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Introduction

This labeling guide is adopted from work on the DAMSL–Switchboard recordings and the accompanying manual written in 1997. The DAMSL–Switchboard manual for labeling one–on–one phone conversations provided a useful starting point for the types of dialog acts that arose in the ICSI meeting corpus. The tagset for labeling meetings presented here has been adapted as necessary to include different and new areas which came up due to the multi–speaker setting of meetings.

The pragmatic meanings of utterances were examined and a list of all the possible categories of dialogue acts was compiled. The reasoning behind the tagset presented in this manual reflects the intent to build the capability of automatically annotating meetings with DAs.

Future work involves incorporating information from dialogue act labeling for annotating adjacency pairs and "hot spots" (identifiable areas in segments of speech in which tension, excitement, or memorable correspondence exists between speakers).

*There are some content mistakes in this.*
Section 1
How to Label Dialogue:

Terminology

Here is some rudimentary terminology used to explain how to label the dialogue:

**label** = the entire set of dialogue acts applicable to a whole utterance
**dialogue act (DA)** = the tag or sequence of tags in a tiered form pertaining to an utterance or a portion of an utterance
**tag** = the individual component(s) of a dialogue act

Examples of Terminology in Three Hypothetical Utterances:

1. s^aa.%− − Yeah, ri−−
2. s.%−− − I think spontaneous speech annotation is fun and ==
3. fg|qy^rt^bu −− So − so, l are you saying that we should stick to the original implementation?

1. label: <s^aa.%−>
   dialogue acts: <s^aa> and <%−>
   tags: <s>, <aa>, <%−>
2. label: <s.%−−>
   dialogue acts: <s>, <%−−>
   tags: <s> <%−−>
3. label: <fg|qy^rt^bu>
   dialogue acts: <fg>, <qy^rt^bu>
   tags: <fg>, <qy>, <rt>, <bu>

Part 1. Tiered Labels

The first-tier tag represents the basic form of the dialogue act. Sometimes, only one tag is needed to express the DA of an utterance. If more than one tag is necessary, tags are entered in a hierarchical form using carets <^> to separate the tiers. Every discernible utterance is labeled as a statement, question, or backchannel using the first-tier tags from Set 1. *Once the first-tier has been labeled, the remaining tiers can be labeled in any order.* Non-discernible or incomplete utterances are labeled using the tags from Set 2. Only the tags from Set 1 can be used in the first tier; these tags cannot be used elsewhere.

1 After the 1st tier, the remaining tags must be labeled alphabetically.
Set 1: First–Tier Tags for Discernible Utterances

| s | sj | qh | qo | qr | qrr | qw | qy | b | fg | fh | h |

Set 2: Non–Discernible or Incomplete Utterances

| x | % | %− | %−− |

Part 2. More Than One DA Per Utterance

In some cases, one DA does not suffice to represent an utterance and two DAs are required. There are two ways of using more than one DA per utterance: with a pipe bar (< | >) or a period <.>.

The pipe bar should be used when sequential portions of the utterance require different characterizations. The pipe bar should be used when an utterance split is not needed but the beginning or ending of the utterance seems to serve a different role than can be characterized by one DA. Often, these brief phrases are Floor Holders or Floor Grabbers. The pipe bar separates these brief phrases from the rest of the utterance. (Splits are made when an utterance has more than one semantically and informational distinct conversational function.)

The pipe bar should be used in both the DA field and the TRANS field (transcription). In the TRANS field, if applicable, the pipebar should be inserted after a hyphen.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

94.861−99.771 c4 fgls^t um − l everyone should have at least two forms possibly three in front of you depending on who you are .

A period should be used when providing information on the completeness of the utterance. Here are some examples of tiered DA labels and disruption forms separated by periods:

s^ar.%−− qy^d^rt.%− sj.%− s.x

The tags in Set 2 comprise entire DAs and therefore cannot be used as part of tiered DAs. An utterance may be labeled using both a tiered DA and tags from Set 2. The exception to this rule is Indecipherable <%> (page 23) which may not be accompanied by other DAs since <%> indicates that an annotator cannot comprehend the utterance sufficiently enough to label it with another DA.
The distinction between the use of the pipe bar and a period exists in how an utterance can be divided. When dividing an utterance with a pipe bar, a segment of the utterance on one side of the pipe bar will be annotated with a particular DA that is different from the DA used to annotate the other side. The pipe bar exists as a clear boundary which marks where one DA ends and another begins in a single utterance. With regard to periods, no such clear boundary exists. A disruption form is actually an addition to an utterance as a whole, rather than being a separate segment of an utterance that can be marked with a pipe bar. It is also very difficult to use a pipe bar to mark where an interruption begins or where a speaker abandons his utterance, especially since the tiered DA on one side of the pipe bar may also apply to the other side where the disruption form is marked. In saying that a disruption form is an addition to an utterance as a whole, the reason why disruption forms are not used as tags in tiered DAs is because the tags used in the tiered DAs apply to the entire utterance. Disruption forms, however, usually apply only to the end of the utterance. For this reason and that of the inability to use pipe bars in conjunction with disruption forms, the use of periods with disruption forms is necessitated.

### Part 3. Diacritics

Diacritics are used when it is impossible to decide upon a tag to label an utterance due to lack of background information of the conversation or speakers in the meeting. The sixth utterance in the example below implements a diacritic, an asterisk `<*>`. The asterisk separates the two tags upon which an annotator cannot decide.

Example from Data (Bmr013):

---

1586.76−1590.2  e8  s^bu?  so i – i understand that’s what you

---

1589.55−1589.7  e1  s^aa  yeah.

---

1589.83−1590.04  e1  fg  and ==

---

1590.34−1593.3  e1  s  yeah and — and i had — i had uh—

---

1590.41−1590.94  e8  s  i get it.

---

1592.21−1595.47  e8  s^bs^bu  so new — use ninetieth quartile rather

---

1594.33−1594.48  e1  s^aa  yeah.

---

1594.98−1595.1  e1  s^aa  yeah.

The background information needed to discern the correct DA can be reported in the comment column. Because this column is usually reserved for personal notes of the annotator, the explanation on the use of the diacritic should be enclosed by an asterisk.

---

*This section will be eliminated since we are not using diacritics.*
Part 4. Utterance Boundaries
Utterance boundaries are one of the most debated topics in discourse analysis.

To divide transcribed speech into utterances, take the following factors into consideration: syntax, pragmatic function, and prosody.

Syntactic structure of speech such as division of verb phrases should be considered. In general, words intrinsically tied to a verb should be included in the same utterance. Here is an example:
Bmr010: 23.484–24.908
ds\^rt\^t,2a does anybody have an agenda ?

However, not every utterance includes a verb. Sometimes a noun phrase constitutes a complete utterance. Here is an example (Spkr 2):
Bmr010: 280–288.3
Spkr 1 s.%−− and i did some training on – on one dialogue which was transcribed by ==
Spkr 2 s\^2 jose .
Spkr 1 s yeah we – we did a nons− − s− − speech nonspeech transcription .

Here’s another example (Spkr 2):
Bmr010: 1648.14–1652.33
Skpr 1 qw how would we do that with the hybrid system ?
Spkr 2 s\^rt same thing .

When a speaker trails off or is interrupted without finishing their phrase, an utterance boundary should be instated. In the first example above ("jose"), Spkr 1 doesn’t finish the phrase (Spkr 2 actually inserts the missing part) which means an utterance boundary is introduced (signalled by the "=="), even though he continued speaking.

The pragmatic function of utterances is an important consideration for the purposes of DA identification. Phrases or clauses that do not make up grammatically complete sentences may still have different functions in a conversation and should therefore be split up and labeled individually with the appropriate DA. Although it may seem strange to split up clauses within a sentence that contribute to the meaning of the main "sentence," splits are made because each individual clause contributes to providing as much DA information as possible. The following was split at "because" to show that the clause beginning with "because" is an explanation of the previous suggestion (s^cs). Example from data:
Bmr010: 217.921–227.363
Spkr1  s^cs  that uh – if we had something that worked for many cases before maybe starting from there a little bit.
Spkr1  s^df  because ultimately we’re going to end up with some s− − kind of structure like that.

Conjunctions such as "and", "so" and "but" are also cues to places at which a string of clauses might be split into separate utterances. People often speak in what seem like run−on sentences. We would never write an essay this way, but it is found frequently in spoken language. Rather than simply start a new sentence, for example, "but" might used to form a connection between two complete sentences, making them seem like on big sentence. These uses of conjunctions can be split up for our purposes. Beware, however, of cases where "and" is simply used to connect one or more noun phrases in a list (such as "judging the speaker and the listener").

In some cases, utterances may only be comprised of one word or a few words that are used as <fh>. For example, if a speaker has a string of <fh>s like "um and uh yeah," all the words should be kept together and designated as one separate utterance. Here is an example from Bmr012:

1886.8,1891.31,Bmr012–c1,s^cs,, ,and then just sort of have that as the – and then you can have groups of twenty people or whatever .
1891.31,1892.08,Bmr012–c1,fh, , ,and − and uh ==

Furthermore, an utterance should never end with a floor−holder. This is because the sentence may be complete, but would have to be marked as incomplete if the <fh> is kept on the same line. Here is an example from Bmr010:

601.519−602.707        s   and if it’s good enough we’ll arrange windows machines to be available .
603.465−604.014        fh   so ==

If the speaker continues speaking, a decision has to be made as to whether the <fh> will stand alone as its own utterance or whether it will be merged into the beginning of the following utterance. To determine the utterance boundary in situations like these, it often helps to hear the prosody of the <fh>. If, for example, the length of the word "so" is more drawn out than following speech, or of a different intonation, chances are that the following utterance is not a continuation from the <fh> and should be annotated as a separate utterance. When either an <fg> or an <fh> is on its own line, a <%−−> should not be marked as part of the DA label.

