

# Towards a Neural Era in Dialogue Management for Collaboration: A Literature Survey

Amogh Mannekote

University of Florida

amogh.mannekote@ufl.edu

## Abstract

Dialogue-based human-AI collaboration can revolutionize collaborative problem-solving, creative exploration, and social support. To realize this goal, the development of automated agents proficient in skills such as negotiating, following instructions, establishing common ground, and progressing shared tasks is essential. This survey begins by reviewing the evolution of dialogue management paradigms in collaborative dialogue systems, from traditional handcrafted and information-state based methods to AI planning-inspired approaches. It then shifts focus to contemporary data-driven dialogue management techniques, which seek to transfer deep learning successes from form-filling and open-domain settings to collaborative contexts. The paper proceeds to analyze a selected set of recent works that apply neural approaches to collaborative dialogue management, spotlighting prevailing trends in the field. This survey hopes to provide foundational background for future advancements in collaborative dialogue management, particularly as the dialogue systems community continues to embrace the potential of large language models.

## 1 Introduction

Human collaboration through dialogue is a fundamental aspect of our everyday lives, as we often engage in conversations to work together, solve problems, and achieve shared goals (Streeck et al., 2011). However, effective collaboration through dialogue is a complex process, as it requires the participants to take turns, negotiate meaning (Clark and Brennan, 1991), coordinate actions (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986), and manage conflicts (Traum et al., 2008), all while maintaining a shared understanding of the task at hand. These factors contribute to the complexity of building an automated dialogue system that can act as a collaborative partner to one or more humans.

It has been a longstanding goal in dialogue systems research to develop domain-specific systems,

general-purpose frameworks, and algorithms to build automated agents that can act as collaborative partners to human users (Rich et al., 2001; Bohus and Rudnicky, 2009; Allen et al., 2002; Galescu et al., 2018). However, most approaches that pre-date the use of neural network models require some form of manual labor to extend their functionality to a new domain. Recently, the advent of deep learning based approaches ushered in a new era of data-driven methods for carrying out various tasks within a dialogue system, including natural language understanding (Louvan and Magnini, 2020; Shah et al., 2019), dialogue management (Mrkšić et al., 2016; Ren et al., 2018), and natural language generation (Wen et al., 2015; Santhanam and Shaikh, 2019). In fact, a long line of work from the mid-2010s has produced success stories in the realms of form-filling agents (e.g., used to carry out tasks such as booking a restaurant table on behalf of the user) and open-domain agents (also called chatbots, which engage in open-ended conversation with the user with no particular end-goal). Nevertheless, compared to form-filling and open-domain agents, there has been a paucity in both theoretical advances and practical implementations that use neural-network based approaches to build agents for collaborative dialogue.

In this survey, I first explore traditional dialogue management paradigms used for over three decades in developing automated agents for collaborative dialogue. Dialogue management paradigms are abstract computational models offering guidelines for processing inputs, guiding conversations, and maintaining context. Concrete data structures and algorithms translate these paradigms into functioning systems. I provide a concise description of each paradigm, emphasizing its applications in collaborative contexts, in Section 4.

The survey then narrows its focus to neural network-based approaches for collaborative dialogue management. Since the mid-2010s, various

methodologies have sought to combine traditional paradigm strengths with the representational flexibility of neural networks. This integration involves modifying standard end-to-end neural architectures, typically used for form-filling and open-domain settings, which is explored in Section 5.

This literature survey systematically explores these themes through the following two research questions (RQs):

- **RQ 1:** What dialogue management approaches have been utilized to develop collaborative dialogue agents?
- **RQ 2:** What techniques have been applied to adapt neural network based dialogue management approaches to collaborative settings?

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides background on collaborative dialogue systems and the dialogue management problem. In Section 3, I list the research questions and discuss the literature search process. Section 4 examines various design paradigms for building collaborative dialogue managers. Before answering RQ 2, Section 4.5.1 outlines challenges faced by neural approaches to collaborative dialogue management. In Section 5, I focus on adaptations made to neural-network-based dialogue management approaches for collaborative settings. Section 6 discusses survey findings and future research directions, while 7 concludes the survey with a summary.

## 2 Background

This section begins by providing a working definition of collaborative dialogue systems. Then, it highlights the role of the dialogue manager within a dialogue system, which is the module responsible for guiding the conversation.

### 2.1 Defining Collaborative Dialogue Systems

Collaborative dialogue systems are designed to collaborate with human users to achieve one or more shared goals, such as co-creating an artifact or navigating a physical environment (Streeck et al., 2011). These systems must support functions such as negotiating shared goals and developing a mental model of the human user. To better understand collaborative dialogue systems, it is helpful to first introduce

two other types of dialogue agents: form-filling assistants and chatbots, and then contrast them with collaborative dialogue agents.

Form-filling assistants, also known as task-oriented dialogue systems (Williams et al., 2014a), perform tasks on the user’s behalf, such as reserving a table or booking a flight. However, they do not possess their own goals or agency. Chatbots, on the other hand, engage users in open-ended conversations without specific goals, making them non-collaborative as well (Huang et al., 2020). In contrast to these two types of dialogue agents, collaborative dialogue agents play a variety of roles that involve working together with the human user.

Some examples of roles that collaborative dialogue agents may assume include that of an information giver (providing step-by-step instructions to the human user to follow), a collaborative partner (planning and working together with the human to complete a task), a tutor (helping the human user learn a concept or a skill), and even an opponent (in a negotiation setting or within the context of a game). These agents have their own goals that may be slightly or even greatly different from that of the human user (e.g., an agent designed to bargain with a human).

### 2.2 Role of the Dialogue Manager

Computational approaches to dialogue serves two distinct purposes: dialogue modeling and dialogue management (Traum, 2017). Dialogue modeling focuses on understanding and explaining conversation dynamics without actively participating. In contrast, dialogue management involves deciding what to say next based on the dialogue context, thereby enabling the agent to actively participate in the conversation. This survey is specifically concerned with dialogue management.

The dialogue manager guides the conversation within a dialogue system. Conceptually, it can be divided into representation and decision-making. Figure 1 shows a standard pipeline architecture of a dialogue system. Note that while most dialogue systems can be factored into these components, it may not always be the case. In this pipeline architecture, dialogue management is carried out jointly by the state tracker and the dialogue policy. The representation, or dialogue state, provides an internal summary of the current dialogue status, which needs to be continuously updated throughout the conversation. The decision-making aspect, or dia-

logue policy, determines the most suitable action based on the dialogue state and other relevant factors, such as the state of a shared task. In some approaches, such as rudimentary script-based approaches, these two functions may be inseparably coupled into a single functional module.




Figure 1: A pipeline-based architecture of a dialogue system, comprising modules for natural language understanding (NLU), state tracking, dialogue policy, and natural language generation (NLG). The state tracking and dialogue policy are jointly responsible for carrying out the function of dialogue management.

### 3 Methods

This section outlines the search methodology, including the inclusion and exclusion criteria employed to select relevant works for the literature survey. Then, it details the approach taken to identify the modeling themes for answering RQ 2.

#### 3.1 Search Strategies

The search strategy for RQ 1 and RQ 2 were conducted independently.

##### 3.1.1 Search Strategy for RQ 1

To address RQ 1, the search began with a curated “seed” collection of influential works presenting foundational dialogue management paradigms for collaborative dialogue. Additional works were identified through the reference lists of these highly cited publications (snowballing). Specifically, the inclusion and exclusion criteria for this RQ were as follows:

- **IC1:** The work should present either a novel paradigm of dialogue management or a domain-independent framework that can be leveraged to develop a wide range of domain-specific dialogue systems.
- **IC2:** A sizeable number of practical dialogue system implementations should be implemented using the paradigm.

- **IC3:** The dialogue management paradigm should have been used to develop one or more of the following types of collaborative agents: collaborative problem-solving, negotiation, or tutoring.
- **EC1:** The system or framework should not specific to one particular domain, in which case it cannot be considered to be a “paradigm.”

From reviewing these combined set of works, I identified five distinct paradigms of collaborative dialogue management: script-based, plan-based, information-state based, those based on Allen et al. (2002)’s collaborative problem solving (CPS) framework, and neural-network based approaches.

##### 3.1.2 Search Strategy for RQ 2

For RQ 2, a separate and distinct search was conducted with the goal of discovering neural network-based approaches to developing collaborative dialogue managers. A targeted search was performed using terms such as “collaborative dialogue systems,” “collaborative dialogue state,” and “collaborative dialogue” across Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL) and search engines such as Zeta Alpha<sup>1</sup>, Semantic Scholar<sup>2</sup>, and Google Scholar<sup>3</sup>. The inclusion and exclusion criteria for selecting papers were applied specifically for RQ 2, as follows:

- **IC1:** Inclusion of neural network-based approaches to developing collaborative dialogue managers.
- **IC2:** Consideration of works primarily published post-2016, reflecting the emergence of neural network approaches during this period.
- **IC3:** Negotiation dialogue systems; although commonly characterized as non-collaborative dialogue, these systems were included as negotiation frequently features in collaborative dialogue during planning and shared goal setting.
- **EC1:** Exclusion of works that lack a data-driven, neural network-based dialogue manager implementation.

<sup>1</sup>zeta-alpha.com

<sup>2</sup>semanticscholar.org

<sup>3</sup>scholar.google.com

- **EC2:** Exclusion of studies focusing on multi-party collaborative dialogue systems, with the scope limited to two-party systems.

The final set of papers was derived from a combination of this search strategy for RQ 2 and additional publications discovered through the citation networks of these articles that also fit these criteria.

#### **4 RQ 1: What dialogue management approaches have been utilized to develop collaborative dialogue agents?**

In this section, I describe script-based, plan-based, information-state, and neural-network based paradigms to collaborative dialogue management. In addition, I also describe the Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) framework, which was designed specially with collaborative dialogue management in mind. Except for the CPS framework, I begin with a general description of each paradigm and then touch upon how they have been used specifically for collaborative settings.

