

# Idiolect: A Reconfigurable Voice Coding Assistant

Breandan Considine  
McGill University  
bre@ndan.co

Nicholas Albion  
Independent Developer  
nalbion@yahoo.com

Xujie Si  
University of Toronto  
six@cs.utoronto.ca

**Abstract**—This paper presents Idiolect, an IDE plugin for voice coding and a novel approach to building bots that allows for users to define custom commands on-the-fly. Unlike traditional chatbots, Idiolect does not pretend to be an omniscient virtual assistant but rather a reconfigurable voice programming system that empowers users to create their own commands and actions dynamically, without rebuilding or restarting the application. We present a case study of integrating Idiolect<sup>1</sup> with the IntelliJ Platform, illustrate some example use cases, and offer some lessons learned during the tool’s development.

**Index Terms**—speech recognition, voice programming, bots

## I. INTRODUCTION

Humans are able to quickly learn new words and phrases, and apply them in a variety of contexts. Chatbots, on the other hand, are often limited to a set of static commands and phrases defined at compile-time. This can be frustrating for users, who struggle to express their intent, as well as bot-developers, who must anticipate user intent and write bindings for each new capability. This rigidity is a common source of misalignment between user intent, author expectations and bot capabilities.

Voice coding allows users to quickly dictate their own commands and phrases without resorting to a Turing Complete programming language. For example, the user might say “whenever I say *open sesame*, do the following action”, thereafter, the system will perform the desired action when so instructed. Or, “whenever I say *redo thrice*, repeat the last action three times”. Or, e.g., invoke a function in a scripting language, open a file, or perform other tedious chores.

Idiolect provides a default lexicon of phrases, but does not force users to learn them explicitly. Instead, we allow users to override the default settings with their own voice commands on-the-fly, which are incorporated into the lexicon immediately. This shifts the burden of adaptation to the system, freeing users to express their intent in a natural way.

Primarily, Idiolect observes the following design principles: be (1) natural to use, (2) easy to configure, (3) as unobtrusive as possible. We believe that these principles are important for a system intended to be used by developers, who are busy people and capable of configuring the system themselves. We also support developers with visual and motor impairments, who may have difficulty typing, or prefer to use a voice interface.

In the following paper, we describe Idiolect, a dynamically reconfigurable voice-programming system that supports teaching the IDE new commands and actions on-the-fly, by either verbally or programmatically expressing the desired behavior.

## II. PRIOR WORK

Mary Shaw, during her 2022 SPLASH keynote [1] called for programming languages to address the needs of “vernacular developers”. Jin Guo has also talked about the need for programming in “ordinary people’s language”. We take their proposals quite literally to mean that computers should be able to interpret spoken programs, and not just written ones.

Early attempts to build voice programming systems can be traced back at least twenty years to Leopold and Amber’s [2] (1997) work on keyboardless programming, later revisited by Arnold and Goldthwaite [3] (2001), Begel and Graham [4] (2005) and others. These systems allow users to write code by speaking into a microphone, however early voice programming systems were limited by a small vocabulary, and do not consider IDE integration or reconfigurability.

Another stream of work has explored teachable voice assistants and user-defined phrases (Chkroun & Azaria [5]). Though similar to our own, their targets general-purpose voice user interfaces and does not consider voice programming. It also predates most of the recent progress on large language modeling, which we consider to be a transformative enabling technology for speech programming.

## III. SPEECH RECOGNITION

Today, automatic speech recognition (ASR), the translation of an audio waveform containing speech to text, is essentially a solved problem - one of the many pretrained ASR models would work well enough for our purposes. However, we also require realtime offline speech recognition capabilities built on an open source deep speech pipeline, which has only recently become possible for users running on commodity hardware.

Idiolect integrates with Vosk, a state-of-the-art deep speech system with realtime models for various languages, which provides an open source Java API. Initially, we distributed a default model for the English language inside the plugin, but at the request of JetBrains to reduce bandwidth, we instead prompt the user to select and download a pretrained model from the Vosk website upon first installing the plugin.

Users may optionally configure a built-in TTS voice from the host operating system and a cloud-based speech recognition or synthesis service, with the caveat that web speech requires uninterrupted internet connectivity and introduces an additional 300-500ms of overhead latency depending on the user’s proximity to the datacenter and other load factors.

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/OpenASR/idiolect>

## IV. INTENT RECOGNITION

Once a spoken utterance is decoded as text, Idiolect must determine the relevant actions and entities needed to resolve the user’s intent. Furthermore, it may need to consider the IDE context, i.e., the current editor state and command history, to resolve potentially ambiguous commands. For example, the command “open plugin menu” could refer to multiple different menus, depending on when and how it was invoked.

