PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF SONIFICATION CONCEPT FOR DYSLEXIA



FACULTY OF COMPUTING AND INFORMATICS UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH 2016

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF SONIFICATION CONCEPT FOR DYSLEXIA

YEOH PUI YENG



FACULTY OF COMPUTING AND INFORMATICS UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH 2016

DECLARATION

I hereby to declare that the material in this thesis is my own except for quotations, excepts, equations, summaries and references, which have been duly acknowledged.

12 August 2015

Yeoh Pui Yeng PI20108134



CONFIRMATION

NAMA	: YEOH PUI YENG
NO. MATRIK	: PI20108134
ТАЈИК	: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF SONIFICATION CONCEPT FOR DYSLEXIA
IJAZAH	: MASTER OF SCIENCE (MULTIMEDIA TECHNOLOGY)
TARIKH VIVA	: 21 MEI 2015



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Many thanks to all the participants in this study for their helps, patience, and kindness in this research. I learned a lot from you. Especially, I would like to thank the staffs of the Association Dyslexia Malaysia and Labuan International School who opened their doors to me and supported this work.

Special thanks go to for my lecturers, Mrs. Laura Jack Penny, Mr. Jonathan Likoh and Mr. Ryan Macdonell Andrias for the assistance, advice, and time that they unselfishly provided from the beginning of this study to its end.

Finally, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my project supervisor, Prof. Madya Dr. Ag. Asri for always believing in me and guiding me with endless patience and incredible kindness throughout this process. It was an honor working with you and learning from you.

I also hope that this research will provide mutual benefits, to other researchers and could provide a new dimension in sonification and dyslexia research fields.



ABSTRACT

Sonification is merely a new research field. It is defined as the representation of data or information using non-speech sound. Dyslexia is a specific learning difficulty that causes a person who has dyslexia to have problems in reading, writing, spelling or manipulating numbers even though they have normal intelligence and were exposed to sufficient education and training. This research aims to find out whether sonification concept can be used in the design of assistive tools for dyslexic students. Before any sonification based assistive tools can be designed, it is important to understand the fundamental issues, which are the listening performances of dyslexic peoples. Based on the tasks used in measuring usability properties of sonification applications, a listening test experimental design was developed and the performance results were analyzed. The overall results show that people who have dyslexia can be concluded as equivalent to normal people in performing general tasks in sonification concepts. However, there are some interesting results that might need to be taken into consideration for future research enhancements.



ABSTRAK

PENILAIAN PRESTASI KONSEP SONIFIKASI UNTUK DISLEXIA

Sonifikasi merupakan satu bidang yang agak baru. Ianya didefinisikan sebagai persembahan data atau maklumat dengan menggunakan bunyi bukan percakapan. Dislexia pula merupakan masalah yang berkaitan dengan pembelajaran yang menyebabkan seseorang yang mempunyai dislexia menghadapi masalah untuk membaca, menulis, mengeja atau memanuipulasi nombor walaupun mereka mempunyai kebijaksanaan yang normal dan didedahkan dengan kaedah pendidikan yang normal. Penyelidikan ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji samada konsep sonifikasi boleh digunakan sebagai alat untuk membantu masalah mereka. Walaubagaimana pun, sebelum sebarang alat bantuan berasaskan sonifikasi direka, adalah penting untuk memahami isu-isu asas yang berkaitan dengan kebolehan mendengar bagi mereka yang mengalami dislexia ini. Berdasarkan kepada kerja dan ujian yang pernah digunakan sebelum ini untuk mengukur elemen-elemen kebolehgunaan suatu aplikasi sonfikasi, ujian mendengar telah direkabentuk dan dijalankan dan keputusan telah dianalysis. Secara keseluruhan, keputusan analisis menunjukkan bahawa mereka yang mempunyai dislexia ini telah menunjukan prestasi yang lebih kurang sama dengan orang normal dalam melaksanakan tugas-tugas umum dalam konsep sonifikasi. Walaubagaimana pun, terdapat juga keputusan yang menarik yang perlu diberikan pertimbangan untuk dijadikan penyelidikan baru dimasa hadapan.

