

Reference Resolution and Context Change in Multimodal Situated Dialogue for Exploring Data Visualizations

Abhinav Kumar

University of Illinois Chicago
akumar34@uic.edu

Barbara Di Eugenio

University of Illinois Chicago
bdieugen@uic.edu

Abari Bhattacharya

University of Illinois Chicago
abhatt62@uic.edu

Jillian Aurisano

University of Cincinnati
jillian.aurisano@uc.edu

Andrew Johnson

University of Illinois Chicago
ajohnson@uic.edu

Abstract

Reference resolution, which aims to identify entities being referred to by a speaker, is more complex in real world settings: new referents may be created by processes the agents engage in and/or be salient only because they belong to the shared physical setting. Our focus is on resolving references to visualizations on a large screen display in multimodal dialogue; crucially, reference resolution is directly involved in the process of creating new visualizations. We describe our annotations for user references to visualizations appearing on a large screen via language and hand gesture and also new entity establishment, which results from executing the user request to create a new visualization. We also describe our reference resolution pipeline which relies on an information-state architecture to maintain dialogue context. We report results on detecting and resolving references, effectiveness of contextual information on the model, and under-specified requests for creating visualizations. We also experiment with conventional CRF and deep learning / transformer models (BiLSTM-CRF and BERT-CRF) for tagging references in user utterance text. Our results show that transfer learning significantly boost performance of the deep learning methods, although CRF still out-performs them, suggesting that conventional methods may generalize better for low resource data.

1 Introduction

Conversation is understood in context. When the world, whether real or simulated, can change because of the user’s actions, new entities are created by the processes that change the world itself; in this context, reference resolution, which is tasked with linking what the user refers to with objects

in the world, is crucial for a dialogue system to effectively respond to the user, including to create the new entities themselves.

In this work, we discuss our approach to new entity establishment and reference resolution to deal with references to visualizations on a large screen display where new visualizations are constantly being added and then moved, opened/closed, or even removed. In our *CITY-CRIME-VIZ corpus*, (see Section 3), the user may ask U_1 : *can I see theft in the downtown area*, resulting in a first visualization Viz_1 ; and then U_2 : *can you show that graph by day of the week?*, which results in a second visualization Viz_2 . Viz_2 is created by first resolving the referring expression *that graph* to Viz_1 , and then generating the specifications for Viz_2 by updating the specifications for Viz_1 according to U_2 . This is an example of *accommodating context change*, a notion first introduced by (Webber and Baldwin, 1992) in their discussion of new entities that are the results of physical processes as in cooking: *Mix the flour, butter and water. Knead the dough until smooth and shiny*. In the 30 years since (Webber and Baldwin, 1992), not much work has been done on how to accommodate the creation of new entities (see (Wilson et al., 2016) for documents and (Li and Boyer, 2016) for tutoring dialogues about programming), and none in the visualization domain; and none that marries traditional information-state architecture with contemporary lexical representations and approaches as we do here. Additionally, our task is inherently multimodal, specifically as concerns deictic gestures.

Our overall research goal is to build a conversational assistant to support users explore data visualization via multimodal interaction. We collected a corpus of interactions *City-Crime-Vis* from 16 sub-

jects tasked with forming effective police deployment strategies based on crime patterns discovered while exploring visualizations of our city’s public data. The subjects interacted with a Visualization Expert (VE) which they knew to be a person interacting remotely from a separate room. We have designed, developed and evaluated a first version of our assistant (References withheld); the reference resolution work we describe here is part of a second version of the assistant.

We highlight our contributions as follows. (1) We believe we are the first to code for visualization references in a large screen environment supporting multiple visualizations at a time. We tagged referring noun phrases (NPs), data attributes (slot fillers) in these NPs, and co-occurring pointing gestures. Because the user rarely fully specifies the visualization to be created, we can use the slot fillers as components of semantic structures that are used both to find the referent visualization, and to create the specification for the new one. (2) Existing visualization software have applied rule-based grammars for detecting references in text, which are difficult to scale, including to the different forms these references can take (pronouns, deictics, full NPs). Alternatively, we use conditional random field (CRF) to detect referential expressions, achieving an F1 score of 61.6% on our corpus data. (3) Furthermore we investigated several deep learning (DL) models for reference detection. Given the small size of our data, we found that using transfer learning techniques leads to an increase in F1 score by 10% over the single task learning baselines. However our experiments also show that our CRF tagger attains superior performance. This is noteworthy as it shows that conventional methods may be better suited for certain tasks and domains for which scarce data is available. (4) Lastly, our reference resolution model crucially relies on an information-state architecture (Larsson and Traum, 2000). It constantly updates the dialogue state after each conversational turn, to keep track of the visualizations on the screen at that instant and information about each of them. Additionally, while our model encodes preference towards more recently added visualizations to the screen, dialogue state allows access to all those currently visible. This approach boosts accuracy by 6% over the baseline, in which only the most recent visualization is an eligible candidate referent).

