CHAPTER 29

Dialog Systems and Chatbots

The rules of conversation are, in general, not to dwell on any one subject, but to pass lightly from one to another without effort and without affectation; to know how to speak about trivial topics as well as serious ones; the Encyclopedia of Diderot, start of the entry on conversation.

The literature of the fantastic abounds in inanimate objects magically endowed with sentience and the gift of speech. From Ovid’s statue of Pygmalion to Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein, there is something deeply touching about creating something and then having a chat with it. Legend has it that after finishing his sculpture of Moses, Michelangelo thought it so lifelike that he tapped it on the knee and commanded it to speak. Perhaps this shouldn’t be surprising. Language is the mark of humanity and sentience, and conversation or dialog is the most fundamental and specially privileged arena of language. It is the first kind of language we learn as children, and for most of us, it is the kind of language we most commonly indulge in, whether we are ordering curry for lunch or buying spinach, participating in business meetings or talking with our families, booking airline flights or complaining about the weather.

This chapter introduces the fundamental algorithms of conversational agents, or dialog systems. These programs communicate with users in natural language (text, speech, or even both), and generally fall into two classes.

Task-oriented dialog agents are designed for a particular task and set up to have short conversations (from as little as a single interaction to perhaps half-a-dozen interactions) to get information from the user to help complete the task. These include the digital assistants that are now on every cellphone or on home controllers (Siri, Cortana, Alexa, Google Now/Home, etc.) whose dialog agents can give travel directions, control home appliances, find restaurants, or help make phone calls or send texts. Companies deploy goal-based conversational agents on their websites to help customers answer questions or address problems. Conversational agents play an important role as an interface to robots. And they even have applications for social good. DoNotPay is a “robot lawyer” that helps people challenge incorrect parking fines, apply for emergency housing, or claim asylum if they are refugees.

Chatbots are systems designed for extended conversations, set up to mimic the unstructured conversational or ‘chats’ characteristic of human-human interaction, rather than focused on a particular task like booking plane flights. These systems often have an entertainment value, such as Microsoft’s ‘XiaoIce’ (Little Bing 小冰) system, which chats with people on text messaging platforms. Chatbots are
also often attempts to pass various forms of the Turing test (introduced in Chapter 1). Yet starting from the very first system, ELIZA (Weizenbaum, 1966), chatbots have also been used for practical purposes, such as testing theories of psychological counseling.

Note that the word ‘chatbot’ is often used in the media and in industry as a synonym for conversational agent. In this chapter we will follow the common usage in the natural language processing community, limiting the designation *chatbot* to this second subclass of systems designed for extended, casual conversation.

Let’s see some examples of dialog systems. One dimension of difference across systems is how many *turns* they can deal with. A dialog consists of multiple turns, each a single contribution to the dialog (the terminology is as if dialog is a game in which I take a turn, then you take a turn, then me, and so on). A turn can consist of a sentence, although it might be as short as a single word or as long as multiple sentences. The simplest such systems generally handle a single turn from the user, acting more like question-answering or command-and-control systems. This is especially common with digital assistants. For example Fig. 29.1 shows screen captures from an early version of Apple’s Siri personal assistant from 2014, demonstrating this kind of single-query behavior.

(a) (b)

Figure 29.1 Two sets of interactions with Siri in 2014. (a) A question (“Find restaurants near me”) returns restaurants, but the system was unable to interpret a follow-up question (“Are any of them Italian?”). (b) An alternative followup (“Tell me more about the second one”) similarly fails. This early system’s confusion at follow-up questions suggests that it is mainly designed for a single interaction.

By contrast, Fig. 29.2 shows that a 2017 version of the Siri digital assistant can handle slightly longer dialogs, handling a second turn with a follow-up question.

While spoken dialogs with mobile phone digital assistants tend to be short, some tasks do require longer dialogs. One such task is travel planning and management, a key concern of dialog systems since the very influential GUS system for planning airline travel (Bobrow et al., 1977); we’ll see an example in the next section.

Dialogue systems can even be used for much more complex domains like automatic tutoring. Figure 29.3 shows part of a dialog from the adaptive ITSPoke dialog system (Forbes-Riley and Litman, 2011). In this example the system detects the hesitancy of the student’s first response (“Is it 19.6 m/s?”), and, even though the answer is correct, decides to explain the answer and ask a follow-up question before moving on.

Finally, conversational agents can be purely for fun, like the agents designed for simple chit-chat like Cleverbot, an IR-based chatbot capable of carrying on the kinds
Figure 29.2  The same follow-up questions that Siri couldn’t answer in 2014 receive appropriate responses when posed to Siri in 2017.

Tutor: What will the velocity of the object be a second after that (where the initial velocity is 9.8 m/s and the acceleration is 9.8 m/s²)?
Student: Is it 19.6 m/s?
Tutor: Good. A second later, its velocity will be 9.8 m/s + 9.8 m/s = 19.6 m/s. This is because its acceleration tells us that every second, its velocity increases by 9.8 m/s. So what’ll its velocity be, a second after that?
Student: Um. I’m thinking. 29.4 m/s
Tutor: Right. Now back to the man and his keys. We’ve shown that they both have an acceleration of 9.8 m/s². So, how do their velocities compare with each other, at every second during the fall?

Figure 29.3  The tutoring domain: An excerpt from a tutorial interaction between a physics student and the ITSPOKE system of Forbes-Riley and Litman (2011) based on the Why2-Atlas text-based tutoring system (VanLehn et al., 2002).

User: Do you like Doctor Who?
Cleverbot: Yes, so funny.
User: What’s your favorite show?
Cleverbot: I don’t have one.
User: What’s your name?
Cleverbot: Jason I already told you.
User: No your real name.
Cleverbot: Stephanie IS my real name.
User: I thought it was Jason?
Cleverbot: How did you come to that conclusion.
User: Because you said so.
Cleverbot: I have to do my homework.

Figure 29.4  Chatbots: A conversation between a user and Cleverbot, an IR-based chatbot (Carpenter, 2017).

We begin in the next section with chatbots, introducing the three major chatbot architectures: rule-based systems, information retrieval systems, and transduction models. We then turn to task-oriented dialog, introducing the frame-based architecture (the GUS architecture) that underlies most modern task-based dialog systems, the VoiceXML system that is a simple industrial instantiation of the architecture,
and information on designing and evaluating these systems.

