

**THE  
JOURNAL  
OF  
SPEECH  
AND  
HEARING  
DISORDERS**

EDU  
BF205  
N7K7  
1950

*Monograph Supplement 1*

September

1950

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE AMERICAN  
SPEECH AND HEARING ASSOCIATION

OHIO STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARIES

*The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders* is published by the American Speech and Hearing Association in March, June, September, and December of each year. Volumes 1-12 appeared under the title *The Journal of Speech Disorders*.

Subscription: \$3.50 per year in U.S.A.; \$4.00 per year outside U.S.A.; \$1.00 per single copy. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office in Danville, Illinois, under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Printed by The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 19-27 North Jackson Street, Danville, Illinois.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	FOREWORD	4
	PREFACE	5
	INTRODUCTION	6
<i>Part I</i>	EFFECTS OF NOISE ON BEHAVIOR	7
<i>Part II</i>	DEAFENING EFFECTS OF NOISE	27
<i>Part III</i>	EFFECTS OF NOISE ON COMMUNICATION BY SPEECH	57
<i>Appendix</i>	BIBLIOGRAPHY ON MEASUREMENT AND REDUCTION OF NOISE	91

# THE AMERICAN SPEECH AND HEARING ASSOCIATION

## OFFICERS

President	Wendell Johnson, Ph.D., State University of Iowa
President-Elect	M. D. Steer, Ph.D., Purdue University
Vice-President	Henry M. Moser, Ph.D., Ohio State University
Vice-President-Elect	Harlan Bloomer, Ph.D., University of Michigan
Secretary-Treasurer	George A. Kopp, Ph.D., Wayne University

## COUNCIL

The Officers and the following Councilors:	
Ollic Backus, Ph.D.	Martin F. Palmer, Sc.D.
Raymond Carhart, Ph.D.	Gordon Peterson, Ph.D.
Grant Fairbanks, Ph.D.	S. Richard Silverman, Ph.D.
Margaret E. Hall, Ph.D.	Charles R. Strother, Ph.D.
Eugene T. McDonald, D.Ed.	Harold Westlake, Ph.D.
D. W. Morris, Ph.D.	

APPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

---

# THE JOURNAL OF SPEECH AND HEARING DISORDERS

## EDITOR

Grant Fairbanks, Ph.D.

## ASSISTANT TO THE EDITOR

Elaine Pagel Paden, Ph.D.

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Stanley H. Ainsworth, Ph.D. <i>Clinical and School Problems</i>	Claude E. Kantner, Ph.D. <i>Voice and Articulation Disorders</i>
Spencer F. Brown, M.D. <i>Psychological Problems</i> <i>Medical Problems</i>	Phonetics S. Richard Silverman, Ph.D. <i>Hearing Disorders</i>
E. Robert Harrington, Ph.D. <i>Organic Speech Disorders</i>	<i>Psychoacoustics</i>

## ASSISTANT EDITORS

Ernest H. Henrikson, Ph.D. <i>Book Reviews</i>	Martin F. Palmer, Sc.D. <i>Records</i>
Eugene T. McDonald, D.Ed. <i>Abstracts</i>	Miriam D. Pauls, Ph.D. <i>News and Announcements</i>

## BUSINESS MANAGER

George A. Kopp, Ph.D.

MANUSCRIPTS and related correspondence should be addressed to: Grant Fairbanks, Editor, *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 321 Illini Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

SUBSCRIPTIONS and orders for back numbers should be addressed to: George A. Kopp, Business Manager, *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, Speech Clinic, Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan.

NEWS and announcements should be addressed to: Miriam D. Pauls, The Hearing and Speech Center, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore 5, Maryland.

## NOTICE TO AUTHORS

Before submitting manuscripts for publication authors should consult Information for Contributors to the *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, *JSHD*, 1949, 14, 93-94. Prospective authors are invited to write the Editor for copies of this Note, and of its supplement, Examples of Manuscript Form.

Monograph Supplement I, 1950

*The Journal of  
Speech and Hearing  
Disorders*

## **THE EFFECTS OF NOISE ON MAN**

*Karl D. Kryter*

Human Resources  
Research Laboratories  
Bolling Air Force Base  
Washington, D. C.

This report was prepared under Contract No. N6onr-272 between Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Mo., and the Office of Naval Research.

EDU  
BF205  
N7K7  
1950

## FOREWORD

THE PUBLICATION of this *Monograph Supplement* to the *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders* is a new venture. Several years ago it became apparent that long articles could not always be accommodated satisfactorily within the *Journal* proper. A major purpose of the present monograph, for example, would not have been accomplished had it been divided and issued piecemeal over several years. To meet this situation the Executive Council of the American Speech and Hearing Association authorized the Editor and Business Manager to proceed with a series of *Monograph Supplements* as suitable manuscripts or groups of manuscripts were submitted, and as the *Journal's* financial status made their publication possible.

*The Effects of Noise on Man* is a review, summary, synthesis, evaluation, and interpretation of the experimental literature on noise as an aspect of man's environment. Its first section is concerned with effects upon behavior, particularly in regard to work output and efficiency. The second part brings together material on auditory damage as the result of noise, and defenses against such damage. The third portion considers noise as a disruptive factor in speech communication. A bibliography on methods of noise measurement and procedures for reduction is added as an appendix. The breadth of the project is indicated by the fact that more than 650 different titles are included in the chapter bibliographies and appendix.

On the subject of noise and men the author, Dr. Karl D. Kryter, is an authority at the experimental level. An experimental psychologist who has specialized in psycho-acoustics and psychophysiology, he has published approximately 20 reports of experimental investigations relating to the effects of noise upon speech communication and audition, and has also done considerable electro-physiological research on functions of the higher acoustic nerve centers in animals. Following graduate study which led to the Ph.D. degree in psychology at the University of Rochester, he was a Fellow of Harvard University, where he was associated with Psycho-Acoustic Laboratory during and immediately after World War II. From 1946 to 1948 he was Assistant Professor of Psychology at Washington University and Research Associate at the Central Institute for the Deaf. Since 1948 he has been Director of the Human Resources Research Laboratories, Headquarters Command, United States Air Force, where he has continued work upon psychological problems of human communication.

The *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders* presents this author and his work with pride. Appreciation of noise as an interferer and a producer of disorders in speech communication is widening. The interest in acoustic hygiene, especially in industrial and military circles, mounts steadily. It is appropriate to take a careful look at the fundamental experimental evidence.

Grant Fairbanks

July 1, 1950

## PREFACE

IN 1948 THE AUTHOR undertook the task of preparing for the Bureau of Ships, under a contract between the Office of Naval Research and the Central Institute for the Deaf, a report that would summarize in as succinct a form as possible the literature on the effects of noise on man. The final report was envisaged as a sort of brief 'handbook' that might be of assistance to engineers in the design and instrumentation of communication systems and work spaces subjected to intense levels of noise. Inasmuch as the 'human operator' is not, at least so it seems to the psychologist, adequately considered and often little understood by the engineer, the job of preparing such a report was eagerly undertaken. In addition, during the war years, particularly in the field of psycho-acoustics, much research had been accomplished which could be discussed and applied with benefit to the art of engineering.

The final aim of the report, however, became more general than a summarization of experiments conducted in the military and industrial situations. An attempt was made to dig as deeply as necessary into basic psychological and physiological experiments to support and elucidate the results of the 'applied' and technical research. It perhaps should be pointed out that all of the literature included in the report for discussion appears either in professional journals or in unclassified and declassified government publications. Also, the scope of the report was not confined in any way to consideration of military problems.

The report is divided into three major parts: (1) Effects of Noise on Behavior, (2) Deafening Effects of Noise, and (3) Effects of Noise on Communication by Speech. Each part of the report is followed by its own bibliography and, in addition, there is attached a bibliography concerned with 'Measurement and Reduction of Noise.' This attachment represents titles accrued during the search through related literature and is included for what it may be worth to the interested student.

The bibliographies of the report represent a joint effort of Mr. Morris C. Leikind and Mrs. Mabel H. Eller of the Navy Research Section of the Library of Congress and the author. Verification of titles and editing was done by Mrs. Eller and Mrs. Virginia Boteler of the Library's staff. Grateful acknowledgment is given to staff of the Navy Research Section of the Library of Congress; through their efforts the references are much more extensive and accurate than would have been otherwise possible.

Appreciation is also due to the many authors and journals for permission to reproduce the figures in the report. Finally, the author wishes to express his gratitude and indebtedness for the guidance and patience of Dr. Hallowell Davis of the Central Institute for the Deaf, under whose supervision this report was prepared. His knowledge of the entire subject matter, suggestions and editorship were invaluable in bringing the report into its final form.

02/6/11

## INTRODUCTION

SINCE THE ADVENT of power driven machinery, man has been beset with the obnoxious effects of noise or 'unwanted sound.' Although it had long been recognized that noise may be present in injurious amounts in some industries, the possibility that the noise on battlefields and aboard planes and warships might interfere with military efficiency directed a new interest to the question of noise control during World War II. The magnitude of the problem can be illustrated by the following example: Tests reveal that with the communication equipment used during the first years of the war, less than 30% of special test words could be correctly heard over the interphones aboard bomber planes and in engine rooms of warships because of the intense, continuous, ambient noise. Besides interfering with the understanding of speech, noise and gun blast contributed to the partial or complete destruction of the hearing of several thousands of military personnel.

In general, the effects of noise on man's health, other than hearing, and behavior have been exaggerated and what effects there are have often been misconstrued. For one thing, a line must be drawn between the effects of sharp, sudden noises or sounds and steady-state (continuous) or regularly intermittent noises. The former possess a characteristic of unexpectedness causing a fright reaction which is, of course, not unique to noise stimuli, but applies equally to sudden visual and tactile stimulation. There has been a tendency to overlook the rather innocuous effects of noise that have become a 'regular' part of one's environment, and to emphasize the drastic effects of the blast of an auto horn or an unexpected bang of a door. Although mention will be made later of the effects of sudden, unexpected sounds, the discussion will be centered on steady-state and regularly repetitious noises in that (a) they are the rule in the industrial and military environment, and (b) experimentation, particularly on work output, has been concerned with this type of noise.

Before entering the discussion, mention should first be made of the fact that it is difficult to define noise in terms of any of the physical parameters of sound waves, such as complexity of wave form or intensity. For example, both music and pure tones under certain conditions are commonly considered as noise; the most acceptable definition of noise is apparently that of 'unwanted sound.'





*Part 1*

EFFECTS OF NOISE ON BEHAVIOR

THE EFFECTS of noise on the mental and motor activity of man have been the subject of many articles and a considerable number of research projects. Industrial management has been extremely interested in the general problem since it has seemed possible that both office and factory noise might have a detrimental effect upon production and personnel efficiency; the military were concerned with the possible effects of noise upon personnel while flying an airplane for long periods, and upon speed and accuracy in aiming guns and fire-control directors; public health authorities were fearful of the consequences of the noises of daily living upon the health of the populace.

The present discussion will be confined to a survey of the effects of noise on work and other behavior that does not require auditory communication for its completion. Such activity might be termed 'non-auditory behavior.'

Viewed from a scientific aspect, a great number of publications in this field represent poorly designed experiments or unsupported opinions. There have been, of course, some outstandingly good studies. Many results that may seem insignificant are included in the following discussion for purposes of criticism and for the sake of completeness. This seems advisable because certain unreliable observations are quoted in the literature again and again without adequate comment regarding the experimental procedures employed in their attainment.

The papers will be divided, for ease of presentation, into (1) industrial field studies, (2) laboratory experiments concerned with work output and accuracy, (3) feelings of annoyance, (4) physiological reactions

to noise, (5) public health and noise, and (6) effects of extreme intensities.

#### INDUSTRIAL FIELD STUDIES

Kornhauser (40) attempted to determine whether typists working in a relatively quiet office do more work and feel less fatigued than those working in a noisy office. (It will be noted in this and many of the experiments to follow that 'noise' is described only qualitatively, making comparison of results among experiments difficult.) Record was kept of (a) two typists who spent the first two days working in a quiet office and then two days in the 'noisy' office and (b) two other typists who worked in the reverse order of noise and quiet. The results showed that wasted lineage was 23% greater in the quiet room than in the noisy room, and also that 1.5% more lines were written under the noisy conditions. Rating scales revealed that the girls felt they were working harder in the quiet than in the 'noise.' The differences between the two conditions cannot be accepted as necessarily significant, because of the small number of subjects. But the most important criticism against this study, and the one that can be leveled at nearly all the 'experiments' conducted on this problem under actual working conditions, is that there could have been many differences between the two work offices other than noise level, such as lighting, ventilation, etc., that might account for the results.

There are some reports that purport to show a deleterious effect from noise. It is claimed, for example (3, 45, 47, 52), that 'moving the assembly department of a regulator company from adjoining a noisy boiler shop to a quiet room resulted in lowering rejections at inspection from 75% to a

low figure of 7%.' The conclusion drawn was that the reduction in noise level caused the increased efficiency. Changes in lighting, temperature, facilities, etc., were again ignored as possible contributing factors. In spite of the numerous articles published on these results there are no references to the original study other than the statement that it was done by a 'Dr. Sachsenberg' in Germany (45).

*Major Field Studies.* It is apparent that 'on the job' studies of work output, fatigue and the like are made exceedingly difficult and suspect by many uncontrolled conditions. Before turning to experiments conducted in the laboratory, however, mention should be made of two studies, one British, the other American, that represent probably the best, most carefully prosecuted 'on the job' researches on this problem.

1. Weston and Adams studied in Britain the effect of noise on the work performance of weavers (99, 100). The looms in weaving sheds create a considerable din which registers 96 db (probably re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>) on a sound level meter. Weston and Adams did three experiments: (1) they had 10 weavers wear ear plugs, which reduced the intensity of the noise at the eardrum by 10 to 15 db<sup>1</sup>, on alternate weeks and recorded their output over a 26-week period, (2) they equated two groups of weavers, 10 in each group, with regard to past efficiency; then one group wore ear plugs while working for a six-month period while the second group served as a control, working without ear plugs, and (3) they repeated the

<sup>1</sup>The decibel (db) is a common unit that can be used for expressing the ratio of two amounts of sound pressure. Number of decibels =  $20 \log_{10} \frac{\text{Pressure 1}}{\text{Pressure 2}}$ .




FIGURE 1. Comparison of weekly outputs of weavers during one year. Experimental group, noise subdued by earplugs, unbroken line; control group, normal shed noise, broken line. From Weston and Adams (100), with permission of the Controller of His Britannic Majesty's Stationery Office.

second experiment, using some different subjects, but extended this experiment over a period of one year.

The results of all three experiments were roughly the same—about a 12% average increase in efficiency for those who wore ear plugs with respect to those who did not. The gain amounted to a 1% increase in the amount of material produced. The results of the first experiment were considered suspect by Weston and Adams, however, because of a difference in humidity between the weeks worked with ear plugs and the weeks when ear plugs were not worn.

Figure 1 shows the results of the third experiment. It is to be noted that towards the end of the year the experimental and the control groups were coming closer together with regard to work output. This suggests that an initial difference in motivation between the two groups might have helped make the experimental group superior and the control group inferior. But as the experiment wore on, it might be surmised, the added motivation or interest from being a

subject began to wane, bringing the control and experimental groups closer together with regard to the work output. Indeed, the subjective reports of some of the subjects indicate an approval of experiments and attempts to help the worker. It is well known that such attitudes alone can result in significant changes in work output, in the presence of noise (6). Another critical point has been made by Berrien (11) who noted that the equality of the control and the experimental groups in the first and second experiments was never demonstrated.

It is possible that in spite of these shortcomings in experimental procedures the results are correct, but they must be accepted with reservations.

2. The major American field study was conducted by the Aetna Life Insurance Company in its own offices. Apparently it has never been published in its entirety, although sample results have appeared several places (47, 52, 101). Semi-monthly bonus figure records for typists, clerical checkers, punchcard and comptometer operators were compared for a year prior to, and a year after sound absorbing material was installed in all offices. As a result of the 'quieting,' calculating machine operators' errors were reduced 52%, typists' errors 29%, health improved 37.5%, and employee turnover was reduced 47%. A truly remarkable achievement for absorbent wall board! The sound level was reported as about 41 db<sup>2</sup> prior to the sound treatment and 35 db after.

<sup>2</sup>In the Aetna and many other studies herein presented, the reference for db expressions of noise levels is not given. In most cases it appears likely that the reference level is probably .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>, although in the Aetna study this would make the noise levels unusually low for an office. In this monograph the reference level is given whenever it was reported.

In view of other studies, these claims are fantastic when accredited, as they are, to 'adjustment of the noise factor alone.' Because of a paucity of relevant facts, it is difficult to criticize the study, but one obvious factor undoubtedly contributing to the differences between the variables recorded was the lapse of time. Two years elapsed in which the workers may have improved their efficiency through learning; the ill and non-adept may have changed jobs, etc. One control check was made a year later which should, by itself, provide ample data for negating the conclusion concerning the effects of noise. For this check the sound-absorbing walls were covered with gypsum board, thereby raising the sound level by 6 db. The bonus efficiency dropped to some extent (not as low as the first year), but within two months was as high as the level of the 'quiet' year!

*General Conclusions from Field Studies.* The evidence, then, from industrial surveys and tests does not convincingly show that the noise encountered in these industries and offices has any detrimental or beneficial effect upon non-auditory tasks performed by man. In none of the studies is evidence presented that workers complained of the noise although there were expressions of approval when 'quiet' was accomplished.

Any tasks involving communication, talking and listening, however, will be interfered with by noise. In this case, noise could be expected to arouse resentment and feelings of annoyance, as well as cause inefficiency. As far as the present author knows, no study involving psycho-motor 'work' in which the variable of communication was studied or held constant has been reported. Speech com-

munication did not appear to play a significant role in any of the jobs involved in the papers discussed thus far, although some of the work in the Aetna study may have required some communication.

#### LABORATORY EXPERIMENTS CONCERNED WITH WORK OUTPUT AND ACCURACY

Scientists, in attempts to determine the role of noise in non-auditory behavior, have found it necessary to study its effects in the laboratory in order to avoid the mass of other contributing conditions present in the factory or office. It is readily accepted that 'real life' conditions are not met in the laboratory, but if the effects of noise are not demonstrable in the laboratory it is safe to say that startling effects attributed to noise in industry are the result of a combination of other factors.

The results of the laboratory studies are more readily interpreted than 'field' investigations, but unfortunately even here there are some experiments that are equivocal.

*Effects of Distraction by Noise on Reaction Time.* Most of the early studies on the effects of noise dealt with effects on reaction time (17, 28, 89). Fairly representative of these early studies is one by Cassel and Dallenbach (16), who studied the effect of auditory distraction upon reaction time to various visual stimuli. For 'noise' they employed a sound hammer striking an anvil near the subject. Noise was presented (a) continuously during both reaction and rest periods for some tests; (b) continuously, but only during the reaction periods for another series; and (c) intermittently, but only during the reactions proper for a third set of tests. Cassel and Dallenbach summarize their results as follows:

(1) The effect of distraction upon the sensory reaction is equivocal. The distractor may inhibit and lengthen the reaction; it may facilitate and shorten the reaction; or it may become habitual and have no effect at all.

(2) The effect of the distraction is dependent (a) upon the temporal relations of the distractor, and (b) upon the conscious attitude of the observer during the distraction.

(3) The distractor most resistant to habituation is the intermittent; the least resistant is the continuous.

*Effects of Distraction by Noise on Learning.* Morgan (64, 65) published in 1916 and 1917 the results of experiments on the effects of distraction by sound on learning. He had subjects learn paired associates consisting of three-letter words and digits in quiet and also when a buzzer and a fire gong were intermittently sounded. The noise interfered slightly with learning, more at the beginning of the experiment than near the end. He also found that in the noise the subjects exerted more muscular effort in manipulating the experimental apparatus and breathed harder than they did in the quiet. Morgan concludes that (1) there is some adaptation to the noise and (2) increased tension and effort can compensate for the effects of the distracting noise so that work output may not be lowered or may even be increased.

*Effect of Distraction by Noise on Intelligence-Test Scores.* Tinker (90) and Hovey (35) administered intelligence tests under noisy (intermittent bell) and quiet conditions to large groups of subjects. The noise had no detrimental effect, as revealed in test scores, although in Hovey's experiment the noise had some, but not a statistically significant, deleterious effect (81).

*Effects of Noise on Mental and Muscular Work.* Since it appeared that distraction, due to repeated applications of noise in terms of its effects on reaction time, simple learning problems and intelligence-test scores, was negligible, investigators turned to measuring work output on various mental and muscular tasks on the assumption that noise, if it did not disrupt activity by being distractive, required a greater expenditure of effort that would lead to fatigue and reduced efficiency. The results of these studies appear to be contradictory; a number demonstrated reduced efficiency because of noise, while others proved that noise does not reduce efficiency and may even increase it.

1. Studies Showing a Deleterious Effect. a. Laird (45) attempted to measure the oxygen consumption of typists when working in a room with hard surfaced walls and, then, when the walls were covered with a sound absorbing material. Noises generated by ball bearings rotating in a sheet iron, hexagonal drum, a siren, and a telephone bell all operating intermittently and automatically, were present throughout the tests. Laird found a 4.3% increase in speed when sound absorbing material was applied to the walls; error scores remained the same. 19% more oxygen was consumed (the subjects breathed through a metabolism-measuring device during all the tests) when the walls were bare than when covered with sound-absorbing material. No statistics are presented whereby the increased speed can be tested for significance and only four subjects were used. Laird concludes that because of the increased effort on the part of the subjects when in the reverberant room, the effect of the noise was less detrimental than expected, and greater

fatigue must be the result if workers keep up production in noise.

Harmon (29) criticizes Laird's metabolism data, pointing out the lack of proper controls and of an adjustment period to the metabolism machine. He considers Laird's study as 'suggestive, and little more.'

b. Hsiao (36) reports that 'noise' caused a 5.6% decrease in speed, and an increase of 26.6% in wrong answers in the multiplication of numbers for a 10-minute period by grade school students. The noise tests were conducted first, however, followed eight days later by tests in the quiet. It is possible that practice effects alone could account for the finding. The length of test was also very short.

c. Luckiesh (55) obtained a statistically significant increase in time required (.82 vs .77 minutes) to take the General Electric 'Demonstration Visual Test' in a noisy generator room in a factory over a quiet room. The work was done in a booth, in both situations, with the level of illumination controlled.

d. Laird (49) set up an 'experimental factory' employing two workers at a time. The workers inserted an electrical stylus in small holes as they appeared in a moving tape and record was kept of work done. The workers, all college students, were paid 40c an hour and worked four and one half hours each afternoon. Noise from a 3-A Western Electric Audiometer was amplified and presented to the workers by loud speakers at a number of intensity levels. Each of four workers worked for three months. No individual results or daily records are presented, but we are told that records for 'humid days, hot days or days when one of the subjects felt indisposed are also not included.'




FIGURE 2. Production output at dexterous repetitive work under various intensity levels of complex noise. From Laird (49), with permission of the author, the American Psychological Association and the *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Figure 2 is taken from Laird's report of this experiment. Two things are apparent: (1) in loud noise production increases with time, suggesting a daily adaptation; Laird (46) previously held that fatigue from noise should lower work output, (2) the more intense the noise, the greater the initial decrease in production. Laird states that as a precaution against the subjects not being used to the noise, the data for the louder noises were obtained last in the course of the experiment. This experimental procedure vitiates the experiment, for it is well known that the motivation of subjects can well decrease from the beginning of a three-month experiment to the end, thereby accounting for the apparent decrease in production with more intense noises.

2. Studies Showing no Deleterious Effect. a. Vernon and Warner (94) found an increase in speed in doing arithmetic problems when noise (gramophone records, bells, whistles, sirens) was introduced after a brief period of adaptation. They also meas-

ured oxygen consumption and found little or no increase in consumption when doing arithmetic problems or reading.

b. Harmon (29) conducted a study (see Figure 3) of the effects of noise (phonograph record of office and street noise played at 50 to 65 db and 65 to 75 db respectively) on arithmetic computation. Full and careful measures were made of changes in metabolism. He found that the increases in the working values caused by the noises may run as high as 60% during the first days of an experiment, but that when the subject is presented with the same situation day after day, over a period of several weeks, the noise effects gradually disappear and the working values return to normal. It was determined that when a person




FIGURE 3. Output of one subject in number of multiplication problems done and per cent correct during quiet and noise conditions. Quiet periods, broken lines; noise periods, solid lines. Series A, quiet and noise conditions present on alternate days; Series B, 10-minute work period in quiet, followed by 10-minute work period in noise (office) on each day; Series C, same as B, except street noise; Series D, same as B, except different subject. From Harmon (29), with permission of the author, the American Psychological Association, and the *Archives of Psychology*.

became adjusted to a noise level and method of presentation, any change required a brief period of adaptation.

c. A similar result was obtained by Ford (25) who found there was an initial slowing up of the speed per problem at the beginning of the noise and again when quiet was restored. In this experiment subjects added sums under quiet, under noise, and again under quiet conditions.

d. Obata et al (68) studied the effects of a 'scratching' or grinding noise from a mechanical noise machine and also various types and intensities of music on the efficiency of 24 high school students taking cancellation, addition and transcription tests. 'Mere noise' they found had little effect on efficiency in the tasks studied.

e. A series of well-conducted experiments on the effect of noise were reported by Pollock and Bartlett (72) in 1932. They chose for investigation a number of tests of motor skill, one of which required the subjects to insert in or remove from a rapidly moving platform a small peg when the platform was in a certain position, and a number of 'mental' tasks, such as making as many words as possible from a given group of letters. A number of types of noises were employed, including the sound of 12 heavy printing presses, gramophone records, clicks presented through earphones, bells, etc.

Proper experimental precautions with regard to sequence of testing in quiet and noise appear to have been observed and adequate numbers of subjects employed. Besides many quantitative measures of performance, subjective impressions of the effects of noise were obtained from the subjects. The conclusions may be summarized as follows:

(1) In general, noise has an adverse initial effect of no great magnitude which rapidly wears off, whether the task be chiefly mental or motor in character.

(2) Discontinuous loud mechanical noises, and 'soft' gramophone records of music were more disturbing than continuous loud noises, indicating that the disturbance was not simply a matter of loudness.

(3) Subjective reports indicated that a sound could be extremely irritating without lessening the efficiency of performance. Some sounds rated as the most annoying were not also rated as the most distracting.

f. Tests conducted with 'military' noises on psycho-motor efficiency were conducted early in World War II by S. S. Stevens and associates (87, 88). For these tests simulated aircraft noise was generated in a test chamber and its spectra and over-all intensity were measured. Two noise levels were used, (a) 'quiet' level (90 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>) that was loud enough to mask casual extraneous laboratory sounds and to discourage conversation among the subjects, and (b) a 'noise' level (115 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>) that corresponds to about the noise level in the cabin of a typical bombing plane. Five subjects were in the noise continuously for seven-hour periods, for four consecutive days a week, during the major experiments which extended over four consecutive weeks. The 'quiet' and 'noise' conditions and sequence of tests were properly balanced and controlled. It is to be noted that the 'quiet' condition was noisier than the 'noise' condition for most of the other experiments presented. This may, or may not, have been a significant factor determining the results.



