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Why POS tagging?

POS tagging is a prerequisite for further analysis:

- **Speech synthesis:**
  - How to pronounce “lead”?
  - INsult or inSULT, OBJect or obJECT, OVERflow or overFLOW,
    DIScount or disCOUNT, CONtent or conTENT

- **Parsing:**
  - What words are in the sentence?

- **Information extraction:**
  - Finding names, relations, etc.

- **Machine Translation:**
  - The noun “content” may have a different translation from the adjective.
POS Tagging

Words often have more than one POS:

- *The back door* (adjective)
- *On my back* (noun)
- *Win the voters back* (particle)
- *Promised to back the bill* (verb)

The POS tagging task is to determine the POS tag for a particular instance of a word.

Since there is ambiguity, we cannot simply look up the correct POS in a dictionary.

These examples from Dekang Lin
Defining a tagset
Defining a tag set

We have to define an inventory of labels for the word classes (i.e. the tag set)

- Most taggers rely on models that have to be trained on annotated (tagged) corpora. Evaluation also requires annotated corpora.
- Since human annotation is expensive/time-consuming, the tag sets used in a few existing labeled corpora become the de facto standard.
- Tag sets need to capture semantically or syntactically important distinctions that can easily be made by trained human annotators.
Defining an annotation scheme

A lot of NLP tasks require systems to map natural language text to another representation:

- POS tagging: Text $\rightarrow$ POS tagged text
- Syntactic Parsing: Text $\rightarrow$ parse trees
- Semantic Parsing: Text $\rightarrow$ meaning representations
- ...: Text $\rightarrow$ ...
Defining an annotation scheme

Training and evaluating models for these NLP tasks requires large **corpora annotated with the desired representations.**

Annotation at scale is expensive, so **a few existing corpora** and their **annotations** and **annotation schemes** (tag sets, etc.) often become the de facto standard for the field.

It is difficult to know what the ‘right’ annotation scheme should be for any particular task

  How difficult is it to achieve high accuracy for that annotation?
  How useful is this annotation scheme for downstream tasks in the pipeline?
  ⇒ We often can’t know the answer until we’ve annotated a lot of data…
Word classes

Open classes:
   Nouns, Verbs, Adjectives, Adverbs

Closed classes:
   Auxiliaries and modal verbs
   Prepositions, Conjunctions
   Pronouns, Determiners
   Particles, Numerals

(see Appendix for details)
Defining a tag set

Tag sets have different granularities:
- Brown corpus (Francis and Kucera 1982): 87 tags
- Penn Treebank (Marcus et al. 1993): 45 tags
- Simplified version of Brown tag set
  (de facto standard for English now)

NN: common noun (singular or mass): water, book
NNS: common noun (plural): books

Prague Dependency Treebank (Czech): 4452 tags
- Complete morphological analysis:
  - AAFP3----3N----: nejnezajímavější
  - Adjective Regular Feminine Plural Dative….Superlative
  [Hajic 2006, VMC tutorial]
How much ambiguity is there?

Most word *types* are unambiguous:

Number of tags per word type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>87-tag Original Brown</th>
<th>45-tag Treebank Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unambiguous (1 tag)</td>
<td>44,019</td>
<td>38,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous (2–7 tags)</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>8844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tags</td>
<td>4,967</td>
<td>6,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 tags</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 tags</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 tags</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 tags</td>
<td>2 (well, beat)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 tags</td>
<td>2 (still, down)</td>
<td>6 (well, set, round, open, fit, down)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 tags</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (’s, half, back, a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 tags</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (that, more, in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: These numbers are based on word/tag combinations in the corpus. Many combinations that don’t occur in the corpus are equally correct.

But a large fraction of word *tokens* are ambiguous

Original Brown corpus: 40% of *tokens* are ambiguous
Evaluating POS taggers
Evaluating POS taggers

Evaluation setup:
Split data into separate training, (development) and test sets.

Better setup: n-fold cross validation:
Split data into $n$ sets of equal size
Run $n$ experiments, using set $i$ to test and remainder to train

This gives average, maximal and minimal accuracies

When comparing two taggers:
Use the same test and training data with the same tag set
Evaluation metric: test accuracy

How many words in the unseen test data can you tag correctly?
  State of the art on Penn Treebank: around 97%.
  ⇒ How many sentences can you tag correctly?

