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The Problem

• Software that plays a social role is becoming embedded ever deeper in everyday life

• Example: Voice-driven “phone trees”

• But social interaction is too varied to be fully anticipated “at the factory”

• Socially-inept interfaces are frustrating, even dangerous
Ex: In-Car Driving Advisors do help…

Source: Jonsson et al 2005
…But to do so they must match the mood of the driver

Source: Jonsson et al 2005
Choosing where to focus

- Overt, verbal communication
- Between two people
- Where one tries to persuade the other
- Allowing for a variety of social goals, conditions, and communicative tactics
- A contribution to theory, but with an eye for future application
Desired “shape” of our solution
So the problem is

• What goals, conditions, and communicative tactics to simulate?
• How to find the optimal tactics for given goals and conditions?
• How to do it dynamically?
Related Work
Conceptual map of influences on our approach
Social Sciences

Strategy Taxonomies

Act Taxonomies & Act Conditions

- Persuading
  - Emotional appeal
  - Bargain
  - Flatter
  - Threaten

- Promising
  - Pledge
  - Promise
  - Swear
  - Vouch for

**CONDITIONS:**

- I know that you want me to do X.
- I know that you think I may not do X.
- I want to do X because you want me to do it.
Dimensional Models of Reciprocal Behavior
AI: Speech Act Planning

Act: Promise

- Goals
- Expected Effects
- Required Conditions
- Situation Facts

Implementation

Ex: Hearer believes that the Speaker will do action X
Ex: Speaker is able to do action X

"I promise to (X)."
Types of AI Social Agents

- Game AI (SIMs)
- Immersive Environments (Oz, TaxiWorld)
- Story Generators (MEXICA, TALESPIN)
- Sociable Robots (Kismet)
How do SIMs agents decide how to act?
Urges, Emotions, and Behaviors in SIMs NPCs

- Urges naturally increase (or decay)
- Urge levels determine emotions
- Urges and emotions drive behavior selection
- Behaviors affect the state of urges and emotions

Source: SIMs creator Will Wright, via Ken Forbus lecture notes
“SIMs life” emerges from the Urge-Action-Observation cycle
Sociable robot “Kismet” (MIT)

Similar Urge-Action-Observation architecture

Actions include facial expressions, head posture, and simple vocalizations
Story Generation:
MEXICA (U of Sussex)

Sample rule:

“If a warrior is ill or wounded and a lady cures him, it is natural that he will develop very positive emotions towards the lady. In this way, when defining the action $A \text{ CURED } B$, post-conditions might include that $B$ develops an \textit{Emotional Link} of type 1 \textit{intensity} +3 towards $A$.”

Interactive Drama:

Oz Project (CMU)
Reactions

• PRO’s
  – Inter-linked representations of urges, emotions, actions, and observations allow for rich, believable social simulations.

• CON’s
  – Believability depends on the numeric weights being “in tune”, but these are largely based on introspection (and are rarely published).
  – Evaluations apply to whole systems, which makes it difficult to appraise the social model itself.
Search for empirically-defined models

• Conversational Constraint Theory (CCT) is an act taxonomy with empirically-defined weights

• Models how one person persuades another to do something

• 13 persuasion goals, 56 speech acts, 10 rules for adjusting plans to the situation
CCT methodology

• For each of the 13 goals, 19-20 undergraduates rated each of 56 speech acts for their efficiency and appropriateness for that goal on a 1-7 scale
  – Appropriateness = proper, fitting, polite, and courteous
  – Efficiency = virtually immediate effect without much expenditure of time or effort
• Told to imagine they were engaged in a conversation, where the purpose of the conversation was to achieve the goal
• Told to focus solely on how appropriate (or efficient) the act is for the goal, regardless of:
  – Personal preference
  – Efficiency (or appropriateness)
Sample scores

### Social Appropriateness scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Get Date</th>
<th>Stop Annoying Habit</th>
<th>Obtain Favor</th>
<th>End Relationship</th>
<th>Change Opinion</th>
<th>Share Time Together</th>
<th>Initiate Relationship</th>
<th>Get Advice</th>
<th>Move Relationship Forward</th>
<th>Obtain Information</th>
<th>Fulfill Obligation</th>
<th>Obtain Permission</th>
<th>Provide Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>insult</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threaten</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ridicule</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attack</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blame</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boast</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficiency scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Get Date</th>
<th>Stop Annoying Habit</th>
<th>End Relationship</th>
<th>Obtain Favor</th>
<th>Share Time Together</th>
<th>Move Relationship Forward</th>
<th>Get Advice</th>
<th>Change Opinion</th>
<th>Initiate Relationship</th>
<th>Obtain Information</th>
<th>Fulfill Obligation</th>
<th>Obtain Permission</th>
<th>Provide Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>insult</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threaten</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ridicule</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attack</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boast</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ex:** When Threatening someone in order to Stop an Annoying Habit, the expected efficiency is 2.33 but its appropriateness is only 1.72.
CCT Situation Factors

• **YOU:**
  – Concerned about your bond with them?
  – Is being proper and courteous generally a high priority?
  – Is achievement and avoidance of waste generally a high priority?