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
TITL	E	i
DECI	LARATION	i
CER	TIFICATION	iii
ACKI	NOWLEDGEMENT	iv
ABS	TRACT	v
ABS	TRAK	V
LIST	OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST	OF TABLES	xi
LIST	OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST	OF PHOTOS	xiv
LIST	OF EQUATIONS	xv
LIST	OF APPENDIX	xvi
CHA 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.7 1.8 1.9	PTER 1: INTRODUCTION Overview Sonification Assistive Technology Dyslexia Research Questions Research Objectives Expected Contribution Hypothesis Overview of Research Methodology	1 1 2 4 6 6 6 8
_	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-
CHA	PTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1	Definition of Sonification	9
2.2	Concept of Sonification	9
2.3	Importance of Sound to Dyslexic	11
2.4	Classifications and Functions of Sonification	11

	2.4.1	Alert Functions	12
	2.4.2	Status and Process Indication Functions	12
	2.4.3	Data Exploration Functions	13
	2.4.4	Art and Entertainment Functions	13
2.5	Sonificat	ion Systems	14
	2.5.1	Exploratory Visualization (EXVIS)	14
	2.5.2	Scaletti: Developing Prototype Sonification Tools Using Kyma	15
2.6	Sonification Techniques and Approaches		16
	2.6.1	Event-based Sonification	16
	2.6.2	Model-based Approaches	17
	2.6.3	Continuous Sonification	17
2.7	Sonificat	ion and Auditory Display	17
	2.7.1	Earcons	19
	2.7.2	Auditory Icons	20
	2.7.3	Parameter Mapping	21
2.8	Applications of Sonification 21		
2.9	Da <mark>ta Propert</mark> ies and Task Dependency 25		
2.10	Data Types 26		
2.11	Taxonomic Description of Auditory Display and Sonification 27		
2.12	Model of Interaction in Sonification SITI MALAYSIA SABAH 28		
2.13			
	2.13.1	Aesthetics and Musicality	29
	2.13.2	Individual Differences and Training	29
2.14	Dyslexia	: An International Perspective	30
	2.14.1	International Definition of Dyslexia	31
	2.14.2	Causes and Characteristics of Dyslexia	35
2.15	Assistive	Technology: What is it all about?	40
2.16	Usability	Evaluation of Sonification	41
	2.16.1	Learnability	41
	2.16.2	Efficiency	42
	2.16.3	Memorability	42
	2.16.4	Errors	42
	2.16.5	Satisfaction	43

2.17	Key Findings from Literature Review		
2.18	3 Tasks in Evaluation		44
	2.18.1	Matching Task	44
	2.18.2	Comparison Task	45
	2.18.3	Classification Task	45
	2.18.4	Ordering Task	45
	2.18.5	Association Task	46
	2.18.6	Prediction Task	46
	2.18.7	Finding Task	47
	2.18.8	Memorization Task	47
	2.18.9	Navigation Task	48
	2.18.10	Identification Task	48
2.19	Summar	у	49
CHAI	PTER 3: M	METHODOLOGY	50
3.1	Introduction		
3.2	.2 Re <mark>search Fra</mark> mework		
3.3	Argumer	nt on the Developed Framework	51
3.4	Objective	es of Evaluation	52
3.5	Type of	Tasks UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH	53
3.6	Experime	ental Design	55
	3.6.1	Independent and Dependent Variables	55
	3.6.2	Subjects	55
	3.6.3	Questionnaire Development	56
	3.6.4	Stimuli and Experiment Materials	56
3.7	Summar	у	65
CHAI	PTER 4: A	ANALYSIS	66
4.1	Introduc	tion	66
4.2	Matching	g, Comparison and Classification Tasks	66
	4.2.1	Matching Task	67
	4.2.2	Comparison Task	72
	4.2.3	Classification Task	76

4.3	Ordering,	Association and Prediction Tasks	80
	4.3.1	Ordering Task	81
	4.3.2	Association Task	85
	4.3.3	Prediction Task	89
4.4	Finding, N	lemorization, Navigation and Identification Tasks	93
	4.4.1	Finding Task	94
	4.4.2	Memorization Task	98
	4.4.3	Navigation Task	102
	4.4.4	Identification Task	106
4.5	Discussio	n	110
4.6	Summary		110
CHA	PTER 5: C	ONCLUSION	113
5.1	Conclusio	n	113
5.2	Research	Contribution	113
5.3	Experime	nt Results	113
5.4	Research	Implication	114
5.5	Research	Limitation	114
5.6	Future Re	search VIVI	114
5.7	Summary	UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH	115
REF	ERENCES		116
ACHIEVEMENT		148	

