Dialogue actions for natural language interfaces

Arne Jonsson
Department of Computer and Information Science
Linkoping University S-581 83 LINKOPING, SWEDEN
email arnjo@ida hu se

Abstract

This paper presents an action scheme for dia logue management for natural language inler faces The scheme guides a dialogue manager which directs the interface's dialogue with the user communicates with the background system, and assists the interpretation and gets eration modules The dialogue manager was designed on the basis of an investigation of empirical material collected in Wizard of Oz experiments The empirical investigations re vealed that in dialogues with database systems users specify an object, or a set of objects and ask for domain concept information, e g the value of a property of that object or set of ob|ects The interface responds 1 perform ing the appropriate action e g providing the requited information or initiating a clarified lion subdialogue The action to bt carried out by the interface can be determined based on how objects and properties are specified from information in the user utterance the dialogue context and the response from the background system and its domain model

1 Introduction

Users of natural language interfaces, should conveniently be able to express the commands and queries that the background system can deal with and the system should react quickly and accurately to all user input Among other things this means that the interface must be able to cope with connected dialogue However, it does not mean that the interface must bt able to mimic human interaction On the contrary, it is erroneous to assume that humans would like to interact with cornput ers the same way as they communicate with humans (cf [Dahlback, 1991b 1991a, Dahlback and Jonsson, 1992 Dahlback *et al,* 1993, Krause, 1993]) Human computer interactions have their own sublanguages (cf [Grishman and Kittredge, 1986]) whose characteristics often allow a much simpler dialogue model than models capturing human interaction

To illustrate some properties of such human computer interaction consider figure 1 In information retrieval systems a common user initiative is a request for domain concept information of a specified object, or set of objects Utterance U11 illustrates this The requested domain concept information is the value of the property shape and the domain object is the Ford Fiesta costing 26 800 crowns Unfortunately the system could not an swer the question as the propert> (shapt) is not utilized in the domain, instead in utterance S12 the system provides information about its capabilities In U13 a new request for information on another property of the same domain object is presented This time the pronoun it replaces the rephrasing of the specification of the object, ic the Ford Fiesta costing 26 800 crowns In utterance U15 the user asks for the same concept information but related to another object while in U17 the object stays the same but the property is altered In U19 the property remains the same but this time the user utilizes a definite description to specify an object discussed previously, and originally specified in utterance U11

The dialogue model presented in this paper does not intend to mimic human conversation It is based on the observation that for information retrieval applications a common user initiative is a request for domain concept information of a specified object or set of objects (cf [Ahrenberg 1987]) A dialogue manager utilizing this information when deciding winch action to perform for user natives concerned with accessing the application will provide efficient and robust user-friendly human computer natural language interaction

2 The Dialogue Manager

A dialogue manager directs a natural language interface and holds information needed by the modules in the interface, including the dialogue manager itself The Dialogue Manager considered in this paper was designed from an analysis of a corpus of 21 dialogues using live different background systems [Ahrenberg *et al* 1990, Jonsson 1991], collected in Wizard Oz-experiments [Dahlback *et al* 1993] The Dialogue Manager need to be customized to account for the sublanguage carried out in a specific application Customization allows us to adapt the behaviour of the interface to the requirements of the application (see Jonsson [1993a, 1993b] for details)

The results presented here are based on the customiza-

U11 What is the shape of Ford Fiesta costing 26 800 crowns?
S12 Wait
Cars cannot answer questions concerning the shape of car models
U13 Is it rusty?
S14 Wait
Checking

Manufacturer	Model	Year	Rust
Ford	Fiesta	1982	2

U15 Does the Mercedes from 1982 have any rust damage?
S16 Wait
Checking

Manufacturer	Model	Year	Rust
Mercedes	200	1982	5

U17 How fast is a Mercedes 200?
S18 Wait
Checking

Manufacturer	Model	Year	Rust	Top Speed
Mercedes	200	1982	5	160

U19 How fast is the Fiesta?
S20 Wait
Checking

Manufacturer	Model	Year	Rust	Top Speed
Ford	Fiesta	1982	2	145

figure 1 Example of human computer dialogue using the CARS system From a corpus of dialogues collected in Wizard of Oz-experiments U denotes user utterances and S utterances from the system The corpus examples are translated from Swedish

U27 what hotels are there on Crete
S28 Wait
The hotels in Platanias on Crete are
Kronos Agrimia Village Suites and Villa Margarita
U29 which one is the cheapest
S30 Wait
Price Villa Margarita

