

PARADISE: A Framework for Evaluating Spoken Dialogue Agents

Marilyn A. Walker, Diane J. Litman, Candace A. Kamm and Alicia Abella

AT&T Labs—Research

180 Park Avenue

Florham Park, NJ 07932-0971 USA

walker,diane,cak,abella@research.att.com

Abstract

This paper presents PARADISE (PARAdigm for DIalogue System Evaluation), a general framework for evaluating spoken dialogue agents. The framework decouples task requirements from an agent's dialogue behaviors, supports comparisons among dialogue strategies, enables the calculation of performance over subdialogues and whole dialogues, specifies the relative contribution of various factors to performance, and makes it possible to compare agents performing different tasks by normalizing for task complexity.

1 Introduction

Recent advances in dialogue modeling, speech recognition, and natural language processing have made it possible to build spoken dialogue agents for a wide variety of applications.¹ Potential benefits of such agents include remote or hands-free access, ease of use, naturalness, and greater efficiency of interaction. However, a critical obstacle to progress in this area is the lack of a general framework for evaluating and comparing the performance of different dialogue agents.

One widely used approach to evaluation is based on the notion of a reference answer (Hirschman et al., 1990). An agent's responses to a query are compared with a predefined key of minimum and maximum reference answers; performance is the proportion of responses that match the key. This approach has many widely acknowledged limitations (Hirschman and Pao, 1993; Danieli et al., 1992; Bates and Ayuso, 1993), e.g., although there may be many potential dialogue strategies for carrying out a task, the key is tied to one particular dialogue strategy.

In contrast, agents using different dialogue strategies can be compared with measures such as inappropriate utterance ratio, turn correction ratio, concept accuracy, implicit recovery and transaction success (Danieli

and Gerbino, 1995; Hirschman and Pao, 1993; Polifroni et al., 1992; Simpson and Fraser, 1993; Shriberg, Wade, and Price, 1992). Consider a comparison of two train timetable information agents (Danieli and Gerbino, 1995), where Agent A in Dialogue 1 uses an explicit confirmation strategy, while Agent B in Dialogue 2 uses an implicit confirmation strategy:

- (1) User: I want to go from Torino to Milano.
Agent A: Do you want to go from Trento to Milano?
Yes or No?
User: No.
- (2) User: I want to travel from Torino to Milano.
Agent B: At which time do you want to leave from Merano to Milano?
User: No, I want to leave from Torino in the evening.

Danieli and Gerbino found that Agent A had a higher transaction success rate and produced less inappropriate and repair utterances than Agent B, and thus concluded that Agent A was more robust than Agent B.

However, one limitation of both this approach and the reference answer approach is the inability to generalize results to other tasks and environments (Fraser, 1995). Such generalization requires the identification of factors that affect performance (Cohen, 1995; Sparck-Jones and Galliers, 1996). For example, while Danieli and Gerbino found that Agent A's dialogue strategy produced dialogues that were approximately twice as long as Agent B's, they had no way of determining whether Agent A's higher transaction success or Agent B's efficiency was more critical to performance. In addition to agent factors such as dialogue strategy, task factors such as database size and environmental factors such as background noise may also be relevant predictors of performance.

These approaches are also limited in that they currently do not calculate performance over subdialogues as well as whole dialogues, correlate performance with an external validation criterion, or normalize performance for task complexity.

This paper describes PARADISE, a general framework for evaluating spoken dialogue agents that addresses these limitations. PARADISE supports comparisons among dialogue strategies by providing a task representation that decouples *what* an agent needs to achieve in terms of

¹We use the term agent to emphasize the fact that we are evaluating a speaking entity that may have a personality. Readers who wish to may substitute the word "system" wherever "agent" is used.




Figure 1: PARADISE's structure of objectives for spoken dialogue performance

the task requirements from *how* the agent carries out the task via dialogue. PARADISE uses a decision-theoretic framework to specify the relative contribution of various factors to an agent's overall *performance*. Performance is modeled as a weighted function of a task-based success measure and dialogue-based cost measures, where weights are computed by correlating user satisfaction with performance. Also, performance can be calculated for subdialogues as well as whole dialogues. Since the goal of this paper is to explain and illustrate the application of the PARADISE framework, for expository purposes, the paper uses simplified domains with hypothetical data throughout. Section 2 describes PARADISE's performance model, and Section 3 discusses its generality, before concluding in Section 4.

2 A Performance Model for Dialogue

PARADISE uses methods from decision theory (Keeney and Raiffa, 1976; Doyle, 1992) to combine a disparate set of performance measures (i.e., user satisfaction, task success, and dialogue cost, all of which have been previously noted in the literature) into a single performance evaluation function. The use of decision theory requires a specification of both the objectives of the decision problem and a set of measures (known as attributes in decision theory) for operationalizing the objectives. The PARADISE model is based on the structure of objectives (rectangles) shown in Figure 1. The PARADISE model posits that performance can be correlated with a meaningful external criterion such as usability, and thus that the overall goal of a spoken dialogue agent is to maximize an objective related to usability. User satisfaction ratings (Kamm, 1995; Shriberg, Wade, and Price, 1992; Polifroni et al., 1992) have been frequently used in the

literature as an external indicator of the usability of a dialogue agent. The model further posits that two types of factors are potential relevant contributors to user satisfaction (namely task success and dialogue costs), and that two types of factors are potential relevant contributors to costs (Walker, 1996).

In addition to the use of decision theory to create this objective structure, other novel aspects of PARADISE include the use of the Kappa coefficient (Carletta, 1996; Siegel and Castellan, 1988) to operationalize task success, and the use of linear regression to quantify the relative contribution of the success and cost factors to user satisfaction.

