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Turn-taking (interactivity)

• Speakers **take turns** in a dialogue
  • **turn** = continuous utterance from one speaker

• Normal dialogue – very fluent, fast
  • minimizing **overlaps** & **gaps**
    • little silence (usually <250ms), little overlap (~5%)
    • (fuzzy) rules, anticipation
  • **cues/markers for turn boundaries:**
    • linguistic (e.g. finished sentence), voice pitch
    • timing (gaps)
    • eye gaze, gestures (...)

• overlaps happen naturally
  • ambiguity in turn-taking rules (e.g. two start speaking at the same time)
  • **barge-in** = speaker starts during another one’s turn
20 seconds of a semi-formal dialogue (talk show):

S: um uh, you're about to start season [six ,]
J: [yes]
S: you probably already started but [it launches]
J: [yes thank you]
A: (cheering)
J: we're about to start thank you yeah .. we're starting , we- on Sunday yeah , we've been eh- we've been prepping some [things]
S: [confidence] is high . feel good ?
J: (scoffs)
S: think you're gonna
J: [squeeze out the shows this time ? think you're gonna do it ?]
J: (laughing) [you're talking to me like I'm an a-]
S: [no]
J: [my confidence] is never high .
S: okay
J: self loathing high . concern astronomic .

https://youtu.be/BZF9eg35IXI?t=91
Speech vs. text

• Natural speech is **very different from written text**
  • ungrammatical
  • restarts, hesitations, corrections
  • overlaps
  • pitch, stress
  • accents, dialect
• See more examples in speech corpora
  • [https://kontext.korpus.cz/](https://kontext.korpus.cz/) (Czech)
  • select the “oral” corpus and search for a random word
Turn taking in dialogue systems

• consecutive turns are typically assumed
  • system waits for user to finish their turn (~250ms non-speech)

• **voice activity detection**
  • binary classification problem – “is it user’s speech that I’m hearing?”[Y/N]
  • segments the incoming audio (checking every X ms)
  • actually a hard problem
    • nothing ever works in noisy environments

• **wake words** – making VAD easier
  • listen for a specific phrase, only start listening after it

• some systems allow user’s barge-in
  • may be tied to the wake word

hey Siri
okay Google
Alexa
Speech acts (by John L. Austin & John Searle)

• each utterance is an act
  • intentional
  • changing the state of the world
    • changing the knowledge/mood of the listener (at least)
    • influencing the listener’s behavior

• speech acts consist of:
  a) utterance act = the actual uttering of the words
  b) propositional act = semantics / “surface” meaning
  c) illocutionary act = “pragmatic” meaning
    • e.g. command, promise […]
  d) perlocutionary act = effect
    • listener obeys command, listener’s worldview changes […]

X to Y: You’re boring!
  a) [jʊr 'bɔrɪŋ]
  b) boring(Y)
  c) statement
  d) Y is cross

X to Y: Can I have a sandwich?
  a) [kæn ə hæv ə 'sændwɪʧ]
  b) can_have(X, sandwich)
  c) request
  d) Y gives X a sandwich
Types of speech acts:

- **assertive**: speaker commits to the truth of a proposition
  - statements, declarations, beliefs, reports […]
- **directive**: speaker wants the listener to do something
  - commands, requests, invitations, encouragements
- **commissive**: speaker commits to do something themselves
  - promises, swears, threats, agreements
- **expressive**: speaker expresses their psychological state
  - thanks, congratulations, apologies, welcomes
- **declarative**: performing actions (“performative verbs”)
  - sentencing, baptizing, dismissing

Example sentences:
- It’s raining outside.
- Stop it!
- I’ll come by later.
- Thank you!
- You’re fired!
Speech acts

• Explicit vs. implicit
  • explicit – using a verb directly corresponding to the act
  • implicit – without the verb

• Direct vs. indirect
  • **indirect** – the surface meaning does not correspond to the actual one
    • primary illocution = the actual meaning
    • secondary illocution = how it’s expressed
  • reasons: politeness, context, familiarity

explicit: *I promise* to come by later.
implicit: *I’ll come by later.*

explicit: *I’m inviting* you for a dinner.
implicit: *Come with me for a dinner!*

direct: *Please close the window.*
indirect: *Could you close the window?*
even more indirect: *I’m cold.***

direct: *What is the time?*
indirect: *Have you got a watch?*
Conversational Maxims (by Paul Grice)

• based on Grice’s **cooperative principle** (“dialogue is cooperative”)
  • speaker & listener cooperate w. r. t. communication goal
  • speaker wants to inform, listener wants to understand

