

Exploring Semi-Supervised Learning for Predicting Listener Backchannels

Vidit Jain*
vidit17370@iiitd.ac.in
IIIT-Delhi
New Delhi, India

Rajiv Ratn Shah^{†‡}
rajivrtn@iiitd.ac.in
IIIT-Delhi
New Delhi, India

Maitree Leekha*
maitreeleekha_bt2k16@dtu.ac.in
Delhi Technological University
New Delhi, India

Jainendra Shukla[†]
jainendra@iiitd.ac.in
IIIT-Delhi
New Delhi, India

ABSTRACT

Developing human-like conversational agents is a prime area in HCI research and subsumes many tasks. Predicting listener backchannels is one such actively-researched task. While many studies have used different approaches for backchannel prediction, they all have depended on manual annotations for a large dataset. This is a bottleneck impacting the scalability of development. To this end, we propose using semi-supervised techniques to automate the process of *identifying* backchannels, thereby easing the annotation process. To analyze our identification module's feasibility, we compared the backchannel *prediction* models trained on (a) manually-annotated and (b) semi-supervised labels. Quantitative analysis revealed that the proposed semi-supervised approach could attain 95% of the former's performance. Our user-study findings revealed that almost 60% of the participants found the backchannel responses predicted by the proposed model more natural. Finally, we also analyzed the impact of personality on the type of backchannel signals and validated our findings in the user-study.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Human-centered computing** → *User studies; Empirical studies in HCI*; • **Computing methodologies** → *Semi-supervised learning settings*.

KEYWORDS

Conversational Agents, Backchanneling, Multimodal analysis.

*The authors contributed equally, and wish they be regarded as joint first authors.

[†]Jainendra Shukla and Rajiv Ratn Shah are partly supported by the Infosys Center for AI and Center for Design and New Media at IIIT Delhi.

[‡]Rajiv Ratn Shah is also partly supported by the ECRA Grant (ECR/2018/002776) by SERB, Government of India.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](https://permissions.acm.org).

CHI '21, May 8–13, 2021, Yokohama, Japan

© 2021 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-8096-6/21/05...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445449>

ACM Reference Format:

Vidit Jain, Maitree Leekha, Rajiv Ratn Shah, and Jainendra Shukla. 2021. Exploring Semi-Supervised Learning for Predicting Listener Backchannels. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '21)*, May 8–13, 2021, Yokohama, Japan. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445449>

1 INTRODUCTION & RELATION TO PRIOR WORK

Human conversations, even the most casual ones, have a lot of complexity associated with them. Two people actively engaged in a conversation frequently respond to each other, not only with respect to the content of the conversation, but also to behavioral aspects, such as facial expressions and prosody. Developing Embodied Conversational Agents (ECAs) [9] and spoken dialogue systems capable of incorporating these complex elements to converse naturally is a challenging task and has been a constant focus of the Artificial Intelligence and Human Computer Interaction research communities. Of these complex conversational constructs, dyadic components like listener backchannels are among the most crucial for modeling virtual humans and are also the main focus of this study¹.

In a peer-to-peer conversation, a backchannel occurs when one of the participants is speaking, and the other (the listener) interjects a short response to the former [41]. These responses do not interrupt the flow of the conversation; rather, they convey the listener's state-of-mind about the speaker's dialog. They also reflect cooperation and understanding between the two parties [17]. Backchannels can be verbal, non-verbal (visual) or both. Vocalisations like 'hmm' or 'uh-huh', gestures such as head nods or head shakes, and a combination of verbal and non-verbal responses are common examples of backchannels.

In the past few years, the research community has shown a keen interest in modeling the listener's backchanneling behavior. A large number of such studies on backchannel prediction have focused on the use of rule-based classifiers. Ward [38], Truong *et al.* [36], Ward and Tsukahara [39] utilized different acoustic features of the speaker such as pitch, pausal information, etc. to predict backchannel opportunities. A recent study by Park *et al.* [29] on backchannel

¹A teaser video demonstrating our work can be found in the video figure section of the submission. It illustrates a virtual listener that emits backchannels to the speaker's context using the models proposed with this work.

prediction for children also used similar prosodic features and hand-crafted rules. Expanding the feature set, Moubayed *et al.* [1] used both visual and prosodic speaker features.

Transitioning towards data-driven automatic prediction from hand-crafted rules, Solorio *et al.* [34] used prosodic features with locally weighted linear regression to predict backchannel opportunities. Morency *et al.* [27] used multimodal (visual and acoustic) speaker features and a hidden markov model to predict backchannels. More recently, many researchers also used deep learning techniques for predicting backchannels. Ruede *et al.* [32] used Long short-term memory (LSTM) based model with acoustic features. Hara *et al.* [16] also used LSTMs to predict turn-taking, filler words, and backchannels in a multitask learning paradigm. In a recent study, Goswami *et al.* [15] used state of the art machine learning and deep learning-based time-series classification techniques to model backchannel opportunities in children with multimodal features. Inspired by prior work, we too explore the use of machine learning and deep learning based time series models and include several similar multimodal features in our analysis.

All these studies, although well-founded, have the following limitations:

- (1) Most of them have focused only on the backchannel opportunity prediction task, with a very few involving the next step of the problem *i.e.*, predicting the type of backchanneling signals.
- (2) All studies in the literature have relied on data with annotated backchannel instances during their modeling phase, where they develop a backchannel predictor using the speaker context. For instance, the datasets used by prior works, including the Switchboard Dialog Act Corpus (SwDA) [23], Iraqi Arabic [40], P2PStory [33], data collected by Morency *et al.* [27], and many others, had to be manually annotated for listener backchannels by multiple coders. This annotation process can be extremely time-consuming, depending on the amount of data present. Furthermore, this approach also does not scale well when trying to expand the scope of development by collecting more data. For instance, in many studies, including the ones cited above, the datasets used cover a relatively small population size. The size of the dataset used is primarily constrained by the amount of time it will take to annotate it, which further impacts the generalizability of the study. Similar challenges are faced when considering conversations from low-resource languages, which may be harder to annotate by virtue of their limited resources. This is one of the major issues we address in the present study *i.e.*, can we automate the process of identifying when and how the listener backchannels from the data, thereby easing the annotation process?

Our novel contributions include:

- (1) Use of self-training based semi-supervision for labeling the instances in a dataset for the presence or absence of listener backchannels, and therefore, exploring computational techniques to guide the development of conversational agents. This *identification* model partly replaces the human annotator, and therefore uses the listener’s multimodal features

to detect his/her backchannel responses. In addition to identifying backchannel opportunities, this step also identifies the type of signals (verbal, visual or both) associated with the backchannels. To analyze the feasibility of automating the labeling process via semi-supervision, we compare the backchannel *prediction* models trained on the labels assigned by the semi-supervised identification process, with the models trained on the ground truth labels (from the annotators).