	4/7	11/7	18/7	25/7
1 week	2725	2725	2675	2625
2 weeks	3272	3275	3225	3175

U31 what is next cheapest
S32 Wait
Price Village Suites

	4/7	11/7	18/7	25/7
1 week	3150	3150	3100	3050
2 weeks	4025	4025	3975	3925

U33 what service can these hotels provide
S34 Wait
The basic price at Villa Margarita includes shared apartment
Cleaning 3 days/week, no dish-washing No meals
The basic price at Village Suites includes shared apartment
Cleaning 3 days/week, no dish-washing No meals

Figure 2 Example of dialogue using the TRAVEL system

tion of the dialogue manager for three applications, other than those utilized in the design, using a set of 30 new dialogues One of the applications, CARS, allows users to retrieve information from a consumers guide on properties of used cars In another application, TRAVEL the application domain was charter trips to the Greek archipelago The TRAVEL application not only utilized information retrieval but also in one scenario, allowed users to order a specified charter trip

Dialogue management information is modeled in dialogue objects These represent the constituents of the dialogue A dialogue object has two components OIK component contains static information describing the properties and relations of the dialogue object Another is a process description of a prototypical use of the dialogue object, an action plan [Jonsson, 1991] During the course of interaction a dialogue tree is built up from instances of dialogue objects (For more details on the Dialogue Manager see Jonsson

Two types of static parameters are distinguished situation parameters and content parameters The situation parameters specify the situation in which the dialogue object occurs, such as Initiator Responder and contextual information The content parameters are needed for focus structure and dialogue structure Focus structure concerns the recording of entities mentioned in the discourse to allow a user to refer to them in the course of the interaction Dialogue structure involves handling the relationships between the segments in the dialogue

2 1 Focus structure parameters

As discussed above, users of information retrieval systems request database information by specifying a database object, or a set of objects, and ask for the value of a property of that object or set of objects The dialogue objects model database objects using a parameter termed Objects and the domain concept information in a parameter termed Properties The values, to these parameters depend on the background system and the natural language interface needs to be customized to account for the demands from each application [jonsson 1993h] For the CARS application a relational database is used and the objects are cars described bj the subparameters (Manufacturer, Model "Year) The TRAVEL application utilizes a hierarchically structured datahase with the Greek archipelago on top, then the resorts and finally the hotels at each resort However it turns out that there is no need to txphcitly represent the various levels in the hierarchy Instead one single sub-parameter holding any of these object types is sufficient To illustrate this, consider figure 1 After utterance 1127 the value of the Objects parameter is the resort Crete Thi* will be changed to a set of hotels when the response from the background system is generated, S28

The value to the Objects parameter can be explicitly provided as for instance, it is in *show saab 900 of J9H5 modtl* However, this is not often the case Instead the user provides only partial information or a new set of objects by specifying properties, e g *Show all mtdtum size cars with a safety factor larger than 4* It is also possible to describe new objects by way of other objects as for example in U27 in figure 2 The Objects parameter will achieve values from such intensionally specified object descriptions by the extensional specification provided from the database access system

The Properties parameter models the domain concept in a Sub-parameter termed Aspect which can be specified, in another sub-parameter termed Value For instance, utterance U17 in figure 1 *Bow fast* is *a MERCEDES 200?* provides Aspect information on the domain con cept *speed* which is specified by tht daTabase manager to *160,* I e the Value of the Aspect *speed* is *160*

For some applications a third focal parameter is needed, termed Secondary Objects Its purpose is to restrict the search in the database to allow the user to investigate objects from a subset of objects one at a time as exemplified in figure 2 The user picks out Ihe set of hotels at the resort but is only interested in a subset of them If we apply the principle that holele are appended to the Objects parameter if the resort remains the same, the Objects parameter will hold the subset requested in U33 However, to restnet the database search in U31 to the set specified in S28 Secondary Objects is needed to hold the subset from which individual ob|ects art itives tigatcd

The focus parameters are properties of discourse segments (cf [Zancanaro *ct at* , 1991]), nol moves Focus is maintained using a simple copving principle where each new dialogue object is instantiated with a copy of the focus parameters from the previous dialogut object (cf [Seneff 1992]) This forms the initial context for the di alogue object and is updated with new, informition from the user initiative and the response from the background system

