

Robotic Speech Synthesis: Perspectives on Interactions, Scenarios, and Ethics

Yuanchao Li

y.li-385@sms.ed.ac.uk

School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh
UK

Catherine Lai

c.lai@ed.ac.uk

School of Philosophy, Psychology & Language Sciences,
University of Edinburgh
UK

ABSTRACT

In recent years, many works have investigated the feasibility of conversational robots for performing specific tasks, such as health-care and interview. Along with this development comes a practical issue: *how should we synthesize robotic voices to meet the needs of different situations?* In this paper, we discuss this issue from three perspectives: 1) the difficulties of synthesizing non-verbal and interaction-oriented speech signals, particularly backchannels; 2) the scenario classification for robotic voice synthesis; 3) the ethical issues regarding the design of robot voice for its emotion and identity. We present the findings of relevant literature and our prior work, trying to bring the attention of human-robot interaction researchers to design better conversational robots in the future.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Human-centered computing** → **HCI design and evaluation methods**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**.

KEYWORDS

robot identity, emotion, speech synthesis, prosody, AI ethics

ACM Reference Format:

Yuanchao Li and Catherine Lai. 2022. Robotic Speech Synthesis: Perspectives on Interactions, Scenarios, and Ethics. In *HRI 2022 Workshop: Robo-Identity: Exploring Artificial Identity and Emotion via Speech Interactions, March 7-10, 2022, Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 4 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of speech synthesis in recent years has made it possible for computers to generate speech that closely resembles human speech, including emotional voice [20, 32]. Robotics is one of the applications that benefit most from this technology. Since the facial expressions and body movements of robots are currently difficult to make as natural as those of human beings, changes in the voice are the most common way to adapt to different scenarios [3, 34]. In this paper, we first illustrate the importance of prosody

to emotional speech synthesis and the difficulty of synthesizing interactional aspects of speech. Through our prior work, we discuss the prosodic and emotional aspects of backchannels, as it is an important component of spoken dialogue that have been widely studied in human-robot conversation [1, 15, 29]. Next, we present our designed scenario classification for robotic speech synthesis and how people perceive robot voices in different scenarios. Finally, we discuss some ethical issues, focusing on the question that how should we design robotic voices.

2 INTERACTIONAL SPEECH SYNTHESIS

2.1 Prosody Settings for Emotion and Identity

Prosody has been proven a dominant aspect to convey emotions. And in fact, prior work has succeeded in setting prosodic features for emotional speech synthesis. In [7], F0 mean (F0: fundamental frequency on which human perception of pitch depends), F0 range and tempo were increased by 50%, 100% and 30% respectively for expressing joy, and 150%, 20% and 30% for fear in German. The synthesized emotions were successfully judged by native speakers. [26] found that increasing F0 mean, F0 range, tempo, and loudness by 10 Hz, 9 semitones, 30 words per minute, and 6 decibels (resp.) is suitable for expressing anger in British English. [5] found log-pitch, intensity, and loudness have high correlations with arousal in four emotion corpora. In our prior work, we also observed valence has clearer correlation with pitch-related features (low, narrow and wide pitch) than other prosodic features, and arousal is also correlated with intensity and speaking rate in addition to pitch [22].

Neural text-to-speech has been widely used [24], yet adjusting prosody settings using Speech Synthesis Markup Language (SSML) [2, 31, 33] to specify parameters for intended emotion is still a typical way for robots, considering the difficulties of real-world applications. Similar to emotion, robot identity can also be formed by prosody variation. Robot identity is a long-term signal usually contains gender, age, personality, etc., and they can also be included in the SSML settings [4].

However, the majority of prior work focused on synthesizing monologues but ignored the aspects of spoken interaction which is necessary for emotion and identity. Personality is largely dependent on fillers and backchannels [6, 37], whose pragmatic meanings are highly conveyed by prosody [36]. Taking the backchannel “really” as an example, it can be used for expressing interest, surprise, or disappointment, depending on its speaking style. In conversations, utterance amount, backchannel frequency, filler frequency, and switching pause length have proven relevant to robot personality traits [37]. [28] revealed that subjects who were less socially adept reported feeling that their robot interlocutor was more sincere than

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.

HRI'22 Robo-Identity Workshop, March 2022, Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

its human counterpart because the robot’s conversational fillers helped mitigate awkwardness and express a cooperative attitude during the interaction. Here, we take backchannels as an example for discussion as we have studied it in human-robot conversation.

