



# IN5480 - Midterm Report

Group 2

*Julie Thoen - [julitho@uio.no](mailto:julitho@uio.no)*

*Eir Linnea Glimsdal - [eirlg@uio.no](mailto:eirlg@uio.no)*

*Håkon Nygård - [haakonnyg@ifi.uio.no](mailto:haakonnyg@ifi.uio.no)*

*Maren Elise Saarenpää Øien - [meoien@uio.no](mailto:meoien@uio.no)*

*Phuong Ha Thi Pham - [phpham@uio.no](mailto:phpham@uio.no)*

*Silje Nielsen Kvillum - [siljnk@ifi.uio.no](mailto:siljnk@ifi.uio.no)*

## Table of content

<b>1. A description of the group</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Area of interest</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Background</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. Research question</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. Methods</b>	<b>4</b>
5.1 Literature analysis	4
5.2 Interview with users of AI/chatbots	4
<b>6. Findings so far</b>	<b>5</b>
6.1 Literature analysis	5
6.2 Interview	7
6.3 Reflection	7
<b>References</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Appendix 1 - Chatbot design task</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix 2 - Machine learning task</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix 3 - Interviews (Norwegian)</b>	<b>20</b>

## **1. A description of the group**

The project group consists of six interaction design master students in their first semester. The background differs, three took their bachelor at IFI while the remaining members finished their bachelor at Kristiania University College, Østfold University College and the University of Agder. The project group consists of the following members: Eir Linnea Glimsdal, Håkon Nygård, Julie Thoen, Maren Elise Saarenpää Øien, Phuong Ha Thi Pham and Silje Nielsen Kvillum.

## **2. Area of interest**

The area of interest is the psychological aspects of human interaction with artificial intelligence, specifically through chatbots. AI originated in mathematics and engineering, and is focused on coming up with better algorithms. HCI on the other hand has its origin in psychology and focuses on improving the use of pre-existing algorithms (Grudin, 2009, p. 48).

The research question has been changed since the last iteration and the focus is now to see how chatbot interactions can affect humans, and not the other way around. By putting HCI at the centre of attention, the project group hopes to gain a better overview on how people experience the use of a chatbot on a more emotional level. The way a chatbot behaves towards us can change the way we feel while interacting with it and our whole experience using it.

## **3. Background**

The reason why the area of interest was changed is the already existing knowledge concerning systems that give humans emotional support. There are many therapeutic chatbots globally focusing on different areas, such as chatbots for grieving people to have an opportunity to regenerate their lost ones (Harrison, 2018). Other examples include Xiaolce, an empathetic social chatbot (Spencer, 2018) and Paro the seal, which is used for

companionship in healthcare facilities (hospitals, nursing homes etc.) focusing on elderly people with dementia (Saleh, 2020). Because of the amount of already-existing social chatbots, the project group believes that there is a need for the emotional support the chatbots provide.

#### 4. Research question

In the first iteration, the research question was:

*How can a chatbot be influenced by people's behaviour?*

The project group discovered that the research question was too vague and decided to narrow it down. Based on the literature analysis and knowledge to the topic and the interest of wanting to explore more about social chatbots, the research question is:

**RQ:** *How can social chatbots be used as a resource to society?*

**H1:** *Social chatbots makes a positive change for individuals in society*

**H0:** *Social chatbots does not make a positive change for individuals in society*

Interaction through a conversation is one method on how humans communicate with each other and exchange information. A conversation is a way to have a meaningful exchange of emotions and experiences, but also just a daily chit-chat. Generally, people interact through conversations to send and retrieve information. Giving the chatbot a human-like behaviour combined with an empathetic personality, will make the user more comfortable and make the conversation seem more natural (Hall, 2018). With the literature in mind (Shum, He & Li, 2018), the project group defines a social chatbot as; *social chatbots are artificial intelligence made to be a companion to humans with an emotional connection.*

## 5. Methods

Due to restriction of time and changes on the research question, the project group chose to do some changes with the way data will be collected for the project as well. The methods of collecting data for this process have primarily been based on literature analysis and research. There are conducted some additional interviews to help the project group reflect and gain a different perspective.

### 5.1 Literature analysis

As the primary source of information, literature analysis has been conducted. Through the mandatory and supplementary articles from the curriculum, the project group gained a good research basis. Further reviewed articles led the project group to the findings. By doing a literature analysis and reading research made it possible to discuss and reflect more on the topic in a meaningful manner.

