



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Disfluencies in change detection in natural, vocoded and synthetic speech

Citation for published version:

Dall, R, Wester, M & Corley, M 2015, Disfluencies in change detection in natural, vocoded and synthetic speech. in *Proc. of DiSS 2015, The 7th Workshop on Disfluencies in Spontaneous Speech*. Edinburgh. <http://www.disfluency.org/DiSS_2015/Programme.html>

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Proc. of DiSS 2015, The 7th Workshop on Disfluencies in Spontaneous Speech

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



DISFLUENCIES IN CHANGE DETECTION IN NATURAL, VOCODED AND SYNTHETIC SPEECH

Rasmus Dall¹, Mirjam Wester¹ & Martin Corley²

¹The Centre for Speech Technology Research, The University of Edinburgh, UK

²School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences, The University of Edinburgh, UK
r.dall@sms.ed.ac.uk, mwester@inf.ed.ac.uk, martin.corley@ed.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we investigate the effect of filled pauses, a discourse marker and silent pauses in a change detection experiment in natural, vocoded and synthetic speech. In natural speech change detection has been found to increase in the presence of filled pauses, we extend this work by replicating earlier findings and explore the effect of a discourse marker, like, and silent pauses. Furthermore we report how the use of "unnatural" speech, namely synthetic and vocoded, affects change detection rates. It was found that the filled pauses, the discourse marker and silent pauses all increase change detection rates in natural speech, however in neither synthetic nor vocoded speech did this effect appear. Rather, change detection rates decreased in both types of "unnatural" speech compared to natural speech. The natural results suggests that while each type of pause increase detection rates, the type of pause may have a further effect. The "unnatural" results suggest that it is not the full pipeline of synthetic speech that causes the degradation, but rather that something in the pre-processing, i.e. vocoding, of the speech database limits the resulting synthesis.

Keywords: change detection, filled pauses, speech synthesis

1. INTRODUCTION

Filled pauses (FPs) in naturally occurring spontaneous speech have received considerable attention and a variety of interesting phenomena have been found, such as faster reaction times [7, 8], faster word integration [3] and more accurate object identification [1].

This work explores the effect of filled pauses ('uh') in the context of "unnatural" speech, namely vocoded and synthetic speech, and compares it to the effects in natural speech. In other work we've explored the effects in various reaction time (RT) experiments [6, 14]. In these studies the same general

tendency has been found. Vocoded speech generally mirrors natural speech effects, however no effects are found in synthetic speech except a generally slower RT in response to synthetic speech compared to the other types. While the reaction time experiments provide evidence that FPs affect people's on-line processing, FPs may have other, and longer term, effects. Change Detection [13] is a paradigm in which participants are asked to listen to short paragraphs of speech and are subsequently presented with the contents of the speech in writing. It is then the task of the participant to detect if a single change has occurred in the text as compared to the speech. This requires participants to not only process the speech as they hear it, but also to memorise it long enough to detect a change at a later point. Thus change detection, as opposed to reaction time, experiments provide a measure of the memorability of the speech in a slightly longer term context.

The basic effect reported by Collard [2] (Chapters 6 & 7), is that the presence of an FP prior to the changing word, as compared to fluent speech, increases the change detection rate by 10-15%. Collard [2] concludes that the acoustic quality of the FP is responsible for the effect (Chapter 7.6, pp. 128). His conclusion was based on manipulating silences around the FP but [12] has shown that a simple silent pause can make the same effect appear. Effects of silence are also found in related studies [4]. We therefore extend this work by including silent pauses and a discourse marker ('like') in natural speech to see if the effect is unique to FPs. Furthermore, as we are interested in the effects of "unnatural" speech types on listeners, we also perform the experiment using vocoded and synthetic speech. Vocoding, in speech synthesis, is the step of parametrising the speech in a manner suitable for statistical machine learning. This parametrised version can be re-formed directly by the vocoder, with some loss in quality, and this is what constitutes vocoded speech. Alternatively, a statistical model of the parametrised speech can be used to generate the speech, this is the method of synthesis applied in this paper.

The working hypothesis was that a similar pattern to the RT experiments would appear, in which the effect of disfluencies is present in natural and vocoded speech, but not in synthetic. This is motivated by the results of the prior experiments, but also by the assumption that current vocoding techniques do not degrade the quality of the speech in a way that would prevent the effect from appearing. It is possible however, that a different pattern will emerge due to the differences between the two paradigms. In RT experiments we are testing people’s online monitoring and recognition of speech, whereas in change detection people are required to memorise the speech in order to detect the change at a later point. This means that even though participants may understand the speech, they may not be able to efficiently memorise it.