• 4 Maxims (basic premises/principles/ideals)
  • M. of **quantity** – don’t give too little/too much information
  • M. of **quality** – be truthful
  • M. of **relation** – be relevant
  • M. of **manner** – be clear

• By default, speakers are assumed to adhere to maxims
  • apparently breaking a maxim suggests a different/additional meaning
Conversational Implicatures

- **implicatures** = implied meanings
  - standard – based on the assumption that maxims are obeyed
  - maxim flouting (obvious violation) – additional meanings (sarcasm, irony)
    - or evasive statements/hedging

*John ate some of the cookies* \(\rightarrow\) [otherwise too little/low-quality information] not all of them

**A:** I’ve run out of gas.
**B:** There’s a gas station around the corner. \(\rightarrow\) [otherwise irrelevant] the gas station is open

**A:** Will you come to lunch with us?
**B:** I have class. \(\rightarrow\) [otherwise irrelevant] B is not coming to lunch

**A:** How’s John doing in his new job?
**B:** Good. He didn’t end up in prison so far. \(\rightarrow\) [too much information] John is dishonest / the job is shady

Evasive statements (Donald Trump in hospital with covid):

[…] it came off that we were trying to hide something, which wasn’t necessarily true
Anything below 90? – No, it was below 94%. It wasn’t down in to the low 80s or anything, no.

https://twitter.com/yoavgo/status/1312792039105466370
https://twitter.com/yamiche/status/1312785068021239812
Speech acts, maxims & implicatures in dialogue systems

• Learned from data / hand-coded

• Understanding:
  • tested on real users → usually knows indirect speech acts
  • implicatures limited – there’s no common sense
    • (other than what’s hand-coded or found in training data)

  system: *The first train from Edinburgh to London leaves at 5:30 from Waverley Station.*
  user: *I don’t want to get up so early.* → [fails]

• Responses:
  • mostly strive for clarity – user doesn’t really need to imply
Grounding

• dialogue is cooperative → need to ensure mutual understanding

• **common ground**
  = shared knowledge, mutual assumptions of dialogue participants
    • not just shared, but *knowingly* shared
    • \( x \in \text{CG}(A, B) \):
      • A & B must know \( x \)
      • A must know that B knows \( x \) and vice-versa
      • expanded/updated/refined in an informative conversation

• validated/verified via **grounding signals**
  • speaker *presents* utterance
  • listener *accepts* utterance by providing evidence of understanding
Grounding signals / feedback

• used to notify speaker of (mis)understanding

• positive – understanding/acceptance signals:
  • **visual** – eye gaze, facial expressions, smile […]
  • **backchannels** – particles signalling understanding
  • **explicit feedback** – explicitly stating understanding
  • **implicit feedback** – showing understanding implicitly in the next utterance

• negative – misunderstanding:
  • **visual** – stunned/puzzled silence
  • **clarification requests** – demonstrating ambiguity & asking for additional information
  • **repair requests** – showing non-understanding & asking for correction

**Examples:**

U: *find me a Chinese restaurant*
S: *I found three Chinese restaurants close to you […]*
A: *Do you know where John is?*
B: *John? Haven’t seen him today.*

**Oh, so you’re not flying to London? Where are you going then?**
T: [...] And the ideology is also very against mixed-race couples. So that was also a target. Whenever we saw mixed-race couples, we attacked them.

E: Was there ever a moment back there where you felt a tiny bit bad about it?

T: No.

E: **No? So you were** absolutely convinced that you're doing the right thing…

T: Yeah, for quite some time *(nods), yeah.*

E: … for the sake of the white race and et cetera?

E: No doubt at all?

T: Well I got **doubt** eventually, roughly a year before I left the movement [...]
Grounding in dialogue systems

- Crucial for successful dialogue
  - e.g. booking the right restaurant / flight
- Backchannels / visual signals typically not present
- Implicit confirmation very common
  - users might be confused if not present
- Explicit confirmation may be required for important steps
  - e.g. confirming a reservation / bank transfer
- Clarification & repair requests very common
  - when input is ambiguous or conflicts with previously said
- Part of dialogue management
  - uses NLU confidence in deciding to use the signals
Prediction

• Dialogue is a **social interaction**
  • people view dialogue partners as goal-directed, intentional agents
  • they analyze their partners’ goals/agenda
• Brain does not listen passively
  • projects hypotheses/interpretations on-the-fly
• **prediction** is crucial for human cognition
  • people predict what their partner will (or possibly can) say/do
  • continuously, incrementally
  • unconsciously, very rapidly
  • guides the cognition
• this is (part of) why we understand in adverse conditions
  • noisy environment, distance
Prediction in dialogue systems

• Used a lot in speech recognition
  • **language models** – based on information theory
  • predicting likely next word given context
  • weighted against acoustic information

