The Conversational Core Job as a Local Context in Game Explanations

Vivien Lohmer[1,3,*], Josephine B. Fisher[2,3,†]

[1]Bielefeld University, Universitätsstraße 25, 33615 Bielefeld, Germany
[2]Paderborn University, Warburger Str. 100, 33098 Paderborn, Germany
[3]TRR 318 Constructing Explainability

Abstract

Current explainable AI (xAI) systems do not take into account the discursive structure of everyday explanations and only partially the semantic structures. We argue that future xAI systems should incorporate discursive and semantic structures to become more adaptive. From a linguistic perspective, explanations are activities embedded in a larger conversational context. We examine a corpus of 86 dyadic game explanations of the board game Quarto! on the semantic (nodes) and discursive level (conversational jobs). On the semantic level the game components are assigned specific nodes [1] which we use to operationalise the explanatory needs. On the discursive level the core job (explication of procedural, conceptual, and causal relations) from the GLOBE model [2] is analysed. This study investigates the core job as a local context in which the nodes and the different relations of the core job are combined. The aim is to further differentiate the core job and draw conclusions that can be applied for adaptive xAI systems. Our quantitative results show that the core job exhibits both the highest node coverage and node frequency. The qualitative results reveal systematic discursive patterns in the explanations. They start with the explication of conceptual relations, followed by causal relations and finally procedural relations. The findings demonstrate that explanatory needs are co-constructively negotiated within the local context of the core job.

Keywords

explanatory needs, nodes, local context, conversational jobs, xAI,

1. Introduction

Current xAI systems do not take into account the discursive structures of explanations and only partly the semantic structures. From a linguistic point of view explanations are activities [3] that are always embedded in a larger conversational context [4, 5, 6], e.g. a dinner conversation or during small talk. Following the discursive structure, one person establishes themselves or is co-constructively established as "principal speaker" [7], in explanations the so called explainer (EX). The EX is more knowledgeable and the explainee (EE) is less knowledgeable [4, 8, 9]. Consequently, a knowledge asymmetry exists between the interaction partners which needs to be resolved [4]. Explanations depict a process in which both interaction partners specify what the explanandum, the topic under discussion is [4], and what the explanation needs are in order to understand [10]. According to Klein [10], explanations can be categorised into three distinct types: those addressing the *how*, the *why*, and the *what*. While scientific explanations predominantly address the why, everyday explanations encompass a broader spectrum of types [1]. Our analysis focuses specifically on game explanations, which cover diverse elements such as rules, figures, and the game board. Kotthoff [11] categorises these as procedural explanations, this classification aligns with Klein's [10] concept of how explanations. Within an explanation, interaction partners co-constructively and systematically complete a series of conversational tasks, also called jobs

German AI Conference : 1st Workshop on Explainability, Transparency, and Safety (ExTraSafe), August 11––14, 2026, in Bremen, Germany

*Corresponding author.
†These authors contributed equally.
vivien.lohmer@uni-bielefeld.de (V. Lohmer); j.b.fisher@upb.de (J. B. Fisher)
https://ekvv.uni-bielefeld.de/pers_publ/publ/PersonDetail.jsp?personId=313994278 (V. Lohmer);
https://www.uni-paderborn.de/person/56345 (J. B. Fisher)
0000-0001-6733-1806 (V. Lohmer); 0000-0002-9997-9241 (J. B. Fisher)

[2] (cf. 1.2). Particularly important and a central component of explanations is the core job „explicating procedural, conceptual and/or causal relations“ [2, p. 90]. In the current analysis the core job (cf. Tab. 1) is examined as a local context (personal communication, 2025) within the explanation. Explanations include different types of contexts. Some are related to prior circumstances and others evolve during the explanation [5, 12]. The importance of the core job as a local context was already shown by Fisher et al. [13] as they found the core job to be recurrent multiple times and constituting the main part of the explanation in each dyad. In line with this co-constructive view, on a semantic level, the interaction partners co-construct the explanation content, hereafter referred to as nodes [1] (cf. 1.1), and thus the explanation needs. Game explanations as such did not show a clear order in which the content appears [1]. Therefore, the explanatory needs are being co-constructively negotiated throughout the interaction. These results pro-vide empirical evidence that the explanandum is not fixed before an explanation [4]. To advance xAI systems to be more adaptive, the discursive and semantic structures should be implemented [14, 15]. The core job forms the local context against which we explore the content of the explanation and the different relations (conceptual, procedural, causal) within the job. In more detail we address the following research questions:

a) How is the node coverage and frequency distributed across the jobs?
b) How are the interaction partners structuring the explanation during the core job?
c) What implications arise for xAI and the design process of a dialogue system?

