IETI Transactions on Engineering Research and Practice
http://ieti.net/TERP/

2024, Volume 8, Issue 1, 24-29, DOI 10.6723/TERP.202408_8(1).0004

SOUND TRANSMISSION CLASS (STC): APPLICATIONS, RESEARCH INSIGHTS, AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN BUILDING ACOUSTICS

Aleksandar Zunjic [1, a], Petar V. M. Lukić [1,b]
[1]University of Belgrade, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering
[a] azunjic@mas.bg.ac.rs, [b] plukic@mas.bg.ac.rs

Abstract This paper aims to review the uses of Sound Transmission Class (STC) in building acoustics as well as its drawbacks. It discusses the application of STC in field measurements and data analysis and identifies the differences between the laboratory and the real world. The study also compares STC with other metrics such as ASTC and OITC and shows that it fails to give a realistic picture of the actual sound insulation and how it is perceived by human beings. Some of the unique uses in wood-frame construction and in new acoustic solutions are described. The research also discusses the importance of the need for better metrics that are more in line with real-world performance and human perception and points to future directions in the development of acoustic metrics that can adapt to future building technologies.

Keywords: Sound Transmission Class (STC); building acoustics; sound insulation; Apparent Sound Transmission Class (ASTC); Outdoor-Indoor Transmission Class (OITC); acoustic metrics; human perception; innovative acoustic treatments; acoustic design.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sound Transmission Class (STC) is one of the most common indices in architectural acoustics to characterize the sound isolation performance of building partitions. It offers a single number measure to quantify the performance of a partition in reducing airborne sound, thus simplifying complex data on sound transmission loss (TL) that varies with frequency. This paper aims at identifying the uses of STC in research, its implications and differences with other acoustical measures of insulation.

2. APPLICATIONS OF STC IN RESEARCH

2.1. Field Measurements and Practical Applications

It was established in previous studies that the density of the wall surface and construction techniques are some of the parameters that affect the STC rating of wall partitions [1]. Real-life case studies which have been discussed by Conroy (2003) and Conroy and Roland (2003) have offered useful experience of how STC ratings can be used in actual situations [2, 3]. These studies showed that the results of STC measurements are influenced by different field conditions and partition types, and therefore, real-world factors should be taken into consideration in the acoustic design.

Moreover, Jones (1975) studied the influence of flanking and test environment on laboratory-field relationships of airborne sound insulation and demonstrated how the results may differ in laboratory and field conditions [4]. This study implies that when analyzing STC ratings, it is necessary to consider environmental factors.

2024, Volume 8, Issue 1, 24-29, DOI 10.6723/TERP.202408_8(1).0004

2.2. Large-Volume Data Analysis

Shafer (2023) used a large database to analyze the tendencies of STC ratings and concluded important information about the efficiency of contemporary acoustic solutions compared to historical data [5]. This study highlighted certain weaknesses in the existing STC calculation method and implied that the existing method should be revised to accommodate modern construction materials and practices.

2.3. Subjective and Objective Comparisons

Clark (1970) performed experiments in order to establish the subjective significance of different frequency bands in the STC rating method [6]. The findings were that the present STC rating system could be rather conservative and provided recommendations for improvement. Park, Bradley, and Gover (2008) compared the STC ratings with speech intelligibility and concluded that the current measures only offered a moderate relationship with intelligibility and hence they point out the need for better methods [7].

Furthermore, Park and Bradley (2009) extended the analysis of the relationship between standard airborne sound insulation parameters and subjective assessment of annoyance, loudness and audibility [8]. This paper provides an additional understanding of how STC ratings are connected with the perception of sound insulation by people.

2.4. Advanced Computational Techniques

Broyles, Shepherd, and Brown (2020) talked about the application of computational optimization methods to enhance the STC ratings of concrete slabs in buildings [9]. Their work focused on the balance between the decrease of the material's weight and the improvement of sound isolation, showing the possibilities of using high-performance computational tools in the field of acoustics.

3. LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES OF STC

3.1. Real-World Performance Discrepancies

Studies have shown that STC often fails to predict the actual performance of insulated wood frame gypsum walls in homes, as it does not account for the perceptible differences in noise reduction that homeowners experience [10, 11]. The STC rating system has been found to overemphasize performance around the 125 Hz third-octave band, leading to significant variations in ratings due to small performance changes at these frequencies [11, 5].

