

5. Übungsblatt - Abgabe: 30.5.2014, 12:00

Answers can be written in either English or German (English is preferred).

THE TEXT

1. Es hatte etwas Versöhnliches, wie die Deutsche Telekom und die Gewerkschaft Verdi gestern den Schulterschluss demonstrierten.
2. Jetzt ging es darum, das gemeinsam erreichte Ergebnis in ein positives Licht zu rücken.
3. Einen Verlierer soll es nicht geben.
4. Es ist aber vor allem die Telekom, die die Einigung für sich als Durchbruch reklamieren kann.
5. Das beharrliche Management hat damit sein Ziel erreicht, die Kosten im Konzern künftig maßgeblich zu senken.
6. Außerdem werden die Beschäftigten mehr arbeiten,
7. was die Produktivität erhöht.
8. Der schwerfällige T-Dampfer nimmt langsam Fahrt auf.
9. Dass der Aktienkurs nach der Einigung deutlich kletterte, spricht Bände.

Exercise 1: Discourse Structure Theory

Analyze the TELEKOM text above following Grosz & Sidner's Discourse Structure Theory, as presented in the lecture.

- Segment the text into (minimal) discourse segments (single sentences or sequences of sentences that have the same intention); assign each segment a Discourse Segment Purpose (i.e. an intention).
- Identify the dominance relations between DSPs.

Example: Assuming that the first segment spans from sentence 1 to 3 (inclusively), and that the DSP of this segment is to convey to the reader the belief that Telekom and Verdi are demonstrating unity, the beginning of your analysis could look like this:

DS1(1,3)

DSP1: convey to the reader the belief that Telekom and Verdi are demonstrating unity

The dominance relation can be written as follows:

$\text{dom}(\text{DSP}_x, \text{DSP}_y)$

to express that the DSP of Segment x dominates the DSP of Segment y .

Hint: For this exercise there is no single correct solution. In fact there are many more than one plausible and coherent possible analyses.

Exercise 2: Rhetorical Structure Theory

Analyze sentences 4-9 of the TELEKOM text according to Rhetorical Structure Theory, as presented in the lecture.

- On the basis of the given sentences, identify which relations exist between segments.
- For each relation, determine which segments are nuclei and which are satellites.

The resulting analysis should be a RST-Tree for sentences 4-9, with these segments as leaf nodes. The list of possible relations can be seen on the RST website (<http://www.sfu.ca/rst/01intro/definitions.html>) – there could be relations in this text passage which were not mentioned in class!

In case you are not able to draw a discourse tree (or don't want to), it is acceptable to present your analysis in the following form:

$\text{elaboration}(10,11) \Rightarrow 20 \text{ N:10 S:11}$

to express, for example, that the segments with numbers 10 and 11 are connected in an Elaboration relation, with 10 as Nucleus and 11 as Satellite, and that the combination of the two segments results in a new segment labeled with the number 20.

Hint: The best way to build an RST analysis is not to go through the text sequentially, but rather to first look for neighboring segments which clearly stand in a rhetorical relation to one another, then build the discourse structure from the bottom up. Segments 6 and 7 would be one good starting point.

As for the DST analysis, there is no single obvious solution. As long as the analysis is fairly plausible and is well-justified, it should be okay.

Additional example analyses can be found here:<http://www.sfu.ca/rst/02analyses/published.html>