The remainder of this section explains the measures (ovals in Figure 1) used to operationalize the set of objectives, and the methodology for estimating a quantitative performance function that reflects the objective structure. Section 2.1 describes PARADISE's task representation, which is needed to calculate the task-based success measure described in Section 2.2. Section 2.3 describes the cost measures considered in PARADISE, which reflect both the efficiency and the naturalness of an agent's dialogue behaviors. Section 2.4 describes the use of linear regression and user satisfaction to estimate the relative contribution of the success and cost measures in a single performance function. Finally, Section 2.5 explains how performance can be calculated for subdialogues as well as whole dialogues, while Section 2.6 summarizes the method.

2.1 Tasks as Attribute Value Matrices

A general evaluation framework requires a task representation that decouples *what* an agent and user accomplish from *how* the task is accomplished using dialogue strategies. We propose that an *attribute value matrix (AVM)* can represent many dialogue tasks. This consists of the information that must be exchanged between the agent and the user during the dialogue, represented as a set of ordered pairs of attributes and their possible values.²

As a first illustrative example, consider a simplification of the train timetable domain of Dialogues 1 and 2, where the timetable only contains information about rush-hour trains between four cities, as shown in Table 1. This AVM consists of four attributes (abbreviations for each attribute name are also shown).³ In Table 1, these attribute-value pairs are annotated with the direction of information flow to represent who acquires the information, although this information is not used for evaluation. During the dialogue the agent must acquire from the user the values of DC, AC, and DR, while the user must acquire DT.

Performance evaluation for an agent requires a corpus of dialogues between users and the agent, in which users execute a set of scenarios. Each scenario execution has

²For infinite sets of values, actual values found in the experimental data constitute the required finite set.

³The AVM serves as an evaluation mechanism only. We are not claiming that AVMs determine an agent's behavior or serve as an utterance's semantic representation.

attribute	possible values	information flow
depart-city (DC)	Milano, Roma, Torino, Trento	to agent
arrival-city (AC)	Milano, Roma, Torino, Trento	to agent
depart-range (DR)	morning,evening	to agent
depart-time (DT)	6am,8am,6pm,8pm	to user

Table 1: Attribute value matrix, simplified train timetable domain

A1:	Hello, This is Train Enquiry Service. Please speak after the tone. Which information do you need?	DC,AC,DR,DT DC,AC,DR,DT DC,AC,DR,DT
U1:	I want to go from Torino to Milano.	DC,AC
A2:	Do you want to go from Trento to Milano? Yes or No?	DC,AC DC,AC
U2:	No.	DC,AC
A3:	Do you want to leave from Trento? Yes or No?	DC DC
U3:	No.	DC
A4:	Where do you want to leave from?	DC
U4:	I want to leave from Torino.	DC
A5:	Do you want to leave from Torino? Yes or No?	DC DC
U5:	Yes.	DC
A6:	Do you want to go to Milano?	AC
U6:	Yes.	AC
A7:	At which time do you want to leave?	DR
U7:	I want to travel in the evening.	DR
A8:	Do you want to leave between 6 and 9 p.m.? Yes or No?	DR DR
U8:	Yes.	DR
A9:	There is a train leaving at 8:00 p.m.	DT
	...	

Figure 2: Agent A dialogue interaction (Danieli and Gerbino, 1995)

a corresponding AVM instantiation indicating the task information requirements for the scenario, where each attribute is paired with the attribute value obtained via the dialogue.

For example, assume that a scenario requires the user to find a train from Torino to Milano that leaves in the evening, as in the longer versions of Dialogues 1 and 2 in Figures 2 and 3.⁴ Table 2 contains an AVM corresponding to a “key” for this scenario. All dialogues resulting from execution of this scenario in which the agent and the user correctly convey all attribute values (as in Figures 2 and 3) would have the same AVM as the scenario key in Table 2. The AVMs of the remaining dialogues would differ from the key by at least one value. Thus, even though the dialogue strategies in Figures 2 and 3 are radically different, the AVM task representation for these dialogues is identical and the performance of the system for the same task can thus be assessed on the basis of the AVM representation.

2.2 Measuring Task Success

Success at the task for a whole dialogue (or subdialogue) is measured by how well the agent and user achieve the information requirements of the task by the end of the

⁴These dialogues have been slightly modified from (Danieli and Gerbino, 1995). The attribute names at the end of each utterance will be explained below.

B1:	Hello, This is Train Enquiry Service. Please speak after the tone. Which information do you need?	DC,AC,DR,DT DC,AC,DR,DT DC,AC,DR,DT
U1:	I want to travel from Torino to Milano.	DC,AC
B2:	At which time do you want to leave from Merano to Milano?	DC,AC,DR
U2:	No, I want to leave from Torino in the evening.	DC, DR
B3:	Do you want to leave from Torino between 6 and 11 p.m? Please answer Yes or No.	DC, DR DC, DR
U3:	Yes.	DC, DR
B4:	A train leaves at 8 p.m.	DT
	...	

Figure 3: Agent B dialogue interaction (Danieli and Gerbino, 1995)

attribute	actual value
depart-city	Torino
arrival-city	Milano
depart-range	evening
depart-time	8pm

Table 2: Attribute value matrix instantiation, scenario key for Dialogues 1 and 2

dialogue (or subdialogue). This section explains how PARADISE uses the Kappa coefficient (Carletta, 1996; Siegel and Castellan, 1988) to operationalize the task-based success measure in Figure 1.