The IntelliJ Platform has over  $10^3$  possible actions. These actions are bound to keyboard shortcuts, menu items, and toolbar buttons. The user can also bind a voice command directly to an action, presuming the user already knows the action’s identifier. Idiolect’s default grammar was manually curated from the IDE action list, using the CamelCase identifier to generate a suitable description for intent recognition.

In keeping with the principle of configurability, we allow users to define custom grammars and bind utterances to actions using a context-free grammar. By providing an extensible DSL, users can bind their own command patterns using either a simple configuration file, or programmatically via the plugin API to handle more complex usage scenarios.

In some cases, the user may not know or recall the exact phrase to which an action they intend to perform was bound. Given an utterance that does not match any of the predefined grammars, the plugin will fall back to a language model (LM), a probabilistic model trained on a large corpus of text, which can be used to perform reasoning simple tasks like predicting the most likely intent from a list of alternatives. For example, the utterance “I want to edit foo.java” is more likely to match the command “open foo.java” than “execute foo.java”.

### A. Recognition Dispatch

Idiolect dispatches utterances to a series of recognizers using a tiered priority system. This system gives each recognizer the chance to match or pass on each utterance. Once a command is matched, the command is consumed and no subsequent recognizer will receive the dispatch.

The plugin first attempts to resolve a spoken utterance using an exact lexical match against a lexicon of predefined commands. Highest priority are those which control the plugin itself, enabling and disabling speech recognition.

User-defined commands are the next highest priority. These can be a lexical match, or more generally a sentence in a context-free language. Nonterminal parameters allow one to define more complex instructions, such as “open the {filename}[in {project\_name}]” or “jump to the {nth}line”.

If there is no exact match, we attempt to repair the phrase using an error-correcting parser. We describe this in Sec. V-E.

The recognizer of last resort is a large language model. Open ended commands which are unrecognizable by any of the previous approaches can be dispatched to a service which matches the intent against a predefined lexicon, using a prompt: “What action most likely fulfills the command ... out of these actions: ...”, and invoked dynamically at runtime.

## V. BARRIERS AND PATHWAYS TO USABILITY

In our experience as plugin users and maintainers, usability challenges typically arise in a few key areas. We discuss some of these obstacles and our efforts to surmount them.

### A. User Onboarding

Several users reported confusion when first installing our plugin. To address this issue, we added a wizard that guides users through during installation. Upon first installing the plugin, a user is greeted and prompted to download the Vosk model for recognizing their natural language of choice, which defaults to the system locale. Once unpacked, the model is stored in the plugin configuration directory, `/.idealelect`. The user is next prompted to configure the properties file, and to bind a few voice commands. This is a one-time process, and users may reconfigure the plugin by opening the settings dialog at any time.

### B. Plugin Observability

Failures can arise in many stages of the intent recognition pipeline. The best way to address this is by improving observability of the plugin, so that users can diagnose when an error occurs and learn how to avoid it in the future.

Failure to recognize is a common issue in intent recognition, the most common source of which is unrecognizability due to a transcription error by the ASR model, due to e.g., noise in the audio signal or poor recognition accuracy. To address this issue, we add a visual cue at the corner of the IDE that reports the phrase transcribed in realtime, as well as the action (if any) that was triggered on intent recognition.

### C. Command Discoverability

We draw a distinction between capability discovery and intent recognition. Users previously familiar with the IDE capabilities may wish to invoke or bind a specific action directly, but may not know the command binding. The first and foremost way to improve discovery is through documentation, however keeping documentation in sync with capabilities can be challenging, and users are uninclined to read verbose documentation. To address this issue, we autogenerate documentation describing the action and their descriptions, by preprocessing the action list and assigning natural language descriptions from the IntelliJ Platform source code.

Another common scenario is when the user is unfamiliar with the IDE capabilities, and the action they wish to perform is not supported by the IDE directly. User awareness of IDE functionality is outside the scope of this plugin, however, many actions that users wish to perform have no associated binding or are compound actions. For example “delete the method named {foo}” requires first resolving the method, selecting the body of the text and deleting it. These actions can be bound, but require a handcrafted recognition handler, and are generally quite brittle. We hope to improve scripting support for such actions in the future.

#### D. API Extensibility

Idiolect tries to anticipate users actions and give users additional action bindings. Some functionality, however, is best left implemented by downstream developers. In addition to end-user configurability, Idiolect is designed to be extensible by external plugin developers and can be used by other IntelliJ Platform plugins to programmatically define their own commands and recognition handlers. We provide a simple message passing API for plugins to communicate with Idiolect, and a DSL for defining custom grammars.

