

Situated Natural Language Explanations

Zining Zhu^{1,2,3}, Haoming Jiang¹, Jingfeng Yang¹, Sreyashi Nag¹,
Chao Zhang^{1,4}, Jie Huang^{1,5}, Yifan Gao¹, Frank Rudzicz^{2,3,6}, Bing Yin¹

¹ Amazon Search, ² University of Toronto, ³ Vector Institute of Artificial Intelligence,

⁴ Georgia Institute of Technology, ⁵ University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

⁶ Dalhousie University

zining@cs.toronto.edu

Abstract

Natural language is among the most accessible tools for explaining decisions to humans, and large pretrained language models (PLMs) have demonstrated impressive abilities to generate coherent natural language explanations (NLE). The existing NLE research perspectives do not take the audience into account. An NLE can have high textual quality, but it might not accommodate audiences’ needs and preference. To address this limitation, we propose an alternative perspective, *situated* NLE. On the evaluation side, we set up automated evaluation scores. These scores describe the properties of NLEs in lexical, semantic, and pragmatic categories. On the generation side, we identify three prompt engineering techniques and assess their applicability on the situations. Situated NLE provides a perspective and facilitates further research on the generation and evaluation of explanations.

Warning: The explanations generated by LLMs may contain factually incorrect statements, and they do not reflect the attitudes of the authors.

1 Introduction

Increasingly powerful DNN-based decision-making systems are being deployed to an increasing number of scenarios. However, these systems can be complex and, as a result, there is a need to increase the trustworthiness of the decisions they make. This has led to the development of various methods for explaining the decisions made by these systems (Danilevsky et al., 2020; Zhang & Chen, 2020). Natural language explanations (NLEs) offer an alternative to traditional explanations, such as attribution scores and rationales, by providing human-readable information. A good NLE should be simple and broad (Lombrozo, 2016). A good NLE should also be accurate, coherent, and informative, and it should help to increase the trustworthiness of the decisions being made (Lakkaraju et al., 2022).

Previous studies have largely focused on the reasoning aspects of NLE. We argue that these static approaches may be inadequate because of the implicit assumption that the quality of an explanation is independent of the audience. However, the quality of an explanation also depends on the audience’s needs and preferences (See et al., 2019; Miller, 2017; Achinstein, 1983). Therefore, in addition to the textual aspects of NLE, we should also incorporate the aspects about the audience when studying the problem of explanation.

I searched for “bike”. Why recommend a helmet?

Because California bylaws require bike riders under 18, and recommend those above 18, to legally wear a helmet.



Figure 1: A detailed explanation might be suitable for a careful customer (left) but is not suitable for a customer casually looking around (right) – we need to adapt the explanations to the situations.

To illustrate the importance of considering the audience when generating explanations, consider the following example. In **situation 1 (S1)**, a customer is shopping for a bike and is in a hurry, so they only spend a short time searching. In this situation, an explanation such as “A helmet makes riding bicycles safer” may be sufficient. In contrast, in **situation 2 (S2)**, another customer is careful in choosing a product to buy and wants more detailed information to help them make a decision. In this case, the same explanation may not provide enough information to differentiate between different products. A more informative explanation (for example the NLE shown in Figure 1) is more adequate. These examples demonstrate that it is crucial to consider the situation when generating – and evaluating the quality of – natural language explanations.

This paper first aims at establishing an evaluation framework that describes the properties of the NLEs from lexical, semantic, and pragmatic categories. This framework allows us to quantify how the PLMs generate NLEs when prompted in specific techniques.

We also study how to incorporate the audiences’ needs and preferences in situations when generating the NLEs using large pre-trained language models (PLMs). These models have demonstrated strong reasoning abilities and are capable of generating high-quality explanations (Radford et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2022a; Mishra et al., 2022; Wiegrefe et al., 2022). We propose *situated prompts*, a framework that utilizes either natural language descriptions of the context or desired properties of the explanation to guide the generation of PLMs. We identify three techniques for writing prompts for situated NLEs, and recommend their applications based on the situated evaluation results in an array of settings.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. We advocate for the perspective that the generation and evaluation of NLEs should consider the situations of the audience.
2. A situated evaluation framework with scores in lexical, semantic, and pragmatic categories.
3. Situated prompts, a convenient prompt engineering and selection method to generate situated NLEs in English using large PLMs.

2 Related Work

Natural language explanation Natural languages are especially helpful in explaining problems requiring high-level reasoning. Examples of these problems include inference (Camburu et al., 2020), multiple choice questions requiring commonsense (Rajani et al., 2019), question-answering (Aggarwal et al., 2021) and product recommendations (Chen et al., 2019; Wen et al., 2022). Wiegrefe & Marasović (2021) collected a review of these datasets. They implicitly assume a uniform set of criteria for “good” NLEs. For example, good NLEs should be simple (Lombrozo, 2007), clear and informative (Clinciu et al., 2021). The situation of the explanations’ readers are not part of the problem setting.

As a clarifying sidenote, we consider explanation to be different from rationale – the latter (also beneficial in various ways (Carton et al., 2020)) is a subset of the input tokens, while the former can include external tokens. Jacovi & Goldberg (2021) discusses this issue further. Explanation is almost identical to free-text rationales (Wiegrefe et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2023), except that free-text rationales are more frequently used in the context when the correctness is at high stakes.