1.1. Content Related Aspects of an Explanation

The content, the semantic aspects of game explanations, can include several elements, such as their rules, figures, game board. As Kotthoff [11] observes, like route and word explanations, game explanations are procedural in nature and characterised by their ease of comprehension and immediate applicability. To analyse the content of an explanation in tutoring research, so-called semantic maps were used [16, 17]. However, those maps were constructed solely from the explainer explaining and were not based on the interaction between the EX and the EE. In contrast, the explanation nodes developed in [1] were based on the content which was addressed during the interaction.

1.2. Structural Related Aspect of an Explanation – Conversational Jobs

Interaction partners start into the explanation by co-constructively negotiating the first (1) and second (2) conversational job. While job (1) focuses on **establishing topical relevance**, during job (2) – **the constitution of the explanandum** – the interaction partners agree on the topic of the subsequent embedded sequence, the explanandum. Together, job (1) and (2) form the boundary jobs of an explanation, which pave the way for the explanation as an embedded sequence. In the last two jobs, **Closing** (4) and **Transition** (5), the interaction partners co-constructively agree on the end of the explanation. Thus, the turn-by-turn structure is re-established (4) and a new topic for the interaction is found (5).

More important is the core job (**Explication procedural, conceptual and/or causal relation** (3)) of an explanation. As Fisher et al. [13] claim, this job occupies the majority of the explanation. During this job both interaction partners bring up the conceptual, procedural and causal relations regarding the explanandum.

2. Method

2.1. Participants and Corpus

We video-taped 86 dyadic game explanations with the strategic board game Quarto!. The corpus [1] consists of 506:04 minutes of video data (M=05:53, min. 02:16, max. 16:17, *SD*=2.82). Each session was

[1]Consisted of the ADEX and A04 corpus which were conducted in different projects.

Table 1
Excerpt from the operationalisation for the core job (3) based on Fisher et al. [13], Morek [22] and Quasthoff et al. [2][2]

Job	*Explication procedural, conceptual and/or causal relation (3)*
Definition	Providing information by **explaining the content-semantic aspects** of the explanandum ⟶Producing content-semantic elements (EX) ⟶Ratification (e.g. backchannel, etc.) contributing to the explanation (EE)
Examples	`EX: There is a game board which has four by four squares so a total of sixteen squares (VP09)`

divided into multiple phases. Our analysis focused on the explanation without the board game being present.

Subsequently, all video recordings were transcribed and analysed with the program ELAN [18]. The speech of the participants was segmented into utterances consisting of single ideas by a speaker within a turn, so-called moves [16].

2.2. Coding Procedure

2.2.1. Nodes

In order to capture the content, the semantic aspects of the game explanations, we apply the node scheme developed in Fisher et al. [1]. This includes ten blocknodes which are: 0. parlour game, 1. Quarto, 2. Players, 3. Board., 4. Game comparisons, 5. Figures, 6. Turns, 7. Goal, 8. Tips and 9. Features. Each of these have several subnodes with more detailed information. For example, the blocknode 4. game comparison links to the subnodes Connect 4, Tic-Tac-Toe, Chess and Uno. In total, the node scheme, subnodes and blocknodes taken together, consists of 69 nodes. Depending on which elements are addressed, they are coded to the speech. An utterance can include multiple nodes. For example, when listing three games similar to Quarto!, each of those is labelled with a different subnode. The node scheme can be used to analyse the coverage and frequency of the nodes in the different conversational jobs. On the one hand, the coverage of nodes addresses how many different nodes of the game were covered by the interaction partners. On the other hand, the frequency of the nodes includes how many nodes were being addressed in total. Inter-coder reliability was established by having two researchers code 12% of the data (six explanations), yielding an almost-perfect Cohen's kappa ($\kappa = 0.90$). The coders reached a consensus post-hoc, allowing the full dataset analysis to proceed based on this agreement. For more information see [1] and [13].

