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## INTRODUCTION

The global smart speaker installed base is expected to reach 640 million by 2024. More and more of these devices, such as Google Home or Amazon Echo, are enriching the Internet of Things (IoT) ecosystem in our homes.

The Intelligent Personal Assistants (IPAs) included in the smart speakers allow users to directly control other IoT devices.

Smart speaker installed base forecasts by country


## INTRODUCTION



## zapıer

Software tools, such as IFTTT, Node-Red, IPA's mobile apps provide advanced features like the possibility to set up some personalization rules in the form of trigger-action: if something happens, then do something else.

The solutions currently on the market are characterized by medium-high complexity. This excludes less technical people in the smart home customization process.

## THESIS GOALS

If a non-technical user would be willing to create personalization rules just by tallking to a smart speaker.What are natural formalisms to compose rules by voice, and if the trigger-action paradigm is good or not.Which characteristics should have an IPA to be suitable for the rule creation process.

## INTERVIEWS

## Participants

| Participant | Age Range | Job | Smart <br> speaker <br> owner |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P1 | $23-27$ | Speech therapist | $\checkmark$ |
| P2 | $18-22$ | Student | $\checkmark$ |
| P3 | $48-52$ | Housewife | $\checkmark$ |
| P4 | $23-27$ | Health technician | $X$ |
| P5 | $23-27$ | Student | $X$ |
| P6 | $43-47$ | Health workers | $X$ |
| P7 | $23-27$ | Math teacher | $\checkmark$ |A heterogeneous group of 7 non-technical participants ranging from 18 to 52 years, with a mix of occupations and educational backgrounds.

The decision was limited to users with a medium-high interest in home automation.

## Study sections

Background interviewImagination exercise
## INTERVIEWS

## Results

The results indicate that users be inclined to compose personalization rules by conversing with a smart speaker.Users vocally composed rulles with a trigger-action formalism.
## IF > THEN

Participants preferred to have an explicit acknowledgment that the IPAs correctly understood their rule formulation.
## DESIGN \& IMPLEMENTATION
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Interfaces


Sample dialog from the Google Action of full-vocal prototype

| Test participants |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Participant | Age <br> Range | Job Sector | Familiarity <br> with Voice <br> Assistants |
| P1 | $48-52$ | Health and Social care | X |
| P2 | $53-57$ | Health and Social care | $\checkmark$ |
| P3 | $23-27$ | Health and Social care | $\checkmark$ |
| P4 | $23-27$ | Health and Social care | $\checkmark$ |
| P5 | $53-57$ | Housewife | $\checkmark$ |
| P6 | $53-57$ | Engineering and manufacturing | $\checkmark$ |
| P7 | $23-27$ | Health and Social care | $X$ |
| P8 | $23-27$ | Teacher training and education | $X$ |
| P9 | $23-27$ | Teacher training and education | $X$ |
| P10 | $23-27$ | Health and Social care | $X$ |
|  |  |  |  |

## Within-subject design

## Smart home simulation



Six tasks: each task represents a real situation to solve through the creation of a rule.


## EVALUATION

## Usability test results

Evaluation metrics

Time on TaskTask completionError MetricsSubjective Measures
System Usability Scale

|  | Task 1 |  | Task 2 |  | Task 3 |  | Task 4 |  | Task 5 |  | Task 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr1 | Pr2 | Pr1 | Pr2 | Pr1 | Pr2 | Pr1 | Pr2 | Pr1 | Pr 2 | Pr1 | Pr2 |
| Avg | 40s | 56s | 39s | 58s | 37s | 48s | 30s | 71s | 41s | 54s | 33s | 59s |

Task execution times

| Prototype | Task 1 | Task 2 | Task 3 | Task 4 | Task 5 | Task 6 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\operatorname{Pr1}$ | $100 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $76.7 \%$ |
| $\operatorname{Pr} 2$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $96.7 \%$ |

Task completions

The average times of tasks have been longer with $\operatorname{Pr} 2$ than $\operatorname{Pr} 1$.

Task 2 and Task 4 were problematic with Pr1.
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## EVALUATION

Usability of conversational agents- SUS scores determine a "good" usability

Failures in the completions did not SUS score affect the perceived usability.

|  | Pr1 | Pr2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Avg | 71.5 | 73.3 |

## - CONCLUSIONS \& FUTURE WORKS

The creation of personalization rules can be natural and effective via voice.Smart speakers are generally considered simple entertainment items. Novel approaches to creating even complex scenarios can have a certain impact on the home environment possibilities of personalization.Future work could expand the functionality of the developed voice applications by allowing users to configure even more complex rules.Further reasoning in the study context could consider other novel approaches for smart homes personalization through conversation.
# Thanks for the attention! 

## Questions?