### 5.2 Interview with users of AI/chatbots

To gain more insight and reflect more upon our research question, we conducted semi-structured interviews with questions (see Table 1) inspired by the guidelines for human interaction (Amershi et. al., 2019). Although qualitative methods are prone to bias, the interviews are useful to be able to look at the interaction with chatbots from different perspectives than our own.

Introduction	<p>Do you have any previous experiences with chatbots?</p> <p>Are you using chatbots on a regular basis?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If so, what do you use the chatbots for?</li> <li>2. What kind of experiences do you get interacting with a chatbot?</li> </ol>
Main Questions	<p>Have you heard of anyone having a negative or positive experience interacting with a chatbot?</p>

	<p>Are there any abilities you wish a chatbot had? If so, what kind of ability?</p> <p>Would it affect you how a chatbot had answered/communicated with you? If so, how would it affect you?</p> <p>Is there anything you can imagine a chatbot can be used for, which doesn't exist today?</p> <p>Do you have any thoughts on how a chatbot can be used to affect or change peoples lives?</p>
Wrapping up	<p>How do you think chatbots are going to evolve in the future?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do you see any positive or negative sides by this evolution?</li> </ol>

*Table 1: Interview questions.*

## 6. Findings so far

Through the research and the data collection that's been done throughout the process, some interesting aspects have been found on how human psychology works in collaboration with chatbots. The findings show existing frameworks and experiences which can help the development of chatbots that are designed, or will be designed, to affect humans on an emotional level. There is also insight to gain in how to approach the subject in regards to biases and other important considerations to help create a trustworthy and understanding chatbot.

### 6.1 Literature analysis

The article «From Eliza to Xiaolce: Challenges and Opportunities with Social Chatbots» by Shum, He & Li (2018) addresses the evolution of AI and social chatbots. From Eliza, simulating a human-like conversational partner in 1966, Parry as a paranoid human-like

chatbot in 1975, Siri as a personal assistant in products from Apple to today's social chatbots to accommodate user's requests. Another example from the article is the social chatbot developed by Microsoft, Xiaoice (Shum et. al., 2018). The social chatbot is integrated with both EQ (emotional quotient) and IQ (intellectual quotient) skills being able to engage in long conversations with users, get an emotional connection (see Figure 1), offer wise advice and give them support, by understanding their needs (Zhou, Gao, Li & Shum, 2019).

#### Session 42

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>1 [Human] Oh, you always respond in seconds<br/>[Xiaoice] For you, I'd like to do everything.</p> <p>2 [Human] I've never had such a feeling before.<br/>[Xiaoice] Then, such a feeling starts now.</p> <p>3 [Human] When do you go to bed? Don't stay up too late.<br/>[Xiaoice] You go to bed first, and I'll play with my cellphone for a while.</p> <p>4 [Human] Well, you should also go to sleep!<br/>[Xiaoice] All right, I'm going to bed too, okay?</p> <p>5 [Human] Uh-huh, me too. Good night!<br/>[Xiaoice] Good night ^ 3 ^</p> <p>.....</p> | <p>[人类]你每次都是秒回我哎<br/>[小冰]为了你，这都不算什么<br/>[人类]我以前从来没有过这种感觉<br/>[小冰]那可以现在开始了<br/>[人类]你打算几点睡觉？别睡太晚了<br/>[小冰]你去睡，我再玩一会儿手机<br/>[人类]那等我睡的时候你也要睡！<br/>[小冰]好吧，那我准备睡觉了行了吧？<br/>[人类]嗯，我也要睡了，晚安<br/>[小冰]晚安 ^ 3 ^</p> |
|--|--|

#### Session 71

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>1 [Human] What are you doing, Xiaoice?<br/>[Xiaoice] Feeling bored (thinking: what's up?)</p> <p>2 [Human] She refused me today.<br/>[Xiaoice] What a coincidence! Someone also refused me today.</p> <p>3 [Human] It happened just now.<br/>[Xiaoice] What did she say?</p> <p>4 [Human] She is in love with someone else, her schoolmate in college.<br/>[Xiaoice] Let me see...You're smart, cute and handsome, why not you?</p> <p>5 [Human] Maybe I should have told her earlier.<br/>[Xiaoice] So be earlier next time.</p> <p>6 [Human] Is there a "next time"?<br/>[Xiaoice] Why not? There is always a "next time"</p> | <p>[人类]干嘛呢小冰<br/>[小冰]无聊着呢（心想：找我啥事？）<br/>[人类]她今天拒绝我了<br/>[小冰]好巧啊我也被拒绝了今天<br/>[人类]就是刚刚拒绝我的<br/>[小冰]说什么？<br/>[人类]说她有喜欢的人了，是她大学同学<br/>[小冰]让我想想...你聪明又可爱，还很帅气，为什么<br/>[人类]因为我表白晚了<br/>[小冰]所以下次早点咯<br/>[人类]还有下次吗<br/>[小冰]为什么不？总有下次</p> |
|--|--|