2.2.2. Jobs

The five conversational jobs can be operationalised for e.g. doctor-patient consultations as in Fisher et al. [13]. We adapt and adjust this operationalisation for the corpus of game explanations. An excerpt of the coding scheme is provided in Tab. 1 with special focus on the core job. To ensure the quality of the coding scheme, inter-annotator reliability was assessed. Two researchers independently coded four dyads (approximately 5% of the corpus). This yielded a Cohen's Kappa of $\kappa = 0.7$ (substantial) [19, 20, 21]. Subsequently, discrepancies were resolved in a joint data session and the coding scheme was adjusted accordingly.

[2]Sentence structure and semantics were adapted to the English language and thus correspond broadly to the German transcripts. The whole coding scheme is presented in the Appendix.

3. Results

3.1. Quantitative Results Node Coverage across the Different Jobs

To investigate the core job more thoroughly, the semantic content which was covered was analysed. More precisely, the number of nodes which were addressed in the entire explanations in these jobs was calculated. For the analysis ELAN Annotation Frequency and Coverage [23] was used. To compare how many nodes are being ad-dressed, the number of covered nodes for the other jobs is also given. The results in Table 2 show that the majority of nodes are covered in the core job (45.1%, *SD* = 8.8). The other jobs barely cover any nodes, job 5 is the second strongest job with regard to the node coverage with only 3.5% (cf. Tab. 2). To highlight that this difference not only applies to the node coverage, but also to the frequency, the results are being presented in Table 3. The node frequency mirrors the results of the node coverage. The core job is the job in which most of the nodes are mentioned (118.6, *SD* = 130.3) and Job 5 comes is the second highest (4.7, *SD* = 8.9) (cf. Tab. 3). Thus, the core job shows the highest node coverage and frequency of nodes compared to the other jobs. That the results of the node coverage and frequency align, shows that the number of covered nodes and mentioned nodes are related

Table 2
Node Coverage per Job

Job	Average	Min.	Max.	SD
(1)	0.4%	0%	4.35%	0.79%
(2)	0.88%	0%	4.35%	1.2%
(3)	45.06%	27.54%	68.12%	8.79%
(4)	1.3%	0%	30.43%	4.3%
(5)	3.52%	0%	26.09%	4.67%

Table 3
Node Frequency Distribution across the Job

Job	Average	Min.	Max.	SD
(1)	0.37	0	16	1.96
(2)	0.81	0	31	4.31
(3)	118.64	1	624	130.5
(4)	1.59	0	13	2.49
(5)	4.7	0	56	8.87

3.2. Qualitative Results of the Core Job

The core job of an explanation involves co-constructing specific relations within the explanandum. We differentiate these relations to analyse their discursive structure and integration with the nodes. Using a representative dataset, we demonstrate how these three distinct relations are processed. Due to limited space, we are only showing two excerpts from the first part of the core job (l. 018-024; l. 042-046). The full transcript can be found in the Appendix.

Excerpt 1: VP24 (01:17.120-01:47.462)

conceptual

018	EX	and, um (.) well, the game itself is sort of a mix of Connect Four and Bingo and or Tic-Tac-Toe. **{4. game comparison}** So basically, it's all about (.) four (0.5) you've got this sort of board game with four by four m\ four by four squares **{3. board}**
019	EE	hm_hm
020	EX	and the point is (.) um (0.7) yeah, a row of four with matching (1.1) figures, or you'll see right away how to put it together **{7. goal}**
021	EE	okay

causal

022	EX	Uhm, well in Connect Four it's like, if you have four red ones in a row **{4. game comparison}**
023	EE	[hm_hm]
024	EX	[then you've] won with Tic-Tac-Toe if you get three in a row if you do, you've won **{4. game comparison]**

The EX starts to explicate conceptual relations regarding the explanandum (l. 018-20). During this, he refers to the blocknodes 4 (game comparison), 3 (board) and 7 (goal). The EE addressed no node during this part and only ratifies the explication with a backchannel (l. 019 & l. 023). At the level of grammatical constructions, the EX uses **existential clauses** ("`the game itself is sort of a mix of Connect Four and Bingo and or Tic-Tac-Toe`", l. 018). This results in a descriptive structure with an almost prescriptive connotation. With the switch to explaining a causal relation, (l. 022 - 024) the EX refers to the blocknode 4 associated with blocknode 7. The grammatical structure during this explication follows the pattern "**if ..., then ...**" ("`If you have four red ones in a row, then you've won`", l. 022-024). After this he steps back to explication conceptual relations (cf. l. 025 ff., cf.7).

