Generating Referring Expressions in Open Domains

Advaith Siddharthan & Ann Copestake

as372@cs.columbia.edu & aac10@cl.cam.ac.uk
Structure of Talk—1

- Motivation
- Attribute Selection
  - The Incremental Algorithm (IE) (Reiter and Dale, 1992)
  - Various Problems (Siddharthan and Copestake, 2002)
- Our Approach
- A Comparison
- Relations
- Nominals
- Evaluation
- Conclusions
A former ceremonial officer from Derby, who was at the heart of Whitehall’s patronage machinery, says there is a general review of the state of the honours list every five years or so.
The Incremental Algorithm (IA)

- Reiter and Dale (1992)

- Representation of Entities:

  \[
  \begin{bmatrix}
  \text{type} & \text{dog} \\
  \text{size} & \text{small} \\
  \text{colour} & \text{black}
  \end{bmatrix}
  \]

- Input:
  - intended referent (AVM)
  - contrast set (AVMs)
  - *preferred-attributes* list
    - eg: [colour, size, shape,...]
\[ e_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \text{type} & \text{dog} \\ \text{size} & \text{small} \\ \text{colour} & \text{black} \end{bmatrix}, \quad e_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \text{type} & \text{dog} \\ \text{size} & \text{large} \\ \text{colour} & \text{black} \end{bmatrix} \]

*preferred-attributes* = \{colour, size, shape\}

- **Incremental Step:**
  Add an attribute from *preferred-attributes* that rules out at least one entity in the contrast set.

- **End Condition:**
  All the entities in the contrast set have been ruled out.
  OR
  All the attributes have been used up
Justification

The psycholinguistic justification for the incremental algorithm:

- Humans build up referring expressions incrementally.
- Humans often use sub-optimal expressions.
- There is a preferred order in which humans select attributes
  eg. colour > shape > size...
Problems with the IA

Assumptions:

- A classification scheme for attributes exists
- The values that an attribute can take are mutually exclusive.
  
  eg: $e_1 = \{\text{big dark dog}\}$, $e_2 = \{\text{huge black dog}\}$
- Linguistic realisation of attributes are unambiguous

$$
e_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{type} \\
\text{age} \\
\text{tenure}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\text{president} \\
\text{old} \\
\text{present}
\end{bmatrix}$$

$$
e_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{type} \\
\text{age} \\
\text{tenure}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\text{president} \\
\text{young} \\
\text{past}
\end{bmatrix}$$
Our Approach

- Measures the relatedness of adjectives
- Works at the level of words, not their semantic labels.
- Treats discriminating power as only one criteria for selecting attributes
- Allows for the easy incorporation of other considerations:
  - reference modification
  - reader’s comprehension skills
How useful is an adjective for referencing an entity?

We define three quotients:

- Similarity Quotient ($SQ$)
- Contrastive Quotient ($CQ$)
- Discriminating Quotient ($DQ$)
Similarity Quotient \((SQ)\)

- Quantifies how similar an adjective \(a_o\) is to adjectives describing distractors
- Transitive WordNet synonymy

We form the Sets:
- \(S_1\): WordNet synonyms of \(a_o\)
- \(S_2\): WordNet synonyms of members of \(S_1\)
- \(S_3\): WordNet synonyms of members of \(S_2\)

For each adjective \(a_i\) describing each distractor:
- if \(a_i\) is in \(S_1\), \(SQ^+ = 4\)
- else, if \(a_i\) is in \(S_2\), \(SQ^+ = 2\)
- else, if \(a_i\) is in \(S_3\), \(SQ^+ = 1\)
Contrastive Quotient ($CQ$)

- Quantifies how contrastive an adjective ($a_o$) is to adjectives describing distractors
- Transitive WordNet antonymy
- We form the Sets:
  - $A_1$: WordNet antonyms of $a_o$
  - $A_2$: WordNet synonyms of members of $A_1$ + WordNet antonyms of members of $S_1$
  - $A_3$: WordNet synonyms of members of $A_2$ + WordNet antonyms of members of $S_2$
- For each adjective ($a_i$) describing each distractor:
  - if $a_i$ is in $A_1$, $CQ^+ = 4$
  - else, if $a_i$ is in $A_2$, $CQ^+ = 2$
  - else, if $a_i$ is in $A_3$, $CQ^+ = 1$
An attribute with high $SQ$ has bad discriminating power.