We strongly believe in ecologically valid data,

which in our case is multimodal as well. This data is by nature small, in fact tiny as compared to most current datasets. We believe work like ours complements work conducted on large datasets such as Multiwoz (Budzianowski et al., 2018), which are somewhat artificially generated.

2 Related Work

Multimodal Dialogue Corpora. Efforts to build corpora with referential cues in situated multimodal dialogue are not new (e.g., referential annotations based on speech and eye gaze for puzzle pieces (Iida et al., 2011); speech and haptic gestures for human-robot interaction (Chen and Di Eugenio, 2012; Chen et al., 2015), and so on). Specifically for visualization, Quda (Fu et al., 2020) includes task annotations for independent queries, but no dialogue corpus is available that we are aware of.

Multimodal Reference Resolution. When processes take place in a real or simulated world, then the user refers to objects not only through language, but also through nonverbal cues such as gestures (Navarretta, 2011; Qu and Chai, 2008; Landragin, 2006; Eisenstein and Davis, 2006), eye gaze (Prasov and Chai, 2008; Iida et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2017), and haptic information (Foster et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2015). The objects being referred to could be text entities introduced earlier in the discourse or those in external environments, such as icons on a screen (Kehler, 2000), ingredients or tools for a recipe (Whitney et al., 2016; Chen and Di Eugenio, 2012).

Reference Resolution applied to Visualization. Other visualization systems either limit interaction to system-initiative dialogue flow (Cox et al., 2001), only handle referents to objects within the current visualization (Sun et al., 2010; Gao et al., 2015; Narechania et al., 2020), or only track referents for follow-up queries on a current visualization (Reithinger et al., 2005; Setlur et al., 2016; Hoque et al., 2017; Srinivasan and Stasko, 2017). Similar to our work, Flowsense (Yu and Silva, 2019) and Articulate (Sun et al., 2010) are capable of displaying multiple visualizations to the user as well. However in contrast to these applications, we focus on reference resolution within a dynamic environment (Webber and Baldwin, 1992) in which each new visualization introduced into discourse is constructed at that time and can subsequently be moved or removed from the screen at a later time. Furthermore, we are the first (as far as we know) to

propose an ML approach to identifying visualization referring expressions compared to rule-based techniques (Hoque et al., 2017).

Transfer Learning techniques are known to boost deep learning performance in low resource settings such as ours. Transfer learning gives a model new insight from auxiliary tasks rather than training from scratch on the target task, consequently reducing training time and improving generalization on smaller data (Pan and Yang, 2009). It is a vital tool for NLP due to data scarcity for domain focused language data, gaining considerable popularity especially for contextual embeddings (Rahman et al., 2020; Howard and Ruder, 2018; Radford et al., 2018), speech recognition (Song et al., 2019), sequence tagging (Perl et al., 2020; Søgaard and Goldberg, 2016), and user adaptation (Genevay and Laroche, 2016).

3 Dataset and annotations

Our *City-Crime-Vis* corpus comprises multimodal interaction for 16 subjects that explored public crime data in our city to better deploy police officers. As noted, they spoke with a human VE who remotely created visualizations on a large screen, was not visible and did not speak back. The corpus contains 3.2K utterances. Since the user was encouraged to reason out loud about the patterns discovered via visualization, conversational turns often start with *think aloud*, followed by what we called an *actionable request* (AR) for the VE.

Using ANVIL (Kipp, 2001, 2014), we annotated 449 utterances in context as ARs, hence obtaining 449 CARs (*contextual actionable requests*): a CAR consists of *setup*, i.e. think aloud prior to the AR (up to and including utterances that mention data attributes, if any); the AR; and the *conclusion*, the think aloud subsequent to the AR (also based on data-attribute mentions). Figure 1 illustrates an excerpt from the corpus, comprising two CARs.