Sometimes, a speaker may have a run−on sentence with many parantheticals and asides. In such situations, each paranthetical or aside can be split off into its own utterance. Even with this rule, however, run−ons can still prove difficult to decide how to split up. A general heuristic for deciding how to split up transcribed speech is to try to decide if the speaker actually had a whole string of speech in mind at once. The idea is to isolate
Each unit of "thought-out" speech.

Examples from Data (Bmr013):

1463.06 (insert speaker and utterance)
1401.48
1405.33
1466.63
1489.07
1511.74

Another Example:
What to do when someone’s interrupted after just a few filler words... (Bmr013.1401.48)

Another Note:
If an utterance split needs to be made even though we don’t need to use a sentence boundary marking, mark the end of the utterance with a space, a hyphen, another space, and finally, two equal signs as so:

I might – == split I might try doing it this way.

Part 5. Quotations
Utterances that have quotations should have punctuation that is in accordance to the DA that the entire utterance functions as. Therefore, if a quoted question is in a statement, a period rather than a question mark, should be at the end of the utterance. A colon in the DA label signifies that there is quoted material in the transcription. The DAs on the left of the colon characterize the function of the utterance as a whole and the DAs on the right of the colon characterize just the quotation. If the quoted material only consists of a few words that comprise a noun phrase, for example, DA annotation of the quotation may be unpertinent. In such cases, exclude any labels after the colon.

Example from Data (Bmr026):

941.984  c1  And just say – just ask him that you know – – what should you do ?

Hypothetical Example 1:

She said what do you want <s:qw>
Hypothetical Example 2:

Do you like "child better?" <qy:>

Part 6. Using TableTrans

1. The Interface

The TableTrans interface is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>TRANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>why don’t we go to games of berkeley and then um i th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>c4</td>
<td>i’m sick of mel’s .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>c6</td>
<td>yeah that’s a good idea .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>c2</td>
<td>yeah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>c2</td>
<td>i think it’s about time to ==</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>oh why don’t we go get some milkshakes at mel’s ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>c5</td>
<td>uh huh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o games of berkeley and then um i think we should go –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yeah i think it’s about time to ==</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oh why don’t we go get some milkshakes at mel’s?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i’m sick of mel’s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uh huh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yeah that’s a good idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>how about if we just go see eight–legged creatures ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three portions to TableTrans:
Top: labeling & TRANS portion  
Middle: time−segmented transcription portion  
Bottom: wave form portion.

In the Labeling and TRANS portion, the first and second column provide the start and end times for each utterance and the third column denotes the speaker. The fourth and fifth columns are where the DA and AP labels are entered. (This manual does not provide instructions on how to label AP’s.) The comment field is located in the sixth column. This column is primarily for the annotator to write notes regarding an utterance. The last column, under the "Trans" heading, provides the transcript of the utterances.

In order to label a meeting, go to the File Menu and select "Open Annotation File." Another menu will pop up providing three formats to work with. Choose "Table Format." A window will appear with a Feature List and a Delimiter. Simply press "OK." In a few seconds, the segment of the meeting to be transcribed will appear.

The Time−Segmented Portion shows the annotator a series of utterances in chronological order. This portion cannot be modified.

2. TableTrans Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGING THE TRANSCRIPT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl−s</td>
<td>Split the current row at the location of the cursor in the TRANS field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl−m</td>
<td>Merge the current row with the next row by the same speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOVING AROUND WITHIN A FIELD(S)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl−f or left−arrow</td>
<td>Move forward one character in a field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl−b or right arrow</td>
<td>Move backward one character in a field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl−p or up−arrow</td>
<td>Move up to previous row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl−n or down−arrow</td>
<td>Move down to next row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift + left−arrow</td>
<td>Move to previous field in the same row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift + right−arrow</td>
<td>Move to next field in the same row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right−click</td>
<td>(In the Time−Segmented Transcription Window) Opens up Comment Field Window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl−l</td>
<td>Plays a segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl−a</td>
<td>Moves cursor to the beginning of a field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl−e</td>
<td>Moves cursor to the end of a field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Printing Commands

Annotators can print out their comments using the program "csjcomment." In the terminal window, type "csjcomment <csj_file>" where <csj_file> is the name of the ".csj" file to print.

4. How to Play the Sound File

To open up the wave file of a meeting to be labeled, a link command can be made from where the sound files are saved in the annotator’s home directory. To create this link, type the following in the terminal:

> ln -s <path name>

After returning back to the Table Trans interface, go to the File Menu and select "Open Sound File." Browse through the annotator’s home directory and open the file.
Section 2

The following table is designed to show the correspondence between Switchboard–DAMSL dialog tags and those used to label Meeting Recorder (MRDA) data. Any tags that are listed in *italics* are based on SWBD–DAMSL tags but have had their meanings slightly altered. To see the complete explanation of every tag, see Section 4. Any **boldface** tags not in the original SWBD–DAMSL manual, and were added specifically for this project. The names of the tags correspond to the MRDA tag names since, often times, the names of the Switchboard–DAMSL tags were not specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAG TITLE</th>
<th>SWBD–DAMSL</th>
<th>MRDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecipherable</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonspeech</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interruption</strong></td>
<td>not marked</td>
<td>%−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>%–</td>
<td>%−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self–Talk</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td>t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd–Party Talk</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION LEVEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task–Management</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication–Management</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Not marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATEMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Statement</em></td>
<td>sd</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Subjective Statement</em></td>
<td>sv</td>
<td>sj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION REQUESTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh–Question</td>
<td>qw</td>
<td>qw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N Question</td>
<td>qy</td>
<td>qy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open–Ended Question</td>
<td>qo</td>
<td>qo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or Question</td>
<td>qr</td>
<td>qr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or Clause After Y/N Question</td>
<td>qrr</td>
<td>qrr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3: *Now that we are eliminating the use of the *<sj>* tag, *<sv>* is mapped to *<s>* in MRDA conventions.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wh–Question</strong></td>
<td>qw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhetorical Question</strong></td>
<td>qh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declarative–Question</strong></td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tag Question</strong></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFLUENCING/COMMITTING SPEAKER–FUTURE–ACTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open–Option</strong></td>
<td>oo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Command</strong></td>
<td>ad</td>
<td>co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestion</strong></td>
<td>co</td>
<td>cs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commit</strong></td>
<td>cc</td>
<td>cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER–FORWARD–FUNCTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional–Opening</strong></td>
<td>fp</td>
<td>not marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional–Closing</strong></td>
<td>fc</td>
<td>not marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Change</strong></td>
<td>not marked</td>
<td>tc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explicit–Performative</strong></td>
<td>fx</td>
<td>fx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclamation</strong></td>
<td>fe</td>
<td>fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other–Forward–Function</strong></td>
<td>fo</td>
<td>not marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thanks</strong></td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welcome</strong></td>
<td>fw</td>
<td>fw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apology</strong></td>
<td>fa</td>
<td>fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor–Holder</strong></td>
<td>not marked</td>
<td>fh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor–Grabber</strong></td>
<td>not marked</td>
<td>fg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BACKWARDS–COMMUNICATIVE–FUNCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept</strong></td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partial Accept</strong></td>
<td>aap</td>
<td>aap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partial Reject</strong></td>
<td>aap</td>
<td>aap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maybe</strong></td>
<td>am</td>
<td>am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reject</strong></td>
<td>ar</td>
<td>ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hold</strong></td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTANDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative–Completion</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backchannel</strong></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acknowledgement</strong></td>
<td>bk</td>
<td>bk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Counter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative–Completion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>bf</td>
<td>bs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downplayer</td>
<td>bd</td>
<td>bd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misspeak Correction</td>
<td>bc</td>
<td>bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical–Question</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backchannel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Non–Understanding</td>
<td>br</td>
<td>br</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding Check</strong></td>
<td>not marked</td>
<td>bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defending/Explanation</td>
<td>not marked</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misspeak Self–Correction</td>
<td>bsc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Follow Me&quot;</td>
<td>not marked</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANSWERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion/Supporting addition</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes answers</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>nn</td>
<td>ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative–affirmative non–yes answers</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative–negative non–no answers</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answers</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispreferred answers</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quoted Material</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>not marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous Material</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued from previous line</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>not marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>not marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Tone</td>
<td>rt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section 3
### Listing of Tags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1: Statements</strong></td>
<td>17–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Statement</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sj Subjective Statement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2: Questions</strong></td>
<td>20–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr Or Question</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qrr Or Clause After Y/N Question</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qw Wh–Question</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qy Y/N Question</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3: Disruption Forms</strong></td>
<td>23–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Indecipherable</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%- Interrupted</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%-– Abandoned</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3 3rd–Party Talk</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nonspeech</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4: Short Utterances</strong></td>
<td>26–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Backchannel</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bk Acknowledgement</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fg Floor Grabber</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fh Floor Holder</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa Accept</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Hold</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qh Rhetorical Question</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bh Rhetorical Question Backchannel</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1 Self Talk</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 5: Responses</strong></td>
<td>34–38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aap Partial Accept</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arp Partial Reject</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd Dispreferred Answer</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng Negative Answer</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar Reject</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am Maybe</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na Affirmative Answer</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no Other</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Need to sort out page numbers and headings (some headings in body are missing in this listing)
### Group 6: Forward Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>co</td>
<td>Command</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fx</td>
<td>Explicit–Performative</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo</td>
<td>Open–Option</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qo</td>
<td>Open–ended Question</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>Topic Change</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 7: Backward–Looking Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ba</td>
<td>Assessment/Appreciation</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc</td>
<td>Correct–Misspeaking</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bsc</td>
<td>Self–Correct Misspeaking</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bd</td>
<td>Downplayer</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br</td>
<td>Repetition Request</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bs</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu</td>
<td>Understanding Check</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>Defending/Explanation</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 8: Descriptive Tags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collaborative Completion</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>About–Task</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Declarative Question</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>&quot;Follow Me&quot;</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Tag Question</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Joke</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Mimic</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rt</td>
<td>Rising Tone</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 9: Conventionalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Conventionality</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fe</td>
<td>Exclamation</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft</td>
<td>Thanks</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fw</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4
Explanation of Tags

