

Evaluating Robustness of Dialogue Summarization Models in the Presence of Naturally Occurring Variations

Ankita Gupta[✉] Chulaka Gunasekara[◇] Hui Wan[♣] Jatin Ganhotra[◇]
Sachindra Joshi[◇] Marina Danilevsky[◇]

[✉]University of Massachusetts Amherst, [◇]IBM Research AI, [♣]Google
ankitagupta@cs.umass.edu, chulaka.gunasekara@ibm.com
{jatinganhotra,mdanile}@us.ibm.com, jsachind@in.ibm.com

Abstract

Dialogue summarization task involves summarizing long conversations while preserving the most salient information. Real-life dialogues often involve naturally occurring variations (e.g., repetitions, hesitations) and existing dialogue summarization models suffer from performance drop on such conversations. In this study, we systematically investigate the impact of such variations on state-of-the-art dialogue summarization models using publicly available datasets. To simulate real-life variations, we introduce two types of perturbations: *utterance-level* perturbations that modify individual utterances with errors and language variations, and *dialogue-level* perturbations that add non-informative exchanges (e.g., repetitions, greetings). We conduct our analysis along three dimensions of robustness: *consistency*, *saliency*, and *faithfulness*, which capture different aspects of the summarization model’s performance. We find that both fine-tuned and instruction-tuned models are affected by input variations, with the latter being more susceptible, particularly to dialogue-level perturbations. We also validate our findings via human evaluation. Finally, we investigate if the robustness of fine-tuned models can be improved by training them with a fraction of perturbed data and observe that this approach is insufficient to address robustness challenges with current models and thus warrants a more thorough investigation to identify better solutions. Overall, our work highlights robustness challenges in dialogue summarization and provides insights for future research.

1 Introduction

An increasing number of conversations are recorded and transcribed every day, spanning customer-support interactions, multi-party meetings, chit-chats among friends, etc. Deriving useful




Figure 1: An example dialogue drawn from the TweetSum dataset, with a repeated utterance introduced as a perturbation. While the summary for the original dialogue includes the agent’s explanation about the train delay, the summary of the perturbed dialogue includes information from the repeated utterance.

insights from such conversations requires enterprises to automatically summarize such long conversations while retaining the most salient information, also referred to as the dialogue summarization task (Gliwa et al., 2019; Khalman et al., 2021; Feigenblat et al., 2021; Feng et al., 2022). For instance, summarizing a customer-support conversation is of great value to businesses as it allows agents to write a brief summary of the conversation for record-keeping, training new agents, and decision-making purposes (Feigenblat et al., 2021).

Conversations can take place in various settings, ranging from casual exchanges between acquaintances to goal-oriented business interactions involving frustrated customers and multitasking support agents. These real-life conversations often exhibit a wide range of language variations, including typographical errors, grammatical mistakes, and certain exchanges such as repetitions and speaker interrup-

*Work done in an IBM internship

tions, which are unrelated to the primary purpose of the conversation (Sacks et al., 1974). However, existing dialogue summarization datasets, used to train current summarization models, do not adequately capture these variations, as they are typically constructed by annotators simulating specific scenarios (Yuan and Yu, 2019) or extracted from English-speaking practice websites (Gliwa et al., 2019). Even some datasets consisting of real-life conversations (Feigenblat et al., 2021) might exhibit only a limited range of variations due to the nature of such conversations (e.g., Twitter conversations would lack spoken language errors). Consequently, dialogue summarization models deployed in business scenarios encounter diverse variations not observed during training. This raises a crucial question: Can current dialogue summarization models effectively handle conversations with naturally occurring variations that are legitimate inputs but not observed in the training data?

In this work, we study the impact of naturally occurring variations on the performance of the state-of-the-art dialogue summarization models using three publicly available dialogue summarization datasets. We examine the performance of a) encoder-decoder Transformer models (Lewis et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2019; Raffel et al., 2020b), which are fine-tuned on specific dialogue summarization datasets and b) instruction-tuned models which have shown impressive zero-shot performance more recently (Gupta et al., 2022; Chung et al., 2022). To simulate variations, we design two kinds of perturbations: (a) utterance-level perturbations, where we make modifications to a single utterance with grammatical errors, typographical mistakes, and language-use variations, and (b) dialogue-level perturbations, where we add new utterances to the original dialogue, such that these utterances introduce no new information (e.g., repetitions, greetings). Our perturbations are inspired by the Natural Conversation Framework (Moore and Arar, 2019), grounded in observational science. This framework was created after analyzing thousands of real-world conversations across various conversational use cases and provides interactive patterns that commonly occur in real-world conversations.¹

We evaluate the performance of summarization models along three conceptually different

¹Some examples include patterns such as C1.0 (opening greeting agent), C4.6 (closing success check), B2.1.0 (repeat request), A2.8 (hold request).

dimensions—*consistency*, *saliency* and *faithfulness*— each corresponding to distinct robustness issues that can arise in a dialogue summarization and elaborate on their empirical relationship. We also validate our findings via a human evaluation study.

Our analysis reveals that both fine-tuned encoder-decoder Transformer-based models and instruction-tuned models are impacted by both utterance- and dialogue-level perturbations. Instruction-tuned models are impacted more than fine-tuned models and are also more susceptible to dialogue-level perturbations than utterance-level perturbations. Both families of models show a preference for information from repeated, long, and leading utterances in the dialogue. Figure 1 shows one such example where the model includes repeated utterances in the summary, whereas the non-repeated original utterance wasn't included in the summary before perturbation. Finally, we investigate if the performance of fine-tuned models can be improved by training with perturbed data and observe that this approach does not yield consistent performance gains, and different perturbations necessitate adding varying amounts of examples in the training data to achieve performance improvements. Thus, a more thorough investigation is needed to address these robustness challenges.

2 Related Work

Prior work has investigated the robustness of language understanding models mainly focusing on classification tasks (Moradi and Samwald, 2021). Some dialogue-related classification tasks have also been explored, including dialogue act prediction (Liu et al., 2021), intent detection and slot tagging (Einolghozati et al., 2019; Sengupta et al., 2021), state tracking and dialogue modeling (Cho et al., 2022; Tian et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2021; Peng et al., 2020).

Some studies have also investigated the robustness of neural language generation models, including neural machine translation (Niu et al., 2020; Karpukhin et al., 2019; Vaibhav et al., 2019), question answering (Peskov et al., 2019), and open domain multi-document summarization (Giorgi et al., 2022). However, some of these studies consider perturbations that are of extreme nature (e.g., random shuffling and deletion of words) and may occur rarely in the real world. Ganhotra et al. (2020) investigated the impact of natural variations on re-

sponse prediction tasks in goal-oriented dialogues.

For summarization task in particular, previous studies have focused on summarizing news articles and documents (Jing et al., 2003; Meechan-Maddon, 2019; Krishna et al., 2022). However, the nature of noise in a dialogue involving multiple parties differs significantly from noise in documents. While some types of noise (e.g., spelling mistakes, grammatical errors) could occur in both, the patterns such as repetitions, reconfirmations, hesitations, and speaker interruptions (Sacks et al., 1974; Feng et al., 2021; Chen and Yang, 2021) are peculiar to dialogues, posing unique challenges for accurate and robust summarization. The focus of this work is to assess the robustness of *dialogue summarization models* in the presence of *naturally occurring variations*, which has been understudied in the prior literature.

3 Simulating Naturally Occurring Variations

To introduce naturally-occurring variations in conversations, we experiment with two kinds of simulated perturbations, utterance-level and dialogue-level. Appendix A.1 provides examples for each perturbation.

3.1 Utterance-level Perturbations

The utterance-level perturbations modify in a single utterance and are adapted from (Liu et al., 2021).

Typographical Errors Typographical errors occur when participants try to type quickly in chat-based interactions. We use simple regex-based perturbations, such as the removal of punctuation marks, removal or addition of whitespaces, changing letter casing, and substitutions of common expansions and contractions. We introduce spelling errors following the approach of Yorke as used in (Mille et al., 2021), replacing random letters with other letters closely co-located on the keyboard positions. We ensure that mistakes are not introduced in a proper-noun phrase (e.g., restaurant name) to avoid changes in important information.

