Speaker identification by listeners compared to expert forensic voice comparison based on state-of-the-art automatic-speaker-recognition technology
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Vocabulary

- **Speaker identification** by lay listeners refers to situations where a **listener who is unfamiliar with the speaker or speakers** listens to:

  - a voice they hear on one occasion (e.g., while a crime is being committed) and a voice that they hear on another occasion (e.g., during a voice lineup);

  - two voice recordings (e.g., recording of a crime being committed and a recording of a police interview);

  - or one voice recording (e.g., a recording of a crime being committed) and a live speaker (e.g., a defendant speaking in court);

  - and **attempts to determine whether they are the same speaker or different speakers.**
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Research questions

- Expert testimony is only admissible in common law if it will potentially assist the trier of fact to make a decision that they would not be able to make unaided.

  - Is speaker identification by a judge listening alone more or less accurate than the output of a forensic-voice-comparison system that is based on state-of-the-art automatic-speaker-recognition technology?

  - Is speaker identification by jury members listening and collaboratively making a judgement more or less accurate than the output of a forensic-voice-comparison system that is based on state-of-the-art automatic-speaker-recognition technology?
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Research questions

- Triers of fact sometimes attempt to perform speaker identification on speech that is in an accent that is unfamiliar to them or even a language that is unfamiliar to them.

- Is the accuracy of a judge’s speaker identification better or worse when the speech is in an unfamiliar accent?

- Is the accuracy of a judge’s speaker identification better or worse when the speech is in an unfamiliar language?
Stimuli

• Pairs of recordings:
  
  • 31 same-speaker pairs
  
  • 30 different-speaker pairs
Stimuli

• Pairs of recordings:

  • 31 same-speaker pairs

  • 30 different-speaker pairs

  • each recording
    • ~15 s long
    • adult male speaker of Australian English
Stimuli

• Pairs of recordings reflect the conditions of a real forensic case:

  • Questioned-speaker condition
    • landline-telephone call
    • background babble noise
    • saved using lossy compression

  • Known-speaker condition
    • interview recorded in a reverberant room
    • background ventilation-system noise
Listeners

- Australian-English listeners (53)

- North-American-English listeners (61, 57)

- Spanish-language listeners (55)
### Procedures for listeners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructions</th>
<th>Recording Pair 1 of 66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioned Speaker Recording:</strong></td>
<td>I think the properties of the recordings are [ ] times more likely if they are both recordings of the same adult male Australian-English speaker than if they are recordings of two different adult male Australian-English speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known Speaker Recording:</strong></td>
<td>I think the properties of the recordings are [ ] times more likely if they are recordings of two different adult male Australian-English speakers than if they are both recordings of the same adult male Australian-English speaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forensic-voice-comparison system

- E³ Forensic Speech Science System (E³FS³)

- x-vector (DNN-embedding) based

- calibrated under casework conditions
Results

- Accuracy

- log-likelihood-ratio cost

- $C_{llr}$
Results

- Forensic-voice-comparison system
  
  - $C_{llr} = 0.42$

- Best listener
  
  - $C_{llr} = 0.51$

  - $D_{llr} = -1.3$

  - $B_{llr} = -1.5$
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  - $D_{llr}$
Results

• Forensic-voice-comparison system
  
  • $C_{llr} = 0.42$
  
  • Example of listener with poor discrimination
    
    • $C_{llr} = 0.77$
    
    • $D_{llr} = -2.9$
    
    • $B_{llr} = -0.5$
Results

- Bias relative to FVC system

- $B_{\text{lr}}$
Results

- Forensic-voice-comparison system
  - $C_{llr} = 0.42$
  - Example of listener with strong bias toward the different-speaker hypothesis
    - $C_{llr} = 1.90$
    - $D_{llr} = -2.5$
    - $B_{llr} = -3.5$
Additional research question

• When presented with expert evidence on forensic voice comparison, triers of fact usually also listen to the recordings and also attempt to perform their own speaker identification.

• Is speaker identification by a judge who both listens to the recordings and considers the output of the forensic-voice-comparison system more or less accurate than the output of a forensic-voice-comparison system alone?
Results

- Accuracy
  - log-likelihood-ratio cost
  - $C_{llr}$
Conclusions

• Is forensic voice comparison based on state-of-the-art automatic-speaker-recognition technology more accurate than speaker identification by individual lay listeners?

  • Yes
Conclusions

- Is forensic voice comparison based on state-of-the-art automatic-speaker-recognition technology more accurate than speaker identification by individual lay listeners?
  - Yes

- Is the accuracy of individual lay listeners’ speaker identification worse when the speech is in an unfamiliar accent and even worse when it is in an unfamiliar language?
  - Yes
Conclusions

• Can individual lay listeners outperform forensic voice comparison based on state-of-the-art automatic-speaker-recognition technology by considering the likelihood ratio output by the forensic-voice-comparison system and also performing their own speaker identification?

  • No
Recommendations

- Should judges attempt to perform their own speaker identification?
  
  - No.
  
  - They should rely on expert testimony based on a calibrated and validated forensic-voice-comparison system.
Recommendations

- Should judges attempt to perform their own speaker identification in addition to considering the likelihood ratio output by a forensic-voice-comparison system?

  - No.

  - They should rely exclusively on expert testimony based on a calibrated and validated forensic-voice-comparison system.
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Results

- Accuracy

- correct-classification rate