

# NAVCON: A Cognitively Inspired and Linguistically Grounded Corpus for Vision and Language Navigation

Karan Wanchoo<sup>1</sup>, Xiaoye Zuo<sup>1</sup>, Hannah Gonzalez<sup>1</sup>, Soham Dan<sup>1</sup>,  
Georgios Georgakis<sup>1\*</sup>, Dan Roth<sup>1</sup>, Kostas Daniilidis<sup>1</sup>, Eleni Miltsakaki<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>University of Pennsylvania,

Correspondence: [kwanchoo@seas.upenn.edu](mailto:kwanchoo@seas.upenn.edu)

## Abstract

We present NAVCON, a large-scale annotated Vision-Language Navigation (VLN) corpus built on top of two popular datasets (R2R and RxR). The paper introduces four core, cognitively motivated and linguistically grounded, navigation concepts and an algorithm for generating large-scale silver annotations of naturally occurring linguistic realizations of these concepts in navigation instructions. We pair the annotated instructions with video clips of an agent acting on these instructions. NAVCON contains 236,316 concept annotations for approximately 30,000 instructions and 2.7 million aligned images (from approximately 19,000 instructions) showing what the agent sees when executing an instruction. To our knowledge, this is the first comprehensive resource of navigation concepts. We evaluated the quality of the silver annotations by conducting human evaluation studies on NAVCON samples. As further validation of the quality and usefulness of the resource, we trained a model for detecting navigation concepts and their linguistic realizations in unseen instructions. Additionally, we show that few-shot learning with GPT-4o performs well on this task using large-scale silver annotations of NAVCON.

## 1 Introduction

The main goal of Vision-Language Navigation (VLN) tasks is to enable robots or other agents to navigate in a variety of spaces following language instructions. Given the resource limitations inherent in robotic navigation, as well as the unpredictability of the navigation spaces, successful VLN models must be (a) resource efficient in real time processing of linguistic and visual inputs and (b) capable of applying their learning to previously unseen linguistic instructions in new physi-

cal environments. In the interest of understanding the non-negligible gap between machines' performance and human benchmarks there is increasing motivation to move from BLACK BOX end-to-end models to models that are grounded, that is, they are capable of demonstrating an understanding of the concepts they learn and the decisions they make. Currently, models such as CLIP-ViL (Shen et al., 2021) have shown unbalanced attention on text and vision (Zhu et al.), thus compromising the reliability of aligning text tokens to visual inputs. To enable the training of more transparent models with regard to this cross-modal alignment, we need datasets with higher-level annotations of linguistically grounded navigation concepts and their associations to navigation action in the physical world. Creating sophisticated datasets with reliable annotations at the scale required for effective training is a well-known challenge that sometimes requires unrealistic human effort. In this paper, we address this challenge by introducing NAVCON<sup>1</sup>, a large scale VLN corpus annotated with high level navigation concepts, requiring minimal human annotation effort. We identify four core navigation concepts, inspired by cognitive functions and observations from VLN datasets, essential for conveying navigation instructions. These concepts, considered higher-order linguistic predicates, are grounded in diverse linguistic realizations from over 30,000 instructions across two popular community-standard VLN datasets. We then ground these linguistic expressions with video clips of agents performing the corresponding navigation tasks. The quality of the generated annotations and video-clip pairings are evaluated with (a) human evaluation studies of NAVCON samples, (b) training and testing of a navigation concept classifier trained on NAVCON, and (c) a battery of experiments with few-shot learning using GPT-4o. This work makes the

\* Currently employed at the Jet Propulsion Lab, California Institute of Technology. This work was done as an outside activity and not in the author's capacity as an employee of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology.

<sup>1</sup>[anonymous.4open.science/r/NAVCON-E068/](https://anonymous.4open.science/r/NAVCON-E068/)

following contributions:

- Public release of a VLN corpus containing annotations of navigation concepts and video-clip pairings for the over-30,000 instructions in the R2R and RxR datasets.
- A high-performing navigation concept classifier model for predicting navigation concepts in unseen text.
- Extensive experiments comparing the few-shot learning of GPT-4o against the fine-tuned classifier model for predicting navigation concepts.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss prior work in connection to VLN tasks and persisting challenges which motivate our work and the need for the NAVCON multi-modal vision-language resource. In Section 3, we present the language navigation concepts annotated in NAVCON. Section 4 describes our approach to generating silver annotations and reports a human evaluation study. To provide further evidence of the quality, validity, and reliability of the annotations in NAVCON, Section 5 reports on (a) training and testing a navigation concept classifier (NCC) model using NAVCON (b) experiments on few-shot learning with GPT-4o as a concept classifier.

## 2 Background and motivation

The problem of instruction following for navigation has drawn significant attention in a wide range of domains. These include Google Street View Panoramas (Chen et al., 2019), simulated environments for quadcopters (Blukis et al., 2018; Misra et al., 2018), multilingual settings (Ku et al., 2020), interactive instruction following task (Shridhar et al., 2020a,b; Min et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2021), interactive vision-dialogue setups (Zhu et al., 2021), real world scenes (Anderson et al., 2021), and realistic simulations of indoor scenes (Anderson et al., 2018; Krantz et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2017). One of the biggest challenges in following instructions is grounding the natural language to a sequence of observed visual inputs.

Earlier works (Matuszek et al., 2010; Tellex et al., 2011; Kollar et al., 2010) assumed that the structure and semantics of the environment were available and employed topological maps and probabilistic models to associate instructions to paths. This was usually preceded by a language parsing

system that would decompose the instruction to a sequence of spatial description clauses (Kollar et al., 2010) or path description language (Matuszek et al., 2010). With the introduction of the Vision-and-Language Navigation task (Anderson et al., 2018), several methods have shifted focus to solving this problem in realistic and previously unseen environments (Krantz et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2018; Ku et al., 2020).

