Annotation Guidelines

Motivation

We intend to annotate communication threads from the Enron corpus and from certain forums for hierarchical power, situational power, people directing the communication and influence.

There are two primary objectives:

1. To see whether a power relation or influence can be predicted with reasonable accuracy based on the contents of a single thread of communication.
2. To verify certain hypothesis on how power is reflected in communication and to develop new claims.

Thus, this annotation is mainly intended to identify features that can be used to predict power relations or influence. To achieve this, as described in the following sections, we ask the annotators to indicate the parts of the communication and the observations made from these parts that support the annotation. From these, we also intend to develop a list of general categories or cues which can be used in future annotation instead of free text.

In all annotations, consider only people present in at least one from, to, or cc fields.

General guidelines for all annotations

- Please specify the person names as mentioned in the to/from/cc tags, even if he was referred to using other names (short names or nick names) within the thread. You can copy and paste the name field from the to/from/cc sections.
- If there are two participants with the same 'name' field in the to/from/cc tags, use the ID field to disambiguate, for e.g. "Zeigham Khokher(id:"121516")"
- If the person name field is empty, use the ID field in the to/from/cc tags and mention the person as "EmptyName(id="9999")"
- If either person_1 or person_2 seem to be all recipients, i.e., all persons in To field or all persons in CC field, or all persons in both To and CC fields, represent them as "To(n)", "CC(n)" or "ToCC(n)" respectively, where n is the message ID of the message

Overt Show of Power

Label a DFU with a 'Y' if it requires the recipient to react according to one of a finite set of options. Do not consider the use of polite language alone as giving an option.

Example:

M1.2. If you have not, can you do so immediately. [Y]

M2.3. Will you be able to sit in on this and decide if we should participate further for our group? [N]

M1.5. If there is any movement of these people between groups can you plese keep me in the loop. [Y]

Hierarchical Power

List *(person_1,person_2,reason)* tuples such that based on the communication in the current thread, *person_1* appears to be above *person_2* in the organizational hierarchy. The *reason* is a list of observations that (not necessarily independently) support this claim, e.g. 1) a characteristic of a part of a message such as being an approval, being a direct order, 2) a person's behavior such as asking for approval, 3) a person's authority to make the final decision, etc. Please refer to specific segments by number if possible. Sometimes it is hard to give a specific reason, or to point to specific text passages; in this case, just be as specific as possible.

Example: thread65

Message 1: From David Forster to Andy Zipper

M1.1. Andy,

M1.2. Attached are some ideas for possible charge structures for EnronOnline.

M1.3. I am recommending something which will probably be surprising, given our conversation.

M1.4. Let's discuss when you have a moment.

M1.5. Dave

M1.6. Recommendation

(………the recommendation follows……..)

Message 2: Reply from Andy Zipper to David Forster

M2.1. Okay. good start.

M2.2. I like the idea of a minimum for each product,

M2.3. and I like staying with existing structure for new products.

M2.4. Let's look at alternative 1, the flat fee per trade,

M2.5. and see what it would need to be to yield $35mm in revs based on average tradecount YTD,

M2.6. i.e. extraplolate that out for rest of year for a pro forma.

M2.7. Thoughts ?

Message 3: Reply from David Forster to Andy Zipper

M3.1. Sorry - xxx (below) was supposed to be replaced with $54.50 per transaction,

M3.2. which is based on 2 * the July00-Dec00 transaction count.

M3.3. Note this results in $40 million of recovery, which includes Amita's costs.

M3.5. If you just look at $35 million recovery, the per-transaction fee is $47.68.

M3.6. This structure has the advantage that it is a little closer to the current cost allocation methodology,

M3.7. but this methodology is not well known by the business units.

M3.8. I actually started drafting this email with Alternative 1 as the recommendation,

M3.9. but decided that if we have to sell this internally, the brokerage lookalike structure would be easer to sell and defend.

M3.10. Dave

Message 4: Reply from Andy Zipper to David Forster

M4.1. Could you send me the commission numbers used for each of the major products in your volume based approach .

Message 5: Reply from David Forster to Andy Zipper

M5.1. Sure.

M5.2. These are actually taken directly from the spreadsheet which Mike Bridges prepared several months ago.

M5.3. If this is a route you want to pursue, we should first verify each of the numbers as current.

M5.4. Dave

Annotation:

Person_1: Andy Zipper

Person_2: David Forster

Reason: Andy Zipper has the power to make decisions. Andy's approval of David's recommendation in M2.1.

Situational Power

List *(person_1,person_2,reason)* tuples such that based on the communication in the current thread, *person 1* has power (authority to direct / approve other people's actions) in the current situation or while a particular task is being performed. Situational power is entirely independent of organizational hierarchy: *person_1* with situational power may or may not be above *person_2* in the organizational hierarchy (or there may be no organizational hierarchy at all). The annotation for situational power should be performed independently of the annotation for hierarchical power. Please refer to specific segments by number if possible. Sometimes it is hard to give a specific reason, or to point to specific text passages; in this case, just be as specific as possible.