2.2 Backchannels

In a prior work [21], we used a female humanoid to conduct spontaneous chats with student participants. The humanoid was remotely operated by a female human operator in a Wizard of Oz manner. The conversations between the humanoid and participants were recorded and analyzed. We focused on the following backchannels: “Really?”, “Ah, I see.” and “I get it.” because we found they occur most frequently in the conversations. Our subjective evaluation demonstrated that when generated in emotions mimicking the participants, the robot backchannels were perceived as natural and authentic compared to those without emotions. What’s more, we also found that even when the backchannels were generated with random emotions, the participants still felt the robot feedback more natural than that without emotions.

The difficulties in synthesizing backchannels are not only the lexical form, but also prosody and timing. False prosody or timing may cause a fatal problem in HRI. For example, imagine if a robot responds “Really?” in a happy voice when the user in fact feels sad and seeks sympathy, then the user may not want to talk to the robot anymore. The solutions lie in 1) accurately recognizing the user’s emotion and matching it, 2) accurately recognizing when to respond. Regarding 1), we noticed that even a simple emotion mapping using only happiness and disappointment corresponding to high and low valence can achieve satisfactory user experience [22]. Regarding 2), some predictive rules have been established. For example, for English backchannel generation is: Upon detection of P1. a region of pitch less than the 26th-percentile pitch level and P2. continuing for at least 110 milliseconds, P3. coming after at least 700 milliseconds of speech, P4. providing you have no output backchannel feedback within the preceding 800 milliseconds, P5. after 700 milliseconds wait, backchannels should be produced. For Japanese, some parameters are different: P1 = 28, P2 = 110, P3 = 700, P4 = 1000, and P5 = 350 [35]. As technology advances, however, these solutions will change as well.

2.3 Open Challenges

While some companies, such as Google, have successfully used synthetic speech to “fool” humans on the phone¹, it is still too early to say that robotic speech synthesis has matured to the point where it can respond naturally. We list the following challenges:

1. For utterances with clear lexical meanings, occasional prosody errors may not have a large effect on one’s evaluation of the robot. However, people have a much lower tolerance for the errors when it comes to interactional speech whose interpretation largely depends on prosody, such as backchannels.

2. Detection of positions for feedback utterances is more difficult than that of other types of dialogue turns. For example, backchannel generation requires a system to be able to process lexical and non-lexical aspects of an utterance, and sometimes involves related tasks such as turn-taking detection.

3. Compared to synthesizing isolated sentence utterances (the commonly used evaluation criteria for text-to-speech), it’s hard to develop a uniform rule for evaluating synthesized feedback utterances as they are highly context dependent.

4. Different languages and cultures have different conventions for conversing. Some languages, such as Japanese, have a large number of fillers and backchannels. How cultural differences should be handled also needs to be taken into account when synthesizing this type of speech.

3 SCENARIO CLASSIFICATION

To the best of our knowledge, there are no uniform standards or best practices for designing robotic voices, not to mention its identity, and the majority of results can only represent scenarios set by the experiments themselves. Here, we present our scenario classification in robotic voice evaluation and explore the differences in their respective focus and the challenges that exist.

3.1 General Scenario

The first category is the general scenario, which typically investigates robot voice in spontaneous dialogues without considering specific applications. For example, in our past work, we recorded and analyzed daily conversations between human participants, whose topics include greetings, introductions, hobbies, daily life, and a little impromptu banter. Based on the analysis results, we designed the robot’s emotional voice by changing the prosody and had human participants engage in conversations with it on the same topics. The evaluation results showed that the human participants were satisfied with the robotic voice and found it to be very emotionally realistic [21]. We believe such robots can be used for all kinds of daily chats without considering specific applications.

When designing this type of robot voice, the most critical point is that the voice should be real as in human sounding and meet the user’s preference, so that the user can feel comfortable. Past studies support this viewpoint from some aspects: Users prefer robot voice whose gender (male/female) matches their own [11, 19], and are more attracted by the robot having similar personality traits (introversion/extroversion) [27].

3.2 Application-Dependent Scenario

We define the second category as the application-dependent scenario, which focuses on designing robotic voices for particular uses and expressing its identity firmly. In such cases, the emotions that can be expressed are limited (e.g., sad emotions that can cause discouragement may not be allowed in some applications such as team sports [18]). Taking healthcare scenario as an example, [16] synthesized a flat monotone and an empathetic voice via prosodic variation for a robot named Healthbot. They recruited 120 participants and asked them to share their perceptions after watching videos of Healthbot talking in the two voices. The results reflected that people prefer empathetic voice for healthcare robots.