The Kappa coefficient, κ , is calculated from a confusion matrix that summarizes how well an agent achieves the information requirements of a particular task for a set of dialogues instantiating a set of scenarios.⁵ For example, Tables 3 and 4 show two hypothetical confusion matrices that could have been generated in an evaluation of 100 complete dialogues with each of two train timetable agents A and B (perhaps using the confirmation strategies illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, respectively).⁶ The values in the matrix cells are based on comparisons between the dialogue and scenario key AVMs. Whenever an attribute value in a dialogue (i.e., data) AVM *matches* the value in its scenario key, the number in the appropriate diagonal cell of the matrix (boldface for clarity) is incremented by 1. The off diagonal cells represent *misunderstandings* that are not corrected in the dialogue. Note that depending on the strategy that a spoken dialogue agent uses, confusions across attributes are possible, e.g., “Milano” could be confused with “morning.” The effect of misunderstandings that *are* corrected during the course of the dialogue are reflected in the costs associated with the dialogue, as will be discussed below.

The first matrix summarizes how the 100 AVMs representing each dialogue with Agent A compare with the AVMs representing the relevant scenario keys, while the

⁵Confusion matrices can be constructed to summarize the result of dialogues for any subset of the scenarios, attributes, users or dialogues.

⁶The distributions in the tables were roughly based on performance results in (Danieli and Gerbino, 1995).

	KEY													
	DEPART-CITY				ARRIVAL-CITY				DEPART-RANGE		DEPART-TIME			
DATA	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5	v6	v7	v8	v9	v10	v11	v12	v13	v14
v1	22		1		3									
v2		29												
v3	4		16	4			1							
v4	1	1	5	11			1							
v5	3				20									
v6						22								
v7			2		1	1	20	5						
v8			1		1	2	8	15						
v9									45	10				
v10									5	40				
v11											20		2	
v12											1	19	2	4
v13											2		18	
v14											2	6	3	21
sum	30	30	25	15	25	25	30	20	50	50	25	25	25	25

Table 3: Confusion matrix, Agent A

	KEY														
	DEPART-CITY				ARRIVAL-CITY				DEPART-RANGE		DEPART-TIME				
DATA	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5	v6	v7	v8	v9	v10	v11	v12	v13	v14	
v1	16		1		4				3	2					
v2	1	20	1			3									
v3	5	1	9	4	2		4	2							
v4	1	2	6	6			2	3							
v5	4				15				2	3					
v6	1	6				19									
v7			5	2	1	1	15	4							
v8			1	3	3	1	2	9	11						
v9	2				2				39	10					
v10									6	35					
v11											20	5	5	4	
v12												10	5	5	
v13											5	5	10	5	
v14											5	5	5	11	
sum	30	30	25	15	25	25	30	20	50	50	25	25	25	25	

Table 4: Confusion matrix, Agent B

second matrix summarizes the information exchange with Agent B. Labels v1 to v4 in each matrix represent the possible values of depart-city shown in Table 1; v5 to v8 are for arrival-city, etc. Columns represent the key, specifying which information values the agent and user were supposed to communicate to one another given a particular scenario. (The equivalent column sums in both tables reflects that users of both agents were assumed to have performed the same scenarios). Rows represent the data collected from the dialogue corpus, reflecting what attribute values were actually communicated between the agent and the user.

Given a confusion matrix M , success at achieving the information requirements of the task is measured with the Kappa coefficient (Carletta, 1996; Siegel and Castellan, 1988):

$$\kappa = \frac{P(A) - P(E)}{1 - P(E)}$$

$P(A)$ is the proportion of times that the AVMs for the actual set of dialogues agree with the AVMs for the scenario keys, and $P(E)$ is the proportion of times that the AVMs for the dialogues and the keys are expected to agree

by chance.⁷ When there is no agreement other than that which would be expected by chance, $\kappa = 0$. When there is total agreement, $\kappa = 1$. κ is superior to other measures of success such as transaction success (Danieli and Gerbino, 1995), concept accuracy (Simpson and Fraser, 1993), and percent agreement (Gale, Church, and Yarowsky, 1992) because κ takes into account the inherent complexity of the task by correcting for chance expected agreement. Thus κ provides a basis for comparisons across agents that are performing *different* tasks.

When the prior distribution of the categories is unknown, $P(E)$, the expected chance agreement between the data and the key, can be estimated from the distribution of the values in the keys. This can be calculated from confusion matrix M , since the columns represent the values in the keys. In particular:

$$P(E) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{t_i}{T}\right)^2$$

⁷ κ has been used to measure pairwise agreement among coders making category judgments (Carletta, 1996; Krippendorff, 1980; Siegel and Castellan, 1988). Thus, the observed user/agent interactions are modeled as a coder, and the ideal interactions as an expert coder.

where t_i is the sum of the frequencies in column i of M , and T is the sum of the frequencies in M ($t_1 + \dots + t_n$).

$P(A)$, the actual agreement between the data and the key, is always computed from the confusion matrix M :

$$P(A) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n M(i, i)}{T}$$

Given the confusion matrices in Tables 3 and 4, $P(E) = 0.079$ for both agents.⁸ For Agent A, $P(A) = 0.795$ and $\kappa = 0.777$, while for Agent B, $P(A) = 0.59$ and $\kappa = 0.555$, suggesting that Agent A is more successful than B in achieving the task goals.

2.3 Measuring Dialogue Costs

As shown in Figure 1, performance is also a function of a combination of cost measures. Intuitively, cost measures should be calculated on the basis of any user or agent dialogue behaviors that should be minimized. A wide range of cost measures have been used in previous work; these include pure efficiency measures such as the number of turns or elapsed time to complete the task (Abella, Brown, and Buntschuh, 1996; Hirschman et al., 1990; Smith and Gordon, 1997; Walker, 1996), as well as measures of qualitative phenomena such as inappropriate or repair utterances (Danieli and Gerbino, 1995; Hirschman and Pao, 1993; Simpson and Fraser, 1993).