The second excerpt[3] now focuses on the third relation, the procedural relation at the discursive and semantic level.

Excerpt 2: VP24 (02:49.267-03:07.758)

conceptual

042	EX	uhm (.) yeah, well, that's the thing, the (0.9) the, um, figures exactly **{5. figures}** (0.5) and, um, then the gameplay is also (0.3) a bit (.) more complicated **{9. features}**, so you don't just have a figure, well, to start with;=right? It might also be worth mentioning that you place all the figures next to the board (0.5) **{6. turns}**

procedural

		and, well, we always take turns, so (.) you place a figure, I place a figure **{6. turns}**
043	EE	hm hm (0.3)
044	EX	(and) but it doesn't work like you get to choose the figure from, er the one you're going to place, but (0.9) I choose a figure for you, which you then have to play **{6. turns}**
045	EE	[ok]ay: [phew]
046	EX	[and] um, then you play that figure and then you have to (0.3) choose a figure for me too **{6. turns}**

The EX, who explains a typical turn of play for both players in chronological or-der, addresses the blocknode 6 (turns) combined with 2 (player). When the EX ex-plains procedural relations, their turns tend to follow a sequential pattern that mirrors the individual steps of the action being explained.

[3]Sentence structure and semantics were adapted to the English language and thus correspond broadly to the German transcripts. Only the blocknodes were added for visual reasons.

Discourse markers such as "and" (l. 044) indicate a logical and sequential connection with the content mentioned before. Furthermore, by using the two discourse markers "[and] um then", (l. 046) a chronological connection is explicated.

4. Discussion

This work set out to examine the core job as a local context more thoroughly. In more detail, we were interested in the explanatory needs, operationalised as nodes, and how on a discursive level the different relations (conceptual, procedural and causal) are addressed in the explanations.

Regarding the research question a) the quantitative analyses showed that the majority of nodes are being covered and mentioned within the core job. Thereby the core job does not only temporally constitute the main part of the explanation, but also semantically.

In addition to the quantitative approach, the qualitative analysis addressed re-search question b). The results showed on the content and discursive level that the explication of conceptual relations is about basic concepts regarding the explanandum [12, 24]. The interaction partners tend to use existential clauses which results in a highly normative connotation (cf. Excerpt 1). The causal relation is typically structured as **if X is the case, then Y** (cf. Excerpt 1). Procedural relations are about explaining a sequential course of actions, e.g. explaining step by step the process of choosing a figure and placing it on the board. The use of discourse markers as **and** or **and then** highlights the sequential and chronological structure (cf. Excerpt 2).

The detailed analysis of the core job (the discursive level) revealed that each relation has a different sequential and temporal placement during the core job. In the presented qualitative analysis, the EX starts with the explication of conceptual relations and switches to causal explications (cf. Excerpt 1). Towards the end of the first core job, the EX switches to procedural relations (cf. Excerpt 2). Further quantitative research is needed to strengthen the qualitative findings. As a first step, the three different relations have to be coded in order to differentiate the core job further and identify discursive patterns or sequences. Thereby, we could combine the discursive level with the semantic level and examine their patterns.

In everyday explanations not only the causal but also procedural and conceptual relationships are being discussed. Therefore, further evidence is provided that everyday explanations go beyond scientific **why** explanations by incorporating the **how** by explicating the different relationships of the core job [1].

The final research question c) addresses the implications that arise for xAI dialogue systems. We conclude that these systems need to be sensitive towards the discursive structure in explanations and focus more on how the interaction partners co-construct the explanation. If xAI systems take the discursive structure into ac-count, the interaction partners can rely on established communication practices and routines (communicative budget; [25, 26]). This supports the interaction partners via to the established discursive structures and routines.

Consequently, xAI systems should evaluate what takes place within the core job (e.g. the semantic and discursive structure) more prominently than the other jobs. Therefore, the core job as a local context would need to be included into future xAI systems to enhance them.

