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Graph Convolutional Network for Swahili News Classification
Alexandros Kastanos and Tyler Martin
In this work, we demonstrate the ability of Text Graph Convolutional Network (Text GCN) to surpass the performance of traditional natural language processing benchmarks on the task of semi-supervised Swahili news categorisation. Our experiments highlight the more severely label-restricted context often facing low-resourced African languages. We build on this finding by presenting a memory-efficient variant of Text GCN which replaces the naive one-hot node representation with a bag of words representation.

Exploring Linguistic Typology Features in Multilingual Machine Translation
Oscar Moreno and Arturo Oncevay
We explore whether linguistic typology features can impact multilingual machine translation performance (many-to-English) by using initial pseudo-tokens and factored language-level embeddings. With 20 languages from different families or groups, we observed that the features of “Order of Subject (S), Object (O) and Verb (V)”, “Position of Negative Word with respect to S-O-V” and “Prefixing vs. Suffixing in Inflectional Morphology” provided slight improvements in low-resource language-pairs despite not overcoming the average performance for all languages.

Multilingual Slot and Intent Detection (xSID) with Cross-lingual Auxiliary Tasks
Rob van der Goot, Ibrahim Sharaf, Aizhan Imankulova, Ahmet Üstün, Marija Stepanović, Alan Ramponi, Siti Oryza Khairunnisa, Mamoru Komachi and Barbara Plank
Digital assistants are becoming an integral part of everyday life. However, commercial digital assistants are only available for a limited set of languages (as of March 2020, between 8 to around 20 languages). Because of this, a vast amount of people can not use these devices in their native tongue. In this work, we focus on two core tasks within the digital assistant pipeline: intent classification and slot detection. Intent classification recovers the goal of the utterance, whereas slot detection identifies important properties regarding this goal. Besides introducing a novel cross-lingual dataset for these tasks, consisting of 13 languages, we evaluate a variety of models: 1) multilingually pretrained transformer-based models, 2) we supplement these models with auxiliary tasks to evaluate whether multi-task learning can be beneficial, and 3) annotation transfer with neural machine translation.

Plugins for Structurally Varied Languages in XMG Framework
Valeria Generalova
This paper aims to suggest an XMG-based design of metagrammatical classes storing language-specific information on a multilingual grammar engineering project. It also presents a method of reusing the information from WALS. The principal claim is the hierarchy of features and the modular architecture of feature structures.
Modeling Linguistic Typology - A Probabilistic Graphical Models Approach
Xia Lu
In this paper, we propose to use probabilistic graphical models as a new theoretical and computational framework to study linguistic typology. The graphical structure of such a model represents a meta-language that consists of linguistic variables and the relationships between them while the parameters associated with each variable can be used to infer the strength of the relationships between the variables. Such models can also be used to predict feature values of new languages. Besides providing better solutions to existing problems in linguistic typology such a framework opens up to many new research topics that can help us to gain further insights into linguistic typology.

Unsupervised Self-Training for Unsupervised Cross-Lingual Transfer
Akshat Gupta, Sai Krishna Rallabandi and Alan W Black
Labelled data is scarce, especially for low-resource languages. This beckons the need to come up with unsupervised methods for natural language processing tasks. In this paper, we introduce a general framework called Unsupervised Self-Training, capable of unsupervised cross-lingual transfer. We apply our proposed framework to a two-class sentiment analysis problem of code-switched data. We use the power of pre-trained BERT models for initialization and fine-tune them in an unsupervised manner, only using pseudo labels produced by zero-shot predictions. We test our algorithm on multiple code-switched languages. Our unsupervised models compete well with their supervised counterparts, with their performance reaching within 1-7% (weighted F1 scores) when compared to supervised models trained for a two-class problem.

Let-Mi: An Arabic Levantine Twitter Dataset for Misogynistic Language
Hala Mulki and Bilal Ghanem
Misogyny is one type of hate speech that disparages a person or a group having the female gender identity; it is typically defined as hatred of or contempt for women. Online misogyny has become an increasing worry for Arab women who experience gender-based online abuse on a daily basis. Such online abuse can be expressed through several misogynistic behaviors which reinforce and justify underestimation of women, male superiority, sexual abuse, mistreatment, and violence against women. Misogyny automatic detection systems can assist in the prohibition of anti-women Arabic toxic content. Developing these systems is hindered by the lack of the Arabic misogyny benchmark datasets. In this work, we introduce an Arabic Levantine Twitter dataset for Misogynistic language (LeT-Mi) to be the first benchmark dataset for Arabic misogyny. The proposed dataset consists of 6,550 tweets annotated either as neutral (misogynistic-free) or as one of seven misogyny categories: discredit, dominance, cursing/damning, sexual harassment, stereotyping and objectification, derailing, and the threat of violence. We further provide a detailed review of the dataset creation and annotation phases. The consistency of the annotations for the proposed dataset was emphasized through inter-rater agreement evaluation measures. Moreover, Let-Mi was used as an evaluation dataset through binary, multi-class, and target classification tasks which were conducted by several state-of-the-art machine learning systems along with Multi-Task Learning (MTL) configuration. The obtained results indicated that the performances achieved by the used systems are consistent with state-of-the-art results for languages other than Arabic, while employing MTL improved the performance of the misogyny/target classification tasks.

Our dataset is available at https://github.com/bilalghanem/let-mi
Towards Figurative Language Generation in Afrikaans

Imke van Heerden and Anil Bas

This paper presents an LSTM-based approach to figurative language generation, which is an important step towards creative text generation in Afrikaans. Due to the scarcity of resources (in comparison to resource-rich languages), we train the proposed network on a single literary novel. This follows the same approach as Van Heerden and Bas (2021), however, we explicitly focus and expand on fully automatic text generation, centring on figurative language in particular. The proposed model generates phrases that contain compellingly novel figures of speech such as metaphor, simile and personification.

Improving Access to Untranscribed Speech by Leveraging Spoken Term Detection and Self-supervised Learning of Speech Representations

Nay San, Martijn Bartelds and Dan Jurafsky

We summarise findings from our recent work showing that a large self-supervised model trained only on English speech provides a noise-robust and speaker-invariant feature extraction method that can be used for a speech information retrieval task with unrelated low resource target languages. A qualitative error analysis also revealed that the majority of the retrieval errors could be attributed to the differences in phonological inventories between English and the evaluation languages. With a longer-term aim of leveraging typological information to better adapt such models for the target languages, we also report on work in progress which examines the phonetic information encoded in these representations.

On the Universality of Lexical Concepts

Bradley Hauer and Grzegorz Kondrak

We posit that lexicalized concepts are universal, and thus can be annotated cross-linguistically in parallel corpora. This is one of the implications of a novel theory that formalizes the relationship between words and senses in both monolingual and multilingual settings. The theory is based on a unifying treatment of the notions of synonymy and translational equivalence as different aspects of the relation of sameness of meaning within and across languages.

Quantitative Detection of Cognacy in the Predictive Structure of Inflection Classes: Romance Verbal Conjugations against the Broader Typological Variation

Borja Herce and Balthasar Bickel

In recent years, Information Theory (with its core notion of entropy) has provided the theoretical background for a lot of empirical research on inflectional systems, and has inspired various metrics to capture (different aspects of) their complexity. So far, however, entropy-based metrics have chiefly been used to assess synchronic states. Here we explore their potential for capturing patterns in language change and phylogenetic relatedness. Specifically, we probe different aspects of an inflectional system for their stability within one language family, Romance, and for the degree to which they distinguish this family from unrelated and less closely related languages. Based on most metrics, Romance appears to be different from the control sample in the mean, variance, or both. The difference in variance is particularly interesting because it might suggest differences in relative diachronic stability and as phylogenetic signals of relatedness.

Subword Geometry: Picturing Word Shapes

Olga Sozinova and Tanja Samardzic

In this work in progress, we are investigating the structural properties of subwords in 20 languages by extracting word shapes, i.e. sequences of subword lengths.
A Look to Languages through the Glass of BPE Compression
Ximena Gutiérrez-Vasques, Tanja Samardzic and Christian Bentz

One of the predominant methods for subword tokenization is Byte-pair encoding (BPE). Originally, this is a data compression technique based on replacing the most common pair of consecutive bytes with a new symbol. When applied to text, each iteration merges two adjacent symbols; this can be seen as a process of going from characters to subwords through iterations.

Regardless of the language, the first merge operations tend to have a stronger impact on the compression of texts, i.e., they capture very frequent patterns that lead to a reduction of redundancy and to an increment of the text entropy. However, the natural language properties that allow this compression are rarely analyzed, i.e., do all languages get compressed in the same way through BPE merge operations? We hypothesize that the type of recurrent patterns captured in each merge depends on the typology and even orthography and other corpus-related phenomena. For instance, for some languages, this compression might be related to frequent affixes or regular inflectional morphs, while for some others, it might be related to more idiosyncratic, irregular patterns or even related to orthographic redundancies.

We propose a novel way to quantify this, inspired by the notion of morphological productivity.

Information-Theoretic Characterization of Morphological Fusion
Neil Rathi, Michael Hahn and Richard Futrell

Traditionally, morphological typology divides synthetic languages into two broad groups (e.g. von Schlegel, 1808; von Humboldt, 1843). Agglutinative languages, such as Turkish, segment morphemes into independent features which can be easily split. On the other hand, fusional languages, such as Latin, “fuse” morphemes together phonologically (Bickel and Nichols, 2013). At the same time, there has long been recognition that the categories “agglutinative” and “fusional” are best thought of as a matter of degree, with Greenberg (1954) developing an “index of agglutination” metric for languages. Here, we propose an information-theoretic definition of the fusion of any given form in a language, which naturally delivers a graded measure of the degree of fusion. We use a sequence-to-sequence model to empirically verify that our measure captures typical linguistic classifications.
Abstract

To transcribe spoken language to written medium, most alphabets enable an unambiguous sound-to-letter rule. However, some writing systems have distanced themselves from this simple concept and little work exists in Natural Language Processing (NLP) on measuring such distance. In this study, we use an Artificial Neural Network (ANN) model to evaluate the transparency between written words and their pronunciation, hence its name Orthographic Transparency Estimation with an ANN (OTEANN). Based on datasets derived from Wikimedia dictionaries, we trained and tested this model to score the percentage of correct predictions in phoneme-to-grapheme and grapheme-to-phoneme translation tasks. The scores obtained on 17 orthographies were in line with the estimations of other studies. Interestingly, the model also provided insight into typical mistakes made by learners who only consider the phonemic rule in reading and writing.

1 Introduction

An alphabet is a standard set of letters that represent the basic significant sounds of the spoken language it is used to write. When a spelling system (also referred as orthography) systematically uses a one-to-one correspondence between its sounds and its letters, the encoding of a sound (also referred as phoneme) into a letter (also referred as grapheme) leads to a single possibility; similarly the decoding of a letter into a sound leads to a single possibility as well. Such orthography is thus transparent with regards to phonemes with the advantage of offering no ambiguity when writing or reading the letters of a word, as illustrated in Figure 1.

In real life, no existing orthography is fully transparent phonemically. One reason is that a word spoken alone is sometimes different from a word spoken in a sentence. An even more consequential reason is that some orthographies like English\(^1\) and French\(^2\) have incorporated deeper depth rules that have moved them away from a transparent orthography (Seymour et al., 2003); this has created ambiguities when trying to write or read phonemically, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Many studies have discussed the degree of transparency of orthographies (Borleffs et al., 2017). These studies are mainly motivated by the estimation of the ease of reading and writing when learning a new language (Defior et al., 2002). Finnish, Korean, Serbo-Croatian and Turkish orthographies are often referred as highly transparent (Aro, 2004) (Wang and Tsai, 2009), (Turvey et al., 1984), (Öney and Durgunoğlu, 1997), whereas English and French orthographies are referred as opaque (van den Bosch et al., 1994). However, little work exists in NLP about measuring the level of transparency of an orthography. One noticeable exception is the work of van den Bosch et al. (1994) who have created grapheme-to-phoneme scores and tested them on three orthographies (Dutch, English and French).

This study extends such work with a method called OTEANN, which models a word-based phoneme-to-grapheme task and a word-based grapheme-to-phoneme task using an ANN. For the sake of simplicity, the former task is called a writing task while the latter task is called a reading task. The goal is not to build a perfect spelling translator or a spell checker. Instead the goal is to build a translator which can indicate a degree of phonemic transparency and thus make it possible to rank orthographies according to this criterion.

Interestingly, recent years have seen tremendous progress regarding NLP with ANNs (Otter et al., 2018). Sutskever et al. (2014) proposed an ANN...
called a Sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) model that has proven to be very successful on language translation tasks. More recently, ANNs based on attention (Bahdanau et al., 2014), (Vaswani et al., 2017) and transformers like Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT), (Devlin et al., 2018) and Generative Pre-Training (GPT) (Radford, 2018) have again enhanced and outperformed seq2seqs. Considering writing a word and reading a word as two translations tasks allows re-using the transformers for our work. To this purpose, we used a minimalist GPT implementation (Karpathy, 2020) called minGPT. Notice that since we don’t aim at building a perfect spelling translator, we do not have to translate a sequence of words into another sequence of words; our model only requires translating a spoken word into a spelled word (writing task) and a spelled word into a spoken word (reading task). In other words, our ANN operates at the character level within a sequence of characters of single words. The pronunciation and spelling of the word are both encoded as a sequence of UTF-8 characters; a pronounced word is encoded with the characters belonging to the set of phonemes of the target language, whereas a spelled word is encoded with the characters belonging to the alphabet of the target orthography. We directly re-used minGPT code with no modification. The only differences were the training data and the code for extracting the prediction at inference time.

We used OTEANN to test seventeen orthographies in order to evaluate their degree of phonemic transparency. Sixteen of them are the official orthographies of their respective language (Arabic, Breton, Chinese, Dutch, English, Esperanto, Finnish, French, German, Italian, Korean, Portuguese, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish, and Turkish) while the seventeenth is a phonemic orthography proposed for French.

A unique multi-orthography ANN model instance was trained to learn the writing and reading tasks on all languages at the same time. In other words, we used a single dataset containing samples of all studied orthographies. The multi-orthography ANN model was then tested for each orthography and each task with new samples, which allowed calculating an average percentage of correct translations. A score of 0% of correct translations represented a fully opaque orthography (no correlation between the input and the target), whereas a score close to 100% represented a fully transparent orthography (full correlation between the input and the target).

Our study first confirms that orthographies like Arabic, Finnish, Korean, Serbo-Croatian and Turkish are highly transparent whereas other ones like Chinese, French and English are highly opaque. For example, when solely based on a phoneme-grapheme correspondence, we estimated the chances of correctly writing a French word at 28%; similarly, when solely based on a grapheme-phoneme correspondence, we estimated the chances of correctly pronouncing an English word at 31%. For Dutch, English and French reading tasks, our obtained ranking is in line with the one of van den Bosch et al. (1994). One unexpected finding is that OTEANN also allows discovering
certain mistakes performed by a new learner during writing and reading.

Remarkably, our method should apply to any orthography, provided a dataset is available.

2 Methodology

In order to evaluate a level of transparency of some orthographies two main steps were necessary: obtaining datasets and carrying out the training and testing experiments with the ANN.

2.1 Datasets

As displayed in Table 1, we needed a multi-orthography dataset with four features per sample: the orthography, the task (write or read), the input word (pronunciation or spelled word) and the output word (spelled word or pronunciation). A spelled word was represented by a sequence of graphemes whereas a pronunciation was represented by a sequence of phonemes. The characters representing phonemes are also called International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) characters. Having a single dataset with multiple orthographies and tasks allows a single multi-orthography ANN model to learn to read and write all orthographies; otherwise, it would require one ANN model per orthography-task pair.

In order to build such dataset, we first generated one sub-dataset per orthography (e.g. one ‘en’ sub-dataset for English), each containing the pronunciation and the spelled word (e.g. ’dZ6b’ and ’job’).

2.1.1 Baseline Orthographies

We first created baselines representing a fully transparent orthography and a fully opaque orthography.

Regarding a fully transparent orthography, we created a new artificial orthography called Entirely Transparent (’ent’) orthography. We generated its samples by taking the IPA pronunciation of real Esperanto words mapping each of their phonemes to a random grapheme from a list of 25 graphemes, which resulted in a sub-dataset containing an ’ent’ orthography with no correlation between the pronunciation and the spelled word.

2.1.2 Studied Orthographies

A sub-dataset was created for each of the following orthographies: Arabic (’ar’), Breton (’br’), German (’de’), English (’en’), Esperanto (’eo’), Spanish (’es’), Finnish (’fi’), French (’fr’), Italian (’it’), Korean (’ko’), Dutch (’nl’), Portuguese (’pt’), Russian (’ru’), Serbo-Croatian (’sh’), Turkish (’tr’) and Chinese (’zh’).

We incorporated the words from the corresponding Wiktionary\(^3\) dump\(^4\), with the exception of the following ones:

- Words containing space characters;
- Words containing more than 25 characters;
- Words containing capital letters (except for German words);
- Words containing non-standard characters with regard to the orthography’s alphabet.

Two orthographies required additional processing:

- For German, proper nouns were discarded and the capital letter of common nouns was transformed into lower case;
- For Korean, the syllabic blocks words were converted in a series of two or three letters (one vowel and one or two consonants) pertaining to the Korean alphabet with ko_pron\(^5\) Python library.

Regarding pronunciation, we directly extracted the IPA pronunciation when available in the associated Wiktionary dump, which was the case for ’br’, ’de’, ’en’, ’es’, ’fr’, ’it’, ’nl’, ’pt’ and ’sh’. The Esperanto (’eo’) pronunciation came from the French Wiktionary. For the others (’ar’, ’ko’, ’ru’, ’fi’, ’tr’), we had to derive it from the spelled word with additional software. For Russian, the Russian Wiktionary dump did not contain the IPA. We thus used

\(^3\)https://wiktionary.org
\(^4\)https://dumps.wikimedia.org/
\(^5\)https://pypi.org/project/ko-pron
wikt2pron ru_pron module\textsuperscript{6} to obtain a pronunciation similar to the one displayed in the Russian Wiktionary web pages. For Chinese, we only selected Mandarin words in simplified Chinese and limited to one or two symbols (a.k.a. Hanzis); we then obtained their pronunciation from the CEDICT\textsuperscript{7} dataset.

Extracting the phonemic pronunciation from Wiktionary may raise concerns given that IPA symbols can be used both for phonetic and phonemic notations and that there is no unified consistency between the different dictionaries. When processing the IPA strings, we nonetheless took care of preserving the highest surface pronunciation as possible: most pitches were removed since they represent no useful hint during the writing task (i.e. no consequence on the spelled word) and especially since they are generally impossible to predict when translating the spelled word into a pronunciation during the reading task. Nevertheless the /:/ pitch was noticed as indispensable for some orthographies, for instance for predicting double vowels in the spelling of Finnish words or the alif letter in Arabic. Regarding the // pitch, it can slightly influence Spanish translation scores: it can lead to a better writing score as it can be a hint for predicting accented letters, but it can also lead to a lower reading score.

Another interesting orthography was a proposal of an alternative orthography for French called French Ortofasil (‘fro’)\textsuperscript{8}, which seeks to be phonemically transparent. Although not fully bijective (e.g. both /o/ and /ɔ/ map to <œ> letter), it indeed seems highly transparent. We therefore used it to generate a sub-dataset for the ‘fro’ orthography.

It is debatable whether Chinese should be included in this study given the term alphabet is usually reserved for largely phonographic systems that have a small number of elements. We decided to include it because our ANN model allowed for alphabets with thousands of graphemes.

Table 2 summarizes the sub-datasets obtained.

2.1.3 Training and test datasets
11,000 samples were randomly selected in each of the 17 sub-datasets. Each sample from a sub-dataset produced two samples in the multi-orthography dataset: one sample for write task and one sample for the read task, as illustrated in Table 1. This multi-orthography dataset was subsequently divided into a training dataset (10,000 * 17 * 2 samples) and a test dataset (1,000 * 17 * 2 samples).

2.1.4 ANN architecture
We used minGTP (Karpathy, 2020) which runs on PyTorch\textsuperscript{9}. Regarding the hyper-parameters, we configured a block size of 63 characters, 4 layers, 4 heads and 336 embedding tokens, which resulted in an ANN of 9,589,536 trainable parameters and an episode training time of 2 hours and 10 minutes on a 4 GPU node. No effort was spent to shrink or prune the ANN, so its size could still be optimized. The data and code are available on Github \textsuperscript{10}.

2.1.5 Performance metric
We used a simple score in order to assess the performance of the ANN prediction during the testing step. When all the predicted characters were equal to those of the true target, a prediction was considered successful, hence allowing to score the percentage of successful predictions performed for each orthography-task pair.

2.1.6 Training and testing
We specified an episode as:

- Generating the training and test datasets.
  At the end of this step, each character present in these datasets was provisioned in the inventory of the ANN instance.

- Training the ANN model. The full training dataset was processed to be used as text blocks containing the concatenation of the four features (orthography, task, input and output) separated by a comma. Therefore, a single instance of the model was used to learn to write and read all 17 orthographies in one training.

- Testing the ANN model for each orthography-task pair. For each orthography-task pair, 1,000 new samples were tested. Each sample was fed into the model with the concatenation of the three first features (orthography, task and input) separated by a comma. The model had to

---

\textsuperscript{6}https://wikt2pron.readthedocs.io/en/latest/_modules/IPA/ru_pron.html
\textsuperscript{7}https://github.com/msavva/transphoner/blob/master/data/
\textsuperscript{8}https://fonétik.fr/v0/faq-en.html#
mapping-table
\textsuperscript{9}https://pytorch.org/
\textsuperscript{10}https://github.com/marxav/oteann4
Table 2: Summary of the sub-datasets. For each sub-dataset, a line indicates the number of samples available, the number of different phoneme UTF-8 characters, the number of different grapheme UTF-8 characters, the mean number of phonemes in words, and the mean number of graphemes in words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Phonemes</th>
<th>Graphemes</th>
<th>Nb. of Phonemes</th>
<th>Nb of Graphemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ar</td>
<td>12,057</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.0 ± 2.0</td>
<td>8.9 ± 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br</td>
<td>17,343</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.6 ± 1.9</td>
<td>7.5 ± 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>529,740</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.2 ± 3.1</td>
<td>11.5 ± 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en</td>
<td>42,206</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.3 ± 2.7</td>
<td>7.6 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eo</td>
<td>26,845</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.8 ± 2.6</td>
<td>8.6 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es</td>
<td>40,824</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.1 ± 2.7</td>
<td>8.7 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi</td>
<td>105,352</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.4 ± 3.5</td>
<td>11.4 ± 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr</td>
<td>1,214,248</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.0 ± 2.7</td>
<td>11.2 ± 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fro</td>
<td>1,214,262</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.0 ± 2.7</td>
<td>8.6 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>26,798</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.1 ± 2.8</td>
<td>9.1 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>64,669</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.6 ± 4.0</td>
<td>8.3 ± 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nl</td>
<td>13,340</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.8 ± 3.1</td>
<td>8.6 ± 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.7 ± 2.3</td>
<td>7.9 ± 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru</td>
<td>304,514</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.5 ± 3.1</td>
<td>10.7 ± 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>98,575</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.1 ± 2.8</td>
<td>8.9 ± 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>117,841</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.3 ± 3.7</td>
<td>10.1 ± 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh</td>
<td>27,688</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4813</td>
<td>9.9 ± 2.2</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eno</td>
<td>26,845</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.8 ± 2.6</td>
<td>8.8 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ent</td>
<td>26,845</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.8 ± 2.6</td>
<td>8.8 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We performed 11 episodes to measure the mean and standard deviation of each orthography-task pair and thus assess the consistency of our results. Future work may use more test samples to gain a statistical insight on the different types of errors depending on the orthography at hand.

