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1 Abstract

Audio commands are a preferred communication medium to keep inspectors in the loop of civil infrastructure inspection performed by a semi-autonomous drone. To understand job-specific commands from a group of heterogeneous and dynamic inspectors, a model needs to be developed cost-effectively for the group and easily adapted when the group changes. This paper is motivated to build a multi-tasking deep learning model that possesses a Share-Split-Collaborate architecture. This architecture allows the two classification tasks to share the feature extractor and then split subject-specific and keyword-specific features intertwined in the extracted features through feature projection and collaborative training. A base model for a group of five authorized subjects is trained and tested on the inspection keyword dataset collected by this study. The model achieved a 95.3% or higher mean accuracy in classifying the keywords of any authorized inspectors. Its mean accuracy in speaker classification is 99.2%. Due to the richer keyword representations that the model learns from the pooled training data, adapting the base model to a new inspector requires only a little training data from that inspector, like five utterances per keyword. Using the speaker classification scores for inspector verification can achieve a success rate of at least 93.9% in verifying authorized inspectors and 76.1% in detecting unauthorized ones. Further, the paper demonstrates the applicability of the proposed model to larger-size groups on a public dataset. This paper provides a solution to addressing challenges facing AI-assisted human-robot interaction, including worker heterogeneity, worker dynamics, and job heterogeneity.
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2 Introduction

Safe, reliable civil infrastructure is a foundation for the nation’s socio-economic vitality. For example, the National Bridge Inventory has 619,588 bridges [5], spatially distributed on the 4,192,479 miles of public roads [9]. The average daily traffic passing the bridges is 4.627 billion [10]. However, 42% of the bridges are over 50-years old, and over 55.1% are rated as fair or poor [3], meaning they have shown deterioration. For traffic safety, most bridges are inspected every two years to monitor their health condition closely. In response to the vast demand for bridge inspection and because of the complexity of this mission, aerial robots such as drones are being introduced to improve the time efficiency, worker safety, and cost-effectiveness of inspection.

An inspector and a drone form a human-robot system for a bridge inspection. Their collaboration method directly impacts the system’s job efficiency and task performance. For example, the requirement on the inspector’s psychomotor, cognitive, and sensory abilities is high if the inspector has to operate the drone entirely in the remote control or teleoperation mode [21]. The drone is preferred to be at least semi-autonomous with the inspector’s assistance or guidance in the loop. Specifically, the drone can automatically perform inspection tasks under predefined conditions, and the inspector will guide the drone or take control of it only when a need is identified. For example, the drone detects an area of concern nearby but off the pre-planned inspection path for a task. The drone hovers there and sends a message to the inspector. The inspector will judge and then tell the robot to either continue its current task or guide the robot to add an incremental task. Human-robot interaction is essential when the robot is semi-autonomous with humans in the loop.

Some types of guidance that inspectors give to a semi-autonomous drone, such as triggering, terminating, and slightly modifying a task that the drone performs automatically, can be provided conveniently using a set of commands. There are different media for communicating with the drone, such as speech commands, non-speech commands, remote controllers, and hand gestures. Speech commands have advantages over others because humans use them naturally in daily communication. Therefore, the mapping between speech commands and the drone’s actions is intuitive to inspectors. A model is required to analyze the inspector’s acoustic signals and classify the command keywords so that the drone can understand the inspector’s guidance. Compared to the literature on speech command recognition or keyword spotting, the application to the collaborative human-robot inspection of bridges has unique characteristics or specifications. First, although only a small set of keywords is required, they are job-specific and not necessarily covered by existing speech command big datasets. Therefore, training and refining the model must be efficient, for instance, using a small sample of data collected for any inspection job. Second, a stakeholder such as a State department of transportation usually has a group of inspectors who differ in their background and speaking habits. The model must reliably recognize the speech commands of a group of heterogeneous inspectors, ranging from a few to tens. Third, the drone should only follow the instruction of authorized inspectors but not others for cyber security, which requires the model can recognize and verify the inspector. Last, the model can adapt to workforce dynamics due to promotion, retirement, recruitment, and turnover. Those requirements are commonly present in various industrial applications of human-robot interactions. While the existing literature on speech command and speaker recognition address one or another need from some perspectives, no model has met all the specifications in this particular application setting.

This paper proposes a multi-tasking deep learning model, motivated by the specifications on speech command and speaker recognition to keep inspectors in the loop of semi-autonomous drone assisted bridge inspection. Contributions of this paper are reflected by the model development method and resulting model capabilities:

- A Share-Split-Collaborate learning architecture that can learn rich keyword representations and extract features for differentiating speakers from their pooled speech command data
- A unified multi-tasking model that can classify spoken keywords and determine who the speaker is if verified as an authorized inspector.
- The model can be developed for any group of inspectors in any specific inspection job in a cost-effectiveness manner. It can also be refined conveniently to adapt to changes in the inspector group.

