



HAL
open science

From local hesitations to global impressions of a speaker's feeling of knowing

Tanvi Dinkar, Beatrice Biancardi, Chloé Clavel

► **To cite this version:**

Tanvi Dinkar, Beatrice Biancardi, Chloé Clavel. From local hesitations to global impressions of a speaker's feeling of knowing. 25th Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue, Sep 2021, Potsdam, Germany. Proceedings of the 25th Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue. hal-03577249

HAL Id: hal-03577249

<https://telecom-paris.hal.science/hal-03577249v1>

Submitted on 16 Feb 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

From local hesitations to global impressions of a speaker’s feeling of knowing

Tanvi Dinkar

LTCI, Télécom Paris
IP Paris, France

tanvi.dinkar@telecom-paris.fr

Beatrice Biancardi

LTCI, Télécom Paris
IP Paris, France

beatrice.biancardi@telecom-paris.fr

Chloé Clavel

LTCI, Télécom Paris
IP Paris, France

chloe.clavel@telecom-paris.fr

1 Introduction

The aim of this work is to empirically study on a real-life dataset, whether the utterance level use of fillers can help in understanding/ interpreting the perception of the speaker that was formed by a listener. According to [Brennan and Williams \(1995\)](#), the listener’s interpretation of the speaker’s utterance includes estimates about the speaker’s commitment to/ expressed confidence in what they are saying. [Flavell \(1979\)](#) termed these processes (of the speaker) as **metacognitive** ones, that is cognition about cognitive phenomena, or more simply “thinking about thinking”. Research has linked fillers to the listener’s assessment of a speaker’s metacognitive state ([Brennan and Williams, 1995](#)). However, these results may not apply to spontaneous speech datasets collected in real-life contexts, or non-QA datasets. Additionally, the focus of analysis tends to be on utterances as if they occur in isolation, rather than part of an overall discourse. Thus existing studies do not focus on the connection between the hierarchical levels of discourse; i.e. how a speaker’s local use of fillers could lead to a listener’s overall (global) impression of the speaker. In this work, we study how does a speaker’s use of fillers relate to the message from the speaker, and consequently, whether this relates to a listener’s perception of the speaker. We do so by studying the POM dataset, a corpus of publicly available English monologue movie reviews ([Park et al., 2014](#)). Annotators (listeners) were asked to label the reviews for attributes such as “confidence”; without explicitly being told to pay attention to the speaker’s use of fillers.

RQ1: (Local effect of fillers): How does a speaker’s use of fillers relate to the message from the speaker? **H1:** Fillers are more likely to occur before the introduction of new and upcoming information in the review.

RQ2: (Global effect of fillers): How does the speaker’s use of fillers relate to a listener’s perception of the speaker? **H2:** the speaker’s use of fillers preceding new information in the message contributes to the listener’s perception of the speaker’s confidence.

2 Methodology

To investigate **H1**, we consider the speaker’s mention of entities related to the movie, that we extract from metadata files¹. These entities could be categorised into actor, director or title of the movie. We inspect for each transcript, the distribution of filler positions, in relation to the automatically annotated entities in the discourse (denoted by *Ent*). We split these entities into *Ent_new*; i.e. entities newly introduced in the discourse, to indicate new information, and *Ent_old* to indicate entities already introduced in the discourse. Then, we check whether the distributions of filler positions (by its token position in the transcript) are significantly different compared to the distributions of 1. *Ent_new* and 2. *Ent_old* positions (by its first token’s position), by utilising a Kruskal-Wallis H test with Benjamini-Hochberg correction. We then estimate the effect size by computing Cliff’s Delta δ . Lastly, we compare the δ distributions of the two experiments, i.e. fillers with *Ent_new* versus fillers with *Ent_old* using a Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

To investigate **H2**, we take the mean of the three confidence labels provided by the three annotators. We then consider reviews that are categorised as high-confidence (HC; ratings ≥ 6 , $n=130$) and low-confidence (LC; ratings ≤ 3 , $n=116$). To calculate the percentage of fillers preceding new information (denoted by a new entity), we count the number of fillers in the review that occur before (but not

¹The complete code and processed data will be made available online for reproducibility here https://github.com/tdinkar/fillers_in_POM.git

after) an *Ent_new*, constrained to a maximum distance of 1 token in between the filler and *Ent_new*. We normalise by dividing this count by the total number of fillers used in the review. From this, we obtain the percentage of fillers that occur before an *Ent_new* versus the percentage of fillers used in any other context that is not *Ent_new*. We then sum these two values for all HC and LC reviews, to get a cumulative percentage. We compute Odds Ratios (*ORs*) in order to investigate whether the use of fillers around new entities is associated with confidence, where the odds denote the outcome of HC or LC, given the occurrence of fillers before new entities, compared to the occurrence of fillers that do not occur before new entities. We expect that the more fillers are used in the context of preceding new entities, the greater the odds of HC.