- (2) Inspired by Bevacqua *et al.*’s work [4] on personality contingent listener backchannels, we statistically analyzed how people with varying personalities emit different types of backchannel responses. In particular, we study the impact of the extraversion trait of a subject on their preference of modality [5] for their backchannel response.
- (3) Finally, unlike most prior works, in addition to predicting the backchannel opportunities, we also predict the signal for the listener agent. The signal prediction task itself is way more challenging than the opportunity prediction task as the signals may vary significantly from person to person. We approach this task by first predicting the type of signal to emit (visual, verbal, or both). Then, based on our findings in (2) and depending on what personality we want our virtual listener to embody, we select the exact signal combination for it to express.

With this work, unlike most of the past studies that have focused on English datasets, we are also amongst the first to use peer-to-peer conversations in Hindi, which is a low-resource language, for listener backchannels². In particular, we use the conversational dataset collected by Khan *et al.* [24], and annotate it for analyzing backchannels. Our quantitative and subjective evaluations reveal that:

- (i) By leveraging semi-supervision for identification of listener backchannels, we were able to detect the presence of backchannels ~ 90% of the times, and the type of signals associated ~ 85% of the times, with only a small subset (25%) of labeled data.
- (ii) Comparing the prediction models trained on the labels generated by the identification models, with those trained on manually-annotated labels: the former setting is able to reach ~ 93% of the latter’s performance in case of opportunity prediction, and ~ 96% for signal category prediction. Note that the cost performance is significantly less for the former as it needs only a small amount of labeled data, thereby substantially reducing the efforts required in annotating the data.
- (iii) Subjective analysis in the form of a user study with twenty seven participants supported our quantitative observations. Approximately 75% of the subjects found the backchannels produced by our proposed model more or equally natural to the responses by the model trained on annotated labels. The participants also confirmed our observations of personality impacting the preference of modality for backchannel responses.

²However, this does not entail that the techniques we propose cannot be used for datasets from other languages

The rest of this paper has been organized as follows: Section 2 discusses the dataset used in this work, the annotation process, and the initial data analysis. In Section 3, we formally describe the problem statements for the identification and prediction tasks and discuss how we model them. Additionally, this section also briefly discusses the features used for modeling these tasks. Section 4 begins by detailing the complete experimental setup and follows with a quantitative evaluation of all the tasks. The section also discusses the observations of a user study, performed to analyze the efficacy of our models in real-time. Finally, we conclude the paper with Section 6, which discusses the future scope of this work.

2 DATASET

In this work, we use *Vyaktiv*, a peer-to-peer Hindi conversations dataset, curated by Khan *et al.* [24]. The dataset provides audio and video recordings of participants involved in a dyadic conversation. There are a total of 25 conversations (50 individual recordings) with each one lasting 16 minutes and 6 seconds on an average. A total of 38 subjects (24 Male, 14 Female) were a part of the dataset. It also provides the Big Five personality traits [10] for all the subjects. Note that, to the best of our knowledge, no work has used Hindi conversations so far for analysing listener backchannels.

2.1 Annotating Listener Backchannels

The audio and visual feeds for the individual speakers were annotated for verbal and visual activity based backchannels. Specifically, three annotators used the ELAN annotation software [8] with a custom tier template to mark the onset and offset time for different backchannel signals including- *nod*, *head-shake*, *mouth*, *eyebrow*, and *short-utterance* (Table 1). The overall agreement amongst the annotators with respect to the presence of backchannels (*i.e.*, if any backchannel activity was present in a particular time range) was near perfect with a Fleiss’ κ of 0.86. For the individual signals (κ): substantial agreement was observed for *nod* (0.71), *head-shake* (0.64), and *mouth* (0.63), and moderate agreement in case of *eyebrow* (0.45) and *short-utterance* (0.49). Similar values were also reported by other dataset annotators, like [1, 33]. A primary reason for relatively low values of annotator agreement in such datasets is the subjective nature of backchannels.

A consensus strategy was adopted to combine the three sets of annotations from different coders. In particular, we assigned a positive label to an instance, provided at least two annotators agreed upon the existence of backchannel activity during that time frame. The feedback signals associated with these backchannel instances (like a nod, smile, etc.) were also decided in a similar fashion using consensus voting, where a particular feedback signal is included in the final annotation if at least two annotators observed that signal’s presence. Figure 1 depicts this strategy using an example where two annotators agree upon the existence of backchannel activity.

Note that the onset and offset times annotated by the three coders were bound to have slight variation even for the same instance. Therefore, to resolve this issue while combining the annotations, any two instances from different annotation sets (labeled by different coders) whose onset and offset time were less than 1 second apart, were considered to point to the same instance. The final




Figure 1: Sample depicting the consensus strategy adopted for combining the annotations from different coders.

| BC Signal | Labels (Default) | N | Mean Freq. | Mean Dur. (s) |
|------------|---|------|------------|---------------|
| Nod | <i>none</i> , nod | 2037 | 42.4 | 1.7 |
| Head-shake | <i>none</i> , head-shake | 207 | 4.3 | 1.7 |
| Mouth | <i>neutral</i> , smile/laugh, frown | 227 | 4.7 | 1.8 |
| Eyebrow | <i>neutral</i> , raise, frown | 27 | 0.6 | 2.1 |
| Utterance | <i>none</i> , short-utterance (eg: “ohh”, “okay”) | 1161 | 24.2 | 1.4 |

Table 1: Backchannel Signals and their Descriptive Statistics. (after taking consensus) N represents the total number of a particular feedback signal observed across the complete dataset. Mean Freq. is the average number of times a participant emits a particular signal during a conversation. Mean Dur. is the average duration of the signals in seconds (s).

value for the onset and offset time was taken as the average of the timestamps by different annotators.

2.2 Data Analysis

A total of 2781 backchannel instances were observed across all the participants in the dataset. In Table 1, we present a descriptive analysis for these instances in terms of the type of feedback signals. In particular, we record the total number (N), average frequency per participant (Mean Freq.), and the average duration (Mean Dur.) for each signal type. Note that a backchannel instance could have multiple feedback signals (eg., nod, and smile), and therefore, has been included in each of the possible signal categories. Observations from the analysis reflect how all the participants frequently used nods and short utterances. On the other hand, backchanneling via head-shakes, mouth, and eyebrow movements was not common. In particular, instances of backchanneling through eyebrow movements were scarce in the dataset (only 27), and therefore, we refrained from considering them in our predictive analysis. Furthermore, the average duration for all these backchanneling signals was around 1.8 seconds.