In a recent NDRC Summary Technical Report, this work was reviewed by Miller, Weiner and Stevens (see 130, Part III, this report). They divided the tests into those that gave inconclusive results and those that showed no effect from the noise. The following tests were inconclusive:

(1) Coordinate Serial Reaction-Time. Here the subject manipulated an airplane stick and rudder bar to direct a beam of light at a target following a definite path on a large panel. Each of the subjects made 20,400 reactions in noise and 'quiet.' The reaction in noise was slower by 5.4% and the number of errors was greater by 5.4%. Examination of this test following the completion of the experiment, however, revealed that the subjects when working in the 'quiet' could have made use of certain 'clicks' of timing relays in the apparatus that were not audible in the noise. The experimenters believe, although it was not further tested, that these acoustic clues in the quiet biased the results of this test, particularly since other similar tests showed no effects due to noise. At the time the first report of these findings was made, these extra clues had not been recognized by the experimenters (87).

(2) Muscular Tension. This was measured by recording electric potentials from arms and legs of subjects. Although there was some evidence of increased tension in the noise, the records were difficult to interpret because of gross muscular movements that created artifacts in the recordings.

(3) Metabolism. Brief measurements repeated several times during the day indicated that for some subjects there was an increase in metabolic rate in the louder noise, while

in other subjects no consistent effects could be noted.

(4) Breathing. Noise caused some, but not all, subjects to breathe more rapidly and less deeply.

(5) Speed of Accommodation. The speed with which the eye can change focus from a near to a distant object and vice versa was reduced by long exposure to noise, but individual differences prevented any generalizations.

(6) Saccadic Eye Movements. The speed with which the eyes could be moved through an angle of 37 degrees was reduced by the noise for one, but only one, of four subjects.

(7) Body sway. The ability of subjects to stand erect without swaying was measured by an ataxiometer. No particular relationship between steadiness and noise was discovered.

(8) Hand Steadiness. The subjects were periodically required to hold a small stylus in the center of a small (3 mm) hole without touching the walls. The noise resulted in a slight increase in steadiness, apparently by 'insulating' the subject from any distractions in his environment.

(9) Reversible Perspective. The subjects were asked to fixate a reversible figure and to press a key at the occurrence of each voluntary reversal. Any relationship between this visual phenomenon and noise was obstructed by variability.

(10) Dark Adaptation. No conclusive effects of noise on the threshold of visual illumination were obtained.

The following tests are not inconclusive like the ones mentioned above, but are positive in their proof that man *can* maintain the *same* levels of performance for these seven tasks in the noise as in the 'quiet.'

(1) Coordinated Serial Pursuit. In this task the subject was required to adjust, by means of airplane controls, the position of the spot on a cathode-ray oscilloscope and the position of a pointer on a direction meter. Graphic records were kept of each of the three dimensions of movement. The performance of the subjects was unimpaired by the noise.

(2) Serial Disjunctive Reaction Time. The ability of the subjects to press a key with the appropriate hand or foot, depending on which of four lights was illuminated in front of him, was absolutely unimpaired by the noise. Each subject made 24,480 reactions in noise and the same number in 'quiet.'

(3) Fast-Speed Pursuit Rotor. Here the subject was required to follow with a stylus a small disk near the edge of a phonograph turn table revolving 99 rpm. The noise had no effect.

(4) Card Sorting. The ability and speed of sorting 12 kinds of cards into 12 compartments was maintained in noise as well as in 'quiet.'

(5) Coding Test. The subjects translated written material into code as rapidly in noise as in the 'quiet.'

(6) Judgment of Distance. Monocular judgments of distance, measured by the ability of the subjects to adjust the distance of a movable wire to match the distance of a comparison wire, were unaffected by the noise.

(7) Subjective Experiences. The subjects filled out daily questionnaires regarding their feelings and uniformly expressed preference for the 'quiet' days. There was an inconsistent tendency to report greater feelings of fatigue at the end of the experiments in noise than in 'quiet.'

It was concluded from this review that airplane noise has no, or at the worst, but slight detrimental effect upon motor coordination, reaction time, sensory perceptions, and certain mental functions even after exposures lasting seven hours. Nevertheless, all the subjects expressed a preference for the quiet over the noise conditions and tended to report subjective feelings of greater fatigue and irritability after being subjected to the noise.

g. Another experiment which was conducted with respect to the military situation dealt with effects of loud sounds on the accuracy of azimuth tracking and stereoscopic range finding with a gun-fire control device (91). In this experiment, operators were subjected to phonographically recorded sounds, such as air-raid sirens, exploding bombs, and airplanes. The results were summarized in one report (91) as follows:

Experiments at Tufts College and Brown University reveal that loud sounds (up to 120-130 db) do not produce a decrement in quality in either azimuth tracking or in stereoscopic range finding, within the limits of this experiment. This includes the condition where loud sounds had not been previously experienced and its onset unexpected. Indeed, in the case of azimuth tracking, the introduction of a loud sound, after a four-hour tracking period, resulted in improved performance which lasts for the duration of the sound. Return to the previous level of performance is rapid. Observers report that the sound produced muscular tension, but, nevertheless, was a relief from the monotony and an aid in staying awake.

h. A study was conducted for the Navy by the Research Laboratory of the American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers to determine the accuracy and variability of work output of men working in hot spaces with different noise levels (95). It

was found that noise had no effect on work accuracy or output, but that noise above 80 and 90 db resulted in feelings of irritability and unpleasantness on the part of the workers.

*General Conclusions from Laboratory Tests.* The experiments on the effects of noise on mental and motor activity conducted under laboratory conditions can be grouped into three categories:

1. Experiments demonstrating definite deleterious effects of noise. Nearly all, if not all, of these studies can be heavily criticized on one or more points so that their findings can be accepted only with considerable reservations.

2. Experiments demonstrating slight, inconsistent, or inconclusive detrimental effects from noise.

3. Experiments that demonstrate conclusively that man can do muscular and mental work as efficiently and productively in noise as in quiet, even for prolonged periods. For some few tasks, noise apparently improves performance. These findings are explained as follows:

- a. Difficult tasks. The subjects concentrate on the task and ignore noise. For some tasks, such as aiming a gun, apparently noise permits a greater concentration of attention than is achieved in average quiet conditions.

- b. Easy tasks. Noise does not disturb performance since the task becomes automatized.

- c. Voluntary compensation. Subjects work harder because of the noise.

- d. Involuntary compensation. Adaptation sets in with continued exposure to a noise so that the noise becomes a part of one's environment. Adaptation to the acoustic environment is possibly a very real reaction that reduces regular or continuous

noises that do not reach the thresholds of feeling or pain to a subjective status that precludes their interference with non-auditory activity. One thinks of the way man adapts to changes in light level without interference with psycho-motor activity, and of the story of the lighthouse keeper who gave a startled cry, 'What in the world is that noise?' when the fog horn which he had heard sounding every 30 seconds for 10 years suddenly ceased bleating.

It is to be understood, of course, that these conclusions apply only within the limits of the kinds of noises and tasks employed in the experiments discussed.

#### FEELINGS OF ANNOYANCE

Mention has been made previously of efforts to secure from the subjects of noise experiments their subjective impressions of the effects of noise and their attitudes towards it.

The annoying value of various noises appears to vary with a number of aspects of the noise. A few of the more obvious are:

1. Unexpectedness. Unexpected noise can elicit certain startle or fright reactions. These will be discussed in a later section.

2. Interference with Auditory Behavior. There have been no systematic investigations of annoyance due to masking.

3. Inappropriateness. The cracking of peanut shells at a concert, music when one is trying to concentrate, etc., are examples. Individual differences and variability make it probably impossible to order sounds or noises on this characteristic with respect to their annoyingness.

4. Intermittency. Cassel and Dallbach (16) found that an intermit-

tent noise resisted habituation more than a continuous sound. Also, Pollock and Bartlett (72) found that irregular mechanical noises were always initially displeasing. They found no particular consistent relationship, however, between work output and subjective feelings of irritation due to noise.

5. Reverberation. Sabine and Wilson (76) report that the 'spreading' or lack of localization of noise contributes to its annoying quality.

6. Intensity or Loudness. Other things being equal the more intense a given noise, the more annoying it is. (50, 74). The intensity threshold at which any sound becomes annoying, however, has not as yet been determined. Half of the workers in Weston and Adams study (99) reported a complete indifference to the noise which measured 96 db. Stevens et al (88) report subjective feelings of irritability in subjects working in 115 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> of airplane noise. The same subjects apparently did not report disagreeable effects when they worked in only 90 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> of airplane noise. Seven out of 10 subjects reported greater than normal feelings of irritability after serving in an experiment requiring them to spend 20 hours over a six-week period in 120 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> of turbo-jet engine noise (70). It was found in another study (23) that noises above 80 and 90 db resulted in feelings of unpleasantness on the part of some of the subjects.

7. Frequency pattern. There have been several studies in which sounds of differing spectra were compared with regard to their annoyance. In most of these researches, two sounds were adjusted to equal subjective an-

noyance and their loudnesses or intensities were then compared.

Laird and Coye (50) had subjects adjust the intensity of a number of pure tones until each appeared to be equally annoying as a standard tone of 256 cps. They found that the higher frequencies tended to be more annoying than the 256 cps tone when of supposedly equal loudness.

Reese and Kryter (74) found essentially the same effect when using bands of noise. In this experiment, the bands of noise were equated first for equal loudness with respect to a 'standard' band of noise extending from 1900 to 2450 cps and secondly for annoyance. The results shown in Figure 4 reveal that annoyance is a characteristic of sound that is discriminable from loudness. There is some evidence, however, that subjects become adapted to this characteristic with prolonged testing so that the annoyance and loudness contours become less separated (44).

It was found that the reduction of high-frequency components of noise by acoustic treatment of a bomber reduced the annoyance to such an extent that the noise in the treated bomber could be 10 db more intense than the noise in the untreated bomber before they were considered as equally annoying (88).

Parkinson and Jack (69) report that a variety of actual experiences in acoustic engineering indicate that high-frequency noise requires special attention all out of proportion to its relative intensity.

Perhaps related to the relationship between frequency pattern and annoyance is the fact that high frequencies tend to be more damaging to the ear than low frequencies.




FIGURE 4. Equal annoyance contours for bands of noise 250 Mels wide; Band no. 7 taken as standard. 5 subjects. From Kryter (44).

PHYSIOLOGICAL REACTIONS TO NOISE

Brief mention has been made previously of the effects of noise on metabolism. The weight of the evidence appears to indicate an initial rise in metabolic rate because of noise, but with continued exposure there is a re-

turn to normal. The apparent difficulty of measuring metabolism precludes any determination of small differences or changes in metabolic rate.

*Internal Changes.* Davis (21) reports an increase in muscle tension and a decrease in the resistance of the

skin to an electric current in the presence of noise. Both return to normal with continued repetitions of noise. Stevens (87) found an inconclusive but slight tendency for muscle tension to be greater in noise than in the quiet. Morgan (65) also found greater muscular tension in his subjects in intermittent noise than in the quiet.

Smith and Laird (82) found a decrease in peristaltic contractions and in the flow of saliva and gastric juices following sudden unexpected noises of 80 and 90 db. Apparently, only two 10-minute periods of noise were presented to each subject so that adaptation to the noise could not have been achieved.

Kennedy (38) describes an experiment in which a tambour was placed over skull defects of operated patients and variations of intra-cranial pressure were graphed. A sharp loud report produced a decided rise in intra-cranial pressure. There is ample evidence (51, 54) that a sharp report will cause a general rise in blood pressure.

Many of the above responses can be classed as startle responses to an unexpected or disturbing stimulus. It is to be noted that in those experiments in which the noise became expected, the internal physiological changes returned to normal.

In a recent study, Finkle and Poppen (23) exposed 10 men for one-hour periods for 10 days followed by two-hour periods for five days to noise of about 120 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>. The noise was generated by a turbo-jet engine. Numerous physiological measures indicated complete adaptation, for the investigators found that the subjects were normal before, during and after daily exposure to the engine noise in respect to (a) pulse rate, (b) respiratory rate, (c) blood pres-

sure, (d) basal metabolism, (e) visual acuity, (f) electrocardiograph, (g) electroencephalograph, (h) urinary tests, (i) kidney function tests, (j) sedimentation rates, (k) bleeding and clotting times, (l) icteric indices, and (m) x-rays of chest and abdomen.

*Effects on Vision.* Of a somewhat different order are some effects of noise or sound upon certain visual functions, such as flicker (42), colour sensibility (1, 43), accommodation and eye movements (87). These effects appear to be so small as to go unnoticed unless measured by extremely accurate methods in the laboratory and the effects may be either inhibitory or excitatory, depending upon the particular function studied and the intensity of the noise.

It is possible that noise may also exert some slight effects upon senses other than vision.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH AND NOISE

No attempt was made to examine the popular literature on the effects of noise on public health, but a discouraging number of opinions and unwarranted statements on this subject were found in the medical journals. Statements are made that noise is ruining the public health (5), that it is filling our mental institutions (56), and that since the onset of the industrial revolution, it has caused a steady decline in the birth rate (71).

Most of these conclusions are based on generalization and extrapolations from experiments based on short exposures to noises that did not allow adaptation. Adaptation to noises is not recognized in these theories or it is proposed that adaptation to noise is costly. Kennedy (38) states, for example, that persons adapted to noise do not realize that 'energy and virtue

[sic] is going out from them, that fatigue is on the way, and that toleration takes its toll.'

Most of the evidence, however, reveals that once adaptation to noise is achieved energy is not expended at a rate significantly greater than normal.

Except as the more or less continuous noises of the factory, office, home and street may damage the ear of man, there is but little evidence of any damage or interference of a physiological sort by such noises, although subjective feelings of annoyance are expressed by some of the people exposed.

#### EFFECTS OF EXTREME INTENSITIES

Up to this point, this study has been concerned with noises and sounds encountered in industries, in the planes and other vehicles of World War II and with approximations of them as generated in the laboratories. These noises extended up to about 120 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>. Apparently, man can completely or nearly completely adapt, both voluntarily and involuntarily, to these noises as they continue so that they have little objective effect on his non-auditory behavior. Sounds above that level, however, have certain consequences that are not observable at lower levels. For one thing, the thresholds of feeling, tickle and, perhaps, pain are reached, and these sensations adapt only to the degree that with continued stimulation at high intensities these thresholds will rise 5 to 10 db.

Sound levels as high as 150 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> have been measured near the exhaust of a turbo-jet aircraft engine (70). (The sound levels inside the cockpit of a turbo-jet plane are considerably less, reaching only about 115 db.)

Parrack, Eldredge and Koster (70) recently reported the effects on man of turbo-jet engine noise and siren-generated sounds of the order of 150 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>. These effects can be summarized as follows:

(1) Severe but temporary hearing loss.

(2) Heating of the skin. (When rats and guinea pigs were exposed for sufficient lengths of time they died because of increased body temperature.)

(3) At frequencies between 700 and 1500 cps, from the siren or in the presence of the turbo-jet engine, there is a sensation of vibration of the cranial bones, and air movement in the nasal passages and sinuses. Vision becomes blurred, apparently due to vibration of the eyeballs.

(4) An apparent weakening of the body supporting musculature. This is apparently not the result of a true muscular weakness but results from an effect on the proprioceptive reflex mechanism, since with conscious effort one can maintain normal posture.

The investigators suggest that these effects, which have usually been attributed to the action of 'ultrasonic' frequencies present near the turbo-jet engine, are really the result of the extremely intense sound in the audible range.

Finkle and Poppen (23) observed the effects in 10 men of the exposure to the noise near a turbo-jet engine. The noise at the positions taken by the subjects reached as high as 120 db, which was not nearly as intense as that generated in the experiments of Parrack, Eldredge and Koster.

#### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

A survey of the literature pertaining to the effects of noise on mental and

motor work in industry and in the laboratory situation and to related studies concerning annoyance and physiological reactions to noise has been made. This survey shows that nearly all industrial and laboratory experiments which report that noise adversely affects work output are open to criticism because of poor experimentation and uncontrolled factors. (By 'work' is meant any mental and motor tasks not involving communication by speech.) On the other hand, experiments carried out with proper control of all pertinent factors reveal that steady or expected noises do not adversely affect psycho-motor activity to any significant extent. As a matter of fact, there is some evidence that noise may 'insulate' a person from intermittent distractions in his environment so that on some tasks, such as aiming a gun, performance is better in noise than in quiet.

The general ineffectiveness of noise on work output and on psycho-motor performance can be largely explained by a psychological and physiological adaptation and perhaps by an increase in effort on the part of the subjects. About 50% of subjects exposed for long periods to intense, and particularly to high-frequency noise, feel that exposure to such noise makes them more irritable than normal. Some comfort is gained by preventing steady noises from exceeding 90 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> at the position of the listener. Most persons exposed to intense noise as high as 120 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> as a matter of course in their work apparently become indifferent to it. Mention is made of certain definite effects of noise when its level is as high as 150 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>.

Although steady-state noises appear to have little real effect on work out-

put, it will have an adverse effect upon communication by speech or other auditory signals, and it has been experimentally demonstrated that the 'annoyance value' of a noise is related to its spectrum. Noises containing the higher frequencies of sound are more annoying than those of predominately low frequencies.

Probably most of the experiments conducted on this problem did not reflect the full impact of noise on the performance of the office and industrial worker in that the studies were primarily confined to non-auditory work not involving communication, whereas communication is required in most occupations. Thus, noise absorption and reduction should lead to greater efficiency and comfort of the office and industrial worker, although most of the experimental results so far have been negative or inconclusive.

#### REFERENCES

1. ALLEN, F. AND SCHWARTZ, M. The effect of stimulation of the senses of vision, hearing, taste, and smell upon the sensibility of the organs of vision. *J. gen. Physiol.*, 1940, 24, 105-121.
2. [Anon.] Effect of noise upon efficiency. *Mon. Labor Rev.*, 1930, 30, 1199-1208.
3. [Anon.] Increased production resulting from lessening noise. *Mon. Labor Rev.*, 1928, 27, 249-250.
4. [Anon.] Production helped by quieting shop. *Industr. Psychol.*, 1928, 3, 323.
5. ARCHAMBAULT, I. The effect of noise on the nervous system. A plea for official action by this society toward abatement of this damaging nuisance. *N. Y. St. J. Med.*, 1932, 32, 1110-1115.
6. BAKER, K. H. Pre-experimental set in distraction experiments. *J. gen. Psychol.*, 1937, 16, 471-488.
7. BANDEIRA DE MELLO, J. Sounds, noises, and vibration from point of view of industrial hygiene. *Hor. med. Rio de Janeiro*, 1945, 16, 25-30.
8. BASU, N. M. The baneful effects of noise on human beings. *Science and Culture, Calcutta*, 1939, 5, 155-158.



9. BENJAMINS, C. E. AND MOREAUX, R. Disagreeable vestibular reflexes by sonorous excitation. *Oto-rhino-laryng. int.*, 1939, 23, 541-550.
10. BERGUIS, R. Distraction from work through noise and music and its typological relationships. *Z. Arbeitsphysiol.*, 1939, 12, 88-114.
11. BERRIEN, F. K. The effects of noise. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1946, 12, 141-161.
12. BOAS, E. P. AND WEISS, M. M. The heart rate during sleep as determined by the cardi tachometer. *J. Amer. med. Ass.*, 1929, 92, 2162-2168.
13. BOGOSLOVSKY, A. I. The effect of sound upon the electric sensitivity of the eye. *Bull. Biol. Med. exp. U.R.S.S.*, 1937, 3, 307-309.
14. BOGOSLOVSKY, A. I. AND KRAVKOV, S. V. The influence of noise of an aircraft engine upon vision. *Probl. fiziol. Optik.*, 1941, 1, 69-75.
15. [Brown Univ.] The effects of loud sounds on the accuracy of azimuth tracking and of stereoscopic range finding. Nov. 27, 1942. OSRD Rept. no. 1001.
16. CASSEL, E. E. AND DALLENBACH, K. M. The effect of auditory distraction upon the sensory reaction. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1918, 29, 129-143.
17. CATTELL, J. McK. Psychometric measurements. *Philos. Stud.*, 1886, 3, 305-335.
18. CONKLIN, V. AND DIMMICK, F. L. An experimental study of fear. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1925, 36, 96-101.
19. CONNOLLY, J. I. Public health engineering: The air we breathe and the sounds we hear. *Amer. J. publ. Hlth.*, 1934, 24, 260-265.
20. DAVIS, A. H. Some aspects of the problem of noise. *Occup. Psychol., Lond.*, 1938, 12, 43-55.
21. DAVIS, R. C. Electrical skin resistance before, during, and after a period of noise stimulation. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1932, 15, 108-117.
22. DORMAN, P. Annoying noise of our offices. *Northw. Med., Seattle*, 1932, 31, 317-321.
23. FINKLE, A. L. AND POPPEN, J. R. Clinical effects of noise and mechanical vibrations of a turbo-jet engine on man. *J. appl. Physiol.*, 1948, 1, 183-204.
24. FLAIZ, J. W. AND WOLF, E. G. The effect of noise on aviation personnel. *Contact, Pensacola*, 1943, 3, 160-167.
25. FORD, A. Attention-automatization: an investigation of the transitional nature of mind. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1929, 41, 1-32.
26. GLIBERT, D. J. Influence of industrial noises. *J. industr. Hyg.*, 1922, 3, 264-275.
27. GOLDBERG, J. A. Noise — enemy of health. *Safety Engng.*, 1945, 89, 63-64.
28. HAMLIN, A. J. Attention and distraction. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1896, 8, 3-66.
29. HARMON, F. L. The effects of noise upon certain psychological physiological processes. *Arch. Psychol., N. Y.*, 1933, No. 147, 1-81.
30. HARTLEY, E. L. Battle noise equipment and screening of fleet groups, preliminary tabulations. [Brown Univ.] July 28, 1944. PB no. 12054.
31. HARTLEY, E. L. AND JONES, D. B. Final summary of research on the use of battle noise equipment. Brown Univ. Apr. 12, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 4931.
32. HARTMANN, G. W. II. Changes in visual acuity through simultaneous stimulation of other sense organs. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1933, 16, 393-407.
33. HIRATSUKA, S. Psychological experiments on the effect of unpleasant noise upon mental work in neurasthenic patients. *Psychiat. et Neurol. Japon.*, 1938, 42, 270-291.
34. HORDER, [T. J.] Human reactions to noise. *J. R. sanit. Inst.*, 1938, 58, 713-721.
35. HOVEY, H. B. Effects of general distraction on the higher thought processes. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1928, 40, 585-591.
36. HSIAO, C. H. An experimental study of the influence of noise upon work. *Chiao yü tsa chih [The Educational Review]*, 1937, 27, 99-102.
37. HUZIMOTO, K. AND UENO, Y. How far sensory function participates in operations. Part I. Influence of sounds upon visual acuity. Part II. Influence upon working efficiency of the presence or absence of typing sounds in the transmission of sounds. Part III. Discussion of changes in working movements and attitude. *Rept. Jap. Inst. Sci. Labor*, 1939, No. 44, 1-23.

