

1-21-2016

Automatic Speech Recognition Systems as Tools to Enhance Spoken Communication in the Workplace

Linda Gottermeier

Bonine L. Bastian

Carol De Filippis

Raja Kushalnagar

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.rit.edu/other>

Recommended Citation

Gottermeier, Linda; Bastian, Bonine L.; De Filippis, Carol; and Kushalnagar, Raja, "Automatic Speech Recognition Systems as Tools to Enhance Spoken Communication in the Workplace" (2016). Accessed from <http://scholarworks.rit.edu/other/839>

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by RIT Scholar Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Presentations and other scholarship by an authorized administrator of RIT Scholar Works. For more information, please contact ritscholarworks@rit.edu.

BACKGROUND

The workplace presents many challenges for individuals with hearing loss. Communication on the job involves written or spoken English about 80% of the time, whether with or without sign (Kelly et al., 2015). Job-related demands cause even more difficult communication situations for those who are deaf compared to those who are hard-of-hearing (Boutin & Wilson, 2009). To gain upward mobility, a wide array of flexible strategies is essential for communicating with people who have typical hearing (Foster & Walter, 1992).

OUR QUESTIONS

Given the spoken-language communication requirements of the workplace, to what extent does current speech recognition technology, especially as available in mobile apps, enhance access by deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals?

Are speech recognition apps usable tools to enhance exchanges between deaf or hard-of-hearing persons and individuals who have typical hearing, whether it be a coworker or a boss?

OUR TRIALS AND PARTICIPANTS

To investigate the capabilities of newer Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) applications/software as tools to support auditory access of spoken communication, we asked deaf and hard-of-hearing college students to use a variety of applications and software in everyday, job-related and social settings and to provide evaluative feedback on their experiences.

Participants were undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in one of these courses or activities:

Freshman Seminar
Organizational Communication and the Deaf Employee
Individual speech-language instruction

Fall 2013

GROUP 1 = 15 students tested in quiet settings

- Office meetings with professors
- Computer Help Desk

Spring 2015

GROUP 2 = 11 students tested in crowded group settings

- Classroom
- Career Fair

Fall 2015

GROUP 3 = 21 students tested in a variety of day-to-day settings

- 1:1 and group social conversations with friends & family

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS AND OVERVIEW OF EXPERIENCES

		Group 1 (n = 15)	Group 2 (n = 11)	Group 3 (n=21)
Location/use setting		Quiet, 1:1	Large crowded open area	Various settings, 1:1 & group social conversations
Self-rated speech intelligibility	"All or most of my speech is intelligible"	n = 8	n = 5	n = 13
	"Some or none of my speech is intelligible"	n = 7	n = 6	n = 8
Predicted on-the-job communication	Speech alone	n = 8	n = 6	n = 13
	Writing	n = 7	n = 5	n = 8
App Ratings on a scale of 1-5 (1 = poor; 5 = outstanding)				
Apps for iPhone users (range and mean of overall ratings)	Dragon Dictation	n = 7 Rated 3.0-4.0; M = 3.5	n = 7 Rated 2.0-4.0; M = 3.0	
	Siri (in Notes app)	n = 4 Rated 3.0-4.0; M = 3.5	n = 3 Rated 2.0-4.0; M = 3.0	n = 11 Rated 2.5-5.0; M = 3.2
	Ava (BETA app)			n = 12 Rated 1.8-5.0; M = 3.6
Apps for Android users (range and mean of overall ratings)	DEAFCOM	n = 2 Rated 3.0-4.0; M = 3.5		
	Google Translate		n = 1 Rated 3.0	
	Virtual Voice	n = 2 Rated 3.5-4.0; M = 3.75		
	Google Now (in Memo app)			n = 8 Rated 2.0-3.8; M = 2.8
	Ava (BETA app)			n = 9 Rated 1.0-4.8; M = 3.1

