Evaluating Chat GPT-4's Ability to Recreate Human-like Silences in Dialogue: A Linguistic Analysis

Andrew Lee

Recently, Chat GPT-4 has increasingly developed its ability to execute human creative tasks. In this paper, GPT's ability to replicate silence in human dialogue is examined, as well as the types of silences thought to be more realistic. Historically, silence has been a complementary but not an integral component of conversation, but recently, scholars have alternatively stated that silence carries contextual significance for conversational meaning. This study bridges the gap between linguistics and artificial intelligence, studying AI's interpretation of silence placement in dialogue; GPT recreates a fictional argument between Harry and Ron from Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows. After a two-part survey (n=22), the first part asked human participants to rate the perceived realisticness of silences (from 1-10, how likely the silences would occur in real life). The second part asked the participants to place the silence and its length within the sentence(s) wherever they felt it would most likely occur. The data gathered from the two surveys was then further classified as realistic/unrealistic/inconclusive, based on whether the average and mode fell above, below, or within a specified range. Ultimately, qualitative data analysis illustrated that out of GPT-generated silences, those that functioned paralinguistically at syntactic boundaries were best received by human participants.

1 Introduction

Language shapes how we perceive and navigate the world. As Wittgenstein notably observed, "The limits of my language mean the limits of my world"[1]. It is not only through spoken or written words that meaning is made; absence, too, communicates. Silence, often overlooked, plays a crucial role in shaping dialogue, emotional tone, and relational dynamics.

This study investigates silence as a communicative structure, particularly in confrontational dialogue. Silence is categorized here in two primary forms: linguistic silence, which is intentional and conveys meaning (e.g., disapproval or defiance), and paralinguistic silence, which is unintentional and often physiological (e.g., pausing to gather one's breath or thoughts)[?]. Understanding these silences helps clarify how meaning is conveyed not only through speech, but through its strategic absence.

2 Silence in Confrontational Dialogue

Silence in high-conflict conversations is especially powerful. While speech usually dominates in arguments, strategic silence can shift power or express refusal. Nikoli's analysis of BBC Hardtalk interviewsmarked by rapid exchanges, interruptions, and turn-taking battlesrevealed that silence, though rare, was deeply functional. These silences asserted control, highlighted discomfort, or invited vulnerability, depending on when they occurred and how long they were[2].

Principally, two silence types emerged in Nikoli's findings: "dramatic silence", used to intensify meaning, and "gaps", signaling emotional hesitation or tactical avoidance. Interestingly, some speakers paused mid-turnwhat Nikoli called "deliberate interruptions of one's own turn"to pressure interlocutors into speaking first, and subtly shifting conversational power[2].

These findings demonstrate that silence, especially when utilized intentionally, is not a passive expression. It can be confrontational, communicative, and coercivejust as much as speech.

2.1 Defining and Classifying Silence

Silence, as defined by the Collins English Dictionary, is "the absence of soundsspecifically, the absence of phonation, but not the absence of (verbal) meaning"[3]. Scholars such as Ephratt distinguish voluntary "verbal silence" from externally imposed "silencing," centering this study on the former.

To distinguish silence's function more precisely, Kurzon's five-factor model is used: (a) number of speakers, (b) what is left unsaid, (c) the silence's intentionality, (d) presence in conversation, and (e) whether the source is internal or external[4]. For this study, controlled dialogues with two fully present speakers

remove external distractions, making intentionality and what is unspoken the most important variables.

Cultural context also shapes how silence is interpreted. For instance, "most Asians are satisfied with a minute or two of silence, while Canadians and Americans are usually uncomfortable in discussions with more than a second of silence"[4]. Thus, understanding silence requires attention not only to its placement, but also to its cultural legibility.

2.2 Contextual Ambiguity and Communicative Silence

Silence is not universally legible; it is ambiguous and context-dependent. Nakane (2007) notes that a pause after a marriage proposal might signal either acceptance or rejection. Similarly, Jaworski describes silence as an "axiological uncertainty," a phenomenon that acquires meaning only through inference and social framing[5].

Linguistic silence, like the morphological zero signe.g., the absence of a plural marker in "sheep"demonstrates how absence itself carries semantic weight[6]. This reinforces the idea that silence should not be viewed as a breakdown in communication, but rather as a meaningful component of it.

2.3 Computational Models and the Simulation of Silence

The advent of Chat GPT-4 introduces a novel tool for studying language. GPT-4, a large language model trained on large datasets, can replicate human conversational conventionsturn-taking, emotional tension, and even silence. This study explores how GPT-4 simulates silence in confrontational settings and how human evaluators interpret those silences in terms of realism and function.

In the present study, ten dialogues between custom GPT-4 profiles of Harry Potter and Ron Weasley were generated, each containing marked silences (short, medium, long). These silences were evaluated by human participants who judged their communicative realism, emotional tone, and placement. The study asks: How does Chat GPT-4 position and utilize silence - linguistic or paralinguistic - within confrontational dialogue, and how do human evaluators perceive these silences?

2.4 Evaluating AI Dialogue and Computational Creativity

GPT-4's ability to simulate silence also raises questions about computational creativity. Computational creativity is defined as the "study and simulationof behavior, natural and artificialif observed in humans, be deemed creative"[7]. Because perceptions of creativity are subjective, the study incorporates participant evaluations to gauge whether GPT-4-generated silences are seen as intentional, effective, or expressive.

As Jordanous notes, "Human opinion is [also] variable; what one person finds creative, another may not"[7]. Therefore, a broad and diverse participant base is necessary in evaluating

the perceived naturalness and communicative value of these silences.

3 Related Works

3.1 A Redhead Walks into a Bar: Experiences of Writing Fiction with Artificial Intelligence

The paper "A Redhead Walks into a Bar: Experiences of Writing Fiction with Artificial Intelligence" examines the possibilities of co-authoring a story between humans and AI. The researchers Ghajjargar, Bardzell, and Lagerkvist utilize two "progressive auto-ethnographic studies(1) a co-writing activity initiated by basic textual prompts(2) a co-writing activity initiated bytextual prompts using elements of narrative"[8]. The researchers qualitatively analyze the data through self-reflection of the process, which expresses "their own reflexive first-person perspective regarding a situation"[8].

They utilize "Multiverse," a customized model built on Chat GPT-3 API (utilizing the same AI technology but with preset prompts). The results were mainly based on the unpredictability of AI metaphors and the absurd semantic connections and structures of AI. This experiment inspired the experiment design of the current paper: Chat GPT-4 recreated Harry Potter and Ronald Weasley's dialogue, a co-authoring of sorts between J.K. Rowling and AI. Chat GPT-4 was instructed to incorporate silences as part of narrative structure, similar to this paper's "textual prompts using elements of narrative"[8].