##### **4.1 Script-based Approaches**

Script-based approaches to dialogue management are based on a predetermined, “ideal” flow of dialogue and are handcrafted to each specific domain (Traum, 2017). Specifically, it involves specifying a handcrafted “script” that both the dialogue system and the user must follow. A script usually consists of fixed patterns and pre-written responses, which can be matched to user input through pattern matching, keyword extraction, or rule-based methods. For instance, a script can encode an adjacency-pair rule stating that a question needs to be followed by an answer (Dählback and Jonsson, 1989). More complex scripts are also equipped to handle a rudimentary level of deviations, such as clarification questions in the dialogue. Examples of popular, early implementations of script-based dialogue systems include ELIZA (Weizenbaum, 1966), LILIN (Dahlbäck et al., 1999), and RailTel (Bennacef et al., 1996).

Within collaborative contexts, one popular type of dialogue systems where script-based dialogue management is extensively employed is dialogue-based intelligent tutoring systems (ITSs) (Webb and Farivar, 1999; Strijbos, 2004). ITSs are adaptive educational systems that provide personalized instruction and feedback to learners, employing techniques from artificial intelligence, cognitive psychology, and education research to optimize the

learning process (Wollny et al., 2021). Many ITSs such as CIRCSIM-Tutor (Evens et al., 1997), Auto-Tutor (Graesser et al., 2004) and Why2-Atlas (Van-Lehn et al., 2002) make use of dialogue-grammar based (also called script-based) dialogue managers. These grammars (or scripts) are designed in such a way so as to help the user achieve a goal.

For example, the grammar in Why2-Atlas (Van-Lehn et al., 2002) enforces the student to provide a comprehensive explanation of a physics phenomenon. It works by mapping utterances to an explanation or a misconception using pattern matching techniques. Once the agent believes it has identified the right explanation or misconception, it then responds with a pre-defined response corresponding to it. The dialogue manager continues to cycle through the list of all pieces of the unmentioned explanations until it is satisfied that the student understands the concept.

While handcrafted, script-based approaches can be useful for creating simple, controlled dialogue systems with predictable conversation flows, they tend to lack flexibility and adaptability. As a result, they might be limited in their ability to handle diverse, complex, or unanticipated user inputs, which can limit their effectiveness in more dynamic and interactive scenarios. Despite these limitations, handcrafted dialogue management has laid the foundation for more advanced techniques, and it continues to be employed in specific contexts where a well-defined, structured conversation is required.

##### **4.2 Plan-Based Approaches**

Humans naturally ascribe intentions and goals to their conversational counterparts, expecting rational behavior in line with these objectives. Plan-based methodologies for dialogue management encapsulate this collaborative mindset (Papaioannou et al., 2018). One notable implication of this viewpoint is that natural language expressions are perceived as actions (dialogue acts (Searle, 1969)) undertaken by rational agents to achieve goals (Allen, 1983; Pollack, 1992). Several systems also make use of plan recognition to deduce user’s objective based on their actions. The goal-oriented nature of this paradigm offers a degree of coherence and consistency in a dialogue agent’s behavior that is challenging to attain through alternative dialogue management paradigms. As such, this approach has been adopted in high-stakes application do-



mains such as healthcare (Vannaprathip et al., 2022; Kane et al., 2022) and education (Freedman, 2000).

Plan-based dialogue management originates from AI planning (Ghallab et al., 2004), which can be described as a search problem aimed at identifying a sequence of *actions* that, upon execution, accomplishes a goal. At any given moment, the agent resides in one of several potential *states*. Actions transition the system from one state to another. Each action possesses a set of *preconditions*, which must be satisfied for the action to be deemed eligible by the planning algorithm. The outcome of performing an action is defined as a series of *effects* on the state. Ultimately, a planning problem is initiated with both an initial and a final goal state.

Over the past three decades, numerous practical implementations of plan-based dialogue management in collaborative dialogues have been proposed. Two notable implementations of plan-based dialogue managers in collaborative problem-solving settings are the TRAINS (Allen et al., 1995) and TRIPS (Allen et al., 2005) systems by James Allen's group. More recent works integrate mixed-initiative capabilities, such as MAPGEN (Ai-Chang et al., 2004), which implemented a plan-based system for ground operations of a NASA Mars Rover and SIADDEX (de la Asunción et al., 2005), which was deployed to help coordinate forest-fire operations. Various domain-independent frameworks such as COLLAGEN (Rich et al., 2001), PASSAT (Myers et al., 2002), and Raven-Claw (Bohus and Rudnicky, 2009) have been developed to allow domain-specific agents to be built.

### 4.3 Information-State Based Approaches

In the information-state based approach to dialogue management, as proposed by Larsson and Traum (2000), the dialogue state is defined by a collection of beliefs, desires, and intentions (BDI) (Rao and Georgeff, 1991). As the dialogue unfolds, each utterance leads to an update in the dialogue state. The precise nature of these updates relies on a series of update rules and strategies. This approach allows for a high level of adaptability due to its minimal constraints on the dialogue manager, making it suitable for various dialogue situations, including collaboration.

When examining the information-state approach more closely, it can be characterized by three primary components: informational components, dialogue acts, and update rules (Larsson and Traum,

2000).

1. **Informational Components.** In collaborative settings, information states are categorized into private aspects (individual agent's beliefs, desires, and intentions) and shared aspects (mutually agreed-upon beliefs, desires, and intentions). These components can be either static, such as agent persona and background knowledge, or dynamic, such as evolving goals and dialogue history.
2. **Formal Representations.** Various representations may be used for informational components, affecting their accessibility, ease of updating, and overall efficiency. These representations can include basic data structures, composite data types, logical forms, or neural embeddings.
3. **Dialogue Moves.** Dialogue moves represent the "illocutionary force" of an utterance as defined by Searle (1969). They are identified using domain-specific coding schemes.
4. **Update Rules.** Drawing inspiration from plan-based dialogue management (see Section 4.2), update rules consist of preconditions and effects (Traum et al., 1999). A rule can only be applied if its preconditions are met; once they are, the effects are used to update the information state.
5. **Control Strategy.** Control strategies dictate the selection and sequence of applied update rules. These strategies can involve: 1) applying the first rule that matches, 2) sequentially applying all matching rules, 3) employing a probabilistic rule for selection, or 4) allowing the user to make the choice.

TrindiKit is a domain-independent framework for collaborative dialogue management (Larsson and Traum, 2000). Basilica is another example of a domain-independent dialogue management framework proposed by Kumar and Rosé (2011). It uses a unified architecture for authoring tutoring and collaborative learning agents. Basilica works on a decentralized network of object-oriented modules, each one programmed and functioning independently through common interfaces. Basilica has been used to develop several collaborative learning agents, including CycleTalk tutor (Roman et al., 2020) and TuTalk (Jordan et al., 2006). To share

information and events across modules, Basilica uses a shared, global state. This state corresponds to the information state of the agent. Modules can perform a wide variety of functions, including recognition of student affect, monitoring of task progress, and dialogue management.

#### 4.4 Collaborative-Problem Solving (CPS) Framework

Allen et al. (2002) introduced the domain-independent CPS framework for dialogue management collaborative agents. The CPS model is designed from ground up to handle more complex tasks than state-based or script-based models (such as those in Sections 4.1 and 4.3). The model views a collaborative dialogue as operating over three levels of interaction (see Figure 2):

1. **Problem Solving Level:** This level describes how a single agent solves problems. It includes processes such as planning, decision-making, and execution.
2. **Interaction Level:** This level involves the interaction between two or more agents. It includes processes such as communication, negotiation, and coordination.
3. **Coordination Level:** This level involves the coordination of multiple interactions between agents to achieve a common goal. It includes processes such as resource allocation, task assignment, and conflict resolution.

The CPS model involves multiple agents working together to solve a problem, with each agent contributing its own expertise and knowledge to the process. While the authors are primarily focused on human-machine collaboration, they believe that the model will equally well apply to interactions between sophisticated software agents that need to coordinate their activities.

Based on the CPS model, Galescu et al. (2018) introduce the Cogent dialogue shell as a practical, extensible, domain-independent “shell” on top of which domain-specific agents can be built. It achieves this by providing many of the domain-independent capabilities out-of-the-box, including general-purpose natural language parsing and collaborative dialogue management capabilities.

#### 4.5 Neural-Network Based Approaches

In their most general form, neural-network based dialogue managers use sequence-to-sequence mod-

els (Sutskever et al., 2014) to generate the dialogue system’s next response directly from the natural language dialogue history. The advantage of building a dialogue manager this way is that it circumvents labor-intensive handcrafting of dialogue management strategies by learning it from a corpus of *training* dialogues. These corpora are typically collected from human-human interactions in the same or similar domain. This paradigm of training a dialogue agent was originally popularized in the context of open-domain chatbots (Shum et al., 2018; Wolf et al., 2019; Serban et al., 2016a). However, several works soon followed it up by extending the paradigm to task-oriented dialogue systems that performed slot-filling (Bordes et al., 2017; Wen et al., 2017).

##### 4.5.1 Challenges in Neural Collaborative Dialogue Management

Before diving deep into the second research question, I enumerate some of the key challenges associated with neural network-based approaches to building collaborative dialogue systems as background.

1. **Lack of interpretability and explainability:** The absence of explicit internal structure and intermediate representations in end-to-end models can make it difficult to interpret and understand the decision-making process, which is particularly important in strategic and collaborative settings where trust and explainability play a critical role.
2. **Difficulty in grounding to real-world entities:** Collaborative dialogue often takes place within the context of a common artifact such as a co-observed image (Shinagawa et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2019) or an environment (Roman et al., 2020; Chi et al., 2020). However, vanilla neural dialogue models<sup>4</sup> often struggle with grounding, as they lack explicit mechanisms to represent or reason about real-world entities, leading to contextually inappropriate or inconsistent responses.
3. **Large amounts of training data required:** These models often need extensive training data to achieve good performance, which may

---

<sup>4</sup>The term “vanilla” is used to describe unmodified or basic versions of architectures, without any special enhancements or adaptations. It refers to the fundamental, original form of a model, serving as a foundation for more advanced or customized variations.




Figure 2: Collaborative problem solving model (Allen et al., 2002)

not be readily available for specialized or niche domains (Sutskever et al., 2014; Li et al., 2016; Serban et al., 2016b).

