

An Empirical Study of Topic Transition in Dialogue

Mayank Soni* Brendan Spillane* Emer Gilmartin†

Christian Saam† Benjamin R. Cowan‡ Vincent Wade*

*ADAPT Centre, Trinity College Dublin, †Trinity College Dublin, ‡ADAPT Centre, University College Dublin
{sonim, spillab, saamc, gilmare, vincent.wade}*@tcd.ie, {benjamin.cowan}‡@ucd.ie

Abstract

Transitioning between topics is a natural component of human-human dialog. Although topic transition has been studied in dialogue for decades, only a handful of corpora based studies have been performed to investigate the subtleties of topic transitions. Thus, this study annotates 215 conversations from the switchboard corpus and investigates how variables such as length, number of topic transitions, topic transitions share by participants and turns/topic are related. This work presents an empirical study on topic transition in switchboard corpus followed by modelling topic transition with a precision of 83% for in-domain(*id*) test set and 82% on 10 *out-of-domain*(*ood*) test set. It is envisioned that this work will help in emulating human-human like topic transition in open-domain dialog systems.

1 Introduction

Human-human conversation consists of multiple natural topic transitions, from introductions, to topics of interest, and on to leave talking, and thus relies on topic change and shading mechanisms to allow participants to maintain and change topics¹. Although topic transition has been studied in linguistics for decades (Gardner, 1984; Lambrecht, 1996; Riou, 2015; Van Dijk, 1977), there are only a few corpora based studies investigating the nature of topic change. This is because of the labour intensive task of manually annotating datasets. Even though the task of annotation is labour intensive and manual, it is necessary to empirically understand how participants engage in topic transition. Towards this end, this work annotates 215 conversations from the Switchboard (Godfrey and Holliman,

¹Our annotated dataset and models do not differentiate between the types of topic transition (change, shift, shading, fading etc.) depicted in Gardner’s model (Gardner, 1984). For simplicity, this paper uses ‘topic transition’ to describe all forms. Where necessary, it uses specific terms to differentiate.

1993) corpus and studies different aspects of topic transition.

| Turns | Dialogue Text |
|-------------|--|
| Turn 1: A: | All right um well [laughter-uh] let's see i'm twenty |
| Turn 2: B: | How old are you Lisa. Okay that i'm older |
| Turn 3: A: | Yeah how old are you. Older [laughter] |
| Turn 4: B: | Older than you [laughter-are] |
| Turn 5: A: | [laughter-okay] |
| Turn 6: B: | Okay we are supposed to talk about places we like to go so i'm gonna and where are you from where are you calling from ? |
| Turn 7: A: | I'm calling from uh Provo Utah but I'm from Plano Texas |
| Turn 8: B: | Oh you are from Plano my sister lives in Plano yes her husband is the new Director of Admissions at uh University of Texas at Dallas |
| Turn 9: A: | Oh really. Oh wow my dad used to work at UTD also |
| Turn 11: B: | Yeah so I [vocalized-noise]. Anyway so where's your favorite place to go ? |
| Turn 12: A: | Um. Generally we just go on family vacations to Arizona my grandparents live there that's generally our usual summer vacation |

Figure 1: Hand-picked example of topic transition in the Switchboard corpus

Topic transition is phenomenon of transitioning from one topic to another as can be seen in Figure 1. In the example, handpicked from a conversation from switchboard, it is observed that participants first begin by talking about each others age, then move on to the places participants want to visit and finally moving on to talking about the state of Arizona in the USA.

Below, we explore the motivation, background and related work. We then describe empirical findings in the corpus, followed by modelling topic transition and evaluating it on in-domain (*id*) and out-of-domain (*ood*) test sets.

2 Background Theory

Definitions of topic in the literature fall into two categories; sentence level (Lambrecht, 1996) and discourse level (Van Dijk, 1977). As this study is concerned with discourse level topic annotation, we adopt the definition of Bonin et al. (2012) which maintains that topic at a discourse level is the “seg-

ments of the discourse sharing coherent information (about the same thing)".