2. CHANGE DETECTION EXPERIMENTS

To perform the change detection experiments 43 short paragraphs, 20 critical, 20 filler and 3 practice, said by the same speaker in a spontaneous conversation were prepared. In each paragraph a target word was chosen and four alternative paragraphs were created. One where the target was preceded by an FP (‘uh’), a silent pause (SP), the discourse marker ‘like’ (DM) or by nothing (i.e. fluent speech). The original paragraph was of one of these four cases, and the alternatives were made by altering the original by splicing out the segment immediately preceding the target word and splicing in the relevant replacement. The change word was a near-synonym or semantically related to the target word (i.e. the close-change condition of [2]). For the filler sentences no change existed, however a dummy target word was still chosen in front of which either an FP, SP or DM was placed. The paragraphs potentially included other FPs, DMs and SPs than the critical one so participants could not learn to use those as cues for the change. Two of the practice sentences contained no change and one a single change.

The vocoded versions were created taking the natural paragraphs and vocoding them using STRAIGHT [11], no further modifications to the audio was made. The synthetic utterances were made using HTS [15] and a good-quality state-of-the-art HMM-based voice trained on approximately 8 hours of speech. The transcripts of the paragraphs were used for the synthesis, and versions including a FP or DM was made by inserting these as words in the token stream, whereas the SP version was made in a similar way as in the RT experiments in [6], the length of the SP was thus similar to that of the FP.




Figure 1: Detection rates per speech type. Permissive includes correct detection of change but incorrect identification. Exact does not.

2.1. Method

108 participants were recruited, 36 listened to natural speech only, 36 to vocoded and 36 to synthetic speech. Each participant only heard samples with either an FP, SP or DM such that for each type of speech and each type of pause there were 12 participants. Each participant listened to the practice sentences and then to each of the 40 paragraphs in a random order, of the 20 critical, half contained the appropriate form of pause, and the other half no pause (with 6 participants getting one set and other 6 the other set). In total this yielded 720 (36*20) critical evaluations per speech type and 240 (12*20) per condition (FP, SP or DM) within each speech style.

3. RESULTS

Due to an error in the experiment scripts 96 trials were invalid (4.4%) and were removed from the analysis. In 116 of the remaining trials (5.6%) participants correctly detected a change but incorrectly specified which change. In 16 of these the participant answered that the DM was the change which can arguably be considered correct. Therefore, two analysis were carried out - with (Exact) or without (Permissive) the exact specification of change. Notably however, the pattern of the results are identical. Please note that in the following analysis *disfluent* speech includes FPs, DMs and notably SPs, thus *fluent* speech is speech with none of these present.

A two-way ANOVA over the by-subject mean scores per condition was run. There was no overall effect of Disfluency Type (FP, DM, SP) or Disfluency Condition (Fluent or Disfluent), however a significant effect of Speech Type (Permissive: $F(2, 99)=5.917$, $p<0.005$, Exact: $F(2, 99)=10.377$, $p<0.0001$) was found and an interaction between Speech Type and Disfluency Condition for the Exact analysis ($F(2, 99)=5.180$, $p<0.01$) which was only marginal in the Permissive ($F(2, 99)=2.788$, $p=0.066$). Using Bonferroni correc-

Disfluency Condition Detection Rates




Figure 2: Detection rates divided by disfluency condition and speech type. DIS are disfluent conditions and FLU the fluent condition.

tion the effect of Speech Type is such that for the Natural Speech detection rates were significantly *higher* than Vocoded (Permissive: $t(139)=2.692$, $p<0.05$, Exact: $t(140)=4.745$, $p<0.0001$) and Synthetic (Permissive: $t(142)=3.878$, $p<0.001$, Exact: $t(139)=4.699$, $p<0.0001$), but no difference existed between Synthetic and Vocoded (Permissive: $t(138)=0.870$, $p=1$, Exact: $t(133)=0.662$, $p=1$), see Figure 1. That is, changes are generally detected better in natural speech than in synthetic (by 13.6% in the Permissive and 16.1% in the Exact case) and vocoded (by 10.9% in the Permissive and 18.6% in the Exact case).

The interaction effect (see Figure 2) was explored as it was significant in the Exact case and near significant in the Permissive. Using Bonferroni correction, there was no effect of disfluency condition in synthetic (Permissive: $t(70)=1.374$, $p=0.521$, Exact: $t(70)=0.582$, $p=1$) and vocoded speech (Permissive: $t(70)=0.355$, $p=1$, Exact: $t(70)=0.075$, $p=1$), however a significant effect was present in natural speech (Permissive: $t(70)=3.326$, $p<0.005$, Exact: $t(70)=3.307$, $p<0.005$). The presence of a disfluency did not have any effect on detection rates in synthetic and vocoded speech, however in natural they increased detection rates by 14.4% in the Permissive and 15.3% in the Exact case.

