Prominent Words as Anchors for TRP Projection
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Abstract

The effect of the position of the last accented word on the projection of TRPs was investigated with two RT experiments. Subjects were asked to respond with minimal responses to prerecorded dialogs and impoverished versions of these dialogs, containing either only intonation and pause information, hummed stimuli, or no periodic component at all, whispered stimuli. The distribution of these elicited response delays was comparable to that of natural turn switches. It is shown that the presence of non-prominent words before a TRP reduces the delays of elicited and natural responses alike, even in impoverished speech. This suggests that the presence of an prominent, informative, word starts the projection of a possible upcoming TRP. The availability of non-prominent, predictable, speech then allows listeners to improve their predictions of the exact timing of the TRP.

1. Introduction

In order to allow for smooth turn transitions in natural conversations, participants have to be able to predict the end of the previous speaker’s turn [1]. Various information sources are known or suspected to help listeners in determining possible Transition Relevance Places (TRPs), like gaze direction, gestures, intonation, syntactic, and timing information (like speaking rate and pauses) [2, 3, 4, 5]. The study of [5] concluded that only lexico-syntactic content was used for projection. However, other studies did find that intonation was used to project TRPs under experimental conditions [3, 4, 6].

Given that subjects are able to project TRPs reliably and are likely to use intonation, raises the question precisely what cues are used. Reaction Time (RT) paradigms are the most sensitive to information distribution and processing. However, projecting TRPs is not like the classical RT experiments (cf., [7, 8]). Instead of starting at the start of the stimulus (information) presentation, the subject is asked to predict an end-point from an ongoing stimulus. In [4] it was argued that subjects started to integrate information over 500ms before the TRP. The RT to a TRP is then dependend on two types of information: Cues about the likelyhood of a TRP being prepared and cues about the exact location of the TRP. The boundary tone, or end-tone, and the coming end of the last word are strong cues about the exact location of the TRP. But these cues are often only available in the last syllable of the utterance [6].

The location of the end of the final word is often predictable if the last word itself is predictable. The same holds for the boundary tone, which can often be predicted from the end of the last pitch accent. These two cues merge on the last prominent word before the TRP. Given the normal Information Structure of prosody, pitch accents are placed on prominent words that generally are also informative, ie, unpredictable words. The last prominent word before a TRP will therefore likely carry the last pitch accent and also will be the last (highly) unpredictable word. The non-prominent words are following the last prominent one will be unaccented and predictable, as will be the remainder of the intonation contour. This leads to the prediction that the more words follow the last prominent word, the better subjects will be able to predict the upcoming TRP.

Subjects listened to original and manipulated versions of recordings of natural dialogs and were asked to give minimal responses by saying ‘AH’. Their responses are assumed to signal comprehension of at least part of the utterance’s structure and a recognition of a possible end-of-turn (TRP). A decision-making model by Sigman and Dehaene [7] is used to compare processing of the different stimuli (see fig. 1). In this model, mental decision-making is modeled as a noisy integrator that stochastically accumulates perceptual evidence from the sensory system in time [7, 8], through a perceptual (P), central decision-making (C) and motor component (M). RTs are the sum of a P + M related deterministic response time, t_0, and a C related random walk to a decision threshold, fully determined by an integration time $\tau = \frac{\alpha}{\sigma^2}$. Experiments by Sigman and Dehaene [7] showed that the central component $C$ is responsible for almost all of the variance in response times. An important property of the model is that the proportion of the integration time constants ($\tau$) for two experimental conditions (e.g. $i$ and $j$) can be determined from their respective variances ($s^2_i$ and $s^2_j$) as:

$$\frac{\tau_i}{\tau_j} = \frac{s^2_j}{s^2_i}$$

Figure 1: Perception-Central-Motor model of Reaction Times. $\tau = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$ is the average central integration time. $\sigma$ is an unknown noise term. The average reaction time $RT = t_p + t_m + \tau$. The variance is $\text{var}(RT) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \tau^2$
2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Speech Materials