4. **Hallucinations and challenges in generating accurate responses:** In the context of generative language models, a hallucination refers to a situation where the AI model generates output that is not grounded in the input data, factual information, or the intended context (Ji et al., 2023; Cao et al., 2022). This can happen due to several reasons, such as overfitting, biases in the training data, or insufficient constraints on the generative process. For example, if a language model is asked to generate an answer to a historical question and it produces a response with incorrect dates or events, that would be considered a hallucination. Hallucinations are, therefore, a challenge to be dealt with when using neural models for generating dialogue responses, decreasing the overall quality and reliability of the conversation.
5. **Difficulty incorporating external knowledge and adapting to changes:** Such models have trouble incorporating external knowledge or adapting to changes in the environment during a conversation, which is a common requirement in strategic and collaborative applications (Sutskever et al., 2014; Weston et al., 2018).

## 5 RQ 2: What techniques have been applied to adapt neural network based dialogue management approaches to collaborative settings?

To systematically analyze the 17 selected works for addressing RQ 2, I employed a three-step approach to investigate each work, extract relevant architectural modifications, and classify them into overarching themes. The process unfolded as follows:

1. **In-depth examination:** I analyzed each work, delving into the proposed architectural alterations and evaluating their significance for neural dialogue management.
2. **Extraction and preliminary grouping:** While assessing each work, I extracted and recorded all architectural changes, observing their distinct attributes and qualities. This process led to an initial collection of categories that encompassed the diverse facets of the modifications.
3. **Thematic integration:** After completing the extraction and preliminary categorization, I executed an extensive synthesis of the findings. Through a recursive process of analysis and comparison, I discerned connections and patterns among the various categories.

Table 1: Overview of different papers and their corresponding modeling themes. Columns with boolean values are marked with a check symbol for true and left empty for false. The columns represent the following: (1) Paper, (2) Participant Roles (\* indicates the participant being modeled), (3) Incorporating Shared Artifacts or Environments, (4) Decoupling Semantics and Surface Realization, (5) Graph-Based Representations of Dialogue State, (6) Incorporating Domain-Specific or Expert Knowledge, (7) Theory-of-Mind Modeling, (8) Modality Encoding/Fusion

Paper	Participant Roles	Modalities or Task	Decoupling	Graph	Domain	ToM	Modality
Bara et al. (2021)	Player 1*, Player 2*	theory-of-mind questionnaires, Minecraft 3D game state				✓	
Chi et al. (2020)	Navigator*, Instructor	3D room environment		✓			✓
de Vries et al. (2018)	Guide*, Tourist	Map of a City		✓			
He et al. (2017)	Friend 1*, Friend 2*	Knowledge Bases of Friends		✓			
He et al. (2018)	Buyer, Seller	Negotiation Scenario + Item Details	✓				
Jayannavar et al. (2020)	Builder*, Architect	Blocks World					✓
Li et al. (2019)	User*, Attacker	Private Profile Information	✓		✓		
Kim et al. (2019)	Teller*, Drawer	Drawing Canvas with Objects					✓
Narayan-Chen et al. (2017)	Builder*, Architect	2D Blocks World					✓

Continued on next page



Table 1: Overview of different papers and their corresponding features (Continued)

Paper	Participant Roles	Modalities or Task	Decoupling	Graph	Domain	ToM	Modality
Narayan-Chen et al. (2019)	Builder*, Architect	3D Minecraft World					✓
Qiu et al. (2022b)	Player*, Other Players*	Game State (including Persona Descriptions)		✓	✓	✓	
Santhanam et al. (2020)	Persuader*, Persuadee	Charity Donation	✓				
Shi et al. (2022)	Architect, Builder*	3D Minecraft World					✓
Yarats and Lewis (2017)	Negotiator 1*, Negotiator 2*	Private Negotiation Goals + Item Pool	✓				
Zhou et al. (2019)	Buyer, Seller, Coach*	Product Listing			✓		
Zhou et al. (2020)	Negotiator 1*, Negotiator 2*	Product Listing (for CraigslistBargain)			✓		
Zhou et al. (2022)	DM*, Players	Game Background Story + Game State				✓	

The above process led to the consolidation of five overarching modeling themes. In this section, I examine these main modeling themes, discussing the details and features of neural dialogue management models. Table 1 maps each work to one or more modeling themes that are identified.

## 5.1 Decoupling Semantics and Surface Realizations

In this section, I review approaches that address an important limitations of vanilla end-to-end trained models of dialogue: separation of semantics and surface realization. In vanilla sequence-to-sequence modeling of dialogue, a trained neural network processes raw dialogue history as input and directly generates the subsequent natural language response without distinct intermediate steps for natural language understanding, state tracking, and generation. Crucially, traditional end-to-end training approaches fail to distinguish between "what to say" (semantics) and "how to say it" (surface realization), leading to complications as a single concept can be expressed in numerous ways.

### 5.1.1 Conditioning Response Generation on Intermediate Symbolic Representations

He et al. (2018) propose an approach that separates a dialogue system's strategy from the natural language surface realization in a negotiation setting. They employ *two* distinct sequence-to-sequence models to represent the dialogue (see Figure 3). The first model operates directly on the tokens in natural language utterances, while the second model works with coarse dialogue acts corresponding to the utterances. First, a parser is trained to map an utterance,  $x_{t-1}$ , to a coarse dialogue act  $z_{t-1}$ , which captures the high-level dialogue flow. A dialogue act consists of an intent and optional arguments. For instance, the utterance "I would like to pay \$125 for it. How does that sound?" is mapped to the dialogue act `propose(price=125)`. The dialogue act ontology includes `inform`, `inquire`, `propose`, `counter`, and `agree`. Both sequences are modeled using LSTMs (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997). Given  $z_{t-1}$  and the dialogue history,  $x_{<t}$ , the dialogue manager predicts the coarse dialogue act of its response,  $z_t$ . Finally, a natural language response is generated based on  $z_t$ .

Santhanam et al. (2020) present an approach that generates an intermediate "plan" to condition the natural language response. They demonstrate this

method on the PERSUASION FOR GOOD dialogue corpus (Wang et al., 2019), in which the agent persuades a listener by offering compelling incentives. The process consists of two steps: first, generating a pseudo-natural language plan, and second, conditioning the model on this plan to produce the final response. Figure 4 illustrates an example dialogue context along with a system-generated intermediate plan. In response to B's final utterance, the model first generates a plan with an *ask* and *framing*, such as `PERFORM [provides [relief]]`. It then creates a natural language response, such as *"Save the Children is an international non-governmental organization that promotes children's rights, provides relief, and supports children in developing countries"* (surface realization).

### 5.1.2 Conditioning Response Generation on Latent Representations

In contrast to approaches that employ symbolic intermediate representations like dialogue acts and plans, some methods utilize latent variables instead.

Yarats and Lewis (2017) propose generating a short-term plan using latent sentence representations. The natural language response is then generated by conditioning the response generation step on this plan. To learn these latent sentence representations from data, the authors deviate from the traditional paradigm of maximizing the likelihood of the current utterance  $x_t$  given the latent representation  $z_t$ . Rather, they train  $z_t$  to maximize the likelihood of the response at the *next turn*,  $x_{t+1}$ . This approach is motivated by the observation that while the traditional method effectively models semantic similarity, it fails to capture the influence of an utterance on the dialogue partner's response. This distinction can be crucial in negotiation settings, where even subtle lexical substitutions such as using "two" instead of "one," can significantly affect the final outcomes of the conversation.

## 5.2 Incorporating Shared Artifacts, Environments and Knowledge

Collaborative dialogues often take place when participants are working on a shared artifact or within a co-observed environment (e.g., an architect and a builder collaborating to build a Minecraft structure). Collaboration can also involve an asymmetry in the *knowledge* that the participants are privy to (e.g., the architect may have a bird's eye view




Figure 3: In He et al. (2018), the natural language parser generates dialogue acts,  $z_{<t}$ , corresponding to the utterances  $x_{<t}$  respectively. The next response is generated in two steps: (1) generating the next dialogue act,  $z_t$  based on the previous dialogue acts,  $z_{<t}$  and 2) generating the natural language response based on both the dialogue history,  $x_{<t}$  and the preceding dialogue act,  $z_t$ .



Figure 4: Separation of NLG into planning and surface realization (Santhanam et al., 2020).

of the world, while the builder only has a first-person view). In this section, I provide a high-level overview of the approaches taken by collaborative dialogue systems to incorporate three common modalities: navigable environments, co-created artifacts, and text-based background knowledge<sup>5</sup>.

### 5.2.1 Navigable Environments

Visual-language navigation (VLN) (Park and Kim, 2023; Lukin et al., 2018) is a broad research area that explores the interplay between natural language instructions and visual perception to enable autonomous agents or robots to navigate complex environments. Typically, a leader (e.g., a human

<sup>5</sup>Note that I do not delve into fine-grained details of multimodal encoding and fusion methods. Several existing surveys on multimodal dialogue systems cover those topics, and I refer readers to works such as Liu et al. (2022) for a comprehensive overview of such techniques.

user) provides natural language directions to a follower (e.g., a robot) navigating the environment. The follower may ask clarification questions to resolve ambiguities in either the environment or the instructions. In this section, I discuss two VLN systems, Chi et al. (2020) and de Vries et al. (2018), focusing on their world and dialogue state representations, how these representations are used in dialogue management, and their approaches to handling clarification questions.

In Chi et al. (2020), a human user instructs a navigating robot situated in a 3D environment with commands such as, “Walk straight, right before you reach the bed”. The authors propose a navigating agent modeled as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) with states representing the agent’s position and orientation. The agent’s action space consists of environment-defined “navigable locations” and an additional clarification question action. Visual perception, position information, and user instructions serve as multimodal input to an LSTM model (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997), outputting a softmax distribution,  $P^t$ , over the action space. The authors explore both supervised and reinforcement learning methods for training.

In supervised learning, the environment calculates the shortest path  $R_t = \{v_t, v_{t+1}, \dots, v_n\}$  from the current viewpoint  $v_t$  to the target location  $v_n$  at each time step  $t$ . Training loss is determined by the cross-entropy loss between the predicted action and the next action in the shortest path. For reinforcement learning, the agent selects its action by sampling from the action distribution  $P^t$ . A reward of +2 is granted if the final location is within 3 meters of  $v_n$ , and -2 otherwise. The Advantage

Actor Critic (A2C) algorithm (Konda and Tsitsiklis, 1999) is utilized for RL training. The reward mechanism is further adjusted to encourage the agent to disambiguate its future trajectory by minimizing clarification questions.

