Audiovisual speech perception: moving beyond McGurk

Kristin J. Van Engen¹, Avanti Dey², Mitchell S. Sommers¹, Jonathan E. Peelle³

¹ Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Washington University in Saint Louis

² PLOS ONE, 1265 Battery Street, San Francisco, CA

³ Department of Otolaryngology, Washington University in Saint Louis

<https://asa.scitation.org/jas/authors/manuscript>

<https://asa.scitation.org/pb-assets/files/publications/jas/jasinfcon.pdf>

Please address correspondence to:

Dr. Kristin Van Engen

Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences

Washington University in Saint Louis

Saint Louis, MO 63130

email: kvanengen@wustl.edu

**This paper is part of a special issue on Reconsidering Classic Ideas in
Speech Communication**

Abstract

Although it is clear that sighted listeners use both auditory and visual cues during speech perception, the manner in which multisensory information is combined is a matter of active debate. One approach to measuring multisensory integration is to use variants of the McGurk illusion, in which discrepant auditory and visual cues produce auditory percepts that differ from those based solely on unimodal input. Not all listeners show the same degree of susceptibility to the McGurk illusion, and these individual differences in susceptibility are frequently used as a measure of audiovisual integration ability. However, despite their popularity, we argue that McGurk tasks are ill-suited for studying the kind of multisensory speech perception that occurs in real life: McGurk stimuli are often based on isolated syllables (which are rare in conversations) and necessarily rely on audiovisual incongruence that does not occur naturally. Furthermore, recent data show that susceptibility on McGurk tasks does not correlate with performance during natural audiovisual speech perception. Although the McGurk effect is a fascinating illusion, truly understanding the combined use of auditory and visual information during speech perception requires tasks that more closely resemble everyday communication: namely, words, sentences, and stories with congruent auditory and visual speech cues.

I. INTRODUCTION

Speech perception in face-to-face conversations is a prime example of multisensory integration: as listeners we have access not only to a speaker's voice, but to visual cues coming from their face, gestures, and body posture. More than 45 years ago, McGurk and MacDonald (1976) published a remarkable (and now famous) example of visual influence on auditory speech perception: when an auditory stimulus (e.g., /ba/) was presented with the face of a talker articulating a different syllable (e.g., /ga/), listeners often experienced an illusory percept distinct from both sources (e.g., /da/)¹. Since that time, McGurk stimuli have been used in countless studies of audiovisual integration in humans (not to mention the multitude of classroom demonstrations on multisensory processing) (Marques et al., 2016). At the same time, the stimuli typically used to elicit a McGurk effect differ substantially from what we typically encounter in conversation. In this paper we consider how to best understand the benefits listeners receive from being able to see a speaker's face while listening to their speech during natural communication. We start by reviewing behavioral findings regarding audiovisual speech perception, as well as some theoretical constraints on our understanding of multisensory integration. With this background, we examine the McGurk effect to assess its usefulness for furthering our understanding of audiovisual speech perception.

II. BENEFITS OF AUDIOVISUAL SPEECH COMPARED TO AUDITORY-ONLY SPEECH

A great deal of research in audiovisual speech processing has focused on the finding that speech signals are consistently more intelligible when both auditory and visual information are

¹ Interested readers can find the story of the original discovery of the McGurk effect (which was an accident!) in John MacDonald's (MacDonald, 2018) article in Multisensory Research.

available compared to auditory-only (or visual-only) perception. Advantages in multisensory processing most obviously come from complementarity between auditory and visual speech signals. For example, /m/ and /n/ are confusable acoustically, but visually distinct; similarly, /p/ and /b/ are visually confusable, but acoustically distinct. Having two modalities of speech information makes it more likely a listener will perceive the intended item. However, advantages may also come in cases when information is redundant across two modalities, particularly in the context of background noise. That is, auditory-visual, as opposed to unimodal, presentations provide listeners with two, rather than a single, “looks” at the intended information.

In experiments that present speech to listeners in noisy backgrounds, recognition of audiovisual (AV) speech is significantly better than recognition of auditory-only speech (Erber, 1975; Sommers et al., 2005; Tye-Murray et al., 2007a; Van Engen et al., 2014, 2017), and listeners are able to reach predetermined performance levels at more difficult signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) (Grant and Seitz, 2000; Macleod and Summerfield, 1987; Sumby and Pollack, 1954). In addition, AV speech has been shown to speed performance in shadowing tasks (where listeners repeat a spoken passage in real time) (Reisberg et al., 1987) and improve comprehension of short stories (Arnold and Hill, 2001) relative to auditory-only presentations. Given that acoustically challenging speech is also associated with increased cognitive challenge (Pelle, 2018), visual information may reduce the cognitive demand associated with speech-in-noise processing (Gosselin and Gagné, 2011) (but see Brown and Strand, 2019). Below we review two key areas in which audiovisual speech is beneficial compared to unimodal speech.

A. Phonetic discrimination

Visual speech conveys information about the position of a speaker's articulators, which can help a listener identify speech sounds by visually distinguishing their place of articulation. For example, labial articulations (such as bilabial consonants or rounded vowels) are visually salient, so words like "pack" and "tack"—which may be difficult to distinguish in a noisy, auditory-only situation—can be readily distinguished if a listener can see the speaker's lips.

Temporal cues in the visual signal also carry information relevant to distinguishing some phonological categories. In English, for example, the difference between a voiceless /t/ and a voiced /d/ (phonemes that share a place of articulation) at the end of a word is largely instantiated as a difference in the duration of the preceding vowel (say the words "beat" and "bead" aloud and take note of the vowel duration in each—"bead" almost certainly contains a longer vowel). Visual speech can provide a critical durational cue for such phonemes, even if the auditory signal is completely masked by the acoustic environment. For example, if a listener is able to visually observe a speaker's mouth close at the end of a word, this provides durational information even if the acoustic signal is completely masked.