With Figure 2(i), we aim to dig deeper by assessing the signals that co-occur frequently. In this study, we refer to a backchannel instance as *multimodal* if it has multiple associated signals; else, it is a *unimodal* instance. Note how unimodal nods and utterances




Figure 3: Methodology: (i) Semi-supervised learning for identifying backchannels and type of signals emitted using a subset of labeled data. (ii) Learning to predict these instances and signals using the speaker’s context.

$$\mathcal{F}_{sig}(L_{ij}) \mapsto \mathcal{BS}_{ij} \quad (2)$$

It is important to note that both the identification tasks make use of only the listener’s features. This is a crucial distinction from the prediction module. The identification module identifies backchannel opportunities and signals much like a human annotator, by paying attention to the listener. On the other hand, as expected, the prediction module would use only the speaker’s contextual features to predict these backchannels.

Modelling: Semi-Supervised Learning. Annotating large datasets is a tedious task, and researchers have long been exploring ways to ease out and automate this manual process [2, 6, 19, 31]. Even in the context of the present study, the annotation process took around 90 hours⁴, where the three annotators viewed and labeled all the conversations. This indeed is a bottleneck! To the best of our knowledge, this challenge in developing ECAs, specifically for modeling the backchannel behavior of an active listener, is an open research gap that has not been investigated by prior literature. The identification module of our workflow is a step towards tackling this challenge.

Several AI techniques based on Semi-Supervision [14, 21] and Weak-Supervision [11, 26] have been utilized to decrease the annotation costs in different application domains. Here we explore self-training based semi-supervised learning paradigm [37] for identifying listener backchannel instances and the signals associated with them, using only a small subset of the manually annotated data. The following steps summarise the general approach to self-training based semi-supervision adopted here (Figure 3):

- (1) We start with the labeled portion of the dataset (\mathcal{L}) to train an initial classifier (C) that learns to identify the backchannel

instances and the signals associated based on the listener’s features.

- (2) C is then used to predict the labels for the unlabeled data (\mathcal{U}).
- (3) Of these predictions, the instances which meet a specific *selection criterion* are removed from \mathcal{U} and added, along with their predicted pseudo labels, to the training set. This updated training set comprising the initially labeled (\mathcal{L}) and the newly added pseudo labeled instances are used to train the classifier C again.
- (4) The cycle continues until no new instance matches the selection criteria.

In the present study, we have the labels for the complete dataset (\mathcal{D}). Therefore, in our context, \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{U} are disjoint subsets of \mathcal{D} ⁵. Furthermore, as selection criteria for Step-3, we use a high threshold value of 0.90 on the predicted class probability. Note that after Step-4, we use the trained classifier C to predict the pseudo labels for all the remaining instances from \mathcal{U} . Our experiments revealed that such instances were very few in number.

3.2 Backchannel Opportunity and Signal Prediction

The formal definition for the backchannel opportunity prediction task is similar to the one proposed in prior literature [15]. Consider a time window T_{ij} , and let S_{ij} be the speaker’s visual and acoustic features for that period. The backchannel opportunity prediction task entails predicting whether the listener would backchannel after T_{ij} (i.e., the label \mathcal{BO}_{ij+}) using only the speaker’s features (context). Similarly, the signal prediction task aims to predict the type of feedback signal (visual, verbal, or both) (i.e., \mathcal{BS}_{ij+}) that will be emitted by the listener using the speaker’s context. The following function mappings represent these tasks:

⁴30 hours each annotator, taking the average time to annotate one side of a conversation as 35 minutes. The total amount of recorded content being ~ 13.5 hours long.

⁵This notion becomes more apparent as we discuss the experimental setup in Section 3.4

$$\mathcal{G}_{bc}(S_{ij}) \mapsto \mathcal{BO}_{ij+} \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{sig}(S_{ij}) \mapsto \mathcal{BS}_{ij+} \quad (4)$$

Inspired by literature [15, 28] we extract a 3 second context window before each instance in our dataset and use the speaker’s visual and acoustic features for that time frame to predict listener backchannels.

The prediction tasks are performed in a supervised fashion, with the labels derived from the semi-supervision based identification module. Since the identification module used the listener’s channel (features), the prediction module is essentially learning based on cross-channel semi-supervised labels.

3.3 Feature Extraction

This section elucidates all the features extracted from the dataset for modeling the identification and prediction tasks. Table 2 summarises these visual and prosodic features. In particular, inspired by prior work [15, 22] we use OpenFace [3] to extract- 18 facial action units (FAUs), velocity and acceleration of gaze, translational and rotational head velocities and accelerations, blink rate, pupil location, and smile ratio. Additionally, we also find the gaze state as a categorical variable, taking up three values- left, right, or blinking⁶. These features from the listener’s channel are used for backchannel opportunity, and signal **identification** tasks and the **prediction** tasks utilize the corresponding features from the speaker’s channel.

As prosodic features, in addition to the voice activity (discussed in Section 2.3), we also extract the fundamental frequency (F_0), the energy, and the first 13 Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCC) using the pyAudioAnalysis library [13]. All of them are used for the identification as well as the prediction tasks.

3.4 Experimental Setup

We now discuss the experimental settings for our work. Since each task can be analyzed and evaluated based on several dimensions, such as the type of features used (multimodal vs. unimodal), and the amount of initial ‘labeled’ data in semi-supervision (\mathcal{L}), we could theoretically have had a combinatorial number of settings corresponding to all pairs of values for these variables. However, we follow a more structured pattern to limit the number of settings and draw focus on the most crucial elements.

3.4.1 Backchannel Opportunity and Signal Identification. Separate models were trained for backchannel opportunity and signal identification tasks. We tried several different machine learning algorithms for training the classifier C in a semi-supervised paradigm described in Section 3.1. Specifically, we experimented with Random Forests (RF), Support Vector Machine Classifier (SVC), K-Nearest Neighbour Classifier (KNN), AdaBoost (ADA), and ResNet (ResNet). ResNet is the state-of-the-art deep learning model for time series classification [12]. Additionally, we also experimented with the widely used Label Spreading algorithm (LSpread, implemented as

⁶The following GitHub repository was used for the same: <https://github.com/antoinelame/GazeTracking>

| Features | Description |
|--------------------------|---|
| Visual Features | |
| FAUs | Regressive values of 18 Facial Action Units: AU01_r, AU02_r, AU04_r, AU05_r, AU06_r, AU07_r, AU09_r, AU10_r, AU12_r, AU14_r, AU15_r, AU17_r, AU20_r, AU23_r, AU25_r, AU26_r, AU28_r, AU45_r |
| gaze_vel, gaze_acc | Velocity and acceleration of eye gaze |
| gaze_state | Categorical feature signifying the direction of gaze as- left, right, blinking |
| head_vel_T, head_acc_T | Translational velocity and acceleration of head |
| head_vel_R, head_acc_R | Rotational velocity and acceleration of head |
| blink_rate | First order differential of Eye Aspect Ratio |
| pupil | Location of the pupils. |
| smile_ratio | Stretch of the smile calculated as the ratio of two characteristic dimensions of the mouth [1] |
| Prosodic Features | |
| F_0 | The fundamental frequency of the speech signal |
| energy | The sum of squares of the signal values, normalized by the respective frame length |
| mfcc | Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients 1-13 |
| voice_activity | Binary state characterizing whether the person is speaking or not, based on acoustic signals. |