PARADISE represents each cost measure as a function c_i that can be applied to any (sub)dialogue. First, consider the simplest case of calculating efficiency measures over a whole dialogue. For example, let c_1 be the total number of utterances. For the whole dialogue D1 in Figure 2, $c_1(D1)$ is 23 utterances. For the whole dialogue D2 in Figure 3, $c_1(D2)$ is 10 utterances.

To calculate costs over subdialogues and for some of the qualitative measures, it is necessary to be able to specify which information goals each utterance contributes to. PARADISE uses its AVM representation to link the information goals of the task to any arbitrary dialogue behavior, by tagging the dialogue with the attributes for the task.⁹ This makes it possible to evaluate any potential dialogue strategies for achieving the task, as well as to evaluate dialogue strategies that operate at the level of dialogue subtasks (subdialogues).

Consider the longer versions of Dialogues 1 and 2 in Figures 2 and 3. Each utterance in Figures 2 and 3 has been tagged using one or more of the attribute abbreviations in Table 1, according to the subtask(s) the utterance contributes to. As a convention of this type of tagging,

⁸Using a single confusion matrix for all attributes as in Tables 3 and 4 inflates κ when there are few cross-attribute confusions by making $P(E)$ smaller. In some cases it might be desirable to calculate κ first for identification of attributes and then for values within attributes, or to average κ for each attribute to produce an overall κ for the task.

⁹This tagging can be hand generated, or system generated and hand corrected. Preliminary studies indicate that reliability for human tagging is higher for AVM attribute tagging than for other types of discourse segment tagging (Passonneau and Litman, 1997; Hirschberg and Nakatani, 1996).




Figure 4: Task-defined discourse structure of Agent A dialogue interaction

utterances that contribute to the success of the whole dialogue, such as greetings, are tagged with all the attributes. Since the structure of a dialogue reflects the structure of the task (Carberry, 1989; Grosz and Sidner, 1986; Litman and Allen, 1990), the tagging of a dialogue by the AVM attributes can be used to generate a hierarchical discourse structure such as that shown in Figure 4 for Dialogue 1 (Figure 2). For example, segment (subdialogue) S2 in Figure 4 is about both depart-city (DC) and arrival-city (AC). It contains segments S3 and S4 within it, and consists of utterances U1 . . . U6.

Tagging by AVM attributes is required to calculate costs over subdialogues, since for any subdialogue, task attributes define the subdialogue. For subdialogue S4 in Figure 4, which is about the attribute arrival-city and consists of utterances A6 and U6, $c_1(S4)$ is 2.

Tagging by AVM attributes is also required to calculate the cost of some of the qualitative measures, such as number of repair utterances. (Note that to calculate such costs, each utterance in the corpus of dialogues must also be tagged with respect to the qualitative phenomenon in question, e.g. whether the utterance is a repair.¹⁰) For example, let c_2 be the number of repair utterances. The repair utterances in Figure 2 are A3 through U6, thus $c_2(D1)$ is 10 utterances and $c_2(S4)$ is 2 utterances. The repair utterance in Figure 3 is U2, but note that according to the AVM task tagging, U2 simultaneously addresses the information goals for depart-range. In general, if an utterance U contributes to the information goals of N different attributes, each attribute accounts for $1/N$ of any costs derivable from U . Thus, $c_2(D2)$ is .5.

Given a set of c_i , it is necessary to combine the dif-

¹⁰Previous work has shown that this can be done with high reliability (Hirschman and Pao, 1993).

ferent cost measures in order to determine their relative contribution to performance. The next section explains how to combine κ with a set of c_i to yield an overall performance measure.

2.4 Estimating a Performance Function

Given the definition of success and costs above and the model in Figure 1, performance for any (sub)dialogue D is defined as follows:¹¹

$$\text{Performance} = (\alpha * \mathcal{N}(\kappa)) - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i * \mathcal{N}(c_i)$$

Here α is a weight on κ , the cost functions c_i are weighted by w_i , and \mathcal{N} is a Z score normalization function (Cohen, 1995).

The normalization function is used to overcome the problem that the values of c_i are not on the same scale as κ , and that the cost measures c_i may also be calculated over widely varying scales (e.g. response delay could be measured using seconds while, in the example, costs were calculated in terms of number of utterances). This problem is easily solved by normalizing each factor x to its Z score:

$$\mathcal{N}(x) = \frac{x - \bar{x}}{\sigma_x}$$

where σ_x is the standard deviation for x .

user	agent	US	κ	c_1 (#utt)	c_2 (#rep)
1	A	1	1	46	30
2	A	2	1	50	30
3	A	2	1	52	30
4	A	3	1	40	20
5	A	4	1	23	10
6	A	2	1	50	36
7	A	1	0.46	75	30
8	A	1	0.19	60	30
9	B	6	1	8	0
10	B	5	1	15	1
11	B	6	1	10	0.5
12	B	5	1	20	3
13	B	1	0.19	45	18
14	B	1	0.46	50	22
15	B	2	0.19	34	18
16	B	2	0.46	40	18
Mean(A)	A	2	0.83	49.5	27
Mean(B)	B	3.5	0.66	27.8	10.1
Mean	NA	2.75	0.75	38.6	18.5

Table 5: Hypothetical performance data from users of Agents A and B

To illustrate the method for estimating a performance function, we will use a subset of the data from Tables 3 and 4, shown in Table 5. Table 5 represents the results