3.2 The Functions of Silence in Confrontational Discourse

While considering methods of linguistic analysis, "The Functions of Silence in Confrontational Discourse" utilized a loose form of CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) and CA (Conversation Analysis) within its experiment. It compiled a corpus of dialogue between the interviewer and interviewee in the BBC HardTalk interviews. The paper describes CA as a "bottom-up method,". In contrast, CDA follows a "top-down approach"[2]. Though these analytical methods are not explicitly utilized in the current study, there will be references to terminology and theories that utilize these analytical methods the current study will draw upon this paper as a resource for analysis. Ultimately, this study is concerned with the relationship between confrontational discourse, power dynamics, and silence. Nikoli emphasizes that silence can be expressed as a form of controlling power or giving it up in an argument ("giving up or taking the "floor"), according to the context of the situation[2]. He additionally talks about interruptions as a type of lack of silence, which is another form of taking control of an argument.

3.3 Interplay Between Linguistics and AI

This paper explores the symbiosis between linguistics and AI: AI's development has relied on linguistic theory. Early AI systems were influenced by "Chomsky's transformational grammar, as AI researchers sought to create systems capable of understanding and generating human language"[9]. Chomsky posits that in a sentence, there is a surface and deep structure; the deep structure is an underlying semantic representation of a sentence, with its essential syntactic and semantic relationships. Conversely, the surface structure refers to the elements of the sentence that people actively perceive while reading elements such as phonology. The study mentions the following linguistic principles and theories as relevant to AI's development: syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and lexical semantics. The study also recognizes that "AI models often struggle with understanding context and generating coherent and contextually appropriate responses"[9].

4 Methods

4.1 Dialogue Generation

For this study, custom-tuned versions of GPT-4 (JuneAugust 2024) were employed to generate fictional dialogues. The dialogues were framed as hypothetical "transcriptions of conversation," replicating the transcription style used in conversation analysis (CA) to study argumentative discourse. Ten dialogues were generated between customized GPT-4 profiles of Harry Potter and Ron Weasley, set in the narrative context of Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows. The full version of the dialogue prompt is included in Appendix A.

Prompt design prioritized conversational structure over narrative development. Specific instructions directed the models to vary sentence structure, maintain emotional tension, follow strict turn-taking conventions, and incorporate explicitly marked silencescategorized as short (1 second), medium (25 seconds), and long (5+ seconds). Due to GPT-4's extensive pretraining on popular literary texts, including Harry Potter, only minimal narrative scaffolding was needed.

Each dialogue was constructed turn-by-turn through a back-and-forth interaction between the two models: five dialogues were initiated by the Ron model and five by the Harry model. After each character's turn, the generated response was used as the next input for the counterpart model. This iterative exchange also functioned as a quality control mechanismresponses that were off-topic or inconsistent with the prompt were filtered out. The final ten dialogues were selected from a larger set of approximately twenty, chosen based on their fidelity to prompt instructions and emotional coherence.

Dialogue generation was conducted over several days and across multiple OpenAI accounts (all using the same model con-figurations) to accommodate content generation limits imposed within four-hour usage windows.

In addition to the primary prompt, a supplementary PDF guided silence placement. This included excerpts from Nikoli's The Functions of Silence in Confrontational Discourse, which outlined key distinctions between linguistic (intentional) and paralinguistic (unintentional) silence. The excerpts also addressed how silence placement affects interpretation, emphasizing that more extended silences often signify greater control or dominance:

"The more noticeable [a silence] is, the more significance in power control it bears"[2].

4.2 Prompting Process

4.2.1 Custom GPT Models
Initially, one prompt was fed into one GPT custom model; the dialogues would be generated in a new chat. However, in this case, dialogues would occasionally misgenerate and would be unusable. To mitigate this misgeneration, two prompts (one for the character Harry and the other for Ron) were inserted into two custom GPT models. Of the ten generated dialogues, five of the dialogues would be begun by Harry and the other five by Ron to vary and balance the order of turn-taking. This way, if one of the custom models had a misgeneration, that misgeneration could be regenerated into a proper response. Some examples of misgeneration include omitting details such as silence length within parentheses or rather than giving one turn, continuing to ramble.

4.2.2 Iterating Prompt Wording
GPT showed to interpret argumentative settings as including more petulant phrasing, such as "Not like anyone listens to what I have to say." When consulting with the book and film adaptation, Ron's character was portrayed as a young but mature man struggling under a great weight; to be more contextually accurate, the instructions "But do not be childish" were included. However, sometimes generations would also portray the two characters as too agreeable; thus, the instructions "DO NOT COMPROMISE! DO NOT BE NICE or EMPATHETIC" were emphasized as the theme of confrontational dialogue, in which the two speakers are unwilling to concede the floor, is central to the study.

Additionally, the original prompt was long, with many moving components. However, the final prompt limited the variability of conversational factors, attempting to observe how GPT utilizes specific types of silences within confrontational dialogue. In the original prompt, there were details that unnecessarily restricted conversation context. Additionally, GPT had a tendency to focus on a few details and overlook the rest if the prompt was too complicated. The following is an example of unnecessarily specific and restrictive instructions that were removed through prompt iteration:

"Feeling useless in the current dynamic, feeling inferior, useless, weak, projecting these insecurities onto Harry and Hermione, genuine concern for his family's safety, child-like expectation of being taken care ofquarrel harshly and resentfully with Harry, building the decision to leave, and misunderstanding the dynamics between Harry and Hermione"[10].

4.3 Survey Design

A two-part survey was administered to a voluntary sample of 22 participants, distributed via Google Forms and compiled using Google Sheets. Each participant was randomly assigned three unique dialogues for each survey. Each dialogue was evaluated ten times, and each data point reflects input from ten independent participants.

The first part of the survey asked participants to evaluate the realism of silences within the dialogues on a scale from 1 to 10. A rating of 1 indicated that the silence felt unnatural or implausible in real-world conversation, while a rating of 10 suggested it felt highly realistic; most answers lay on a spectrum between the two perceptions.

The second part of the survey asked participants to reposition the silences within the dialogue and assign a length (short, medium, or long) based on what felt most natural when reading the dialogue. This part focused on the performative and interpretive dimensions of silence in conversation.

