

agents, considering perspective (Arnold-1st or Arron-3rd), identity (Human or VH) and embodiment (Human or VH).

4. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

In order to shed light on the best design choices for virtual human stories in story-swapping dialogue, we recruited experimental participants to engage in dialogue with the six agents described in the previous section. We examined independent variables of perspective (first vs 3rd person), identity (human or VH), and presentation (human video or virtual human). We used a partial within-subjects design, where each participant talked to multiple virtual humans. We decided to look at perspective (first vs third) within subjects, and to keep the identity and presentation variables the same for that subject. To control for order effects, half of the participants first talked to Arnold, while the other half first talked to Arron.

4.1 Metrics

The experiment consisted of a 3 (agent: VH-VH vs. VH-Human vs. Human-Human) \times 2 (order: 1st then 3rd vs. 3rd then 1st) design. Our 60 participants (38 male, 22 female) were randomly assigned to one of these 6 cells (10 per cell). We measured the following dependent variables for each interaction: a 9-item rapport scale based on [3], a 6-item ancillary rapport scale, two items on subjective sharing of personal information, a set of 30 personality characteristics, length of participant responses and number of participant responses containing stories.

4.2 Protocol

After receiving a general explanation of the system and the procedure of the study, participants gave consent. Prior to starting the interaction with the agent, participants were given the set of questions that were supposed to be the topics of their conversation and 5 minutes to plan their answers. Each conversation consisted of a sequence of sub-dialogue episodes. After the greetings, each episode began with an ice breaking question like 'What was your favorite vacation?' from the participant followed by the agent's answer. The agent responded to the question and told stories according to its assigned perspective and identity. After his answer, the agent prompted the user to reciprocate, using phrases like "What about you?" or "Yourself?".

After going through all the questions, participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire with the subjective items about their experience with the agent. Then, participants went through the same procedure with the second character.

5. RESULTS

On each of the dependent variables, we conducted a 2 (perspective: 1st person vs. 3rd person) \times 2 (order: 1st then 3rd vs. 3rd then 1st) \times 3 (agent: human-human, VH-VH, vs. VH-human) mixed ANOVA with order and agent as between-subject factors, and perspective as a within-subjects factor. For the Rapport Scale, there was only a marginally significant main effect of perspective, $F(1, 53) = 3.21, p = .08$, such that users experienced greater rapport with the 1st person agent ($M = 3.61, SE = 0.09$) than with the 3rd person agent ($M = 3.42, SE = 0.09$).

For our ancillary rapport measure, we also found a main effect of perspective, $F(1, 53) = 4.44, p = .04$, again such

that users experienced greater rapport with the 1st person agent ($M = 3.41, SE = 0.12$) than with the 3rd person agent ($M = 3.10, SE = 0.12$). Participants shared significantly more personal information with the 1st person agent ($M = 3.92, SE = 0.12$) than with the 3rd person agent ($M = 3.65, SE = 0.14$) $F(1, 53) = 6.88, p = .01$. 1st person agents were also seen as significantly more cheerful and trustworthy and less aloof and (marginally) less rude.

In the VH-human condition, participants overall rated both agents as more "unsympathetic" when they interact first with the 3rd person agent. This was true also for ratings of "unintelligent", but the opposite held for VH-VH and Human-Human conditions. Furthermore, users spent more time speaking with the agents they came across second. We did not witness any other significant differences in the percentage of told stories among the six conditions.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In Summary, like [2], we see a general preference for 1st person over third person stories. On the other hand, we do not see differences in objective measures of user reactions to the stories in dialogue, so it may also be fine to tell third-person stories or have a non-human backstory identity, as long as the stories are interesting and approachable, and the identities are consistent.

There are many ways in which we would like to follow up this study. We can vary the within-subjects variables, look at effects of different genders of virtual humans, and other subject matter. We also want to look at different dialogue protocols, and a mixture of types of stories.

Acknowledgments

The effort described here is supported by the U.S. Army. Any opinion, content or information presented does not necessarily reflect the position or the policy of the United States Government, and no official endorsement should be inferred. We owe special thanks to Anton Leuski, Ed Fast, Arno Hartholt, Abigail Kronenberg, Andrew Jones, Jill Boberg and Rachel Wood for helping us through the course of this project.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Bell and J. Gustafson. Interaction with an animated agent in a spoken dialogue system. In *Proceedings of Eurospeech '99*, pages 1143–1146, 1999.
- [2] T. W. Bickmore, D. Schulman, and L. Yin. Engagement vs. deceit: Virtual humans with human autobiographies. In Z. Ruttkay, M. Kipp, A. Nijholt, and H. H. Vilhjálmsón, editors, *IVA*, pages 6–19. 2009.
- [3] J. Gratch, N. Wang, J. Gerten, E. Fast, and R. Duffy. Creating Rapport with Virtual Agents. In *Proceedings of the 7th IVA*, 2007.
- [4] A. Hartholt, D. Traum, S. C. Marsella, A. Shapiro, G. Stratou, A. Leuski, L.-P. Morency, and J. Gratch. All together now: Introducing the virtual human toolkit. In *IVA 2013*.
- [5] N. R. Norrick. *Conversational narrative: Storytelling in everyday talk*, John Benjamins Publishing, 2000.
- [6] K. Ryokai, C. Vaucelle, and J. Cassell. Virtual peers as partners in storytelling and literacy learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 19(2):195–208, 2003.