Each AR is annotated for user intent with one of 8 Dialogue Acts (DA) labels, e.g., WINMGMT for window management operations, such as closing, moving, maximizing, or minimizing a visualization; CREATEVIS for creating a new visualization from scratch; MODIFYVIS for creating a new visualization based on an existing one. Referential expression annotation is described next. Full details on the annotation, including intercoder agreement, can be found in (Reference withheld). The transcribed corpus is publicly available; and so is

an augmented dataset built to alleviate data scarcity, comprising a 10-fold increase to 160 subjects covering approximately 15K utterances obtained via delexicalization and paraphrasing.

3.1 Referring Expressions

We annotated both *text* (NPs) and *gestural* references to visualizations. Hand gestures were coded with various labels (e.g., the kind of gesture, the objects pointed to on the screen, and so on); approximately a third were identified as referential when they co-occur with text references. Within text references, we also identify certain phrases as slot fillers corresponding to data attributes (i.e., *slots*) in our knowledge ontology (KO)¹.

We labeled a total of 294 references in the corpus (176 text references (60%) and 118 gesture references (approximately one third co-occur with text references) (40%)) as well as 680 slot fillers. For reference resolution, we attained an excellent intercoder agreement of $\kappa = 0.85$ with 2 judges on the full interaction from one subject: the transcript and potential references were provided, and each of the judges filled out the referent target visualization for each reference.

Currently, for simplicity, our model focuses on single references occurring in *setup* and *AR*, not in *conclusion*. Consider "*Can you bring up the the graph behind the River North one?*". The user refers to two visualizations here: the "*the River North one*" and the graph placed behind it on the screen. We only evaluate "*the graph*" in this case since we only process a single reference per request. We also only consider visualization references to a *single target*. The request "[...] *I would like to see battery by— well I would like to see battery by day of week, battery by month, and battery by year.*" results in 3 new corresponding visualizations. However, our model only adds one of these visualizations to the dialogue history (DH) as part of the evaluation and hence we ignore any references to either of the other two visualizations, which are not in the DH.

Table 1 presents reference counts for *setup* and ARs: 5% of text references are in *setup* and 62% in ARs; 8.5% of gesture references are in *setup* and 74% in ARs; hence, 33% of text references (52) and 18% of gesture references (21) appear in

¹Semi-automatically constructed via external sources comprised of 3.5K total terms categorized into 11 parent slots such as CRIME TYPE, NEIGHBORHOOD, MONTH, YEAR (Reference withheld)

Text References		
Total: 176		
Category	Setup	Request
Overall	19	109
Single References	18	86
Single Targets	14	66

Gesture References		
Total: 118		
Category	Setup	Request
Overall	10	87
Single References	9	70
Single Targets	9	45

Table 1: Text and gesture reference corpus counts.

conclusion. Single references account for about 94.7% of references in setup and for about 80% of those in ARs. Finally, when filtering on single targets, we are left with the 80 text and 54 gesture references on which we will focus.

4 Approach: Detection, Resolution, and New Entity Establishment

The pipeline relies on an information state architecture with dialogue state tracking. Reference resolution is carried out in two particular scenarios: the user asks to (1) perform window management on a current visualization (e.g., close, move, and so on) or (2) create a new visualization based on current data or template. An example for the latter is shown in Fig. 2, in which the user asks to construct visualization "09" by using "08-3" as a template. The pipeline begins with language understanding of the full CAR #2 from Fig. 1 (we only show the AR part of the entire CAR segment here for simplicity) to form a *User Action* frame containing fixed frame attributes. While user intent, visualization references, and slots are filled, others are left empty either because of under-specification by the user (e.g., axes labels, plot title, plot type, and so on) or they require back-end processing (e.g., query results to retrieve requested data, referent visualization identifiers to resolve references). Then the state tracker uses the DH to keep track of which visualizations are on the screen. In Fig. 2, the DH contains a single entry for "08-3". Subsequently, the dialogue manager executes a dialogue policy which aside from making back-end decisions such as forming an SQL query for data retrieval, also seeks to populate the unknown frame attribute values; it outputs an *Agent Action* frame (structurally identical to User Action). Finally the state tracker adds the Agent Action as a new entry in the DH while the system also outputs a json object (which

we call a *visualization specification*) that instructs a separate visualization interface software to accordingly update the screen (i.e., add visualization "09" in this case).