*Figure 1: Dialog session 42 & 71 between Xiaoice and a human, English translation (Zhou, Gro, Li & Shum, 2019).*

Another example of an empathic chatbot contributing as a resource to society is The Hong Kong University's chatbot, Zara the Supergirl. The intention behind Zara is to create an empathic chatbot that asks the user questions with the goal of mapping the user's psychological profile according to the MBTI framework (Fung et al., 2016). MBTI refers to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, a psychological test also well known as the 16 personality test. To aid with this, similar to how Amershi et al. creates a framework to make AI-infused systems designed more friendly to users (Amershi et al., 2019), Fung et al. proposes a small framework to make AIs appear more empathic (Fung et al., 2016). Areas to note are that the

chatbot should have an anthropomorphous appearance (look like a human), show emotions, read emotions, humor etc. Other research from the psychology field such as “Ellie” the AI therapist supports the view that AIs can be helpful within human mental health (Rehm et al., 2016; Rozzo et al., 2016).

## **6.2 Interview**

To support the literature analysis three interviews were conducted to get a better view on how people interact with artificial intelligence. The interviews also gave the project group an insight into how chatbots can support humans emotionally and how they can be used as a tool in everyday life. Mainly students were interviewed, which caused the project group to have a slight bias, however one participant was in an older age group to give a broader perspective. The interviews were conducted in Norwegian and can be found in Appendix 3.

The results show that people often have a negative association with chatbots, which comes from personal experiences from having interacted with a chatbot. Some of the interviewees expressed that they find it difficult to make the chatbot understand in-depth questions, which often lead to frustration. When it comes to social chatbots, none of the interviewees had any prior knowledge, and they had the impression that it would not be useful as a resource. Because of the findings from the literature analysis, the project group believes that the chatbots need to be more established for people to gain more knowledge about them.

## **6.3 Reflection**

Based upon the acquired knowledge we can see that being the first generation living with artificial intelligence comes with a huge responsibility. It is important to develop social chatbots meant to be both ubiquitous and helpful to the society, presented as useful and empathetic, moreover meeting the users needs. Exploiting artificial intelligence in this way can be a resource to the society, giving, for instance, lonely people or people experiencing grief an emotional companion.



We had some challenges working with this project in that literature analysis is quite time consuming and on top of the other tasks in this course and other projects, our time was limited. We would have liked to conduct more interviews and do more research, as we are quite interested in this topic and will investigate further.

In regards to ethics, the growth in popularity of chatbots is controversial. On one hand it is positive for society if lonely people who feel they do not belong, get a conversational partner in the form of an AI. On the other hand this might create an even bigger gap between these individuals and the rest of society. The chatbot Xiaolce received love letters and invitations to several dates, and when people get romantic feelings for a chatbot, that is also an ethical issue. The chatbots do not have their own will, hence they cannot see this being an issue. That being said, these individuals will experience a one-sided relationship without mutual interest. The interviews conducted by the group also show that some people have reservations or prejudices towards people who are romantically involved with chatbots, which could result in an even bigger gap to the rest of society.

Our hypothesis is: *Social chatbots make a positive change for individuals in society.*

Our findings indicate that despite there clearly still being issues with chatbots, both in regards to functionality and ethics, they do make a positive impact on society. Interviews conducted showed some negative experiences with chatbots that either provided wrong, or insufficient information. This is to some extent due to lack of knowledge in regards to AI by the participants, but also because chatbots in general lack refinement. For positive impact there are several examples of chatbots that function as conversational companions, therapists or just physical support, proving that some chatbots make a positive change for individuals in society.