One way to quantify phonetic constraints in speech perception is in the context of a lexical competition framework. Lexical competition frameworks start from the assumption that listeners must select the appropriate target word from among a set of similar-sounding words (phonological neighbors), which act as competitors. Words with a relatively high number of phonological neighbors (such as "cat") thus have higher levels of lexical competition and may thus rely more on cognitive processes of inhibition or selection compared to words with relatively few phonological neighbors (such as "orange"). Originally developed for auditory-only speech perception (Luce and Pisoni, 1998; Marslen-Wilson and Tyler, 1980), lexical competition frameworks have since been extended to consider AV speech perception (Feld and Sommers,

2011; Strand, 2014). Tye-Murray et al. (2007b) introduced the concept of intersection density, suggesting that it is only the words that overlap in both auditory and visual features that compete during word recognition. Specifically, they investigated whether auditory-only, visual-only, or AV neighborhoods predicted listeners' performance in AV speech perception tasks, and found that it was the combined AV neighborhood—reflecting the intersection of auditory and visual cues—that was most closely related to a listener's speech perception accuracy.

In summary, visual speech can provide informative cues to place of articulation and timing that are important for phonetic identification. Visual information therefore can help reduce the number of lexical competitors during comprehension and increase accuracy of perception.

B. Temporal prediction

At a basic level, temporal information in the visual signal can also help listeners by simply serving as a cue that a person has begun speaking. In a noisy restaurant, for example, seeing a talker's mouth can help listeners direct their attention to the talker's speech and better segregate it from other interfering sound sources.

However, in addition to alerting listeners to the start of speech, mouth movements also provide ongoing information about the temporal envelope of the acoustic signal during continuous speech, with louder amplitudes being associated with opening of the mouth (Chandrasekaran et al., 2009; Grant and Seitz, 2000; Summerfield, 1987). The visual signal thus provides clues about the rhythmic structure of connected speech, which helps listeners form expectations about incoming information and therefore supports linguistic processing. As discussed in more detail below, visual information regarding the acoustic envelope may aid in how ongoing brain oscillations track the incoming acoustic speech signal. Intuitively one might

presume that visual information would necessarily be available to listeners before acoustic information, and thus be predictive by its temporal order. However, even if the relationship is not so straightforward (Schwartz and Savariaux, 2014), it is still possible to consider complementary information the auditory and visual speech signals provide with respect to the acoustic amplitude envelope.

III. MULTISENSORY INTEGRATION

Although it is clear that visual information significantly aids auditory speech recognition, understanding speech perception requires determining *how* (or if) listeners combine the simultaneously-available information from visual and auditory modalities during communication. The issue is critical because if there is only a single mechanism for audiovisual integration, then any task (such as one using McGurk stimuli) that involves integrative processes necessarily relates to other audiovisual tasks (such as everyday speech perception). On the other hand, if there are multiple ways in which information can be combined across modalities, it is critical to determine whether two tasks rely on the same integrative mechanism.

One way to classify different integrative mechanisms is by whether integration occurs at an early or late stage of processing (Peelle and Sommers, 2015): Early integration refers to modulations of activity in primary sensory cortex—that is, “early” in terms of both processing hierarchy and time. Late integration occurs in regions of heteromodal cortex (for example, posterior superior temporal sulcus [STS]), incorporating auditory and visual information into a unified percept only after unimodal processing has occurred.

A. Late integration models of audiovisual integration

Many classical frameworks for audiovisual speech processing have focused on late integration (Grant et al., 1998; Oden and Massaro, 1978), which makes sense under the intuitive assumption that auditory and visual cortex receive largely unimodal inputs. In other words, perceptual information is necessarily segregated at the level of sensory receptors, setting the stage for independent processing of auditory and visual information. If integration occurs outside of unimodal processing, it is straightforward to postulate independent abilities for auditory-only speech processing, visual-only speech processing, and audiovisual integration. Separating integrative ability is of theoretical benefit in explaining the performance of listeners who are matched in unimodal processing, but differ in their success with audiovisual tasks. For example, Tye-Murray et al. (2016) matched individuals on auditory-only and visual-only performance by using individually determined levels of babble noise and visual blur to obtain 30% accuracy in both unimodal conditions. Despite nearly identical unimodal performance, however, participants varied substantially in the auditory-visual condition when tested using the degraded auditory and visual stimuli. Under this framework, by separately measuring unimodal and audiovisual perception, an individual listener's ability to integrate audiovisual speech information can be estimated, independent of their ability to encode auditory-only and visual-only speech cues. Subsequent work showed that if unimodal performance is taken into account, knowing the age of participants does not explain additional variance (Myerson et al., 2021)—arguing against the need for an “integration” ability to explain age-related differences in AV speech perception.

The posterior STS is a region of heteromodal cortex that shows responses to both auditory and visual inputs, making it an appealing candidate to underlie audiovisual integration (Beauchamp, 2005). We consider the posterior STS to be involved in late integration, as it

receives inputs from primary sensory regions. Consistent with an integrative role, regions of middle and posterior STS show activity for AV speech relative to unimodal speech (Venezia et al., 2017). Nath and Beauchamp (2011) offered a particularly nice demonstration of audiovisual integration by investigating functional connectivity between auditory regions, visual regions, and posterior STS while participants were presented with syllables and words. Importantly, they varied the accuracy of unimodal information by either blurring the visual speech signal (“auditory reliable”) or putting the speech in noise (“visual reliable”). They found that functional connectivity between sensory cortices and posterior STS changed as a function of unimodal clarity such that when auditory information was clear, connectivity between auditory regions and posterior STS was stronger than when visual information was clear. These functional imaging results are consistent with performance of patients with brain damage, which is most strongly impaired when regions of STS are damaged (Hickok et al., 2018), and that transcranial magnetic stimulation to posterior STS interferes with the McGurk illusion (Beauchamp et al., 2010). Together, these findings support the posterior STS playing an important role in audiovisual integration and suggest that it may weigh modalities as a function of their informativeness.

B. Early integration models of audiovisual integration

Despite their intuitive appeal, significant challenges for strict late integration models come from a variety of perspectives. For example, electrophysiological research in nonhuman primates shows that neural activity in primary auditory cortex is modulated by multisensory cues, including from motor/haptic (Lakatos et al., 2007) and visual (Lakatos et al., 2008) inputs. In humans, regions of posterior STS also represent visual amplitude envelope information (Micheli et al., 2018). Non-auditory information may arrive at primary auditory cortex through nonspecific thalamic pathways (Schroeder et al., 2008) and/or cortico-cortical connections from

visual to auditory cortex (Arnal and Giraud, 2012). Multisensory effects in primary auditory regions argue against late integration models because they suggest that, at least by the time information reaches cortex, there are no longer pure unisensory representations.