Grammatical Errors We focus on two frequent grammatical errors: dropping determiners and subject-verb disagreements. To drop determiners, we drop all the words in a sentence with the DET tag. To introduce subject-verb disagreement, we identify auxiliary verbs (via AUX tag) and convert

between plural and singular forms as appropriate, keeping the tense unchanged.

Language-use Variations Users can vary in their choices of dialect and vocabulary. We consider three language-use perturbations: substituting adjectives with synonyms, inflectional variations, and synthetic African American Vernacular English (AAVE) dialect. For synonym substitution, we substitute adjectives in an utterance with their WordNet (Miller, 1998) synonyms. To introduce inflectional variations, we follow the approach proposed in Dhole et al. (2021), where we lemmatize each content word in an utterance, randomly sample a valid POS category, and re-inflect the word according to the chosen category. To transform an utterance to synthetic AAVE dialect, we use the set of lexical and morphosyntactic transformation rules proposed by Ziems et al. (2022).

Spoken Language Errors Spoken language errors are commonly seen in transcripts of conversations. We swap words with their homophones (e.g., their → there) to mimic speech recognition errors. We also insert filler words and speech disfluencies (Laserna et al., 2014) at random positions in a given utterance, spanning general filler words (e.g., uhm, ah, err); phrases emphasizing speaker opinion/mental state (e.g., I believe); and phrases indicating uncertainty (e.g., maybe).

3.2 Dialogue-level Perturbations

We craft dialogue-level perturbations by introducing new utterances that contribute no additional information, to test a model’s ability to focus on the overall meaning of a conversation and identify salient information.

Repetitions Repeating and rephrasing occur commonly in real-life conversations. In this perturbation, we inject a synthetic utterance requesting the other participant to repeat information (e.g., ‘Sorry, I couldn’t hear you, can you repeat?’). Since humans tend to rephrase the original message slightly instead of repeating it verbatim, we also paraphrase the original utterance before including it as a response to the request for repetition. We use the paraphraser proposed by Qian et al. (2019) to paraphrase utterances. This perturbation enables us to examine repetition bias; i.e., does the model consider repeated utterances to be more significant, even when they do not contain important information.

Time delays In customer support conversations, the agents commonly ask the customers to wait while they gather some information. To simulate this scenario, we add a synthetic utterance requesting to wait (e.g., ‘Just give me a few minutes.’), an acknowledgment from the other participant (e.g., ‘sure’), and finally an utterance from the first participant expressing gratitude (e.g., ‘Thanks for waiting.’).

Greeting and closing remarks It is also common to begin a conversation with a friendly greeting and end with some closing remarks. For example, in customer support conversations, we add a greeting like ‘Hi! I am your customer support assistant. How may I help you today?’ and closing remarks like ‘Thank you for contacting us.’. In open domain chat, we use greetings such as ‘Hey there!’ or phrases which signal end of a conversation like ‘Cool, talk to you later!’. These perturbations help us investigate structural biases present in dialogue summarization models, also known to impact news summarization models (Xing et al., 2021; Jung et al., 2019). For instance, the greeting perturbation help examine lead bias (preference for the first utterance) and closing remarks help examine recency bias (preference for the last utterance).

Split and combined utterances In chat-based conversations, participants can have varying preferences for either conveying information over multiple consecutive utterances or by sending one long message. To simulate both, we split or combine utterances from the original dialogue. For example, we split an utterance into consecutive utterances by segmenting it at every five words. Conversely, we identify sequences of consecutive utterances from a single speaker in a dialogue and concatenate them. These perturbations allow us to examine long bias (model’s preference to include a long utterance over shorter utterances, even when multiple short utterances include salient information).

3.3 Perturbation Quality Evaluation

To validate the assumption that our perturbations do not change the meaning of the dialogue or add any new information and to ensure the quality of our perturbed test set, we conduct a human evaluation. We sample 20 dialogues and their summaries from each of the three datasets (§5.1) and perturb each dialogue with all of the utterance and dialogue-level perturbations, resulting in a total of

480 dialogues. 2 annotators are asked to check whether the reference summary from the original dialogue is still a valid summary for all such perturbed dialogues (see Appendix A.2 for details on annotation guidelines). For cases where the two annotators disagree, we ask a third annotator to break ties. Our annotators marked 97.5% of the perturbed dialogues as being reasonably summarized by the summary of the original dialogue, thus validating our use of these perturbations to investigate the robustness of dialogue summarization models. This human evaluation also implies that the perturbed dialogues are readable and semantically consistent. Otherwise, for a drastically altered dialogue due to perturbations, the original summary would have been marked invalid.

4 Quantifying Robustness

For tasks involving text generation, such as dialogue summarization, measuring robustness involves determining the relationship between different pairs of natural language texts. As a result, the robustness of generative tasks is less well-defined, compared to a classification task (Liu et al., 2021) and can manifest in several ways. We consider three dimensions for measuring robustness issues that can arise in dialogue summarization.

To facilitate subsequent discussion, we introduce the following notation: Let x denote the original dialogue, y_r be the reference summary of the original dialogue, f be the summarization model trained on $(x, y_r) \sim D$, and $f(x)$ be its prediction over x . Let $x' = x + \delta$ denote the perturbed dialogue and $f(x')$ be its predicted summary.

Consistency A model is consistent (and hence robust) under a perturbation (δ) if the two summaries, $f(x)$ and $f(x' = x + \delta)$, are *semantically similar*, resulting in minimal change. We quantify the change in model-generated output as follows,

$$\Delta z_c = \frac{|\text{SCORE}(f(x), f(x)) - \text{SCORE}(f(x), f(x'))|}{\text{SCORE}(f(x), f(x))} \quad (1)$$

further simplified as,

$$\Delta z_c = 1 - \text{SCORE}(f(x), f(x')) \quad (2)$$

where SCORE is any text similarity metric (e.g., BERTScore) that assigns a value of 1 for identical inputs and 0 for dissimilar inputs. By definition, $\Delta z_c \in [0, 1]$. Note that consistency is sufficient but

not necessary for robustness: a good summary can be expressed in diverse ways, which leads to high robustness but low consistency.

Saliency Assuming that the reference summary includes the most salient information conveyed in the input dialogue, we compute the change in salient information captured by the model-generated summaries (before and after perturbation) w.r.t the reference summary as follows:

$$\Delta z_s = \frac{|\text{SCORE}(y_r, f(x)) - \text{SCORE}(y_r, f(x'))|}{\text{SCORE}(y_r, f(x))} \quad (3)$$

where SCORE is any text similarity metric (e.g., BERTScore). Since Δz_s measures the normalized change in similarity scores, $\Delta z_s \in [0, 1]$.

Faithfulness Faithfulness refers to the extent to which the generated summary is supported by the content of the input dialogue, thus accurately reflecting the information without introducing spurious or fabricated details, commonly termed as hallucinations. We compute the change in faithfulness as follows:

$$\Delta z_f = \frac{|\text{SCORE}(x, f(x)) - \text{SCORE}(x, f(x'))|}{\text{SCORE}(x, f(x))} \quad (4)$$

where SCORE is any text-based precision metric measuring the fraction of information in the summary ($f(x)$) supported by the input dialogue (x) (e.g., BERTScore-Precision). Since Δz_f measures the normalized change in precision scores, $\Delta z_f \in [0, 1]$. Note that, the second term in the numerator compares x with $f(x')$ since we are interested in measuring the fraction of summary information supported by the ‘original dialogue.’ Furthermore, since our added perturbations do not add any new information to the dialogue, x and x' would essentially contain the same information.

Clearly, for all three dimensions, higher the Δz , the lower the robustness of the model. We empirically evaluate model robustness along these dimensions and discuss their relationship in §6.

5 Evaluating Robustness

We present the results of our main experiments across different dialogue summarization datasets and provide key observations on how various perturbations impact the model performance.

