

Vocal Quality after a Performance in Theatre Actors compared to Dancers

Daelman, J.*, Leyns, C*., Meerschman, I., Van Lierde, K., D'haeseleer, E.

10th European Congress of Speech and Language Therapy, May 10th – 12th, Cascais, Portugal



DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH, LANGUAGE AND HEARING SCIENCES





VOCAL QUALITY IN ACTORS



- Pressure, stress & typical lifestyle (Ormezzano et al., 2011)
- Vocal overload (Emerich et al., 2005)
- Vocal fatigue _

GHENT

UNIVERSITY

(Novak et al., 1991; D'haeseleer et al., 2016)

Vocally violent behaviour —

(Ferrone et al., 2004; Roy et al., 2000)

- Environmental conditions (Goulart et al., 2011; ____ Hoffman-Ruddy, Lehman, Crandell, Ingram, & Sapienza, 2001)
- Poor vocal hygiene habits (Timmermans et al., — 2002; Varosanec-Skanic, 2008; D'haeseleer et al., 2016)

(Zeine et al., 2002)

(Master et al., 2008)



IMPACT PERFORMANCE





- Objective vocal quality

- Expiratory airflow (Rangarathnam et al., 2017)
- Auditory perceptual vocal quality
 - CAPE-V (Rangarathnam et al., 2017)

- Objective vocal quality

- AVQI (D'haeseleer et al., 2016)
- (Novak et al., 1991)
- Auditory perceptual vocal quality
 - (Novak et al., 1991)





Objective vocal quality I_{max}, perturbation measures, s/z ratio (*Ferrone et al., 2004*) Auditory perceptual vocal quality GRBASI scale (D'haeseleer et al., 2016)

Introduction	Purpose	Methods	Results	

Is there a difference in objective and subjective vocal quality between professional actors, non-professional actors and professional dancers, measured at the baseline?



Is there an impact of one performance on the objective and subjective vocal quality of professional actors, non-professional actors and professional dancers?



Introduction	Purpose	Methods	Results
--------------	---------	---------	---------

SUBJECTS

n (total) = 62	Professional actors (PA)	Non- professional actors (NPA)	Professional dancers (PD)	p-value
n (♀, ♂)	27 (13 ♀, 14 ♂)	19 (12 ♀, 7 ♂)	16 (12 ♀, 4 ♂)	/
Age tot. (years)	35,8 (21-48)	21,6 (18-29)	25,8 (16-42)	PA-NPA/PD: <0,001
Age ♂ (years)	37,9 (29-48)	22,0 (20-23)	38,3 (33-42)	PA/PD-NPA: <0,001
Age \bigcirc (years)	33,6 (21-46)	21,4 (18-29)	22,7 (16-32)	PA-NPA/PD: <0,001
Dur. perf. (min)	87	101	52	PA/NPA-PD: <0,001

Inclusion & exclusion criteria

- Professionals: earn their living with performing
- Min. 4 hours/week acting/dancing
- Leading of relevant supporting role
- No musical actors
- No health or hearing problems



Introduction	Purpose	Methods	Results
Introduction	Гарозе	Methodo	rtesuits





Vocal quality

Performance





Vocal quality

VOICE ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL

Auditory perceptual evaluation

• GRBASI scale (Hirano, 1981; Dejonckere et al., 1996)

Acoustic analysis in PRAAT

- /a:/
 - F_0 , jitter
- /a:/ + continuous speech
 - CPPS, HNR, SL, SLdB, slope, tilt

Voice Range Profile in PRAAT

GHENT

UNIVERSITY

Self-evaluation questionnaires

- Voice Handicap Index (Jacobson et al., 1997; De Bodt et al., 2000)
- Vocal Tract Discomfort Scale (Mathieson, 2009; Luyten et al., 2016)
- Corporal Pain Scale (Van Lierde, 2011)

Multiparamater indexes

- MPT, jitter, Fhigh, Ilow • Vocal capacities al.,2010)
- Dysphonia Severity. Index (Wuyts et al, 2000) • Acoustic Vocal Quality Index (Maryn et
 - CPPS, HNR, SL, SLdB, slope, tilt
 - Vocal quality

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

- Linear mixed models
 - Restricted maximum likelihood estimations
 - Scaled identity covariance structures
- GRBASI
 - Kruskal-Wallis Test between groups
 - Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test within groups



VOCAL QUALITY BETWEEN GROUPS

PA – NPA

 $\begin{array}{c} \bigcirc \downarrow \mathsf{F}_0 \ (p=0,003) \\ \bigcirc \uparrow \mathsf{F}_{range} \ (p=0,010) \\ \bigcirc \uparrow \mathsf{MFT} \ (p=0,008) \\ \downarrow \mathsf{I}_{\mathsf{low}} \ (p=0,020) \end{array}$

PD – PA ↑ CPS I (*p*=0,002)

PD – PA / NPA ↑ AVQI (*p*=0,025 / *p*=0,003) **PD – NPA** ↑ VTDS F (*p*=0,016) ↑ VTDS I (*p*=0,039)



DSI GRBASI VHI

IMPACT OF THE PERFORMANCE

Professional actors

No differences

Non-professional actors

 $\downarrow I_{high} (p=0,015)$ $\downarrow I_{range} (p=0,032)$ $\circlearrowleft MPT (p=0,038)$

Professional dancers

↓ VHI total score (*p*=0,048)



2









	Introduction	Purpose	Methods	Results	
VOCAL QUALITY					

- Better vocal capacities in PA than in NPA
- Worse vocal quality in PD than in actors
- Bad vocal habits in professional actors



- No short-term impact on vocal capacities and vocal quality
- Long-term impact? -



1901	ION
1000	





Julie Daelman PhD Student – Msc Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences

Clara Leyns MSc Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences

DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH, LANGUAGE AND HEARING SCIENCES

- E jldaelma.daelman@ugent.be
- T +32 9 332 54 71



www.ugent.be