# Parser Evaluation

# Parser Evaluation

- View a parse as a set of labeled *brackets* / constituents

S(0,3)

NP(0,1)

PRP(0,1) (but standard evaluation *does not count POS tags*)

VP(1,3), VBD(1,2), NP(2,3), PRP(2,3)



# Parser Evaluation




**S(0,3)**,
**NP(0,2)**,
**NP(2,3)**,
~~PRP(0,1)~~,
~~NN(1,2)~~,
~~PRP(2,3)~~




**S(0,3)**,
**NP(0,1)**,
**VP(1,3)**,
**NP(2,3)**,
~~PRP(0,1)~~,
~~VBD(1,2)~~,
~~PRP(2,3)~~

- Precision: number of correct predictions / number of predictions = 2/3
- Recall: number of correct predictions / number of golds = 2/4
- F1: harmonic mean of precision and recall = $(1/2 * ((2/4)^{-1} + (2/3)^{-1}))^{-1}$

  $= 0.57$ (closer to min)

# Results

- Standard dataset for English: Penn Treebank (Marcus et al., 1993)
- “Vanilla” PCFG: ~71 F1
- Best PCFGs for English: ~90 F1
- State-of-the-art discriminative models (using unlabeled data): 95 F1
- Other languages: results vary widely depending on annotation + complexity of the grammar

# Refining Generative Grammars

# PCFG Independence Assumptions




- Language is not context-free: NPs in different contexts rewrite differently
- [They]$_{NP}$ received [the package of books]$_{NP}$

# Vertical Markovization




Basic tree (v = 1)




v = 2 Markovization

- Why is this a good idea?

# Annotating Trees

- First apply vertical Markovization, then do another transformation during binarization



# Tag Splits

- Can do some other specialized tag splits: e.g., sentential prepositions behave differently from other prepositions

- ~70 F1 => 86.3 F1 using these tricks




Klein and Manning (2003)

# Lexicalized Parsing, Dependency Parsing

# Lexicalized Parsers

- Annotate each grammar symbol with its “head word”: most important word of that constituent
- Rules for identifying headwords (e.g., the last word of an NP before a preposition is typically the head)
- Collins and Charniak (late 90s): ~89 F1 with these



# Lexicalized Parsing



# Dependency Parsing

- Dependency syntax: syntactic structure is defined by these arcs
  - Head (parent, governor) connected to dependent (child, modifier)
  - Each word has exactly one parent except for the ROOT symbol, dependencies must form a directed acyclic graph




- POS tags same as before, usually run a tagger first as preprocessing

# Why are they defined this way?

- Constituency tests:
  - Substitution by *proform*: the dog *did so [ran to the house]*, *he [the dog]* ran to the house
  - Clefting (*It was [to the house] that the dog ran*…)
- Dependency: verb is the root of the clause, everything else follows from that
  - No notion of a VP!

# Dependency Parsing

- Still a notion of hierarchy! Subtrees often align with constituents



# Dependency Parsing

- Can label dependencies according to syntactic function
- Major source of ambiguity is in the structure, so we focus on that more (labeling separately with a classifier works pretty well)



# Dependency vs. Constituency: PP Attachment

- Constituency: several rule productions need to change



# Dependency vs. Constituency: PP Attachment

- Dependency: one word (with) assigned a different parent

the children ate the cake with a spoon

- More predicate-argument focused view of syntax
- "What's the main verb of the sentence? What is its subject and object?" — easier to answer under dependency parsing

# Dependency vs. Constituency: Coordination

- Constituency: ternary rule NP -> NP CC NP






# Dependency vs. Constituency: Coordination

- Dependency: first item is the head



**dogs** in houses **and cats**

[dogs in houses] and cats

dogs in **houses and cats**

dogs in [houses and cats]

- Coordination is decomposed across a few arcs as opposed to being a single rule production as in constituency
- Can also choose *and* to be the head
- In both cases, headword doesn't really represent the phrase — constituency representation makes more sense

# Shift-Reduce Parsing
# (see notes)