# The Why and How of With-Height Surround Sound

#### Jörn Nettingsmeier <nettings@stackingdwarves.net>

freelance audio engineer Essen, Germany



## Your next 45 minutes on the graveyard shift this lovely Saturday morning:

- A bit of history
- How do we perceive elevated sound?
- Why include height at all?
- How do different methods (re-)produce height?
  - A closer look at multichannel stereo techniques
  - VBAP
  - Ambisonics



German Pavillon World Expo 1970: 50 speakers in a sphere, acoustically transparent grid floor.







Mostly discrete routing, a bit of amplitude panning.

Lots of fun with acoustics.





François Bayle's Acousmonium (Radio France): 80 different speakers spread around, for live *diffusion* of tape music (usually stereophonic).





François Bayle's Acousmonium (Radio France): 80 different speakers spread around, for live *diffusion* of tape music (usually stereophonic).



The music is being diffused in real-time, usually by the composer, sitting at a mixing desk designed for the purpose.



François Bayle's Acousmonium (Radio France): 80 different speakers spread around, for live *diffusion* of tape music (usually stereophonic).



The music is being diffused in real-time, usually by the composer, sitting at a mixing desk designed for the purpose.

Speakers are chosen for their different characteristics. Localisation is part of the interpretation, but not independent of speaker positions.



François Bayle's Acousmonium (Radio France): 80 different speakers spread around, for live *diffusion* of tape music (usually stereophonic).



The music is being diffused in real-time, usually by the composer, sitting at a mixing desk designed for the purpose.

Speakers are chosen for their different characteristics. Localisation is part of the interpretation, but not independent of speaker positions.

A modern-day successor is the **BEAST** (Birmingham Electro-Acoustic Sound Theatre).



Systems like these are not aiming at a systematic, portable approach to with-height surround.







Systems like these are not aiming at a systematic, portable approach to with-height surround.

They are part of the artwork, and of the creative process.







Systems like these are not aiming at a systematic, portable approach to with-height surround.

They are part of the artwork, and of the creative process.

Their strengths can be exploited in depth.







Systems like these are not aiming at a systematic, portable approach to with-height surround.

They are part of the artwork, and of the creative process.

Their strengths can be exploited in depth.





Their deficiencies mark important artistic constraints, which are either fought against, or put to use.



Systems like these are not aiming at a systematic, portable approach to with-height surround.

They are part of the artwork, and of the creative process.

Their strengths can be exploited in depth.





Their deficiencies mark important artistic constraints, which are either fought against, or put to use.

In any case, they are integral parts of the artwork, too.





That is of course a brilliant excuse :-D







Let's look instead at systems that

That is of course a brilliant excuse :-D



• aim for widespread deployment in a wider potential market





Let's look instead at systems that

That is of course a brilliant excuse :-D



- aim for widespread deployment in a wider potential market
- aim to reproduce content by third parties





Let's look instead at systems that

That is of course a brilliant excuse :-D



- aim for widespread deployment in a wider potential market
- aim to reproduce content by third parties
- define clearly how the system should be implemented



- Michael Gerzon 1973, *periphonic* (i.e. withheight) surround sound using 4 channels: *B-format*.
  - loudspeaker layout agnostic
  - scalable

In 1992, Gerzon proposed this as a candidate format for HDTV. Alas, ...



 Tomlinson Holman, 1999: eight speakers on the horizontal plane (with heavy frontal bias), two subs left and right, and two elevated frontal speakers: 10.2

• speaker feed mixing

("Twice as good as 5.1")



- Werner Dabringhaus, 1999: front left/right, rear left/right, elevated front left/right: **2+2+2** 
  - stereo-pairwise mixing using traditional miking techniques

Designed to work on DVD-Audio, with the 5 plus 1 channels available. Some tricks to ensure a meaningful (although compromised) image when played back over an ITU 5.1 rig.



- Wilfried van Baelen (Galaxy Studios), 2005: an ITU 5.1 system with elevated speakers above L, R, Ls and Rs: *Auro-3D*
  - same basic idea, yet more channels

The proposal includes some neat encoding tricks to funnel 10 (or more) signals into 5.1 carriers, or into the 8 PCM streams of a Blu-ray disc.



The Why and How of With-Height Surround Sound - Jörn Nettingsmeier <<u>nettings@stackingdwarves.net</u>> Linux Audio Conference 2012, CCRMA, Stanford University

21

 Kimio Hamasaki et. al, 2005 (NHK): ten horizontal channels, eight elevated channels, one "voice of God", three front low channels, two subs:

#### 22.2

Designed as a complement to the proposed Ultra-HDTV standard for total immersion. Again, more channels...



22

### And back in the present...

It seems there are many variations on the theme.

Now let's all go pick an arbitrary pair {N.M} and stick our names on it.