5.1 Implementation Details

Datasets We consider two task-oriented dialogues, TWEETSUMM (Feigenblat et al., 2021) and TODSum (Zhao et al., 2021), both consisting of conversations between an agent and a customer. TODSum comprises dialogues from multiple sub-domains (restaurants, movies, etc), collected via crowdsourcing where annotators are tasked to generate dialogues based on a given scenario. In contrast, TWEETSUMM focuses solely on customer support conversations occurred at Twitter. We also include SAMSUM (Gliwa et al., 2019), a corpus of chit-chat dialogues between two or more friends.

Models We analyze the robustness of three state-of-the-art Transformer based encoder-decoder models for dialogue summarization, Pegasus-large (568M parameters) (Zhang et al., 2019), BART-large (400M parameters) (Lewis et al., 2020) and T5-base (220M parameters) (Raffel et al., 2020a) models. We choose model configurations such that the number of parameters is comparable. We fine-tune each model on the train split of the respective dialogue summarization dataset. We use beam search² with size 5 to generate summaries of unperturbed and perturbed dialogues. We also investigate the robustness of two instruction-tuned models, DIAL-BART0 (Gupta et al., 2022) and FLAN-T5 (Chung et al., 2022), used as zero-shot summarizers, without fine-tuning on the three dialogue summarization datasets considered in this work.

Metrics We evaluate summaries using BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020), which has been shown to better correlate with human judgment (Fischer et al., 2022). BERTScore calculates precision, recall, and F1 scores by comparing a model-generated summary to a reference summary. We use F1 to compute *consistency* and *saliency*, and precision to compute *faithfulness*. To validate our observed trends, we additionally evaluate summaries using ROUGE-L metric (Lin, 2004), which measures lexical overlap, and SummaC metric (Laban et al., 2022), which measures factual consistency. Results based on the ROUGE-L and SummaC metrics are provided in the Appendix A.7. While we choose these metrics to report our results, the three robustness dimensions can be computed using any summarization

²We did not use nucleus sampling to avoid sampling variance.

Dataset	Model	Utterance Perturbations			Dialogue Perturbations		
		$\Delta z_c\%$	$\Delta z_s\%$	$\Delta z_f\%$	$\Delta z_c\%$	$\Delta z_s\%$	$\Delta z_f\%$
TweetSum	BART	17.48±0.32	13.37±0.68	24.68±1.98	16.77±0.40	10.25±2.04	14.48±1.98
	Pegasus	16.73±0.42	17.18±1.04	29.51±5.20	16.67±0.42	11.33±1.97	21.03±5.20
	T5	17.89±0.37	14.44±0.82	16.67±2.94	17.02±0.38	11.78±1.35	9.81±2.94
TODSum	BART	7.26±0.24	3.87±0.16	51.71±17.09	5.85±0.24	2.70±0.42	19.07±15.06
	Pegasus	5.20±0.21	3.50±0.17	37.85±10.74	3.26±0.17	1.74±0.32	22.92±19.33
	T5	7.19±0.26	3.86±0.17	35.25±11.46	5.12±0.23	2.11±0.34	28.13±29.91
SAMSum	BART	13.06±0.36	6.57±0.25	11.39±0.73	22.05±0.52	5.11±0.65	6.62±1.28
	Pegasus	14.21±0.39	6.59±0.26	8.21±2.05	20.59±0.54	4.35±0.5	6.74±5.52
	T5	13.58±0.36	6.72±0.28	4.08±2.77	21.18±0.49	4.5±0.48	4.78±2.22

Table 1: Robustness evaluation of fine-tuned dialogue summarization models. The higher the score, the lower the robustness; scores are obtained using BERTScore. We observe similar trends using ROUGE-L and SummaC metrics, as mentioned in the Appendix A.7.

evaluation metric. For each reported result, we use a non-parametric bootstrap (Wasserman, 2004, ch. 8) to infer confidence intervals. We utilize 10^4 bootstrap samples of the dialogues to report 95% bootstrap confidence intervals (CI) via the normal interval method (Wasserman, 2004, ch. 8.3).

5.2 How robust are fine-tuned models?

We next investigate the impact of perturbations on all three fine-tuned models across all three datasets.

Fine-tuned dialogue summarization models are affected by both utterance and dialogue level perturbations Table 1 shows the change in *consistency*, *saliency*, and *faithfulness* owing to utterance and dialogue level perturbations on all three datasets. All three models are equally impacted by various perturbations. Models trained on TweetSum and SAMSum are impacted equally by both utterance-level and dialogue-level perturbations. TODSum is the least impacted, since this dataset contains template-based summaries where only entities from the dialogue are required to be filled. We see a major impact on faithfulness, with the highest impact on the model trained on the TODSum dataset.

Impact of utterance perturbations Table 2 shows that utterance-level perturbations have a comparable impact (shown averaged over all three models). We also observe that the models trained on TODSum has little change in consistency and saliency, but a significant change in faithfulness. This is expected since the TODSum summaries are extractive in nature, following a pre-defined template, and only require substituting entity information extracted from the dialogue. Since the template is fixed and the summaries can only change in entity information before and after perturbation

and w.r.t reference summary, we see a small change in consistency and saliency. However, we observe a large change in faithfulness, as this dimension focuses on factual correctness of the summary.

Impact of dialogue perturbations: Table 3 reports the impact of dialogue-level perturbations (shown averaged over all three models) and shows significant changes for repetition, time delays, greetings, and split utterances. For instance, when subjected to repetition perturbation, the models tend to include repeated utterances in the summary, even if they were previously deemed unimportant, which is referred to as repetition bias (see Figure 1). Additionally, the models demonstrate a preference for the first utterance in a dialogue (lead bias), rendering them susceptible to greetings perturbation. This observation aligns with prior findings in the field of news summarization, where sentences at the beginning of an article are more likely to contain summary-worthy information. Consequently, models trained on such datasets exhibit lead bias. Similarly, in customer-support conversations, the first utterance frequently addresses the primary issue faced by the customer. Finally, the models also prefer incorporation of lengthy utterances in the summary (long bias), by being more affected by split perturbations, and less affected by short utterances being combined.

5.3 Effect of model size on robustness

Table 4 shows the change in consistency for four models, BART-base, BART-large, T5-base, and T5-small, each with a different number of parameters. The models of different sizes are almost equally affected by perturbations, suggesting that robustness issues cannot be mitigated merely by scaling the model size.

Dimension	Dataset	Typographical	Grammar	Language Use	Speech Recognition
$\Delta z_c\%$	TweetSum	24.65±0.54	23.32±0.87	20.43±0.69	16.81±0.71
	TODSum	9.97±0.30	5.82±0.38	5.73±0.28	4.73±0.28
	SAMSum	16.27±0.36	16.93±0.71	17.78±0.48	10.88±0.52
$\Delta z_s\%$	TweetSum	16.27±1.93	16.93±2.7	17.78±1.96	10.88±2.45
	TODSum	5.59±1.32	3.12±1.04	2.96±0.89	2.49±0.98
	SAMSum	7.38±2.23	7.44±1.54	7.38±1.13	4.76±1.02
$\Delta z_f\%$	TweetSum	28.01±6.43	26.13±9.42	19.55±8.14	20.27±8.73
	TODSum	36.73±6.76	25.30±9.81	30.31±8.82	18.59±9.61
	SAMSum	11.17±1.75	9.98±1.83	8.97±1.57	6.89±1.89

Table 2: Robustness to utterance perturbations. Models are equally impacted by different perturbations.