3 Results

First, regarding the results of the two baseline orthographies, the 'eno' opaque orthography obtained a score of 0% in both writing and reading, which was in line with the expectations given that there was no correlation between its phonemes and its graphemes; on the other hand, the 'ent' transparent orthography scored above 99.6% on the writing and reading tasks, which indicated a high level of correlation between its phonemes and its graphemes. We thus considered our ANN model satisfactory for our objective of comparing the performance of different orthographies.

Comparing OTEANN’s reading results with those of van den Bosch et al. (1994), OTEANN first seems to naturally assimilate the grapheme complexity (e.g. for French, it successfully learnt that "cadeau" should be pronounced /kado/). Regarding grapheme-to-phoneme complexity (G-P complexity), they ranked English (G-P complexity=90%) more complex than Dutch (G-P complexity=25%) which, in turn, was more complex than French (G-P complexity=15%). OTEANN results preserved the same ranking with transparency scores of 31%, 57% and 79s% for English, Dutch and French. Admittedly, OTEANN’s scores were different in terms of scale but OTEANN had to deal

predict a value equal to the output feature, which was the target to be found.

We performed 11 episodes to measure the mean and standard deviation of each orthography-task pair and thus assess the consistency of our results. Future work may use more test samples to gain a statistical insight on the different types of errors depending on the orthography at hand.

3 Results

First, regarding the results of the two baseline orthographies, the 'eno' opaque orthography obtained a score of 0% in both writing and reading, which was in line with the expectations given that there was no correlation between its phonemes and its graphemes; on the other hand, the 'ent' transparent orthography scored above 99.6% on the writing and reading tasks, which indicated a high level of correlation between its phonemes and its graphemes. We thus considered our ANN model satisfactory for our objective of comparing the performance of different orthographies.

Figure 3 and Table 3 present our main results. They are significantly different between writing and reading since these tasks are generally not symmetrical. Two features are likely to influence the symmetry, and therefore the efficiency of each task. As recalled by Figure 2, the most important feature would undoubtedly be the number of possible phoneme-to-grapheme and grapheme-to-phoneme ambiguities per tested orthography. Unfortunately we did not possess such data. Another impacting feature may be the number of possible values (graphemes or phonemes) for a given target character. The higher the number of values, the harder the prediction should be for the ANN. Future work should investigate the relative importance of these features on the OTEANN performances.

Comparing OTEANN’s reading results with those of van den Bosch et al. (1994), OTEANN first seems to naturally assimilate the grapheme complexity (e.g. for French, it successfully learnt that "cadeau" should be pronounced /kado/). Regarding grapheme-to-phoneme complexity (G-P complexity), they ranked English (G-P complexity=90%) more complex than Dutch (G-P complexity=25%) which, in turn, was more complex than French (G-P complexity=15%). OTEANN results preserved the same ranking with transparency scores of 31%, 57% and 79s% for English, Dutch and French. Admittedly, OTEANN’s scores were different in terms of scale but OTEANN had to deal
Table 3: Phonemic transparency scores.
(OTEANN trained with 10,000 samples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>Write</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ent</td>
<td>99.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>99.8 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eno</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar</td>
<td>84.3 ± 0.8</td>
<td>99.4 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br</td>
<td>80.6 ± 0.6</td>
<td>77.2 ± 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>69.1 ± 1.0</td>
<td>78.0 ± 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en</td>
<td>36.1 ± 1.5</td>
<td>31.1 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eo</td>
<td>99.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>99.7 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es</td>
<td>66.9 ± 2.0</td>
<td>85.3 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi</td>
<td>97.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>92.3 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr</td>
<td>28.0 ± 1.4</td>
<td>79.6 ± 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fro</td>
<td>99.0 ± 0.3</td>
<td>89.7 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>94.5 ± 0.8</td>
<td>71.6 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>81.9 ± 1.0</td>
<td>97.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nl</td>
<td>72.9 ± 1.7</td>
<td>55.7 ± 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt</td>
<td>75.8 ± 1.0</td>
<td>82.4 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru</td>
<td>41.3 ± 1.6</td>
<td>97.2 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>99.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>99.3 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>95.4 ± 0.7</td>
<td>95.9 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh</td>
<td>19.9 ± 1.4</td>
<td>78.7 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 also allows categorizing the studied orthographies with respect to their degree of transparency:

- **Esperanto**: With scores above 99.3%, Esperanto orthography is nearly as transparent as the ‘ent’ baseline. The most common error occurred on a doubled letter in the input, which was incorrectly translated to a single letter.

- **Arabic, Finnish, Korean, Serbo-Croatian and Turkish**: Their scores above 80% both in writing and reading confirmed that their orthography is highly transparent as indicated in (Aro, 2004), (Wang and Tsai, 2009) and (Öney and Durgunoğlu, 1997). The Arabic score is high on in the read direction, which is likely due to the use of diacritics in the dataset; without them, the score would undoubtedly be lower. Regarding Korean, its orthography became a little less transparent during the twentieth century; its high scores suggest that further work should check the dataset and evaluate new scores.

- **Dutch**: The Dutch reading score (56%) is low but might be slightly enhanced given a possible lack of consistency regarding the phonemes used in the Dutch sub-dataset.

- **Russian**: The Russian writing score (41%) may seem low. However, Russian has strong stress-related vowel reduction, which makes it hard to know how to write a word without knowing the morphemes involved. Nevertheless, future work should either study their sub-dataset more in depth or use a different data source like wikipron\(^\text{11}\) to possibly improve its scores.

- **Chinese**: The results indicated a low writing score (20%), which is not surprising given

---

\(^{11}\)https://pypi.org/project/wikipron/
than some phonemes can have multiple corresponding graphemes and that there are thousands of graphemes (Hanzis) to be learnt. However, it turns out that its reading score is much higher (79%).

- **French**: With a low writing score (28%), the results showed that the chances of correctly writing a French word on the sole basis of its pronunciation were rare, as anticipated given the high number of phoneme-to-grapheme possibilities. Without being able to access a broader context than the word itself, the ANN was not able to reliably predict how to write a French word. With a much higher reading score (80%), the ANN obtained good reading results. As a comparison, for the same language, the alternative ‘fro’ orthography obtained excellent writing score (99%) and reading score (90%). Recall that the difference between its two scores is due to the fact that the ‘fro’ orthography is not bijective. For instance, in the reading direction, the <œ> letter can be translated into /o/ or /œ/.

- **English**: With a low writing score (36%) and a low reading score (31%), the results showed that English orthography is also highly opaque, which is consistent with most studies. As a reminder, a phonemic reading of an English word often does not work because of its high number of grapheme-to-phoneme possibilities. For instance the grapheme <œ> can either correspond to /a/ (as in "hug"), to /ju:/ (as in "hug"), to /ɪə/ (as in "cur") or /juə/ as in "cure". As for Russian, additional work should be dedicated to check the English sub-dataset and possibly enhance it if necessary, which could improve ‘en’ scores by a few percent.

Observing the detailed result of each prediction also made it possible to study the phonemic correspondences learned or not learned by the OTEANN model.

- For task-orthographies with a high transparency score, the model successfully predicted most pronunciations or spellings even when the correspondences involved more than one letter. For instance, OTEANN predicted that the Italian word "cerchia" should be pronounced /ʃɛrˈkjɑ/, hence showing that the model had successfully learned that <c>, when followed by <e>, should be pronounced as /ʃ/ and also that <c>, when followed by <h>, should be pronounced as /k/.

- For task-orthographies with a low transparency score, the model generally failed on letters involved in ambiguous correspondences (recall Figure 2). For instance, it incorrectly predicted that the pronunciation of the English word "level" was "lɪvl" instead of "lɜːvl", which might be a bad generalization from words like "lever" learned at training time. OTEANN also incorrectly predicted that the spelling of the French word /ale/ was "allez" when the expected target was "aller" (another French homophone); this type of error is inevitable since the OTEANN model intentionally use single word input samples and therefore cannot rely on neighboring words as additional context to discriminate between homophones with different spelling.

- Surprisingly, the model also predicted spellings that do not exist but who could have existed, in the same vein as ThisWordDoesNotExist.com. For instance, OTEANN predicted that the spelling of the French word /swaʁe/” was "soiër", which does not exist but looks like a French infinitive verb that would mean "to celebrate at a party".

In addition, the results in Table 3 also showed that the ANN has less than a 30% chance of correctly writing a word in French or Chinese after training on 10000 samples while Figure 9 shows that the same ANN has more than an 85% chance of correctly writing a word in Finnish, Italian, Serbo-Croatian or Turkish after training only on 1000 samples. Such a discrepancy highlights the enormous additional cost in terms of time and energy for learning a non-transparent orthography.

### 4 Discussion and Conclusion

Among the tested orthographies, some shared the grapheme inventory. Given that they are all trained together, there might be an impact on performance. Although some of our preliminary experiments with a single ANN instance per orthography did not seem to lead to significant differences, it could be interesting to formally compare both approaches.

---

12https://www.thisworddoesnotexist.com
The accuracy metric we used is all or nothing. Additional work could also study alternative accuracy metrics and compare their results on the different orthographies.

Although Wiktionary data may be inconsistent in quality and therefore positively or negatively impact the measured metric, the results obtained for Dutch, English and French orthographies reasonably extended those of van den Bosch et al. (1994) while the other results reflected the perception of several other studies. Consequently, our OTEANN model showed that an ANN can convincingly estimate a level of phonemic transparency for multiple orthographies both for the phoneme-to-grapheme and grapheme-to-phoneme directions.

This method should be easily applicable to other orthographies beyond those tested in this study. However, since the superfluous IPA symbols slightly influence the score results, future work should closely examine and discuss the phonemes to use depending on the orthography to be tested.

As OTEANN also points out some possible grapheme or phoneme errors when writing or reading phonemically, it could also be used to detect possible errors in the dictionaries of transparent orthographies; it could also be used to evaluate proposals for improving opaque orthographies.

Finally, it would be beneficial to investigate if our ANN and its artificial neural units somehow imitate the way a beginner learns to write and read a language. If so, it might suggest that a transparent orthography would be easier and faster to learn than an opaque orthography.
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A Additional Experiments and Results

In addition to testing our OTEANN model trained on 10,000 samples, we also tested the same OTEANN model but trained with fewer samples (1,000, 2,000, 3,000, and 5,000), each time following the methodology described in section 2. We then aggregated the results to summarize them in Figure 9, which shows the learning curve of the studied orthographies as a function of the number of training samples.
Figure 4: Scores with 1,000 training samples.

Figure 5: Scores with 2,000 training samples.

Figure 6: Scores with 3,000 training samples.

Figure 7: Scores with 5,000 training samples.

Figure 8: Scores with 10,000 training samples.

Figure 9: Scores according to the number of training samples.
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Abstract

Research in linguistic typology has shown that languages do not fall into the neat morphological types (synthetic vs. analytic) postulated in the 19th century. Instead, analytic and synthetic must be viewed as two poles of a continuum and languages may show a mix analytic and synthetic strategies to different degrees. Unfortunately, empirical studies that offer a more fine-grained morphological classification of languages based on these parameters remain few. In this paper, we build upon previous research by Liu & Xu (2011) and investigate the possibility of inferring information on morphological complexity from syntactic dependency networks.

1 Introduction

Language classification based on morphological profiles has prominently featured in the linguistic typology research agenda since the earliest days of the discipline. Earlier 19th century classifications essentially focused on morphological complexity in terms of the number of morphemes per word and the number of meanings per morpheme, and proposed that languages may be typologized into neatly discrete type, e.g. ‘isolating’, ‘agglutinative’, ‘inflectional’ (see Schwegler 1990). However, it soon became clear that such a holistic approach does not adequately capture the variation of natural languages (already Sapir 1921). Instead, morphological complexity should be viewed as an empirically measurable “multidimensional typological space” (Arkadiev & Klamer 2018: 444), in which languages can be arranged based on a number of parameters. Based on this line of reasoning, scholars have variously tried to measure morphological complexity by means of quantitative methods and classify languages accordingly. In this paper, we build upon a proposal by Liu & Xu (2011) and investigate whether syntactic dependency networks can be effectively used as tools for measuring (at least some aspects of) morphological complexity.

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 we review previous research on quantitative approaches to morphological typology. Section 3 briefly introduces syntactic dependency networks and network analysis. Section 4 is devoted to our own analysis. We first illustrate our data and methods (Section 4.1 and 4.2), and then present and discuss our results (Section 4.3 and 4.4). Section 5 contains a summary of our findings.

2 Quantitative morphological typology: previous research

Scholars generally agree that a more accurate and realistic morphological typology can only be achieved through empirical investigations of naturalistic (corpus) data, but how this measurement is to be carried out remains a matter of debate. To our knowledge, there exist two main approaches that have so far been pursued in the quantitative study of morphological typology.

1 We use the term morphological complexity in the narrow sense of enumerative complexity, that is, “the number of elements of which a given morphological entity consists, mainly inventory size and string length” (Arkadiev & Gardani 2020: 8).

2 For the large scale cross-linguistic investigation of some of these parameters see e.g. Bickel & Nichols (2013a; 2013b; 2013c).

3 By quantitative study, we intend here typological studies based on corpus data, that is, what Levshina (2019) refers to
The first approach stems from Greenberg (1960). Greenberg proposes that morphological complexity be decomposed in a few easily measurable indexes, e.g. the number of morphemes per word and the number of meanings expressed by each morpheme. To test this approach, Greenberg calculated each index by looking at 100-word stretches of texts in 8 different languages.

Siegel et al. (2014) follow a similar approach and focus on two morphological indexes, that is, the analyticity and the syntheticity indexes. They measure these by taking into account several parameters, including e.g. number of morphemes per words, in randomized samples of 1000 manually annotated tokens for 19 languages (4 languages plus 13 varieties of English and two English-based creoles).

The main advantage of the approach pursued by Greenberg (1960) and Siegel et al. (2014) is that they employ indexes that are theoretically well-grounded and offer an accurate morphological typology of the languages investigated. However, previous studies of this type present two major shortcomings. The first one concerns the data: both studies focus on a relatively narrow set of languages. The second one concerns the methodology: the indexes must be calculated by manually annotating (a sample of) tokens in each of the languages under investigation. While this methodology undoubtedly results in high quality and reliable data, it is a labor-intensive and time-consuming task, less suitable to investigate morphological complexity on a large cross-linguistic scale.

As an alternative, Liu & Xu (2011) propose to use syntactic dependency networks to explore morphological typology. The main assumption behind this approach is that network structure can be used as a proxy of morphological complexity, which can thus be measured by means of topological indexes of networks (see Section 3). The main advantage of this approach is that it allows to compare a potentially large number of languages for which annotated corpora are available, without the need to manually code each token for its morphological features.

Liu & Xu (2011) results suggest that networks can indeed be a useful tool to explore morphological typology, but their work may be improved in a number of respects. First, the methodology needs to be tested on a wider set of languages (Liu and Xu’s sample includes only 15 languages, with a significant overrepresentation of Indo-European languages). Secondly, the authors partly leave open the question of which network measure best captures morphological complexity.

3 Syntactic dependency networks

In this section, we describe syntactic dependency networks and their properties (Section 3.1), and we illustrate various indexes that can be used to interpret network structure (Section 3.2), with a focus on those indexes that we use in our own analysis in Section 4.

3.1 Defining syntactic dependency networks

A network is a structure consisting of a set of objects, called vertices or nodes, and a set of links, called edges. Edges connect two nodes and may be directed, if two nodes are involved in a hierarchical structure, or undirected. Directed and undirected networks differ based on whether they feature directed or undirected edges, respectively.¹

Networks have been shown to be a suitable tool to represent syntactic relations (Liu 2008; Čech & Mačutek 2009; Čech, Mačutek & Žabokršt 2011; Passarotti 2014; Čech, Mačutek & Liu 2016). This holds particularly true for dependency grammars, which view syntactic structures as binary and hierarchical relations between lexical nodes (Robinson 1970), thereby allowing the representation of sentences as rooted trees.² In Figure 1, we illustrate the representation of the sentences ‘John calls Mary’, ‘John eats an apple’, ‘The apple is red’ and ‘Mary buys some apples’ as dependency trees.

¹ For the purpose of this work, we treat dependencies as undirected.
² A tree is a graph in which no cycle can be found. A rooted tree is a tree in which one node is designated as the root of the tree.

---

as token-based typology and Gerdes et al. (2021) as typometrics. This contrasts with e.g. the classifications proposed by Bickel & Nichols (2013a; 2013b; 2013c), which are based on a sample of few formatives per language (Bickel & Nichols 2013d) and thus fall within the more traditional type-based typology (Levshina 2019).
A syntactic dependency network is a network representing dependency relations. We follow the definition of syntactic dependency network given by Ferrer i Cancho et al. (2004), that is, a set of words \( V \), consisting of the vocabulary of a language, and an adjacency matrix \( A \). If it happens in at least one sentence that two elements of \( V \), let us call them \( x \) and \( y \), are syntactically related, then the value in \( A \), corresponding to column \( x \) and row \( y \), will be equal to 1, otherwise it will be 0. The network is then induced from the matrix. This means that syntactic dependency networks built from treebanks actually consist of the combination of all networks that can be drawn from individual dependency trees. Taking the trees in Figure 1 as representing our treebank, the corresponding network has the structure shown in Figure 2.

Dependency networks can be further differentiated into word-based and lemma-based networks (see Čech & Mačutek 2009). The former feature words occurring in sentences as nodes, while in the latter the nodes consist of lemmas. The difference between word- and lemma-based networks is shown in Figure 2 and 3.

### 3.2 Network indexes

The structure of networks can be analyzed by taking into account a number of parameters, or indexes. Here, we briefly illustrate the network topological indexes that we employ in our analysis (we refer to Albert & Barabasi 2002; Liu & Xu 2011 for extensive discussion on how the indexes are measured).

**Number of edges and nodes:** this is the total count of all nodes and edges featured in a network.

**Average degree:** the count of the links in which a node is involved is called degree. The average of the degrees of a network is the simplest measure that can be calculated.

**Average path length:** in a connected network, it is always possible to find a path between two given nodes. If two nodes are connected, the path length between them is 1, if they are not directly connected, then the path length is computed ‘jumping’ from one node to another starting from the source node until the target node is reached. The distance is calculated by considering the shortest possible path. The average path length refers to the average of the distances between each pair of nodes in the network.

**Clustering coefficient:** syntactic dependency networks have the tendency to form clusters in which groups of three elements are completely connected. Clustering coefficient measures the proportion of fully connected triplets of nodes over the number of all the possible groups of three nodes in the network.

**Diameter:** the diameter of a network is the maximal distance between any pair of its nodes.
Network centralization (Horvath & Dong 2008): network centralization (NC) is a measure to find the most central nodes in a network.

\textit{Gamma}. according to Albert & Barabási (2002), in so-called real networks the degree distribution follows a power-law. It has been shown that syntactic dependency networks are real networks and likewise follow a power-law \( P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma} \) (thus Ferrer i Cancho et al. 2004).

In particular, based on data discussed by (Ferrer i Cancho 2005), it seems that syntactic dependency networks share a common behavior: their degree distributions follow a power-law, their average path length is similar to average path length in random graphs (Erdős-Rényi graphs) and their clustering coefficient is significantly higher than clustering coefficient in random graphs. These features allow us to consider syntactic dependency networks as small-world and scale-free networks (see further Albert & Barabási 2002; Ferrer i Cancho et al. 2004; Liu & Xu 2011 for discussion).

4 Using networks to measure morphological complexity

Studies by Liu & Xu (2011) and Čech & Mačutek (2009) make a strong case that dependency networks may be used to infer morphological complexity. In this paper, we focus on the networks’ potential to explore one component of morphological complexity, that is, the analyticity/syntheticity index. This index reflects the prevalence of synthetic vs. analytic strategies in individual languages. Based on Greenberg’s (1960) insights, our assumption is that the index is a gradient, and languages may vary from highly synthetic (prevalence of synthesis) to highly analytic (prevalence of analysis), with several intermediate types.

Following Siegel et al. (2014: 52–53), we distinguish analytic vs. synthetic strategies based on how they convey grammatical information: analytic strategies use free markers, whereas synthetic strategies use bound markers (see also Bickel & Nichols 2013a for discussion).

Dependency treebanks are well suited to explore analyticity/syntheticity for a number of reasons. First, treebanks are already tokenized, which makes it straightforward to single out free vs. bound markers. Moreover, the number of dependencies in a sentence can be indirectly taken as a sign of higher/lower analyticity.

To illustrate these points, let us compare the dependency trees of the sentence ‘I will eat the apple’ in Italian and English, as in Figure 4. The main difference between English and Italian is that in Italian grammatical information concerning verbal person/number and TAM is packed by a single form, i.e. \textit{mangerò ‘eat.FUT.1SG’}, while the same content must be expressed by three free forms \textit{I will eat} in English. In other words, to express future tense, Italian resorts to a more synthetic strategy than English. This is reflected in the number of nodes and links in the trees: the English tree features more nodes and hence more dependencies. This information easily translates into different network structures, in the sense that in principle the more analytic the construction the more edges and nodes the corresponding network will show.

In the reminder of this section, we put Liu & Xu’s (2011) intuitions about the connection between analyticity and network structure to a test.

4.1 Data sampling

This study is based on a sample of 42 languages (Appendix A). The sampling procedure has been essentially practical in nature. First, we have only included languages for which treebanks are available in Universal Dependencies (UD) (Nivre et al. 2016; Croft et al. 2017). The reason to work with UD is both practical and theoretical. In the first place, UD allows to easily access already uniform tokenization schema. This limits the risk of biases induced by different tokenization styles across treebanks.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example.png}
\caption{Italian vs. English dependency trees}
\end{figure}

\footnote{Clearly, the reliability of tokenization is a potential issue, especially considering problematic items such as clitics. In this study, we work with UD treebanks, which share a...}
annotated data from a variety of languages. From a theoretical viewpoint, the UD annotation schema, which maximizes consistency of annotation across languages, makes UD treebanks particularly well suited for typological studies (see e.g. Levshina 2019; Gerdes et al. 2021).

To maximize diversity among the available UD treebanks, we have picked out one treebank for each language family represented in UD (and one for each branch in each family, where available). Moreover, we have also included historical varieties within the same branch where possible (e.g. Classical Chinese and Mandarin Chinese, Ancient Greek and Modern Greek).

In addition, we have split the treebanks into two groups. The first group features a set of six treebanks that we use to set up our control group. These languages are able to be reasonably taken as instantiating two poles of higher analyticity vs. higher syntheticity. The former include Vietnamese (vie), Mandarin Chinese (zh), and Classical Chinese (zh). The latter are Russian (rus), Finnish (fin), and Uyghur (uig). The second group includes all the other languages in the sample, whose degree of analyticity/syntheticity we seek to measure.

4.2 Methods

Our study diverges from Liu & Xu (2011) in a number of significant methodological respects. In the first place, Liu & Xu (2011) calculated for each of the 15 languages in their sample several topological indexes and then performed a cluster analysis to classify languages accordingly. In this study, we do not apply clustering techniques. The reason is that clustering analysis may force languages into “hierarchically organized groups” even in absence of a real underlying motivation (Cysouw 2007: 63–64). In our case, we do not in principle expect languages to cluster into neatly defined groups based on their degree of analyticity. Instead, as we have already mentioned, we conceive analyticity/syntheticity as a one-dimension continuum (cf. Gerdes et al. 2021: 13–19).

Abandoning clustering techniques also means that we need to independently single out among the topological indexes those that most likely reflect the difference between the prevalence of analytic vs. synthetic strategies. Moreover, we need take into consideration the different size of the treebanks in our sample (ranging from 955 tokens to 473.881 tokens), as treebank size could lead to potential biases when measuring network indexes.

To overcome these issues, we first established which network indexes perform well in distinguishing analytic vs. synthetic languages irrespective of treebank size. To do so, we set 7 arbitrary sizes (1,000, 5,000, 10,000, 20,000, 30,000, 50,000 and 75,000 tokens) and we extracted one random sub-treebank for each of the above sizes for the languages in the control group.