Table 2: Visual and vocal prosodic features used in the study.

a part of the scikit-learn python library [30]) for semi-supervised learning as a baseline. All but for the ResNet model were trained using the mean and standard deviation aggregates of the time series based listener features. ResNet was trained using the detailed time series features for the complete time window. Finally, for the proportion (x) of the dataset \mathcal{D} taken as the initial ‘labeled’ data (\mathcal{L}) for training C , we experimented with all values in the range (5%, 100%) with a step size of 5%. Although semi-supervision is applicable only when the amount of unlabelled data exceeds the labeled, experimenting with the whole range helps in the analyzing the models’ sensitivity, *i.e.*, how the performance changes when we approach the fully supervised setting (by increasing x).

Manifold evaluation for the identification tasks can be easily understood from Figure 4. First, we randomly create 5 folds from the data (\mathcal{D}). Four of these folds are used for training C via semi-supervision; *i.e.*, a random $x\%$ sample of the data from these four folds serve as the initial ‘labeled’ set (\mathcal{L}), while the rest is termed as ‘unlabelled’ (\mathcal{U}). Once the model has been trained, it is evaluated on the 5th fold, *i.e.*, the pseudo labels produced by the identification models are compared against the ground truth labels. To ensure that our models do not over-fit to a particular random split, we run 10 simulations of training and evaluation for each pair of values of C and x , and report the average results across all the simulations⁷. As evaluation metrics, we use the weighted average precision, recall, F1-score, and overall accuracy, for both the opportunity and signal identification tasks.

⁷The results for each simulation were taken as the average of all 5 folds.




Figure 4: 5-Fold evaluation of semi-supervised models for backchannel opportunity and signal identification.




Figure 5: Multimodal RNN Fusion based architecture for backchannel opportunity prediction model.

3.4.2 Backchannel Opportunity and Signal Prediction. We begin evaluating the prediction experiments by first analyzing the impact of using different sets of features *i.e.*, unimodal vs. multimodal features. This is done by using the supervised (manually annotated) labels for both training and evaluation. Inspired by Tavabi *et al.* [35], we use a multimodal RNN fusion-based architecture for backchannel opportunity prediction, shown in Figure 5. In essence, the time-series features for video and audio modalities are first individually passed through LSTM encoders. Following this, the encoders’ outputs are concatenated and again passed through a recurrent layer, enabling the model to learn the temporal dependencies between modalities. The latent representation from this fusion layer is finally passed to a softmax layer through a fully-connected layer to predict feedback opportunities. The two unimodal models simply include a softmax layer after the encoder to output predictions.

The signal prediction task was more complex, as the labels for the task also suffered from a serious class imbalance (*visual*: 1593, *verbal*: 326, *both*: 835) which was adversely impacting the predictive performance of the models⁸. Therefore, we use the mean and standard deviation aggregates of the time series based speaker context features, along with SVM-SMOTE [7] to handle this imbalance⁹. Note that signal prediction was made using only the feature set (unimodal/multimodal) that performed the best for the opportunity prediction task. Using the upsampled data¹⁰, we tried several

⁸Note that though the same data was also used for the signal identification task, the imbalance did not cause a degradation in the performance there.

⁹SMOTE takes data of the shape ($n_samples, n_features$) as input, and therefore, time-series data had to be aggregated. This also eliminated the utility of models like ResNet for the task.

¹⁰Only the training set was upsampled *i.e.*, the test set remained as is.

models for signal prediction, including Random Forests (RF), Support Vector Machine Classifier (SVC), AdaBoost (ADA), K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), and a Multi-Layered Perceptron model (MLP)¹¹.

The next set of experiments analyze the feasibility and the performance to cost trade-off when adopting semi-supervision to label the dataset. For this, we compare the prediction tasks in two paradigms:

- (1) A complete supervised setting, using true labels provided by the annotators during the training and evaluation phases. Note that previous evaluations of the prediction tasks already produced the results for this setting.
- (2) The proposed setting using labels generated by the semi-supervised identification modules for training, while evaluating on the true labels. For this, we use only the best feature set (unimodal/multimodal) found via the previous evaluations, along with the pseudo labels produced by the best-found pair of C and x from the identification tasks.

With these two paradigms, we assessed how far semi-supervised backchannel identification fetches in comparison to human annotations for the downstream prediction tasks.

For evaluating the backchannel prediction models, several recent works have used the leave-one-subject-out approach [22]. In the present study, we use a slightly modified version of this technique to evaluate our prediction models in different paradigms. Instead of having the data from each subject comprise a test fold, we divide the subjects into 6 groups, and data from each of these groups form a test fold, *i.e.*, leave-one-group-out. This modification was primarily done because some subjects had very few backchannel instances in their conversations. Combining instances from multiple subjects to form a test set helped in better analyzing the model predictions and keeping the number of folds tractable. As metrics for the backchannel opportunity prediction task, we report the positive class’ precision, recall, and F1-score, as well as the overall accuracy. For signal prediction, we report the weighted average precision, recall, and F1-score, the overall accuracy, and the confusion matrices.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Identification Tasks

In Figure 6, we have the sensitivity analysis in terms of accuracy of all the models we tried for the backchannel opportunity and signal identification tasks. Each curve in these plots represents how the performance of a particular classifier (C) for the identification task changes as we increase the amount of initial labeled data available (x) for semi-supervision. Using this information, we looked for the best possible pair of values for C and x . However, in addition to achieving high performance, we also wanted to limit x . For this, we manually found the *elbow* point for the best performing classifier in each task. The elbow value for x is one where decreasing it further would cause a drastic drop in performance, while increasing it would not change the performance significantly. Ideally, we also wanted x to be less than 50%, where we could have more unlabelled than labeled data for semi-supervision, thereby improving the annotation cost trade-off.