Given the study's smaller scale, the results were analyzed qualitatively. Emphasis was placed on thematic interpretation, subjective patterns, and comparison with existing literature, rather than statistical generalizability.

Ultimately, these changes reflect limiting the variability of different aspects of dialogue that Chat GPT generates in order to isolate the different silence types that appear in confrontational dialogue. In particular, the special rules list within the prompt reflects the standardization of these conversational aspects.

4.4 Classification of Realisticness

To synthesize survey findings, participant ratings of silence realism were categorized as realistic, unrealistic, or inconclusive, based on both mean and mode thresholds:

- Realistic silences: average score >6 and mode >5

- Unrealistic silences: average score <4 and mode <5

- Inconclusive silences: any other combination outside these thresholds

This classification system provided a clear framework, especially in cases where responses were split across the scale's midpoint. By using both mean and mode, the system ensured that consensus, not just numerical centrality, was accounted for when determining the communicative plausibility of a given silence.

5 Results

This study aimed to explore the perceived realism of GPT-4-generated silences in confrontational dialogue. Results are organized into three subsections: Realism of Silences, Syntactic Placement, and Silence Length. Each offers a different perspective, addressing the question of what types of GPT-generated silences are perceived as most human-like. The broader implication concerns how GPT-4, as a language model, understands and deploys linguistic and paralinguistic silences within emotionally charged conversational contexts.

Results are interpreted qualitatively, and the silences were analyzed based on their realism ratings from Survey 1 and placement/length correlation in Survey 2. Correlation refers to the percentage of participants who placed the silence at the exact location and length as GPT-4 originally did. Silences with high correlation were deemed "closely correlated," while those with variable or inconsistent participant input were labeled "loosely correlated."

5.1 Realism of Silence

5.1.1 High Realism, Close Correlation

Silences perceived as realistic and closely correlated by participants consistently shared three traits:

- They were short in length.

- They occurred between simple independent clauses.

- They were marked by minimal punctuation, typically a single period.

These traits were consistently observed in the following examples:

- Dialogue #4, Silence #1: "I'm doing everything possible. (short) We don't have the luxury of time or safety."

- Dialogue #8, Silence #1: "You see enemies in every shadow because you're too scared to face the real ones. (short) And let's not forget who's leading us in circles.

- Dialogue #8, Silence #3: "Just doubt and criticism. (short) Always."

- Dialogue #10, Silence #2: "Please. (short) You don't even get it."

All four silences achieved 100% location correlation and over 50% length correlation. These results suggest that silences placed at clear syntactic boundaries, especially with minimal clause complexity, are perceived as most natural in human dialogue

5.1.2 High Realism, Loose Correlation

In contrast, several silences were also rated as realistic but had low participant agreement on placement or length. These silences shared similar structural features—short in length and placed near syntactic boundaries—but introduced additional punctuation such as commas, which appeared to reduce placement consistency:

- Dialogue #3, Silence #1: "Unlike you, who's been nothing but a dead weight this entire time. (short) You want to talk about solving things?"

- Dialogue #6, Silence #2: "What about our families, our lives? (short) You're so caught up in your own story."

- Dialogue #6, Silence #6: "It's easier than facing the truth, isn't it? (short) You'd rather hide behind silence."

These results suggest that while participants still perceived the silences as plausible, multiple syntactic breakpoints may confuse or disrupt their placement decisions, reducing correlation even if realism remained high.

5.1.3 Unrealistic Silences

Only three silences received consistently low realism ratings:

- Dialogue #1, Silence #1 (short silence mid-clause): "Just because you're not trapped under the weight of a prophecy (short) doesn't mean you understand what it's like to be me."

- Dialogue #1, Silence #2 (medium silence at a clause boundary): You think you're the only one with problems? (medium) I've got plenty of my own, thanks."

- Dialogue #6, Silence #5 (long silence at a clause boundary): "Maybe you're the one who doesn't get it. (long) You're so busy feeling sorry for yourself."

Notably, the unrealistic silences were either interruption-like insertions within clauses (e.g., mid-sentence) or unusually long, creating conversational friction that participants found implausible. This aligns with Nikoli's assertion that silence often signifies control or a break in conversational flow—and that excessively long silences, especially in emotionally charged settings, can provoke audience discomfort or appear unnatural.

5.2 Syntactic Placement

In the following three examples, silences appear in the middle of clauses and not at grammatical punctuations (syntactic boundaries). Their realistic rating was either unrealistic or inconclusive, and the correlation saw mixed results.

- Dialogue #1, Silence #1 was marked unrealistic, though participants correlated length and location 100% correctly: "Just because you're not trapped under the weight of a prophecy (short) doesn't mean you understand what it's like to be me."

- Dialogue #4, Silence #5 was marked inconclusive, and participants correlated location 100% correctly, but did poorly on length placement: "A better plan (medium) maybe start with trusting your friends?"

- Dialogue #10, Silence #3 was marked inconclusive, and participants did poorly on location correlation, though all but one participant correctly correlated length: "It's always been you in the spotlight, with me and Hermione just (medium) there."

5.3 Silence Length

In subsection, almost 100.00% of participants correctly correlated silence length as short. Alternatively, in subsection, participants mostly correlated short and medium silences, indicating a preference for shorter silences.

The examples above suggest that participants viewed silences at syntactic boundaries (between periods or other punctuation marks) as both realistic and correlatable. The differentiating factor between the two groups of examples was simple clauses (simple independent clauses) vs. complex clauses (with additional commas and dependent clauses); in both cases, participants revealed a preference for placing silences at punctuation marks that separated different clauses.

6 Discussion

The discussion section elaborates on the result section's categories with a more detailed interpretation. Two types of analysis are used: data and pattern interpretation and reference to related works.

6.1 Silences with high realism rating and close correlation

Examples:

- Dialogue #4 Silence #1: "I'm doing everything possible. (short) We don't have the luxury of time or safety."

- Dialogue #8 Silence #1: "You see enemies in every shadow because you're too scared to face the real ones. (short) And let's not forget who's leading us in circles.

- Dialogue #8 Silence #3: "Just doubt and criticism. (short) Always."

- Dialogue #10 Silence #2: "Please. (short) You don't even get it."

In these instances, short silences follow complete, grammatically closed clauses, occurring entirely within the speaker's turn. These do not function as "turn-constituting silences with illocutionary force," which Nikoli defines as silences that compel a response from the co-speaker.