The details on how to update tht focal parameters vary and need lo hi considered when customizing tht di ilogue objects for a specific tpphcalion For instance consider tht system response S18 in hgun 1 This re sponse does not only contain the requested information on the Aspect sllb-parami ter *top speed* It also provides information on Ihi Aspect sub parameter nisi specified in the previous user initiative If the valut to the Objects parameter remains the same (or is a &ubset of the previous value), the value to the Properties parameter will be the conjunction of tht previous valui and tht new values provided m the new move This principle is appropriate when information is presented in tables allow ing additional information to be presented conveniently [Ahrenberg *et at* 1993]

2 2 Dialogue structure parameters

The dialogue is divided into three main classes on the basis of structural complexity There is one class corre sponding to the size of a dialogue, another class corresponding to the size of a discourse segment and a third class corresponding lo the size of a single speech act or dialogue move UUerancet, are not analyzed as dialogue objects, but as linguistic objects which function as vein cles of one or more moves There are various other proposals as to the number of categories needed They differ mainly on the modeling of complex units that consist of sequences of discourse segments, but do not comprise the whole dialogue For instance, LOKI [Wachtel 198b] and SUNDIAL [Bilange 1991] use four In LOKI the levels are conversation, dialogue, exchange and move SUNDIAL uses the categories Transaction level Exchange level, Intervention level and Dialogue Acts The feature characterizing the intermediate level (i e the Dialogue and Exchange levels respectivelv in Wachtel's and Bilange s models) is that of having a common topic, i e an object whose properties are discussed over a sequence of exchanges However, as illustrated in figure 1, a se quence of segments may hang together in a number of different ways e g by being about one object for which different properties are at issue But it ma> also be tht other way around, so that the same property is topical while difh rent objects are talked about (cf [Ahreu berg *et ai*, 1990]) Thus only one discourse segment category is distinguished and an Initiative-response (IR) structure is assumed (cf adjacency-pairs [ScheglofT and Sacks, 1973]) where an initiative opens a segment by introducing a new goal and the response closes the segment [Dahlback 1991b]

To specify the functional role of a move we use the parameters Type and Topic

Type corresponds to the Illoculionarv. type of the niov< For so-called sirnplt service systems[1] two subgoals can be identified [Hayes and Reddy 1983 p 2bb] 1) specifying a paramet< r to the system and 2) obtaining tht specification of a parameter Initiatives an cat< gonzed atturdlliglv as being of two different types 1) update, U where users provide information to the system and 2) question Q, where users obtain information from the svstem Responses are categorized as answer A for database answers from Ihe s\stem or answers to clarification requests The Dialogut Manager utilizes other Type ralegorif s such as Greeting Farewtll and Discourse Continuation (DC) [Dahlback 1991b] tht latter being used for utterances from the system whose purpose i& lo keep the conversation going but thev will not b» further considered in this[1] pap< r

Topic describes winch knowledge source to contult For information retrieval applications three different knowledge sources are utilized the database for solving a task (T) acquiring information about the database system related (S) or, finally, the ongoing dialogue (D) If the background system allows ordering of a specified item a fourth category is needed to account for such ul terances

The Type/Topic parameters can be used to describi tin dialogue structure, n which action to be carried out b\ th[j] interface This in turn can be modeled in a dialogut grammar [Jonsson 1993a]

3 Actions for task-related initiatives

Normal!} a natural language interface to database in formation retrieval applications is user-directed I e the user initiates a request for information from the hackground svstem and the interface responds with the requested information The interface only lakes the initiative to begin a clarification request under Ihree

'Simple service sjstems "require in essence only that the customer or clienl identify certain entities to the person pruviduig the aervice these entities are parameters of the ser vice and once they are identified the service can be provided" [Hayes and Reddy 1983 p 252]

Objects	Properties	Action(s)
Correct Partly Correct Not Provided	Correct Partly Correct Aspect	A_T
Correct Partly correct Not provided Incompatible	Erroneous Value Ambiguous Aspect	Q_D/A_D A_T (A_D)
Correct	Not provided	Q_D/A_D A_T
Erroneous	-	A_S
-	Erroneous Aspect	A_S
Incompatible		A_S
(Too large to print)		Q_D/A_D A_T

Table 1 A summary of the Dialogue Manager's actions to task-related initiatives

circumstances[2]

- a difficulty arises when interpreting an utterance, e g unknown words or questions outside the domain of the database
- a difficulty arises when accessing the database e g when the user needs to provide a parameter for correct access
- a difficulty arises in the presentation of the result from the database access, e g the answer is too large to print on one screen