Dimension	Dataset	Repetitions	Time Delays	Greetings	Closing Remarks	Split	Combine
$\Delta z_c\%$	TweetSum	18.04±0.59	14.15±0.85	20.01±1.34	9.80±1.0	16.71±0.83	6.77±0.36
	TODSum	5.96±0.39	4.31±0.4	6.61±0.59	2.02±0.4	4.38±0.36	-
	SAMSum	27.32±0.46	22.19±0.67	32.89±0.99	16.29±0.89	11.63±0.59	7.80±0.52
$\Delta z_s\%$	TweetSum	12.49±3.45	10.53±1.47	15.23±5.98	6.03±2.23	11.13±1.45	5.40±1.34
	TODSum	3.31±0.98	2.20±0.67	3.48±0.88	1.10±0.66	2.19±1.11	-
	SAMSum	10.87±0.23	8.38±0.98	12.63±0.95	6.04±1.14	14.65±0.96	7.05±1.26
$\Delta z_f\%$	TweetSum	19.34±5.91	15.81±1.2	18.31±9.23	6.99±8.28	15.11±7.47	8.65±1.42
	TODSum	64.74±6.67	22.74±1.66	50.98±9.51	10.52±9.89	23.37±8.23	-
	SAMSum	17.99±8.91	12.76±2.44	21.25±0.91	10.28±0.95	16.05±5.91	10.21±1.91

Table 3: Robustness to dialogue perturbations. Models are most susceptible to repetitions and time delays (repetition bias), greetings (lead bias), and split utterances (long bias). TODSum dataset has no consecutive utterances from the same speaker, thus we do not perform combine utterance perturbation on this dataset.

5.4 How robust are instruction-tuned models when used as zero-shot summarizers?

DIAL-BART0 and FLAN-T5 have both been instruction-tuned on multiple tasks, with DIAL-BART0, in particular, has been instruction-tuned on dialog-specific tasks. However, neither model was trained on the TweetSum dataset, giving us a zero-shot setting to test their ability to summarize dialogues. As depicted in Table 5, both DIAL-BART0 ($\Delta z_c=30.37\%$ for utterance and 34.30% for dialogue) and FLAN-T5 ($\Delta z_c=38.23\%$ for utterance and 44.12% for dialogue) are much more sensitive to perturbations compared to fine-tuned models ($\Delta z_c=17.36\%$ for utterance and 16.82% for dialogue, averaged over all three models).

In contrast to fine-tuned models, the zero-shot models are affected more by the dialogue-level perturbations ($\Delta z_c=34.30\%$ for DIAL-BART0 and $\Delta z_c=44.12\%$ for FLAN-T5) than utterance-level perturbations ($\Delta z_c=30.37\%$ for DIAL-BART0 and $\Delta z_c=38.23\%$ for FLAN-T5). Among utterance-level perturbations, similar to the fine-tuned models, zero-shot models are also impacted equally by all perturbations. Among dialogue-level perturbations as well, similar to the fine-tuned models, zero-shot models are most impacted by repetitions, greetings

and split utterances (Appendix A.5).

5.5 Validity of findings with human evaluation

To validate the trends observed using the automatically computed similarity metric, we conduct a human evaluation. We use the consistency dimension for human evaluation for two main reasons: (1) Correlations: While theoretically, all three dimensions aim to measure different aspects of robustness, empirical observations reveal a strong correlation among them (Table 7). Owing to these correlations, using any of the three dimensions would suffice for human evaluation, and (2) Ease of human evaluation: Among the three dimensions, consistency is easiest to use for human evaluation since it only requires comparison of two summaries, unlike saliency and faithfulness. We crowdsourced similarity scores via the Appen platform³ and ask annotators to compare summaries of perturbed and unperturbed dialogues, ranking their similarity on a Likert scale of 1 (highly dissimilar) to 4 (identical or paraphrases).

To collect annotations, we utilized the same set of 20 dialogues as in §3.3 from the TweetSum and SAMSum datasets. Each dialogue was modified by introducing perturbations from eight categories

³<https://appen.com/>

Model	Parameters	Utterance Perturbations			Dialogue Perturbations		
		$\Delta z_c\%$	$\Delta z_s\%$	$\Delta z_f\%$	$\Delta z_c\%$	$\Delta z_s\%$	$\Delta z_f\%$
BART-large	440	17.48 \pm 0.33	13.37 \pm 0.68	24.68 \pm 0.85	16.77 \pm 0.40	10.25 \pm 2.01	14.48 \pm 1.98
BART-base	140	18.2 \pm 0.30	16.42 \pm 0.58	25.78 \pm 0.89	18.2 \pm 0.30	13.28 \pm 1.84	15.6 \pm 2.29
T5-base	220	17.89 \pm 0.37	14.44 \pm 0.82	16.67 \pm 2.94	17.02 \pm 0.38	11.78 \pm 1.35	9.81 \pm 2.94
T5-small	60	19.15 \pm 0.32	14.18 \pm 0.53	25.31 \pm 2.16	19.15 \pm 0.32	8.03 \pm 2.72	18.64 \pm 5.69

Table 4: Evaluating robustness of different sized fine-tuned models on the TweetSum dataset.

Model	Utterance Perturbations			Dialogue Perturbations		
	$\Delta z_c\%$	$\Delta z_s\%$	$\Delta z_f\%$	$\Delta z_c\%$	$\Delta z_s\%$	$\Delta z_f\%$
BART	17.48 \pm 0.32	13.37 \pm 0.68	24.68 \pm 1.98	16.77 \pm 0.40	10.25 \pm 2.04	14.48 \pm 1.98
Pegasus	16.73 \pm 0.42	17.18 \pm 1.04	29.51 \pm 5.20	16.67 \pm 0.42	11.33 \pm 1.97	21.03 \pm 5.20
T5	17.89 \pm 0.37	14.44 \pm 0.82	16.67 \pm 2.94	17.02 \pm 0.38	11.78 \pm 1.35	9.81 \pm 2.94
DIAL-BART0	30.37 \pm 0.39	21.80 \pm 3.54	37.09 \pm 2.57	34.30 \pm 0.44	26.44 \pm 8.31	47.13 \pm 7.51
FLAN-T5	38.23 \pm 0.57	41.36 \pm 9.1	46.80 \pm 14.53	44.12 \pm 0.71	39.89 \pm 9.09	48.23 \pm 11.44

Table 5: Robustness of zero-shot summarizers on the TweetSum dataset

	Typos	Grammar	Language Use	Spoken Language	Repetition	Time Delay	Greeting	Closing Remark	Split Utterance	Combined Utterance
TweetSum	31.50	43.53	35.50	26.47	33.62	40.40	29.89	14.57	29.78	16.75
SAMSum	33.50	33.57	26.93	26.93	24.45	44.50	22.44	8.50	33.60	18.08

Table 6: $\Delta z_c\%$ for dialogue and utterance-level perturbations using similarity scores from human annotators.

(utterance- and dialogue-level), yielding 320 examples. We collected 3 annotations per example, totalling 1077 annotations; after filtering out noisy annotations, we conducted our analysis on the remaining 514 examples (see Appendix A.3 for annotation procedure and guidelines).

We aggregate annotations using majority voting over multiple annotations per example to get similarity predictions for each example. To compute consistency scores as per equation 1, we map Likert scale to continuous numeric scores from 0 to 1. Finally, we compute mean consistency scores across all examples for a given dataset and perturbation.

As shown in Table 6, we observe similar trends, with models exhibiting repetition, long, and lead biases and that the models are affected nearly equally by all utterance perturbations. It is important to note that while the absolute values of Δz_c may differ between calculations using automatic metrics and human annotations, our focus lies in the relative impact of different perturbations on the model. Repetition, greetings, and split utterance perturbations have a greater impact on the model than combined utterance and closing remarks.

6 Are all three dimensions necessary to measure robustness?

While theoretically, all the three dimensions discussed in §4 aim to measure different aspects of robustness, empirical observations reveal a strong correlation among them. Table 7 shows the Pearson

correlations⁴ between each pair of dimensions on the TweetSum dataset. Similar high correlations are also observed on the SAMSum and TODSum datasets.

This observation can be conceptually explained to some extent. For instance, high saliency implies high consistency, i.e., if the model-generated summaries are similar to the reference summary before and after perturbation, they will be similar to each other. Similarly, high saliency implies high faithfulness, i.e., if the model-generated summary is similar to the reference summary, it will also be factually consistent with the input dialogue (assuming the good quality of the reference summary). Thus, if Δz_s is low, then Δz_c is low since the summaries are close to the reference summary before and after perturbation. Furthermore, Δz_s is large, then Δz_c will also be large as the summaries before and after perturbation undergo change w.r.t reference summary and hence deviate from one another. Thus, Δz_s and Δz_c are expected to be correlated. Comparing saliency and faithfulness, if Δz_s is small, then Δz_f is also small. However, if Δz_s is large, the model could still remain faithful (hence small Δz_f) under perturbation, since the summaries may be factually consistent with the input dialogue before and after perturbation yet convey very different information compared to reference summary. Thus, conceptually, there is a relation in only one direction but not the other. However, empirically these

⁴We use the SciPy’s implementation available at: <https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/generated/scipy.stats.pearsonr.html>

Model	Pair of dimensions		
	$(\Delta z_c, \Delta z_s)$	$(\Delta z_c, \Delta z_f)$	$(\Delta z_f, \Delta z_s)$
BART	0.89	0.91	0.85
T5	0.94	0.93	0.89
Pegasus	0.86	0.85	0.84

Table 7: Pearson correlations between pairs of dimensions on the TweetSum dataset.