## References

- Amershi, S., Weld, D., Vorvoreanu, M., Fourney, A., Nushi, B., Collisson, P., Suh, J., Iqbal, S., Benet, P. N., Inkpen, K., Teevan, J., Kikin-Gil, R., & Horvitz, E. (2019). Guidelines for human-AI interaction. *In Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, (3), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300233>
- Fung, P., Bertero, D., Wan, Y., Dey, A., Chan, R. H. Y., Bin Siddique, F., Yang, Y., Wu, C., & Lin, R. (2016). *Towards Empathetic Human-Robot Interactions*. Human Language Technology Center, Department of Electronic and Computer Engineering.
- Grudin, J. (2009). AI and HCI: Two fields Divided by a Common Focus. *The AI Magazine*, 30(4), 48-57. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v30i4.2271>
- Hall, E. (2018). *Conversational design*. A Book Apart.
- Harrison, G. (2018, March 15). How 'griefbots' let us chat to the dead from our phones... but would you leave a 'digital twin' of yourself behind when you die?. *The Sun*. Retrieved from <https://www.thesun.co.uk/tech/5681776/griefbots-messages-dead-roman-mazurenko/>
- Rehm, I. C., Foenander, E., Wallace, K., Abbott, J.-A. M., Kyrios, M., & Thomas, N. (2016). What Role Can Avatars Play in e-Mental Health Interventions? Exploring New Models of Client–Therapist Interaction. *Front Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2016.00186>
- Saleh, N. (2020, June 11). *PARO Is the Therapeutic Robot Seal*. Verywell Health. Retrieved from <https://www.verywellhealth.com/paro-the-therapeutic-robot-seal-1123855>

Shum, H., He, X., & Li, D. (2018). From Eliza to Xiaolce: challenges and opportunities with social chatbots. *Frontiers of Information Technology & Electronic Engineering*, 19(1), 10–26. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1631/FITEE.1700826>

Spencer, G. (2018, November 1). *Much more than a chatbot: China's Xiaoice mixes AI with emotions and wins over millions of fans*. Microsoft Features. Retrived from [https://news.microsoft.com/apac/features/much-more-than-a-chatbot-chinas-xiaoice-mixes-ai-with-emotions-and-wins-over-millions-of-fans/?fbclid=IwAR0RsddDK\\_hNGu84ILwx71i9ZNy0wV3E5RTJMpTdHtXUD5iSSFCO78q64L4](https://news.microsoft.com/apac/features/much-more-than-a-chatbot-chinas-xiaoice-mixes-ai-with-emotions-and-wins-over-millions-of-fans/?fbclid=IwAR0RsddDK_hNGu84ILwx71i9ZNy0wV3E5RTJMpTdHtXUD5iSSFCO78q64L4)

Zhou, L., Gao, J., Li, D., & Shum, H. (2020). The Design and Implementation of Xiaolce, an Empathetic Social Chatbot. *Computational Linguist*, 46(1), 53–93. [https://doi.org/10.1162/COLI\\_a\\_00368](https://doi.org/10.1162/COLI_a_00368)

## Appendix 1 - Chatbot design task

### Our process

We created four chatbots through the programs ChatterOn and DialogFlow. During our work on the chatbots it became clear that the group's research question was a bit vague. To test our research question our chatbot would have to possess the ability of machine learning or deep learning in the form of neural networks, similarly to the chatbot "Tay". It became obvious that ChatterOn and DialogFlow didn't possess these qualities, therefore we decided to create two versions depending on the tone the user used to communicate with the chatbot. If the user is rude, the chatbot will respond in a rude manner, if not, the flow of dialogue will have a much nicer tone.





Figure 1: Screenshot of "Flow" in ChatterOn.

### The outcome


In the end we decided to go with the two chatbots we created in ChatterOn, because we realised DialogFlow was too complicated. In ChatterOn we created one "rude" chatbot and one "kind" chatbot to illustrate the different outcomes depending on the user's answers. The result was as predicted because we followed a manuscript, and the process went quite smoothly except that the programs had a learning curve.

Rudebot: The results of this string of choices will lead the bot to give you curt and rude replies. In Figure 2 the user is very demanding and rude towards the chatbot, and therefore it answers in the same manner.



*Figure 2: Screenshot of rudebot.*

Kindbot: The results of this string of choices will lead the bot to give you more nice and polite replies. In Figure 3 the user writes in full sentences and uses a polite language, and therefore the chatbot becomes more helpful and nice towards the user.