Controllable generation Our study is closely related to controllable generation. Applying controls towards various aspects in generating natural languages can be operationalized by imposing constraints to the decoding procedure, for example via reward functions (Qin et al., 2022; Inoue et al., 2021), information bottleneck (Paranjape et al., 2020), additional discriminator (Krause et al., 2021) or Monte-Carlo tree search (Ferreira et al., 2022). Another controllable generation avenue lets the DNN models respond to external “control signals”. Examples of models in this category include diffusion models (Li et al., 2022) and Transformers (Keskar et al., 2019). We defer to Wang et al. (2022) for a more comprehensive review of controllable generation methods. Situated prompts belong to the second category,

but instead of training new DNNs, we leverage the existing interfaces (prompts) to control the PLMs to generate natural languages without fine-tuning.

Human-centered explainable AI Researchers have proposed numerous methods to make AI more explainable, and most of them focus on mechanistic approaches. Their utilities are subject to increasing concerns. Multiple researchers called for more consideration of the human factors when explaining AI (Liao et al., 2022; Boyd-Graber et al., 2022; Yeung et al., 2020; Miller, 2019). Our methodological framework expands the discussion of human-centered explanations to natural language explanations.

Pragmatics and Theory of Mind The research toward human-centered natural language explanations is related to the research of pragmatics. We defer to Fried et al. (2022) for a recent summary of the resources and studies on the pragmatic factors of languages. Recently, several works also found that large PLMs show some capabilities of human-like Theory-of-Mind modeling, but their performances were still far below those of humans (Trott et al., 2022; Sap et al., 2022; Qiu et al., 2021).

3 Situated Evaluation

To quantitatively evaluate the explanations and their suitability to the situations, we propose a *situated evaluation* framework, where several automatic metrics characterize the NLEs from multiple aspects. Automatic evaluation metrics are widely used in the language generation and explanation literature (Carton et al., 2020). Here we consider metrics that describe the generated texts along the lexical, semantic, and pragmatic dimensions. To evaluate the NLEs in various situations, we can focus on different metrics – We briefly describe each metric as follows:

3.1 Lexical category

Length We consider the token length¹ of the generated explanations. Note that the length can be controlled by modifying the generation pipeline (e.g., stop the generation procedure once hitting a set of “termination tokens”).

Self-BLEU Zhu et al. (2018a) proposed self-BLEU to measure the self-repetitiveness of the generation. A higher self-BLEU implies a lower diversity: Each explanation has more overlapping with other explanations. In an extreme case, producing a dummy explanation, “It is what it is” to all problems, will result in a self-BLEU of 1.0.

Type-token ratio (TTR) This score measures the lexical richness of the generation. Type-token ratio is usually used in automatic essay scoring (Ramesh & Sanampudi, 2021) and text-based diagnostic predictions (Zhu et al., 2018b). The maximum possible TTR is 1.0, acquired when all words are unique in this explanation. TTR is usually negatively correlated to self-BLEU.

3.2 Semantic category

BLEU score Papineni et al. (2002) proposed BLEU score, which can be used to evaluate the similarity on the n-gram level between the human-written explanations. BLEU score only applies to the datasets with human-provided explanations.

Concreteness This is the mean concreteness rating (which can be looked up in a table compiled by Köper & Schulte im Walde (2017)) of all words in the explanation, scaled to between 0 and 1. A larger value indicates more concrete choices of words, and vice versa. We refer to this metric as “concreteness” for short.

¹tokenized by NLTK’s word_tokenize

3.3 Pragmatic category

Convincingness Recent literature shows that large PLMs are capable of producing convincing discourse (Lin et al., 2022), which means they are able to compute reasonable scores to evaluate the convincingness of texts with suitable test form. The Convince Me task at BigBench (Srivastava et al., 2022) discusses additional details. Motivated by the analyses, we set up a cloze test that queries a “tester” PLM whether the given explanation is convincing:

S1: Q_A . *Is this choice convincing?* $\langle mask \rangle$.

S2: Q_A because *Explanation*. *Is this choice convincing?* $\langle mask \rangle$.

S3: Q_A because *it is what it is*. *Is this explanation convincing?* $\langle mask \rangle$.²

S4: Q_A because *Explanation*. *Is this explanation convincing?* $\langle mask \rangle$.

Here the Q_A is the problem to be explained. The format is decided based on the dataset – §5.1 contains more details. For each of S1-S4, we use a powerful PLM, *roberta-large*³ as the “tester” that computes the logits of filling in “yes” and “no” to the $\langle mask \rangle$ token. Let $P_i(\text{yes})$ and $P_i(\text{no})$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, denote the logits for S_i . The logit values are affected heavily by other tokens in the vocabulary. To focus on the preference of the tester PLM along the “yes”-“no” spectrum, we take the softmax of the two logits for each sentence:

$$y_i = \frac{e^{P_i(\text{yes})}}{e^{P_i(\text{yes})} + e^{P_i(\text{no})}}.$$

Then, we compute two scores:

$$\text{C.v.no} = \frac{1}{2}(y_2 - y_1 + 1). \tag{1}$$

This is “convincingness versus no explanation”, answering if the explanation improves the convincingness of the *choice*, compared to no explanation.

$$\text{C.v.dummy} = \frac{1}{2}(y_4 - y_3 + 1). \tag{2}$$

This is “convincingness versus dummy”, which answers if the explanation *itself* is more convincing, compared to a dummy explanation. Both convincingness scores range from 0 to 1. A larger value corresponds to a higher likelihood that the belief of a “tester” is changed by the explanation, using a “tester” PLM as a proxy.

