

**EVALUATION OF FM FITTINGS**

**Susan E. Cotton**

**B. A. (Hons)**

**Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements**

**for the degree of**

**Master of Arts**

**(Audiology)**

**Macquarie University**

**March 1988**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many children, teachers, parents and audiologists participated in this project and I would like to express my thanks to them all for their time and interest. I am especially grateful to the teachers and students from St. Gabriel's school, Castle Hill who assisted me in every way possible.

Thankyou also to my two supervisors, Phillip Newall for his support and encouragement, and Harvey Dillon for his enthusiasm, wealth of ideas and for giving me the opportunity to do this project justice.

In particular, I am very grateful to my parents who bravely welcomed me into their house for the period that it took to write this thesis, and for my father's much appreciated help with the proofreading. Finally, thanks to Simon who, although he was not here, helped keep my chin up throughout these long weeks.

## ABSTRACT

Only very limited research has examined the issue of how well FM systems are decreasing the speech perception difficulties of hearing impaired children. A comprehensive study of the effectiveness of FM fittings and factors associated with benefit was therefore undertaken using 4 different measures. Tracking of continuous discourse in classroom settings (12 subjects) showed significant improvement when FM aids were used compared to hearing aids alone. Also, significantly greater gains in tracking rate were made over 4 sessions for the FM condition compared to the hearing aid only listening condition. In order to investigate the subjective response of listeners to various features of FM processed signals, another experiment was conducted using a paired comparison procedure in noise with 21 moderately to profoundly deaf children and using two different types of FM systems. Overall results showed significant preferences for combined mode above both VOX/SOX settings and FM microphone alone settings. There were no significant preferences for microphone style, and a significant volume control setting preference (for a 5 dB higher than recommended setting) was shown for one of the two types of FM systems evaluated. The most interesting result was that, overall, listeners did not significantly prefer any FM settings to their hearing aids alone and, in fact, most listeners actually significantly preferred the aid alone to the FM alone or VOX/SOX settings. These results occurred despite the fact that a large FM advantage was shown in terms of improved S/N ratio on all these settings. However, judgements tended to be different for experienced users of at least one of the types of FM being evaluated, who significantly preferred the FM on any mode compared to their hearing aid

alone. These results are discussed with regard to clinical practices and the need for demonstration to, and training and encouragement of, new users to ensure the available FM advantage is realised. A third study evaluated the clinical usefulness and accuracy of an adaptive speech test (NU-CHIPS) in noise to verify and measure degree of FM advantage. Results from 31 mildly to profoundly hearing impaired children showed that significant signal-to-noise ratio advantage was obtained overall, and that the advantage was greater on the FM alone than the C setting. Over all listening conditions through the FM, there were 28 out of a possible 51 occurrences of hearing impaired listeners performing equal to or significantly better than 11 normal hearing children also tested using this procedure. The predictive accuracy and clinical feasibility of this approach are discussed. The way in which these FM advantages are moderated by interactions with users in practical situations are described by the results from questionnaires or interviews of 75 teachers, 52 children and 14 parents regarding use, perceived benefits and problems associated with FM systems. Factors which seemed to affect perceptions and use included feelings of self-consciousness about the FM as age of users increased, lack of confidence in the systems due to frequent breakages and faults in combination with lack of knowledge about how to check the systems effectively and efficiently, problems with being able to securely attach the systems to the body, and lack of knowledge about how to make the best use of the units in a variety of situations. On the basis of all of these findings, some suggestions on how to improve FM acceptance and use are offered.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
ABSTRACT	
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION	
1.1 : Overview	1
1.2 : The need for FM systems	
1.2.1 : The performance of hearing impaired listeners in conditions of noise and/or reverberation	3
1.2.2 : Noise and speech levels in typical classroom situations	6
1.2.3 : Typical reverberation times for classrooms	11
1.2.4 : Conclusions	12
1.3 : Description of FM systems	
1.3.1 : The principle of microphone proximity to the source	14
1.3.2 : Traditional types of classroom amplification systems	14
1.3.3 : Characteristics of FM transmission	15
1.3.4 : An examination of the features of presently available FM systems	16
1.4 : Evaluation of FM systems	
1.4.1 : Needs	27
1.4.2 : Distortion associated with use of FM equip- ment	28
1.4.3 : Reliability of FM units	29
1.4.4 : Measuring FM advantage using behavioural measures	30
1.4.5 : Acceptance and use of FM systems	33
1.4.6 : Fitting practices and procedures	34
1.5 : Aims of the present study	37

CHAPTER 2 : THE USE OF CONTINUOUS DISCOURSE TRACKING TO ASSESS  
DEGREE OF FM ADVANTAGE RECEIVED BY MODERATELY TO  
PROFOUNDLY HEARING IMPAIRED CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM  
CONDITIONS