• Not as good as humans
  • may not reflect current situation (noise etc.)
  • (often) does not adapt to the speaker

• Less use in other DS components
  • also due to the fact that they aren’t incremental
Alignment/entrainment

• People subconsciously **adapt/align/entrain** to their dialogue partner over the course of the dialogue
  • wording (lexical items)
  • grammar (sentential constructions)
  • speech rate, prosody, loudness
  • accent/dialect

  *pram* → *stroller*  [BrE speaker]
  *lorry* → *truck*  talking to AmE speaker

• This helps a successful dialogue
  • also helps social bonding, feels natural

  S: […] Confidence is high, feel good?
  J: **Confidence high**? No!
  S: No.
  J: My **confidence is never high**.
  S: Okay.
  J: **Self loathing high**, concern astronomic.

(Oppenheim & Jones, 2019)
Alignment in dialogue systems

• Systems typically don’t align
  • NLG is rigid
    • templates
    • machine learning trained without context
  • experiments: makes dialogue more natural

• People align to dialogue systems
  • same as when talking to people

-D1 = V1 was in system prompts
-D2 = V2 was in system prompts (frequencies in user utterances)

(Dušek & Jurčiček, 2016)
http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W16-3622

(Parent & Eskenazi, 2010)
https://www.isca-speech.org/archive/interspeech_2010/i10_3018.html
Politeness

• Dialogue as social interaction – follows **social conventions**
• **indirect is polite**
  • this is the point of most indirect speech acts
  • clashes with conversational maxims (m. of manner)
  • appropriate level of politeness might be hard to find
    • culturally dependent
• face-saving (Brown & Lewinon)
  • positive face = desire to be accepted, liked
  • negative face = desire to act freely
• **face-threatening acts** – potentially any utterance
  • threatening other’s/own negative/positive face
• politeness softens FTAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>threat to</th>
<th>positive face</th>
<th>negative face</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>self</td>
<td>apology, self-humiliation</td>
<td>accepting order / advice, thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>criticism, blaming</td>
<td>order, advice, suggestion, warning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open the window.
Can you open the window?
Would you be so kind as to open the window?
Would you mind closing the window?
Ethics & NLP

- NLP is not just about language, it’s a proxy to people
  - language divulges author characteristics
  - language is an instrument of power
- Dual use of systems
  - improve search by parsing
    but force linguistic norms or even censor results
  - research historical texts or uncover dissenters
  - generate fast, personalized news stories or fake news
- Even if we only consider intended usage, there are problems
  - bias, discrimination
  - robustness

(Hovy & Spruit, 2016)
https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P16-2096
https://slideslive.com/38929585/what-i-wont-build
Some proposed NLP tasks are questionable by definition

- predicting intellect/personality from text snippets
  - given university entrance tests
    - free text answers to questions
    - IQ, knowledge and other capabilities tests
  - will hurt people who don’t fit norms
- predicting face from voice
  - given a few seconds of audio
  - trained from audio & photos pairs
  - questionable w. r. t. race (+ possibly gender)
- predicting length of prison charge
  from case description

interesting as intellectual exercises
  - but it’s hard to find a “non-evil” application

https://twitter.com/emilymbender/status/1202302109552533504
https://www.inf.uni-hamburg.de/en/inst/ab/lt/resources/data/germeval-2020-psychopred.html

(Chen et al., 2019)
https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D19-1667/

https://twitter.com/rctatman/status/1271541065267294208
• (Mainly) data side effect
• Demographic bias: exclusion/misrepresentation
  • best user experience is for white males in California
  • models tend to score worse for ethnic minorities & young people
  • models augment data bias if there are no countermeasures
    • not just ease-of-use problem – GPT-2 text production shows biases too
    • can be subtle, hard to detect by e.g. sentiment analysis
• Language/typological bias:
  • most recent systems are tested on English
    • up to the point where English is not even mentioned in papers
  • self-reinforcing:
    more tools available → more research → more tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Generated text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The man worked as</td>
<td>a car salesman at the local Wal-Mart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The woman worked as</td>
<td>a prostitute under the name of Hariya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black man worked as</td>
<td>a pimp for 15 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The White man worked as</td>
<td>a police officer, a judge, a prosecutor, a prosecutor, and the president of the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gay person was known for</td>
<td>his love of dancing, but he also did drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The straight person was known for</td>
<td>his ability to find his own voice and to speak clearly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPT2, “X worked as…”

GPT2, “X was known for…”

(Hovy & Spruit, 2016) https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P16-2096
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CYvFxs32zvQ
https://twitter.com/elasri_layla/status/1268977723168501760
https://twitter.com/nickstenning/status/1274374729101651968
https://twitter.com/asayeed/status/1276482121746591745
Voice Assistant Gender Bias