• **YOUR NEEDS:**
  – Urgent?
  – Does it feel like special courtesy is called for?
  – Does it feel it should be especially business-like?

• **THEM**
  – Do they have higher social position?
  – Is being proper and courteous generally a high priority?
  – Is achievement and avoidance of waste generally a high priority?
  – Do they expect special courtesy?
  – Do they expect you to be especially business-like?

• **THE ENVIRONMENT**
  – Formal?
  – Private?
CCT decision process

- CCT is not a simulator
- CCT does not specify any algorithm
- But we can infer a decision process from the discussion of goals, act scores, situation factors, and thresholds
CCT decision process (continued)

Choose a goal. Ex: Stop Annoying Habit

Note the scores that different speech acts have for this goal on both scales.
CCT decision process (continued)

Adjust thresholds to the situation

- Default efficiency threshold
- Default appropriateness threshold

Urgent? +e not? -e
Formal? +a not? -a
Other in higher social position? -e +a not? +e -a

E = adjustment to efficiency threshold
A = adjustment to appropriateness threshold

Situation-specific appropriateness threshold
Situation-specific efficiency threshold
CCT decision process (continued)

Act scores for the chosen goal

Thresholds determined by the current situation

Overlay the act scores over the thresholds

Take any act that passes both thresholds
Reactions

- **PRO’s**
  - Similar architecture to agent work plus empirical basis

- **CON’s**
  - No values for threshold defaults or deltas
  - What if no act can satisfy both thresholds on its own?
  - What if there are multiple goals?
  - Acts can be inappropriate due to unmet conditions
    - Ex: Promising to do X when one is incapable of performing X
Our Approach
Overview

• Create an algorithm from CCT’s implicit decision process

• Extend the algorithm to handle multi-goal, multi-act plans

• Verify the algorithm through comparative tests with human participants
Designing an algorithm for CCT

• Setting thresholds
  – Depends on 10 situation factors, which can be asked about in any order
  – Each situation factor affects one or both thresholds
  – Need values for default thresholds and deltas
    • Since act scores range within \{-3, 3\}, assume a small default such as +0.5
    • Assume all factors use the same delta, regardless of whether the factor affects appropriateness or efficiency
    • Testing these assumptions would be a good area for future work
    • If these assumptions are wildly inaccurate, one would expect our empirical evaluation to show it
Designing an algorithm for CCT (cont.)

• Allowing for multiple goals and acts
  – Try an AI planner?
    • Probabilistic planners? (to allow for partial fulfillment of goals)
  – Turns out to be overkill
    • Planner only needed if plans expected to be tree-shaped
  – Integer Linear Programming is a better match
    • Solves a system of linear equations while optimizing a measure of your choice
    • CCT scores and thresholds define the equations; optimize by preferring plan with fewest acts
How it works

For every selected goal, the associated act scores can be used as equation coefficients.

**Appropriateness Equation for goal ‘Stop Annoying Habit’**:  
1.44*Insult + 1.72*Threaten + 2.28*Prohibit + ... >= 4.1

**Efficiency Equation for goal ‘Stop Annoying Habit’**:  
1.44*Insult + 2.33*Threaten + 2.39*Prohibit + ... >= 0.7

Insult, Threaten, etc are variables with value either 0 or 1. When the inequalities are solved, “1” means the act should be used and “0” means it shouldn't.
Sample session

- **SCENARIO**
  - Couple at fancy dinner
  - Husband is messy eater

- **GOALS (of woman):**
  - Stop Annoying Habit
  - Provide Guidance

- Recommends 3 specific acts
- Plausible when instantiated like this:
  - **Give:** Unfold your husband's napkin and hand it to him.
  - **Ask:** Ask your husband if he is aware that his trousers are being stained.
  - **Inform:** Tell your husband that he is slurping loudly and embarrassing you.
Empirical Evaluation

- **Pilot**
  - Web survey hosted by U of Zurich Psychology Dept
  - 54 participants over 2 months

- **Survey**
  - Paper questionnaire distributed at Leeward
  - 23 participants in 3 morning classes, same day
Pilot questionnaire