Compare your model against a baseline
  Standard: assign to each word its most likely tag
  (use training corpus to estimate P(t|w) )
  Baseline performance on Penn Treebank: around 93.7%

... and a (human) ceiling
  How often do human annotators agree on the same tag? Penn Treebank: around 97%
Is POS-tagging a solved task?

Penn Treebank POS-tagging accuracy
≈ human ceiling

Yes, but:
Other languages with more complex morphology need much larger tag sets for tagging to be useful, and will contain many more distinct word forms in corpora of the same size

They often have much lower accuracies
Qualitative evaluation

Generate a **confusion matrix** (for development data): How often was a word with tag i mistagged as tag j:

See what errors are causing problems:
- Noun (NN) vs ProperNoun (NNP) vs Adj (JJ)
- Preterite (VBD) vs Participle (VBN) vs Adjective (JJ)
Building a POS tagger
Statistical POS tagging

She promised to back the bill

\[ w = w^{(1)} w^{(2)} w^{(3)} w^{(4)} w^{(5)} w^{(6)} \]

\[ t = t^{(1)} t^{(2)} t^{(3)} t^{(4)} t^{(5)} t^{(6)} \]

PRP VBD TO VB DT NN

What is the most likely sequence of tags \( t = t^{(1)} \ldots t^{(N)} \) for the given sequence of words \( w = w^{(1)} \ldots w^{(N)} \)?

\[ t^* = \arg\max_t P(t \mid w) \]
POS tagging with generative models

\[
\arg\max_t P(t|w) = \arg\max_t \frac{P(t,w)}{P(w)} = \arg\max_t P(t,w) = \arg\max_t P(t)P(w|t)
\]

\(P(t,w)\): the joint distribution of the labels we want to predict \(t\) and the observed data \(w\).

We decompose \(P(t,w)\) into \(P(t)\) and \(P(w|t)\) since these distributions are easier to estimate.

Models based on joint distributions of labels and observed data are called generative models: think of \(P(t)P(w|t)\) as a stochastic process that first generates the labels, and then generates the data we see, based on these labels.
Hidden Markov Models (HMMs)

HMMs are the most commonly used generative models for POS tagging (and other tasks, e.g. in speech recognition) HMMs make specific independence assumptions when defining $P(t)$ and $P(w \mid t)$:

$P(t)$ is an n-gram model over tags:
- Bigram HMM: $P(t) = P(t^{(1)})P(t^{(2)} \mid t^{(1)})P(t^{(3)} \mid t^{(2)}) \ldots P(t^{(N)} \mid t^{(N-1)})$
- Trigram HMM: $P(t) = P(t^{(1)})P(t^{(2)} \mid t^{(1)})P(t^{(3)} \mid t^{(2)}, t^{(1)}) \ldots P(t^{(n)} \mid t^{(N-1)}, t^{(N-2)})$

$P(t_i \mid t_j)$ or $P(t_i \mid t_j, t_k)$ are called transition probabilities

In $P(w \mid t)$ each word is generated by its tag:

$P(w \mid t) = P(w^{(1)} \mid t^{(1)})P(w^{(2)} \mid t^{(2)}) \ldots P(w^{(N)} \mid t^{(N)})$

$P(w \mid t)$ are called emission probabilities
HMMs as probabilistic automata

An HMM defines
 Transition probabilities:
\[ P( t_i | t_j) \]
 Emission probabilities:
\[ P( w_i | t_i) \]
How would the automaton for a trigram HMM with transition probabilities $P(t_i \mid t_j t_k)$ look like?

What about unigrams or n-grams?
Encoding a trigram model as FSA

Bigram model:
States = Tag Unigrams
Trigram model:
States = Tag Bigrams
HMM definition

A HMM $\lambda = (A, B, \pi)$ consists of

- a set of $N$ states $Q = \{q_1, \ldots, q_N\}$
  with $Q_0 \subseteq Q$ a set of initial states
  and $Q_F \subseteq Q$ a set of final (accepting) states

- an output vocabulary of $M$ items $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}$

- an $N \times N$ state transition probability matrix $A$
  with $a_{ij}$ the probability of moving from $q_i$ to $q_j$.
  $(\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij} = 1 \ \forall i; \ 0 \leq a_{ij} \leq 1 \ \forall i, j)$