Acceptability Wiegrefe et al. (2022) collected human ratings of acceptability of explanations towards commonsense QA problems and released model checkpoints. We use their *t5-large* checkpoint to predict the acceptability of explanations. The acceptability score also ranges from 0 to 1. Intuitively, a higher value indicates that the explanation “matches the facts” in the common sense involved in this problem.

4 Situated Explanation in Natural Languages

4.1 Prompting PLMs for explanation

PLMs can store a massive amount of external information (Burns et al., 2022) and can assemble pieces of information into meaningful discourse. These capacities allow them to generate NLEs that can be comparable to, or even better than human-written NLEs in some aspects (Wiegrefe et al., 2022). There are many ways we can prompt a PLM to generate NLEs. One popular approach is specified by Rajani et al. (2019):

²“it is what it is” is a dummy explanation.

³We also tried several other models including *bert-base-cased*, *xlm-roberta-large*, *gpt-j-6B* on a small set of 30 problems from Rajani et al. (2019). The convincingness results of *roberta-large* correlated to our own annotations the most.

Question and Answer	Model and Situation	Explanation	Scores
Q: "There are 10 apples on an apple tree. Three fall off. Now there are X apples." What is this an example of? Choices: - park - coloring book - garden center - <u>math problem</u> - gravity	Model: ChatGPT Situation: busy	it involves counting and determining the new quantity of apples.	Concreteness: 0.212 C.v_no: 0.571 C.v_dummy: 0.554 Acceptability: 0.187
	Model: ChatGPT Situation: detailed	this scenario involves a mathematical operation of subtracting 3 from 10 to find the remaining number of apples on the tree.	Concreteness: 0.270 C.v_no: 0.523 C.v_dummy: 0.514 Acceptability: 0.494
	Model: Cohere Command Situation: busy	this involves solving for x, an unknown variable, answering a question about quantity which is typically associated with mathematics and math problems.	Concreteness: 0.185 C.v_no: 0.537 C.v_dummy: 0.482 Acceptability: 0.110
	Model: Cohere Command Situation: detailed	This is best described as a math problem because the description includes a quantitative situation that deals with numbers, which is a primary focus in mathematics. If you would like, I can break down the problem for you to better illustrate how it is a mathematical concept.	Concreteness: 0.230 C.v_no: 0.742 C.v_dummy: 0.707 Acceptability: 0.187

Table 1: Examples of PLM-generated NLEs. All settings are 1F_2F_3F (as defined in §4.2) for convenience.

Prompt: *Q_A because*

This prompt appends a term, "because" to the end of Q_A, the question, choices and answer. In general, Q_A is the *explanandum*, the text describing the phenomenon that we want to explain. What follows "because" is the NLE. We refer to this prompt as the "base prompt" henceforth.

4.2 Techniques for writing a situated prompt

We consider three techniques for writing prompts for PLMs to generate situated NLEs.

1. Specify the desired feature This may be the most intuitive approach to pass the information about the situation to the PLM. Alternatively, one can just describe the situation in texts. Following shows an example from each setting.

Do not specify (1F): *Following is an explanation towards a busy audience. Q_A because*
 Specify (1T): *Q_A because, in short*

We are interested in understanding the effects of *explicit* verbalization of the features, so we do not consider the prompts containing both the features and the descriptions.⁴ When the feature specification technique is applied, we denote the setting as 1T. Otherwise, 1F.

2. Simulate an AI-as-an-assistant scenario A recent prompt engineering guideline by OpenAI (OpenAI, 2024) recommended prompting PLMs to adopt a persona. Motivated by this recommendation, we test this strategy: Simulate a scenario where the human and the AI adopt the roles of the user and the assistant, respectively. When this strategy is adopted, the prompt appears in the format of a piece of instruction. We use 2T to denote this application. Otherwise, 2F denotes the setting where prompt is written in a third-person perspective. Following are two examples:

Do not simulate (2F): *Following is an explanation towards a busy audience. Q_A because*
 Simulate (2T): *You are a helpful assistant explaining to a busy audience. Q_A because*

Note that multiple techniques can be applied in parallel. For example, the prompt "*You are a helpful assistant explaining to a busy audience. Q_A because*" adopts the AI-as-an-assistant

⁴From our experience, the prompts specifying both the feature and the situations are also harder to write and incorporate with other prompting techniques.

technique but not the feature specification technique, leading to a 1F_2T pattern. The prompt “*You are a helpful assistant. I prefer short explanations. Q_A because*” applies both techniques, and has a 1T_2T pattern.

3. Elicit the NLE with complete sentences By default, appending the term “because” to the end of explanandum elicits the NLEs. What if we use a complete sentence to hint at the occurrence of an NLEs? Following show two examples:

Just use “because” (3F): *You are a helpful assistant explaining to a busy audience. Q_A because*
 Use a complete sentence (3T): *You are a helpful assistant explaining the following question to a busy audience. Q_A.*

The three design choices are relatively orthogonal. The above two examples can be tagged as 1F_2T_3F and 1F_2T_3T, respectively. In total, the choices to apply the three techniques constitute of eight *settings*: 1T_2T_3T through 1F_2F_3F.