Sepmeyer (1979, 1986) gave additional insights on the drawbacks of the STC system, arguing that a more refined method of assessing the performance of building partitions was required [12, 13]. Some of the inconsistencies in the literature include the effectiveness of the STC rating system. It has been found that the ASTM E413 standard for calculating STC may give a rather pessimistic estimate of the actual level of annoyance that can be caused by sound transmission through partitions. Some argue that the STC rating may overestimate the TL performance particularly where there are high-frequency dips [12, 13]. These studies help in the further debate on the applicability of STC in real-life scenarios.

2024, Volume 8, Issue 1, 24-29, DOI 10.6723/TERP.202408_8(1).0004

3.2. Field vs. Laboratory Measurements

Real life measurements of STC can be often lower than laboratory measurements due to flanking transmission and other environmental conditions that are not accounted for in the STC rating [4,14]. This indicates that there is a need to develop better field testing methods in the future and to take into consideration the actual conditions that exist in acoustic design.

Weissenburger (2004) extended the discussion to room-to-room privacy and acoustical design criteria and pointed out that both laboratory and field data should be taken into consideration in acoustic design [14].

4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS WITH OTHER ACOUSTICAL METRICS

4.1. Apparent Sound Transmission Class (ASTC)

The Apparent Sound Transmission Class (ASTC) has been introduced in Canada to consider structural flanking transmission; this gives a better prediction of the sound insulation between dwelling units [15, 16]. This metric improves on STC in some ways by taking into consideration realistic transmission paths.

Qian et al. (2021) proposed acoustic design tools for predicting both, the STC and airborne sound transmission class (ASTC) of wood wall and floor assemblies [15]. This research adds value to the application of these metrics in building design.

4.2. Outdoor-Indoor Transmission Class (OITC)

Loverde and Dong (2017) have also done a study where they compared STC with OITC to assess their suitability in describing exterior facade performance [17]. The study indicated that OITC could be more accurate in some cases, especially in assessing the sound transmission through exterior walls and windows.

5. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS

5.1. Need for Alternative or Improved Metrics

There is a rising demand for a new rating system that would provide a better indication of what people hear in the quiet room conditions, as STC is becoming more of a preliminary evaluation than a full-fledged measure [10, 5]. Further research should be conducted in order to find the indicators that would be closer to the human ear perception of sound isolation.

Northwood (1981) came back to the STC system to discuss possible modifications, and to review the history of sound insulation ratings [18]. This work offers useful information on the development of acoustic metrics and possible future developments.

2024, Volume 8, Issue 1, 24-29, DOI 10.6723/TERP.202408_8(1).0004

5.2. Incorporation of Subjective Factors

Studies indicate that the current STC rating system does not align well with subjective human perception of sound insulation, particularly in the presence of narrow frequency dips [6]. Future improvements to STC or alternative metrics should aim to better incorporate subjective factors and human perception of sound insulation.

Recent research by Barabah et al. (2019) on predicting sound insulation for middle-class apartments based on noise site analysis highlights the importance of considering local environmental factors in acoustic design [19]. This approach could inform future developments in sound insulation metrics.

6. SPECIALIZED APPLICATIONS AND INNOVATIONS

6.1. Wood-Frame Construction

Richardson and McPhee (1996) conducted research on fire-resistance and STC ratings for wood-frame walls, providing valuable data for building codes and standards [20]. This work demonstrates the importance of considering multiple performance criteria in building design.

6.2. Innovative Acoustic Treatments

Du, Lau, and Lee (2019) reviewed the experimental studies of the sound insulation of ventilation partitions, which illustrate new strategies for enhancing STC performance while addressing other performance criteria [21]. Such research suggests that there is a possibility of new materials and concepts in enhancing the acoustic performance.

6.3. Multi-Layered Materials

Lin, Kuo, and Wang (2007) investigated the sound insulation of specially orthotropic multi-layered media and helped to develop the knowledge of advanced acoustic systems [22]. The findings of this research have implications for the advancement of new and improved acoustic materials and their effects on STC ratings.

7. CONCLUSION

Although Sound Transmission Class (STC) is still an essential parameter in architectural acoustics, research in the field has exposed its advantages and drawbacks. The use of STC in research has brought a lot of improvement in the knowledge that we have concerning building acoustics but at the same time has exposed some areas that require further enhancement. With the development of new materials and different construction techniques, ways of assessing sound insulation should also be developed. Further research should be directed to the enhancement of the current metrics so as to provide better representations of the real-world performance and human perception of sound insulation.

Hoeller and Mahn (2017) describe the process of revising sound insulation requirements in Canada as one of the examples of the continuous development of acoustic standards [16]. Thus, it is necessary to

2024, Volume 8, Issue 1, 24-29, DOI 10.6723/TERP.202408_8(1).0004

go further in the evaluation and development of acoustic metrics and standards in the context of building systems and human requirements.