The rest of the paper is organized as the following. The next section summarizes the related work. The architecture of the proposed multi-tasking model is introduced in Section 4 and details of the implementation
are discussed in Section 5. Section 6 further discusses experiments that demonstrate the model performance and requirements for achieving the performance. At the end, in Section 7 the paper concludes the study by summarizing insights learned from this study and important future work.

3 The Literature

The literature related to this paper includes keyword spotting or speech command recognition, acoustic signal-based speaker recognition, and multi-tasking models that integrate the two tasks into a unified model.

3.1 Keyword Spotting and Speech Command Recognition

Speech command is one of the media to deliver human instruction to robots [14]. Compared to other media such as hardware, gestures, and natural language, speech command is easier to implement. A reliable recognition system for simple commands can be developed quickly. Therefore, it is favored by various applications such as smart home [2] and air traffic control [16]. Speech command recognition for keeping inspectors in the loop of civil infrastructure inspection performed by a semi-autonomous drone has not been widely developed yet.

Along with the growing need for human-machine interactions, the development of lightweight models for recognizing simple commands is gaining growing interest. Keyword spotting is a small-scale speech recognition task to identify keywords from audio streams. In recent decades, deep neural networks have outperformed standard Hidden Markov Models (HMMs) and become a new stream of speech command recognition methods [7]. For example, convolutional neural networks designed for keyword spotting showed an accuracy of more than 95% on the Google speech command dataset [27, 24]. Two different inputs are mainly used in speech recognition studies: spectrogram (frequency-domain) and waveform (time-domain). Mel-spectrograms are widely used as a standard pre-processing method for various audio-related deep learning models (e.g., [25, 13]).

Speakers have unique voices and speaking habits. Therefore, speech recognition models are classified into speaker-dependent and speaker-independent models [12]. A speaker-dependent model is created for one particular speaker, whereas a speaker-independent model is for various speakers. Although a speaker-dependent model is easier to develop, it is a nontransferable point solution. Maintaining many point solutions is difficult in many real-world applications that have multiple model users or users can change quickly. Therefore, speaker-independent models are the mainstream.

3.2 Speaker Recognition

Speaker recognition predicts a speaker’s identification according to the speaker’s acoustic signals. Past research observed that the performance decreased when the number of speakers increased. For example, the accuracy decreased to 65.3% with 30 speakers from 96% with five speakers [6]. Recently, deep neural networks trained on large-scale datasets have achieved high accuracy. For example, each of 630 speakers provided six phonetically rich sentences, and the data were used to train a model that has achieved 97.0% accuracy [23]. [29] trained model using 127,551 utterances collected from 400 speakers, and the accuracy is 98.96%.

3.3 Multi-tasking Models Attained by Joint Training

Recently, keyword spotting and speaker recognition have been considered two related tasks, not just because acoustic signals contain both phonetic and speaker information, but the needs and benefits of integrating them as a unified model. The association of the two tasks arises from various real-world applications. The study by [26] was motivated by the need to detect voice triggering phrases and verify if the speaker is a registered user. [8] aimed to recognize who says what and when in a conversation. Personalized devices, such as hearing assistive devices, require the ability to detect external speakers and prevent them from triggering the device. [22] developed a multi-tasking keyword spotting model with the ability to detect non-users.

Joint training of speech and speaker recognition as a unified multi-tasking model usually has the following one or both benefits over training two independent models. First, the two tasks can share the data processing or feature learning pipeline to some extent [26, 22, 28, 18, 17]. Second, each can benefit from the improved performance of the other [28, 18]. Voice trigger detection and speaker verification in [26] are respectively performed by two stacks of four LSTM layers, but they share the first two layers without sacrificing the accuracy compared to two independent models. The two downstream tasks, keyword spotting and speaker verification, in [17] share the same wav2vec v2 backbone. The keyword spotting and own voice/external
speaker detection tasks in [22] share the same residual deep learning network for feature extraction. [28] developed a multi-tasking model for speech and speaker recognition through collaborative training. The two tasks just share a common front-end and they have their respective recurrent neural networks. The two networks are connected at the task level to inform each other of the desired and undesired information. The keyword spotting and speaker verification tasks in [18] share an enhancement network for the noise removal. The two tasks have their respective feature extractors, but the acoustic feature extractor provides the phonetic conditional vector to augment the speaker feature extractor’s ability. A pooling network further integrates outputs from the two feature extractors to generate the keyword and speaker embeddings.

Deep neural networks suffer from the catastrophic forgetting problem in class-incremental learning. This problem also challenges speech recognition, for example, the incremental classes of new accents, new words, or new acoustic environments [11]. Few-shot learning-based speaker identification networks were proposed to handle new speakers [19, 1]. The effectiveness of few-shot learning to handle new speakers in a multi-tasking model of speaker-keyword classification has not been verified yet.