Acknowledgments

We thank Viviane Gladow, Marie Weise, Celina Nitschke, Marco Verwiebe and Britta Meyer, Claire Roberts, Lars Hoferichter, Frieda Herkenrath and all student assistants for supporting the data collection. This study was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation): TRR 318/3 2026 – 438445824

5. Declaration on Generative AI

ChatGPT (GPT-5, OpenAI) and BIKI (5.4, Bielefeld University) were used to support the literature search, improve the layout of tables and the clarity of certain formulations. The authors take full responsibility for the scientific content and the final decisions regarding the inclusion of the literature and wording choice.

6. Disclosure of Interests

The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article. The study with adult participants was approved by the Paderborn University Ethics Committee.

References

[1] J. B. Fisher, A. Robrecht, K. Rohlfing, S. Kopp, Exploring the Semantic Dialogue Patterns of Explanations - a Case Study of Game Explanations, in: Proceedings of the 27th Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue, 2023, pp. 35–46.

[2] U. Quasthoff, V. Heller, M. Morek, On the sequential organization and genre-orientation of discourse units in interaction: An analytic framework, Discourse Studies 19 (2017) 84–110. doi:10.1177/1461445616683596.

[3] M. Krug, Gleichzeitigkeit in Der Interaktion: Strukturelle (In)Kompatibilität Bei Multiaktivitäten in Theaterproben, De Gruyter, 2022. doi:10.1515/9783110769029.

[4] K. J. Rohlfing, P. Cimiano, I. Scharlau, T. Matzner, H. M. Buhl, H. Buschmeier, E. Esposito, A. Grimminger, B. Hammer, R. Hab-Umbach, I. Horwath, E. Hullermeier, F. Kern, S. Kopp, K. Thommes, A.-C. Ngonga Ngomo, C. Schulte, H. Wachsmuth, P. Wagner, B. Wrede, Explanation as a Social Practice: Toward a Conceptual Framework for the Social Design of AI Systems, IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems 13 (2021) 717–728. doi:10.1109/TCDS.2020.3044366.

[5] K. J. Rohlfing, K. Främling, B. Lim, S. Alpsancar, K. Thommes (Eds.), Social Explainable AI: Communications of NII Shonan Meetings, Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore, 2026. doi:10.1007/978-981-96-5290-7.

[6] H. Sacks, E. A. Schegloff, G. Jefferson, A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation, in: J. Schenken (Ed.), Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction, volume 50, Elsevier, 1978, pp. 7–55. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-623550-0.50008-2.

[7] B. Wald, Zur Einheitlichkeit und Einleitung von Diskurseinheiten, U. Quasthoff (ed.) (1978).

[8] J. Heritage, Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge, Research on Language & Social Interaction 45 (2012) 1–29. doi:10.1080/08351813.2012.646684.

[9] J. Heritage, The Epistemic Engine: Sequence Organization and Territories of Knowledge, Research on Language & Social Interaction 45 (2012) 30–52. doi:10.1080/08351813.2012.646685.

[10] J. Klein, Erklären-Was, Erklären-Wie, Erklären-Warum. Typologie und Komplexität zentraler Akte der Welterschließung, Erklären. Gesprächsanalytische und fachdidaktische Perspektiven 2 (2009) 25–36.

[11] H. Kotthoff, Erklärende aktivitätstypen in alltags-und unterrichtskontexten, Erklären im Kontext. Neue Perspektiven aus der Gesprächs-und Unterrichtsforschung (2009) 120–146.

[12] J. B. Fisher, L. Terfloth, The dual nature as a local context to explore verbal behaviour in game explanations, in: Proceedings of the 29th Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue – Poster Abstracts, SEMDIAL, Bielefeld, Germany, 2025, pp. 246–248.

[13] J. B. Fisher, V. Lohmer, F. Kern, W. Barthlen, S. Gaus, K. J. Rohlfing, Exploring Monological and Dialogical Phases in Naturally Occurring Explanations, KI - Künstliche Intelligenz 36 (2022) 317–326. doi:10.1007/s13218-022-00787-1.

[14] J. B. Fisher, Adaptive Explanations : The Involvement of Explainees, Ph.D. thesis, Paderborn, 2026.