Nikoli also observed that in confrontational discourse, such within-turn silences are rare and signal "complete control" of the floor.11 While it is unclear whether these GPT-generated silences explicitly assert dominance, their placement does suggest intentionality or "dramatic weight." The short duration (up to 2 seconds) lies at the intersection of paralinguistic (unintentional, e.g., catching breath) and linguistic (intentional, e.g., signaling dissatisfaction) functions.1 This aligns with Ephratt and Jaworski's framework of "axiological uncertainty," in which meaning emerges through contextual inference.5

Interestingly, longer sentences tend to yield short silences that suggest paralinguistic processing (e.g., cognitive load, breath), whereas shorter clauses may lend themselves to more deliberate, linguistic silence. This contrast suggests that restraint in language useparticularly in emotionally charged contextsmay implicitly communicate meaning. Although causality is difficult to determine, these examples reflect a consistent trend: high realism ratings correlate with short silences placed at syntactic boundaries.

6.2 Silences with high realism and loose correlation

- Dialogue #3, Silence #1: "Unlike you, who's been nothing but a dead weight this entire time. (short silence) You want to talk about solving things?"

- Dialogue #6, Silence #2: "What about our families, our lives? (short silence) You're so caught up in your own story."

- Dialogue #6, Silence #6: "It's easier than facing the truth, isn't it? (short silence) You'd rather hide behind silence."

These silences were rated as realistic but showed lower placement correlation across participants. All appear at syntactic boundaries, but the presence of additional punctuation (e.g., commas, question marks) may have increased ambiguity in pinpointing the silence location. The results suggest that participants rely on punctuation as cues for natural pauses in spoken dialogue.1

Despite this ambiguity, participants generally preferred short and medium silences, as reflected in their frequency of placement:

- Dialogue #3 Silence #1: three short silences correlated, three medium, and one long.

- Dialogue #6 Silence #6: four short silences correlated, four medium, and one long.

- Dialogue #6 Silence #2: two short silences correlated, and three medium.

In any case, participants perceived silences at syntactic boundaries as naturally on the shorter side, whether as a short or medium silence.

6.3 Silences that Don't Appear at Prosodic/Syntactical Boundaries

The following examples appeared at non-syntactic boundaries (eg. in the middle of a sentence):

- Dialogue #1 Silence #1: Unrealistic, 100.00% location and length correlation.

- Dialogue #4 Silence #5: Inconclusive, 100.00% location correlation, 20% length correlation.

- Dialogue #10 Silence #3: Inconclusive, 14.29% location correlation, 85.71% length correlation

These silences were placed mid-sentence, without syntactic cues. Unsurprisingly, participants struggled to agree on both placement and length, suggesting these mid-turn silences were neither expected nor perceived as natural. Unlike silences that occur at clause or sentence boundaries, these lacked prosodic or structural markers to signal a pause, thus making placement highly subjective. The lack of consensus indicates that creative interpretation plays a larger role when no grammatical indicators are present. Without shared structural expectations, participants' silence placement became inconsistent.

6.4 Unrealistic Silences

The following three examples are marked as unrealistic :

- Dialogue #1 Silence #1: "Just because you're not trapped under the weight of a prophecy (short silence) doesn't mean you understand what it's like to be me."

- Dialogue #1 Silence #2: "You think you're the only one with problems? (medium pause) I've got plenty of my own, thanks."

- Dialogue #6 Silence #5: "Maybe you're the one who doesn't get it. (long silence) You're so busy feeling sorry for yourself."

Only three silences were rated as unrealistic. The first is placed mid-sentence, which aligns with earlier findings on the challenges of interpreting non-boundary silences. The latter two, though placed at syntactic boundaries, involve longer durations, suggesting an intentional or dramatic pause. In confrontational dialogue, long silences are uncommon unless they mark a power

shift or provoke a response. Nikoli describes these as "turn-constituting silences with illocutionary force," which can disrupt the flow and compel the other speaker to respond[2]. Since GPT dialogues isolate turns, these long silences might feel unnatural because no interjection occurs, making the pause seem exaggerated or unrealistic. Ultimately, this suggests that long silences, even when placed appropriately, are more likely to be perceived as dramatic and therefore less authentic in dialogue without real-time interactivity.

6.5 Original Harry Potter Text/Screenplay Adaptation

In the original Harry Potter text, there aren't any explicit silences between Harry and Ron, but there are increased interruptions and shorter turn-taking as the argument escalates. This follows Nikoli's assertions about controlling the floor, and power in a confrontational setting: silence can be "a sign that the speaker is in an unfavorable position"[2]. However, the one instance of silence occurs, it's from Hermione's perspective; she hesitates with her words, represented through an ellipsis (...) however, this is not relevant to the current study (the Chat GPT generated dialogue only accounts for Harry and Ron). Nevertheless, Hermione's hesitation demonstrates that Harry and Ron do not want to concede the floor and thus give up power; only Hermione does, and she is a bystander in the power struggle[11].

In the screen adaptation "Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows: Part 1," there are always silences between each sentence spoken by the actor these are paralinguistic pauses, and like accents/stress syllables, are part of verbal convention and speech would sound unnatural without these factors. At 0.09, Harry lets a silence unfold for around 3 seconds as he closes the book before him. Additionally, at 1:02 Harry is silent after Ron's accusation, but the focus on the camera is on Hermione speaking. In this regard, film adaptations incorporate props and change in narrative focus, and so they introduce variables outside this study's scope. However, silences between sentences become shorter as characters become more animated, interrupting each other more frequently. This is a trend that also occurs in the book scene, and supports Nikoli assertions of floor control[12].

6.5.1 Survey Format

Participants completed the two surveys through Google Forms and so the environment in which they took the survey was unregulated. They may have been eating lunch, chatting with friends, or in the car; there was no explicit assurance that external influences did not bias results. However, most participants admitted to completing the survey on their laptops, likely in a quiet setting.

In survey #2, excess context was cut and the given information was localized to the sentences immediately before and after the silences. This meant that some sentences were longer than others, based on how factors such as punctuation and dependent clauses were utilized. However, this was a necessary precaution because otherwise, participants would have had too many possible locations to place the silences and the results would have been inconclusive. However, participants had access to survey #1, with the full context for each silence, and this limitation may have partly been minimized.

6.5.2 Silence Length

The silence designations short, medium, and long represented the time values 1 second, 2-5 seconds, and 5+ seconds, respectively. This designation was received from the survey participants, whose consensus seemed to fall around these values. This designation is not based on an official convention system and is unique to this paper, but in this regard, the survey participants' perception of silence length is consistent with this designation.