29.1 Chatbots

Chatbots are systems that can carry on extended conversations with the goal of mimicking the unstructured conversational or ‘chats’ characteristic of human-human interaction.

These systems often have an entertainment value, such as Microsoft’s ‘XiaoIce’ (Little Bing 小冰) system, which chats with people on text messaging platforms. Yet starting from the very first system, ELIZA (Weizenbaum, 1966), chatbots have also been used for practical purposes, such as testing theories of psychological counseling.

Like practically everything else in language processing, chatbot architectures fall into two classes: rule-based systems and corpus-based systems. Rule-based systems include the early influential ELIZA and PARRY systems. Corpus-based systems mine large datasets of human-human conversations, which can be done by using information retrieval (IR-based systems simply copy a human’s response from a previous conversation) or by using a machine translation paradigm such as neural network sequence-to-sequence systems, to learn to map from a user utterance to a system response.

29.1.1 Rule-based chatbots: ELIZA and PARRY

ELIZA (Weizenbaum, 1966) is the most important chatbot dialog system in the history of the field, and so we take some time here to describe its algorithm in detail. ELIZA was designed to simulate a Rogerian psychologist, based on a branch of clinical psychology whose methods involve drawing the patient out by reflecting patient’s statements back at them. Rogerian psychology is the rare type of conversation in which, as Weizenbaum points out, one can “assume the pose of knowing almost nothing of the real world”. If a patient says “I went for a long boat ride” and the psychiatrist says “Tell me about boats”, you don’t assume she didn’t know what a boat is, but rather assume she had some conversational goal. Most chatbots trying to pass Turing test choose a domain with similar properties.

Let’s look at the most famous ELIZA conversation, excerpted (deleting some material with ...) from a full interaction given in the original paper:

Men are all alike.
IN WHAT WAY
They’re always bugging us about something or other.
CAN YOU THINK OF A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE
Well my boyfriend made me come here.
YOUR BOYFRIEND MADE YOU COME HERE
He says I’m depressed much of the time.
I AM SORRY TO HEAR YOU ARE DEPRESSED
...
...
WHO ELSE IN YOUR FAMILY TAKES CARE OF YOU?
My father
YOUR FATHER
You are like my father in some ways.
WHAT RESEMBLANCE DO YOU SEE
You are not very aggressive but I think you don't want me to notice that.
WHAT MAKES YOU THINK I AM NOT AGGRESSIVE
You don't argue with me.
WHY DO YOU THINK I DON'T ARGUE WITH YOU
You are afraid of me.
DOES IT PLEASE YOU TO BELIEVE I'M AFRAID OF YOU
My father is afraid of everybody.
WHAT ELSE COMES TO MIND WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR FATHER
Bullies.
DOES THAT HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE FACT THAT YOUR BOYFRIEND MADE YOU COME HERE

As we summarized briefly in Chapter 1, ELIZA worked by pattern/transform
rules like the following one:
(0 YOU 0 ME) [pattern]
-->  (WHAT MAKES YOU THINK I 3 YOU) [transform]

In the ELIZA pattern, 0 means Kleene*, and in the transform rules the numbers
are the index of the constituent in the pattern. Thus the number 3 refers to the second
0 in the first pattern. This rule would transfer
You hate me
into:
WHAT MAKES YOU THINK I HATE YOU

Each ELIZA pattern/rule is linked to a keyword that might occur in a user sentence.
The architecture is summarized in Fig. 29.5.

function ELIZA GENERATOR(user sentence) returns response

Find the word w in sentence that has the highest keyword rank
if w exists
    Choose the highest ranked rule r for w that matches sentence
    response ← Apply the transform in r to sentence
    if w = 'my'
        future ← Apply a transformation from the 'memory' rule list to sentence
        Push future onto memory stack
    else (no keyword applies)
        either
            response ← Apply the transform for the NONE keyword to sentence
        or
            response ← Pop the top response from the memory stack
    return(response)

Figure 29.5 A simplified sketch of the ELIZA algorithm. The power of the algorithm come
from the particular transforms associated with each keyword.

Keywords are associated with a rank, with specific words being more highly
ranked, and more general words ranking lower. Consider the following user sentence:
I know everybody laughed at me
Because it has the word “I”, this sentence could match the following rule whose keyword is I:

\[(I \ast) \rightarrow (\text{You say you 2})\]

producing:

\[\text{YOU SAY YOU KNOW EVERYBODY LAUGHED AT YOU}\]

But as Weizenbaum points out, “I” is a very general word and its keywords lead to very general responses. Instead the keyword “everybody” is much more interesting, since someone using universals like everybody or always is probably “referring to some quite specific event or person”. Therefore, ELIZA prefers to respond with the pattern associated with the more specific keyword everybody (implementing by just assigning “everybody” rank 5 and “I” rank 0 in the lexicon), whose rule thus transforms the sentence to:

\[\text{WHO IN PARTICULAR ARE YOU THINKING OF?}\]

If no keyword matches, ELIZA chooses a non-committal response like “PLEASE GO ON”, “THAT’S VERY INTERESTING”, or “I SEE”.

Finally, ELIZA has a clever memory trick that accounts for the very last sentence of the conversation above. Whenever the word “my” is the highest ranked keyword, ELIZA will randomly select a transform on the MEMORY list, apply it to the sentence, and store it on the stack:

\[\text{(MEMORY MY}\]
\[\text{((0 MY 0 = LETS DISCUSS FURTHER WHY YOUR 3))}\]
\[\text{((0 MY 0 = EARLIER YOU SAID YOUR 3))}\]
\[\text{((0 MY 0 = DOES THAT HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE FACT THAT YOUR 3))}\]

Later, if no keyword matches a sentence, ELIZA will return the top of the MEMORY queue instead.\(^1\)

People became deeply emotionally involved with the program. Weizenbaum tells the story of one of his staff who would ask Weizenbaum to leave the room when she talked with ELIZA. When Weizenbaum suggested that he might want to store all the ELIZA conversations for later analysis, people immediately pointed out the privacy implications, which suggested that they were having quite private conversations with ELIZA, despite knowing that it was just software.

Eliza’s framework is still used today; modern chatbot system tools like ALICE are based on updated versions of ELIZA’s pattern/action architecture.