3 Results and Discussion

H1: By Kruskal-Wallis H test the distributions of filler positions compared to 1. *Ent_new* and 2. *Ent_old* positions are significantly different for $\approx 15 - 20\%$ of the reviews (where $p \leq .05$). However, after utilising the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure for multiple testing correction, the distributions using this method do not significantly differ. This test is calculated using the sum of the ranks of each distribution. Given that the average review length is short (≈ 256 tokens), and considering the close average median of fillers, *Ent_new* and *Ent_old* on reflection, this test may not capture nuances of the positional effects of fillers. However, by computing δ to estimate effect sizes, we found that for most reviews, fillers do occur before *Ent_new* (median = -0.30 , $SD = 0.41$), but not before *Ent_old* (median = 0.20 , $SD = 0.37$), where the distributions of the δ values significantly differ ($Z = 27578.0$, $p < .05$ using Wilcoxon signed rank test). Majority of the reviews (565) have fillers occurring before *Ent_new* (sum of “large” to “small” δ sizes)², compared to 163 reviews that had negligible effect size, and 139 reviews that had positive effect size (reviews that had fillers occurring after the introduction of new entities). We see the opposite δ effect sizes for *Ent_old*, where most of the reviews have fillers occurring after entities already introduced in the discourse, but not before. Fillers occurring after

Ent_old is entirely plausible given that new entities can occur throughout the review, and not just at the start of one. Given the large group with negligible effect size (247 reviews) for *Ent_old*, this does show that speakers may sometimes use fillers when repeating entities already introduced into the discourse. Compared to Dinkar et al. (2020), our findings suggest that there is more nuance to the way speakers utilise fillers (and indeed, our methodology is agnostic to sentence boundaries) in spontaneous speech. Therefore, regarding H1, **stylistically speakers do tend to use fillers when introducing a new entity rather than one already introduced** (whether intentionally or not remains an open question), and the positions of fillers w.r.t *Ent_new* significantly differ from positions of fillers w.r.t *Ent_old*.

H2: The results of the test show $OR = 0.72$ ($p < .001$, $95\%CI 0.6 - 0.8$). While $OR < 1$ (indicating that **the presence of fillers occurring before new entities gives a higher odds of LC**), **the presence of the stimulus on the outcome is small**. Interestingly, these findings are the opposite of what was expected (the speaker’s use of fillers preceding new information contributes to the listener’s perception of confidence; i.e. the more fillers are used in this way, the greater the odds of HC). According to the results, fillers occurring before new entities do not have a great effect on the odds of the HC (28% lower given the presence of new entities) rating that the listener gives the speaker. Inspecting the average rate of fillers in the review, it is clear that the use of fillers differs between HC and LC rated speakers (median filler rate of 0.026 and 0.045 respectively, with $U = 3873.0$ and $p < .05$ by Mann-Whitney U test). These results do not necessarily contradict Brennan and Williams (1995), i.e. there could be impressions formed by the listener about the speaker’s expressed confidence based on fillers in spontaneous speech (as found in Dinkar et al. (2020)). However, these results would suggest that the effect may not be from fillers used in the context of introducing new entities. This is an interesting finding; as fillers in these contexts could still have a metacognitive function; i.e. the listener is drawn to the mind of the speaker and (their difficulties in) formulating a new referent as discussed in (Barr and Seyfeddinipur, 2010). But, it may be expected by the listener and thus not necessarily contribute to the listener’s perception of the speaker’s expressed confidence.

²The magnitude of Cliff’s Delta δ can be interpreted by using the thresholds from Romano et al. (2006), i.e. $|\delta| < 0.147$ “negligible”, $|\delta| < 0.33$ “small”, $|\delta| < 0.474$ “medium”, and otherwise “large”.

References

- Dale J Barr and Mandana Seyfeddinipur. 2010. The role of fillers in listener attributions for speaker disfluency. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 25(4):441–455.
- Susan E Brennan and Maurice Williams. 1995. The feeling of another’s knowing: Prosody and filled pauses as cues to listeners about the metacognitive states of speakers. *Journal of memory and language*, 34(3):383–398.
- Tanvi Dinkar, Pierre Colombo, Matthieu Labeau, and Chloé Clavel. 2020. [The importance of fillers for text representations of speech transcripts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7985–7993, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John H Flavell. 1979. Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry. *American psychologist*, 34(10):906.
- Sunghyun Park, Han Suk Shim, Moitreyia Chatterjee, Kenji Sagae, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2014. [Computational Analysis of Persuasiveness in Social Multimedia: A Novel Dataset and Multimodal Prediction Approach](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Multimodal Interaction, ICMI 2014*, page 50–57, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Jeanine Romano, Jeffrey D Kromrey, Jesse Coraggio, and Jeff Skowronek. 2006. Appropriate statistics for ordinal level data: Should we really be using t-test and cohen’s d for evaluating group differences on the nsse and other surveys? In *annual meeting of the Florida Association of Institutional Research*, volume 177.