Example: thread81

Message 1: From Karen Buckley to Lloyd Will, John Lavorato, Kimberly Hillis, etc.

M1.1. Attached is the current list of rotations for the Trading Track participants and future assigned rotations (as decided at the time of hiring).

M1.2. Can you please re-confirm you have these people in your group currently,

M1.3. as I appear to have conflicting information.

M1.4. I will re-send, if any changes occur.

M1.5. If there is any movement of these people between groups can you plese keep me in the loop.

M1.6. Kind regards,

M1.7. Karen.

Message 2: Reply from Lloyd Will to Karen Buckley, John Lavorato, Kimberly Hillis, etc.

M2.1. Karen attached is the latest status of the power trading track folks.

M2.2. I will use your template going forward to track changes.

M2.3. Thanks.

Message 3: Reply from Karen Buckley to John Lavorato, Kimberly Hillis, etc.

M3.1. John

M3.2. Following the interviews next week,

M3.3. suggest your management team get together to review the rotations for the Trading Track,

M3.4. to see if they continue to meet business/Employe needs to ensure we have accurate data from a tracking perspective.

M3.5.Karen

Message 4: From John Lavorato to Karen Buckley, etc.

M4.1. Great.

M4.2. Do we have any outside people.

Message 5: Karen Buckley to John Lavorato, etc.

M5.1. Yes, we have 5 externals coming in next Wednesday.

M5.2. From the 32 resumes shortlisted by you

M5.3. 14 of which were interviewed by your direct reports (remainder were not interested in Houston/job)

M5.4. 8 of which were recommended by your traders

M5.5. 6 of which accepted an 2nd round interview

M5.6. (five of which are confirmed for next Wednesday, 1 could not make that date)

M5.7. We therefore have a confirmd number of 15 to interview next Wednesday,

M5.8. however I was given additional internal names last night to follow up on this am.

M5.9. I will confirm exact number of interviews later this morning but could be anywhere in the region from 15-20.

M5.10. I have asked the current group in the Trading Track to faciliate an office tour of the trading floors/gas control room.

M5.11. Following which there will be an informal lunch for all of the candidates in one of the conference rooms to include the current Trading Track folks.

M5.12. Interviews will follow at 2.00 pm at the Allen Center.

M5.13. Schedules are being formalised today and will be forwarded to you.

M5.14. Thanks,

Annotation:

Person_1: Karen Buckley

Person_2: John Lavorato / Lloyd Will

Reason: In messages 1 and 3 from Karen (specifically M1.2, M1.5, M3.3), she gives specific directives to the others; in Message 2 from Lloyd Will to Karen, he complies with her request.

Attempt at Exercising Power

List *(DFUs,Person_1,Person_2,Type,Successful?,Reason)* where *DFUs* denotes a contiguous sequence of DFUs (e.g. Mx.y-Mx.z) which indicate an attempt by some communicator to exercise power. *Person_1* denotes the communicator associated with the DFU sequence. *Person_2* denotes the communicator being addressed. *Type* denotes the type of power i.e. Hierarchical or Situational. *Successful?* is one of {Y, N, NoReply} depending on whether the attempt is successful, not successful or was not responded to. The *Reason* is a list of observations that indicate whether the attempt is successful or not. Please refer to specific segments by number if possible. Sometimes it is hard to give a specific reason, or to point to specific text passages; in this case, just be as specific as possible.

Example: Consider the thread used as an example in the last section.

Annotation:

DFUs: M1.2-M1.5

Person_1: Karen Buckley

Person_2: Lloyd Will

Type: Situational

Successful?: Y

Reason: Lloyd complies with Karen's request in M2.1-M2.2

People directing the Communication

There are two subtasks:

1. First you must annotate the thread intention.
2. Then you must annotate whether there are people who are actively attempting to achieve this intention by controlling the dialog.

Intention

What, in general, is the purpose, or content type, of this discussion thread?

- **Knowledge-Acquisition**: The thread purpose is mainly to convey or exchange information.
- **Argumentation**: The thread purpose is mainly to argue or explore the pros and cons of a position or claim.
- **External-event-planning**: Planning events that will take place outside of the email exchange, such as a meeting, or performance of a task.
- **Collaboration-on-information-product** Collaboration on a document or information. Mark this if the work will be done "inside" the email communication channel.
- **Social**: The main purpose of the thread is simply being social.
- **Other or Unsure**: None of the above applies, or it's too complicated to decide (explain briefly why).

A thread can be annotated with more than one intention.

Then, enter in freehand a very short description of the topic of the thread. Use the list below as a guide (it may be useful for Enron in particular), but feel free to enter your own one-to-three word topic.

