

DERIVING LOCAL RELATIONAL SURFACE FORMS FROM DEPENDENCY-BASED ENTITY EMBEDDINGS FOR UNSUPERVISED SPOKEN LANGUAGE UNDERSTANDING

YUN-NUNG (VIVIAN) CHEN & DILEK HAKKANI-TÜR



Yun-Nung (Vivian) Chen

PhD student advised by Prof. Alexander I Rudnicky

Language Technologies Institute, School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University

Research focus: spoken dialogue system, unsupervised spoken language understanding

Outline

Introduction

- Main Idea
- Semantic Knowledge Graph
- Semantic Interpretation via Relation

Proposed Approach

- Relation Inference from Gazetteers
- Relational Surface Form Derivation
- Probabilistic Enrichment
- Boostrapping

Experiments

Conclusions

Ongoing & Future Work

Main Idea Relation Detection for Unsupervised SLU

Spoken Language Understanding (SLU): convert automatic speech recognition (ASR) outputs into pre-defined semantic output format

- "when was james cameron's avatar released"

Intent: FIND_RELEASE_DATE Slot-Val: MOVIE_NAME="avatar", DIRECTOR_NAME="james cameron"

Relation: semantic interpretation of input utterances

movie.release_date, movie.name, movie.directed_by, director.name

Unsupervised SLU: utilize external knowledge to help relation detection without labelled data

Semantic Knowledge Graph Priors for SLU

What are knowledge graphs?

- Graphs with
 - strongly typed and uniquely identified entities (nodes)
 - facts/literals connected by relations (edge)

Examples:

• Satori, Google KG, Facebook Open Graph, Freebase

How large?

> 500M entities, >1.5B relations, > 5B facts

How broad?

- Slides of Larry Heck, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, and Gokhan Tur, Leveraging Knowledge Graphs for Web-Scale Unsupervised Semantic Parsing, in Proceedings of Interspeech, 2013.



Semantic Interpretation via Relations

Two Examples

• differentiate two examples by including the originating node types in the relation

User Utterance:

find movies produced by james cameron

SPARQL Query (simplified):

SELECT ?movie {?movie. ?movie.produced_by?producer. ?producer.name"James Cameron".}

Logical Form:

 λx . $\exists y$. movie.produced_by(x, y) Λ person.name(y, z) Λ z="James Cameron" **Relation:**

movie.produced_by producer.name

User Utterance:

who produced avatar

SPARQL Query (simplified):

SELECT ?producer {?movie.name"Avatar". ?movie.produced_by?producer.} Logical Form:

 λy . $\exists x. movie.produced_by(x, y) \land movie.name(x, z) \land z="Avatar"$ **Relation:**

movie.name movie.produced_by



>、 produced_by

PERSON

name

Proposed Framework



Proposed Framework



Relation Inference from Gazetteers

Gazetteers (entity lists)



• Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Asli Celikyilmaz, Larry Heck, and Gokhan Tur, Probabilistic enrichment of knowledge graph entities for relation detection in conversational understanding, in *Proceedings of Interspeech*, 2014.

Proposed Framework



Relational Surface Form Derivation Web Resource Mining

Bing query snippets including entity pairs connected with specific relations in KG



Relational Surface Form Derivation (cont.)

Dependency-Based Entity Embeddings

1) Word & Context Extraction



Word	Contexts	Word	Contexts
\$movie	film/nsub ⁻¹		film/nsub, is/cop, a/det, 2009/num,
is	film/cop ⁻¹	film	american/nn, epic/nn, science/nn, fiction/nn, directed/vmod
а	film/det ⁻¹	directed	Śdirector/prep. by
2009	film/num ⁻¹	unceteu	Surcetor/prep_by
2009	mmynum	\$director	directed/prep by-1
american, epic, science, fiction	film/nn ⁻¹		

Relational Surface Form Derivation (cont.) Dependency-Based Entity Embeddings

2) Training Process

- Each word w is associated with a vector v_w and each context c is represented as a vector v_c
- Learn vector representations for both words and contexts such that the dot product $v_w \cdot v_c$ associated with good word-context pairs belonging to the training data D is maximized
- Objective function:

$$\arg\max_{v_w, v_c} \sum_{(w,c)\in D} \log \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-v_c \cdot v_w)}$$

Word	Contexts	Word	Contexts
\$movie	film/nsub ⁻¹		film/nsub, is/cop, a/det, 2009/num,
is	film/cop ⁻¹	film	american/nn, epic/nn, science/nn, fiction/nn, directed/ymod
а	film/det ⁻¹	directed	Śdirector/prep. by
2009	film/num⁻¹	directed	
american, epic, science, fiction	film/nn ⁻¹	Şdirector	directed/prep_by ⁻¹

Relational Surface Form Derivation (cont.) Surface Form Derivation

Entity Surface Forms

• learn the <u>surface forms</u> corresponding to entities \$char, \$director, etc.