An attribute with high $CQ$ has good discriminating power.

We define the Discriminating Quotient ($DQ$) as

$$DQ = CQ - SQ$$

We now have an order (decreasing $DQ$s) in which to incorporate attributes.
Example—1

Assume we want to refer to $e_1$.

Following a typing system, comparing the $age$ attribute would rule out $e_2$.

We would end up with the old president that is ambiguous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>distractor</th>
<th>CQ</th>
<th>SQ</th>
<th>DQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>$e_2{young, past}$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current</td>
<td>$e_2{young, past}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have four dogs in context: $e_1$ (a large brown dog), $e_2$ (a small black dog), $e_3$ (a tiny white dog) and $e_4$ (a big dark dog).

To refer to $e_4$:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>distractor</th>
<th>CQ</th>
<th>SQ</th>
<th>DQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>$e_1${large, brown}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>$e_2${small, black}</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>$e_3${tiny, white}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the big dark dog
We have four dogs in context: $e_1$(*a large brown dog*), $e_2$(*a small black dog*), $e_3$(*a tiny white dog*) and $e_4$(*a big dark dog*).

To refer to $e_3$:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>distractor</th>
<th>CQ</th>
<th>SQ</th>
<th>DQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tiny</td>
<td>$e_1${large, brown}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiny</td>
<td>$e_2${small, black}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiny</td>
<td>$e_4${big, dark}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the white dog*
The psycholinguistic justification for the incremental algorithm:

1. Humans build up referring expressions incrementally.
2. There is a preferred order in which humans select attributes
   *e.g.* colour > shape > size...

Our algorithm:

- Is also incremental but differs from premise 2
- Assumes that speakers pick out attributes that are distinctive in context
- Averaged over contexts, some attributes have more discriminating power than others (largely because of the way we visualise entities)
- Premise 2 is an approximation to our approach.
$N = \text{Max number of entities in the contrast set}$

$n = \text{Max number of attributes per entity}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incremental Algo</th>
<th>Our Algorithm</th>
<th>Optimal Algo$^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O(nN)$</td>
<td>$O(n^2N)$</td>
<td>$O(n2^N)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ such as Reiter (1990)
Other Considerations

- Discriminating power is only one of many reasons for selecting an attribute.
Attributes can be reference modifying:

- $e_1 = an\ alleged\ murderer$
- *alleged* modifies the reference *murderer*
- *alleged* does not modify the referent $e_1$

We handle reference modifying adjectives trivially by adding a positive weight to their $DQ$s.

This has the effect of forcing that attribute to be selected in the referring expression.
Uncommon adjectives have more discriminating power than common adjectives.

However, they are more likely to be incomprehensible to people with low reading ages.

Giving uncommon adjectives higher weights will generate referring expressions with fewer, though harder to understand, adjectives.

Giving common adjectives higher weights will generate referring expressions with many simple adjectives.
The incremental algorithm assumes the availability of a contrast set of distractors

The contrast set, in general, needs to take context into account

Krahmer and Theune (2002) propose an extension to the incremental algorithm which treats the contrast set as a combination of a discourse domain and a salience function.

Incorporating salience into our algorithm is trivial

- We computed $SQ$ and $CQ$ for an attribute by adding $w \in \{4, 2, 1\}$ to them each time a distractor’s attribute was discovered in a synonym or antonym list.