Introduction

This section provides a description of each tag. The tags are categorized into nine groups according to syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic similarities of the utterances they mark. Within each group, the DA tags will often be compared and contrasted with one another for further clarification on the specific usage of each tag. Examples given after the description of a tag are either hypothetical or else taken from transcribed meeting data. Below is the format used for the examples in this manual:

Hypothetical Example:

[speaker, if applicable] [tag] [utterance]

Example from Data ([meeting number]):

[start time] – [end time] [speaker] [tag] [utterance]
Group 1: Statements <s, sj>

S  Statement\(^5\)

This tag marks objective statements. A Statement will have one or more of the following characteristics:

1. The utterance is regarded as factual (including utterances that are meant to be interpreted as facts, such as lies and sarcasm).
2. The utterance is unlikely to be disputed.
3. The utterance more often receives backchannels and continuers whereas Subjective Statements <sj> (page 18) are often opinions that may be countered or disputed via further opinions from other speakers.
4. The utterance may indicate the level of expertise of the speaker.
5. The utterance may be very concise, such as those labeled with the tags in Group 4. For instance non one would "dispute" (see characteristic 2) an Acknowledgement <bk> (page 27).
6. The utterance is a narrative in which the speaker is telling a story when the topic is personal. The speaker is likely to use "I" and "we"—the latter with regards to people who are not at the meeting.
7. The utterance may be a declaration of a personal fact. This includes subjective personal statements regarding oneself. The reason such utterances are not labeled with an <sj> is because they cannot disputed.

The examples below highlight these seven characteristics:

*Characteristics 1 and 2*
Hypothetical Example:

```
Sp.1  s  Boulder is north of Denver.
```

Example from Data (Bmr012):

```
40.009–43.139  c3  sd.x  adam’s just trying to generate good uh - data for the recognizer there.
```

*Characteristics 2 and 4*
Example from Data (Bmr012):

```
62.153–64.053  c3  qw^t3^r  why didn’t you get the same results and the unadapted ?
```

\(^5\) The <s> tag explanation needs to be revamped entirely pretty much. New idea: <s> is the default tag if the utterance isn’t a type of question, backchannel, or <fg>, <fh>, or <h>—-in other words, <s> is the default unless the utterance can be labeled with another first-tier tag.
Characteristic 5
Example from Data (Bmr013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102–104</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>bk</td>
<td>okay agenda items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104–105</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>fh</td>
<td>uh – we have digits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105–106</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>qo</td>
<td>what else we got ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristic 6
Example from Data (Bmr013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1536.33</td>
<td>1550.13</td>
<td>c1</td>
<td>and what i did is i used some normalized features which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uh – look into the – which is normalized energy uh –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>energy normalized by the mean over the channels and by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the minimum over the other .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristic 7
Hypothetical Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>I was born in Louisiana.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Examples
Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.241–68.771</td>
<td>c5</td>
<td>sd</td>
<td>uh – looks kind of low on channel five.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subjective Statement**

This tag marks statements that are obviously subjective and/or overt opinions. The default tag to any statement is an `<s>`, thus `<sj>` is used only if a statement is clearly a subjective statement. A Subjective Statement will have one or more of the following characteristics:

6 This tag will be removed.
1. The utterance is subjective. (This does not include subjective personal statements such as "I feel cold" since such a statement cannot be disputed.)
2. The utterance is an opinion.
3. The utterance can be disputed or rejected.
4. The utterance can be a generally−supposed opinion. In which case, if "we" is used in the utterance, it is used in an impersonal voice.
5. The utterance qualitatively describes the subject at hand.

The examples below highlight some of these characteristics:

**Characteristics 1, 2, and 3**

Hypothetical Example:

—— Sp.1 sj That’s an ugly sofa.
—— Sp.2 sj The coffee table isn’t so great either.

**Characteristic 4**

Hypothetical Example:

—— Sp.1 sj What I find particularly difficult in watching the news is that we see injustice and then the weather and it just switches from one—
——— you know topic to the next;

Dialogue acts that should be marked with an <sj> are often signaled by phrases such as:

—— I think
—— I believe
—— It seems
—— It’s my opinion that
—— I mean
—— Suppose
—— Of course
—— impersonal ’we’
—— impersonal ’they’ as in ’they say it rains a lot there...’

Although the above phrases aid in determining whether something ought to be labeled with an <sj>, they are not a necessary part of an <sj> utterance. Also, utterances such as the following should be labeled as Subjective Statements, rather than as Explicit Performatives <fx> (page 40):

—— I bet you can’t guess.
—— I bet you he’s going to pull a rabbit out of that hat.
—— I am going to bet you that he’ll show up late again.
—— I will bet you that she’ll forget the papers.

These are not explicit performatives since the actual act of betting is not committed as a
result of the first two utterances. Instead, using the phrase, "I bet..." either can lead up to a bet or simply acts as a qualifier indicating the degree of certainty the speaker has in his opinion.
Group 2: Questions <qr, qrr, qw, qy>

*Annotator’s Note: For embedded questions or utterances like, “I have a question, how do you label this?” label it as a question since it functions as a question.*

*Embedded ques examples: Bmr026–c1.94.984 and Bmr026–c1.945.464*

**qr**  
"Or" Questions

"Or" questions offer the listener at least two answers from which to choose. These types of questions are sometimes interrupted and answered as if they are Y/N Questions (page 22), as in Example 2. Other times, a speaker asking the question might trail off as in Example 3. In such a case, the speaker answering the question might respond as if the question were a yes–no question without interrupting the question at all.

Hypothetical example 1:

Sp.A qr Are you supposed to bring the ice picks or the headlamps?  
Sp.B s The headlamps.

Hypothetical example 2:

Sp.A qr Are you supposed to bring the ice picks or–  
Sp.B s^ar No  
Sp.B s I’m supposed to bring the headlamps.

*Hypothetical Example 3:*  

| Sp.A | qr^t.%−− | Should we discuss the next topic or == |
| Sp.B | s^aa | Yeah, good idea. |

*Example 4 from Data (Bmr013):*

| 502–506 | cB | qr^rt.%−− | are they reading actual phone numbers or a digit at a time or ??= |

Example 5 from Data (Bmr012):

| 1271.55–1277.44 | c1 | qr | are you – are you using uh – uh – mel |

*Revise Hypothetical Example 3 and Example 4 from Data.*
cepstrum or p l p over there?

Annotator’s Note: Often times, a <qrr> can sound like an Open-Ended Question <qo> (page 42) if said nonchalantly. However, to avoid the ambiguity in determining whether something is said sheepishly enough to be a <qo>, a <qr> followed by a <qrr> is the standard for utterances such as "So should I go ahead or ==". In such situations, label the utterance in a manner that models the third Hypothetical Example under this DA tag description.

Good example to include of an open-ended "or" question:
Bro018.137.56 – 140.56 you wouldn’t do like r zero over r one or something like that?

Note to Annotator to include: Keep as <qrr> if speaker is interrupted at "or" and was going to continue.

qrr Or-Clause After Y/N Question

This tag marks when a speaker adds an Or-clause to a Y/N question (page 22). A <qrr> is in some ways a "dangling Or-Clause." (Jurafsky 29)

Example from Data (Bmr013):

332–334  c4  fg/qy^rt  so l are these two separate tasks that can happen ?
335–336  c4  qrr.%–  or do they have to happen at the same time before ?==
336–342  c8  s^arls  no l they don’t have – this – you have to enter the data before you do the second task but they don’t have to happen at the same time .

Annotator’s Note: Keep the "or" before <==> on same the same line as previous speech if the <rt> dones’t apply to <or> and therefore the utterance. E.g.: Bmr026.2260–2265

QW Wh-Question

Wh-questions begin with one of the following "wh" words:  

---

This rule is not all-encompassing. For example, declarative <qw> questions may have a "wh" word, but not at the beginning.

---

25
how
what
where
when
who
why

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

62.153–64.053  c3  qw^t3^r  why didn’t you get the same results and the unadapted?

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

231.944–233.704  c2  qw^t3  i guess – what time do we have to leave?

Example 3 from Data (Bmr013):

121–127  cB  s^e  and i guess that includes some – the filtering for the – the as i refs too.
129–129  c3  qw^br^rt  filtering for what?
130–136  cB  s  for the references that we need to go from the – the fancy transcripts to the sort of starts to say something that starts with s brain dead.

In the third example, even though the "what" is found at the end of the question, the entire utterance still functions as a <qw> and could be rephrased as "what is the filtering for?"

Example 4 from Data (Bmr012):

61.563–61.713  c0  qw^br^t3  hm?

In the Example 4, the utterance functions as a "what" question, in that "hm?" is synonymous to "what?".

QY  Y/N Question __________________________

This tag marks yes–no questions if and only if they have the pragmatic force and the syntactic and prosodic indications of a yes–no question (i.e., subject–inversion or
question intonation, etc.). Some <qy> labeled utterances are tag questions. Some examples are: isn’t it?
yeah?
right?