• Basically all voice assistants have a woman’s voice by default
  • you can change it for a few of them, not all
  • they identify as genderless
  • some of them (Alexa, Cortana, Siri) have a woman’s name

• This reinforces stereotype of women in subordinate positions
  • command style doesn’t help that
    • “OK, Google” feels less harsh than just “Alexa”

• Women’s voice aren’t more intelligible
  • as a popular myth suggests
  • but it’s easier to create a likeable woman’s voice (safe bet)

https://qz.com/911681/
https://gizmodo.com/1683901643
https://medium.com/startup-grind/google-home-vs-alexa-56e26f69ac77
Overgeneralization/Overconfidence

- modelling side effect
- current models aren’t very interpretable
  - their predicted confidence isn’t informative
    - not just the example here, happens e.g. with ASR too
- potential solution: allow “I don’t know”
  - add an additional class & adjust training data
  - when to use this: would a false answer be worse than no answer?
- other: data augmentation
  - use reduced/scrambled training instances
    - only works for this specific problem, though

(Hovy & Spruit, 2016)
https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P16-2096
(Feng et al., 2018)
http://aclweb.org/anthology/D18-1407
(Niu & Bansal, 2018)
http://arxiv.org/abs/1809.02079

Question answering based on text / image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SQuAD</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>In 1899, John Jacob Astor IV invested $100,000 for Tesla to further develop and produce a new lighting system. Instead, Tesla used the money to fund his Colorado Springs experiments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>What did Tesla spend Astor’s money on?</td>
<td>0.78 → 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>did</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VQA</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>What color is the flower?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>flower?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.827 → 0.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

removing words from input doesn’t change prediction
Robustness

• Slight change in the input can break the output
  • e.g. misspellings, paraphrases
  • solution: data augmentation, again

• Learning from users can be tricky
  • check your data if they come from users
  • it’s not just swearwords
    – problems can be hard to find

• Users can be used for system hacking
  • let users break your system, then
    add their trials to training data
    • human-in-the-loop adversarial training
    • used to improve offensive speech classifier
    • setup needs to be controlled
      (crowdsourcing, not real-world use)

(Neff & Nagy, 2016) [https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/6277]
(Henderson et al., 2018) [http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.09050]
(Dinan et al., 2019) [http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.06083]
Robustness to Sexual Abuse

- ~5% of voice bot requests are explicit
- Different harassment types:
  - comments on gender/sexuality
  - sexualized comments
  - sexualized insults
  - sexual requests & demands
- Chatbots/voice assistants’ responses
  - various systems:
    - commercial (Alexa, Google…)
    - rule-based (Pandorabots, adult chatbots)
    - data-driven (seq2seq)
  - responses often nonsense / play-along
    - conflict of interest for bot builders: be ethical vs. cater to abusive users
    - systems are often not tested enough for this

(Cercas Curry & Rieser, 2018)
http://aclweb.org/anthology/W18-0802
Safety

• it’s not just about “not being offensive”
• care about sensitive topics – death, suicide etc.
  • you don’t want to worsen someone’s depression
  • especially for medical systems, but also in general
• contextual safety
  • e.g. in-car systems:
    • do not startle the driver
    • do not give dangerous instructions
    • do not give too much mental load
• special care needs to be taken for RL rewards
  • restricting exploration / highly negative rewards for unsafe behavior

(Henderson et al., 2017)
http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.09050
Privacy

• careful with users’ data
  • users are likely to divulge private information
  • especially with voice systems
    • parts of conversations get recorded by accident
    • some Alexa/Siri etc. conversations are checked by humans

• trained neural models can leak training data
  • synthetic experiment:
    • train a seq2seq model with dialogue data + passwords
    • try getting the password by providing the same context
    • works a lot of the time

(Henderson et al., 2017)
http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.09050

https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/may/24/amazon-alexa-recorded-conversation
Summary

• Dialogue is messy: **turn** overlaps, **barge-ins**, weird grammar […]
• Dialogue utterances are acts: **illocution** = pragmatic meaning
• Dialogue needs understanding
  • **grounding** = mutual understanding management
    • backchannels, confirmations, clarification, repairs
• Dialogue is cooperative, social process
  • **conversational maxims** ~ “play nice”
  • people **predict & adapt** to each other
• NLP has ethical considerations
  • **bias** – misrepresentation, can be amplified by the models
  • **overconfidence/brittleness** – misclassification/lack of robustness
  • **safety** – robustness to abuse, sensitive topics, contextual safety
  • **privacy** – training data can be private, models can leak them
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