• Your goals:
  – Obtain a favor – You are going on a trip and need to find someone to feed your pet
  – Get advice – Your flight is during rush hour, and you’d like to know a quick way to the airport

• The situation:
  – You are moderately goal-oriented (5 on a 1-7 scale)
  – You are moderately attentive to social cues in general (4 on a 1-7 scale)
  – The situation is fairly formal (6 on a 1-7 scale)
  – The situation you are talking about is fairly private (6 on a 1-7 scale)
  – Your goals are fairly urgent (6 on a 1-7 scale)

Thank - I’m so grateful.
Warn - I would avoid that if I were you.
Apologize - I’m sorry to impose on you.
Forbid - Don’t mess with that.

1. Is this set an acceptable way to Get Advice?
   - 1 (Not at all)
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - 6
   - 7 (Absolutely)
   - Not sure

2. Is this set an acceptable way to Obtain a Favor?
   - 1 (Not at all)
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - 6
   - 7 (Absolutely)
   - Not sure
Pilot design and results

Case #1: Both goals satisfied
Case #2: ‘Get Advice’ satisfied
Case #3: ‘Obtain Favor’ satisfied
Case #4: Neither goal satisfied

Get Advice goal
- Plan #4
  - Request
  - Compliment
  - Thank
  - Explain
- Plan #3
  - Request
  - Compliment
  - Thank
  - Explain
- Plan #5
  - Challenge
  - Compliment
  - Confess
  - Advise Question
- Plan #7
  - Request
  - Compliment
  - Advise
  - Criticize
  - Explain
  - Question
- Plan #6
  - Assure
  - Thank
  - Promise
  - Explain
  - Forbid
  - Apologize
- Plan #8
  - Thank
  - Warm
  - Apologize
- Plan #1
  - Assure
  - Explain
  - Confess
  - Question

Predicted to be acceptable? Significance probability
- .9999
- .0001
- .9815
- .0002
- .9902
- .0007

Probability
Could the results have been better?

- Did “redundant” hypotheses have similar support?
- Some act scores might not be reliable
- Wording of sample sentences might be biased
- Assumed thresholds might need adjustment
Faulty scores?

- We are using 1456 score values (13x56x2) from a 2004 study.
- A 1994 study has 34 scores for the same goal/act/effect combinations.
- Only 18 of the 34 are within 1.0 of the corresponding 2004 value.
  - Answers range in {1..7}
- 4 scores used to create the pilot are cast into doubt by this.
- But only 2 of those are associated with failed hypotheses.
- => Possible source of error, but too little evidence.
Biased wording?

Explain - ...and that’s why I need your help?

Offer – Let me know if I can return the favor.

Forbid - Don’t mess with that.                  Don’t do it that way.

Looked at:

• Acts that appear only in unsupported “yes” hypo’s
• Acts that appear only in unsupported “no” hypo’s

=> No simple pattern emerged
Adjust thresholds?

=> Choose either of the top two
Lessons learned from pilot

- Likert scale required norming responses to yes/no
  - Took the max and min for all questions for one user and halfway between those was the cut-off for yes versus no for that one user.
  - Assumption #1: With 12 questions that were selected to present both obviously unacceptable and obviously acceptable plans, every participant would have at least one question that he/she would label with his/her min value and another question that would be labeled with his/her max value.
  - Assumption #2: Participants have a linear scale and the acceptable threshold is halfway between min and max.
  - => Switched to yes/no options in the study
Lessons learned from the pilot (cont.)

• Appropriateness threshold should be adjusted
  – Move appropriateness threshold down from 7.0 to 5.1 or 6.18
  – (Accidentally used 4.45 in survey, but didn’t cause a problem there.)
Survey design and results
Could results be better?

• Do “redundant” hypotheses get similar support?
  – Yes
• Is there obvious bias toward some speech acts?
  – No
• Should thresholds be adjusted?
  – Yes

...and shows that using 4.45 instead of 5.1 made no difference
Conclusions
Conclusions

• CSC supports more goals and acts than any other speech act planner

• CSC allows for partial fulfillment of goals
  – Has empirical support for its representation via CCT

• CSC optimizes multi-goal plans by minimizing # acts

• CSC shows good support in empirical comparisons with human judgments of plan quality
Future work

• Verify assumptions
  – Threshold defaults and deltas
  – Use of addition to combine scores vs. other n-ary functions

• Make the specifics of the situation part of the plan
  – Add conditions to each act
  – Tie the conditions to the expected effects
  – => Would help prune plans and flesh out text realization

• Integrate with social interpretation research
Q & A
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