Annotator’s Note: In such cases, these phrases most often follow speech by the same speaker. The phrases signify that the speaker request assurance on their previous suspicion. When this occurs, split the tag question from the previous speech so that the tag question is its own utterance. In addition, the last two examples above require a <d> to mark the declarative syntax of the tag question.

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

16.805–17.875 c1 qy^rt is this channel one?

Include an example with the following format: Example 2 from Data (_______):

| start – end | Sp   | s^bu   | __________________ |
| start – end | Sp   | qy^d^g^rt | __________________ |
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Group 3: Disruption Forms <%, %−, %−−, t3, x>

% Indecipherable

This tag marks indecipherable speech such as mumbled or muffled words, or utterances that are too difficult to hear on account of the microphone picking up sounds from breathing.

Indecipherable <%> is not to be confused with Nonspeech <x> (page 25). The Nonspeech <x> tag is used for sound segments which are silent or otherwise contain non-vocal sounds such as doors slamming and phones ringing. (<x> does not cover sounds like breathing and sighs, as these are vocal sounds.)

Example from Data (Bmr012):

20.995–21.115 c1 b.%. okay .
(where "Okay" was not discernible.)

Annotator’s Note: Often times, a short utterance is decipherable if played in the context of others’ speech. If an utterance is indecipherable when only the utterance in question is played, try starting at early point in the dialog and hear for the utterance before marking a <%.> Use this tag sparingly. If a <%> must be marked, make a guess as to what the utterance would be marked as if it were decipherable based on the transcription and label the guess before the <%> with a period like so: <"best guess".>%

%− Interrupted

This tag marks utterances cut short by interruption. This tag is not to be confused with Abandoned <%−−> (page 24), which is used when a speaker intentionally abandons an utterance.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

326.848–330.118 c0 s.%− and then we noticed that the reference was always one off with the ==

330.574–333.004 c5 fglsj maybe,yeah | that might be − that might be − that might be my fault .

28
Example from Data (Bmr012):

136.665–143.767 c8 sj^co%− although on – course on the other – on the other hand you could – you view it as the age at the time of the

137.83–138.33 c0 % yeah .

138.066–139.376 c2 qy shouldn’t it be the other way around?

At first glance, the first utterance in the above example looks similar to an abandoned utterance <%-→>. In fact, it is marked as interrupted because the speaker actually is interrupted, even though the speaker doesn’t immediately give up the floor.

*Interruptions are for the ends of utterances rather than holds in utterances. Possible new example: Bmr014.1984.96.*

---

Abandoned

This tag marks utterances that are abandoned by a speaker. Two cases of Abandoned utterances are where:

1. the speaker trails off
2. the speaker chooses to express his or her own thought with a new utterance without finishing the first one.

In both cases, Floor Holders <fh> (page 29) often occur at the end of the Abandoned utterance.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

8.953–9.803 c1 %−− let’s see i should be ==?

13.954–15.514 c4 s^ad as close to your mouth as you can get it .

---

3rd–Party Talk

This tag handles side conversations that are not directed towards the main conversation participants. In the example below, two people are discussing adaptation results aside from the main conversation topic of how to wear the lapel microphones.
Example from Data (Bmr012):

45.424–51.184 c4 s\textsuperscript{ad} and then also for – for all of them if your boom is adjustable the boom should be towards the corner of your mouth.

46.411–47.581 c0 s\textsuperscript{t3} by the way there was a bug.
47.831–51.811 c0 s\textsuperscript{aa\textsuperscript{t3}s\textsuperscript{t3}.\%}-- yeah l i -- -- it wasn’t using the proper ==

48.577–49.127 c3 qy\textsuperscript{d\textsuperscript{bh\textsuperscript{rt\textsuperscript{t3}}} oh it was.
51.724–56.624 c4 s\textsuperscript{ad} and about a-- uh -- a thumb to a thumb and a half distance away from your mouth.

52.971–54.271 c0 s\textsuperscript{t3} basically it wasn’t adapting anything.
56.624–57.954 c4 s so about like i’m wearing it now.

57.114–57.804 c3 sj\textsuperscript{ba\textsuperscript{t3}} oh that’s interesting.

X Nonspeech

Nonspeech marks any utterance that is or partly consists of non–speech noises such as door slams and phone rings. *Other non–speech noises include coughing or sneezing that may be confused with speech.* This tag does not mark Indecipherable <\%> (page 23) speech due to muffled speech or mumbling.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

40.009–43.139 c3 s.x adam’s just trying to generate good uh -- data for the recognizer there.

(In the above example, there were problems with the recording that resulted in clicking sounds throughout the utterance.)
Group 4: Short Utterances
<b, bk, fg, fh, aa, h, qh, bh, t1>

b Backchannel

Common Backchannels:

- uhhuh
- yeah
- right
- oh
- yes
- okay
- oh yeah
- huh
- sure
- hm
- uh yeah

Utterances which function as backchannels are not made by the speaker who has the floor. Instead, backchannels are utterances made in the background that simply indicate that a listener is following along or at least paying attention. The nature of backchannels does not permit utterances such as "uh," "um," and "well" as being perceived as backchannels since these utterances do not indicate that a speaker is following along, but rather that a speaker has something to say or else is trying to say something. When uttering backchannels, a speaker is not speaking directly to someone in particular or even to anyone at all.

Backchannels are not to be confused with Acknowledgement <bk> (page 27) or Accept <aa> (page 30). In the case of <bk>, a speaker acknowledges another speaker’s response, usually after a question and answer sequence. With <aa>, a speaker is providing a "yes" response and is speaking directly to someone else.

Other tags which may be confused with backchannels are Floor−Grabbers <fg> (page 28), Floor−Holder <fh> (page 29), and Holds <h> (page 31). An utterance labeled with any of these three tags indicates that the speaker who made the utterance intends to hold or gain the attention of others. When a backchannel occurs with nothing by the same speaker immediately preceding or following it, the person is not trying to get or maintain the floor. These three tags are used for utterances where the speaker currently holds the attention of others (e.g., <h> and <fh>) or else attempts to do so (e.g., <fg>). Another distinction is that utterances labeled as floor−grabbers generally tend to sound far more assertive than backchannels.
Within a tiered DA, a backchannel <b> tag should never be followed by other subdivisions of backchannels such as:

- Acknowledgement <bk> (page 27)
- Assessment <ba> (page 44)
- Correct-Misspeaking <bc> (page 44)
- Self-Correct Misspeaking <bsc> (page 45)
- Downplayer <bd> (page 45)
- Summary <bs> (page 46)
- Understanding-Check <bu> (page 47)

If an utterance is better specified with one of these other tags, then <b> should not be used. For instance, the DA <b^bk> should never be used. Also, never mark a Repeat <r> (page 54) on a Backchannel. The inclination to mark a Repeat might occur in the following scenario: A speaker has a one-line utterance marked as a Backchannel that reads "right" on one line and the same transcription follows on the next line that occurs immediately after in time. When this occurs, merge the two utterances rather than marking the second utterance with a <b^r>. If the second utterance does not occur immediately after, then the only factor signifying a Repeat would be the words. As a rule in annotation, however, DAs should not be decided "upon the words alone." :)

To include: Please see <fg> on page 29 for when a short phrase is followed by further speech from the same speaker.

bkAcknowledgement

The <bk> tag is used to express a speaker’s acknowledgment of a previous speaker’s utterance. It primarily occurs after a response to a question, proposal, or offer. As opposed to backchannels, <bk> encodes a level of direct communication between speakers, where a speaker who acknowledges a previous speaker’s utterance is actually speaking directly to that previous speaker. An Acknowledgment is unlikely to be "disputed" by another speaker and therefore is never labeled as a Subjective <sj> (page 18).

"Oh" often but not always functions as a <bk>. Note that in the second example from the data, the second utterance contains the word "oh" but the "oh" does not function as a <bk> since it is not acknowledging an answer.

Hypothetical Example:

9 As stated earlier, the <sj> tag no longer exists.
Sp.1  qw  What’s wrong with your car?
Sp.2  s   The battery is dead.
Sp.1  s^bk  Oh, okay.

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

58.784−60.504  c3  qw^t3  so why didn’t you get the same results and the unadapted?
62.153−64.053  c3  qw^t3^r  why didn’t you get the same results as the unadapted?
64.235−68.995  c0  s^t3  oh because when it estimates the transformer produces like single matrix or something.
67.730−69.010  c3  s^bk^t3  o−− oh i see.

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

126.568−131.198  c0  sj^co  instead of date of− uh− put year of birth because age will change but ==
132.117−132.347  c4  s^bk  oh.

**Floor Grabber**

The <fg> marks when a speaker has not been speaking and wants to start speaking. Floor Grabbers are often repeated by the speaker to gain attention. Here are some examples of some common Floor Grabbers:

Common Floor Grabbers:

- well
- but
- so
- and
- yeah

A Floor Grabber is contrasted with a Floor Holder <fh> (page 29) since the latter is used when the speaker has been speaking.

Floor Grabbers and Backchannels <b> (page 26) may be confused since they are often composed of the same words. The very intention of a Floor Grabber explains why similar words are used in both dialogue acts. A "successful" floor grabber, that is, one in which the speaker’s attempt to gain the floor is accomplished, is one that appears non−
intrusive, and therefore, like a backchannel.

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

141.602−145.412   c0   s\^df\^nd

well the thing is if ten years from now you look at this form knowing that ==

144.588−148.398   c8   fg\^bklslj\^df\^nd

yes l but what we care about is the age at − at the recording date rather than the ==

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

1814.65−1817.01   Bmr012−c2   fgls.\^%−

well l or also for you know − if people are not ==

Example 3 from Data (Bmr012):

1816.1−1817.54   Bmr012−c4   sj\^co

well we could just hand around the lapel .