From each sub-treebank, we induced the corresponding word-based dependency network excluding punctuation marks, symbols and elliptical dependency relations. We calculated the topological indexes described in Section 3 using the python package igraph (Csárdi & Nepusz 2006). For the purpose of this paper, we have focused on word-based networks, as these have been claimed to better represent morphological variation than lemma-based networks (Liu & Xu 2011; Čech & Mačutek 2009).

We then carried out a Welch t-test (Welch 1947) to establish which indexes are more reliable to separate the two groups, and have picked out only those indexes that perform significantly better across all sub-treebanks' sizes. The Welch t-test is used to test the hypothesis that two groups have equal means. The null hypothesis, in our case, was that the two groups means were equal. If a t-test performed on a topological index resulted to discard null hypothesis (significance level=0.05), then we consider it as a metric able to separate the two groups, hence possibly reflecting the analytic vs. synthetic distinction.

Once the significant metrics have been singled out, the second step was to measure these indexes for the rest of the languages in our sample and compare them with those of the control group. For

---

1 We are aware that the choice of these languages is in part arbitrary, but these are languages (or belong to language families) that have been repeatedly pointed out in the literature as instantiating prototypically analytic vs. synthetic languages.

2 The code and data used for this study are freely available at https://github.com/bavagliladri/tb2net.

3 The test was carried out using the python library SciPy (Virtanen et al. 2020)
the other languages we extracted only one treebank for the largest possible size (up to 30k, see Section 4.3), in order to make the best use of the available data. For example, for the UD_Wolof-WTB treebank, whose size is 38,937 tokens, we produced a sub-treebank of 30,000 tokens. From these treebanks, we induced the corresponding dependency networks and calculated the relevant network indexes following the procedure outlined above. The results of our analysis are discussed in the next section.

4.3 Results

Let us first discuss the results of the t-test performed on the control group. Table 1 reports the p-value for each index across all treebank sizes (with 3 languages per group in the 1k-30k and 2 languages per group in 50-70k; see Appendix B for the raw data). As the results show, the indexes that consistently give a p-value of less than 0.05 are number of nodes and average path length.

The other indexes give a mixed picture. Number of edges is never significant. However, the other indexes are significant for some specific sub-size(s). For example, unlike Liu & Xu (2011: 4), we do not find network centrality (nc) to be a consistently significant index. This index performs well for treebank size 5k-30k, but not for the smallest size of 1k, and we found a similar result for clustering coefficient. By contrast, average degree gives consistent results only for the smallest sizes 1k and 5k. Nevertheless, since none of these indexes performs consistently well for size 1k-30k, for this preliminary study we have decided to leave these aside and focus only on number of nodes and average path length. More research is needed to fully understand the interplay between treebank size and topological indexes of the corresponding networks, also adopting other statistical tests.

In addition, note that none of the indexes yields significant results when the treebank size is 50k tokens or higher. It may be possible that the significant results obtained from the networks induced from the smaller treebanks are due to chance. However, it must be mentioned that only 4 out of the 6 treebanks of the control group have more than 50k tokens and the reduced size of the control group may have affected the statistical testing. For these reasons, for treebanks more than 30k tokens, we have randomly created 30k size sub-treebanks and have only analyzed the corresponding networks, since beyond this size the indexes appear to be less reliable.

We have then measured number of nodes and average path length for the networks induced from the rest of the languages in our sample. The results are reported in Appendix C. In Figure 5 and 6 we visualize the results for 5k and 30k treebanks respectively. Data is visualized as a one-dimension continuum for each index (see Gerdes et al. 2021: 13–19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1k</th>
<th>5k</th>
<th>10k</th>
<th>20k</th>
<th>30k</th>
<th>50k</th>
<th>75k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n_edges</td>
<td>0.46654</td>
<td>0.29684</td>
<td>0.23868</td>
<td>0.23032</td>
<td>0.20536</td>
<td>0.36893</td>
<td>0.36173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n_nodes</td>
<td>0.04801</td>
<td>0.02542</td>
<td>0.02413</td>
<td>0.02402</td>
<td>0.02458</td>
<td>0.17776</td>
<td>0.17076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av_degree</td>
<td>0.00219</td>
<td>0.03466</td>
<td>0.05941</td>
<td>0.06613</td>
<td>0.07789</td>
<td>0.30949</td>
<td>0.31478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg_path_length</td>
<td>0.02765</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>0.00441</td>
<td>0.10372</td>
<td>0.09932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clus_coeff</td>
<td>0.2025</td>
<td>0.0186</td>
<td>0.02495</td>
<td>0.03039</td>
<td>0.03114</td>
<td>0.23311</td>
<td>0.22447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diam</td>
<td>0.04674</td>
<td>0.03303</td>
<td>0.06705</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>0.06032</td>
<td>0.08439</td>
<td>0.21913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nc</td>
<td>0.35234</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
<td>0.01896</td>
<td>0.01642</td>
<td>0.00805</td>
<td>0.04418</td>
<td>0.10778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gamma</td>
<td>0.26583</td>
<td>0.12827</td>
<td>0.03547</td>
<td>0.03731</td>
<td>0.0401</td>
<td>0.26701</td>
<td>0.21379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An anonymous reviewer suggests that, as an alternative, one could also place each treebank in the uppermost allowable group and then, for treebanks with more than 5k, sample smaller sub-sets for each of the smaller sizes. While we see the potential for this approach, we have not pursued it in this paper. The reason is that based on the control group, we establish which network indexes perform well irrespective of treebank size. Once treebank size becomes irrelevant, this means that for the rest of the sample we can safely look one treebank of the largest possible size.
4.4 Discussion

Let us first comment upon the results of the t-test on the control group. Our hypothesis that average path length and number of nodes might be taken as proxies for the analyticity index can be linguistically motivated by the nature of networks.

Average path length represents the average distance between any pair of nodes and therefore reflects connectivity in the network. The more highly connected the nodes are, the easier it will be to reach any node in the network starting from any arbitrary point. In particular, the occurrence of hub nodes, that is, highly connected nodes, will result in a generally lower average path length, because hub nodes frequently serve as bridge between nodes which would otherwise be connected by longer paths. As shown by Passarotti (2014), in the case of syntactic dependency networks, hub nodes are often grammatical words like determiners, adpositions, and auxiliaries. Notably, these are as a general rule preferably used in analytic languages, which by definition tend to express grammatical information by means of independent words as opposed to bound morphology (see Siegel et al. 2014: 52–53). The prediction is thus that analytic languages will have a lower average path length than synthetic languages.

Number of nodes also indirectly reflects morphological complexity. In particular, in word-based networks, languages with inflectional morphology will feature more nodes per lexeme, one for each inflected form, than analytic languages. This can clearly be observed in Figure 1, where apple and apples are two distinct nodes. The prediction is thus that analytic languages will have a lower number of nodes than synthetic languages.\(^\text{11}\)

\(^{11}\) One anonymous reviewer suggests that the same result, i.e. higher number of nodes correlates with higher synthesis, could also be extracted by simply measuring the ratio of different word forms per lemma in treebanks, without the need to resorting to networks. However, a higher number of word forms per lemma does not necessarily mean that a language is more synthetic, but simply that it has larger inflectional paradigms. To achieve a more fine-grained...
Both predictions are fully borne out by data from the control group (see Appendix B): networks induced from synthetic languages have higher average path length and higher number of nodes than those from analytic languages.

Turning to the rest of the languages in the sample, for treebanks with size lower than 30k, in most cases the results seem to match our intuitions about the relationship between the indexes under analysis and the analyticity/syntheticity index. Consider Figure 5. First, languages are indeed placed along a continuum, and do not seem to cluster into neatly defined groups. This matches our assumption that analyticity is a continuum. Languages of the control group indeed seem to occupy different regions of the continuum. The other languages also pattern accordingly. For example, Chukchi (ckt) and Buryat (bua), both rich inflectional languages (see Dunn 1999; Skribnik 2003), show an average path length comparable to that of synthetic languages. By contrast, Yoruba, which shows a marked analytic profile (Awobuluyi 1978), shows an average path degree even lower than that of the control group analytic languages.

Unfortunately, the picture is not as neat for the rest of the languages in the sample. This is particularly true for the group of treebanks with 30k size (recall that this group also includes reduced versions of all treebanks with size over 30k in our sample). The results shown in Figure 6 can hardly reflect underlying morphological complexity of the languages under analysis. For example, it is not clear why most languages, even highly inflectional ones such as Latin and Ancient Greek, seem to pattern with the analytic languages in the control group. Further study is needed to understand why we get less reliable results with treebanks of higher size. Note that there seems to be a cluster of languages whose dependency networks have average path length between 3.5 and 4.0. This result has previously not been discussed in the literature, and more research is needed to investigate whether this is accidental or not.

Another limitation of the methodology pursued in this paper is that other indexes of morphological complexity cannot be inferred from network structure alone. For example, syntactic dependency networks do not allow to extrapolate more fine-grained information about the internal structure of words in term of cumulation. This means that distinctions that are crucial to morphological typology, such as the distinction between cumulative vs. agglutinative strategies, cannot be measured with this methodology.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we have put to an empirical test the proposal advanced by Liu & Xu (2011) that syntactic dependency networks can be exploited to investigate cross-linguistic variation in morphological complexity.

Our findings only partly support the validity of this methodology. While we are sympathetic with the underlying assumptions, we must conclude, against Liu & Xu’s (2011) more optimistic view, that when applied to larger cross-linguistic datasets, network indexes do not yet yield consistently interpretable results as to morphological complexity.

This means that more research is needed to fully ascertain the suitability of networks to explore morphological complexity. In particular, more attention needs to be paid to the role of treebank size and to the potential impact of annotation schemas. Another potentially confounding factor is that we have worked on networks directly extracted from treebanks as a whole. It needs to be tested whether better results may be achieved by working with networks that operate a finer-grained distinction for e.g. parts of speech.

Finally, we must stress that even for neat data such as that in Figure 5, the proposed correlation between network indexes and the language’s analyticity index must remain at this stage tentative. While there might well be a linguistic motivation to link higher number of nodes and average path length to higher syntheticity, the validity of these assumptions needs to be tested against a finer-grained qualitative assessment such as that

result, one would need to calculate and compare the ratio of word forms per lemma for various lemmas and various parts of speech. This is a more complex procedure than simply exploring the number of nodes in a network, which is therefore in principle a more efficient procedure. Notably, variation in paradigm size in inflectional languages can also be explored with networks, by comparing word-based with corresponding lemma-based networks (see Čech & Mačutek 2009).
proposed by Greenberg (1960) and Siegel et al. (2014).
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### Appendix A: Language sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>ISO code</th>
<th>Treebank</th>
<th>Token size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akkadian</td>
<td>akk</td>
<td>UD_Akkadian-RIAO</td>
<td>21961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>ara</td>
<td>UD_Arabic-PADT</td>
<td>242383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambara</td>
<td>bam</td>
<td>UD_Bambara-CRB</td>
<td>11873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buryat</td>
<td>bua</td>
<td>UD_Buryat-BDT</td>
<td>8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>cat</td>
<td>UD_Catalan-AnCora</td>
<td>473881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukchi</td>
<td>ckt</td>
<td>UD_Chukchi-HSE</td>
<td>4740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td>cop</td>
<td>UD_Coptic-Scriptorium</td>
<td>45496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>ell</td>
<td>UD_Greek-GDT</td>
<td>56145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>eng</td>
<td>UD_English-GUM</td>
<td>97979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>eus</td>
<td>UD_Basque-BDT</td>
<td>101444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>fas</td>
<td>UD_Persian-PerDT</td>
<td>457439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>fin</td>
<td>UD_Finnish-TDT</td>
<td>171836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old French</td>
<td>fro</td>
<td>UD_Old_French-SRCMF</td>
<td>170740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>gle</td>
<td>UD_Irish-IDT</td>
<td>104547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>got</td>
<td>UD_Gothic-PROIEL</td>
<td>55317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Greek</td>
<td>grc</td>
<td>UD_Ancient_Greek-PROIEL</td>
<td>213980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbyá Guaraní</td>
<td>gun</td>
<td>UD_Mbya_Guarani-Thomas</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>hin</td>
<td>UD_Hindi-HDTB</td>
<td>328101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>hun</td>
<td>UD_Hungarian-Szeged</td>
<td>36212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>hye</td>
<td>UD_Armenian-ArmTDP</td>
<td>42213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>ind</td>
<td>UD_Indonesian-GSD</td>
<td>103238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>jpn</td>
<td>UD_Japanese-GSD</td>
<td>172209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>kaz</td>
<td>UD_Kazakh-KTB</td>
<td>8316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>kor</td>
<td>UD_Korean-Kaist</td>
<td>310205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komi Zyrian</td>
<td>kpv</td>
<td>UD_Komi_Zyrian-Lattice</td>
<td>4060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>lat</td>
<td>UD_Latin-LLCT</td>
<td>206859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>lav</td>
<td>UD_Latvian-LVTB</td>
<td>179744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Chinese</td>
<td>lzh</td>
<td>UD_Classical_Chinese-Kyoto</td>
<td>232188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erzya</td>
<td>myv</td>
<td>UD_Erzya-JR</td>
<td>13038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Russian</td>
<td>orv</td>
<td>UD_Old_Russian-TOROT</td>
<td>149484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naija</td>
<td>pcm</td>
<td>UD_Naija-NSC</td>
<td>100557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>rus</td>
<td>UD_Russian-GSD</td>
<td>78200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit Vedic</td>
<td>san</td>
<td>UD_Sanskrit-Vedic</td>
<td>27117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nort Sami</td>
<td>sme</td>
<td>UD_North_Sami-Giella</td>
<td>22702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>tam</td>
<td>UD_Tamil-TTB</td>
<td>8580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>tgl</td>
<td>UD_TAGalog-Ugnayan</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>tha</td>
<td>UD_Thai-PUD</td>
<td>21916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uyghur</td>
<td>uig</td>
<td>UD_Uyghur-UDT</td>
<td>32401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>vie</td>
<td>UD_Vietnamese-VD</td>
<td>33887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolof</td>
<td>wol</td>
<td>UD_Wolof-WTB</td>
<td>38937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>yor</td>
<td>UD_Yoruba-YTB</td>
<td>7119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: number of nodes and average path length for the control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size*</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>ISO code</th>
<th>avg_path_length</th>
<th>n_nodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1k</td>
<td>avg_path_length</td>
<td>fin 7,0926602 rus 7,1181678 uig 8,3712409 lzh 5,1750507 vie 5,7376548 zho 5,729498 3841 2128 4100 650 692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n_nodes</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5k</td>
<td>avg_path_length</td>
<td>fin 6,4890935 rus 6,2090146 uig 6,0436406 lzh 4,1943988 vie 4,3817425 zho 4,7894008 765 9103 765 1642 2037 2534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n_nodes</td>
<td>3477</td>
<td>3359</td>
<td>3063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10k</td>
<td>avg_path_length</td>
<td>fin 6,0495081 rus 5,8471496 uig 5,5202574 lzh 3,8458437 vie 4,0076761 zho 4,4870999 5797 6262 5797 1562 1362 2534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n_nodes</td>
<td>6309</td>
<td>6125</td>
<td>5306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20k</td>
<td>avg_path_length</td>
<td>fin 5,6139062 rus 5,4378837 uig 5,0921595 lzh 3,7027092 vie 3,7923894 zho 4,217152 5427 7007 5427 1842 1737</td>
<td>5797 6262 5797 1562 1362 2534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n_nodes</td>
<td>11174</td>
<td>10715</td>
<td>8888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30k</td>
<td>avg_path_length</td>
<td>fin 5,3847064 rus 5,1784228 uig 4,8219065 lzh 3,5586503 vie 3,6615379 zho 4,1005896 822 783 801 549 650 692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n_nodes</td>
<td>15535</td>
<td>14699</td>
<td>11828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50k</td>
<td>avg_path_length</td>
<td>fin 5,0969112 rus 4,957050 uig - lzh 3,428777 vie - zho 3,9497258 3333 3333 3333 3333 3333 3333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n_nodes</td>
<td>23451</td>
<td>22020</td>
<td>5273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75k</td>
<td>avg_path_length</td>
<td>fin 4,9043123 rus 4,7678429 uig - lzh 3,3602782 vie - zho 3,8341283 3333 3333 3333 3333 3333 3333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n_nodes</td>
<td>31823</td>
<td>29734</td>
<td>6330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C: network indexes for the sample languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISO code</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>avg_path_length</th>
<th>n_nodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gun</td>
<td>1k</td>
<td>4,3342128</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kpv</td>
<td>1k</td>
<td>7,5279103</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tgl</td>
<td>1k</td>
<td>3,8475797</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bua</td>
<td>5k</td>
<td>6,7303552</td>
<td>3072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ckt</td>
<td>5k</td>
<td>5,6628477</td>
<td>2471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaz</td>
<td>5k</td>
<td>7,3374322</td>
<td>3241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>5k</td>
<td>5,7456242</td>
<td>2637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yor</td>
<td>5k</td>
<td>3,7964219</td>
<td>1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bam</td>
<td>10k</td>
<td>3,1309446</td>
<td>1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myv</td>
<td>10k</td>
<td>5,6029887</td>
<td>5137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akk</td>
<td>20k</td>
<td>4,0322794</td>
<td>2802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sme</td>
<td>20k</td>
<td>4,4667009</td>
<td>7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha</td>
<td>20k</td>
<td>3,5982284</td>
<td>4076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ara</td>
<td>30k</td>
<td>3,8098087</td>
<td>8732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For reasons of space, in Appendix B and C we only report data on average path lengths and number of nodes. Data on the other indexes can be consulted at https://github.com/bavagiladri/tb2net.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Size (30k)</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cat</td>
<td>3.6261545</td>
<td>7752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cop</td>
<td>3.1254</td>
<td>3341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ell</td>
<td>3.973389</td>
<td>7892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>3.8710204</td>
<td>8076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eus</td>
<td>4.463648</td>
<td>12130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fas</td>
<td>3.6510337</td>
<td>8517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fro</td>
<td>3.8691324</td>
<td>7066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gle</td>
<td>3.7789008</td>
<td>7670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got</td>
<td>3.7018547</td>
<td>6311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grc</td>
<td>4.0874524</td>
<td>8941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hin</td>
<td>3.5812191</td>
<td>6320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hun</td>
<td>4.4091939</td>
<td>12430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hye</td>
<td>4.704363</td>
<td>11406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>4.3958122</td>
<td>10332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jpn</td>
<td>3.5393915</td>
<td>7644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kor</td>
<td>6.2509272</td>
<td>17359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat</td>
<td>3.7646329</td>
<td>3645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lav</td>
<td>4.9259688</td>
<td>13437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orv</td>
<td>4.2763492</td>
<td>10635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pcm</td>
<td>3.2327011</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>san</td>
<td>4.5486621</td>
<td>7785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wol</td>
<td>3.6142526</td>
<td>5720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

This paper investigates updates of Universal Dependencies (UD) treebanks in 23 languages and their impact on a downstream application. Numerous people are involved in updating UD’s annotation guidelines and treebanks in various languages. However, it is not easy to verify whether the updated resources maintain universality with other language resources. Thus, validity and consistency of multilingual corpora should be tested through application tasks involving syntactic structures with PoS tags, dependency labels, and universal features. We apply the syntactic parsers trained on UD treebanks from multiple versions (2.0 to 2.7) to a clause-level sentiment extractor. We then analyze the relationships between attachment scores of dependency parsers and performance in application tasks. For future UD developments, we show examples of outputs that differ depending on version.

1 Introduction

Universal Dependencies (UD) (Nivre and Fang, 2017; Zeman et al., 2020) is a worldwide project that provides cross-linguistic treebank annotations. UD defined 17 PoS tags and 37 dependency labels to annotate multilingual sentences in a uniform manner, allowing language-specific extension to be represented by features. The resources and documents are updated every six months. The latest version 2.7, as of November 2020, consists of 183 treebanks in 104 languages.

The UD corpora are consistently annotated in multiple languages and are extensively used to train and evaluate taggers and parsers (Zeman et al., 2017). Kondratyuk and Straka (2019) trained a single dependency model for many languages relying on UD corpora. Schwenk and Douze (2017) used universal PoS (UPOS) labels to evaluate multilingual sentence representations. However, few studies have focused on the contributions of syntactic parsers trained by UD corpora to real-world applications.

Extrinsic evaluation of dependency parser has been already studied in a series of shared tasks (Oepen et al., 2017; Fares et al., 2018) using tasks of event extraction, negation detection and opinion analysis for English documents. In addition to extrinsic evaluation of parsers, Kanayama and Iwamoto (2020) established a method for evaluating the universality of UD-based parsers and UD corpora by using a clause-level sentiment extractor, which detects positive and negative predicates and targets on top of UD-based syntactic trees. They showed that language-universal syntactic structures
and features are effective in their multilingual systems.

In this paper we investigate how the UD corpora and underlying guidelines are updated and how they contribute to the parser and sentiment extractor which consumes the output of the parser. We compared UD versions 2.0 to 2.7 in 23 languages from diverse language families.

Figure 1 shows the proposed methodology. The idea is to use corpora with sentence-level sentiment annotations (SA) in two ways: 1) we can compare SA results considering different syntactic models; 2) we can compare the SA annotation with the golden sentiment annotation. The first one is useful for qualitative analysis. The second one is useful for quantitative analysis, given that we can measure the SA efficiency.

First, we trained a dependency parsing model for each UD corpora version (UD release) using a fixed syntactic parser. Using the models, we produce as many syntactic analyses as models for each corpus with sentence-level sentiment annotations. Later, we applied a deterministic rule-based sentiment annotator for each syntactic tree. The advantage of this methodology is that it is much easier to find sentiment annotation errors than syntactic annotation errors, and those errors often show the essential aspects of syntax. Comparing the gold sentiment annotation of input and final output, we can quantitatively estimate the usefulness of parsing models, moreover, a qualitative analysis of system outputs provides practical insights for corpora maintainers. In particular, inspecting the output of a sentiment analysis system for discovering possible annotation inconsistencies is one important additional advantage.

We found examples where improvements in the corpus have led to improvements in the output of the sentiment annotator (reducing the number of uses of the \texttt{dep} relation and minimizing the errors reported by the UD validator). But some examples can be also found where change in the corpus had made a negative impact in the sentiment analysis (Section 5). We use a different measure ($F_2$) to extrinsically evaluate the UD corpora. It is not directly related to the intrinsic UD measures such as star rating for UD corpora and LAS for the dependency parser.

Section 2 summarizes the changes of the UD corpora in versions 2.0–2.7. Section 3 describes the sentiment analysis methodology which is used for benchmarking dependency parsers. In Section 4 we show how to evaluate multilingual systems, and in Section 5, we discuss the differences of multiple versions of UD corpora with multilingual instances of changes in syntactic structures and downstream results.

## 2 Universal Dependencies

Universal Dependencies is a framework for designing and maintaining consistent syntactic annotations across multiple languages. The UD corpora are updated every six months by numerous contributors.

However, few studies have focused on the changes in outputs of UD-trained parsers used for application tasks. Labeled Attachment Score (LAS) and the UD star rating are two commonly used metrics to evaluate the update of the UD corpora. LAS is a measure of the performance of dependency parsers, where the universal dependency labels are taken into account in the measurement. The star rating is a measure designed by UD organizers, which quantifies the qualities of the corpora themselves, such as usability of corpora and variety of genres. While the UD corpora and the parsers have been evaluated, there is a need for an external evaluation of UD in application tasks.