#### E. Error Recovery

Another common usability barrier is when transcription is accurate, but the utterance does not correspond to an actionable command, possibly due to stopwords verbal fillers or extraneous text which cannot be directly parsed. In short, if a given phrase, e.g., “open uh foo java” is received, we attempt to repair the utterance. At the user’s discretion, or in case of ambiguity when the phrase has multiple plausible alternatives, we can either visually or verbally prompt the user to choose from a set of actionable phrases, e.g., “Did you mean (a)open file foo.java, (b)open folder foo/java, or (c)something else?”

To correct recognition errors, we apply Considine et al.’s [6] work on Tidyparse, which supports recognition and parsing of context-free and mildly context-sensitive grammars, and computing language edit distance. Tidyparse implements a novel approach to error correction based on the theory of context-free language reachability, conjunctive grammars and Levenshtein automata. We use a SAT solver to find the smallest edit transforming a string outside the language to a string inside the language. Only when the utterance is one or two tokens away from a known command do we attempt a repair.

VoskAPI is also capable of returning a list of alternate utterances, alongside a confidence score for each, which we use to determine if the user’s utterance is sufficiently close to a known command in the list of alternates.

#### F. Build Reproducibility

One of the challenges of managing a multiplatform audio project is ensuring reproducible builds. The IntelliJ Platform does not allow shipping OS-specific plugins, which requires building a single artifact. In the past, updates would result in breaking changes for Windows, Mac OS, or Linux, which are difficult to debug or test on a development environment and only identified by user acceptance testing on those platforms.

To streamline the development process and mitigate the risk of platform-specific regressions in production, we set up an automated pipeline for testing and deploying the plugin. We use GitHub Actions to build the plugin for each release, and when a new commit is tagged with a release number and merged, a changelog is automatically generated from the intervening commit messages, then the plugin is signed and automatically uploaded to the JetBrains plugin repository. This allows us to quickly iterate on the plugin, test the plugin on multiple platforms, and to release new versions with assurance.

## VI. EVALUATION

We conducted a preliminary experiment to evaluate recognition performance on synthetic speech. Using a set of English TTS voices (both male and female) included in MacOS Ventura 13.1, we synthesized 100 utterances from the predefined command list using the `say` command, then transcribed a 16000 kHz PCM signed 16-bit little-endian audio recording using `ffmpeg`, and finally transcribe the audio using VoskAPI to simulate a user-generated utterance. We report the average word error rate (WER) of three ASR models trained on US English speakers: `vosk-model-en-us-0.22` (0.30) `vosk-model-small-en-us-0.15` (0.28), and `vosk-model-en-us-0.22-lgraph` (0.35). Results on a per-voice and per-model basis are shown in Fig. 1 below.

	Eddy	Flo	Reed	Rocko	Samantha	Sandy	Shelly	Fred
...-en-us-0.22	0.581	0.635	0.627	0.981	0.293	0.492	0.528	0.888
...-en-us-0.22-lgraph	0.631	0.659	0.672	0.977	0.346	0.544	0.569	0.877
...-small-en-us-0.22	0.793	0.736	0.760	0.998	0.271	0.725	0.661	0.905

Fig. 1. WER for synthetic ASR using 100 commands from the default lexicon across three US English models and seven TTS voices (lower is better).

We evaluated the plugin using a variety of downstream metrics, including user downloads of the plugin over a five-year timespan, bug reports and GitHub Insights. We also collected feedback from the JetBrains Plugin Marketplace to determine how satisfied users were with the plugin.




Fig. 2. Plugin downloads stalled circa August 2017 due to incompatibility.

Downloads of the plugin have stalled over time since its initial release in 2015. We hypothesize this is due to the lack of steady updates, resulting in incompatibility with more recent versions of the IntelliJ Platform. Originally developed using the CMUSphinx speech recognition platform, we performed an intervention by migrating to a more robust and technically capable ASR engine. Following a five-year hiatus, we rewrote the plugin from scratch, implemented the usability improvements described in Sec. V, republished the plugin in 2023 under its current name and are collecting usage statistics – though promising, the results are still inconclusive.

Over 30% of the plugin page visitors originated from the People’s Republic of China, indicating a substantial and potentially underserved programming demographic. A careful analysis suggests the need to support internationalization and localization, an omission we hope to remedy in a future release.

## VII. THREATS TO VALIDITY

While voice programming may serve a niche purpose for developers, it has not been fully tested as a general paradigm. Our experience suggests frequent vocalizations may disturb nearby programmers and anticipate its usefulness in colocated workspaces will thus be limited, but do foresee some genuine use-cases, e.g., providing an alternate input method for those with vision and motor disabilities.