References

[1] Green, D. W., and Sherry, C. W., 1982, Sound Transmission Loss of Gypsum Wallboard Partitions. Report ♯1. Unfilled Steel Stud Partitions, *The Journal of The Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 71, Iss. 1, pp. 90-96.

[2] Conroy, J., 2003, Analysis of practical sound transmission class (STC) measurements performed under a variety of field conditions, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 114, pp. 2306-2307.

[3] Conroy, J., and Roland, J., 2003, Sound Transmission Class – Field Testing and Results, *Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 37, pp. 10-15.

[4] Jones, R., 1975, Effects of flanking and test environment on lab–field correlations of airborne sound insulation, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 57, pp. 1138-1149.

[5] Shafer, B., 2023, An investigation of the sound transmission class rating system using large-volume, high-variability datasets, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 154, Iss. 4 supplement, A85.

[6] Clark, D. M., 1970, Subjective Study of the Sound-Transmission Class System for Rating Building Partitions, *The Journal of The Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 47, Iss. 3, pp. 676-682.

[7] Park, H. K., Bradley, J. S., and Gover, B. N., 2008, Evaluating Airborne Sound Insulation in Terms of Speech Intelligibility, *The Journal of The Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 123, Iss. 3, pp. 1458-1471.

[8] Park, H. K., and Bradley, J. S., 2009, Evaluating Standard Airborne Sound Insulation Measures in Terms of Annoyance, Loudness, and Audibility Ratings, *The Journal of The Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 126, Iss. 1, pp. 208-219.

[9] Broyles, J., Shepherd, M., and Brown, N., 2020, Investigation of optimization techniques on structural-acoustical shaped concrete slabs in buildings, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 42, Iss. 1, 022001.

[10] Godfrey, R., Alter, H., and Clarke, B., 2005, Sound transmission class (STC) is not a good predictor of performance of insulated wood frame gypsum walls used as interior partitions in most North American homes, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 118, pp. 1844-1844.

[11] Dong, W., Shafer, B., Girdhar, S., and Loverde, J., 2023, Investigation of alternative methods for measuring and evaluating airborne sound insulation, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 154, Iss. 4 supplement, A301.

[12] Sepmeyer, L. W., 1979, Study of the Sound Transmission Class System for Rating Building Partitions: Another View, *The Journal of The Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 66, Suppl. 1, S52.

[13] Sepmeyer, L. W., 1986, Study of the Sound Transmission Class System for Rating Building Partitions—Another View, *The Journal of The Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 80, Iss. 5, pp. 1404-1407.

[14] Weissenburger, J., 2004, Room-to-room privacy and acoustical design criteria, *Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 38, pp. 14-17.

[15] Qian, C., Hu, L., Dagenais, C., and Gagnon, S., 2021, Acoustic design tools for estimation of sound insulation performance of wood wall and floor assemblies, *INTER-NOISE and NOISE-CON Congress and Conference Proceedings*, https://doi.org/10.3397/in-2021-1384.

[16] Hoeller, C., and Mahn, J., 2017, Update on the change in sound insulation requirements in Canada, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 141, pp. 3538-3538.

[17] Loverde, J., and Dong, D., 2017, Comparison of Sound Transmission Class and Outdoor-Indoor Transmission Class for specification of exterior facade assemblies, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 141, pp. 3539-3539.

[18] Northwood, T., 1981, Sound insulation ratings - the STC revisited, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 69, Iss. S1, S47.

2024, Volume 8, Issue 1, 24-29, DOI 10.6723/TERP.202408_8(1).0004

[19] Barabah, H. A. G., Utami, S. S., Fela, R. F., Yanti, R. J., Hapsari, H. R., and Prasetiyo, I., 2019, Prediction of Sound Insulation for Middle Class Apartment Based on Noise Site Analysis, *AIP Conference Proceedings*, https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5095344.

[20] Richardson, L. R., and McPhee, R. A., 1996, Fire-Resistance and Sound-Transmission-Class Ratings for Wood-Frame Walls, *Fire and Materials*, Vol. 20, Iss. 3, pp. 123-131.

[21] Du, L., Lau, S.-K., and Lee, S., 2019, Experimental Study on Sound Insulation of Ventilation Partitions, *Journal of Acoustics*, Vol. 1, Iss. 1, e190005.

[22] Lin, H.-J., Kuo, Y.-M., and Wang, C.-N., 2007, Characterizing the Sound Insulation of a Specially Orthotropic Multi-Layered Medium, *Journal of Mechanics*, Vol. 23, Iss. 1, pp. 63-68.