As concerns referring expressions and their resolution, the pipeline undertakes the following steps, to be described in detail next: referring expression detection; semantic structure / visualization vector construction; reference resolution; new entity establishment.

4.1 Detection

We trained a sequence tagging model to detect text references (see Section 5.1 for details). The model predicts tags using the standard IOB2 format (i.e., "B-REF"/"I-REF"/"O-REF" for beginning of / inside / outside text reference respectively. In the current example, our model tagging output is: [(Ok, O), (let's, O), (have, O), (a, O), (look, O), (at, O), (can, O), (you, O), (have, O), (**this, B**), (**graph, I**), (for, O), (months, O), (of, O), (the, O), (year, O)]. The User Action frame (#1 in Fig. 2) attribute **Text Ref.** is updated accordingly.

Gestures are determined to be referential if they are pointing to a visualization on the screen and also co-occur with a text reference. In our example, a text reference is present ("*this graph*") hence the User Action frame boolean attribute **Gest Ref.** is set to *True*.

4.2 Semantic Structure Construction

Each time a user asks to construct a new visualization, our model looks for slots in the request to form the semantic structure for the new visualization (this also applies for the referring expression). In particular, we find phrases that are in close proximity in the embedding vector space to terms in the KO, by using a domain targeted word embedding model (WE)². Subsequently the candidate words are pruned based on linguistic patterns using the SpaCy³ dependency parse of the entire utterance to form the finalized list of slot fillers. For example in the AR in Fig. 2, the prepositional phrase "*for months of year*" contains the complements "*month*" and "*year*", both of which are known as temporal slots in KO. Here, the terms are merged to form "*months of year*", and mapped to the parent slot MONTH, since "*month*" appears first in the phrase.

²100-dimensional continuous bag-of-words model trained on 5GB of online articles and wikipedia pages related to crime.

³<http://spacy.io>




Figure 1: Excerpt comprising two Contextualized Actionable Requests (CARs); references shown in red (text) and blue (gesture), and slot fillers in green. In CAR #1 future visualization "08-3" is specified via temporal axis DAY associated with slot filler "week" and similarly CRIME for "crimes". In CAR #2, follow-up request to "08-3" (referred to via text reference "this graph" and co-occurring gesture) creates "09" substituting temporal axis DAY with MONTH, associated with slot filler "month of year" (identifiers are for clarity but not part of display).

The slot fillers are then transformed to low-dimensional space. In particular, the 11 slots in the KO are projected onto an embedding space along 11 dimensions, each computed using the WE model, representing features for visualization and referring expressions. In case a slot filler corresponds to a slot value in the KO, it is simply averaged into the corresponding parent slot position in the feature vector.

4.3 Reference Resolution

In Fig. 2, the DH contains only an entry for "08-3" introduced previously in the interaction. Subsequently, when resolving visualization references for future visualization "09" the model only considers "08-3" as a candidate referent (it is selected because their cosine similarity score exceeds a cut-off score).

Our model encodes preference to the most recent entries. If n represents the total entries in

the DH, then the visualization vectors of the most recent $\frac{n}{2}$ entries in the DH are associated with a multiplicative factor of 1.0 signifying that they are equally preferred. The latter $\frac{n}{2}$ entries in the DH however are associated with a linear decrease by a factor of $\frac{1}{n}$. For example, if $n = 6$, then any of the most recent 3 entries are equally likely candidates; the visualization vectors for the remaining entries are multiplied by factors of $\frac{2}{3}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, and $\frac{0}{3}$ respectively. Finally, cosine similarity is used to score each visualization in the DH relative to the referring expression and the visualization with the highest score is selected.

4.4 New Entity Establishment

Finally visualization "09" is constructed using the "08-3" template. Note that MONTH serves a double purpose since it was used to resolve the referring expression (via WE embedding and cosine similarity among semantic structures), while also

replacing WEEK as the temporal axis in "09".

Our model also infers missing information the user does not mention in the request. For example plot type is set to line chart in the presence of temporal entities to better display trends across time. Otherwise, by default bar chart would be selected since 56% of all visualizations in the corpus are bar charts. In the case of *follow-up requests*, in which the user makes reference to a visualization from a previous query, information can be added from the original request. In the running example, CRIME is added to the entities list in the Agent Action because "08-3" of the previous request includes it.

