

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is an author's version which may differ from the publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/76245>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2021-02-25 and may be subject to change.

THE SELECTION OF PRONUNCIATION VARIANTS: COMPARING THE PERFORMANCE OF MAN AND MACHINE

Judith M. Kessens, Mirjam Wester, Catia Cucchiarini & Helmer Strik

A²RT, Dept. of Language & Speech, University of Nijmegen
P.O. Box 9103, 6500 HD Nijmegen, The Netherlands
{kessens, wester, catia, strik}@let.kun.nl, <http://lands.let.kun.nl/>

ABSTRACT

In this paper the performance of an automatic transcription tool is evaluated. The transcription tool is a Continuous Speech Recognizer (CSR) running in forced recognition mode. For evaluation the performance of the CSR was compared to that of nine expert listeners. Both man and the machine carried out exactly the same task: deciding whether a segment was present or not in 467 cases. It turned out that the performance of the CSR is comparable to that of the experts.

1. INTRODUCTION

In many sociolinguistic investigations, phonetic transcriptions are used as a basis for research. A phonetic transcription is obtained by auditory analysis of an utterance into a sequence of speech units represented by phonetic symbols. It follows that making phonetic transcriptions is extremely time-consuming. For this reason, sociolinguists often decide not to transcribe whole utterances, but only those parts of the utterance where the phenomenon under study is expected to take place. In this way, the amount of material to be transcribed can be limited in a way that is least detrimental for the investigation being carried out. However, even in this case, obtaining the transcriptions still requires a considerable amount of time and money. Moreover, another problem with phonetic transcriptions is that they are error-prone [1].

In order to solve part of the problem of errors in transcriptions, it has become common practice to check the quality of the transcriptions in various ways. The most common way to do this is by asking an independent transcriber to transcribe at least part of the material and by taking inter-transcriber agreement as a measure of transcription quality. This means that part of the material has to be transcribed twice, which obviously increases the costs of the investigation.

To summarize, the problems connected with obtaining good phonetic transcriptions impose limitations on the amount of material that can be analyzed in sociolinguistic research, with obvious consequences for the generalizability of the results. Therefore, it seems that it would be advantageous for linguistic research if it were possible to obtain phonetic transcriptions automatically. In Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) tools have been developed that go some way toward obtaining adequate phonetic representations of speech in an automatic manner. In order to find out whether these tools are useful in certain types of sociolinguistic research, their performance should be studied. However, this is not straightforward because, as for human phonetic transcription, it is impossible to obtain a reference representation that can be assumed to be correct [2: pp. 11-13] and that could be used to validate the performance of the automatic

transcription tool. The most usual procedure is to take a consensus transcription [1] as the reference. A consensus transcription is made by a group of transcribers after they have reached a consensus on each transcribed symbol. Another possibility consists in having several transcribers transcribe the same material and in constructing a reference transcription on the basis of the response of the various transcribers, by using a 'majority vote' procedure. The latter procedure will be adopted in this study. By comparing the automatically obtained transcriptions with the reference transcriptions, it is possible to determine whether the automatic transcription tool performs satisfactorily.

In this paper, we will report on exactly this kind of experiment. The aim of this paper is to show that an automatic tool developed for ASR can be used to obtain transcriptions for sociolinguistic investigations. In particular, it will be shown how well its performance compares to that of expert linguists who carried out the same task.

2. METHOD

In this experiment a number of utterances were judged both by a panel of expert linguists and by a CSR. Both the linguists and the CSR had to carry out the same task: selecting the variant that had been realized for some of the words contained in the utterances.

2.1. Phonological Rules

For the current experiment, pronunciation variants were generated with the following five phonological rules: /n/-deletion, /r/-deletion, /t/-deletion, schwa-deletion and schwa-insertion. All these rules describe either insertion or deletion processes (i.e. alterations in the number of segments) within words. The main reasons for selecting these five phonological rules are that they are frequently applied in Dutch and are well described in the literature. A more detailed description of the phonological rules can be found in [3, 4]. These rules were used to automatically generate pronunciation variants for the words being studied. Sometimes, more than one rule could apply in the same word. However, in selecting the speech material we decided to limit the number of rules which could apply in one word to two, in order not to make the task too complex for the listeners.