To explore the impacts caused by updates of UD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lang</th>
<th>name</th>
<th># sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ar</td>
<td>PADT</td>
<td>7,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td>AnCora</td>
<td>16,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs</td>
<td>PDT</td>
<td>87,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>GSD</td>
<td>15,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en</td>
<td>EWT</td>
<td>16,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es</td>
<td>Ancora</td>
<td>17,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa</td>
<td>Seraji</td>
<td>5,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr</td>
<td>GSD</td>
<td>16,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>6,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi</td>
<td>HDTB</td>
<td>16,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hr</td>
<td>SET</td>
<td>9,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id</td>
<td>GSD</td>
<td>5,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>ISDT</td>
<td>14,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja</td>
<td>GSD</td>
<td>8,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>GSD</td>
<td>6,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nl</td>
<td>Alpino</td>
<td>13,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Bokmaal</td>
<td>20,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>LFG</td>
<td>17,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt</td>
<td>Bosque</td>
<td>9,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru</td>
<td>SynTagRus</td>
<td>61,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv</td>
<td>Talbanken</td>
<td>6,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>IMST</td>
<td>5,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh</td>
<td>GSD</td>
<td>4,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: UD corpora used in this study and their sizes. Sizes are based on sentence numbers in v2.7.
corpora on the sentiment analysis task, we first investigate the changes in the UD corpora listed in Table 1 with versions 2.0–2.7. One treebank was selected per language on the basis of the following conditions: texts are included in the corpus, the corpus is sufficiently large, the updates are frequent so a long term comparisons can be made across versions 2.0–2.7.

Figure 2 shows the UD treebanks updates for versions 2.0 (March 2017) to 2.7 (November 2020) in 23 languages. Inspecting the amount of changes between versions for each treebank was done regarding six out of the ten fields in the CoNLL-U files (form, lemma, upostag, feats, head, and deprel). Most languages have been actively updated in versions 2.0–2.7. In versions 2.0–2.4, most of the modifications in the UD corpora focused on fundamental syntactic elements such as PoS tags and dependency labels, and universal features were incrementally appended. On the other hand, in versions 2.4–2.6, the major updates shifted towards language-specific features.

Through discussion across languages, the UD’s annotation policy is gradually becoming more consistent among close languages. PoS tags for copulas and auxiliary verbs are one typical examples of this: “be” in “have been” and “will be” were changed from VERB to AUX in English v2.5, as well as “hebben” in Dutch v2.4. In addition, there is a movement to make AUX a closed set. In Portuguese v2.5, many AUX were changed to VERB, e.g., “continuar” (“continue”), “deixar” (“leave”). Similarly, French v2.1 and onward limit AUX to “être”, “avoir” and “faire,”. “Pouvoir” (‘can’) and other words in the same category are tagged as VERB, even though English modal verbs are tagged as AUX.

3 Multilingual Clause-level Sentiment Analysis

We investigate changes in UD corpora and their impact on an application task. We use clause-level sentiment analysis designed for fine-grained sentiment detection with high precision. Kanayama and Iwamoto (2020) demonstrated that a system which fully utilizes UD-based syntactic structures can easily handle many languages, making it an effective platform for evaluating UD corpora and parsing models trained on them.

The main objective of clause-level sentiment analysis is to detect polar clauses associated with a predicate and a target. For example, the sentence (1) below conveys two polarities: (1a) a positive polarity regarding the hotel (which is loved) and (1b) a negative polarity about the waiters (who are not friendly).

(1) I love the hotel but she said none of the waiters were friendly.
(1a) + love (hotel)
(1b) − not friendly (waiter)

Figure 3 illustrates the top-down process of detecting sentiment clauses in the dependency tree. The main clause is headed by the root node of the dependency tree. When the node has child nodes labeled conj and parataxis, those nodes are
Figure 3: Dependency tree for sentence (1). The dependencies in bold lines from the root node are traversed to detect two sentiment clauses (predicates and targets).

Table 2: Examples of lexical entries. ‘+’ is positive and ‘−’ is negative. Underline denotes the target case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>lemma</th>
<th>PoS tag</th>
<th>polarity</th>
<th>case frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>nsubj, obj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>nsubj, with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>unhappy</td>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>nsubj, with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all of the languages, detecting negation is the key to detecting polarities with high precision. The basic types of negation are direct negation of the verb and noun in (3) and (4).

(2) [−] I was unhappy with the breakfast.

(3) [−] The hotel was not good.

(4) [+] It was no problem.

To multilingualize the clause-level sentiment detector, the English polarity lexicon shown in Table 2 was transferred to other languages as described in previous paper (Kanayama and Iwamoto, 2020).

4 Experimental Settings

To extrinsically evaluate the UD corpora, we combine a UD-compliant dependency parser trained with multiple versions of UD corpora to the sentiment extractor. Since the syntactic structure is the only factor that changes the output of sentiment detection, we can easily find the effects of parsing to the downstream application.

4.1 Dependency parser

In our experiments, we have used two UD-compliant dependency parsers: UDPipe and Stanza. UDPipe (Straka and Straková, 2017) is the standard pipeline which performs sentence segmentation, tokenization, PoS tagging, lemmatization and dependency parsing, can be trained given annotated CoNLL-U format. Though a prototype of UDPipe 2.0 is released with improved morphosyntactic performance compared to UDPipe 1.2, we use UDPipe 1.2 because the resources for training UDPipe 2.0 was not available at this moment.

Since pretrained models are provided for most of treebanks, we used the distributed models trained on UD versions 2.0, 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5. For UD v2.6 and v2.7, we trained the models using the same parameters and word embeddings as those of v2.5. The models for Chinese v2.0 and v2.2 were not included since a simplified Chinese corpus was not available in those versions, and Polish for v2.0 is missing as well.

We also used Stanza, an open-source Python natural language processing toolkit that supports 66 languages. In this study we trained the Stanza models using each version of the UD corpora.

4.2 Datasets

To our knowledge, there is no multilingual clause-level sentiment annotation such as the Stanford Sentiment Treebank (Socher et al., 2013) for English. To compare output of various languages under the same parameters and word embeddings as those of v2.5, we used the same UD-Chinese-GSDSimp dataset which was not available in those versions and the models for Chinese v2.0 were not included since a simplified Chinese corpus was not available in those versions.

Downloaded from http://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/udpipe.

UD-Chinese-GSDSimp did not exist in the official version of UD2.4 thus we trained the model for Chinese v2.4 by picking up the pre-release corpus from the development branch as of September 9, 2019.
same conditions as possible, existing sentiment analysis datasets with clause-, aspect- or sentence-level annotations are simplified to sentence-level annotations by Kanayama and Iwamoto (2020). The reformatted dataset in each language consists of about 500 sentences, each with a positive or negative label. The percentage of those labels is equal and a sentence with a label does not contain a clause of the opposite polarity. Refer to the paper for more details.

4.3 Metrics

We evaluated the performance of the sentiment extractor using sentence-based metrics. Given a sentence, which is labeled either positive or negative in the datasets, our system detects an arbitrary number of sentiment clauses.

We calculate recall as the ratio of sentences for which the system detects one or more sentiment clauses that have the same polarity as the sentence-based polarity labeled in the gold data. Precision is the ratio of polarity coincidence between the system output (for a clause) and the gold label (for a sentence) for polar clauses detected by the system. A sentence that is labeled either positive or negative may have multiple clauses of opposite polarities, but for simplicity we just consider the sentence polarity in the gold data because we found that a simple evaluation is sufficient for relative comparison of parsers and syntactic operations.

To give precision more weight than recall for practical evaluation, we use the F₂ score in Equation (5), setting $\beta = 2$,

$$F_\beta = \frac{(1 + \beta^2) \cdot \text{prec} \cdot \text{rec}}{\text{prec} + \beta^2 \cdot \text{rec}} \text{ (5)}$$

We do not measure our system using the F₁ score because a naive word-spotting approach may result in a higher F₁ score where every sentence is classified positive or negative. The system is not for polarity classification, but to detect clauses that certainly express polarity. Therefore, non-syntactic sentiment clues (e.g. hashtags) or polar clauses with uncertain polarity to the target (e.g. subjunctive) are basically undetected.

5 Results and Analysis

5.1 Overall Quantitative Results

Figure 4 shows an overview of the relationship between dependency parsing and sentiment detection. The F₂ values calculated by switching the dependency parsing models trained on UD versions 2.0–2.7 in 23 languages and keeping the rest of the process (sentiment lexicon and tree-screening algorithms) consistent described in Section 3.

The figure shows that within a language, F₂ tend to increase as the LAS improves, and the latest version (v2.7) achieves better LAS and F₂ scores than the oldest one (v2.0) in many languages. The removing of bugs using UD validator and a variety
of annotation changes in the corpus contributes to the improvement of both the LAS and the F2, but other changes do not always improve the scores. For example, when annotations with complex and correct dependency relations are added, the learning of parsers become difficult and the LAS may decrease. No clear correlations between LAS and F2 scores can be observed, and that is precisely the motivation for the qualitative analysis presented in next section. It means, F2 (or our system, namely, evaluation in an application task) works as a different measure from the LAS or star rating.

Note that the F2 score is difficult to compare in different languages because of diversity in complexity of datasets. The performance of the dependency parsers are determined not only by the training corpora but also by the parameter settings and external resources (e.g. word embeddings).4

5.2 Analysis of each language

We illustrate sentence pairs where dependency parsers changed the outputs of the sentiment extractor correspondingly. A label such as “(nl2.4U)” denotes the language, UD version and dependency parser (UDPipe or Stanza). For example, (nl2.4U) denotes a Dutch result parsed by UDpipe which was trained on UD v2.4. A highlighted box shows the predicate and an underlined word shows its target, with blue color for positive and red for negative.

First, we show the differences in parsing that can significantly affect the results of sentiment clause detection, although we cannot guarantee whether they are caused by changes in corpora. Correct detection of negation is important for a downstream task, especially polarity detection. The sentiment extractor detected a polar expression “groot” (‘large’) from Dutch sentences (nl2.4/U). In (nl2.5U), the adjective “groot” is correctly negated by the adverb “niet” due to the direct link between two words and resulted in the correct extraction of negative sentiment, while in (nl2.4U) the system failed to change the polarity because “niet” was not directly attached to “groot”.

As shown in Section 3, a dependency label conj is heavily used for multiple clause detection; thus, it is the factor that significantly impacts the recall of the sentiment detector. For example, let us see (pt2.5U) and (pt2.6U) where the root node is “fácil” (‘easy’). In (pt2.6U), the system correctly detected “fluente” as positive predicate, while it is regarded a conjunct of “fácil”. In (pt2.5U), a predicate “fluente” (‘fluent’) is modifying the root node with a wrong label amod thus only one positive predicate “fácil” is detected.

Giving correct annotations and removing inconsistencies within a corpora improve the performance of parsing, and output of the sentiment extractor as well. Reduction of unspecified labels, namely dep label, is still a challenge in a variety of UD corpora. In (cs2.5U), the parsing result was not correct with a dep label, but the parsing result was improved in (cs2.6U) and thus a positive predicate was extracted.

---

4In some languages, different LAS scores were reported in different versions even when two corpora were identical.
A similar change in parsing results was observed in Dutch. There were 1,471 dep labels in UD Dutch v2.0, but they were explicitly labeled in v2.2. That makes it possible to extract the polarity of the sentence in (nl2.2S) with the correct dependency labels.

In the update of UD Arabic v2.4, various bugs were fixed which found by the new UD validation tool. In (ar2.2U), the tokenizer did not correctly split a token “ حياتي” (‘my life’), and thus the parser wrongly duplicate the token. In addition, many words had been tagged as X in (ar2.2U). The usage of X tag should be limited to special cases such as foreign words. In (ar2.4U), all words were correctly tagged and helped the detection of negative polarity. These are typical examples where refinements of corpus improved the output of the sentiment extractor.

A lot of dependency labels and PoS tags were updated in UD French v2.4. In a noun phrase (fr2.4U), a negative adjective “méprisant” (‘contemptuous’) was successfully detected because its was correctly attached to the head noun “maître” (‘master’).

---

5Arabic tokens are written from right to left, based on the actual order of the sentences.
A similar example can be found in Dutch. In (nl2.0S), the lemma of "hadden" ('had') was "heb", but in (nl2.2S) the lemma was changed to "hebben". Since our system is based on the lemma of UD Dutch v2.4 (e.g., for making dictionaries), parsers trained on corpora with different annotation policies result in worse performance.

If a dependency parser trained on UD is to be used for an application task, the user may consider whether the parser should be retrained for the new UD corpus. Detailed change logs of a corpus will help the system catch up the updated corpus.

Next, we show an example where the updates in UD corpora have affected unintended parts of parsing results. In Arabic, the improvement of the MWT (multi-word token) labels has influenced other parts of the system. In UD Arabic v2.4, the labeling of MWTs containing "ف" ('and') has been improved. However, it caused overfitting: the model learned that words containing "ف" are always MWTs and increased parsing errors in the word "فندق" ('hotel') as shown in (ar2.4S).

The change in the labels attached to verbs had an effect on the application task. In Catalan, many occurrences of AUX tag were changed to VERB in version 2.4. A PoS tag of "tornar" ("return") is changed from AUX to VERB, making the polar expression "segur" ('safe') being missed, because "segur" is the root node in (ca2.2S) but not in (ca2.4S).

To utilize UD-trained parsers in application tasks, it is expected to be robust to a variety of inputs. In (en2.5U), PoS tagging was not robust enough for an upparcased writing "HIGHLY RECOMMEND", and the PoS tagging error was propagated to dependency parsing and sentiment extraction.

A similar issue can be found in German. Nouns should be always capitalized regardless of its position in a German sentence. In (de2.2U), a noun "Schneiden" ('blades') was wrongly tagged as VERB because it was not capitalized. Since real-world inputs such as reviews may contain such capitalizing errors and misspellings, robust PoS taggers to those errors are desired. It is important to use UD treebanks that is sufficiently large for the parser training and suitable genres for the downstream tasks.
6 Conclusion

We observed updates of the UD corpora versions 2.0–2.7 in 23 languages and extrinsically evaluated the parsing models trained by the corpora in a real-world scenario. The evaluation using the sentiment extractor with UD-trained parsers do not correlate clearly with existing evaluations such as LAS and star rating, indicating that evaluation using an application task is useful to measure UD corpus from a new perspective.

We showed examples where the updates of UD corpora have either adversely or positively affected the output of dependency parsing and sentiment clause detection. Our methodology is easier to find the changes of sentiment detection. Those changes often show the important aspects of syntax.

We identified issues in multilingual applications of the UD platform. For example, some corpora have less diverse writing styles for informal sentences which are more common in review documents. In some languages, UD corpora updates have been slowed down after version 2.4 and shifted towards language-specific features and augmented dependencies, but there are still open problems in fundamental syntactic structures. We anticipate continuous improvements to multilingual corpora for UD communities worldwide. We hope the emergence of other applications that utilize UD’s syntactic structures will lead to further discussions and enhancements of multilingual corpora.
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Abstract

Sentiment analysis has come a long way for high-resource languages due to the availability of large annotated corpora. However, it still suffers from lack of training data for low-resource languages. To tackle this problem, we propose Conditional Language Adversarial Network (CLAN), an end-to-end neural architecture for cross-lingual sentiment analysis without cross-lingual supervision. CLAN differs from prior work in that it allows the adversarial training to be conditioned on both learned features and the sentiment prediction, to increase discriminativity for learned representation in the cross-lingual setting. Experimental results demonstrate that CLAN outperforms previous methods on the multilingual multi-domain Amazon review dataset. Our source code is released at https://github.com/hemanthkandula/clan.

1 Introduction

Recent success in sentiment analysis (Yang et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2019; Howard and Ruder, 2018; Brahma, 2018) is largely due to the availability of large-scale annotated datasets (Maas et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2015; Rosenthal et al., 2017). However, such success can not be replicated to low-resource languages because of the lack of labeled data for training Machine Learning models.

As it is prohibitively expensive to obtain training data for all languages of interest, cross-lingual sentiment analysis (CLSA) (Barnes et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2016b; Xu and Wan, 2017; Wan, 2009; Demirtas and Pechenizkiy, 2013; Xiao and Guo, 2012; Zhou et al., 2016a) offers the possibility of learning sentiment classification models for a target language using only annotated data from a different source language where large annotated data is available. These models often rely on bilingual lexicons, pre-trained cross-lingual word embeddings, or Machine Translation to bridge the gap between the source and target languages.

CLIDSA/CLCDSA (Feng and Wan, 2019) is the first end-to-end CLSA model that does not require cross-lingual supervision which may not be available for low-resource languages.

In this paper, we propose Conditional Language Adversarial Network (CLAN) for end-to-end CLSA. Similar to prior work, CLAN performs CLSA without using any cross-lingual supervision. Differing from prior work, CLAN incorporates conditional language adversarial training to learn language invariant features by conditioning on both learned feature representations (or features for short) and sentiment predictions, therefore increases the features’ discriminativity in the cross-lingual setting. Our contributions are three fold:

• We develop Conditional Language Adversarial Network (CLAN) which is designed to learn language invariant features that are also discriminative for sentiment classification.

• Experiments on the multilingual multi-domain Amazon review dataset (Prettenhofer and Stein, 2010) show that CLAN outperforms all previous methods for both in-domain and cross-domain CLSA tasks.

• t-SNE visualization of the held-out examples shows that the learned features align well across languages, indicating that CLAN is able to learn language invariant features.

2 Related Work

Cross-lingual sentiment analysis (CLSA): Several CLSA methods (Wan, 2009; Demirtas and Pechenizkiy, 2013; Xiao and Guo, 2012; Zhou et al., 2016a; Wan, 2009; Xiao and Guo, 2012) rely on Machine Translation (MT) for providing supervision across languages. MT, often trained from parallel corpora, may not be available for low-resource languages. Other CLSA methods (Barnes et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2016b; Xu and Wan, 2017)
uses bilingual lexicons or cross-lingual word embeddings (CLWE) to project words with similar meanings from different languages into nearby spaces, to enable training cross-lingual sentiment classifiers. CLWE often depends on a bilingual lexicon (Barnes et al., 2018) or parallel or comparable corpora (Mogadala and Rettinger, 2016; Vulić and Moens, 2016). Recently, CLWE methods (Lample and Conneau, 2019; Conneau et al., 2019) that rely on no parallel resources are proposed, but they require very large monolingual corpora to train. The work that is most related to ours is (Feng and Wan, 2019), which does not rely on cross-lingual resources. Different from the language adversarial network used in (Feng and Wan, 2019), our work performs cross-lingual sentiment analysis using conditional language adversarial training, which allows the language invariant features to be specialized for sentiment class predictions.

**Adversarial training for domain adaptation**

Our approach draws inspiration from Domain-Adversarial Training of Neural Networks (Ganin et al., 2016) and Conditional Adversarial Domain Adaptation (CDAN) (Long et al., 2018). DANN (Ganin et al., 2016) trains a feature generator to minimize the classification loss, and a domain discriminator to distinguish the domain where the input instances come from. It attempts to learn domain invariant features that deceive the domain discriminator while learning to predict the correct sentiment labels. CDAN (Long et al., 2018) additionally makes the discriminator conditioned on both extracted features and class predictions to improve discriminativity.

**3 Conditional Language Adversarial Networks for Sentiment Analysis**

Figure 1 shows the architecture of CLAN. It has three components: a multilingual language model (LM) that extracts features from the input sentences, a sentiment classifier built atop of the features extracted by the LM, and a conditional language adversarial trainer to force the features to be language invariant. All three components are jointly optimized in a single end-to-end neural architecture, allowing CLAN to learn cross-lingual features and to capture multiplicative interactions between the features and sentiment predictions. The resulting cross-lingual features are specialized for each sentiment class.

CLAN aims at solving the cross-lingual multi-domain sentiment analysis task. Formally, given a set of domains \( \mathcal{D} \) and a set of languages \( \mathcal{L} \), CLAN consists of the following components:

- **Sentiment classifier**: train on \((l_s, d_s)\) (sentiment labels are available) and test on \((l_t, d_t)\) (no sentiment labels), in which \(l_s, l_t \in \mathcal{L}, l_s \neq l_t \) and \(d_s, d_t \in \mathcal{D} \). CLAN works for both variants of the CLSA problem: in-domain CLSA where \(d_s = d_t\), and cross-domain CLSA where \(d_s \neq d_t\).
- **Language model**: train on \((l, d)\) in which \(l \in \mathcal{L}, d \in \mathcal{D} \). The language IDs are known.
- **Language discriminator**: train on \((l, d)\) in which \(l \in \mathcal{L}, d \in \mathcal{D} \). The language IDs are known.

**Language Model (LM)**: For a sentence \(x\), we compute the probability of seeing a word \(w_k\) given the previous words: 

\[
p(x) = \prod_{k=1}^{[x]} P(w_k|w_1, \ldots, w_{k-1})
\]

We first pass the input words through the embedding layer of language \(l\) parameterized by \(\theta_{\text{emb}}^l\). The embedding for word \(w_k\) is \(\vec{w}_k\). Then we pass the word embeddings to two LSTM layer parameterized by \(\theta_1\) and \(\theta_2\), that are shared across all languages and all domains, to generate hidden states \((z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_x)\) that can be considered as features for CLSA: 

\[
h_k = \text{LSTM}(h_{k-1}, \vec{w}_k; \theta_1),
\]

\[
z_k = \text{LSTM}(z_{k-1}, h_k; \theta_2).
\]

We then use a linear decoding layer parameterized by \(\theta_{\text{dec}}^l\) with a softmax for next word prediction. To summarize, the LM objective for \(l\) is:
\[ J_{lm}(\theta_{emb}, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_{dec}) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim L}[-\frac{1}{|x|} \sum_{k=1}^{|x|} \log p(w_k|w_1, ..., w_{k-1})] \]

where \( x \sim L \) indicates that \( x \) is sampled from text in language \( l \).

**Sentiment Classifier** We use a linear classifier that takes the average hidden states \( \frac{1}{|x|} \sum_{k=1}^{|x|} z_k \) as input features, and then a softmax to output sentiment labels. The objective is:

\[ J_{senti}^{l}(\theta_{emb}, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_{senti}) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim C_senti}[-\log p(y|x)] \]

where \((x, y) \sim C_senti\) indicates that the sentence \( x \) and its label \( y \) are sampled from the labeled examples in language \( l \), and \( \theta_{senti} \) denotes the parameters of the linear sentiment classifier.

**Conditional Language Adversarial Training**

To force the features to be language invariant, we adopted conditional adversarial training (Long et al., 2018): a language discriminator is trained to predict language ID given the features by minimizing the cross-entropy loss, while the LM is trained to fool the discriminator by maximizing the loss:

\[ J_{adv-lang}(\theta_{emb}, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_{dis-lang}) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim C_{lang}}[-\log p(l|f(x) \otimes g(x))] \]

where \( f(x), g(x) \) and \( l \in L \) are features extracted by the LM for input text \( x \), its sentiment prediction and its language ID respectively, \( \theta_{emb} = \theta_{emb}^1 \oplus \theta_{emb}^2 \oplus ... \oplus \theta_{emb}^{|L|} \) denotes the parameters of all embedding layers and \( \theta_{dis-lang} \) denotes the parameters of the language discriminator. We use multilinear conditioning (Long et al., 2018) by conditioning \( l \) on the cross-covariance \( f(x) \otimes g(x) \).

A key innovation is the conditional language adversarial training: the multilinear conditioning enables manipulation of the multiplicative interactions across features and class predictions. Such interactions capture the cross-covariance between the language invariant features and classifier predictions to improve discriminality.

**The Full Model**

Putting all components together, the final objective function is the following:

\[ J(\theta_{emb}, \theta_{lstm}, \theta_{dec}, \theta_{senti}, \theta_{dis-lang}) = \sum_{(l,d)} J_{lm}^l + \alpha J_{senti}^l - \beta J_{adv-lang}^l \]

where \( \theta_{lstm} = \theta_1 \oplus \theta_2 \) denotes parameters of the LSTM layers, \( \theta_{dec} = \theta_{dec}^1 \oplus \theta_{dec}^2 \oplus ... \oplus \theta_{dec}^{|L|} \) denotes the parameters of all decoding layers, \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are hyperparameters controlling the relative importance of the sentiment classification and the language adversarial training objectives. Parameters \( \theta_{dis-lang} \) is trained to maximize the full objective function while the others are trained to minimize it:

\[ \hat{\theta}_{dis-lang} = \arg \max_{\theta_{dis-lang}} J \]

\[ (\hat{\theta}_{emb}, \hat{\theta}_{lstm}, \hat{\theta}_{dec}, \hat{\theta}_{senti}) = \arg \min_{\theta_{emb}, \theta_{lstm}, \theta_{dec}, \theta_{senti}} J \]

### 4 Experiments

**Datasets:** We evaluate CLAN on the Websis-CLS-10 dataset (Prettenhofer and Stein, 2010) which consists of Amazon product reviews from 4 languages and 3 domains. Following prior work, we use English as the source language and other languages as the target languages. For each language-domain pair there are 2,000 training documents, 2,000 test documents, and 9,000-50,000 unlabeled documents depending on the language-domain pair (details are in Prettenhofer and Stein, 2010).