Topic transition has been categorized by Gardner (1984), whose model of topic development in spoken interaction details the multiple means by which humans introduce, maintain, and change topics. Two areas which have received particular attention in the literature are topic change and topic shift. They have been defined as the point between two pieces of discourse which are considered to have different topics. Bublitz (1988) differentiates between topic change and topic shift as having low and high degrees of connectivity respectively to the previous topic. Topic shift includes both topic shading and topic fading (Maynard, 2009; Brown and Yule, 1983; Garcia and Joannette, 1997). Topic change includes reintroduction and full blown change. Our goal is to annotate all such topic transitions.

3 Related Work

Related work in the literature is primarily found in the domains of *topic annotation* and *topic segmentation*. The basic approaches in both of these areas can be divided into manual and automatic.

3.1 Manual Annotation or Segmentation

Early work to manually annotate topic transition was predominantly done for the purpose of conversation analysis. Planalp and Tracy (1980) were among the first to annotate topic transition. They showed that information integration by the interlocutors impacts their topic transition strategies. Crow (1983)'s analysis of topic shift in couples' conversations showed that it occurred fairly frequently; every 48 seconds on average. Later work by Ries (2001) showed that speaker initiative and style can also be indicative of topic transition. Recently, Konigari et al. (2021) annotated a subset of the switchboard corpus (Godfrey and Holliman, 1993) into *major*, *minor* and *other* topics. Sevgnani et al. (2021) introduced a one-turn topic transition corpus by asking annotators to produce bridging sentence connecting two sentences of different topics. More recently, automatic annotation or segmentation has increasingly become the focus of research due to the significant costs and effort of manual annotation.

3.2 Automatic Annotation or Segmentation

There have been many attempts to automatically annotate or segment text based on topic. A detailed overview of early work is provided by Purver et al. (2011). There have been two approaches: applying algorithms that work with text segmentation to dialog segmentation and algorithms specifically invented to model dialog topical transitions. These approaches can also be divided into unsupervised and supervised approaches. Among the earliest relevant works is that of Reynar (1994) who proposed a method of identifying topic boundaries based on lexical cohesion and dot plots. Hearst (1997) developed an unsupervised method to separate texts into multiple paragraphs representing subtopics. Passonneau and Litman (1997) developed two algorithms that use utterance features to segment dialogue by topic. Boufaden et al. (2001) used Hidden Markov Models to segment transcriptions of telephone conversations into topics. Galley et al. (2003) tackled the difficult problem of topic segmentation in multiparty speech by focusing on the content of the transcripts and their form, *i.e.* the linguistic cues in the speech. Hsueh et al. (2006) built on the work of Galley et al. (2003) by combining Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) with existing text based methods of topic segmentation. Arguello and Rosé (2006) also adopted a hybrid approach by combining linguistic features with local context indicators in the text. Sapru and Boulard (2014) demonstrated that latent topic features are effective predictors of topic transition in transcripts of multiparty speech from office meetings. Joty et al. (2011) developed a supervised method of segmenting topic in email conversations. More recently, Zhang and Zhou (2019) introduced a method based on BERT and TCN (Temporal Convolution Network). Xing and Carenini (2021) introduced an unsupervised method for topical segmentation of dialog by utterance-pair scoring. There are other relevant techniques and we regret not to be able to provide a comprehensive overview due to space constraints.

4 The Annotation Framework and Guideline

4.1 The Switchboard Corpus

The Switchboard-1 Release 2 Corpus (Godfrey and Holliman, 1993) consists of recordings of about 2400 telephone conversations between 543 distinct speakers who did not know each other (Calhoun

et al., 2010). All interlocutors spoke American English. They choose a topic from a list of about 70 topics and were connected to another interlocutor by a switchboard robot. About 50 of the 70 topics were chosen regularly. The conversation is not limited to the initial topic and participants could change it at any time. The individual conversation transcripts have been transcribed and annotated to the utterance level and include conversation *IDs*, time stamps, and label for speakers identity.

4.2 Annotation Framework

For empirically studying topic transition and modelling topic transition 215 conversations, drawn at random, from the switchboard corpus are annotated. The annotation were performed for start (*S*) and end (*E*) of the conversation, greeting and leave taking (*GIL*), topic, topic transition (*C*), and failed topic transition (*X*). This manually annotated corpus consists of 20, 566 turns from 215 conversation. Table 1 displays the statistics of annotated dataset. The average number of turns per conversation is 96 with the shortest conversation lasting 33 turns and the longest conversation lasting 242 turns.

