90	0.64	1.07
Earmuff B2	72.00 ± 2.40	62.93 ± 2.90	0.58	9.07
Earmuff B3	72.00 ± 3.40	62.93 ± 2.90	0.13	9.07
Prototype earplug	84.20 ± 3.50	62.93 ± 2.90	0.04	21.27

Table 1 shows subjects' speech intelligibility with and without earphones at S/N = + 5. The paired sample T-test showed that there were no significant differences in speech intelligibility in the all examined HPDs ($p > 0.05$). The results show that HPDs have not notable effect on speech intelligibility at S/N = + 5. The speech intelligibility descriptively has been improved by using common earmuffs by only 1.87%. The common earplugs improved the speech intelligibility by only 2.13%. The molded filtered earplugs could increase the speech intelligibility only up to 3.6%.

The results showed that there was a significant correlation between two signal to noise ratios($r = 0.79$ and $p < 0.05$). The results showed that there was a significant correlation between the noise insertion loss and the percentage of speech intelligibility ($r = -0.37$ and $p < 0.05$). The results showed that there was a significant correlation between the noise insertion loss and the percentage of speech intelligibility ($r = -0.224$ and $p < 0.05$).

Discussion

Occupational health experts seek to strike a balance between employee hearing protection and their ability to communicate. The current results proposed some local derating patterns for the labeled noise reduction of the common HPDs. The actual noise reduction for all studied HPDs is less than their nominal noise reduction, which is consistent with the findings reported by Biabani et al and Norain et al. [21, 22]. The studied earmuffs show higher actual acoustic performance compared with the earplugs. The noise protection data of the tested hearing protectors were relatively similar to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) derating patterns. NIOSH proposed that a subtraction of 25% from the manufacturers' labeled NRR for earmuffs, and 25 to 50% for earplugs [16]. Low quality of the existing models of earphones in the real market and the appropriateness of the size of the earplugs and earmuffs to the anthropometric dimensions of the employees are the main reasons for the difference in actual performance values with the manufacturer's nominal values. The flanged earplugs have the higher noise reduction compared with foam formable earplug.

The participants correctly recognized 98% of the Persian words in silent conditions without HPDs. However, percentage of identified correct Persian words were reduced to 72% and 62.93% at S/N = + 5 and S/N = 0, respectively. Statistically, the observed trends were significant and indicate that background noise level is very effective in the ability to understand speech. Some HPDs at S/N = 0 had more effect on improving speech intelligibility compared with at S/N = + 5. Ljung et al. showed that speech intelligibility was reduced linearly with an increase at signal to noise by using protective earphones, which was consistent with the results of the present study [23].

Fernandez et al. showed at positive signal-to-noise levels, earphones reduced speech intelligibility and when the signal-to-noise levels were negative, earphones increase speech intelligibility. In industrial environments, where the signal-to-noise level is usually negative, HPDs can considerably improve employees' verbal communication in addition to preventing hearing loss. The use of HPDs has affected the ability to understand speech up to 3.6% at S/N = 0, and about 3% at S/N = + 5, which shows the decreasing trend of speech intelligibility with the increased signal to noise which was relatively similar to the present study[14]. Dastpak et al. showed that using HPDs can improve speech intelligibility by increasing background noise from 75 decibels to 95 decibels which was somewhat consistent with the present study [24].

A proposed molded earplug can considerably improve the speech intelligibility compared with the studied traditional HPDs while maintaining acceptable noise reduction. It can be concluded that, for reducing the gap between HPDs traditional hearing protection and speech communication, some new designs on HPDs intelligently may improve communication of employees while also maintain acceptable noise reduction. The results showed at S/N = + 5, the percentage of speech intelligibility more decreased by increasing the insertion losses compared to the S/N = 0. Therefore, in higher signal-to-noise ratio, HPDs with higher insertion loss can more reduced the speech intelligibility.

Conclusion

Speech communications at work environments is always challenging while wearing hearing protection. The actual noise reduction for the studied HPDs is less than their nominal noise reduction so that the studied earmuffs show higher actual acoustic performance compared with the earplugs. The HPDs at S/N = 0 had higher effect on improving speech intelligibility of Persian words compared with at S/N = + 5. It seems that, if the trend of signal to noise ratio was positive, the HPDs will reduce the ability to understand speech. It was verified that molded filtered earplugs considerably improve the speech intelligibility compared with the studied traditional HPDs while also maintain acceptable noise reduction.

Limitations

The interpretation of the current results is limited to two signal to noise ratios only simulated office noise emission. It is proposed that employees' speech intelligibly were examined while using common HPDs at the other signal to noise ratios such as -5, -10, etc.

Abbreviations

HPDs
hearing protection devices; REAT:Real Ear attenuation at Threshold; SDS:speech discrimination score; NRR:noise reduction rating; S/N:signal to noise; NIOSH:National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

Declarations

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude for the active cooperation and participation of the students of Hamadan University of Medical Sciences in this research.

Authors' contributions

MK contributed to acquisition and analysis of data.

MA contributed to study conception and design, analysis and interpretation of data and drafting manuscript.

RG contributed to study conception and design.

MHN contributed to study conception and design and acquisition of data.

Funding

This study was supported by Vice-Chancellor of Research and Technology of Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Contractor No. 980127286. Funder had no role in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets during and/or analyzed during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Hamadan University of Medical Sciences with IR.UMSHA.REC.1397.918. After being informed about this research, each subject completed consent

form.

Consent to publish

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors state that they have no competing interests.

Authors Details

1. MSC student of Department of ergonomics, School of Public Health, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan, Iran.
2. *Center of Excellence for Occupational Health, Occupational Health and Safety Research Center, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan, Iran. mohsen.aliabadi@umsha.ac.ir
3. Center of Excellence for Occupational Health, Research Center for Health Sciences, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan, Iran.
4. Department of audiology, School of rehabilitation, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan, Iran.