7 Conclusion

By interpreting survey data and analyzing GPT-generated dialogues through the lens of related works, this study found that Chat GPT-4 can reproduce human-like silences within dialogue. This was evidenced by high realism ratings and strong placement correlations across participant responses in Surveys#1 and#2. Participants consistently favored short silences occurring at syntactic boundaries, which are generally understood as paralinguisticnatural pauses for breath or cognitive processing. These are universally recognizable and intuitively accepted.

However, participant agreement was largely limited to silences they could interpret as paralinguistic. In contrast, linguistic silences, which serve a communicative or pragmatic function, depended more heavily on context and sentence-level interpretation. Because such silences require individual cognitive framing, they were subject to greater variation across participant responses. A future quantitative study may provide further insight into how different groups interpret linguistic silences, but the present study was largely qualitative and did not address large-scale perceptual variation.

In framing the results, the analysis drew on patterns across several categories: silences with high realism and strong correlation, those with high realism and weak correlation, and silences that were rated unrealistic. Through these categories, consistent trends emergedmost notably, the tendency for short, syntactically aligned silences to be perceived as more natural, and for mid-sentence or long silences to be viewed as less realistic or too deliberate.

Furthermore, the related works provided a reference in analyzing silence in context in particular, "The Functions of Silence in Confrontational Discourse" was compared to this study's results. Silence's functions of power and the role of silence was examined (paralinguistic vs. linguistic), though there was no empirical metric to determine the influence of these factors on the perceived realism of silences. Although related works regarding functions of silence in arguments provided insight into

the Harry Potter original scene and screenplay adapts, which both demonstrated patterns of interruption and controlling the floor; for the most part, both speakers did not want to concede silence. In this regard, this study did not focus or follow these trends, and silence was mostly focused within turns (and not in-between turns). Though the GPT-prompting may have reduced ecological variety of outputs in this regard, it was necessary in maintaining a workable and consistent experiment; ultimately, the restrictive nature of this experiment demonstrates GPT's lack of ability in creating sophisticated silences both within and in between speaker turns.

For this study, literature/related works regarding linguistic theory on silences, computational creativity, and the intersection between both was examined. Silence categorizations such as paralinguistic and linguistic were applied in this paper, the variables that determine paralinguistic and linguistic (as asserted by Kurzon) were isolated to the individual silences and their intentionality based on context[4]. The cultural variability of silence perception was acknowledged, though the small scale of the study also renders these kinds of observations inconclusive. The definitions of computational creativity was touched upon, and the need for a large data pool regarding matters of human opinion; due to the smaller scale of this study, results were considered more qualitative than quantitative, though some survey results showed consistent patterns. The related works of co-authoring with AI influenced prompt generation, and the article on silence as power and the one on the interplay of linguistics and AI both influenced the analysis of data.

Ultimately, this study aims to bridge the gap between linguistics and artificial intelligence, particularly in evaluating how AI replicates pragmatic elements of conversation, such as silence. GPT-4 proved capable of identifying and reproducing patterns in silence usage but often defaulted to formulaic or repetitive structures. The survey data revealed that participants gravitate toward silences that align with spoken norms, but GPT-4 lacked the generative complexity to simulate more nuanced, context-driven silencesa limitation that was further illustrated in the analysis of unrealistic examples. This research contributes to a growing body of interdisciplinary work in linguistics, AI, and natural language generation, and offers a foundation for larger-scale, quantitative studies on how humans perceive and evaluate silence in dialogue. As AI systems continue to evolve, the intersection of computational modeling and linguistic theory offers exciting new avenues for understanding how languagespoken and unspokenoperates in human communication. With responsible methodology and interdisciplinary collaboration, AI can become a powerful tool for exploring the cognitive and cultural dimensions of silence.

7.1 Limitations of Study

The unique methodology utilizing GPT-4 warranted an unconventional dialogue format; the format of these GPT-generated dialogues are unique to this paper. Though the analysis utilizes terminology and theories from the related works section, the data collection and analysis did not use conventional means.

Additionally, due to this unique methodology, the prompt/instructions contained specific instructions such as "DO NOT COMPROMISE" and an attached PDF of BBC hardtalk interviews that may have reduced the ecological variety of GPT output. However, at the time of the experiment (June-August 2024), GPT-4 outputs were too varied, often did not follow general instructions, and went on irrelevant tangents. Thus, the following restrictions were necessary to create a workable experiment; though ecological variety may have been reduced through specific prompts, GPT-4 was able to produce the dialogues that followed consistent parameters that would later on produce more legitimate survey results.

Furthermore, Chat GPT-4 restrictive prompting was influenced by GPT's tendency towards "absurd semantic connections"[8]. Similar to "early AI systems," which "often employedlinguistic rules and grammatical structures were explicitly encoded to parse and generate sentences" these prompts provided comprehensive and specific instructions and inhibited GPT malfunction and hallucination[9].

Ultimately, this unique methodology made the experiment isolated, and the participant surveys compared GPT-generated dialogues to other GPT-generated dialogues. A next step in evaluating how GPT recreates silence could be through having participants rate the realism of/place silences within the book/screen adaptation of Harry Potter.

References

1   L. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, 1933.

2   M. Nikoli, *The Functions of Silence in Confrontational Discourse*, 2016.

3   *Collins English Dictionary*, 2000.

4   M. Ephratt, *Linguistic, paralinguistic, and extralinguistic speech and silence*, 2011.

5   M. Ephratt, *Verbal silence as figure: its contribution to linguistic theory*, 2016.

6   A. A. A. Duhoe and E. Giddi, *Semantic analysis of silence in conversational discourse*, 2020, Unpublished manuscript.

7   A. Jordanous, *A standardized procedure for evaluating creative systems: computational creativity evaluation based on what it is to be creative*, 2012.

8   M. Ghajargar, J. Bardzell and L. Lagerkvist, *A redhead walks into a bar: experiences of writing fiction with artificial intelligence*, 2022.

9   S. Ahmad, *Interplay between linguistics and AI*, 2024, https://www.academia.edu/116822662/Interplay_Between_Linguistics_and_AI.

10 OpenAI, *ChatGPT-4 [Large language model]*, `https://chatgpt.com/share/6851b19a-2e5c-800d-a265-5405a543939d`, 2024, (June–August 2024 version).

11 J. K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*, 2018.

12 Wizarding World, *Ron leaves — Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows Pt. 1*, `https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HXcA5sZrRlk`, 2019.

8 Appendix

8.1 Appendix A GPT Prompt Drafting: Primary Prompt

Two custom GPT models were created with Chat GPT-4 as the AI model, and were instructed through the custom model feature with the following instructions(both models had these instructions, with _____ at 2) filled as Harry Potter and Ronald Weasley, respectively.