5 Experiments and Results

5.1 Detection

As described in Sec. 4.1, we treat the problem of detecting text references (DTR) as a sequence labeling task. With only 294 references appearing across 449 CARs in the corpus, the task has access to a limited number of labels for model training. We investigated transfer learning to address data insufficiency, i.e. our goal is to transfer knowledge from a source sequence tagging task with access to a large number of labels (i.e., NER in our case) to DTR. The *City-Crime-Vis* corpus data is supplied to the DTR task associated with 3 possible tags (see Sec. 4.1) while the augmented dataset of approximately 15K utterances (see Sec. 3) is provided to the NER task, comprising 23 labels (the "B" and "I" tag for each of the 11 parent slots in the KO plus "O" tag).

For knowledge transfer in sequence tagging problems, a generalizable architecture is preferred to optimize relatedness of tasks to maximize weight sharing (Collobert et al., 2011). Advanced approaches known to combine the benefits of CRF with deep learning (Collobert et al., 2011; Hammerton, 2003; Jagannatha and Yu, 2016; Chiu and Nichols, 2016) in particular can be leveraged where only the CRF layer needs to be adjusted to account for the difference in labels while sharing the other layers (Yang et al., 2017). For our experiments, we chose CRF for sequence tagging (Fields, 2001; Sha and Pereira, 2003) which is implemented using Sklearn-CRF Suite⁴ package; and also chose BiLSTM-CRF and BERT-CRF are implemented in Keras⁵.

⁴<https://sklearn-crfsuite.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

⁵<https://keras.io/>

5.1.1 Features

The input to the models consist of utterances (20 words maximum), coarse-grained POS tags, and sequential text features. They are trained using 5-cross validation. For training CRF we used L-BFGS optimization with 0.10 coefficients for L1 and L2 regularization. BiLSTM-CRF is trained on a batch size of 1024 and 10 epochs and BERT-CRF is trained on batch size of 64 and 5 epochs. Early stopping was applied to F1 score to address class imbalance. Finally, "O" tags which commonly dominate other labels in NER data are addressed by skipping utterances only containing "O" labels. The following describes the deep learning models:

- (a) **Single Task learners (Baselines)** BiLSTM-CRF consists of an embedding layer of 100 hidden units followed by a BiLSTM layer for the current utterance and similarly for coarse-POS tags, followed by a merge layer and dense layer and finally a CRF layer. The BERT-CRF architecture has a similar architecture to BiLSTM-CRF except it uses a BERT layer (corresponding to the pre-trained cased model) to output 768 dimensional contextual embeddings for the utterance input and an embedding layer and BiLSTM layer to process POS tag input. Both models are trained on the target DTR data.
- (b) **Sequential Transfer Task Learners (STL)** The models are trained on the NER data first using a CRF layer with 23 output dimensions to build pre-trained models. Then, the CRF layer is replaced with a new untrained CRF layer with 3 dimensions output for fine tuning with the DTR data.
- (c) **Multi Task Learners (MTL)** In both BiLSTM-CRF and BERT-CRF, the model architecture is altered to share weights from all the layers prior to the CRF layer between the NER and DTR tasks. The CRF layer cannot be shared due to difference in number of possible labels for the two tasks.

Results in table 2 show that transfer learning boosts the performance of the deep learning models. In particular, the multi-task learners (i.e., BiLSTM-CRF-MultiL and BERT-CRF-MultiL) statistically significantly ⁶ ($p < 0.001$) outperform the baselines (i.e., BiLSTM-CRF, BERT-CRF) by over 10%

⁶One-way Anova with post-hoc Tukey HSD.




Figure 2: The user (inside the circle) currently has visualization "08-3" on the screen and is asking to construct "future" visualization "09" (in dashed lines). Language understanding creates user action (1); then the dialogue manager takes dialogue history (2) and creates agent action (3); finally the state tracker updates dialogue history (4).

Model	F1
BERT-CRF	0.318
BiLSTM-CRF	0.327
BERT-CRF-STL	0.345
BiLSTM-CRF-STL	0.404
BiLSTM-CRF-MTL	0.435
BERT-CRF-MTL	0.435
CRF	0.616

Table 2: Text ref. detection using transfer learning. CRF statistically significantly outperforms other models.

F1. This is consistent with the literature which indicates weight sharing allows increased sharing of knowledge between similar neural network architectures.