38. KENNEDY, F. Fatigue and noise in industry. *N. Y. St. J. Med.*, 1936, 36, 1927-1933.
39. KING, W. G. AND LAIRD, D. A. The effect of noise intensity and pattern on locating sounds. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1930, 2, 99-102.
40. KORNHAUSER, A. W. The effect of noise on office output. *Industr. Psychol.*, 1927, 2, 621-622.
41. KRAVCOV, S. V. Changes of visual acuity in one eye under the influence of the illumination of the other or of acoustic stimuli. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1934, 17, 805-812.
42. ———. Action of auditory stimuli upon the critical frequency of luminous flickering. *Acta ophthol., Kbh.*, 1935, 13, 260-272.
43. ———. The influence of sound upon the light and colour sensibility of the eye. *Acta ophthol., Kbh.*, 1936, 14, 348-360.
44. KRYTER, K. D. Loudness and annoyance value of bands of noise. *Trans. 30th Annual Meeting Nat. Forum on Deafness and Speech Path.*, 1948, 26-28.
45. LAIRD, D. A. The measurement of the effects of noise on working efficiency. *J. industr. Hyg.*, 1927, 9, 431-434.
46. ———. Experiments on the physiological cost of noise. *J. nat. Inst. industr. Psychol.*, 1929, 4, 251-258.
47. ———. The effects of noise: a summary of experimental literature. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1930, 1, 256-262.
48. ———. Experiments on the influence of noise upon digestion, and the counteracting effects of various food agencies. *Med. J. Rec.*, 1932, 135, 461-464.
49. ———. The influence of noise on production and fatigue, as related to pitch, sensation level, and steadiness of noise. *J. appl. Psychol.*, 1933, 17, 320-330.
50. LAIRD, D. A. AND COYE, K., Psychological measurements of annoyance as related to pitch and loudness. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1929, 1, 158-163.
51. LANDIS, C. AND GULLETTE, R. Studies of emotional reactions. III. Systolic blood pressure and inspiration-expiration ratios. *J. comp. Psychol.*, 1925, 5, 221-253.
52. LINDAHL, R. Noise in industry. *Industr. Med.*, 1938, 7, 664-669.
53. LING, T. M. Noise. In Ling, T. M. *Recent Advances in Industrial Hygiene and Medicine*. Philadelphia: Blakiston's, 1937.
54. LOVELL, G. D. Physiological and motor responses to a regularly recurring sound. [Abstract] *Psychol. Bull.*, 1941, 38, 715.
55. LUCKIESH, M. Visual efficiency in quiet and noisy workplaces. *Elect. World, N. Y.*, 1931, 98, 472-473.
56. MCCARTNEY, J. L. Noise drives us crazy: the causes of echoeses. *Penn. med. J.*, 1941, 44, 1402-1404.
57. MCCORD, C. P., TEAL, E. E. AND WITHERIDGE, W. N. Noise and its effect on human beings; noise control as a by-product of air conditioning. *J. Amer. med. Ass.*, 1938, 110, 1553-1560.
58. MCCOY, D. A. The industrial noise hazard. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1944, 39, 327-330.
59. ———. Industrial noise—its analysis and interpretation for preventive treatment. *J. industr. Hyg.*, 1944, 26, 120-123.
60. MCFARLAND, R. A. Fatigue in aircraft pilots. *New Engl. J. Med.*, 1941, 225, 845-855.
61. MCKENZIE, D. Noise and the public health. *J. State Med.*, 1934, 42, 542-551.
62. ———. Noise and health. *Brit. med. J.*, 1934, 2, 636-637.
63. MASSEY, A. Public health and the noise problem. *Med. Offr.*, 1935, 54, 85-86.
64. MORGAN, J. J. B. The overcoming of distraction and other resistances. *Arch. Psychol., N. Y.*, 1916, No. 35. (Also published separately as a Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia Univ., 1916.)
65. ———. The effect of sound distraction upon memory. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1917, 28, 191-208.
66. MORGAN, M. W. AND OLMSTED, J. M. D. Response of the human lens to a sudden, startling stimulus. *Proc. Soc. exp. Biol., N. Y.*, 1939, 42, 612-613.
67. NASMYTH, T. G. Noise and health. *Caledon. med. J.*, 1934, 15, 281-286.
68. OBATA, J. AND OTHERS. The effects of noise upon human efficiency. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1934, 5, 255-261.
69. PARKINSON, J. S. AND JACK, W. A. A re-examination of the noise reduction

- coefficient. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1941, 13, 163-169.
70. PARRACK, H. O. AND OTHERS. Physiological effects of intense sound. Engineering div., Air Materiel Command, May 24, 1948. TIP U2570.
  71. PODOLSKY, E. Noise. *Illinois med. J.*, 1935, 67, 478-480.
  72. POLLOCK, K. G. AND BARTLETT, F. C. Two studies in psychological effects of noise. Part I. Psychological experiments on the effects of noise. *Rept. industr. Hlth. Res. Bd., Lond.*, 1932, Rept. No. 65.
  73. PURVES-STEWART, J. The influence of noise on health. *J. R. Inst. publ. Hlth. Hyg.*, 1938, 1, 667-671.
  74. REESE, T. W. AND KRYTER, K. D. The relative annoyance produced by various bands of noise. Psycho-acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Mar. 17, 1944. PB No. 27306.
  75. REINARTZ, E. G. Some mental aspects of aviation medicine. *J. Aviat. Med.*, 1943, 14, 75-83.
  76. SABINE, H. J. AND WILSON, R. A. The application of sound absorption to factory noise problems. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1943, 15, 27-31.
  77. SABINE, P. E. The problem of industrial noise. *Amer. J. publ. Hlth.*, 1944, 34, 265-270.
  78. \*SCHNELL, J. The effects of noise upon the nervous system. *Városi Szemle*, 1933, 19, 35-45.
  79. SCHWEISHEIMER, W. Effects of noise in the textile industry. *Rayon Text. Mon.*, 1945, 26, 593.
  80. SKAGGS, E. B. Changes in pulse, breathing, and steadiness under conditions of startledness and excited expectancy. *J. comp. Psychol.*, 1926, 6, 303-317.
  81. ———. Mr. Hovey on distraction. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1929, 41, 162-163.
  82. SMITH, E. L. AND LAIRD, D. A. The loudness of auditory stimuli which affect stomach contractions in healthy human beings. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1930, 2, 94-98.
  83. SMYTH, H. F. Noise in industry: its effect on the hearing and on general health (a review of the literature). *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1932, 41, 1108-1116.
  84. SNYDER, R. R. Noise and some of its ill effects. *J. Iowa St. med. Soc.*, 1932, 22, 263-267.
  85. SPOONER, H. J. Health problems involved in noise and fatigue. Rhythms, cadences, periodicities regulate human activities, but noise lessens the aptitude for work. *Nation's Hlth.*, 1922, 4, 91-95+.
  86. ———. The year's progress in the reduction of noise. Low's audiometer aids in determining standard limit of permissible noise. *Nation's Hlth.*, 1922, 4, 368-369.
  87. STEVENS, S. S. The effects of noise and vibration on psycho-motor efficiency. Psycho-acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Mar. 31, 1941. OSRD Rept. no. 32.
  88. STEVENS, S. S. AND OTHERS. Part I. The effects of noise on psychomotor efficiency. Part II. Noise reduction in aircraft as related to communication, annoyance and aural injury. Psychological Lab., Harvard Univ., Dec. 1, 1941. OSRD Rept. no. 274.
  89. SWIFT, E. J. Disturbance of the attention during simple mental processes. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1892, 5, 1-19.
  90. TINKER, M. A. Intelligence in an intelligence test with an auditory distractor. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1925, 36, 467-468.
  91. Tufts Coll. The effects of sound on accuracy of azimuth tracking. Sept. 18, 1942. PB No. 60988.
  92. VAUGHAN, P. E. AND VAN LIERE, E. J. An experimental study on the effect of noise on the gastric secretion in Pavlov dogs. *J. Aviat. Med.*, 1940, 11, 102, 107.
  93. VERNON, H. M. The ideal factory. V. Noise. *Welfare Work*, 1930, 2, 83-85.
  94. VERNON, H. M. AND WARNER, C. G. Objective and subjective tests for noise. *Persommel J.*, 1932, 11, 141-149.
  95. VITELES, M. S. AND SMITH, K. R. An experimental investigation of the effect of change in atmospheric conditions and noise upon performance. *Trans. Amer. Soc. Heat. Vent. Engrs.*, 1946, 52 (1291), 167-182.
  96. VON PINOFF. Impairment of health by slight noise. *Münch. med. Wschr.*, 1932, 79, 2041-2042.

\*Reference not verified in original.

97. WARING, C. E. (ed.) Transmission and reception of sounds under combat conditions. Office of scientific research and development, 1946. TIP U1130.
  98. WELLS, W. A. The noises of civilization and their evil effects. *Trans. Amer. laryng. rhin. otol. Soc.*, 1931, 37, 344-353.
  99. WESTON, H. C. AND ADAMS, S. Two studies in psychological effects of noise. Part II. The effect of noise on the performance of weavers. *Rept. industr. Hlth. Res. Bd., Lond.*, 1932, Rept. no. 65, 38-70.
  100. ———. The performance of weavers under varying conditions of noise. *Rept. industr. Hlth. Res. Bd., Lond.*, 1935, Rept. no. 70, 1-24.
  101. WILSON, A. Better concentration reduces employee turnover 47%. *Bankers Mon.*, 1942, 59, 254-255+.
  102. WOOLARD, H. H. Noise. *St. Bart's Hosp. J.*, 1938, 46, 36-38.
  103. WYDER, C. G. Noise in industry: a primer of cause, effect and cure. *Fact. Mgmt. Mainten.*, 1944, 102, 138-156.
  104. WYNNE, S. W. New York City's Noise Abatement Commission. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1930, 2, 12-17.
  105. YAKOVLEV, P. A. The influence of acoustic stimuli upon the limits of visual fields for different colors. *J. opt. Soc. Amer.*, 1938, 28, 286-289.
  106. ZELIGS, R. Noise and nerves. *Hygeia, Chicago*, 1940, 18, 392-395.
-

*Part II* | DEAFENING EFFECTS OF NOISE

IT HAS BEEN amply demonstrated that noise may be damaging to the auditory mechanism of man and it is the purpose of the second part of this report to review and evaluate the results of research conducted on this subject. For ease of presentation the literature will be divided into several divisions: (1) Deafness Resulting from Noise, (2) Relationship of Hearing Loss to Social Adequacy, (3) The Use of Ear Plugs, and (4) Problems of Deafness in Military Situations.

The word deafness in everyday terminology is used to indicate only a condition of total deafness wherein a person is unable or almost completely unable to hear sound. In the medical sense, however, the word deafness is applied to all degrees of impairment of hearing from that of a slight deficit to the case of total deafness and of either temporary or permanent duration. In the present report the word deafness is used in the latter or medical sense.

#### DEAFNESS RESULTING FROM NOISE

Even though an otologist as late as 1938 claims credit for first relating industrial noise and a localized hearing loss, the general facts of deafness due to industrial noise were discussed as early as 1831 by Fosbrooke (61). Indeed, as has been noted also by Bunch (14), Fosbrooke speaks in 1831 of 'old' and 'modern' discussants of this subject. Nevertheless, there have since been numerous studies of the hearing of industrial workers in Europe and America.

Except for Coosemans (32) who believed from an analysis of data he collected that industrial noises were harmful only when the worker was

predisposed to deafness because of lesions or ear infections, the early investigators of professional deafness, from Fosbrooke on, found what they considered a significant percentage of industrial workers to be deaf. For example, Temkin (236), who has published one of the most complete studies on this subject, found that in certain metal-working occupations 83% of the men could not hear a whisper more than 4 meters away and that after 15 years work none could hear a whisper at 4 meters.

Larsen (128), in making an exhaustive study of shipyard and factory laborers, employed both the whisper and audiometric tests. He found hearing deficient in about 50% of the men examined. McKelvie (141) found with the whisper and voice tests that about 25% of 1001 weavers had some form of deafness.

The early studies clearly revealed that in 'noisy' occupations deafness was common. A number of questions related to industrial deafness, however, such as temporary vs. permanent effects of noise, effects of age, type of deafness and effects of different frequencies and intensities of sound were raised in these studies.

*Temporary Effects.* McCoy (137) compared the hearing loss of men working at metal 'chipping' in 110-130 db (probably re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>) after seven hours and after one month of exposure (See Figure 1). McCoy states that the hearing loss became slightly greater after six months than after one month of exposure. Although McCoy does not present his data in sufficient detail with respect to number of subjects and period of testing to demonstrate any 'adaptation,' he




FIGURE 1. Audiograms of shipyard workers. Solid lines, hearing as tested before employment. Broken lines, A, hearing recorded after seven hours of work in the chipping school; B, hearing recorded after one month of work in the chipping school. From McCoy (137), with permission of the author and the American Medical Association, Chicago, Illinois.

does, apparently, find that initially the workers are more bothered by the noise than after working in it for several weeks. This is similar to an observation by Larsen (128) that initially workers experience a buzzing and ringing in their ears which vanishes after several days of work in a noisy factory.

It might now be asked whether or not the measured residual hearing losses are permanent, or a defect that disappears with rest. Pertinent to this is a study by Chamberlain (27), who found great individual differences among boilermakers in this regard. Figure 2 shows the recovery experienced after a 15-hour rest and a six-months rest. Boemer (11) states that recovery can continue for as long as two months.

Davis, Morgan, Hawkins, Galambos and Smith (47) in a laboratory

experiment on stimulation deafness found recovery from sound exposure extending for several weeks. In these studies, however, the exposures were brief and widely separated and not of the daily type encountered in the industrial situation. In all probability the amount of recovery afforded the deafened worker by a more than 10- to 20-hour respite from noise is of only academic, though perhaps medical interest in that the worker is daily re-exposed to the noise usually after a rest period of about that length.

It could be argued that the deafness accrued by the industrial worker is a beneficial adaptation that shields him from 'buzzing' ears and the like. This seems unlikely, however, in view of the severity of deafness encountered and the findings of certain laboratory experiments that real damage can be inflicted upon the cochlea of animals by intense noise stimulation. Also, not to be forgotten is the fact that only a certain percentage of workers become afflicted with deafness even though exposed to the same intensities of noise. If this deafness was merely an 'adaptive' reaction not involving damage it could be expected to occur for all persons.

*Type of Injury.* Although post-mortem evidence of damage to the ear as a result of industrial noise is lacking for human subjects, otological examination definitely places the damage in the inner ear or eighth nerve.<sup>1</sup> This is, of course, in accordance with

<sup>1</sup>Habermann (86) made post-mortem examination of several boilermakers with histories of deafness and found cochlear degeneration. The men were extremely old, however, and since cochlear degeneration is fairly common in older people, his findings do not demonstrate that the cause of the degeneration was noise stimulation.




FIGURE 2. Audiograms of boilermakers. Heavy lines, hearing recorded before the day's work. A, light lines, hearing recorded after 40 minutes bucking rivets inside the boiler; broken lines, hearing after 15 hours of subsequent rest. B, light lines, hearing six months later with no exposure to similar excessive noise in the interim. From Chamberlain (27), with permission of the author and the American Medical Association, Chicago, Illinois.

the laboratory studies with animals, which have been reviewed by Kemp (108).

Sacher (202) according to Larsen (128) found, for example, that of 458

boilermakers 73.4% possessed some degree of deafness; of these 82.7% suffered cochlear malfunction while only 17.3% had middle ear infections. In most of the studies of professional



deafness ample precautions were taken to eliminate from consideration those persons suffering from ear infections or with previous histories of infections.

*Effects of Age.* Early investigators felt that the increasing incidence of deafness with years on the job proved that repeated exposures over the years progressively increased the degree of deafness. As has been long recognized, deafness increases in the general population with age, presumably independently of exposure to noise although it has been suggested by Bunch (14) that the sounds of daily living account for this deterioration. Whatever the facts, the publication of hearing norms for the population attending the 1939 World Fairs at New York and San Francisco, as measured by Bell Telephone Laboratories (226), permitted comparisons between 'normals' and industrial workers for comparable age groups.

Figure 3 is from such a comparative study made by Gardner (68). Figure 3A is for the normal World's Fair population and Figure 3B is for shipyard workers. Considering the differences in auditory acuity for the normals between the B and E age groups, there is about a 10-db decrease in hearing with a 20-year increase in age; the difference between the matched groups, B and E, for the shipyard workers is likewise about 10 db (the A groups do not seem to be closely enough matched in age to include in the comparison). This would seem to indicate that the greater degree of deafness among the older employees was due to increased age rather than repeated exposures to the noise. Apparently after an initial loss, perhaps stabilized after a month's exposure




FIGURE 3. Comparison of auditory acuity of normal population with that of shipyard workers. Top, World's Fair population: A, 10-19 years; B, 20-29 years; C, 30-39 years; D, 40-49 years; E, 50-59 years. Bottom, 296 shipyard workers: A, 16-20 years (N=28); B, 21-30 years (N=92); C, 31-40 years (N=120); D, 41-50 years (N=44); E, 51-65 years (N=12). From Gardner (68), with permission of the author and the publishers of *Industrial Medicine*.

(McCoy, 137) further losses in hearing of the worker is due primarily to increasing age rather than repeated exposure. A similar conclusion can be reached from an examination of data reported by Rosenblith (190).

*Possible Error in Comparative Studies.* It is to be noted that the use of the electronic audiometer from the 1930's on has enabled the investigators to measure more precisely hearing losses at various frequencies of sound and to establish norms. In most of the studies reported the hearing losses were taken as the difference between the threshold intensities required for the subjects under study and the average threshold intensities required for an entirely different population tested in a *properly sound insulated room* at the 1939 World Fairs. It has been

found that even in the testing rooms of some otologists there is enough residual noise to elevate the thresholds of the average normal person by 10 db or more (100), and the testing conditions present in many of the experiments conducted in industry must have left much to be desired. This means that it would not be amiss to judge that the degree of deafness measured in some of the investigations reported were overestimated, to be conservative, by 10-15 db. This uncontrolled factor would, of course, cause no appreciable error in cases of severe hearing losses, but may represent an appreciable error in the determinations of mild losses (less than 15 db).

*Structure of the Cochlea and Deafness.* Almost without exception, hearing losses due to noise among industrial workers appear in the high frequency range (above 1000-2000 cps) and only after prolonged exposure (or age) do the losses extend into the lower frequencies. The prevalence of a hearing defect above 4000 cps or of a 'dip' around 4000 cps has led to much speculation concerning the cause. It has been held, as reviewed by Larsen (129), for example, that the portion of the cochlea, which according to the place theory of sound perception transduces sounds of 4000 cps into neural impulses, is weakened because of a bifurcation of blood vessels and a constriction within the cochlear structure at that point. The condition supposedly makes that portion of the cochlea vulnerable to various toxic conditions, head injury, disease and noise that precede or accompany a hearing loss at 4000 cps. Recent anatomical studies (255), however, cast doubt on the contention that the cochlea is structurally anomalous in

the region (4000 cps) as originally suspected.

*Relationship between Sound Spectrum and Hearing Loss.* While it is incontestable that hearing losses around 4000 cps are found among industrial workers (and frequently in the 'normal' population) without ear infections, it is possible that rather than the cause being a structural weakness of a particular portion of the cochlea, this locus of deafness is predictable from a general principle relating auditory acuity and the spectrum of sound stimulation.

Underlying this theory are the results of stimulation deafness experiments carried out under laboratory conditions on various forms of animals, including man. It is not the purpose of this report to review the literature on stimulation deafness but a recent series of experiments conducted by Davis, Morgan, Hawkins, Galambos and Smith (47) that represent the most exhaustive studies done to date on man will be described briefly for the light they cast upon the general problem of the pattern of hearing losses resulting from exposure to noise.

The audiograms in Figure 4 were made at various times following exposure to pure tones of different intensity and duration. The exposures, while a little more intense than the 'noise' levels to be found in a noisy factory, were relatively brief. In addition to the rather rapid recovery from hearing loss, it should be noted that the hearing loss appears to be centered about one-half octave above the frequency of tonal stimulation. Perlman (168) found that with test tones of 512, 1024, 2048 and 4096 cps the greatest loss lay about one octave above the stimulus tones, and Rüedi and Furrer (197) demonstrated that




FIGURE 4. Audiograms following exposures to various pure tones and durations as indicated. From Davis, et al. (47).

with pure tone stimulation hearing loss begins just below the excitation frequency and reaches its maximum about one octave higher.

Other findings of Davis, Morgan, Hawkins, Galambos and Smith presented in Figure 5A show the average hearing loss incurred by a band of





FIGURE 5. A, audiograms for 5 subjects following 32-minute exposure to band spectrum noise shown in B. From Davis, et al. (47).

noise with the spectrum shown in Figure 5B. It is seen that the average audiogram after exposure roughly approximates the noise spectra turned upside down and that the hearing defects, though shifted somewhat to the higher frequencies, are roughly proportional to the intensities of the frequency components of the noise.

Since the ear is most sensitive at about 2000 cps one would expect, with exposure to an intense noise that contained all audio frequencies at about equal intensities, that the greatest hearing loss would occur in the 2000-4000 cps region.

Figures 23 and 24, given in Part III of this report, and Figures 6 and 7 below indicate that for a wide variety of industries the noise is greatest in the middle and upper frequencies. This could account, in accordance with the findings of Davis et al, Perlman, and Rüedi and Furrer, for the pattern of audiograms discovered among industrial workers without recourse to the suspect notion of an inherent weakness of a portion of the cochlea. Instead it may be supposed that hearing losses below 1000 cps do not occur in professional deafness be-




FIGURE 6. Noise spectrogram of a mechanical weaving mill. From Rüedi and Furrer (197), with permission of the author and the Acoustical Society of America, Washington, D.C.




FIGURE 7. Spectrum of the noise produced by riveting (after Perwitzschky and Lanzig). From Larsen (129), with permission of the author.

cause of the lack in industrial noises of frequency components in that region that are intense relative to the sensitiveness of the ear (See Figure 8).

*Hydrodynamic Action and Deafness.* Rüedi and Furrer (197) suggest that the 4000-cps dip so common to audiograms may be related to the hydrodynamic action of the fluid in the cochlea. Békésy (246) has shown that eddies are formed in the lymph fluid of the cochlea when the ear is stimulated with sound. Rüedi and Furrer propose that when the ear is stimulated simultaneously with sound frequencies above and below 4000 cps, a strong, mechanical pull due to eddies rotating in opposite directions is placed on the portion of the cochlea where the 4000-cps tonal stimulation is localized and thereby causes a 4000-cps deafness. Further experimentation, however, is required before it can be stated that this hydrodynamic action is the primary or even one of perhaps several causes of localized hearing losses.

*Intensity Levels.* Parrack, Eldredge and Koster (161) have conducted a




FIGURE 8. Comparison of 'normal' and industrial hearing loss in middle age. Broken line, average loss age 40-49, World's Fair population; solid line, average loss for boilermakers (average age about 45) after 15 years' service. Zero line, minimum audible pressure threshold. From Rosenblith (190) with permission of the author and the Acoustical Society of America, Washington, D. C.

series of experiments using a turbo-jet engine and a special siren for generating sounds of over 150 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>. It was found that for exposure of three to ten minutes severe hearing losses (60 db) occurred but that hearing returned to normal after 1-7 days rest. Whereas sounds of this intensity, having over 2000 times the power of common machine noises, are not representative of industry, the experiments demonstrate the amazing resistance of the ear to permanent damage.

While it has been demonstrated that both temporary and perhaps permanent deafness result from exposure to noises occurring in industry and to some extent probably in everyday life, it is not clear just what intensities are required to effect damage. There is some question as to whether or not the hearing losses reported for industrial workers in the various studies are not somewhat exaggerated

due to inadequate testing conditions, lack of measures before exposure, and of proper evaluation of recovery. In addition, there are great individual differences in susceptibility.

*Maximum Safe Intensity Level.* Sleight and Tiffin (222), in a recent review article, list a number of investigators who make estimates ranging from 80 to 100 db as being maximum levels of noise to which a worker may be subjected without incurring deafness. In many industrial situations noise levels equal or exceed these levels as evidenced by the spectra given in various figures and in Table 1, taken from Sabine and Wilson (201).

A fair, perhaps conservative, evaluation of the laboratory and industrial studies on stimulation deafness would seem to be that for long and intermittent exposures any frequency of sound (or narrow band not exceeding the critical width) that is 85 db or less above .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> will not cause any temporary or permanent deafness.

TABLE 1. Noise levels of various machines at a distance of 3 feet. [From Sabine and Wilson (201).]

Machine	Decibels
Punch presses, various types	96-103
Headers	101-105
Drop hammers	99-101
Bumping hammers	100
Hydraulic press	130
Automatic riveters	95-99
Lathes (average)	80
Automatic screw machines	93-100
Airplane propeller grinding	100-105
Cotton spinning	84-87
Looms	94-101
Sewing machines	93-96
Wood planers	98-110
Wood saw	100
Wire rope, stranding machines	100-104
Ball mill	99

The 'guess' that tones 85 db above .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> may cause some deafness, either temporary or permanent, applies only for long periods of exposure, applied intermittently over months or years. On the other hand, for brief exposures lasting up to an hour, the intensities necessary to cause deafness appear to be in the order of 100 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> for any frequency or critical band.

*Critical Band Concept and Stimulation Deafness.* It has been assumed by Fletcher and others that the concept of critical bands (the narrowest band around any frequency which just masks that frequency when of equal over-all intensity) should cover not only masking phenomena as described in Part III of this report but also the deafening effect of noise. The assumption is that since the addition of sound frequencies beyond the critical bands does not contribute to the masking effectiveness of the noise within the critical band, these additional frequencies likewise contribute nothing to the deafening effect of the noise within the critical band.

It is possible, but undemonstrable with present data, that the degree of deafness could be predicted by the use of critical band measures of noise intensity and plotting such measures relative to 85 db above the threshold for pure tones in a manner somewhat similar to that described in Part III of this report for calculating speech intelligibility. A suitable threshold line would be that for minimum audible pressure which is presented as curve A in Figure 7 of Part III.<sup>2</sup> Because of

<sup>2</sup>The minimum audible pressure threshold referred to is not to be confused with the normal hearing threshold. The latter is the mean threshold of hearing for persons of all ages as measured by the Bell Tele-

the greater intensities required to reach threshold at low and at high frequencies, .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> would represent a more conservative, safer reference point for calculating the probable deafening effects of noise than the minimum audible threshold; further experiments are needed to determine which reference level is more suitable.

*Over-all Noise Level Measurement vs. Spectrum Analyses.* Because noise level meters as commonly used add together the pressures present in a noise throughout the range of sound frequencies, the over-all measures of noise level do not necessarily indicate their deafening effects. For example, a noise containing all frequencies at approximately equal intensity would measure more than 30 db higher than any single frequency component or even any 'critical band' of the noise. If the energy in a noise were mostly in the low and/or high frequencies, the over-all intensity level would be even less indicative of its potential deafening effects.

It is clear that *the spectrum of a noise must be analyzed before its deafening value can be estimated.* Unfortunately, most sound level measures in the past, for example those given in Table 1, are over-all measures of intensity.

#### RELATIONSHIP OF HEARING LOSS TO SOCIAL ADEQUACY

Partial deafness is recognized as a hardship, even though it does afford

phone Laboratories at the 1939 World's Fair and by the Public Health Service (34). This average threshold for the population is on the average about 15 db above the minimum audible pressure required to reach threshold on the most acute ears. It is represented by curve C in Figure 7, Part III.

some insulation against obnoxious sounds and noises. Nevertheless, the interpretation of the audiogram in terms of the handicap it places on a person in daily living is a medico-legal problem that is as yet not completely solved.

Amazingly enough, the damage wrought to hearing in industry, presumably by the exposure to noise, has apparently not been resented to a great extent by the individual workers, although in recent years legislation providing for compensation for occupational deafness has been enacted in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Danzig and USSR (130), and public health authorities elsewhere consider it a real menace.

*Audiometric Method of AMA.* In 1942 the Council on Physical Medicine of the American Medical Association published a tentative standard procedure for evaluating the effective hearing loss in medico-legal cases. The recommendations were revised in some details in 1947 (33). The procedure is based on the well-established method of measuring hearing loss with a pure tone audiometer at octave frequencies. The audiometers used are calibrated so that hearing defects are measured in decibels with respect to the intensities required to be just detectable for the average person in a quiet room.

The procedure suggested by the American Medical Association does two things:

1. It recommends that thresholds for only four frequencies, 512, 1024, 2048 and 4096 cps, be considered in the calculation of hearing losses since most speech sounds fall within this range. It is assumed that the most important function of hearing for the

TABLE 2. Tentative standard procedure for evaluating the percentage loss of hearing in medicolegal cases (33).

Hearing Loss in db	Frequency in cps			
	512	1024	2048	4096
10	.2	.3	.4	.1
15	.5	.9	1.3	.3
20	1.1	2.1	2.9	.9
25	1.8	3.6	4.9	1.7
30	2.6	5.4	7.3	2.7
35	3.7	7.7	9.8	3.8
40	4.9	10.2	12.9	5.0
45	6.3	13.0	17.3	6.4
50	7.9	15.7	22.4	8.0
55	9.6	19.0	25.7	9.7
60	11.3	21.5	28.0	11.2
65	12.8	23.5	30.2	12.5
70	13.8	25.5	32.2	13.5
75	14.6	27.2	34.0	14.2
80	14.8	28.8	35.8	14.6
85	14.9	29.8	37.5	14.8
90	15.0	29.9	39.2	14.9
95		30.0	40.0	15.0

average person is the hearing of speech.

2. The method further assigns different weights to these four frequencies, as is shown in Table 2. The column of numbers under each frequency in this table represents the percentage hearing loss that should be attached to the degrees of audiometric hearing loss indicated in the left hand column.

Although the proposed method does not suggest that the age factor should be considered in the calculation of percentage hearing loss in cases of industrial deafness, an adjustment to eliminate the amount of deafness due to normal deterioration would seem logical.

Curve C of Figure 3B represents an example of industrial deafness for a fairly large sample ( $N = 120$ ), and since Gardner gives the average age



(31-40 yrs) of his subjects, the percentage hearing loss is calculated by (1) measuring the hearing loss of the workers relative to the standards for normal young adults and determining the appropriate percentage from Table 2, (2) finding the percentage hearing loss of normal adults 30-39 years old, and (3) subtracting the percentage obtained in step 2 from that of step 1.

Accordingly (see Table 3) a .1 percentage hearing loss represents the average handicap incurred by the average person 30-39 years old; a further 28 per cent loss is suffered by the subjects in this particular example because, presumably, of their exposure to noise.

Actually, the percentage losses due to noise are overestimated in these calculations inasmuch as the procedure recommended by the Council on Physical Medicine weights the hearing in the poorer ear 1/7th as much as the losses in the better ear. The formula is: 
$$\text{aural hearing} = \frac{\text{avg. better ear losses} \times 7 + \text{avg. poorer ear}}{8}$$

The audiograms in Figure 3B, which were used for these calculations, represent an average of the losses in both ears equally weighted. The individual

ear audiograms were not reported in the study used as an example.