A few years after ELIZA, another chatbot with a clinical psychology focus, PARRY (Colby et al., 1971), was used to study schizophrenia. In addition to ELIZA-like regular expressions, the PARRY system including a model of its own mental state, with affect variables for the agent’s levels of fear and anger; certain topics of conversation might lead PARRY to become more angry or mistrustful. If PARRY’s anger variable is high, he will choose from a set of “hostile” outputs. If the input mentions his delusion topic, he will increase the value of his fear variable and then begin to express the sequence of statements related to his delusion. Parry was the first known system to pass the Turing test (in 1972!); psychiatrists couldn’t distinguish text transcripts of interviews with PARRY from transcripts of interviews with real paranoids (Colby et al., 1972).

\(^1\) Fun fact: because of its structure as a queue, this MEMORY trick is the earliest known hierarchical model of discourse in natural language processing.
29.1.2 Corpus-based chatbots

Corpus-based chatbots, instead of using hand-built rules, mine conversations of human-human conversations, or sometimes mine the human responses from human-machine conversations. Serban et al. (2017) summarizes some such available corpora, such as conversations on chat platforms, on Twitter, or in movie dialog, which is available in great quantities and has been shown to resemble natural conversation (Forchini, 2013). Chatbot responses can even be extracted from sentences in corpora of non-dialog text.

There are two types of corpus-based chatbots: systems based on information retrieval, and systems based on supervised machine learning based on sequence transduction.

Like rule-based chatbots (but unlike frame-based dialog systems), most corpus-based chatbots tend to do very little modeling of the conversational context. Instead they tend to focus on generating a single response turn that is appropriate given the user’s immediately previous utterance. For this reason they are often called response generation systems. Corpus-based chatbots thus have some similarity to question answering systems, which focus on single responses while ignoring context or larger conversational goals.

IR-based chatbots

The principle behind information retrieval based chatbots is to respond to a user’s turn X by repeating some appropriate turn Y from a corpus of natural (human) text. The differences across such systems lie in how they choose the corpus, and how they decide what counts as an human appropriate turn to copy.

A common choice of corpus is to collect databases of human conversations. These can come from microblogging platforms like Twitter or Sina Weibo (微博). Another approach is to use corpora of movie dialog. Once a chatbot has been put into practice, the turns that humans use to respond to the chatbot can be used as additional conversational data for training.

Given the corpus and the user’s sentence, IR-based systems can use any retrieval algorithm to choose an appropriate response from the corpus. The two simplest methods are the following:

1. Return the response to the most similar turn: Given user query $q$ and a conversational corpus $C$, find the turn $t$ in $C$ that is most similar to $(q)$ (for example has the highest cosine with $q$) and return the following turn, i.e. the human response to $t$ in $C$:

$$r = \text{response} \left( \arg \max_{t \in C} \frac{q^T t}{||q|| ||t||} \right)$$

(29.1)

The idea here is to directly match the users query $q$ with turns from $C$, since a good response will often share words or semantics with the prior turn.

2. Return the most similar turn: Given user query $q$ and a conversational corpus $C$, return the turn $t$ in $C$ that is most similar to $(q)$ (for example has the highest cosine with $q$):

$$r = \arg \max_{t \in C} \frac{q^T t}{||q|| ||t||}$$

(29.2)
In each case, any similarity function can be used, most commonly cosines computed either over words (using tf-idf) or over embeddings.

Although returning the response to the most similar turn seems like a more intuitive algorithm, returning the most similar turn seems to work better in practice, perhaps because selecting the response adds another layer of indirection that can allow for more noise (Ritter et al., 2011, Wang et al. 2013).

The IR-based approach can be extended by using more features than just the words in the \( q \) (such as words in prior turns, or information about the user), and using any full IR ranking approach. Commercial implementations of the IR-based approach include Cleverbot (Carpenter, 2017) and Microsoft’s ‘XiaoIce’ (Little Bing 小冰) system (Microsoft).

Instead of just using corpora of conversation, the IR-based approach can be used to draw responses from narrative (non-dialog) text. For example, the pioneering COBOT chatbot (Isbell et al., 2000) generated responses by selecting sentences from a corpus that combined the Unabomber Manifesto by Theodore Kaczynski, articles on alien abduction, the scripts of “The Big Lebowski” and “Planet of the Apes”. Chatbots that want to generate informative turns such as answers to user questions can use texts like Wikipedia to draw on sentences that might contain those answers (Yan et al., 2016).

Sequence to sequence chatbots

An alternate way to use a corpus to generate dialog is to think of response generation as a task of transducing from the user’s prior turn to the system’s turn. basically the machine learning version of Eliza; machine learning from a corpus to transduce a question to an answer.

This idea was first developed by using phrase-based machine translation (Ritter et al., 2011) to translate a user turn to a system response. It quickly became clear, however, that the task of response generation was too different from machine translation. In machine translation words or phrases in the source and target sentences tend to align well with each other; but a user utterance may share no words or phrases with a coherent response.

Instead, (roughly contemporaneously by Shang et al. 2015, Vinyals and Le 2015, and Sordoni et al. 2015) transduction models for response generation were modeled instead using sequence to sequence (seq2seq) models (Chapter 25).

A number of modifications are required to the basic seq2seq model to adapt it for the task of response generation. For example basic seq2seq models have a tendency to produce predictable but repetitive and therefore dull responses like “I’m OK” or “I don’t know” that shut down the conversation. This can be addressed by changing the objective function for seq2seq model training to a mutual information objective, or by modifying a beam decoder to keep more diverse responses in the beam (Li...
et al., 2016a).

Another problem with the simple SEQ2SEQ response generation architecture is its inability to model the longer prior context of the conversation. This can be done by allowing the model to see prior turns, such as by using a hierarchical model that summarizes information over multiple prior turns (Lowe et al., 2017b).

Finally, SEQ2SEQ response generators focus on generating single responses, and so don’t tend to do a good job of continuously generating responses that cohere across multiple turns. This can be addressed by using reinforcement learning, as well as techniques like adversarial networks, to learn to choose responses that make the overall conversation more natural (Li et al. 2016b, Li et al. 2017).

