Please cite this article in press as: Gandras K et al. Electrophysiological correlates of speaker segregation and foreground-background selection in ambiguous listening situations. Neuroscience (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2017.07.021

Neuroscience xxx (2017) xxx-xxx

Δ

1

# ELECTROPHYSIOLOGICAL CORRELATES OF SPEAKER SEGREGATION AND FOREGROUND-BACKGROUND SELECTION IN AMBIGUOUS LISTENING SITUATIONS

### KATHARINA GANDRAS.<sup>a</sup>\* SABINE GRIMM<sup>b</sup> AND 5

## ALEXANDRA BENDIXEN<sup>a,b</sup> 6

7 <sup>a</sup> Department of Psychology, Cluster of Excellence

#### 8 "Hearing4all", European Medical School, Carl von Ossietzky

9 University of Oldenburg, D-26111 Oldenburg, Germany

<sup>b</sup> Department of Physics, School of Natural Sciences, Chemnitz 10

University of Technology, D-09126 Chemnitz, Germany 11

12 Abstract-In everyday listening environments, a main task for our auditory system is to follow one out of multiple speakers talking simultaneously. The present study was designed to find electrophysiological indicators of two central processes involved - segregating the speech mixture into distinct speech sequences corresponding to the two speakers, and then attending to one of the speech sequences. We generated multistable speech stimuli that were set up to create ambiguity as to whether only one or two speakers are talking. Thereby we were able to investigate three perceptual alternatives (no segregation, segregated - speakerA in the foreground, segregated speakerB in the foreground) without any confounding stimulus changes. Participants listened to a continuously repeating sequence of syllables, which were uttered alternately by two human speakers, and indicated whether they perceived the sequence as an inseparable mixture or as originating from two separate speakers. In the latter case, they distinguished which speaker was in their attentional foreground. Our data show a long-lasting event-related potential (ERP) modulation starting at 130 ms after stimulus onset, which can be explained by the perceptual organization of the two speech sequences into attended foreground and ignored background streams. Our paradigm extends previous work with pure-tone sequences toward speech stimuli and adds the possibility to obtain neural correlates of the difficulty to segregate a speech mixture into distinct streams.

This article is part of a Special Issue entitled: Sequence Processing. © 2017 IBRO, Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Key words: auditory scene analysis, attention, perceptual multistability, sequence processing, speech, event-related potential (ERP).

13

INTRODUCTION

15 16 17

14

Disentangling two or more speakers in a complex auditory scene, such as in a busy cafeteria, poses a challenge to every listener. Our auditory system is able to make sense of such scenes by separating them into 18 meaningful perceptual streams; an ability and branch of 19 research termed auditory scene analysis (Bregman, 20 1990). To accomplish this task, target sound elements 21 need to be separated from other sound elements (segre-22 gation) by using frequency, location or other cues; and 23 they need to be bound together over time (integration) 24 to form a coherent stream, such as sentences expressed 25 by a conversational partner (Shamma et al., 2011; Snyder 26 et al., 2012). For solving the challenging problem of audi-27 tory scene analysis, it is assumed that the auditory sys-28 tem is constantly exploring the acoustic environment 29 and testing alternative ways of structuring the sensory 30 input into perceptual units (Gregory, 1980; Winkler 31 et al., 2012). This process can be captured with deliber-32 ately ambiguous sound sequences, where listeners report 33 random switches between different perceptual interpreta-34 tions (Denham and Winkler, 2006; Pressnitzer and Hupé, 35 2006). Such perceptual fluctuations despite unchanged 36 stimulus parameters constitute a case of perceptual bi-37 or multistability. Auditory multistability has most frequently 38 been studied with pure-tone (ABA-ABA-...) streaming 39 paradigms (Gutschalk et al., 2005; Pressnitzer and 40 Hupé, 2006; Denham et al., 2014). Their value lies in 41 the fact that they permit research on perception without 42 the confounding influence of differences in stimulus 43 parameters. As such, multistability has become a popular 44 research tool (cf. Pressnitzer et al., 2011). 45

Most studies on auditory multistability have focused 46 on having listeners distinguish between integrated and 47 segregated percepts (e.g., 'ABA' triplet sequences 48 versus separate sequences of 'A' and 'B' tones). A few 49 studies (e.g. Gutschalk et al., 2005) have additionally 50 included the distinction between perceptual foreground 51 and background in the segregated case (e.g., whether 52 the 'A' or the 'B' tone sequence appears in the focus of 53 attention). This distinction is important as it provides 54 methodological and conceptual links between the 55 research fields of auditory multistability (Pressnitzer 56 et al., 2011; Snyder et al., 2012) and auditory-selective 57 attention in situations with more than one sound source 58 (Fritz et al., 2007; Zion Golumbic et al., 2013; 59 Bronkhorst, 2015). 60

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2017.07.021

0306-4522/© 2017 IBRO. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author. Address: Department of Psychology, Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg, Ammerländer Heerstraße 114-118, D-26129 Oldenburg, Germany.

katharina.gandras@uni-oldenburg.de E-mail addresses: (K. Gandras), sabine.grimm@physik.tu-chemnitz.de (S. Grimm), alexandra.bendixen@physik.tu-chemnitz.de (A. Bendixen).