¹¹Please refer the supplementary material for details on the hyper-parameters used for all the different models in the identification and prediction tasks




Figure 6: Sensitivity Analysis using accuracy as the metric for semi-supervised backchannel opportunity and signal identification models. The shaded portion represents standard deviation.

| Model | Opportunity Identification | | | | Signal Identification | | | |
|---------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Precision | Recall | F1-score | Accuracy | Precision | Recall | F1-score | Accuracy |
| LSpread | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.67 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 0.65 |
| SVC | 0.56 | 0.52 | 0.56 | 0.54 | 0.69 | 0.70 | 0.68 | 0.71 |
| KNN | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.67 | 0.62 | 0.67 |
| ADA | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.69 | 0.75 |
| RF | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.86 | 0.85 |
| ResNet | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.90 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.83 | 0.83 |

Table 3: Backchannel opportunity and signal identification: Detailed results for $x = 25\%$.

Figure 6 (i) shows how ResNet outperforms all the other models in terms of the listener backchannel opportunity identification task. Observe how increasing x beyond 25% does not change the performance a lot. It also meets all the other criteria we discussed above. Therefore, we choose $x = 25\%$ as the final seed value (used to initialize the amount of labeled data) for the opportunity identification task. For the signal identification task (Figure 6 (ii)), we observe that ResNet and Random Forests both have somewhat overlapping accuracy for different values of x . However, by taking a closer look, we analyze that for values of $x < 30\%$, Random Forests lead ResNet. The elbow point for Random Forests is at 25%, while that for ResNet (with a similar accuracy value) is observed at 35%. Therefore, for the signal identification task, our final choice is Random Forests with $x = 25\%$. The detailed results obtained for other classifiers with x set to 25% for both the opportunity and signal identification tasks are shown in Table 3.

4.2 Prediction Tasks

We begin discussing the prediction models with Table 4, which records the results of our backchannel opportunity prediction task performed using the annotated labels for training, while experimenting with different subsets of input features. The unimodal-audio model, with positive class F1 of 0.74 and overall accuracy of 0.70, outperforms the unimodal-video model, with the corresponding metric values of 0.71 and 0.66, respectively. The multimodal model utilizing both the video and audio features beats the audio model by a small margin, attaining an F1 of 0.75 and 0.72 accuracy.

| Feature set | Precision | Recall | F1-score | Accuracy |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Video | 0.61 | 0.86 | 0.71 | 0.66 |
| Audio | 0.64 | 0.90 | 0.74 | 0.70 |
| Video + Audio | 0.66 | 0.89 | 0.75 | 0.72 |

Table 4: Backchannel opportunity prediction model trained across different sets of features using supervised (manually-annotated) labels for training. Overall, the multimodal feature set performed the best.

| Labels used | Precision | Recall | F1-score | Accuracy |
|-----------------|-----------|--------|----------|----------|
| Supervised | 0.66 | 0.89 | 0.75 | 0.72 |
| Semi-Supervised | 0.62 | 0.82 | 0.70 | 0.66 |

Table 5: Backchannel opportunity prediction: comparison of model trained using supervised manually-annotated labels with the one using labels generated by the identification module.

| Model | Supervised Labels | | | | Semi-Supervised Labels | | | |
|-------|-------------------|--------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------|-------------|-------------|
| | Precision | Recall | F1-score | Accuracy | Precision | Recall | F1-score | Accuracy |
| SVC | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| KNN | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.71 | 0.72 |
| ADA | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 |
| RF | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| MLP | 0.80 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.87 | 0.75 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.84 |

Table 6: Backchannel signal prediction: comparison of models trained using supervised (manually-annotated) labels, and those using labels generated by the semi-supervised signal identification Random Forest model (with 25% initial labeled data).

| | | PREDICTED | | | | | PREDICTED | | |
|------|----|-----------|------|------|------|----|-----------|------|------|
| | | C1 | C2 | C3 | | | C1 | C2 | C3 |
| TRUE | C1 | 0.71 | 0.07 | 0.23 | TRUE | C1 | 0.70 | 0.09 | 0.21 |
| | C2 | 0.07 | 0.87 | 0.06 | | C2 | 0.08 | 0.80 | 0.12 |
| | C3 | 0.27 | 0.05 | 0.67 | | C3 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.72 |

Table 7: Confusion matrices for the best backchannel signal prediction model (i) trained on manually-annotated labels, (ii) trained using labels generated by the signal identification models. Here, C1, C2, C3 refer to the ‘visual’, ‘verbal’, and ‘both’ class labels, respectively.

Since this set has overall the best performance for the baseline opportunity prediction task with supervised labels, we use the same to train and analyze models for subsequent tasks as well.

Continuing with opportunity prediction, we now discuss the results obtained using the semi-supervised labels generated by the opportunity identification model for training (the evaluation/test set used the same supervised labels). Table 5 records these results. Evidently, with the labels generated using just 25% of the annotated data (in the identification step), we are able to achieve nearly 93% of the supervised F1 and 92% of the supervised accuracy scores on the opportunity prediction tasks. The values of these metrics observed here are 0.70 and 0.66, respectively.

Moving on to backchannel signal prediction for determining the category of signals for the listener to emit, Table 6 shows the results obtained for all the models trained in different settings. When using the manually-annotated labels for training, we observe that the MLP model has the best accuracy of 0.87, however in terms of the F1-Score, the ADA model outperforms all the others. Given the data imbalance in the signal prediction task, we use F1-score as the deciding metric, and choose ADA as the best performing model, with an F1-score of 0.81. We observe a similar performance trend when using the semi-supervised signal identification model to generate the training labels. Here as well, ADA is the best performing model in terms of F1-score, with a value of 0.78, which is 96% of the corresponding metric for the supervised setting. In Table 7, we report the confusion matrices for the best (ADA) signal prediction models found for the two settings. We used the worst-case confusion matrix [25] computed using all the matrices generated across manifold evaluation of the model. The performance for the ‘visual’ (C1) class remained almost unchanged in the two settings. The false positives between the ‘visual’ and the ‘both’ (C3) classes reduced when using semi-supervised labels. The ‘verbal’ (C2) class performance dropped slightly. On the other hand, we performed better for the class C3, but that came at the cost of a slight increase in the false positives from C2. Overall, the performance of the model trained using semi-supervised labels was indeed comparable with the one trained on manually-annotated labels.

