# Computational Modeling of Face Acts during Persuasive Conversations

We present our face act annotation framework on two existing corpus of [persuasion conversations](https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P19-1566.pdf) in the following sections: Task Description, Face Act Descriptions, Flowchart, and Example.

### Task Description

In this task, we study the underlying states of polite language usage in social interactions by investigating the politeness dynamic changes between the two parties. We use the concept of “face” to represent politeness. Face, in general, refers to the public self-image that an individual claims for himself. It consists of two related aspects:

**Positive face**: an individual’s positive self-image and the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of by others

**Negative face**: an individual’s basic claims to freedom of action and freedom from imposition

In our task, we have four types of face namely

* SPos : This refers to an individual’s/ speaker’s own positive face.
* HPos : This refers to the positive face of the other participant or the hearer.
* SNeg : This refers to an individual’s/ speaker’s own negative face.
* HNeg : This refers to the negative face of the other participant or the hearer.

This is a more general framework in my opinion than using ER and EE since it can be extended to both the negotiator and other two party conversations.

| **Positive Face Act** | **Generalized framework when that happens** |
| --- | --- |
| SPos+ | (i) S says that **they are virtuous** in some aspects or they are good.  (ii) **Compliments** the brand or item **they represent or endorse.** (Project their credibility).  (iii) States **their preferences or wants**, something that they **like or value**. |
| SPos- | (i) **Confessions** or admissions of guilt or **apologizing for being unable to do something that is expected of you.** (It is their duty/responsibility but they do not do that).  (ii) **Self-criticism** or self-humiliation. They damage their reputation or values by either saying that they are not so virtuous, (Example: I am sorry for sounding stupid but can you explain this again.) or they criticize some aspect of the brand/ item they endorse. |
| HPos+ | (i) S **compliments** H for their taste, efforts, virtues or **S acknowleges the efforts of H.** (ii) It can also be an implicit compliment such as **incentivizing H** to do something good.  (iii) S **empathizes/ sympathizes** or in general agrees with H.  (iv) **S is willing to carry out the FTA as imposed by H.** (implying the FTA is something that S would like to do willingly) |
| HPos- | (i) S voices **doubts or criticizes H** or the **product/ brand that H endorses**.  (ii) S **disagrees with H** over some stance, basically contradicting their viewpoint.  (iii) S is either **unaware or indifferent to** some aspect/ thing that H cares about. |
| **Negative Face act** | **Generalized Framework from Brown and Levinson** |
| SNeg+ | (i) S **rejects or is unwilling to do the FTA**. Stating the reason does not change the circumstances of non-compliance but sometimes helps to mitigate the face act |
| SNeg- | (i) S **offers to assist** H. |
| HNeg+ | (i) S seeks to **decrease the imposition of the FTA** on H by either **decreasing the inconvenience** such as providing alternate, simpler ways to carry out the FTA or **decreasing the threat associated with the FTA** . (ii) S **apologizes for the FTA** to show that S understands the inconvenience of imposing the request but has to request nevertheless. |
| HNeg- | (i) S i**mposes an FTA** on the hearer. The FTA is an act which H would not have done on their own.  (ii) S **increases the threat or ranking** of the FTA.  (iii) S asks/requests H for **assistance.** |

We note that the generalized framework might not be well-suited for an individual/specific domain. For a particular scenario, there will be other factors in play, such as power, social distance, in addition to the notion of face threat. Hence a specific formulation for the face act framework for the Persuasion conversations are enlisted below.

| Face Act | Persuader | Persuadee |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SPos+ | (i) ER praises/promotes the good deeds of STC.  (ii) ER shows their involvement for STC | (i) EE states their preference for other charities.  (ii) EE states that they do good deeds |
| HPos+ | (i) ER appreciates/praises EE's generosity or time.  (ii) ER incentivises EE to donate by saying it is a good deed. (iiI) Empathizes or agrees with EE | (i) EE shows willingness to donate or discuss the charity with ER.  (ii) EE acknowledges the efforts of STC.  (iii) EE empathizes or agrees with ER. |
| SPos- |  | (i) EE apologizes for not donating |
| HPos- | (i) ER criticises EE | (i) EE doubts/questions STC or EE (ii) EE is not aware of STC |
| SNeg+ |  | (i) EE rejects donation out-right. (ii) EE cites reasons for not donating at all or not donating more. |
| HNeg+ | (i) ER provides EE convenient ways to donate. (ii) ER apologizes for inconvenience. (iii) ER decreases the amount of donation. |  |
| HNeg- | (i) ER ask’s EE’s time/ permission for discussion. (ii) ER asks EE for donation. (iii) ER asks EE to donate more. | (i) EE asks ER questions about STC. |

We observe that certain face acts are not realizable in this current formulation since they do not take place in this situation. For example, since ER represents the charity, they are not expected to criticise it and thus there is no SPos- here.

We also attach the flowchart for these conversations in this folder and the list of annotated conversations. We show a small annotation snippet here.

| **User** | **Text** | **Face Act** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ER | How much do you like to donate to the charity now? | HNeg- |
| ER | Your donation will be directly deducted from your task payment. | HNeg+ |
| ER | You can choose any amount from $0 to all your payment | HNeg+ |
| EE | I do not wish to donate | SNeg+ |
| EE | I've been given no info about the charity | HPos- |