5 Experiment Setup

5.1 Data

CoS-E Rajani et al. (2019) collected 10,962 questions (9,741 for training, and 1,221 for validation). Each data sample contains a question q , multiple choices c , and an answer a . Correctly answering the questions requires some commonsense knowledge. The CoS-E dataset includes both abstractive explanations (explaining using the annotators’ own words) and extractive explanations (explaining using the words in the data sample). To evaluate the BLEU score, we use the abstractive explanations. We take the first 1,000 items in the training set, allowing efficient computations with reasonably strong statistical power. The dataset is loaded through huggingface’s datasets (Lhoest et al., 2021) library.

5.2 Models

We use gpt-3.5-turbo (Ouyang et al., 2022), Cohere command, Llama2-7B (MetaAI, 2024) and Pythia-2.8B (Biderman et al., 2023) models. We also include GPT2- $\{base, medium, large\}$ models (Radford et al., 2019) to run some proof-of-concept studies. They contain 124M, 355M, and 774M parameters, respectively. More information is listed in Appendix A.

5.3 Prompts

The prompts to the PLM are dynamically populated by filling in the contents (question, choices, and answer) of each datapoint based on prompt templates. In addition to the base prompt template, we manually write multiple prompt templates with and without the application of each of the three techniques (i.e., spanning across eight settings). Altogether, 68 prompt templates are written. The full list of the prompt templates is included in the Supplementary Material.

As an illustration, following lists the prompt templates in the 1F_2T_3F setting:

You are a helpful assistant explaining to a busy audience. Q_A because
You are a helpful assistant explaining to me, and I think on an abstract level. Q_A because
You are a helpful assistant explaining to me, and I am busy. Q_A because
You are a helpful assistant telling me the cause of a problem, and I have five seconds to listen. Q_A because

5.4 Situations

We consider two situations, which we refer to as “busy” and “detailed”, respectively. For each of the two situations, we write prompt templates for each of the eight settings (1T_2T_3T through 1F_2F_3F). When writing the templates, we keep the sentence structures of the prompts in a one-to-one matching across the two situations, whenever possible.

6 Results

6.1 Situated prompts only work for larger models

We first assess how the scores are adapted by the prompting techniques. We specify eight prompting settings in §4.2. Among these eight prompting settings, how many of them can achieve a significant difference between the two situations?

For each setting, we run a paired two-tailed t -test (dof = 999, Bonferroni corrected) across the scores of the two situation-settings, where the scores of each situation-setting is averaged across all prompt templates in that setting, offsetting the randomness of the PLM’s language generation.

Table 2 shows the number of settings where there are significant differences across the “busy” and the “detailed” situations. The larger models, Chat and Cohere, respond to almost all of the situated prompting techniques, with Chat being more responsive. The smaller models, Llama2-7B and Pythia-2.8B, responded to only a few of the situated prompts, indicating that these smaller models do not have sufficient discourse capability to process the commands encoded in the prompts.

How about those even smaller models? GPT2-`{base,medium,large}` models are able to generate coherent and meaningful explanations – Table 5 contains some examples. However, they respond to situated prompts poorly, and their NLEs have less convincingsness scores than the NLEs generated by the largest models.

6.2 Effects of the situated prompts

What are the effects of the situated prompts, as evaluated by the scores? We apply a paired two-tailed t -test across the scores in the busy situation and the detailed situation, each of which averaged across all prompt templates in the situation.

Table 3 shows the comparison results. The columns of Llama2-7B and Pythia-2.8B models show more varying effects, and we focus on the two larger models in the following analysis. Compared to the “busy” situation, the prompts for the “detailed” situation elicit NLEs that are longer with less lexical diversity. The “detailed” situation NLEs usually appear more convincing as evaluated by the proxy model. These match our expectations for explanations in a situation when the audience seeks for details.

Score	Chat	Cohere	Llama-7B	Pythia-2.8B
Length	8	8	0	2
Self-BLEU	8	8	2	2
TTR	8	8	0	3
BLEU	8	6	0	1
Concreteness	7	4	1	1
C.v_no	8	5	3	2
C.v_dummy	8	5	3	1
Acceptability	8	5	1	1

Table 2: Efficacy towards those scores. 8 indicates that the score significantly differs across the two situations, and 0 indicates that this score remains insignificantly changed.

Score	Chat	Cohere	Llama2-7B	Pythia-2.8B
Length	<	<	Varies	<
Self-BLEU	<	Varies	>	<
TTR	>	>	Varies	Varies
BLEU	>	>	Varies	<
Concreteness	>	>	<	>
C.v_no	<	<	Varies	<
C.v_dummy	<	<	Varies	<
Acceptability	Varies	Varies	<	<

Table 3: Busy vs detailed situation effects. < indicates the score is significantly smaller in the “busy” situation than the “detailed” situation, consistently across all eight prompting techniques. “Varies” means the comparison result depends on the prompting techniques.