A closely related work is that of de Vries et al. (2018), where a Tourist agent and a Guide agent collaborate using natural language dialogue to reach a target location that is known only to the Guide. While the Guide has access to a 2D city map, the Tourist only has a first-person view of the local surroundings.

### 5.2.2 Co-Created Artifacts

Many collaborative activities involve co-creating some kind of artifact. Artifacts can range from block-based structures in a Minecraft game (Shi et al., 2022; Narayan-Chen et al., 2019) to drawings (Kim et al., 2019) to source code (Griffith et al., 2022). The two participants may be set up in either an asymmetric leader-follower setup or a symmetric one where both of them possess equal knowledge and skills.

Minecraft is a widely-used platform for studying collaborative dialogue in "Architect-Builder" scenarios, where the Architect agent instructs the Builder agent on constructing a target structure in the game environment. Narayan-Chen et al. (2019) introduce a dialogue model for the Architect that utilizes two types of counters—global and local block counters—to track the building progress. Global counters monitor overall block placements, upcoming placements, and removals, while local counters focus on a 3x3x3 region surrounding the Builder’s last action. These block counter vectors, capturing attributes such as position and color, are processed through a fully-connected layer and combined with the word embedding vector for the decoder. This integration of dialogue history and world state representations enables the generation of contextually accurate instructions and a mental model of the target structure.

Shi et al. (2022) explore generating clarification questions from the Builder’s perspective. Unlike previous works, which prioritize Architect communication and Builder actions, their study addresses the generation of Builder utterances. The dialogue state consists of dialogue history, world state (with 3D voxels represented as 8-dimensional vectors), and the last action (encoded as a vector detailing action type, block color, and location). These three elements are transformed into vector representations

through a convolutional neural network (CNN) and merged using a neural fusion module, resulting in the final dialogue state representation.




Figure 5: Architecture Diagram from Narayan-Chen et al. (2019).

Kim et al. (2019) present a goal-driven collaborative task very similar to the Minecraft setting, involving two participants—a Teller and a Drawer—where the Teller describes a drawing to the Drawer, who then recreates it based on the instructions. The authors propose initial models for automating both agents, assuming the Drawer does not ask clarifying questions. The Teller’s role involves understanding the drawing and generating natural language descriptions, while the Drawer is expected to comprehend the Teller’s instructions and replicate the drawing. Neural models are proposed for both agents, with the Teller’s model using a conditional language model with an LSTM and two attention modules that attend to individual clip art pieces in the drawing. The Teller model also incorporates an auxiliary training objective to track which parts of the scene have been communicated, using the LSTM’s output at each utterance separator token to classify whether each clip art has been described or not.

### 5.2.3 Textual Background Knowledge

In many instances, it is common for the background knowledge pertaining to the collaborative task to be in the form of text. For example, in Qiu et al. (2022b), a game agent is provided background and situational knowledge of the world using three pieces of text: the setting (e.g., *The main foyer is massive. A grand staircase sits to the back of the foyer leading to the upstairs . . .*), the agent’s self-persona (e.g., *Servant. I come from the lower*



class. I do what I am told without question. I can not read. I have not seen my family in a long time. I carry a duster, a small bucket, a rag ...), the partner’s persona (e.g., *I am a king of the whole empire. I give rules and pursuit them. I am brave and fearless. I am carrying a crown and a scepter*).

The proposed model in Qiu et al. (2022b) encodes this text-based representation by feeding it into GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), a large language model (LLM) as part of its prompt. For example, the above description is fed into the model as follows: “*The following is a conversation that happened in a game of Dungeons and Dragons: [Context] [DM Text] [Player Name]:[Player Ability Check] Question: What do you think that the DM is trying to guide the player to do by mentioning [Extracted Guiding Sentence]? Answer*”.

### 5.3 Graph-Based Representations of Dialogue State

Graph-based dialogue state representations strive to strike a balance between rigid data structures, such as slot-value pairs, and completely unstructured continuous vector representations. By employing graphs, these representations closely mirror the inherent structure of real-world tasks or domains. This approach offers semi-interpretable and robust neural representations, blending the advantages of visualizations with the potential for adaptable representation. Such representations learn entity representations from data, and their popularity has surged in recent years for task-oriented dialogue applications (Walker et al., 2022; Andreas et al., 2020). In this section, I discuss the components (nodes and edges) of a graph and the methods employed to update the graph as the dialogue unfolds.

#### 5.3.1 Graph Representation

Among the reviewed works, He et al. (2017) uses a graph-based dialogue state representation for a task that involves identifying a mutual friend from a knowledge base through text-based dialogue. Their proposed approach consists of a knowledge graph, graph embeddings, and an utterance generator. The knowledge graph comprises the following three types of nodes, with edges between them representing their relations. When an utterance  $t$  mentions a new entity, it is added as a new node to the knowledge graph.

1. entity nodes representing people, universities, and companies,

2. item nodes corresponding to a single row-entry in the agent’s knowledge base (e.g., a friend), and
3. attribute nodes that represent relationships between entities, such as a person’s connection to a university

In Qiu et al. (2022b), a knowledge graph is used to represent the agent’s mental state at a given point in a game. The graph is initialized by parsing a text-based description of the agent’s persona into constituent entities and relations using a rule-based parser. The nodes in the graph correspond to the agents involved in the game, persona descriptions, objects, descriptions of the objects, and descriptions of the environment. The edges describe the relationships between the agents and the objects as present in the agent’s mental state. Figure 8 shows an example “mental state graph.”

#### 5.3.2 Graph Encoding and Updating

In He et al. (2017), the final dialogue state representation is obtained from the dialogue state graph’s node embeddings (Figure 6 provides a sample snapshot of the dialogue state used in this system). Given a dialogue of  $T$  utterances,  $T$  graphs  $(G_t)_{t=1}^T$  are constructed for each agent  $A$ . The graph  $G_t$  is constructed by updating  $G_{t-1}$  with any new entities not previously mentioned. To obtain a latent representation of the graph, an embedding is associated with each node in the graph,  $v \in G_t$ . A node embedding  $V_t(v)$  is built from structural properties of an entity in the knowledge base, embeddings of the utterances in the text-based dialogue history, and the message passing between the graph nodes. Each of these is elaborated below.

1. **Structural properties:** The structural properties of a node  $v$  are encoded using a featurization function  $F_t(v)$ , which encodes various pieces of information such as the degree, type and number of mentions of the node.
2. **Mention vectors:** A mention vector of a node  $v$  contains an aggregate representation of the mentions of that entity so far in the dialogue history. At every dialogue turn  $t$ , the mention vector  $M_t(v)$  is set to  $M_{t-1}(v)$  if utterance  $t$  does not contain mention of the entity and a soft weighted sum of  $M_{t-1}(v)$  and  $\tilde{u}$  if the utterance does contain mention of the entity.  $\tilde{u}$  is obtained by using an LSTM to encode the utterance.




Figure 6: Architecture of symmetric collaborative dialogue state from He et al. (2017).

3. **Recursive node embeddings:** It is important to take into account information from neighboring nodes in the knowledge graph. For example, to answer the question “*anyone went to colombia?*” as in Figure 6, the model should take cognizance of the entity nodes of type *person* who went to COLOMBIA university (in this case, JESSICA and JOSH). This is achieved through a mechanism known as belief propagation.

In Qiu et al. (2022b), the graph update step is broken down into two update types: discrete and continuous. The actions in the game environment, which can be converted into simple, text-based templates are modeled as discrete graph updates, while the unconstrained natural language utterances, which are harder to model, are incorporated to the representation through a continuous graph update instead.

1. **Discrete update:** In the discrete update step,  $\delta g_t$  is a set of ADD and DEL operations. Each action in the game environment is parsed into a set of these atomic operations over the graph. For example, the action “*give object to agent*” is parsed into  $\text{DEL}(\text{actor}, \text{object}, \text{carrying})$  and  $\text{ADD}(\text{agent}, \text{object}, \text{carrying})$ .
2. **Continuous update:** The continuous update step is motivated by the reasoning that an utterance can also have implicit effects on the agent’s mental state. This step is handled by a recurrent neural network in the following

steps:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta g_t &= f_\delta(h_{G_{t-1}}, h_{O_t}) \\ h_t &= \text{RNN}(\delta g_t, h_{t-1}) \\ G_t &= \text{MLP}(h_t)\end{aligned}$$

Here,  $f_\delta$  is a bi-directional attention layer (Yu et al., 2018) that aggregates information from the previous graph state and the latest set of observations to generate the graph update,  $g_\delta$ . A graph convolutional network (GCN) (Schlichtkrull et al., 2018) and a BERT-based text encoder is used to encode  $G_{t-1}$  and the text-based dialogue history into their latent representations  $h_{G_{t-1}}$  and  $h_{t-1}$  respectively. The RNN is modeled by an LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997), which models an intermediate hidden state, which is finally used by a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) to generate the updated graph.

## 5.4 Incorporating Domain-Specific or Expert Knowledge

Neural dialogue management methods aim to be data-driven without manual feature engineering. Nonetheless, encoding domain-specific or expert knowledge as inductive biases can be advantageous, as it may accelerate learning or reduce data dependency. In this section, I examine various approaches taken in the selected works to incorporate domain-specific or expert knowledge into neural dialogue managers.

### 5.4.1 Utterance-Level Labels

One straightforward method to encode domain knowledge into neural dialogue managers is through the use of handcrafted taxonomies for utterance classification. For instance, in a negotiation

context, Zhou et al. (2019) initially classify each dialogue utterance into one or more *tactics* from a predefined set. This set of tactics, derived manually from behavioral science research, includes tactics such as *communicate politely*, *use hedge words*, and *show dominance*. A sequence model is trained on the sequence of these tactic labels to determine the subsequent dialogue move. Similarly, Zhou et al. (2020) transform utterances into a sequence of tactic and strategy labels for another negotiation scenario.