The action to be carried out for task-related questions depends on how the information in the user initiative together with the information copied from the previous IR-unit and context information from the dialogue tree and the answer from the database system specify the values to the focal parameters Objects and Properties This contrasts with other structural based approaches such as Sitter and Stein [1992], where the user s purpose is considered primary when deciding which action to carry out An object or property description can be either correct, partly correct incompatible ambiguous erroneous, or not provided Erroneous means that the user has specified an object which is not in the database Partly correct means that the description contains at least one correct object or property description, but also one or more erroneous descriptions Incompatible descriptions utilize elements which do not belong together e g Volvo Camry

The relation between the values to the Objects and Properties parameters and the resulting action described in terms of Type and Topic is summarized in table 1[3] Any combination of Objects and Properties in a cell in a row results in the action to the right From the table we can identify three basic actions to task-related IR-units depending on the values of the parameters Objects and Properties A_T, A_S, and Q_D/A_D A_T

- A_T is the normal action following a Q_T This describes a successful task-related user initiative followed by a successful system answer with information taken from the database This requires correct values for both Objects and Properties The values for these parameters can be taken either from the preceding dialogue or they could be provided in the user input What is important is that the initiative in context provides enough information so that it can be used to access the background system and that the answer from the background system is in some sense correct A special case is when no explicit Objects description is provided but the Properties are fully specified and can be used to access the database e g *show all medium class cars costing less than 70 000 crowns*

  If the parameters Objects or Properties are partly correct, i e contain one or more erroneous items then an answer is presented on the correctly specified items together with information about what was erroneous, if possible

- Q_D/A_D A_T is to be considered as a special case of the normal A_T action as specified above This category is concerned with cases where the system initiates a clarification subdialogue to achieve more information from the user in order to get fully and correctly specified values to Objects or Properties If the user decides not to answer the clarification request then the values from the initiating IR-unit are copied to the new IR-unit and interaction proceeds from there The treatment of multiple sequential clarifications follows the same pattern as that for one clarification subdialogue

  A clarification subdialogue can be initiated when the Objects are correctly specified but the values of the Value slot to the Properties are erroneous or under-specified For instance, in *remove all cars with low operational safety* the expression low is too vague Another case is where no Aspect is provided or the provided Aspect is ambiguous The latter is illustrated in utterance U17 in figure 3

  Such cases are handled by a system initiated clarification subdialogue, a Q_D/A_D, directed from the IR unit which started the interaction, normally a Q_T, with the under-specified or ambiguous prop-

U17 which 10 car models between 60 000 and 70 000 crowns are most spacious
S18 Wait
Checking
Information on space is either coupe or boot
Please be more specific
U19 best coupe

Figure 3 Example of ambiguous Aspect resulting in a clarification request

[2]The system also takes the initiative to collect ordering information

[3]When presenting the dialogue actions Topic type will be indicated with a subscript to the Type, e g A_T denotes a task related answer IR units are presented as a TypeTopic-pair with the Initiative separated from the Response by a slash (/)

erty copied from the initiating 1R unit The Aspect slot is used to hold the parameter for which the system wants an answer and the Value slot is used for the user's answer If the user answers correctly at, in U19 in figure 3, the values for Properties in the initiating IR-unit are updated A Q_D/A_D unit is identified from the type information, 1 e the Type of the response from the user is A Otherwise the user move is regarded not to be an answer to the systems clarification request A clarification subdialogue is not initiated unless the system is able to explicitly provide alternatives to the user

A special case of clarification request occurs when a correct specification of the parameters Objects and Properties is provided, but the answer is too large to print on the screen In such cases the system initiates a clarification subdialogue asking the user to restrict the number of items to be printed, for example, *S2 Wait There are 16 car models which satisfy your requirements* CARS *normally only shows 25 cars at a time Do you want to seee them alt?* The answer can be either a number a restriction such as *US* remove *cars costing less than 40 000 crowns-* or Yes or No It is used to restrict the number of objects to output on the screen arid also in some cases affect the values of the Objects parameter

- *As* is used for task related user initiatives resulting in a system inswtr which provides information about the database system Information can be provided on various aspects of what type of information there is in the database and what type of questions that can be used to elicit this information A Ivpiol example is *Cars cannot answer questions concerning tht shape of car models* An *As* is utilized for an> utteranct with erroneous Objects or Aspect Incompatible Properties and Objects alw result in in A_s, this means that although both Properties and Objects are correct they cannot be used together