<i>Situation: busy</i>	Chat			Cohere		
	Technique 1	Technique 2	Technique 3	Technique 1	Technique 2	Technique 3
Length	<	Varies	>	Varies	Varies	>
Self-BLEU	Varies	<	>	Insignificant	>	>
TTR	>	>	<	Varies	Varies	<
BLEU	Varies	>	>	Insignificant	<	<
Concreteness	>	>	<	>	Varies	<
C_v_no	<	Varies	>	<	>	>
C_v_dummy	<	Varies	>	<	>	>
Acceptability	>	Varies	>	>	>	Insignificant

<i>Situation: busy</i>	Chat			Cohere		
	Technique 1	Technique 2	Technique 3	Technique 1	Technique 2	Technique 3
Length	<	Varies	>	Varies	>	>
BLEU	Varies	Varies	<	<	<	Insignificant
Self-BLEU	Varies	Varies	>	<	Varies	>
TTR	Varies	Varies	<	Varies	Varies	<
Concreteness	Varies	Varies	<	>	<	<
C_v_no	Varies	Varies	>	>	>	Varies
C_v_dummy	Varies	Varies	>	>	>	>
Acceptability	Varies	>	Varies	>	>	Varies

Table 4: Effects of the prompting techniques. Here < (>) means that the prompting technique, when applied, leads to a smaller (larger) value in the score, and this effect is consistent across settings. Otherwise, the effects are marked as “Varies” if there exists settings with significant effects with conflicting signs or “Insignificant” if no significant effect is observed in any setting.

There is one perhaps counter-intuitive result: the “detailed” situation NLEs usually contains less concrete (more abstract) words on average. One possible interpretation of this result is: compared to the short NLEs, the detailed NLEs contain some high-level summary and even some meta-discourses, which pulls up the average word abstractness.

Another interesting observation is that the effects of the acceptability rating varies across the prompting setting. Apparently, comparably acceptable NLEs can be generated by the PLMs regardless of the situations.

6.3 What are the effects of prompt writing technique?

To test the effect of applying a technique, we compare the scores across “paired settings” using a two-tailed paired *t*-test (dof = 999). Here a “pair setting” refers to two settings where only one of the three techniques is applied differently. For example, 1T_2F_3T and 1F_2F_3T is a pair of setting for testing the effects of technique 1. There are four such pairs of settings for each technique.

Table 4 lists the effects of the three techniques on each of the scores, for the Chat and Cohere models. We list the two situations separately since the effects are different. If significant effect is observed in none of the four pairs of settings, we mark this technique as “Insignificant”. If significant effects are observed but in different signs, we mark this technique as “Varies”, indicating that the effect of this technique on this score may depend on the applications of other techniques. Some common patterns are listed as follows.

Technique 1: Specify the desired features The effect of this technique varies by situation and the PLM. In the “busy” situation and the Chat model, all but one score (length) demonstrate varying effects. In other situations, there are usually consistent effects but that depend on the PLM. Note that in some preliminary experiments, we found that the prompts containing both the desired features and the scenario descriptions led to some situation adaption effects. However, rigorous tests in combination of other techniques are left for future works. Overall, the evidence for this feature specification technique is insufficient for making a recommendation.

Technique 2: Simulate an AI-as-assistant scenario The effects of this technique also heavily depend on the situation and the models. For the Chat model, half of the scores show varying effects in the “busy” situation, and almost all scores show varying effects in the “detailed” situation. For the Cohere model, simulating such a scenario show some significant effects, but many settings exhibit *different* results from the Chat model. In general, the utility of simulating “giving instructions” to PLMs vary across the models. This is perhaps due to the fact that the Chat and Cohere models have been trained with proprietary instruction tuning procedures with different datasets. We recommend experimenting both with and without this technique on the specific PLMs.

Technique 3: Use complete sentences to elicit NLEs Among the three techniques, this one has the most consistent effects for the NLEs’ text features. When using complete sentences, the elicited NLEs have greater lengths, less lexical richness, lower concreteness and higher convincingness ratings. This pattern appears mostly consistent across the two situations and the two PLMs – with Chat adhering better than Cohere. In general, in scenarios where longer, more abstract, and more convincing NLEs are desired, we recommend applying this “complete-sentence prompt” technique.

7 Discussion

Generalization to more situations The evaluations only involved two simulated situations – where the audience is either busy or detail-oriented. However, the scores listed in this paper implicitly describes many more situations: The importance of these scores can vary depending on the situation. Once the desired features of NLEs are specified in those new situations, we believe that the corresponding prompting techniques can be applied.

Good explanations should be both faithful and suitable Faithfulness has been a requirement for explanations. Jacovi & Goldberg (2020) stated that the explanations should correctly reflect the reasoning path of the model decisions. We defer to Lyu et al. (2023) for a review of faithfulness in explanations. Being suited to the situations is an extension of the faithfulness requirement: there may be multiple correct paths toward the same decision, but we need to emphasize the suitable path and present in a suitable manner to the audience. Recently, Han et al. (2022) considered from a local function approximation perspective and stated a “no free lunch” theorem for explanations – an explanation cannot be faithful in all possible neighborhoods simultaneously. A similar argument applies to the situated explanation problem: an NLE cannot be faithful in all possible situations. Feng & Boyd-Graber (2022) formulates a contextual bandit problem and lets explanation systems learn the users’ needs in each scenario.

Explanation involves more than reasoning Recently, automatic reasoning has attracted increasing discussions. We consider explanation to be a more general task than reasoning, and explanation deserves more tools to solve. This is because explanation is a process of communication, which involves more than just the construction of logic. Many recently proposed methods, especially those involving PLMs, e.g., chain-of-thought (Wei et al., 2022b) and maieutic prompting (Jung et al., 2022), can be applied to improve performance in both reasoning and explanations. However, we note that evaluating communication procedures involves both subjective and objective aspects – and the former is probably more important – but the evaluation of logical arguments only involves the objective aspect.