4.3 Subjective Evaluation: User Case Study

For problems like predicting listener backchannels, quantitative evaluations based on different metrics may not be sufficient to analyze the models’ efficacy. For such cases, qualitative assessments become extremely important. Many prior studies have used ECAs or robots to deploy their models and assess the backchannel predictions. However, in the present study, we follow a slightly different approach, which is partly inspired by [15] and [28]. Specifically, using Apple’s Memoji feature, we created two virtual avatars- Arjun (introvert) and Karan¹² (extrovert). We used the same Memoji technology to record (as short clips) the neutral state and different combinations of backchannel signals, mentioned in Table 8, for each of them. Furthermore, we prepared a short video compilation (nearly 4 minutes long) of a few speakers from the dataset used in this work. Using our prediction models¹³, along with a personality contingent signal combination sampling technique, we recorded the backchanneling responses that Arjun and Karan would emit for the speakers in the compilation. Although the sampling is not the main focus of this work, we briefly describe below the steps followed for re-use by future works:

- After getting the predictions for backchannel opportunity, and the signal category from our models, we use inverse transform sampling to decide whether to emit unimodal or multimodal signals (in case of visual and verbal categories only) based on the personality being modeled (extrovert or

| | Unimodal | Multimodal |
|--------|---|--|
| Visual | nod (0.83), head-shake (0.08), smile (0.09) | nod + smile (0.60), head-shake + smile (0.40) |
| Verbal | utter: top short utterances like <i>okay</i> , <i>hmm</i> , <i>haan</i> (yes), etc., were probabilistically sampled | nod+utter (0.80), smile+utter (0.13), head-shake+utter (0.05), head-shake+utter+smile (0.01), nod+utter+smile (0.01) |
| Both | - | |

Table 8: Signal combinations from different categories used in the present study. The corresponding normalized probabilities inferred from the data and used while sampling the signal combinations are also shown.

introvert). Note that the probabilities used here are calculated from the data and are mentioned in Section 2.2.

- Now, we choose the exact signals to emit from Table 8 using inverse transform sampling, where the probabilities for each signal combination are calculated from the data¹⁴.

We recorded six response videos, three for each Arjun and Karan, using the following different prediction policies:

- (1) Random Prediction Model (**Random** policy): A baseline model that predicted backchannel opportunities and the signal categories at **random**.
- (2) Supervised Model (**MA** policy): The best opportunity (multimodal) and signal category (**ADA**) prediction models trained on the manually-annotated labels.
- (3) Semi-supervised Model (**SSL** policy): The opportunity (multimodal) and signal category (**ADA**) prediction models trained with the labels generated from the semi-supervised identification models (**ResNet** and **RF**, respectively with 25% data) used in this work.

With these short clips recording the backchannel responses as predicted by different models for Arjun and Karan, we wanted to test the following three hypotheses:

- [H1]: As perceived by a human watching the response videos, the backchannels predicted by our models look more natural, and therefore, better than those predicted by the random policy model.
- [H2]: From a user’s perspective, there is no significant difference in the quality of backchannel responses emitted by models in the settings 2 and 3 above, *i.e.*, using semi-supervised learning with a small subset of labelled data does not impact the quality of backchannel responses generated by the final prediction models.
- [H3]: Finally, to assess the extent to which backchannel responses depend on personality, and the utility of using such personality contingent signal sampling: A human can judge the extraversion personality trait for Arjun and Karan based on their response videos.

Twenty seven students were recruited as participants from a university’s mailing list. They were all native Hindi speakers. As an introduction, the participants were acquainted with the concept

¹²The names used are hypothetical, and do not compromise anonymity.

¹³Backchannel opportunity prediction was done at an interval of 3 seconds. Depending on the output, the signal categories were predicted. We also ensured that the models used for different speakers in the compilation were the ones where the speaker belonged to the test set.

¹⁴The only step that is contingent on personality is deciding on the unimodal vs. multimodal signals. The second step of signal sampling uses common probabilities for both characters.




Figure 7: Stills from two of our user study videos- (i) Karan, and (ii) Arjun




Figure 8: Box & Whisker plot for the Likert scale ratings (where 1 is *very poor* and 5 is *very good*) given by the participants to each of the three policies, based on (i) placement & frequency, and (ii) signal type selection.

of listener backchannels. They were instructed to watch all six response videos and carefully observe the virtual listeners' backchannel responses in each one. It was a blind study, *i.e.* the participants knew neither about the prediction policies nor about the listeners' personality traits in the videos.

Furthermore, to ensure that the appearance of the two avatars did not bias the participants' judgement, we switched the avatars (with everything else as is) for half the participants. In other words, for half of the participants, Arjun acted as an extrovert, and vice versa. With this, we will be able to analyze whether backchannels indeed depend on the extraversion personality trait.

After watching all the videos, the participants were presented with a questionnaire meant to test the three hypotheses mentioned above. In particular, we asked the participants to

- Rank the three policies in order based on the quality of backchannels, taking into consideration factors like the placement, frequency, and selection of backchannel signals.
- Rate each one on a Likert scale based on the above parameters.
- Identify the personality traits of the avatars based on the videos.

Post survey analysis of the participants' responses lead to some exciting findings which supported our hypothesis:

- (1) **Models from both the manually-annotated and semi-supervised settings performed better than random:** 95% of the participants ranked our prediction models to be better than the random prediction policy. In addition, the Likert

scale ratings suggested that our models performed *significantly* better than the random policy, both in terms of the placement & frequency, as well as the signal selection. We used the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, and the corresponding p-values are [P- placement & frequency, S- signal selection, * indicates significant difference at 95% confidence interval]:

- MA > Random: 0.0019 (P*); 0.0013 (S*)
- SSL > Random: 0.00011 (P*); 0.0001 (S*)

A box-plot for these ratings is shown in Figure 8. Notice how the boxes for MA and SSL do not overlap with Random. This also indicates that the former two certainly received better ratings than the later. This validates our first hypothesis [H1] that with a data-driven approach, we were able to emit more natural and human-like backchannels.

- (2) **Prediction models trained on semi-supervised labels produced more natural backchannels:** Comparing the ratings provided for the MA and the SSL policies, we found that in terms of the frequency and placement (P), there was no *significant* difference between the two (p-value=0.1024). For signal selection (S), the ratings suggested that SSL was significantly better than MA (p-value=0.0122). The box-plot in Figure 8 also aligns with these results. In case of Placement & Frequency, the boxes for MA and SSL overlap, with the median line for SSL slightly above MA's. This indicates that there is likely to be a difference between the two sets of ratings, even though it may not be significant (as found from the test). For Signal Selection, the boxes do not overlap at all, indicating a difference.

Furthermore, as a part of the questionnaire, we also asked the participants to compare the response videos generated by these two prediction models. Of the total, 60% of the participants found the backchannel responses emitted by the SSL model more natural than the MA model (SSL > MA), and 15% observed no perceptible difference between the two (SSL ~ MA). This also aligns with our quantitative prediction results where the proposed SSL model was able to reach ~ 95% of the latter's performance. Thus, the two models were, both qualitatively and quantitatively, very similar.

This confirms our second hypothesis [H2] with most of the participants finding the proposed model (SSL) similar (or more natural) to the MA model.

- (3) **Karan and Arjun's extraversion traits were perceptible:** 80% of the participants were able to accurately identify which of the two virtual-human characters was introvert and extrovert. This confirms our third and final hypothesis [H3] that the type of backchannel signals emitted by an individual indeed depends on their personality.