To illustrate the action scheme consider utterance UII *What* is *the shape of hard Fusta costuig 26 800 nowus?* in figure 1 This will be interpreted is a task-related question, a *QT* with correctly specified Objects parameter However tht Aspect MibparameLer is erroneous as there is no information in the database on the concept *shape* Furthermore the system can not provide alternatives to the user Thus the resulting action is an 4? S12 The next user utterance, U13, is- a *QT* with both correct Objects, as copied from the previous IR-unit, and correct Aspect sub-parameter, *rust* 1 hus the resulting action is an *AT,* S14

It is not always possible to directly use the values in the Objects and Properties slots even if correctly specified For applications such as TRAVEL with hierarchically structured databases the Dialogue Manager sometimes needs to search the domain base or the dialogue tree to find an applicable object or property For instance, if the user in the dialogue in figure *l* asks for concept information on properties associated with resorts, such as climate, when the hotels are m focus the domain model is utilized to find the appropriate resort

There are user initiatives which do not depend on the values of Objects and Properties, such as system-related questions, *Qs,* i e the user requests information about the system These are recognized on the grounds of linguistic information provided by the syntactic/semantic analyzer [Ahrenberg, 1988]

If ordering is allowed it is important to know which task is currently being performed e xploring the database or ordering This problem has been discussed by for instance, Ramshaw [I99l] and Lambert and Carberry [1991] They present models using three different but interacting, levels of plans to know when users stop exploring different plane and instead commit themselves to one plan However a result emerging from the analysis of our dialogues [Jonsson 1993a] is that the subjects clearly signal when the) change plan using utterances such as *I would like to order a trip for two to Lefkada* Thus retrieval of ordering information from tht users can be, collected in a formalized fashion controlled by the system (cf [Hoeppner *et a l* 1980])

4 Results

Dialogue objects has been customized to meet the demands of the three systems discussed above CARS and TRAVEL with and without ordering The customized dialogue objects for the CARS system has also been integrated with an INGRES database and interpreting niodules using a grammar and a lexicon covering a subset of the ulterances found in the corpus A context free grammar with less than 20 rules can accurately model the dialogue structure, utilized in the corpus The principle of copying information from ONE dialogue object to the other provides the correct context for most referring expressions FOT t ARS onl> 5% required a search in the dialogue tree The corresponding numbers for TRAVEl were 6% for information retrieval and *2%* if ordering is utilized (For more details on the results from customizing the dialogue and focus structures see lonsson [l993a] and Ahrenberg *et al* [l993])

The action scheme presented in table 1 covers all task-related user initiatives utilized in the corpus In the CARS application 85% of the us+r initiatives are task related questions In the TRAVEL application without ordering the number of task-related user initiatives account for 93% cf the user utti rances and dually when ordering is allowed 90% of the user utterances are task-related The other user initiatives are system related questions, farewells greetings, etc which art interpreted from linguistic information thus a majority of the users lintratives are task-related and will be handled efficiently and accliately using the action scheme

5 Discussion

The Dialogue Manager presented in this paper is restricted to written human-computer interaction in natural language However when communicating with a natural language interface, a user should not be limited to typed keyboard input and screen output The possibilities of using various modalities must be addressed to further improve the interaction Examples of systerns which use a variety of modalities for both interpretation and generation include AlFresco [Stock, 1991], XTRA [Wahlster, 1991], Voyager [Zue, 1994] and CUBRICON [Neal and Shapiro, 1991]

The main difference between multi-modal interfaces to simple service systems and conventional natural language interfaces to such applications is their ability to utilize a combination of input and output modali ties such as speech, graphics pointing and video output Thus, more advanced interpretation and generation modules are required and principles for determining how to utilize each media are needed [Arens *tt al*, 1993]

However, the dialogue and focus structures need not neceasanly be more complicated For instance, Voyager [Zue, 1994] successfully utilizes the approach presented here of copying the focus parameters from one segment to the other [Seneff, 1992] Sitter and Stein [1992] present a model for dialogue management to information-seeking dialogues The model assumes that conversation is based on possible sequences of dialogue acts which are modeled in a transition network In Stein and Thiel [1993] the model is extended to handle multi-modal interaction as utilized in the MERIT system [Stein *tt al* 1992]