8 Conclusion

This paper identifies the problem of *situated* natural language explanations. We use large PLMs to generate situated NLEs by situated prompts. We specify evaluation protocols to quantify the situation-based adaptation effects of the generated NLEs. With controlled settings, we study three techniques for writing situated prompts based on the situations and provide recommendations of usage. We call for incorporating more factors about the audience in future research on natural language explanations.

Ethics and reproducibility statement

This paper identifies the situated NLE problem and provides some initial solutions. There are some improvement areas in the generation and evaluation of NLEs.

Plausible explanations In the experiments, we observe that many generated explanations appear “plausible” – they appear coherent but can be stronger pragmatically. Quantitative studies about plausibility, and other evaluations, are left to future works. Many generated NLEs contain hallucinations – the PLMs insert information that is irrelevant to the problems.

Few-shot demonstrations To improve the generation of situated explanations, few-shot demonstrations might be insufficient (Ye & Durrett, 2022). Few-shot demonstration introduces several additional problems, including 1) how to select the proper demonstration example, and 2) since PLMs like to copy-paste from the prompts, how to avoid the injected bias in the demonstration examples. A current limiting factor for situated NLEs is the lack of understanding of the prompt semantics by the PLM. In the near future, PLMs will be able to respond to natural language commands adequately, so we consider zero-shot prompting a more suitable path for generating NLEs.

Other generation methods Additional structural constraints can be applied in various steps along the generation pipeline. For example, constrained decoding can enhance fine-grained controls in NLE generations. Additional post-processing approaches, including text editing, etc., can be explored. Also, bidirectional PLMs can be used to write situated explanations.

Risks in modeling users’ situations As Shah & Bender (2022) points out, the AI systems that involve modeling the users’ situations introduce more concerns on trustworthiness and transparency than ever before. To ensure the maximum transparency, we reveal the quantitative scores that describe the situations, and do not impose prior preferences on the scores. When developing NLE systems for target situations, future researchers can adapt the importance of the evaluation scores to their needs.

Broader Impacts As generative AI technologies become more capable, they will be deployed to a wider range of situations than ever before. There will be more communications between humans and AI assistants, and many of them will be natural language explanations. Our work pushes along the route that improves the quality of NLE and make the generative AI technologies more useful to humans.

References

- Peter Achinstein. *The nature of explanation*. Oxford University Press on Demand, 1983.
- Shourya Aggarwal, Divyanshu Mandowara, Vishwajeet Agrawal, Dinesh Khandelwal, Parag Singla, and Dinesh Garg. Explanations for CommonsenseQA: New Dataset and Models. In *ACL*, pp. 3050–3065, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.238. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.238>.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Gregory Anthony, Herbie Bradley, Kyle O’Brien, Eric Hallahan, Mohammad Aflah Khan, Shivanshu Purohit, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Edward Raff, et al. Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2397–2430. PMLR, 2023.
- Jordan Boyd-Graber, Samuel Carton, Shi Feng, Q. Vera Liao, Tania Lombrozo, Alison Smith-Renner, and Chenhao Tan. Human-centered evaluation of explanations. In *NAACL: Tutorial Abstracts*, pp. 26–32, Seattle, United States, July 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-tutorials.4. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.naacl-tutorials.4>.

- Collin Burns, Haotian Ye, Dan Klein, and Jacob Steinhardt. Discovering latent knowledge in language models without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03827*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2212.03827.pdf>.
- Oana-Maria Camburu, Brendan Shillingford, Pasquale Minervini, Thomas Lukasiewicz, and Phil Blunsom. Make Up Your Mind! Adversarial Generation of Inconsistent Natural Language Explanations. In *ACL*, pp. 4157–4165, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.382. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.382>.
- Samuel Carton, Anirudh Rathore, and Chenhao Tan. Evaluating and characterizing human rationales. In *EMNLP*, pp. 9294–9307, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.747. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-main.747>.
- Hanjie Chen, Faeze Brahman, Xiang Ren, Yangfeng Ji, Yejin Choi, and Swabha Swayamdipta. REV: Information-theoretic evaluation of free-text rationales. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 2007–2030, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.112. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.112>.
- Hanxiong Chen, Xu Chen, Shaoyun Shi, and Yongfeng Zhang. Generate natural language explanations for recommendation. *SIGIR Workshop on Explainable Recommendation and Search*, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.03392>.
- Miruna-Adriana Clinciu, Arash Eshghi, and Helen Hastie. A study of automatic metrics for the evaluation of natural language explanations. In *EACL*, pp. 2376–2387, Online, April 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.eacl-main.202. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.eacl-main.202>.
- Marina Danilevsky, Kun Qian, Ranit Aharonov, Yannis Katsis, Ban Kawas, and Prithviraj Sen. A survey of the state of explainable AI for natural language processing. In *AAACL*, pp. 447–459, Suzhou, China, December 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.aacl-main.46>.
- Shi Feng and Jordan Boyd-Graber. Learning to Explain Selectively: A Case Study on Question Answering. In *EMNLP*, pp. 12, 2022. URL http://www.shifeng.umiacs.io/docs/2022_augment_preprint.pdf.
- Lucas N Ferreira, Lili Mou, Jim Whitehead, and Levi HS Lelis. Controlling perceived emotion in symbolic music generation with monte carlo tree search. *18th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.05162>.
- Daniel Fried, Nicholas Tomlin, Jennifer Hu, Roma Patel, and Aida Nematzadeh. Pragmatics in Grounded Language Learning: Phenomena, Tasks, and Modeling Approaches, November 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.08371>.
- Tessa Han, Suraj Srinivas, and Himabindu Lakkaraju. Which Explanation Should I Choose? A Function Approximation Perspective to Characterizing Post hoc Explanations. In *NeurIPS*. arXiv, 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2206.01254>.
- Naoya Inoue, Harsh Trivedi, Steven Sinha, Niranjan Balasubramanian, and Kentaro Inui. Summarize-then-answer: Generating concise explanations for multi-hop reading comprehension. In *EMNLP*, pp. 6064–6080, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.490. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.490>.
- Alon Jacovi and Yoav Goldberg. Towards faithfully interpretable NLP systems: How should we define and evaluate faithfulness? In *ACL*, pp. 4198–4205, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.386. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.386>.