A second, related line of research relates to the role of brain oscillations in speech perception (Giraud and Poeppel, 2012; Peelle and Davis, 2012). Cortical oscillations entrain to acoustic information in connected speech (Luo and Poeppel, 2007), an effect that is enhanced when speech is intelligible (Peelle et al., 2013). This cortical entrainment may be thought of as encoding a sensory prediction because it relates to the times at which incoming information is likely to occur. Interestingly, visual information increases the entrainment of oscillatory activity in auditory cortex to the amplitude envelope of connected speech in both quiet and noisy listening environments (Crosse et al., 2015; Luo et al., 2010; Zion Golumbic et al., 2013). These findings suggest a role for audiovisual integration in auditory cortex. Because oscillatory entrainment is a phenomenon associated with connected speech (that is, sentences or stories) rather than isolated words or syllables, these findings raise the possibility that non-sentence stimuli might fail to engage this type of early integrative process.

IV. THE MCGURK EFFECT

On the surface, the McGurk effect appears to be an ideal measure of auditory-visual integration: discrepant inputs from two modalities (auditory and visual) are combined to produce a percept that can be distinct from either of the unimodal inputs. Video demonstrations of the McGurk effect often ask viewers to open and close their eyes, with the percept changing instantaneously depending on the availability of visual input. And, the effect is robust: auditory judgments are affected by visual information even when listeners are aware of the illusion, when male voices are dubbed onto female faces (and vice versa) (Green et al., 1991), when auditory

information lags behind the visual signal by as much as 300 ms (Munhall et al., 1996; Soto-Faraco and Alsius, 2009; Venezia et al., 2016), and for point light displays (Rosenblum and Saldana, 1996). As illustrated in Figure 1a, individual observers differ widely in their susceptibility to the McGurk illusion: some hardly ever experience it, whereas others experience it often.

In addition to demonstrating a clear combination of auditory and visual information, the McGurk effect is a useful tool in that it is observable across a range of populations: pre-linguistic infants (Rosenblum et al., 1997), young children (Massaro et al., 1986), speakers of different languages (Magnotti et al., 2015; Sekiyama, 1997), and individuals with Alzheimer's disease (Delbeuck et al., 2007), among others, have all been shown to be susceptible to the illusion. Because susceptibility to the McGurk effect varies considerably across individuals even within

these groups, it has been used as an index of integrative ability: individuals who show greater susceptibility to the McGurk effect are typically considered to be better integrators (Magnotti and Beauchamp, 2015; Stevenson et al., 2012). Finally, the McGurk effect appears to be quite reliable: Strand et al. (2014) and Basu Mallick et al. (2015) also both showed high test-retest reliability in the McGurk effect (even, in the case of Basu Mallick, et al., 2015, with a year between measurements, Figure 1b), suggesting that these tasks measure a stable trait within individual listeners.

Neuroanatomically, as noted above, functional brain imaging studies frequently find activity in left posterior STS associated with McGurk stimuli, illustrated in Figure 1C. Given the heteromodal anatomical connectivity of these temporal regions and their response to a variety of multisensory stimuli, this brain region makes intuitive sense as playing a key role in audiovisual integration.

V. CONCERNS ABOUT THE MCGURK EFFECT

There is no question that the McGurk effect demonstrates a clear combination of auditory and visual information, is a reliable within-listener measure, and reveals considerable variability among listeners. However, its status as a truly *perceptual* illusion has been questioned recently by Getz and Toscano ((Getz and Toscano, 2021)), who argue that the McGurk effect is more appropriately viewed as the result of decision-level processes². Regardless of the precise level at

² To support their argument, they cite numerous examples of top-down influences on rates of fusion (e.g., expectation (Tuomainen et al., 2005), attention (Alsus et al., 2005), mental imagery (Berger and Ehrsson, 2013)) and their own experimental data, which found fusion rates ranging from 10% to 60% for the same set of stimuli depending on task and data collection modality (i.e., in the lab versus online).

which the illusion occurs, the imperfect correspondence between McGurk stimuli and natural speech raises significant concerns about the face validity of comparing the two.

Table 1 summarizes several characteristics of speech, and whether these are present in either natural speech or typical McGurk stimuli.³ Although there are certainly commonalities, there are also significant differences. For example, incongruent auditory and visual cues are central to the McGurk effect, but never occur in natural speech (a speaker cannot produce speech incongruent with their vocal apparatus). Given the artificial nature of the stimuli typically used to elicit the McGurk effect, we move on to consider experimental evidence that might speak to how the McGurk effect might relate to natural speech perception. We argue that there are good reasons to think the mechanisms of integration for McGurk stimuli and audiovisual speech processing may differ.

Table 1. Speech characteristics of McGurk stimuli and natural speech

	McGurk stimuli	Natural speech
Audiovisual	x	x
Phonetic content	x	x
Audio-visual congruency		x
Phonological constraints		x
Lexical constraints		x
Semantic context		x
Syntax		x

³ Of course, different studies may use different variations of McGurk stimuli; we have here focused on the most common type, which involves isolated phonemes (e.g., /ba/) presented without linguistic or acoustic context, with congruent or incongruent visual information.

A. McGurk susceptibility and audiovisual speech perception

Perhaps the most compelling evidence against the use of the McGurk effect for understanding audiovisual integration in natural speech comprehension comes from studies that have investigated whether an individual listener's susceptibility to McGurk stimuli correlates with their audiovisual speech benefit (for example, the intelligibility of sentences in noise with and without access to the visual signal). Grant and Seitz (1998) showed equivocal results in this regard. For older adults with acquired hearing loss, McGurk susceptibility was correlated with visual enhancement (i.e., the proportion of available improvement listeners made relative to their audio-only performance) for sentence recognition, but McGurk susceptibility did not contribute significantly to a regression model predicting visual enhancement, suggesting McGurk susceptibility did not provide information above and beyond other, non-McGurk factors.

