



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Fassnidge, C., Cecconi-Marcotti, C. & Freeman, E. D. (2015). Hearing through your eyes: the Visually-Evoked Auditory Response

This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://city-ref-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/12888/>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

HEARING THROUGH YOUR EYES

THE VISUALLY-EVOKED AUDITORY RESPONSE

Fassnidge, Christopher; Cecconi-Marcotti, Claudia; Kazaz, Zainab; Knudsen, Synøve; Rahimzadeh, Nicole; & Freeman, Elliot. D.

Introduction

Saenz & Koch (2008) first described '*hearing-motion synaesthesia*', in which visual flashes and movements induce auditory sensations. They reported that self-identified synaesthetes found it easier than non-synaesthetes to distinguish sequences of flashes, perhaps because they could hear them too.

There has been no research on this since 2008! Until now...

Our questions:

1. How *prevalent* is this? We tested a random rather than self-selected sample.
2. Are induced sounds *perceptually real* enough to affect detection of real sounds?
3. Do objective measures correlate with subjective measures?


Methods

Task 1 – Same/different sequence discrimination (after Saenz & Koch, 2008).

- Either auditory or visual sequences
- Visual stimuli were a white disk (1.5 degrees visual angle) presented on a black background.
- Auditory stimuli were 360 Hz sine wave tones.


Task 2 – Auditory detection task (after Lovelace et al., 2003).

- 'Yes/No' auditory detection task.
- Either unimodal or with non-predictive visual stimulation.
- Auditory target: 300 ms white noise burst presented near threshold, 50% probability; concurrent background white noise.
- Visual stimulus (when present): rotating radial grating for 500ms.



Task 3 – Measure of visual dominance over audition (after Colavita, 1974).

- Visual (40% of trials), Auditory (40%) or bimodal stimuli (20%), randomly.
- Identify modality – Hit 'A' and/or 'V' key.
- Visual dominance ← missed auditory responses on bimodal trials.
- Visual stimuli: white disk (1.5°) on black background.
- Auditory stimuli: white noise bursts.



Task 4 – Debrief Questionnaire (performed after Task 1).

- Used to gauge whether subjects perceived any sound on viewing visual flashes.
- E.g. What strategy were you using to remember the visual sequences?
- E.g. Did you actually hear faint sounds when you saw the flashes?

Participants

All participants took part in task 1, with subsets performing the remaining 3 tasks. All were naïve to the purpose of the study and had normal/corrected vision, normal hearing, and did not identify as synaesthetes.

Task 1 N = 96 (65 female, ages 18-55 (M 23, SD 6.5))
 Task 2 N = 40 (25 female, ages 19-36 (M 24.5, SD 3.5))
 Task 3 N = 22 (17 female, ages 19-36 (M 23.9, SD 4.5))
 Task 4 N = 38 (24 female, ages 19-36 (M 24.5, SD 4.9))



CITY UNIVERSITY
LONDON


Colavita, F. B. (1974). Human sensory dominance. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 16(2), 409-412.

Lovelace, C. T., Stein, B. E., & Wallace, M. T. (2003). An irrelevant light enhances auditory detection in humans: a psychophysical analysis of multisensory integration in stimulus detection. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 17(2), 447-453

Saenz, M., & Koch, C. (2008). The sound of change: visually-induced auditory synesthesia. *Current Biology*, 18(15), 650-651.

Results

Higher visual sequence discrimination (relative to auditory) on Task 1 correlated significantly with lower auditory detection rates in the presence of visual stimuli (relative to without) on Task 2 ($\rho(39) = -0.36$, $p < 0.02$). This suggests that internal auditory noise evoked by the visual stimulus can actually interfere with an externally-originating auditory signal.




a – The presence of an irrelevant visual stimulus could either increase or decrease a participant's auditory detection performance.

b – Sequencing task performance was higher for auditory than for visual stimuli, although the extent of this auditory advantage varied.

c – There was a significant negative correlation between subjects with greater visual relative to auditory sequencing and poorer auditory detection in the presence of a visual stimulus.

Prevalence: Sequencing task (Task1)




High prevalence on Task 1 objective measure: >50% of our random sample resembled Saenz & Koch's self-selected synaesthetes, on S&K's statistical criterion.

When asked in Task 4, 8 out of 28 subjects (21%) reported being able to hear faint sounds when viewing the flashes. These 8 subjects performed significantly better at visual sequencing [$M = 2.341$, $SD = .841$] than others [$M = 1.599$, $SD = .788$], $t(36) = -2.336$, $p = .025$ (See below, left).

Visual Attentional Bias?

A robust Colavita effect was seen in task 3, with more missed auditory stimuli [$M = 25.77$] than missed visual stimuli [$M = 9.91$] on bimodal trials, $t(21) = -3.26$, $p = .004$.

However visual dominance scores did not correlate with visual sequencing ability expressed as either d' ($r = .01$, $p > .05$) nor as percentage of correct trials ($r = .036$, $p > .05$).



Discussion

In >50% of our random sample, remarkably similar results to Saenz & Koch's self-selecting synaesthetes are observed. Their objective measure appears less reliable than a subjective measure. However in the sample as a whole visual flashes appear able to disrupt auditory detection. We suggest that this synaesthesia may exist as a continuum, even if any corollary sensation is below perceptual threshold in most individuals. We term this the visually-evoked auditory response.