A CLOSER LOOK AT ASR APP RATINGS

GROUP 3 DATA	Siri (in Notes app) iOS Users	Google Now (in Memo app) Android Users	Ava (BETA app) iOS Users	Ava (BETA app) Android Users
Ease of use	Rated 3.5-5.0 M = 4.1	Rated 2.5-3.8 M = 3.0	Rated 3.8-5.0 M = 4.2	Rated 2.5-3.5 M = 3.0
Usefulness in making communication happen	Rated 2.8-4.0 M = 3.4	Rated 2.0-3.0 M = 2.3	Rated 2.8-4.0 M = 3.6	Rated 1.8-2.8 M = 2.0
Latency or lag time	Rated 2.5-3.0 M = 2.8	Rated 2.0-3.5 M = 3.0	Rated 1.8-3.0 M = 2.9	Rated 1.0-3.5 M = 2.5
Accuracy of the text when people spoke	Rated 3.0-3.5 M = 3.3	Rated 2.0-3.0 M = 2.3	Rated 3.5-3.8 M = 3.6	Rated 2.0-3.5 M = 2.8
Accuracy of the text when deaf users spoke	Rated 2.8-3.0 M = 2.9	Rated 2.0-3.0 M = 2.5	Rated 3.3-4.0 M = 3.4	Rated 2.5-3.3 M = 3.0

STUDY RESULTS

Students who relied on ASL:

- Found key word reception to be an "amazing" and "awesome" benefit of ASR.
- Ava performed "Better than Google. Helped me a lot."

Students who relied on Spoken English:

- Found issues with accuracy and latency, especially in noise.
- Even though many had highly intelligible speech, Ava/built-in ASR failed to recognize all deaf users' speech.

Overall:

- Ava performed slightly better than Siri for ALL iOS users.
- Perceived benefit of ASR apps is highly individual.
- Perceptions of ASR apps ranged all along a continuum of claims: "Not worth it to my family. We are very oral". "Had the best conversation with a hearing family member in past 5 years because we were able to talk in deeper context".


FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- Improve algorithms for increased accuracy and decreased latency, especially in noise and when experiencing poor internet connectivity.
- Investigate directional and Bluetooth microphones to improve performance in noise.
- Improve recognition of deaf talkers' speech.
- Develop user training in the area of persuading hearing individuals to use ASR apps.
- Explore the possibility of using Ava/built-in ASR to support video transcription.

ADDITIONAL APP RESOURCES



<http://bit.ly/AppleAppsNTID>



<http://bit.ly/AndroidAppsNTID>



<http://bit.ly/WindowsAppsNTID>



REFERENCES

Amlani, A. (2015). *Improving patient compliance to hearing healthcare services and treatment through self-efficacy and smartphone applications*. *Hearing Review*, 21(2):16.

Boutin, D. L., and Wilson, K. B. (2009). *Professional jobs and hearing loss: A comparison of deaf and hard of hearing consumers*. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 75(1): 36-40.

Cauchon, D. (2010). *Driest spell yet for summer work*. *USA Today*, 9/7/10.

Childress, T. (2015). *Apps for Kids (and Adults) with Hearing Loss*. Used with written permission.

Foster, S., & Walter, G. (1992). *Deaf students in postsecondary education*. Accessed from <http://scholarworks.rit.edu/books/5>

Harris, R. (1989). *Deaf people as entrepreneurs*. *The Deaf American*, 39 (4), 6-16.

Kelly, R., Quagliata, A., DeMartino, R., & Perotti, V. (2015). *Deaf workers: Educated and employed, but limited in career growth*. In Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Education of the Deaf. Athens, Greece.

Ludden, LaVerne (2013). *Job Savvy*. New York: Just Publishing.

MacLeod-Gallinger, J. (1992). *The career status of deaf women: A comparative look*, *American Annals of the Deaf*, 137 (4), 320.

Pressman, S. (1999). *A National Study of Deaf Entrepreneurs and Small Business Owners*. Doctoral dissertation. Virginia Technical Institute