¹¹We assume an additive performance (utility) function because it appears that κ and the various cost factors c_i are utility independent and additive independent (Keeney and Raiffa, 1976). It is possible however that user satisfaction data collected in future experiments (or other data such as willingness to pay or use) would indicate otherwise. If so, continuing use of an additive function might require a transformation of the data, a reworking of the model shown in Figure 1, or the inclusion of interaction terms in the model (Cohen, 1995).

from a hypothetical experiment in which eight users were randomly assigned to communicate with Agent A and eight users were randomly assigned to communicate with Agent B. Table 5 shows user satisfaction (US) ratings (discussed below), κ , number of utterances (#utt) and number of repair utterances (#rep) for each of these users. Users 5 and 11 correspond to the dialogues in Figures 2 and 3 respectively. To normalize c_1 for user 5, we determine that \bar{c}_1 is 38.6 and σ_{c_1} is 18.9. Thus, $\mathcal{N}(c_1)$ is -0.83. Similarly $\mathcal{N}(c_1)$ for user 11 is -1.51.

To estimate the performance function, the weights α and w_i must be solved for. Recall that the claim implicit in Figure 1 was that the relative contribution of task success and dialogue costs to performance should be calculated by considering their contribution to user satisfaction. User satisfaction is typically calculated with surveys that ask users to specify the degree to which they agree with one or more statements about the behavior or the performance of the system. A single user satisfaction measure can be calculated from a single question, or as the mean of a set of ratings. The hypothetical user satisfaction ratings shown in Table 5 range from a high of 6 to a low of 1.

Given a set of dialogues for which user satisfaction (US), κ and the set of c_i have been collected experimentally, the weights α and w_i can be solved for using multiple linear regression. Multiple linear regression produces a set of coefficients (weights) describing the relative contribution of each predictor factor in accounting for the variance in a predicted factor. In this case, on the basis of the model in Figure 1, US is treated as the predicted factor. Normalization of the predictor factors (κ and c_i) to their Z scores guarantees that the relative magnitude of the coefficients directly indicates the relative contribution of each factor. Regression on the Table 5 data for both sets of users tests which factors κ , #utt, #rep most strongly predicts US.

In this illustrative example, the results of the regression with all factors included shows that only κ and #rep are significant ($p < .02$). In order to develop a performance function estimate that includes only significant factors and eliminates redundancies, a second regression including only significant factors must then be done. In this case, a second regression yields the predictive equation:

$$\text{Performance} = .40\mathcal{N}(\kappa) - .78\mathcal{N}(c_2)$$

i.e., α is .40 and w_2 is .78. The results also show κ is significant at $p < .0003$, #rep significant at $p < .0001$, and the combination of κ and #rep account for 92% of the variance in US, the external validation criterion. The factor #utt was not a significant predictor of performance, in part because #utt and #rep are highly redundant. (The correlation between #utt and #rep is 0.91).

Given these predictions about the relative contribution of different factors to performance, it is then possible to return to the problem first introduced in Section 1: given potentially conflicting performance criteria such as robustness and efficiency, how can the performance of Agent A and Agent B be compared? Given values for α and w_i , performance can be calculated for both agents

using the equation above. The mean performance of A is $-.44$ and the mean performance of B is $.44$, suggesting that Agent B may perform better than Agent A overall.

The evaluator must then however test these performance differences for statistical significance. In this case, a t test shows that differences are only significant at the $p < .07$ level, indicating a trend only. In this case, an evaluation over a larger subset of the user population would probably show significant differences.

2.5 Application to Subdialogues

Since both κ and c_i can be calculated over subdialogues, performance can also be calculated at the subdialogue level by using the values for α and w_i as solved for above. This assumes that the factors that are predictive of global performance, based on US, generalize as predictors of local performance, i.e. within subdialogues defined by subtasks, as defined by the attribute tagging.¹²

Consider calculating the performance of the dialogue strategies used by train timetable Agents A and B, over the subdialogues that repair the value of depart-city. Segment S3 (Figure 4) is an example of such a subdialogue with Agent A. As in the initial estimation of a performance function, our analysis requires experimental data, namely a set of values for κ and c_i , and the application of the Z score normalization function to this data. However, the values for κ and c_i are now calculated at the subdialogue rather than the whole dialogue level. In addition, only data from comparable strategies can be used to calculate the mean and standard deviation for normalization. Informally, a comparable strategy is one which applies in the same state and has the same effects.

For example, to calculate κ for Agent A over the subdialogues that repair depart-city, $P(A)$ and $P(E)$ are computed using only the subpart of Table 3 concerned with depart-city. For Agent A, $P(A) = .78$, $P(E) = .265$, and $\kappa = .70$. Then, this value of κ is normalized using data from comparable subdialogues with both Agent A and Agent B. Based on the data in Tables 3 and 4, the mean κ is $.515$ and σ is $.261$, so that $\mathcal{N}(\kappa)$ for Agent A is $.71$.

To calculate c_2 for Agent A, assume that the average number of repair utterances for Agent A's subdialogues that repair depart-city is 6, that the mean over all comparable repair subdialogues is 4, and the standard deviation is 2.79. Then $\mathcal{N}(c_2)$ is $.72$.

Let Agent A's repair dialogue strategy for subdialogues repairing depart-city be R_A and Agent B's repair strategy for depart-city be R_B . Then using the performance equation above, predicted performance for R_A is:

$$\text{Performance}(R_A) = .40 * .71 - .78 * .72 = -0.28$$

For Agent B, using the appropriate subpart of Table 4 to calculate κ , assuming that the average number of depart-city repair utterances is 1.38, and using similar

calculations, yields

$$\text{Performance}(R_B) = .40 * -.71 - .78 * -.94 = 0.45$$

Thus the results of these experiments predict that when an agent needs to choose between the repair strategy that Agent B uses and the repair strategy that Agent A uses for repairing depart-city, it should use Agent B's strategy R_B , since the $\text{performance}(R_B)$ is predicted to be greater than the $\text{performance}(R_A)$.