All speech materials were obtained from the Spoken Dutch Corpus (CGN) [9, 10], making hand-aligned utterances ("chunks"), word boundary segmentations, transliterations, and phonetic transcriptions available. This study is based on the hand aligned word boundaries and the pro1 and pro2 prominence markings. In the CGN protocol, prominence was explicitly connected with the possibility of a pitch accent (cf, [9, 12]). The last word that either of the two transcribers considered to be prominent, was marked as the last prominent word. We will refer to the prominent words as accented words. However, it must be kept in mind that the transcribers used a broader definition of prominence.

Based on audio quality and coverage of turn switching categories [3, 4], a stimulus set of 7 switchboard (8 kHz, dual channel telephone recordings) and 10 volunteer home recordings (16 kHz, stereo face-to-face) of 10 minutes each (total duration 165 min.) was selected.

2.2. Stimulus preparation and presentation

Stimulus selection and preparation was identical to [3, 4]. The 17 dialog recordings were each divided into two overlapping 6 minute stimuli, i.e. the first and last 6 minutes of each dialog. This is the original stimulus set (34 stimuli). Two new stimulus sets were constructed. First, a set of hummed stimuli was created by converting the original stimuli to pitch contours with Praat [11] and having them resynthesized as neutral-vowel speech [3, 4]. This hummed speech contains nothing but the intonation and pause structure of the original speech, i.e. no loudness or spectral information was present. Second, the original stimuli were resynthesized from an LPC analysis using white noise as the sound source. The LPC order was chosen as 8 poles for telephone speech and 16 poles for the home recordings. The amplitude was scaled to prevent clipping. These constitute whispered stimuli as they did not contain a periodic component. However, it must be remembered that both the hummed and whispered speech were artificial and sounded not like natural humming or whispering. The artificially whispered stimuli were still intelligible and did audibly contain non-periodic prosodic cues. All stimuli were upsampld to 16

![Figure 2](image)

Figure 2: Example response waveform and segmentation. Top: Mono waveform of the stimulus, Center: laryngograph signal of a single response, Bottom: Annotation tiers for the automatic segmentation of the response and the transliterated utterances of the two speakers. The response delay is the interval between the vertical lines.
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Figure 3: Distribution of reaction-time delays with respect to corresponding utterance-ends. Top: Voiced responses, Mid: Early responses, Bottom: Difference between Voiced and Early responses. Bin size is 40ms. Early responses must start more than 40ms before the Voiced response. (# responses)

Table 1: Distribution of Voiced and Early responses over stimulus types by pitch accent positions. Only responses to utterances with at least 3 words are used. '-' indicates no accent in the last three words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accent</th>
<th>position</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>Orig. (32)</td>
<td>3545</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>7147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(subj.)</td>
<td>Hum. (21)</td>
<td>2425</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>5513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whisp. (11)</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>2162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Orig. (32)</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>2873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(subj.)</td>
<td>Hum. (21)</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whisp. (11)</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterances</td>
<td></td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>3271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
kHz and 16 bit where necessary.

Stimuli were pseudo-randomized and balanced for presentation. Each of the 32 subjects (with one exception due to an error) heard a different subset and order of 4 original and 4 manipulated dialog fragments of 6 minutes duration in alternating order, starting with an original stimulus. These first 8 dialog fragments were all from different full dialogs. These were followed by two repeat stimuli (ignored in the current study), the dialog complements of the first two stimuli. The whole 10 stimulus session contained two 2 minute breaks and was preceded by two 2 minute practice items, a full speech and hummed or whispered fragment from a dialog that was not in the stimulus set.

