REVIEW: BA diploma thesis

Author of the work: Iva Kokotková

Title of the work: Pragmatics and Artificial Intelligence

Supervisor: Mgr. Markéta Janebová, Ph.D.

Opponent: Mgr. Michaela Čakányová, Ph.D.

Author of this review: Mgr. Markéta Janebová, Ph.D.

==

Points /results (for each section & proposed classification)

excellent	5	A		acceptable	2	D
very good	4	B		weak/sufficient	1	E
good	3	C		insufficient	0	F

	Points
1. *Originality and new contribution to the field, up-to-date presentation of the problem.* This is a very original thesis; the topic and methodology was the author's idea.	A
2. *Awareness of treatments in the field (literature).* Occasionally, the literature review lacks coherence and a clear focus. A major part of the thesis relies on conversation analysis, but more sources could have been used. There is no "maxim of relevance", but a "maxim of relation" in the Gricean framework (p. 31); the distinction between maxim violation and flouting is sometimes obscure ("As with other maxims, I also tried to somehow violate the Maxim of Manner too, in this case my being obscure and flouting the maxim", p. 26). The author calls flouting a pragmatic error (p. 24), but it is not regarded as such in the Gricean framework.	C
3. *Clarity of the topic, research question(s), hypotheses* This is a very complex topic. For the purpose of the BA thesis, the author – reasonably – focused on selected phenomena, but as mentioned below, perhaps she could have been even more selective, and research questions could have been stated more clearly.	C
4. *Methodology.* The author works with topics from conversation analysis as well as the Gricean framework; it is argued that there "might be some apparent incoherence between the chosen pragmatic concepts. That is undeniable. However, there nonetheless exists a link between them, as inconspicuous as it might be." These could have been made more conspicuous. Code-switching seems to be an outlier here. In some the conversations with the chatbots, I wasn't entirely convinced by the choice of the author's answers which were supposedly not adhering to the maxims (e.g. 27, where the author does not make a distinction between flouting and violation).	C
5. *Argumentation, discussion, interpretation of the results, summary.* It is argued in the Czech summary that chatbots violate pragmatic rules which is caused by the fact that they borrow from previous conversations with humans. It is not clearly explained why is this a source of mistakes. Does this mean that there were pragmatic mistakes in the previous conversations? "Bylo potvrzeno, že chatboty se od nás liší nedostatkem inferencí a vedlejších znalostí, díky nimž jsme my lidé schopni tvořit logické výroky. Výroky chatbotů často porušovaly pragmatická pravidla správné konverzace. Také bylo potvrzeno, že chatboty kopírují jazyk na základě zažitých konverzací s uživateli, což působilo jako důvod pro jejich časté pragmatické chyby. "	B

6. *Formal aspects of the work: format, graphics, bibliography formatting.* Capitals are not used in the Chicago Manual of Style.	B
7. *English (language correctness, style)* Occasional misprints or stylistically awkward passages ("academical", "capable to", "This claim of the principle's importance is based on its scope.")	B-C
8. *For the supervisor (if not applicable, write " Not applicable ")* Very good cooperation. Deadlines were met. The author was able to work independently.	A

Summary: A very interesting and original thesis. A more narrow research topic might have improved the overall structure.

Questions for the defence:
1. The choice of conversation topics with the chatbots: could you elaborate on that? Why (not) use the same conversation starters with both chatbots.
2. The author argues that the Gricean framework is "perhaps the most ideal parameter by which communicative aspects can be analysed." Why?
3. Some of the formulations suggest that according to the author, the chatbots do something (in)voluntarily or cooperate or ignore the other interlocutor. Also: "This would mean that it can copy human language and its patterns, glue the strings of language together, but do not **mean** them", and [the chatbot] "probably playing a joke on me (if the reader believes the hypothesis of Cleverbot being able to make jokes)". Does **the author** believe that?
4. Why was code-switching included? Is it on a par with extralinguistic contextual knowledge and common ground as understood in pragmatics?
5. What I find interesting is that the chatbot did not do well in adjacency pairs (good-byes, greetings, e.g. example 52: Hi – Is Working?;[sic!]), which are quite automatic structures, unlike other phenomena, such as flouting. Any ideas why this is so? Any ideas about Evie's ungrammaticality?

I recommend the work for the defence: YES

Proposed classification:[1]   **C**

Date: *28.8.2022*

Name (and signature): Mgr. Markéta Janebová, Ph.D.

---

[1] The itemized number evaluations above do **NOT** provide automatically the final evaluation - some weaknesses are more crucial than others and some cannot be compensated at all. The proposed classification is therefore independent on these statistics. It is the comprehensive evaluation of the presented written work and it can be still modified during the defence to become the result of the defence.