Note that the ability to calculate performance over subdialogues allows us to conduct experiments that simultaneously test multiple dialogue strategies. For example, suppose Agents A and B had different strategies for presenting the value of depart-time (in addition to different confirmation strategies). Without the ability to calculate performance over subdialogues, it would be impossible to test the effect of the different presentation strategies independently of the different confirmation strategies.

2.6 Summary

We have presented the PARADISE framework, and have used it to evaluate two hypothetical dialogue agents in a simplified train timetable task domain. We used PARADISE to derive a performance function for this task, by estimating the relative contribution of a set of potential predictors to user satisfaction. The PARADISE methodology consists of the following steps:

- definition of a task and a set of scenarios;
- specification of the AVM task representation;
- experiments with alternate dialogue agents for the task;
- calculation of user satisfaction using surveys;
- calculation of task success using κ ;
- calculation of dialogue cost using efficiency and qualitative measures;
- estimation of a performance function using linear regression and values for user satisfaction, κ and dialogue costs;
- comparison with other agents/tasks to determine which factors generalize;
- refinement of the performance model.

Note that all of these steps are required to develop the performance function. However once the weights in the performance function have been solved for, user satisfaction ratings no longer need to be collected. Instead, predictions about user satisfaction can be made on the basis of the predictor variables, as illustrated in the application of PARADISE to subdialogues.

Given the current state of knowledge, it is important to emphasize that researchers should be cautious about generalizing a derived performance function to other agents or tasks. Performance function estimation should be done iteratively over many different tasks and dialogue strategies to see which factors generalize. In this way, the field can make progress on identifying the relationship between various factors and can move towards more predictive models of spoken dialogue agent performance.

¹²This assumption has a sound basis in theories of dialogue structure (Carberry, 1989; Grosz and Sidner, 1986; Litman and Allen, 1990), but should be tested empirically.

3 Generality

In the previous section we used PARADISE to evaluate two confirmation strategies, using as examples fairly simple information access dialogues in the train timetable domain. In this section we demonstrate that PARADISE is applicable to a range of tasks, domains, and dialogues, by presenting AVMs for two tasks involving more than information access, and showing how additional dialogue phenomena can be tagged using AVM attributes.

attribute	possible values	information flow
depart-city (DC)	Milano, Roma, Torino, Trento	to agent
arrival-city (AC)	Milano, Roma, Torino, Trento	to agent
depart-range (DR)	morning, evening	to agent
depart-time (DT)	6am, 8am, 6pm, 8pm	to user
request-type (RT)	reserve, purchase	to agent

Table 6: Attribute value matrix, train timetable domain with requests

First, consider an extension of the train timetable task, where an agent can handle requests to reserve a seat or purchase a ticket. This task could be represented using the AVM in Table 6 (an extension of Table 1), where the agent must now acquire the value of the attribute request-type, in order to know what to do with the other information it has acquired.

U1:	I want to go from Torino to Roma	DC, AC
C1:	Approximately what time of day would you like to travel?	DR
U2:	What are the options?	DR
C2:	Morning or evening.	DR
U3:	Are those departure times?	DR
C3:	Yes.	DR
U4:	I'd like to leave in the morning.	DR
C4:	Train 702 leaves Torino Porto at 8 a.m.	DT
U5:	Please reserve me a seat on that train.	RT

Figure 5: Hypothetical Agent C dialogue interaction

Figure 5 presents a hypothetical dialogue in this extended task domain, and illustrates user utterance types and an agent dialogue strategy that are very different from those in Figures 2 and 3. First, Agent C in Figure 5 uses a “no confirmation” dialogue strategy, in contrast to the explicit and implicit confirmation strategies used in Figures 2 and 3. Second, Figure 5 illustrates new types of *user* utterances that do not directly further the informational goals of the task. In U2, the user asks the agent a wh-question about the DR attribute itself, rather than providing information about that attribute’s value. Since U2 satisfies a knowledge precondition related to answering C1, U2 contributes to the DR goal and is tagged as such. In U3, the user similarly asks a yes-no question that addresses a subgoal related to answering C1. Finally, U5 illustrates a user request for an agent action, and is tagged with the RT attribute. The value of RT in the AVM instantiation for the dialogue would be “reserve.”

Second, consider the very different domain and task of diagnosing a fault and repairing a circuit (Smith and

Gordon, 1997). Figure 6 presents one dialogue from this domain.

1. C:	This is the circuit fix it shop. How may I help you?	ID, CB, RB, FT, FC, T
2. U:	I want to fix a circuit.	ID, CB, RB, FT, FC, T
3. C:	What is the ID of the circuit?	ID
4. U:	Rs111.	ID
5. C:	I am familiar with that circuit. The LED is supposed to be displaying alternately flashing one and seven.	CB
6. U:	The LED is off.	RB
7. C:	What is the switch at when the LED is off?	RB
8. U:	The switch is down.	RB
9. C:	Put the switch up.	RB
10. U:	Okay.	RB
11. C:	Put the knob to one zero.	RB
12. U:	Okay.	RB
13. C:	What is the LED displaying?	RB
14. U:	LED is displaying only a flashing seven.	RB
15. C:	Is there a wire between connector eight four and connector nine nine?	FT
16. U:	No.	FT
17. C:	Add a wire between connector eight four and connector nine nine.	FC
18. U:	Done.	FC
19. C:	What is the LED displaying?	T
20. U:	Alternately flashing one and seven.	T
21. C:	Is the one on the LED displaying for a longer period of time?	T
22. U:	No.	T
23. C:	Is the seven on the LED displaying for a longer period of time?	T
24. U:	No.	T
25. C:	Put the knob to zero.	T
26. U:	Okay.	T
27. C:	What is the LED displaying?	T
28. U:	Alternately displaying one and seven.	T
29. C:	Is the one on the LED displaying for a longer period of time?	T
30. U:	Yes.	T
31. C:	Put the switch down.	T
32. U:	The switch is down.	T
33. C:	What is the LED displaying?	T
34. U:	Nothing.	T
35. C:	The circuit is working correctly. Good-bye.	T