Figure 2. Visual enhancement (improved intelligibility for AV speech compared to auditory-only speech) during sentence comprehension does not depend on susceptibility to the McGurk effect across two types of background noise and several signal-to-noise ratios (Van Engen et al., 2017).

Van Engen et al. (2017) measured participants' susceptibility to the McGurk effect and their ability to identify sentences in noise (Figure 2). Listeners were tested in both speech-shaped noise and in two-talker babble across a range of signal-to-noise ratios. For each condition, listeners were tested in both audio-only and audiovisual modalities. McGurk susceptibility did not predict performance overall, nor did it interact with noise level or modality. In fact, in speech-shaped noise there was a trend reflecting a negative association between McGurk susceptibility and speech recognition, particularly in the AV conditions. If anything, then, McGurk susceptibility may predict poorer performance on some AV speech tasks. The same study also failed to find any significant correlations between McGurk susceptibility and visual

enhancement in any of the listening conditions. (Notably, the two conditions which showed marginally significant relationships again indicated that, if anything, greater susceptibility to the McGurk illusion was associated with lower rates of visual enhancement.) Similar results were reported by Hickok and colleagues (2018), who found no relationship between McGurk susceptibility and AV enhancement for phoneme perception. These empirical findings indicate that McGurk susceptibility is measuring something different from congruent audiovisual processing.

B. Differences between typical McGurk stimuli and natural audiovisual speech

Perhaps the most important difference between McGurk stimuli and everyday audiovisual speech signals is that the auditory and visual inputs in McGurk tasks are, by definition, incongruent. Resolving discrepant inputs is decidedly *not* what listeners are doing when they use congruent auditory and visual information to better understand spoken utterances. In an fMRI study, Erickson et al. (2014) showed distinct brain regions involved in the processing of congruent AV speech and incongruent AV speech when compared to unimodal speech (acoustic-only and visual-only). Left posterior STS was recruited during congruent bimodal AV speech, whereas left posterior superior temporal gyrus (posterior STG) was recruited when processing McGurk speech, suggesting that left posterior STG may be especially important when there is a discrepancy between auditory and visual cues. Moris Fernandez and colleagues (2017) further showed regions of the brain associated with conflict detection and resolution (anterior cingulate cortex and left inferior frontal gyrus) were more active for incongruent than congruent speech stimuli. Using EEG, Crosse and colleagues (2015) have shown that neural entrainment to the speech envelope is inhibited when auditory and visual information streams are incongruent compared to congruent. On balance these studies suggest the processes supporting the perception

of incongruent speech (including McGurk stimuli) differing from those engaged in the perception of congruent speech. However, comparisons between tasks are not always straightforward and largely across different studies and methodologies, making direct comparisons challenging.

Second, the near-exclusive use of single syllables for demonstrating the McGurk effect (with some exceptions; e.g. Dekle et al., 1992) does not reflect the nature of AV integration in the processing of more natural linguistic stimuli such as words and sentences (Sams et al., 1998; Windmann, 2004). Sommers et al. (2005), for example, found no correlation between AV perception of syllables and AV perception of words or sentences. Grant and Seitz (1998) similarly showed no correlation between integration measures derived from consonant versus sentence recognition. Although additional research is required, these results suggest that correlations between McGurk susceptibility for syllables, words, and sentences is likely to be similarly low, making it questionable whether integration based on syllable perception is closely related to integration in the processing of words or sentences. Indeed, Windmann (2004) showed that the clarity and likelihood of the McGurk effect was dependent on listeners' semantic and lexical expectations.

C. General problems for the McGurk task as a measure of audiovisual integration

In addition to concerns about whether McGurk tasks tap into the same mechanisms of integration that are relevant for speech communication, there are also more general concerns about the McGurk effect as a measure of integration (see also Alsius et al., 2017).

One factor complicating interpretation of group and individual differences in McGurk susceptibility is that such differences can also arise from variability in unimodal (auditory-only or visual-only) performance. Group and individual differences in unimodal encoding are

particularly important given the extensive variability in visual-only (lip reading) abilities, even within groups of homogeneous participants. Therefore, even for normal-hearing young adults, individual differences in McGurk susceptibility could be attributed to differences in auditory-visual integration, visual-only encoding, or some combination of both. Strand et al. (2014) showed, for example, that McGurk susceptibility depends in part on differences in lipreading skill and detection of incongruity. Issues of individual differences in unimodal performance will be magnified in populations, such as older adults, where both auditory-only and visual-only encoding can vary substantially across individuals, further complicating interpretation of group differences in McGurk susceptibility as arising exclusively from differences in auditory-visual integration. In fact, it has been suggested that published estimates of group differences in McGurk susceptibility are inflated because true group differences are swamped by individual variability (Magnotti and Beauchamp, 2018).

Given that individual differences in auditory-visual integration and in unimodal encoding can contribute to measures of McGurk susceptibility, it is perhaps not surprising that individuals vary tremendously in how likely they are to experience the McGurk illusion: susceptibility to the McGurk effect has been shown to vary from 0% to 100% across individuals viewing the identical stimuli (Basu Mallick et al., 2015; Strand et al., 2014). Of perhaps even greater concern is that the distribution of responses for McGurk stimuli is often bimodal—most individuals will perceive the fused response from a given McGurk stimulus either less than 10% of the time or greater than 90% of the time. Basu Mallick et al. (2015), for example, found that across 20 different pairs of McGurk stimuli, 77% of participants either showed the fused response less than 10% of the time or greater than 90% of the time. One likely reason for the extensive individual

variability is that McGurk susceptibility reflects a combination of differences in auditory-visual integration and unimodal encoding.

Brown and colleagues (2018) investigated whether individual variability in McGurk susceptibility might be explained by differences in sensory or cognitive ability. Although lipreading ability was related to McGurk susceptibility, the authors failed to find any influence of attentional control (using a flanker task), lexical processing speed (using a lexical decision task), or working memory capacity (using an operation span task), even though these abilities are frequently related to auditory speech perception. The lack of any clear perceptual or cognitive correlates (outside of lipreading) of McGurk susceptibility suggests the integration operating during McGurk tasks is cognitively isolated from many factors involved in speech perception.