#### 5.4.2 Vector Featurization

Domain knowledge can also come into play while designing one-hot representations preceding an embedding layer. Kim et al. (2019) develop a neural dialogue model to act as a *Teller* agent that describes a clip-art drawing to a *Drawer* through a natural language dialogue. From human-human dialogues in the same environment, they observed that humans use compositional language to describe clip-art configurations and attributes (e.g., "where is trunk of second tree, low or high"). To help understand such utterances, each clip-art piece in the scene is represented using a vector that is a sum of learned embeddings for attributes such as *type=Mike*, *size=small*, etc.

Another example of domain-specific vector featurization is in developing an Architect for the visual-language navigation setting described by Shi et al. (2022). Each voxel in the 3D Minecraft environment is first encoded using a one-hot vector that captures the voxel’s 3D position, its colors, and its neighboring voxels. Along with that, their representation also includes the location at which the Builder last made a move. This is motivated by the observation that Builders often refer to their recent actions in their utterances.

#### 5.4.3 Response Ranking

Qiu et al. (2022b) train a dialogue agent to behave in a “socially intelligent” way. Their agent is situated within a large-scale, crowd-sourced fantasy text-adventure game called LIGHT (Urbanek et al., 2019). In their work on intercultural research, Schwartz (1992) identify a set of universal basic human values that transcends cultures (see Figure 7), which Qiu et al. (2022b) adopt in the response generation step of their model. Specifically, a learned *value function*  $f_v(\cdot)$  ( $v \in \{\text{achievement}, \text{power}, \text{security}, \dots\}$ ) takes in an action (or utterance) and outputs a scalar value.

The value function is learned from a knowledge base of human values from the VALUENET dataset (Qiu et al., 2022a). During response generation, the agent first narrows down the action space based on feasibility, and then ranks the filtered actions based on the equation below (here,  $p$  is a text-based description of the agent’s persona that the agent is seeded with (elaborated in Section 5.2.3)). The main purpose of doing the second step is to ensure that the agent’s responses are consistent with its own value system.

$$u(a_i) = \sqrt{\sum_{v \in V} (f_v(p) - f_v(a_i))^2}$$




Figure 7: Theory of basic human values used in Qiu et al. (2022b)’s socially intelligent agent.

#### 5.4.4 Reward Functions for RL

Another way to incorporate domain-specific knowledge is through the use of handcrafted reward functions for reinforcement learning. In Cuayahuitl et al. (2015), a dialogue agent is trained to engage in conversations within the context of the Settlers of Catan game, focusing on resource trading. An example trading offer might be, "I will give anyone sheep for clay." The reward function is manually defined within the environment through a user simulator. Specifically, the reward,  $r$ , is constructed as a piecewise function that depends on the number of points obtained in the game. This information is used to train a deep reinforcement learning model.

$$r = \begin{cases} GainedPts \times w_{gp}, & \text{if } GainedPts > 0 \\ TotalPts \times w_{tp}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

In the reward function above,  $w_{gp}$  and  $w_{tp}$  represent weighted hyperparameters that are manually

set by the authors. The function assigns a reward based on the number of points gained during a specific action (GainedPts) or the total points accumulated in the game (TotalPts), depending on whether any points were gained during that action.

## 5.5 Theory-of-Mind Modeling

Theory-of-Mind (ToM) (Premack and Woodruff, 1978) is a concept in cognitive science that refers to the ability to attribute mental states such as beliefs, desires, intentions, and emotions to oneself and others, understanding that these mental states may differ among individuals. The incorporation of a Theory-of-Mind model into a collaborative dialogue manager is closely related to the BDI (beliefs, desires, and intentions) framework (Gratch, 2000) used in plan-based approaches.

This section examines the chosen works to detail how they incorporate ToM in their dialogue management. Specifically, it discusses two things: 1) the aspects of the mental state captured and 2) the methods used to collect labels for training machine learning models that can predict theory-of-mind variables from the dialogue context.

### 5.5.1 Dimensions of Mental State

Among the reviewed works, the aspects of mental states that are modeled include both task-related (e.g., what a participant is currently working on or believes the task state to be) as well as aspects related to a participant’s personality and emotion (Qiu et al., 2022b).

In Bara et al. (2021), the authors investigate a setting involving two partners (Player A and Player B) collaborating to create a target material in a Minecraft environment by mining and combining blocks. Owing to the asymmetry in both their skills and knowledge, the participants engage in rich natural language dialogue to develop a strong mental model of the task requirements, their own task-state, their partner’s knowledge, and their partner’s task-state. Specifically, the proposed ToM model in their paper seeks to capture 1) a player’s own task status (whether a specific material has already been created or not), 2) a player’s self-knowledge (whether a player knows how to create a material or not), and 3) their partner’s current task (what a player thinks their partner is working on at a given point in time).

The setting of dialogue in Qiu et al. (2022b) is a fantasy text-adventure game, LIGHT (Urbanek et al., 2019), in which agents can talk to other

agents in free-form text, take a closed set of actions, or express certain emotions. In this setting, Urbanek et al. (2019) present a “socially-aware” response generation model that explicitly models the mental state of the agent as a time-varying graph. The graph is constructed (and updated) based on three sources: 1) an initial persona description associated with the agent, 2) the dialogue history, and 3) the game state. A sample graph from their model is shown in Figure 8. The nodes correspond to natural language descriptions of agents and objects in the world.




Figure 8: Graph-based mental state representation of the Servant agent in the LIGHT fantasy text-adventure game (from Qiu et al. (2022b)).

Zhou et al. (2022) develop an agent that can play the role of a Dungeon Master (DM) in a Dungeons-and-Dragons (D&D) game. The agent’s goal is to produce utterances such that the remaining players are incentivized to perform a specific action that the DM has in mind. This action, in turn, is designed to make progress in the story that the DM has constructed. Therefore, the specific aspect of the player’s mental model that is modeled by the DM agent in this work is the following: *How will the player react to my utterance?*

### 5.5.2 Label Collection Methods for ToM Modeling

Collecting training labels is a crucial challenge when training machine learning models for ToM modeling. In this section, I discuss three approaches identified from the reviewed works.

**Simulated Environment.** In the agent proposed by Qiu et al. (2022b), situated within a simulated game, the dialogue agent has full visibility into the game state. This visibility enables the construction and updating of the mental state representation directly from the available information. The agent’s



mental state is represented as a graph, initialized by parsing the "seed" natural language description of the agent's persona. As the conversation progresses, the dialogue history and game state are used to incrementally update this graph representation.

**Human-in-the-Loop.** In the setting proposed by Bara et al. (2021), dialogue agents operate within a Minecraft world and collaborate with a partner to combine primitive blocks into a target block. To collect labels for ToM modeling, they employ an online human-in-the-loop data collection methodology, prompting users to reveal their mental models during the interaction. A machine learning model is then trained to predict the mental models of both partners based on dialogue and task context. The proposed model utilizes either an LSTM or a Transformer to process inputs from three different modalities: a video feed encoded with a convolutional neural network, knowledge in the form of a graph encoded using a gated recurrent unit (GRU) network (Chung et al., 2014), and dialogue utterances encoded with a BERT model. User-prompted questions at 90-second intervals are also encoded and combined with the Transformer representation, which is then fed into a feed-forward network predicting the partner's ToM attributes. This architecture is depicted in Figure 9.

**Leveraging LLMs to Generate Labels.** Zhou et al. (2022) propose a method designed to circumvent the expensive nature of human-in-the-loop approaches. The dialogue agent plays the role of a Dungeon Master (DM) in a Dungeons and Dragons game, with the objective of generating utterances so as to generate utterances that maximize the likelihood of players making a specific move intended by the DM. The agent predicts the players' next moves to a given utterance using a set of language models working together to generate affordable proxies for user responses. The process consists of the following steps:

1. Annotators label a small number of Dungeon Master's (DM's) utterances in a collected corpus of interactions, identifying the specific span that influenced the players' actions.
2. An "inverse dynamics model (IDM)" is trained over these labels to predict the specific span that influenced the player's actions, given their next action (from the future).

3. An intent generator is trained by first mining intents from the DM's utterances and then training another model over the mined intents.
4. A player model is trained to predict the player's next move based on the dialogue history.
5. Lastly, the DM model is trained using reinforcement learning (RL) to generate utterances that lead to the player performing an action aligned with the DM's intent.

Both the IDM and the intent generator are trained by prompting GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) to 1) output excerpts from the DM's utterance and 2) generate natural language descriptions of intents, respectively.

## 6 Discussion

This section summarizes the findings from the literature review and discusses open challenges and future research directions for neural collaborative dialogue management.

### 6.1 General Trends

I begin by outlining some general trends uncovered through this literature review.

**Historical Trends.** Most of the works that laid the foundation for collaborative dialogue systems (outlined in Section 4) came about in the period from the late-1980s to the mid-2000s. Throughout the late-2000s and the 2010s, dialogue systems research became predominantly focused on slot-filling assistants and open-domain chatbots, resulting in limited advancements in both theoretical and practical frameworks for collaborative agents. Similar observations about the research trends have been echoed by notable researchers in the field (Cohen, 2019; Papaioannou et al., 2018).

**Amount of Research Activity.** The search for works proposing neural network-based techniques in constructing collaborative agents yielded only a small number of results, despite the flurry in research activity for neural network based techniques for task-oriented and open-domain dialogue systems during the same time period. I hypothesize three reasons for this disparity:

1. The lack of straightforward automated evaluation methods in complex collaborative dialogue settings (elaborated below in Section 6.2)




Figure 9: Architecture of the ToM-prediction model proposed in Bara et al. (2021).

2. Immediate commercial impetus for task-oriented and open-domain dialogue provided by the proliferation of “virtual assistants” such as Amazon Alexa, Apple Siri, and Google Home, and
3. The lack of collaborative analogues of large benchmark corpora such as MultiWOZ (Budzianowski et al., 2018) and Schema-Guided Dialog (Rastogi et al., 2020; Mehri and Eskenazi, 2021) as well as shared community challenges such as DSTC (Williams et al., 2014b), which were instrumental in catapulting research activity in task-oriented dialogue systems.

