

# Word Prediction and Communication Rate in AAC

---

Keith Trnka, John McCaw, Debra Yarrington,  
Kathleen F. McCoy, and Christopher Pennington

University of Delaware  
[trnka@cis.udel.edu](mailto:trnka@cis.udel.edu)

# Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC)

- communicating with speech and/or motor impairments
- AAC devices
  - high-tech devices - word/letter/phrase, speech synthesis output
- the **communication rate divide** and fatigue



# Word Prediction

- reduce the number of keystrokes
- guess the word currently being typed:
  - the part of the word typed so far (can be no letters)
  - a language model

# Example





# Does prediction help?

- reduces the number of keystrokes
  - less physical fatigue
- increase communication rate?
  - not significantly different (Venkatagiri, 1993)
  - Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) participants decreased, non-SCI increased (Koester and Levine, 1994)
  - 10% speedup, but frustrating (Anson et al., 2004)

# Hypotheses

- word prediction will increase communication rate ***if the predictions are good***
- users will trust a better system more
- implicit hypotheses
  - cognitive overhead has an effect on input rate
  - better prediction methods will show more increase



# User study

- 28 adult participants
  - simulated motor impairment
  - no prior AAC device experience
- copy task

# Copy task





# Independent variables

- text entry method
  - letter-by-letter
  - basic prediction - recency plus a word list
  - advanced prediction - also takes into account the previous two words
- text to type: 3 different samples

# Controls

- Bias for/against prediction - varied treatment orders of entry methods
- Bias to testing data - 3 text samples evenly distributed across treatments
- Learning bias - training session before each session
- Fatigue, forgetting biases - each session on separate day, but within a week



# Does prediction help?

basic  
prediction

---

keystroke savings

19.8%

---

communication rate

9.1%

words per minute

---

user trust

78.2%

utilization of the potential benefit

---

input rate

14.6%

time to hit each key

# Does prediction help?

	basic prediction	advanced prediction
keystroke savings	19.8%	52.1%
communication rate words per minute	9.1%	<b>58.6%</b>
user trust utilization of the potential benefit	78.2%	<b>93.6%</b>
input rate time to hit each key	14.6%	30.5%



# Conclusions

- **Input rate**  
longer to press each key with more reliance on word prediction
- **Communication rate**  
increases with either prediction method, much more with better predictions
- **User trust**  
increases with better predictions, measured in utilization of potential keystroke savings

# Future Work

- Validate findings on a small AAC user group
- Examine data in more detail
  - (Learning) Does utilization increase over a conversation?
  - (Bias) Does the treatment order affect utilization?
  - (Errors) Does word prediction reduce typos?
  - (Cognitive load) How/when is there extra load?



# Questions?

[trnka@cis.udel.edu](mailto:trnka@cis.udel.edu)