$$S_i^F(w_j) = \underbrace{\frac{\sin(w_j, e_i)}{\sum_{e_k \in E} \sin(w_j, e_k)}}_{P^F(r_i \mid w_j)}$$

based on word vector v_w

\$char: "character", "role", "who"
\$director: "director", "filmmaker"
\$genre: "action", "fiction"

 \rightarrow with similar contexts

Entity Syntactic Contexts

learn the <u>important contexts</u> of entities

$$S_{i}^{C}(w_{j}) = \underbrace{\frac{\sin(\hat{w}_{j}, e_{i})}{\sum_{e_{k} \in E} \sin(\hat{w}_{j}, e_{k})}}_{\text{based on context vector } v_{e_{k}}}$$

\$char: "played"
\$director: "directed"

 \rightarrow frequently occurring together

Proposed Framework



Probabilistic Enrichment

Integrate relations from

- \circ Prior knowledge $P_E(r \mid w)$
- Entity surface forms $P_F(r \mid w)$
- $\,\circ\,$ Entity syntactic contexts $P_C(r\mid w)$

Integrated Relations for Words by

- **Unweighted**: combine all relations with binary values
- Weighted: combine all relations and keep the highest weights of relations
- Highest Weighted: combine the most possible relation of each word

Integrated Relations for Utterances by

$$R_u(r_i) = \max_{w \in u} R_w(r_i)$$

r	actor	produced_by	location
$P_E(r \mid w)$	0.7	0.3	0
$P_F(r \mid w)$	0.4	0	0.6
$P_C(r \mid w)$	0	0	0
Unweighted $R_w(r)$	1	1	1
Weighted $R_w(r)$	0.7	0.3	0.6
Highest Weighted $R_w(r)$	0.7	0	0.6

[•] Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Asli Celikyilmaz, Larry Heck, and Gokhan Tur, Probabilistic enrichment of knowledge graph entities for relation detection in conversational understanding, in *Proceedings of Interspeech*, 2014.

Proposed Framework



Boostrapping Unsupervised Self-Training

Training a multi-label multi-class classifier estimating relations given an utterance



Experiments

Dataset

Knowledge Base: Freebase

- 670K entities
- 78 entity types (movie names, actors, etc)

Relation Detection Data

- Crowd-sourced utterances
- $\,\circ\,$ Manually annotated with SPARQL queries \rightarrow relations

Query Statistics	Dev	Test
% entity only	8.9%	10.7%
% rel only w/ specified movie names	<u>27.1%</u>	<u>27.5%</u>
% rel only w/ specified other names	39.8%	39.6%
% more complicated relations	15.4%	14.7%
% not covered	8.8%	7.6%
#utterances	3338	1084

User Utterance: who produced avatar Relation: movie.name movie.produced_by



Evaluation Metric: micro F-measure (%)

	Approach		Unweighted		Weighted		Highest Weighted	
			Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap	
ſ	Gazetteer	35.21	36.91	37.93	40.10	36.08	38.89	
Baseline	Gazetteer + Weakly Supervised	25.07	37.39	39.04	39.07	39.40	39.98	
	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Reg)	34.23	34.91	36.57	38.13	34.69	37.16	

Evaluation Metric: micro F-measure (%)

	Approach	Unweighted		Weighted		Highest Weighted	
		Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap
ſ	Gazetteer	35.21	36.91	37.93	40.10	36.08	38.89
Baseline	Gazetteer + Weakly Supervised	25.07	37.39	39.04	39.07	39.40	39.98
L	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Reg)	34.23	34.91	36.57	38.13	34.69	37.16
	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Dep)	37.44	38.37	41.01	41.10	39.19	42.74

Words derived by dependency embeddings can successfully capture the surface forms of entity tags, while words derived by regular embeddings cannot.

Evaluation Metric: micro F-measure (%)

	Approach	Unweighted		Weighted		Highest Weighted	
		Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap
ſ	Gazetteer	35.21	36.91	37.93	40.10	36.08	38.89
Baseline	Gazetteer + Weakly Supervised	25.07	37.39	39.04	39.07	39.40	39.98
L	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Reg)	34.23	34.91	36.57	38.13	34.69	37.16
	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Dep)	37.44	38.37	41.01	41.10	39.19	42.74
	Gazetteer + Entity Context	35.31	37.23	38.04	38.88	37.25	38.04

Words derived from entity contexts slightly improve performance.

Evaluation Metric: micro F-measure (%)

	American	Unweighted		Weighted		Highest Weighted	
	Approach	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap
ſ	Gazetteer	35.21	36.91	37.93	40.10	36.08	38.89
Baseline -	Gazetteer + Weakly Supervised	25.07	37.39	39.04	39.07	39.40	39.98
	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Reg)	34.23	34.91	36.57	38.13	34.69	37.16
ſ	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Dep)	37.44	38.37	41.01	41.10	39.19	42.74
Proposed-	Gazetteer + Entity Context	35.31	37.23	38.04	38.88	37.25	38.04
	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form + Context	37.66	38.64	40.29	41.98	40.07	43.34

Combining all approaches performs best, while the major improvement is from derived entity surface forms.