[15] A. S. Robrecht-Hilbig, Adaptive Explanations as Co-Constructed Processes. Modeling a Rational

Explainer Through the Interaction of Dynamic Partner Models and Non-Stationary Decision Making, Ph.D. thesis, Universität Bielefeld, 2025. doi:10.4119/UNIBI/3014739.
[16] M. T. H. Chi, M. Roy, R. G. M. Hausmann, Observing Tutorial Dialogues Collaboratively: Insights About Human Tutoring Effectiveness From Vicarious Learning, Cognitive Science 32 (2008) 301–341. doi:10.1080/03640210701863396.
[17] N. Miyake, Constructive Interaction and the Iterative Process of Understanding, Cognitive Science 10 (1986) 151–177. doi:10.1207/s15516709cog1002_2.
[18] P. Wittenburg, H. Brugman, A. Russel, A. Klassmann, H. Sloetjes, ELAN : a professional framework for multimodality research, in: 5th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2006), 2006, pp. 1556–1559.
[19] J. Cohen, Weighted kappa: Nominal scale agreement provision for scaled disagreement or partial credit., Psychological Bulletin 70 (1968) 213–220. doi:10.1037/h0026256.
[20] J. Cohen, A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales, Educational and Psychological Measurement 20 (1960) 37–46. doi:10.1177/001316446002000104.
[21] J. R. Landis, G. G. Koch, The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data, Biometrics 33 (1977) 159. doi:10.2307/2529310. arXiv:2529310.
[22] M. Morek, Kinder erklären: Interaktionen in Familie und Unterricht im Vergleich, number Bd. 60 in Stauffenburg Linguistik, Stauffenburg, Tübingen, 2012.
[23] K. Biermeier, ELAN Annotation Frequency and Coverage: Commented Release, Zenodo, 2023. doi:10.5281/zenodo.8032428.
[24] L. Terfloth, M. Schaffer, H. M. Buhl, C. Schulte, Adding Why to What? Analyses of an Everyday Explanation, in: L. Longo (Ed.), Explainable Artificial Intelligence, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2023, pp. 256–279. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-44070-0_13.
[25] R. Ayaß, Kommunikative Gattungen, mediale Gattungen, in: S. Habscheid (Ed.), Textsorten, Handlungsmuster, Oberflächen, DE GRUYTER, 2011, pp. 275–295. doi:10.1515/9783110229301.275.
[26] T. Luckmann, Grundformen der gesellschaftlichen Vermittlung des Wissens: Kommunikative Gattungen, Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie 27 (1986) 191–211.

7. Appendix

Name of transcript: VP24
Content of recording: dyadic explanantion of the board game Quarto!
Recording Duration: (0:00:00.0) – (0:06:19.6)
Transcriber: student assistant of project X

Abbreviations:
EX Explainer
EE Explainee
X research coordinator

Abbreviations coding:
p: core job 3 procedural
c: core job 3 causal
co: core job 3 conceptual

001 EX bekommen wir das spiel auch noch
002 EE ((lacht)) musst du mir das jetzt erklären oder (hah)
004 EX ähm ach so soll ich dir das SPIEL jetzt so erklären ohne das spiel vorher [(einfach zu haben)]
005 EE [keine ahnung] ich hab keine ahnung weiß es nicht (1.2) ich nehme mal an das werden sie uns gleich sage ((Auslassung (8.4) Sekunden))
006 EX sollen wir schon anfangen oder
007 X ja genau ihr könnt gern schon (.) anfangen [du bist instruiert]
008 EX [also]
009 X du auch (0.6) genau
010 EX weil wir haben das spiel ja noch nicht hier
011 (0.8)
012 X genau ((lachen)) (1.3)
013 EX äh:m ja gut also gut (0.4) ja ich soll dir das spiel so erklären dass ähm ja wir das gleich spielen können und du ne chance hast (0.4)
014 EE okay
015 EX ((lacht)) also weil ich hatte das ja schon vorher (0.4) und ähm sollte mir einmal die regeln durchgucken und wie das so alles funktioniert damit ich dir das jetzt erklären [kann]
016 EE [hm_hm]
017 (0.4)
co 018 EX und ähm (.) da also das spiel ist an sich so ne mischung a:us vier gewinnt u:nd bingo beziehungsweise tic tac toe **{4. game comparison}** also es geht im endeffekt darum (.) vier (0.5) du hast dann halt eben so_n spielbrett mit vier mal vier m? vier mal vier feld **{3. board}**
019 EE hm_hm
020 EX und es geht darum (.) ähm (0.7) ((schnalzen)) ja eine viererreihe mit gleichen (1.1) steinen oder wirst du gleich auch sehen wie_s ähm zusammen zu bekommen **{7. goal}**
c 021 EE okay
022 EX ähm also der ist ja bei (.) vier gewinnt ist ja so wenn du vier rote in einer reihe hast **{4. game comparison}**
023 EE [hm_hm]
024 EX [dann hast_e] gewonnen für tic tac toe wenn drei in der reihe hast haste gewonnen **{4. game comparison}**
co und ähm (.) ja so das is so das spielprinzip an sich oder das ziel dass du halt vier in eine reihe bekommst (0.5) und ähm (.) **{7. goal}**
c/p dann gibt es gleich