Studies of age differences in susceptibility to the McGurk effect also raise questions as to whether the illusion reflects the operation of mechanisms typically engaged in speech perception. Specifically, as noted, both age and individual differences in visual enhancement can be accounted for by differences in visual-only speech perception – not surprisingly, individuals who are better lipreaders typically exhibit greater visual enhancement (Tye-Murray et al., 2016). Although older adults typically have reduced visual-only performance (Sommers et al., 2005), studies have shown either equivalent (Cienkowski and Carney, 2002) or enhanced (Sekiyama et al., 2014) susceptibility to the McGurk effect relative to young adults.

VI. MOVING BEYOND MCGURK

McGurk stimuli differ in a number of important properties from natural speech, and—perhaps as a result—we are not aware of empirical evidence relating McGurk susceptibility to audiovisual perception of natural speech. For these reasons we argue that McGurk stimuli are not

well-suited for improving our understanding of audiovisual speech perception. What, then, is a better alternative?

If our goal is to better understand natural speech, we suggest that currently the best option is to use natural speech stimuli: in other words, stimuli that contain all of the speech cues listed in Table 1. There are good precedents for using actual speech stimuli across multiple levels of language representation. For example, studies of word perception use real words that can vary in psycholinguistic attributes, including frequency, phonological neighborhood density, or imageability. Similarly, countless studies of sentence processing use sentences that vary in attributes including syntactic complexity, prosodic information, or semantic predictability. By using coherent stimuli that vary in their perceptual and linguistic properties, it has proven possible to learn a great deal about the dimensions that influence speech understanding. Studies of audiovisual speech perception would benefit from a similar approach: using natural speech samples in auditory-only, visual-only, and audiovisual modalities, all of which are encountered in real life conversation. By manipulating specific properties of these signals—for example, the degree to which auditory and visual information are complementary vs. redundant—it is still possible to vary the audiovisual integration demands.

One way to differentially engage multisensory processing is to alter the clarity of the visual data. Tye-Murray and colleagues (2016) presented AV sentences; the video portion of the stimuli were blurred to manipulate the fidelity of the visual signal, resulting in poorer visual-only and AV performance. Critically, the authors found that auditory-only and visual-only abilities related to audiovisual performance, but age *per se* did not, nor was there evidence for an “integration” ability. Many other examples of AV paradigms that avoid McGurk stimuli are

available (Crosse et al., 2015; Luo et al., 2010; McLaughlin et al., 2022; Okada et al., 2013; Park et al., 2016, 2018; Yi et al., 2013, 2014).

Of course, the clarity of the auditory signal can also be manipulated, for example using background noise. One example from the neuroimaging literature is found from Peelle and colleagues (2022), who presented single AV words in different levels of background noise. They found that, compared to auditory-only speech, AV speech resulted in increased functional connectivity between auditory and visual cortex. These findings suggest that the temporal coordination of activity across brain regions may play a key role in multisensory speech processing. Support for the role of posterior superior temporal sulcus was somewhat equivocal, which highlights the importance of using ecologically-valid stimuli.

Finally, in addition to using stimuli that are real speech, computational modeling may also provide a fruitful way of understanding natural speech. Magnotti and colleagues (2020) use a model framework to analyze responses to McGurk stimuli on both a classic McGurk fusion task and a speech-in-noise task, as well as sentences in noise taken from Van Engen et al. (2017). They conclude that McGurk tasks and speech-in-noise understanding share some processes, but that speech-in-noise has different task requirements, making the lack of correlation of these two abilities across listeners not unexpected. Although we find the prospect of unifying responses to different stimuli within a computational framework promising, the lack of agreement of behavioral scores between McGurk and speech-in-noise tasks remains.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

There is no question that the McGurk effect is a robust and compelling demonstration of multisensory integration: auditory and visual cues combine to form a fused percept. At the same time, there are many reasons to think it may not be an effective means to study the processes

occurring during natural speech perception. Speech communication is centered around real words, usually involves connected speech, and involves auditory and visual inputs that are congruent, meaning they can provide complementary and/or redundant (rather than conflicting) information. To understand what occurs during speech perception, we join the voices of others (Alsius et al., 2017; Getz and Toscano, 2021; Massaro, 2017; Rosenblum, 2019) in advocating that we move beyond McGurk. A more productive line of research requires that we focus on audiovisual speech comprehension in situations that are closer to real-life communication. If these results are consistent with those provided by McGurk stimuli, we can be more certain that both are indexing the same phenomena. However, if they disagree, we will need to consider the real possibility that the McGurk effect, although fascinating, does not inform our understanding of everyday speech perception.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by grants R01 DC014281, R01 DC019507, and R01 DC016594 from the National Institutes of Health. We are grateful to Violet Brown for helpful comments on prior drafts of this manuscript.

References

- Alsius, A., Navarra, J., Campbell, R., and Soto-Faraco, S. (2005). "Audiovisual integration of speech falters under high attention demands," *Curr. Biol.*, **15**, 839–843.
- Alsius, A., Paré, M., and Munhall, K. G. (2017). "Forty Years After Hearing Lips and Seeing Voices: the McGurk Effect Revisited," *Multisensory Research*, , doi: 10.1163/22134808-00002565.
doi:10.1163/22134808-00002565
- Arnal, L. H., and Giraud, A.-L. (2012). "Cortical oscillations and sensory predictions," *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, **16**, 390–398.
- Arnold, P., and Hill, F. (2001). "Bisensory augmentation: A speechreading advantage when speech is clearly audible and intact," *Br. J. Audiol.*, **92**, 339–355.
- Basu Mallick, D., Magnotti, J. F., and Beauchamp, M. S. (2015). "Variability and stability in the McGurk effect: contributions of participants, stimuli, time, and response type," *Psychon. Bull. Rev.*, **22**, 1299–1307.
- Beauchamp, M. S. (2005). "See me, hear me, touch me: multisensory integration in lateral occipital-temporal cortex," *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.*, **15**, 145–153.
- Beauchamp, M. S., Nath, A. R., and Pasalar, S. (2010). "fMRI-guided transcranial magnetic stimulation reveals that the superior temporal sulcus is a cortical locus of the McGurk effect," *Journal of Neuroscience*, **30**, 2414–2417.
- Berger, C. C., and Ehrsson, H. H. (2013). "Mental imagery changes multisensory perception," *Curr. Biol.*, **23**, 1367–1372.
- Brown, V. A., Hedayati, M., Zanger, A., Mayn, S., Ray, L., Dillman-Hasso, N., and Strand, J. F. (2018). "What accounts for individual differences in susceptibility to the McGurk effect?," *PLoS One*, **13**, e0207160.
- Brown, V. A., and Strand, J. F. (2019). "About face: Seeing the talker improves spoken word recognition but increases listening effort," *J. Cogn.*, **2**, 44.

