

# Niek J Versfeld

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/374520/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

30  
papers

1,468  
citations

516710

16  
h-index

477307

29  
g-index

31  
all docs

31  
docs citations

31  
times ranked

944  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Method for the selection of sentence materials for efficient measurement of the speech reception threshold. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2000, 107, 1671-1684.	1.1	279
2	A Speech Intelligibility Index-based approach to predict the speech reception threshold for sentences in fluctuating noise for normal-hearing listeners. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2005, 117, 2181-2192.	1.1	232
3	Extended speech intelligibility index for the prediction of the speech reception threshold in fluctuating noise. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2006, 120, 3988-3997.	1.1	156
4	The eye as a window to the listening brain: Neural correlates of pupil size as a measure of cognitive listening load. <i>NeuroImage</i> , 2014, 101, 76-86.	4.2	130
5	Impact of stimulus-related factors and hearing impairment on listening effort as indicated by pupil dilation. <i>Hearing Research</i> , 2017, 351, 68-79.	2.0	114
6	The relationship between the intelligibility of time-compressed speech and speech in noise in young and elderly listeners. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2002, 111, 401-408.	1.1	104
7	Release from informational masking by time reversal of native and non-native interfering speech. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2005, 118, 1274-1277.	1.1	102
8	The optimum decision rules in the same-different paradigm. <i>Perception &amp; Psychophysics</i> , 1996, 58, 1-9.	2.3	36
9	The dynamic range of speech, compression, and its effect on the speech reception threshold in stationary and interrupted noise. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2009, 126, 3236-3245.	1.1	36
10	Prediction of the Intelligibility for Speech in Real-Life Background Noises for Subjects With Normal Hearing. <i>Ear and Hearing</i> , 2008, 29, 169-175.	2.1	30
11	The optimum decision rules for the oddity task. <i>Perception &amp; Psychophysics</i> , 1996, 58, 10-21.	2.3	27
12	Annoyance caused by sounds of wheeled and tracked vehicles. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 1997, 101, 2677-2685.	1.1	27
13	Predictors of Entering a Hearing Aid Evaluation Period: A Prospective Study in Older Hearing-Help Seekers. <i>Trends in Hearing</i> , 2017, 21, 233121651774491.	1.3	25
14	Brain Volume Differences Associated With Hearing Impairment in Adults. <i>Trends in Hearing</i> , 2018, 22, 233121651876368.	1.3	25
15	Please try harder! The influence of hearing status and evaluative feedback during listening on the pupil dilation response, saliva-cortisol and saliva alpha-amylase levels. <i>Hearing Research</i> , 2019, 381, 107768.	2.0	23
16	Modelling the speech reception threshold in non-stationary noise in hearing-impaired listeners as a function of level. <i>International Journal of Audiology</i> , 2010, 49, 856-865.	1.7	18
17	Effects of attention on the speech reception threshold and pupil response of people with impaired and normal hearing. <i>Hearing Research</i> , 2017, 354, 56-63.	2.0	18
18	Preference judgments of artificial processed and hearing-aid transduced speech. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 1999, 106, 1566-1578.	1.1	14

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Learning effect observed for the speech reception threshold in interrupted noise with normal hearing listeners. <i>International Journal of Audiology</i> , 2008, 47, 185-188.	1.7	14
20	Perception of Spectral Changes in Multi-tone Complexes. <i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A: Human Experimental Psychology</i> , 1991, 43, 459-479.	2.3	12
21	Discrimination of changes in the spectral shape of two-tone complexes. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 1995, 98, 807-816.	1.1	11
22	The Presence of Another Individual Influences Listening Effort, But Not Performance. <i>Ear and Hearing</i> , 2021, Publish Ahead of Print, 1577-1589.	2.1	8
23	Effect of Audibility and Suprathreshold Deficits on Speech Recognition for Listeners With Unilateral Hearing Loss. <i>Ear and Hearing</i> , 2019, 40, 1025-1034.	2.1	6
24	The Influence of Hearing Loss on Cognitive Control in an Auditory Conflict Task: Behavioral and Pupillometry Findings. <i>Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research</i> , 2020, 63, 2483-2492.	1.6	5
25	The effect of a carrier phrase on hearing aid amplification of single words in quiet. <i>International Journal of Audiology</i> , 2013, 52, 189-193.	1.7	3
26	Informational masking with speech-on-speech intelligibility: Pupil response and time-course of learning. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2021, 149, 2353-2366.	1.1	3
27	Discrimination of changes in the spectral shape of noise bands. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 1997, 102, 2264-2275.	1.1	2
28	Spectral Shape Discrimination of Two-tone Complexes. , 1992, , 363-371.		1
29	Effects of changes of the spectral masking slope on sound quality and clarity of music sounds in the normal and impaired ear. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 1997, 102, 3187-3187.	1.1	1
30	Comment on "Sensitivity of the Speech Intelligibility Index to the Assumed Dynamic Range," by Jin et al. (2017). <i>Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research</i> , 2018, 61, 186-188.	1.6	0