4 The Model

A group of $M$ inspectors, indexed by their identification (ID) number $i$, will use one unified model to communicate with their respective drone using the same set of $N$ command keywords, indexed by their class ID $j$. As Figure 1 shows, an input to the model is an utterance that lasts for a fixed time period, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, which may come from one of the $M$ inspectors, indicated by a one-hot coded vector, $y_s \in \mathbb{R}^M$. $x$ may pertain to one of the $N$ keywords, represented by a one-hot coded vector, $y_w \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Given an input $x$, the model predicts the speaker ID, $\hat{y}_s$, and the keyword class, $\hat{y}_w$, in parallel.

![Figure 1: The proposed Share-Split-Collaborate (S²C) multi-tasking framework for the speaker-keyword classification](image)

4.1 Architecture of the Multi-tasking Model

A Share-Split-Collaborate (S²C) deep learning architecture, shown in Figure 1, is proposed to build the desired model functions. First, each input utterance $x$ is transferred into a Mel-spectrogram in size $224 \times 224 \times 3$. The feature extractor ResNet50 [15], pre-trained on the ImageNet and transferred into the speaker-keyword classification tasks, extracts a feature map, $F \in \mathbb{R}^{7 \times 7 \times 2048}$, from the Mel-spectrogram. Two projection networks split the subject-specific feature vector, $f_s$, and keyword-specific feature vector, $f_w$, respectively from $F$:

$$f_s = L(P(F; W_{s,0}, b_{s,0}),$$

$$f_w = L(P(F; W_{w,0}, b_{w,0}),$$

where $P(F; W, b)$ represents a network that projects an input feature map $F$ onto a new space in the same dimensions using the projection matrix $W$ and the bias vector $b$. Here, $W_{s,0}$ and $W_{w,0}$ ($\in \mathbb{R}^{2048 \times 2048}$) are projection weights, and $b_{s,0}$ and $b_{w,0}$ ($\in \mathbb{R}^{2048}$) are projection biases of the two projection networks. $L$ reshapes the output feature map into a vector; therefore, feature vectors $f_s$ and $f_w$ are $\in \mathbb{R}^{100352}$.

The speaker and keyword classification tasks are respectively performed by two separate networks that each consists with two fully connected layers, $\phi$, followed by a softmax function, $\gamma$. After passing the speaker classification network, the subject-specific feature vector, $f_s$, becomes a probability mass function, $\hat{y}_s$ ($\in \mathbb{R}^M$), to capture the likelihood that the input utterance belongs to any of the $M$ inspectors. Similarly, the keyword-specific feature vector, $f_w$, is turned into the probability mass function, $\hat{y}_w$ ($\in \mathbb{R}^N$). Mathematically, the two
down-stream classification tasks are:

\[ \hat{y}_n = \gamma(\phi(f_n; W_{n,1}, b_{n,1}, h_{n,1}); W_{n,2}, b_{n,2}, h_{n,2})) \],

where \( n \in \{ s, w \} \), \( \phi(f; W, b, h) \) represents a fully connected layer with the input vector \( f \), the weight matrix \( W \), the bias vector \( b \), and the activation function \( h \). Here, \( W_{s,1} \in \mathbb{R}^{100352 \times 128} \), \( W_{s,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{100352 \times 256} \), \( W_{w,1} \) and \( W_{w,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{100352 \times 512} \), \( b_{s,1} \in \mathbb{R}^{128} \), \( b_{s,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{256} \), \( b_{w,1} \) and \( b_{w,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{512} \), \( h_{s,1} \) is a ReLU function, and \( h_{s,2} \), \( h_{w,1} \) and \( h_{w,2} \) are sigmoid functions. The two rear-end classification networks are determined based on the result from numerical experiments that seek to achieve a stably high performance on the validation dataset.

The subject-specific feature vector, \( f_s \), should be keyword-agnostic. For that purpose, it is also entered into the keyword classification network to predict the keyword class, \( \hat{y}_{sw} \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \). Similarly, the keyword-specific feature vector, \( f_w \), is expected to be subject-agnostic. After entering it into the speaker classification network, the speaker ID prediction, \( \hat{y}_{ws} \in \mathbb{R}^{M} \), is obtained. These two regulations to support disentangling the two types of features intertwined in the feature map are expressed as:

\[ \hat{y}_{ln} = \gamma(\phi(f_l; W_{l,1}, b_{l,1}, h_{l,1}); W_{l,2}, b_{l,2}, h_{l,2})) \],

where \( l \) and \( n \in \{ s, w \} \), and \( l \neq n \). The data flows for predicting \( \hat{y}_{sw} \) and \( \hat{y}_{ws} \) in Figure 1 are dashed arrows, meaning that they are only calculated for the model training purpose.