Social, Personal nonsocial, Internal project, Internal policy, Energy trading, Energy regulation, Business partnership, Legal advice, Human resources, Meeting minutes, etc

Control

Now that the threads are annotated with intention (which is one of Knowledge-Acquisition, Argumentation, Collaboration-on-information-product, External-event-planning, Social and other), identify the people who actively attempt to achieve the intended goals. This would be people who ask questions, request others to take action, etc. and not people who simply respond to questions or perform actions when directed to do so. For each such person, provide a *reason,* ideally referring to specific parts of the thread that show their active participation in achieving the intention.

Example: Consider the thread used as an example in the last section.

Annotation for intention:

Collaboration-on-information-product and Knowledge-Acquisition: updating trading rotations document, discussion of interview plan.

Annotation for control:

Karen Buckley: Karen initiates the thread and sends out directives in Message 1 and Message 3 to achieve the intention of updating the trading rotations document. She sends out information on the interview plan in Message 5.

Influence

Identify *(person_1,person_2,reason)* tuples where *person_1 has influence as per below definition for person with influence and person_2 (if identifiable) is the person (or set of persons) on which person_1 has influence.* The *reason* is supporting evidence, ideally referring to specific parts of the thread where *person_1* seem to have influence over person_2.

Definition for Person with Influence

1) Has credibility in the group
2) Persists in attempting to convince others, even if some disagreement occurs.
3) Introduces topics/ideas that others pick up on or support.
4) Must be a group participant but need not be active in the discussion(s) where others support/credit him.

- Influencer's ideas or language may be adopted by others
- others may explicity recognize influencer's authority.

1-4 are 'core' parts of the definition (necessary), and the two side points are additional indicators.

Example: thread96

Message 1: From Jaime Sanabria to Richard Shapiro

M1.1. Paul / Dan:

M1.2. Can you give me your opinion as to the structure of this deal, based on your experience?

Message 2: Reply from Dan to Jaime Sanabria

M2.1. Jaime,

M2.2. Seems like this could be a good deal for Eco.

M2.3. The pricing seems reasonable to me given the fact that Peerless will have money tied up on inventory that we will seldom use.

M2.4. Questions:

M2.5. 1. what is the going rate for leasing tank capacity in the area?

M2.6. 2. will Peerless be storing No.2 (that meets our quality specs) in tanks in addition to Eco's?

M2.7. Do they plan to transfer diesel back and forth between those tanks?

M2.8. If so, how do we control quality?

M2.9. 3. how much Minimum Inventory will Peerless agree to?

M2.10. The more the better for Eco.

M2.11. Note: The Platt's Index is Low Sulfur No.2 U.S. Gulf Coast - Waterborne

M2.12. Dan

M2.13. - comments?

Annotation:

Person_1: Dan Masters, Paul Ybarbo

Person_2: Jaime Sanabria

Reason: Dan and Paul are asked for their opinions in M1.1-M1.2 by Jaime.

Attempt at Influence

List *(DFUs,Person_1,Person_2, Successful?,Reason)* where *DFUs* denotes a contiguous sequence of DFUs (e.g. Mx.y-Mx.z) which indicate an attempt by some communicator to influence other communicators as per the definition given for Person with influence in previous section. *Person_1* denotes the communicator associated with the DFU sequence. *Person_*2 denotes the communicator being addressed. *Successful?* is one of {Y, N, NoReply} depending on whether the attempt is successful, not successful or was not responded to. The *Reason* is a list of observations that indicate whether the attempt is successful or not. Please refer to specific segments by number if possible. Sometimes it is hard to give a specific reason, or to point to specific text passages; in this case, just be as specific as possible.

Example: thread86

Message 1: From Hunter Shively to John Lavorato

M1.1. Fines:

M1.2. I know you have talked with Phillip but I wanted to give my two cents.

M1.3. I think the fines are a great idea.

M1.4. We must be accountable for VAR.

M1.5. However the fines do not allow the desks to push the envelope.

M1.6. The desks need to stay a couple million under VAR to protect against volatility and factor changes.

M1.7. We do not have the tools to predict our VAR with any strong degree of accuracy

M1.8. but we are penalized for going over a few hundred thousand dollars.

M1.9. I propose a one day grace period of 10% to 12% over limit.

M1.10. This would allow the desks to max their VAR and protect against unexpected changes.

M1.11. EOL:

M1.12. We continue to have trouble with brokers not working our EOL numbers.

M1.13. We believe Dynegy has written a program to mirror our cash markets on their system.

M1.14. When we suspend, they suspend

M1.15. and as our markets move, so do theirs.

Message 2: From John Lavorato to Hunter S Shively

M3.1. Call me about the dynegy thing I have an idea.

Annotation:

DFUs: M1.2-M1.10

Person_1: Hunter S Shively

Person_2: John Lavorato

Successful?: N

Reason: Hunter's opinion is ignored in message 3 from John