For the particular age group examined, the deficit due to age alone is negligible; however, the deficit increases with age so that the hearing of average 50-59-year-old normal persons is about 5.6% below that of the average person.

*Speech Articulation Method.* Davis (43) has developed a more direct measure of ability to hear speech. In this method a number of specially prepared and recorded word tests are administered to the listener at different intensity levels ranging from what seems faint to loud for the person with normal hearing. The percentage of words heard correctly at three standard levels of intensity is averaged and taken as the 'social adequacy index' for the hearing of that person. In Figure 9 are shown the 'articulation' curves (the percentage of words heard correctly) for normal hearing and for two cases of impaired hearing. The Social Adequacy Index for hearing (SAI) is the average of the articulation scores achieved for the three standard intensities, 55, 70 and 85 db re .0002 dync/cm<sup>2</sup>. In practice only two tests are administered. One is a test of the patient's threshold for

TABLE 3. Example of use of tentative standard procedure for evaluating the percentage loss of hearing. [Data taken from Gardner (68), as presented in Fig. 3.]

Frequency	Hearing Loss in Decibels		Percentage Hearing Loss*	
	Normal 30-39-yr.- old people	31-40-yr.- old workers	Normal 30-39-yr.- old people	31-40-yr.- old workers
512	0	25	0	1.8
1024	0	30	0	5.4
2048	5	40	0	12.9
4096	10	50	.1	8.0

\*Percentage loss due to age and noise, 28.1; to age, 0.1; to noise, 28.0.




FIGURE 9. Social Adequacy Threshold Curves (based on average percentage of PB words correctly understood at three speech levels, 55, 70 and 85 db) for normal hearing and for two cases of impaired hearing. From Davis (43), with permission of the author and the publishers of *The Laryngoscope*.

speech. This serves to locate the 'foot' of his articulation curve. The second test is a discrimination test. One of the standardized lists of monosyllabic words is given at a level at least 35 db above the patient's threshold for speech. The articulation score on this test gives the height of the plateau of the patient's articulation curve. It is assumed that the shape of the curve is normal; and therefore two points are enough to locate it on a chart like Figure 9. The articulation scores corresponding to speech levels of 55, 70 and 85 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> can then be read off and averaged. In practice a table is employed in which the SAI corresponding to all combinations of threshold for speech and 'discrimination loss' have been calculated in advance.

Although the SAI method requires instruments not available to the average otologist, the results are more di-

rectly interpretable in terms of the effects of deafness upon the lives of the patient than the pure tone audiograms, inasmuch as this latter method has not been validated against speech tests. The relationship between the two methods is under further investigation at the Central Institute for the Deaf (221).

Besides face validity, the SAI method has a characteristic not present in the audiometric method that should be mentioned. That is the fact that it reflects loss in ability of the patient to discriminate normally among sounds that lie above his threshold. With this condition, a person hears the sound but cannot understand what is said. The words sound mangled and jumbled. This phenomenon, which presumably occurs only for nerve type deafness (as could be caused by overexposure to noise), is not directly measured by audiometric threshold determinations. A case of this type is

shown by the curve in Figure 9 that does not rise above 60 per cent word articulation and having an SAI of 33. An SAI of 33 is considered by Silverman, Thurlow, Walsh and Davis (221) as the threshold of social adequacy.

THE USE OF EARPLUGS

It was suggested earlier in this report that if noise cannot be eliminated or abated, its deleterious effects can be somewhat prevented by the use of ear plugs.

Two main varieties have been developed and used, the plug type that fits snugly into the external meatus of the ear, and a cushion type held by a head band or in a helmet that lies around and over the ear. Among the plugs, there are many varieties: dry cotton and wool, wet or wax-impreg-

nated cotton or wool, wax, plastic and rubber.

The crucial test of the adequacy of an earplug is, of course, how much it attenuates sound passing through the external ear canal. This can be determined by measuring the threshold shift that occurs when the ear is plugged. This shift at a number of frequencies for a number of different kinds of plugs is shown in Figure 10.

In spite of the utmost care in design and selection of materials, however, some people find standard sizes of earplugs uncomfortable, at least upon initial use. Other complaints have been that they are easy to lose and hard to keep clean. In addition, after considerable exposure to intense noise and the onset of deafness, the noise becomes less disturbing to the worker




FIGURE 10. Attenuation in db for pure tones afforded by various types of earplugs. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (Part III, 130).

so that, to him, the earplugs do not seem so necessary. The hygienic aspect of wearing earplugs has been examined by Davis (42) and found to be much less a hazard than the possible deafness without them.

It is possible that a certain degree of the discomfort could be overcome, although at much greater expense, by the use of cushion fittings over the ears. Also, when earplugs are molded individually for each person it is found that the plugs are reasonably comfortable and provide good sound attenuation (35, 104).

*Effects of Earplugs on Speech Reception.* The development and use of earplugs and 'ear covers' has had a rather interesting history. The use of such devices was probably inhibited, at least in the armed forces of the USA, as the result of discussion centered around their function during World War I (82). It was feared that soldiers and sailors would fail to hear faint signals and commands when wearing earplugs. There were attempts to build earplugs that would let 'little sounds' through but keep out 'big sounds.'

The effect of wearing earplugs on the intelligibility of speech has been tested experimentally and results are presented in Figure 27 in Part III of this report. In any noise whose effective masking on speech is more than 60 db, earplugs will not interfere with speech reception.<sup>3</sup> By 'effective masking' is meant the number of db the noise elevates the threshold for

<sup>3</sup>It might be added that a hearing loss resulting from an explosion or the firing of a gun may temporarily deafen the listener so that his effective hearing in the quiet (between gun firings) will be no better than the hearing of a person who is wearing earplugs but who, as a result, is not suffering from temporary deafness.

speech. The effective masking is usually much less than the over-all intensity level of the noise measured relative to .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>. It is the simplest measure that may legitimately be used for comparing the masking effectiveness of different types of noise.

In noises with effective masking of more than 60 db the wearing of earplugs actually *improves* the reception of speech. While it seems illogical that plugging the ears should permit one to detect sounds as well or better than with the ears open, the phenomenon is easy to explain. For one thing, the insertion of earplugs reduces the noise reaching the ear as much as it reduces the speech signal. Therefore, the signal-to-noise ratio remains constant. The over-all reduction of the noise and the speech levels presents a more moderate intensity of sound to the middle ear with a concomitant reduction of distortion. The situation is perhaps analogous to the improvement of vision when the glare of extremely bright light is reduced.

It has been argued that the insertion of earplugs would reduce speech sounds that were only slightly above the absolute threshold of hearing to a completely inaudible level. Speech sounds of such weak intensity would not be heard in any case, however, due to the masking effect of noise. Therefore, the attenuation afforded by the earplugs would again have no effect on the intelligibility of speech as long as the noise produces an effective masking of 60 db. It is to be noted, however, that it is the effective masking for speech (or any other signal) of the noise that is the determining factor as to whether the wearing of earplugs will interfere with hearing and not the over-all noise level as measured by a sound level meter.

## DEAFNESS IN THE MILITARY SITUATION

Deafness may be incurred during military service. The situation, however, is much more complicated than the mere presence of noise, so that sharp distinctions must be made among: (1) the effects of noise or sound, (2) the effects of blast or shock waves, and (3) the effects of changes in barometric pressure.

Shilling (217) and Shilling and Everly (218), for example, attribute hearing deficiencies among submarine personnel as being due in part to the compound effects of noise, gun blasts and barometric pressure changes.

*Shock Waves.* The effects on deafness of military noises such as is present in tanks, engine rooms of boats, and airplanes are no different from the effects described previously for the industrial situation. Shock waves, however, represent a different order of insult to the ears. A blast or 'shock wave is to a sound wave what a tidal wave is to a ripple' (127). The change in pressure in a sound wave is small compared to the normal undisturbed air pressure, whereas the pressure increase in a shock wave may be greater than the total original atmospheric pressure. Shock waves are single waves and must be considered as successive transient phenomena, not as steady states like a sustained tone with a particular frequency.

Although shock waves occur frequently enough in everyday life, it is around guns, cannons and bombs that the effects reach an appreciable and measurable magnitude. The momentary peak pressures near the source of these explosions often far exceed atmospheric pressure. Thompson (238) gives a number of measures of intensity for shock waves from different sources. Often these transient sound pressures of shock waves are

measured in terms of pounds per square inch rather than dynes per square centimeter.

*Effect of Shock Waves on Deafness.* There will be found over three-score articles in the bibliography that are concerned with the effects of blasts, particularly gun blasts, upon hearing. Typical results for exposure to gun and cannon fire are given in Figure 11 taken from Machle (140). Machle experimentally exposed gunnery instructors to 37 and 75mm and 30 caliber guns, obtaining audiograms before and at various stages after exposures. He also surveyed the hearing loss for a large number of gunnery instructors.

Some of Machle's findings can be summarized as follows:

- (1) Gunnery instructors in general display about an 11% hearing deficiency according to the tentative AMA method of computation described previously.
- (2) There was a regular but partial recovery following the termination of exposures.




FIGURE 11. Mean and extreme audiograms of 45 gunnery instructors (ages 19-36; no significant histories of ear disease). 80% of the men used cotton earplugs; 20% used no earplugs. From Machle (140), with permission of the American Medical Association, Chicago, Illinois.

(3) With repeated exposures there was a cumulative hearing loss with retarded recovery, lasting up to eight days.

(4) Earplugs prevented the hearing loss.

Murray and Reid (157) measured temporary hearing losses ranging from 55 to 85 db due to pressures ranging from 1½ to 8 lbs. per square inch; whereas after the rapid firing of a rifle, ¼ lb. per square inch near the muzzle, for over 100 rounds they measured small hearing losses.

*Damage to Eardrum.* Besides suffering from temporary and apparently permanent deafness as the result of repeated exposures to gun and concussion blasts, military personnel may sustain ruptured eardrums. Glass (72) and others have found that the rupture of the eardrum by a blast wave does not necessarily lead to deafness. It is generally held (85, 170) that when the eardrum ruptures the more delicate inner ear mechanism is thereby protected.

Collins (31) examined a number of battle casualties and found that 20% sustained some aural trauma due to blast. Forty per cent of these cases showed some degree of deafness, but the majority of those with deafness had infected middle ears resulting from ruptured eardrums.

*Protections against Blast.* The use of earplugs for protection against gun blast has been almost universally recommended. The 20 to 30 db of protection afforded by proper plugs is sufficient to prevent rupture of the eardrum in the severest of blast waves usually encountered. The ear itself, in addition, appears to be admirably constructed to accept blast waves of 'reasonable' intensity.

Perlman (170) has investigated the

reaction to blast of the ossicular chain of bones connecting the eardrum with the inner ear. He lists a number of characteristics of the conductive mechanism of the middle ear that afford protection from shock or blast, such as the ballistic characteristics of the ear which prevent it from following accurately the extremely rapid pressure changes of a blast wave and the manner of oscillation of the ossicular chain to intense sound and blast waves. Perlman demonstrated the effectiveness of a perforation in the eardrum in reducing blast transmission.

There is another mechanism in the ear that might be thought to protect the ear from blast—the middle ear muscles which can reduce the oscillation of the ossicular chain. The latent period of this reflex, however, around 10 milliseconds, is too long to protect against a pulse wave which may last but 1 millisecond (172).

*Effects of Barometric Changes.* The pressure change due to rapid changes in altitude or in barometric pressure is a very slow affair compared to sound or shock waves. The result is a changed steady-state pressure on the eardrum. Unfortunately, the air pressure on the inner side of the eardrum (in the middle ear) may not change as rapidly as the external pressure because the eustachian canal is not always open like the external ear canal. The result is a differential in pressure between the two sides of the eardrum.

There are numerous articles about deafness in flying and submarine personnel following rapid changes in altitude such as are encountered in diving an aircraft or in escape from a submarine. The effects of this rapid pressure change may involve bleeding in the outer and middle ear and, subsequently, an inflamed condition of the ear tissues with fluids forming in

the middle ear. Only rarely is the drum ruptured. These effects, however, are very painful.

It is not clear that any damage is inflicted upon the inner ear, except indirectly from possible infection in the middle ear. Hearing is affected, of course, by the presence of any fluids or exudates in the ear.

Inasmuch as flying and submarine personnel are usually exposed to fairly intense noise levels, deafness in these personnel may be due to the compounded effects of both noise and insults from barometric pressure changes. In commercial aircraft the noise levels and rates of ascent and descent are below the levels required for damaging the ear, and even for personnel in a military aircraft Campbell (20) states that deafness is not a significant problem.

#### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The study of the experimental literature on the effects of noise on the auditory mechanism reveals the following points:

(1) Exposure to intense noise from machinery causes partial and temporary hearing losses that persist for a few minutes to several hours. Apparently, continued repeated exposures over extended periods (years) may result in a partial but permanent deafness. The more intense the sound the greater the deafening effect. The maximum safe intensity at which no deafening effect will occur is probably in the neighborhood of 85 db above .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> for 'critical bands' of noise. The over-all intensity of a noise in decibels usually will not correctly indicate its deafening effect.

(2) Both field and laboratory tests indicate that deafness occurs for the dominant frequency in a noise and/or for higher frequencies.

(3) Exposure to gun fire and other shock or blast waves results in a partial deafness that lasts for a few minutes up to several days, and continued repeated exposure results in a partial but *permanent* deafness that may be progressive with continued exposure.

(4) Rupture of the eardrum may be caused by blast waves or by extreme and rapid pressure changes resulting from rapid changes in altitude such as may occur in military flying and submarine activity. Deafness resulting from such insult is apparently due to secondary effects occurring in the middle ear such as infection, the development of fluids and exudates, and the rearrangement of middle ear structures in addition to possible direct damage to the cochlear structure.

Earplugs which afford 20 to 30 db of sound attenuation for the middle range of frequencies will in practically all present industrial and military situations where noise and shock waves are a problem afford sufficient protection from the noise to prevent deafness. The wearing of proper earplugs in intense noise fields improves speech communication as well as giving comfort and protection.

Earplugs individually molded and fitted to each person would probably be the most comfortable and adequate method of protecting an individual from high levels of noise. There are certain earplugs now manufactured which provide good sound attenuation but not all people can wear them with comfort. Dry cotton, which has been used extensively by military personnel, does not afford much protection against the low and middle range of sound frequencies although it does reduce to some extent the intensity of high frequencies which subjectively are the most annoying.

REFERENCES<sup>4</sup>

- Code
- B 1. ALEXANDER, A. B. Rupture of the drumhead as a wartime injury. *Brit. med. J.*, 1941, 2, 195-196.
- A&S 2. [Anon.] Certain medical aspects of dive-bombing. [Letter to the editor] *St. Thom. Hosp. Gaz.*, 1940, 38, 110-111.
- A&S 3. AUBRIOT, P. Note on the pathogenesis of certain cases of occupational deafness among aviators. *Oto-rhino-laryng. int.*, 1935, 19, 65-68.
- L 4. AUBRY, M. AND OUMIKOV, S. Noxious action of noise on the auditory organ; fatigue, auditory adaptation and sound trauma. *Ann. Oto-laryng.*, 1945, 12, 235-239.
- L 5. \*AZOY, C. A. Contribution to the study of sound trauma and occupational deafness. *Ann. Med., Barcelona*, 1945, 32, 470-477.
- I 6. BARR, T. Enquiry into the effects of loud sounds upon the hearing of boilermakers and others who work amid noisy surroundings. *Proc. R. phil. Soc. Glasg.*, 1886, 17, 223-239.
- R 7. BEHNKE, A. R., JR. Noise in relation to hearing and efficiency. *N. Y. St. J. Med.*, 1940, 40, 1080-1088.
- L 8. \*BERENDES, J. The audiogram of temporary auditory disturbance caused by sound and its interpretation. *Arch. Otor., Nas., u. Kehlkeilk.*, 1940, 147, 281-287.
- B 9. BETTINGTON, R. H. B. Injuries to the ear due to blast. *Med. J. Aust.*, 1945, 2, 210-211.
- B 10. BJORK, H. Otological observations during the Finnish-Russian war. *Acta oto-laryng., Stockh.*, 1942, 30, 54-64.
- B 11. BOEMER, L. C. Acoustic trauma. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1945, 54, 513-517.
- L 12. BRONSTEIN, A. On the functional state of the fatigued ear. *Bull. Biol. Med. exp. U.R.S.S.* (French ed.), 1936, 1, 363-365.
- L 13. BRONSTEIN, A. J. AND CHURILOVA, E. A. The dependence of time taken to restore the initial excitability of the hearing apparatus upon the pitch of the acting tone. *Bull. Biol. Med. exp. U.R.S.S.* (French ed.), 1936, 1, 428-430.
- I 14. BUNCI, C. C. 'Nerve deafness' of known pathology or etiology. The diagnosis of occupational or traumatic deafness; a historical and audiometric study. (Symposium; the neural mechanism of hearing. [Part] B.) *Laryngoscope*, 1937, 47, 615-691.
- A&S 15. ———. The problem of deafness in aviators. *War Medicine*, 1941, 1, 873-886.
- I 16. ———. Conservation of hearing in industry. *J. Amer. med. Ass.*, 1942, 118, 588-593.
- A&S 17. CAMPBELL, P. A. The effect of flight upon hearing. *J. Aviat. Med.*, 1942, 13, 56-61.
- A&S 18. ———. The progress of aviation otology in World War II. *Laryngoscope*, 1944, 54, 387-397.
- A&S 19. ———. The present status of the problem of aviation deafness. *Trans. Amer. Acad. Otol. Otolaryng.*, 1944, 49, 72-74.
- A&S 20. ———. The problem of aviation deafness: the airman, his history and his plane. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1945, 41, 319-321.
- A&S 21. CAMPBELL, P. A. AND HARGREAVES, J. Aviation deafness—acute and chronic. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1940, 32, 417-428.

<sup>4</sup>To aid in the identification and grouping of articles according to various sub-topics, the references are coded as follows:

- A&S—Deafness in submarine and aircraft personnel.  
 B—Literature concerned with blast or shock waves.  
 I—Industrial and clinical studies.  
 L—Laboratory experiments.  
 P—Studies involving earplugs.  
 R—Review articles.

Although some of the publications could be classified in more than one of the above classes, they were placed in what was felt to be the most descriptive category. Those references not verified in the original are marked with an asterisk.



- B 22. CANTOR, J. J. Rupture of the tympanic membrane due to blast; a mechanical hypothesis. *Ann. Otol., Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1945, 54, 544-567.
- R 23. CARHART, R. AND PETERSON, G. A selected bibliography on hearing and deafness. *JSD*, 1943, 8, 254-256.
- A&S 24. CARSON, L. D. Otolaryngologic problems occurring in fliers. *J. Amer. med. Ass.*, 1942, 120, 4-9.
- R 25. CARTER, H. A. Review of methods used for estimating percentage loss of hearing. *Laryngoscope*, 1942, 52, 879-890.
- L 26. CAUSSE, R. AND CHAVASSE, P. Studies on auditory fatigue. *Année psychol.*, 1942-1943 (pub. 1947), 43-44, 265-298.
- I 27. CHAMBERLAIN, D. Occupational deafness: audiometric observations on aural fatigue and recovery. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1942, 35, 595-602.
- A&S 28. CHESTER, L. AND DROOKER, J. C. Aero-otitis media and aeroinusitis. *Laryngoscope*, 1943, 53, 203-209.
- L 29. CIURLO, L. Contribution to the physiology of the internal ear: I. Vasmotor reflexes caused by sound. *Arch. ital. Otol.*, 1936, 48, 239-250.
- A&S 30. COERMANN, R. Effect of noise in aircraft. Deutsche Versuchsanstalt für Luftfahrt. ZWB Forschungsber. no. 1102, Sept. 12, 1939. PB no. 37299.
- B 31. COLLINS, E. G. Injury to the ears among battle casualties of the Western Desert. *J. Laryng.*, 1944, 59, 1-15.
- I 32. COOSEMANS, E. Hearing in beetlers. Contribution to the study of occupational deafness. *Trans. 6th Int. otol. Congr., Lond.*, 1899, 296-304.
- R 33. COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL MEDICINE. Tentative standard procedure for evaluating the percentage loss of hearing in medicolegal cases. *J. Amer. med. Ass.*, 1947, 133, 396-397.
- R 34. ———. Minimum requirements for acceptable earphone audiometers. *J. Amer. med. Ass.*, 1949, 140, 1095-1096.
- P 35. COX, L. K. AND GELLER, J. W. Anticoncussion ear plugs; prevention of aural complications from gunnery concussion. *Nav. med. Bull., Wash.*, 1944, 43, 139-142.
- P 36. CRAIG, D. H. Injury of tympanic membrane caused by explosions; report of six cases. *Journal-Lancet*, 1940, 239, 40-41.
- B 37. ———. Blast injuries of the ear. *J. Laryng.*, 1944, 59, 443-456.
- L 38. CROWE, S. J., GUILD, S. R. AND POLVOGT, L. M. Observations on the pathology of high-tone deafness. *Johns Hopk. Hosp. Bull.*, 1934, 54, 315-379.
- R 39. CURRIER, W. D. Office noises and their effect on audiometry. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1943, 38, 49-59.
- B 40. DAVIS, E. D. D. Deafness due to gun-fire. *Med. Pr.*, 1940, 204, 332-334.
- L 41. DAVIS, H. Effects of noise on hearing. [Harvard Med. School], 1942-1943. PB no. 41037.
- P 42. ———. Protection of workers against noise. *J. industr. Hyg.*, 1945, 27, 56-57.
- L 43. ———. The articulation area and the social adequacy index for hearing. *Laryngoscope*, 1948, 58, 761-778.
- L 44. DAVIS, H. and others. Experimental stimulation deafness. *Science*, 1935, 81, 101-102.
- L 45. ———. Functional and histological changes in the cochlea of the guinea-pig resulting from prolonged stimulation. *J. gen. Psychol.*, 1935, 12, 251-278.
- L 46. ———. Physiological effects of exposure to certain sounds; final report. Harvard Med. School, July 31, 1942. OSRD Rept. no. 889.
- L 47. ———. Temporary deafness following exposure to loud tones and noise; final report. Harvard Med. School, Sept. 30, 1943.
- L 48. ———. Temporary deafness following exposure to loud tones

- and noise. *Laryngoscope*, 1946, 56, 19-21.
- L 49. DE CERQUEIRA FALCAO, E. Hematoma of the tympanum due to sound trauma (shouting). *Rev. oto-laring. de S. Paulo*, 1936, 4, 629-632.
- I 50. DE GAULEJAC, R. Concerning the noxiousness of the atmosphere of test benches and of the injurious action of motors under test upon the auditory system of the workers. *Ann. Hyg. publ., Paris*, 1937, 15, 544-559.
- B 51. DE WIT, G. Professional deafness in the Naval staff. *Acta otolaryng., Stockh.*, 1942, 30, 373-382.
- A&S 52. DICKSON, E. D. D. Aviation noise deafness and its prevention. *J. Laryng.*, 1942, 57, 8-10.
- A&S 53. DICKSON, E. D. D., EWING, A. W. G. AND LITTLER, T. S. The effects of aeroplane noise on the auditory acuity of aviators: some preliminary remarks. *J. Laryng.*, 1939, 54, 531-548.
- P 54. DYSON, G. W. Let's hear about it. *Sci. Mon., N. Y.*, 1946, 62, 267-270.
- L 55. EWING, A. W. G. AND LITTLER, T. S. Auditory fatigue and adaptation. *Brit. J. Psychol.*, 1935, 25, 284-307.
- L 56. FENNER, E. The audiogram of acoustic trauma. *Schweiz. med. Wschr.*, 1943, 73, 823-827.
- L 57. FINCH, G. AND CULLER, E. Effects of protracted exposure to a loud tone. *Science*, 1934, 80, 41-42.
- B 58. FISCHER, J. AND WOLFSON, L. E. *The Inner Ear, including Otoneurology, Otosurgery, and Problems in Modern Warfare*. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1943.
- A&S 59. FLAIZ, J. W. AND WOLF, E. G. The effect of noise on aviation personnel. *Contact, Pensacola*, 1943, 3, 160-167.
- L 60. FLETCHER, H. Audiometric measurements and their uses; (notes on a talk). *Trans. Coll. Phys. Philad.*, 1923, 45 (3rd Series), 489-501.
- I 61. FOSBROKE, J. Practical observations on the pathology and treatment of deafness. No. II. *Journal-Lancet*, 1831, 19, 645-648.
- I 62. FOWLER, E. P. Marked deafened areas in normal ears. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1928, 8, 151-155.
- L 63. ———. Limited lesions of the basilar membrane. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1929, 10, 624-632.
- L 64. ———. Head noises in normal and in disordered ears; significance, measurement, differentiation and treatment. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1944, 39, 498-503.
- A&S 65. ———. Causes of deafness in flyers. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1945, 42, 21-32.
- L 66. FOX, S. L. Hearing losses. *Dis. Eye, Ear, Nose & Throat*, 1942, 2, 322-336.
- B 67. ———. The effects on hearing of acoustic trauma in industry and war. *Stb. med. J.*, 1943, 36, 97-100.
- I 68. GARDNER, W. H. Injuries to hearing—in industry. *Industr. Med.*, 1944, 13, 676-679.
- A&S 69. \*GARROTE, V. M. Vibrations, noise, and toxic substances in aviation medicine. *Gac. méd. esp.*, 1946, 20, 284-288.
- L 70. \*GERMAN, T. The injurious effects of noises upon the organ of hearing. *Városi Szele*, 1933, 19, 28-35.
- B 71. \*GERSHUNI, G. V. and others. Disorders of activity of sensory organs and certain other nervous functions due to 'air blast.' *Vo.-med. Sborn.*, 1945, 2, 98-192.
- B 72. GLASS, E. J. G. Blast injury of the tympanic membrane. *J. Laryng.*, 1945, 60, 441-444.
- R 73. GLIBERT, D. J. Influence of industrial noises. *J. industr. Hyg.*, 1922, 3, 264-275.
- R 74. GLICK, H. N. Who can work? Symposium: defective hearing in industry. *Industr. Med.*, 1944, 13, 539-540.
- R 75. GOLDNER, A. Occupational deafness; with special reference to chronic occupational deafness. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1945, 42, 407-411.