Another example is the instruction scenario. [10] recruited student participants to evaluate a new robotic operating system by rating their perceptions towards the robotic voice, which was created as older male voice by using a text-to-speech program. Ten participants were asked to indicate the perceived age of the robotic

¹<https://ai.googleblog.com/2018/05/duplex-ai-system-for-natural-conversation.html>

voice. Results indicated that higher age-identified students rated the older robotic voice higher for credibility, social presence and reported more motivation to learn. Perhaps the older male voice sounds like a “professor” or “instructor” role identity.

We believe these phenomena are caused by consensus, where we unconsciously assume that certain voices and languages have specific identity/professional attributes [8, 9, 13].

3.3 Culture-Dependent Scenario

Many past studies have demonstrated differences in the perception of robots by participants from different countries [14, 17, 23]. Nevertheless, few studies have discussed in depth the reasons behind this, leading to an open question: how to design robotic voices for different regional/cultural populations. Accordingly, we define the third category as the culture-dependent scenario.

Take Japan, for example, which is the most popular country in the world for robots. Japan has been influenced by Confucianism, Buddhism, and indigenous Shintoism for a long time, and believes that every object has a soul. Based on this culture, Japanese robots such as ASIMO [30] and ERICA [12], are generally more like real people. Besides, as the birthplace of manga comic culture, Japanese are very accepting of non-human features. For instance, the voice of humanoid Pepper in SoftBank stores is designed to resemble an anime robot. Moreover, according to the Global Gender Gap Report², Japan has the largest gender gap among all developed countries, and this is reflected in the labor force. The ratio of male to female labor force is 73%, and the vast majority of front desk, reception, and wait staff are female. Perhaps due to this special culture, receptionist robots in Japan are designed to have a female voice almost by default.

Therefore, the evaluation results obtained by participants from one cultural background cannot simply be applied to other situations.

3.4 Open Challenges

Unlike interactional speech synthesis, which focuses on technical challenges, scenario classification considers more design-level challenges:

1. The perception of robot emotion and identity is not only affected by its voice but also visual appearance. Giving a mismatched voice to a robot might introduce a confounding effect [25].
2. Is there any other classification design that can more comprehensively cover the scenario of robotic speech synthesis?
3. Associating voice with identity perception will inevitably raise ethical and social debates. Does assigning a robot voice based on human experience create bias?

4 ETHICAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES

People are not yet too concerned about current problems that exist in robotic speech and have a high tolerance for robot speech errors. Based on developments in the field of speech technology and HRI, we list the following ethical issues that we think will be gradually discussed in near future.

²<http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2020/the-global-gender-gap-index-2020/results-and-analysis/>

4.1 Language Bias

It is well known that robotic speech synthesis usually follows automatic speech recognition. Therefore, one of the major issues of robotic speech synthesis is caused and shared by the language bias of speech recognition. Speech recognition has been developed for many years yet is still limited by the availability of training data. Languages that spoken by a large population, such as English and Chinese, are relatively mature for speech recognition and can achieve similar performance as human speech recognition in specific scenarios. However, the performance for minority languages remains high, which inevitably leads to inaccurate robotic speech synthesis and thus affects the user experience. The same is true for accents and dialects.

4.2 Identity Bias

As mentioned in Section 3.2, older male voice are considered to have higher credibility and more suitable for instructor robots in some cases. Similar situation also occurs with other robotic identities, such as caregivers. Is this practice of tying voice to identity harmful for society? If these settings are widely used, will they in turn affect career choices in human society?

4.3 Gender Bias

As mentioned in Section 3.3, there are serious gender differences in some regions, resulting in the robotic voice that uses almost exclusively one gender in certain situations. Even if this is culturally acceptable to the majority of the local population, is there a gender bias involved in such design? Conversely, if the voice of male and female were used fairly, would the people of the region be willing to accept these robots?

4.4 Aesthetic Bias

In today’s society, where aesthetic diversity is prized, will the aesthetics and preferences of voice also become a topic of discussion? If so, how should we design voice timbre when synthesizing robotic voices? Should they be associated with the appearance of the robot? For example, should a robot with a cute appearance always generate a sweet tone?

