An Interactive Form for Customer Complaints: Matching the Cases

Boris Galitsky*

School of Computer Science and Information Systems Birkbeck College, University of London London, United Kingdom galitsky@dcs.bbk.ac.uk

In the last two decades, the interest to formal modeling of various forms of human reasoning and mental behavior has strongly risen, particularly in connection with legal reasoning. A series of phenomena in human reasoning have been reflected in such approaches as reasoning about action and knowledge, space and time, nonmonotonic and counterfactual reasoning, etc. Also, algorithms of information extraction from legal documents that is expected to form an initial knowledge base for further reasoning have undergone dramatic improvement. However, extraction of information about conflicting agents from a plain text (a written complaint) is still hard and unreliable.

We suggest a novel legal application area for machine learning and reasoning – the interactive forms for representation of multiagent conflicts (customer complaints). In this research abstract we explore the role of *mental component* in a natural language legal document, written by a person who is not a legal professional. We call mental component of a text its formal semantic representation that consists from the entities for mental states including *knowledge*, *belief, intention, desire, dissatisfaction*, as well as entities for mental actions such as *inform, check, reject, appeal, ask*, etc. In this respect we follow along the lines of what is called BDI model, subject to our development in a series of studies.

We choose such a domain as customer complaints because they are primarily descriptions of multiagent conflict, where the mental states and actions of the participating agents are essential. Also, our choice is motivated by a high logical complexity of textual complaints on one hand and availability of a large relatively uniform dataset of complaints on the other hand. In the domain of customer complaints, the general task of understanding a natural language legal document allows a specific and feasible formulation. We pose the task of understanding a customer complaint as determining whether it is valid (justified) or invalid (non-justified). It is then necessary to obtain an accurate description of agent's problems, intentions and opinions from text and to suggest possible ways of its resolution. In our studies [1-3] we have explored a series of logical means to process customer complaints, assuming the ideal natural language information extraction.

Analyzing the experience of previously designed systems for understanding multiagent interaction, one can easily come to conclusion that the performance limitation is caused by the natural language processing unit, because the vocabulary the plaintiffs express their problems is rather extensive and their emotional writing is rather hard to understand (even for humans). Therefore, in this study we focus on the way to efficiently extract information about multiagent interaction, based on the division of the domain knowledge into domain-specific and mental components.

^{*}http://www.dcs.bbk.ac.uk/~galitsky/complaints.htm

Boris Galitsky, 'An Interactive Form for Customer Complaints: Matching the Cases' in D. Bourcier (ed.), *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems. Jurix 2003: The Sixteenth Annual Conference*. Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2003, pp. 141-142.

The back end of the interactive complaint forms includes the following reasoning components:

- Machine learning logic programming-based system Jasmine, capable of predicting the mental action, given the dataset of mental states and actions of a given opponent agent, http://www.dcs.bbk.ac.uk/~galitsky/JaSMine/JaSMine.htm;
- Logic programming implementation of reasoning about mental actions, predicting the opponent actions given the explicitly coded pre-conditions and effect axioms;
- Multiagent mental simulator NL_MAMS, which yields the consecutive mental states given the initial one, simulating the decision-making process of agents, http://www.dcs.bbk.ac.uk/~galitsky/Nl_mams/NL_MAMS.htm

Specify your complaint						
Your problem in one sentence (or choose from the list)					1	
4 Lost submission					3	
-	(Leose Sabi	10000				
Your initial reques	st			Initial response vo	u received No response	
way of submission	In person (with no appoin	tme 🔻		way of response	E-mailing directly	
date of submission	14/02/2003			date of response		
essense of request	getting my mark			essense of response	[
vou	explain 💌	that	I was not able to save my test on drive	your tutor	understand problem That	student unable to save on network
also, you	bring tutor's attentio 🔻	that	we were allowed to save on floppy	also, she/he	agree That	That students could submit on floppy
and you	bring tutor's attentio	that	others were upphie to save as well	and shelfe	confirm That	The submission would be marked
ana you		ti ion	California Hore and so to save as their		- Olar	The submission would be marked
Your second request/iteration Sec					rou received No response	
way of submission	E-mailing directly			way of response	E-mailing directly	
date of submission	04/08/2003			date of response		
essense of request	of request finding my mark/grade for test				(
vou	explain 💌	that	Did not receive mark/grade	your tutor	bring to student attention - that	No record of my test
also you	bring tutor's attentio	that	I have waited three months	also she/he	remind That	file saving is part of assessment
u	remind				suggest	
and unit	Terrinite	dia at	that tutor confirmed that the submission would be	and also fee	that	vecili la cultura
Your third reques	est/iteration			Second recoonee	mu received V No response	resit in addunin
way of submission		In (11)	4	way of response	E maline discutto	
date of submission	E-mailing via course adm	in 💌	2	date of response	E-mailing directig	
essense of request	ance of request			essense of response	í	
wou	ungat I	that	there is no record	bour tutor	none that	
you	apper i	LITICAL	undre is no record	your totor	indite inter	
also, you	explain	that	I need the results badly	also, sne <i>i</i> ne	none that	
and you	none 💌	that		and she/he	none 💌 that	
	incone	1				
	I IICONS	цî —	uninctitied student status			justified 🛛 🔽 tutor status
	Run					
Add Complaint	student See	2				
reatures to KB	moou results	2				
	prediction					

Figure 1: A front end of the interactive form.

The interactive form for filing the students' complaints is shown at Fig.1. It is suggested instead of plain text to present a conflict between a student and a tutor. On the left, the student plots her attempts to resolve the conflict, and on the right side the tutor's responses (from the student's viewpoint) are specified. The soundness of a given complaint is determined, using analysis of agents' mental states and experience with previous complaints: the system obtains the complaint status (justified, unjustified).

The deployment of the complaint justification system ComplaintEngine with interactive form has lead to a significant improvement of complaint handling procedure. ComplaintEngine accelerates the complaint response time, increases the objectivity and efficiency in the complaint resolution strategy and decreases the stress and emotional load of the participating parties.

References

- [1] Galitsky, B. and Vinogradov, D. Using inductive reasoning and reasoning about dynamic domains for automatic processing of claims. DIMACS Tech Report #2002-42, 2002, Rutgers University NJ.
- [2] Galitsky, B. and Pampapathi, R. Deductive and inductive reasoning for processing the complaints of unsatisfied customers 16th IEA/AIE Conference, LNAI 2718 Loughborough University, UK 2003.
- [3] Galitsky, B. and Mirkin, B. Building interactive forms to input the scenarios of multiagent conflicts *Proceedings of the 2003 UK Workshop on Computational Intelligence*, 2003.