In spite of the significant progress achieved on the VLN task on public benchmarks (Gao et al., 2023; An et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024), especially in regards to the mapping and planning (Huang et al., 2023; Krantz and Lee, 2022; Georgakis et al., 2022; An et al., 2024) aspects of the problem, the limited availability of human instruction data still remains a challenge. Recent efforts attempted to alleviate this issue by collecting large numbers of non-navigation related image-caption pairs from the web (Majumdar et al., 2020; Guhur et al., 2021). Instead of relying on task-agnostic data, other methods proposed to enrich current datasets through synthetic generation processes either by augmenting existing instructions (Kamath et al., 2023) using navigation instruction generators (Wang et al., 2022), using semantic maps (Li et al., 2024), or through a speaker model that takes as input sequences of images and semantic labels (Chen et al., 2022). Another line of work ignores the collection of new data altogether and elects to take advantage of the rich pre-trained representations of large vision-language models (Huang et al., 2023; Gadre et al., 2023; Shah et al., 2023; Dorbala et al., 2022) such as CLIP (Radford et al., 2021). While all the aforementioned efforts seek to increase access to data or to aligned vision-language representations, they do not perform any analysis of the underlying navigation concepts in the instructions.

Recently, there has been a number of efforts to use additional linguistic information derived from the dependency parse of a navigation instruction to help in improving performance of the VLN agent, using specialized architectures (Li et al., 2021; Zhang and Kordjamshidi, 2023, 2022; Zhang et al., 2021). However, the previous works employ several heuristics in addition to the noisy, off-the-shelf dependency parse of the instruction which hurts reproducibility as well as linguistic interpretability as to which parts of the instruction actually help.

To tackle these challenges, in this work we propose a Navigation Concept Corpus (NAVCON) where we annotate the instructions in VLN bench-

marks with cognitively motivated concept category tags, and comprehensively evaluate our annotation using human annotators to provide a reliable, general-purpose resource with annotation models that can be used for general language-guided navigation applications.

### 3 Cognitively Inspired Definition of Navigation Concept Classes

We were inspired by brain mapping studies for the identification of core navigation concept classes. Navigation is a basic survival capability that the brain of animals and humans devotes dedicated areas for representing places, headings, boundaries, and path integration:

1. Firing rates of place cells in the hippocampus area of animals increase or decrease based on the animal’s location (Situating Yourself) (O’Keefe and Dostrovsky, 1971).
2. Head direction cells found in limbic system areas (Taube, 2007) fire on the basis of the animal’s head direction independently of the animal’s location (Change Direction).
3. Boundary cells fire on the basis of boundaries of regions in the environment (Solstad et al., 2008) (Change Region).
4. Spatial navigation and orientation rely on locomotion (and its activation of motor, vestibular, and proprioceptive systems). (Taube et al., 2013). From a psychological perspective, (Lynch, 1964)’s classification of spatial behavior includes “paths” as the channels along which individual moves. (Move along a Path).

Following these findings, we identify the four concepts above, namely "situate yourself", "change direction", "change region", and "move along a path" as core navigation concepts (shown in Table 1). Our first task in building NAVCON is to identify and annotate the diverse linguistic realizations of these concepts so that we can train a model that can identify them in a variety of seen and unseen navigation instructions. We detail this effort in Section 4. Table 1 shows the four navigation concept classes included in NAVCON, the annotation labels, and an example of each class.

## 4 Description of NAVCON

Research on Vision-and-Language Navigation has been based on a limited number of publicly available benchmarks. The R2R (Room-to-Room) (Anderson et al., 2018) dataset and its R4R (Room-for-Room) and RxR (Room-Across-Rooms) (Ku et al., 2020) extensions is a prominent, community-standard dataset. For this reason we opted to enrich this dataset (specifically R2R and RxR - Creative Commons Public Licenses) with annotations of the navigation concepts introduced in Section 3. The R2R dataset includes panoramic images of indoor spaces and written language instructions that provide guidance for navigation from one place to another within a space. The RxR dataset is multilingual with longer and more variable paths as well as more fine-grained lower level language instructions. Both R2R and RxR use simulators (Savva et al., 2019) built on a dataset containing real scenes (Chang et al., 2017). Other popular VLN datasets include Touchdown (Chen et al., 2019), ALFRED (Shridhar et al., 2020a), VLN-CE (Krantz et al., 2020) which is R2R but ported in continuous environments rather than a navigation graph, and REVERIE (Qi et al., 2020). REVERIE includes short high-level instructions for executing household tasks where the end location is an object, while ALFRED operates in a purely synthetic environment.

We have determined that R2R and RxR are the most suitable datasets for building NAVCON, due to their detailed instructions and challenging paths situated in real environments.

NAVCON contains annotations of instructions taken from the following two VLN datasets<sup>2</sup>: a) R2R VLNCE: Room-to-Room Vision and Language Navigation in Continuous Environments (Krantz et al., 2020) and b) RxR VLNCE: Room-Across-Room Vision and Language Navigation in Continuous Environments (Ku et al., 2020). Table 2 shows the number of English instructions included in the two datasets across four data splits. We processed and generated annotations for the total of 30,815 instructions in the training split of the two datasets. The methodology we used to generate these large scale annotations with minimal human annotation effort is detailed in the next subsections. Figure 1 outlines all the processing steps.

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/jacobkrantz/VLN-CE>

Concept Class	Abbreviation	Example
Situate Yourself	SIT	standing in front of that pillar
Move along a Path	MOVE	step into this area with a large pool
Change Direction	CD	turn around from the bench
Change Region	CR	enter the room that is in front of you

Table 1: Navigation concept classes and example instantiations.




Figure 1: Outline of processing steps for the generation of NAVCON annotations

#### 4.1 Identification and Annotation of Navigation Concepts

For the identification of linguistic realizations of the four navigation concept classes we defined the following subtasks: a) retrieve and evaluate unique root verbs, b) generate a list of navigation verbs, c) retrieve and clean up the verb phrases anchored by the root verbs including syntactic children.