We also acknowledge that our system is limited by its own natural language understanding capabilities. Speech is a comparatively inefficient medium for conducting programming tasks and users may be hesitant to invest time customizing the system if intent recognition is low. Furthermore, the system is currently limited to the set of actions that can be easily expressed using the IntelliJ Platform API.

## VIII. FUTURE WORK

In the future, we plan to conduct a thorough user study to better understand the use cases for the plugin. In particular, we hope to better understand the development habits of visually and motor-impaired users to improve accessibility, as well as broader support for other languages and dialects.

We plan to conduct an evaluation of the plugin’s intent-recognition capability and improve support for personalization, such as speaker adaptation and user-specific language models.

We also aim to improve the interaction mechanism by adding audiovisual feedback and modal voice commands. We would like to provide a more user-friendly configuration interface, possibly using an embedded DSL for defining dialog trees with a choose-your-own-adventure style modal dialog navigator. Incorporating modal logic a la Hazel [7] by adding a visual backpack and modal operators would be an interesting direction to take and one we hope to explore.

Currently, we only track download statistics, although to inform the development of these features and better address the needs of voice programmers, it would be helpful to collect minimal telemetry on user utterances and custom commands.

Recent progress in machine learning has enabled the use of large language models (LLMs) for a variety of tasks, including speech recognition, machine translation, and text generation. An LLM trained on a large corpus of natural language can be used to perform simple reasoning tasks, such as predicting the most likely intent from a given utterance, for example, the utterance “I want to edit foo.java” is more likely to be the command “open foo.java” than the command “execute foo.java”. While LLMs are currently served on the cloud, recent efforts to compress and do inference on commodity hardware are ongoing. We predict in the next few years these models will become available on the edge, and can be used to perform end-to-end speech-to-intent recognition in realtime.

As such, we would like to use a language model to rerank the most likely intent corresponding to a user’s utterance, conditioned on a previous context of historical commands, the dictionary, UI context and a list of alternate utterances.

## IX. CONCLUSION

In this work, we presented Idiolect, a plugin for the IntelliJ Platform that allows users to control the IDE and reconfigure the plugin using voice commands. This addresses a common usability issue in voice UX design, where users are unable to express their intent in a way that the system understands. We described the design of the plugin, and the challenges we faced while implementing it. We also presented the results of our evaluation, and discussed future work.

On one end of the design spectrum are metaprogramming languages and software language engineering frameworks that allow users to define their own commands and build embedded domain specific languages (eDSLs). These systems can be powerful, but require a high upfront investment from the user, who must design a language, and then learn the language itself, all whilst doing their daily job as a software engineer. On the other end are finite languages, which are too rigid.

In the middle of this language design spectrum are *idiolects*, which give users the freedom to create a conversational domain-specific languages according to their own idiomatic style: this is the design space which Idiolect occupies. By targeting IDEs, whose users are typically adept programmers, commands with complex semantics can be written programmatically, then invoked on-the-fly, sans recompilation.

We believe the intersection between conversational agents, vernacular programming languages and programmable voice assistants to be fertile ground, and one that is relatively unexplored in the language design space. We hope our small contribution inspires others to explore these ideas and work towards making programming more fun and accessible.

## X. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first author wishes to thank his former colleagues Alexey Kudinkin and Yaroslav Lepenkin, who contributed to the plugin during the original JetBrains hackathon in 2015, and former manager Hadi Hariri for his advice and encouragement.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Shaw, “Myths and mythconceptions: What does it mean to be a programming language, anyhow?” *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, vol. 4, no. HOPL, pp. 1–44, 2022.
- [2] J. L. Leopold and A. L. Ambler, “Keyboardless visual programming using voice, handwriting, and gesture,” in *Proceedings. 1997 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages (Cat. No. 97TB100180)*. IEEE, 1997, pp. 28–35.
- [3] S. C. Arnold, L. Mark, and J. Goldthwaite, “Programming by voice, vocalprogramming,” in *Proceedings of the fourth international ACM conference on Assistive technologies*, 2000, pp. 149–155.
- [4] A. Begel and S. L. Graham, “Spoken programs,” in *2005 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC’05)*. IEEE, 2005, pp. 99–106.
- [5] M. Chkroun and A. Azaria, “Lia: A virtual assistant that can be taught new commands by speech,” *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, vol. 35, no. 17, pp. 1596–1607, 2019.
- [6] B. Considine, J. Guo, and X. Si, “Tidyparse: Real-Time Context-Free Error Correction,” in *Workshop on Live Programming*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/tidyparse/tidyparse>
- [7] C. Omar, D. Moon, A. Blinn, I. Voysey, N. Collins, and R. Chugh, “Filling typed holes with live GUIs,” in *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, 2021, pp. 511–525.