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 4.1:	Actual observation for Matching Task	67
Table 4.2:	Probability table for Matching Task	68
Table 4.3:	Result findings for Matching Task	69
Table 4.4:	Actual observations for Comparison Task	72
Table 4.5:	Probability table for Comparison Task	72
Table 4.6:	Result findings for Comparison Task	73
Table 4.7:	Actual observations for Classification Task	76
Table 4.8:	New Actual observations for Classification Task	76
Table 4.9:	Probability table for Classification Task	76
Table 4.10:	Result findings for Classification Task	77
Table 4.11:	Actual observations for Ordering Task	81
Table 4.12:	Probability table for Ordering Task	81
Table 4.13:	Result findings for Ordering Task	82
Table 4.14:	Actual observations for Association Task	85
Table 4.15:	Probability table for Association Task	85
Table 4.16:	Result findings for Association Task	86
Table 4.17:	Actual observations for Prediction Task LAYSIA SABAH	89
Table 4.18:	Probability table for Prediction Task	89
Table 4.19:	Result findings for Prediction Task	90
Table 4.20:	Actual observations for Finding Task	94
Table 4.21:	Probability table for Finding Task	94
Table 4.22:	Actual observations for Finding Task	94
Table 4.23:	Actual observations for Memorization Task	98
Table 4.24:	Probability table for Memorization Task	98
Table 4.25:	Result findings for Memorization Task	99
Table 4.26:	Actual observations for Navigation Task	102
Table 4.27:	Probability table for Navigation Task	102
Table 4.28:	Result findings for Navigation Task	103
Table 4.29:	Actual observations for Identification Task	106

Table 4.30:	Probability table for Identication Task	107
Table 4.31:	Result findings for Identification Task	107



LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 1.1:	Overview of research methodology.	8
Figure 2.2:	General process in communication system.	18
Figure 2.3:	The process of sonification.	24
Figure 3.4:	Framework of research.	50
Figure 3.5:	Questionnaires for Matching Task.	58
Figure 3.6:	Questionnaires for Comparison Task.	59
Figure 3.7:	Questionaires for Classification Task.	60
Figure 3.8:	Questionnaires for Ordering Task.	61
Figure 3.9:	Questionnaires for Association Task.	62
Figure 4.1:	Performance for Matching, Comparison and Classification Tasks.	66
Figure 4.2:	Histograms for Matching Task.	71
Figure 4.3:	Histograms for Comparison Task.	75
Figure 4.4:	Histograms for Classification Task.	80
Figure 4.5:	Performance for Ordering, Association and Prediction Tasks.	80
Figure 4.6:	Histograms for Ordering Task.	85
Figure 4.7:	Histograms for Association Task.	89
Figure 4.8:	Histograms for Prediction Task. TIMALAYSIA SABAH	93
Figure 4.9:	Performance for Finding, Memorization, Navigation and ${\rm I}$	93
	Dentification Tasks.	
Figure 4.10:	Histograms for Finding Task.	102
Figure 4.11:	Histograms for Memorization Task.	102
Figure 4.12:	Histograms for Navigation Task.	106
Figure 4.13:	Histograms for Identification Task.	109
Figure 4.14:	Summary of listening sound based on ten tasks.	112

LIST OF PHOTOS

Photo 3.1: Briefing before experiment

Page 57



LIST OF EQUATIONS

Equation 4.1: Two sample proportion test

Page 69



LIST OF APPENDIX

		Page
Appendix A	Version 1 Questionnaires	12828
Appendix B	Version 2 Questionnaires	12833
Appendix C	Version 3 Questionnaires	12838
Appendix D	Version 4 Questionnaires	12843



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

This chapter gives overview about sonification, assistive tools and dyslexia.

1.2 Sonification

Based on NSF report (Kramer et al., 1999) by the International Community for Auditory Display (ICAD), sonification is defined as the process of using non-verbal sound to convey information. For instance, auditory icons (Hermann, 2002) are used for display sound information through an automatic process that adopts commonly held meaning for everyday sounds. Let's consider the sound of a bottle filling up, which can be used to indicate a progressing file download in the environment where the filling up is taking place.