References

1. Golmohammadi R, Aliabadi M, Motlagh MS, Goodarzi R. Efficiency assessment of acoustic cabin for providing acoustic comfort in turbine unit of a thermal power plant. J Occup Hyg Eng. 2019;6(1):1–7.
2. Golmohammadi R, Aliabadi M, Nezami T. An experimental study of acoustic comfort in open space banks based on speech intelligibility and noise annoyance measures. Arch Acoust. 2017;42(2):333–45.
3. Aliabadi M, Golmohammadi R, Mansoorizadeh M, Khotanlou H, Hamadani AO. An empirical technique for predicting noise exposure level in the typical embroidery workrooms using artificial neural networks. Appl Acoust. 2013;74(3):364–74.
4. Biabani A, Aliabadi M, Golmohamadi R. Study of performance of acoustic fixture for using in noise reduction rate tests of hearing protection devices. J Occup Hyg Eng. 2016;3(1):60–6.
5. Lemoine AJ. The frequency attenuations of foam ear plugs affected by user error of college students. *Honors Theses.* 50; 2018. https://egrove.olemiss.edu/hon_thesis/50.
6. Berger EH. Methods of measuring the attenuation of hearing protection devices. J Acoust Soc Am. 1986;79(6):1655–87.

7. Berger EH, Royster LH, Driscoll DP. The noise manual. Fifth Edition, American Industrial Hygiene Association; 2003.
8. ISO 4869-1. Acoustics; Hearing Protectors, Part 1: Subjective Method for the Measurement of Sound Attenuation. International Organization for Standardization; 1990.
9. Canetto P. Hearing protectors: Topicality and research needs. Int J Occup Saf Ergo. 2009;15(2):141–53.
10. Giguere C, Berger EH. Speech recognition in noise under hearing protection: A computational study of the combined effects of hearing loss and hearing protector attenuation. Int J Audiol. 2016;55:30–40.
11. Howell K, Martin A. An investigation of the effects of hearing protectors on vocal communication in noise. J Sound Vib. 1975;41(2):181–96.
12. Nelisse H, Gaudreau M-A, Boutin J, Voix J, Laville F. Measurement of hearing protection devices performance in the workplace during full-shift working operations. Ann occup hyg. 2012;56(2):221–32.
13. Hashimoto M, Kumashiro M, Miyake S. Speech perception in noise when wearing hearing protectors with little low-frequency attenuation. Int J Ind Ergon. 1996;18(2–3):121–6.
14. Fernandes JC. Effects of hearing protector devices on speech intelligibility. Appl Acoust. 2003;64(6):581–90.
15. Boothroyd A. Developments in speech audiometry. British J Audiol. 1968;2(1):3–10.
16. NIOSH. Criteria for a recommended standard - Occupational noise exposure, Revised Criteria. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Cincinnati, OH. DHHS (NIOSH), Publication No.98–126; 1998.
17. ANSI. American national standard for the measurement of real-ear hearing protectors and physical attenuation of earmuffs. In: ANSI S3.19-1974. New York: American National Standards Institute; 1974.
18. ISO 4869 – 2.2. Acoustics -Hearing protectors - Part 2: Estimation of effective A weighted sound pressure levels when hearing protectors are worn. ISO/DIS 4869 2.2, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland; 1992.
19. ISO 8253-3. Acoustics: Audiometric test methods part 3: Speech audiometry. International Organization for Standardization; 1996.
20. *ISO* 8253-1. Acoustics: Audiometric Test methods. basic pure tone air and bone conduction threshold audiometry. International Organization for Standardization; 1989.
21. Biabani A, Aliabadi M, Golmohammadi R, Farhadian M. Individual fit testing of hearing protection devices based on microphone in Real Ear. Saf Health Work. 2017;8(4):364–70.
22. Norin JA, Emanuel DC, Letowski TR. Speech intelligibility and passive, level-dependent earplugs. Ear Hearing. 2011;32(5):642–9.
23. Ljung R, Israelsson K, Hygge S. Speech intelligibility and recall of spoken material heard at different signal-to-noise ratios and the role played by working memory capacity. Appl Cogn Psychol.

2013;27(2):198–203.
24. Dastpaak H, Alimohammadi I, Jalal Sameni S, Abolghasemi J, Vosoughi S. Effects of earplug hearing protectors on the intelligibility of Persian words in noisy environments. Appl Acoust. 2019;148:19–22.
25. Tufts JB, Frank T. Speech production in noise with and without hearing protection. J Acoust Soc Am. 2003;114(2):1069–80.
26. Jianxin P. Chinese speech intelligibility at different speech sound pressure levels and signal-to-noise ratios in simulated classrooms. Appl Acoust. 2010;71(4):386–90.

Figures



Figure 1

The HPDs types investigated in this study.

Table 2
The subjects' speech intelligibility with and without HPDs at S/N = + 5

HPDs types	With HPDs (%)	Without HPDs (%)	P value	Difference (%)
Earplug A1	74.13 ± 4.40	72.00 ± 2.70	0.15	2.13
Earplug A2	72.80 ± 2.10	72.00 ± 2.70	0.71	0.80
Earplug A3	72.10 ± 1.10	72.00 ± 2.70	0.70	0.10
Earmuff B1	73.87 ± 5.60	72.00 ± 2.70	0.10	1.87
Earmuff B2	72.00 ± 5.20	72.00 ± 2.70	0.41	0.00
Earmuff B3	72.00 ± 2.20	72.00 ± 2.70	0.09	0.00
Prototype earplug	75.60 ± 3.60	72.00 ± 2.70	0.65	3.60