- an $N \times M$ symbol emission probability matrix $B$
  with $b_{ij}$ the probability of emitting symbol $v_j$ in state $q_i$
  $(\sum_{j=1}^{N} b_{ij} = 1 \ \forall i; \ 0 \leq b_{ij} \leq 1 \ \forall i, j)$

- an initial state distribution vector $\pi = \langle \pi_1, \ldots, \pi_N \rangle$
  with $\pi_i$ the probability of being in state $q_i$ at time $t = 1$.
  $(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_i = 1 \ \ 0 \leq \pi_i \leq 1 \ \forall i)$
An example HMM

Transition Matrix $A$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emission Matrix $B$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>the</th>
<th>man</th>
<th>ball</th>
<th>throws</th>
<th>sees</th>
<th>red</th>
<th>blue</th>
<th>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial state vector $\pi$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\pi$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building an HMM tagger

To build an HMM tagger, we have to:

- **Train** the model, i.e. estimate its parameters (the transition and emission probabilities)
  Easy case: we have a corpus labeled with POS tags (supervised learning)

- Define and implement a **tagging algorithm** that finds the best tag sequence $t^*$ for each input sentence $w$:
  $$t^* = \arg\max_{t} P(t)P(w \mid t)$$
Learning an HMM from *labeled* data

We count how often we see \( t_i t_j \) and \( w_j t_i \) etc. in the data (use relative frequency estimates):

Learning the transition probabilities:

\[
P(t_j | t_i) = \frac{C(t_i t_j)}{C(t_i)}
\]

Learning the emission probabilities:

\[
P(w_j | t_i) = \frac{C(w_j t_i)}{C(t_i)}
\]
We can’t count anymore.
We have to guess how often we’d expect to see \( t_i t_j \) etc. in our data set. Call this expected count \( \langle C(\ldots) \rangle \)

- Our estimate for the transition probabilities:
  \[
  \hat{P}(t_j | t_i) = \frac{\langle C(t_i t_j) \rangle}{\langle C(t_i) \rangle}
  \]

- Our estimate for the emission probabilities:
  \[
  \hat{P}(w_j | t_i) = \frac{\langle C(w_j | t_i) \rangle}{\langle C(t_i) \rangle}
  \]

- We will talk about how to obtain these counts on Friday.
Finding the best tag sequence

The **number of possible tag sequences** is **exponential** in the length of the input sentence:

- Each word can have up to $T$ tags.
- There are $N$ words.
- There are up to $N^T$ possible tag sequences.

We **cannot enumerate** all $N^T$ possible tag sequences.

But we can exploit the **independence assumptions in the HMM** to define an efficient algorithm that returns the tag sequence with the highest probability.
We use a N×T table ("trellis") to keep track of the HMM. The HMM can assign one of the T tags to each of the N words.
Computing $P(t, w)$ for one tag sequence

- One path through the trellis = one tag sequence
- We just multiply the probabilities as before
Using the trellis to find $t^*$

Let $\text{trellis}[i][j]$ (word $w^{(i)}$ and tag $t_j$) store the probability of the best tag sequence for $w^{(1)}\ldots w^{(i)}$ that ends in $t_j$

$$\text{trellis}[i][j] = \max P(w^{(1)}\ldots w^{(i)}, t^{(1)}\ldots, t^{(i)} = t_j)$$

We can recursively compute $\text{trellis}[i][j]$ from the entries in the previous column $\text{trellis}[i-1][j]$

$$\text{trellis}[i][j] = P(w^{(i)}|t_j) \cdot \max (\text{trellis}[i-1][k]P(t_j|t_k))$$

At the end of the sentence, we pick the highest scoring entry in the last column of the trellis
Retrieving $t^{*} = \arg\max_t P(t,w)$

By keeping one backpointer from each cell to the cell in the previous column that yields the highest probability, we can retrieve the most likely tag sequence when we’re done.
More about this on Friday...
Appendix: English parts of speech
Nouns

Nouns describe entities and concepts:

Common nouns: dog, bandwidth, dog, fire, snow, information

- Count nouns have a plural (dogs) and need an article in the singular (the dog barks)
- Mass nouns don’t have a plural (*snows) and don’t need an article in the singular (snow is cold, metal is expensive). But some mass nouns can also be used as count nouns: Gold and silver are metals.