As disfluency had an effect in natural speech, individual tests for each disfluency type was run. Using Bonferroni correction a marginal effect of the FP was found in the permissive case ($t(220)=2.356$, $p=0.058$) which was significant in the exact ($t(220)=2.468$, $p=0.043$). For the DM a significant effect was found in the permissive case ($t(223)=2.736$, $p=0.020$) which was marginal in the exact ($t(223)=2.3608$, $p=0.057$). There was no effect of SP in the permissive case ($t(236)=1.739$, $p=0.250$) but a marginal effect in the exact ($t(236)=2.234$, $p=0.079$). See below discussion about this. Figures 3, 4 and 5 show individual detection rates for each disfluency type in each

speech type.

4. DISCUSSION

Disfluent speech increases change detection rates in natural speech compared to fluent speech with no disruption. However, this is not the case in vocoded or synthetic speech (Figure 2).

In natural speech the FP and DM provides the larger and more significant benefit, while the contribution of a SP is less clear-cut (Figure 5). The results are, seemingly, in line with [2] who concludes that the acoustic quality of the FP is important in providing a benefit. While Collard investigated varying the length of SPs surrounding the FP he did not evaluate SPs on their own as done here. Our SP results are, however, different from those found by [12] in a very similar experimental setting. Their results are in line with the temporal delay hypothesis of [4] that it is simply the disruption which causes the increase in change detection rates. Something which, in a strict interpretation, is not supported by our results. While the tendency was for the SP to have lower detection rates than either FP or DM it did still increase detection rates (Permissive: 9%, Exact: 15%). It may be that the difference between the SP/DM and FP results is a consequence of our many tests and as such we have lost statistical power. That the effect appears with the DM can support both the hypothesis that it is the disruption which is the cause but also the idea that the use and purpose of DMs and FPs is similar (e.g. as seen in [9]). To determine which is more likely to be true using a non-speech condition as in [4] could be considered in future studies, besides replicating the SP experiment with a focus purely on natural speech.

Current Synthesis and Vocoding techniques do not produce speech for which the change detection results observed for natural speech are replicated (Figure 4 and 3). Where FPs, DMs and SPs increase the detection rate with 11-17% in natural speech there is no discernible pattern in synthetic and vocoded speech, rather, they tend to produce the same detection rates. Not only did the natural effect not appear, for both vocoded and synthetic speech the overall detection rate dropped as compared to natural speech by 11 to 18%. This is not just an effect of increased detections in the disfluency conditions of the natural speech, but rather an overall effect of the speech type. It is notable that this inability to replicate the effect occurs in *both* synthetic and vocoded, as the initial expectation was that current vocoding techniques were good enough to replicate the effect. That they do not suggests that it is not simply a matter of the speech prosody and




Figure 3: Detection rates per disfluency type for synthetic speech. FP = filled pause. DM = discourse marker. SP = silent pause. FLU = fluent. DIS = disfluent.




Figure 4: Detection rates per disfluency type for vocoded speech. FP = filled pause. DM = discourse marker. SP = silent pause.

general naturalness being poor, but rather that there is something about the inherent speech quality of the vocoder which limits synthetic speech in this regard.

In reaction time experiments we have found that vocoded speech [6, 14] elicits the same patterns as natural speech, which is in contrast to current results. Vocoding is known to introduce a buzzy character to the speech, while we are aware of the perceived naturalness of this [10], other possible psychological effects of this buzziness are unknown. It is possible that this demonstrates one of them. To detect a change the participant must necessarily be able to commit to (short term) memory what was being said in the paragraph in order to compare with the text later. Thus if the effect of vocoding decreases participants ability to memorize the salient elements of the paragraph, it should show an overall decrease in a participant's ability to detect changes, something which is the case. This decrease is likely due to an additional strain on the participant's cognitive resources and can also explain the lack of disruption/temporal delay effect. The participant must use so many resources to simply process the incoming speech stream that any potential benefit to be had from the disruption is lost. Following [2], the effect of disfluency found in natural speech is due to heightened attention to the target word, resulting




Figure 5: Detection rates per disfluency type for natural speech. FP = filled pause. DM = discourse marker. SP = silent pause.

in better recall and notice of changes. While durational and prosodic cues may still be present after vocoding, if the participant is already straining their cognitive resources to simply understand and commit the content to memory, it is likely that these cues do not result in an attentional shift. This is, however, speculative and further experimental evidence would be needed. Experiments explicitly manipulating the cognitive strain on participants, such as dual-attention tasks, could be used in combination with a change detection paradigm using natural speech, if this alters the results for natural speech to look similar to those of vocoded and synthetic speech it would provide evidence for a cognitive strain hypothesis.