Fig. 29.7 shows some sample responses generated by a vanilla SEQ2SEQ model, and from a model trained by an adversarial algorithm to produce responses that are harder to distinguish from human responses (Li et al., 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Vanilla-SEQ2SEQ</th>
<th>Adversarial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“tell me ... how long have you had this falling sickness?”</td>
<td>“i’m not a doctor.”</td>
<td>“a few months, i guess.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“so i had the doctors test sammy ‘s response to conditioning.”</td>
<td>“sammy wrote the test sammy wrote the test.”</td>
<td>“so he took the pills.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“they didn’t have much success with this problem commander.”</td>
<td>“they’re not the only ones who have been in the system.”</td>
<td>“can we find someone else?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29.7 Sample responses generated by a SEQ2SEQ model trained either with a vanilla maximum likelihood objective, or adversarially trained to produce sentences that are hard for an adversary to distinguish from human sentences (Li et al., 2017).

Evaluating Chatbots

Chatbots are generally evaluated by humans. The slot-filling evaluations used for task-based dialogue (Section 29.2.3) aren’t appropriate for this task (Artstein et al., 2009), and word-overlap metrics like BLEU for comparing a chatbot’s response to a human response turn out to correlate very poorly with human judgments (Liu et al., 2016). BLEU performs poorly because there are so many possible responses to any given turn; word-overlap metrics work best when the space of responses is small and lexically overlapping, as is the case in machine translation.

While human evaluation is therefore required for evaluating chatbots, there are beginning to be models for automatic evaluation. The ADEM (Lowe et al., 2017a) classifier is trained on a set of responses labeled by humans with how appropriate they are, and learns to predict this label from the dialogue context and the words in the system response.

Another paradigm is adversarial evaluation (Bowman et al. 2016, Kannan and Vinyals 2016, Li et al. 2017), inspired by the Turing test. The idea is to train a “Turing-like” evaluator classifier to distinguish between human-generated responses and machine-generated responses. The more successful a response generation system is at fooling this evaluator, the better the system.

29.2 Frame Based Dialog Agents

Modern task-based dialog systems are based on a domain ontology, a knowledge
structure representing the kinds of intentions the system can extract from user sentences. The ontology defines one or more **frames**, each a collection of **slots**, and defines the **values** that each slot can take. This frame-based architecture was first introduced in 1977 in the influential GUS system for travel planning (Bobrow et al., 1977), and has been astonishingly long-lived, underlying most modern commercial digital assistants. Figure 29.8 shows a conversation with the original GUS system.

| GUS: | Hello. My name is GUS. I can help you plan a simple trip by air. Where do you want to go? |
| Client: | I want to go to San Diego on May 28 |
| GUS: | What time do you want to leave? |
| Client: | I must be in San Diego before 10 am |
| GUS: | Would you like P.S.A. flight 102 that arrives at 9.15 am? |
| Client: | What is the next flight? |
| GUS: | Air California flight 310 that leaves at 8.30am and arrives at 10.00am |
| Client: | I’ll take the first one |
| GUS: | In what name should I make a reservation, please? |
| Client: | Dan Bobrow |
| GUS: | I have confirmed the following flight: |
| Client: | P.S.A. flight 102 on Wednesday May 28 from San Jose to San Diego that leaves at 7.30 am and arrives at 9.15 am. |
| GUS: | What date do you want to return on? |
| Client: | On Friday in the evening. |
| GUS: | Would you like the flight that leaves at 7.45 pm? |
| Client: | That’s fine. |
| GUS: | I have confirmed the following flight: P.S.A. flight 307 on Friday May 30 from San Diego to San Jose that leaves at 7.45 pm and arrives at 9.30 pm Thank you for calling. Goodbye |

Figure 29.8 The travel domain: A transcript of an actual dialog with the GUS system of Bobrow et al. (1977). P.S.A. and Air California were airlines of that period.

The set of slots in a GUS-style frame specifies what the system needs to know, and the filler of each slot is constrained to values of a particular semantic type. In the travel domain, for example, a slot might be of type city (hence take on values like San Francisco, or Hong Kong) or of type date, airline, or time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slot</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGIN CITY</td>
<td>city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESTINATION CITY</td>
<td>city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTURE TIME</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTURE DATE</td>
<td>date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRIVAL TIME</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRIVAL DATE</td>
<td>date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types in GUS, as in modern frame-based dialog agents, may have hierarchical structure; for example the **date** type in GUS is itself a frame with slots with types like **integer** or members of sets of weekday names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONTH NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY (BOUNDDED-INTEGER 1 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR INTEGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKDAY (MEMBER (SUNDAY MONDAY TUESDAY WEDNESDAY THURSDAY FRIDAY SATURDAY))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29.2.1 Control structure for frame-based dialog

The control architecture of frame-based dialog systems is designed around the frame. The goal is to fill the slots in the frame with the fillers the user intends, and then perform the relevant action for the user (answering a question, or booking a flight). Most frame-based dialog systems are based on finite-state automata that are hand-designed for the task by a dialog designer.

Consider the very simple finite-state control architecture shown in Fig. 29.9, implementing a trivial airline travel system whose job is to ask the user for the information for 4 slots: departure city, a destination city, a time, and whether the trip is one-way or round-trip. Let’s first associate with each slot a question to ask the user:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slot</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGIN CITY</td>
<td>“From what city are you leaving?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESTINATION CITY</td>
<td>“Where are you going?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTURE TIME</td>
<td>“When would you like to leave?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRIVAL TIME</td>
<td>“When do you want to arrive?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29.9 shows a sample dialog manager for such a system. The states of the FSA correspond to the slot questions, user, and the arcs correspond to actions to take depending on what the user responds. This system completely controls the conversation with the user. It asks the user a series of questions, ignoring (or misinterpreting) anything that is not a direct answer to the question and then going on to the next question.

The speaker in control of any conversation is said to have the initiative in the conversation. Systems that completely control the conversation in this way are thus called system-initiative. By contrast, in normal human-human dialog, initiative shifts back and forth between the participants (Bobrow et al. 1977, Walker and Whittaker 1990).

The single-initiative finite-state dialog architecture has the advantage that the system always knows what question the user is answering. This means the system can prepare the speech recognizer with a language model tuned to answers for this
question, and also makes natural language understanding easier. Most finite-state
systems also allow universal commands that can be said anywhere in the dialog,
like help, to give a help message, and start over (or main menu), which returns
the user to some specified main start state. Nonetheless such a simplistic finite-state
architecture is generally applied only to simple tasks such as entering a credit card
number, or a name and password.