4.2 The Loss Function for Collaborative Training

The training dataset, \( \Omega_T = \{ x(k), y_s(k), y_w(k) | k = 1, \ldots, K \} \), contains \( K \) observations, where \( x(k) \) is the input utterance indexed as \( k \), and \( y_s(k) \) is the truth speaker ID and \( y_w(k) \) is the truth keyword class pertaining to \( x(k) \). The proposed model predicts the speaker ID \( \hat{y}_s(k) \) and the keyword class \( \hat{y}_w(k) \). The goal of model training is to fit the feature extractor, the two projection networks, and the two classification networks, achieved by minimizing the loss function, \( \mathcal{L} \):

\[ \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_s + \mathcal{L}_w + \mathcal{L}_{sw} + \mathcal{L}_{ws} \]

which is composed of four components:

\[ \mathcal{L}_s = - \sum_{k=1}^{K} < y_s(k), \log \hat{y}_s(k) >, \]

\[ \mathcal{L}_w = - \sum_{k=1}^{K} < y_w(k), \log \hat{y}_w(k) >, \]

\[ \mathcal{L}_{sw} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \| \hat{y}_{sw}(k) - 1/N \|_2^2, \]

\[ \mathcal{L}_{ws} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \| \hat{y}_{ws}(k) - 1/M \|_2^2. \]

Here, \( <, > \) is the inner product of two vectors, \( \mathcal{L}_s \) is a cross-entropy loss penalizing the inaccuracy in classifying speakers by subject-specific features. \( \mathcal{L}_w \) is also a cross-entropy loss penalizing the inaccuracy in classifying keywords by keyword features. \( \mathcal{L}_{sw} \) regulates the subject-specific features to be keyword-agnostic, meaning that the ideal prediction scores on keyword classes follow a uniform distribution. Similarly, \( \mathcal{L}_{ws} \) regulates the keyword-specific features to be subject-agnostic.

4.3 Inspector Verification

Given an input utterance \( x (\notin \Omega_T) \), the model renders the speaker classification scores \( \hat{y}_s \), that measure the probabilities of being each of the \( M \) speakers. A verification module can be further developed, which uses the speaker classification result to verify if the speaker is in the pool of authorized inspectors. The pool of unauthorized speakers is infinite. Therefore, a method to detect unauthorized speakers without collecting any data from them is ideal. In predicting the class of a speaker, the model is likely to render prediction scores \( \hat{y}_s \) close to a discrete uniform distribution if the speaker is an unauthorized speaker. That is, the speaker is not more likely to be one of the \( M \) speakers than the other. However, the speaker classification scores of
some hard-to-analyze authorized inspectors may have a similar pattern. This paper develops a method to differentiate unauthorized speakers from authorized inspectors.

A measure, \( \lambda_v \), defined as the ratio of the highest score \( \hat{y}_{s}^{(1)} \) to the second highest score \( \hat{y}_{s}^{(2)} \) of \( \hat{y}_s \):

\[
\lambda_v = \frac{\hat{y}_{s}^{(1)}}{\hat{y}_{s}^{(2)}},
\]

which quantifies the minimum relative strength of the top ranked prediction score. \( \lambda_v \) takes values within the range \([1, \infty)\). The larger the value, the stronger the belief in the top scorer prediction. A threshold needs to be defined appropriately to differentiate unauthorized speakers from authorized inspectors according to \( \lambda_v \).

A threshold \( \lambda \) is defined based on the training dataset:

\[
\lambda = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{1}{\text{var}[\hat{y}_s(k)]}
\]

where \( \text{var}[\hat{y}_s(k)] \) designates the variance of \( \hat{y}_s(k) \), the classification scores for the person spoken the input utterance \( x(k) \in \Omega_T \). A small variance indicates a difficulty in trusting the prediction to be the top scorer. Therefore, Eq. 7 indicates the easier that the model classifies speakers, the smaller the value that \( \lambda \) takes.

A derivation further shows the threshold \( \lambda \) takes a value within the range \([M + 1 + \frac{1}{M - 1}, \infty)\), and the lower boundary of the threshold value \( M + 1 + \frac{1}{M - 1} \) is approaching \( M + 1 \) as \( M \) increases. That is, the lower boundary increases with the number of subjects that the training dataset contains.

### 4.4 Model Adaption to Worker Changes

If any inspectors leave the group (e.g., retirement, turnover, or on leave), they become inactive users of the model. Regarding these changes, the speaker-keyword classification model does not have to be updated. A speaker recognized as an inactive inspector is seen as “others not on duty”. However, if new inspectors join the group (e.g., new hires or contractors), the model must be calibrated for two reasons. First, the speaker classification network will have one or multiple new classes. Second, adding the data from the new inspectors to the training dataset may further improve the model’s ability to classify keywords, particularly when the original training dataset contains only a few subjects.

To calibrate the model regarding newly added inspectors, a small amount of data will be collected from the new inspectors and added to the training dataset. For example, the additional training data can be collected by letting each new inspector say every keyword for five times. In the calibration of the model, the keyword-specific feature projection network, the keyword classification network, and the feature extractor will use their current weights as the initial values. The underlying rationale is that those networks are at least near optimal before the calibration, and the updated training dataset may help refine them to become optimal. However, the subject-specific feature projection network and the speaker classification network will use randomly assigned weights as the initial values. Re-training these two networks from scratch would avoid the issue of forgetting existing inspectors when learning to recognize new inspectors.