## 6.2 Challenges to Holistic Evaluation

We see that in all the works identified under RQ 2, the tasks, domains, environments, and objectives are carefully curated so as to facilitate automated, quantitative evaluation. However, in this process, the authors are often forced to make simplifying assumptions that might not be reflective of the full complexity of the real-world. For example, a common simplifying assumption made in Leader-Follower setups such as (Kim et al., 2019; Chi et al., 2020; Narayan-Chen et al., 2019, 2017) is that the Follower cannot initiate dialogue, but can instead only receive instructions, or at best, ask clarification questions.

As another example, Sanders et al. (2022) observe, in the context of a persuasion dialogue for charity donation, that a strict definition of success such as the amount of money donated by the latter may not accurately capture the performance of the Persuader agent since the Persuadee’s decision can be influenced by factors out of the Persuader’s

control, such as the Persuadee not having money to donate. In such a situation, holistic, automated evaluation can be challenging. Such difficulties in evaluation is a general trend among most collaborative dialogue settings excluding a few well-defined cases such as certain types of negotiations, where the outcomes can be captured quantitatively by the end result of the dialogue.

In general, the roadblock for holistic evaluation is that on one hand, automated measures can only evaluate individual modules of a dialogue system or individual aspects of what makes a successful collaborative dialogue. On the other hand, complete end-to-end human evaluation is expensive. Existing works mostly take the former, piecemeal approach to evaluating a dialogue system, which, albeit useful, may not be fully capture the features that stakeholders ultimately care about.

## 6.3 Combining the Strengths of Neural and Plan-Based Approaches

The works identified for RQ 2 reveal a clear trend of incorporating features typically found in plan-based approaches to dialogue management. Specifically, the modeling approaches proposed in these works, such as decoupling semantics from surface-level representations (Section 5.1), moving towards human-interpretable representations of dialogue state (Section 5.3), and incorporating Theory-of-Mind models (Section 5.5), can all be mapped one-to-one with constructs that are “natively available” in plan-based dialogue managers (Section 4.2). Plan-based dialogue management techniques (Section 4.2) employ discrete action-spaces, can explain their decisions (Shams et al., 2016; Nothdurft et al., 2015a; Honold et al., 2014; Nothdurft

et al., 2015b), and maintain explicit notions of their partners' beliefs through the use of belief-desire-intention (BDI) models in their architectures (Cohen and Galescu, 2023). Given this inherent applicability of plan-based dialogue management for collaborative dialogue, exploring ways to combine the strengths of both approaches presents a promising area for further research. Neural approaches can learn directly from data and provide high representational power and flexibility, while plan-based approaches are recognized for their reliability, consistency, and dependability.

## 6.4 LLMs for Data Generation

Deep learning has achieved remarkable success in various NLP tasks, including question-answering, text classification, and natural language generation. Nevertheless, dialogue management remains an unresolved problem, as collecting extensive data for new domains is often exceptionally difficult and impractical. Although reinforcement learning-based approaches can learn from interactions without a large corpus to begin with, deploying sub-optimal dialogue policies in sensitive areas such as medicine, aviation, and education may lead to detrimental or even fatal consequences. However, the potential of large language models (LLMs) could transform this situation.

Traditionally, gathering training data for neural dialogue models in specific domains involves either using a small number of in-house researchers as annotators (e.g., graduate students) or enlisting larger groups of individuals through crowdsourcing platforms like Amazon M-Turk. Both methods demand substantial effort and incur significant costs. This issue becomes even more pronounced when deep domain expertise is required for annotation, as crowdsourced annotations from the general populace may not be reliable. Recently, Gilardi et al. (2023) demonstrated that instruction-tuned LLMs, such as ChatGPT, outperform crowdworkers in annotation quality for several NLP tasks. Figure 10 compares ChatGPT and M-Turk crowdworkers in terms of inter-annotator agreement with trained annotators. Advancements in harnessing large language models for annotating data, creating new datasets, and augmenting existing ones are promising directions to help address this challenge.

## 6.5 Absence of a Software Ecosystem

Finally, despite over four decades of research, the software landscape for practical authoring tools and development frameworks for developing collaborative dialogue systems is still largely limited to research prototypes and narrow domain-specific techniques. Developing general-purpose tools for system designers to quickly prototype an agent in a completely new domain continues to be non-trivial even today. This situation is in striking contrast to the current landscape for form-filling and open-domain assistants, where widely accessible commercial tools such as Google DialogFlow<sup>6</sup>, Amazon Lex<sup>7</sup>, Rasa<sup>8</sup>, LUIS<sup>9</sup>, and ParlAI<sup>10</sup> empower individuals without expertise in dialogue systems or natural language processing to create agents suitable for a vast range of scenarios.

Schema-driven dialogue system design (Kane et al., 2022; Mehri and Eskenazi, 2021; Rastogi et al., 2020) and prompt-based techniques (Kaplan et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2022) represent two promising classes of interfaces for dialogue system authoring. However, to determine the optimal type of interface for a specific user and domain, further human-centered research is needed, including user studies that encompass diverse user groups and various dialogue systems.

## 7 Summary

This paper begins by reviewing foundational paradigms for developing collaborative dialogue agents that have emerged over the past four decades of dialogue systems research. Each dialogue paradigm is described, and the applications in handling collaborative dialogues are illustrated. The focus then shifts to data-driven, neural approaches for collaborative dialogue management that require minimal handcrafting. The limitations of "vanilla" end-to-end neural networks and slot-based methods for dialogue state representation are discussed, serving as motivation for reviewing neural modeling approaches for collaborative dialogue. From a selection of 17 works, this review identifies five core modeling themes and examines the implementation of each theme by the respective studies in specific domains. Lastly, the overarching trends

<sup>6</sup><https://cloud.google.com/dialogflow>

<sup>7</sup><https://aws.amazon.com/lex/>

<sup>8</sup><https://rasa.com/>

<sup>9</sup><https://www.luis.ai/>

<sup>10</sup><https://parl.ai/>




Figure 10: Gilardi et al. (2023) shows that ChatGPT outperforms M-Turk crowdworkers when it comes to inter-annotator agreement against a trained annotator.

are analyzed, and the paper concludes by presenting a set of open challenges and future research directions for the field of collaborative dialogue management.

## Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Dr. Kristy Elizabeth Boyer and Dr. Bonnie Dorr for their invaluable advice. I would like to also thank Dr. Anthony Botelho for his helpful inputs during the initial stages of organizing this literature review.

## References

- Mitchell Ai-Chang, John Bresina, Len Charest, Adam Chase, JC-J Hsu, Ari Jonsson, Bob Kanefsky, Paul Morris, Kanna Rajan, Jeffrey Yglesias, et al. 2004. Mapgen: mixed-initiative planning and scheduling for the mars exploration rover mission. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 19(1):8–12.
- James Allen. 1983. Recognizing intention from natural language utterances. *Computational Model of Discourse*, pages 107–166. Publisher: MIT press.
- James Allen, Nate Blaylock, and George Ferguson. 2002. [A problem solving model for collaborative agents](#). In *Proceedings of the first international joint conference on autonomous agents and multiagent systems: Part 2*, AAMAS '02, pages 774–781, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery. Number of pages: 8 Place: Bologna, Italy.
- James Allen, George Ferguson, Amanda Stent, Scott C Stoness, Mary Swift, Lucian Galescu, Nathanael Chambers, Ellen Campana, et al. 2005. Two diverse systems built using generic components for spoken dialogue (recent progress on trips). In *Proceedings of the ACL Interactive Poster and Demonstration Sessions*, pages 85–88.
- James F Allen, Lenhart K Schubert, George Ferguson, Peter Heeman, Chung Hee Hwang, Tsuneaki Kato, Marc Light, Nathaniel Martin, Bradford Miller, Massimo Poesio, et al. 1995. The trains project: A case study in building a conversational planning agent. *Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence*, 7(1):7–48.
- Jacob Andreas, John Bufe, David Burkett, Charles Chen, Josh Clausman, Jean Crawford, Kate Crim, Jordan DeLoach, Leah Dorner, Jason Eisner, Hao Fang, Alan Guo, David Hall, Kristin Hayes, Kellie Hill, Diana Ho, Wendy Iwaszuk, Smriti Jha, Dan Klein, Jayant Krishnamurthy, Theo Lanman, Percy Liang, Christopher H. Lin, Ilya Lintsbakh, Andy McGovern, Aleksandr Nisnevich, Adam Pauls, Dmitriy Petters, Brent Read, Dan Roth, Subhro Roy, Jesse Rusak, Beth Short, Div Slomin, Ben Snyder, Stephon Striplin, Yu Su, Zachary Tellman, Sam Thomson, Andrei Vorobev, Izabela Witoszko, Jason Wolfe, Abby Wray, Yuchen Zhang, and Alexander Zotov. 2020. [Task-oriented dialogue as dataflow synthesis](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:556–571. Place: Cambridge, MA Publisher: MIT Press.
- Cristian-Paul Bara, Sky CH-Wang, and Joyce Chai. 2021. [MindCraft: Theory of Mind Modeling for Situated Dialogue in Collaborative Tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1112–1125, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Samir Bennacef, Laurence Devillers, Sophie Rosset, and Lori Lamel. 1996. Dialog in the RAIL-TEL telephone-based system. In *Proceeding of fourth international conference on spoken language*