- I 76. GOTTSTEIN, J. AND KAYSER, R. On hearing defects in locksmiths and blacksmiths. *Breslauer ärztl. Z.*, 1881, No. 18, 205-207.
- A&S 77. GRAEBNER, H. Auditory deterioration in airline pilots. *J. Aviat. Med.*, 1947, 18, 39-47.
- I 78. GROBSHTEIN, S. S. AND KUGARO, A. V. Changes in the organs of hearing under the influence of noise of persons engaged in production. *Russk. oto-laring.*, 1931, 24, 429-449.
- L 79. GROSSMAN, F. M. Sound transmission through the ear and its relation to sound injury. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1943, 52, 666-674.
- R 80. GROVE, W. E. Symposium on noise. (b) Noise in industry. *Laryngoscope*, 1947, 57, 114-124.
- R 81. GRUSS, L. The effect of noise on the hearing of industrial workers. *Volta Rev.*, 1939, 41, 511-514+.
- B 82. GUILD, S. R. The otopathies of war; with especial reference to the traumas due to air waves. *J. tech. Meth.*, 1918, Bull. no. 7, 225-245.
- B 83. ———. War deafness and its prevention: report of the labyrinths of the animals used in testing of preventive measures. (Middle ears previously reported.) *J. Lab. clin. Med.*, 1919, 4, 153-180.
- B 84. ———. War deafness and its prevention. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1941, 50, 70-76; *Trans. Amer. laryng. rhin. otol. Soc.*, 1941, 47, 370-377.
- B 85. ———. Anatomical changes responsible for blast deafness and the prevention of such damage to the ear. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1944, 16, 68-70.
- I 86. HABERMANN, J. On the deafness of boiler-makers. *Arch. Ohr., Nas., u. Kehlkheilk.*, 1890, 30, 1-25.
- I 87. ———. Contribution to the knowledge of occupational hearing loss. *Arch. Ohr., Nas., u. Kehlkheilk.*, 1906, 69, 106-130.
- B 88. HAGERMAN, F. Aural shot injuries and their healing. (A contribution to the problem of the regenerative power in the nerve end apparatus of the hearing organ.) Preliminary report II. *Acta oto-laryng., Stockh.*, 1942, 30, 13-25.
- B 89. ———. Hearing injuries after acoustic shot traumata. (Preliminary report.) *Acta oto-laryng., Stockh.*, 1942, 30, 75-86.
- A&S 90. HARRIS, J. D. Auditory acuity in severe aero-otitis media. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1945, 17, 139-143.
- L 91. HAWKINS, J. E., LURIE, M. H. AND DAVIS, H. Injury of the inner ear produced by exposure to loud tones; supplementary rept. [to OSRD Rept. no. 889]. Harvard Med. School, Dec. 31, 1943.
- L 92. HAYS, H. The treatment of deafness and tinnitus. *N. Y. St. J. Med.*, 1923, 23, 157-160.
- B 93. HENDRICKS, J. E. War deafness in gunnery instructors. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1946, 55, 68-80.
- B 94. HENRY, G. A. Blast injuries of the ear. *Laryngoscope*, 1945, 55, 663-672.
- A&S 95. HEYDEN, R. Aviators' deafness. *Acta oto-laryng., Stockh.*, 1944, 32, 164-175.
- B 96. HIPSKIND, M. M. War injuries to the auditory apparatus. Clinical and audiometric observations. *Laryngoscope*, 1945, 55, 678-705.
- P 97. HOLMGREN, L. Some general and special remarks on the investigations regarding aural protections in the army during the autumn of 1941. *Acta oto-laryng., Stockh.*, 1944, 32, 502-509.
- I 98. HOLT, E. E. Boiler-maker's deafness and hearing in a noise. *Trans. Amer. otol. Soc.*, 1882, 3 (Part I) 34-44.
- L 99. HOLWAY, A. H., STATON, R. C. AND ZIGLER, M. J. The neurophysiology of hearing: I. The magnitude of threshold-stimuli during recovery from stimulation-deafness. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1940, 27, 669-677.

- B 100. HOOPLE, G. D., WOLFE, W. C. AND GREGANDE, S. C. Symposium on noise. (c) Unrecognized battle noise trauma. *Laryngoscope*, 1947, 57, 125-136.
- L 101. HORTON, G. P. A quantitative study of hearing in the guinea pig (*cavia cobaya*). *J. comp. Psychol.*, 1933, 15, 59-73.
- L 102. HUGHSON, W. AND WITTING, E. G. An objective study of auditory fatigue. *Acta oto-laryng., Stockh.*, 1935, 21, 457-486.
- A&S 103. IWASZKIEWICZ, J. Seeking a solution to the problem of hearing in aviators. *Lek. wojsk.*, 1945, 36, 53-56.
- P 104. JAMES, J. A. Gun blast and the use of moulded ear defenders. *J. Laryng.*, 1945, 60, 294-297.
- A&S 105. JOHNSON, N. C. Ear disorders in flying. *Contact, Pensacola*, 1947, 6, 177-188.
- B 106. KATZSCHMANN. On loss of hearing due to vibration in miners, with a review of the mechanization of modern mining industry. *Z. Laryng. Rhinol.*, 1931, 20, 353-361.
- L 107. KAWATA, S. Experimental studies on noise injuries to the ear. *Jap. J. med. Sci., XII, Oto-Rhino-Laryngology*, 1937, 2, 77-109.
- R 108. KEMP, E. H. A critical review of experiments on the problem of stimulation deafness. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1935, 32, 325-342.
- A&S 109. KIPP, P. F. Hearing impairment caused by aircraft noise. [Institut für Flugmedizin der deutschen Versuchsanstalt für Luftfahrt] n.d. (Translated as Aero Medical Center, 3rd Central Medical Establishment (AF) U8-46-18, May 26, 1946).
- P 110. KNUDSEN, V. O. Hearing better in the presence of a noise. *Science*, 1925, 62, 109-111.
- P 111. ———. Ear defenders. *Nat. Safety News*, 1939, 39, 32+.
- P 112. ———. Defense against noise. *Nat. Safety News*, 1942, 45, 28-29.
- L 113. KOBRAK, H. G. Observations on the acoustic movements of the human sound conduction apparatus. (Abstract of motion picture demonstration.) *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1942, 51, 554-555.
- L 114. KOBRAK, H. G., LINDSAY, J. R. AND PERLMAN, H. B. Experimental observations on the question of auditory fatigue. *Laryngoscope*, 1941, 51, 798-810.
- L 115. ———. Experimental observations on auditory masking. *Laryngoscope*, 1942, 52, 870-878. Also published as: Chicago Univ., *Douglas Smith Foundation-Studies*, 1942-1943, 15 (16) 1-11.
- I 116. KOELSCH, F. Noise—vibrations. *Jahreskurse ärztl. Fortbild.*, 1935, 26 (9) 1-13.
- I 117. ———. The knowledge of noise and of noise injuries. *Jahreskurse ärztl. Fortbild.*, 1939, 30 (12) 24-50.
- B 118. KORKIS, F. B. Effect of blast on human ear. *Brit. med. J.*, 1946, 1, 198-201.
- A&S 119. KOS, C. M. Effect of barometric pressure changes on hearing. *Trans. Amer. Acad. Ophthal. Oto-laryng.*, 1944, 49, 75-81.
- I 120. KRISTENSEN, H. K. On the relation between the hearing of weavers and the body type. *Acta oto-laryng., Stockh.*, 1946, 34, 82-94.
- L 121. ———. Weaver's deafness. *Acta oto-laryng., Stockh.*, 1946, 34, 157-175.
- P 122. KRYTER, K. D. Effects of ear protective devices on the intelligibility of speech in noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1946, 18, 413-417.
- P 123. KRYTER, K. D. and others. Experiments with earplugs. I. Their effect on the intelligibility of speech; II. Their use as protection against gun blast. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., June 1, 1944. PB. no. 22912.
- I 124. KULIKOV, C. I. The acoustical conditions during the lunch pause and the auditory threshold of workers in noisy plants. *Fiz. Zb.*, 1940, 28, 113-122.

- R 125. LAKE, R. A note on boiler-makers' deafness. *J. Laryng.*, 1923, 38, 323-324.
- I 126. LANGENBECK, B. Hearing in noisy surroundings. *Z. Hals-Nas.- u. Ohrenheilk.*, 1931, 30, 1-64.
- B 127. LAPORTE, O. Shock waves. *Sci. Amer.*, 1949, 181, 14-19.
- I 128. LARSEN, B. Investigations of professional deafness in shipyard and machine factory labourers. *Acta oto-laryng.*, *Stockh.*, 1939, Suppl. 36.
- I 129. ———. Investigations on noise in certain factories. *Acta oto-laryng.*, *Stockh.*, 1946, 34, 71-77.
- R 130. LEDERER, E. Measurement of noise. In: International Labor Office, Geneva. *Industrial Environment and Health; Practical Methods of Investigation*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1936.
- A&S 131. LEROUGE, J. Influence of noise on aviators. *Progr. méd.*, *Paris*, 1940, 68, 132-135.
- P 132. LITTLER, T. S. Effect of noises of warfare on the ear. *Nature*, *Lond.*, 1940, 146, 217-219.
- L 133. LOCH, W. E. Effect of experimentally altered air pressure in the middle ear on hearing acuity in man. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1942, 51, 995-1006.
- L 134. LURIE, M. H. Studies of acquired and inherited deafness in animals. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1940, 11, 420-426.
- B 135. ———. War and deafness. *Conn. St. med. J.*, 1943, 7, 763-765.
- L 136. LURIE, M. H., DAVIS, H. AND HAWKINS, J. E. Acoustic trauma of the organ of Corti in the guinea pig. *Laryngoscope*, 1944, 54, 375-386.
- I 137. MCCOY, D. A. The industrial noise hazard. *Arch. Otolaryng.*, *Chicago*, 1944, 39, 327-330.
- R 138. MACFARLAN, D. Military symposium. Prevention and treatment of acoustic trauma in war and civil life. *Laryngoscope*, 1941, 51, 964-969.
- P 139. MCGIBBON, J. E. G. Protection of the auditory apparatus from noise. [Letter to the editor] *Brit. med. J.*, 1940, 2, 365-366.
- B 140. MACHLE, W. The effect of gun blast upon hearing. *Trans. Amer. Acad. Ophthal. Oto-laryng.*, 1944, 49, 90-96; *Arch. Otolaryng.*, *Chicago*, 1945, 42, 164-168.
- I 141. MCKELVIE, W. B. Weaver's deafness. *J. Laryng.*, 1933, 48, 607-608.
- R 142. ———. The effects of noise on hearing. *Med. Pr.*, 1937, 195, 401-402.
- B 143. MCMAHON, B. J. Post-war deafness, a challenge to the otologist. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1945, 54, 61-68.
- A&S 144. MALONE, P. W. Aviation deafness. *Arch. Otolaryng.*, *Chicago*, 1944, 40, 468-474.
- B 145. MARAGE. Contribution to the study of war concussions. *C. R. Acad. Sci.*, *Paris*, 1918, 166, 132-135.
- B 146. ———. Causes and duration of certain types of war deafness. *Bull. Acad. Med. Paris*, 1919, 81, 779-782.
- L 147. MARX, H. Investigations on experimental injury to the ear. C. On injury to the ear produced by adequate stimuli. *Z. Ohrenheilk.*, 1909, 59, 333-343.
- L 148. MATSUURA, S. On the pathological changes of the hearing organs caused by sound injuries. *J. Okayama med. Soc.*, 1935, 47, 279-297.
- A&S 149. MERKEL, B. M. Aviation deafness. *J. Iowa St. med. Soc.*, 1946, 36, 288-291.
- A&S 150. MEYER ZUM GOTTESBERGE, A. Hearing injuries in flying personnel. (A contribution to the question of C.-decrease.) *Luftfabrtmedizin*, 1943, 8, 256-264.
- B 151. MILLER, D. C. Concussion sound waves from large guns in action. Author's abstract. *Laryngoscope*, 1938, 48, 720-723.
- L 152. MINKINA, E. M. Relation between injury to the ear and intensity of noise. *J. Otol. Rhin. Laryng.*, *U.S.S.R.*, 1940, 17, 379-392.

- R 153. MOLLISON, W. M. Ear and occupation. *Guy's Hosp. Rep.*, 1936, 86, 185-190.
- L 154. MORGAN, C. T. AND GALAMBOS, R. A reinvestigation of the relation between pitch and intensity [Abstract]. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1943, 15, 77.
- I 155. MUCK, O. Is there a hearing loss in miners caused by noise? *Z. Laryng. Rhinol.*, 1934, 25, 159-161.
- B 156. MURRAY, N. E. AND REID, G. Temporary deafness due to gunfire. *J. Laryng.*, 1946, 61, 92-130.
- B 157. ———. Experimental observations on the aural effects of gunblast. *Med. J. Aust.*, 1946, 1, 611-617.
- P 158. NASIELL, V. Principles concerning the prophylaxis of aural injuries in the services. *Acta otolaryng.*, *Stockb.*, 1944, 32, 509-526.
- I 159. New York (State) Department of Labor, Bureau of Women in Industry. *Effect of Noise upon Hearing of Industrial Workers: A Study of a Group of Workers in Noisy Industries*. New York (State) Department of Labor, Special Bulletin no. 166, Sept., 1930.
- L 160. PARKER, R. C. The nature of fatigue in the auditory system. *Proc. phys. Soc. Lond.*, 1938, 50, 108-118.
- B 161. PARRACK, H. O., ELDREDGE, D. H. AND KOSTER, H. F. Physiological effects of intense sound. Engineering div., Air materiel command, May 24, 1948. TIP U2571.
- P 162. PASSE, E. R. G. Gun-fire deafness. *Brit. med. J.*, 1940, 2, 295.
- A&S 163. PASTORE, P. N. Hearing among experienced aviators. *Proc. Mayo Clin.*, 1941, 16, 214-217.
- B 164. PATT, H. M. Hearing loss from gunfire. *Hosp. Corps Quart.*, 1945, 18, 41-42.
- B 165. ———. Auditory acuity of artillerymen and of rifle coaches. *Arch. Otolaryng.*, *Chicago*, 1946, 44, 298-302.
- P 166. PAVLOV, L. Aural protection in severe flying conditions. *Vo.-sanit. Dyelo.*, 1932, no. 9, 46-47.
- R 167. PEDLEY, F. G. The incidence of occupational deafness and methods for its prevention. *Safety Engng.*, 1930, 60, 237-241.
- L 168. PERLMAN, H. B. Acoustic trauma in man; clinical and experimental studies. *Arch. Otolaryng.*, *Chicago*, 1941, 34, 429-452.
- R 169. ———. The effects of noise and concussion on hearing. *JSD*, 1943, 8, 289-295.
- B 170. ———. Reaction of the human conduction mechanism to blast. *Laryngoscope*, 1945, 55, 427-443.
- B 171. ———. Acoustic trauma. *Ann. Surg.*, 1945, 122, 1086-1091.
- L 172. PERLMAN, H. B. AND CASE, T. J. Latent period of the crossed stapedius reflex in man. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1939, 48, 663-675.
- P 173. PERWITZSCHKY, R. Hearing loss due to noise and hearing protection. *Gesundb. u. Erziehg.*, 1937, 50, 9-14.
- I 174. PERWITZSCHKY, R. AND LANIG. Hearing protection for workers in noisy occupations. *Z. Hals-Nas.- u. Ohrenheilk.*, 1936, 41, 178-186.
- P 175. PEUGNET, H. B. AND SENTURIA, B. H. Evaluation of ear plug effectiveness. School of Aviation Medicine, Randolph Field (AAF), July 1, 1944.
- I 176. PEYSER, A. The occupational diseases and injuries of the ear in industrial workers with particular consideration of the injuries caused by operation noise: their place within workers' protection and workers' insurance, as well as the difficulty of their mutual distinction. *Arch. soz. Hyg.*, 1911, 6, 143-164.
- I 177. ———. Progress in the study, prevention, and compensation of occupational hearing loss due to noise. *Z. Bahnärzt.*, 1930, 25, 30-38.
- L 178. ———. On the methodology of otologic prophylaxis of hearing

- loss in industry due to noise; Part I. Part II. The influence of chronic affections of the middle ear upon ear fatigue through noise. *Acta oto-laryng., Stockb.*, 1940, 28, 443-462; 1943, 31, 351-364.
- I 179. PILAT, F. AND PACHNER, P. Noise and hearing in industry. *Sborn, lék.*, 1944, 46, 106-137.
- L 180. PLUMMER, R. N. High frequency deafness and discrimination of 'high frequency' consonants. *JSD*, 1943, 8, 373-381.
- L 181. POHLMAN, A. G. The reactions in the ear to sound. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1941, 50, 363-378.
- I 182. POPOFF, N. F. On the changes in the auditory apparatus of white mice caused by noises in the metal trades: preliminary report from the All Russian Congress of Oto-laryngologists held at Moscow in 1927 [Abstract]. *J. industr. Hyg.*, 1931, 13, 17-18.
- I 183. ———. On histo-pathological changes of the ear of white mice caused by factory (metal) noise and vibration. *Mschbr. Obrenheitk*, 1932, 66, 1488-1502.
- L 184. RAWDON-SMITH, A. F. Auditory fatigue. *Brit. J. Psychol.*, 1934, 25, 77-85.
- L 185. ———. Experimental deafness: further data upon the phenomenon of so-called auditory fatigue. *Brit. J. Psychol.*, 1936, 26, 233-244.
- P 186. \*RICHARDSON, C. W. Ear protectors for the benefit of the soldiers in actual conflict. Office memo to Surgeon General, Feb., 20, 1918, on file in Historical Div., S.G.O.
- L 187. ROCARD, Y. On a physiological effect bearing on hearing under noisy conditions. *Rev. Acoust.*, 1938, 7, 37-38.
- I 188. RODGER, T. R. Noise-deafness: a review of recent experimental work, and a clinical investigation into the effect of loud noise upon the labyrinth in boiler-makers. Part I. *J. Laryng.*, 1915, 30, 91-105.
- R 189. ———. The pathological effects of excessive sounds on the cochlear apparatus, considered in relation to the theories of sound perception. *J. Laryng.*, 1923, 38, 66-71.
- I 190. ROSENBLITH, W. A. Industrial noises and industrial deafness. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1942, 13, 220-225.
- B 191. RUEDI, L. Acoustic trauma in active service. *Schweiz. med. Wschr.*, 1941, 71, 512-517.
- L 192. ———. Effects of noise, with special reference to aural damage. *Schweiz. med. Wschr.*, 1943, 73, 913-917.
- P 193. RUEDI, L. AND FURRER, W. Preliminary report on a new device protecting against noise. *Pract. oto-rhino-laryng., Basel*, 1944, 6, 255-265.
- L 194. ———. Acoustic trauma and function of internal ear. *Acta oto-laryng., Stockb.*, 1945, 33, 460-470.
- L 195. ———. Perception of pitch and acoustic trauma. *Experimentia, Basel*, 1945, 1, 201-202.
- L 196. ———. Acoustic trauma; its origin and prevention. *Schweiz. med. Wschr.*, 1946, 76, 843-851.
- L 197. ———. Physics and physiology of acoustic trauma. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1946, 18, 409-412.
- B 198. RUEDI, L. AND MINDER, H. Further contribution on acute acoustic trauma. *Pract. oto-rhino-laryng., Basel*, 1943, 5, 169-193.
- I 199. RUSSI, U. On noise injuries in industrial operations and their prevention. *Pract. oto-rhino-laryng., Basel*, 1946, 8, 71-113.
- B 200. RYLAND, A. Assessment of aural disability resulting from military service. *J. Laryng.*, 1920, 35, 354-362.
- R 201. SABINE, H. J. AND WILSON, R. A. The application of sound absorption to factory noise problems. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1943, 15, 27-31.
- I 202. SACHER, A. Contribution to the study of occupational hearing loss: the deafness of boiler-makers.

- Msschr. Ohrenheilk.*, 1927, 61, 337-359.
- A&S 203. SALEM, W. Does occupational deafness exist in aviation? *Rev. Med. Hyg. milit., Rio de J.*, 1942, 31 (3), 281-286.
- I 204. SANGIOVANNI, V. On a case of acute acoustic trauma (Clinical note). *Oto-rino-laring. ital.*, 1936, 6, 284-293.
- R 205. SCAL, J. C. Noise deafness in industry and environment: (occupational deafness). *N. Y. St. J. Med.*, 1933, 33, 1251-1254.
- A&S 206. SCHMALIX, J. Inner ear injury caused by airplane noise. *Luft-fahrtmedizin*, 1944, 8, 368-380.
- B 207. SCHMIDT, M. Acoustical trauma. *Pract. oto-rhino-laryng., Basel*, 1944, 6, 250-255.
- A&S 208. SCOTT, V. T. Airplane deafness and its prevention. *Milit. Surg.*, 1923, 52, 300-301.
- A&S 209. SENTURIA, B. H. Effect of aircraft noise on hearing. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1945, 41, 327-332; *Trans. Amer. Acad. Ophthal. Oto-laryng.*, 1944, 49, 82-89.
- A&S 210. ———. Auditory acuity of aviation cadets. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1944, 53, 705-716.
- I 211. SEYFARTH, W. Results of examination of 120 workers in very noisy operations. *Arch. Gewerbepath. Gewerbehyg.*, 1940, 10, 238-258.
- R 212. SHAMBAUGH, G. E. Part II. The ear—physiology. In *Year Book of the Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat*. Chicago: The Year Book Publishers, Inc., 1935.
- I 213. SHAMBAUGH, G. E., JR. Prevention and treatment of acoustic trauma. *JSD*, 1943, 8, 369-372.
- P 214. SHAW, W. A. *Development of Ear Wardens Type V-51R*. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., July 1, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 5122.
- I 215. SHEIVKHMANN, B. E. The effect of noise on the hearing of workers in noisy factories. *Chevert. Soveshch. Fiziol. Probl., Fiziol. Org. Chuvstv. Akad. Nauk. USSR. VIEM*. 1938, 23-24.
- I 216. [SHEIVKHMANN] SCHIFWECHMANN, B. E. The influence of frequency of sound waves on the hearing of workers in noisy operations. *Bull. Biol. Med. exp. U.R.S.S.* (French ed.), 1939, 8, 185-188. (Also pub. in Russian ed., 1939, 8, 170-172.)
- A&S 217. SHILLING, C. W. Acro-otitis media and auditory acuity loss in submarine escape training. *Trans. Amer. Acad. Ophthal. Oto-laryng.*, 1944, 49, 97-102.
- A&S 218. SHILLING, C. W. AND EVERLEY, I. A. Auditory acuity among submarine personnel; Part I. Part II. Hearing loss due to exposure to radio under service conditions. Part IV. Hearing loss due to exposure to gunfire. *Nav. med. Bull., Wash.*, 1942, 40, 27-42, 396-403, 938-947.
- A&S 219. SHOCH, D. E. Effect of listening to aircraft radio for lengthy intervals on auditory acuity. In *School of Aviation Medicine, Randolph Field, AAF. Quarterly Research Report*, Jan. 1-Mar. 31, 1948. TIP U635.
- B 220. SILCOX, L. E. AND SCHENCK, H. P. Blast injury of the ears. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1944, 39, 413-420.
- I 221. SILVERMAN, S. R. and others. Improvement in the social adequacy of hearing following the fenestration operation. *Laryngoscope*, 1948, 58, 607-631.
- R 222. SLEIGHT, R. B. AND TIFFIN, J. Industrial noise and hearing. *J. appl. Psychol.*, 1948, 32, 476-489.
- R 223. SMYTH, H. F. Noise in industry: its effects on the hearing and on general health (a review of the literature). *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1932, 41, 1108-1116.
- I 224. STEINBERG, J. C. AND GARDNER, M. B. The dependence of hearing impairment on sound intensity [Abstract]. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1937, 8, 207.
- L 225. ———. On the auditory significance of the term hearing loss. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1940, 11, 270-277.



- L 226. STEINBERG, J. C., MONTGOMERY, H. C. AND GARDNER, M. B. Results of the World's Fair hearing tests. *Bell Teleph. Syst. tech. Publ.*, Monograph B-1256, 1940; *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1940, 19, 533-562; abridged form in *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1940, 12, 291-301.
- L 227. STEVENS, S. S., DAVIS, H. AND LURIE, M. H. The localization of pitch perception on the basilar membrane. *J. gen. Psychol.*, 1935, 13, 297-315.
- B 228. STEWART, J. V. AND BARROW, D. W. Concussion deafness. *Arch. Otolaryng.*, Chicago, 1946, 44, 274-279.
- B 229. SUGGII, S. Deafness resulting from gunfire and explosions. *J. Laryng.*, 1943, 58, 313-326.
- B 230. ———. Gunfire deafness. *Med. Pr.*, 1946, 215, 424-426.
- I 231. SWANN, C. C. The effect of noise on hearing. *Int. J. Med.*, 1933, 46, 314-315.
- L 232. TAKEZAWA, N. Experimental investigation on the degeneration of the inner ear caused by vibration. *Mitt. med. Akad. Kioto*, 1934, 12 (4), 1337-1364.
- I 233. TALINI, P. C. Otopathy due to noise in metallurgical workers (clinical study). *Med. d. Lavoro*, 1942, 33, 1-7.
- B 234. TAYLOR, H. M. Traumatic deafness; problems of prevention. *Laryngoscope*, 1944, 54, 362-373; *Trans. Amer. otol. Soc.*, 1944, 33, 186-201.
- P 235. ———. Symposium on noise. (d) Ear defenders. *Laryngoscope*, 1947, 57, 137-141.
- I 236. TEMKIN, J. Aural injury through noise and vibration. *M Schr. Obrenheilck.*, 1933, 67, 257-299, 450-479, 527-553, 705-736, 823-834.
- B 237. TERRACOL, J. AND CHEYNEL, M. J. On a case of true concussion of labyrinth caused by detonation of cannon. *Rev. Laryng., Paris*, 1936, 57, 372-375.
- L 238. THOMPSON, L. Shock waves in air and characteristics of instruments for their measurement. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1940, 12, 198-204.
- L 239. THURAS, A. L., JENKINS, R. T. AND O'NEIL, H. T. Extraneous frequencies generated in air carrying intense sound waves. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1935, 6, 173-180.
- P 240. TRIBLE, G. B. AND WATKINS, S. S. Ear protection. *Nav. med. Bull., Wash.*, 1919, 13, 48-60.
- A&S 241. TROINA, F. Changes in hearing in aircraft personnel. *Valsalva*, 1933, 9, 337-353.
- A&S 242. ULLMAN, E. V. Traumatic deafness in combat flyers. *Arch. Otolaryng.*, Chicago, 1944, 40, 374-381.
- L 243. UNDRITZ, W. AND SASSOSSOW, R. On injuries caused by noise and on the function of the sacculus. *Acta oto-laryng.*, Stockh., 1935, 21, 487-501.
- L 244. UPTON, M. Functional disturbances of hearing in guinea pigs after long exposure to an intense tone. *J. gen. Psychol.*, 1929, 2, 397-412.
- B 245. VADALA, A. J. Effects of gun explosions on the ear and hearing mechanism. *Milit. Surg.*, 1930, 66, 810-822.
- L 246. VON BEKESY, G. Concerning the theory of hearing: the vibration form of the basilar membrane. *Phys. Z.*, 1928, 29, 793-810.
- L 247. VON WITTMACK, K. New evidence supporting Helmholtz's resonance theory. *Pflüg. Arch. ges. Physiol.*, 1907, 120, 249-252.
- L 248. ———. On injuries to the ear caused by the action of noise; an experimental study. *Z. Obrenheilck.*, 1907, 54, 37-80.
- A&S 249. WALTER, J. L. The protection of the aviator from noise. *J. Aviat. Med.*, 1936, 7, 18-21.
- P 250. WATSON, N. A. AND KNUDSEN, V. O. Ear defenders. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1944, 15, 153-159.
- L 251. WEGEL, R. L. AND LANE, C. E. The auditory masking of one pure tone by another and its probable relation to the dynamics of the inner ear. *Phys. Rev.*, 1924, 23 (2nd Series), 266-285.