2.2. The Speech Material

The speech material used in this experiment was selected from a database named VIOS, which contains a large number of telephone calls recorded with the on-line version of a spoken dialogue system called OVIS [5]. OVIS is employed to automate part of an existing Dutch public transport information service. Currently, OVIS can

be used to obtain information about Dutch train times. The speech material therefore consists of interactions between man and machine.

From the VIOS corpus, 186 utterances were selected, which contain 379 words to which one or two rules apply. For 88 words two rules applied and four pronunciation variants were generated. For the other 291 words only one rule applied and two variants were generated. Consequently, the total number of instances in which a rule could be applied is 467 (/n/-del: 155, /r/-del: 127, /l/-del: 84, schwa-del: 53, schwa-ins: 48).

2.3. Experimental Procedure

Nine listeners and the CSR carried out the same task, i.e. deciding for the 379 words which variant best matched the word that had been realized in the spoken utterances (forced choice). For 88 words four variants were present, as mentioned above. For each of these words two binary scores were obtained, i.e. for each of the two underlying rules it was determined whether it was applied (1) or not (0). For each of the remaining 291 words with two variants one binary score was obtained. Thus, 467 binary scores were obtained for each listener and for the CSR.

The nine expert linguists were selected to participate in this experiment because they have all carried out similar tasks for their own investigations. For this reason, they are representative for the kind of people that may have to make phonetic transcriptions and that can be interested in automatic ways of obtaining such transcriptions. The 186 utterances were presented to them over headphones, in three sessions, with the possibility of a short break between successive sessions. The orthographic representation of the whole utterance was shown on a screen. The words which had to be judged were indicated by an asterisk. Beneath the utterance, the phonemic transcriptions of the pronunciation variants were shown. The listeners' task was to indicate for each word which of the presented phonemic transcriptions best corresponded to the spoken word. The listener had the possibility of listening to an utterance as often as he/she felt was necessary in order to judge which pronunciation variant had been realized.

The utterances presented to the listeners were also used as input for the CSR, which is part of the spoken dialogue system OVIS [5]. In this CSR, for most phonemes, one context-independent HMM is used, except for the /l/ and the /r/, for which separate models are trained for prevocalic and postvocalic position in the syllable. For automatic transcription purposes, the CSR is used in forced recognition mode, which means that the recognizer does not choose between all the words in the lexicon, but only between the different pronunciation variants of the same word. In this way, the CSR carries out the same task as the listeners, i.e. for each of the 379 words it determines which of the present variants best matches the actual realizations. The phone models we used were iterated models, which means they were trained on a corpus in which pronunciation variants of the five phonological rules had been added by means of a forced recognition. For a more detailed description of this iterative process see [6].

3. RESULTS

In order to determine whether the CSR performs in a way that is comparable with that of the nine listeners, two types of analyses

were conducted. First we checked whether the degree of agreement between the CSR and the nine listeners is comparable to that computed for the various listener pairs (section 3.1.). Second, on the basis of the responses of the nine listeners a reference transcription was composed. Subsequently, the responses of the CSR and those of the nine listeners were compared with the reference transcription. A comparison was made for all rules together (section 3.2.), and for each of the rules separately (section 3.3.).

3.1. Percentage Agreement

For all pairs of listeners, a percentage agreement score was calculated. Subsequently, the percentage of agreement between each of the nine listeners and the CSR was also calculated. The results are presented in Fig. 1. For instance, shown in 'column 1' are the percentage agreement scores of listener 1 with the CSR (■), with the other 8 listeners (x), and the average of these 8 between-listener agreement scores (●).




Figure 1: Percentage agreement between the CSR and each listener, and between all listener pairs plus an average over all listeners.

Percentage agreement for the listener pairs varies between 75% and 87%, and the average over all listener pairs is 82%. The average agreement over the nine listener-CSR pairs is 78%. So, on average, the degree of agreement between the CSR and the listeners is only 4% lower than the degree of agreement between the listeners.