Table 2 also indicates CRF performs statistically significantly better than all other models. This suggests that auxiliary tasks in addition to NER may be necessary to further see improvement as well as adding features other than POS tags. This reaffirms our choice for the detection framework (i.e., CRF), which we use in the evaluation of the whole reference resolution pipeline in the following. Note that only detection can benefit from deep learning / transfer learning, since it can be set up as a classification problem.

5.2 Reference Resolution Pipeline

Detection. Table 3 shows how accurately our model detects the annotated labels for the reference

Label	Setup	Request
Text Ref.	60.0	55.0
Gesture Ref.	53.0	39.0

Table 3: Accuracy on detecting referring expressions (B-REF, I-REF, O-REF).

Type	Slots Detected				
	= 0	≤ 25	≤ 50	≤ 75	≤ 100
AR	16	5	18	67	132
FR	16	0	4	8	13

Table 4: Total ARs with percent of slots matched. Also shown for follow up (FR), a small subset of AR.

resolution task; recall there are a total of 54 gesture and 80 text references cross setup and request, achieving an overall accuracy score of 52.2%. Note that the model performed worst on gesture references. One possible reason for this is that the heuristic rule for deciding whether a gesture is referential may need to be relaxed (we currently ignore any gesture that did not co-occur with a text reference). Another factor could be that our CRF tagger model for detecting text references may need further exploration potentially taking gesture features into account since they often co-occur.

Semantic Structure Construction. Overall, our model achieved an accuracy score of 66.2% for detecting slots as part of the new entity establishment process for visualization features. Further analysis

Ref	Setup Win. =			AR Win. =		
	0	1	∞	0	1	∞
Gest.	0.0	93.0	100.0	0.0	68.4	100.0
Text	0.0	85.3	85.3	0.0	74.4	68.3
All	0.0	82.6	87.0	0.0	73.0	82.9

Table 5: Resolution accuracy for varying window sizes.

from Table 4 shows that in over half of all utterances (57.6%), all the slots were detected while in 85.3% of the utterances, at least 75% of them were successfully detected. We will discuss follow-up requests shortly.

Resolution. Accuracy on resolving text and gesture references for varying *WINDOW* sizes is shown in Table 5. Focusing first on unlimited window size (i.e., ∞ for all referent visualization candidates are eligible), we see 100% accuracy for gesture references for both setup and request as expected: ground truth gestures are used for input for the experiment. This also validates that our DM is correctly performing state tracking. Next, text references found in ARs are correctly resolved for over 68% while for setup it is 85%. Overall accuracy score for resolving references is 83.6%.

Turning now to other window sizes, an expected trend can be observed in Table 5: as one increases the number of eligible candidate referents for resolution, there is an overall increase in correctly resolved visualization references. In particular dialogue context boosts accuracy by approximately 10% for ARs and 4% for setup. However, text references struggle with increasing window size, suggesting our linear decay function may need further tuning to better model the user preference behavior. Further analysis actually shows similar behavior between the model and user: in over 75% of the time the most recent visualization is chosen by both, however for further away entries the linear decay function penalizes them too harshly leading to the model rarely choosing them.

Under-specification. Table 4 shows in over half the cases (51.2%), at least 75% of slots in follow up requests are detected by our model. Moreover Table 7 shows that the model achieves close to a 6% boost in accuracy, however the model struggles to identify slots beyond one request in follow up sequences of requests. Next, Table 6 shows model performance on plot type prediction. The model predicts between three kinds of plots including heat map, line chart, and bar graphs. Bar graphs

Plot type	F1
Heat map	0.467
Line chart	0.511
Bar graph	0.739

Table 6: Average F1 score for predicted plot type.

WINDOW	Acc
0	60.0
1	65.8
∞	66.2

Table 7: Slot detection accuracy for varying window sizes.

achieved superior performance. Over half the visualizations (56%) shown to the user are bar graphs. Heat maps performed worst; it is not always obvious when to use heat maps. For instance, asking for crimes by neighborhood could be shown as a bar graph to quickly determine the safest and most dangerous neighborhoods whereas as a heat map the location of the neighborhoods is also shown.

6 Conclusions and Future Work

We have presented a reference resolution model for multi-modal visualization dialogue. In particular, the model resolves visualization references in the context of the current interaction, crucially tracking visualizations constantly being added and removed from the screen. Also the model is central to the creation of new visualizations: visualization features via entity introduction help the model know how to refer to a visualization later on.