Figure 6: A circuit domain dialogue (Smith and Gordon, 1997), with AVM tagging

Smith and Gordon collected 144 dialogues for this task, in which agent initiative was varied by using different dialogue strategies, and tagged each dialogue according to the following subtask structure:¹³

- Introduction (I)—establish the purpose of the task
- Assessment (A)—establish the current behavior
- Diagnosis (D)—establish the cause for the errant behavior
- Repair (R)—establish that the correction for the errant behavior has been made
- Test (T)—establish that the behavior is now correct

Our informational analysis of this task results in the AVM shown in Table 7. Note that the attributes are almost identical to Smith and Gordon’s list of subtasks. Circuit-ID corresponds to Introduction, Correct-Circuit-Behavior and Current-Circuit-Behavior correspond to Assessment,

¹³They report a κ of .82 for reliability of their tagging scheme.

Fault-Type corresponds to Diagnosis, Fault-Correction corresponds to Repair, and Test corresponds to Test. The attribute names emphasize information exchange, while the subtask names emphasize function.

attribute	possible values
Circuit-ID (ID)	RS111, RS112, ...
Correct-Circuit-Behavior (CB)	Flash-1-7, Flash-1, ...
Current-Circuit-Behavior (RB)	Flash-7
Fault-Type (FT)	MissingWire84-99, MissingWire88-99, ...
Fault-Correction (FC)	yes, no
Test (T)	yes, no

Table 7: Attribute value matrix, circuit domain

Figure 6 is tagged with the attributes from Table 7. Smith and Gordon’s tagging of this dialogue according to their subtask representation was as follows: turns 1-4 were I, turns 5-14 were A, turns 15-16 were D, turns 17-18 were R, and turns 19-35 were T. Note that there are only two differences between the dialogue structures yielded by the two tagging schemes. First, in our scheme (Figure 6), the greetings (turns 1 and 2) are tagged with all the attributes. Second, Smith and Gordon’s single tag A corresponds to two attribute tags in Table 7, which in our scheme defines an extra level of structure within assessment subdialogues.

4 Discussion

This paper presented the PARADISE framework for evaluating spoken dialogue agents. PARADISE is a general framework for evaluating spoken dialogue agents that integrates and enhances previous work. PARADISE supports comparisons among dialogue strategies with a task representation that decouples *what* an agent needs to achieve in terms of the task requirements from *how* the agent carries out the task via dialogue. Furthermore, this task representation supports the calculation of performance over subdialogues as well as whole dialogues. In addition, because PARADISE’s success measure normalizes for task complexity, it provides a basis for comparing agents performing *different* tasks.

The PARADISE performance measure is a function of both task success (κ) and dialogue costs (c_i), and has a number of advantages. First, it allows us to evaluate performance at any level of a dialogue, since κ and c_i can be calculated for any dialogue subtask. Since performance can be measured over any subtask, and since dialogue strategies can range over subdialogues or the whole dialogue, we can associate performance with individual dialogue strategies. Second, because our success measure κ takes into account the complexity of the task, comparisons can be made across dialogue tasks. Third, κ allows us to measure partial success at achieving the task. Fourth, performance can combine both objective and subjective cost measures, and specifies how to evaluate the relative contributions of those costs factors to overall performance. Finally, to our knowledge, we are the first to propose using user satisfaction to determine

weights on factors related to performance.

In addition, this approach is broadly integrative, incorporating aspects of transaction success, concept accuracy, multiple cost measures, and user satisfaction. In our framework, transaction success is reflected in κ , corresponding to dialogues with a $P(A)$ of 1. Our performance measure also captures information similar to concept accuracy, where low concept accuracy scores translate into either higher costs for acquiring information from the user, or lower κ scores.

One limitation of the PARADISE approach is that the task-based success measure does not reflect that some solutions might be better than others. For example, in the train timetable domain, we might like our task-based success measure to give higher ratings to agents that suggest express over local trains, or that provide helpful information that was not explicitly requested, especially since the better solutions might occur in dialogues with higher costs. It might be possible to address this limitation by using the interval scaled data version of κ (Krippendorff, 1980). Another possibility is to simply substitute a domain-specific task-based success measure in the performance model for κ .

The evaluation model presented here has many applications in spoken dialogue processing. We believe that the framework is also applicable to other dialogue modalities, and to human-human task-oriented dialogues. In addition, while there are many proposals in the literature for algorithms for dialogue strategies that are cooperative, collaborative or helpful to the user (Webber and Joshi, 1982; Pollack, Hirschberg, and Webber, 1982; Joshi, Webber, and Weischedel, 1984; Chu-Carroll and Carberry, 1995), very few of these strategies have been evaluated as to whether they improve any measurable aspect of a dialogue interaction. As we have demonstrated here, any dialogue strategy can be evaluated, so it should be possible to show that a cooperative response, or other cooperative strategy, actually improves task performance by reducing costs or increasing task success. We hope that this framework will be broadly applied in future dialogue research.