5 DISCUSSION

Relation to prior work and some interesting findings: Our quantitative and qualitative evaluations in the previous section greatly validate how semi-supervision can be extremely useful in designing human-like ECAs, by focusing on the task of listener backchannel prediction. We found that with just 25% of manually annotated data (175 minutes), we were able to train a backchannel prediction system that performed comparably well, and even better

in terms of some parameters, as the one trained using 100% data. Most of the prior works, even the most recent ones, including [15, 16, 29, 32], have depended on a large amount of annotation. We believe that this observation can significantly benefit the HCI community. Furthermore, studies have shown that backchannel responses vary greatly with culture [18, 42], and most of the prior studies have focussed primarily on the American and European population in this regard. In this work, we worked with subjects of Indian origin, and therefore, our work holds cultural significance as well.

A particularly interesting finding from Section 4.3 was that most participants found the backchannel responses generated by the **SSL** policy more ‘natural’ than the **MA** policy. We hypothesise this could be attributed to some form of label noise: After annotations, we only took those positive instances where at least two raters agreed, and the rest were discarded. Our negative samples overlapped with those instances where only 1 of the raters had annotated a positive BC. The **SSL** model could be learning to predict these backchannels. In fact, in our demo videos, we found two such instances. Starting with a small amount of seed data, the **SSL** model could have been learning these instances as well (given there are some hints of BC), which could explain the observation that even though **SSL** performed comparably with **MA** quantitatively, but seemed more natural to the participants in the subjective study.

Limitations: We would also like to highlight some limitations of our work, which can form the basis for future studies. First, we only used the participants’ visual and acoustic features and did not include the content of the conversation itself for predicting backchannels. The main reason for this was that the primary language used in the *Vyaktiv* dataset was Hindi. The English translations for the dialogues were not available, making the use of state-of-the-art NLP techniques non-trivial. In another aspect, our qualitative user case study involved a short 4-minute long compilation of speakers from the *Vyaktiv* dataset. A more rigorous analysis could follow by deploying the models and the avatars as a real time-system. Finally, we did not annotate eye blinks/gaze [20] as backchannel signals, primarily because they were not as apparent in the dataset. This could be a cultural difference as well.

Ethical Consideration: When developing data-driven systems leveraging data from human-subjects, it becomes imperative that we respect their privacy boundaries. We want to state that no Personally Identifiable Information (PII) was used while training or evaluating the system. We also complied with the agreements in the *Vyaktiv* dataset to ensure the safe use of data.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we confirmed the feasibility of using semi-supervised learning to (semi-) automate the process of identifying and labeling listener backchannel instances (both opportunities and the associated signals) from conversations. We used a Hindi peer-to-peer conversation-based multimodal dataset *Vyaktiv*, for our experiments. However, the methodology proposed in the study is general and can be adapted for other conversational datasets as well. Quantitative evaluation alongside a subjective analysis in the form of a

user study strongly validated our hypothesis that- prediction models trained using semi-supervised labels performed comparably with those using manually annotated labels. Furthermore, we statistically and qualitatively confirmed that the type of backchannel signals emitted are intimately linked to an individual’s personality (extraversion in particular).

Future work directions include validating the scope of semi-supervised learning for listener backchannel prediction on other datasets. Other parallel tasks, like listener disengagement prediction, can also be similarly performed. Methodologically, future studies could explore by devising heuristics and using weak supervision based techniques to identify backchannels. Our observations from analyzing the impact of personality on the type (modality) of backchannel response also open some new research questions; for instance- can we also analyze if the frequency of backchannels emitted by different individuals depend on personality [4]? Furthermore, can we use these findings to embed personality into a virtual human further? These are some exciting lines future researchers can look into by conducting more extensive analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Jainendra Shukla and Rajiv Ratn Shah are partly supported by the Infosys Center for AI and Center for Design and New Media at IIT Delhi. In addition, Rajiv Ratn Shah is also partly supported by the ECR Grant (ECR/2018/002776) by SERB, Government of India. Finally, we would like to thank the annotators, and all the participants who took part in our case study for their time and efforts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Samer Al Moubayed, M. Baklouti, Mohamed Chetouani, Thierry Dutoit, Ammar Mahdhaoui, Jean-Claude Martin, Stanislav Ondás, Catherine Pelachaud, Jerome Urbain, and M. Yilmaz. 2009. Generating Robot/Agent backchannels during a storytelling experiment. *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation ICRA'09 (06 2009)*, 3749 – 3754. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ROBOT.2009.5152572>
- [2] Stéphane Ayache and Georges Quénot. 2008. Video corpus annotation using active learning. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 187–198.
- [3] Tadas Baltrusaitis, Amir Zadeh, Yao Chong Lim, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2018. Openface 2.0: Facial behavior analysis toolkit. *2018 13th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2018)* 1 (2018), 59–66.
- [4] Elisabetta Bevacqua, Etienne De Sevin, Sylwia Julia Hyniewska, and Catherine Pelachaud. 2012. A listener model: introducing personality traits. *Journal on Multimodal User Interfaces* 6, 1-2 (2012), 27–38.
- [5] Elisabetta Bevacqua, Maurizio Mancini, and Catherine Pelachaud. 2008. A listening agent exhibiting variable behaviour. In *International Workshop on Intelligent Virtual Agents*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 262–269.
- [6] Patricia Bota, Joana Silva, Duarte Folgado, and Hugo Gamboa. 2019. A semi-automatic annotation approach for human activity recognition. *Sensors* 19, 3 (2019), 501.
- [7] Kevin W. Bowyer, Nitesh V. Chawla, Lawrence O. Hall, and W. Philip Kegelmeyer. 2011. SMOTE: Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique. *CoRR* abs/1106.1813 (2011), 321–357. [arXiv:1106.1813](http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.1813) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.1813>
- [8] Hennie Brugman, Albert Russel, and Xd Nijmegen. 2004. Annotating Multimedia/Multi-modal Resources with ELAN. *LREC Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'04)* (2004), 2065–2068.
- [9] Justine Cassell, Joseph Sullivan, Elizabeth Churchill, and Scott Prevost. 2000. *Embodied conversational agents*. MIT press, Cambridge, MA, United States.
- [10] John M Digman. 1990. Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual review of psychology* 41, 1 (1990), 417–440.
- [11] Jared A Dunmon, Alexander J Ratner, Khaled Saab, Nishith Khandwala, Matthew Markert, Hersh Sagreiya, Roger Goldman, Christopher Lee-Messer, Matthew P Lungren, Daniel L Rubin, et al. 2020. Cross-modal data programming enables rapid medical machine learning. *Patterns* 1 (2020), 100019.