For the retrieval of unique root verbs we ran a full NLP pipeline including tokenization, lemmatization, part-of-speech tagging<sup>3</sup>, and syntactic parse for 30,815 R2R and RxR instructions. For the syntactic parse, we used the Stanza constituency parser<sup>4</sup>. We identified 348 instances of root verbs (with a V part-of-speech tag and being a syntactic head of the verb phrase). The list of 348 verbs was evaluated by humans to identify the verbs participating in a navigation instruction. This process resulted in a list of 81 root navigation verbs unambiguously mapped into the four navigation concepts. The distribution of the 81 ROOT VERBS in the taxonomy across the four concept classes: Situate: 29 (36%), Move: 33 (40%), Change Direction: 11 (14%), and Change Region: 8 (10%).

Next, using the output of the syntactic parse, we retrieved all the instances of the 81 ROOT VERBS and their syntactic children. A total of 244,894 verb phrases headed by a NAVCON root verb were retrieved. Note that although the range of identified root verbs is limited, the range of children which often include important navigation landmarks and other words co-occurring with NAVCON roots is

broad. After a cursory analysis of the output and clean-up (e.g., removing instances of phrases with two root verbs), we obtained automatic annotations of **236,316 linguistic instantiations of navigation concepts**.

Figure 2 illustrates the distribution of the four classes of navigation concepts across the 30,815 instructions included in NAVCON. Instruction counts and percentages for more than 10 instances per instruction were omitted from the charts for visual clarity. The following number of instructions that have at least 1 occurrence of each concept: Situate: 10,811 (35%), Move: 6,397 (21%), Change Direction: 8,734 (28%), and Change Region: 8,299 (27%). In addition, we counted 8,560 instructions that have at least one occurrence of all four concepts. This distribution confirms that NAVCON includes sufficient representation of all the concept classes. We also measured the occurrences of individual root verbs in NAVCON instantiations. These numbers are proportionate to the reported concept distributions. A total of 70 root verbs were present in the final set out of the 81 included in our taxonomy. We note here the top 5 root verbs and their frequency of occurrence in NAVCON: 1) TURN: 51,768, 2) WALK: 29,848, 3) MOVE: 24,250, 4) GO: 22,081, and 5) FACE: 18,210.

#### 4.2 Human Evaluation of Automatically Annotated Concepts

To evaluate the quality of annotations generated by the methodology described in the previous section, we conducted a human evaluation study. We randomly extracted 300 instances of silver concept annotations resulting from our approach. Two an-

<sup>3</sup><https://spacy.io/usage/linguistic-features>

<sup>4</sup><https://stanfordnlp.github.io/stanza/constituency.html>

Dataset	Train	Test	Val Seen	Val Unseen
R2R VLNCE	10,819	3,408	778	1,839
RxR VLNCE	19,996	3,186	2255	3,669

Table 2: Size of English instructions in the R2R & RxR datasets




Figure 2: Distribution of navigation concepts in NAVCON. Instruction counts and percentages for more than 10 instances per instruction have been omitted from the charts for visual clarity.

Concept	Annotated Phrases	Percentage
Situate	65,765	28%
Move	98,418	42%
Change Direction	51,798	22%
Change Region	20,335	9%

Table 3: Distribution of NAVCON annotations

notators evaluated the accuracy of a) the detected text and b) the assigned concept label. The annotators were presented with a) the full text of the instruction, b) the identified concepts, and c) the text corresponding to each identified concept. Each identified concept was marked as *correct*, *incorrect*, or *missing*. A concept was marked missing when the instruction included a concept that was missed by our silver annotation method. Each textual span associated with a concept was evaluated as *correct*, *partially correct*, or *missing*. As shown in Table 4, our method of identifying concept instantiations missed identifying less than 4% of instantiated concepts and correctly identified the corresponding textual spans for over 95% of cases.

To further evaluate the quality of the textual annotations in NAVCON, we trained and tested a concept identification model using NAVCON annotations presented in Section 5.1.

Overlap	Textual Span	Concept Class
Correct	95.49%	95.82%
Incorrect	0.31%	0.88%
Partial	0.79%	N/A
Missing	3.39%	3.28%

Table 4: Human evaluation of automatically annotated concepts and corresponding textual spans

### 4.3 Identification and Annotation of Concepts on Video

To enable training of cross-modal models for VLN tasks, NAVCON includes video frames corresponding to the annotated navigation concepts. To identify and retrieve the corresponding video frames, we utilized the timestamps that are included in the text instructions in the RxR dataset. The timestamp of each word corresponds to the time when that part of instruction was uttered. We utilized this mapping to annotate the correspondence of a linguistic instantiation of a navigation concept (the entire phrase) with the corresponding sequence of images. Henceforth, we will refer to a sequence of video frames corresponding to a navigation concept as a video-clip.

Specifically, the video frames are extracted from

the RxR dataset using the Habitat Simulator<sup>5</sup>. First, we downloaded the guide annotations and their corresponding pose traces from RxR. Guide annotations contain the instruction id and scene id which allowed us to extract the scene from Matterport 3D for each episode. For each instruction, we initialized an agent in Habitat and obtained agent positions and rotations from pose traces of the instruction. At each timestep, we configured the agent with the current pose in Habitat using previously obtained position and rotation parameters. Once we placed the agent, we obtained RGBD observations through its camera and stored them as images. We repeated this process for all instructions.

We encountered several challenges during the image retrieval process. Firstly, not all words in the RxR dataset had matching timestamps. For those that were missing, we interpolated the timestamps based on the nearest neighbors. Secondly, in some cases, phrases instead of words had timestamps mapped. We split the phrase at white-space into words so that each word received the corresponding timestamp. Thirdly, some timestamps-word mappings in RxR are not accurate which led to alignment issues when extracting the video frames. We addressed this problem by extending the timestamp window at the end of each clip to include the concept content (eg.movement) in extracted frames.