- B 252. WEISS, J. A. Deafness due to noises of warfare. *Nav. med. Bull., Wash.*, 1946, 46, 381-386.
- B 253. WELLS, W. A. The danger to the hearing apparatus in modern warfare. *Trans. Amer. laryng. rhin. otol. Soc.*, 1941, 47, 215-223.
- L 254. WEVER, E. G. The problem of the tonal dip. *Laryngoscope*, 1942, 52, 169-187.
- R 255. ———. *Theory of Hearing*. New York: Wiley, 1949.
- L 256. WEVER, E. G. AND SMITH, K. R. The problem of stimulation deafness. I. Cochlear impairment as a function of tonal frequency. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1944, 34, 239-245.
- A&S 257. WHALEY, J. B. Problems of aviation medicine relating to ear, nose and throat. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1942, 36, 438-442.
- B 258. WHIPPLE, F. J. W. Audibility of gunfire. [Letter to the editor] *Nature, Lond.*, 1927, 119, 782.
- L 259. WHITAKER, J. G. Deafness and loud sound. *Rev. oto-laring. de S. Paulo*, 1937, 5, 131-142.
- B 260. WILSON, W. H. Prevention of traumatic deafness; further studies. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1944, 40, 52-59.
- A&S 261. WODAK, E. The auditory apparatus and aviation. *Journal-Lancet*, 1941, 240, 8-9.
- L 262. WOLFF, D. Microscopic examination of human labyrinths from patients exposed to loud noises. *Arch. Otolaryng., Chicago*, 1942, 36, 843-852.
- R 263. WYDER, C. G. Noise in industry: a primer of cause, effect and cure. *Fact. Mgmt. Mainten.*, 1944, 102, 137-156.
- L 264. YOSHII, U. Experimental investigations on injury to the ear caused by noise. *Z. Ohrenheilk.*, 1909, 58, 201-251.
-

*Part III*

EFFECTS OF NOISE ON COMMUNICATION BY SPEECH

THIS SECTION of the report is directed toward an understanding of the problem of communication by speech in the presence of the kind of noises encountered in the vicinity of power driven machinery, and under certain other special listening conditions.

To ascertain and measure the basic causes of failures in communication and the requirements for success, it is necessary to consider a number of rather complicated functions and relationships pertaining to the characteristics of speech, hearing and the intelligibility of speech sounds.<sup>1</sup> The most important of these factors are presented in the following paragraphs in as non-technical manner as possible. A brief discussion of these factors first should make the later presentation of the effects of noise on communication by speech more meaningful.

#### THE PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SPEECH

Spectra of human speech, as analyzed at the Bell Telephone Laboratories by Dunn and White (20), and at the Electro-Acoustic Laboratory, Harvard University, by Rudmose et al (107), are shown in Figures 1 and 2. For these determinations, the contributions of successive, narrow bands

<sup>1</sup>It is beyond the scope of this paper to do more than indicate, at the proper places, the well-known techniques and instruments used in making the physical measurements of speech and noise. 'Articulation' or 'speech intelligibility' testing methods are less well-known. Briefly, a speaker reads person-to-person, or over a communication system, a list of standardized nonsense syllables, monosyllabic words, polysyllables or sentences to a listener or group of listeners who record what they hear. The answer sheets are then scored and the results expressed in percentage of items correctly recorded. For a detailed discussion of such methods, see 21, 45.

of frequencies throughout the audible sound region were averaged over periods considerably longer than the duration of a syllable. The results represent what is called the 'long average' spectrum of speech. Meters with square law characteristics and suitable filters were used. The sentence, 'Joe took father's shoe bench out; she was waiting at my lawn,' which includes the most important conversational speech sounds, was repeated over and over by talkers in the study conducted by Rudmose et al, whereas Dunn and White had their talkers read connected discourse. The variations in spectrum among seven talkers are shown in Figure 2. For all of the men, the sound energy of speech extends from 100 cps to at least 8,000 cps.

*Range of RMS Intensities Appearing in One-Eighth Second Intervals.* Because of the dynamic nature of speech, the starting and stopping of sounds, the changes of pitch, etc., the intensity level of any narrow band of frequency varies widely from moment to moment. The distributions of frequency components, with respect to both instantaneous peak and root-mean-square (rms) intensity for intervals of one-eighth second (corres-




FIGURE 1. Average speech spectra at a distance of 30 cm from the talkers' lips. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after Dunn and White (20).




FIGURE 2. Person-to-person variation for sentence 'Joe . . . . Lawn'. From Rudmose et al. (108), with permission of author and the Acoustical Society of America, Washington, D. C.




FIGURE 3. Peak pressure in  $\frac{1}{8}$ -sec. intervals for conversational speech at a distance of 30 cm from the talkers' lips (Average of 6 men). From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after Dunn and White (20).




FIGURE 4. RMS pressures in  $\frac{1}{8}$ -sec. intervals for conversational speech at a distance of 30 cm from the talkers' lips (Average of 6 men). From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after Dunn and White (20).

ponding roughly to the duration of a syllable) have been determined by Dunn and White (20) and are shown in Figures 3 and 4. The percentages of one-eighth second intervals in which the sound pressure exceeded the value of the ordinate on the left are shown by the curves.

Note the ordinate and the markings on the right side of Figures 3 and 4. This ordinate gives the sound pressure level, summated over all frequencies, for  $\frac{1}{8}$  second intervals which occurred according to the percentages indicated. For example, Figure 4 shows that the rms sound pressure summated over all frequencies reached approximately 84 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> 1% of the time, whereas for 50% of the  $\frac{1}{8}$  second intervals rms sound pressure reached about 72 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>.

Also, Figure 4 shows that the weakest value at each frequency falls ap-

proximately 30 db below the strongest value. This 30 db represents the dynamic intensity range from the weakest to the most intense sounds at each frequency. The listener must detect sounds throughout this dynamic range if he is to hear all the components in conversational speech. The dynamic range is over 42 db if peak pressures are considered, as in Figure 3, instead of rms values.

*Difference between Instantaneous Peak and RMS Pressures.* If the difference in decibels is taken between instantaneous peak and rms pressures for any given contour in Figures 3 and 4, the *instantaneous peak factor* for speech is obtained. This peak factor for the 10% contour is shown in Figure 5. The instantaneous peaks are 12 db higher on the average for all frequencies than the average rms value. It has not often been appreciated in the use of communication




FIGURE 5. Peak factors of conversational speech at the 10% level of  $\frac{1}{8}$ -sec. intervals. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after Dunn and White (20).

equipment that the peak factor of speech is so large and as a result, a 'chopping off' or 'amplitude distortion'<sup>2</sup> of the peaks of the speech waves has occurred because of inadequate power in the electronic amplifiers in military equipment and in many public address systems.

<sup>2</sup>In this paper 'amplitude distortion' and 'non-linear amplification' will mean that as the sound input to a system at a given frequency is increased in intensity above a certain level, the output from that system will not increase proportionately. The term 'frequency distortion' will mean that a system transduces or transmits different frequencies of sound with different gain.

*Vowel-to-Consonant Ratio.* Another variation in the speech signal is important in the presence of noise and/or with non-linear amplification of the signal. This is the vowel-consonant ratio which, like the instantaneous peak factor, amounts on the average to about 12 db. The range between the weakest consonant [θ] and strongest vowel [ɔ] is of the order of 28 db (109). The vowel-consonant ratio is the difference between the average power of vowels and consonants. The oscillogram of the word *show* in Figure 6 exemplifies a difference in the intensities of a vowel and a consonant.




FIGURE 6. Oscillogram of the word *show*: A, No distortion; B, 12 db peak clipping and reamplification; C, 24 db peak clipping and reamplification. It is seen that the vowel-consonant ratio is reduced with peak clipping. After Kryter and Stein (67).

It is apparent from Figure 6 that the consonants are more likely to be masked by noise than vowels. On the other hand, non-linear amplification will distort the stronger vowel sounds first. The effects of these relationships on the intelligibility of speech will be presented later.

#### SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF HEARING

Three fundamental characteristics of hearing are important for present purposes:

1. The ability to distinguish the presence of sound from the absence of sound. The minimum audible intensity of sound defines the *absolute threshold*.

2. The ability to distinguish the presence of a wanted sound (speech, music, tones, etc.) in a background of other sounds or noise. When the wanted sound is barely distinguishable from the noise, the ear is operating at the *masked threshold*.

3. The ability to respond to and discriminate changes in intensity up to at least 125 db above absolute

threshold. Above this level other thresholds are reached and sound elicits, in turn, feelings of discomfort, tickle and pain. Above that level speech becomes less intelligible because, apparently, of its painfulness and/or an overloading of the ear.

*The Absolute Threshold.* The absolute threshold for pure tones over the audible frequency range for normal young adults listening with both ears in a free field is shown in Curve A of Figure 7 (Taken from Sivian and White (116).) The tones were presented by a loudspeaker.

Wiener and Ross (136) measured the difference between free field pressure and pressure at the ear drum, and Curve B in Figure 7 represents the result of adding the appropriate corrections to Curve A.

Curve C in Figure 7 represents the national mean for all ages for pressure measured under an earphone. Curve C is the accepted standard for audiometers, i.e., the sound pressures indicated by the various frequencies on Curve C are those supposedly generated under an earphone by a standard audiometer when indicating normal hearing.

There are several factors contributing to the difference between Curves A and C. Some of these are:

(a) Curve C is for all ages whereas Curve A is for young observers, whose ears are more acute than those of older people.

(b) For some unknown reason 6 or 7 db more sound pressure must be produced at the eardrum by earphones than by a loud speaker at a meter's distance to achieve threshold.

(c) Two or 3 db less pressure is required for threshold when both ears are exposed to sound than when one ear is exposed (103).




FIGURE 7. The audible threshold for pure tones with subjects in quiet. Curve A is based on data obtained by Sivian and White (116), B is Curve A corrected for the difference between pressure in the free field and at the eardrum as found by Wiener and Ross (136), and Curve C is the national mean for all ages (Part II, 227). From Beranek (2), with permission of the author and the Institute of Radio Engineers, New York City.






FIGURE 8. Monaural thresholds for pure tones when masked by various levels of white noise having uniform energy per cycle. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after Hawkins, Garner and Miller (56).

The problem of the absolute threshold is a tricky one, but for many en-

gineering purposes these differences among threshold measures must be taken into account.

*The Masked Threshold.* Functions relating the intensity required for persons with normal hearing just to detect the presence of pure tones of various frequencies in quiet and in noise are presented in Figure 8. In obtaining these results, tones and noise were presented monaurally through an earphone and the sound pressure measurements were made with a probe tube at the entrance to the ear canal. Masking thresholds were obtained for 16 frequencies between 100 and 9,000 cps in quiet and with eight different levels of masking noise. The




FIGURE 9. Relation between masking (M) and the effective level (Z) of the masking noise. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens, (130), after Hawkins, Garner and Miller (56).

noise used contained nearly all frequencies over the audible range and each frequency between 100 to 9,000 cps carried on the average the same energy. Such a noise is called 'flat,' 'white' or 'thermal' by various writers. Steam escaping from a radiator often makes a white or flat noise.

The lowest contour in Figure 8 is the *absolute* threshold curve and the upper curves represent *masked* thresholds. The masking effect of noise can be considered as a shift of threshold. The amount of masking is measured by the extent to which the threshold of detection for pure tones or for speech is elevated above the quiet or absolute threshold. The data of Figure 8, when plotted as in Figure 9, reveal

that, except near threshold, the masked threshold goes up linearly as the intensity of the noise is raised. Previous results from Bell Telephone Laboratories (38) show, on the contrary, a non-linear relationship above an effective noise level of 50 db. Effective noise level or 'Z' is the level in db above threshold for the 'critical band.' This latter term will be defined later.

This notion of a shift in threshold can be extended to speech perception. Figure 10 shows the articulation obtained with a high fidelity communication system and various levels of masking noise. The abscissa gives the intensity level of the speech in db above the absolute threshold for speech under quiet conditions. The




FIGURE 10. Relationship between speech intensity level and per cent syllable articulation. The parameter is intensity of white noise in db re threshold of detectability. As the noise intensity is raised 10 db, the articulation function is shifted approximately 10 db to the right. The ordinate on the top of the graph gives the sensation level of speech in db. From Fletcher (37), by permission of D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., and Bell Telephone Lab.




FIGURE 11. Ratio between the monaural masked threshold of a pure tone and the level per cycle of the masking noise measured at the frequency of the pure tone. Solid line, data obtained at Bell Telephone Laboratories; points, data obtained on this relationship at Psycho-Acoustic Laboratories. The dashed curve is a smoothed curve showing the width of equal (5 per cent) articulation bands plotted against the center frequency of each band. The ordinate on the left gives the width of the critical band in cycles per second. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after Hawkins, Garner and Miller (56).

absolute threshold for speech or 'threshold of detectability' corresponds roughly to zero intelligibility. The number on each curve gives the intensity of noise present for each particular curve. The noise is measured in terms of the number of db it raised the threshold of detectability of the speech. The noise had a continuous or 'white' spectrum.

The bending down in the articulation curves in Figure 10 at the higher speech levels has been attributed to 'overloading' and to nonlinearity of the ear at the higher intensity levels.

The intelligibility of speech rises at a fairly constant rate above the threshold of detectability regardless of the absolute level of the noise. Raising the level of speech to 25 db above the threshold of detectability, for example, results in approximately 50% articu-

lation in each intensity of noise; the masking or background noise has no effect on the intelligibility of speech when the wanted pure tone or speech signal is sufficiently above the noise. There is a practical limit to this principle, however. Very intense sounds are uncomfortable or even painful, and when the masking noise approaches such intensities, it is not possible to make the wanted speech or tone intense enough to be heard and not painful.

The ratios between the intensity per cycle of the masking noise and the intensity of the pure tones at masked threshold for the four top curves in Figure 8 are plotted as points in Figure 11. The solid line represents the results from similar experiments conducted by Bell Telephone Laboratories (50).




FIGURE 12. Auditory map for pure tones for normal hearing. The curves in the upper half of the figure represent pressures measured under the receiver by means of a coupler. The lower curve for minimum audible pressure has been corrected to give the pressure at the ear drum. It is, therefore, approximately but not precisely comparable with the upper curves. From Silverman (113), with permission of the author and the *Annals of Otolaryngology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, St. Louis, Mo.

If an extremely wide band of masking noise is taken at the minimum intensity required to mask a pure tone located at the middle of the frequency range, the band of noise can be symmetrically reduced in width towards the tone without lowering the masking effectiveness until the 'critical band width' is reached. It is usually assumed that the energy in the narrowed band now equals the energy in the pure tone. Reducing the band width further will require that the energy in the noise be raised if it is still to mask the tone. Each 'critical band' is believed to be independent of masking effects from other adjacent bands since the masking threshold is not altered by the subtraction, or addition, of noise falling outside the critical band. It is probable that the concept of 'critical band width' can be applied to the masking of speech in the same way it is to the masking of tones.

The widths of critical bands are indicated in Figure 11 in terms of db,

i.e., the threshold level of the pure tone minus the level per cycle of the noise. The band width in db can be converted into width in cycles since energy in a band of white noise is proportional to the width of the band. Since 20 db represents a ratio of 1 to 100, a 20 db band relative to a pure tone one cycle wide would be 100 cycles wide. Thus, the band centered at 2000 cps and 20 db wide extends from 1950 to 2050 cps.

*The Upper Thresholds.* Thresholds for discomfort, tickle and pain for normal and hard-of-hearing subjects have been determined at the Central Institute for the Deaf with both pure tones and speech (113, 114). The medians of the pure tone thresholds of persons with normal hearing are presented in Figure 12. The corresponding thresholds for speech are given in Table 1. It was found, as is indicated in the table, that tolerance for loud sounds increased during the first several testing sessions so that the final thresholds were somewhat higher than initially. For example, the threshold of discomfort for speech increased from 117 to a final value of about 130 db. The threshold of discomfort for pure tones extends as a broad plateau over the frequency range from 250 to 5,000 cps at about 120 db re .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>.

#### INTELLIGIBILITY OF SPEECH

On the basis of results from numerous articulation tests, Fletcher, and also French and Steinberg (50) of the

TABLE 1. Thresholds of tolerance for speech in decibels re .0002 dyne cm<sup>2</sup>.

	<i>Discomfort</i>	<i>Tickle</i>	<i>Pain</i>
<i>Initial</i>	117	128	138
<i>Final</i>	130	135	139

Bell Telephone Laboratory, has attempted to devise a method whereby the intelligibility of speech can be estimated by means of proper physical measures of the communication system and the noise conditions alone.

Inasmuch as the methods of testing directly the intelligibility of speech are time consuming and require carefully controlled experimentation, this method of calculation could be a very practical device. It should be mentioned that Collard (7), and later Zoldakov (137), suggested a number of years previous to publication of the Bell Telephone Laboratory method that such procedures would be valid. Both of them devised methods of computing the intelligibility of speech that are somewhat similar to but not so well founded as the method eventually derived at the Bell Telephone Laboratories, which will be summarized briefly.

*Articulation Index (AI).* The first step was to divide the audible speech spectrum into 20 'equal articulation bands.' The bands or frequency limits are supposedly set so that each band individually and independently contributes one-twentieth to the over-all articulation index. The Articulation Index (AI) is taken as 1.0 for perfect articulation. Thus, the speech in each of the equivalent bands can contribute no more than .05 to the total index. The frequency limits of each band were determined from articulation tests conducted with filters set at various cut-off frequencies and inserted into an otherwise high-fidelity transmission system. Nonsense syllables, i.e., syllables constructed from consonant-vowel-consonant combinations with meaningful combinations eliminated, were used as the test material. Articulation scores were obtained for intensities of speech from




FIGURE 13. Articulation scores vs cut-off frequency of high-pass and low-pass filters inserted in a wide-band system. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after French and Steinberg (50).

minimum to optimal and for many filter settings.

Syllable articulation as a function of the cut-off frequency of the filters at two different speech intensities is shown in Figure 13. These curves show clearly that the articulation index must be used rather than simple articulation scores in order to obtain additive speech bands. For example, at optimum gain<sup>2</sup> a system passing only frequencies above 1900 cps (the point of intersection of the two curves) gives as good an articulation score as a system that allows only frequencies below 1900 cps to be passed. The articulation score, however, is not 50% as might be expected but 68%. In other words, an *articulation score* of 68% requires only half of the speech frequencies necessary to achieve 100% articulation. It is therefore given an *articulation index* of 0.5.

Next, articulation scores were obtained for a number of filter settings at an intensity gain that gave a 68% articulation score (.5 Articulation In-

<sup>2</sup>Optimum gain was found to be the speech level (in quiet) that is 10 db more intense than direct conversational speech at one meter's distance from the talker's mouth.




FIGURE 14. Approximate relation between syllable articulation and articulation index. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after French and Steinberg (50).

dex) with wide pass-bands. The curves of the results happen to cross (Figure 13) at the 25% articulation score. This articulation score (25%) is given an articulation index of .25, i.e., half of 0.5, because either half of the speech spectrum is enough to obtain this score under conditions which would yield an index of 0.5 if the entire spectrum were used. By similar procedures of fractionation applied to numerous articulation functions, the function in Figure 14 was derived. This function relates articulation score to articulation index expressed in per cent.

By referring to Figure 14 the per cent articulation values of Figure 13 were converted to the articulation index values shown by B in Figure 15. This figure shows the articulation index value in per cent as a function of upper cut-off frequency of a filter inserted in the speech transmission system. Curve A in Figure 15 represents the same function for only male voices. Curve A is now divided into frequency bands, each one of which

contributes 5% (.05) to the articulation index. These bands of equal importance to articulation or intelligibility thus revealed are indicated in Table 2 and on the abscissa of Figure 18.

On Figure 11 the width in cycles per second of each of the 20 equal articulation bands is plotted above the center frequency of each band. The similarity in shapes of the two curves in Figure 11 indicates an internal consistency between and lends support to the assumptions underlying the articulation index and the concept of critical band width.

It is of theoretical significance that the shape of the curves in Figure 15 are similar to that of the pitch scale (122), to the function relating position of maximum agitation on the basilar membrane to the frequency of the stimulating tone, and to a function relating critical band width to frequency.

*Relationship Between Articulation Index and Articulation Scores.* It is clear that the relationship between per cent articulation and articulation index is dependent upon the type of test material used. Different talkers and




FIGURE 15. Articulation index versus cut-off frequency of ideal low-pass filters as determined by French and Steinberg (50). From Beranek (2), with permission of the author and the Institute of Radio Engineers, New York City.

TABLE 2. Frequency bands of equal contribution to articulation index (for male voices).

No.	Limits	Mean
1	200 to 330	270
2	330 to 430	380
3	430 to 560	490
4	560 to 700	630
5	700 to 840	770
6	840 to 1000	920
7	1000 to 1150	1070
8	1150 to 1310	1230
9	1310 to 1480	1400
10	1480 to 1660	1570
11	1660 to 1830	1740
12	1830 to 2020	1920
13	2020 to 2240	2130
14	2240 to 2500	2370
15	2500 to 2820	2660
16	2820 to 3200	3000
17	3200 to 3650	3400
18	3650 to 4250	3950
19	4250 to 5050	4650
20	5050 to 6100	5600

listeners also cause minor differences. Articulation index can be converted to word (polysyllables) or to sentence intelligibility, however, by using the curves shown in Figure 16. Results of tests (unpublished) conducted at the Psycho-Acoustic Laboratory have shown that the special monosyllabic word tests (the so-called 'phonetically balanced' or 'PB' lists) constructed at that laboratory are about equivalent in difficulty (for well-trained listeners) to the nonsense syllable tests used at the Bell Telephone Laboratories.

*Relationship Between Speech-to-Noise Ratio and Articulation Index.* In order to calculate the total articulation index for a given communication system the intensity of speech and of masking noise in each of the 20 bands of equal articulation must be measured physically. Since the dynamic range between rms pressures of speech is about 30 db (Figure 4),

the speech intensity must exceed the masked threshold by 30 db or more if the weakest speech sounds are to be audible. Per cent articulation does not increase linearly with speech intensity (see Figure 10), however, but gradually tapers off at very weak and high intensities.

On the basis of the data gathered in the development of the articulation index the weights ( $W_p$ ) given in Figure 17 were derived. ' $B_s$ ' indicates the long average speech, and ' $B$ ' the long average noise intensity. The long average of speech falls approximately 12 db below the rms intensities occurring in 1% of one-eighth second intervals (Figure 4), but the average intensity of the continuous 'white' noise is constant for one-eighth second intervals; for this reason 12 db has been subtracted from signal-to-noise ratios determined from long average measurements of intensity in order to properly determine weights for Figure 17.




FIGURE 16. Approximate relations between articulation index and subjective measure of intelligibility. From French and Steinberg (50), with permission of the author and the Acoustical Society of America, Washington, D. C.




FIGURE 17. Weighting factor vs speech-to-noise ratio. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after French and Steinberg (50).

A weight of 1.0 is therefore given to each of the 20 articulation bands in which the speech sufficiently ex-

ceeds the masking noise (or the absolute threshold if there is no noise present). A proportional fractional weight is given if the difference is less.

*Articulation Index Work Sheet.* Beranek (2) has devised a work sheet (Figure 18) that is useful for computing the articulation index of a communication system. The numerical values for the frequency bands on his work sheet are based on data for men's voices only.

It is to be noted on this work sheet that the spectrum level (the intensity per cycle) of the speech must not exceed about 95 db above .0002 dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>. Since the speech has a continuous spectrum, the over-all intensity will be about 125 db when the spectrum values are 95 db above .0002




FIGURE 18. Work sheet for evaluating the articulation index of a communication system with noise present. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after Beranek (2).



dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>. This approaches the threshold of tickle and pain and for that reason, as well as because intelligibility normally begins to decrease at such high intensities, the spectrum intensity should not exceed 95 db. An increase above 95 db probably makes no additional contribution to the articulation index.

If the articulation index is used for the calculation of speech intelligibility, it must be certain that the measurements of the speech and noise reaching the listener's ears are expressed in comparable terms. This often requires a considerable number of operations. If there is, for example, an aircraft interphone system involving a microphone, amplifier, earphone and earphone cushions, the following must be determined:

(1) The noise pressure in the outer ear canal of the listener due to noise picked up by the microphone and amplified by the interphone. Determinations of the speech-to-noise ratio for various military microphones when used in noise can be found in a report by the Electro-Acoustic Laboratory (30).

(2) The noise pressure in the outer ear canal due to the noise that leaks in around the earphone cushion. The noise reaching the ear when various types of earphone cushions are worn in an ambient noise field can be calculated on the basis of attenuation measurements made at the Psycho-Acoustic Laboratory by Shaw (111).

(3) The 'real voice' objective response of the microphone. This is the voltage produced by the microphone across a resistive load when it is activated by a human voice operating at conversational level. 'Conversational level' is loud enough to produce an over-all rms level of 74 db re .0002

dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> at a distance of 1 meter from a talker in an anechoic (non-reverberant) chamber. The speech used for this purpose is often the sentence, 'Joe took father's shoe bench out; she was waiting at my lawn.'

The output of the microphone is fed into a number of band pass filters so that measurements of intensity may be made for a number of frequencies or narrow bands of frequencies throughout the speech spectrum. There appears to be no well-defined method of how to read the meters indicating intensity; usually, however, rms readings are taken for each word uttered and then averaged.

(4) The 'real ear' objective<sup>3</sup> response of the earphone. This is the sound pressure produced in the ear canal of an average listener as a function of frequency and with constant voltage applied to the terminals. The measurements must be made with a small probe tube inserted into the entrance of the listener's ear canal.

(5) The response characteristic of the amplifier to audible frequencies. This is the input-output characteristic of the amplifier as a function of input frequency.

The figures for 3, 4 and 5 are then added together to get the spectrum level of speech. This represents what is called the 'orthotelephonic gain.' A constant of 12 db should be added if

<sup>3</sup>Real ear *subjective* calibrations may be used in place of the objective measures. The listener adjusts the intensity of a pure tone from the earphone until it sounds as loud as a pure tone of the same frequency coming from a loud-speaker that is one meter away from him in a free field. The intensity of the tone from the loud-speaker is measured at the position occupied by the listener's head. When subjective earphone calibrations are used it is important that noise leaking around the earphone cushion be measured by similar methods.

the intensity measures are taken over an appreciable period of time to take into account the rms intensities that occur in one-eighth second intervals one per cent of the time. The result is the speech spectrum to be plotted on the work sheet. It is to be noted that the orthotelephonic gain involves a specified 'conversational' voice level. For the 'real voice' measures of microphones, Beranek (2) recommends that talkers speak at 'half effort' in the quiet of an anechoic chamber. When the talker is operating in the noise, however, it is possible that his voice level will be considerably above the conversational or half-effort level (69). This is one possible reason for the divergence between the obtained and calculated articulation scores presented below.