**Implementation details:** The models are implemented in PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019). All models are trained on four NVIDIA 1080ti GPUs.

**Experiment results:** We follow the experiment setting described in (Feng and Wan, 2019). Table 1a and 1b show the accuracy of CLAN comparing to prior methods for the in-domain CLSA and cross-domain CLSA tasks, respectively. We compare CLAN to the following methods: CL-SCL, BiDRL, UMM, CLDFA, CNN-BE (Ziser and Reichart, 2018), PBLM-BE (Ziser and Reichart, 2018), A-SCL (Ziser and Reichart, 2018) are methods that require cross-lingual supervision.
We present Conditional Language Adversarial Networks for cross-lingual sentiment analysis, and show that it achieves state-of-the-art performance.
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Abstract

UDify is the state-of-the-art language-agnostic dependency parser which is trained on a polyglot corpus of 75 languages. This multilingual modeling enables the model to generalize over unknown/lesser-known languages, thus leading to improved performance on low-resource languages. In this work we used linguistic typology knowledge available in URIEL database, to improve the cross-lingual transferring ability of UDify even further.

1 Introduction

State-of-the-art approaches to dependency parsing are supervised approaches that require large manually annotated dataset to be trained on, thus limiting their utility to only few high-resource languages. Multilingual modeling which involves training a model on a mixed polyglot corpus of high-resource source-languages and applying it on a low resource target-language, is an effective way to circumvent this issue of data-sparsity.

In a similar way, as the proficiency of a speaker’s previous languages can enhance his/her ability to learn a new language (Abu-Rabia and Sanitsky, 2010), a model which is trained on multilingual dataset can learn to generalize over unknown or lesser-known languages.

UDify (Kondratyuk and Straka, 2019) is the state-of-the-art mBERT based language-agnostic dependency parser, which takes the advantage of multilingual modeling to improve its performance on low-resource languages. The authors of UDify (Kondratyuk and Straka, 2019) trained it on a joint polyglot corpus created by concatenating all training treebanks in UDv2.3, and evaluated it on all test treebanks in UDv2.3 individually. Results outlined in (Kondratyuk and Straka, 2019) show that for dependency parsing task, the UDify outperforms its baseline monolingual UDPipe Future (Straka, 2018) model by a large margin especially for low-resource languages, as the model benefit significantly from the cross-lingual transfer learning which occurs due to joint polyglot training.

However, the performance of UDify model on the low-resource languages (less represented in the polyglot training corpus) is still much lower than the performance of it on the high-resource languages which are well represented within the training corpus.

In this work, we use linguistic typology knowledge to improve the cross-lingual transferring ability of UDify model even further, thereby significantly reducing this gap between model’s performance on high-resource and low-resource languages.

We induce the linguistic typology knowledge available in URIEL (Littell et al., 2017) database into the UDify model by adding an auxiliary task of linguistic typology feature prediction to it, within the multitasking framework. Sections 3 and 4 will describe the model in more details.

2 Related Work

Cross-lingual Model-transfer approaches to Dependency Parsing such as (McDonald et al., 2011; Cohen et al., 2011; Duong et al., 2015; Guo et al., 2016; Vilares et al., 2015; Falenska and Çetinoğlu, 2017; Mulcaire et al., 2019; Vania et al., 2019; Shareghi et al., 2019) involve training a model on high-resource languages and subsequently adapting it to low-resource languages. Participants of CoNLL 2017 shared-task (Daniel et al., 2017) and CoNLL 2018 shared task (Zeman et al., 2018) also provide numerous approaches to dependency parsing of low-resource languages.

Some approaches such as (Naseem et al., 2012; Täckström et al., 2013; Barzilay and Zhang, 2015; Wang and Eisner, 2016a; Rasooli and Collins, 2017; Ammar, 2016; Wang and Eisner, 2016b) indeed used linguistic typology to facilitate the cross-lingual transfer between source and target languages. However, all these approaches directly
feed the linguistic typology features into the respective model, whereas we induce the linguistic typology knowledge into UDify model through Multitask learning.

Inducing typology knowledge through Multitask learning rather than directly feeding it along with word-embeddings have following advantages.

1. The model can also be applied to low-resource languages for which many typology feature values are unknown/missing.

2. The auxiliary task should help to improve the performance on the main dependency parsing task as well, since it would make the model give special emphasis on the syntactic typology (specially word-order typology) of language being parsed while predicting the dependency relations.

3 UDify

UDify is a multitasking multilingual BERT based model which performs four key language-processing tasks simultaneously namely UPOS-tagging, UFeat-tagging, Lemmatization and Dependency Parsing, in a multitasking framework. The model utilizes a single shared mBERT based encoder, and four individual task-specific decoders, for each of the four tasks respectively. The mBERT Encoder takes in the entire sentence as input, tokenizes it using pre-trained WordPiece Tokenizer (Wu et al., 2016) and subsequently outputs mBERT (Wu and Dredze, 2019) based contextualized-embeddings for each word within the input-sentence. We refer to original UDify (Kondratyuk and Straka, 2019) paper for detailed description of mechanism of computing/fine-tuning such contextualized embeddings.

The decoders for both UPOS-tagging and UFeat-tagging tasks adopt standard sequence-tagging architecture with softmax layer on the top. These decoders accept the contextual embeddings generated from the mBERT Encoder for each word from the input sentence, and predicts its UPOS/Ufeats tag.

For Lemmatization task as well, the model uses a standard sequence-tagger which predicts a class-tag representing a unique edit script, for each word. An edit-script is simply the sequence of character operations to transform a word form to its lemmatized form.

For dependency-parsing, the model adopts the popular deep biaffine architecture (Dozat and Manning, 2016) for graph-based parsing, with LSTM-encoder been replaced by the shared mBERT Encoder.

4 Linguistic Typology prediction

To improve the cross-lingual transferring ability of UDify model, we added a fifth auxiliary task of Linguistic Typology prediction to it. Our Typology-predictor is a simple deep feed-forward neural network with sigmoid activation function, which predicts the values of all typology features provided by the URIEL database (Littell et al., 2017).

URIEL database is a collection of binary features extracted from multiple typological, phylogenetic, and geographical databases such as WALS (Haspelmath, 2009), PHOIBLE (Moran and Richard Wright, 2014), Ethnologue (M. Paul Lewis and Fennig, 2015) and Glottolog (Harald Hammarstrom and Bank, 2015). URIEL database can be accessed through Pyton PyPi library called lang2vec.

Let $\hat{N}$ be the number of typology features provided by URIEL database. Our Typology predictor would then output the probability vector $Pr_{ty} \in R^{\hat{N}}$ by applying equation 1.

$$Pr_{ty} = \text{sigmoid}(\epsilon_{<s>} * U + c) \quad (1)$$

Here $\epsilon_{<s>} \in R^{d}$ is the contextual embedding from the shared mBERT Encoder for end-token $< /s >$ of the input-sentence. $U \in R^{d x \hat{N}}$ and $c \in R^{\hat{N}}$ are weights and biases respectively, $Pr_{ty}$ comprises of the probability of value of each URIEL binary feature being as 1, for the specific language being parsed. The total-loss is computed by simply adding the Typology Predictor loss to UDify model’s (as computed in (Kondratyuk and Straka, 2019))

5 Experiments

This section describes the details of experiments conducted to evaluate our proposed model.

5.1 Experimental Setup

Both baseline UDify and the proposed UDify+Typology-predictor models are trained on a single large joint-polyglot corpus, created by concatenating all training datasets available in...
Before each training-epoch, we randomly shuffled all sentences in our polyglot training corpus, and subsequently fed mixed batches of sentences from this shuffled corpus into the model being trained, where each batch may contain sentences from any language or treebank (as done by authors of UDify (Kondratyuk and Straka, 2019)). We used batch-size of 32, drop-out probability of 0.01 and the pre-trained mBERT model *cased_L-12_H-768_A-12* downloaded from tensorflow-hub³. We fine-tuned these hyper-parameters on Dev dataset for English-EWT treebank.

The performance of our model with two baselines namely *UDPipe Future* (Straka, 2018) and *UDify*. URIEL database comprises of three categories of typology features namely *Syntactic, Semantic* and *Phonological* features. In this work, we evaluated three variants of our proposed model, based on the categories of features predicted by the typology-predictor within the auxiliary task, namely *UDify-w-Syntax* (predicts only syntactic typology features), *UDify-w-Syntax+Semantic* (predicts syntactic and semantic typology-features) and *UDify-w-All* (predicts all the URIEL typology-features). Furthermore, we evaluated the performance of *UDify-w-Lang_id* model. The architecture of it is identical to our proposed model but the linguistic-typology predictor is replaced by a simple language-id predictor.

7 Discussion

It is observed that the *UDify-w-Syntax* variant of our proposed model outperforms the other two variants of it, for most of the test-treebanks, despite the fact that the *UDify-w-Syntax+Semantic* and *UDify-w-All* variants utilizes more typology-features than the *UDify-w-Syntax* variant.

The reason being that since all four tasks performed by the UDify model namely UPOS-tagging, UFeats-tagging, Lammelization and Dependency Parsing are syntactic tasks, only the syntactic typology-features are relevant to these tasks. (Henderson, 2004) proved that, having large number of unrelated features makes it difficult for a neural-network model to effectively learn from provided training-data, and thereby would lead to drop in performance.

Figures 1 and 2 depict the trends in LAS and UAS achieved by the *UDify* and *UDify-w-Syntax* models on all 80 test treebanks. The test-treebanks (as indexes) on the x-axes in these figures are inversely-sorted by the size of their corresponding train treebank, which is part of the training corpus. It is evident in the figures that the *UDify* model shows stronger performance on the high-resource languages which are well represented in the training corpus as compared to the low-resource languages. On the other hand, *UDify+Syntax* shows relatively uniform performance across all languages.

Overall the results in Appendix A, show that *UDify+Syntax* outperforms baselines *UDPipe Future*, *UDify* and *UDify+Lang_id* for almost all 80 test-treebanks. For high-resource languages, the *UD-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>UPOS</th>
<th>UFeats</th>
<th>Lemmas</th>
<th>UAS</th>
<th>LAS</th>
<th>Typo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>94.27</td>
<td>91.37</td>
<td>94.99</td>
<td>86.24</td>
<td>81.78</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all UDv2.5 test-banks)</td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>94.03</td>
<td>89.33</td>
<td>90.92</td>
<td>87.84</td>
<td>82.83</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>95.76</td>
<td>90.95</td>
<td>91.52</td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td>85.61</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify-w-Syntax</td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td>92.05</td>
<td>91.87</td>
<td>93.18</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>94.04</td>
<td>88.06</td>
<td>87.09</td>
<td>89.26</td>
<td>83.84</td>
<td>73.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify-w-All</td>
<td>92.85</td>
<td>85.48</td>
<td>84.33</td>
<td>84.86</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>64.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Overall Results achieved by the baseline and all variants of our proposed model. These are average of all results outlayed in Appendix A.

Table 2: Selected results from Appendix A. UDify+ refers to UDify+Syntax model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>UPOS</th>
<th>UAS</th>
<th>LAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English-EWT</td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>97.73</td>
<td>94.64</td>
<td>90.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 25377)</td>
<td>UDify+</td>
<td>98.32</td>
<td>95.73</td>
<td>91.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French-GSD</td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>98.14</td>
<td>94.74</td>
<td>92.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 33399)</td>
<td>UDify+</td>
<td>99.24</td>
<td>96.19</td>
<td>92.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buryat-BDT</td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>60.23</td>
<td>36.98</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 19)</td>
<td>UDify+</td>
<td>73.73</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian- HSE</td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>90.47</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>70.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 2494)</td>
<td>UDify+</td>
<td>93.56</td>
<td>90.14</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Results of t-test for correlation between various performance parameters. **Typo F1**: Its F1 score achieved by UDify+Syntax for auxiliary task.; **UDify, UDify+**: UAS achieved by UDify and UDify+Syntax models; **Diff**: Improvement in UAS of UDify+ over UDify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typo F1</th>
<th>Diff</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typo F1</td>
<td>84.23</td>
<td>3.24e-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typo F1</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>7.36e-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typo F1</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typo F1</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>6.26e-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Typo F1** model shows only marginal improvement in performance over UDify whereas for low-resource languages it shows strong improvement in performance. Such trends can also be observed in Table 2. Table 4 outlines results obtained on selected languages which are not represented in the training data at all (zero-shot learning). For such treebanks, UDify+Syntax under-performs UDify. Hence it can be inferred that the auxiliary task of linguistic typology prediction, does lead to significant improvement in performance of UDify within few-shot learning scenario, but does not lead to any improvement within zero-shot learning scenario. Furthermore, to ensure that the auxiliary task of linguistic typology-prediction is indeed responsible for the improvement in performance of UDify, we conducted numerous statistical t-tests to find the correlation between F1 scores achieved by the UDify+Syntax model for the auxiliary-task of typology-prediction, and various other performance parameters including the improvement in performance of UDify+Syntax over UDify. Table 3 outlays results of these t-tests.

**8 Conclusion**

In this work we used linguistic typology knowledge available in URIEL database to improve the cross-lingual transferring ability of the state-of-the-art language-agnostic UDify parser. We injected typology knowledge in UDify model through an auxiliary task, in multitasking settings.
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### A Results

This section outlines the results obtained by the three variants of our proposed models namely UDify-w-Syntax (predicts only syntactic typology features), UDify-w-Syntactic+Semantic (predicts syntactic and semantic typology-features) and UDify-w-All (predicts all the URIEL typology-features), as well as the baselines.

Table 1: Results achieved on all 80 test tree-banks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>UPOS</th>
<th>UFeats</th>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>UAS</th>
<th>LAS</th>
<th>Typo F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans-AfriBooms (size: 1315)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>98.25</td>
<td>97.66</td>
<td>97.46</td>
<td>91.26</td>
<td>88.46</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>95.31</td>
<td>91.34</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>88.79</td>
<td>85.17</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>96.61</td>
<td>92.64</td>
<td>94.84</td>
<td>90.15</td>
<td>87.87</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>96.73</td>
<td>93.51</td>
<td>95.04</td>
<td>94.36</td>
<td>89.96</td>
<td>82.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>90.51</td>
<td>88.31</td>
<td>83.91</td>
<td>90.63</td>
<td>74.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>93.73</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>86.48</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>85.96</td>
<td>64.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic-PADT (size: 21864)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>96.83</td>
<td>94.11</td>
<td>95.28</td>
<td>88.29</td>
<td>83.69</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>95.35</td>
<td>99.35</td>
<td>99.97</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>84.42</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>96.64</td>
<td>99.33</td>
<td>99.66</td>
<td>89.92</td>
<td>87.13</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>96.76</td>
<td>99.31</td>
<td>99.59</td>
<td>93.78</td>
<td>89.24</td>
<td>81.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>96.41</td>
<td>92.77</td>
<td>94.39</td>
<td>90.83</td>
<td>84.12</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>96.16</td>
<td>89.76</td>
<td>90.53</td>
<td>86.93</td>
<td>81.51</td>
<td>69.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian-ArmTDP (size: 1975)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>93.49</td>
<td>82.85</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>94.42</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>85.63</td>
<td>87.01</td>
<td>79.99</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>96.02</td>
<td>80.58</td>
<td>86.62</td>
<td>89.06</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>96.15</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>87.19</td>
<td>93.43</td>
<td>86.23</td>
<td>83.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>82.87</td>
<td>86.93</td>
<td>85.35</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>71.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>81.24</td>
<td>85.22</td>
<td>79.53</td>
<td>81.21</td>
<td>60.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque-BDT (size: 5396)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>96.11</td>
<td>92.48</td>
<td>96.29</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>83.55</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>90.53</td>
<td>85.47</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>96.71</td>
<td>88.85</td>
<td>91.16</td>
<td>88.02</td>
<td>85.28</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td>94.95</td>
<td>98.46</td>
<td>92.96</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang.id</td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusian-HSE (size: 319)</td>
<td>93.63</td>
<td>96.12</td>
<td>97.01</td>
<td>96.64</td>
<td>95.56</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>87.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian-BTB (size: 8907)</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>97.54</td>
<td>97.64</td>
<td>95.06</td>
<td>93.42</td>
<td>97.82</td>
<td>97.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buryat-BDT (size: 19)</td>
<td>40.34</td>
<td>61.73</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>73.73</td>
<td>70.76</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>58.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan-AnCora (size: 13123)</td>
<td>98.88</td>
<td>98.89</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>99.08</td>
<td>96.12</td>
<td>98.37</td>
<td>99.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese-GSD (size: 7994)</td>
<td>94.88</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>97.47</td>
<td>96.12</td>
<td>99.22</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</th>
<th>Multi-w-All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coptic</strong></td>
<td>95.17 93.62 70.49 86.34 91.08 49.85</td>
<td>94.17 91.89 67.93 81.95 88.31 38.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scriptorium</strong></td>
<td><strong>UDPipe</strong></td>
<td>94.7 96.35 95.49 87.4 82.79 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UDify</strong></td>
<td>27.17 52.85 55.71 28.29 11.53 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>51.24 60.49 58.89 51.29 32.13 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>52.06 65.65 60.7 71.54 53.73 84.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>50.62 59.7 59.62 71.52 49.73 75.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>48.95 56.29 57.39 68.19 43.67 64.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Croatian</strong></td>
<td><strong>UDPipe</strong></td>
<td>98.13 92.25 97.27 92.45 88.13 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SET</strong></td>
<td><strong>UDify</strong></td>
<td>97.89 88.97 97.15 92.98 90.5 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>98.33 90.66 97.3 94.29 92.07 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.42 91.8 97.38 95.65 92.08 81.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>97.08 86.49 92.89 95.4 81.97 72.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>96.44 83.45 90.91 90.35 75.32 61.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Czech</strong></td>
<td><strong>UDPipe</strong></td>
<td>99.37 96.34 98.57 93.48 91.2 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAC</strong></td>
<td><strong>UDify</strong></td>
<td>98.14 96.55 97.18 94.74 92.77 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>98.5 96.99 97.33 93.9 92.84 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.59 97.29 97.41 96.04 93.82 82.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>96.63 94.17 94.72 97.75 87.74 76.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>96.29 90.57 92.35 91.46 85.34 65.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Czech</strong></td>
<td><strong>UDPipe</strong></td>
<td>98.88 91.59 98.25 87.86 84.99 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLTT</strong></td>
<td><strong>UDify</strong></td>
<td>99.17 93.66 98.86 93.7 91.97 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>99.18 94.58 98.88 94.14 91.71 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>99.26 95.19 98.9 95.13 93.7 82.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>98.64 91.41 91.24 86.51 89.79 74.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>96.66 88.17 87.53 80.78 86.25 66.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Czech</strong></td>
<td><strong>UDPipe</strong></td>
<td>98.55 95.87 98.63 93.32 90.16 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FicTree</strong></td>
<td><strong>UDify</strong></td>
<td>98.18 96.36 97.33 95.77 93.98 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>98.52 96.83 97.47 95.9 93.27 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.61 97.15 97.54 95.3 93.52 82.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech-PDT</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>97.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>95.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>98.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>95.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>93.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish-DDT</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>97.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>96.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>97.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>96.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>95.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch-Alpino</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>96.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>97.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>97.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>97.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>97.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>96.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch-LassySmall</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>98.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>99.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-EWT</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>96.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>97.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>98.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>UDify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-GUM</td>
<td>96.02</td>
<td>95.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 25377)</td>
<td>96.82</td>
<td>94.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-LinES</td>
<td>96.91</td>
<td>94.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 25377)</td>
<td>96.31</td>
<td>90.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-ParTUT</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>96.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 25377)</td>
<td>95.51</td>
<td>92.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian-EDT</td>
<td>97.64</td>
<td>96.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 25749)</td>
<td>96.23</td>
<td>87.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish-FTB</td>
<td>96.65</td>
<td>94.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 27198)</td>
<td>95.49</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>UDify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish-TDT</td>
<td>97.45</td>
<td>94.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.43</td>
<td>90.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.45</td>
<td>82.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.67</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.25</td>
<td>82.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French-GSD</td>
<td>97.63</td>
<td>99.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.13</td>
<td>95.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.35</td>
<td>98.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.77</td>
<td>94.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.18</td>
<td>92.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French-ParTUT</td>
<td>96.93</td>
<td>95.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.43</td>
<td>95.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>96.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.97</td>
<td>92.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.43</td>
<td>88.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French-Sequoia</td>
<td>98.79</td>
<td>98.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.09</td>
<td>95.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.57</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.84</td>
<td>93.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>90.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French-Spoken</td>
<td>95.91</td>
<td>96.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.92</td>
<td>96.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.08</td>
<td>86.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.71</td>
<td>81.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.23</td>
<td>98.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.34</td>
<td>98.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>UDpipe</td>
<td>UDify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician-CTG (size: 2872)</td>
<td>97.84</td>
<td>99.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.51</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.41</td>
<td>97.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.52</td>
<td>97.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.75</td>
<td>93.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.31</td>
<td>92.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician-TreeGal (size: 2872)</td>
<td>95.82</td>
<td>93.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.59</td>
<td>80.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.13</td>
<td>83.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>85.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.16</td>
<td>84.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.12</td>
<td>82.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-GSD (size: 166849)</td>
<td>94.48</td>
<td>90.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.48</td>
<td>96.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.06</td>
<td>97.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.78</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.85</td>
<td>91.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.76</td>
<td>89.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic-PROIEL (size: 3387)</td>
<td>96.61</td>
<td>90.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.55</td>
<td>85.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.77</td>
<td>88.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>92.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.55</td>
<td>85.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>82.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek-GDT (size: 1662)</td>
<td>97.98</td>
<td>94.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.08</td>
<td>99.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.79</td>
<td>99.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.89</td>
<td>99.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew-</td>
<td>97.69</td>
<td>92.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTB (size: 5241)</td>
<td>95.88</td>
<td>89.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi-</td>
<td>97.02</td>
<td>95.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDTB (size: 13304)</td>
<td>96.21</td>
<td>96.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian-</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>96.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szeged (size: 910)</td>
<td>97.32</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian-</td>
<td>97.32</td>
<td>95.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSD (size: 4477)</td>
<td>96.81</td>
<td>92.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish-IDT (size: 858)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian-</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>96.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDTB (size: 13304)</td>
<td>97.32</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian-</td>
<td>97.32</td>
<td>95.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bokmål (size: 5241)</td>
<td>96.81</td>
<td>92.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-</td>
<td>97.69</td>
<td>92.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE (size: 5241)</td>
<td>95.88</td>
<td>89.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish-</td>
<td>97.02</td>
<td>95.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaeilge (size: 5241)</td>
<td>96.21</td>
<td>96.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil-</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>96.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil (size: 5241)</td>
<td>97.32</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese-</td>
<td>97.32</td>
<td>95.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZHS (size: 5241)</td>
<td>96.81</td>
<td>92.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>UD Pipe</td>
<td>UDify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian- ISDT (size: 29685)</td>
<td>98.39</td>
<td>98.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.51</td>
<td>98.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.47</td>
<td>97.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.14</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.13</td>
<td>90.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian- ParTUT (size: 29685)</td>
<td>98.38</td>
<td>97.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.18</td>
<td>96.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.19</td>
<td>97.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.15</td>
<td>97.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.52</td>
<td>90.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.83</td>
<td>88.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese- GSD (size: 47926)</td>
<td>98.13</td>
<td>99.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.73</td>
<td>93.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.22</td>
<td>94.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.31</td>
<td>94.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.63</td>
<td>90.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.98</td>
<td>90.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh- KTB (size: 31)</td>
<td>55.84</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.29</td>
<td>99.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.94</td>
<td>99.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>99.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.45</td>
<td>96.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.23</td>
<td>93.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean- GSD (size: 27410)</td>
<td>96.29</td>
<td>99.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.98</td>
<td>99.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>99.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.55</td>
<td>99.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>UDify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Korean-Kaist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 27410)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>95.59</td>
<td>94.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>90.58</td>
<td>88.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>80.58</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>75.91</td>
<td>84.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>86.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kurmanji-MG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>53.36</td>
<td>60.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>37.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>58.08</td>
<td>58.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>36.98</td>
<td>36.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>44.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>66.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin-ITTB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 34060)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>98.34</td>
<td>98.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>96.97</td>
<td>96.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>98.99</td>
<td>98.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>92.35</td>
<td>92.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>90.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>90.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin-Perseus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 34060)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>83.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>81.45</td>
<td>80.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>72.86</td>
<td>80.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>62.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>75.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin-PROIEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 34060)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>97.01</td>
<td>97.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>91.53</td>
<td>91.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>96.32</td>
<td>96.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>84.97</td>
<td>84.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>80.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>81.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian-LVTB</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>96.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>98.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>97.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>97.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian-HSE</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>90.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>93.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>93.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>91.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltese-MUDT</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>95.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>90.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>93.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>93.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>92.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>92.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi-UFAL</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>94.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>95.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>96.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>94.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian-Bokmaal</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>98.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>98.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>98.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Tagging Model</td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian-Nynorsk (size: 33282)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>98.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>97.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang</td>
<td>98.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>98.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>96.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian-NynorskLIA (size: 33282)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>89.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>95.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang</td>
<td>96.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>96.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>96.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian-Seraji (size: 4798)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>97.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>96.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang</td>
<td>97.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>95.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>95.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish-LFG (size: 31496)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>98.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang</td>
<td>99.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>99.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>95.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>95.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese-Bosque (size: 17992)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>97.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>97.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>97.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese-UDPipe (size: 17992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese-GSD</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>98.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>98.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>98.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>94.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>93.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian-UDPipe (size: 21782)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian-Nonstandard (size: 21782)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>96.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>96.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>97.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>95.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>94.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian-RRT (size: 21782)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>97.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>96.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>97.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>96.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian-GSD (size: 54099)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>97.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>98.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>97.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>96.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian-SynTagRus (size: 54099)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>99.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>97.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang_id</td>
<td>98.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td><code>UDPipe</code></td>
<td>95.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>UDify</code></td>
<td>93.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian-Taiga (size: 54099)</td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Lang_id</code></td>
<td>96.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Syntax</code></td>
<td>96.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</code></td>
<td>94.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-All</code></td>
<td>92.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian-SET (size: 3328)</td>
<td><code>UDPipe</code></td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>UDify</code></td>
<td>96.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Lang_id</code></td>
<td>98.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Syntax</code></td>
<td>98.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</code></td>
<td>96.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-All</code></td>
<td>96.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak-SNK (size: 8483)</td>
<td><code>UDPipe</code></td>
<td>96.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>UDify</code></td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Lang_id</code></td>
<td>98.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Syntax</code></td>
<td>99.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</code></td>
<td>98.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-All</code></td>
<td>96.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian-SSJ (size: 8556)</td>
<td><code>UDPipe</code></td>
<td>98.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>UDify</code></td>
<td>97.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Lang_id</code></td>
<td>98.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Syntax</code></td>
<td>98.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</code></td>
<td>98.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-All</code></td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian-SST (size: 8556)</td>
<td><code>UDPipe</code></td>
<td>93.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>UDify</code></td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Lang_id</code></td>
<td>96.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>Multi-w-Syntax</code></td>
<td>96.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.89</td>
<td>91.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-AnCora</td>
<td>93.25</td>
<td>89.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 28492)</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>89.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.92</td>
<td>71.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-GSD</td>
<td>98.91</td>
<td>98.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 28492)</td>
<td>99.17</td>
<td>92.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.77</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>98.53</td>
<td>97.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>98.07</td>
<td>94.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.23</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-Talbanken</td>
<td>98.76</td>
<td>98.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>98.15</td>
<td>94.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.69</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil-TTB</td>
<td>98.84</td>
<td>98.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 400)</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>95.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.43</td>
<td>82.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.49</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil-TTB</td>
<td>98.49</td>
<td>94.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.46</td>
<td>86.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.26</td>
<td>74.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.92</td>
<td>66.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-GSD</td>
<td>97.12</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 28492)</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>82.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>68.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-GSD</td>
<td>96.85</td>
<td>97.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 28492)</td>
<td>98.97</td>
<td>92.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.46</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>92.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.69</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>97.15</td>
<td>90.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.44</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>97.26</td>
<td>91.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>94.57</td>
<td>95.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.11</td>
<td>84.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>96.27</td>
<td>88.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>86.95</td>
<td>88.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.98</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-GSD</td>
<td>95.32</td>
<td>87.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 28492)</td>
<td>83.41</td>
<td>84.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.81</td>
<td>67.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-AnCora</td>
<td>96.78</td>
<td>89.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 28492)</td>
<td>97.03</td>
<td>86.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.76</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>96.83</td>
<td>88.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>89.33</td>
<td>91.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.21</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>97.63</td>
<td>90.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>93.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.63</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>97.73</td>
<td>91.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>90.46</td>
<td>94.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.37</td>
<td>82.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>96.32</td>
<td>85.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>88.97</td>
<td>95.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.05</td>
<td>72.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>84.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>85.93</td>
<td>88.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.54</td>
<td>64.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-GSD</td>
<td>97.94</td>
<td>96.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 28492)</td>
<td>98.01</td>
<td>90.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.71</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>98.48</td>
<td>95.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>98.08</td>
<td>92.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>98.72</td>
<td>96.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>98.16</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.35</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>98.81</td>
<td>96.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>98.21</td>
<td>93.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.65</td>
<td>81.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>97.59</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>95.15</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.69</td>
<td>72.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish-LinES</td>
<td>96.31</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 7479)</td>
<td>92.99</td>
<td>79.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.24</td>
<td>65.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil-TTB</td>
<td>91.05</td>
<td>87.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 400)</td>
<td>93.92</td>
<td>74.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.63</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil-TTB</td>
<td>90.47</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 400)</td>
<td>67.17</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.38</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil-TTB</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>76.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 400)</td>
<td>82.58</td>
<td>86.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.59</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil-TTB</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(size: 400)</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>89.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.32</td>
<td>91.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>UDify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>76.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>75.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu-MTG (size: 1051)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>93.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>96.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>95.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>95.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish-IMST (size: 3664)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>96.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>88.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>92.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>92.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>89.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>88.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian-IU (size: 5496)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>97.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>98.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>98.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>98.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>96.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>95.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu-UDTB (size: 4043)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>93.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>95.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>95.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>94.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uyghur-UDT (size: 1656)</td>
<td>UDPipe</td>
<td>89.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>75.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Lang id</td>
<td>83.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>83.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>UPOS</td>
<td>UFeats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>83.15</td>
<td>72.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>69.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese-UDPipe (size: 1400)</td>
<td>89.68</td>
<td>99.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDify</td>
<td>85.59</td>
<td>65.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Lang, id</td>
<td>90.14</td>
<td>71.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax</td>
<td>90.36</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-Syntax+Semantic</td>
<td>88.68</td>
<td>68.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-w-All</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>67.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>UPOS</th>
<th>UFeats</th>
<th>Lemmas</th>
<th>UAS</th>
<th>LAS</th>
<th>Typo</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>UPOS</th>
<th>UFeats</th>
<th>Lemmas</th>
<th>UAS</th>
<th>LAS</th>
<th>Typo</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Abstract