### 5 Implementation Details

#### 5.1 The Data

The study collected inspection command data spoken by eight subjects. They will be trained to guide a semi-autonomous drone to perform a bridge inspection job that consists of four tasks using a virtual reality based training system [21]. In this study, the drone can automatically perform the four tasks by flying along the pre-planned routes of the tasks with GPS-based navigation and basic obstacle avoidance functions. The start and termination of a task, as well as certain deviations from the pre-planned path for the task, must be guided by an inspector. Ten keywords were collected and summarized in Table 1, which are in three categories. “BIRDS” is the name of the drone and it is the wake-up command for an inspector to trigger the communication with the drone. The communication is on until a silence of over two seconds is detected. The inspector uses the command “Task \( i \)” (\( i = \text{One, Two, Three, Four} \)) to let the drone start a specific task. Therefore, there are five keywords falling in the category of assignment commands. Four additional single-word commands allow the inspector to modify the automatic inspection mode. The inspector can use the command “Backward” to ask the drone to move reversely along the pre-defined path. The drone will stay still if it receives the
The drone will continue performing the uncompleted task automatically if the inspector says “Continue”. The command “Stop” will terminate the current task and let the inspector take control of the drone. This list of keywords is an example developed based on one inspection job. Commands can be developed for any inspection job with unique specifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wakeup</td>
<td>“BIRDS”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>“Task”, “One”, “Two”, “Three”, “Four”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>“Backward”, “Continue”, “Hover”, “Stop”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of the eight subjects in this study are female and the other half are male. Each of them repeated each of the ten keywords about 50 times. Utterances that each contains a keyword and lasts for 1.5 seconds are extracted from the recorded audio signals. The utterances are all transformed into Melspectrogram images. The dataset in the Melspectrogram format can be downloaded from the project webpage [20]. Figure 2 illustrates one image of each keyword from every subject. The similarity of the images in the same row and dissimilarity among those in the same column are both observed, indicating keyword-specific features are present and can be extracted from the images for classifying keywords. Meanwhile, inter-subject variation is present in each row, which means subject-specific features are intertwined with keyword-specific features.

### 5.2 Model Training

A speaker-keyword classification model is trained and refined based on the following study scenario. The initial group has five authorized inspectors. The model proposed in Section 4.1 is trained, validated, and tested for this group using their data. The data collected from each subject and on each keyword are split into three subsets for three purposes: training (60%, ~30 utterances), validation (20%, ~10 utterances), and testing (20%, ~10 utterances). Developing a satisfying model does not necessarily use up all the data reserved for model training. The requirement on the training data size will be discussed in the next section. The initial model is trained in two stages. In the first stage, the feature extractor that has already been pre-trained on ImageNet is frozen, and the other four networks are trained from the scratch for up to ten epochs. In the second stage, the feature extractor is unfrozen and all the five networks are refined for up to ten epochs. Any of the two training stages may be terminated earlier if the validation accuracy is no longer improved for at least five epochs. The initial model is the one that achieves the lowest loss from the second stage.
Later on, a remaining inspector joins the group, and the initial model is calibrated accordingly by following the method delineated in Section 4.4. A hypothesis of this study is that the model calibration regarding the worker dynamics requires less data than training the initial model usually built for a small group. Therefore, only five utterances of each keyword from the new inspector are added to the training data for calibrating the model. Experiments in the next section validate that this small amount is sufficient. Still, about ten utterances per keyword from each prospective new inspector is used for the testing purpose to maintain the even distribution of testing data on subjects and keywords. The model calibration for the incremental class of inspector runs for ten epochs.

6 Results and Discussion

6.1 Model Development Efficiency

To determine the requirements on training data size and training time for achieving a satisfying classification accuracy, the speaker-keyword classification model is trained and tested on the keyword data collected from five subjects (sub1~sub5). Table 2 summarizes four models developed on training data in different sizes. Each model is trained and tested 10 times to obtain the average accuracy. The dataset for training the first model contains 10 utterances per keyword (/kw) from each of the five subjects, indicated by a vector (10, 10, 10, 10, 10). The overall keyword classification accuracy is 0.951, and the accuracy at the subject-level ranges from 0.878 to 0.991. The speaker classification accuracy is 0.969, and the accuracy of recognizing a specific subject ranges from 0.917 to 0.997. The model’s ability to analyze subject 2 is clearly lower than that of others. Subject 2 seems quite different than others by looking at Figure 2. To improve the accuracy for subject 2, the second model is developed by doubling the training data. This time, the average accuracy of classifying the keywords of subject 2 is effectively increased to 0.927, and the average accuracy of recognizing subject 2 is increased to 0.987. If 0.95 is a desired accuracy level, the second model has not achieved a satisfying accuracy in classifying the keywords of subject 2, which motivates the third model that adds additional 10 utterances of each keyword from subject 2 to the training data. This time, the keyword classification accuracy is at least 0.953 for every subject and the speaker recognition accuracy is at least 0.984. Compared to the fourth model that uses 30 utterances per keyword for all subjects, the third model is developed with less training data but with comparable performance. Results in Table 2 indicate collecting about 20 utterances per keyword from each subject would be required to develop a model for a small group of inspectors and, in some circumstances, a little more data from a difficult-to-analyze inspector would be helpful. In the remainder of the paper, the third model, trained using 30 utterances per keyword from subject 2 and 20 utterances per keyword from the other four subjects, is used as the base model for further discussion. Training the base model is efficient, taking only 63 seconds. Transferring the pre-trained ResNet50 into this study as the feature extractor is an important reason for achieving the time efficiency.