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present new perspectives to answer this question: *how should we synthesize robotic voices to meet the needs of different situations?* Firstly, we point out the difficulties of synthesizing interactional utterances that are highly frequent in dialogue speech, particularly backchannels. Secondly, we provide a novel scenario classification scheme for speech and robot researchers to better design robotic voices. Lastly, we discuss some ethical and social issues that may have not been mentioned yet. We hope our discussion can bring attention in HRI community for better robotic speech synthesis.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The first author would like to thank Kawahara Lab (Kyoto Univ.), ATR Ishiguro Lab, and Prof. Nigel Ward for their guidance in the completion of the prior work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sames Al Moubayed, Malek Baklouti, Mohamed Chetouani, Thierry Dutoit, Ammar Mahdhaoui, J-C Martin, Stanislav Ondas, Catherine Pelachaud, Jérôme Urbain, and Mehmet Yilmaz. 2009. Generating robot/agent backchannels during a storytelling experiment. In *2009 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. IEEE, 3749–3754.
- [2] Paolo Baggia, Paul Bagshaw, Michael Bodell, De Zhi Huang, Lou Xiaoyan, Scott McGlashan, Jianhua Tao, Yan Jun, Hu Fang, Yongguo Kang, et al. 2010. Speech synthesis markup language (SSML) version 1.1. *World Wide Web Consortium, Recommendation REC-speechsynthesis11-20100907* (2010).
- [3] Sandra Bedaf, Patrizia Marti, Farshid Amirabdollahian, and Luc de Witte. 2018. A multi-perspective evaluation of a service robot for seniors: the voice of different stakeholders. *Disability and rehabilitation: assistive technology* 13, 6 (2018), 592–599.
- [4] Oliver Bendel. 2017. SSML for sex robots. In *International Conference on Love and Sex with Robots*. Springer, 1–11.
- [5] Daniel Bone, Chi-Chun Lee, and Shrikanth Narayanan. 2014. Robust unsupervised arousal rating: A rule-based framework with knowledge-inspired vocal features. *IEEE transactions on affective computing* 5, 2 (2014), 201–213.
- [6] Carolin Brück, Benjamin Kreifelts, Evangelia Kaza, Martin Lotze, and Dirk Wildgruber. 2011. Impact of personality on the cerebral processing of emotional prosody. *Neuroimage* 58, 1 (2011), 259–268.
- [7] Felix Burkhardt and Walter F Sendlmeier. 2000. Verification of acoustical correlates of emotional speech using formant-synthesis. In *ISCA Tutorial and Research Workshop (ITRW) on speech and emotion*.
- [8] Carol M Eastman. 1985. Establishing social identity through language use. *Journal of language and social psychology* 4, 1 (1985), 1–20.
- [9] Penelope Eckert and John R Rickford. 2001. *Style and sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Chad Edwards, Autumn Edwards, Brett Stoll, Xialing Lin, and Noelle Massey. 2019. Evaluations of an artificial intelligence instructor’s voice: Social Identity Theory in human-robot interactions. *Computers in Human Behavior* 90 (2019), 357–362.
- [11] Friederike Eyssel, Laura De Ruiter, Dieta Kuchenbrandt, Simon Bobinger, and Frank Hegel. 2012. ‘If you sound like me, you must be more human’: On the interplay of robot and user features on human-robot acceptance and anthropomorphism. In *2012 7th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*. IEEE, 125–126.
- [12] Dylan F Glas, Takashi Minato, Carlos T Ishi, Tatsuya Kawahara, and Hiroshi Ishiguro. 2016. Erica: The erato intelligent conversational android. In *2016 25th IEEE International symposium on robot and human interactive communication (RO-MAN)*. IEEE, 22–29.
- [13] Jette G Hansen and Jun Liu. 1997. Social identity and language: Theoretical and methodological issues. *Tesol Quarterly* 31, 3 (1997), 567–576.
- [14] Kerstin Sophie Haring, David Silvera-Tawil, Yoshio Matsumoto, Mari Velonaki, and Katsumi Watanabe. 2014. Perception of an android robot in Japan and Australia: A cross-cultural comparison. In *International conference on social robotics*. Springer, 166–175.
- [15] Nusrat Hussain, Engin Erzin, T Metin Sezgin, and Yucel Yemez. 2019. Speech driven backchannel generation using deep q-network for enhancing engagement in human-robot interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.01618* (2019).
- [16] Jesin James, BT Balamurali, Catherine I Watson, and Bruce MacDonald. 2020. Empathetic Speech Synthesis and Testing for Healthcare Robots. *International Journal of Social Robotics* (2020), 1–19.