FrameNet and the Multilingual FrameNet project have produced multilingual semantic annotations of parallel texts that yield extremely fine-grained typological insights. Moreover, frame semantic annotation of a wide cross-section of languages can provide information on the limits of Frame Semantics (Fillmore, 1982, 1985). Multilingual semantic annotation offers critical input for research on linguistic diversity and recurrent patterns in computational typology. Drawing on results from FrameNet annotation of parallel texts, this paper proposes frame semantic annotation as a new component to complement the state of the art in computational semantic typology.¹

1 Introduction

For some time, typologists and cognitive linguists have explored and discovered recurring cross-linguistic semantic patterns of differences across languages. Talmy (2000) characterized languages as verb framing or satellite framing, depending on the locus of path information in descriptions of motion events. Nichols et al. (2004) studied basic verbs and their causative counterparts (sit, seat; fall, drop) in 80 languages, determining just four ways of treating the realization of intransitives/transitives as basic/derived. Croft’s (2012) model of event structure for aspect and argument structure in diverse languages presents the causal chain as the primary semantic factor in argument realization of simple verbs.

¹Frame Semantics is distinct from PropBank and Unified Meaning Representation (UMR), a typologically-informed annotation scheme, both only peripherally addressing representing predicate-specific roles analogous to FrameNet’s frame-specific FEs. PropBank has a feature termed framefiles that UMR inherited. These framefiles are syntactic in nature, bearing no relation to FrameNet’s semantic frames. As developers of UMR agree, Frame Semantics is not fully integrated into Computational Typology (Gysel et al., To Appear in Künstliche Intelligenz).

How many such recurring patterns exist? How are such patterns related to each other? Because these and many other questions remain open, we suggest that annotation with semantic frames can help to find semantic universals and language-specific exceptions, just as syntactic annotation is useful for investigating syntactic typology. Such semantic frames may be very general or quite specific, depending on the nature of the research.

The goal of Computational Typology is “the development of robust language technology applicable across the world’s languages” (Dubossarsky et al., 2019). As such, the computational linguistics world must exploit all resources that contribute to the community’s understanding of typological phenomena in those languages. FrameNet (FN) and its related projects in diverse languages are underutilized resources that must be a part of an inclusive drive to model semantic typology.

The rest of this paper proceeds as follows here: Section 2 presents FrameNet and Multilingual FN; Section 3 describes a FN study showing typological differences across diverse languages; Section 4 describes another crosslinguistic annotation study; Section 5 discusses crosslinguistic comparability of frames and presents ViToXF, a frame alignment visualization tool; and finally, Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 Background

2.1 FrameNet

FrameNet (Ruppenhofer et al., 2016) is a research and resource development project in corpus-based computational lexicography grounded in the theory of Frame Semantics (Fillmore, 1985).

At the heart of the work is the semantic frame, a script-like knowledge structure that facilitates inferencing within and across events, situations, states-of-affairs, relations, and objects. FN defines a semantic frame in terms of its frame elements.
(FEs), or participants (and other concepts) in the scene that the frame captures; a lexical unit (LU) is a pairing of a lemma and a frame, characterizing that LU in terms of the frame that it evokes.

Example 1 illustrates annotation for the verb **BUY**, which FN defines in the **Commerce_buy** frame, with the FEs **BUYER**, **SELLER**, **GOODS**, and **MONEY**.2

1. Chuck **BUYER** BOUGHT a car **GOODS** from Jerry **SELLER** for $2,000 **MONEY**

Along with frames and their associated annotations, FN employs a set of Frame-to-Frame Relations to link semantically related frames into a set of frame hierarchies, including Inheritance, Subframe, Precedes, Perspective_on, Inchoative_of, and Causative_of. For instance, FN defines the frame **Commerce_buy** as Inheriting from **Getting** and holding a Perspective_on relation to **Commerce_goods_transaction**, which is a Subframe of **Commercial_transaction**. **Commerce_sell** has the same relations, but it inherits from **Giving** (not **Getting**). Table 1 lists FN’s frame-to-frame relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Superframe</th>
<th>Subframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subframe</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precedes</td>
<td>Earlier</td>
<td>Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective_on</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Perspectivized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See_also</td>
<td>Main Entry</td>
<td>Referring Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative_of</td>
<td>Inchoative</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative_of</td>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>Inchoative/State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Frame-to-Frame Relations

2.2 Multilingual FrameNet (MLFN)

Do semantic frames represent universals of human language or are they language specific characterizations of the lexicon? Despite many and varied language-specific patterns of expression, the successful development of FN-type resources for typologically distinct languages leads to the conclusion that many frames constitute appropriate characterizations of events, situations, etc., across typologically diverse languages, especially frames for basic human experiences, like eating, drinking, and sleeping. Even frames for cultural practices are similar across languages; for instance, all commercial transactions, regardless of culture, involve the same participants (or frame elements) defined for English **buy**.

Berkeley FrameNet (BFN) has inspired the development of numerous comparable resources for languages other than English.4 While the methods to develop these resources have differed, each project creating frames based on its own linguistic data, all consider how they compare with BFN’s frames for the lexicon of English (Boas, 2009). Table 2 lists the number of frames and LUs for languages available with the MLFN tool (Gilardi and Baker, 2018), ViToXF (Visualization Tool across Frames). The tool visualizes a comparison of BFN’s English to frame resources for each of seven other languages (See Section 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th># Frames</th>
<th># LUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FrameNet (BFN)</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>13,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese FN</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>20,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN Brasil (PT)</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>2,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French FN (Asfalda)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German FN (SALSA)</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese FN</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>3,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish FN</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>11,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish FN</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>38,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Sizes of FrameNets accessible in ViToXF

3 Typology via Frames

Translations attempt meaning equivalence; so, expecting them to evoke the same frames as the original text seems reasonable. Yet, an analysis of frame mismatch (Ellsworth et al., 2006) reveals typological differences in motion and location vocabulary across languages. The annotation of Chapter 14 of The Hound of the Baskervilles (Doyle, 1902) in English, Japanese, Spanish, and German demonstrated that even a modest amount of annotation confirmed known typological differences between English and Ger-

---

2This paper uses these typographical conventions: Frame names are in typewriter font; FE Names are in SMALL CAPS; and lexical units are in BOLD CAPS.

3This point still allows the possibility of monotransitive predicates in giving events. In this cross-linguistically rare conceptualization of giving, recipients are encoded as possessors of the transferred object (as in English “gave his book”, meaning “gave him a book”)(Daniel, 2006). A recipient is semantically relevant, even if encoded monotransitively. Frame Semantics can encode the relationship in both types of giving events by creating a new frame with a Perspective_on relation to Giving.

4Global FrameNet serves as an umbrella for more than 12 such language resources.
man as satellite-framing languages vs. Spanish and (less so) Japanese as verb-framing ones.\textsuperscript{5} The annotation also showed several patterns unrelated to these typologies. Consider example 2a, showing an original sentence; 2b is the text of one Japanese translation, and 2c is a (fairly literal) back-translation of the Japanese.\textsuperscript{6} In this case, while the Japanese (2) does show a verb-framed clause (“這う "crawl on") compared to a satellite-framed clause with a manner verb in English (“came crawling round”), it also profiles an entirely different concept of visibility, i.e. the extent to which a sentence shows that some focal part of a scene is visible to the speaker. We hypothesize that the cline of saliency of visibility may be comparable to the cline of saliency of manner (Slobin, 2004).

2. (a) As we watched it the fog-wreaths [camed _Motion_] [crawling _Self_motion_] [round _Path_] both corners of the house and [rolled _Moving_in_place_] slowly into one dense bank.

(b) やがて [あた里は (all_around) _Locative_relation_] 一面にうす [はやけって (became_blurry) _Change_visibility_] しまいに霧の [なかへ (wrap_up) _Filling_] いったが、ことに白い 霧がひくく地を [這う (crawl on) _Self_motion_] ので

(c) Translation: ‘Eventually the whole area became slightly blurry, and was gradually wrapped up in the fog, especially as the white fog crept low along the ground.’

Japanese consistently makes visibility explicit when other languages leave visibility as an inference from the location and nature of objects (2b vs. 2a). A large sample would show whether this phenomenon is an artifact of the sample (due to stylistics of a particular translation or the nature of the text) or a regular difference between Japanese and the other languages. Still, these results are suggestive.

To the best of our knowledge, typologists have not proposed a feature to distinguish languages based on the preferential encoding of visibility in this way. The frames approach holds power in its ability to code for vastly different domains simultaneously within the same framework.

4 Parallel Annotation of TED Talk

Building on results from the Hound study and the expansion of FrameNet-related projects, Global FN teams each annotated their own language’s version of a TED talk “Do Schools Kill Creativity?”\textsuperscript{7} in English, Portuguese, Japanese, and French. Since annotations with different frame inventories are hard to compare (Section 5), the teams agreed only to use the frames and LUs from Berkeley FrameNet (BFN) Release 1.7. If annotators found an appropriate BFN frame, they annotated the target language text with the BFN frame. If not, they marked the phrase with the closest available BFN frame, recording the discrepancy.

However, this exercise had problems. The policy called for teams to annotate the text completely, yet each understood “complete annotation” differently. Also, although the English was a fairly exact transcription of the original talk, versions in other languages were briefer than a full translations would be, since they were intended as subtitles and had to match the video stream timing (Ohara, 2020).

The TED annotation reinforced a key finding of the Hound study: even with an available equivalent frame, the translated phrase may evoke a different target frame, a phenomenon known as a frame shift, analogous to translation shift (Čulo et al., 2012). Consider # 3, where two English sentences (3a) translate into a single sentence of Japanese (3b). (Partial annotation of this sentence appears in # 4 and # 5, below. As in example # 2, # 3c is a back-translation from the Japanese.)

3. (a) If you think of it, children starting school this year will be retiring in 2065. Nobody has a clue, despite all the expertise that’s been on parade for the past four days, what the world will look like in five years’ time.\textsuperscript{8}

(b) 今年小学校に入学する子供たち は 2065 年に定年を迎えます

\textsuperscript{5}An experienced frame semanticist and native speaker of each language did the annotation.

\textsuperscript{6}An asterisk (*) before a frame name indicates that the frame does not yet exist in published FrameNet.

\textsuperscript{7}Ken Robinson, 2006, https://www.ted.com/talks/sir_ken_robinson_do_schools_kill_creativity

\textsuperscript{8}In the audio, the word five has contrastive stress.
5. (a) [children starting school this year EMPLOYEE] will be [retiring Quitting] [in 2065 TIME]
(b) [今年小学校に入学する子供たちは EMPLOYEE] [2065年にTIME] [定年を迎えます Quitting]

Such data suggest that detecting frame shifts facilitates recognizing precise cultural and conceptual differences across languages. The examples above are quite specific, but form part of larger conceptual systems reflected in the lexicon of each language, such as the system of terms for older/younger classmates partially shared across Chinese, Japanese, and Korean (Davies and Ikeno, 2002). Frame annotation can help typologists take advantage of many such patterns. Work is also underway on a system to predict frame shifts, based on the TED annotation data.11

5 Frame Alignment

Comparing the annotations across FrameNet projects demands raising the question about the extent to which frames are universal. In the individual and joint projects, all FrameNet projects agreed on semantic frames and found BFN frames generally applicable to their language. For example, all languages have a Self_motion frame, with MOVER, SOURCE, PATH, and GOAL FEs. Thus, semantic frames provide useful generalizations both over LUs within a language and across languages. However, crosslinguistic frame relations are not limited to equivalence. A language’s frames can be broader or narrower than the nearest BFN frame; it even might give a different point of view on a scene.12

For example, English I LIKE X, with its verb in the Experiencer_focused_emotion frame translates into Spanish Me GUSTA X - ‘X pleases me’ with its verb in the Experiencer_object frame. Moreover, as Section 4 indicates, cultural differences may preclude the existence of equivalent frames, e.g., for religious concepts or legal processes, which differ greatly across cultures.

---

11Zheng Xin Yong, personal communication.
12The frame-to-frame relation Perspective_on captures different views on a scene in a language (Petrucc and de Melo, 2012).

---

4. (a) [children AGENT] [starting Activity start] [school ACTIVITY]
(b) [小学校に(in elementary school) GROUP] [入学する(enroll) Becoming a member] [子供たちは (children) NEW MEMBER]

The English verb phrase repeated in 5a uses the one word retiring that evokes the frame Quitting. The Japanese 5b uses 定年を迎えます, analyzable either as a multiword expression (also evoking Quitting) or separately as 定年 (teinen) ‘fixed year’ and 過えます (mukaemasu) ‘welcome/go to meet’. Since Japanese workers generally retire at age 60, teinen has come to mean ‘fixed retirement age’. The highly entrenched collocation with mukaemasu can imply happiness about reaching one’s goal, as if meeting with a friend. Analyzed as such, mukaemasu evokes a motion frame and a backgrounded emotion frame,10 with teinen the (metaphorical) GOAL.

---

9Of course, school itself can stand for the institution or organization, the place where this is located, the activity at the school, and for the people via metonymy.
10The Japanese mukaemasu is highly associated with happiness, which can be encoded in Frame Semantics by placing it in a frame that inherits from Arriving and uses Experiencer_focused_emotion, a frame that also contains happily.

---

が、TEDに集まるあらゆる分野のエキスパートをもってしても5年先の世界ですらわかりません。

(c) Translation: ‘Children enrolling in elementary school this year will reach retirement age in 2065, but even with the experts in every possible field gathered at TED, we don’t even know about the world five years from now.’

This short passage includes several examples of frame shift. The first English sentence (roughly, the first Japanese clause) treats school as the activities that occur in the building, evoking Activity_start, while Japanese specifies that it is an elementary school, treating it as an organization of which children become a part, evoking Becoming_a_member. An alternative analysis treats the whole phrase ‘enroll in elementary school’ as a multiword expression, evoking Activity_start, as in English.9
The MLFN team developed several different approaches to provide quantitative measures of frame similarity across languages. Some of them rely on finding translation equivalents from the LUs in the BFN frame to those in the target language frame, using Open Multilingual Wordnet (Bond and Foster, 2013). Various measures of set overlap then give a value for the frame similarity. Other approaches use MUSE vector embeddings (Bojanowski et al., 2017); the metric can be either the mean vector similarity of all pairs of LUs in a pair frames in the two languages or the similarity between the mean vector for the LUs in a frame in one language and the same value for a frame in the other. Both approaches are beset with problems caused by the ambiguity of words taken out of context, but nevertheless reveal interesting differences in conceptualization between languages.

The MLFN team also developed a tool to facilitate visualizing cross-linguistic frame similarity, called ViToXF (Visualization Tool across FrameNets). The tool provides numerous parameter settings, such as the type of alignment algorithm and the minimum level of similarity to display. Figure 1 shows the tool displaying English and Spanish alignments of motion frames. Baker and Lorenzi (2020) provides details about the alignment algorithms and the parameters of the visualization tool. These data, the tool, and the TED parallel annotation will be available for the workshop.