5. CONCLUSION

We have shown that disfluent speech increase change detection rates in natural speech, but that this effect is not present in either vocoded or synthetic speech. Our vocoding results are in contrast to [6, 14] where the effect appears. The SP results seemingly support [2] and could be interpreted against the temporal delay hypothesis of [4]. As our results differ from [12] we have cautioned that this may be due to our high number of tests and given suggestions for further work which may resolve these tensions, including using a non-speech condition and a dual-attention paradigm. All research data associated with this paper can be found at Edinburgh DataShare [5] (<http://hdl.handle.net/10283/808>).

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Amelie Osterrieth and Anisa Jamal for help collecting the natural speech data. This work has been partially funded by the JSTCREST uDialogue project and EPSRC Programme Grant EP/I031022/1 (Natural Speech Technology). The NST research data collection may be accessed at <http://datashare.is.ed.ac.uk/handle/10283/786>.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] Brennan, S. Feb. 2001. How Listeners Compensate for Disfluencies in Spontaneous Speech. *Journal of Memory and Language* 44(2), 274–296.
- [2] Collard, P. 2009. *Disfluency and listeners' attention: An investigation of the immediate and lasting effects of hesitations in speech*. PhD thesis University of Edinburgh.
- [3] Corley, M., Hartsuiker, R. J. 2003. Hesitation in speech can . . . um . . . help a listener understand. *Proceedings 25th meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* Boston, USA.
- [4] Corley, M., Hartsuiker, R. J. Jan. 2011. Why um helps auditory word recognition: the temporal delay hypothesis. *PloS one* 6(5), e19792.
- [5] Dall, R., Wester, M., Corley, M. Experiment materials for "disfluencies in change detection in natural, vocoded and synthetic speech.", [dataset]. University of Edinburgh, School of Informatics, Centre for Speech Technology Research, <http://dx.doi.org/10.7488/ds/274>.
- [6] Dall, R., Wester, M., Corley, M. 2014. The Effect of Filled Pauses and Speaking Rate on Speech Comprehension in Natural, Vocoded and Synthetic Speech. *Proceedings Interspeech* Singapore, Singapore.
- [7] Fox Tree, J. E. 1995. The Effects of False Starts and Repetitions on the Processing of Subsequent Words in Spontaneous Speech. *Journal of Memory and Language* 34(6), 709–738.
- [8] Fox Tree, J. E. 2001. Listeners' uses of um and uh in speech comprehension. *Memory and Cognition* 29(2), 320–326.
- [9] Fox Tree, J. E., Schrock, J. C. Feb. 1999. Discourse Markers in Spontaneous Speech: Oh What a Difference an Oh Makes. *Journal of Memory and Language* 40(2), 280–295.
- [10] Henter, G. E., Merritt, T., Shannon, M., Mayo, C., King, S. September 2014. Measuring the perceptual effects of modelling assumptions in speech synthesis using stimuli constructed from repeated natural speech. *Proceedings Interspeech* Singapore, Singapore. 1504–1508.
- [11] Kawahara, H., Masuda-Katsuse, I., de Cheveigne, A. 1999. Restructuring speech representations using a pitch-adaptive time-frequency smoothing and an instantaneous-frequency-based F0 extraction: Possible role of a repetitive structure in sounds. *Speech Communication* 27(3-4), 187–207.
- [12] Sanford, A. J. S., Molle, J. August 2006. Disfluencies and selective attention in speech processing. *Proceedings AMNLP* Turku, Finland. 183.
- [13] Sturt, P., Sanford, A. J., Stewart, A., Dawydiak, E. 2004. Linguistic focus and good-enough representations: An application of the change-detection paradigm. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 11(5), 882–88.
- [14] Wester, M., Corley, M., Dall, R. 2015. The temporal delay hypothesis: natural, vocoded and synthetic speech. *Proceedings DiSS* Edinburgh, UK.
- [15] Zen, H., Nose, T., Yamagishi, J., Sako, S., Masuko, T., Black, A. W., Tokuda, K. 2007. The HMM-based Speech Synthesis System Version 2.0. *Proceedings SSW* Bonn, Germany. 294–299.