Figure 2: Correlation between consistency and saliency dimensions on TweetSum dataset.

two dimensions are also correlated.

Since all three dimensions are empirically correlated, this observation holds important implications for future robustness studies. For instance, reference summaries may not be always readily accessible, especially when assessing models in a new domain. In such situations, the consistency or faithfulness dimension can serve as a measure of robustness instead of saliency. The consistency dimension is also best suited for human evaluation for robustness studies as it depends on comparing two summaries only. In contrast, the saliency requires annotations for two “pairs” of summaries, and the faithfulness necessitates the comparison of the summary with the dialogue, making human evaluation labor-intensive and expensive.

Visualization of correlations among the three dimensions on TweetSum datasets is provided in Figures 3, 4, and 2. A similar analysis for SAMSUM and TODSUM is provided in the Appendix A.6.

7 Improving Robustness

To examine if training with perturbations can help mitigate robustness issues, we fine-tune BART on the training data augmented with perturbations and re-evaluate its performance. We create multiple training datasets, each modified by a specific kind of perturbation, using the training split of the TweetSum dataset. For utterance-level perturbations, we consider typographical errors and language use variations. For dialogue-level perturbations, we consider repetitions, split utterances, and greetings. For each perturbation, we modify differ-




Figure 3: Correlation between faithfulness and saliency dimensions on TweetSum dataset (Outliers excluded for the purpose of visualization).




Figure 4: Correlation between faithfulness and consistency dimensions on TweetSum dataset.

ent fractions of dialogues from the entire training set ranging from 5% to 50%. We then fine-tune BART on all datasets and evaluate each model on the test split of TweetSum, which is also perturbed following the same process.⁵ In general, we anticipate performance improvement as we include more perturbed dialogues in the training dataset, up to a certain threshold. Beyond that point, the model would tend to overfit to the perturbations, resulting in a decline in performance.

Figure 5 and Figure 6 show the change in model consistency when fine-tuned with perturbations. The lower the change in consistency, the higher the model robustness to the perturbations. One take-away is that different perturbations necessitate varying amounts of perturbed examples in the training set to achieve maximum performance improvement. For example, typographical errors and language use variations yield the largest drop in Δz_c when approximately 40% and 45% of the dialogues are perturbed during training. In contrast, dialogue-level perturbations require significantly less perturbed data during training, with approximately 30% split utterances, 15% greetings, and only 5% repetitions

⁵We experimented with training a single model on data with multiple perturbations and evaluating on all perturbations. However, since different perturbations can have different impacts on model performance, we found perturbation-wise analysis more interpretable.




Figure 5: Fine-tuning with utterance perturbations.




Figure 6: Fine-tuning with dialogue perturbations.

being sufficient. Overall, the results demonstrate that fine-tuning with perturbed data does not yield consistent performance improvements, and more detailed exploration needs to be conducted as part of future work.

8 Can we remove perturbations using reverse heuristics or language models to address robustness issues?

Removing perturbations using reverse heuristics A potential solution to address the robustness issues can be to use reverse heuristics to remove certain perturbations from the dialogues (e.g., greetings). However, not all of the perturbations we consider are easily discoverable and removable. For instance, in repetitions or time-delay perturbations, the repeated utterance could include more or less information than the original utterance. As a result, using heuristics that preserve only the original or the repeated utterance can not only affect the dialogue’s readability but also impact the information conveyed in the dialogue.

We acknowledge that greetings and closing remarks can be simpler to remove via reverse heuristics. However, our primary purpose in introducing greetings and closing remarks perturbations is to study model behavior (e.g., potential lead and recency biases). Introducing greetings and conclusions is just a means to an end, i.e., a systematic approach to investigate these biases, illustrating the model’s preferences towards first and last utterances in a dialogue. There can be many scenarios

where a non-greeting first utterance is not salient in the dialogue compared to other utterances, yet it is included in the summary just because of its position in the dialogue. The space of such generic utterances is vast and, hence difficult to operationalize. Thus, we propose to use greetings/closing remarks, which occur naturally in real-life conversations and provide a simple way to investigate these biases.

Removing perturbations using language models

Another potential solution to address robustness issues can be to use language models (LM) to pre-process dialogues to remove errors and repetitions. Such an approach could suffer from two potential challenges: (1) In a deployment setting, such a strategy could increase latency since it will require a) dialogue pre-processing via LM followed by b) dialogue summarization, instead of directly summarizing the dialogue. (2) LMs are known to hallucinate content, and such pre-processing poses the risk of introducing unwanted factual errors in the input dialogue.

9 Conclusion

We investigate the impact of naturally occurring variations on state-of-the-art dialogue summarization models using three publicly available datasets. To simulate variations, we introduce utterance-level and dialogue-level perturbations. We conduct our analysis using three dimensions of robustness: consistency, saliency, and faithfulness, which capture different aspects of summarization model performance. Our results show that both fine-tuned and instruction-tuned models are affected by perturbations, with instruction-tuned models being more susceptible, particularly to dialogue-level perturbations. We also observe that both model families exhibit repetition, long, and lead biases. We confirm our findings via human evaluation. Finally, we show that training with perturbed data improves the robustness of fine-tuned models.

10 Limitations

We list some of the limitations of our study which researchers and practitioners would hopefully benefit from when interpreting our analysis. 1) Our analysis uses automatic metrics to measure semantic similarity. Established metrics such BERTScore are imperfect (Deutsch et al., 2022). However, they are widely used in the summarization literature, and also correlate with human judgements of summary quality, and thus are useful for comparing

system-level performance. To validate our findings, we also conduct a human evaluation to better understand trends observed due to various perturbations. The investigation of better-automated metrics for natural language generation is an active field of research, and we hope to integrate novel performance metrics in future work. (2) While our perturbations are motivated by real-life scenarios, they are still synthetic in nature. However, we take care wherever possible to avoid unrealistic changes to the dialogues. (3) Our study limits to only open-sourced models and does not investigate the robustness of proprietary LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT), which may be more robust. We decided to limit our study to open-sourced models as it allows us to carefully control what is in the training data, which is not possible with proprietary LLMs and the possibility of data contamination also makes it hard to draw conclusions. (4) Our study does not include spoken conversations, which would bring in very different and diverse nuances of spoken conversations compared to text-based conversations, and is currently out of the scope of this paper. (5) Our study proposes one possible method to measure robustness, and we acknowledge that there can be many other viable ways to quantify robustness. However, quantifying the robustness of tasks involving text generation (e.g., summarization) is an active area of research (Wang et al., 2022) and we hope our work will spur further investigation as part of future work. (6) We did not investigate the robustness of models under both utterance and dialogue level perturbations occurring together in a single dialogue, as that would result in a large number of possible combinations to consider. We leave this for future work.

11 Ethics Statement

All annotators in our human evaluation were recruited via Appen platform and were presented with a consent form prior to the annotation. They were also informed that only satisfactory performance on the screening example will allow them to take part in the annotation task. None of the material/examples they looked at had any hateful or abusive content. We also ensured that the annotators were paid fair amount of wages using Appen’s Fair Pay Price Per Judgment which equates to an hourly rate matching a little over the minimum wage of annotators in their respective countries.