During image retrieval, we sampled 1 out of every 10 consecutive video frames to include in the NAVCON dataset. Sampling the frames significantly reduced dataset size and allowed much faster rendering while retaining visual continuity. We set the output image resolution to 320 px x 240 px for retrieval speed and storage size considerations. A total of 7.6 million frames were extracted from RxR using Habitat Simulator and 2.7 million frames were mapped to corresponding concepts. As a result, we are able to include in the release of NAVCON 2.7 million video frames paired with corresponding concepts for 19,074 instructions. To our knowledge, NAVCON is the first dataset that offers paired text-video annotations of core navigation concepts at this scale.

#### 4.4 Evaluation of Concept-Video Pairings

The evaluations are done by human annotators on 100 clips from 10 randomly sampled instructions.

The annotators were presented with the concepts and the corresponding video frames for each concept. The annotators evaluated if the aligned sequence was an *exact match* or incomplete match of the corresponding navigation concept. An *exact match* is when the sequence of images displays the navigation concept. For example, an exact match pairing of the annotation *you are standing in front of the mirror* would show a sequence of images displaying a mirror. An exact pairing for *walk towards the living room* would show a sequence of images showing that the agent is moving closer to the living-room and so forth. We show an example of exact match instances in Figure 3. An *incomplete match* is when the sequence of images is a partial match of the corresponding concept. For example, if for the annotation of *turn left into the living-room*, the sequence of images does not show the living room or any other indication of turning.

Incomplete matches occurs when the agent’s pose changes at a specific time step do not align with the words corresponding to the movement as the accuracy of concept-video pairings relies heavily on the accuracy of word-timestamp mappings available in the RxR dataset. In these cases, we would need to extract extra frames in order to achieve an accurate pairing. We found that around 44% of clips classified as movement (i.e. "move" and "change region") did not have any changes in their corresponding pose sequences. We analyzed the problematic clips and found that extending the extraction time window by 5% of the entire video sequence length increased the prediction accuracy from 73.6% to 88.6% (see Table 5). This is because extending the extraction window helped with including delayed pose changes that occurred in about half of the clips with movement concepts due to inaccurate timestamp-word mapping of the RxR data that our dataset built upon.

## 5 Training Concept Navigation Models

### 5.1 Navigation Concept Classifier (NCC)

The success of a model trained on annotated datasets reflects the quality of the provided annotations. To further evaluate the quality and usefulness of the annotations in NAVCON, we trained a model which identifies navigation concepts and their corresponding phrases. To achieve this, we trained a Navigation Concept Classifier (NCC) to predict for each word in the input text if it belongs to one of five classes; the four navigation

<sup>5</sup><https://aihabitat.org/>




Figure 3: Example of concept-clip alignments in NAVCON. Timesteps progress from left to right.

	<b>% Clips before window extension</b>	<b>% Clips after window extension</b>
Exact Match	73.63%	88.62%
Incomplete Match	26.37%	11.38%

Table 5: Accuracy of concept-clip alignments

concepts and one out-of-class. We fine-tuned a light-weight general purpose language representation model, distilbert-base-uncased<sup>6</sup> (Sanh et al., 2019) using 30,629 annotated instructions. For the training, each word was assigned a label out of the five classes mentioned above.

Distilbert-base-uncased requires a BIO format for training data. A prefix "B-" was added for the first word of the concept phrase signifying beginning of the concept phrase and prefix "I-" was added for the remaining words in the concept phrase. We fine-tuned the classifier with a learning rate of  $10^{-5}$  over 6 epochs. The training and validation set characteristics are shown in Figure 4. For the cross validation evaluation, we tested both the correct identification of the phrase instantiating a navigation concept and the prediction of the concept type. For every instruction, we first evaluated the accuracy of the predicted label. If a concept was predicted correctly, then we measured the percentage of intersection between the ground truth concept phrase and the predicted concept phrase. If a concept was not predicted correctly, then this instance and the corresponding phrase were mea-

sured as erroneous. The percentage of overlap between the ground truth phrase and the predicted phrase was measured as a ratio of overlapping tokens to all the tokens of the ground truth data, see Table 6. Specifically, we show the results for 100%, 75%, 50%, 25% and 0% phrase match. The category of 0% includes all the concepts that were not predicted correctly regardless of the corresponding phrase. In other words, we assumed 0% phrase match for incorrect concepts. We share the evaluation outputs with the NAVCON dataset. The performance of the navigation concept classifier exceeded our expectation, yielding a 96.53% accuracy for predicting the concept and the exact phrase that corresponds to the concept.

Training a concept classifier model that successfully identifies core navigation concepts and the textual spans that describes them provides solid evidence that our approach to generating silver annotations of navigation concepts at scale is valid and that the annotations are reliable.

## 5.2 Few Shot Learning with GPT-4o

Given the recent success of Large Language Models in few-shot learning, it is reasonable to ask whether we could use few shot learning with LLMs

<sup>6</sup><https://huggingface.co/distilbert-base-uncased>




Figure 4: Navigation Concept Classifier (NCC) training and validation characteristics

% Concept Phrase Overlap	# of Concepts	% of Concepts
0	7,842	3.41%
1-25	3	0.00%
25-50	16	0.01%
50-75	50	0.02%
75-99	69	0.03%
100	222,043	96.53%

Table 6: Evaluation of Navigation Concept Classifier (NCC)

to generate silver annotations of high level navigation concepts. In preliminary studies that we ran with GPT-3 text-davinci-003 and GPT-4, the performance was not worthy of consideration. However, GPT-4o showed to be promising, but not as good as the NLP pipeline method.