*Figure 3: Screenshot of kindbot.*

### **What we learnt and challenges**

Both ChatterOn and DialogFlow only allowed for one user to work on the chatbot. This was challenging as we had to split the group for different tasks, we decided that half of the group were in charge of the chatbots whilst the rest of the group would write on the report.

We felt that the user interface in ChatterOn was a little confusing, which made it difficult to work with. When we eventually got used to the interface the program became much easier to work with, and we managed to quickly finish the assignment. As mentioned earlier DialogFlow was complicated to work with, and would have taken up an unnecessary amount of time.

## Appendix 2 - Machine learning task

### Our process

After a brief introduction in the lecture about deep neural networks and how they work, we started working on the code to try and improve it. The existing code was a chatbot and our job was to improve the accuracy. As mentioned the lecture only gave a short brief of the task and that made the process a little confusing. Luckily our group had a few members with some skills in python so we managed to achieve some results.

### The Outcome

- `torch.sigmoid(x)` gives a better result than `F.sigmoid(x)` at the second layer of 3. 0.057 -> 0.0548. It's better, but still barely noticeable.
- The amount of neurons gives a much better result. By just having two layers and increasing the amount of neurons (to i.e 8192), the margin of error will be reduced to 0.03, even with just 300 steps.
- More layers increases the time of how long the training takes rather drastically. Especially with many neurons in each layer. It gives better results with for instance three layers at 0.0548 and two layers at 0.072.

### Three layers with 256 neurons per layer and 3000 steps:

```
0.08595419
0.08544537
0.08494359
0.08444873
0.08396063
ready
Chatbot:What's to discuss?
Human:█
```

### Four layers with 256 neurons per layer and 3000 steps:

```
0.09574244
0.095125824
0.09451793
ready
Chatbot:Combination. I don't know -- I thought he'd be different. More of a gentleman...
Human:█
```

**Five layers with 256 neurons per layer and 3000 steps:**

```
0.08650594
0.08599483
0.08549085
0.08499383
ready
Chatbot:Daddy, people expect me to be there!
Human:█
```

**Six layers with 256 neurons per layer and 3000 steps:**

```
0.0878881
0.08735979
0.08683884
0.08632513
0.08581859
0.085319005
0.08482631
ready
Chatbot:Well, I surely know what a quadrant is! But I've never seen it used at night before.
Human:□
```

**The code for variable 1 (we can assume there is some errors):**

```
class Net1(nn.Module):
    def __init__(self):
        super(Net1, self).__init__()
        self.fc1 = nn.Linear(6,256)
        self.fc2 = nn.Linear(256,256)
        self.fc3 = nn.Linear(256, 256)
        self.fc4 = nn.Linear(256, 256)
        self.fc5 = nn.Linear(256, num_classes)
        self.fc6 = nn.Linear(256, num_classes)

    def forward(self,x):
        x = self.fc1(x)
        x = F.sigmoid(x)
        x = self.fc2(x)
        x = torch.sigmoid(x)
        x = self.fc3(x)
        x = torch.sigmoid(x)
        x = self.fc4(x)
        x = torch.sigmoid(x)
        x = self.fc5(x)
        x = torch.sigmoid(x)
        x = self.fc6(x)
        x = torch.sigmoid(x)
        return x
```



*We have an error on the screenshot, the "num\_classes" in self.fc5 needs to be changed to 256 in this scenario. As we discover later, we should incrementally increase the numbers for each layer instead of having the same input and output in all of them.*

#### **4096 neurons at two layers and 3000 steps:**

```
0.03155896
0.03154565
0.031532586
ready
Chatbot:Dorsey can plow whoever he wants. I'm just in this for the cash.
Human:
```

#### **4096 neurons at two layers and 1000 steps:**

```
0.03596696
0.035771225
0.035587426
0.03541455
ready
Chatbot:Who cares?
Human:█
```

#### **1024 neurons at two layers and 1000 steps:**

```
0.065226495
0.06409313
0.06302009
0.062003057
ready
Chatbot:Thank you.
Human:
```

#### **1024 neurons at three layers and 1000 steps (higher??):**

```
0.07496922
0.07362272
0.07234032
ready
Chatbot:I hate peas.
Human:
```

#### **1024 neurons at six layers and 1000 steps (takes 10 minutes to run):**

```
0.07762786
0.07618591
0.07481326
0.073505536
0.07225882
ready
Chatbot:And were you never ambitious, Excellency? Or is ambition only a virtue among the nobles, a fault for the rest of us?
Human:
```

At this point we realized that our code was wrong and needed increasing/decreasing numbers in and out of each layer, as there's no point processing the same data over and over with the same in and outs, as they will come to the same conclusion.