- We can incorporate salience by weighting $w$ with the salience of the distractor whose attribute we are considering.

- This will result in attributes with high discriminating power with regard to more salient distractors getting selected first in the incremental process.
To Summarise...

- Reference generation belongs in the realisation module, not in microplanning.
- Adjective classification is *unnatural* and infeasable
- Context matters
- Attribute selection is possible regardless
- Discriminating power is only one of many criteria
Relations

\[
d_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{head} \\
\text{attrib} \\
\text{in} \\
\text{near}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{dog} \\
[\text{small}, \text{grey}] \\
\text{b1} \\
\text{d2}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
d_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{head} \\
\text{attrib} \\
\text{outside} \\
\text{near}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{dog} \\
[\text{small}, \text{grey}] \\
\text{b1} \\
\text{d1}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
b_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{head} \\
\text{attrib} \\
\text{containing} \\
\text{near}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{bin} \\
[\text{large}, \text{steel}] \\
\text{d1} \\
\text{d2}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Relations

- **attributes** describe an entity (the small grey dog)
- **relations** relate an entity to other entities (the dog in the big bin)

The IA does not consider relations and the referring expression is constructed out of only attributes.

It is difficult to imagine how relational descriptions can be incorporated in the incremental framework of the IA.

Dale and Haddock (1991) allows for relational descriptions but involves exponential global search.

Our approach computes the order in which attributes are incorporated on the fly, by quantifying their utility through $DQ$.

We can compute $DQ$ for relations in much the same way as we did for attributes.
Graph Approach

Krahmer et al. (2003)
Calculating $DQ$ for Relations

To compute the three quotients for the relation $[prep_o e_o]$:

- We consider each entity $e_i$ in the contrast set in turn.
- If $e_i$ does not have a $prep_o$ relation $CQ^+ = 4$
- If $e_i$ has a $prep_o$ relation:
  - If the object of $e_i$’s $prep_o$ relation is $e_o$ then $SQ^+ = 4$.
  - Else $CQ^+ = 4$.
- For attributes, we defined $DQ = CQ - SQ$.
- For relations, we can define $DQ = (CQ - SQ)/length$
- Approximate $length$ as $length = 3 + n$ where $n$ is number of distractors containing a $prep_o$ relation with a non-$e_o$ object
Attributes are usually used to *identify* an entity

Relations, in most cases, serve to *locate* an entity

Generating instructions for using a machine:

*switch on the red button on the top-left corner*

Generating directions for finding things

*The salt behind the corn flakes on the shelf above the fridge*

If the discourse plan requires preferential selection of relations or attributes, we can add a positive amount $\alpha$ to their $DQ$s

$$DQ = (CQ - SQ)/length + \alpha$$

$length = 1$ for attributes

By default, $\alpha = 0$ for both relations and attributes.
The Algorithm

To generate a referring expression for an entity:

- calculate $DQ$s for all its attributes and approximate the $DQ$s for all its relations.
- form the *preferred* list
- add elements of *preferred* till the contrast set is empty
  - straightforward for attributes
  - For relations, recursively generate the prepositional phrase first
    - check that it hasn’t entered a loop
      - *the dog in the bin containing the dog in the bin...*
    - generate a new contrast set for the object(*bin*)
    - recursively generate a referring expression for the object of the relation
An Example

\[
d1 = \begin{bmatrix}
    \text{head} & \text{dog} \\
    \text{attrib} & \text{[small, grey]} \\
    \text{in} & b1 \\
    \text{near} & d2
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
d2 = \begin{bmatrix}
    \text{head} & \text{dog} \\
    \text{attrib} & \text{[small, grey]} \\
    \text{outside} & b1 \\
    \text{near} & d1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
b1 = \begin{bmatrix}
    \text{head} & \text{bin} \\
    \text{attrib} & \text{[large, steel]} \\
    \text{containing} & d1 \\
    \text{near} & d2
\end{bmatrix}
\]
An Example