5 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank James Allen, Jennifer Chu-Carroll, Morena Danieli, Wieland Eckert, Giuseppe Di Fabbrizio, Don Hindle, Julia Hirschberg, Shri Narayanan, Jay Wilpon, Steve Whittaker and three anonymous reviews for helpful discussion and comments on earlier versions of this paper.

References

- Abella, Alicia, Michael K Brown, and Bruce Buntschuh. 1996. Development principles for dialog-based interfaces. In *ECAI-96 Spoken Dialog Processing Workshop*, Budapest, Hungary.

- Bates, Madeleine and Damaris Ayuso. 1993. A proposal for incremental dialogue evaluation. In *Proceedings of the DARPA Speech and NL Workshop*, pages 319–322.
- Carberry, S. 1989. Plan recognition and its use in understanding dialogue. In A. Kobsa and W. Wahlster, editors, *User Models in Dialogue Systems*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, pages 133–162.
- Carletta, Jean C. 1996. Assessing the reliability of subjective codings. *Computational Linguistics*, 22(2):249–254.
- Chu-Carrol, Jennifer and Sandra Carberry. 1995. Response generation in collaborative negotiation. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the 33rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 136–143.
- Cohen, Paul R. 1995. *Empirical Methods for Artificial Intelligence*. MIT Press, Boston.
- Danieli, M., W. Eckert, N. Fraser, N. Gilbert, M. Guyonard, P. Heisterkamp, M. Kharoune, J. Magadur, S. McGlashan, D. Sadek, J. Siroux, and N. Youd. 1992. Dialogue manager design evaluation. Technical Report Project Esprit 2218 SUNDIAL, WP6000-D3.
- Danieli, Morena and Elisabetta Gerbino. 1995. Metrics for evaluating dialogue strategies in a spoken language system. In *Proceedings of the 1995 AAAI Spring Symposium on Empirical Methods in Discourse Interpretation and Generation*, pages 34–39.
- Doyle, Jon. 1992. Rationality and its roles in reasoning. *Computational Intelligence*, 8(2):376–409.
- Fraser, Norman M. 1995. Quality standards for spoken dialogue systems: a report on progress in EAGLES. In *ESCA Workshop on Spoken Dialogue Systems Vigso, Denmark*, pages 157–160.
- Gale, William, Ken W. Church, and David Yarowsky. 1992. Estimating upper and lower bounds on the performance of word-sense disambiguation programs. In *Proc. of 30th ACL*, pages 249–256, Newark, Delaware.
- Grosz, Barbara J. and Candace L. Sidner. 1986. Attentions, intentions and the structure of discourse. *Computational Linguistics*, 12:175–204.
- Hirschberg, Julia and Christine Nakatani. 1996. A prosodic analysis of discourse segments in direction-giving monologues. In *34th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 286–293.
- Hirschman, Lynette, Deborah A. Dahl, Donald P. McKay, Lewis M. Norton, and Marcia C. Linebarger. 1990. Beyond class A: A proposal for automatic evaluation of discourse. In *Proceedings of the Speech and Natural Language Workshop*, pages 109–113.
- Hirschman, Lynette and Christine Pao. 1993. The cost of errors in a spoken language system. In *Proceedings of the Third European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology*, pages 1419–1422.
- Joshi, Aravind K., Bonnie L. Webber, and Ralph M. Weischedel. 1984. Preventing false inferences. In *COLING84: Proc. 10th International Conference on Computational Linguistics.*, pages 134–138.
- Kamm, Candace. 1995. User interfaces for voice applications. In David Roe and Jay Wilpon, editors, *Voice Communication between Humans and Machines*. National Academy Press, pages 422–442.
- Keeney, Ralph and Howard Raiffa. 1976. *Decisions with Multiple Objectives: Preferences and Value Tradeoffs*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 1980. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, Ca.
- Litman, Diane and James Allen. 1990. Recognizing and relating discourse intentions and task-oriented plans. In Philip Cohen, Jerry Morgan, and Martha Pollack, editors, *Intentions in Communication*. MIT Press.
- Passonneau, Rebecca J. and Diane Litman. 1997. Discourse segmentation by human and automated means. *Computational Linguistics*, 23(1).
- Polifroni, Joseph, Lynette Hirschman, Stephanie Seneff, and Victor Zue. 1992. Experiments in evaluating interactive spoken language systems. In *Proceedings of the DARPA Speech and NL Workshop*, pages 28–33.
- Pollack, Martha, Julia Hirschberg, and Bonnie Webber. 1982. User participation in the reasoning process of expert systems. In *Proceedings First National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages pp. 358–361.
- Shriberg, Elizabeth, Elizabeth Wade, and Patti Price. 1992. Human-machine problem solving using spoken language systems (SLS): Factors affecting performance and user satisfaction. In *Proceedings of the DARPA Speech and NL Workshop*, pages 49–54.
- Siegel, Sidney and N. J. Castellan. 1988. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. McGraw Hill.
- Simpson, A. and N. A. Fraser. 1993. Black box and glass box evaluation of the SUNDIAL system. In *Proceedings of the Third European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology*, pages 1423–1426.
- Smith, Ronnie W. and Steven A. Gordon. 1997. Effects of variable initiative on linguistic behavior in human-computer spoken natural language dialog. *Computational Linguistics*, 23(1).
- Sparck-Jones, Karen and Julia R. Galliers. 1996. *Evaluating Natural Language Processing Systems*. Springer.
- Walker, Marilyn A. 1996. The Effect of Resource Limits and Task Complexity on Collaborative Planning in Dialogue. *Artificial Intelligence Journal*, 85(1–2):181–243.
- Webber, Bonnie and Aravind Joshi. 1982. Taking the initiative in natural language database interaction: Justifying why. In *Coling 82*, pages 413–419.