References

- Jiaao Chen and Diyi Yang. 2021. [Simple conversational data augmentation for semi-supervised abstractive dialogue summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6605–6616, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hyundong Cho, Chinnadhurai Sankar, Christopher Lin, Kaushik Sadagopan, Shahin Shayandeh, Asli Celikyilmaz, Jonathan May, and Ahmad Beirami. 2022. [Know thy strengths: Comprehensive dialogue state tracking diagnostics](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 5345–5359, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.
- Daniel Deutsch, Rotem Dror, and Dan Roth. 2022. [Re-examining system-level correlations of automatic summarization evaluation metrics](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 6038–6052, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kaustubh D. Dhole, Varun Gangal, Sebastian Gehrmann, Aadish Gupta, Zhenhao Li, Saad Mahamood, Abinaya Mahendiran, Simon Mille, Ashish Srivastava, Samson Tan, Tongshuang Wu, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Jinho D. Choi, Eduard Hovy, Ondrej Dusek, Sebastian Ruder, Sajant Anand, Nageender Aneja, Rabin Banjade, Lisa Barthe, Hanna Behnke, Ian Berlot-Attwell, Connor Boyle, Caroline Brun, Marco Antonio Sobrevilla Cabezudo, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Emile Chapuis, Wanxiang Che, Mukund Choudhary, Christian Clauss, Pierre Colombo, Filip Cornell, Gautier Dagan, Mayukh Das, Tanay Dixit, Thomas Dopierre, Paul-Alexis Dray, Suchitra Dubey, Tatiana Ekeinhor, Marco Di Giovanni, Rishabh Gupta, Rishabh Gupta, Louanes Hamla, Sang Han, Fabrice Harel-Canada, Antoine Honore, Ishan Jindal, Przemyslaw K. Joniak, Denis Kleyko, Venelin Kovatchev, Kalpesh Krishna, Ashutosh Kumar, Stefan Langer, Seungjae Ryan Lee, Corey James Levinson, Hualou Liang, Kaizhao Liang, Zhexiong Liu, Andrey Lukyanenko, Vukosi Marivate, Gerard de Melo, Simon Meoni, Maxime Meyer, Afnan Mir, Nafise Sadat Moosavi, Niklas Muennighoff, Timothy Sum Hon Mun, Kenton Murray, Marcin Namysl, Maria Obedkova, Priti Oli, Nivranshu Pasricha, Jan Pfister, Richard Plant, Vinay Prabhu, Vasile Pais, Libo Qin, Shahab Raji, Pawan Kumar Rajpoot, Vikas Raunak, Roy Rinberg, Nicolas Roberts, Juan Diego Rodriguez, Claude Roux, Vasconcellos P. H. S., Ananya B. Sai, Robin M. Schmidt, Thomas Scialom, Tshephisho Sefara, Saqib N. Shamsi, Xudong Shen,

- Haoyue Shi, Yiwen Shi, Anna Shvets, Nick Siegel, Damien Sileo, Jamie Simon, Chandan Singh, Roman Sitelew, Priyank Soni, Taylor Sorensen, William Soto, Aman Srivastava, KV Aditya Srivatsa, Tony Sun, Mukund Varma T, A Tabassum, Fiona Anting Tan, Ryan Teehan, Mo Tiwari, Marie Tolkiehn, Athena Wang, Zijian Wang, Gloria Wang, Zijie J. Wang, Fuxuan Wei, Bryan Wilie, Genta Indra Winata, Xinyi Wu, Witold Wydmański, Tianbao Xie, Usama Yaseen, M. Yee, Jing Zhang, and Yue Zhang. 2021. [NI-augmenter: A framework for task-sensitive natural language augmentation](#).
- Arash Einolghozati, Sonal Gupta, Mrinal Mohit, and Rushin Shah. 2019. Improving robustness of task oriented dialog systems. *3rd Conversational AI Workshop at 33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Guy Feigenblat, Chulaka Gunasekara, Benjamin Szneider, Sachindra Joshi, David Konopnicki, and Ranit Aharonov. 2021. [TWEETSUMM - a dialog summarization dataset for customer service](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 245–260, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiachong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, and Bing Qin. 2021. A survey on dialogue summarization: Recent advances and new frontiers. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.03175.
- Xiachong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, and Bing Qin. 2022. [A survey on dialogue summarization: Recent advances and new frontiers](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, pages 5453–5460. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization. Survey Track.
- Tim Fischer, Steffen Remus, and Chris Biemann. 2022. [Measuring faithfulness of abstractive summaries](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference on Natural Language Processing (KONVENS 2022)*, pages 63–73, Potsdam, Germany. KONVENS 2022 Organizers.
- Jatin Ganhotra, Robert Moore, Sachindra Joshi, and Kahini Wadhawan. 2020. [Effects of naturalistic variation in goal-oriented dialog](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4013–4020, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Giorgi, Luca Soldaini, Bo Wang, Gary Bader, Kyle Lo, Lucy Lu Wang, and Arman Cohan. 2022. Exploring the challenges of open domain multi-document summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10526*.
- Bogdan Gliwa, Iwona Mochol, Maciej Biesek, and Aleksander Wawer. 2019. [SAMSum corpus: A human-annotated dialogue dataset for abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 70–79, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Prakhar Gupta, Cathy Jiao, Yi-Ting Yeh, Shikib Mehri, Maxine Eskenazi, and Jeffrey Bigham. 2022. [InstructDial: Improving zero and few-shot generalization in dialogue through instruction tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 505–525, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongyan Jing, Daniel Lopresti, and Chilin Shih. 2003. [Summarization of noisy documents: A pilot study](#). In *Proceedings of the HLT-NAACL 03 Text Summarization Workshop*, pages 25–32.
- Taehee Jung, Dongyeop Kang, Lucas Mentch, and Eduard Hovy. 2019. [Earlier isn’t always better: Subaspect analysis on corpus and system biases in summarization](#). In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Hong Kong.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Omer Levy, Jacob Eisenstein, and Marjan Ghazvininejad. 2019. [Training on synthetic noise improves robustness to natural noise in machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text (W-NUT 2019)*, pages 42–47, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Misha Khalman, Yao Zhao, and Mohammad Saleh. 2021. Forumsum: A multi-speaker conversation summarization dataset. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 4592–4599.
- Seokhwan Kim, Yang Liu, Di Jin, Alexandros Papanagelis, Karthik Gopalakrishnan, Behnam Hedayatnia, and Dilek Z. Hakkani-Tür. 2021. “how robust r u?”: Evaluating task-oriented dialogue systems on spoken conversations. *2021 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, pages 1147–1154.
- Kundan Krishna, Yao Zhao, Jie Ren, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Jiaming Luo, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J Liu. 2022. Improving the robustness of summarization models by detecting and removing input noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09928*.
- Philippe Laban, Tobias Schnabel, Paul N Bennett, and Marti A Hearst. 2022. SummaC: Re-visiting NLI-based models for inconsistency detection in summarization. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:163–177.
- Charlyn M. Laserna, Yi-Tai Seih, and James W. Pennebaker. 2014. Um . . . who like says you know. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 33:328 – 338.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training](#)