Referring Expression for \(d1\)

- \(\text{ContrastSet} = [d2]\)
- \(DQ_{\text{small}} = -4, DQ_{\text{grey}} = -4\)
  \[DQ_{[\text{in } b1]} = 4/3, DQ_{[\text{near } d2]} = 4/4\]
- \(*\text{preferred}*= [[\text{in } b1], [\text{near } d2], \text{small}, \text{grey}]
- \text{iteration 1: } [\text{in } b1]\)
  - \(\text{ContrastSet} \text{ is empty}\)
  - return \{\text{bin}\}
- add the PP \([\text{in the } \{\text{bin}\}]\) to RE
- \(\text{ContrastSet} \text{ is now empty}\)
- return \{[\text{in the } \{\text{bin}\}], \text{dog}\}
Nominals

- Nominals introduced through relations can also be introduced attributively

  1. professor at Columbia ↔ Columbia professor
  2. novel by Archer ↔ Archer novel
  3. president of IBM ↔ IBM president
  4. company from East London ↔ East London company
  5. church in Paris ↔ Paris church

- We need to compare nominal attributes with the objects of relations.

- We also need to extend the algorithm for calculating $DQ$ for a relation
An Example

Also contributing to the firmness in copper, the analyst noted, was a report by Chicago purchasing agents, which precedes the full purchasing agents report that is due out today and gives an indication of what the full report might hold.

\[
e_0 = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{head} & \text{report} \\
\text{by} & \begin{bmatrix}
\text{head} & \text{agents} \\
\text{attrib} & [\text{Chicago, purchasing}] \\
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
e_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{head} & \text{report} \\
\text{attributes} & [\text{full, purchasing, agents}]
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Also contributing to the firmness in copper, the analyst noted, was a report by Chicago purchasing agents. The Chicago report precedes the full purchasing agents report and gives an indication of what the full report might hold. The full report is due out today.
Evaluation

- Notoriously difficult!
- Existing algos are domain specific
- Can’t be compared easily
- No standard test sets
- In fact, no quality evaluations at all!
Evaluation

- Our Algo is open domain
- Evaluation possible on the Penn WSJ Treebank
  - We identified instances of referring expressions,
  - Then identified the antecedent & all the distractors in a four sentence window,
  - Then generated a referring expression for the antecedent, giving it a contrast-set containing the distractors
  - Compared with the ref exp. in the text.
Evaluation

- There were 146 instances of Ref Exps (noun phrases with a definite determiner) for which:
  - An antecedent was found for the referring expression.
  - There was at least one distractor in the discourse window.
  - The ref exp. had at least one attribute or relation.

- 81.5% Perfect!

- Many others seemed ok, some are hard to tell!

- eg: ref exp in WSJ = *the one-day limit*
  antecedent found = *the maximum one-day limit for the S&P 500 stock-index futures contract*

Contrast set = {the five-point opening limit for the contract, the 12-point limit, the 30-point limit, the intermediate limit of 20 points}

Our program generated = *the maximum limit*
Evaluation

- **Examples of Wrong REs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Generate Ref. Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal care products</td>
<td>care products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open end mutual funds</td>
<td>end funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privately funded research</td>
<td>funded research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Open Domain
- Selects attributes and relations that are distinctive in context
- Does not require adjective classification
- Incremental incorporations of relations
- Treatment of nominals
- Corpus-Based Evaluation (Nenkova et al., 2005)
The Need for 3 Quotients

Questions

- Why do we need three different quotients?
- In particular, what role does the synonymy quotient $SQ$ play?
- Why can’t we perform the above analysis using only the contrastive quotient $CQ$?

Answers

- Our definition $(CQ)$ of contrastive is too strict.
- Combining $SQ$ with $AQ$ increases the robustness of the approach.
- Computing antonyms transitively can give spurious results.
- But sensible results are found first.
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