The inference speed of the model is reasonable, about 0.11 seconds per Melspectrogram. Adding the required time to convert an utterance into a Melspectrogram, which takes about 0.03~0.04 seconds, the speed for analyzing the acoustic signal is about seven utterances per second.

### Table 2: Impact of training data size on the accuracy of speaker-command classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10,10,10,10,10)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.946 0.878 0.966 0.977 0.991</td>
<td>0.954 0.917 0.977 0.959 0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20,20,20,20)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.970 0.927 0.988 0.988 0.999</td>
<td>0.974 0.987 0.992 0.987 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20,30,20,20)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.973 0.953 0.989 0.988 1.000</td>
<td>0.980 0.984 0.995 0.986 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30,30,30,30)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.985 0.958 0.989 0.988 1.000</td>
<td>0.984 0.982 0.994 0.990 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>overall</td>
<td>0.969 0.991 0.997 0.990 1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Benefits of Pooled Training Data

The between-subject variation of a keyword’s feature vector is always present. Therefore, a model trained on a big volume of data collected from just one subject would not be effective for classifying the same set of keywords for other subjects. Pooling the data from a group of subjects has two advantages. On one hand, it allows for learning richer keyword representations. On the other hand, the between-subject variation can be utilized to differentiate subjects. As a result, a unified model can be developed from the pooled data to
substitute a set of point solutions that each is dedicated to one subject. To illustrate the benefits of pooled training data, 18 models in 6 groups are developed. Table 3 summarizes their average accuracy in classifying the keywords for each of the five subjects. The average value is based on ten repetitions of the model training and testing. The first group consists of three models that are trained on subject 1’s data in different sizes. When the training data size is 10 utterances per keyword, the average accuracy in classifying the keywords for subject 1 is 0.937, but the average accuracy in classifying the same keywords of other subjects ranges from 0.341 to 0.630. Adding more data collected from subject 1 to the training dataset will not effectively improve the classification accuracy for other subjects. For example, when the training data size is tripled, the average accuracy of classifying the keywords of other subjects is improved by 0.09 or less, far below a satisfying level. The non-transferability is consistently observed among other models trained on the data collected from one subject. The last group of models are trained by pooling data from all five subjects. For instance, the training dataset that contains only 6 utterances per keyword from each of the 5 subjects is of the same size as the one that consists of 30 utterances per keyword from only one subject. With the pooled training dataset, the average accuracy in classifying the keywords of subject 2 is 0.821 and 0.935 or higher for other subjects, shown in Table 3, and the average accuracy in classifying speakers is 0.953. In the scenario of collecting 10 utterances per keyword from the 5 subjects for model development, the unified model developed on the pooled dataset has outperformed 4 out of 5 models developed respectively using the unpooled data. The comparison in Table 3 verifies the effectiveness of pooling data to learn richer keyword representations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Data Size (/kw)</th>
<th>Avg. Accuracy of Keyword Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10, 0, 0, 0, 0)</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20, 0, 0, 0, 0)</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30, 0, 0, 0, 0)</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 10, 0, 0, 0)</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 20, 0, 0, 0)</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 30, 0, 0, 0)</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 0, 10, 0, 0)</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 0, 20, 0, 0)</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 0, 30, 0, 0)</td>
<td>0.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 0, 0, 10, 0)</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 0, 0, 20, 0)</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 0, 0, 30, 0)</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 6, 6, 6, 6)</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10,10,10,10,10)</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20,30,20,20,20)</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Model Adaptability to New Inspectors