- for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Jixi Liu, Ryuichi Takanobu, Jiabin Wen, Dazhen Wan, Hongguang Li, Weiran Nie, Cheng Li, Wei Peng, and Minlie Huang. 2021. [Robustness testing of language understanding in task-oriented dialog](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 2467–2480, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ailsa Meechan-Maddon. 2019. The effect of noise in the training of convolutional neural networks for text summarisation.
- Simon Mille, Kaustubh Dhole, Saad Mahamood, Laura Perez-Beltrachini, Varun Gangal, Mihir Kale, Emiel van Miltenburg, and Sebastian Gehrmann. 2021. [Automatic construction of evaluation suites for natural language generation datasets](#). In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 1)*.
- George A Miller. 1998. *WordNet: An electronic lexical database*. MIT press.
- Robert J. Moore and Raphael Arar. 2019. *Conversational UX Design: A Practitioner’s Guide to the Natural Conversation Framework*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA.
- Milad Moradi and Matthias Samwald. 2021. Evaluating the robustness of neural language models to input perturbations. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Xing Niu, Prashant Mathur, Georgiana Dinu, and Yaser Al-Onaizan. 2020. [Evaluating robustness to input perturbations for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8538–8544, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Zhu Zhang, Chenguang Zhu, Jinchao Li, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Radicle: An evaluation benchmark and analysis platform for robust task-oriented dialog systems. *ArXiv*, abs/2012.14666.
- Denis Peskov, Joe Barrow, Pedro Rodriguez, Graham Neubig, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. 2019. Mitigating noisy inputs for question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.02914*.
- Lihua Qian, Lin Qiu, Weinan Zhang, Xin Jiang, and Yong Yu. 2019. [Exploring diverse expressions for paraphrase generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3173–3182, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020a. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, Peter J Liu, et al. 2020b. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail D. Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50:696 – 735.
- Sailik Sengupta, Jason Krone, and Saab Mansour. 2021. [On the robustness of intent classification and slot labeling in goal-oriented dialog systems to real-world noise](#). In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Conversational AI*, pages 68–79, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xin Tian, Xinxian Huang, Dongfeng He, Yingzhan Lin, Siqi Bao, H. He, Liankai Huang, Qiang Ju, Xiyuan Zhang, Jianyue Xie, Shuqi Sun, Fan Wang, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2021. Tod-da: Towards boosting the robustness of task-oriented dialogue modeling on spoken conversations. *ArXiv*, abs/2112.12441.
- Vaibhav Vaibhav, Sumeet Singh, Craig Stewart, and Graham Neubig. 2019. [Improving robustness of machine translation with synthetic noise](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 1916–1920, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuezhi Wang, Haohan Wang, and Diyi Yang. 2022. [Measure and improve robustness in NLP models: A survey](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4569–4586, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Larry Wasserman. 2004. *All of statistics: a concise course in statistical inference*, volume 26. Springer.
- Linzi Xing, Wen Xiao, and Giuseppe Carenini. 2021. Demoting the lead bias in news summarization via

alternating adversarial learning. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.

Alex Yorke. [butter-fingers](#).

Lin Yuan and Zhou Yu. 2019. Abstractive dialog summarization with semantic scaffolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.00825*.

Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J. Liu. 2019. [Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization](#).

Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. [BERTScore: Evaluating text generation with BERT](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Lulu Zhao, Fujia Zheng, Keqing He, Weihao Zeng, Yuejie Lei, Huixing Jiang, Wei Wu, Weiran Xu, Jun Guo, and Fanyu Meng. 2021. Todsum: Task-oriented dialogue summarization with state tracking. *ArXiv*, abs/2110.12680.

Qi Zhu, Zheng Zhang, Yan Fang, Xiang Li, Ryuichi Takanobu, Jinchao Li, Baolin Peng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Minlie Huang. 2020. Convlab-2: An open-source toolkit for building, evaluating, and diagnosing dialogue systems. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.

Caleb Ziems, Jiaao Chen, Camille Harris, Jessica Brooke Anderson, and Diyi Yang. 2022. Value: Understanding dialect disparity in nlu. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.03031.

A Appendix

A.1 Details/Examples of Perturbations

See Table 8.

A.2 Details of annotation guidelines of quality validation in §5.2

For annotation collection, we only allowed annotators proficient in English from a small group of the most experienced annotators adjudicated by the Appen platform; from any country. We also used hidden test questions for quality control and required annotators to maintain at least 80% accuracy throughout the job on these hidden test questions. These test questions are pre-labeled and are used before and during the task to quiz the annotator. We selected 15 test questions from the validation split of each dataset ensuring that these questions do not overlap with questions seen by the annotators for the actual annotation task. Figure 7 shows the annotation guidelines and Figure 8 shows examples provided for this task.

A.3 Details of annotation guidelines for the validity of trends in §5.6

Quality Control: For this task, as well we only allowed annotators proficient in English from a small group of the most experienced annotators adjudicated by the Appen platform; from any country. We also used hidden test questions for quality control and required annotators to maintain at least 80% accuracy throughout the job on these hidden test questions. Figure 9 shows the annotation guidelines, and Figure 10 shows examples provided for this task.

Number of annotations: In the main task, each annotator was shown 5 examples per page with one hidden test example. For each example, we collected three annotations. In cases where there was no agreement among the initial three annotations, we obtained additional annotations. A maximum of five annotations was considered.

Noise Filtering: Before computing consistency scores, we took several steps to filter out noisy annotations. The Appen platform estimates the trust score for each worker (by calculating accuracy on hidden test examples) and also marks examples as tainted if it is annotated by an annotator whose accuracy score has fallen below the minimum accuracy threshold. To retain only the highest quality annotations, we remove annotations that were

Perturbation Type	Perturbation Category	Perturbation Name	Examples
Utterance Level	Typographical Errors	remove punctuation	great! → great
		remove/add whitespace	Customer → Custo mer
		change letter casing	action → actIon
Utterance Level	Grammatical Errors	common substitutions expansions	n't → not
		common substitutions contractions	I am → I'm
		dropping determiners	a, the, an
Utterance Level	Spoken Language Errors	subject-verb disagreements	She likes apples. → She like apples.
		homophone swaps	their → there
		filler words and disfluencies	uhm, uh, erm, ah, er, err, actually, like, you know I think/believe/mean, I would say maybe, perhaps, probably, possibly, most likely
Dialogue Level	Repetitions	N/A	'Sorry, I couldn't hear you, can you repeat?'
	Time Delays	N/A	'Just give me a few minutes..'
	Greeting and closing remarks	greeting (Customer Support)	'sure', 'yup!'
		greeting (friends)	'Thanks for waiting.'
		closing (Customer Support)	'Hi! I am your customer support assistant. How may I help you today?'
closing (friends)	'Hi!' or 'Hey there!'		
			'Thank you for contacting us. Have a nice day!'
			'Cool, talk to you later!', 'Bye.'

Table 8: Examples of each perturbation

Valid Summaries

Instructions ▾

Overview

In this task, you will be shown a dialogue and a summary of this dialogue. The dialogue may contain some spelling or grammar errors. It may also contain back-and-forth utterances asking for clarifications, repetitions, etc., which should not change the main focus of the conversation. **Your task will be to identify if this summary is relevant and contains the most important information mentioned in the dialogue.** You are required to choose one among the following options:

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

If you chose Unsure, you will be asked to provide a brief reason that makes you unsure about this dialogue-summary pair.

Steps

- Read the dialogue and the summary.
- Determine if the summary is relevant to the dialogue.
- If the summary is relevant, determine if the summary captures the most important information from the dialogue.
- Pro Tips:
 - A summary is relevant if it only contains information from the dialogue.
 - If the summary is not relevant to the dialogue, then answer "No."
 - If the summary is relevant, then check whether it contains most important information.
 - Additional back-and-forth utterances asking for clarifications, repetitions, etc often don't include important information.

Figure 7: Annotation guidelines for quality validation of perturbed dialogue-summary pairs.

marked as tainted and only keep annotations from workers whose trust score is 100%, resulting in 795 annotations. On qualitatively examining the annotations we also found cases where the two summaries were word-by-word the same, yet the annotator did not give a rating of 4 (highly similar or exact match). Since this is a case of obvious noise, we remove such cases. If an example has less than 3 annotations left after the filtering step, we drop the example. After this filtering, we finally use 514 annotations to conduct our analysis.

A.4 Targeted dialogue perturbations to investigate the repetition bias

To delve deeper into the repetition bias observed in the models, we conducted targeted perturbations, where we repeat utterances based on whether the information conveyed in those utterances was considered important by the reference summary. Specifically, we identify utterances that are highly rele-

Dataset	Model	Repeated Utterance		
		Most Relevant	Least Relevant	Random
TweetSum	BART	12.40	14.53	14.46
	Pegasus	13.49	16.68	14.22
	T5	9.26	11.46	10.84
TODSum	BART	1.94	4.32	3.52
	Pegasus	2.05	2.05	2.92
	T5	1.85	3.66	3.50

Table 9: Saliency scores of fine-tuned models with targeted perturbations. Perturbing the least relevant utterance results in the highest change in saliency, suggesting that the model exhibits repetition bias.

vant and least relevant to the reference summary. To measure relevance, we compute semantic similarity⁶ between each utterance and each sentence in the reference summary. For each summary sentence, we then determine the most (least) relevant utterance by selecting the one with the highest (lowest) similarity with the summary sentence. When perturbing the most relevant utterance, we perturb

⁶using sentence transformers [CITE]




Figure 8: Examples provided as part of annotation guidelines for quality validation of perturbed dialogue-summary pairs




Figure 9: Annotation guidelines for the validity of trends; to collect similarity annotations for pair of summaries.

the utterances that were identified as relevant to at least one summary sentence. When perturbing the least relevant utterance, we perturb the utterances that were identified as least relevant to all the summary sentences.