The conversations were annotated by two annotators who devised the annotation scheme. Annotations are based on previous studies demonstrating that naive annotators are capable of annotating topic transition with success (Mann et al., 1977; Passonneau and Litman, 1997; Planalp and Tracy, 1980). The inter-annotator agreement (Cohen's Kappa) obtained on a sample of five conversations is 0.64, signifying substantial agreement.

| | |
|--|--------|
| No. conversations | 215 |
| No. total turns | 20,566 |
| Avg. turns per conversation | 96 |
| Avg. topics transitions per conversation | 8 |
| Avg. turns per topic transitions | 12 |

Table 1: Annotated switchboard dataset statistics

5 Empirical Studies of Topic Transitions

In this section, qualitative analysis on nature of topic change is analysed. Precisely, the following aspects are investigated.

- Relationship between length of a conversation and number of topic transitions.

- Share of topic transition per participants.
- Turns/topic by order of topics.




Figure 2: Scatter plot of number of topic transitions and length of conversations

Relationship between length of a conversation and number of topic transitions: *Are there more topic transitions in longer conversations (more turns)?* A scatter-plot is constructed to examine the relationship between the number of topic transitions in a conversation and the length of the conversation. The Pearson correlation coefficient between number of length of a conversation and number of topic transitions is found to be 0.75, indicating a positive correlation. Figure 2 further highlights that number of topic transitions increase as length of a conversation increases. Most conversations consist of five to thirteen topic transitions. Thus, it is concluded that longer conversations have more topic transitions.

Share of topic transition by participants: *Do participants engage in topic transitions evenly or unevenly?* To answer this question, each conversation is grouped by participants and the count of topic transitions is computed. It is observed that topic transitions are unequally distributed between participants. Only about 15% of conversations had an equal share of topic transition per participant. In about 85% of conversations, one participant had at least one more topic transition than the other. Figure 3 shows a bar plot of topic transition difference and percentage of conversations with such difference. Thus, it can be concluded that topics are transitioned more by one participant in a conversation. This aspect of dialog can be specially useful in Mixed-initiative dialog where a dialog system could lead a conversation by straddling between topics.




Figure 3: Topic transition difference and percentage of conversations with such difference

Turns/topic by chronology of topic progression in a conversation:

Next, the study seeks to investigate the distribution of turns/topic as the conversation progresses. Mean and standard deviation of turns/topic is computed for all conversations. It is observed that standard deviation from mean of no.turns is significant for all topics within a conversation. Thus, this study did not find any pattern between no.turns and topics, as conversation progressed from one topic to another in a given conversation. Figure 4 shows a combined plot of number of turns by topic order. Since the conversations are of different length the plot appears less dense as topic order increases.




Figure 4: Line plot of turns/topic in a conversation

6 Modelling Topic Transition

Approaches to topical segmentation in dialogue include unsupervised and supervised methods. Unsupervised algorithm work on finding similarity or dissimilarity between segments of text. TextTiling (Hearst, 1997) is implemented as a unsupervised

baseline. Similar to many previous approaches (Arguello and Rosé, 2006; Xing and Carenini, 2021; Konigari et al., 2021) mentioned in section 3.2, topic transition turn detection is formulated as a binary classification problem. Classical machine learning as well as deep learning based classification algorithms are implemented to distinguish between turns that transition from topics and turns that continue a topic.

Participants in a conversation communicate in chunk and chat phases (Gilmartin et al., 2019). Since, dialogue is inherently context based *i.e.* the next utterance is influenced by previous utterances, consecutive utterances are grouped by speaker and termed *chunk*. A chunk could consist of multiple utterances where the first utterance might be a participant's contribution of the current topic, the second utterance could be the introduction of a new topic and a third utterance could be continuation of the newly introduced topic. Chunks could also be single utterance where the user did not change topic. An example of topic transition is provided in the Appendix and a general formulation is shown in equation 1.

$$Chunk = \sum_i^j Utterance_i \quad (1)$$

i = Beginning consecutive utterance

j = Ending consecutive utterance

As a baseline to distinguish between topic transition and non-topic transition chunks, TextTiling (Hearst, 1997) is implemented (Using the code from NLTK Bird et al. (2009)). Chunks are formatted as paragraphs separated by two line breaks ($\backslash n \backslash n$) as required by TextTiling which works with Lexical Cohesion. The last chunk of a paragraph (TextTiling) is labelled as topic transition chunk and all other chunks are labelled as topic continuation chunks. Additionally, as classic machine learning classifiers, Naive Bayes and LightGBM are implemented.