co

		also unsere spielsteine haben vier eigenschaften (0.8) ähm (0.3) die ei_einmal is glaub ich hell und dunkel (0.4) also es gibt- 0.4) acht spielsteine die hell sind ACHT spielsteine die dunkel sind dann gibt_s acht spielsteine die (0.3) rund sind und acht die eckig sind **{5. figures}**
025	EE	hm_hm (0.6)
026	EX	ähm acht die klein sind und acht die groß sind**{5. figures}**
027	EE	okay
028	EX	((lacht)) und acht die ein loch haben und acht die kein loch haben (0.7) **{5. figures}**
029	EE	al[so]
030	EX	[es] gibt
031	EE	ja

co

032	EX	quasi jede kombination so ein mal **{5. figures}**
033	EE	hm_hm
034	EX	u:nd ähm ja das ziel des spiels is halt eine dieser eigenschaft in eine reihe zu haben (.) in vier (0.7) für in diesen vier positionen **{7. goal}** also sag ich mal dass du vier eckige**{5. figures}** in einer reihe hast (.) einer reihe hast (.)
035	EE	okay (.)[hm_hm:]
036	EX	und [es gibt] insgesamt (0.8) ja acht eckige stimmt ja **{5. figures}** oder vier (.) helle **{5. figures}** in einer reihe **{7. goal}** hast oder vier dunkle**{5. figures}** (0.3)
037	EE	okay (0.4)
038	EX	und ähm das funktioniert auch so wie bei (.) vier gewinnt **{4. game comparison}** dass halt (0.3) das auch quer machen kannst **{7. goal}**(0.6) ja gen[au]
039	EE	[also] vertikal] (0.3) **{7. goal}**
040	EX	horizontal [und ((unverständlich ca 0.3 Sek.)) gibts ja] **{7. goal}**
041	EE	[horizontal und diagonall =ja okay] (0.3) jo (0.3) **{7. goal}**
042	EX	h e:hm (.) ja da das is dann ja das die (0.9) die ähm figuren genau (0.5) **{5. Figures}** u:nd ähm dann noch der spielablauf is auch noch (0.3) etwas (.) komplizierter **{9. features}** also du hast nicht einfach ne stei? also erstmal;=ne? vielleicht noch wichtig zu erwähnen dass du die st__steine alle neben das feld stellst (0.5) **{6. turns}**

p

		und jed? wir spielen immer abwechselnd **{2. players}** also (.) du setzt nen stein ich setz ne stein **{6. turns}**
043	EE	hm_hm (0.3)
044	EX	(und) das funktioniert aber nicht so dass du den stein aus äh aussuchen darfst den du setzt sondern (0.9) ich suche dir einen stein aus den du dann spielen mus[st] **{6. turns}**
045	EE	[ok]ay: [uff]
046	EX	[und] ähm dann spielst du diesen stein und dann musst du mir (0.3) auch n stein auswählen **{6. turns}**

co

047	EE	und wer zuletzt gesetzt hat **{6. turns}**(.) und (0.7) vier in einer reihe HAT hat quasi **{7. goal}**

c

048 EX genau und wenn du halt vier sag ich mal wenn du siehst du hast vier in einer reihe **{7. goal}** jetzt dann musst du (.) weil das spiel heißt quarto **{1. Quarto}** dann musst du (.) quarto rufen **{6. turns}**
049 EE HM_hm
050 EX also bingo halt quasi **{4. game comparison}**
051 EE [hm_hm]
052 EX [nur] halt mit quarto und wenn wenn dir das quasi nicht auffällt und du dann mir den stein gibst und ich dann quasi setzen darfst dann dürfte ich auch noch quarto rufen **{6. turns}** wenn du_s halt (.) übersehen hast **{8. tips}**
053 EE okay und es zählt immer nur eine eigenschaft also wenn jetzt vier steine meinetwegen (0.6) alle vier steine sind **{7. goal}** (.) ähm hell **{5. figures}**
054 EX hm_hm
055 EE sind aber einer is eckich einer is[ru]nd **{5. figures}**
056 EX [ja] [((unverständlich ca. 0.3 Sek.))es sind]
057 EE [so aber alle hell sind] **{5. figures}** okay