The Why and How of With-Height Surround Sou Linux Audio Conference 2012, CCRMA, Stanfor

44.4





The Why and How of With-Height Surround Sou Linux Audio Conference 2012, CCRMA, Stanfor

### 44.4

#### Eat my dust, Kimio :-D



The Why and How of With-Height Surround Sou Linux Audio Conference 2012, CCRMA, Stanfor



That is of course just a joke.

The system was used for IOSONO playback, and higher-order Ambisonics.





The Why and How of With-Height Surround Sou Linux Audio Conference 2012, CCRMA, Stanfor

### Learning from History

- Except for Ambisonics, all proposals share the same paradigms/problems
  - more and more channels without real up- and downwards compatibility
  - frontal bias
  - speaker-feed mixing
  - underspecified signal relationships (correlation etc.)



29

#### Perception



### How do we perceive direction? Left/right (horizontal) cues are

- interaural time difference *ITD* (at LF)
  - no head shading (perfect diffraction)
  - unambiguous phase (wavelength > 2x ear dist.)



31

How do we perceive direction? Left/right (horizontal) cues are

- interaural time difference *ITD* (at LF)
  - no head shading (perfect diffraction)
  - unambiguous phase (wavelength > 2x ear dist.)
- interaural level difference *ILD* (at HF)
  - head shading
  - ambiguous phase!



How about a source that moves up on the *median plane* (i.e. right in front of us)?

- constant ITD, no cue
- constant ILD, no cue

-> All we have is a slight change of tone colour, due to ear flaps (*pinnae*) and head/torso effects.



If it's just tone colour, how do we perceive height when we don't know the uncoloured sound?



If it's just tone colour, how do we perceive height when we don't know the uncoloured sound?

Short answer: we don't.



If it's just tone colour, how do we perceive height when we don't know the uncoloured sound?

Short answer: we don't.

#### Long answer: we do not.



If it's just tone colour, how do we perceive height when we don't know the uncoloured sound?

Short answer: we don't.

Long answer: we do not. But some narrowband signals suggest height regardless of the actual source elevation (Blauert, 1983).



Humans don't perceive height very well. Signal semantics dominate:

- Airplane? must be up. Birds, likewise.
- Footsteps? flowing water? down.

And if you see a source, that's where you hear it, usually (*multi-modal perception*).



But:

- We can move our head to direct the more acute horizontal localisation mechanisms at any source.
- We can "explore" a sound field at leisure.



### Then why bother?



A few common claims, supported by personal experience (not research):



A few common claims, supported by personal experience (not research):

improved immersion/envelopment



A few common claims, supported by personal experience (not research):

- improved immersion/envelopment
- increased robustness against listening room problems



A few common claims, supported by personal experience (not research):

- improved immersion/envelopment
- increased robustness against listening room problems
- enlarged usable listening area



A few common claims, supported by personal experience (not research):

- improved immersion/envelopment
- increased robustness against listening room problems
- enlarged usable listening area
- more natural timbre



45

A few common claims, supported by personal experience (not research):

- improved immersion/envelopment
- increased robustness against listening room problems
- enlarged usable listening area
- more natural timbre
- height localisation



A few common claims, supported by personal experience (not research):

- improved immersion/envelopment
- increased robustness against listening room problems
- enlarged usable listening area
- more natural timbre

height localisation

**Nobody cares!** 



### Uses for height *localisation*

- better audibility of complex structures due to vertical separation: e.g. organ music
- more precise reproduction of room acoustics: characteristic ceiling reflections
- use of location as a precisely audible musical parameter, like pitch and duration
- discrete sources at height: elevated choirs or solo instruments, opera scenes



### Height reproduction in Stereo

- Stereo := using stereophonic techniques
  - level differences in speaker pairs (=artificial ILD)
  - time differences in speaker pairs (=artificial ITD)

But: not used on the median plane.

Tone colour for any given height is *not* the sum of upper speaker tone colour plus lower speaker tone colour weighted by relative amplitude.



The Why and How of With-Height Surround Sound - Jörn Nettingsmeier <nettings@stackingdwarves.net> Linux Audio Conference 2012, CCRMA, Stanford University

49

### Height reproduction in Stereo

Hence: ILD/ITD not much use for height, steep localisation curve.

Bottomline: it's either on the bottom speaker, or on the upper speaker.

No stable auditory events in between (however, suggesting quick vertical movement is possible).



50

### Height reproduction in Stereo

Artificially delivered ITD/ILD fall apart when the listener's head is rotated away from the frontal upright orientation.

Don't move!



### Height reproduction in Ambisonics

Ambi attempts to get the soundfield correct, to some degree.

In a correct soundfield, you can move any way you like and collect useful cues.

Once your brain has locked onto a cue, localisation remains stable even if you move.



### Bottom line:

• Only Higher-order Ambisonics and VBAP can create meaningful and stable auditory events at continuously variable elevation.



## Is with-height surround really worth the trouble?



#### Depends.



#### Thanks for your attention. I'm looking forward to your remarks and questions.

