

Washington University in St. Louis

Washington University Open Scholarship

Volume 12

Washington University
Undergraduate Research Digest

Spring 2017

Machine Learning Psychometric Function Testing

Nikki Metzger

Washington University in St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wuurd_vol12

Recommended Citation

Metzger, Nikki, "Machine Learning Psychometric Function Testing" (2017). *Volume 12*. 135.
https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wuurd_vol12/135

This Abstracts J-R is brought to you for free and open access by the Washington University Undergraduate Research Digest at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Volume 12 by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

MACHINE LEARNING PSYCHOMETRIC FUNCTION TESTING

Nikki Metzger

Mentor: Dennis Barbour

Psychometric functions resulting from psychophysical tasks relate physical stimuli to perception. Current methods of psychometric function testing have been designed to be robust and precise, at the expense of efficiency and explanatory power. The Barbour Lab has developed a novel form of psychometric inference that can trade any of these properties for another, thereby yielding an extremely flexible estimator. The current study assessed the agreement between psychometric function thresholds obtained through the lab's novel machine learning (ML) audiometric testing procedure and those obtained from the conventional method of constant stimuli in fifteen participants. Test-retest reliability of the two methods was evaluated in each ear, totaling four tests per ear and eight tests per participant. The ML audiogram tested frequencies from 1,000 Hz to 4,000 Hz, while the method of constant stimuli tested solely 2,000 Hz. The estimated hearing thresholds of these two methods were compared at 2,000 Hz. The hearing thresholds estimated by the lab's ML audiometric testing procedure were very similar to those estimated by the method of constant stimuli: the mean absolute difference between the two different estimates was 4.15 dB SPL. Additionally, the mean absolute difference between repeated measurements of the ML audiogram was 3.80 dB SPL, while the mean absolute difference between repeated measurements of the method of constant stimuli was 2.17 dB SPL. The lab's ML audiometric testing procedure therefore appears to accurately estimate hearing thresholds at 2,000 Hz, suggesting that it also accurately estimates the hearing threshold at all frequencies within the tested range.