2.3. Response collection and processing

Stereo stimulus playback and response recording were done concurrently on a single laptop [3, 4]. The laryngograph (Laryngograph Ltd, Lx proc) responses were recorded at a 16 kHz sampling rate on one channel, with the fed-back (summed) mono version of the stimulus on the other channel for alignment purposes [3, 4]. 32 Naive, native Dutch subjects participated in the experiment. 21 Subjects heard the original and hummed stimuli and 11 subjects heard the original and whispered stimuli. Some subjects were paid. Only one subject had some knowledge of the aims of the experiment. Subjects were explained what Minimal Responses were (in layman’s terms if necessary) and asked to act like they participated in the conversation they would hear. The subjects were asked to respond with ‘AH’ if possible, as often as they could. After the practice stimuli, none of the subjects had any problems with the software they were using as a reference point. A clear correlation between the average turn start delays for home recordings and telephone speech in the CGN. The distributions of the Voiced responses correspond quite well to that of the natural turn switch delays. This indicates that our elicited responses capture at least part of the natural conversational behavior. The distribution of the Early responses and the delay differences between Voiced and Early responses is as expected from [4] (note the 40ms lower cutoff in the latter).

In fig. 4, the average RT delay to TRPs is presented against the position of the last accented word (1 is ultimate, etc.). A plot of the RT with respect to the start of the last accented word showed a large increase of over 200 ms in response delay going from ultimate to antepenultimate accent (not shown). So the TRP will be used as a reference point. A clear correlation between the average RT and the distance to the last accent is visible. For the natural turn switches and the Voiced and Early responses to the original and whispered stimuli, the relation between accent position and RT is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$, one-way ANOVA on Accent position). The Voiced responses to hummed utterances are affected by accent position ($p < 0.02$, one-way ANOVA). This can be attributed to the effect of the final accent (1) which differed from the rest combined ($p < 0.001$, t-test 1 vs. 2, 3, 4). No difference was found for the Early responses to hummed stimuli. The effect of accent position on the delay difference between Voiced and Early responses is only significant for whispered stimuli ($p < 0.002$, speaker) within a window of 2 seconds. The relevant utterance had to start at least 0.1 seconds before the start of the response. Furthermore, responses with a duration shorter than 15ms were discarded as spurious. Using the same criteria, Turn Transfer delays in the Spontaneous and Telephone dialogs of the hand aligned part of the Spoken Dutch Corpus were determined. The distribution of responses with respect to the intonation boundary tones is given in table 1. At the current level of analysis, we did not distinguish between the prescribed ‘AH’ responses and other, more complex, responses [3, 4].

3. Results

In total, 25.6 hours of responses are used from 32 subjects, containing 14,822 responses to utterances of three words and longer (see table 1). In fig. 3, the distribution of all 25,868 response delays that could be attributed to specific utterances is compared to the natural turn start delays for home recordings and telephone speech in the CGN. The distributions of the Voiced responses correspond quite well to that of the natural turn switch delays. This indicates that our elicited responses capture at least part of the natural conversational behavior. The distribution of the Early responses and the delay differences between Voiced and Early responses is as expected from [4] (note the 40ms lower cutoff in the latter).
one-way ANOVA on Accent position for difference). There was a main effect of stimulus type for all data pooled for all response types ($p < 0.01$, ANOVA). There was also an effect of stimulus type on the Voiced responses to whispered stimuli ($p < 0.01$, ANOVA, by subject) and the Voiced minus Early difference for hummed stimuli ($p < 0.001$, ANOVA, by subject).

The variances of the RTs are related to the integration (decision) time [4]. Fig. 5 shows that accent position had little or no impact on the standard deviation of the RTs for any of the stimulus types ($p > 0.05$, one-way ANOVA). The natural turn switches had the highest variance, followed by the Voiced and Early responses of the hummed stimuli and both the original and whispered stimuli, which did not differ ($p < 0.001$, t-test on each pair of conditions). No differences were found for the delay between Voiced and Early responses.

Fig. 6 expresses the differences in variance in terms of the relative decision (integration) time, $\tau_{\text{orig}}$, of [4] (see eq. 1 and fig. 1). It is clear that there is no effect of accent position on the integration time, but only of stimulus type. Hummed stimuli take consistently more time to decide.
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