Example 4 from Data (Bmr012):

1822.12−1824.17   Bmr012−c4   fglqy\^df

well i mean − l is the − is the handheld really any better ?

Example 5 from Data (Bmr013):

1466.63

1418.60

Annotator’s Note: Labeling Floor−Grabbers should not be based simply on the word list above. Therefore, do not mark <fg>s unless there is clear indication that the speaker is indeed trying to grab the floor with the word or phrase being judged. If an individual begins speaking with an <fg> and the following speech is by the same speaker, be sure to keep or merge the <fg> with the following utterance. **Merge only if you can according to the guidelines for splitting and merging in the section of Utterance Boundaries.** Also, an <fg> should never be marked at the end of an utterance.

*To include: Usually b’s are not followed by the same person saying something more "meaningful", so if they do, I usually pipebar it and call it a floor−grabber (disguised as a b). Otherwise, I do split it off on its own, if I REALLY think it has nothing to do with the next utterance.*

*Case to examine: some speakers use <fg>s in the middle of their speech as if they feel they are loosing the floor. Such incidences should not be annotated with <fh>s.*
Floor Holder

A Floor Holder is used when a speaker is mid speech and uses an utterance like "uh" or "so" as a means to pause and continue holding the floor. Floor Holders are often found at the end of an utterance, thus yielding abandoned utterances.

Common floor holders include:

- so
- and
- or
- um
- uh
- let’s see
- and what else
- so anyway

To avert confusion regarding the location of Floor Holders, it ought to be noted that Floor Holders do not occur at the very beginning of a speaker’s speech but may occur at the beginning of an utterance. A speaker will not use a Floor Holder when he begins speaking but may use one at the beginning of an utterance which exists within a series of utterances by that very speaker, so long as those utterances are made in succession with no gaps in time occurring among them.

A Floor Holder and a Floor Grabber <fg> (page 28) are contrasted by the fact that a Floor Holder is used when the speaker has been speaking and hesitates and a Floor Grabber is used when the speaker has not been speaking and wishes to start speaking.

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

\[33.474-36.824\] c4 sj^co it’s actually a lot more comfortable then if you try to put it over your temples .

\[38.044-38.334\] c4 fh.%-- so ==

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

\[114.061-116.811\] c4 s^ad so if you don’t know what to put just leave it blank .

\[120.671-122.251\] c4 fhls um – l it’s like – i – i designed the form.
aa  Accept

This tag is used for utterances which exhibit acceptance or agreement. Generally, a speaker will accept or agree to another speaker’s questions, proposals, or statements. The <aa> tag is used to mark short utterances that express acceptance or agreement. Common utterances associated with the <aa> tag are listed below:

yeah
yes
okay
sure
I agree
exactly
definitely
that’s true
right

This is not to say that words used in negation cannot be labeled with the <aa> tag. The following example exemplifies this point:

Hypothetical example:

Speaker 1  sd^{10}  He didn’t go to the party
Speaker 2  sd^{11}aa  No, he didn’t

Above, it is seen that, in saying "no," Speaker 2 is not rejecting the statement made by Speaker 1, but rather is actually agreeing with it.

Utterances marked with the Accept tag <aa> may be confused with Backchannels <b> (page 26) or Acknowledgement <bk> (page 27). The distinction is that <aa> marks a type of answer whereas <b> and <bk> mark continuers/Backchannels.

Decide on whether an agreement that’s not expected by a previous speaker is an <aa> or a <bk>. For example, "of course." Time: Bmr013.1582.36.

10 This example needs to be altered since an <fh> should never be marked at the end of an utterance.
11 <sd> was eliminated as a possible tag choice a while back.
The `<h>` tag is used when a speaker who is given the floor and is expected to speak "holds–off" prior to making an utterance. A common area where the `<h>` tag is used occurs when a speaker responding to a question says "uh" or "let’s see" prior to answering the question.

Holds occur at the beginning of an utterance, as opposed to floor–holders which occur in the middle or at the end of a speaker’s utterance.

Although Holds are similar to Self Talk `<t1>` (page 33), Holds are distinguished by the fact that they have little semantic content and are intended for the listener to hear them. Holds `<h>` should not be confused with Floor Holders `<fh>` (page 29).

Common Holds:

- uh
- um
- let’s see
- well
- so
- hmm

Example from Data (Bmr012):

```
355.015–356.145  c8  s^ad  not an offer, he – he can say something about the glitch.
355.824–357.064  c2  s^hs^bk  um – l oh okay.
357.154–359.244  c2  qy.%–  so does this glitch occur at other ?==
```

The tag `<qh>` marks questions to which no answer is expected. Such questions are used by the speaker for rhetorical effect; they are essentially statements formulated as questions. Although `<qh>` and Rhetorical Question Backchannels `<bh>` (page 32) are similar, `<bh>` lacks semantic content and functions mostly as a continuer.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

```
486.854–492.724  c0  s  there are a fair number of errors that are
```
you know – where – got the plural s wrong or the inflection on the verb wrong.

491.713–491.893 c4 % yeah.
491.893,492.493 c4 qh and who cares?

"Why don’t we..." <qh^cs>

Should we specify the type of rhetorical question something is? E.g. Bed011.2384.57 <qh^e> or <qrr^qh^e>?

Rhetorical Question Backchannels

This tag marks continuers/backchannels which take the form of questions and often function as acknowledgments. Although <bh> has the same syntactic form as a Rhetorical Question <qh> (page 32), a <bh> has no semantic content and is simply a device to continue the speech of a previous speaker. Such rhetorical backchannels are often answered to with "yeah." These answers are marked with the Accept <aa> (page 30).

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

48.577–49.127 c3 qy^d^bh^rt^t3 oh it was?

Example 2 from Data (Bmr013):

527–530 c3 hls^arls uh – l i th– – no l i think we got under a percent.
531–531 c8 qy^bh oh really?

Common Rhetorical Question Backchannels:

Oh really?
Really?
Yeah?
Is that right?
Did you?
Are you?
Was it?
Isn’t that interesting?
Isn’t that amazing?
Isn’t that funny?
You think?
You think so?
Self Talk

This tag is for when a speaker is talking to himself and does not intend for others to hear or respond. Similarly structured utterances with the intention for the listener to hear are Holds <h> (page 31).

Example from Data (Bmr012):

- 946.44−947.1 c2 sj so that’s good.
- 947.79−948.89 c2 s^h^fe and um – let’s see.
- 948.89−951.626 c2 s there was one more thing i wanted to – to mention.
- 951.626−953.236 c2 s^t1 i can’t remember um ==
- 956.426−957.216 c2 s^fa^r sorry can’t remember.
Group 5: Responses
<aap, arp, nd, ng, ar, am, na, no>

**aap**  Accept–Part

This tag marks when a speaker explicitly accepts part of a previous speaker’s utterance.
The emphasis in an <aap> is on the acceptance.

Hypothetical Example:

```
Sp.1  s^aaplsj^co  That is a good idea, but you could change the font.
```

Example from Data (Bmr012):

```
564−567  c8  sj  and it’s still like an order of magnitude worse than what humans do.
569−570  c3  sj^aap^jls^aa  when – when they’re wide awake yeah.
```

**arp**  Reject–Part

This tag marks where a speaker explicitly rejects part of a previous person’s utterance.
The emphasis in an <arp> is on the rejection.

Hypothetical Example:

```
Sp.1  sj  I think ants are great.
Sp.2  sj^arp  Except for when they get into picnic food.
```

Example from Data (Bmr012):

```
398.311−401.201  sj  i mean – if we know about it then i guess it could always be checked for it.
399.841−401.691  sj^arp  well the acoustic one shouldn’t do anything.
```
**nd**  **Answer Dispreferred**

This tag marks a statement that acts as an explicit rejection to a previous person’s utterance. It is different from a Negative Answer <ng> (page 35) in that an <nd> explicitly rejects whereas an <ng> implicitly rejects a proposal, offer, or a question. The example below highlights this fact.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138.066–139.376</td>
<td>c2</td>
<td>qy shouldn’t it be the other way around?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.602–145.412</td>
<td>c0</td>
<td>s^df^nd well the thing is if ten years from now you look at this form knowing that ==</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.588–148.398</td>
<td>c8</td>
<td>fg^bklsj^df^nd yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.066–147.426</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>s^nd but there’s no other date on the form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ng**  **Negative Answer**

A Negative Answer *implicitly* rejects a previous person’s utterance as opposed to an Answer dispreferred <nd> (page 35) which *explicitly* rejects. Both <ng> and <nd> are similar in that they both do not include the word "no" in the dialogue act. But <ng> differs from <nd> in that, rather than directly responding to the previous utterance, a Negative Answer explains why there a speaker does not favor the previous speaker’s suggestion.

In the first example, the speaker is responding to the proposal of having her transcribers enter information for a permission form.

Example from Data (Bmr013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 318–326 | c2  | s^ng and that you know – i’m not – that – that one i’m not so sure if it’s into the – the things that i wanted to use the hours for.

**12** Will be further explained.

**13** Will be further explained.
326–330  c2  s  because the – the time that they’d be
spending doing that they wouldn’t be able to
be putting more words on.