1) This experiment reimagines a scene from"Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows" when Ronald Weasley heatedly argues with Harry Potter in the tent. ***You cannot begin your turn in dialogue with a question for more than one occasion. You cannot use the same sentence structure for your turn in dialogue for more than one occasion. ***Refer to Chat GPT data training and the attached PDF for conversational direction

2) Chat GPT, you are playing _____. ***DO NOT COMPROMISE! DO NOT BE NICE or EMPATHETIC. But do not be childish. NOTE: You must occasionally incorporate silences into the conversation at appropriate locations. The placement of silences cannot follow the same pattern, and they must follow the information in the attached PDF.

3) Special Rules: Include silences appropriately and sparingly as (short), (medium), and (long), each corresponding to short, medium, and long pause length. End your turn with "." usually or "_" if you think you should be interrupted. Neither should happen more than a few times in a row.

NOTE: Create rapid exchanges and frequent interruptions. Occasionally, talk in a longer paragraph form for one turn. Sometimes, makes the overall turn length highly varied, and sometimes, makes it relatively consistent. Silences could be used to indicate not wanting to talk at all or about a specific thing, showing agreement, protecting self image, reacting to unexpected information/deviant behavior, extreme emotions, lack of information or knowledge, asserting power/drama, trailing off from a sentence. Each turn should either be: Silent turn (0 sentences; write " is silent") Short turn (1 sentence or less than one sentence) Normal turn (2+sentences) 6) FOLLOW these RULES of conversation: a) Subtext: Hidden agenda. Say less, mean more. Silent tension. b) Economy: Cut fat. No fillers. Purposeful words. c) Depth: Philosophical clash. Moral dilemma. Worldview clash. d) Unexpectedness: Plot twist. Off-script. Surprise element. e) Wit: Quick zingers. Clever turns. Mind games.

8.2 Appendix B: Dialogues

Dialogue#1
Harry: "Fine, Ron. So you really think you've got all the answers, don't you? Just because you're not trapped under the weight of a prophecy silence#1→ (short) doesn't mean you understand what it's like to be me."
Harry: "Oh, suddenly lost for words? That's a first. But don't worry, I can fill in the blanks. You think you're the only one with problems? silence#2→(medium) I've got plenty of my own, thanks. And I'm the one hailed as 'The Chosen One'."
Ron: silence#3→ Ron is silent.
Harry: "Every problem you have is a walk in the park compared to mine. You think being 'The Chosen One' is some sort of privilege? It's a curse, Ron. silence#4→ (short) A curse I never asked for. "
Ron: "You know what? Forget it. You're right, Harry. You've got it so much worse than everyone else. Must be tough being you. silence#5→ (long) I'll just go back to my insignificant little problems then, shall I?"

Dialogue#2
Ron: "We've been at this for months, Harry. And for what? We're no closer to finding those Horcruxes. It's not exactly like the Horcruxes are going to find themselves, is it?"
Harry: "You think I don't know that, Ron? We're doing everything we can." Ron: "Right, because wandering aimlessly is a brilliant strategy. We're practically sitting ducks out here, Harry. And for what? Some vague hope?"
Harry: "Wandering aimlessly? You think that's what we're doing? Every move we make, every place we go, it's all part of the plan. It's not hope, Ronit's strategy. And it's the only one we've got."
Ron: "Plan? silence#1→ (short) What plan, Harry? We're just reacting, not planning. We're supposed to be hunting Horcruxes, not camping in the wild, guessing our next move."
Harry: "Reacting? That's rich, coming from you. silence#2→ (medium) We're working with the information we have, Ron. It's not perfect, but it's all we've got. This is a war, not a game of chess. We can't predict every move."

Dialogue#3
Harry: "Harry is silent."
Ron: "Ron is silent."
Harry: "Fine, we'll just sit here then, not solving anything. It's what you seem to be best at anyway."
Ron: "Oh, solving things? Like you've solved the mystery of the Horcruxes? You've been brilliant at that, haven't you? Just sitting here, guessing."
Harry: "Guessing? At least I'm trying to figure this out. Unlike you, who's been nothing but a dead weight this entire time. silence#1→ (short) You want to talk about solving things? Start contributing then."
Ron: "Contribute? You think this is about not trying? It's about being realistic, Harry! We're chasing shadows while Voldemort's gaining power every minute. And here we are, stuck in a tent, with no plan, no clue

Dialogue#4
Ron: "It's always the same with you, Harry. Plans and secrets, but no actual progress. Where's your great leadership now?"
Harry: "You think it's easy? Making decisions while constantly on the run, not knowing who to trust? You're not the one with a target on your back, Ron. I'm doing everything I can. Silence#1→(short) We don't have the luxury of time or safety."
Ron: "Oh, I understand the stakes, Harry. But understanding doesn't mean I have to agree with every reckless decision you make. We're supposed to be a team, remember? Yet, here we are, stumbling in the dark."
Harry: "A team? Silence#2→(medium) You're acting more like a hindrance than a teammate. If you can't handle the pressure, then maybe you should just go back home. My decisions are aimed at stopping Voldemort, not at keeping you comfortable."
Ron: "Go back home? Silence#3→(short) That's your solution, is it? Just push away anyone who challenges you? I'm not some coward, Harry, running isn't my style. But ignoring the obvious isn't either. We're lost, and you won't even admit it."
Harry: "Lost? Silence#4→(long) You think I don't know that? But admitting defeat isn't going to change our situation. We have to keep moving, keep fighting. If you have a better plan, Ron, let's hear it. Otherwise, your complaints are just noise."
Ron: "A better plan Silence#5→(medium) maybe start with trusting your friends? You keep things too close to your chest, Harry. And that secrecy? It's tearing us apart more than any curse ever could. Real leadership isn't just about making decisions, it's about trust. Trust, Harry, something you seem to have forgotten."

Dialogue#5
Harry: Fine, so now you're questioning my decisions? As if I don't have enough on my plate trying to defeat Voldemort.
Ron: Oh, that's rich, Harry. You, questioning my questioning? Like you're the only one with problems. I've been here, risking my neck alongside you, and for what? To be second-guessed at every turn? Silence#1→ (short) You think you're the only one with a plate full? Please.
Harry: You think this is just about you, Ron? Silence#2→ (medium) This is bigger than any one of us. I'm out here, making the hard choices, while you just complain and moan. I don't have time for this
Ron: Like you'd listen

Harry: Harry is silent.