For most applications, users need a bit more flexibility. In a travel-planning
situation, for example, a user may say a sentence that fills multiple slots at once:

\[(29.3)\] I want a flight from San Francisco to Denver one way leaving after five
p.m. on Tuesday.

Or in cases where there are multiple frames, a user may say something to shift
frames, for example from airline reservations to reserving a rental car:

\[(29.4)\] I'd like to book a rental car when I arrive at the airport.

The standard GUS architecture for frame-based dialog systems, used in various
forms in modern systems like Apple’s Siri, Amazon’s Alexa, and the Google Assis-
tant, therefore follows the frame in a more flexible way. The system asks questions
of the user, filling any slot that the user specifies, even if a user’s response fills mul-
tiple slots or doesn’t answer the question asked. The system simply skips questions
associated with slots that are already filled. Slots may thus be filled out of sequence.
The GUS architecture is thus a kind of mixed initiative, since the user can take at
least a bit of conversational initiative in choosing what to talk about.

The GUS architecture also has condition-action rules attached to slots. For ex-
ample, a rule attached to the DESTINATION slot for the plane booking frame, once
the user has specified the destination, might automatically enter that city as the de-
fault StayLocation for the related hotel booking frame.

Once the system has enough information it performs the necessary action (like
querying a database of flights) and returns the result to the user.

We mentioned in passing the linked airplane and travel frames. Many domains,
of which travel is one, require the ability to deal with multiple frames. Besides
frames for car or hotel reservations, we might need frames with general route in-
formation (for questions like Which airlines fly from Boston to San Francisco?),
information about airfare practices (for questions like Do I have to stay a specific
number of days to get a decent airfare?).

In addition, once we have given the user a options (such as a list of restaurants),
we can even have a special frame for ‘asking questions about this list’, whose slot is
the particular restaurant the user is asking for more information about, allowing the
user to say ‘the second one’ or ‘the Italian one’.

Since users may switch from frame to frame, the system must be able to disam-
biguate which slot of which frame a given input is supposed to fill and then switch
dialog control to that frame.

Because of this need to dynamically switch control, the GUS architecture is a
production rule system. Different types of inputs cause different productions to
fire, each of which can flexibly fill in different frames. The production rules can
then switch control according to factors such as the user’s input and some simple
dialog history like the last question that the system asked.

Commercial dialog systems provide convenient interfaces or libraries to make
it easy to build systems with these kinds of finite-state or production rule systems,
for example providing graphical interfaces to allow dialog modules to be chained
together.
29.2.2 Natural language understanding for filling slots

The goal of the natural language understanding component is to extract three things from the user’s utterance. The first task is domain classification: is this user for example talking about airlines, programming an alarm clocks, or dealing with their calendar? Of course this 1-of-n classification tasks is unnecessary for single-domain systems that are focused on, say, only calendar management, but multi-domain dialog systems are the modern standard. The second is user intent determination: what general task or goal is the user trying to accomplish? For example the task could be to Find a Movie, or Show a Flight, or Remove a Calendar Appointment. Finally, we need to do slot filling: extract the particular slots and fillers that the user intends the system to understand from their utterance with respect to their intent.

From a user utterance like this one:

Show me morning flights from Boston to San Francisco on Tuesday

a system might want to build a representation like:

```
DOMAIN: AIR-TRAVEL
INTENT: SHOW-FLIGHTS
ORIGIN-CITY: Boston
ORIGIN-DATE: Tuesday
ORIGIN-TIME: morning
DEST-CITY: San Francisco
```

while an utterance like

```
Wake me tomorrow at 6
```

should give an intent like this:

```
DOMAIN: ALARM-CLOCK
INTENT: SET-ALARM
TIME: 2017-07-01 0600-0800
```

The task of slot-filling, and the simpler tasks of domain and intent classification, are special cases of the task of semantic parsing discussed in Chapter ?? . Dialogue agents can thus extract slots, domains, and intents from user utterances by applying any of the semantic parsing approaches discussed in that chapter.

The method used in the original GUS system, and still quite common in industrial applications, is to use hand-written rules, often as part of the condition-action rules attached to slots or concepts.

For example we might just define a regular expression consisting of a set strings that map to the SET-ALARM intent:

```
wake me (up) | set (the|an) alarm | get me up
```

We can build more complex automata that instantiate sets of rules like those discussed in Chapter 20, for example extracting a slot filler by turning a string like Monday at 2pm into an object of type date with parameters (DAY, MONTH, YEAR, HOURS, MINUTES).

Rule-based systems can be even implemented with full grammars. Research systems like the Phoenix system (Ward and Issar, 1994) consists of large hand-designed semantic grammars with thousands of rules. A semantic grammar is a context-free grammar in which the left-hand side of each rule corresponds to the semantic entities being expressed (i.e., the slot names) as in the following fragment:
Semantic grammars can be parsed by any CFG parsing algorithm (see Chapter 12), resulting in a hierarchical labeling of the input string with semantic node labels, as shown in Fig. 29.10.

Whether regular expressions or parsers are used, it remains only to put the fillers into some sort of canonical form, for example by normalizing dates as discussed in Chapter 20.

A number of tricky issues have to be dealt with. One important issue is negation; if a user specifies that they “can’t fly Tuesday morning”, or want a meeting “any time except Tuesday morning”, a simple system will often incorrectly extract “Tuesday morning” as a user goal, rather than as a negative constraint.

Speech recognition errors must also be dealt with. One common trick is to make use of the fact that speech recognizers often return a ranked N-best list of hypothesized transcriptions rather than just a single candidate transcription. The regular expressions or parsers can simply be run on every sentence in the N-best list, and any patterns extracted from any hypothesis can be used.

As we saw earlier in discussing information extraction, the rule-based approach is very common in industrial applications. It has the advantage of high precision, and if the domain is narrow enough and experts are available, can provide sufficient coverage as well. On the other hand, the hand-written rules or grammars can be both expensive and slow to create, and hand-written rules can suffer from recall problems.

A common alternative is to use supervised machine learning. Assuming a training set is available which associates each sentence with the correct semantics, we can train a classifier to map from sentences to intents and domains, and a sequence model to map from sentences to slot fillers.

For example given the sentence:

I want to fly to San Francisco on Monday afternoon please

we might first apply a simple 1-of-N classifier (logistic regression, neural network, etc.) that uses features of the sentence like word N-grams to determine that the domain is AIRLINE and the intent is SHOWFLIGHT.