Finally, utilizing modern deep-learning based classification algorithms, XLNet (Yang et al., 2019) is implemented. XLNet is state-of-the-art in text classification tasks (Miniae et al., 2020). The implementation was based on Hugging Face's Transformers (Wolf et al., 2019). XLNet-base is fine-tuned with 4 epochs using AdamW (Adam with weight decay) optimizer with Learning Rate of $1e - 5$. More than 4 epochs reduce the train er-

ror rate but the difference in valid and train error rate increases. The fine-tuning was done on a single GPU. One epoch took about 28 minutes to complete.

Models (mentioned above) are evaluate against precision, recall and f1 score. Precision is a metric indicating how accurately topic transition chunk is detected and the values can be seen in Table 2.

6.1 Results and Error Analysis

Results in Table 2 show that chunk where topic transitions occur can be differentiated from chunks where topics are continued. Evaluation is performed on two test sets. An in-domain *id* test set which is a subset of annotated switchboard corpus (described in section 4.2) and an out-of-domain(*ood*) test set. out-of-domain (*ood*).

It is observe from the study that TextTiling (Hearst, 1997) is more suitable for expository text since it works with Lexical Cohesion and requires input text to be in paragraphs, which is a property of expository text and not necessarily of a text conversation. Previous studies Gupta et al. (2020); Konigari et al. (2021) have also demonstrated that TextTiling (Hearst, 1997) is more suitable for text with clearly defined topics. In terms of precision, Naive Bayes performs better than other algorithms for *id* dataset with a precision of 0.83. In terms of recall and f1 score, XLNet-base performs better than other algorithms with recall of 0.32 and f1 score of 0.38. The recall scores from all algorithms are low. F1 scores are low because the recall score from models are subpar. In future works, advanced techniques will be employed to enhance these scores and improve overall model performance.

We further evaluate the performance of XLNet (fine-tuned on annotated switchboard corpus) on an out-of-domain (*ood*) test set. The test set selected for *ood* evaluation is Topical-Chat (Gopalakrishnan et al., 2019) as it is also a knowledge-grounded dataset. 10 conversations from Topical-Chat (Gopalakrishnan et al., 2019) are annotated following the annotation guidelines mentined in section 4.2. Statistic on the *ood* can be observed in Table 3. Results of evaluation on Topical-chat can be seen in Table 2 with suffix *ood*. It is observed that XLNet-base predicted topic transitions with a precision of 0.82 on *ood* test set. TextTiling detects topic transitions with a precision of 0.48 on *ood* test set.

| Model | split | Precision | Recall | F1 |
|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Naive Bayes | <i>id</i> | 0.83 | 0.24 | 0.38 |
| LightGBM | <i>id</i> | 0.64 | 0.12 | 0.20 |
| TextTiling | <i>id</i> | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.19 |
| TextTiling | <i>ood</i> | 0.48 | 0.21 | 0.29 |
| XLNet-base | <i>id</i> | 0.47 | 0.32 | 0.38 |
| XLNet-base | <i>ood</i> | 0.82 | 0.31 | 0.45 |

Table 2: Evaluation scores for various algorithms on testset

| | |
|--|------|
| No. conversations | 10 |
| No. total turns | 216 |
| Avg. turns per conversation | 21.6 |
| Avg. topics transitions per conversation | 7.60 |
| Avg. turns per topic transitions | 2.82 |

Table 3: *ood* testset statistics

7 Limitations and Future Work

The first limitation is low recall and f1 scores obtained from models. Future work will study advanced methods to obtain better scores. Another limitation is the inter-annotator agreement could only be obtained on a small sample of conversation. Future work will include obtaining inter-annotator agreement for all 215 Switchboard and 10 Topical-Chat corpora.

8 Conclusion

Empirical study on how participants engage in topic transitions was presented. It is concluded that longer conversations have more topic transitions and one participants changes topic more than the other participant. Topic transition was modelled with satisfactory precision and the *ood* evaluation produced satisfactory results as well.