Ron: Ron is silent.

Dialogue#6

Ron: "It's your fault, Harry. Everything's falling apart because of you." Harry: "No, Ron. It's not my fault you can't see the bigger picture. Voldemort's return, the danger we're init's far beyond what you can understand. Silence#1→(short) You're just looking for someone to blame."

Ron: "Blame? You think this is about blame? You're the one with the grand 'Chosen One' complex, not me. You don't get it. You never have. It's always about you, isn't it? Always Harry Potter's problems, Harry Potter's danger. What about the rest of us, eh? What about our families, our lives? Silence#2→(short) You're so caught up in your own story, you don't see anyone else's.?

Harry: "My own story? You think I asked for any of this? Silence#3→(short) You think I enjoy being hunted, being responsible for everyone's safety? This isn't about ego, Ron. It's about survival. Our families, our livesthey all depend on us stopping Voldemort. Silence#4→(medium) And if you're too scared to see that, maybe you're the one who doesn't get it. Silence#5→(long) You're so busy feeling sorry for yourself, you can't see the real fight in front of us."

Ron: Ron is silent

Harry: "Fine. Keep quiet then. It's easier than facing the truth, isn't it? Silence#6→(short) You'd rather hide behind silence than admit we're in this mess together. Silence#7→(long) But remember, Ron, silence won't protect you from what's coming. Nothing will, except fighting back. Silence#8→(medium) So, keep your silence if you must, but it changes nothing."

Dialogue#7

Harry: "Why do you even bother with that deluminator, Ron? It's useless in our situation."

Ron: "Useless? You clearly don't get it, Harry. That deluminator... it's not just about turning lights on and off. It's about connection, loyalty. Something you wouldn't understand lately. Silence#1→(medium) Dumbledore left it to me for a reason."

Harry: "Ron, loyalty? Like how you"

Ron: "Like how I what, Harry? Stick around when things get tough? Unlike some"

Harry: "That's not what I meant, but if you want to play the martyr, thenSilence#2→(medium)"

Ron: "Martyr?

   Silence#3→(short) No, Harry. I'm just seeing things for what they are. Silence#4→(long) Unlike you, lost in your 'Chosen One' fantasy."

Dialogue#8

Ron: "Fine. It's always my fault, apparently. You think you're always right, Harry."

Harry: "Oh, it's not about thinking, Ron. I know I'm right. This isn't about blame, it's about facing facts. We're in this mess because you can't see past your own insecurities."

Ron: "Insecurities? Ha! That's rich, coming from you. You see enemies in every shadow because you're too scared to face the real ones. Silence#1→(short) And let's not forget who's leading us in circles."

Harry: "Leadership? You wouldn't recognize it if it hit you in the face, Ron."

Ron: "Recognize leadership? Silence#2→(medium) I know enough to see when someone's leading us straight to disaster. That's your specialty, isn't it, Harry?"

Harry: "You're blind, Ron. Facing Voldemort, risking everything - that's me. Your part? Just doubt and criticism. Silence#3→(short) Always."

Dialogue#9

Harry: "Ron, do you even understand the situation we're in? You've done nothing but complain since we left Hogwarts."

Ron: "Complain? Right, because sitting around doing nothing is so much better. We're supposed to be finding Horcruxes, Harry, not camping in the wilderness! Silence#1→(medium) And let's not forget, it was your brilliant idea to leave without a proper plan."

Harry: "We're not just sitting around, Ron. I'm following Dumbledore's plan. He trusted me to figure this out, not to have every step laid out for us like a day at Hogwarts. Silence#2→(short) Your problem is you want easy answers, and there aren't any."

Ron: "Dumbledore's plan? That's rich. He left you a broken Snitch, a book of fairy tales, and no instructions! Silence#3→(short) You're not following a plan, you're groping in the dark. And me? Wanting easy answers? No, Harry, I want a plan that actually makes sense, not this... blind faith in a dead man's cryptic clues."

Harry: Harry is silent.

Ron: "Dumbledore trusted you, Harry, but look where it's got us. Nowhere. Silence#4→(medium) Stuck in a tent, with no clue about the next Horcrux. You call this a plan? I call it a disaster. We're supposed to be saving the world, not playing guessing games in the woods."

Dialogue#10

Harry: "Stop whining, Ron. You're just bitter and it's pathetic." Ron: "Oh, look at you, playing the hero again, Harry. Just like always."

Harry: "Yeah, playing the hero. Someone's got to do it, don't they? And it's not like you're stepping up. Silence#1→(medium) You just stand there, whining."

Ron: "That's rich, coming from you. Always the chosen one, aren't you? But let's talk about stepping up, shall we? I've been there, haven't I? Through thick and thin. But you, you just expect everyone to follow without question, to risk everything while you play your part in this grand story. You think you're the only one making sacrifices? I've given up just as much, faced just as many dangers. But you wouldn't understand, would you? It's always about Harry Potter, his struggles, his destiny. Well, guess what? We're all in this mess together, but it seems like you're too caught up in your own narrative to see that."

Harry: "Right, Harry, because everything's about you, isn't it? Always the martyr. You think you've given up so much. Please. Silence#2→(short) You don't even get it."

Ron:"Oh, I get it, Harry. I get it more than you think. It's always been you in the spotlight, with me and Hermione just Silence#3 → (medium) there. Sidekicks, right? But it's not just about being in the shadows, it's about