Next to do slot filling we might first apply a classifier that uses similar features of the sentence to predict which slot the user wants to fill. Here in addition to
word unigram, bigram, and trigram features we might use named entity features or features indicating that a word is in a particular lexicon (such as a list of cities, or airports, or days of the week) and the classifier would return a slot name (in this case DESTINATION, DEPARTURE-DAY, and DEPARTURE-TIME). A second classifier can then be used to determine the filler of the named slot, for example a city classifier that uses N-grams and lexicon features to determine that the filler of the DESTINATION slot is SAN FRANCISCO.

An alternative model is to use a sequence model (MEMMs, CRFs, RNNs) to directly assign a slot label to each word in the sequence, following the method used for other information extraction models in Chapter 20 (Pieraccini et al. 1991, Raymond and Riccardi 2007, Mesnil et al. 2015, Hakkani-Tür et al. 2016). Once again we would need a supervised training test, with sentences paired with IOB (Inside/Outside/Begin) labels like the following:

```
0 0 0 0 0 B-DES I-DES 0 B-DEPTIME I-DEPTIME 0
```

I want to fly to San Francisco on Monday afternoon please

In IOB tagging we introduce a tag for the beginning (B) and inside (I) of each slot label, and one for tokens outside (O) any slot label. The number of tags is thus $2n + 1$ tags, where $n$ is the number of slots.

Any IOB tagger sequence model can then be trained on a training set of such labels. Traditional sequence models (MEMM, CRF) make use of features like word embeddings, word unigrams and bigrams, lexicons (for example lists of city names), and slot transition features (perhaps DESTINATION is more likely to follow ORIGIN than the other way around) to map a user’s utterance to the slots. An MEMM (Chapter 10) for example, combines these features of the input word $w_i$, its neighbors within $l$ words $w_{i-l}^{i+l}$, and the previous $k$ slot tags $s_{i-k}^{i-1}$ to compute the most likely slot label sequence $S$ from the word sequence $W$ as follows:

$$
\hat{S} = \arg\max_S P(S|W) = \arg\max_S \prod_i P(s_i|w_{i-l}^{i+l}, s_{i-k}^{i-1}) = \arg\max_S \prod_i \frac{\exp \left( \sum_j w_i f_i(s_i, w_{i-l}^{i+l}, s_{i-k}^{i-1}) \right)}{\sum_{s'} \exp \left( \sum_j w_i f_i(s', w_{i-l}^{i+l}, s_{i-k}^{i-1}) \right)}.
$$

Current neural network architectures, by contrast, don’t generally make use of an explicit feature extraction step. A typical LSTM-style architecture is shown in Fig. 29.11. Here the input is a series of words $w_1...w_n$ (represented as embeddings or as 1-hot vectors) and the output is a series of IOB tags $s_1...s_n$ plus the domain and intent. Neural systems can combine the domain-classification and intent-extraction tasks with slot-filling simply by adding a domain concatenated with an intent as the desired output for the final EOS token.

One the sequence labeler has tagged the user utterance, a filler string can be extracted for each slot from the tags (e.g., “San Francisco”), and these word strings can then be normalized to the correct form in the ontology (perhaps the airport code ‘SFO’). This normalization can take place by using homonym dictionaries (specifying, for example, that SF, SFO, and San Francisco are the same place).
29.2.3 Evaluating Slot Filling

An intrinsic error metric for natural language understanding systems for slot filling is the Slot Error Rate for each sentence:

\[
\text{Slot Error Rate for a Sentence} = \frac{\# \text{ of inserted/deleted/substituted slots}}{\# \text{ of total reference slots for sentence}}
\]  

(29.6)

Consider a system faced with the following sentence:

(29.7) Make an appointment with Chris at 10:30 in Gates 104

which extracted the following candidate slot structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slot</th>
<th>Filler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOM</td>
<td>Gates 104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the slot error rate is 1/3, since the TIME is wrong. Instead of error rate, slot precision, recall, and F-score can also be used.

A perhaps more important, although less fine-grained, measure of success is an extrinsic metric like task error rate. In this case, the task error rate would quantify how often the correct meeting was added to the calendar at the end of the interaction.
29.2.4 Other components of frame-based dialog

We’ve focused on the natural language understanding component that is the core of frame-based systems, but here we also briefly mention other modules.

The ASR (automatic speech recognition) component takes audio input from a phone or other device and outputs a transcribed string of words, as discussed in Chapter 31. Various aspects of the ASR system may be optimized specifically for use in conversational agents.

Because what the user says to the system is related to what the system has just said, language models in conversational agent depend on the dialog state. For example, if the system has just asked the user “What city are you departing from?”, the ASR language model can be constrained to just model answers to that one question. This can be done by training an N-gram language model on answers to this question. Alternatively a finite-state or context-free grammar can be hand written to recognize only answers to this question, perhaps consisting only of city names or perhaps sentences of the form ‘I want to (leave|depart) from [CITYNAME]’. Indeed, many simple commercial dialog systems use only non-probabilistic language models based on hand-written finite-state grammars that specify all possible responses that the system understands. We give an example of such a hand-written grammar for a VoiceXML system in Section 29.3.

A language model that is completely dependent on dialog state is called a restrictive grammar, and can be used to constrain the user to only respond to the system’s last utterance. When the system wants to allow the user more options, it might mix this state-specific language model with a more general language model.

The language generation module of any dialog system produces the utterances that the system says to the user. Frame-based systems tend to use template-based generation, in which all or most of the words in the sentence to be uttered to the user are prespecified by the dialog designer. Sentences created by these templates are often called prompts. Templates might be completely fixed (like ‘Hello, how can I help you?’), or can include some variables that are filled in by the generator, as in the following:

What time do you want to leave CITY-ORIG?
Will you return to CITY-ORIG from CITY-DEST?

These sentences are then passed to the TTS (text-to-speech) component (see Chapter 32).

More sophisticated statistical generation strategies will be discussed in Section ?? of Chapter 30.

29.3 VoiceXML

There are a wide variety of commercial systems that allow developers to implement frame-based dialog systems, such as the user-definable skills in Amazon Alexa or the actions in Google Assistant. Such industrial systems provide libraries for defining the rules for detecting a particular user intent and filling in slots, and for expressing the architecture for controlling which frames and actions the system should take at which times.