In what follows, we report the results of identifying navigation concepts by using few-shot learning with GPT-4o. Specifically, we use the prompt used in A.0.1. The prompt describes the task of predicting navigation concepts, followed by 3 examples of navigation instructions and their corresponding navigation concepts.

To evaluate the predictions from the GPT-4o model we adopted the same approach as stated in section 5.1. We passed the prompt (see Appendix A.0.1) along with 3 instructions from the gold dataset (refer Table 4). These instructions are part of NAVCON and were validated by the annotators. Once, GPT-4o received the tokenized and tagged few-shot examples, it learned the associations between key phrases and navigation concepts. We then instructed GPT-4o to assign concept tags to each of the words of 190 unseen instructions (from the same gold dataset) that had 1,521 concepts.

In Table 7 we see that GPT-4o performance from few-shot NAVCON yielding a 82.12% accuracy

% Concept Phrase Overlap	# of Concepts	% of Concepts
0	270	17.75%
1-25	0	0.00%
25-50	0	0.00%
50-75	2	0.13%
75-99	0	0.00%
100	1249	82.12%

Table 7: Evaluation of Generations by GPT-4 model after few shot examples from NAVCON

for predicting the complete concept and the exact phrase.

## 6 Limitations

NAVCON primarily relies on Stanza Constituency Parser to extract verb phrases and we understand the accuracy of such parsers is not perfect. Furthermore, the video frames extracted are limited by the accuracy of word-timestamp mapping in the RXR dataset as well as the rendering artifacts of the Habitat simulator.

## 7 Conclusion

We introduced four core, cognitively motivated and linguistically grounded, NAVigation CONcepts. We suspect that these four concepts may account for most if not all naturally occurring navigation instructions. We created NAVCON, a corpus with annotations of navigation concepts for thirty thousand navigation instructions in the R2R and RxR benchmarks. The corpus counts 200K language instantiations of navigation concepts. We paired the language navigation annotations with over 2.7 million corresponding video-clip frames. The dataset is released under the Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0). We provided evidence for the quality and usefulness of the annotations



with a) human evaluation studies and b) experiments with few-shot learning of GPT-4o.

We anticipate that future VLN studies will benefit from NAVCON in two important ways: 1) It will render results more interpretable by examining the association of actions to higher level navigation concepts, and 2) the intermediate representation of the navigation concepts will facilitate simpler alignment of language instructions to sequential visual inputs.

## References

- Dong An, Yuankai Qi, Yangguang Li, Yan Huang, Liang Wang, Tieniu Tan, and Jing Shao. 2023. Bevbert: Topo-metric map pre-training for language-guided navigation. *International Conference on Computer Vision*.
- Dong An, Hanqing Wang, Wenguan Wang, Zun Wang, Yan Huang, Keji He, and Liang Wang. 2024. Etpnav: Evolving topological planning for vision-language navigation in continuous environments. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*.
- Peter Anderson, Ayush Shrivastava, Joanne Truong, Arjun Majumdar, Devi Parikh, Dhruv Batra, and Stefan Lee. 2021. Sim-to-real transfer for vision-and-language navigation. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 671–681. PMLR.
- Peter Anderson, Qi Wu, Damien Teney, Jake Bruce, Mark Johnson, Niko Sünderhauf, Ian Reid, Stephen Gould, and Anton Van Den Hengel. 2018. Vision-and-language navigation: Interpreting visually-grounded navigation instructions in real environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3674–3683.
- Valts Blukis, Dipendra Misra, Ross A Knepper, and Yoav Artzi. 2018. Mapping navigation instructions to continuous control actions with position-visitation prediction. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 505–518. PMLR.
- Angel Chang, Angela Dai, Thomas Funkhouser, Maciej Halber, Matthias Niessner, Manolis Savva, Shuran Song, Andy Zeng, and Yinda Zhang. 2017. Matterport3d: Learning from rgb-d data in indoor environments. *International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*.
- Howard Chen, Alane Suhr, Dipendra Misra, Noah Snaveley, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Touchdown: Natural language navigation and spatial reasoning in visual street environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12538–12547.
- Jiaqi Chen, Bingqian Lin, Ran Xu, Zhenhua Chai, Xiaodan Liang, and Kwan-Yee K Wong. 2024. Mapgpt: Map-guided prompting for unified vision-and-language navigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07314*.
- Shizhe Chen, Pierre-Louis Guhur, Makarand Tapaswi, Cordelia Schmid, and Ivan Laptev. 2022. Learning from unlabeled 3d environments for vision-and-language navigation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 638–655. Springer.
- Vishnu Sashank Dorbala, Gunnar Sigurdsson, Robinson Piramuthu, Jesse Thomason, and Gaurav S Sukhatme. 2022. Clip-nav: Using clip for zero-shot vision-and-language navigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.16649*.
- Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Ludwig Schmidt, and Shuran Song. 2023. Cows on pasture: Baselines and benchmarks for language-driven zero-shot object navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 23171–23181.
- Chen Gao, Xingyu Peng, Mi Yan, He Wang, Lirong Yang, Haibing Ren, Hongsheng Li, and Si Liu. 2023. Adaptive zone-aware hierarchical planner for vision-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14911–14920.
- Georgios Georgakis, Karl Schmeckpeper, Karan Wanchoo, Soham Dan, Eleni Miltsakaki, Dan Roth, and Kostas Daniilidis. 2022. Cross-modal map learning for vision and language navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15460–15470.
- Pierre-Louis Guhur, Makarand Tapaswi, Shizhe Chen, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. 2021. Airbert: In-domain pretraining for vision-and-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1634–1643.
- Chenguang Huang, Oier Mees, Andy Zeng, and Wolfram Burgard. 2023. Visual language maps for robot navigation. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 10608–10615. IEEE.
- Aishwarya Kamath, Peter Anderson, Su Wang, Jing Yu Koh, Alexander Ku, Austin Waters, Yinfei Yang, Jason Baldridge, and Zarana Parekh. 2023. A new path: Scaling vision-and-language navigation with synthetic instructions and imitation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10813–10823.
- Byeonghwi Kim, Suvaansh Bhambri, Kunal Pratap Singh, Roozbeh Mottaghi, and Jonghyun Choi. 2021. Agent with the big picture: Perceiving surroundings for interactive instruction following. In *Embodied AI Workshop CVPR*.