Thus, it seems that for simple service systems the dialogue model presented here will be sufficient *not* only for natural language interfaces but also interfaces utilizing various oilier modalities However, for task-oriented dialogues, where the user's task directs the dialogue [Loo and Bego, 1993], a model of this and the user's goals need to be consulted in order to provide user-friendly interaction (cf [Burger and Marshall, 1993]) This does not imply the necessity, of a sophisticated, model based on the user's intentions Utilizing a hierarchical struc ture of plans based on the various tasks possible to carry out in the domain might do just as well (cf [Wahlster *tt al* 1993])

6 Summary

Natural language interaction will be more robust and habitable if the users can participate in a coherent dialogue with the system For natural language interfaces to information retrieval applications the necessary dialogue actions can be determined using a straightforward solution Users specify a database object, or set of objects and ask Tor domain concept information of that object or objects This is modeled in two parameters, one associated with the objects and another with the requested properties of that object The parameters are specified from information in the user initiative, the discourse and the background system and its domain model The ac tion to be carried out by the interface can be determined from the specification of these objects and properties parameters

Acknowledgments

This work results from a project on Dynamic Natural-Language Understanding supported by The Swedish Council *of* Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSFR) and The Swedish National Board for In dustnal and Technical Development (NUTEK) in the joint Research Program for Language Technology The work has been carried out with the members of the Natural Language Processing Laboratory at Linkoping University, Sweden, and 1 am especially indebted to Lars Ahrenberg, Nils Dahlback and Ake Thuree

References

[Ahrenberg e*t al* , 1990] Lars Ahrenberg Arne Jonsson and Nils Dahlback Discourse representation and discourse management for natural language interfaces In Proceedings *of the Second Nordic Conference on Tixt Cojnprrhcnsion in Man and Machine, Tdby, Swtdtn,* 1990

[Ahrenberg *tt al* 1993] Lars Ahrenberg, Arne Jonsson, and Ake Thuree Customizing interaction for natu ral language interfaces In *Workshop on Pragmatic* in *Dialogue, The XIV th Scandinavian Confertnn of Linguistics and the VIII th Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics, Gotebolg, S\vtdcn,* 1993

[Ahrenberg, 1987] Lars Ahrenberg *Interrogative Structures of Swedish A spects of the Relation betwtt n grammar and speech acts* PhD thesis, Uppsala University, 1987

[Ahrenberg, 1988] Lars Ahrenberg Functional constraints in knowledge-based natural language under standing In *Proceedings of the I2ih Inttmahonal Conference on Computational Linguistics Budapest,* pages 1V18, 1988

[Arens *et al* , 1993] Yigal Arens, Eduard Hovy and Mira Vo6sers On the knowledge underlying multime dia presentations In Mark T Maybury editor. *Intelligent Multimedia Interface** pages 280-306 MITPress J 993

[Bilange 199l] Eric Bilange A task independent oral dialogue model In *Proceedings of the Fifth Confer enct of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics Berlin,* 1991

[Burger and Marshall, 1993] John D Burger and Ralph J Marshall The application of natural language models to intelligent multimedia In Mark T Maybury, editor, *Intelligent Multimedia Interfaces,* pages 174 - 196 MITPress, 1993

[Dahlback and Jonsson, 1992] Nils Dahlback and Arne Jonsson An empirically based computationally tractable dialogue model In *Proceedings of the Fourtetnth Annual Meeting of The Cognitive Science* Soc *tiy Bloommgton Indiana,* 1992

[Dahlback *tt al* , 1993] Nils Dahlback A rne Jonsson, and Lars Ahrenberg Wizard of oz studies - wh> and how *h nowledge-Based Systems,* 6(4) 258-266 1993

[Dahlback, 1991a] Nils Dahlback Empirical analysis of a discourse model for natural language interfaces In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of The Cognitive Science Society, Chicago, Illinois,* pages 1-6, 1991

[Dahlback, 1991b] Nile Dahlback *Representations of Discourse, Cognitive and Computational Aspects* PhD thesis, Linkoping University, 1991

[Grishman and Kittredge, 1986] Ralph Grishman and Richard I kittredge *Analysing language in restricted domains* Lawrence Erlbaum, 1986

[Hayes and Reddy, 1983] Philip J Haves and D Raj Reddy Steps toward graceful interaction in spoken and written man-machine communication *Interna tional Journal of Man Machine Studies* 10 231-284 1983