Sonification concept is a branch of auditory display. Auditory display can generally be defined as any form of display that makes use of non-verbal sounds to communicate information. Sonification is a type of auditory display that adopts nonspeech audio to represent information. Kramer et al. (1999) further broadened the concept by elaborating that sonification as the conversion of data relations into perceived relations in a non-speech sound signal to help facilitate communication or interpretation. Thus, the main objective of sonification is to translate the relationship in a data into non-speech sound(s), and make use of human beings auditory perceptual abilities to make the data relationship comprehensible.

There are several exsiting sonification techniques that currently available e.g., audification (Dombois, 2001), parameter mapping (Kramer, 1994), model based sonification (Hermann, 2002), earcons, auditory icons etc. These techniques are normally guided by the type of data to be presented and the required user tasks that the sonification can support such as programming debugging (Vickers, 1999), multi-channel display (pauletto, 2004), stock market prediction (Janata et al., 2004) etc.

1.3 Assistive Technology

Assistive technology is a technology used by individuals or persons with disabilities to accomplish their tasks. Examples of assistive tools are mobility devices such as walkers and wheelchairs. Individuals with restricted hand purpose can make use of a keyboard with large keys or a separate mouse to work on computer. Blind people can also use software that recognize text on the screen to computer-generated voice, people with low vision can use software that increase the size of screen words, deaf people can use a TTY (text telephone), or individuals with speech impairments can use a tool that speaks out loud when they typing the text on keyboard (Boyle et al., 2005).

In this research, assistive technology for dyslexia is defined as any technology that can be used to support people with dyslexia. Such technology includes hearing aids, visual aids, sound aids etc. However, this paper will focus on the idea of adopting sonification as an assistive technology to help dyslexic students. Previous researches have shown that assistive technology can recover certain skill deficits (e.g., reading and spelling) (Raskind and Higgins, 1999; Higgins and Raskind, 2000).

1.4 Dyslexia

Although dyslexia was officially recognized in the UK as a disability under the Disability Discrimination Act of 1995, there have been widespread of knowledge of the problems associated with such hidden disabilities (Dale and Taylor, 2001). Dyslexia is a serious disability across the globe, and affects a huge number of people. In the UK alone, it was reported that about 4 per cent of the country's population is severely dyslexic, with another 6 per cent being moderately dyslexic (BDA, 2006). Therefore, the total numbers of people that suffer from dyslexia in the UK make up 10 per cent of the country's population. In such an advanced country where access to quality health care and medications is assured, it must be

worrying to estimate the number of people suffering the same problem in developing and underdeveloped countries.

Taylor et al. (2007) stated the possible difficulties dyslexic patients to be: reading hesitantly; misreading, making understanding difficult; difficulty in clearly organizing thoughts; poor time management and planning; and erratic spelling.

The first issue of dyslexia was reported by Pringle-Morgan in 1896 (Pringle-Morgan, 1896). Pringle-Morgan and Hinshelwood (an ophthalmologist) made speculations that the issue of difficulty with reading and writing is caused by "congenital word blindness" (Hinshelwood, 1917), and it was widely believed that dyslexia is caused by visual processing difficulties.

While this view is not generally acceptable in the modern world, some current literatures still maintain that dyslexia is caused by a disorder in visual processing. Stein and Talcott (1999) reported on visual search difficulties that are caused by reduced ability of a person to correctly control ocular movement. Additionally, individuals who suffer from dyslexia are less sensitive to certain variables like contrast sensitivity and visual persistence when compared with normal people (Lovegrove, 1993). Notwithstanding that these literatures try to link dyslexia with visual difficulties, it is widely believed by researchers that dyslexia is a linguistic disorder, and on a more precise note it's caused by a disorder in phonological processing (Vicari et al., 2005). People who suffer from dyslexia normally experience difficulty with analysis and processing phonological elements of spoken words (Snowling, 1987; Snow et al., 1998). For instance, a dyslexic patient might have problem with subdividing words into their single phonemes (Shaywitz, 1998; Pennington et al., 1990). Thus, it can be stated that there is a possibility of some individuals having "linguistic" causes of dyslexia, while other having "visual" causes of dyslexia or some of them might be caused by both factors. As such, it is important that researchers appreciate the differences that exist between these numbers of causing agents. To be precise, dyslexic readers differ in relation to the extent of their ability to make use of phonological reading and spelling strategies. Research has shown these differences in the seriousness of dyslexic individual's

phonological disabilities can determine their level of reading abilities (Snowling, 2001). Simmons and Singleton (2000) also commented that dyslexic students tend to experience difficulties with reading comprehension that are not usually accounted for by their inability to understand words individually in a page of text, but this difficulty can be accounted for in their construction of references when processing passage of text.