We plan to address potential extensions in future work. First, the model assumes proximity to measure the word dependency relationship between a referring expression and nearby slots (e.g., "*months of year*" is in the same utterance as "*this graph*"). Incorporating additional linguistic information via the dependency parse tree can capture this relationship more reliably. Other worthwhile avenues to explore include ways to better model user behavior for referring to more distant visualizations and adapting our resolution algorithm beyond the cosine similarity measure to more sophisticated machine learning based approaches to take advantage of the rich visualization feature space in our case. Also, as part of our broader research objectives, we intend to conduct studies with real users interacting with our visualization system, by integrating our resolution pipeline with the first version of the assistant: there, we used an Android app that employs

the Google Speech API to perform speech-to-text on the click of a button and a gesture recognition system that recognizes pointing gestures using a Microsoft Kinect camera calibrated for our large screen display.

References

- 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*.
- Lin Chen and Barbara Di Eugenio. 2012. Co-reference via pointing and haptics in multi-modal dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 2012 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 523–527. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lin Chen, Maria Javaid, Barbara Di Eugenio, and Miloš Žefran. 2015. The roles and recognition of haptic-ostensive actions in collaborative multimodal human–human dialogues. *Computer Speech & Language*, 34(1):201–231.
- Jason PC Chiu and Eric Nichols. 2016. Named entity recognition with bidirectional lstm-cnns. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:357–370.
- Ronan Collobert, Jason Weston, Léon Bottou, Michael Karlen, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Pavel Kuksa. 2011. Natural language processing (almost) from scratch. *Journal of machine learning research*, 12(ARTICLE):2493–2537.
- Kenneth Cox, Rebecca E Grinter, Stacie L Hibino, Lalita Jategaonkar Jagadeesan, and David Mantilla. 2001. A multi-modal natural language interface to an information visualization environment. *International Journal of Speech Technology*, 4(3-4):297–314.
- Jacob Eisenstein and Randall Davis. 2006. Gesture improves coreference resolution. In *Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference of the NAACL, Companion Volume: Short Papers*.
- Conditional Random Fields. 2001. Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. In *ICML 2001*.
- Mary Ellen Foster, Ellen Gurman Bard, Markus Guhe, Robin L Hill, Jon Oberlander, and Alois Knoll. 2008. The roles of haptic-ostensive referring expressions in cooperative, task-based human-robot dialogue. In *2008 3rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*, pages 295–302. IEEE.
- Siwei Fu, Kai Xiong, Xiaodong Ge, Siliang Tang, Wei Chen, and Yingcai Wu. 2020. Quda: Natural language queries for visual data analytics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03257*.
- Tong Gao, Mira Dontcheva, Eytan Adar, Zhicheng Liu, and Karrie G Karahalios. 2015. Datatone: Managing ambiguity in natural language interfaces for data visualization. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software & Technology*, pages 489–500. ACM.
- Aude Genevay and Romain Laroche. 2016. Transfer learning for user adaptation in spoken dialogue systems. In *AAMAS*, pages 975–983.
- James Hammerton. 2003. Named entity recognition with long short-term memory. In *Proceedings of the seventh conference on Natural language learning at HLT-NAACL 2003*, pages 172–175.
- Enamul Hoque, Vidya Setlur, Melanie Tory, and Isaac Dykeman. 2017. Applying pragmatics principles for interaction with visual analytics. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics*, 24(1):309–318.
- Jeremy Howard and Sebastian Ruder. 2018. [Universal language model fine-tuning for text classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 328–339, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ryu Iida, Masaaki Yasuhara, and Takenobu Tokunaga. 2011. Multi-modal reference resolution in situated dialogue by integrating linguistic and extralinguistic clues. In *Proceedings of 5th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 84–92.
- Abhyuday N Jagannatha and Hong Yu. 2016. Structured prediction models for rnn based sequence labeling in clinical text. In *Proceedings of the conference on empirical methods in natural language processing. conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, volume 2016, page 856. NIH Public Access.
- Andrew Kehler. 2000. Cognitive status and form of reference in multimodal human-computer interaction. In *AAAI/IAAI*, pages 685–690.
- Hansol Kim, Kun Ha Suh, and Eui Chul Lee. 2017. Multi-modal user interface combining eye tracking and hand gesture recognition. *Journal on Multimodal User Interfaces*, 11(3):241–250.
- Michael Kipp. 2001. Anvil—a generic annotation tool for multimodal dialogue. In *Seventh European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology*.
- Michael Kipp. 2014. Anvil: The video annotation research tool.