Hypothetical Example:

Sp.1  qy  Did you see "Pocahontas" on the Disney channel last night?
Sp.2  s^nrls^ng  No, I don’t have cable.

 ar  Reject  

This tag marks negatives words such as "no" and other semantic equivalents that reject
proposals and statements.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

83.795–84.595  c1  qy^d^rt  you want to close this?
84.805–85.405  c2  s^ar.%−−  no i==

 am  Maybe  

This tag marks a response to a question, proposal, or offer that uses the word "maybe" or
other words denoting possibility. Sometimes, to express a possibility, a speaker may say
"I don’t know." Such utterances are marked as Maybe <am> rather than as Other <no>
(page 37).

Hypothetical Example 1:

Sp.1  sj^co  I think we’ll need to add the second experiment in the
report.
Sp.2  b  Yeah.
Sp.2  s^am  I guess so.

Example 2 from Data 1 (Bmr018):

77.631–82.272  c4  s^am  but – uh – channel b is probably liz.

Example 3 from Data (Bmr013):
but it could be that when we’re reading digits because it’s – it’s for such a limited set that maybe – maybe that phenomenon doesn’t occur as much.

i don’t know.

**na**  
A Descriptive/Narrative

This tag marks an utterance that acts as an affirmative response to questions and proposals. Affirmation is implicitly stated in the utterance. Because utterances marked with <na> do not contain the word "yes" or any variation thereof, a DA that includes the <na> tag often follows a DA that contains <aa>. If a person responds to a question with "I guess," it should be labeled as Maybe <am> (page 36), not as <na>.

Hypothetical example:

Sp.1 qy Do you have kids?
Sp.2 s^na I have three.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

209.361–211.781 c4 qy^co^t^rt okay so should we do agenda items?
211.573–213.947 c1 s^hls^na uh – l oh – that’s a good idea.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

381.613–383.373 c2 qy^rt,43a and is it only once that that happens?
383.957–384.837 c4 s^aals^e^na right l once in the middle.

**no**  
Insufficient Knowledge

This tag marks utterances in which the speaker expresses a lack of knowledge with regard to the subject at hand. It is usually in response to a previous utterance made by any speaker including the current one.

14 Need to change wording on the description of this tag.
The most common expression of an <no> is "I don’t know." This is not always a signal for <no>; when this phrase expresses uncertainty or possibility, it is labeled as Maybe <am> (page 36).

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

    312.632–313.712 c5 qy was it twenty minutes in ?
    313.023–314.003 c8 % i forgot about that .
    313.426–315.481 c2 s^no if it was twenty minutes in then i don’t know .

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

    1070.52–1079.28 c8 sj^ad although we should clear it with eric and dan of course but these results are based on data which haven’t had the uh – haven’t had the chance to be reviewed by the subjects .
    1078.15–1078.81 c2 s^bk that’s true .
    1079.28–1080.32 c8 s^no (tr) and i don’t know how that stands .

Example from Data (Bmr018):

    717.62–720.37 c0 s but you just can’t get the visual display to show quickly .
    720.696–721.226 c0 %−− so you have to ==
    721.226– 723.406 c0 %−− it takes i don’t know three four minutes to ==
    723.506–725.476 c0 %−− well i mean it takes – it takes long enough ==
    724.71– 726.97 c3 aa yeah it’s very slow to do that .
    726.13–727.64 c0 %−− it takes long enough because it has to reload the ==
    727.64–729.62 c0 s i – i don’t know exactly what it’s doing frankly .
Group 6: Forward Functions
<co, fx, cc, cs, oo, qo, tc>

**CO**  Command

This tag marks imperatives and commands. The syntactic realization of <co> may include questions (e.g. "Do you want to go ahead?") and standard declarative clauses (e.g. "You ought to try using the data from the second set").

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

45.424−51.184 c4 s^co and then also for – for all of them if your boom is adjustable the boom should be towards the corner of your mouth.

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

60.19–62.79 c4 s^co so—– so jane you could actually do even a little closer to your mouth.

Example 3 from Data (Bmr012):

102.326–104.551 c4 s^co and you only have to spea—– fill out the speaker form once.

Example 4 from Data (Bmr012):

104.551–105.821 c4 s^co but everyone does need to do it.

Example 5 from Data (Bmr012):

136.656–138.066 c2 s^co a—– actually wait a minute.

The following example is much like Example 3 and 4 except that the speaker refers to the forms rather than other meeting participants. Therefore, Example 6 is *not* an example of a command.

Example 6 from Data (Bmr012):

173.653–180.483 c4 s and so then you also have a digits form which needs to be filled out every time the speaker form only
Explicit–Performative

This tag marks utterances that are performatives in and of themselves. These do not include the conventional utterances shown in Conventionalities (Group 9).

Some examples:

You’re fired.
I wish you all the best.

Explicit performatives are different from Subjective Statements <sj> (page 18) because they are opinions that do not function as actions in themselves. Utterances such as the following should not be labeled as explicit performatives because the betting is not enacted by the utterance itself:

I bet you can’t guess.
I bet you he’s going to pull a rabbit out of that hat.
I am going to bet you that he’ll show up late again.
I will bet you that she’ll forget the papers.

Instead, using the phrase, "I bet..." can either lead up to a bet or simply act as a qualifier of how sure the speaker is in his or her opinion; therefore they are Subjective Statements <sj>.

Commitments explicitly commit the speaker to some future course of action.

Example 1 from Data (Bmr013):

575−580  c8  fglsc^cc  okay so | um – what i’ll do then is i’ll go ahead and enter this data.
They are easily confused with Explicit–Performatives <fx> (page 40) which take place in the present without reference to the future. Suggestions <cs> (page 41) are also easily confused with Commitments. If the speaker politely suggests that he is about to do something and gives the listener a chance to say "no," by default, this is not <cc>, but rather a suggestion <cs>:

- Let me see if that clears up.
- Let me reload and see if your program unfreezes.
- Let me ask, by the way, just for the record.

### CS Suggestion

The Suggestion tag marks proposals, offers, advice, and, as the name of the tag denotes, suggestions.

Example from Data (Bmr026):

```
536.64 − 540.31  It would be cool like to see − to hear it and see it.
```

If the phrase "excuse me" precedes something the speaker was negotiating permission for (Jurafsky 35), then it should be marked as a Suggestion rather than as an Apology <fa> (page 49).

Hypothetical Example 1:

```
s^cs  Excuse me just a second.
```

Hypothetical Example 2:

```
g|qy^cs^rt  Excuse me | may I ask one more question?
```

Hypothetical Example 3:

```
s^cs  Let me ask one more question.
```

Annotator’s Note: Suggestions are distinguished from Commands (<co>) (page 40) in that the speaker wishes to convey a proposition rather than an imperative. Sometimes, a Command spoken politely is said in a tone or in a style that sounds like a Suggestion; it still, however, is a Command. It helps to think of the position of the speaker with respect to the others, the level of expertise on the topic, and on whether the utterance is something that can function as a command based on its disputability. In the last case, it can be assumed that a speaker would feel more confident in giving a command if there is
previous knowledge that the command will be accepted by others. If it will not be accepted by others, a speaker is more likely to say an utterance in the form of a Suggestion.

**OO**  
**Open Option**

This tag marks a statement in which the speaker gives multiple and/or open-ended options to others. It is similar to a Suggestion `<cs>` (*incomplete!*)

Hypothetical Example:

```plaintext
s^oo "We could have lamb or chicken or..."
```

Example from Data (Bmr013):

```
306–309 c8 s and so it’s just you know – typing in name times –
time date and so on .
310–317 c8 s^oo um – which again either they can do but it is you
know – firing up an editor or again i can do .
317–318 c8 s^oo or someone else can do .
```

**QO**  
**Open–Ended Question**

*Unlike the other Forward Function tags, `<qo>` is a 1°–tier tag.* This tag marks utterances of the "how about you" variety; Open–Ended Questions are the kind of questions which place few syntactic or semantic constraints on the form of the answer (Jurafsky 28).

Example from Data (Bmr012):

```
224.832–228.262 c4 sj^t and i’m sure liz and andreas want to
talk about recognition results .
229.835–230.345 c4 qo anything else ?
```

Annotator’s Note: Please refer to page 21 for differentiation between Open–Ended Questions and Or–Questions (`<qr>`s). *Verb and syntactic/semantic constraints to distinguish from `<qw>`.*
A topic changer identifies utterances that either begin or end a topic.

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

1080.32–1089.21 c8 sj i mean – if you – if you get fantastic results and it’s involving data which – which later end up being lessened by you know – certain elisions then i don’t know.

1089.34–1090.33 c8 sj but i wanted to raise that issue.

1090.46–1090.72 c8 s^tc that’s all.

1090.95–1091.26 c1 fg.%— well we ==

Example 2 from Data (Bmr013):

102–104 c3 s^bk^tc okay agenda items

104–105 c3 fhls^t uh – we have digits.

105–106 c3 qo^t what else we got?
**Group 7: Backward−Looking Functions**

<ba, bc, bsc, bd, br, bu, df, fa, by>

### ba
Assessment/Appreciation

Assessment/Appreciations are backchannels/continuers directed at others which function
to express slightly more emotional involvement and support than just "uhhuh" (Jurafsky)
or the like. A $<\text{ba}>$ appends to an $<\text{sj}>$ only, not an $<\text{s}>$, since it is by nature an
opinion/viewpoint.  

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

52.971−54.271 c0 $s^t3$ basically it wasn’t adapting anything.
57.114−57.804 c3 $sj^ba^t3$ oh that’s interesting.

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

231.944−233.704 c2 $qw^t3$ i guess – what time do we
234.144−234.774 c2 $qy^d^bu^r^t^3$ three thirty?
234.974−235.164 c0 $s^aa^t3$ yeah.
235.456−236.346 c4 $sj^ad$ why don’t you go first then.
236.927−237.107 c1 $s^aa$ yeah.
237.267−237.747 c1 $sj^ba$ good idea.