148

149

2

## K. Gandras et al. / Neuroscience xxx (2017) xxx-xxx

Because the foreground-background distinction is not 61 very salient in the classic 'ABA' auditory streaming 62 paradigm, Szalárdy and colleagues (2013b) developed a 63 more complex variant of this paradigm that allowed listen-64 ers to clearly differentiate between perceptual foreground 65 and background. Based on Wessel (1979), they 66 employed rising 3-tone pitch patterns ('123123123...') 67 68 with alternating timbre (creating a repeating six-tone sequence 'A1B2A3B1A2B3', with 'A' and 'B' denoting 69 the different timbres). With this stimulus, sequential inte-70 gration leads to the percept of a rising tone pattern 71 (123123), whereas sequential segregation leads to the 72 percept of a falling tone pattern with either timbre A 73 (A3A2A1...) or timbre B (B3B2B1) in the perceptual fore-74 ground. Those three perceptual options allowed Szalárdy 75 and colleagues (2013b) to investigate event-related 76 potential (ERP) correlates of sequential integration versus 77 segregation as well as of perceptual foreground-78 background formation with the same stimulus. They 79 observed an early difference between foreground and 80 background ERPs in the P1 latency range (around 81 70 ms after stimulus onset). 82

83 In the present study, we aimed to assess the 84 replicability of the findings of Szalárdy et al. (2013b) when 85 transferring the paradigm to speech signals. Finding sim-86 ilar effects for speech material would permit clearer links 87 between research on ERP correlates of multistability 88 and auditory-selective attention (e.g. O'Sullivan et al., 2015), since studies in the latter field often investigate 89 speaker selection (as opposed to the tone sequences in 90 auditory multistability). Previous research manipulating 91 statistical structure in single sound streams has demon-92 strated that material type (speech versus non-speech) 93 plays a role for segmenting a continuous stream into its 94 constituent units (e.g., a speech stream into the con-95 stituent words or syllables) (Tremblay et al., 2013). It is 96 97 thus conceivable that the decomposition of sound mix-98 tures into their sound sources is likewise affected by the type of auditory material; be it as a consequence of 99 increased stimulus familiarity for speech material or of 100 genuine domain-specific processing. Hence we designed 101 an experiment that transferred the approach of Szalárdy 102 et al. (2013b) to speech material. We developed a 103 sequence of interleaved consonant-vowel syllables 104 uttered alternately by two human speakers, making sure 105 that this sequence is able to evoke multistable perception. 106 Participants listened to the syllable sequences and contin-107 uously indicated via button presses whether they per-108 ceived the sequence as an inseparable mixture of both 109 speakers (integrated percept) or as two separate 110 streams. In the latter case, they distinguished which 111 speaker was in the attentional foreground (segregated-112 speakerA percept or segregated-speakerB percept). 113 Thus, our paradigm captures the two key features of the 114 classic cocktail party situation (Cherry, 1953), in which 115 the listener tries to recognize what one person is saying 116 (attended foreground) while others are speaking at the 117 same time (ignored background) whose voices are some-118 times difficult to tell apart from that of the conversation 119 partner (stream segregation). The perceptual organiza-120 tion alternatives are readily relatable to those at the core 121

of current selective auditory attention research (a critical 122 difference of our paradigm to classical multistable speech 123 stimuli such as those causing the verbal transformation 124 effect, cf. Warren, 1968). By combining perceptual reports 125 with electroencephalography (EEG), we aimed at identify-126 ing neural correlates of the attentional foreground and 127 background representations. A difference between the 128 ERP markers of foreground and background percept 129 should reflect only the effect of the listener's perception, 130 because the stimulus stays constant. 131

We expect to find ERP modulations that are governed 132 by the perceptual organization of the speech sequences. 133 If the ERP effects mainly reflect sound source selection as 134 observed in Szalárdy et al. (2013b), we should find that 135 the ERPs elicited by background tones differ from those 136 elicited by foreground tones. Since each integrated sylla-137 ble is part of the perceptual foreground, we hypothesize a 138 difference between the ERPs elicited during integrated 139 and segregated-background percepts, but not between 140 the ERPs elicited during integrated and segregated-141 foreground percepts (cf. Szalárdy et al., 2013b). If, in con-142 trast, the ERP effects also reflect sound source segrega-143 tion, we should find time ranges in which the ERP elicited 144 during integrated percepts differs from the ERPs in both 145 segregated percepts regardless of foreground/back-146 ground selection. 147

## EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

# Participants

Twenty-seven healthy adult volunteers (15 male) between 150 the age of 19 and 30 years (average age 23.7 ± 3.2 151 years) participated in the experiment. All participants 152 were native German speakers, right-handed, and 153 reported normal hearing as well as normal or corrected-154 to-normal vision. They had no history of neurological 155 disorder and did not take any medication acting on the 156 central nervous system. All experimental procedures 157 were approved by the ethics committee of the University 158 of Oldenburg and conducted in accordance with the 159 principles laid out in the Declaration of Helsinki (World 160 Medical Association, 2013). 161

Data of seven participants were excluded post hoc 162 due to complications with the behavioral measures or to 163 highly unbalanced perceptual reports. One participant 164 showed an inconsistent response pattern (the oral 165 description given after each block did not match the 166 actual response behavior), indicating difficulties in 167 understanding or following the instructions. Two 168 participants performed poorly (more than two standard 169 deviations below the mean performance) in the 170 (see unambiquous control conditions section 171 Experimental Procedure for details). Another four 172 participants were excluded from the EEG analysis due 173 to a strong imbalance of the proportions of the three 174 different percepts: Each of them experienced at least 175 one of the percepts of interest in less than 5% of the 176 time. While this is a valid response pattern, it implies 177 that not enough trials were available for achieving a 178 sufficient signal-to-noise ratio in the EEG analysis. 179

Please cite this article in press as: Gandras K et al. Electrophysiological correlates of speaker segregation and foreground-background selection in ambiguous listening situations. Neuroscience (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2017.07.021

Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/11017826

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/11017826

Daneshyari.com