- Frédéric Landragin. 2006. Visual perception, language and gesture: A model for their understanding in multimodal dialogue systems. *Signal Processing*, 86(12):3578–3595.
- 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.
- Xiaolong Li and Kristy Boyer. 2016. Reference resolution in situated dialogue with learned semantics. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 329–338.
- Arpit Narechania, Arjun Srinivasan, and John Stasko. 2020. NI4dv: A toolkit for generating analytic specifications for data visualization from natural language queries. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 27(2):369–379.
- Costanza Navarretta. 2011. Anaphora and gestures in multimodal communication. In *Proceedings of the 8th Discourse Anaphora and Anaphor Resolution Colloquium (DAARC 2011), Faro, Portugal, Edicoes Colibri*, pages 171–181. Citeseer.
- Sinno Jialin Pan and Qiang Yang. 2009. A survey on transfer learning. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 22(10):1345–1359.
- Tal Perl, Sriram Chaudhury, and Raja Giryes. 2020. Low resource sequence tagging using sentence reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2692–2698.
- Zahar Prasov and Joyce Y Chai. 2008. What’s in a gaze?: the role of eye-gaze in reference resolution in multimodal conversational interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on Intelligent user interfaces*, pages 20–29. ACM.
- Shaolin Qu and Joyce Y Chai. 2008. Beyond attention: the role of deictic gesture in intention recognition in multimodal conversational interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on Intelligent user interfaces*, pages 237–246. ACM.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.
- Wasifur Rahman, Md Kamrul Hasan, Sangwu Lee, Amir Zadeh, Chengfeng Mao, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ehsan Hoque. 2020. Integrating multimodal information in large pretrained transformers. In *Proceedings of the conference. Association for Computational Linguistics. Meeting*, volume 2020, page 2359. NIH Public Access.
- Norbert Reithinger, Dirk Fedeler, Ashwani Kumar, Christoph Lauer, Elsa Pecourt, and Laurent Romary. 2005. Miamm—a multimodal dialogue system using haptics. In *Advances in Natural Multimodal Dialogue Systems*, pages 307–332. Springer.
- Vidya Setlur, Sarah E Battersby, Melanie Tory, Rich Gossweiler, and Angel X Chang. 2016. Eviza: A natural language interface for visual analysis. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pages 365–377. ACM.
- Fei Sha and Fernando Pereira. 2003. Shallow parsing with conditional random fields. In *Proceedings of the 2003 Human Language Technology Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 213–220.
- Anders Søgaard and Yoav Goldberg. 2016. Deep multi-task learning with low level tasks supervised at lower layers. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 231–235.
- Yuanfeng Song, Di Jiang, Xueyang Wu, Qian Xu, Raymond Chi-Wing Wong, and Qiang Yang. 2019. Topic-aware dialogue speech recognition with transfer learning. In *INTERSPEECH*, pages 829–833.
- Arjun Srinivasan and John Stasko. 2017. Orko: Facilitating multimodal interaction for visual exploration and analysis of networks. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics*, 24(1):511–521.
- Yiwen Sun, Jason Leigh, Andrew Johnson, and Sangyoon Lee. 2010. Articulate: A semi-automated model for translating natural language queries into meaningful visualizations. In *International Symposium on Smart Graphics*, pages 184–195. Springer.
- Bonnie Lynn Webber and Breck Baldwin. 1992. [Accommodating context change](#). In *30th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 96–103, Newark, Delaware, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Whitney, Miles Eldon, John Oberlin, and Stefanie Tellex. 2016. Interpreting multimodal referring expressions in real time. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 3331–3338. IEEE.
- Shomir Wilson, Alan W Black, and Jon Oberlander. 2016. This table is different: A wordnet-based approach to identifying references to document entities. In *Proceedings of the 8th Global WordNet Conference (GWC)*, pages 432–440.
- Zhilin Yang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and William W. Cohen. 2017. [Transfer learning for sequence tagging with hierarchical recurrent networks](#). *CoRR*, abs/1703.06345.
- Bowen Yu and Cláudio T Silva. 2019. Flowsense: A natural language interface for visual data exploration within a dataflow system. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics*.