[Hoeppner *et* a/, 1986] Wolfgang Hoeppuer, kathamna. Monk, and Hein7 Marburger Talking it over The natural language dialog system ham-ans In Leonard Bole and Matthias Jarke, editors *Cooperative Interfaces to Information Systems* Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1986

[Jonsson, 1991] Arne Jonsson A dialogue manager using initiative-response units and distributed control In *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Berlin,* 1991

[Jonson, 1993a] Anne Jonsson *Dialogue Management for Natural Language Interfaces - An Impnical Ap proach* PhD thesis Linkoping University 1993

[Jonsson 1993b] Arm Jonsson A method for development of dialogue managers for natural language mti r-faces In *Proceedings of the Eleventh National Confer tnce of Artifical intellengence Washington DC pages* 190-195 1993

[Krause, 1993] Jurgen krause A multilavered empirical approach to multimodalitv Towards mixed soul tions of natural language and graphical interfaces In Mark T Maybury editor, *Intellegent Multimedia In ttrfaces,* pages 328 - 352 MITPress, 199 J

[Lambert and Carberry, 1991] Lynn I amberl and Sandra Carberry A tripartite plan-bast d model of dialogue In *Proceedings of iht 29th Annual Meeting of the AC L Berkeley,* pages 193-200, 1991

[Loo and Bego, 1993] W Van Loo and II Bcgo Agent tasks and dialogue management In *Workshop on Pragmatics m Dialogue The* A/I *th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics and tht V III th C onference of Nordic and General Linguistics Gottborg Sweden* 1993

[Neal and Shapiro, 1991] Jiannettc G Neal and Stu artC Shapiro Intelligent multi media nitcrfac< tech nology In Joseph W Sullivan and Sherman W Tyler editors, *Intelligent User Inttifacts* ACM Press Addison-Wesley 1991

[Ramshaw, 1991] lance A Ramshaw A three-level model for plan exploration In *Procttdmys of Hit »<)th Annual Meeting of the ACL Berkeley* pages 39-46 1991

[ScheglofT and Sacks, 1973] Emanuel A ScheglofT and Harvey Sacks Opening up closings *Sanwtica* 7 289-327,1973

[Seneff, 1992] Stephanie Seneff A relaxation method for understanding spontaneous, speech utterances In *Paper presented at the Fifth DARPA Workshop on Speech and Natural Language* 1992

[Sitter and Stein 1992] Stefan SitUr and Adelhe.it Stein Modeling the Illocutionarv aspects of mformation-seeking dialogues *Information Processing f> Manage mtnt,* 28(2) 165-180 1992

[Stem and Thiel, 1991] Adelheit Stun and Ulnch Thitl A conversational model of multimodal interaction in information systems In *Proceedings of the Eleventh National Conference of Artificial Intelligence Wash mgton DC* pages 283 - 288 1993

[Stein *et at ,* 1992] Adelheit Stein Ulnch Thiel and Anne TiBen Knowledgt based control of visual di alogues in information systems In *Proceedings of tin 1st International Workshop on Advanced Visual In terfaces Rome Italy* 1992

[Stock 1991] Oliviero Slock Natural language exploration of an information space the alfresco interactive systcm In *Proceeding* of the Twelfth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence Sydney iustralia* pages 972-978 1991

[Waclilel 1986] loin Wachlel Pragmatic sensitivity in nl interfaces and the structure of conversation In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conferente of f ompiitahonat Linquistn s Univnsity of Bonn* pages *35-42* 1986

[Wahlsler *et at* 1991] Wolfgang Wahlsler Elisabeth Andre Wolfgang Fmkler, Hans Jurgen Prolihch and Thomas Rist PJan-based integration of natural language and graphics generation *Artificial Intelligence* 63 387 - 427, 1993

[WahlsLer 1991] Wolfging Wahtster *X)* ser and discourse models for multimodal communication In Joseph W Sullivan and Sherman W Tyler, editors *Intelligent User Intti faces* AC M Press, Addison- Weslev 1991

[Zaneaniro et *al* , 1993] Massimo Zancanaro, Oliviero Stock, and (arlo Strapparava Dialogue cohesion sharing and adjusting in an enhanced multimodal environment In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference of Artificial Intelligence*, *C hambery France* page-, 1230- 1236 1993

[ZUP 1994] Victor W Zue loward systems that understand spoken language *IEEFFrpert* 9 51-59 1994