Proper nouns (Names): Mary, Smith, Illinois, USA, France, IBM

Penn Treebank tags:

NN: singular or mass
NNS: plural
NNP: singular proper noun
NNPS: plural proper noun
(Full) verbs

Verbs describe activities, processes, events:

- eat, write, sleep, ....

Verbs have different morphological forms:
- infinitive (to eat), present tense (I eat), 3rd pers sg. present tense (he eats),
- past tense (ate), present participle (eating), past participle (eaten)

Penn Treebank tags:
- VB: infinitive (base) form
- VBD: past tense
- VBG: present participle
- VBN: past participle
- VBP: non-3rd person present tense
- VBZ: 3rd person singular present tense
Adjectives

Adjectives describe properties of entities:
  blue, hot, old, smelly,…

Adjectives have an…
  … attributive use (modifying a noun):
    the blue book
  … and a predicative use (e.g. as argument of be):
    The book is blue.

Many gradable adjectives also have a…
  …comparative form: greater, hotter, better, worse
  …superlative form: greatest, hottest, best, worst

Penn Treebank tags:
  JJ: adjective    JJR: comparative    JJS: superlative
Adverbs

Adverbs describe properties of events/states.
- Manner adverbs: slowly (slower, slowest) fast, hesitantly,…
- Degree adverbs: extremely, very, highly….
- Directional and locative adverbs: here, downstairs, left
- Temporal adverbs: yesterday, Monday,…

Adverbs modify verbs, sentences, adjectives or other adverbs:
  Apparently, the very ill man walks extremely slowly

NB: certain temporal and locative adverbs (yesterday, here)
can also be classified as nouns

Penn Treebank tags:
  RB: adverb   RBR: comparative adverb   RBS: superlative adverb
Auxiliary and modal verbs

Copula:  *be* with a predicate
         She is a student. I am hungry. She was five years old.

Modal verbs: *can, may, must, might, shall,…*
              She can swim. You must come

Auxiliary verbs:
   - *Be, have, will* when used to form complex tenses:
     He was being followed. She has seen him. We will have been gone.
   - *Do* in questions, negation:
     Don’t go. Did you see him?

Penn Treebank tags:
   MD: modal verbs
Prepositions

Prepositions occur before noun phrases to form a prepositional phrase (PP):

- on/in/under/near/towards the wall,
- with(out) milk,
- by the author,
- despite your protest

PPs can modify nouns, verbs or sentences:

- I drink [coffee [with milk]]
- I [drink coffee [with my friends]]

Penn Treebank tags:

- IN: preposition
- TO: ‘to’ (infinitival ‘to eat’ and preposition ‘to you’)
Conjunctions

Coordinating conjunctions conjoin two elements:

X and/or/but X

[ [John]NP and [Mary]NP] NP,
[ [Snow is cold]S but [fire is hot]S ]S.

Subordinating conjunctions introduce a subordinate (embedded) clause:

[ He thinks that [snow is cold]S ]S
[ She wonders whether [it is cold outside]S ]S

Penn Treebank tags:
CC: coordinating
IN: subordinating (same as preposition)
Particles

Particles resemble prepositions (but are not followed by a noun phrase) and appear with verbs:

- come on
- he brushed himself off
- turning the paper over
- turning the paper down

Phrasal verb: a verb + particle combination that has a different meaning from the verb itself

Penn Treebank tags:

- RP: particle
Pronouns

Many pronouns function like noun phrases, and refer to some other entity:
- Personal pronouns: I, you, he, she, it, we, they
- Possessive pronouns: mine, yours, hers, ours
- Demonstrative pronouns: this, that,
- Reflexive pronouns: myself, himself, ourselves
- Wh-pronouns (question words):
  what, who, whom, how, why, whoever, which

Relative pronouns introduce relative clauses
  the book that [he wrote]

Penn Treebank tags:
  PRP: personal pronoun   PRP$: possessive   WP: wh-pronoun
Determiners

Determiners precede noun phrases:
the/that/a/every book

- Articles: the, an, a
- Demonstratives: this, these, that
- Quantifiers: some, every, few,…

Penn Treebank tags:
DT: determiner