When a new inspector is joining the inspector group, collecting a small amount of additional training data from the new inspector would be sufficient to adapt the model to the changed inspector group. To verify the requirement for the additional training data from a new inspector, the base model is respectively calibrated for each of the three remaining subjects (i.e., sub6∼sub8) using two sizes of training data: 5 and 10 utterances per keyword from the new subject. Results are summarized in Table 4. The accuracy of the base model in classifying the keywords of subject 6 is 0.700. When subject 6 becomes a new inspector, the model is calibrated by adding just 5 utterances per keyword collected from the new subject to the training dataset. The accuracy of the calibrated model in classifying the keywords of subject 6 becomes 0.970, and the accuracy for the existing five subjects has no significant change. If subject 7 is the new subject, collecting 10 instances per keyword from the subject to calibrate the model effectively increases the accuracy from 0.464 to 0.968. Collecting 5 instances per keyword from subject 8 can effectively adapt the base model to this subject, manifested by the increase of the accuracy from 0.267 to 0.990. The additional 5 to 10 utterances per keyword from the new subject are also
sufficient for the model to obtain the ability to recognize the new subject with an accuracy near 1.000 without forgetting the existing subjects. The study verifies the efficiency and effectiveness of adapting an existing model to new inspectors. Table 4 also indicates that a model’s ability to classify keywords of unauthorized subjects would increase if more subjects are included in the training data. For example, the accuracy of the base model in classifying the keyword of subject 8 is 0.267. After the base model is adapted to the bigger group that consists of subjects 1~6, the accuracy of the updated model in classifying the keywords of subject 8 is increased to 0.336. Therefore, the model adaptability on a public dataset is further examined in a later section.

Table 4: Requirement on the training data size for model adaption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Size (/kw)</th>
<th>Authorized Subjects</th>
<th>New Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub1</td>
<td>sub2</td>
<td>sub3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base model</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Effectiveness of Inspector Verification

The effectiveness of the inspector verification method delineated in Section 4.3 is illustrated using the base model. Therefore, subjects 1~5 are authorized inspectors, and subjects 6~8 are unauthorized ones. The threshold value $\lambda_v$ in Eq.6 for the base model is 7.048, close to its lower boundary of 6.25. If the ratio value $\lambda$ calculated based on a speaker classification result is greater than this threshold value, the inspector is predicted as an authorized inspector. The test data of the eight subjects are used to test the performance of the inspector verification method. Table 5 summarizes the distribution of $\lambda_v$ value by subject. In total, 869 utterances are tested, with 543 from the authorized inspectors (sub1~sub5) and 326 from the unauthorized speakers (sub6~sub8). The statistic measures of $\lambda_v$ in Table 5 clearly differentiate the two groups of subjects, verifying the rationale of using $\lambda_v$ defined in Eq.6 as a measurement for inspector verification.

Table 5: Statistics of Inspector Verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Test Sample Size</th>
<th>$\lambda_v$</th>
<th>{ $\lambda_v &gt; \lambda$ }</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>40.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>47.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.988</td>
<td>14.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.801</td>
<td>24.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.641</td>
<td>37.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub7</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>1.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>1.439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 presents the confusion matrix of inspector verification. 510 out of the 543 utterances from the authorized inspectors are predicted correctly, indicating the chance that the base model can correctly verify authorized inspectors is 93.9%. 248 out of 326 utterances from the unauthorized inspectors are predicted correctly, which means the chance of successfully detecting an unauthorized speaker is 76.1%. As a result, the precision of inspector verification is 86.7% (=510/588), and the precision of unauthorized speaker detection is 88.3% (=248/281). The result in Table 6 indicates the proposed inspector verification method is effective.
A model owner can adjust the threshold value according to the specific situation of implementation. For example, slightly increasing the threshold value $\lambda$ allows to increase the sensitivity of detecting unauthorized speakers, but it lowers the accuracy in verifying authorized inspectors. The lowered verification accuracy can be improved by adopting a temporal coherence analysis that verifies a speaker according to a sequence of acoustic inputs from the speaker rather than a single input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground Truth</th>
<th>Authorized</th>
<th>Unauthorized</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorized</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: The confusion matrix of the base model’s inspector verification result**

### 6.5 Impacts of Larger Group Sizes

To demonstrate the applicability of the proposed speaker-keyword classification model to groups in larger sizes, an online audio dataset [4] is analyzed. This dataset includes 30,000 utterances of digits 0∼9 collected from 60 different speakers who spoke every digit 50 times.

Firstly, an initial model is developed for a group of five subjects. To keep consistent with the inspection command example in this paper, the dataset for training this classification model uses the same data size. That is, the initial training dataset contains 20 utterances per keyword from each of the five subjects. The validation dataset and the test dataset respectively have 10 utterances per keyword from the subjects. The initial group of authorized subjects is expanded by adding one subject at once until reaching the size of 30 authorized subjects. When adapting the model to a new subject, 5 utterances per keyword are collected from the subject and added to the training dataset to calibrate the model. In total, 26 models are developed, from a 5-subject group to a 30-subject group. Subjects whose data are included in the training dataset are named the authorized group and those whose data are not included are the unauthorized group. In this experiment, subjects 51∼60 form a group of 10 unauthorized subjects.