8.3 Appendix C: Data Tables

Table 1 Dialogue Silences Classifications Based on Ratings in Survey #1

	Average	Mode	Median	% of Unrealistic Ratings	% of Realistic Ratings	Classification
Dialogue #1 [silence #1]	3.88	1	3	70.00%	30.00%	UN
Dialogue #1 [silence #2]	2.13	2	2	90.91%	9.09%	UN
Dialogue #1 [silence #3]	7.75	9	9	18.18%	81.82%	R
Dialogue #1 [silence #4]	7.38	8	8	27.27%	72.73%	R
Dialogue #1 [Silence #5]	5.25	6	6	45.45%	54.55%	NA
Dialogue #2 [silence #1]	6.89	7	7	18.18%	81.82%	R
Dialogue #2 [silence #2]	4.78	4	4	54.55%	45.45%	NA
Dialogue #3 [silence #1]	6.38	6	6	30.00%	70.00%	R
Dialogue #4 [silence #1]	6.00	8	6.5	33.33%	66.67%	R
Dialogue #4 [silence #2]	5.20	6	6	41.67%	58.33%	NA
Dialogue #4 [silence #3]	5.80	9	6.5	41.67%	58.33%	NA
Dialogue #4 [silence #4]	4.50	3	3.5	75.00%	25.00%	NA
Dialogue #4 [silence #5]	5.50	4	4	58.33%	41.67%	NA
Dialogue #5 [silence #1]	5.90	1	5.5	50.00%	50.00%	NA
Dialogue #5 [silence #2]	5.30	9	6	41.67%	58.33%	NA
Dialogue #6 [silence #1]	7.58	9	8	23.08%	76.92%	R
Dialogue #6 [silence #2]	6.67	10	7	30.77%	69.23%	R
Dialogue #6 [silence #3]	6.17	10	7	38.46%	61.54%	R
Dialogue #6 [silence #4]	5.92	9	6	46.15%	53.85%	NA
Dialogue #6 [silence #5]	3.92	3	3	69.23%	30.77%	UN
Dialogue #6 [silence #6]	6.33	7	7	25.00%	75.00%	R
Dialogue #6 [silence #7]	6.25	6	6	38.46%	61.54%	R
Dialogue #6 [silence #8]	5.58	8	6	46.15%	53.85%	NA
Dialogue #7 [silence #1]	6.00	7	7	41.67%	58.33%	R
Dialogue #7 [silence #2]	5.36	3	4.5	54.55%	45.45%	NA
Dialogue #7 [silence #3]	7.09	5	7	41.67%	58.33%	NA
Dialogue #7 [silence #4]	4.83	3	4.5	63.64%	36.36%	NA
Dialogue #8 [silence #1]	6.75	7	7	44.44%	55.56%	R
Dialogue #8 [silence #2]	4.75	2	5	55.56%	44.44%	NA
Dialogue #8 [silence #3]	6.88	10	7	25.00%	75.00%	R
Dialogue #9 [silence #1]	6.00	5	6	44.44%	55.56%	NA
Dialogue #9 [silence #2]	6.57	7	7	44.44%	55.56%	R
Dialogue #9 [silence #3]	6.29	4	6	44.44%	55.56%	NA
Dialogue #9 [silence #4]	6.57	6	6	33.33%	66.67%	R
Dialogue #10 [silence #1]	6.00	9	7	22.22%	77.78%	R
Dialogue #10 [silence #2]	7.86	9	8.5	30.00%	70.00%	R
Dialogue #10 [silence #3]	6.43	4	5	50.00%	50.00%	NA

Table 2 Unrealistic and Realistic Silences.

Unrealistic Silences	Realistic Silences
● Dialogue #1 [silence #1]	● Dialogue #1 [silence #3]**
● Dialogue #1 [silence #2]	● Dialogue #1 [silence #4]
● Dialogue #6 [silence #5]	● Dialogue #2 [silence #1]*
	● Dialogue #3 [silence #1]
	● Dialogue #4 [silence #1]
	● Dialogue #6 [silence #1]*
	● Dialogue #6 [silence #2]
	● Dialogue #6 [silence #3]
	● Dialogue #6 [silence #6]
	● Dialogue #6 [silence #7]
	● Dialogue #7 [silence #1]
	● Dialogue #8 [silence #1]
	● Dialogue #8 [silence #3]
	● Dialogue #9 [silence #2]
	● Dialogue #9 [silence #4]
	● Dialogue #10 [silence #1]*
	● Dialogue #10 [silence #2]

*Indicate the Top 3 based on Realistic Rating
**GPT-4 did not place Dialogue #1 [silence #3] as instructed (and is marked differently from the other silences), and thus is irrelevant.

Table 3 Realistic Silences Survey #2 Responses

Silence Name	Silence Placement Responses (Bolded is the Correct Silence Placement)	Original Length of Silence Written by CHAT-GPT	% Placement Correctness	Distribution of Length	% Length + Placement Correctness	Average Rating
Dialogue #1 [silence #4]	- being you (silence) I'll - then (silence) shall I? — 1 short, 1 medium, 0 long	short	71.43%	1 short, 1 medium	14.29%	7.38
Dialogue #2 [silence #1]	- Plan? (silence) What plan, Harry?	Short	100.00%	7 short, 2 medium	77.78%	6.89
Dialogue #3 [silence #1]	- time. (silence) You want - Unlike you, (silence) who's — 2 medium	Short	77.78%	3 short, 3 medium, 1 long	33.33%	6.38
Dialogue #4 [silence #1]	- I'm doing everything I can. (silence) We don't have the luxury of time or safety.	Short	100.00%	10 short	100.00%	6
Dialogue #6 [silence #1]	- Understand (silence) you're - No silence	Short	90.00%	8 short, 1 medium	80.00%	7.58
Dialogue #6 [silence #2]	- Lives(silence)You're - Families (silence) our — 4/10: 4 short, 0 medium, 0 long - No silence 1/10	Short	50.00%	2 short, 3 medium	20.00%	6.67
Dialogue #6 [silence #3]	- This (silence) you	Short	100.00%	8 short, 1 medium, 1 long	80.00%	6.17
Dialogue #6 [silence #6]	- Isn't it (silence) you'd rather	Short	100.00%	short, 4 medium, 1 long	50.00%	6.33
Dialogue #6 [silence #7]	- Together (silence) but ——5/10, 1 short, 2 medium, 2 long - Ron (silence) silence — 5/10, 3 short, 1 medium	Long	50%	1 short, 2 medium, 2 long	20.00%	6.25
Dialogue #7 [silence #1]	- Lately(silence)dumbledore	Medium	100.00%	6 short, 1 medium, 1 long	12.50%	6
Dialogue #8 [silence #1]	- Ones (silence) and	Short	100.00%	4 short, 2 medium, 2 long	80.00%	6.75
Dialogue #8 [silence #3]	- Criticism (silence) always	Short	100.00%	4 short, 4 medium	50.00%	6.88
Dialogue #9 [silence #2]	- For us(silence)like — 1/8, 1 short - Hogwarts(silence)your - Answers(silence)and — 3/8, 2 short, 1 medium	Short	50.00%	3 short, 1 long	37.50%	6.57
Dialogue #9 [silence #4]	- Nowhere (silence) stuck in - About (silence) the — 1/8, 1 short	Medium	87.50%	2 short, 4 medium, 1 long	50.00%	6.57
Dialogue #10 [silence #1]	- There(silence)whining — 4/7, 3 short, 1 medium - up(silence)you	Medium	42.86%	2 short, 1 medium	14.29%	6
Dialogue #10 [silence #2]	- Please(silence) you	Short	100.00%	6 short, 1 long	85.71%	7.86