Attempted analysis of extended real-life conversation using Grasgy/Sidner theory

mention that both commentators are grandmasters

1996 match: Karpov won 4-2, but lost 1st game (this is the conversation we are annotating)

1997 match: R.P, er, dr, dr, D: 3.5-2.5

we were all astonished! And we were good students in AI!

But none of you are astonished; (probably more amused by the idea that we were astonished)

Overall observations (from me or the class)

- disagreements about segment boundaries; embedding, but generally no "co-interlocked bracketing"
  (Takimoto's main article: PST tends to have less annotator disagreement)
- should we consider the audience to also be a (silent) participant
- much discussion of how to handle the "return" in 248 to "psychological pressure":
  - violation of popped segment theory?
  - indicative of a pop?
  - just a reminder of what had originally been talking about?
- are 241-42 an interruption, or does their DSP(s) fit into the intention tree?
  - again, excellent discussion in support of point of psycho. pressure
  - why isn't "pressure" a factor?
- does organizational/online material remain on screen? (2.14-10)
- probably better/easier to do w/ full multimodality (tone of voice, gaze, etc.)
- intensional structure vs. information/led-imposed structure

17-24
- better for larger segments or small?
- one interp: 22-23 is an interrupt, Ashley's intent is to make a joke.
  23 is VS asking, in order to close the segment
  (segment getting other party to recognize the intention
  is the DSP) (yuk, yuk, yuk, little joke)

  In 24 VS repeats "so naturally", reinforcing the pop. regaining control
  alt interp: "so you're in shock" is an attempt by MT to indicate that he
  gets where this is going on and close the segment?

24: "just as you were saying, Maurice" seems odd. Ref to 160? Or to previous conversation?
  or to what VS was saying?"
Is the same thing still on the stack? or got popped off?

Is there a DSI for the entire conversation?

---

Next hw: two readings chosen for wide range in topic coverage (not coherence)

We should be thinking about project topics

(studied through what it says on the course webpage about the assignment).

I'll be aiming to pick papers that are:

- relatively accessible
- interesting (inspirational)
- dataset available or relatively reproducible is a plus.

We want to be in the mode of generating ideas for projects, and we need to know early if you're gonna need to get (or clean) data.
Your task: by midnight of **Wed September 17th** (so, after your A1 presentations), upload to CMS a mark-up of this document to indicate what discourse structure elements and cues you find. Include in your analysis pertinent remarks as to what phenomena, if any, accord with the Grosz/Sidner theory as presented in class, and what phenomena, if any, appear to contravene the Grosz/Sidner theory. You are welcome to work in whatever size group you like, and to discuss with each other on Piazza if you like. Each group should submit their marked-up document (together with notes if you want) as a single pdf to CMS by the due date.

My goal in assigning this is that you practice some discourse analysis as fodder for our discussion on September 18th, but I don’t expect you to spend more than 30-60 minutes on this assignment.


---

1 MR. ASHLEY: Welcome to the ACM chess challenge. I'm Maurice Ashley. My partner is Yasser Seirawan. Garry Kasparov is playing against IBM's Deep Blue, and as most everybody here knows, he is down 1 nothing already. So Kasparov needing to play well in order to come back. A big question for him is whether or not he can handle the psychological pressure of being down against the computer that, first of all, everybody thought he was going to beat, including himself and, second of all, he simply has no idea how strong it is because this version that they're using has never been tested and is clearly playing some excellent chess.

2 Yasser, yesterday's game was a model of computer cold-bloodedness.

3 MR. ASHLEY: Mr. Seirawan: Precision.

4 MR. ASHLEY: It just did not care about Kasparov's attack and just ripped him off the board. It was unbelievable.

5 MR. SEIRAWAN: It's terrible. I'm still recovering.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. SEIRAWAN: Actually, prior to the match I had said, okay, it's great. This is wonderful. There's a lot of hype, the best computer in the world versus the best human player in the world. Well, it's no contest. Garry is going to just win. And I would be shocked, shocked if the computer won any game. So naturally —

8 MR. ASHLEY: So you're in shock.

9 MR. ASHLEY: ...in shock.

20 MR. SEIRAWAN: I'm in shock.

21 So naturally Deep Blue won the first, and just as you were saying, 22 Maurice, I can't fault any single move that the computer made.

23 We had dinner last night together with a group of ourselves, and we 24 just kept going through the game at various stages, and we said, this 25 is a very, very serious opponent for Garry. This is a very legitimate 26 match, and of course now that Garry is down a point, he's got to prove 27 himself. Yesterday I had spoken about the fact that in tennis -- and 28 again I'm probably misattributing the quote. It was of Rod Laver, when

(OVER)
he was going to sum up his opposition, he said, I only need to see 3
shots. I need to see the forehand, backhand and the serve, and then I
will tell you how long or how many sets the match is going to last
before I win.

And Garry said the same thing on Friday at the press conference. He
said basically I need to see the computer on offense, on defense, and
then the match is going to be mine. So he basically saw the first 2
games as just being his ability to sum up his opponent and then
vanquish him in the latter half of the match.

Well, that may still work, but he’s got his work cut out for him. He’s
made it more difficult for himself.

MR. ASHLEY: What about the psychological pressure on him? From what
I’ve seen, I’ve seen Kasparov down in matches before. He was down
against Anand in game 9. He was down against Kramnik in the Paris leg
of the Gran Prix tournament and came back and won. In each case
Kasparov seems to bounce back from matches. He is not just the kind of
guy who goes down in chess games and falls apart.