As shown in Table 9, we observe that the model exhibits the highest change in saliency scores when we perturb the least relevant utterance, which further demonstrates the model's tendency to consider repeated information as important, even though it was not considered important as per the reference summary. In contrast, repetition of the most relevant utterance shows the least change in the scores, since the model already focuses on the most relevant information before perturbation and after re-

peating that utterance, it still remains important to be included in the summary.

A.5 Perturbation-wise impact on zero-shot models

See Table 10 and Table 11

A.6 Correlation analysis

A.6.1 SAMSUM

See Figures 12, 13, 11.

A.6.2 TODSum

See Figures 15, 16, 14.

A.7 Analysis using ROUGE-L and SummaC scores

Model	Perturbation					
	repetitions	time_delays	greetings	Closing remarks	split utterances	combined utterances
DIAL-BART0	35.30	31.15	35.02	23.07	35.10	18.31
FLAN-T5	45.65	32.88	60.10	48.11	41.45	20.34

Table 10: Change in consistency scores due to dialogue-level perturbations on instruction-tuned models when used as zero-shot summarizers. Models are more affected due to repetitions, time-delays, greetings, and split utterances compared to closing remarks and combined utterances.

Model	Perturbation			
	typographical	grammar	language_use	speech_recognition
DIAL-BART0	33.74	32.26	27.53	30.33
FLAN-T5	42.60	48.03	39.75	33.86

Table 11: Change in consistency scores due to utterance-level perturbations on instruction-tuned models when used as zero-shot summarizers. Models are equally affected due to all perturbations.

Model	Utterance Perturbations			Dialogue Perturbations		
	Consistency	Saliency	Faithfulness	Consistency	Saliency	Faithfulness
BART Large	14.00±0.22	10.91±0.01	9.18±0.01	14.37±0.37	10.37±0.01	8.97±0.01
BART Base	14.18±0.29	10.65±0.01	9.60±0.01	15.40±0.31	9.74±0.01	9.04±0.09
Pegasus	13.50±0.46	13.24±0.01	11.29±0.02	14.78±0.39	12.14±0.02	9.80±0.01
T5 Base	14.72±0.36	13.43±0.01	11.01±0.01	13.88±0.42	12.27±0.02	9.79±0.01
T5 Small	14.66±0.33	14.40±0.01	10.11±0.01	15.75±0.31	10.99±0.01	8.72±0.08
DIAL-BART0	29.72±0.36	22.70±0.01	20.53±0.01	34.09±0.30	26.3±0.02	23.29±0.01
FLAN-T5	34.06±0.55	34.63±0.01	36.67±0.02	39.84±0.53	36.98±0.03	40.82±0.06
LLAMA-2	47.1±0.17	35.16±0.01	33.19±0.09	54.53±0.48	33.59±0.03	31.69±0.02

Table 12: Results on TweetSum using ROUGE-L

Model	Utterance Perturbations			Dialogue Perturbations		
	Consistency	Saliency	Faithfulness	Consistency	Saliency	Faithfulness
BART Large	19.18±0.35	6.66±0.01	3.37±0.01	20.85±0.60	7.70±0.02	2.11±0.01
BART Base	19.35±0.41	6.67±0.01	4.23±0.02	21.08±0.47	5.34±0.02	3.07±0.01
Pegasus	19.67±0.50	8.33±0.02	3.75±0.01	21.70±0.53	7.43±0.03	3.67±0.03
T5 Base	19.20±0.50	7.81±0.03	3.87±0.03	21.40±0.58	7.76±0.04	3.44±0.01
T5 Small	20.77±0.55	8.44±0.06	3.69±0.01	21.17±0.63	5.93±0.01	2.38±0.04
DIAL-BART0	43.05±0.52	12.8±0.03	4.55±0.01	51.75±0.47	16.05±0.02	6.32±0.03
FLAN-T5	39.54±0.64	14.96±0.00	5.95±0.01	45.93±0.65	15.35±0.04	7.72±0.02
LLAMA-2	45.05±0.44	20.51±0.04	18.06±0.02	56.32±0.43	20.58±0.11	12.79±0.06

Table 13: Results on TweetSum using SummaC

Dimension	Repetitions	Time Delays	Greetings	Conclusion	Split Utterances	Combine Utterances
Consistency	31.03±0.52	25.73 ±0.77	36.89±1.07	18.17±0.95	13.34±0.75	8.7±0.62
Saliency	12.16±0.66	9.64±0.97	16.72±2.36	5.62±0.73	11.63±1.05	6.62±0.77
Faithfulness	10.17±0.45	7.54±0.58	10.84±0.93	5.3±0.69	8.96±0.6	5.33±0.49

Table 14: Impact of Dialogue Perturbations on TweetSum using ROUGE-L

Example 1 (SAME):

Summary 1: The customer is upset about the train delay. According to the agent, delay repay compensation is available to those affected by disruption who have been delayed for more than 30 minutes.

Summary 2: Customer is complaining about the delay in the train. Agent states that the delay repay compensation is available to those who have been caught up in disruption and delayed by over 30 minutes.

Answer: 4 (SAME): Both summaries convey the exact same information and have the same meaning. Thus, these summaries are very similar. On a scale of 1-4, these two summaries score 4.

Example 2 (SUPER SET):

Summary 1: Customer is complaining about the fluctuation in the internet which goes in and out and fluctuates speed is also extremely variable. Agent requests to speak privately via direct message so that they can look further into this issue.

Summary 2: The customer is complaining that he was disappointed with the internet services. The agent asked the customer to directly message them for further assistance.

Answer: 3 (SUPER SET) In this example, the summary 1 is a super set of the summary 2. The summary 2 mentions that the customer is complaining about internet services. This information is also mentioned in the summary 1 which provides more details about the complaint (e.g., fluctuating speed). In other words, the summary 1 contains some additional information not present in the summary 2 and thus summary 1 is a superset of summary 2. Both summary 1 and summary 2 mention that the agent requested the user to directly message, thus this portion of the summary 2 exactly matches with the summary 1. Overall, the summary 1 is a super set of the summary 2. On a scale of 1-4, these two summaries score 3.

Example 3 (SUB SET):

Summary 1: Customer is complaining that he is unable to change the reservation. Agent requests to provide confirmation number via DM so that they can assist further.

Summary 2: The customer is complaining that he was trying to contact Delta about changing the reservation. the agent asked to provide their confirmation number via DM so that they can assist

Answer: 2 (SUB SET) In this example, the summary 2 slightly differs from the summary 1. The summary 2 mentions that the customer was trying to contact Delta about changing the reservation. However, the summary 1 mentions that the customer is unable to change the reservation and doesn't mention anything about Delta. At the same time, both summaries are similar when mentioning the agent's response. Thus, overall, the two summaries are only partially similar, with summary 1 missing some information compared to the summary 2. On a scale of 1-4, these two summaries score 2.

Figure 10: Examples provided as part of annotation guidelines to collect similarity annotations for pair of summaries.




Figure 11: Correlation between consistency and saliency dimensions on SAMSUM dataset.




Figure 14: Correlation between consistency and saliency dimensions on TODSUM dataset.




Figure 12: Correlation between faithfulness and saliency dimensions on SAMSUM dataset (Outliers excluded for the purpose of visualization).




Figure 15: Correlation between faithfulness and saliency dimensions on TODSUM dataset (Outliers excluded for the purpose of visualization).




Figure 13: Correlation between faithfulness and consistency dimensions on SAMSUM dataset.




Figure 16: Correlation between faithfulness and consistency dimensions on TODSUM dataset.