

Individual differences play an important role in the interpretation of implicit relations

Vera Demberg, Saarland University

We know from discourse-annotated corpora that explicit and implicit relations are differently distributed: causal and additive relations are more likely to be implicit than contrastives and concessives (e.g., Asr & Demberg, 2012). It is however also instructive to consider how consistent annotators are in their labelling of explicit vs. implicit relations. In order to investigate this, we compared the annotations of the PDTB against RST-DT annotations (as both discourse banks are on the same texts). While PDTB and RST-DT have different goals in their annotation (PDTB uses a lexically grounded approach, while RST aims to capture the writer's intentions), they nevertheless use a set of relations in their inventory which can be mapped onto one another (Bunt and Prasad 2016; Chiarcos 2014; Sanders et al. 2018). We find that explicit relation annotations between the two frameworks correspond to one another a lot better than annotations for implicit relations. I will report on a series of follow-up crowd-sourcing studies which specifically focus on the interesting observation that specification and instantiation in PDTB are often annotated as pragmatic causal relations in RST. The results of these experiments provide evidence for substantial intra-individual differences in the interpretation of implicit relations.