6 Concluding Remarks

Crosslinguistic frame semantic annotation highlights the tension between language-specific meaning representations and the kind of generalizations that typology needs (Haskemath, 2020). However, to be useful, the relationships between meanings must be structured to allow the recognition of commonalities and differences. FrameNet relations provide a sufficiently general framework to explore crosslinguistic semantic differences, without prejudging the nature of such relationships. Fine-grained analysis tied to an elaborate frame hierarchy of the sort available in FrameNet allows the viewing of linguistic structures at any level of abstraction from which computational typologists can confirm, refute, or add nuance to existing hypotheses, as well as discover previously unseen semantic patterns.
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Abstract

We translate a closed text that is known in advance into a severely low resource language by leveraging massive source parallelism. In other words, given a text in 124 source languages, we translate it into a severely low resource language using only ~1,000 lines of low resource data without any external help. Firstly, we propose a systematic method to rank and choose source languages that are close to the low resource language. We call the linguistic definition of language family Family of Origin (FAMO), and we call the empirical definition of higher-ranked languages using our metrics Family of Choice (FAMC). Secondly, we build an Iteratively Pretrained Multilingual Order-preserving Lexiconized Transformer (IPML) to train on ~1,000 lines (~3.5%) of low resource data. To translate named entities correctly, we build a massive lexicon table for 2,939 Bible named entities in 124 source languages, and include many that occur once and covers more than 66 severely low resource languages. Moreover, we also build a novel method of combining translations from different source languages into one. Using English as a hypothetical low resource language, we get a +23.9 BLEU increase over a multilingual baseline, and a +10.3 BLEU increase over our asymmetric baseline in the Bible dataset. We get a 42.8 BLEU score for Portuguese-English translation on the medical EMEA dataset. We also have good results for a real severely low resource Mayan language, Eastern Pokomchi.

1 Introduction

We translate a closed text that is known in advance into a severely low resource language by leveraging massive source parallelism. In other words, we aim to translate well under three constraints: having severely small training data in the new target low resource language, having massive source language parallelism, having the same closed text across all languages. Generalization to other texts is preferable but not necessary in the goal of producing high quality translation of the closed text.

2020 is the year that we started the life-saving hand washing practice globally. Applications like translating water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) guidelines into severely low resource languages are very impactful in tribes like those in Papua New Guinea with 839 living languages (Gordon Jr, 2005; Simons and Fennig, 2017). Translating humanitarian texts like WASH guidelines with scarce data and expert help is key (Bird, 2020).

We focus on five challenges that are not addressed previously. Most multilingual transformer works that translate into low resource language limit their training data to available data in the same or close-by language families or the researchers’ intuitive discretion; and are mostly limited to less than 30 languages (Gu et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2018a; Zhu et al., 2020). Instead, we examine ways to pick useful source languages from 124 source languages in a principled fashion. Secondly, most works require at least 4,000 lines of low resource data (Lin et al., 2020; Qi et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2018a); we use only ~1,000 lines of low resource data to simulate real-life situation of having ex-

Table 1: Top ten languages closest to Eastern Pokomchi (left) and English (right) in ranking 124 source languages. FAMD and FAMP are two constructions of Family of Choice (FAMC) by distortion and performance metrics respectively. All are trained on ~1,000 lines. We star those in Family of Origin.
tremely small seed target translation. Thirdly, many works use rich resource languages as hypothetical low resource languages. Moreover, most works do not treat named entities separately; we add an order-preserving lexiconized component for more accurate translation of named entities. Finally, many multilingual works present final results as sets of translations from all source languages; we build a novel method to combine all translations into one.

We have five contributions. Firstly, we rank the 124 source languages to determine their closeness to the low resource language and choose the top few. We call the linguistic definition of language family Family of Origin (FAMO), and we call the empirical definition of higher-ranked languages using our metrics Family of Choice (FAMC). They often overlap, but may not coincide.

Secondly, we build an Iteratively Pretrained Multilingual Order-preserving Lexiconized Transformer (IPML) training on ∼1,000 lines of low resource data. Using iterative pretraining, we get a +23.9 BLEU increase over a multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer baseline (MLc) using English as a hypothetical low resource language, and a +10.3 BLEU increase over our asymmetric baseline. Training with the low resource language on both the source and target sides boosts translation into the target side. Training on randomly sampled 1,093 lines of low resource data, we reach a 31.3 BLEU score testing on 30,022 lines of Bible. We have a 42.8 BLEU score for Portuguese-English translation on the medical EMEA dataset.

Thirdly, we use a real-life severely low resource Mayan language, Eastern Pokomchi, a Class 0 language (Joshi et al., 2020) as one of our experiment setups. In addition, we also use English as a hypothetical low resource language for easy evaluation.

We also add an order-preserving lexiconized component to translate named entities well. To solve the variable-binding problem to distinguish “Ian calls Yi” from “Yi calls Ian” (Fodor and Pylyshyn, 1988; Graves et al., 2014; Zhou et al., 2018a), we build a lexicon table for 2,939 Bible named entities in 124 source languages including more than 66 severely low resource languages.

Finally, we combine translations from all source languages by using a novel method. For every sentence, we find the translation that is closest to the translation cluster center. The expected BLEU score of our combined translation is higher than translation from any of the individual sources.

2 Related Works

2.1 Information Dissemination

Interactive Natural Language Processing (NLP) systems are classified into information assimilation, dissemination, and dialogue (Bird, 2020; Ranzato et al., 2015; Waibel and Fugen, 2008). Information assimilation involves information flow from low resource to rich resource language communities while information dissemination involves information flow from rich resource to low resource language communities. Taken together, they allow dialogue and interaction of different groups at eye level. Most work on information assimilation (Bérard et al., 2020; Earle et al., 2012; Brownstein et al., 2008). Few work on dissemination due to small data, less funding, few experts and limited writing system (Östling and Tiedemann, 2017; Zhou et al., 2016; Anastasopoulos et al., 2017; Adams et al., 2017; Bansal et al., 2017).

2.2 Machine Polyglotism and Pretraining

Recent research on machine polyglotism involves training machines to be adept in many languages by adding language labels in the training data with a single attention (Johnson et al., 2017; Ha et al., 2016; Firat et al., 2016; Gillick et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2018b). Some explores data symmetry (Freitag and Firat, 2020; Birch et al., 2008; Lin et al., 2019). Zero-shot translation in severely low resource settings exploits the massive multilinguality, cross-lingual transfer, pretraining, iterative back-translation and freezing subnetworks (Lauscher et al., 2020; Nooralahzadeh et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Peiffer et al., 2020; Baziotes et al., 2020; Chronopoulou et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2020; Thompson et al., 2018; Luong et al., 2014; Wei et al., 2020; Dou et al., 2020).

2.3 Linguistic Distance

To construct linguistic distances (Hajič, 2000; Oncvay et al., 2020), some explore typological distance (Chowdhury et al., 2020; Rama and Kolachina, 2012; Pienemann et al., 2005; Svalberg and Chuchu, 1998; Hansen et al., 2012; Comrie, 2005), lexical distance (Huang et al., 2007), Levenshtein distance and Jaccard distance (Serva and Petroni, 2008; Holman et al., 2008; Adebar et al., 2020), sonority distance (Parker, 2012) and spectral distance (Dubossarsky et al., 2020).
3 Methodology

3.1 Multilingual Order-preserving Lexiconized Transformer

3.1.1 Multilingual Transformer

In training, each sentence is labeled with the source and target language label. For example, if we translate from Chuj (“ca”) to Cakchiquel (“ck”), each source sentence is tagged with __opt_src_ca __opt_tgt_ck. A sample source sentence is “__opt_src_ca __opt_tgt_ck Tec’b’ejec e b’a mach ex tzeyac’ och Jehová yipoc e’cool”.

We train on Geforce RTX 2080 Ti using ~100 million parameters, a 6-layer encoder and a 6-layer decoder that are powered by 512 hidden states, 8 attention heads, 512 word vector size, a dropout of 0.1, an attention dropout of 0.1, 2,048 hidden transformer feed-forward units, a batch size of 6,000, “adam” optimizer, “noam” decay method, and a label smoothing of 0.1 and a learning rate of 2.5 on OpenNMT (Klein et al., 2017; Vaswani et al., 2017). After 190,000 steps, we validate based on BLEU score with early stopping patience of 5.

3.1.2 Star Versus Complete Configuration

We show two configurations of translation paths in Figure 1: star graph (multi-source single-target) configuration and complete graph (multi-source multi-target) configuration. The complete configuration data increases quadratically with the number of languages while the star configuration data increases linearly.

3.1.3 Order-preserving Lexiconized transformer

The variable binding problem issue is difficult in severely low resource scenario; most neural models cannot distinguish the subject and the object of a simple sentence like “Fatma asks her sister Wati to call Yi, the brother of Andika”, especially when all named entities appear once or never appear in training (Fodor and Pylyshyn, 1988; Graves et al., 2014). Recently, researchers use order-preserving lexiconized Neural Machine Translation models where named entities are sequentially tagged in a sentence as __NEs (Zhou et al., 2018a). The previous example becomes “__NE0 asks her sister __NE1 to call __NE2, the brother of __NE3”.

This method works under the assumption of translating a closed text known in advance. Its success relies on good coverage of named entities. To cover many named entities, we build on existing research literature (Wu et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2018a) to construct a massively parallel lexicon table that covers 2,939 named entities across 124 languages in our Bible database. Our lexicon table is an expansion of the existing literature that covers 1,129 named entities (Wu et al., 2018). We add in 1,810 named entities that are in the extreme end of the tail occurring only once. We also include 66 more real-life severely low resource languages.

For every sentence pair, we build a target named entity decoding dictionary by using all target lexicons from the lexicon table that match with those in the source sentence. In severely low resource setting, our sequence tagging is larged based on dictionary look-up; we also include lexicons that are not in the dictionary but have small edit distances with the source lexicons. In evaluation, we replace all the ordered __NEs using the target decoding dictionary to obtain our final translation.

Let us translate “Fatma asks her sister Wati to call Yi, the brother of Andika” to Chinese and German. Our tagged source sentence that translates to Chinese is “__opt_src_en __opt_tgt_zh __NE0 asks her sister __NE1 to call __NE2, the brother of __NE3” and we use __opt_tgt_de for German. The source dictionary is “__NE0: Fatma, __NE1: Wati, __NE2: Yi, __NE3: Andika” and we create the target dictionaries. The Chinese output is “__NE0叫她的姐妹__NE1去打电话给__NE3的兄弟__NE2” and the German output is “__NE0 bittet ihre Schwester __NE1 darum, __NE2, den Bruder __NE3, anzurufen”. We decode the named entities to get final translations.
3.2 Ranking Source Languages

Existing works on translation from multiple source languages into a single low resource language usually have at most 30 source languages (Gu et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2018a; Zhu et al., 2020). They are limited within the same or close-by language families, or those with available data, or those chosen based on the researchers’ intuitive discretion. Instead, we examine ways to pick useful source languages in a principled fashion motivated by cross-lingual impacts and similarities (Shoemark et al., 2016; Sapir, 1921; Odlin, 1989; Cenoz, 2001; Toral and Way, 2018; De Raad et al., 1997; Hermans, 2003; Specia et al., 2016). We find that using many languages that are distant to the target low resource language may produce marginal improvements, if not negative impact. Indeed, existing literature on zero-shot translation also suffers from the limitation of linguistic distance between the source languages and the target language (Lauscher et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2020; Pfeiffer et al., 2020). We therefore rank and select the top few source languages that are closer to the target low resource language using the two metrics below.

We rank source languages according to their closeness to the low resource language. We construct the Family of Choice (FAMC) by comparing different ways of ranking linguistic distances empirically based on the small low resource data.

Let \( S_s \) and \( S_t \) be the source and target sentences, let \( L_s \) be the source length, let \( P(S_t = s_t|s_s, L_s) \) be the alignment probability, let \( F_s \) be the fertility of how many target words a source word is aligned to, let \( D_t \) be the distortion based on the fixed distance-based reordering model (Koehn, 2009).

We first construct a word-replacement model based on aligning the small amount of target low resource data with that of each source language using \texttt{fast_align} (Dyer et al., 2013). We replace every source word with the most probable target word according to the product of the alignment probability and the probability of fertility equalling one and distortion equalling zero \( P(F_s = 1, D_t = 0|s_t, s_s, l_s) \). We choose a simple word-replacement model because we aim to work with around 1,000 lines of low resource data. For fast and efficient ranking on such small data, a word-replacement model suits our purpose.

We use two alternatives to create our FAMCs. Our distortion measure is the probability of distortion equalling zero, \( P(D_t = 0|s_t, s_s, l_s) \), aggregated over all words in a source language. We use the distortion measure to rank the source languages and obtain the distortion-based FAMC (FAMD); we use the translation BLEU scores of the word-replacement model as another alternative to build the performance-based FAMC (FAMP). In Table 1, we list the top ten languages in FAMD and FAMP for Eastern Pokomchi and English. We use both alternatives to build FAMCs.

To prepare for transformer training, we choose the top ten languages neighboring our target low resource language in FAMD and FAMP. We choose ten because existing literature shows that training with ten languages from two neighboring language families is sufficient in producing quality translation through cross-lingual transfer (Zhou et al., 2018a). Since for some low resource languages, there may not be ten languages in FAMO in our database, we add languages from neighboring families to make an expanded list denoted by FAMO+.

3.3 Iterative Pretraining

We have two stages of pretraining using multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer on the complete and the star configuration. We design iterative pretraining on symmetric data to address catastrophic forgetting that is common in training (French, 1999; Kirkpatrick et al., 2017).

3.3.1 Stage 1: Pretraining on Neighbors

Firstly, we pretrain on the complete graph configuration of translation paths using the top ten languages neighboring our target low resource language in FAMD, FAMP, and FAMO+ respectively. Low resource data is excluded in training.

We use the multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer. Our vocabulary is the combination of the vocabulary for the top ten languages together with the low resource vocabulary built from the \( \sim 1,000 \) lines. The final model can translate from any of the ten languages to each other.

3.3.2 Stage 2: Adding Low Resource Data

We include the low resource data in the second stage of training. Since the low resource data covers \( \sim 3.5\% \) of the text while all the source languages cover the whole text, the data is highly asymmetric. To create symmetric data, we align the low resource data with the subset of data from all source languages. As a result, all source languages in the second stage of training have \( \sim 3.5\% \) of the text that is aligned with the low resource data.
We therefore create a complete graph configuration of translation paths using all the eleven languages.

Using the pretrained model from the previous stage, we train on the complete graph configuration of translation paths from all eleven languages including our low resource language. The vocabulary used is the same as before. We employ the multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer for pretraining. The final model can translate from any of the eleven languages to each other.

### 3.4 Final Training

Finally, we focus on translating into the low resource language. We use the symmetric data built from the second stage of pretraining. However, instead of using the complete configuration, we use the star configuration of translation paths from the all source languages to the low resource language. All languages have ~ 3.5% of the text.

Using the pretrained model from the second stage, we employ the multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer on the star graph configuration. We use the same vocabulary as before. The final trained model can translate from any of the ten source languages to the low resource language. Using the lexicon dictionaries, we decode the named entities and obtain our final translations.

### 3.5 Combination of Translations

We have multiple translations, one per each source language. Combining all translations is useful for both potential post-editing works and systematic comparison of different experiments especially when the sets of the source languages differ.

Our combination method assumes that we have the same text in all source languages. For each sentence, we form a cluster of translations from all source languages into the low resource language. Our goal is to find the translation that is closest to the center of the cluster. We rank all translations according to how centered this translation is with respect to other sentences by summing all its similarities to the rest. The top is closest to the center of the translation cluster. We take the most centered translation for every sentence to build the combined translation output. The expected BLEU score of our combined translation is higher than translation from any of the individual source languages.

### 4 Data

We use the Bible dataset and the medical EMEA dataset (Mayer and Cysouw, 2014; Tiedemann, 2012). EMEA dataset is from the European Medicines Agency and contains a lot of medical information that may be beneficial to the low resource communities. Our method can be applied to other datasets like WASH guidelines.

For the Bible dataset, we use 124 source languages with 31,103 lines of data and a target low resource language with ~1,000 lines (~3.5%) of data. We have two setups for the target low resource language. One uses Eastern Pokomchi, a Mayan language; the other uses English as a hypothetical low resource language. We train on only ~1,000 lines of low resource data from the book of Luke and test on the 678 lines from the book of Mark. Mark is topically similar to Luke, but is written by a different author. For the first stage of pretraining, we use 80%, 10%, 10% split for training, validation and testing. For the second stage onwards, we use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Sentence</th>
<th>IPML Translation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En terwyl Hy langs die see van Galilea loop, sien Hy Simon en Andreas, sy broer, besig om 'n net in die see uit te gooi; want hulle was vissers.</td>
<td>And as He drew near to the lake of Galilee, He Simon saw Andrew, and his brother, lying in the lake, for they were fishermen.</td>
<td>And walking along beside the Sea of Galilee, He saw Simon and his brother Andrew casting a small net in the sea; for they were fishermen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En toe Hy daarvandaan 'n bietjie verder gaan, sien Hy Jakobus, die seun van Sebedeus, en Johannes, sy broer, wat besig was om die nette in die skuit heel te maak.</td>
<td>And being in a distance, He saw James, the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother. who kept the nets in the boat.</td>
<td>And going forward from there a little, He saw James the son of Zebedee, and his brother John. And they were in the boat mending the nets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En verder Jakobus, die seun van Sebedeus, en Johannes, die broer van Jakobus- aan hulle het Hy die bynaam Boanerges gegee, dit is, seuns van die donder.</td>
<td>And James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and He gave to them the name, which is called Boanerges, being of the voice.</td>
<td>And on James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James, He put on them the names Boanerges, which is, Sons of Thunder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Examples of Iteratively Pretrained Multilingual Order-preserving Lexiconized Transformer (IPML) translation from Afrikaans to English as a hypothetical low resource language using FAMP. We train on only 1,093 lines of English data.
95%, 5% split of Luke for training and validation, and 100% of Mark for testing.

Eastern Pokomchi is Mayan, and English is Germanic. Since our database does not have ten members of each family, we use FAMO+, the expanded version of FAMO. For English, we include five Germanic languages and five Romance languages in FAMO+; for Eastern Pokomchi, we include five Mayan languages and five Amerindian languages in FAMO+. The Amerindian family is broadly believed to be close to the Mayan family by the linguistic community.

We construct FAMCs by comparing different ways of ranking linguistic distances empirically based on ∼1,000 lines of training data. In Table 1, we list the top ten languages for Eastern Pokomchi and English in FAMD and FAMP respectively.

To imitate the real-life situation of having small seed target translation data, we choose to use ∼1,000 lines (∼3.5%) of low resource data. We also include Eastern Pokomchi in addition to using English as a hypothetical low resource language. Though data size can be constrained to mimic severely low resource scenarios, much implicit information is still used for the hypothetical low resource language that is actually rich resource. For example, implicit information like English is Germanic is often used. For real low resource scenarios, the family information may have yet to be determined; the neighboring languages may be unknown, and if they are known, they are highly likely to be low resource too. We thus use Eastern Pokomchi as our real-life severely low resource language.

In addition to the Bible dataset, we work with the medical EMEA dataset (Tiedemann, 2012). Using English as a hypothetical language, we train on randomly sampled 1,093 lines of English data, and test on 678 lines of data. Since there are only 9 languages in Germanic and Romance families in EMEA dataset, we include a slavic language Polish in our FAMO+ for experiments.

The EMEA dataset is less than ideal comparing with the Bible dataset. The Bible dataset contains the same text for all source languages; however, the EMEA dataset does not contain the same text. It is built from similar documents but has different parallel data for each language pair. Therefore, during test time, we do not combine the translations from various source languages in the EMEA dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiments</th>
<th>IPML</th>
<th>MLc</th>
<th>MLs</th>
<th>PMLc</th>
<th>PMLs</th>
<th>AML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretrained</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iterative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexiconized</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined 37.3 13.4 14.7 34.7 35.7 27.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Comparing our iteratively pretrained multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer (IPML) with the baselines training on 1,093 lines of English data in FAMO+. We checkmark the key components used in each experiments and explain all the baselines in details in Section 5.

5 Results

We compare our iteratively pretrained multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer (IPML) with five baselines in Table 3. MLc is a baseline model of multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer training on complete configuration; in other words, we skip the first stage of pretraining and train on the second stage in Chapter 3.3.2 only. MLs is a baseline model of multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer training on star configuration; in other words, we skip both steps of pretraining and train on the final stage in Chapter 3.4 only. PMLc is a baseline model of pretrained multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer training on complete configuration; in other words, we skip the final stage of training after completing both stages of pretraining. PMLs is a baseline model of pretrained multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer training on star configuration; in other words, after the first stage of pretraining, we skip the second stage of pretraining and proceed to the final training directly. Finally, AML is a baseline model of multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer on asymmetric data. We replicate the ∼1,000 lines of the low resource data till it matches the training size of other source languages; we train on the complete graph configuration using eleven languages. Though the number of low resource training lines is the same as others, information is highly asymm-
Table 4: Performance of Iteratively Pretrained Multilingual Order-preserving Lexiconized Transformer (IPML) training for English on FAMO+, FAMD and FAMP. We train on only 1,093 lines of English data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Language</th>
<th>BLEU</th>
<th>FAMO+</th>
<th>FAMD</th>
<th>FAMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three pretrained models on symmetric data, IPML, PMLc and PMLs, beat asymmetric baseline AML. In Table 3, IPML has a +10.3 BLEU increase over our asymmetric baseline on combined translation using English as a hypothetical low resource language training on FAMO+. All four use the same amount of data, but differ in training strategies and data configuration. In severely low resource scenarios, effective training strategies on symmetric data improve translation greatly.

We compare IPML results training on different sets of source languages in FAMO+, FAMD, and FAMP, for English and Eastern Pokomchi in Table 4 and 5. FAMP performs the best for translation into English while both FAMP and FAMD outperform FAMO+ as shown in Table 4. FAMD performs best for translation into Eastern Pokomchi as shown in Table 5. Afrikaans has the highest score for English’s FAMD and FAMP, outperforming Dutch, German or French. A reason may be that Afrikaans is the youngest language in the Germanic family with many lexical and syntactic borrowings from English and multiple close neighbors of English (Gordon Jr, 2005). When language family information is limited, constructing FAMC to determine neighbors is very useful in translation.

Comparing Eastern Pokomchi results with English results, we see that translation into real-life severely low resource languages is more difficult than translation into hypothetical ones. The combined score is 38.3 for English in Table 4 and 23.1 for Eastern Pokomchi on FAMD in Table 5. Eastern Pokomchi has ejective consonants which makes tokenization process difficult. It is agglutinative, morphologically rich and ergative just like Basque (Aissen et al., 2017; Clemens et al., 2015). It is complex, unique and nontransparent to the out-
We are curious of how our model trained on ∼1,000 lines of data performs on the rest of the Bible. In other words, we would like to know how IPML performs if we train on ∼3.5% of the Bible and test on ∼96.5% of the Bible. In Table 7, we achieve a BLEU score of 31.3 training IPML on randomly sampled 1,093 lines of data for English on FAMO+. Note that the training data is randomly sampled in Table 7 comparing to training on Luke in Table 4 and Table 5. We use this experiment to show that we have good results not only with specific book, but also with randomly sampled data.

We show qualitative examples in Table 2 and 9. The source content is translated well overall and there are a few places for improvement in Table 2. The words “fishermen” and “fishers” are paraphrases of the same concept. IPML predicts the correct concept though it is penalized by BLEU.

Infusing the order-preserving lexiconized component to our training greatly improves qualitative evaluation. But it does not affect BLEU much as BLEU has its limitations in severely low resource scenarios. This is why all experiments include the lexiconized component in training. The BLEU comparison in our paper also applies to the comparison of all experiments without the order-preserving lexiconized component. This is important in real-life situations when a low resource lexicon list is not available, or has to be invented. For example, a person growing up in a local village in Papua New Guinea may have met many people named “Bosai” or “Kaura”, but may have never met a person named “Matthew”, and we may need to create a lexicon word in the low resource language for “Matthew” possibly through phonetics.

We also see good results with the medical EMEA dataset. Treating English as a hypothetical low resource language, we train on only 1,093 lines of English data. For Portuguese-English translation, we obtain a BLEU score of 42.8 while the rest of languages all obtain BLEU scores above 34 in Table 6 and Table 8. In Table 8, we see that our translation is very good, though a few words are carried from the source language including “vétérinaire”. This is mainly because our ∼1,000 lines contain very small vocabulary; however, by carrying the source word over, key information is preserved.