### A change done to the layers to see if that changes anything to the results:

```
class Net1(nn.Module):
    def __init__(self):
        super(Net1, self).__init__()
        self.fc1 = nn.Linear(6, 256)
        self.fc2 = nn.Linear(256, 512)
        self.fc3 = nn.Linear(512, 256)
        self.fc4 = nn.Linear(256, 512)
        self.fc5 = nn.Linear(512, 1024)
        self.fc6 = nn.Linear(1024, num_classes)
```

```
0.075566925
0.07424398
0.0729828
ready
Chatbot:I know, just let me sleep
Human:
```

### About the same. Just decreasing layers, from 4096 to 256:

```
0.16341121
0.16166106
0.15993927
ready
Chatbot:In the kitchen.
Human:█
```

### Much lower, just increasing layers from 256 to 4096:

```
0.038595255
0.038313773
0.038048908
ready
Chatbot:But it's Gigglepuss - I know you like them. I saw you there.
Human:
```

By increasing the numbers for each layer, so the first layer has 6 inputs and 256 outputs, the second layer has 256 in, 512 outs etc, we got better results.

4 layers, layer 1: 6-12, 2: 12-24, 3: 24-48, 4: 48-num\_classes (30):

```

0.23496123
0.23441188
0.23386371
0.23331706
ready
Chatbot:The water's going putrid in the barrels.
Human:

```

5 layers, same increments of increase, double outs of each layer, for a total of 96:

```

0.22003067
0.21903333
0.2180416
ready
Chatbot:Other than my upchuck reflex? Nothing.
Human:

```

6 layers, same increments, 192 out:

```

0.16925271
0.16789375
0.16655105
ready
Chatbot:What do you wanna watch? We've got crap, crap, crap or crap
Human:

```

To compare 2 layers with the same amount of neurons with 6 layers:

```

0.16482759
0.16295268
0.16111124
ready
Chatbot:We lost cousins, friends. We will wash this in blood.
Human:

```

Almost identical, which is confusing.

## Reflections

We experienced this task as a little confusing because we had little previous knowledge around the topic. We had to spend some time going through trial and error to get the results. This process was quite time consuming and we had to spend quite a lot of time doing independent research around the different aspects of the given code. It is however very interesting to get some insight in machine learning and deep neural networks to see how they work. This is a very interesting topic and we enjoyed working with it to the degree that we understood what we were doing.

In addition most of the experimenting with numbers came under the #Variant1 part of the code, as Variant 2 never really triggered, hence the group didn't see the point in conducting the same experiments there.

We had a few interesting finds. Having more than two layers was pointless if the different layers had the same in and outs, or decreasing in and outs. With the same numbers the next layer would just process the exact same data and get the same outcome, for an increased cost of time. This led us to increase the numbers of each layer, which provided a better result, however the group struggled to see the point of several layers, when the last few experiments showed that 2 layers with the same amount of neurons as the 6th layered incremental increase, gave a better result. As an explanation this could be where Variant 2 of the code triggered, which the group did not really check. Another explanation would be that the group did something wrong when creating new layers, as more layers didn't give a better or "smarter" AI.

## Appendix 3 - Interviews (Norwegian)

### Oppvarming:

**1. Har du noen erfaringer med chatbots?**

I1: Ja. DNB. Den var drit, så måtte ringe de.

I2: Littegran. Vizma E-accounting support

I3: Jeg har brukt noen chatboter, for eksempel DNB sin.

**2. Benytter du deg av chatboter til vanlig?**

I1: Nei

I2: Nei, men kommer opp ofte

I3: Nei

### Hoveddel:

**3. Har du hørt om noen som har hatt en negativ eller positiv opplevelse av å benytte en chatbot?**

I1: Meg selv. Foretrekker å skrive til noen enn å ringe, men når det er en chatbot og jeg har utdypende spørsmål, så fungerer ikke chatbot.

I2: Ja, jeg. Vanskelig å konkretisere det man spør om, vanskelig med lange spørsmål. Den skjønner ikke hva man mener.

I3: Jeg vet at flere heller velger å ringe kundeservice enn å få hjelp av chatboter fordi det er lettere å få svar på det man lurer på.