Acknowledgments

This work was conducted with the financial support of the Science Foundation Ireland Centre for Research Training in Digitally-Enhanced Reality (D-REAL) under Grant No. 18/CRT/6224 and Science Foundation Ireland (SFI) under Grant Agreement No. 13/RC/2106 at the ADAPT SFI Research Centre at Trinity College Dublin. The ADAPT SFI Centre for Digital Media Technology is funded by Science Foundation Ireland through the SFI Research Centres Programme and is co-funded under

the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) through Grant Number 13/RC/2106.

References

- Jaime Arguello and Carolyn Rosé. 2006. Topic segmentation of dialogue. In *Proceedings of the Analyzing Conversations in Text and Speech*, page 42–49.
- Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. 2009. *Natural Language Processing with Python*, 1st edition. O’Reilly Media, Inc.
- Francesca Bonin, Nick Campbell, and Carl Vogel. 2012. [Laughter and topic changes: Temporal distribution and information flow](#). In *2012 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Cognitive Infocommunications (CogInfoCom)*, pages 53–58. IEEE.
- Narjès Boufaden, Guy Lapalme, and Yoshua Bengio. 2001. Topic segmentation: A first stage to dialog-based information extraction. In *Natural Language Processing Pacific Rim Symposium, NLP-RS’01*. Citeseer.
- Gillian Brown and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press. Google-Books-ID: ZUnEAgAAQBAJ.
- Wolfram Bublitz. 1988. *Supportive Fellow-speakers and Cooperative Conversations: Discourse Topics and Topical Actions, Participant Roles and “Recipient Action” in a Particular Type of Everyday Conversation*. John Benjamins Publishing. Google-Books-ID: d85TIj7odQC.
- Sasha Calhoun, Jean Carletta, Jason M. Brenier, Neil Mayo, Dan Jurafsky, Mark Steedman, and David Beaver. 2010. The next-format switchboard corpus: a rich resource for investigating the syntax, semantics, pragmatics and prosody of dialogue. *Language resources and evaluation*, 44(4):387–419.
- B Crow. 1983. *Topic shifts in couples’ conversations*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Michel Galley, Kathleen McKeown, Eric Fosler-Lussier, and Hongyan Jing. 2003. [Discourse segmentation of multi-party conversation](#). In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics - Volume 1, ACL ’03*, page 562–569. Association for Computational Linguistics. Event-place: Sapporo, Japan.
- Linda J. Garcia and Yves Joanette. 1997. [Analysis of conversational topic shifts: A multiple case study](#). *Brain and Language*, 58(1):92–114.
- Roderick Gardner. 1984. [Discourse analysis: implications for language teaching, with particular reference to casual conversation](#). *Language Teaching*, 17(2):102–117.
- Emer Gilmartin, Benjamin R Cowan, Carl Vogel, and Nick Campbell. 2019. Chunks in multiparty conversation—building blocks for extended social talk. In *Advanced Social Interaction with Agents*, pages 37–44. Springer.
- John J. Godfrey and Edward Holliman. 1993. [Switchboard-1 release 2 - LDC97s62 - linguistic data consortium](#).
- Karthik Gopalakrishnan, Behnam Hedayatnia, Qinlang Chen, Anna Gottardi, Sanjeev Kwatra, Anu Venkatesh, Raefer Gabriel, and Dilek Hakkani-Tür. 2019. [Topical-Chat: Towards Knowledge-Grounded Open-Domain Conversations](#). In *Proc. Interspeech 2019*, pages 1891–1895.
- V. Gupta, G. Zhu, A. Yu, and D. E. Brown. 2020. A comparative study of the performance of unsupervised text segmentation techniques on dialogue transcripts. In *2020 Systems and Information Engineering Design Symposium (SIEDS)*, pages 1–6.
- Marti A Hearst. 1997. Texttiling: Segmenting text into multi-paragraph subtopic passages. *Computational linguistics*, 23(1):33–64.
- Pei-Yun Hsueh, Johanna D. Moore, and Steve Renals. 2006. [Automatic segmentation of multiparty dialogue](#). In *11th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shafiq Joty, Giuseppe Carenini, Gabriel Murray, and Raymond T Ng. 2011. Supervised topic segmentation of email conversations. In *Fifth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.
- Rachna Konigari, Saurabh Ramola, Vijay Vardhan Aluri, and Manish Shrivastava. 2021. Topic shift detection for mixed initiative response. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 161–166.
- Knud Lambrecht. 1996. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge University Press. Google-Books-ID: bsXLCgAAQBAJ.
- William C. Mann, James H. Carlisle, James A. Moore, and James A. Levin. 1977. [An Assessment of Reliability of Dialogue-Annotation Instructions](#). ISI/RR-77-54.
- Douglas W. Maynard. 2009. [Placement of topic changes in conversation](#). *Semiotica*, 30(3-4):263–290.
- Shervin Minaee, Nal Kalchbrenner, Erik Cambria, Narjes Nikzad, Meysam Chenaghlu, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Deep learning based text classification: A comprehensive review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.03705*.
- Rebecca J. Passonneau and Diane J. Litman. 1997. [Discourse segmentation by human and automated means](#). *Comput. Linguist.*, 23(1):103–139.