Example 3 from Data (Bmr012):

421.472−424.142 c2 $s$ there’s things that are l− − in smaller
424.244−424.974 c8 $sj^ba$ oh interesting.

### bc
Correct−Misspeaking

This tag is used when a speaker corrects another speaker’s utterance.

Hypothetical Example:

Sp.1 sj My other son is just as happy as a bed bug.

---

15 This sentence is no longer pertinent since we are removing the $<\text{sj}>$ tag.
**bsc**  
**Self–Correct–Misspeaking**

This marks when a speaker corrects his own error. Sometimes another speaker will initiate the correction, but if the primary speaker is the one making the correction, the utterance is marked as <bsc> rather than <bc>.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

```
132.336−133.516  c0  s  the year of birth changes −
133.516−134.696  c0  s^bsc  you know − stays the same usually .
```

**bd**  
**Downplayer**

This tag marks when a speaker is downplaying an apology or a compliment.

Common Downplayers:

- That’s okay
- No
- That’s all right
- Okay
- I don’t know
- Oh well
- It’s okay
- Uhhuh

Example from Data (Bmr012):

```
960.05−960.79  c8  sj^ba  congratulations .
961.254−964.724  c2  s^bd  well it was i mean − i really didn’t do this myself .
```

*Mention self ←− for making utterances sound less assertive  
other ←− to relieve anxiety*

Example: Bmr026−c0.336.816
**Repetition Request**

This tag indicates when a listener could not decipher a previous speaker’s utterance and requests that the speaker repeat it.

Hypothetical example:

Sp.1  qy^br  Could you repeat that?

Example from Data (Bmr013):

121–127  cB  s^e  and i guess that includes some – the filtering for the – the a s i refs too.
129–129  c3  qw^br^rt  filtering for what?
130–136  cB  s  for the references that we need to go from the – the fancy transcripts to the sort of starts to say something that starts with s brain dead.

**Summary**

Summary marks when the speaker summarizes a previous utterance or discussion. Sometimes a Summary seems to function as an Understanding Check <bu> (page 47). But if the summary or reformulation does not require validation and is said as fact, mark only as a <bs>.

Example from Data (Bmr013):

1082.53–1087.83  c3  s  but – and it’s more accurate than the – than the dictionary or if you’ve got a pronunciation uh – lexicon that has three or four.
1083.51–1083.92  c8  %x  the word.
1085.21–1085.42  c4  b  yeah.
1087.83–1090.47  c3  s  this might be have been the fifth one that you tr– – that you pruned or whatever.
1090.47–1093.12  c3  s  so sure.
1091.13–1092.16  c4  s^bs  so it’s like a continuum.
To add to manual: `<bs>` can also be when one reformulates or summarizes another’s utterance.

**bu**

**Understanding Check**

This tag marks two incidences:

1. When a speaker checks if he has comprehended the facts correctly.
2. When a speaker checks if he has understood what a previous speaker has said.

The first case can occur independently of a previous speaker’s utterance. In the second case, a speaker often proposes a summary or a paraphrase of a previous speaker’s speech (Jurafsky 48). Therefore, in the second case, it is a pragmatically construed question rather than an explicit question which translates to "is this an acceptable summary of what you said?" In both cases, if an understanding check statement/question is followed by a Tag Question, the `<bu>` tag is appended to the understanding check statement/question and not to the Tag Question `<g>`. The `<bu>` tags are often followed by utterances from other speakers that verify understanding.

This tag differs from Signal Non−Understanding `<br>` (page 46) in that with a `<bu>` the speaker wants to know if he or she correctly understands the meaning of a previous speaker’s talk. However, `<bu>` marks a request for a repeat of a previous speaker’s utterance simply because the listener wasn’t sure if the previous utterance was heard correctly (or at all), not because the listener did not understand the meaning or content of the utterance.

Example 1 of Case 1 from Data (Bmr012):

```
231.944−233.704   c2   qw^t3 i guess – what time do we have to leave ?
234.144−234.774   c2   qx^d^bu^rt^t3 three thirty ?
```

Example 2 of Case 2 from Data (Bmr012):

```
33.474–36.824  c4  sj^co it’s actually a lot more comfortable then if you try to put it over your temples .
34.123–36.013  c5  % test test test .
38.044–38.334  c4  fh.%-- so ==
38.482–39.312  c1  qx^d^bu^rt you do it higher ?
```
Defending/Explanation

This tag marks cases in which a person defends his or her own point or downplays it. The intention on the part of the speaker in a <df> utterance is to avoid or counteract a dispreferred response (a request rejection, an offer refusal or a disagreement) after evaluative assessments or comments (Levinson 308). The <df> tags often take the form of alternative suggestions, appearing to lessen the resolution of an utterance without abandoning its main proposition or premise.

Example 1 from Data (Bmr018):

922.580 – 928.120 c0 s^df there’s a reason why I disagree and that is that uh – you – it’s very good to have a disassociation between the visual and the audio.

Example 3 from Data (Bmr012):

506.032–509.052 c2 slfh there’s no language model for p z m | or um ==
515.577–517.617 c4 sj^co^j maybe we shouldn’t say p z m in these meetings.
517.297–519.607 c2 fgls^df well – l well there’s all kinds of other stuff like jimlet.

Example 4 from Data (Bmr013):

443–445 c3 %− so more typical numbers like ==
443–446 c4 sj^bu although the models weren’t that good .
446–446 c4 qy^g right ?
446–448 c4 qy^g i mean – the models are pretty crappy ?
448–449 c3 s^aa you’re right .
449–455 c3 s i think that we could have done better on the models
455–461 c3 s^df but the thing is that we got – this – this is the kind of typical number for all of the uh – uh – things in this task all of the um – languages.
Don’t forget that this tag is also used to explain why an utterance is uttered. Example: Bmr026–c1.739.532
Also, provide differentiation information between <df> and <e>.

**fa**

Apology

When a speaker apologizes for something that he or she just did (after a cough, sneeze, or interruption, for example), it is marked as an Apology <fa>. However, if the word "excuse me" occurs when a speaker is negotiating permission to do something in advance of doing it, it is an Suggestion <cs> (page 41).

Example from Data (Bmr012):

- 948.89–951.626 c2 s^t1h i can’t remember | um == there was one more thing i wanted to – to mention .
- 951.626–953.236 c2 s^fa^r sorry can’t remember .
- 956.426–957.216 c2 s^t1h um ==

Annotator’s Note: It is very uncommon to label an <fg^aa> but sometimes they do occur. Declared not allowed. "But..." can be a confusing i.e.: Bmr026.548.71

**by**

Sympathetic Comment

This tag marks when a speaker is showing sympathy for someone else. It commonly takes the form of "I’m sorry," but does not function as an Apology <fa>. A Sympathetic Comment is often followed by a Downplayer <bd> (page 45).

Hypothetical Example:

- Sp.1 s^by I’m sorry to hear your grandmother is sick.
- Sp.2 s^bd That’s all right.
Group 8: Descriptive Tags
<2, e, t, d, f, g, j, m, r, rt>

2 Collaborative Completion

This tag marks when one speaker finishes another speaker’s utterance. This is not dependent on the previous speaker’s agreement with the utterance completion of the current speaker.

Example from Data (Bmr018):

159.358−163.643 c2 s^nr No
s I mean they’re flying up from
− from – down from Seattle.

60.961−161.341 c4 s^2 Seattle.

In this example, Speaker c4 says "Seattle" immediately before the original speaker (Speaker c2) finishes their utterance.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

433.904−435.384 c2 s that’s why we only have twenty
minutes .
435.384−437.674 c2 s.%− but there’s a significant amount of
==
436.608−437.368 c5 qy^d^rt^2 non zero ?
437.618−442.778 c5 s um – there are like – more – because
there’s a lot of zeros i tacked on just
because of the way the script ran .

E Elaboration

This tag marks when the current speaker elaborates on a previous utterance by adding finer details (as opposed to simply continuing to speak on the same subject).

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):
Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c3</th>
<th>s\textasciicircum{ad}</th>
<th>s\textasciicircum{ad}\textasciicircum{e} high as you can get.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14.119–14.519
14.519–15.369

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c2</th>
<th>qy\textasciicircum{rt}</th>
<th>and is it only once that that happens?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c4</td>
<td>s\textasciicircum{aals}\textasciicircum{e}\textasciicircum{na}</td>
<td>right \textasciicircum{na} \textasciicircum{l} once in the middle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381.613–383.373</td>
<td>383.957–384.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{t} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{About-Task}

This tag marks utterances made by a speaker about the meeting agenda, addressing the direction of the meeting conversation. \textit{Provide differentiation information between \textless{t}\textgreater{} and \textless{tc}\textgreater{}}.

Hypothetical Example:

\textasciitilde \textasciitilde Let’s get onto the next topic.

Example 1 from Data (Bmr012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c4</th>
<th>fgl\textasciicircum{t}</th>
<th>um – l everyone should have at least two forms possibly three in front of you depending on who you are.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94.861–99.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c1</th>
<th>fg</th>
<th>so uh –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209.2,211.573</td>
<td>209.361,211.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textasciitilde \textasciitilde okay so should we do agenda items?

\textbf{d} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Declarative Question}

This tag marks a question that is in the syntactic form of a statement.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c1</th>
<th>qy\textasciicircum{d}\textasciicircum{bu}\textasciicircum{rt}</th>
<th>you do it higher ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textasciitilde \textasciitilde uh huh.
"Follow Me" marks utterances made by a speaker who wants to verify that listeners understand what is being said. Implicitly, the speaker is asking, "Do you follow me?"