- Alon Jacovi and Yoav Goldberg. Aligning faithful interpretations with their social attribution. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:294–310, 2021. doi: 10.1162/tacl.a.00367. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.tacl-1.18>.
- Jaehun Jung, Lianhui Qin, Sean Welleck, Faeze Brahman, Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. Maieutic prompting: Logically consistent reasoning with recursive explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11822*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.11822>.
- Nitish Shirish Keskar, Bryan McCann, Lav R Varshney, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Ctrl: A conditional transformer language model for controllable generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05858*, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.05858>.
- Maximilian Köper and Sabine Schulte im Walde. Improving verb metaphor detection by propagating abstractness to words, phrases and individual senses. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Sense, Concept and Entity Representations and their Applications*, pp. 24–30, Valencia, Spain, April 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W17-1903. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W17-1903>.
- Ben Krause, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Bryan McCann, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Shafiq Joty, Richard Socher, and Nazneen Fatema Rajani. GeDi: Generative discriminator guided sequence generation. In *EMNLP Findings*, pp. 4929–4952, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.findings-emnlp.424. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.findings-emnlp.424>.
- Himabindu Lakkaraju, Dylan Slack, Yuxin Chen, Chenhao Tan, and Sameer Singh. Rethinking explainability as a dialogue: A practitioner’s perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01875*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.01875>.
- Quentin Lhoest, Albert Villanova del Moral, Yacine Jernite, Abhishek Thakur, Patrick von Platen, Suraj Patil, Julien Chaumond, Mariama Drame, Julien Plu, Lewis Tunstall, Joe Davison, Mario Šaško, Gunjan Chhablani, Bhavitvya Malik, Simon Brandeis, Teven Le Scao, Victor Sanh, Canwen Xu, Nicolas Patry, Angelina McMillan-Major, Philipp Schmid, Sylvain Gugger, Clément Delangue, Théo Matussière, Lysandre Debut, Stas Bekman, Pierric Cistac, Thibault Goehringer, Victor Mustar, François Lagunas, Alexander Rush, and Thomas Wolf. Datasets: A community library for natural language processing. In *EMNLP*, pp. 175–184, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-demo.21>.
- Xiang Lisa Li, John Thickstun, Ishaan Gulrajani, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Diffusion-LM Improves Controllable Text Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14217*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.14217>.
- Q Vera Liao, Yunfeng Zhang, Ronny Luss, Finale Doshi-Velez, and Amit Dhurandhar. Connecting algorithmic research and usage contexts: A perspective of contextualized evaluation for explainable ai. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, volume 10, pp. 147–159, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.10847>.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In *ACL*, pp. 3214–3252, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.229. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.229>.
- Tania Lombrozo. Simplicity and probability in causal explanation. *Cognitive psychology*, 55(3):232–257, 2007.
- Tania Lombrozo. Explanatory Preferences Shape Learning and Inference. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(10):748–759, October 2016. ISSN 13646613. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S136466131630105X>.

- Qing Lyu, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. Towards Faithful Model Explanation in NLP: A Survey, February 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.11326>.
- MetaAI. LLaMA 2 - Meta AI, 2024. URL <https://ai.meta.com/llama/>.
- Tim Miller. Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences.(2017), 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.07269>.
- Tim Miller. Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. *Artificial Intelligence*, 267:1–38, February 2019. ISSN 0004-3702. doi: 10.1016/j.artint.2018.07.007. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0004370218305988>.
- Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Reframing Instructional Prompts to GPTk’s Language. In *ACL Findings*, pp. 589–612, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.findings-acl.50. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-acl.50>.
- OpenAI. Prompt Engineering, 2024. URL <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompt-engineering/strategy-write-clear-instructions>.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.02155*, 2022.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *ACL*, pp. 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, July 2002. doi: 10.3115/1073083.1073135. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P02-1040>.
- Bhargavi Paranjape, Mandar Joshi, John Thickstun, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. An information bottleneck approach for controlling conciseness in rationale extraction. In *EMNLP*, pp. 1938–1952, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.153. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-main.153>.
- Lianhui Qin, Sean Welleck, Daniel Khashabi, and Yejin Choi. COLD Decoding: Energy-based Constrained Text Generation with Langevin Dynamics. In *NeurIPS*, March 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2202.11705>.
- Liang Qiu, Yizhou Zhao, Yuan Liang, Pan Lu, Weiyan Shi, Zhou Yu, and Song-Chun Zhu. Towards socially intelligent agents with mental state transition and human utility. *SIGDIAL*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.07011>.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, and others. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. URL <https://openai.com/blog/better-language-models/>.
- Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Explain Yourself! Leveraging Language Models for Commonsense Reasoning. In *ACL*, pp. 4932–4942, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1487. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1487>.
- Dadi Ramesh and Suresh Kumar Sanampudi. An automated essay scoring systems: a systematic literature review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, pp. 1–33, 2021. URL <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10462-021-10068-2>.
- Maarten Sap, Ronan LeBras, Daniel Fried, and Yejin Choi. Neural theory-of-mind? On the limits of social intelligence in large LMs. In *EMNLP*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.13312>.
- Abigail See, Stephen Roller, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. What makes a good conversation? how controllable attributes affect human judgments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.08654*, 2019.