- processing. *ICSLP'96*, volume 1, pages 550–553. Tex.organization: IEEE.
- Dan Bohus and Alexander I. Rudnicky. 2009. [The RavenClaw dialog management framework: Architecture and systems](#). *Computer Speech & Language*, 23(3):332–361.
- Antoine Bordes, Y.-Lan Boureau, and Jason Weston. 2017. [Learning End-to-End Goal-Oriented Dialog](#). ArXiv:1605.07683 [cs].
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, and others. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Paweł Budzianowski, Tsung-Hsien Wen, Bo-Hsiang Tseng, Inigo Casanueva, Stefan Ultes, Osman Ramadan, and Milica Gašić. 2018. Multiwoz—a large-scale multi-domain wizard-of-oz dataset for task-oriented dialogue modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00278*.
- Meng Cao, Yue Dong, and Jackie Chi Kit Cheung. 2022. Hallucinated but factual! inspecting the factuality of hallucinations in abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3340–3354.
- Ta-Chung Chi, Minmin Shen, Mihail Eric, Seokhwan Kim, and Dilek Hakkani-tur. 2020. [Just Ask: An Interactive Learning Framework for Vision and Language Navigation](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(03):2459–2466. Number: 03.
- Junyoung Chung, Çağlar Gülçehre, KyungHyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. [Empirical evaluation of gated recurrent neural networks on sequence modeling](#). *CoRR*, abs/1412.3555. ArXiv: 1412.3555 tex.bibsource: dblp computer science bibliography, <https://dblp.org> tex.biburl: <https://dblp.org/rec/journals/corr/ChungGCB14.bib> tex.timestamp: Mon, 13 Aug 2018 16:47:38 +0200.
- Herbert H. Clark and Susan Brennan. 1991. Grounding in communication. In *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*.
- Herbert H Clark and Deanna Wilkes-Gibbs. 1986. Referring as a collaborative process. *Cognition*, 22(1):1–39. Publisher: Elsevier.
- Philip Cohen. 2019. [Foundations of Collaborative Task-Oriented Dialogue: What’s in a Slot?](#) In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual SIGdial Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 198–209, Stockholm, Sweden. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Philip R. Cohen and Lucian Galescu. 2023. [A Planning-Based Explainable Collaborative Dialogue System](#). ArXiv:2302.09646 [cs].
- Nils Dahlbäck, Annika Flycht-Eriksson, Arne Jönsson, and Pernilla Qvarfordt. 1999. An architecture for multi-modal natural dialogue systems. In *ESCA tutorial and research workshop (ETRW) on interactive dialogue in multi-modal systems*.
- Marc de la Asunción, Luis Castillo, Juan Fdez-Olivares, Óscar García-Pérez, Antonio González, and Francisco Palao. 2005. Siadex: An interactive knowledge-based planner for decision support in forest fire fighting. *Ai Communications*, 18(4):257–268.
- Harm de Vries, Kurt Shuster, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, Jason Weston, and Douwe Kiela. 2018. [Talk the Walk: Navigating New York City through Grounded Dialogue](#). ArXiv:1807.03367 [cs].
- Nils Dählback and Arne Jonsson. 1989. [Empirical studies of discourse representations for natural language interfaces](#). In *Fourth conference of the European chapter of the association for computational linguistics*, Manchester, England. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Martha W. Evens, Ru-Charn Chang, Yoon Hee Lee, Leem Seop Shim, Chong Woo Woo, and Yuemei Zbang. 1997. [CIRCSIM-Tutor: An Intelligent Tutoring System Using Natural Language Dialogue](#). In *Fifth Conference on Applied Natural Language Processing: Descriptions of System Demonstrations and Videos*, pages 13–14, Washington, DC, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Reva Freedman. 2000. [Plan-Based Dialogue Management in a Physics Tutor](#). In *Sixth Applied Natural Language Processing Conference*, pages 52–59, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lucian Galescu, Choh Man Teng, James Allen, and Ian Perera. 2018. [Cogent: A Generic Dialogue System Shell Based on a Collaborative Problem Solving Model](#). In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual SIGdial Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 400–409, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Malik Ghallab, Dana Nau, and Paolo Traverso. 2004. *Automated Planning: theory and practice*. Elsevier.
- Fabrizio Gilardi, Meysam Alizadeh, and Maël Kubli. 2023. Chatgpt outperforms crowd-workers for text-annotation tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15056*.
- Arthur C. Graesser, Shulan Lu, George Tanner Jackson, Heather Hite Mitchell, Mathew Ventura, Andrew Olney, and Max M. Louwerse. 2004. [AutoTutor: A tutor with dialogue in natural language](#). *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 36(2):180–192.
- Jonathan Gratch. 2000. Emile: Marshalling passions in training and education. In *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on Autonomous agents*, pages 325–332.

- Amanda E. Griffith, Gloria Ashiya Katuka, Joseph B. Wiggins, Kristy Elizabeth Boyer, Jason Freeman, Brian Magerko, and Tom McKlin. 2022. [Investigating the Relationship Between Dialogue States and Partner Satisfaction During Co-Creative Learning Tasks](#). *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*.
- He He, Anusha Balakrishnan, Mihail Eric, and Percy Liang. 2017. [Learning Symmetric Collaborative Dialogue Agents with Dynamic Knowledge Graph Embeddings](#). ArXiv:1704.07130 [cs].
- He He, Derek Chen, Anusha Balakrishnan, and Percy Liang. 2018. [Decoupling strategy and generation in negotiation dialogues](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 2333–2343, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780.
- Frank Honold, Pascal Bercher, Felix Richter, Florian Nothdurft, Thomas Geier, Roland Barth, Thilo Hörnle, Felix Schüssel, Stephan Reuter, Matthias Rau, Gregor Bertrand, Bastian Seegebarth, Peter Kurzok, Bernd Schattenberg, Wolfgang Minker, Michael Weber, and Susanne Biundo. 2014. [Companion-technology: Towards user- and situation-adaptive functionality of technical systems](#). In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Intelligent Environments*, IE '14, page 378–381, USA. IEEE Computer Society.
- Minlie Huang, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Challenges in building intelligent open-domain dialog systems. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 38(3):1–32.
- Prashant Jayannavar, Anjali Narayan-Chen, and Julia Hockenmaier. 2020. [Learning to execute instructions in a Minecraft dialogue](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 2589–2602, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38. Publisher: ACM New York, NY.
- Pamela Jordan, Michael Ringenberg, and Brian Hall. 2006. Rapidly developing dialogue systems that support learning studies. In *Proceedings of ITS06 Workshop on Teaching with Robots, Agents, and NLP*, pages 1–8.
- Benjamin Kane, Catherine Giugno, Lenhart Schubert, Kurtis Haut, Caleb Wohn, and Ehsan Hoque. 2022. [A Flexible Schema-Guided Dialogue Management Framework: From Friendly Peer to Virtual Standardized Cancer Patient](#). ArXiv:2207.07276 [cs].
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Scaling laws for neural language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2001.08361.
- Jin-Hwa Kim, Nikita Kitaev, Xinlei Chen, Marcus Rohrbach, Byoung-Tak Zhang, Yuandong Tian, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. 2019. [CoDraw: Collaborative drawing as a testbed for grounded goal-driven communication](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 6495–6513, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vijay Konda and John Tsitsiklis. 1999. [Actor-Critic Algorithms](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12. MIT Press.
- Rohit Kumar and Carolyn P. Rosé. 2011. [Architecture for Building Conversational Agents that Support Collaborative Learning](#). *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 4(1):21–34. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies.
- Staffan Larsson and David R Traum. 2000. Information state and dialogue management in the TRINDI dialogue move engine toolkit. *Natural language engineering*, 6(3-4):323–340. Publisher: Cambridge University Press.
- Jiwei Li, Will Monroe, Alan Ritter, Dan Jurafsky, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. 2016. [Deep Reinforcement Learning for Dialogue Generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1192–1202, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yu Li, Kun Qian, Weiyan Shi, and Zhou Yu. 2019. [End-to-End Trainable Non-Collaborative Dialog System](#). ArXiv:1911.10742 [cs].
- Guangya Liu, Shiqi Wang, Jianxing Yu, and Jian Yin. 2022. A survey on multimodal dialogue systems: Recent advances and new frontiers. In *2022 5th international conference on advanced electronic materials, computers and software engineering (AEMCSE)*, pages 845–853. Tex.organization: IEEE.
- Samuel Louvan and Bernardo Magnini. 2020. [Recent neural methods on slot filling and intent classification for task-oriented dialogue systems: A survey](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 480–496, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Stephanie M. Lukin, Felix Gervits, Cory J. Hayes, Pooja Moolchandani, Anton Leuski, John G. Rogers III, Carlos Sanchez Amaro, Matthew Marge, Clare R. Voss, and David Traum. 2018. [ScoutBot: A dialogue system for collaborative navigation](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2018, system demonstrations*, pages 93–98, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Shikib Mehri and Maxine Eskenazi. 2021. [Schema-Guided Paradigm for Zero-Shot Dialog](#). In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 499–508, Singapore and Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nikola Mrkšić, Diarmuid O Séaghdha, Tsung-Hsien Wen, Blaise Thomson, and Steve Young. 2016. Neural belief tracker: Data-driven dialogue state tracking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.03777*.
- Karen L Myers, W Mabry Tyson, Michael J Wolverton, Peter A Jarvis, Thomas J Lee, and Marie desJardins. 2002. Passat: A user-centric planning framework. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International NASA Workshop on Planning and Scheduling for Space*, pages 1–10. AAAI Press Stanford, California.
- Anjali Narayan-Chen, Colin Graber, Mayukh Das, Md Rakibul Islam, Soham Dan, Sriraam Natarajan, Janardhan Rao Doppa, Julia Hockenmaier, Martha Palmer, and Dan Roth. 2017. [Towards Problem Solving Agents that Communicate and Learn](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Language Grounding for Robotics*, pages 95–103, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anjali Narayan-Chen, Prashant Jayannavar, and Julia Hockenmaier. 2019. [Collaborative Dialogue in Minecraft](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5405–5415, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Florian Nothdurft, Stefan Ultes, and Wolfgang Minker. 2015a. Finding appropriate interaction strategies for proactive dialogue systems—an open quest. pages 73–80.
- Florian Nothdurft, Gregor Behnke, Pascal Bercher, Susanne Biundo, and Wolfgang Minker. 2015b. [The interplay of user-centered dialog systems and AI planning](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 344–353, Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ioannis Papaioannou, Christian Dondrup, and Oliver Lemon. 2018. Human-robot interaction requires more than slot filling-multi-threaded dialogue for collaborative tasks and social conversation. In *FAIM/ISCA Workshop on Artificial Intelligence for Multimodal Human Robot Interaction*, pages 61–64.
- Sang-Min Park and Young-Gab Kim. 2023. Visual language navigation: A survey and open challenges. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 56(1):365–427. Publisher: Springer.
- Martha E Pollack. 1992. The uses of plans. *Artificial Intelligence*, 57(1):43–68. Publisher: Citeseer.
- David Premack and Guy Woodruff. 1978. Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 1(4):515–526. Publisher: Cambridge University Press.
- Liang Qiu, Yizhou Zhao, Jinchao Li, Pan Lu, Baolin Peng, Jianfeng Gao, and Song-Chun Zhu. 2022a. Valuenet: A new dataset for human value driven dialogue system. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 11183–11191.
- Liang Qiu, Yizhou Zhao, Yuan Liang, Pan Lu, Weiyan Shi, Zhou Yu, and Song-Chun Zhu. 2022b. [Towards Socially Intelligent Agents with Mental State Transition and Human Value](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 146–158, Edinburgh, UK. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anand S. Rao and Michael P. Georgeff. 1991. Modeling rational agents within a bdi-architecture. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, KR’91, page 473–484, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Abhinav Rastogi, Xiaoxue Zang, Srinivas Sunkara, Raghav Gupta, and Pranav Khaitan. 2020. [Towards Scalable Multi-Domain Conversational Agents: The Schema-Guided Dialogue Dataset](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(05):8689–8696. Number: 05.
- Liliang Ren, Kaige Xie, Lu Chen, and Kai Yu. 2018. [Towards universal dialogue state tracking](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2780–2786, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Charles Rich, Candace L. Sidner, and Neal Lesh. 2001. [Collagen: Applying Collaborative Discourse Theory to Human-Computer Interaction](#). *AI Magazine*, 22(4):15–15. Number: 4.
- Homero Roman Roman, Yonatan Bisk, Jesse Thomason, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. [RMM: A Recursive Mental Model for Dialog Navigation](#). ArXiv:2005.00728 [cs].
- Abraham Sanders, Tomek Strzalkowski, Mei Si, Albert Chang, Deepanshu Dey, Jonas Braasch, and Dakuo Wang. 2022. [Towards a Progression-Aware Autonomous Dialogue Agent](#). ArXiv:2205.03692 [cs].
- Sashank Santhanam, Zhuo Cheng, Brodie Mather, Bonnie Dorr, Archana Bhatia, Bryanna Hebenstreit, Alan Zemel, Adam Dalton, Tomek Strzalkowski, and Samira Shaikh. 2020. [Learning to Plan and Realize Separately for Open-Ended Dialogue Systems](#). arXiv:2009.12506 [cs]. ArXiv: 2009.12506.
- Sashank Santhanam and Samira Shaikh. 2019. A survey of natural language generation techniques with a focus on dialogue systems-past, present and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00500*.