An alternative way to obtain the speech spectrum is to use calibrations of earphones made on artificial ears and of microphones made with an artificial voice. The response characteristics thus obtained are added to the uppermost idealized voice spectrum given in Figure 4. The sum is the speech spectrum to be plotted on the work sheet. Although certain interactions between a live voice and microphone and between the human ear and earphone are not reflected in the 'artificial' physical calibrations, the more tedious 'real' voice and ear measurements are thereby avoided. In reference 30 there will be found a host of artificial voice and ear calibrations of various military and commercial microphones, earphones and amplifiers that can be used for this purpose.

(6) The noise spectrum to be plotted on the work sheet is a summation of the noise reaching the ear through the communication system

and from all other sources. This summation can be done in terms of the root-mean-square pressures of the noises involved.<sup>4</sup>

(7) The differences in db between the resulting spectra of noise and of speech at the midpoint of each equal articulation band are taken. The corresponding weights ( $W_p$ ) are taken from Figure 17. The weight for each of the 20 bands is then multiplied by .05. The sum of these products is the total articulation index. The assumption that the same weights can be applied regardless of absolute speech and noise levels within the limits indicated on the work sheet, is based on the linearity of the masking function shown in Figure 11.

By use of Figure 16 the *articulation index* can finally be converted into *per cent articulation* or intelligibility scores.

*Obtained vs. Calculated Articulation Scores.* Egan and Wiener (29) conducted a series of syllable articulation tests wherein a variety of bands of speech were transmitted by the communication system. A noise of constant intensity and continuous spectrum was present during most of the testing. From these data they derived generalized equal-articulation contours that show the relationships among frequency distortion of a communication system, the intensity level of speech and the resulting syllable articulation (see Figure 19).

<sup>4</sup>The Bell Telephone Laboratories (50) have determined the value of two other factors in speech reception that may be included in the noise spectrum, although they are relatively insignificant compared to the effects of noises usually present from other sources: (a) the masking effect of one band of speech on other bands, and (b) the temporary deafening caused by speech peaks.




FIGURE 19. Generalized equal-articulation contours plotted for band-pass systems all having a center frequency of 1500 cps. The same contours may be used to predict the relative performance of pass bands having other center frequencies, provided the family of contours is shifted horizontally to make them correspond to the new center frequency. From Egan and Wiener (29).

The results of this experiment would appear to afford a good test of the method of calculating articulation and Beranek (2) has made the necessary computations. His findings are shown in Figure 20. The agreement between actual and computed articulation is not as close as might be desired for some of the pass-bands.

Beranek also compared the calculated articulation scores with actual articulation data obtained on a number of interphone systems operating at various gain levels in B-25 and B-17 bombers (75). The results are presented in Figure 21; it is seen that the agreement here is rather close.

Beranek concludes that a communication system having an articulation index greater than .5 will give satis-

factory intelligibility of speech, while a system with an articulation index of lower than .3 should be considered




FIGURE 20. Comparison of experimentally determined and calculated articulation scores for speech transmission systems numbers 7 to 12 in noise spectrum A. From Beranek (2), with permission of the author and the Institute of Radio Engineers, New York City.




FIGURE 21. Comparison of experimentally determined and calculated articulation scores for three types of interphone systems in an untreated bomber. From Beranek (2), with permission of the author and the Institute of Radio Engineers, New York City.

unsatisfactory in that regard. Systems falling between .3 and .5 should be viewed with suspicion. Beranek's reasoning here is probably based on the curves shown in Figure 16 which depict the relationship between intelligibility of sentences, words and syllables and the articulation index. An examination of this figure reveals that over 93% of isolated words and over 98% of sentences would be correctly understood with an articulation index of .5 or higher; for an articulation index of .3 about 73% of isolated words and 93% of sentences would be heard correctly whereas below .3 the curves drop precipitously. Therefore, communication systems falling between .3 and .5 would permit reasonable sentence intelligibility, but would have a small margin of safety and a significant number of isolated words would be misunderstood. Below an articulation index of .3 intelligibility even for sentences would be close to the 'breaking' point.

*Limitations of the Method.* It appears that the Bell Telephone Laboratories' method of calculating articula-

tion is accurate enough to warrant its use under certain conditions. Some of the assumptions and propositions, however, are subject to further proof. The originators of the method have pointed out that (1) the Articulation Index does not take into account effects of nonlinear (amplitude) distortion, (2) the masking effects when the noise is intermittent cannot be considered, and (3) the method is workable only if the noise is of the continuous spectrum type or not too far removed from it. As stated previously, the calculation of articulation or intelligibility as presented here is based, in part, on the assumption that the 'critical bands' of masking, shown in Figure 11, are really independent and that masking effectiveness increases linearly with increases in intensity. It is well known (see Figure 22), however, that a pure tone will mask higher frequencies to a greater degree than it masks frequencies falling below its own frequency. Also, the more intense the tone, the greater is the masking 'spread.' The question might be raised, then, as to why the concept of critical bands for masking is valid for noise with a fairly continuous spectrum. Apparently, with pure tones the spread of masking to higher frequencies is due, in part at least, to distortion products introduced by overloading the ear, but with noise of continuous spectrum the distortion products of the lower frequency components are insignificant in comparison to the masking afforded by the actual noise already present at the higher frequencies. Just how far from 'flat' the noise may be before the method fails on this account has not been determined.

In a recent study Pollack (104) measured the intelligibility of speech when passed through a variety of




FIGURE 22. The threshold shift in db of various pure tones just detectable in the presence of a steady pure tone of frequency indicated at the top of each graph. The parameter is the sensation level of the masking tone and is indicated in db on each curve. From Fletcher (37), by permission of D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., and Bell Telephone Lab.

high-pass and low-pass filters at various intensity levels in the presence of noise. He found that the Bell Telephone Laboratories' method of computing speech intelligibility was valid for the majority of his test conditions. It appeared, however, that the intelligibility conveyed by the low frequencies was not constant with constant signal-to-noise ratio, as the computational method assumes, but varied

somewhat as a function of the overall intensity level. Also, he points out that the proposed computational procedures do not take into account possible interactions between noise and voice levels used by talkers. In noise, a talker unconsciously raises his voice to help override the noise.

*Typical Noise Encountered in Industry and in Military Vehicles.* Octave-band measurements have been

made of noise found aboard various military vehicles and in some industries. Examples of these measurements are to be found in Figures 23 and 24. The noise analysis in Figure 23 for the Liberator Bomber represents the noise present in the articulation tests that yielded the results given in Figure 21. Here the agreement between calculated and actual test scores was rather close. It is probable that under most of the noise conditions shown in Figures 23 and 24 the noise is sufficiently continuous in spectrum so that the

Bell Telephone Laboratories' method can be used to predict articulation in its presence.

SPECIAL TESTS OF INTELLIGIBILITY OF SPEECH IN NOISE

While the Bell Telephone Laboratories' method of computing the intelligibility of speech is not as general a method as might be desired, its presentation has brought together many important experimental facts concerning the intelligibility of speech in noise. Some other results dealing with




FIGURE 23. Noise levels and spectra in the turret of a medium tank, a Liberator Bomber, Landing Vehicle LVT-4, and a USS Submarine. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130).




FIGURE 24. Noise levels and spectra in an aircraft factory. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130).

the effects of special treatments of the speech signal, the noise, or methods of presenting the speech and noise are presented in the next sections.

*Effect of Intermittent Noise.* So far the effects of a continuous uninterrupted noise have been considered. Miller and Mitchell (89) have found that interrupting the noise but leaving the speech continuous greatly reduces the masking effect of the noise. The nature of speech is such that the speech can be obliterated, either with a masking noise or by being turned

off directly for over 25% of the time without significant loss of intelligibility. As the fraction of the time the noise is on is increased, its masking efficiency increases directly as shown in Figure 25 (130). The abscissa in Figure 25 is the ratio of speech intensity to noise, which was varied. The over-all noise intensity was kept constant for all tests. The parameter is the percentage of time the noise was on.

In situations where both the noise and speech are intermittent it is, of




FIGURE 25. Masking efficiency of a noise signal which is interrupted for different proportions of the time at a rate of nine interruptions per second. From Miller, Wiener and Stevens (130), after Miller and Mitchell (89).

course, possible to predict the intelligibility of speech only in a statistical sense.

*Amplitude Distortion.* The effects of non-linear or amplitude distortion which can be present in any or all the component parts of an electrical communication system have not been given as much attention as those of frequency distortion, which was the primary concern of the Bell Telephone studies. And, interestingly, properly controlled amplitude distortion

may be a useful technique for improving the intelligibility of speech in the presence of noise.

Licklider (71) was the first to test exhaustively the effects of various kinds of amplitude distortion on the intelligibility of speech, although previous observations had been made at the Bell Telephone Laboratories (37). He found, among other things, that by peak-clipping the peaks of speech as much as 24 db (thereby essentially reducing the vowel-consonant ratio [Figure 6]) and by amplifying the resulting signal to its former peak value the quality of the speech was not greatly affected. Also, in the presence of noise and in quiet, the speech thus treated was *more* intelligible at many intensities than undistorted speech of *comparable peak amplitude* (see Figure 26). This is possible because the weak consonant sounds have been increased in intensity and made more audible, although the over-all peak intensity of the speech has not been increased. Thus, by limiting the maximum amplitude of the speech to a level just below discomfort, (a) the




FIGURE 26. Functions relating articulation to peak amplitude of received speech with peak clipping and background noise as parameters. From Licklider (71).






FIGURE 27. The relation between articulation and speech level with noise level as the parameter. In loud noise ear wardens improve articulation. From Kryter (65).

listener's ears can be protected, and (b) the area of audibility remaining in the presence of a loud masking noise can be used to a fuller extent than is normally possible. Also, and what is effectively the same thing, the reduced auditory area of a person who is suffering from certain types of deafness can be used more effectively.

Proper application of peak-clipping (or compression) of the speech signal is clearly one method for improving communication in the presence of intense noise, and indeed is being used in some recently designed audio and radio equipment. The amount of peak-clipping to be applied depends on a number of factors, such as type and source of noise, the frequency distortion in the communication system, etc., and it is not possible to name one single optimal amount (67, 68, 71).

*Effects of Wearing Ear Plugs on Speech Intelligibility.* One simple and effective way of reducing the effects of intense noise is to wear ear plugs. Suitable ear plugs have been developed and the effects of wearing the NDRC 'type V-51R' plug, which was adopted for use by the Army and Navy, upon the intelligibility of speech, has been investigated (66). The results of these tests are shown in Figure 27. Wearing ear plugs in the presence of intense noise does not lower the intelligibility of speech, but slightly *improves* it in the higher noise levels. This is understandable because the plugs in no way alter the signal-to-noise ratio but merely lower the effective level of both the speech and noise by about 20 db.

The attenuation is sufficient to reduce intense noise and speech to a more tolerable level, perhaps to avoid non-linear distortion of intense speech

sounds by the ear itself, and to minimize any 'glare' effect of noise. 'Glare' effect here refers to a temporary reduction of the power of auditory discrimination by very intense sound.

*Influence of Interaural Phase Relations on Intelligibility of Speech.* In the experiments discussed so far, it has been assumed that the intelligibility of speech in noise is essentially a function of the signal-to-noise ratio at the listener's ears. When ear phones are a part of the communication system, however, a number of phase relationships between the sound waves reaching the two ears are possible and it has been found that intelligibility is somewhat dependent upon these phase relationships.

Licklider (73) examined by means of intelligibility tests the effects of interaural phase relations upon the masking of speech by white noise. His classification is shown in Table 3.

Class 1, homophasic  $++$ , is best illustrated by a communication system that involves earphones. Normally in such a system the two earphones for each listener are wired so that, when activated by a signal, the diaphragms move together towards or away from the ear. Class 5, homophasic  $--$ , can be achieved by reversing the wires on one earphone, so that now the diaphragms when activated by the same

signal, move in opposite directions with respect to the ears.

Class 2,  $+ -$ , and 4  $- +$ , describe the antiphase interaural relationship that can be accomplished only by a system having a separate amplification channel for each earphone, and separate speech and noise inputs for each channel. Here, if the speech (noise) wave reaching the right ear is in phase with the wave at the left ear, the noise (speech) wave is adjusted to reach the ears 180 degrees out of phase.

In Classes 3,  $+ 0$ , and 6,  $- 0$ , called heterophasic, the ear phones were wired to present the speech either in or out of phase, but the noise reached the two ears with random phase relations. From moment to moment the phase relations for noise at the two ears change at random to give any relation between completely in phase and completely out of phase.

The results of the articulation tests are presented in Table 4. For listening in a relative quiet field, but with noise emanating from the earphones, considerable improvement over the standard homophasic condition results if the interaural relationship is made antiphase. If noise is randomly phased, it apparently does not matter whether the speech reaches the two ears in phase or out of phase.

TABLE 3. Classes of interaural phase relations involving speech and white noise.

<i>Speech</i>	<i>Noise</i>	<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Class</i>
1. In phase	In phase	$++$	Homophasic
2. In phase	Out of phase	$+ -$	Antiphase
3. In phase	Random phase	$+ 0$	Heterophasic
4. Out of phase	In phase	$- +$	Antiphase
5. Out of phase	Out of phase	$--$	Homophasic
6. Out of phase	Random phase	$- 0$	Heterophasic

TABLE 4. The influence of interaural phase relations upon the intelligibility of speech in noise (73).

Experiment	Speech-to-noise ratio	Noise level (re 0.0002 dyne/cm <sup>2</sup> )	Per cent word articulation					
			1 (+ +)*	2 (+ -)*	3 (+ 0)*	4 (- +)*	5 (- -)*	6 (- 0)*
1	0 db	90 db	69.4	77.4	73.6	79.4	68.4	72.3
1	-10 db	90 db	14.4	40.3	29.7	43.7	11.3	27.9
2	-10 db	80 db	18.0	35.4	27.4	43.0	15.8	27.3

\*The first symbol refers to speech waves, the second symbol refers to noise waves; + in phase, - out of phase, 0 random phase.

It is clear that masking of speech by noise is more than a simple function of signal-to-noise ratio, and that masking is related to a physiological and psychological reaction to inter-

aural phase relations. Interestingly, it was found that usually there was a strong correlation between the degree of masking and the subjective impression of 'overlapping' of the speech




FIGURE 28. Diagram illustrating the influence of interaural phase relations upon the localization of speech and white noise in phenomenal space. Each circle represents a rear view of the listeners' head. The region in which the speech is heard is cross-hatched; the region filled with noise is dotted. From Licklider (73), with permission of the author and the Acoustical Society of America, Washington, D. C.

and the noise in the listener's head. The speech and noise sounded as though separated under certain conditions but seemed to occupy the same phenomenal space with other phase conditions. A comparison of Figure 28 with Tables 4 and 5 illustrates the possible relation between the intelligibility of speech and the proximity of speech and noise in 'the listener's head.'

The question is raised as to how closely the various test 'classes' resemble standard operating situations. The answers are:

(a) The antiphase condition, which provided for the highest intelligibility scores, is artificial in that normally the speech and noise signals are mixed electrically in the interphone and cannot be controlled separately, as is required to achieve the antiphase relationship.

(b) The heterophase class with randomly phased noise is also artificial, although it is partially realized when speech is presented via earphones to a listener in ambient, 'field' noise such as in an airplane or engine room. Because of the distance between the ears and the length of sound waves, however, ambient noise is not randomly phased in the real life condition. Rather, the low frequencies tend to be in phase whereas higher fre-

quencies tend to be out of phase at the two ears. The experimental heterophase classes, then, with completely randomly phased noise are not true representations of ambient noise conditions. Licklider found in some preliminary tests that in actual ambient white noise the articulation scores were approximately five percentage units higher with the connections of one earphone reversed than with the usual in-phase arrangement of the earphones.

(c) The homophase is representative of the natural condition where circuit and/or static noise emanates from the earphones along with speech signals.

*Monaural vs. Binaural Listening.* It is fairly common to see a radio operator aboard a plane or ship wearing only one earphone, the other phone being stuck on top of his head. The question arises as to how monaural compares with binaural listening for intelligibility.

Egan (22) and Hirsh (57) have investigated several aspects of this problem but nearly all the possible variations were studied by Licklider (73) in a single experiment and his findings are presented in Table 5. This table shows that the interaural phase relations of the noise and speech have a critical effect on the intelligibility of

TABLE 5. Monaural-binaural presentation and interaural phase relations as factors influencing the masking of speech by white noise.\*

		<i>Binaural Noise</i>			<i>Monaural Noise</i>	
		+	0	-	R	L
Binaural Speech	+	18.0	27.4	35.4	98.0	99.0
	-	43.0	27.3	15.8	98.1	98.8
Monaural Speech	R	30.3	13.2	20.1	16.6	98.7
	L	18.1	8.3	15.2	98.4	15.4

\*Key: + in phase; - out of phase; 0 random phase; R right ear; L left ear.

speech. Three conclusions to be drawn are: (1) noise alone in one ear does not mask speech presented alone in the other ear<sup>5</sup>, (2) turning off in-phase speech in one ear, but leaving in-phase noise continuous in both ears, causes an increase in the articulation score from 18 to 30.3 per cent. This represents again an artificial condition for, with standard interphone equipment, the speech cannot be turned off in one ear independently of interphone noise. (3) Except as stated in conclusion 2, the binaural presentation of speech gives better intelligibility than monaural presentations. The articulation scores may be compared to the degree of subjective overlapping of speech and noise in the head, illustrated in Figure 28.

*Reverberation.* In an ordinary room, or in any enclosure with hard-surfaced walls, speech signals presented either person-to-person or through a loudspeaker will 'generate' noise that interferes with intelligibility. This effect is, of course, due to the reverberation of speech from wall to wall, ceilings and floor. The echoes from preceding sounds tend to mask succeeding sounds as they reach the listener.

Reverberation in a room is measured, usually, in terms of the time required for an abruptly terminated tone to decay 60 db in intensity (37). Reverberation time is thus an indirect measure of noise due to reverberation.

Fletcher (37) presents an apparently idealized curve for speech articula-

<sup>5</sup>Egan (22) found that a white noise of moderate intensity in one ear actually increased by several db the loudness of speech presented only to the opposite ear. If the noise was above a certain intensity, however, some 70 to 90 db above its threshold of audibility, the noise reduced the loudness of the speech signal in the opposite ear.




FIGURE 29. Per cent articulation vs reverberation time in seconds. From Fletcher (37), by permission of D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. and Bell Telephone Laboratories.

tion as a function of reverberation time (Figure 29). Other data on this effect can be found in reference 64.<sup>6</sup>

#### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Probably the most deleterious effect that noise has on man's behavior is the disruption or 'masking' of speech communication. It would be desirable to be able to engineer, on the basis of physical measures, electronic communication systems that would provide satisfactory intelligibility of speech in the presence of intense noise. A method has been derived whereby an 'Articulation Index' or 'Speech Intelligibility Index' can be computed from careful physical measures of the signal coming from any particular communication system and of the noise in which that system is operated.

<sup>6</sup>As this report was being prepared for press, the following article appeared: Bolt, R. H. and MacDonald, A. D. Theory of speech masking by reverberation. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1949, 21, 577-580. The authors develop a general statistical theory for the masking effect of reverberation on speech intelligibility. It was found that values of speech intelligibility as a function of reverberation time calculated on the basis of their theory agrees well with experimental values presented previously by Knudsen, V. O. *Architectural Acoustics*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932.

In general, noise will have little effect on the intelligibility of speech provided the long average intensity of speech is 18 db more intense than the noise throughout the frequency range from 200 to 7000 cps. The 'Articulation Index' is valid, however, only with certain types of noise. Also, in its computation, such significant factors as amplitude distortion, interaural phase relations, reverberation, and others, are not taken into account.

## REFERENCES

1. ABRAMS, M. H. and others. Speech in noise: a study of the factors determining its intelligibility. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Sept. 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 4023.
2. BERANEK, L. L. The design of speech communication systems. *Proc. Inst. Radio Engrs., N. Y.*, 1947, 35, 880-890.
3. BERANEK, L. L. and others. Collected informal reports on sound control in airplanes. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., April 10, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1323.
4. BLACK, J. W. Memorandum on 'The relation between loudness of voice and the intelligibility of airplane interphone communication.' Based on OSRD Rept. no. 3313. Psychological Corp., Feb., 1944. PB no. 12021.
5. ———. Final report in summary of work on voice communication. Psychological Corp., Sept. 11, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 5568.
6. BRITAIN, F. H. The loudness of continuous spectrum noise and its application to loudness measurements. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1939, 11, 113-117.
7. COLLARD, J. Calculation of the articulation of a telephone circuit from the circuit constants. *Elect. Commun.*, 1930, 8, 141-163.
8. CRANDALL, I. B. The sounds of speech. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1925, 4, 586-626.
9. CRANDALL, I. B. AND SACIA, C. F. Dynamical study of the vowel sounds. Part I. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1924, 3, 232-237.
10. ———. Dynamical study of the vowel sounds. Part II. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1927, 6, 100-116.
11. CURTIS, J. F. The relation between loudness of voice and the intelligibility of airplane interphone communication. Psychological Corp., Feb., 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3313.
12. DAVIS, H., ed. *Hearing and Deafness; A Guide for Laymen*. New York: Murray Hill Books, 1947.
13. \*DEWEY, G. *Relative Frequency of English Speech Sounds*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1923.
14. DIENEL, H. F. Sound level measurements in U. S. military airplanes. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., Feb. 25, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 4648.
15. ———. Sound levels and their reduction in Type K airships. Electro-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Aug. 25, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 5512.
16. DIENEL, H. F. AND LIENESCH, J. P. Sound level measurements in U. S. military airplanes. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., June 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3681.
17. DIENEL, H. F. AND NICHOLS, R. H. Sound levels in a P-59B jet propelled airplane. Electro-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Oct. 29, 1945.
18. DIETZE, E. AND GOODALE, W. D., JR. The computation of composite noise resulting from random variable sources. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1939, 18, 605-623.
19. DUDLEY, H. The carrier nature of speech. *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 1940, 19, 495-515.
20. DUNN, H. K. AND WHITE, S. D. Statistical measurements on conversational speech. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1940, 11, 278-288.
21. EGAN, J. P. Articulation testing methods II. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Nov. 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3802.
22. ———. The effect of noise in one ear upon the loudness of speech in the other ear. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 58-62.
23. EGAN, J. P. and others. The performance of communication equipment in noise. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Oct. 1, 1942. OSRD Rept. no. 901.
24. ———. The articulation efficiency of magnetic and dynamic earphones used

\*Reference not verified in the original.

- with various earphone cushions in noise. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., June 15, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1491.
25. ———. Collected informal communications on articulation tests of interphone equipment. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., July 9, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1572.
  26. ———. Microphone and headset studies, I. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Nov., 20, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 2037.
  27. ———. Studies on the effect of noise on speech communication. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Nov. 25, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 2038.
  28. ———. The articulation efficiency of nine carbon microphones for use at low altitudes. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., June 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3515.
  29. EGAN, J. P. AND WIENER, F. M. On the articulation efficiency of bands of speech in noise. Psycho-Acoustic and Electro-Acoustic Labs., Harvard Univ., May 1, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 4872.
  30. ELECTRO-ACOUSTIC LAB. Audio characteristics of communication equipment. Harvard Univ., Feb. 1, 1946.
  31. ERICSON, H. L. AND BERANEK, L. L. Noise reduction in LVT-4 and LVT-A-4 amphibious tractors. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., Oct. 9, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 4249.
  32. ERICSON, H. L. and others. Problems in voice communication in extremely high ambient noise: Landing vehicles tracked. Psycho-Acoustic and Electro-Acoustic Labs., Harvard Univ., Dec. 31, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 5532.
  33. ESCHWEILER, H. Old and new methods of analyzing sounds, especially speech sounds. *Z. Hals- Nas.- u. Ohrenheilk.*, 1939, 45, 127-140.
  34. FULLER, A. S. and others. The pressure distribution in the auditory canal in a progressive sound field. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Dec. 1, 1945.
  35. FLETCHER, H. The nature of speech and its interpretation. *J. Franklin Inst.*, 1922, 193, 729-747.
  36. ———. Useful numerical constants of speech and hearing. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1925, 4, 375-386.
  37. ———. *Speech and Hearing*. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1929.
  38. ———. Loudness, masking and their relation to the hearing process and the problem of noise measurement. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1938, 9, 275-293.
  39. ———. The mechanism of hearing as revealed through experiment on the masking effect of thermal noise. *Proc. nat. Acad. Sci., Wash.*, 1938, 24, 265-274.
  40. ———. Auditory patterns. *Rev. mod. Phys.*, 1940, 12, 47-65.
  41. ———. Hearing, the determining factor for high-fidelity transmission. *Proc. Inst. Radio Engrs., N. Y.*, 1942, 30, 266-277.
  42. FLETCHER, H. AND MUNSON, W. A. Loudness, its definition, measurement and calculation. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1933, 5, 82-108.
  43. ———. Relation between loudness and masking. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1937, 9, 1-10.
  44. FLETCHER, H. AND STEINBERG, J. C. The dependence of the loudness of a complex sound upon the energy in the various frequency regions of the sound. *Phys. Rev.*, 1924, 24, 306-317.
  45. ———. Articulation testing methods. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1929, 8, 806-854.
  46. FLYNN, J. P. and others. Auditory factors in the discrimination of radio range signals: Collected informal reports. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Dec. 31, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 6292.
  47. FLYNN, J. P., TRUSCOTT, I. P. AND NEWMAN, E. B. Intensity discrimination as a function of signal-to-noise ratio and intensity level. [Abstract] *Amer. Psychologist*, 1946, 1, 277.
  48. \*FRENCH, N. R. Factors governing the intelligibility of speech. Bell Telephone Lab., Sept. 21, 1942.
  49. FRENCH, N. R. and others. The words and sounds of telephone conversations. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1930, 9, 290-324.
  50. FRENCH, N. R. AND STEINBERG, J. C. Factors governing the intelligibility of speech sounds. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1947, 19, 90-119; *Bell Teleph. Syst. tech. Publ., Monograph B-1436*, 1947.
  51. GALT, R. H. Methods and apparatus for measuring the noise audiogram. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1929, 1, 147-157.