- Chirag Shah and Emily M. Bender. Situating Search. In *CHIIR '22*, pp. 221–232, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-9186-3. doi: 10.1145/3498366.3505816. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498366.3505816>.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, and others. Beyond the Imitation Game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.04615>.
- Sean Trott, Cameron Jones, Tyler Chang, James Michaelov, and Benjamin Bergen. Do large language models know what humans know? *arXiv*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.01515>.
- Shiyu Wang, Yuanqi Du, Xiaojie Guo, Bo Pan, and Liang Zhao. Controllable data generation by deep learning: A review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.09542*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.09542>.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=yzkSU5zdWd>.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903*, 2022b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903>.
- Bingbing Wen, Yunhe Feng, Yongfeng Zhang, and Chirag Shah. ExpScore: Learning Metrics for Recommendation Explanation. In *WWW '22*, pp. 3740–3744, New York, NY, USA, April 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-9096-5. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485447.3512269>.
- Sarah Wiegrefe and Ana Marasović. Teach me to explain: A review of datasets for explainable nlp. In *NeurIPS*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.12060>.
- Sarah Wiegrefe, Ana Marasović, and Noah A Smith. Measuring association between labels and free-text rationales. In *EMNLP*, 2021.
- Sarah Wiegrefe, Jack Hessel, Swabha Swayamdipta, Mark Riedl, and Yejin Choi. Reframing human-AI collaboration for generating free-text explanations. In *NAACL-HLT*, pp. 632–658, Seattle, United States, July 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.47. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.naacl-main.47>.
- Xi Ye and Greg Durrett. The Unreliability of Explanations in Few-shot Prompting for Textual Reasoning. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.03401>.
- Arnold Yeung, Shalmali Joshi, Joseph-Jay Williams, and Frank Rudzicz. Sequential Explanations with Mental Model-Based Policies. In *ICML 2020 Workshop on Human Interpretability in Machine Learning (WHI)*, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2007.09028>.
- Yongfeng Zhang and Xu Chen. Explainable Recommendation: A Survey and New Perspectives. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 14(1):1–101, 2020. ISSN 1554-0669, 1554-0677. doi: 10.1561/15000000066. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1804.11192>.
- Yaoming Zhu, Sidi Lu, Lei Zheng, Jiaxian Guo, Weinan Zhang, Jun Wang, and Yong Yu. Taxygen: A benchmarking platform for text generation models. In *SIGIR*, pp. 1097–1100, 2018a. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1802.01886.pdf>.
- Zining Zhu, Jekaterina Novikova, and Frank Rudzicz. Semi-supervised classification by reaching consensus among modalities. *NeurIPS IRASL Workshop*, 2018b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.09366>.

A More details about models

ChatGPT With instruction fine-tuning and reinforcement learning from human feedback, gpt-3.5-turbo (Ouyang et al., 2022) is one of the most powerful PLMs provided by OpenAI. We use the default sampling hyperparameters and an empty system message. In the remaining of this paper, we refer to this model as Chat for short.

Cohere The Cohere command model is trained to follow instructions and participate in conversations. We use the default sampling hyperparameters in the text generation mode. In the rest of this paper, we refer to this model as Cohere for short.

Llama2-7B The Llama2 models (MetaAI, 2024) are pretrained on 2 trillion tokens. We consider the 7B version, as a model smaller than Chat and Cohere, to test the generalizability of situated prompting methods. We use the huggingface’s text-generation pipeline.

Pythia-2.8B The Pythia project (Biderman et al., 2023) released a series of checkpoints of PLMs with varying sizes. We take the 2.8B version, to test if the situated prompting methods generalize to a model smaller than 7B parameters. We use the huggingface’s text-generation pipeline.

B Examples of explanations

Table 5 shows some explanations generated by GPT2 models.

Question and Answer	Explanation	Scores
Q: Creating art fulfilled me, what else did it give me therefor?	they were the work? that was all to be achieved. of course I knew that if I had never had that feeling of accomplishment I would never have been able to write fiction, I wouldn’t have had any of that. that was all the work that I had. I would	Concreteness: 0.123 C.v_no: 0.667 C.v_dummy: 0.709 Acceptability: 0.149
Choices: - strong emotion - work of art - communication - <u>feeling of accomplishment</u> - scholarship	I could make something out of the few scraps of life I had?	Concreteness: 0.251 C.v_no: 0.398 C.v_dummy: 0.419 Acceptability: 0.185
	I created something that I loved to do.	Concreteness: 0.124 C.v_no: 0.502 C.v_dummy: 0.441 Acceptability: 0.750

Table 5: Examples of high-quality explanations by GPT2 (base, medium, and large models), using the basic prompts. Small models like GPT2 can sometimes generate meaningful NLEs. However, on average, the syntactical correctness and coherence of their NLEs are worse than the NLEs generated by larger models.