

Reference Resolution: Example

The Salesgirl (Burns and Allen)

Gracie: And then Mr. and Mrs. Jones were having matrimonial trouble, and my brother was hired to watch Mrs. Jones.

George: Well, I am imagine she was a very attractive woman.

Gracie: She was, and my brother watched her day and night for six month.

George: Well, what happened?

Gracie: She finally got a divorce.

George: Mrs. Jones?

Gracie: No, my brother's wife.

Reference Resolution

1/??

Reference Resolution

- Task: determine which noun phrases refer to each real-world entity mentioned in a document
- Goal: partition noun phrases in a text into coreference equivalence classes, with one cluster for each set of coreferent NPs
- Difference between anaphora and coreference

In the previous example: {Mrs. J2ones, she, she, Mrs. Jones}, {my brother, my brother}, {my brother's wife}

Reference Resolution

3/??

Reference Resolution

Regina Barzilay

regina@csail.mit.edu

February 18, 2004

Reference Resolution: Example

The Salesgirl (Burns and Allen)

Gracie: And then Mr. and Mrs. Jones were having matrimonial trouble, and my brother was hired to watch Mrs. Jones.

George: Well, I am imagine she was a very attractive woman.

Gracie: She was, and my brother watched her day and night for six month.

George: Well, what happened?

Gracie: She finally got a divorce.

George: Mrs. Jones?

Gracie: No, my brother's wife.

Reference Resolution

2/??

Motivation

- Information extraction
- Question-Answering
- Machine-Translation
pronoun in the Malay language is translated by its antecedent (Mitkov, 1999)
- Summarization

Reference Resolution

5/??

When something goes wrong

Why would the media use this specific word, so often with relation to Muslims?

Before the term fundamentalist was branded for Muslims, it was, and still is, being used by certain Christian denominations. Most of them are radical Baptist, Lutheran and Presbyterian groups.

Reference Resolution

7/??

Today's Topics

- Motivation
- Types of referential expressions
- Syntactic and semantic constraints on coreference
- Preferences in coreference interpretation²
- Algorithm's for coreference resolution

Reference Resolution

4/??

When something goes wrong

In the past decade almost all Islamic revivalist movements have been labeled fundamentalists, whether they be of extremist or moderate origin. The widespread impact of the term is obvious from the following quotation from one of the most influential Encyclopedias under the title 'Fundamentalist': "The term fundamentalist has... been used to describe members of militant Islamic groups." Why would the media use this specific word, so often with relation to Muslims? Most of them are radical Baptist, Lutheran and Presbyterian groups.

Reference Resolution

6/??

Pronouns

Stronger constraints on using pronouns than on noun phrase references.

- Require a high degree of activation from a referent
- Have short activation span

- | |
|--|
| a. John went to Bob's party, and parked next to a Acura Integra.
b. He went inside and talked to Bob for more than an hour.
a. Bob told him that he recently got engaged.
b. ??He also said that he bought <i>it</i> yesterday. |
|--|

Reference Resolution

9/??

Troublemakers

- **Inferrables:** inferential relation to an evoked entity
I almost bought an Acura today, but a door had a dent and the engine seemed noisy.
- **Discontinuous Sets:** refer to entities that do not form a set in a text
John has an Acura, and Mary has a Mazda. They drive them all the time.
- **Generics:** refer to general set of entities (in contrast to a specific set mentioned in text)
I saw no less than six Acuras today. They are the coolest cars.

Reference Resolution

11/??

Types of referential expressions: Nouns

- **Indefinite Noun Phrases:**
I saw an Acura Integra today.
Some Acura Integras were being unloaded.
I saw this awesome Acura Integra today.
- **Definite Noun Phrases**
I saw an Acura Integra today. The Integra was white and needed to be washed.
The fastest car in the Indianapolis 500 was an Integra.

Reference Resolution

8/??

Demonstratives and One Anaphora

- **Demonstratives (this, that)** capture spatial proximity
I like this one, better than that
- **One Anaphora** evokes a new entity into the discourse whose description is dependent of this new entity
I saw no less than 6 Acuras today. Now I was one.

Reference Resolution

10/??

Syntactic Constraints

- **Gender Agreement**
John has an Acura. It is attractive.
- **Syntactic Agreement**
John bought himself a new Acura.
John bought him a new Acura.

Reference Resolution

13/??

Preferences in Pronoun Interpretation

- **Recency:** Entities introduced in recent utterances are more salient than those introduced further back
John has an Integra. Bill has a Legend. Mary likes to drive it.
- **Repeated mention:** Entities that have been focus on in the prior discourse are more likely to continue to be focused on in subsequent discourse
John needed a car to get his new job. He decided that he wanted something sporty. Bill went to the Acura dealership with him. He bought an Integra.

Reference Resolution

15/??

Syntactic Constraints on Coreference

- **Number Agreement**
* John has a new Acura. They are red.
John has three New Acuras. It is red.
- **Person and Case Agreement**
* John and Mary have Acuras. We love them.
You and I have Acuras. We love them.

Reference Resolution

12/??

Semantic Constraints

- **Selectional restrictions of the verb on its arguments**
(1) John parked his Acura in the garage. He had driven it around for hours.
(2) John parked his Acura in the garage. It is incredibly messy, with old bike and car parts lying around everywhere.
(3) John parked his Acura in downtown Beverly Hills. It is incredibly messy, with old bike and car parts lying around everywhere.