- Chandrasekaran, C., Trubanova, A., Stillittano, S., Caplier, A., and Ghazanfar, A. A. (2009). "The natural statistics of audiovisual speech," *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, **5**, e1000436.
- Cienkowski, K. M., and Carney, A. E. (2002). "Auditory-visual speech perception and aging," *Ear Hear.*, **23**, 439–449.
- Crosse, M. J., Butler, J. S., and Lalor, E. C. (2015). "Congruent visual speech enhances cortical entrainment to continuous auditory speech in noise-free conditions," *Journal of Neuroscience*, **35**, 14195–14204.
- Dekle, D. J., Fowler, C. A., and Funnell, M. G. (1992). "Audiovisual integration in perception of real words," *Percept. Psychophys.*, **51**, 355–362.
- Delbeuck, X., Collette, F., and Van der Linden, M. (2007). "Is Alzheimer's disease a disconnection syndrome? Evidence from a crossmodal audio-visual illusory experiment," *Neuropsychologia*, **45**, 3315–3323.
- Erber, N. P. (1975). "Auditory-visual perception of speech," *J. Speech Hear. Disord.*, **40**, 481–492.
- Erickson, L. C., Zielinski, B. A., Zielinski, J. E., Liu, G., Turkeltaub, P. E., Leaver, A. M., and Rauschecker, J. P. (2014). "Distinct cortical locations for integration of audiovisual speech and the McGurk effect," *Front. Psychol.*, **5**, 534.
- Feld, J., and Sommers, M. S. (2011). "There goes the neighborhood: Lipreading and the structure of the mental lexicon," *Speech Commun.*, **53**, 220–228.
- Getz, L. M., and Toscano, J. C. (2021). "Rethinking the McGurk effect as a perceptual illusion," *Atten. Percept. Psychophys.*, **83**, 2583–2598.
- Giraud, A.-L., and Poeppel, D. (2012). "Cortical oscillations and speech processing: Emerging computational principles and operations," *Nat. Neurosci.*, **15**, 511–517.
- Gosselin, P. A., and Gagné, J.-P. (2011). "Older adults expend more listening effort than younger adults recognizing audiovisual speech in noise," *Int. J. Audiol.*, **50**, 786–792.
- Grant, K. W., and Seitz, P. F. (1998). "Measures of auditory-visual integration in nonsense syllables and sentences," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **104**, 2438–2450.

- 506 Grant, K. W., and Seitz, P.-F. (2000). "The use of visible speech cues for improving auditory detection of
507 spoken sentences," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **108**, 1197–1208.
- 508 Grant, K. W., Walden, B. E., and Seitz, P. F. (1998). "Auditory-visual speech recognition by hearing-
509 impaired subjects: Consonant recognition, sentence recognition, and auditory-visual integration," *J.*
510 *Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **103**, 2677–2690.
- 511 Green, K. P., Kuhl, P. K., Meltzoff, A. N., and Stevens, E. B. (1991). "Integrating speech information
512 across talkers, gender, and sensory modality: female faces and male voices in the McGurk effect,"
513 *Percept. Psychophys.*, **50**, 524–536.
- 514 Hickok, G., Rogalsky, C., Matchin, W., Basilakos, A., Cai, J., Pillay, S., Ferrill, M., et al. (2018). "Neural
515 networks supporting audiovisual integration for speech: A large-scale lesion study," *Cortex*, **103**,
516 360–371.
- 517 Lakatos, P., Chen, C.-M., O'Connell, M. N., Mills, A., and Schroeder, C. E. (2007). "Neuronal
518 oscillations and multisensory interaction in primary auditory cortex," *Neuron*, **53**, 279–292.
- 519 Lakatos, P., Karmos, G., Mehta, A. D., Ulbert, I., and Schroeder, C. E. (2008). "Entrainment of neuronal
520 oscillations as a mechanism of attentional selection," *Science*, **320**, 110–113.
- 521 Luce, P. A., and Pisoni, D. B. (1998). "Recognizing spoken words: The neighborhood activation model,"
522 *Ear Hear.*, **19**, 1–36.
- 523 Luo, H., Liu, Z., and Poeppel, D. (2010). "Auditory cortex tracks both auditory and visual stimulus
524 dynamics using low-frequency neuronal phase modulation," *PLoS Biol.*, **8**, e1000445.
- 525 Luo, H., and Poeppel, D. (2007). "Phase patterns of neuronal responses reliably discriminate speech in
526 human auditory cortex," *Neuron*, **54**, 1001–1010.
- 527 MacDonald, J. (2018). "Hearing Lips and Seeing Voices: the Origins and Development of the 'McGurk
528 Effect' and Reflections on Audio–Visual Speech Perception Over the Last 40 Years," *Multisensory*
529 *Research*, **31**, 7–18.
- 530 Macleod, A., and Summerfield, Q. (1987). "Quantifying the contribution of vision to speech perception in
531 noise," *Br. J. Audiol.*, **21**, 131–141.