- [12] Hassan Ismail Fawaz, Germain Forestier, Jonathan Weber, Lhassane Idoumghar, and Pierre-Alain Muller. 2019. Deep learning for time series classification: a review. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 33, 4 (2019), 917–963.
- [13] Theodoros Giannakopoulos. 2015. pyAudioAnalysis: An Open-Source Python Library for Audio Signal Analysis. *PLoS one* 10 (2015), 1–17.
- [14] Mononito Goswami, Lujie Chen, and Artur Dubrawski. 2020. Discriminating Cognitive Disequilibrium and Flow in Problem Solving: A Semi-Supervised Approach Using Involuntary Dynamic Behavioral Signals. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 34 (2020), 420–427.
- [15] Mononito Goswami, Minkush Manuja, and Maitree Leekha. 2020. Towards Social & Engaging Peer Learning: Predicting Backchanneling and Disengagement in Children. arXiv:2007.11346 [cs.LG]
- [16] K. Hara, K. Inoue, K. Takanashi, and Tatsuya Kawahara. 2018. Prediction of Turn-taking Using Multitask Learning with Prediction of Backchannels and Fillers. *INTERSPEECH* 2 (2018), 991–995.
- [17] Bettina Heinz. 2003. Backchannel responses as strategic responses in bilingual speakers' conversations. *Journal of pragmatics* 35, 7 (2003), 1113–1142.
- [18] Bettina Heinz. 2003. Backchannel responses as strategic responses in bilingual speakers' conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35, 7 (2003), 1113 – 1142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00190-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00190-X)
- [19] Réka Hollandi, Ákos Diósi, Gábor Hollandi, Nikita Moshkov, and Péter Horváth. 2020. AnnotatorJ: an ImageJ plugin to ease hand-annotation of cellular compartments. *Molecular Biology of the Cell* 31 (2020), mbc–E20.
- [20] Paul Hömke, Judith Holler, and Stephen C Levinson. 2018. Eye blinks are perceived as communicative signals in human face-to-face interaction. *PLoS one* 13, 12 (2018), e0208030.
- [21] Danfeng Hong, Naoto Yokoya, Gui-Song Xia, Jocelyn Chanussot, and Xiao Xiang Zhu. 2020. X-ModalNet: A semi-supervised deep cross-modal network for classification of remote sensing data. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 167 (2020), 12–23.
- [22] Rajni Jindal, Maitree Leekha, Minkush Manuja, and Mononito Goswami. 2020. What makes a Better Companion? Towards Social & Engaging Peer Learning. *Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth European Conference on Artificial Intelligence. IOS Press* 325 of Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications (2020), 482–489.
- [23] Daniel Jurafsky, Carol Van Ess-dykema, et al. 1997. Switchboard discourse language modeling project.
- [24] S. N. Khan, M. Leekha, J. Shukla, and R. R. Shah. 2020. Vyaktiv: A Multimodal Peer-to-Peer Hindi Conversations based Dataset for Personality Assessment. *2020 IEEE Sixth International Conference on Multimedia Big Data (BigMM)* 1 (2020), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigMM50055.2020.00024>
- [25] Maitree Leekha, Mononito Goswami, Rajiv Ratn Shah, Yifang Yin, and Roger Zimmermann. 2019. Are You Paying Attention? Detecting Distracted Driving in Real-Time. *2019 IEEE Fifth International Conference on Multimedia Big Data (BigMM)* 1 (2019), 171–180.
- [26] Pierre Lison, Aliaksandr Hubin, Jeremy Barnes, and Samia Touileb. 2020. Named Entity Recognition without Labelled Data: A Weak Supervision Approach. *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 1 (2020), 1518–1533.
- [27] Louis-Philippe Morency, Iwan Kok, and Jonathan Gratch. 2010. A probabilistic multimodal approach for predicting listener backchannels. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems* 20 (01 2010), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10458-009-9092-y>
- [28] Markus Mueller, David Leuschner, Lars Briem, Maria Schmidt, Kevin Kilgour, Sebastian Stuecker, and Alex Waibel. 2015. Using Neural Networks for Data-Driven Backchannel Prediction: A Survey on Input Features and Training Techniques. In *Human-Computer Interaction: Interaction Technologies*, Masaaki Kurosu (Ed.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 329–340.
- [29] Hae Won Park, Mirko Gelsomini, Jin Lee, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2017. Telling Stories to Robots: The Effect of Backchanneling on a Child's Storytelling. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 100–108. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2909824.3020245>
- [30] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12 (2011), 2825–2830.
- [31] Michael Rubinstein, Ce Liu, and William T Freeman. 2012. Annotation propagation in large image databases via dense image correspondence. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 85–99.
- [32] Robin Ruede, Markus Müller, Sebastian Stüker, and Alex Waibel. 2019. *Yeah, Right, Uh-Huh: A Deep Learning Backchannel Predictor*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 247–258. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92108-2_25
- [33] Nikhita Singh, Jin Joo Lee, Ishaan Grover, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2018. P2PSTORY: Dataset of Children as Storytellers and Listeners in Peer-to-Peer Interactions. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, United States, 1–11.
- [34] T. Solorio, O. Fuentes, Nigel G. Ward, and Yaffa Al Bayyari. 2006. Prosodic feature generation for back-channel prediction. *INTERSPEECH* 5 (2006), 2398–2401.
- [35] Leili Tavabi, Kalin Stefanov, Setareh Nasihati Gilani, David Traum, and Mohammad Soleymani. 2019. Multimodal Learning for Identifying Opportunities for Empathetic Responses. In *2019 International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 95–104. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3340555.3353750>
- [36] Khiet P Truong, Ronald Poppe, and Dirk Heylen. 2010. A rule-based backchannel prediction model using pitch and pause information. *Eleventh Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association* 4 (2010), 3058–3061.
- [37] Jesper E Van Engelen and Holger H Hoos. 2020. A survey on semi-supervised learning. *Machine Learning* 109, 2 (2020), 373–440.
- [38] N. Ward. 1996. Using prosodic clues to decide when to produce back-channel utterances. *Proceeding of Fourth International Conference on Spoken Language Processing. ICSLP '96* 3 (1996), 1728–1731.
- [39] Nigel Ward and Wataru Tsukahara. 2000. Prosodic features which cue back-channel responses in English and Japanese. *Journal of pragmatics* 32, 8 (2000), 1177–1207.
- [40] Nigel G Ward and Yaffa Al Bayyari. 2006. A case study in the identification of prosodic cues to turn-taking: Back-channeling in Arabic. *Ninth International Conference on Spoken Language Processing* 5 (2006), 2018–2021.
- [41] Sheida White. 1989. Backchannels across cultures: A study of Americans and Japanese. *Language in society* 18, 1 (1989), 59–76.
- [42] Sheida White. 1989. Backchannels across Cultures: A Study of Americans and Japanese. *Language in Society* 18, 1 (1989), 59–76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4168001>