To verify that the keyword classification is not negatively affected by the increasing number of authorized subjects, the 95% confidence intervals of each model’s keyword classification accuracy for authorized subjects and unauthorized subjects are respectively shown in Figure 5. The mean accuracy of classifying the keywords spoken by the authorized subjects is near 1, and adding more and more subjects to the group does not change the mean accuracy of keyword classification. The initial model’s mean accuracy in classifying the keywords spoken by the unauthorized speakers is 0.927. It demonstrates a growing trend if the number of authorized subjects in the training dataset increases, reaching 0.975 when the size reaches 30 subjects. Subjects 52, 57, and 60 are the three unauthorized subjects whose spoke keywords are classified by the initial model with a 0.86∼0.88 accuracy. When the number of authorized subjects is increased to 30, the mean accuracy in classifying the keywords of subjects 57 and 60 is 0.89, but it is 1 for subject 52. The difference between the two groups’ mean accuracy is anticipated to diminish when the training dataset contains data from more and more subjects. However, the interval estimate of the classification accuracy for the unauthorized group is clearly wider than that of the authorized group. Figure 5 confirms that pooling data from more subjects would reduce the gap of mean accuracy in keyword classification between the two groups, but not the difference in their variances of accuracy. To achieve a reliable classification result, it is recommended to include a small sample of training data from any new inspectors.

It is anticipated that classifying speakers will become more challenging when the number of authorized inspectors keeps increasing. But this difficulty can be addressed by collecting more training data from the incrementally added subjects. To verify this hypothesis, Figure 4 shows the mean value of subject-level speaker classification accuracy and the 95% interval estimate under two scenarios: the training data contains 5 utterances per keyword from each incrementally added subject vs. 20 utterances per keyword. When only 5 utterances per keyword are collected from each sequentially added subject, the mean accuracy clearly demonstrates a decreasing trend when the number of authorized subjects increases, and the interval estimate becomes wider. If more training data are collected from newly added subjects, the decreasing trend of mean accuracy slows down and the interval estimate becomes narrower. Figure 4 implies that adapting the speaker-keyword classification model to a larger group of subjects may require more training data due to the challenge of classifying speakers in a larger sized group.
7 Conclusions

This paper aimed to develop a multi-tasking deep learning model to classify the keywords of spoken commands for guiding a semi-autonomous drone in inspection and, simultaneously, recognize inspectors who spoke the commands. To achieve the goal, a Share-Split-Collaborate (S$^2$C) learning architecture was designed and found to be effective in this study. With the S$^2$C architecture, the two classification tasks can share the feature extractor, and the subject-specific and keyword-specific feature intertwined in the extracted features can be split through feature projection and collaborative training. The model is trained on pooled data collected from the group of authorized inspectors who will use the model to stay in the loop of the drone performed inspection. From the pooled training data, the model learns richer keyword representations and the features to differentiate inspectors.

This study collected an inspection keyword dataset from 8 subjects to illustrate the proposed model. The dataset contains 10 keywords that each of them is repeated about 50 times by every subject. A base model for a group of 5 authorized subjects was developed on a training dataset composed of 20 utterances per keyword from each of the 5 subjects and a little more from a hard-to-analyze subject. The model achieved 95.3% or higher average accuracy in classifying the keywords of every subject in the group and a 99.2% average accuracy in classifying the subjects. The proposed model has effectively addressed the nontransferrability of point solutions that each is trained on the data from one subject and can be used only by that subject due to the between-subject variation of keyword features. Consequently, adapting the base model to a new subject only requires collecting a small amount of training data from the new subject, like 5 utterances per keyword. The speaker prediction scores were also used to verify if the command is given by an authorized inspector. The base model’s success rate in verifying authorized subjects is 93.9% and 76.1% in detecting unauthorized subjects. The proposed model was further trained and tested on a public audio dataset collected
from 60 subjects. The proposed model is applicable to large-size groups, manifested by the consistently high and reliable keyword classification accuracy. Speaker classification will become more challenging when the group size is large, indicated by the decreased mean value and the enlarged variance of subject-level speaker recognition accuracy. At the minimum, collecting sufficient training data from the subjects can address the challenge effectively.

Implementing the classification model still requires additional efforts that go beyond the study score of this paper. For example, an additional module needs to be created to locate command-related segments from stream data and extract keyword utterances from the segments. Every working environment is unique and every inspector is special. How to further improve the model’s adaptability to noises in open-working environments and to the largely varied spoken habits of inspectors is a research question. Effective data augmentation and model adaptation methods could be possible solutions. The current study assumes a bijective relationship between the audio commands and the actions of the drone. A more user-friendly approach to communication requires a surjective function that allows for mapping variants of each command from inspectors to the corresponding action of the drone. If new inspectors to be included as authorized model users propose adding new keywords, class-incremental learning will happen to both classification tasks. This paper provides an opportunity for exploring those new research questions.

Acknowledgment

Qin and Li are supported by National Science Foundation through the award ECCS-#2026357. Yao is supported by the SBU-BNL seed grant (1168726-9-63845) and National Science Foundation through the award ECCS-#2129673.

References