52. GOFFARD, S. J. AND LICKLIDER, J. C. R. Effects of static on radio range performance: Laboratory tests of the improvement provided by noise-reducing circuits. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Mar. 21, 1946.
53. GRAY, G. W. Phonemic microtomy: the minimum duration of perceptible speech sounds. *Speech Monogr.*, 1942, 9, 75-90.
54. HAAGEN, C. H. Intelligibility measurement: Techniques and procedures used by the voice communication laboratory. Psychological Corp., May, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3748.
55. HARRIS, J. D. Studies on pitch discrimination in masking. II. The effect of signal/noise differential. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1947, 19, 816-819.
56. HAWKINS, J. E. and others. The masking of signals by noise. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Oct. 1, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 5387.
57. HIRSH, I. J. The influence of interaural phase on interaural summation and inhibition. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 536-544.
58. HIRSH, I. J. AND POLLACK, I. The role of interaural phase in loudness. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 761-766.
59. KARLIN, J. E. and others. Auditory tests of the ability to hear speech in noise. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Sept. 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3516.
60. KARLIN, J. E. AND STEVENS, S. S. The relation between the ability to listen in noise and ability to listen in stepped tones. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Jan. 20, 1945.
61. KINGSBURY, B. A. A direct comparison of the loudness of pure tones. *Phys. Rev.*, 1927, 29, 588-600.
62. KRYTER, K. D. Articulation-test comparisons of six signal corps aircraft interphones at low and high altitudes. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Mar. 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 1974.
63. ———. Effects of ear protective devices on the intelligibility of speech in noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1946, 18, 413-417.
64. ———. Effects of high altitude on speech intelligibility. *J. appl. Psychol.*, 1948, 32, 503-511.
65. KRYTER, K. D., LICKLIDER, J. C. R. AND STEVENS, S. S. Premodulation clipping in AM voice communication. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1947, 19, 125-131.
66. KRYTER, K. D. and others. Experiments with earplugs: I. Their effects on the intelligibility of speech. II. Their use as protection against gun blast. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., June 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3541.
67. ———. The advantages of clipping the peaks of speech waves prior to radio transmission. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., October 10, 1944. PB no. 22859.
68. ———. The combined effects of clipping the peaks of speech waves in an ATB transmitter and limiting static peaks in an ARB receiver. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Mar. 15, 1945. PB no. 19806.
69. KRYTER, K. D. AND STEVENS, S. S. The effects of voice intensity on the output voltage of various microphones. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., June 1, 1944. PB no. 22556.
70. LICKLIDER, J. C. R. Voltage gain and power-output capability requirements for high-altitude interphone amplifiers. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Mar. 10, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 1975.
71. ———. The effects of amplitude distortion upon the intelligibility of speech. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Nov. 15, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 4217.
72. ———. Effects of amplitude distortion upon the intelligibility of speech. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1946, 18, 429-434.
73. ———. The influence of interaural phase relations upon the masking of speech by white noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 150-159.
74. LICKLIDER, J. C. R. AND GOFFARD, S. J. The performance of counter-modulation and static-canceling circuits in aircraft radio receiver AN/ARR-15. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Mar. 1, 1946.
75. LICKLIDER, J. C. R. AND KRYTER, K. D. Articulation tests of standard and modified interphones conducted during flight at 5,000 and 35,000 feet (with appendices). Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., July 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 1976.



76. LICKLIDER, J. C. R. AND NEWMAN, E. B. Field tests of pre-modulation clipping in the transmitter of a type 19 wireless set. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., May 8, 1945. PB no. 19809.
77. LICKLIDER, J. C. R. and others. Articulation tests of the Wasimansdorff noise-peak limiter. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Sept. 12, 1944. PB no. 22857.
78. ———. A premodulation clipper unit for voice-communication transmitters. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., June 30, 1945. PB no. 19807.
79. LICKLIDER, J. C. R. AND POLLACK, I. Effects of differentiation, integration, and infinite peak clipping upon the intelligibility of speech. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 42-51.
80. LICKLIDER, J. C. R. AND STEVENS, S. S. Articulation tests of two noise-reducing circuits in experimental aircraft radio receiver AN/ARR-15. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Aug. 1, 1945. PB no. 32722.
81. LËENESCH, J. P. AND NICHOLS, R. H. Noise levels of telegraphic typewriters in combat information center. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., May 28, 1945.
82. LÏFSHITZ, S. Elementary quantity of sound perception. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1941, 12, 526-528.
83. MACKENZIE, D. The relative sensitivity of the ear at different levels of loudness. *Phys. Rev.*, 1922, 20, 331-348.
84. MASON, H. M. Phonetic characteristics of words as related to their intelligibility in aircraft-type noise. Psychological Corp., Feb. 10, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 4681.
85. ———. Phonetic characteristics related to intelligibility of words in noise: Sounds correctly understood in misunderstood words. Psychological Corp., June 6, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 5174.
86. MILLER, G. A. The masking of speech. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1947, 44, 105-129.
87. ———. Sensitivity to changes in the intensity of white noise and its relation to masking and loudness. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1947, 19, 609-619.
88. MILLER, G. A. AND GARNER, W. R. The masking of tones by repeated bursts of noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 691-696.
89. MILLER, G. A. AND MITCHELL, S. E. The design of jamming signals for use against voice communications. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Aug. 15, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 5293.
90. MILLER, G. A. AND MITCHELL, S. Effects of distortion on the intelligibility of speech at high altitudes. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1947, 19, 120-125.
91. MILLER, G. A. AND TAYLOR, W. G. The perception of repeated bursts of noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 171-182.
92. MILLER, R. L. Masking effect of periodically pulsed tones as a function of time and frequency. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1947, 19, 798-807.
93. NEWMAN, E. B. The problem of voice communication in extremely high ambient noise. [Abstract] *Amer. Psychologist*, 1946, 1, 276.
94. NICHOLS, R. H. and others. Interphone equipment. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., June 1, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1524.
95. ———. Interphone equipment. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., July 5, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1545.
96. ———. Interphone equipment. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., Oct. 20, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1927.
97. ———. Interphone equipment. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., June 6, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3682.
98. ———. Interphone equipment. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., June 10, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3683.
99. ———. Interphone equipment. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., Aug. 2, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3905.
100. ———. Collected informal reports on the performance of special communication equipment. Electro-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Oct. 24, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 6311.
101. OJIMO, S. Telephone hearing under noisy circumstances. *Jap. J. Psychol.*, 1936, 11 n.s., 549-556.
102. PEUGNET, H. B. Measurements of noise in aircraft. School of Aviation Medicine, Randolph Field (AAF), Feb. 19, 1945.
103. POLLACK, I. Monaural and binaural threshold sensitivity for tones and for white noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 52-57.

104. ———. Effects of high pass and low pass filtering on the intelligibility of speech in noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 259-266.
105. RIESZ, R. R. Differential intensity sensitivity of the ear for pure tones. *Phys. Rev.*, 1928, 31, 867-875.
106. RUDMOSE, H. W. and others. Effects of high altitude on the human voice. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., Jan. 30, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3106.
107. ———. Voice measurements with an audio spectrometer. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1948, 20, 503-512.
108. SACIA, C. F. Speech power and energy. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1925, 4, 627-641.
109. SACIA, C. F. AND BECK, C. J. The power of fundamental speech sounds. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1926, 5, 393-403.
110. SENTURIA, B. H. AND PEUGNET, H. B. Noise in aircraft. *Air Surgeon's Bull.*, 1945, 2, 12-13.
111. SHAW, W. A. Measurements of insulation and sensitivity of service headsets. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Oct. 31, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 6113.
112. SHOWER, E. G. AND BIDDULPH, R. Differential pitch sensitivity of the ear. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1931, 3, 275-287.
113. SILVERMAN, S. R. Tolerance for pure tones and speech in normal and defective hearing. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryng.*, 1947, 56, 658-677.
114. SILVERMAN, S. R. and others. Tolerance for pure tones and speech in normal and hard-of-hearing ears. Central Institute for the Deaf, July 31, 1946. OSRD Rept. no. 6303.
115. SIVIAN, L. J. Speech power and its measurement. *Bell Syst. tech. J.*, 1929, 8, 646-661.
116. SIVIAN, L. J. AND WHITE, S. D. On minimum audible sound fields. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1933, 4, 288-321.
117. SMITH, G. M. AND SEITZ, C. P. Speech intelligibility under various degrees of anoxia. *J. appl. Psychol.*, 1946, 30, 182-191.
118. SNOW, W. B. Audible frequency ranges of music, speech and noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1931, 3, 155-166.
119. STEINBERG, J. C. The relation between the loudness of a sound and its physical stimulus. *Phys. Rev.*, 1925, 26, 507-523.
120. ———. Effects of distortion upon the recognition of speech sounds. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1929, 1, 121-137.
121. ———. Speech and music. In Pender, H. (ed.) *Electrical Engineers' Handbook*. (3rd ed.) New York: Wiley, 1936.
122. ———. Positions of stimulation in the cochlea by pure tones. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1937, 8, 176-180.
123. STEVENS, S. S. AND DAVIS, H. *Hearing, its Psychology and Physiology*. New York: Wiley, 1938.
124. STEVENS, S. S., EGAN, J. P. AND MILLER, G. A. Methods of measuring speech spectra. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1947, 19, 771-780.
125. STEVENS, S. S., MILLER, J. AND TRUSCOTT, I. The masking of speech by sine waves, square waves, and regular and modulated pulses. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1946, 18, 418-424.
126. STEVENS, S. S. AND VOLKMAN, J. The relation of pitch to frequency; a revised scale. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 1940, 53, 329-353.
127. TALLEY, C. H. and others. Report on voice loudness: Over aircraft radios and microphones. Psychological Corp., Oct. 27, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 4290.
128. VENEKLASEN, P. S. AND MILLER, J. Microphones, earphone cushions and handsets for special applications. Electro-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Oct. 22, 1945. OSRD Rept. no. 6310.
129. VERMEULEN, R. Auditorium acoustics and intelligibility. *Philips tech. Rev.*, 1938, 3, 139-146.
130. WARING, C. E., ed. Transmission and reception of sounds under combat conditions. Office of Scientific Research and Development, 1946. TIP U1130.
131. WATHEN-DUNN, W. Audible P-80 jet aircraft noise. Naval Research Lab., Mar. 26, 1948. TIP U5567.
132. WEGEL, R. L. AND LANE, C. E. The auditory masking of one pure tone by another and its probable relation to the dynamics of the inner ear. *Phys. Rev.*, 1924, 23, 266-285.
133. WIENER, F. M. AND FILLER, A. S. The response of certain earphones on the ear and on closed couplers. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Dec. 1, 1945.

134. WIENER, F. M. and others. Response characteristics of interphone equipment IV. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., Jan. 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3105.
135. ———. Performance of U. S. Navy sound-powered telephones. Cruft and Psycho-Acoustic Labs., Harvard Univ., June 15, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 3789.
136. WIENER, F. M. AND ROSS, D. A. The pressure distribution in the auditory canal in a progressive sound field. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1946, 18, 401-408.
137. ZOLDAKOV, I. V. The determination of speech intelligibility in a channel with a limited frequency band. *Izv. Elektropromysl. slab. Toka.*, 1940, No. 12, 32-41. (Translation issued by Gt. Brit., Ministry of supply, TPA3 Technical information bureau as T-2266.)

*Appendix*

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON MEASUREMENT AND REDUCTION  
OF NOISE

1. ABBOTT, E. J. Scales for sound measurements used in machinery noise reduction. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1935, 6, 137-149.
2. ———. Quieting machinery. *Mech. Engng.*, N. Y., 1936, 58, 713-723.
3. ———. Sound measurements in industry. *J. appl. Phys.*, 1939, 10, 526-531.
4. ALGAR, P. L. I. Progress in noise measurements. *Elect. Engng.*, Chicago, 1933, 52, 741-744.
5. AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION. COMMITTEE ON NOISE. Noise [Progress report]. In *Amer. publ. Hlth. Ass. Yearb.*, 1933-1934, 76-77. (Suppl. to *Amer. J. publ. Hlth.*, 1934, 24 (2)).
6. AMERICAN STANDARDS ASSOCIATION. *American Standard Acoustical Terminology*. New York: Amer. Stand. Ass., 1942.
7. ———. *American Standard for Noise Measurement*. New York: Amer. Stand. Ass., 1942.
8. ———. *American Standard Sound Level Meters for Measurement of Noise and Other Sounds*. New York: Amer. Stand. Ass., 1944.
9. [Anon.] Proposed standards for noise measurement (as adopted June 26, 1933 by the American standards association, Committee on acoustical measurements and terminology). *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1933, 5, 109-111.
10. [Anon.] Noise measurement methods, a review of instruments and methods used in determining the cause and extent of industrial noise. *Electronics*, 1935, 8, 110-113.
11. [Anon.] Reducing noise in enclosed spaces. *Nature, Lond.*, 1940, 146, 714.
12. [Anon.] Struggle against noise on motorships. *Pêche marit.*, 1943, 25 (910), 8-9. (Incorporated in *J. Mar. march.*, 1943, 25 (1247), 1396-1397.
13. [Anon.] Noise reduction in Diesel installations. *Gas and Oil Power*, 1945, 40, 81-82.
14. ARNHYM, A. A. Soundproofing of military aircraft. *Aeronaut. Engng. Rev.*, 1944, 3, 13-23.
15. BAGENAL, H. *Practical Acoustics and Planning Against Noise*. Brooklyn, N. Y.: Chemical Publ. Co., 1942.
16. BARTLETT, F. C. *The Problem of Noise*. Cambridge, Eng.: The Univ. Press, 1934.
17. BASSETT, P. R. AND ZAND, S. J. Noise reduction in cabin airplanes. *Trans. Amer. Soc. mech. Engrs.*, 1934, 56, 49-56.
18. BERANEK, L. L. AND OTHERS. I. Materials and techniques for sound control in airplanes. II. Vibration insulation of aircraft seats. III. Sound levels inside and outside marmon-herrington tanks. Electro-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., June 30, 1941. OSRD Rept. No. 33.
19. ———. Collected informal report on sound control in airplanes. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., Apr. 10, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1323.
20. ———. Principles of Sound Control in Airplanes. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 1543.
21. BROWN, L. H. Attacking city noises by science and law. *Amer. City (Mag.)*, 1931, 44, 97-101.
22. BRUDERLIN, H. H. Developments in aircraft sound control. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1937, 8, 181-184.
23. CARSON, L. D., MILES, W. R. AND STEVENS, S. S. Vision, hearing, and aeronautical design. *J. aero. Sci.*, 1943, 10, 127-130; *Sci. Mon.*, N. Y., 1943, 56, 446-451; *Federation Proc.*, 1943, 2, 126-129.
24. CASTNER, T. G. and others. Indicating meter for measurement and analysis of noise. *Trans. Amer. Inst. elect. Engrs.*, 1931, 50, 1041-1047.
25. CHRISLER, V. L. AND SNYDER, W. F. Soundproofing of airplane cabins. *Bur. Stand. J. Res., Wash.*, 1929, 2, 897-908. (RP 63)
26. CHURCHER, B. G. Noise measurements for engineering purposes. *Elect. Engng.*, N. Y., 1935, 54, 55-65.
27. ———. A loudness scale for industrial noise measurements. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1935, 6, 216-226.
28. CHURCHER, B. G. AND KING, A. J. The analysis and measurement of the noise emitted by machinery. *J. Instn. elect. Engrs.*, 1930, 68, 97-131.
29. ———. Measurements of noise. [Letter to the editor]. *Nature, Lond.*, 1936, 138, 329.
30. CHURCHER, B. G., KING, A. J. AND DAVIES, H. The measurement of noise, with special reference to engineering noise problems. *J. Instn. elect. Engrs.*, 1934, 75, 401-446.

31. CONFERENCE ON ROAD TRAFFIC NOISES AND PRIORITY OF TRAFFIC AT CROSS ROADS, London, October, 25, 1928-January 3, 1929. *Report of Conference on Road Traffic Noises and Priority of Traffic at Cross Roads*. London: H. M. Stationery off., 1929.
32. DASGUPTA, M. K., RAY, J. AND KHASTGIR, S. R. Measurements of 'inherent' noise in radio receivers. *Indian J. Phys.*, 1947, 21, 239-258.
33. DAVIES, H. *An Introduction to the Study of Noise Problems*. London: The Draughtsman Publishing Co., Ltd., 1937.
34. DAVIS, A. H. Measurements of noise by means of a tuning-fork. [Letter to the editor]. *Nature, Lond.*, 1930, 125, 48-49.
35. ———. Noise. *J. R. aero. Soc.*, 1931, 35, 676-710.
36. ———. Silencing aircraft. *Gt. Brit. aero. Res. Comm., Repts. and Memos*, Sept., 1932.
37. ———. The measurement of noise. *Engineering*, 1934, 138, 663-666.
38. ———. *Noise*. London: Watts, 1937.
39. DAVIS, A. H. AND MORREAU, C. J. The reduction of noise in buildings. *Gt. Brit., Dept. of Scientific and Industrial Research. Building Research Board*. London: H. M. Stationery off., 1939.
40. DEBOER, J. Absolute sound pressure measurements. *Philips Tech. Rev.*, 1936, 1, 82-86.
41. DENNIS, E. B., JR. Noise—its measurement, effect and control. *N. Y. St. J. Med.*, 1930, 30, 573-576.
42. DICKSON, E. D. D. and others. A suggested method for measuring attenuation of sound by flying helmets. *J. Laryng.*, 1946, 61, 221-240.
43. DIENEL, H. F. The measurement of acoustic attenuation characteristics of soundproofing materials for aircraft. *Electro-Acoustic and Psycho-Acoustic Labs., Harvard Univ.*, Jan. 11, 1946.
44. EASON, A. B. *The Prevention of Vibration and Noise*. London: H. Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton, 1923.
45. FABRITIUS, H. F. Noise and its harmful effects. *Nord. hyg. tidskr.*, 1946, 27, 361-374.
46. FERGUSON, G. H. Noise and vibration control. *Canad. publ. Hlth. J.*, 1940, 31, 613-618.
47. ———. *Noise and Vibration Control*. Ottawa: *National Health Series*, No. 37, 1946.
48. FIRESTONE, F. A. Technique of sound measurements. *J. Soc. automot. Engrs., N. Y.*, 1926, 19, 461-466.
49. FIRESTONE, F. A., DURBIN, F. M. AND ABBOTT, E. J. Reducing noise of machines. *Mech. Engng., N. Y.*, 1932, 54, 271-274.
50. FLEMING, N. Noise and its prevention. *J. Text. Inst., Manchr.*, 1939, 30, 261-271.
51. FLETCHER, H. Proposed standards for noise measurement. *Elect. Engng., N. Y.*, 1933, 52, 744-746.
52. FREBERG, C. R. Noise—Its character and measurement. *Refriger. Engng.*, 1947, 53, 119-123+.
53. GALT, R. H. Methods and apparatus for measuring the noise audiogram. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1929, 1, 147-157.
54. ———. Results of noise surveys. Part I. Noise out-of-doors. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1930, 2, 30-58.
55. GENERAL RADIO COMPANY. *The Noise Primer*. Cambridge, Mass.: General Radio Co., 1943.
56. *GT. BRIT. MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT. Committee on noise in the operation of mechanically propelled vehicles. Interim Reports of the Departmental Committee on Noise in the Operation of Mechanically Propelled Vehicles*. London: H. M. Stationery off., First rep., 1935; second rep., 1936; final rep., 1937.
57. HANNA, C. R., MARVIN, H. B. AND WOLF, S. K. Researches and measurements on noise in the United States. *C. R. Congr. Int. d'Electricité, Paris*, 1932, 13 (12th sect.), 197-218.
58. HANNAM, G. C. *The Reduction of Office Noise*. New York: American Management Ass., 1926.
59. HARDY, H. C. Fundamentals of noise. *Prod. Engng.*, 1948, 19, 131-134.
60. HODGE, W. J. Sound control and noise elimination. *Personnel J.*, 1936, 15, 11-18.
61. HOUGHTEN, M. L. (comp.) *Bibliography on Noise Measurement; Arranged Alphabetically in Two Chronological Groups*. Washington: Technical Literature Research of Research and Standards Branch, Bureau of Ships, Navy dept.,

1945. (U. S. Bureau of Ships. Tech. lit. research ser., no. 37).
62. HUBER, P. Some physical problems in noise measurement. *J. appl. Phys.*, 1938, 9, 452-456.
  63. HUTCHINSON, A. C. Noise. *Proc. Instn. mech. Engrs., Lond.*, 1935, 130, 479-519.
  64. KAYE, G. W. C. The measurement of noise. In Smithsonian Institution. *Annual Report*, 1932. Washington, 1933.
  65. ———. Sound and noise. *Sci. Progr.*, 1936, 30, 385-401.
  66. ———. Noise and the nation. *Nature, Lond.*, 1937, 140, 446-449.
  67. KIMBALL, A. L. Elimination of noise in machinery. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1930, 2, 297-304.
  68. KING, A. J. The reduction of noise from air-conditioning systems. *Metrop. Vick. Gaz.*, 1945, 21, 61-68.
  69. KLIMA, J. AND NISTLER, L. Results of measurement of noise in Prague. *Trav. Inst. Hyg. publ. Tchecosl.*, 1937, 8, 59-66.
  70. KOSTYAMIN, N. N. The problem of noise and its prevention. *Vrach. Dyelo.*, 1946, 26 (7-8), 543-546.
  71. LAIRD, D. A. Overcoming noise in the home. *Hygeia, Chicago*, 1929, 7, 50-52.
  72. LEAGUE OF NATIONS. Housing commission. The hygiene of housing. III. Report on noise and housing. *League of Nations, Bull. Health Organ.*, 1937, 6, 541-550.
  73. LEEDY, H. A. Noise and vibration isolation. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1940, 11, 341-345.
  74. LONDON, A. Principles, practice and progress of noise reduction in airplanes. Tech. Notes Nat. Adv. Comm. Aero., Wash., No. 748, Jan., 1940.
  75. LUBCKE, E. Methods and results of subjective and objective noise measurements. *Naturwissenschaften*, 1938, 26, 17-21.
  76. MCCOY, D. A. Control of industrial noise. *Safety*, 1944, 31, 280+.
  77. MCCURDY, R. G. Standardization of noise meters. *Elect. Engng., N. Y.*, 1935, 54, 14-15.
  78. ———. Tentative standards for sound level meters. *Elect. Engng., N. Y.*, 1936, 55, 260-263.
  79. McLACHLAN, N. W. *Noise; a Comprehensive Survey from Every Point of View*. London: Oxford univ. press, 1935.
  80. McMAHAN, K. D. The noise problem in the application of fans. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1936, 7, 204-212.
  81. MARVIN, H. B. The measurement of machinery noise. *Trans. Amer. Inst. elect. Engrs.*, 1931, 50, 1048-1051. (Discussion 1071-1076).
  82. ———. On the loudness of noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1932, 3, 388-392.
  83. MORGAN, R. L. Noise measurements. *Communications*, 1948, 28 (2), 28-31; (7) 21+.
  84. MUCHOW, A. J. Noise and its measurement. *Gen. elect. Rev.*, 1935, 38, 293-296.
  85. NAVJAZSKII, G. L. AND SUPONIN, K. I. New methods and apparatus for the measurement of industrial noises. *Zhur. Tekhn. Fiz.*, 1938, 8, 243-251.
  86. NEERGAARD, C. F. What can the hospital do about noise? *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1942, 13, 217-219.
  87. NEWHART, H. AND HARTIG, H. E. Some practical applications of acoustics in medicine. *Journal-Lancet*, 1936, 56, 393-396.
  88. NEWMAN, E. B. AND STEVENS, S. S. The electronic generation of airplane noise for use in testing and training. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., May 25, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1445.
  89. New York (City) Noise abatement commission. *City Noise; The Report of the Commission Appointed by Dr. Shirley W. Wynne, Commissioner of Health, to Study Noise in New York City and to Develop Means of Abating it*. New York: Noise Abatement Commission, Department of Health, 1930.
  90. PARKINSON, J. S. Results of noise surveys. Part IV. Noise reduction. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1930, 2, 68-74.
  91. PARKINSON, J. S. The ear as a noise-measuring instrument. *J. Soc. automot. Engrs., N. Y.* (Trans. Sect.) 1936, 39, 381-385.
  92. *The Radio Noise Reduction Handbook*. (2nd ed.) Los Angeles: Radio Ltd., 1940.
  93. REIHER, H. Problems of acoustics. *Z. Ver. dtsh. Ing.*, 1925, 69, 475-476.
  94. RICHARDSON, E. G. *The Prevention and Insulation of Noise*. London: E. & F. N. Spon, Ltd., 1932.
  95. ROBINSON, R. S. Noise reduction in ships. *Engineer, Lond.*, 1938, 166, 568-569.

96. RUDMOSE, H. W. and others. Design of an automatic octave sound analyzer and recorder. Cruft lab., Harvard Univ., Nov. 21, 1942. OSRD Rept. no. 969.
97. RUDMOSE, H. W. AND BERANEK, L. L. Noise reduction in aircraft. *J. aero. Sci.*, 1947, 14, 79-96.
98. SABINE, P. E. The Acoustical Society and noise abatement. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1942, 13, 207-209.
99. ———. Bibliography on noise. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1942, 13, 210.
100. SABINE, H. J. AND WILSON, R. A. The application of sound absorption to factory noise problems. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1943, 15, 27-31.
101. SILVERMAN, D. Noise and noise measurement (Bibliography). *Electronics*, 1939, 12, 34.
102. SIMMS, H. A. Noise measurements aboard ship. *Engineer, Lond.*, 1938, 166, 345-346.
103. SLEEPER, H. P. AND BERANEK, L. L. Sound absorbing properties of acoustical materials for use aboard ships of the U. S. Navy. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., Oct. 1, 1944. OSRD Rept. no. 4173.
104. SLOCUM, S. E. *Noise and Vibration Engineering*. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1931.
105. SMITH, M. A. Principles of noise reduction in offices and factories. *Engng. News Rec.*, 1946, 137, 643-645.
106. SNOOK, H. C. Automobile-noise measurements. *J. Soc. automot. Engrs., N. Y.*, 1925, 17, 115-124.
107. SNOW, W. B. Lifting a finger against noise. *Bell Lab. Rec.*, 1938, 16, 418-420.
108. SPOONER, T. AND FOLTZ, J. P. Study of noises in electrical apparatus. *J. Amer. Inst. elect. Engrs.*, 1929, 48, 199-202.
109. STANTON, G. T. AND TWEEDALE, J. E. The noise survey of the Rapid Transit Lines of New York City. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1932, 3, 371-387.
110. STEVENS, S. S. The science of noise. *Atlant. Mon.*, 1946, 178, 96-102.
111. STEVENS, S. S. and others. An electronic device to simulate atmospheric static. Psycho-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., May 29, 1944.
112. STUBBINGS, G. W. The measurement of loudness. *Mech. World.*, 1943, 114, 231-234.
113. \*TRAMBITSKII, G. S. Noise and measures for its control. *Zhur. ush., nos. i gorl. bolez.*, 1938, 15, 247-260.
114. TUCKER, R. S. Results of noise surveys. Part II. Noise in buildings. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1930, 2, 59-64.
115. VENEKLASSEN, P. S. AND RUDMOSE, H. W. A thermal noise generator for acoustical measurements. Electro-Acoustic Lab., Harvard Univ., Aug. 1, 1945. PB. No. 19810.
116. WAGNER, K. W. Noise. *Sitzber. d. preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 1931, 9, 154-165.
117. WAR DEPT. AND NAVY DEPT. Noise-measuring equipment. (Army-Navy aeronautical specification AN-N-7), Oct. 5, 1944.
118. WASMANSDORFF, C. Reducing radio noise. *Electronic Industries*, 1944, 3, 80-83+.
119. WIENER, F. M. AND MARQUIS, R. J. Sound levels due to an airplane passing overhead in level flight. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., May 15, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1404.
120. ———. Noise levels due to an airplane passing overhead. *J. acoust. Soc. Amer.*, 1946, 18, 450-452.
121. WIENER, F. M. and others. Design, operation and calibration of the sound pressure meter. Cruft Lab., Harvard Univ., Sept. 25, 1943. OSRD Rept. no. 1817.
122. ZAND, S. J. Quiet within the airplane. *Aviation*, 1933, 32, 106-108.

\*Reference not verified in the original.