Another survey by the UK Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA, 2006) revealed that in the academic year of 2003/2004, the number of first year undergraduate students in the UK with a stated disability of dyslexia was 15,600. Hatcher et al. (2002) stated that the number of students with dyslexia has been growing rapidly in recent years. Richardson and Wydell (2003) found that university students with dyslexia are more likely to drop from school during their first year of study and less likely to complete their course fully, but appropriate support for students can increase completion rate of students with dyslexia and it can equal that of students without disabilities. Some of the famous people with dyslexia include: Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, Michael Faraday (Dyslexia.com, 2013). See Appendix 1 for full more information about some of the famous and talented people with dyslexia.

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

In that notion, it is important for dyslexic students to be assisted with any form of technology that can help booster their cognitive competence and encourage them not to drop out from school. The reason being that, they will be able to acquire necessary skills that will be used to contribute towards the development of the society they live in.

1.5 Research Questions

The main aim of this research is to investigate and understand the potential of sonification concepts to be used in helping people with dyslexia to overcome their learning disabilities.

People who have dyslexia might get so frustrated and sad as reading and spelling are so hard to them. For kids, they might not like of being separated with their friends during reading class or having to see a special reading inscructors. However, helping them is important to ensure they can go on and do great things in their life. Some successful people have dyslexia, but it did not stop them from achiving their goals. As a results, many applications with assistive technologies have been developed purposely to help this kind of people.

Graphical respresentation currently dominates the fields of external representation, but sound is now seen as alternative and its complement. Previous research has shown the success of using sound in several areas, especially for blind or visually impared users or in situations where the users eyes are occupied with other tasks such as looking at a patient in medical dignosis or something that is difficult to represent using graphics such as multidimentional data.

An example of application for people with learning disabilities like dyslexia is text-to-speech application such as AB-Web (Roth et al., 1998), which is a browser that generates a virtual sound of the information including text and images. Another example is VoiceXML by Teppo et al. (2001) which is design for creating audio dialogs that features synthesised speech; digitised audio, recognition of spoken input, recording of spoken input etc. This is not only good for blind people but also for people with learing disabilities as it brings a better and more convenient text reading and writing experience especially with foreign language texts. Most of these existing applications are using speech sound.

However, this research will look into the potential of 'non-speech sound representation' of data, or also known as sonification, to be implemented as part of assistive technologies to aid people with dyslexia to potentially solve their problem. To the best of our knowledge, there is no current research of sonification concept for dyslexia. As a result, this research aims to find out whether sonification concept can be used in the design of assistive tools for dyslexic students. Before any sonification based assistive tools can be designed, it is important to understand the following fundamental issues and questions:

- a. **How to measure or evaluate** the performance of dyslexia peoples in using sonification applications.
- What are the listening performances between both dyslexic and normal people.

1.6 Research Objectives

The main objectives of this research are as below:

- 1. To introduce a general performance evaluation of sonification concepts.
- 2. To evaluate the performance of dyslexic students in sonification concepts.

1.7 Expected Contribution

The contributions of this research are:

- 1. A new general performance evaluation of sonification concepts.
- Empirical results of general performance evaluation of sonification concepts for both normal and dyslexia people.

1.8 Hypothesis

Below are the hypotheses of this research:

Hypothesis 1

- H₀: There is no significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of matching task.
- H₁: There is significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of matching task.

Hypothesis 2

- H₀: There is no significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of comparison task.
- H₁: There is significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of comparison task.

Hypothesis 3

H₀: There is no significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of classification task.

H₁: There is significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of classification task.

Hypothesis 4

- H₀: There is no significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of ordering task.
- H₁: There is significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of ordering task.

Hypothesis 5

- H₀: There is no significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of association task.
- H₁: There is significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of association task.

Hypothesis 6

- H₀: There is no significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of prediction task.
- H₁: There is significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of prediction task.

Hypothesis 7

- H₀: There is no significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of finding task.
- H₁: There is significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of finding task.

Hypothesis 8

- H₀: There is no significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of memorization task.
- H₁: There is significant difference between control group and dyslexic students in terms of memorization task.