Evaluation Metric: micro F-measure (%)

	American	Unweighted		Weighted		Highest Weighted	
	Approach	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap
ſ	Gazetteer	35.21	36.91	37.93	40.10	36.08	38.89
Baseline	Gazetteer + Weakly Supervised	25.07	37.39	39.04	39.07	39.40	39.98
l	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Reg)	34.23	34.91	36.57	38.13	34.69	37.16
ſ	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Dep)	37.44	38.37	41.01	41.10	39.19	42.74
Proposed	Gazetteer + Entity Context	35.31	37.23	38.04	38.88	37.25	38.04
	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form + Context	37.66	38.64	40.29	41.98	40.07	43.34

With the same information, learning surface forms from dependency-based embedding performs better, because there's mismatch between written and spoken language.

Evaluation Metric: micro F-measure (%)

	Approach	Unwei	Unweighted		Weighted		Veighted
	Approach	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap
ſ	Gazetteer	35.21	36.91	37.93	40.10	36.08	38.89
Baseline	Gazetteer + Weakly Supervised	25.07	37.39	39.04	39.07	39.40	39.98
	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Reg)	34.23	34.91	36.57	38.13	34.69	37.16
ſ	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Dep)	37.44	38.37	41.01	41.10	39.19	42.74
Proposed-	Gazetteer + Entity Context	35.31	37.23	38.04	38.88	37.25	38.04
	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form + Context	37.66	38.64	40.29	41.98	40.07	43.34

Weighted methods perform better when less features, and highest weighted methods perform better when more features.

Evaluation Metric: micro F-measure (%)

	Approach	Unweighted		Weighted		Highest Weighted	
	Approacn	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap	Ori	Boostrap
ſ	Gazetteer	35.21	36.91	37.93	40.10	36.08	38.89
Baseline	Gazetteer + Weakly Supervised	25.07	37.39	39.04	39.07	39.40	39.98
l	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Reg)	34.23	34.91	36.57	38.13	34.69	37.16
ſ	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form (Dep)	37.44	38.37	41.01	41.10	39.19	42.74
Proposed -	Gazetteer + Entity Context	35.31	37.23	38.04	38.88	37.25	38.04
l	Gazetteer + Entity Surface Form + Context	37.66	38.64	40.29	41.98	40.07	43.34
	+ Names of Entity Types					43.03	46.94

Additionally adding names of entity types helps improve performance.

Experiments (cont.)

Entity Surface Forms Derived from Dependency Embeddings

The functional similarity carried by dependency-based entity embeddings effectively benefits relation detection task.

Entity Tag	Derived Word
\$character	character, role, who, girl, she, he, officier
\$director	director, dir, filmmaker
\$genre	comedy, drama, fantasy, cartoon, horror, sci
\$language	language, spanish, english, german
\$producer	producer, filmmaker, screenwriter

Experiments (cont.) Effectiveness of Boosting



- The best result is the combination of all approaches, because probabilities came from different resources can complement each other.
- Only adding entity surface forms performs similarly, showing that the major improvement comes from relational entity surface forms.
- Boosting significantly improves most performance

Conclusions

We propose an unsupervised approach to capture the relational surface forms including entity surface forms and entity contexts based on dependency-based entity embeddings.

The detected relations viewed as local observations can be integrated with background knowledge by probabilistic enrichment methods.

Experiments show that involving derived relational surface forms as local cues together with prior knowledge can significantly improve the relation detection task and help open domain SLU.

Ongoing & Future Work Active Learning

Idea: manually label small data to boost performance

Approach

- 1. Extract exemplar utterances by clustering
 - Feature set: ngram, relation prob, both
 - Clustering: affinity propagation, k-means, etc.
- 2. Label exemplar utterances
- 3. Train the classifier on labelled data

Unsupervised results

- Embeddings: 0.4334
- Embeddings + Names: 0.4694

#training data (total = 3338)	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50
Baseline: random selection	0.2892	0.3581	0.3867	0.3921	0.4306	0.4421	0.4522	0.4741	0.4810	0.4821
Unigram: Euclidean distance	0.1937	0.3167	0.3202	0.3252	0.3557	0.4005	0.4283	0.4447	0.4566	0.4689
Relation (embeddings)	0.3219	0.3545	0.4126	0.4218	0.4671	0.4907	0.4550	0.4808	0.4629	0.4800
Relation (names)	0.2780	0.2480	0.3686	0.3966	0.2860	0.4341	0.4490	0.4903	0.5005	0.5150
Relation (embeddings + names)	0.3457	0.3269	0.4552	0.4012	0.4489	0.4916	0.5191	0.5247	0.5570	0.5417



Thanks to...

Dilek Hakkani-Tür & Gokhan Tur for their advising

Dilek Hakkani-Tür for her help and care

Qi Li & Xiang Li for their discussion

All friends met here for enjoying summer together

MSR for this internship & XBOX ONE



THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTIONS!!