- Sally Planalp and Karen Tracy. 1980. [Not to change the topic but...: A cognitive approach to the management of conversation](#). *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 4(1):237–258.
- Matthew Purver, Gokhan Tur, and Rento De Mori. 2011. [Topic segmentation](#), page 291–317. John Wiley ‘l&’ Sons.
- Jeffrey C Reynar. 1994. An automatic method of finding topic boundaries. *arXiv preprint cmp-lg/9406017*.
- Klaus Ries. 2001. [Segmenting conversations by topic, initiative, and style](#). In *Information Retrieval Techniques for Speech Applications*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 51–66. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Marine Riou. 2015. A methodology for the identification of topic transitions in interaction. *Discours. Revue de linguistique, psycholinguistique et informatique. A journal of linguistics, psycholinguistics and computational linguistics*, (16).
- Ashtosh Sapru and Hervé Bourlard. 2014. [Detecting speaker roles and topic changes in multiparty conversations using latent topic models](#). In *INTER-SPEECH*, page 2882–2886.
- Karin Sevegnani, David M Howcroft, Ioannis Konostas, and Verena Rieser. 2021. Otters: One-turn topic transitions for open-domain dialogue. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.13710*.
- Teun A. Van Dijk. 1977. [Sentence topic and discourse topic](#). *Papers in slavic philology*, 1:49–61.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. 2019. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *ArXiv*, pages arXiv–1910.
- Linzi Xing and Giuseppe Carenini. 2021. Improving unsupervised dialogue topic segmentation with utterance-pair coherence scoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.06719*.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V. Le. 2019. [Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding](#).
- Leilan Zhang and Qiang Zhou. 2019. Topic segmentation for dialogue stream. In *2019 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC)*, pages 1036–1043. IEEE.

A Example of Topic Transition

Topic transition sample where participants were asked to talk about budgeting. Bold utterances are topic transition chunks. Boxes represent conversation chunks

| | |
|---|--|
| A | "okay" g |
| B | "well budgeting is a sore subject in this [laughter-family]" |
| A | "yeah me too i know exactly what [laughter-you] [laughter-mean]" |
| B | "[laughter] we've actually uh uh tried uh budgeting is very important to us we we try it every month and um [vocalized-noise] i think it's good i mean it it gives us a sense of uh" |
| B | "uh of of staying in some semblance of control but uh we we do have uh we we never seem to be able to stick with it" |
| A | "no it's really hard to do that i mean it's [laughter] i don't know i guess um we do kind of have a budget um but it's kind of funny what we" |
| A | "what we do i guess is we try to proportion uh who pays what according to the salary that we make" c |
| A | "uh do you not understand what i'm saying we we pay a percentage" |
| B | "no" |
| A | "um which is kind of strange [laughter] a lot of people don't do [laughter-that] but hey we find that it works you know" |
| B | "[laughter]" |
| B | "now i'm sorry what is what is this again [laughter]" |
| A | "well okay um [laughter] like i pay a certain percentage of my pay check to the bills and he pays a certain percentage of his paycheck do you understand [laughter] okay i guess i didn't really explain that too [laughter-well]" |
| B | "oh okay oh i see" |
| B | "oh sure" |