- [17] Frédéric Kaplan. 2004. Who is afraid of the humanoid? Investigating cultural differences in the acceptance of robots. *International journal of humanoid robotics* 1, 03 (2004), 465–480.
- [18] Divesh Lala, Yuanchao Li, and Tatsuya Kawahara. 2017. Utterance Behavior of Users While Playing Basketball with a Virtual Teammate. In *ICAART (1)*. 28–38.
- [19] Eun Ju Lee, Clifford Nass, and Scott Brave. 2000. Can computer-generated speech have gender? An experimental test of gender stereotype. In *CHI’00 extended abstracts on Human factors in computing systems*. 289–290.
- [20] Younggun Lee, Azam Rabiee, and Soo-Young Lee. 2017. Emotional end-to-end neural speech synthesizer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05447* (2017).
- [21] Yuanchao Li, Carlos Toshinori Ishi, Koji Inoue, Shizuka Nakamura, and Tatsuya Kawahara. 2019. Expressing reactive emotion based on multimodal emotion recognition for natural conversation in human-robot interaction. *Advanced Robotics* 33, 20 (2019), 1030–1041.
- [22] Yuanchao Li, Carlos Toshinori Ishi, Nigel Ward, Koji Inoue, Shizuka Nakamura, Katsuya Takahashi, and Tatsuya Kawahara. 2017. Emotion recognition by combining prosody and sentiment analysis for expressing reactive emotion by humanoid robot. In *2017 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC)*. IEEE, 1356–1359.
- [23] Velvetina Lim, Maki Rooksby, and Emily S Cross. 2021. Social robots on a global stage: establishing a role for culture during human-robot interaction. *International Journal of Social Robotics* 13, 6 (2021), 1307–1333.
- [24] Zhen-Hua Ling, Shi-Yin Kang, Heiga Zen, Andrew Senior, Mike Schuster, Xiao-Jun Qian, Helen M Meng, and Li Deng. 2015. Deep learning for acoustic modeling in parametric speech generation: A systematic review of existing techniques and future trends. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 32, 3 (2015), 35–52.
- [25] Conor McGinn and Ilaria Torre. 2019. Can you tell the robot by the voice? an exploratory study on the role of voice in the perception of robots. In *2019 14th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*. IEEE, 211–221.
- [26] Iain R Murray and John L Arnott. 1995. Implementation and testing of a system for producing emotion-by-rule in synthetic speech. *Speech Communication* 16, 4 (1995), 369–390.
- [27] Clifford Ivar Nass and Scott Brave. 2005. *Wired for speech: How voice activates and advances the human-computer relationship*. MIT press Cambridge, MA.
- [28] Naoki Ohshima, Keita Kimijima, Junji Yamato, and Naoki Mukawa. 2015. A conversational robot with vocal and bodily fillers for recovering from awkward silence at turn-takings. In *2015 24th IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*. IEEE, 325–330.
- [29] Hae Won Park, Mirko Gelsomini, Jin Joo Lee, Tonghui Zhu, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2017. Backchannel opportunity prediction for social robot listeners. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2308–2314.
- [30] Satoshi Shigemi, Ambarish Goswami, and Prahlad Vadakkepat. 2018. ASIMO and humanoid robot research at Honda. *Humanoid robotics: A reference* (2018), 55–90.
- [31] Paul Taylor and Amy Isard. 1997. SSML: A speech synthesis markup language. *Speech communication* 21, 1-2 (1997), 123–133.
- [32] Noé Tits, Kevin El Haddad, and Thierry Dutoit. 2019. Exploring transfer learning for low resource emotional tts. In *Proceedings of SAI Intelligent Systems Conference*. Springer, 52–60.
- [33] Mark R Walker, Jim Larson, and Andrew Hunt. 2001. A new W3C markup standard for text-to-speech synthesis. In *2001 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing. Proceedings (Cat. No. 01CH37221)*, Vol. 2. IEEE, 965–968.
- [34] Michael L Walters, Dag Sverre Syrdal, Kheng Lee Koay, Kerstin Dautenhahn, and René Te Boekhorst. 2008. Human approach distances to a mechanical-looking robot with different robot voice styles. In *RO-MAN 2008-The 17th IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication*. IEEE, 707–712.
- [35] 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.
- [36] Nigel G Ward, Yuanchao Li, Tianyu Zhao, and Tatsuya Kawahara. 2016. Interactional and pragmatics-related prosodic patterns in Mandarin dialog. In *Speech prosody*.
- [37] Kenta Yamamoto, Koji Inoue, Shizuka Nakamura, Katsuya Takahashi, and Tatsuya Kawahara. 2018. Dialogue behavior control model for expressing a character of humanoid robots. In *2018 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC)*. IEEE, 1732–1737.