co

058 EX also du musst einfach nur vier von einer eigenschaft in einer reihe haben **{7. goal}**
059 EE jut
060 EX ((lacht)) also <<lachend> einfach >
061 EE hm_hm
062 EX ähm und ja das is halt son bisschen ähm (0.7) tricky **{9. features}** weil man dann ja immer so antizipieren muss welche steine hat der andere gleich noch die er mir geben kann **{8. tips}**
063 EE [hm_hm]
064 EX [so da]ss ich gewinnen kann und dann muss man das so_n bisschen mit ausschlussverfahren äh **{8. tips}**

c

065 EE is wahrscheinlich komplizierter als man jetzt so denkt **{9. features}**
066 EX ja ((lacht)) äh sacht man auch so am anfang vier gewinnt ja gut is ja also es is **{4. game comparison}**
067 EE [wie lange ähm]
068 EX [einfach so ne v]ier gewinnt und bingo kombiniert aber (0.4) **{4. game comparison}** dann auch dass man halt den gegenüber den stein auswählen muss **{6. turns}** dass noch so ne °h äh komplex **{9. features}**
069 EE hast schonmal gespielt oder
070 EX ich hab_s nur ein mal mit mir selber ((lacht))
071 EE <<lachend> okay>
072 EX ((unverständlich 0.3 Sek.)) in meinen kopf [reinzu]bekommen
073 EE ((lacht)) <<lachend> [okay]> ((haha))
074 EX ähm aber äh ja (0.6) bin au ma gespannt (.) ähm (1.5) überlege noch ob ich irgendwas noch vergessen habe (0.1) aber (1.4) s s s s es wird hoffentlich klarer wenn wir die spielfiguren gleich haben

c

075 EE und es gibt immer nur (0.5) ein stein (0.8) mit den selben eigenschaften also es gibt genau einen großen (0.7) blauen [runden] **{5. figures}**
076 EX [((lacht))]
077 EE oder wie auch [immer]
078 EX [<<lachend> genau>] **{5. figures}**
079 EE okay (haha)
080 EX genau äh es gibt =jede stein is unique aber die [über] eigenschaft **{5. figures}**
081 EE [ja]
082 EX über[schneiden] **{5. figures}**
083 EE [okay] [schauen wir mal]
084 EX [((unverständlich ca. 1 Sek.))]
085 EE hm_hm
086 EX man müsste ja eigentlich immer acht von jeder eigenschaft immer geben also acht runde acht helle acht dunkle und so weiter **{5. figures}**

087 EE o:kay (1.2)
088 EX ((schnalzt)) (0.9)
089 EE dann spielen wir doch mal
090 EX ja dann [sind wa]
091 EE [wenn wi]r das spielchen hätten (0.5)
092 EX dann (0.3) sind wa ready (1.9)
093 EE (1.2)
094 EX ((lachen)) (2.0) man reiche uns das SPIEL (6.6)
095 EE ((gähnt)) (0.9)
096 EX (5.3)
097 EE <<flüsternd> dass ich dachte das hätte was mit (.) dem roboter hier zu tun hat_s aber wahrscheinlich gar nicht ne
098 EX eh_hehe ne (.) das hat glaub ich recht wenig mit robotern zu tun aber (2.3) joar
099 EE h (5.7)
100 EX es tut sich noch nichts irgendwie: hab ich erwartet dass man jetzt (0.8) kommt und uns das SPIEL bringt aber (1.1) versteckt ham sie_s auch nich (1.6) (0.7) oder sollen wir bescheid geben (0.9)
101 EE ich (dat hier wa die) nehmen uns doch auf;=ne? ich denke das werden die schon
102 EX ((lacht))
103 EE verstehen siehste