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1 Introduction

This poster presents work carried out for my MSc dissertation (de Lhoneux, 2014) at the University of Edinburgh under the supervision of Mark Steedman and Omri Abend.

The goal of our work was to find out whether or not information about Multiword Expressions (MWEs) can improve statistical parsing with Combinatory Categorial Grammar (CCG). This is interesting because information about MWEs has recently been shown to be useful for syntactic parsing and because syntactic parsing is central to NLP. Since MWEs forced a non-modular view of grammar in Linguistics theory: Syntax and the Lexicon are not separate modules in the Grammar, as argued for example in Construction Grammar (Hoffmann and Trousdale, 2013) and since CCG adopts a grammar architecture in which syntactic information is partially encoded in the Lexicon, it seemed also particularly interesting to work on MWEs within the CCG framework.

2 Background studies

Nivre and Nilsson (2004) manually created two versions of a Treebank, one in which MWE units are joined to form a token (commonly called the ‘words-with-spaces’ approach) and one in which they are separate. They tested whether this ‘perfect MWE recognition’ could help parsing accuracy. Korkontzelos and Manandhar (2010) automatically created two versions of an unannotated corpus based on a list of MWEs randomly selected. They observed a gain in parsing accuracy when the test data contained MWEs joined as one token. Both studies limited the types of MWEs dealt with. Two questions remained unanswered: whether or not parsing can benefit from MWE information obtained by automatic MWE recognition and whether or not the representation of MWEs as one unit in a parsing model can improve the parsing model when used with other MWE types.

3 Methodology

For clarity, an unchanged version of the model or data is called A and when a change has been made, it is called B. By training effect is meant that the parser has learnt something useful. By parsing effect is meant that collapsed test data have helped the parser in its decisions.

We worked with CCGbank with the traditional sections 01-22 for training, 00 for development and 23 for testing. The jMWE library (Finlayson and Kulkarni, 2011) was used to detect MWEs in a sentence. Different parameters of the library were used for the different experiments. MWEs were collapsed to one unit in Trees when their units did not cross constituent boundaries, as shown in Figure 1 which is transformed as in Figure 2.

![Figure 1: Original tree](image1)

![Figure 2: Collapsed tree](image2)
Dependency edges between the units of MWEs are discarded as shown in Figure 3 which is collapsed as in Figure 4.

![Figure 3: Original dependency graph](image)

![Figure 4: Collapsed dependency graph](image)

**Evaluation** We computed Precision (P), recall (R) and F1 ($F_1$) of unlabelled dependencies of the output data against the gold standard.

To answer the question of whether or not there is a training effect, we compared the results of outA with outB (with training and test data changed) on goldB. To answer the question of whether or not there is a parsing effect, we compared the results of outA with outB (with test data changed) on goldB. To find out whether or not the recognition method influences the results, we experimented and compared the results of different outB (which we decollapsed) on goldA.

### 4 Results

Due to a shortcoming in the methodology (the algorithm we used to modify MWEs in the Treebank is only capable of dealing with MWEs that do not cross constituent boundaries), adjustments had to be made to obtain a fair comparison of the models. This section gives result which are representative of the trends we observed.

ModelB (with only test data changed) was found to perform slightly but significantly ($p>.05$) better than ModelA on goldB as shown in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collapsed</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$F_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>test (before parsing)</td>
<td>79.83</td>
<td>79.34</td>
<td>79.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>test (after parsing)</td>
<td>79.38</td>
<td>79.60</td>
<td>79.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Parsing effect**

Differences in results obtained with different recognizers are also small but significant (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collapsed</th>
<th>decollapsed</th>
<th>MWE types handled</th>
<th>$F_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>training and test</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>85.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training and test</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>Proper Nouns</td>
<td>85.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training and test</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>Length 2</td>
<td>85.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training and test</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>Stop words</td>
<td>85.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: MWE recognition experimentation**

The results in Table 1 and 2 were cross-validated on goldA: by decollapsing the output of modelB, we obtained an improved performance on goldA. This improvement was however not significant.

### 5 Conclusion

The main contributions of our work are improvements on CCG parsing with automatic MWE recognition with significant results despite limited settings. We have developed techniques for distinguishing training from parsing effects and provided empirical support that there is both training and parsing effects. We have observed differences in results when using different recognizers.

### 6 Future research

For future research, we suggest extending the collapsing algorithm to the non-sibling case, testing more MWE recognition methods with more data, conducting error analysis such as is done in Korkontzelos and Manandhar (2010).
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1The differences between Table 1 and Table 2 are a result of the methodology adjustments we had to make and are not meaningful.
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