Prosody and listeners' interpretation of ambiguous discourse

Joseph Tyler

(University of Michigan), jctyler@umich.edu,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Uit

Ambig

Discourse

The

Experiment

The

http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jctyler/

22nd Annual Meeting of the Society for Text and Discourse July 10-12, 2012 Montreal, Canada

Background: Speakers produce prosodic correlates of discourse structure in their speech, but less is known about how listeners use such variation in interpretation. Most work that has explored discourse prosody perception has used metalinguistic measures like naturalness judgments (Smith, 2004) or judgments about the position of a sentence in a paragraph (Lehiste, 1982). The two studies that have used linguistic measures (Mayer et al., 2006, Silverman 1987) have used discourse ambiguities that are reducible to discourse recency, e.g. whether a pronoun corefers with a recent or more distant antecedent in the discourse. The experimental results presented here test whether prosody can bias the interpretation of discourse ambiguities that are not reducible to discourse recency, but instead depend on a hierarchical representation of the discourse.



Did Sally mean that she read about housing prices and watched a cool documentary (in history class/separate from history class)?



Results

Conclusions

	MTurk12345	MTurk12	MTurk1	MTurk2	MTurk345	PsychPool12345	Rising pitch at end of S1 appears to be driving effect, biasing towards Coord
Match	t=4.415,	t=3.902,	t=2.743,	t=582,	t=222,	t=3.931,	
	p<.001	p<.001	p=.006	p=.561	p=.825	p<.001	
Coord prosody	747/693	746/646	747/693	687/825	686/778	571/389	
(Match/mismatch)							
Subord prosody	846/594	784/608	818/622	809/703	772/692	547/413	
(Match/mismatch)							

These experiments show that prosody, specifically a terminal pitch rise, can systematically bias the interpretation of ambiguous discourse. These results bring a novel kind of discourse ambiguity to work on prosodic disambiguation, an area that has largely focused on syntactic ambiguities. The generalizability of the current results to other kinds of discourse structures is the object of subsequent study.

References: Lehiste, I. (1982). Some phonetic characteristics of discourse. Studia Linguistica, 36(2), 117-130. Mayer, J., Jasinskaja, E., & Kölsch, U. (2006). Pitch Range and Pause Duration as Markers of Discourse Hierarchy: Perception Experiments Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Spoken Language Processing, Potsdam, Germany. Silverman, K. E. A. (1987). The structure and processing of fundamental frequency contours. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, U.K. Smith, C. L. (2004). Topic transitions and durational prosody in reading aloud: production and modeling. Speech Communication, 42(3-4), 247-270. doi: 10.1016/j.specom.2003.09.004