- Michael Schlichtkrull, Thomas N Kipf, Peter Bloem, Rianne Van Den Berg, Ivan Titov, and Max Welling. 2018. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. In *The Semantic Web: 15th International Conference, ESWC 2018, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, June 3–7, 2018, Proceedings 15*, pages 593–607. Springer.
- Shalom H Schwartz. 1992. Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In *Advances in experimental social psychology*, volume 25, pages 1–65. Elsevier.
- John R. Searle. 1969. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Iulian Serban, Alessandro Sordoni, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Joelle Pineau. 2016a. Building end-to-end dialogue systems using generative hierarchical neural network models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 30. Number: 1.
- Iulian Vlad Serban, Alessandro Sordoni, Ryan Lowe, Laurent Charlin, Joelle Pineau, Aaron C. Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2016b. *A hierarchical latent variable encoder-decoder model for generating dialogues*. *CoRR*, abs/1605.06069.
- Darsh J Shah, Raghav Gupta, Amir A Fayazi, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. 2019. Robust zero-shot cross-domain slot filling with example values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.06870*.
- Zohreh Shams, Marina De Vos, Nir Oren, and Julian Padget. 2016. Normative practical reasoning via argumentation and dialogue. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’16*, page 1244–1250. AAAI Press.
- Zhengxiang Shi, Yue Feng, and Aldo Lipani. 2022. *Learning to Execute Actions or Ask Clarification Questions*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 2060–2070, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Seitaro Shinagawa, Koichiro Yoshino, Seyed Hossein Alavi, Kallirroi Georgila, David Traum, Sakriani Sakti, and Satoshi Nakamura. 2020. *An Interactive Image Editing System Using an Uncertainty-Based Confirmation Strategy*. *IEEE Access*, 8:98471–98480. Conference Name: IEEE Access.
- Heung-Yeung Shum, Xiao-dong He, and Di Li. 2018. From Eliza to XiaoIce: challenges and opportunities with social chatbots. *Frontiers of Information Technology & Electronic Engineering*, 19:10–26. Publisher: Springer.
- Jürgen Streeck, Charles Goodwin, and Curtis LeBaron. 2011. *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jan-Willem Strijbos. 2004. The effect of roles on computer-supported collaborative learning.
- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V Le. 2014. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27.
- David Traum. 2017. *Computational Approaches to Dialogue*. In Weigand Edda, editor, *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Dialogue*, 1 edition, pages 143–161. Routledge, New York, NY : Routledge, [2017] | Series: Routledge Handbooks in Linguistics.
- David Traum, Johan Bos, Robin Cooper, Staffan Larsson, Ian Lewin, Colin Matheson, and Massimo Poesio. 1999. A model of dialogue moves and information state revision.
- David Traum, Stacy C. Marsella, Jonathan Gratch, Jina Lee, and Arno Hartholt. 2008. *Multi-party, Multi-issue, Multi-strategy Negotiation for Multi-modal Virtual Agents*. In *Intelligent Virtual Agents*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 117–130, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.
- Jack Urbanek, Angela Fan, Siddharth Karamcheti, Saachi Jain, Samuel Humeau, Emily Dinan, Tim Rocktäschel, Douwe Kiela, Arthur Szlam, and Jason Weston. 2019. *Learning to speak and act in a fantasy text adventure game*. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and the 9th international joint conference on natural language processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 673–683, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kurt VanLehn, Pamela W. Jordan, Carolyn P. Rosé, Dumisizwe Bhembé, Michael Böttner, Andy Gaydos, Maxim Makatchev, Umarani Pappuswamy, Michael Ringenberg, Antonio Roque, Stephanie Siler, and Ramesh Srivastava. 2002. *The Architecture of Why2-Atlas: A Coach for Qualitative Physics Essay Writing*. In *Intelligent Tutoring Systems*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 158–167, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.
- Narumol Vannaprathip, Peter Haddawy, Holger Schultheis, and Siriwan Suebnukarn. 2022. *Intelligent Tutoring for Surgical Decision Making: a Planning-Based Approach*. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32(2):350–381.
- Nicholas Thomas Walker, Stefan Ultes, and Pierre Lison. 2022. *GraphWOZ: Dialogue Management with Conversational Knowledge Graphs*. ArXiv:2211.12852 [cs].
- Xuewei Wang, Weiyan Shi, Richard Kim, Yoojung Oh, Sijia Yang, Jingwen Zhang, and Zhou Yu. 2019. *Persuasion for good: Towards a personalized persuasive dialogue system for social good*. In *Proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 5635–5649, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.



- Noreen M. Webb and Sydney Farivar. 1999. Developing productive group interaction in middle school mathematics. In *Cognitive perspectives on peer learning*, The Rutgers Invitational Symposium On Education Series, pages 117–149. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, Mahwah, NJ, US.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*.
- Joseph Weizenbaum. 1966. ELIZA—a computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Communications of the ACM*, 9(1):36–45. Publisher: ACM New York, NY, USA.
- Tsung-Hsien Wen, Milica Gasic, Nikola Mrksic, Pei-Hao Su, David Vandyke, and Steve Young. 2015. Semantically conditioned lstm-based natural language generation for spoken dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.01745*.
- Tsung-Hsien Wen, David Vandyke, Nikola Mrksic, Milica Gasic, Lina M. Rojas-Barahona, Pei-Hao Su, Stefan Ultes, and Steve Young. 2017. [A Network-based End-to-End Trainable Task-oriented Dialogue System](#). ArXiv:1604.04562 [cs, stat].
- Jason Weston, Emily Dinan, and Alexander Miller. 2018. [Retrieve and refine: Improved sequence generation models for dialogue](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop SCAI: The 2nd International Workshop on Search-Oriented Conversational AI*, pages 87–92, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason D Williams, Matthew Henderson, Antoine Raux, Blaise Thomson, Alan Black, and Deepak Ramachandran. 2014a. The dialog state tracking challenge series. *AI Magazine*, 35(4):121–124.
- Jason D. Williams, Matthew Henderson, Antoine Raux, Blaise Thomson, Alan Black, and Deepak Ramachandran. 2014b. [The Dialog State Tracking Challenge Series](#). *AI Magazine*, 35(4):121–124. Number: 4.
- Thomas Wolf, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, and Clement Delangue. 2019. [TransferTransfo: A transfer learning approach for neural network based conversational agents](#).
- Sebastian Wollny, Jan Schneider, Daniele Di Mitri, Joshua Weidlich, Marc Rittberger, and Hendrik Drachsler. 2021. [Are We There Yet? - A Systematic Literature Review on Chatbots in Education](#). *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 4:654924.
- Denis Yarats and Mike Lewis. 2017. Hierarchical text generation and planning for strategic dialogue. In *International conference on machine learning*.
- Adams Wei Yu, David Dohan, Minh-Thang Luong, Rui Zhao, Kai Chen, Mohammad Norouzi, and Quoc V Le. 2018. Qanet: Combining local convolution with global self-attention for reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.09541*.
- Pei Zhou, Andrew Zhu, Jennifer Hu, Jay Pujara, Xiang Ren, Chris Callison-Burch, Yejin Choi, and Prithviraj Ammanabrolu. 2022. [An AI Dungeon Master’s Guide: Learning to Converse and Guide with Intent and Theory-of-Mind in Dungeons and Dragons](#). ArXiv:2212.10060 [cs].
- Yiheng Zhou, He He, Alan W Black, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2019. [A dynamic strategy coach for effective negotiation](#). In *Proceedings of the 20th annual SIGdial meeting on discourse and dialogue*, pages 367–378, Stockholm, Sweden. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yiheng Zhou, Yulia Tsvetkov, Alan W. Black, and Zhou Yu. 2020. [Augmenting Non-Collaborative Dialog Systems with Explicit Semantic and Strategic Dialog History](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.