- Thomas Kollar, Stefanie Tellex, Deb Roy, and Nicholas Roy. 2010. Toward understanding natural language directions. In *2010 5th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*, pages 259–266. IEEE.
- Jacob Krantz and Stefan Lee. 2022. Sim-2-sim transfer for vision-and-language navigation in continuous environments. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*.
- Jacob Krantz, Erik Wijmans, Arjun Majumdar, Dhruv Batra, and Stefan Lee. 2020. Beyond the nav-graph: Vision-and-language navigation in continuous environments. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*.
- Alexander Ku, Peter Anderson, Roma Patel, Eugene Ie, and Jason Baldridge. 2020. Room-Across-Room: Multilingual vision-and-language navigation with dense spatiotemporal grounding. In *Conference on Empirical Methods for Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Chengzu Li, Chao Zhang, Simone Teufel, Rama Sanand Doddipatla, and Svetlana Stoyanchev. 2024. Semantic map-based generation of navigation instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19603*.
- Jialu Li, Hao Tan, and Mohit Bansal. 2021. Improving cross-modal alignment in vision language navigation via syntactic information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.09580*.
- Kevin Lynch. 1964. *The image of the city*. MIT press.
- Arjun Majumdar, Ayush Shrivastava, Stefan Lee, Peter Anderson, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. 2020. Improving vision-and-language navigation with image-text pairs from the web. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 259–274. Springer.
- Cynthia Matuszek, Dieter Fox, and Karl Koscher. 2010. Following directions using statistical machine translation. In *2010 5th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*, pages 251–258. IEEE.
- So Yeon Min, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Pradeep Ravikumar, Yonatan Bisk, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2021. Film: Following instructions in language with modular methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07342*.
- Dipendra Misra, Andrew Bennett, Valts Blukis, Eyvind Niklasson, Max Shatkhin, and Yoav Artzi. 2018. Mapping instructions to actions in 3d environments with visual goal prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.00786*.
- John O’Keefe and Jonathan Dostrovsky. 1971. The hippocampus as a spatial map: preliminary evidence from unit activity in the freely-moving rat. *Brain research*.
- Yuankai Qi, Qi Wu, Peter Anderson, Xin Wang, William Yang Wang, Chunhua Shen, and Anton van den Hengel. 2020. Reverie: Remote embodied visual referring expression in real indoor environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9982–9991.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.
- Manolis Savva, Abhishek Kadian, Oleksandr Maksymets, Yili Zhao, Erik Wijmans, Bhavana Jain, Julian Straub, Jia Liu, Vladlen Koltun, Jitendra Malik, et al. 2019. Habitat: A platform for embodied ai research. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9339–9347.
- Dhruv Shah, Błażej Osiniński, Sergey Levine, et al. 2023. Lm-nav: Robotic navigation with large pre-trained models of language, vision, and action. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 492–504. PMLR.
- Sheng Shen, Liunian Harold Li, Hao Tan, Mohit Bansal, Anna Rohrbach, Kai-Wei Chang, Zhewei Yao, and Kurt Keutzer. 2021. How much can clip benefit vision-and-language tasks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06383*, 3.
- Mohit Shridhar, Jesse Thomason, Daniel Gordon, Yonatan Bisk, Winson Han, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Dieter Fox. 2020a. Alfred: A benchmark for interpreting grounded instructions for everyday tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10740–10749.
- Mohit Shridhar, Xingdi Yuan, Marc-Alexandre Côté, Yonatan Bisk, Adam Trischler, and Matthew Hausknecht. 2020b. Alfworld: Aligning text and embodied environments for interactive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03768*.
- Trygve Solstad, Charlotte N Boccara, Emilio Kropff, May-Britt Moser, and Edvard I Moser. 2008. Representation of geometric borders in the entorhinal cortex. *Science*, 322(5909):1865–1868.
- Jeffrey S Taube. 2007. The head direction signal: origins and sensory-motor integration. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.*, 30:181–207.
- Jeffrey S Taube, Stephane Valerio, and Ryan M Yoder. 2013. Is navigation in virtual reality with fmri really navigation? *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 25(7):1008–1019.

Stefanie Tellex, Thomas Kollar, Steven Dickerson, Matthew Walter, Ashis Banerjee, Seth Teller, and Nicholas Roy. 2011. Understanding natural language commands for robotic navigation and mobile manipulation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 25.

Su Wang, Ceslee Montgomery, Jordi Orbay, Vighnesh Birodkar, Aleksandra Faust, Izzeddin Gur, Natasha Jaques, Austin Waters, Jason Baldrige, and Peter Anderson. 2022. Less is more: Generating grounded navigation instructions from landmarks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15428–15438.

Xin Wang, Wenhan Xiong, Hongmin Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2018. Look before you leap: Bridging model-free and model-based reinforcement learning for planned-ahead vision-and-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 37–53.

Yue Zhang, Quan Guo, and Parisa Kordjamshidi. 2021. Towards navigation by reasoning over spatial configurations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.06839*.

Yue Zhang and Parisa Kordjamshidi. 2022. Explicit object relation alignment for vision and language navigation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 322–331.

Yue Zhang and Parisa Kordjamshidi. 2023. Vln-trans, translator for the vision and language navigation agent. In *The 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL-2023)*.

W Zhu, Y Qi, P Narayana, K Sone, S Basu, XE Wang, Q Wu, M Eckstein, and WY Wang. Diagnosing vision-and-language navigation: What really matters. arxiv 2021. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.16561*.