Instead of focusing on one of these commercial engines, we introduce here a simple declarative formalism that has similar capabilities to each of them: VoiceXML, the Voice Extensible Markup Language (http://www.voicexml.org/), an XML-
based dialog design language used to create simple frame-based dialogs. Although VoiceXML is simpler than a full commercial frame-based system (it’s deterministic, and hence only allows non-probabilistic grammar-based language models and rule-based semantic parsers), it’s still a handy way to get a hands-on grasp of frame-based dialog system design.

A VoiceXML document contains a set of dialogs, each a **menu** or a **form**. A form is a frame, whose slots are called **fields**. The VoiceXML document in Fig. 29.12 shows three fields for specifying a flight’s origin, destination, and date. Each field has a variable name (e.g., `origin`) that stores the user response, a **prompt**, (e.g., *Which city do you want to leave from*), and a grammar that is passed to the speech recognition engine to specify what is allowed to be recognized. The grammar for the first field in Fig. 29.12 allows the three phrases `san francisco`, `barcelona`, and `new york`.

The VoiceXML interpreter walks through a form in document order, repeatedly selecting each item in the form, and each field in order.

```xml
<form>

<block> Welcome to the air travel consultant. </block>

<field name="origin">
    <prompt> Which city do you want to leave from? </prompt>
    <grammar type="application/x-nuance-gsl">
        [[san francisco] barcelona (new york)]
    </grammar>
    <filled>
        <prompt> OK, from <value expr="origin"/> </prompt>
    </filled>
</field>

<field name="destination">
    <prompt> And which city do you want to go to? </prompt>
    <grammar type="application/x-nuance-gsl">
        [[san francisco] barcelona (new york)]
    </grammar>
    <filled>
        <prompt> OK, to <value expr="destination"/> </prompt>
    </filled>
</field>

<field name="departdate" type="date">
    <prompt> And what date do you want to leave? </prompt>
    <filled>
        <prompt> OK, on <value expr="departdate"/> </prompt>
    </filled>
</field>

<block>
    <prompt> OK, I have you are departing from <value expr="origin"/>
        to <value expr="destination"/> on <value expr="departdate"/>
    </prompt>

    send the info to book a flight...
</block>
</form>
```

**Figure 29.12**  A VoiceXML script for a form with three fields, which confirms each field and handles the `noinput` and `nomatch` situations.

The prologue of the example shows two global defaults for error handling. If the user doesn’t answer after a prompt (i.e., silence exceeds a timeout threshold), the VoiceXML interpreter will play the `<noinput>` prompt. If the user says something that doesn’t match the grammar for that field, the VoiceXML interpreter will play the `<nomatch>` prompt. VoiceXML provides a `<reprompt/>` command, which repeats the prompt for whatever field caused the error.

The `<filled>` tag for a field is executed by the interpreter as soon as the field
VoiceXML 2.0 specifies seven built-in grammar types: boolean, currency, date, digits, number, phone, and time. By specifying the departdate field as type date, a date-specific language model will be passed to the speech recognizer.

Figure 29.13 A mixed-initiative VoiceXML dialog. The grammar allows sentences that specify the origin or destination cities or both. The user can respond to the initial prompt by specifying origin city, destination city, or both.

Figure 29.13 gives a mixed initiative example, allowing the user to answer questions in any order or even fill in multiple slots at once. The VoiceXML interpreter has a guard condition on fields, a test that keeps a field from being visited; the default test skips a field if its variable is already set.

Figure 29.13 also shows a more complex CFG grammar with two rewrite rules, Flight and City. The Nuance GSL grammar formalism uses parentheses () to mean concatenation and square brackets [ ] to mean disjunction. Thus, a rule like (29.8) means that Wantsentence can be expanded as i want to fly or i want to go, and Airports can be expanded as san francisco or denver.

(29.8) Wantsentence (i want to [fly go])
Airports ([san francisco] denver)

VoiceXML grammars allow semantic attachments, such as the text string ("denver, colorado") the return for the City rule, or a slot/filler, like the attachments for the
Flight rule which fills the slot \(<\text{origin}>\) or \(<\text{destination}>\) or both) with the value passed up in the variable \(x\) from the City rule.

Because Fig. 29.13 is a mixed-initiative grammar, the grammar has to be applicable to any of the fields. This is done by making the expansion for Flight a disjunction; note that it allows the user to specify only the origin city, the destination city, or both.

### 29.4 Evaluating Dialogue Systems

Evaluation is crucial in dialog system design. If the task is unambiguous, we can simply measure absolute task success (did the system book the right plane flight, or put the right event on the calendar).

To get a more fine-grained idea of user happiness, we can compute a user satisfaction rating, having users interact with a dialog system to perform a task and then having them complete a questionnaire. For example, Fig. 29.14 shows multiple-choice questions of the sort used by Walker et al. (2001); responses are mapped into the range of 1 to 5, and then averaged over all questions to get a total user satisfaction rating.

It is often economically infeasible to run complete user satisfaction studies after every change in a system. For this reason, it is often useful to have performance evaluation heuristics that correlate well with human satisfaction. A number of such factors and heuristics have been studied. One method that has been used to classify these factors is based on the idea that an optimal dialog system is one that allows users to accomplish their goals (maximizing task success) with the least problems (minimizing costs). We can then study metrics that correlate with these two criteria.

**Task completion success:** Task success can be measured by evaluating the correctness of the total solution. For a frame-based architecture, this might be the percentage of slots that were filled with the correct values or the percentage of subtasks that were completed. Interestingly, sometimes the user’s perception of whether they completed the task is a better predictor of user satisfaction than the actual task completion success. (Walker et al., 2001).

**Efficiency cost:** Efficiency costs are measures of the system’s efficiency at helping users. This can be measured by the total elapsed time for the dialog in seconds, the number of total turns or of system turns, or the total number of queries (Polifroni et al., 1992). Other metrics include the number of system non-responses and the "turn correction ratio": the number of system or user turns that were used solely to correct errors divided by the total number of turns (Danieli and Gerbino 1995, Hirschman and Pao 1993).
Quality cost: Quality cost measures other aspects of the interactions that affect users’ perception of the system. One such measure is the number of times the ASR system failed to return any sentence, or the number of ASR rejection prompts. Similar metrics include the number of times the user had to barge-in (interrupt the system), or the number of time-out prompts played when the user didn’t respond quickly enough. Other quality metrics focus on how well the system understood and responded to the user. The most important is the slot error rate described above, but other components include the inappropriateness (verbose or ambiguous) of the system’s questions, answers, and error messages or the correctness of each question, answer, or error message (Zue et al. 1989, Polifroni et al. 1992).