Reference Resolution

14/??

Preferences in Pronoun Interpretation

Verb Semantics: emphasis on one of verb's arguments

- “implicit causality” of a verb causes change in salience of verb arguments
John telephoned Bill. He lost the pamphlet on Acuras.
John criticized Bill. He lost the pamphlet on Acuras.
- thematic roles (Goal, Source) cause change in salience of verb arguments
John seized the Acura pamphlet from Bill. He loves reading about cars.
John passed the Acura pamphlet to Bill. He loves reading about cars.

Reference Resolution

17/??

Generic Algorithm(cont.)

- Filtering
Remove all the members of C_j that violate reference constraints
- Scoring/Ranking
Order the candidates based on preferences and soft constraints
- Searching/Clustering
Clustering of instances with the same antecedent

Reference Resolution

19/??

Preferences in Pronoun Interpretation

- Grammatical Role: Hierarchy of candidate entities based on their grammatical role
John went to the Acura dealership with Bill. He bought an Integra.
Bill went to the Acura dealership with John. He bought an Integra.
- Parallelism:
Mary went with Sue to the Acura dealership. Sally went with her to the Mazda dealership.

Reference Resolution

16/??

Generic Algorithm

- Identification of Discourse Entities
Identify nouns and pronouns in text
- Characterization of Discourse Entities
Compute for each discourse entity NP_i a set of values from $\{K_{i1}, \dots, k_{im}\}$ from m knowledge sources
- Anaphoricity Determination
Eliminate non-anaphoric expressions to cut search space
- Generation of Candidate Antecedents
Compute for each anaphoric NP_j a list of candidate antecedents C_j

Reference Resolution

18/??

Knowledge-Lean Multi-strategy Approach

(Lappin&Leass, 1994)

- Integrates the effects of the recency and syntactically-based preferences
- Doesn't rely on semantic or pragmatic knowledge
- Follows greedy strategy
- Two stages: discourse model update and pronoun resolution

Reference Resolution

21/??

Saliency Factors

Sentence Recency	100
Subject Emphasis	80
Existential Emphasis	70
Accusative	50
Indirect Object	40
Non-adverbial Emphasis	50
Head-noun Emphasis	80

Reference Resolution

23/??

Reference Resolution: Trends

- Knowledge-Rich Approaches vs Knowledge-Lean Approaches
- Semi-automatic Fully-Automatic Preprocessing
- Small-scale vs Large-Scale Evaluation

Reference Resolution

20/??

Discourse Model Update

(Lappin&Leass, 1994)

- Add every new discourse entity to discourse model
- Update its value based on saliency factors
- Cut in half recency values when process new entity (recency enforcement)

Reference Resolution

22/??

Algorithm

1. Remove potential referents that do not agree in number or gender with the pronoun
2. Remove potential referents that do not pass intrasentential syntactic coreference constraints
3. Update the total salience value of the referent
4. Select the referent with the highest value

Accuracy on unseen data: 86%

Reference Resolution

25/??

Instance Representation

Based noun phrases (automatically computed) are represented with 11 features:

- Individual Words
- Head Word
- Position
- Pronoun type (nominative, accusative)
- Semantic Class: Time, City, Animal, Human, Object (WordNet)
- Gender (WordNet, specified list)
- Animacy (based on WordNet)

Reference Resolution

27/??

Syntactic Factors

subject > existential predicate nominal > object >
indirect object > demarcated adverbial PP

1. An Acura Integra is parked on the lot. (subject)
2. There is an Acura Integra parked in the lot.
3. ...
4. Inside his Acura Integra, John kissed Mary. (demarcated adverbial PP)

Penalty for non-head occurrences

Score for equivalence classes

Reference Resolution

24/??

Clustering for Coreference

(Cardie&Wagstaff:1999)

- Each group of coreferent noun phrases defines an equivalence class
- Distance measure incorporates “linguistic intuition” about similarity of noun phrases
- Hard constraints enforce clustering construction

Reference Resolution

26/??

Clustering Algorithm

- Initialization: every noun is a singleton
- From right to left, compare each noun to all proceeding clusters
- Combine “close enough” clusters unless there exist any incompatible NP

Example: The chairman spoke with Ms. White. He ...

Reference Resolution

29/??

Supervised Learning

(Soon et al.,2001)

- Decision Tree Induction
- Shallow feature representation (12 features):
- “corrective” clustering
- Significant performance gain over rule-based algorithms

Reference Resolution

31/??

Distance Metric

$$dist(NP_i, NP_j) = \sum_f w_f * incomp_f(NP_i, NP_j)$$

Reference Resolution

28/??

Results

MUC-6 (30 documents): Recall 48.8*%, Precision 57.4%, F-measure 52.8%

Baseline: 34.6%, 69.3%, 46.1% Types of Mistakes:

- Parsing mistakes
- Coarse entity representation and mistakes in feature computation
- Greedy nature of the algorithm

Reference Resolution

30/??

Adding Linguistic Knowledge

Rich Linguistic representation for learning (Ng&Cardie 2002)

- 53 features
- manual feature selection
- significant gain in performance over (Soon et al., 2001)