Yi Zhu, Yue Weng, Fengda Zhu, Xiaodan Liang, Qixiang Ye, Yutong Lu, and Jianbin Jiao. 2021. Self-motivated communication agent for real-world vision-dialog navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1594–1603.

## A Appendix / supplemental material

### A.0.1 Experiments with GPT-4o

Prompt for GPT-4o fewshot: *I will give you a navigation instruction in a list format. Follow the same tokens, don't change, add, or remove anything from the list. The first element of the tuples in Values List is the tokenized words from the instruction in sequence. The second element are their acronyms: O means out of class, CR means change region, CD means change direction, SIT means situate, MOVE means move along the path. The four acronyms (CR, CD, SIT, MOVE) have a prefix in the json, which is B- or I-. B- means it is in the beginning of the phrase. I- means it is in the remaining*

*part of the phrase. Please add the value tag to the instruction. Both the Instruction List and the Values List must have the same count.*

*Instruction: ['right', 'now', 'you', 'are', 'standing', 'at', 'the', 'entrance', 'of', 'the', 'room', 'in', 'which', 'you', 'have', 'two', 'white', 'tables', 'and', 'two', 'black', 'chairs', 'turn', 'around', 'and', 'exit', 'the', 'room', 'through', 'the', 'open', 'door', 'and', 'now', 'turn', 'right', 'and', 'walk', 'straight', 'on', 'the', 'right', 'hand', 'side', 'you', 'can', 'see', 'the', 'open', 'door', 'enter', 'into', 'it', 'it', 'is', 'an', 'empty', 'room', 'turn', 'around', 'and', 'exit', 'the', 'room', 'through', 'the', 'same', 'entrance', 'door', 'and', 'now', 'turn', 'left', 'and', 'go', 'straight', 'now', 'you', 'have', 'crossed', 'the', 'semicircle', 'round', 'pillar', 'go', 'straight', 'keep', 'going', 'straight', 'now', 'you', 'have', 'been', 'crossed', 'the', 'second', 'semi', 'circle', 'pillar', 'keep', 'moving', 'straight', 'now', 'on', 'the', 'left', 'hand', 'side', 'you', 'can', 'see', 'the', 'semi', 'circle', 'third', 'pillar', 'and', 'now', 'turn', 'right', 'you', 'can', 'see', 'the', 'open', 'door', 'enter', 'into', 'the', 'open', 'door', 'room', 'and', 'move', 'towards', 'the', 'carton', 'boxes', 'which', 'are', 'present', 'under', 'the', 'white', 'table', 'right', 'in', 'front', 'of', 'the', 'carton', 'boxes', 'in', 'the', 'middle', 'of', 'the', 'room', 'that', 'is', 'the', 'end', 'point.']*

*Values List: [('right', 'O'), ('now', 'O'), ('you', 'O'), ('are', 'O'), ('standing', 'B-SIT'), ('at', 'I-SIT'), ('the', 'I-SIT'), ('entrance', 'I-SIT'), ('of', 'I-SIT'), ('the', 'I-SIT'), ('room', 'I-SIT'), ('in', 'I-SIT'), ('which', 'I-SIT'), ('you', 'I-SIT'), ('have', 'I-SIT'), ('two', 'I-SIT'), ('white', 'I-SIT'), ('tables', 'I-SIT'), ('and', 'I-SIT'), ('two', 'I-SIT'), ('black', 'I-SIT'), ('chairs', 'I-SIT'), ('turn', 'B-CD'), ('around', 'I-CD'), ('and', 'O'), ('exit', 'B-CR'), ('the', 'I-CR'), ('room', 'I-CR'), ('through', 'I-CR'), ('the', 'I-CR'), ('open', 'I-CR'), ('door', 'I-CR'), ('and', 'O'), ('now', 'O'), ('turn', 'B-CD'), ('right', 'I-CD'), ('and', 'O'), ('walk', 'O'), ('straight', 'O'), ('on', 'O'), ('the', 'O'), ('right', 'O'), ('hand', 'O'), ('side', 'O'), ('you', 'O'), ('can', 'O'), ('see', 'B-SIT'), ('the', 'I-SIT'), ('open', 'I-SIT'), ('door', 'I-SIT'), ('enter', 'B-CR'), ('into', 'I-CR'), ('it', 'I-CR'), ('it', 'O'), ('is', 'O'), ('an', 'O'), ('empty', 'O'), ('room', 'O'), ('turn', 'B-CD'), ('around', 'I-CD'), ('and', 'O'), ('exit', 'B-CR'), ('the', 'I-CR'), ('room', 'I-CR'), ('through', 'I-CR'), ('the', 'I-CR'), ('same', 'I-CR'), ('entrance', 'I-CR'), ('door', 'I-CR'), ('and', 'O'), ('now', 'O'), ('turn', 'B-CD'), ('left', 'I-CD'), ('and', 'O'), ('go', 'O'), ('straight', 'O'), ('now', 'O'), ('you', 'O'), ('have', 'O'), ('crossed', 'O'), ('the', 'O'), ('semicircle', 'O'), ('round', 'O'), ('pillar', 'O'), ('go', 'B-MOVE'), ('straight', 'I-MOVE'), ('keep', 'I-MOVE'), ('going', 'I-MOVE'), ('straight', 'I-MOVE'), ('now', 'O'), ('you', 'O'), ('have', 'O'), ('been', 'O'), ('crossed', 'O'), ('the', 'O'), ('second', 'O'), ('semi', 'O'), ('circle', 'O'), ('pillar', 'O'), ('keep', 'B-MOVE'), ('moving', 'I-MOVE'), ('straight', 'I-MOVE'), ('now', 'O'), ('on', 'O'),*

