ANNOTATION AND ANALYSIS OF OVERLAPPING SPEECH IN POLITICAL INTERVIEWS

Martine Adda-Decker, Claude Barras, Gilles Adda, Patrick Paroubek, Philippe Boula de Mareüil LIMSI-CNRS Orsay FRANCE, Benoît Habert ICAR/ENS-LSH, Lyon FRANCE



TALK OUTLINE

- Framework
- Corpus
- Overlap segmentation
- Overlap tagset and annotation
- Analysis of overlapping speech
- Overlapping speech and disfluencies
- Conclusion and discussion



FRAMEWORK

- Overlapping speech in TV political interviews
- Questions addressed:
 - How to segment and annotate overlapping speech?
 - Typology of overlapping speech in relation with its intrusive nature
 - Speaker roles in different overlap types
 - Link with disfluencies



CORPUS

- 8 one-hour French TV shows
- 1 major figure (either politician or from civil society) interviewed by 3 journalists and 1 chairman
- Fine-grained transcriptions including discourse markers and disfluencies (filled pauses, repetitions, revisions)
- Overlaps transcribed using a customised version of TRANSCRIBER http://trans.sourceforge.net/



OVERLAP SEGMENTATION

Two overlapping cases: case ①: no speaker change; case ②: speaker change.





OVERLAP SEGMENTATION

Overlap segmentation examples (cases (1) and (2)) in the customised Transcriber annotation editor





OVERLAP TAGSET AND ANNOTATION

Overlap tagset defined after an interative process:

- good inter-annotator agreement
- mutually exclusive categories

4 overlap tags:

bck *backchannel*: "hmm", the listener follows the speaker;

cmp *complementary*: the incoming speaker overlaps the main speaker but does not take the floor.

tst *turn stealing*: the incoming speaker clearly interrupts the main speaker;

att anticipated turn taking: the incoming speaker anticipates the end of the main speaker's turn;



OVERLAP TAGSET AND ANNOTATION

Examples of the different overlap types, producing case (1) (bck, cmp) and case (2) (tst, att) overlaps.

bck: backchannel					
A: it is simply <mark>/the fact/ /B: hmm/</mark> that					
cmp : <i>complementary</i>					
A: I have a last question /about/ /B: very short/ about your					
tst: turn stealing					
A: and in /this case/					
B: /I want to/ come back					
att: anticipated turn taking					
A: and this leads to humanitarian /action?/					
B: /well I/ think					



DISTRIBUTION OF SPEECH OVERLAPS PER TAG PASSIVE/ACTIVE ROLES

3-4 overlaps per minute including less than 5% of the words of the corpus

Overlap frequency (# segments per minute), word rate and mean length for passive (P) and active (A) roles, for **bck**, **cmp**, **tst** and **att**.

category		over. freq.	words %	mean length			
non intrusive overlaps							
bck	P 1.2		0.8	1.6			
	A		0.6	1.2			
att	Ρ	0.4	0.4	2.1			
	A		0.5	2.3			
intru	sive o	overlaps					
cmp	Ρ	0.7	1.1	3.4			
	Α		1.1	3.5			
tst	Ρ	1.1	1.7	3.3			
	A		1.9	3.8			



ANALYSIS OF OVERLAPPING SPEECH ATTACK/RESIST RATIO



A = active zone of the speaker; P = passive; M = mono-speaker (in words)

						interviewees	R	D
						IntPF0	-0.1	2.4
set	R	D	ioumolista	D		IntPF1	0.0	3.6
all	0.0	4.0	Journalists			IntPF2	-0.2	3.4
journalists	0.3	8.0	Journa	0.3		IntPF3	-0.6	1.0
interviewees	-0.3	2.2	Journ2	0.5	6.7	IntCF1	-0.4	2.9
Chairman	0.2	6.6	Journ3	0.1	4.3	IntCF2	-0.7	1.2
L	1	1]				IntPI1	-0.4	0.7
						IntPI2	-0.1	2.3



Disfluency rates for the different segment types

non-ov: non overlapping speech
over: overlapping speech

non-intr: non-intrusive overlaps (bck, att)
intr: intrusive overlaps (cmp, tst)





Disfluency rates for the different segment types

non-ov: non overlapping speech
over: overlapping speech

non-intr: non-intrusive overlaps (bck, att)
intr: intrusive overlaps (cmp, tst)





LREC 2008 Marrakech, 28th may 2008

Disfluency rates for the different segment types

non-ov: non overlapping speech
over: overlapping speech

non-intr: non-intrusive overlaps (bck, att)
intr: intrusive overlaps (cmp, tst)





LREC 2008 Marrakech, 28th may 2008

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

- Annotation of overlapping speech
 - annotation process which preserve the interaction structure
 - reduced tagset to simplify the annotation
 - enables the study of overlap/disfluencies/speaker role
- Overlapping speech and disfluencies
 - twice more disfluencies on overlaps
 - very high %disfluencies for passive speakers in *complementary* overlaps
 - lower %disfluencies on *backchannel* than on non-overlapping speech
- Speaker role and disfluencies
 - high %disfluencies for journalists in passive/intrusive situation



Disfluency rates for the different segment types

bck: *backchannel*; **cmp**: *complementary*; **tst**: *turn stealing*; **att**: *anticipated turn taking*





LREC 2008 Marrakech, 28th may 2008

ANNOTATORS' AGREEMENT

Overlap label distribution from 5 annotators (one show)

		anno	otator	labels	s (%)
label	count	bck	cmp	tst	att
bck	63	91.1	8.0	1.0	0.0
cmp	50	9.2	75.8	15.0	0.0
tst	107	0.4	3.6	89.2	6.8
att	26	0.0	0.0	24.0	76.0

Kappa inter-annotation agreement 0.7 - 0.8



HOMOGENEOUS SPEECH REGIONS

H-Region:

maximum length segment keeping homogeneous speaker characteristics

set	#H-regions	(%H-regions)	#words	(%words)	average length
all	4,000	(100)	83,000	(100)	20.7
mono-speaker	2,600	(65)	79,300	(95)	30.0
overlap	1,400	(35)	3,700	(5)	2.7



OVERLAPPING SPEECH DISCOURSE MARKERS AND DISFLUENCIES

DM: discourse markers; FP: filled pauses; RV: revisions; RP: repetitions

category	%	%	% disfluencies					
	DM	FP	RV	RP	All			
mono-speaker	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.5	6.9			
overlaps	Ρ	2.1	1.6	2.3	7.2	11.1		
	Α	5.9	0.5	3.0	11.0	14.5		
non-intrusive	Ρ	2.4	1.6	2.0	1.3	4.9		
	Α	7.2	0.6	0.9	5.2	6.7		
intrusive	Ρ	2.0	1.6	2.5	9.5	13.6		
	Α	5.4	0.4	3.8	13.0	17.2		



ANALYSIS OF OVERLAPPING SPEECH ATTACK/RESIST RATIO

Attack/resist ratio R					attack	c density D		
						interviewees	R	D
						Pinay	-0.1	2.4
set	R	D	ioumolista	D	D	Delors	0.0	3.6
all	0.0	4.0	Journalists	\mathbf{R}		Pasqua	-0.2	3.4
journalists	0.3	8.0	Dunamei	0.3	10.8	De Robien	-0.6	1.0
interviewees	-0.3	2.2	Colomboni	0.5	0.7	Voynet	-0.4	2.9
Chairman	0.2	6.6	Colombani	0.1	4.3	Brauman	-0.7	1.2
	1	1				Diouf	-0.4	0.7



Brittan

-0.1 2.3