2.1 : Rationale	40
2.2 : Method	
2.2.1 : Subjects	40
2.2.2 : Equipment	42
2.2.3 : Classroom conditions	43
2.2.4 : Procedure	44
2.3 : Results	
2.3.1 : Degree of FM advantage	47
2.3.2 : Comparison of improvements in tracking rates in the FM and hearing aid only listening conditions	54
2.3.3 : Influence of degree of hearing loss on amount of FM advantage	55
2.4 : Discussion	58

CHAPTER 3 : SUBJECTIVE PREFERENCES OF HEARING IMPAIRED CHILD-  
REN FOR LISTENING THROUGH FM SYSTEMS USING A  
PAIRED COMPARISON PROCEDURE

3.1 : Rationale	62
3.2 : Method	
3.2.1 : Subjects	62
3.2.2 : Equipment	64
3.2.3 : Materials and Recording	69
3.2.4 : Instructions	70
3.2.5 : Procedure	71
3.3 : Results	
3.3.1 : Overall preferences of listeners for each FM feature	76
3.3.2 : Significant preferences of individual listeners for each FM feature	82
3.3.3 : Effects of previous experience using FM systems on listener preferences	83
3.3.4 : Relationship between degree of hearing loss and preferred listening condition	85
3.3.5 : Relationship between degree of FM advantage and preferred listening condition	86

### 3.4 : Discussion

3.4.1 : Mode preferences	89
3.4.2 : Microphone style preferences	95
3.4.3 : Volume preferences	95
3.4.4 : Concluding remarks	97

## CHAPTER 4 : DEGREE OF FM ADVANTAGE AS MEASURED USING AN ADAPTIVE SPEECH TEST PROCEDURE WITH MILDLY TO PROFOUNDLY HEARING IMPAIRED CHILDREN

### 4.1 : Rationale 98

### 4.2 : Method

4.2.1 : Subjects	98
4.2.2 : Test materials	99
4.2.3 : Instructions	100
4.2.4 : Equipment set up and calibration	101
4.2.5 : Procedure	103

### 4.3 : Results

4.3.1 : Degree of FM advantage in FM alone and C listening conditions - group results	105
4.3.2 : Degree of FM advantage shown in individual cases	106
4.3.3 : Comparison between performances of normal hearing and hearing impaired listeners	108
4.3.4 : Relationship between degree of hearing loss and size of FM advantage	110

### 4.4 : Discussion

4.4.1 : Degree of FM advantage demonstrated	112
4.4.2 : Comparison of the performance of hearing impaired children wearing FM units with that of normal hearing subjects	119
4.4.3 : Comments about degree of hearing loss and amount of FM advantage	120
4.4.4 : Recommendations for the use of an adaptive speech test to assess degree of FM advantage in the clinic	121

## CHAPTER 5 : BENEFITS AND USE OF FM SYSTEMS : A SURVEY OF TEACHERS, CHILDREN AND PARENTS

### 5.1 : Rationale 124

### 5.2 : Method

5.2.1 : Background information	124
5.2.2 : The teacher questionnaire - sample population	125
5.2.3 : Questionnaire design and development	126
5.2.4 : Procedure	126

5.2.5 : The child and parent questionnaire - sample population	127
5.2.6 : Questionnaire design and development	127
5.2.7 : Procedure	128
5.2.8 : Equipment	129
5.3 : Results	
5.3.1 : Response rate and characteristics of response sample	130
5.3.2 : Analysis of responses	132
5.3.2.1 : Aid use and benefit	133
5.3.2.2 : Settings/facilities used	141
5.3.2.3 : Repairs and support	144
5.3.2.4 : Attitude towards using the system	146
5.3.2.5 : Differences attributable to FM use	148
5.4 : Discussion	
5.4.1 : Comments on the response samples	150
5.4.2 : Aid use and benefit	152
5.4.3 : Attitudes towards use	156
5.4.4 : Differences attributable to FM use	157
5.4.5 : Settings and facilities used	158
5.4.6 : Repairs and support	162
CHAPTER 6 : CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	166
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A : Two-way ANOVA results on listening condition x tracking session number - Experiment 1 - Chapter 2	173
APPENDIX B : Relationship between degree of hearing loss in the better ear and preferred listening conditions	174
APPENDIX C : Raw data from experiment 3 - NU-CHIPS adaptive speech test	176
APPENDIX D : Teacher questionnaire	186
APPENDIX E : Copy of teacher questionnaire cover letter	192
APPENDIX F : Questionnaire for children	193
APPENDIX G : Questionnaire for parents of pre-school and younger aged children	198
APPENDIX H : Situations where the FM is reported to be of most benefit by teachers, children and parents	204
APPENDIX I : Ratings of attitude towards use of FM's by teachers, parents and children - responses grouped according to whether the child user was in mainstream or special education	205
BIBLIOGRAPHY	206