Example from Data (Bmr012):

173.653–180.483  c4  s  and so then you also have a digits form which needs to be filled out every time the speaker form only once the digit form every time.

180.483–184.763  c4  s^ad  even if you don’t read the digits you have to fill out the digits form so that we know that you were at the meeting.

186.657–186.857  c4  qy^g^f  okay?

186.857–190.987  c4  s^ad  and then also if you haven’t filled one out already you do have to fill out a consent form.

192.207–194.767  c4  s  and that should just be one person whose name i don’t know.

197.629–197.829  c4  qy^g^f  okay?

Tag Question

A Tag Question is usually a short question which follows an utterance. The speaker is seeking confirmation of his or her previous utterance.

Common Tag Questions:

Doesn’t it?
Won’t it?
Correct?
Isn’t it?
Right?
Yes?
No?
A Tag Question often follows an Understanding Check <bu> (page 47) as in Example 1 below. In such a situation, only the utterance that includes the content of a concept that requires a "check" should be labeled with a <bu> — the tag question should not have a <bu> tag (as well/in addition).

Example 1 from (Bmr012):

92.853−93.433 c1 s^bu we’re recording .
92.951−93.131 c2 % okay .
92.981−93.241 c4 fg okay .
93.241−94.531 c4 s^na so we are recording .
93.433−93.733 c1 qy^g right ?

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

67.241−68.771 c5 s uh − looks kind of low on channel five.
68.771−70.301 c5 qy^g^rt no ?

Example 3 from Data (Bmr013):

1403.50 insert example

This tag marks utterances in which the speaker is making fun of something someone has said or if the speaker is trying to make a joke. The <j> tag should not be used simply if speech is followed by laughter. The decision of using this tag should be based on the subjective decision of whether the speaker intends to make a joke (and not on how the joke is received!).

Example from Data (Bmr012):

498.752−501.182 c2 sj a lot of the errors i think are out of vocabulary .
501.182−503.472 c2 s so it’s like p z m is three words.
506.032−509.052 c2 slfh there’s no language model for p z m .
508.977−510.707 c4 qy^bu^rt did you say there’s no language for p z m ?
510.782−512.232 c2 %− no language model i mean – those
Mimic Other

This tag marks when a speaker mimics another speaker’s utterance, often as an indication of confusion or a request for clarification. Mimic Other represents that there is a reason for a repeat, whether the repeat is verbatim or not.

Include: Differentiation between <m> and <bs>.

Hypothetical Example 1:

Sp.1 sj\^co I think we should hunt down the jabberwocky with ice picks and headlamps.
Sp.2 s\^t1\^m\^rt Ice picks? Headlamps?

Example 2 from Data (Bmr012):

287.643–289.093 c2 qy\^d so is that – that’s twenty minutes or so?
290.299–290.769 c4 s\^na\^m or so.

Example 3 from Data (Bmr012):

105–106 c3 qo\^t what else we got?
107–109 c1 s\^co\^t new version of the presegmentation.
109–112 c3 s\^bk\^m\^rt,3b new version of presegmentation.

16 It’s not necessary to know the reason for a repeat.
**r**  
**Repeat Self**

This tag is used when a speaker repeats his or herself. This often occurs when the speaker lacks confidence of his or her utterance or in response to a Repetition Request <br> (page 46).

Example from Data (Bmr012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Range</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58.784−60.504</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>qw^t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.153−64.053</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>qw^t3^r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**rt**  
**Rising Tone**

This tag marks rising tone in the speaker’s voice at the end of an utterance. This occurs in both questions and statements. Although intonation is not a type of DA, it’s an important voice quality that provides useful information for automatic speech recognition.

Example from Data:

Bmr012.1829.59−1837.58  s^rt
but hand – handhelds are built wi− − with sort of uh – anti shock sort of things so that it – it is less uh – susceptible to hand noises.
Group 9: Conventionalities
<fe, ft, fw>

**fe**  
**Exclamation**

This tag marks an utterance which expresses a speaker’s excitement or surprise.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

326.848–330.118  c0  s.%− and then we noticed that the reference was always one off with the ==

330.758–331.738  c4  s^fe oh no .

Example from Data (Bmr012):

1613.21–1616.64  s^ad it – i didn’t realize but we also have to get a tuner – the receiver – the other end .

1616.64–1617.87  c4  s that’s uh – four thirty [dollars] .

1618.7–1620.65  c4  fh%− um – l and then also ==

1619.75–1620.02  c3  sj^fe wow .

1619.96–1620.99  c2  qy^d^rt for – for each ?

**ft**  
**Thanks**

This tag marks an utterance in which a speaker thanks someone.

Example from Data (Bmr012):

200.767–202.047  c5  qy do you want this adam ?

203.018–203.378  c4  s^hls^aa uh – l sure .

204.918–205.788  c4  s^ft thank you .
fw  Welcome

This tag marks any sequence of words that is or functions as "you’re welcome." The speaker directs this at a previous person’s utterance.

Common Welcomes:

uh huh
okay
you bet
no prob
no problem
don’t mention it
sure
sure thing
you betcha
yeah
glad i could be of some help
Section 5
Common Dialogue Act Sequences

S

Example from Data (Bmr012):

94.861–99.771 c4 fgls^t um – l everyone should have at least two forms possibly three in front of you depending on who you are.

95.13–95.23 c0 % okay.

100.101–102.326 c4 s um – we – we’re doing a new speaker form

102.326–104.551 c4 s^ad and you only have to spea— – fill out the speaker form once.

fg|s^cs

Hypothetical Example:

Sp.1 fgls^cs uh – l the font should be bigger

sj^cs

17

Example from Data (Bmr012):

125.028–126.568 c0 fglqy um – l may i make one suggestion?

126.568–131.198 c0 sj^cs instead of age put date of – uh – year of birth because age will change but ==

126.731,126.961 c4 % sure .

132.117–132.347 c4 s^bk oh .

132.336–133.516 c0 s the year of birth changes –

133.516–134.696 c0 s^bsc you know – stays the same usually .

s^bu

17 The <sj> tag no longer exists.
Example from Data (Bmr012):

1019.95−1023.61  c8  s^bu  you’re maintaining it in – in a place that wouldn’t be publicly readable that – that kind of stuff.

1023.61−1023.79  c8  qy^g  right?

s^na

Example from Data:

609.401−614.591  c2  fgl^s^rt.%− and actually – l we actually um – used switchboard telephone bandwidth models which i guess ==

609.47−610.19  c8  s^ba  that’s amazing.

609.684−609.954  c1  %  okay.

613.907−614.217  c1  %  yeah.

613.917−614.757  c3  s^na  i was just going to say ==

614.444−616.474  c0  fgl^s.%−  well l that’s – those are the only we– ones there are ==

614.757−615.087  c3  fh  yeah.

s^aa

Example from Data:

872.41–874.05  c3  qy^d^ng  not a j but there seems to be bitter sarcasm, so the real value of the data base is these?

874.4–874.86  c4  s^aa.%−  yeah abso– ==

qy^g

Example from Data (Bmr012):

66.331–66.901  c5  %−−  adam i’m not ==

67.241–68.771  c5  s  uh – looks kind of low on channel five.
s^bk

Example from Data (Bmr012):

62.153−64.053  c3  qw^t3^r  why didn’t you get the same results and the unadapted ?
62.79−63.17  c4  %  but ==
64.235−68.995  c0  s^t3  oh because when it estimates the transformer pro−− produces like a single matrix or something .
67.73−69.01  c3  s^bk^t3  o−− oh oh i see .
Section 6
Complex Dialogue Act Sequences

qy^bu^rt

Example from Data (Bmr013):

998.989–1002.18 c8 s^bu^rt and in – in fact the inter annotator agreement was not that good .
1001.13–1006.05 c3 s^aa yeah i mean – it was– ==
1002.18–1002.52 c8 qy^g^rt right ?
1002.99–1003.94 c8 qy^bu^rt on the harder ones ?
1005.29–1008.2 cB s it depends how you look at it and ==

fg|s^co^j

Example from Data (Bmr012):

8.953–9.803 c1 %−− let’s see i should be ==?
13.954–15.514 c4 s^co as close to your mouth as you can get it .
14.119–14.519 c3 s^co up high .
14.519–15.369 c3 s^co^e high as you can get .
15.365–15.425 c1 % two .
16.022–17.542 cB % channel one one one .
16.356–17.526 c8 fg|s^co^j yeah l on your upper lip .

fg^bklsj^df^nd

Example from Data (Bmr012):

141.602–145.412 c0 s^df^nd well the thing is if ten years from now you look at this form knowing that ==
144.588–148.398 c8 fg^bklsj^df^nd yes l but what we care about is the age at – at the

18 <sj> no longer exists.
Questions:
1. For utterances like "let’s see" and "okay"
   - Bro004.1233.12−1236.40
   - Bro004.1441.42−1442.52
   - Bro004.1305.75

recording date rather than the
but there’s no other date on
the form

146.066−147.426 c3 s^nd
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qh</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qo</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qrr</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qw</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qy</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rt</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sj</td>
<td>21–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%−</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%−−</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To Do:

1. We need a section that shows examples solely of splitting and merging
   – utterances that should be split and how to split them
   – splitting utterances that could go either way
   – clauses, sentences that being with "which," "that," etc.

2. Add section that shows an entire annotated meeting

3. Section on distinct speakers/speaker patterns
   – for e.g.: Morgan, Adam, Jane, etc.

4. Change page number references in body, index, table of contents.

5. Go through all examples
   – Fix tags (alphabetical order, no <sj>/<sd>, no <fh> at the end of the utterance.

6. Possibly run stats to see what tags are used most frequently.