In Fig. 1 it can also be seen that for each of the nine listeners percentage agreement with the CSR is lower than the average percentage agreement between listeners, however, the differences are small. In four cases the CSR score is within the listener range (i.e. for listeners 1, 4, 7 and 8), and in the remaining five cases the CSR score is maximally 2% below the range.

To summarize, these analyses show that although percentage agreement between the listeners and the machine is lower than percentage agreement between the listeners, the differences are so small that we can conclude that the performance of the CSR is comparable to that of the listeners.

3.2. Reference Transcriptions for All Rules

On the basis of the responses of the nine listeners, a reference transcription was composed by using a 'majority vote' procedure. When nine listeners are involved, as in this experiment, a reference transcription of this kind can be made by using different degrees of strictness: ❶ a majority of at least 5 out of 9, ❷ 6 out of 9, ❸ 7 out of 9, ❹ 8 out of 9 and, eventually, by taking only those cases in which ❺ all nine listeners agree. It is obvious that in going from 1 to 5 the number of cases involved is reduced (1: 467, 2: 435, 3: 385, 4: 335, 5: 246). Furthermore, it is to be expected that if we compare the performance of the CSR with the reference transcriptions of type ❶, ❷, ❸, ❹, and ❺, the degree of agreement between the CSR and the reference transcription will also increase when going from 1 to 5. The rationale behind this is that the cases for which a greater number of judges agree should be easier to judge than the other ones. Therefore, it can be expected that they should be easier for the CSR too.




Figure 2: Percentage agreement between listeners and various reference transcriptions, and between CSR and the reference transcriptions.

In Fig. 2, we see that the degree of agreement between the reference transcriptions and the listeners is higher than that between the reference transcriptions and the CSR. This is not surprising if we consider that the reference transcriptions are based on the listeners' responses and not on those of the CSR. In Fig. 2 we also see that percentage agreement gradually increases from 81% to 90%, as expected. We may therefore conclude that the CSR shows similar behavior to the humans in the sense that for cases in which the agreement between listeners is higher, the agreement of the listeners with the CSR is also higher.

3.3. Reference Transcription for Various Phonological Rules

In the previous section, we have compared the various reference transcriptions with the responses of the nine listeners and those of the CSR for all the cases pooled together. However, it is possible that the CSR and the nine listeners perform differently for the various phonological rules. Therefore, we will now break down the

results for the five phonological rules. Since chance agreement differs for the various conditions, percentage agreement is not the most suitable measure to compare between the rules. That is why for this comparison we will use Cohen's κ , in which a correction for chance agreement is made [7]:

$$\kappa = (P_o - P_c) / (1 - P_c)$$

P_o = observed proportion of agreement
 P_c = proportion of agreement on the basis of chance

In order to calculate Cohen's κ , the reference transcription of type 1 was used, i.e. the transcription obtained by taking the 'majority vote' of the nine listeners (5 out of 9). The results are shown in Fig. 3.




Figure 3: Cohen's κ for the listeners and the CSR compared to the reference transcriptions for the various phonological rules.

For each condition in Fig. 3 the degree of agreement between the reference transcription and the nine listeners (x) plus the CSR (■) is shown, first for all rules and then for the individual rules. As is clear from Fig. 3, the results do indeed differ for the five phonological rules. It is clear that both the CSR and the listeners perform best on the /n/-deletion rule. Furthermore, agreement is somewhat lower for the other three deletion rules, both for the CSR and the listeners. Finally, for schwa-insertion agreement is again higher for most listeners and the CSR. However, it can also be seen that for this rule the variability in the degree of agreement between the listeners is larger than the variability for the other rules. In general, it can be concluded that also for the individual rules the behavior of the CSR is similar to that of the listeners.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results presented in the previous section reveal that, for the task under study, the performance of the listeners and that of the CSR are very similar, and that, on average, the degree of agreement between the CSR and the listeners is only slightly lower than that between listeners. This means that the automatic tool proposed in this paper can be used effectively to obtain phonetic transcriptions of deletion and insertion processes.