- 532 Magnotti, J. F., Basu Mallick, D., Feng, G., Zhou, B., Zhou, W., and Beauchamp, M. S. (2015). "Similar
533 frequency of the McGurk effect in large samples of native Mandarin Chinese and American English
534 speakers," *Exp. Brain Res.*, **233**, 2581–2586.
- 535 Magnotti, J. F., and Beauchamp, M. S. (2015). "The noisy encoding of disparity model of the McGurk
536 effect," *Psychon. Bull. Rev.*, **22**, 701–709.
- 537 Magnotti, J. F., and Beauchamp, M. S. (2018). "Published estimates of group differences in multisensory
538 integration are inflated," *PLoS One*, **13**, e0202908.
- 539 Magnotti, J. F., Dzeda, K. B., Wegner-Clemens, K., Rennig, J., and Beauchamp, M. S. (2020). "Weak
540 observer-level correlation and strong stimulus-level correlation between the McGurk effect and
541 audiovisual speech-in-noise: A causal inference explanation," *Cortex*, **133**, 371–383.
- 542 Marques, L. M., Lapenta, O. M., Costa, T. L., and Boggio, P. S. (2016). "Multisensory integration
543 processes underlying speech perception as revealed by the McGurk illusion," *Language, Cognition
544 and Neuroscience*, **31**, 1115–1129.
- 545 Marslen-Wilson, W. D., and Tyler, L. K. (1980). "The temporal structure of spoken language
546 processing," *Cognition*, **8**, 1–71.
- 547 Massaro, D. W. (2017). "The McGurk effect: Auditory visual speech perception's piltown man," *The
548 14th International Conference on Auditory-Visual Speech Processing (AVSP2017)*, Available:
549 https://mambo.ucsc.edu/files/2017/12/ms5avspPUB-AVSP2017_paper_1-20bkkq5.pdf. Retrieved
550 from https://mambo.ucsc.edu/files/2017/12/ms5avspPUB-AVSP2017_paper_1-20bkkq5.pdf
- 551 Massaro, D. W., Thompson, L. A., Barron, B., and Laren, E. (1986). "Developmental changes in visual
552 and auditory contributions to speech perception," *J. Exp. Child Psychol.*, **41**, 93–113.
- 553 McGurk, H., and MacDonald, J. (1976). "Hearing lips and seeing voices," *Nature*, **264**, 746–748.
- 554 McLaughlin, D. J., Brown, V. A., Carraturo, S., and Van Engen, K. J. (2022). "Revisiting the relationship
555 between implicit racial bias and audiovisual benefit for nonnative-accented speech," *Atten. Percept.
556 Psychophys.*, , doi: 10.3758/s13414-021-02423-w. doi:10.3758/s13414-021-02423-w
- 557 Micheli, C., Schepers, I. M., Ozker, M., Yoshor, D., Beauchamp, M. S., and Rieger, J. W. (2018).

- 558 “Electrocorticography reveals continuous auditory and visual speech tracking in temporal and
559 occipital cortex,” *Eur. J. Neurosci.*, , doi: 10.1111/ejn.13992. doi:10.1111/ejn.13992
- 560 Moris Fernandez, L., Macaluso, E., and Soto-Faraco, S. (2017). “Audiovisual integration as conflict
561 resolution: The conflict of the McGurk illusion,” *Hum. Brain Mapp.*, **38**, 5691–5705.
- 562 Munhall, K. G., Gribble, P., Sacco, L., and Ward, M. (1996). “Temporal constraints on the McGurk
563 effect,” *Percept. Psychophys.*, **58**, 351–362.
- 564 Myerson, J., Tye-Murray, N., Spehar, B., Hale, S., and Sommers, M. (2021). “Predicting Audiovisual
565 Word Recognition in Noisy Situations: Toward Precision Audiology,” *Ear Hear.*, **42**, 1656–1667.
- 566 Nath, A. R., and Beauchamp, M. S. (2011). “Dynamic changes in superior temporal sulcus connectivity
567 during perception of noisy audiovisual speech,” *Journal of Neuroscience*, **31**, 1704–1714.
- 568 Oden, G. C., and Massaro, D. W. (1978). “Integration of featural information in speech perception,”
569 *Psychol. Rev.*, **85**, 172–191.
- 570 Okada, K., Venezia, J. H., Matchin, W., Saberi, K., and Hickok, G. (2013). “An fMRI study of
571 audiovisual speech perception reveals multisensory interactions in auditory cortex,” *PLoS One*, **8**,
572 e68959.
- 573 Park, H., Ince, R. A. A., Schyns, P. G., Thut, G., and Gross, J. (2018). “Representational interactions
574 during audiovisual speech entrainment: Redundancy in left posterior superior temporal gyrus and
575 synergy in left motor cortex,” *PLoS Biol.*, **16**, e2006558.
- 576 Park, H., Kayser, C., Thut, G., and Gross, J. (2016). “Lip movements entrain the observers’ low-
577 frequency brain oscillations to facilitate speech intelligibility,” *Elife*, **5**, e14521.
- 578 Peelle, J. E. (2018). “Listening effort: How the cognitive consequences of acoustic challenge are reflected
579 in brain and behavior,” *Ear Hear.*, **39**, 204–214.
- 580 Peelle, J. E., and Davis, M. H. (2012). “Neural oscillations carry speech rhythm through to
581 comprehension,” *Front. Psychol.*, **3**, 320.
- 582 Peelle, J. E., Gross, J., and Davis, M. H. (2013). “Phase-locked responses to speech in human auditory
583 cortex are enhanced during comprehension,” *Cereb. Cortex*, **23**, 1378–1387.