(‘the’, ‘O’), (‘left’, ‘O’), (‘hand’, ‘O’), (‘side’, ‘O’), (‘you’, ‘O’), (‘can’, ‘O’), (‘see’, ‘O’), (‘the’, ‘O’), (‘semi’, ‘O’), (‘circle’, ‘O’), (‘third’, ‘O’), (‘pillar’, ‘O’), (‘and’, ‘O’), (‘now’, ‘O’), (‘turn’, ‘B-CD’), (‘right’, ‘I-CD’), (‘you’, ‘O’), (‘can’, ‘O’), (‘see’, ‘B-SIT’), (‘the’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘open’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘door’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘enter’, ‘B-CR’), (‘into’, ‘I-CR’), (‘the’, ‘I-CR’), (‘open’, ‘I-CR’), (‘door’, ‘I-CR’), (‘room’, ‘I-CR’), (‘and’, ‘O’), (‘move’, ‘B-MOVE’), (‘towards’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘carton’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘boxes’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘which’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘are’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘present’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘under’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘white’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘table’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘right’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘in’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘front’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘of’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘carton’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘boxes’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘in’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘middle’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘of’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘room’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘that’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘is’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘end’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘point’, ‘I-MOVE’)]

Instruction: [‘begin’, ‘in’, ‘a’, ‘bedroom’, ‘with’, ‘a’, ‘kitchen.’, ‘head’, ‘to’, ‘the’, ‘left’, ‘of’, ‘the’, ‘blue’, ‘rug’, ‘next’, ‘to’, ‘the’, ‘fridge.’]

Values List: [(‘begin’, ‘O’), (‘in’, ‘O’), (‘a’, ‘O’), (‘bedroom’, ‘O’), (‘with’, ‘O’), (‘a’, ‘O’), (‘kitchen.’, ‘O’), (‘head’, ‘B-MOVE’), (‘to’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘left’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘of’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘blue’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘rug’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘next’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘to’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘fridge.’, ‘I-MOVE’)]

Instruction: [‘you’, ‘are’, ‘facing’, ‘a’, ‘wall’, ‘with’, ‘a’, ‘view’, ‘on’, ‘the’, ‘left’, ‘outside.’, ‘turn’, ‘right’, ‘and’, ‘walk’, ‘inside’, ‘the’, ‘house’, ‘to’, ‘the’, ‘front’, ‘of’, ‘the’, ‘silver’, ‘bar’, ‘stools.’, ‘walk’, ‘all’, ‘the’, ‘way’, ‘to’, ‘the’, ‘last’, ‘bar’, ‘stool’, ‘that’, ‘is’, ‘closer’, ‘to’, ‘the’, ‘stairs’, ‘on’, ‘the’, ‘right.’, ‘turn’, ‘right.’, ‘walk’, ‘between’, ‘the’, ‘dining’, ‘room’, ‘table’, ‘and’, ‘the’, ‘back’, ‘of’, ‘the’, ‘white’, ‘couch.’, ‘walk’, ‘around’, ‘the’, ‘white’, ‘couch’, ‘to’, ‘the’, ‘right’, ‘and’, ‘through’, ‘the’, ‘opening’, ‘to’, ‘the’, ‘right.’, ‘you’, ‘will’, ‘see’, ‘a’, ‘black’, ‘and’, ‘white’, ‘picture.’, ‘turn’, ‘left’, ‘and’, ‘take’, ‘the’, ‘first’, ‘right.’, ‘you’, ‘will’, ‘see’, ‘a’, ‘washer’, ‘and’, ‘dryer’, ‘in’, ‘a’, ‘room.’, ‘stay’, ‘in’, ‘the’, ‘threshold’, ‘of’, ‘the’, ‘door.’, ‘you’, ‘are’, ‘done.’]

Values List: [(‘you’, ‘O’), (‘are’, ‘O’), (‘facing’, ‘O’), (‘a’, ‘O’), (‘wall’, ‘O’), (‘with’, ‘O’), (‘a’, ‘O’), (‘view’, ‘O’), (‘on’, ‘O’), (‘the’, ‘O’), (‘left’, ‘O’), (‘outside.’, ‘O’), (‘turn’, ‘B-CD’), (‘right’, ‘I-CD’), (‘and’, ‘O’), (‘walk’, ‘B-MOVE’), (‘inside’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘house’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘to’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘front’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘of’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘silver’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘bar’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘stools.’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘walk’, ‘B-MOVE’), (‘all’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘way’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘to’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘last’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘bar’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘stool’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘that’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘is’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘closer’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘to’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-

MOVE’), (‘stairs’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘on’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘right.’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘turn’, ‘B-CD’), (‘right.’, ‘I-CD’), (‘walk’, ‘O’), (‘between’, ‘O’), (‘the’, ‘O’), (‘dining’, ‘O’), (‘room’, ‘O’), (‘table’, ‘O’), (‘and’, ‘O’), (‘the’, ‘O’), (‘back’, ‘O’), (‘of’, ‘O’), (‘the’, ‘O’), (‘white’, ‘O’), (‘couch.’, ‘O’), (‘walk’, ‘B-MOVE’), (‘around’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘white’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘couch’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘to’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘right’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘and’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘through’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘opening’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘to’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘the’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘right.’, ‘I-MOVE’), (‘you’, ‘O’), (‘will’, ‘O’), (‘see’, ‘B-SIT’), (‘a’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘black’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘and’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘white’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘picture.’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘turn’, ‘B-CD’), (‘left’, ‘I-CD’), (‘and’, ‘O’), (‘take’, ‘O’), (‘the’, ‘O’), (‘first’, ‘O’), (‘right.’, ‘O’), (‘you’, ‘O’), (‘will’, ‘O’), (‘see’, ‘B-SIT’), (‘a’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘washer’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘and’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘dryer’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘in’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘a’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘room.’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘stay’, ‘B-SIT’), (‘in’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘the’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘threshold’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘of’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘the’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘door.’, ‘I-SIT’), (‘you’, ‘O’), (‘are’, ‘O’), (‘done.’, ‘O’)]