The question that arises is then: How can this automatic tool be used in sociolinguistic studies? It is clear that this tool cannot be used to obtain phonetic transcriptions of complete utterances from scratch, but it clearly can be employed for hypothesis verification, which is probably the most common way of using phonetic transcriptions in linguistic research. Another possible limitation of this tool is that so far it has been tested for deletions and insertions only, so that we do not know how it performs with substitutions. However, in spite of these limitations we are convinced that this instrument may contribute to facilitating and perhaps even improving sociolinguistic research to a considerable extent.

It is obvious that an automatic transcription tool could be used in all research situations in which the phonetic transcriptions have to be made by one person. Given that a CSR does not suffer from tiredness and loss of concentration, it could assist the human transcriber who is likely to make mistakes owing to concentration loss. By comparing his/her own transcriptions with those produced by the CSR a human transcriber could spot possible errors that are due to absent-mindedness. Furthermore, this kind of comparison could be useful for other reasons. For instance, a human transcriber may be biased by his/her own hypotheses and expectations with obvious consequences for the transcriptions, while the biases which an automatic tool may have can be controlled. Checking the automatic transcriptions may help discover possible biases in the human data. It should also be noted that using an automatic transcription tool will be less expensive than having a second human transcriber carry out the same task. In addition, an automatic transcription tool could be employed in those situations in which more than one transcriber is involved, in order to solve possible doubts about what was actually realized. Finally, an important contribution of automatic transcription to sociolinguistic research would be that it makes it possible to analyze enormous amounts of material in a relatively short time. The importance of this aspect for the generalizability of the results cannot be overestimated.

At this point, it is important to note that in the current experiment we simply employed the CSR which we use in our ASR research. We did not try to adapt our CSR so as to make its transcriptions more similar to the human transcriptions. Still, the transcriptions made by the CSR do depend on the properties of the CSR, like e.g. the phone models and the internal parameters. In the near future we intend to study the effect of the CSR properties on the produced transcriptions. In this way, we hope to improve the quality of the automatic transcriptions.

To conclude, in this paper we have presented a tool that can be used effectively to obtain automatic transcriptions of deletion and insertion processes. Future research will indicate whether this tool can be used for other processes and whether its performance can be improved. For the time being, an instrument is available that can be very useful in a variety of sociolinguistic investigations.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research by J.M. Kessens was carried out within the framework of the Priority Programme Language and Speech Technology, sponsored by NWO (Dutch Organisation for Scientific Research). The research by Dr. H. Strik has been made possible by a fellowship of the Royal Netherlands Academy of

Arts and Sciences. We thank Lou Boves for thoroughly reviewing an earlier version of this paper.

6. REFERENCES

1. Shriberg, L.D., Kwiatkowski, J. and Hoffman, K. "A Procedure for Phonetic Transcription by Consensus," *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 27: 456-465, 1984.
2. Cucchiari, C. *Phonetic transcription: a methodological and empirical study*, PhD thesis, University of Nijmegen 1993.
3. Booij, G. *The Phonology of Dutch*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.
4. Cucchiari, C. and van den Heuvel, H. "t/ Deletion in Standard Dutch," *Proc. of the Dept. of Language & Speech*, University of Nijmegen, Vol. 19: 59-65, 1995.
5. Strik, H., Russel, A., van den Heuvel, H., Cucchiari, C. and Boves, L. "A Spoken Dialogue System for the Dutch Public Transport Information Service," *Int. Journal of Speech Technology*, Vol. 2, No. 2: 119-129, 1997.
6. Wester, M., Kessens, J.M., and Strik, H. "Improving the Performance of a Dutch CSR by Modeling Pronunciation Variation," *Proc. of the Workshop Modeling Pronunciation Variation for Automatic Speech Recognition*, Kerkrade, 145-150, 1998.
7. Rietveld, T. and van Hout, R. *Statistical techniques for the study of language and language behaviour*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 1993.