29.5 Dialogue System Design

The user plays a more important role in dialog systems than in most other areas of speech and language processing, and thus this area of language processing is the one that is most closely linked with the field of Human-Computer Interaction (HCI).

How does a dialog system developer choose dialog strategies, prompts, error messages, and so on? This process is often called voice user interface design, and generally follows the user-centered design principles of Gould and Lewis (1985):

1. Study the user and task: Understand the potential users and the nature of the task by interviews with users, investigation of similar systems, and study of related human-human dialogs.

2. Build simulations and prototypes: A crucial tool in building dialog systems is the Wizard-of-Oz system. In wizard system, the users interact with what they think is a software system but is in fact a human operator (“wizard”) behind some disguising interface software (Gould et al. 1983, Good et al. 1984, Fraser and Gilbert 1991). The name comes from the children’s book The Wizard of Oz (Baum, 1900), in which the Wizard turned out to be just a simulation controlled by a man behind a curtain or screen.

A Wizard-of-Oz system can be used to test out an architecture before implementation; only the interface software and databases need to be in place. General the wizard gets input from the user, has a graphical interface to a database to run sample queries based on the user utterance, and then has a way to output sentences, either by typing them or by some combination of selecting from a menu and typing. The wizard’s linguistic output can be disguised by a text-to-speech system or, more frequently, by using text-only interactions.

The results of a wizard-of-oz system can also be used as training data to training a pilot dialog system. While wizard-of-oz systems are very commonly used, they are not a perfect simulation; it is difficult for the wizard to exactly simulate the errors, limitations, or time constraints of a real system; results
of wizard studies are thus somewhat idealized, but still can provide a useful first idea of the domain issues.

3. Iteratively test the design on users: An iterative design cycle with embedded user testing is essential in system design (Nielsen 1992, Cole et al. 1997, Yankelovich et al. 1995, Landauer 1995). For example in a famous anecdote in dialog design history, an early dialog system required the user to press a key to interrupt the system (Stifelman et al. 1993). But user testing showed users barged in, which led to a redesign of the system to recognize overlapped speech. The iterative method is also important for designing prompts that cause the user to respond in normative ways. There are a number of good books on conversational interface design (Cohen et al. 2004, Harris 2005, Pearl 2017).

29.6 Summary

Conversational agents are a crucial speech and language processing application that are already widely used commercially.

- Chatbots are conversational agents designed to mimic the appearance of informal human conversation. Rule-based chatbots like ELIZA and its modern descendants use rules to map user sentences into system responses. Corpus-based chatbots mine logs of human conversation to learn to automatically map user sentences into system responses.
- For task-based dialogue, most commercial dialog systems use the GUS or frame-based architecture, in which the designer specifies a domain ontology, a set of frames of information that the system is designed to acquire from the user, each consisting of slots with typed fillers.
- A number of commercial systems allow developers to implement simple frame-based dialog systems, such as the user-definable skills in Amazon Alexa or the actions in Google Assistant. VoiceXML is a simple declarative language that has similar capabilities to each of them for specifying deterministic frame-based dialog systems.
- Dialog systems are a kind of human-computer interaction, and general HCI principles apply in their design, including the role of the user, simulations such as Wizard-of-Oz systems, and the importance of iterative design and testing on real users.

Bibliographical and Historical Notes

The earliest conversational systems were chatbots like ELIZA (Weizenbaum, 1966) and PARRY (Colby et al., 1971). ELIZA had a widespread influence on popular perceptions of artificial intelligence, and brought up some of the first ethical questions in natural language processing —such as the issues of privacy we discussed above as well the role of algorithms in decision-making— leading its creator Joseph Weizenbaum to fight for social responsibility in AI and computer science in general.
Another early system, the GUS system (Bobrow et al., 1977) had by the late 1970s established the main frame-based paradigm that became the dominant industrial paradigm for dialog systems for over 30 years.

In the 1990s, stochastic models that had first been applied to natural language understanding began to be applied to dialogue slot filling (Miller et al. 1994, Pieraccini et al. 1991).

By around 2010 the GUS architecture finally began to be widely used commercially in phone-based dialogue systems like Apple’s SIRI Bellegarda (2013) and other digital assistants.

The rise of the web and online chatbots brought new interest in chatbots and gave rise to corpus-based chatbot architectures around the turn of the century, first using information retrieval models and then in the 2010s, after the rise of deep learning, with sequence-to-sequence models.

Exercises

29.1 Write a finite-state automaton for a dialogue manager for checking your bank balance and withdrawing money at an automated teller machine.

29.2 A dispreferred response is a response that has the potential to make a person uncomfortable or embarrassed in the conversational context; the most common example dispreferred responses is turning down a request. People signal their discomfort with having to say no with surface cues (like the word well), or via significant silence. Try to notice the next time you or someone else utters a dispreferred response, and write down the utterance. What are some other cues in the response that a system might use to detect a dispreferred response? Consider non-verbal cues like eye gaze and body gestures.

29.3 When asked a question to which they aren’t sure they know the answer, people display their lack of confidence by cues that resemble other dispreferred responses. Try to notice some unsure answers to questions. What are some of the cues? If you have trouble doing this, read Smith and Clark (1993) and listen specifically for the cues they mention.

29.4 Build a VoiceXML dialogue system for giving the current time around the world. The system should ask the user for a city and a time format (24 hour, etc) and should return the current time, properly dealing with time zones.

29.5 Implement a small air-travel help system based on text input. Your system should get constraints from users about a particular flight that they want to take, expressed in natural language, and display possible flights on a screen. Make simplifying assumptions. You may build in a simple flight database or you may use a flight information system on the Web as your backend.

29.6 Augment your previous system to work with speech input through VoiceXML. (Or alternatively, describe the user interface changes you would have to make for it to work via speech over the phone.) What were the major differences?

29.7 Design a simple dialogue system for checking your email over the telephone. Implement in VoiceXML.

29.8 Test your email-reading system on some potential users. Choose some of the metrics described in Section 29.4 and evaluate your system.


