Abbreviated Text Input

Stuart M. Shieber and Ellie Baker

Harvard University / Division of Engineering and Applied Sciences



Abstract

We address the problem of improving the efficiency of natural language text input under degraded conditions (for instance, on PDAs or cell phones or by disabled users) by taking advantage of the informational redundancy in natural language. Previous approaches to this problem have been based on the idea of *prediction* of the text, but these require the user to take overt action to verify or select the system's predictions. We propose taking advantage of the duality between prediction and *compression*. We allow the user to retext in compressed form, in particular, using a simple stipulated abbreviation method that reduces characters by about 30% yet is simple enough that it can be learned easily and generated relatively fluently. Using statistical language processing techniques, we can decode the abbreviated text with a residual word error. To be system's operation is completely independent from the user's, the overhead from cognitive task switching and attending to the system's actions online is eliminated, opening up the possibility that the compression-based methods have not.

The problem

Text entry under degraded conditions

- Growth of portable and embedded computing and telecom devices
- · Interaction under environmental hindrances
- Disabilities



The question

Can we leverage language processing technology to improve the speed and accuracy of text entry even while using slow or otherwise impoverished input media?

The standard approach: Prediction

Exploiting statistical redundancy through prediction

- e.g., The Reactive Keyboard (Darragh and Witten, 1992)
- <u>indif</u>ference, <u>glanced back to where he</u> had <u>witnessed</u> her (27/57)

Advantages: Reduced keystrokes

Disadvantages: Cognitive load from task switching (Goodenough-Trepagnier et al., 1986)

Construction of the second secon		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2
Constraint and section an			
Construction in the construction of the c	and a gala a shire	Contraction Office - State	
Bernenk and Server an		(an (an an a	ň
		no regulare sur falors y our rense P i problem 22 product	
Dilate Particip year 11	10 mm (s)	n 🗆 🖂	

Our approach: Compression

Prediction and compression are duals

Lempel-Ziv (gzip) as an (impractical) text input method

- + Excellent bitrate
- + Eliminates task switching
- + Lossless
- Adds cognitive load from compression method

Making the approach practical

- *Problem 1:* A *human-centered* compression method, i.e., low human cognitive load
- Problem 2: ...and computer decodable
- *Problem 3:* ... with good bitrate
- Problem 4: ...and low error rate
- Problem 4: Computer must aid in error correction



The computational mechanism

Statistical natural-language processing via a cascade of weighted finite-



Empirical performance

LM training corpus: 1.8M words of Wall Street Journal Test corpus: 5099 words (28,045 characters) of WSJ

Performance: 26.5

5099 Worus (20,045	churaciers) of wis
26.5% compression	(cf 60.5% gzip)

	Disabbreviation		Keypad	Both
Model	errors	rate	rate	rate
uniform	2586	50.7%	41.3%	79.7%
unigram	310	6.1	12.5	28.7
bigram	177	3.5	5.4	13.3
trigram	155*	3.0	5.0	12.1

* About half of the residual errors are second occurrences (or later). Adaptive methods thus have excellent potential for error reduction