- 584 Peelle, J. E., and Sommers, M. S. (2015). "Prediction and constraint in audiovisual speech perception,"
585 *Cortex*, **68**, 169–181.
- 586 Peelle, J. E., Spehar, B., Jones, M. S., McConkey, S., Myerson, J., Hale, S., Sommers, M. S., et al. (2022).
587 "Increased connectivity among sensory and motor regions during visual and audiovisual speech
588 perception," *Journal of neuroscience*, **42**, 435–442.
- 589 Reisberg, D., McLean, J., and Goldfield, A. (1987). "Easy to hear but hard to understand: A
590 speechreading advantage with intact stimuli," In R. Campbell and B. Dodd (Eds.), *Hearing by eye: The psychology of lip-reading*, Erlbaum, London, pp. 97–113.
- 592 Rosenblum, L. (2019). "Audiovisual speech perception and the McGurk effect," *Oxford Research*
593 *Encyclopedia, Linguistics*, Retrieved from <https://par.nsf.gov/servlets/purl/10190134>. Retrieved
594 from <https://par.nsf.gov/servlets/purl/10190134>
- 595 Rosenblum, L. D., and Saldana, H. M. (1996). "An audiovisual test of kinematic primitives for visual
596 speech perception," *J. Exp. Psychol. Hum. Percept. Perform.*, **22**, 318–331.
- 597 Rosenblum, L. D., Schmuckler, M. A., and Johnson, J. A. (1997). "The McGurk effect in infants,"
598 *Percept. Psychophys.*, **59**, 347–357.
- 599 Sams, M., Manninenb, P., Surakkab, V., Helinb, P., and Kättöb, R. (1998). "McGurk effect in Finnish
600 syllables, isolated words, and words in sentences: Effects of word meaning and sentence context,"
601 *Speech Commun.*, **26**, 75–87.
- 602 Schroeder, C. E., Lakatos, P., Kajikawa, Y., Partan, S., and Puce, A. (2008). "Neuronal oscillations and
603 visual amplification of speech," *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, **12**, 106–113.
- 604 Schwartz, J.-L., and Savariaux, C. (2014). "No, there is no 150 ms lead of visual speech on auditory
605 speech, but a range of audiovisual asynchronies varying from small audio lead to large audio lag,"
606 *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, **10**, e1003743.
- 607 Sekiyama, K. (1997). "Cultural and linguistic factors in audiovisual speech processing: the McGurk effect
608 in Chinese subjects," *Perception and Psychophysics*, **59**, 73–80.
- 609 Sekiyama, K., Soshi, T., and Sakamoto, S. (2014). "Enhanced audiovisual integration with aging in

- speech perception: a heightened McGurk effect in older adults,” *Front. Psychol.*, **5**, 323.
- Sommers, M. S., Tye-Murray, N., and Spehar, B. (2005). “Auditory-visual speech perception and auditory-visual enhancement in normal-hearing younger and older adults,” *Ear Hear.*, **26**, 263–275.
- Soto-Faraco, S., and Alsius, A. (2009). “Deconstructing the McGurk-MacDonald illusion,” *J. Exp. Psychol. Hum. Percept. Perform.*, **35**, 580–587.
- Stevenson, R. A., Zemtsov, R. K., and Wallace, M. T. (2012). “Individual differences in the multisensory temporal binding window predict susceptibility to audiovisual illusions,” *J. Exp. Psychol. Hum. Percept. Perform.*, **38**, 1517–1529.
- Strand, J. F. (2014). “Phi-square Lexical Competition Database (Phi-Lex): An online tool for quantifying auditory and visual lexical competition,” *Behavioral Research Methods*, **46**, 148–158.
- Strand, J. F., Cooperman, A., Rowe, J., and Simenstad, A. (2014). “Individual differences in susceptibility to the McGurk effect: links with lipreading and detecting audiovisual incongruity,” *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.*, **57**, 2322–2331.
- Sumby, W. H., and Pollack, I. (1954). “Visual contribution to speech intelligibility in noise,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **26**, 212–215.
- Summerfield, A. Q. (1987). “Some preliminaries to a comprehensive account of audio-visual speech perception,” In B. Dodd and R. Campbell (Eds.), *Hearing by eye: The psychology of lip reading*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 3–87.
- Tuomainen, J., Andersen, T. S., Tiippana, K., and Sams, M. (2005). “Audio-visual speech perception is special,” *Cognition*, **96**, B13–22.
- Tye-Murray, N., Sommers, M. S., and Spehar, B. (2007a). “The effects of age and gender on lipreading abilities,” *J. Am. Acad. Audiol.*, **18**, 883–892.
- Tye-Murray, N., Sommers, M. S., and Spehar, B. (2007b). “Auditory and visual lexical neighborhoods in audiovisual speech perception,” *Trends Amplif.*, **11**, 233–241.
- Tye-Murray, N., Spehar, B., Myerson, J., Hale, S., and Sommers, M. (2016). “Lipreading and audiovisual speech recognition across the adult lifespan: Implications for audiovisual integration,” *Psychol.*

- 636 Aging, **31**, 380–389.
- 637 Van Engen, K. J., Phelps, J. E. B., Smiljanic, R., and Chandrasekaran, B. (2014). “Enhancing speech
638 intelligibility: Interactions among context, modality, speech style, and masker,” *J. Speech Lang.
639 Hear. Res.*, **57**, 1908–1918.
- 640 Van Engen, K. J., Xie, Z., and Chandrasekaran, B. (2017). “Audiovisual sentence recognition not
641 predicted by susceptibility to the McGurk effect,” *Atten. Percept. Psychophys.*, **79**, 396–403.
- 642 Venezia, J. H., Thurman, S. M., Matchin, W., George, S. E., and Hickok, G. (2016). “Timing in
643 audiovisual speech perception: A mini review and new psychophysical data,” *Atten. Percept.
644 Psychophys.*, **78**, 583–601.
- 645 Venezia, J. H., Vaden, K. I., Jr., Rong, F., Maddox, D., Saberi, K., and Hickok, G. (2017). “Auditory,
646 Visual and Audiovisual Speech Processing Streams in Superior Temporal Sulcus,” *Front. Hum.
647 Neurosci.*, **11**, 174.
- 648 Windmann, S. (2004). “Effects of sentence context and expectation on the McGurk illusion,” *J. Mem.
649 Lang.*, **50**, 212–230.
- 650 Yi, H.-G., Phelps, J. E. B., Smiljanic, R., and Chandrasekaran, B. (2013). “Reduced efficiency of
651 audiovisual integration for nonnative speech,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **134**, EL387–93.
- 652 Yi, H.-G., Smiljanic, R., and Chandrasekaran, B. (2014). “The neural processing of foreign-accented
653 speech and its relationship to listener bias,” *Front. Hum. Neurosci.*, **8**, 768.
- 654 Zion Golumbic, E., Cogan, G. B., Schroeder, C. E., and Poeppel, D. (2013). “Visual input enhances
655 selective speech envelope tracking in auditory cortex at a ‘cocktail party,’” *Journal of Neuroscience*,
656 **33**, 1417–1426.

657