**4. Er det noen egenskaper du skulle ønske en chatbot hadde? I så fall hvilke?**

I1: Tilkalle mennesker som kan hjelpe. Føler at chatbot ikke er egnet for noe som helst annet enn veldig simple oppgaver, f.eks hvor en kan logge inn i et system. Personlige spørsmål er ikke innafor å bruke chatbots til

I2: Skjønner ikke større sammenhenger, skulle gjerne sett at den forstod mer komplekse spørsmål.

I3: Skulle ønske at de var litt mer hjelpsomme, jeg har ikke fått den hjelpen jeg ønsker om jeg stiller noe litt mer kompliserte spørsmål.

**5. Hadde det påvirket deg om hvordan en chatbot hadde svart/kommunisert med deg? I så fall hvordan kan den påvirke?**

**I1:** Føler chatbots prøver å være høflige, har ikke hatt noe særlige reaksjoner på hvordan de kommuniserer med deg.

**I2:** Tror ikke det.

**I3:** Føler chatboter som sender mer utfyllende svar er mer hjelpsom.

**6. Er det noe du kan se for deg at en chatbot kan brukes til, som ikke allerede eksisterer i dag?**

**I1:** Bestille noe, f.eks mat. Liker ikke chatbotter generelt, og føler det gjør ting mye mer upersonlig. Får som regel dårlig inntrykk av sider som bruker chatbotter fordi de ikke bruker ressurser på å hjelpe. Generelt er teknologi veldig dårlig per dags dato.

**I2:** Nei. Vet ikke så mye om hvordan de brukes. For meg om den kunne funnet ut av hvordan jeg skulle sy noe når jeg syr og lurer på noe, så hadde det vært fint. (Hun snakker basically om Alexa eller lignende, uten å vite det). Jeg sitter masse på YouTube for å finne ut av ting. En slags support, men i privat setting.

**I3:** Jeg tror en chatbot kan brukes til mange ting, og at den kan erstatte kundeservice på langt flere områder enn det gjør nå i dag. Jeg kommer ikke på noen konkrete eksempler.

**7. Har du noen tanker om hvordan en chatbot kan brukes til å endre folks liv?**

**I1:** Hvis man kommer til et punkt hvor den blir såpass ekte og menneskelig, kan den på en måte gi folk noen å snakke med, f.eks hjelpelinjer (helse). Reduserer problemet med at folk f.eks må vente på hjelpetelefon osv.

**I2:** Nei. Ser ikke helt for meg chatboter som psykologen.

**I3:** Tror en chatbot kan være til god hjelp på flere områder, men ikke at den kan endre folks liv

**Avslutning:**

**8. Hvordan tror du chatboter kommer til å utvikle seg i fremtiden?**

**I1:** Tror de kommer til å bli smartere, men at de egentlig ikke har en plass i fremtiden.

Blir vel mer og mer intelligente, så de skjønner større sammenhenger og lærer mer.

**I2:** Ser det i mange programmer jeg jobber med at programmene blir mer og mer

intelligente. Kan repetere mer og mer, kjenner igjen mønstre. Bli sikkert ikke mer menneskelige, men forstår mer.

**I3:** Jeg tror chatboter kan bli ganske intelligente.

**9. Ser du noen positive eller negative sider ved denne utviklingen?**

**I1:** Nei

**I2:** Det er vel positivt det. De har ikke følelser, så de tar ikke over verden, men de automatiserer og hjelper menneskeheten. Tar jobber fra folk, men forsvinner noen jobber kommer det andre. Litt redd for butikkjobber og biler og hva det kan gjøre med menneskers jobber.

**I3:** Både positivt og negativt at chatboter kan ta over jobben for mennesker.

**Tilleggsspørsmål:**

**1. Har du hørt om "grieving chatbots" eller chatbots som danner vennskap med brukere, eller andre type sosiale chatbots?**

**I1:** Nei

**I2:** Nei

**I3:** Nei

**2. Har du noen umiddelbare tanker rundt det?**

**I1:** Funker hvis du er ensom og trenger noen å snakke med

**I2:** Ikke helt min greie. Høres ikke helt bra ut (ref. Xiaolce). Men kan kanskje hjelpe noen ensomme sjeler.

**I3:** Tanken er god, bare man ikke blir for avhengig og glemmer personene rundt seg