6 Conclusion

We use ∼1,000 lines of low resource data to translate a closed text that is known in advance to a severely low resource language by leveraging massive source parallelism. We present two metrics to rank the 124 source languages and construct FAMCs. We build an iteratively pretrained multilingual order-preserving lexiconized transformer and combine translations from all source languages into one by using our centric measure. Moreover, we add a multilingual order-preserving lexiconized component to translate the named entities accurately. We build a massively parallel lexicon table for 2,939 Bible named entities in 124 source languages, covering more than 66 severely low resource languages. Our good result for the medical EMEA dataset shows that our method is useful for other datasets and applications.

Our final result can also serve as a ranking measure for linguistic distances though it is much more expensive in terms of time and resources. In the future, we would like to explore more metrics that are fast and efficient in ranking linguistic distances to the severely low resource language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Sentence</th>
<th>IPML Translation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caso detecte efeitos graves ou outros efeitos não mencionados neste folheto, informe o médico veterinário.</td>
<td>If you notice any side effects or other side effects not mentioned in this leaflet, please inform the vétérinaire.</td>
<td>If you notice any serious effects or other effects not mentioned in this leaflet, please inform your veterinarian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No tratamento de Bovinos com mais de 250 Kg de peso vivo, dividir a dose de forma a não administrar mais de 10 ml por local de injeção.</td>
<td>In the treatment of infants with more than 250 kg in vivo body weight, a the dose to not exceed 10 ml per injection.</td>
<td>For treatment of cattle over 250 kg body weight, divide the dose so that no more than 10 ml are injected at one site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No entanto, uma vez que é possível a ocorrência de efeitos secundários, qualquer tratamento que exceda as 1-2 semanas deve ser administrado sob supervisão veterinária regular.</td>
<td>However, because any of side effects is possible, any treatment that 1-5 weeks should be administered under regular supervision.</td>
<td>However, since side effects might occur, any treatment exceeding 1-2 weeks should be under regular veterinary supervision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Examples of IPML translation on medical EMEA dataset from Portuguese to English using FAMO⁺.
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7 Appendix

In Table 1 and Table 5, Kanjobal is Eastern Kanjobal, Mam is Northern Mam, Cuzco is Cuzco Quechua, Ayacucho is Ayacucho Quechua, Bolivian is South Bolivian Quechua, and Huallaga is Huallaga Quechua.

We show an illustration of WASH guidelines in Figure 2. We also show IPML translations into Eastern Pokomchi (Mayan) in Table 9.
Figure 2: An Amharic illustration of translation of water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) guidelines in Ethiopia (USAID, 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Sentence</th>
<th>IPML Translation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ket idi limmabas iti dinna ti baybay ti Galilea, nakitana ni Simon ken ni Andres a cabsatna, nga iwaywayatda ti iket iti baybay; ta dumadaclisda idi.</td>
<td>Eh noq ojik i rub’an i Jesús juntar i k’isa palaw i Galilea, xrilow reje i Simón ruch’ihil i Andres, re’i rutuut i k’isa palaw, ruum jinaj i k’isa palaw barco.</td>
<td>Noq k’ahchi’ rik’ik i Jesús chi chii’ i k’isa palaw ar Galilea, xrilow reje wach i Simón ruch’ihil i ruchaaq’, Andres rub’ihnaal. Re’ keh aj karineel taqe, k’ahchi’ kikutum qhoq i kiya’l pan palaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ket idi nagna pay bassit nakitana ni Santiago nga anac ni Zebedeo ken ni Juan a cabsatna, nga addada idi iti barangayda, a tartarimaanenda dag-iti iketda.</td>
<td>Eh noq ojik i rub’an i Jesús, xrilow i Jacobo, re’i Jacobo rak’un i Zebe-deo, re’ Juan rub’ihnaal, ruch’ihil taqe i raj tahqaneel. eh xkikoj wo’ wach chinaah i k’isa palaw.</td>
<td>Eh jumehq’iil xwuktik johtoq, eh junk’aam-oq chik i xb’ehik reje i Jesus, xrilow kiwach i kiib’chi winaq kichaaq’ kiib’, re’ Jacobo, re’ Juan, rak’unuq taqe i Zebedeo. Eh wilkeeb’ chupaam jinaj i barco, k’ahchi’ kik’ojem wach i kiya’l b’am’bal kar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ket immasideg ni Jesus ket iniggamanna iti imana ket pinatacderma; ket pinanawan ti gorigor, ket nagservi cadacuada.</td>
<td>Eh re’ Jesús xuqil i koq riib’, xutza’aj i koq chinaah i q’ab’, eh re’ i kaq tz’a’ chi rij. eh jumehqi’il xwuktiik jhoq, re’ chik i reh xutoq’aa’ cho yej-anik kiwa’.</td>
<td>Eh re’ i Jesús xuqil i koq riib’ ruuk’ i yowaab’, xuchop chi q’ab’, xruksaj jhoq, eh jumehqi’il xik’ik i tz’a’ chi rij. Eh re’ chik i reh xutoq’aa’ cho yej-anik kiwa’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Examples of Iteratively Pretrained Multilingual Order-preserving Lexiconized Transformer (IPML) translation from Ilokano to Eastern Pokomchi using FAMD. We train on only 1,086 lines of Eastern Pokomchi data.
Abstract

It has long been recognized that suffixing is more common than prefixing in the languages of the world. More detailed statistics on this tendency are needed to sharpen proposed explanations for this tendency. The classic approach to gathering data on the prefix/suffix preference is for a human to read grammatical descriptions (948 languages), which is time-consuming and involves discretization judgments. In this paper we explore two machine-driven approaches for prefix and suffix statistics which are crude approximations, but have advantages in terms of time and replicability. The first simply searches a large collection of grammatical descriptions for occurrences of the terms ‘prefix’ and ‘suffix’ (4,287 languages). The second counts substrings from raw text data in a way indirectly reflecting prefixation and suffixation (1,030 languages, using New Testament translations). The three approaches largely agree in their measurements but there are important theoretical and practical differences. In all measurements, there is an overall preference for suffixation, albeit only slightly, at ratios ranging between 0.51 and 0.68.

1 Introduction

It has long been recognized that suffixing is more common than prefixing in the languages of the world (see Himmelmann 2014, 927 and references therein). More detailed statistics on this tendency are needed to sharpen and evaluate proposed explanations for this tendency. In particular, dense data is needed to properly account for genealogical and areal effects (cf. Murawaki and Yamauchi 2018). With some 7,000 languages in the world, gathering these data is a gargantuan task. In this paper, we investigate three approaches that span the range from minimal to maximal curation.

Motivated by potential functional explanations (Himmelmann, 2014), the ideal measure for prefixing/suffixing would be to count the proportion of prefixes/suffixes per phonological word in a morphologically segmented corpus (cf. Greenberg 1954, 1957). It is believed that such ratios converge as the corpus grows towards infinite amounts of sampled data produced by the speakers of a language, and as such the ratios constitute properties of the language. The ideal measure would range from 0 to (potentially) infinity but, in practice, ratios beyond 5 are unheard of. An alternative equivalent characterization is to have an affixation score (AS) from 0 to (potentially) infinity comprising both prefixes and suffixes, along with a ratio — called the suffix ratio (SR) — from 0.0 to 1.0 of the division of labour between suffixes and prefixes ($\frac{S}{S+P}$). We use this characterization here, remembering that it is only defined for languages which have at least some affixation.

Since large morphologically segmented corpora are not available for a wide range of languages of the world, the ideal token count measure must be approximated. The classic approach, which we may call Humans read grammars (HRG), is for a human to extract the relevant information from grammatical descriptions of the languages of the world. This approach is ideal in many ways, but requires a large amount of manual labour and requires a certain amount of judiciousness on behalf of the curator. While grammars are systematizations of raw text/spoken data, they rarely contain token counts, so this approach can only reflect any specific ratios indirectly. At the other end of the spectrum, a quick-and-dirty approach where Machines read grammars (MRG) is possible now that large collections of digitized grammatical descriptions are available and practical to use. We may obtain a crude approximation of the functional load of prefixes/suffixes by simply counting the occurrences of the terms prefix and suffix of the same grammatical descriptions that were written for a human audience. While there are obvious drawbacks to such a “naive” measure, it has obvi-
ous advantages in terms of speed, replicability and transparency. A similar crude measure may also be obtained by Machines Read Raw Text (MRT) given that a large collection of (not infinite-size, but comparable) raw text collection of New Testaments are available electronically (McCarthy et al., 2020). Correct automatic morphological segmentation and labeling of such a large array languages is not possible at present. Nevertheless, measures inspired by work in Unsupervised Learning of Morphology (Hammarström and Borin, 2011) may be enough to gauge the amount and ratio of affixation even if the tokens cannot be accurately segmented.

2 Related Work

Currently the largest available humanly curated database on prefixation/suffixification in the languages of the world is the WALS chapter 26A by Dryer (2005) featuring 948 languages. It continues a long tradition of growing databases of similar kinds (see, e.g., Himmelmann 2014, 927). We use the Dryer (2005) database here as it represents the culmination of these efforts and is available and methodologically explicit.

Information Extraction from grammatical descriptions has only recently become possible in practice, with the advent of a large collection of digitized grammars (Virk et al., 2020). Given its novelty, only a few embryonic approaches (Virk et al., 2019; Wichmann and Rama, 2019; Macklin-Cordes et al., 2017; Virk et al., 2017; Hammarström et al., 2021) have addressed the task so far. Arguably, the task in the present study is keyword-associated (of the simplest kind) wherefore we follow the method of Hammarström et al. (2021) which requires no tuning of parameters and estimates a noise-level for each source in addition to the simple counts.

While there are no comparable morphologically segmented corpora for a wide range of languages, it should be noted that there is a growing body of scattered resources in the NLP world (e.g., Mott et al. 2020), morphologically segmented texts in the DOBeS and ELAR archives (e.g., Paschen et al. 2020), and Interlinear Glossed Text extracted from miscellaneous publications (see references cited in Round et al. 2020 and Howell 2020). These resources do not yet have the breadth and comparability required for the present study, but the large raw text parallel Bible corpus of McCarthy et al. (2020) does — the culmination of a several decades long tradition of amassing Bible corpora for NLP. Combined with unsupervised morphological segmentation they could provide an excellent resource for direct measurements of affixation. A very large body of work in Unsupervised Learning of Morphology (see Hammarström and Borin 2011 for an overview up to 2010 and, e.g., Eskander et al. 2020 for an overview of more recent work) seeks to do segmentation of raw text. However, despite some progress to date, no off-the-shelf method exists that will segment a very broad range of languages accurately without a large amount of manual tuning of parameters, if even then. Fortunately, for the present task, we only need a score reflecting affixation, not necessarily an accurate segmentation itself. We have thus chosen one of the simplest counting techniques for overrepresentation of initial/terminal string segments (cf. Hammarström and Borin 2011, 322-326) explained in Section 3.3, thought to reflect actual segmentation proportionately. Many other choices would have been possible, with, we suspect, largely equivalent outcomes.

3 Methods

3.1 Humans Read Grammars

Dryer (2005)’s database, reflected in WALS Feature 26A Prefixing vs. Suffixing in Inflectional Morphology proceeds by calculating a prefix/suffix index for a given language by considering inflectional endings of ten different types, shown in Table 1 (top) along with four example languages. The relative proportion of suffixes versus prefixes ($\frac{S}{P}$), called the affixing index (AI), is discretized into five categories along with one category for languages with little or no affixation, as shown in Table 1 (bottom). We only have access to the languages labeled with the discretized labels, not the underlying counts, which would have been a richer rendering (cf. Gerdes et al. 2021). The scope of Dryer (2005) excludes non-inflectional, i.e., derivational prefixes/affixes, pre-/postclitics, intercalated fixes (also known as templatic morphology), tonal changes, preverbs, etc.

3.2 Machines Read Grammars

The data for the experiments in this paper consists of a collection of over 10 000 raw text grammatical descriptions digitally available for computational processing (Virk et al., 2020). A listing of the
Table 1: Top: Calculating the affixing index (AI) as per Dryer (2005) given the existence of different types of inflectional prefixes (P) and suffixes (S). The three boldfaced types are considered important enough to count double, hence the 2 points in the respective cells. Bottom: Labels used in Dryer (2005) for different types of prefix/suffix languages given the Affixing index (AI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affixing index (AI)</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th># lgs</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P + S \leq 2$</td>
<td>Little or no inflectional morphology</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Thai [tha] (0+0), Vai [vai] (0+2), …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8 $\leq AI &lt; 0.8$</td>
<td>Strongly suffixing</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>Swedish [swe] (3/3), Turkish [tur] (11/11), …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6 $\leq AI &lt; 0.8$</td>
<td>Weakly suffixing</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Beja [bej] (10/13), Mokilese [mkj] (2/3), …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4 $\leq AI &lt; 0.6$</td>
<td>Equal prefixing and suffixing</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Ubykh [uby] (5/10), Kiribati [gil] (2/4), …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 $\leq AI &lt; 0.4$</td>
<td>Weakly prefixing</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Mohawk [moh] (3/9), Au <a href="1/3">avt</a>, …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$AI &lt; 0.2$</td>
<td>Strongly Prefixing</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Hunde [hke] (0.5/10), Sango [sag] (0/3), …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The collection can be enumerated via the open-access bibliography Glottolog (glottolog.org, Hammarström et al. 2020). For each item, we know the (i) language it is written in (the meta-language, usually English, French, German, Spanish, Russian or Mandarin Chinese, see Table 2), (ii) the language(s) described in it (the vernacular, typically one of the thousands of minority languages throughout the world), and (iii) the type of description (comparative study, description of a specific feature, phonological description, grammar sketch, full grammar etc.). For the experiments in the present study, we used grammars and grammar sketches written in the ten most popular meta-languages. The subset counts 12 032 documents describing 4 287 languages of the world (Table 2). The collection has been OCRRed using ABBYY Finereader 14 with using the meta-language as recognition language. The original digital documents are of quality varying from barely legible typescript copies to high-quality scans and even born-digital documents. We have no reason to believe that OCR quality plays any significant role in the experiments to follow. We have however taken care to read latin ligatures accurately as the fi ligature (U+FB01) affects the searches for prefix/suffix.

The search over the grammar was done using the Regexp5 in Table 3 tailored to each language, giving a number of suffix hits $S$ and prefix hits $P$. In the result output, sources are grouped by language for easy browsing and inspection, as shown in Figure 1. Also included is the total number of tokens of each grammar as well as the “purity level” $\alpha_i$ and associated threshold $t$ automatically calculated using the technique of Hammarström et al. (2021). The suffix ratio for Machines Read Grammars is $SR_{MRG} = \frac{S}{S + T}$ if $S + P > 0$ and conventionally set to 0.5 otherwise.

For Chinese, the Jieba (https://github.com/fxsjy/jieba) tokenizer was employed.
3.3 Machines Read Raw Text

New Testament translations for over 1000 languages are available in the Bible corpus collection of McCarthy et al. (2020). For the purpose of the present study, we assume that whitespace-indicated boundaries correspond to phonological words of the language in question. Languages written in a script that does not indicate word boundaries are excluded from computation. For comparability, we selected only the New Testament and excluded languages which had less than 7000 verses thereof. The longest text was selected when different versions were available for the same language. A total of 1030 languages remained.

The type/token ratio is widely taken to be proportionate to the amount of affixation of a language. To measure the division between prefixing and suffixing, we adopt the RA measure of Hammarström (2009, 25-30). As noted above, the technique is one of many variations of the essentially the same theme (Hammarström and Borin, 2011, 322-326). Given any string $x$ and a set $W$ of word types of a corpus, we may calculate the probability of $x$ as final occurrence and the probability of $x$ as a non-final occurrence. $RA(-x)$ is simply the ratio between final and non-final probability, and $RA(x-)$, analogously, the ratio between initial and non-initial probability. For example, $RA(-ing) \approx 35.1$ and $RA(ing-) \approx 0.01$ in the English New Testament. Each segment $x$ may thus be ranked according to prefixhood and suffixhood. From the entire set of attested segments, we keep only the set of suffixes $S$ which are the best suffix-parse (= highest $RA$) for some word in $W$ and only the set of prefixes $P$ which are the best prefix-parse for some word in $W$. This makes the very long lists of potential affixes less unwieldy, and the length of the resulting list is believed to be proportionate to the actual number of affixes of each kind. However, it is known that resulting lists of this kind contain segments that are too long compared the actual segmentation, i.e., that contain the true affix plus one or more common characters of the stem or affix of an inner layer. Since we are only interested in the relative amount of prefixation/suffixation here — not the actual segmentation — we may hy-

---

Table 2: Meta-languages of the grammatical descriptions for the present study. The total number of distinct languages covered is 4287.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-language</th>
<th># lgs</th>
<th># docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>eng</td>
<td>3345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>fra</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>deu</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>spa</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>rus</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>cmn</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>por</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>ind</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>nld</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>ita</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12032

---

Figure 1: Example output of the Machines Read Grammars approach.
Table 3: Regular expressions for various meta-languages used in the Machines Read Grammar search.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\W[Pp][r]efix</td>
<td>\W[Pp][r]efix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\W[Ss][u]fix</td>
<td>\W[Ss][u]fix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Examples of top RA scoring affixes in three languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish [swe]</th>
<th>English [eng]</th>
<th>Swahili [swh]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x RA(x)</td>
<td>x RA(x)</td>
<td>x RA(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-igt</td>
<td>814.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-ades</td>
<td>362.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>förb-</td>
<td>343.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>upp-</td>
<td>316.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>fram-</td>
<td>248.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-igen</td>
<td>222.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>förh-</td>
<td>216.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>tills-</td>
<td>203.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>förk-</td>
<td>203.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>förm-</td>
<td>197.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Examples of top RA scoring affixes in three languages.

The amount of raw text data needed to reach a stable $SR_{MRT}$ is shown in Figure 2 for some example languages including the ones with the lowest (Tok Pisin) and highest (Northwest Alaska Inupiatun) type-token ratio.

Figure 2: The convergence of $SR_{MRT}$ given increasing percentages of (random) tokens of the New Testament for some example languages including the ones with the lowest (Tok Pisin) and highest (Northwest Alaska Inupiatun) type-token ratio.

4 Experiments

4.1 The Individual Measures

For the Humans Read Grammars (HRG) approach, there are no experiments to report, but we may note that the average suffix ratio is $SR_{HRG} = 0.67$ (using the midpoint of the range associated with each label, i.e., 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9) or $SR_{HRG} = 0.65$ if the languages with little affixation are conven-
Figure 3: Differences in \( SR_{MRG} \) for pairs of different source documents \( s_1, s_2 \) describing the same language.

Traditionally said to have a ratio of 0.5.

For the Machines Read Grammars (MRG) approach, there is some latitude in how to treat different sources for the same language. More than half of the languages (2516 of 4287) have more than one source and the average number of sources per language is 2.81. Surprisingly, sources for the same language differ quite a lot in their suffix ratio, on average \( |SR_{MRG}(s_1) - SR_{MRG}(s_2)| \approx 0.24 \) (see Figure 3 for a histogram). This discrepancy is likely not driven by any effects related to different meta-languages as it is \( \approx 0.24 \) when the sources have the same meta-language, only slightly lower than \( \approx 0.26 \) when they do not. Different sources agree on whether \( SR_{MRG} > 0.5 \) only 68.6% of the time (70.2% if the same meta-language versus 66.3% if different). Manual inspection suggests that the discrepancies are mainly due to differences in scope and attention to functional load across descriptions of the same language, but also relate to differences in author style. For example, Lazard (1981)’s description frequently uses the term ‘préfix’ along with a hyphenated form \( x- \), as expected, but does not use the term suffix when discussing suffixes (that the language does have) which are introduced as \( -x \) without any explicit accompanying term. The differences notwithstanding, if the suffix ratio of a language is understood as the average suffix ratio of its sources, the average suffix ratio across all 4287 in MRG is 0.59. It is only a little different, 0.61, if instead we take the source with the most hits (suffix + prefix) per language.

For the Machines Read Raw Text (MRT) approach, the average \( SR_{MRT} \approx 0.51 \) — only a minimal suffix preference.

4.2 Comparison Between the Three Measures

Table 5 shows a comparison between the three dataset in terms of number of languages in common, average \( SR \) for the languages in common, Pearson’s \( r \) and agreement on whether \( SR > 0.5 \). HRG and MRG agree on a \( SR \) of over 0.6 while MRT exhibits only a small suffix preference. All three measures are correlated with an \( r > 0.5 \). A scatter plot for \( MRG \cap MRT \) — the two continuous measures — is shown in Figure 4. The agreement between all three measures increases to around 0.7 if we only consider the polarity of \( SR \).

We should not expect these measures to fully agree given the significant theoretical differences. HRG has been forcibly discretized, considers only inflectional morphology and has an opaque link to the token ratio. MRG is quite sensitive to the descriptive aims (and whims) of particular authors and is unable to discern the type and context of affixes. Some authors discuss more comparative aspects, some include detailed discussions of morphophonology, some describe subordinate clauses in more detail than others and so on. It is telling that MRG agrees with the other measures roughly as much as MRG for different sources of the same language. It thus seems that this accuracy is a natural limit to what naive keyword counting can achieve on this (and similar) tasks. Similarly, MRT can not differentiate between derivational, inflectional or fossilized/productive affixation and it is not known how close the HRT measure is to the ideal token count and/or if there is a simple improvement.

To exemplify these differences, consider the comparison of SR-measurements for ten randomly
chosen languages in Table 6. We have not been able to investigate in depth the judgment of MRT of Alekano as a prefix-dominant language. A possibility informally observed in some other cases is that frequent stems are judged as prefixes. Indeed the MRT method lacks any information needed to distinguish stems from affixes if not for their frequency distributions. Amharic is written in an abugida script which should theoretically make the MRT estimate more coarse grained, and this is possibly reflected in its comparatively lower SR\text{MRT}. Burarra is judged by MRT as a suffixing language, but here the explanation may be related to the orthography. The Burarra words as rendered in the Bible corpus contain a lot of dashes, likely indicating (some? all?) affix boundaries, possibly interfering with the MRT method (but this has not been investigated in depth). The two grammars used in MRG for Wubuy (one of which, Heath 1984, also underlies the HRG value) do discuss the prefixes much more than the suffixes since the prefix system indicating noun classes in this language is quite complicated.

Judging from the three-way comparison, the MRT measure is more often deviant from the other two. A closer look is needed to determine the source(s) of discrepancy more systematically. More research is needed into the robustness of the MRT-measure and related techniques, especially as it concerns the influence of orthography/writing system.

While the above discussion concerns the division of labour between suffixes and prefixes, we should also note how well the amount of affixation can be measured. In HRG, 141 of 948 languages are said to have “Little Affixation”. Simple logistic regression gives an accuracy of 86% in predicting this class from the type/token ratio of MRT and 85% in predicting the class from the suffix, prefix, purity level and token count of the grammar with the most hits for each language. But these numbers do not improve on the baseline, and so add no actual information as to this class. Furthermore, there is only a weak correlation ($r \approx 0.15$) between the type-token ratio of MRT and the ratio of affixation hits to tokens times purity level. Clearly, predicting the amount of affixation is not as simple as it appears at first glance (cf. Bentz et al. 2016).

### 5 Conclusion

We have compared three ways to obtain data on the amount of prefixes/suffixes in the languages of the world. The three measures, correlate to a high degree but none can be said to reflect an ideal measure. At the same time, there are considerable differences in the measurements of individual languages. These differences reflect differences in aim and scope as well as sketchy measurements. The
Humans Read Grammars method only focuses on inflectional morphology with only weak integration of functional load. The Machines Read Grammars approach is vulnerable to differences in scope of description and individual styles, of which there is plenty of variation for the same language. More research is needed in to see to what extent these dimensions of variation can somehow be normalized automatically. The Machines Read Raw Text method reads a very noisy reflection of prefixation/suffixing from the raw data and cannot differentiate between derivational, inflectional or fossilized/productive affixation. The simple measure used here should be abandoned in favour of a more complicated, but less noisy measure. The resulting database, in total spanning the tremendous 4 437 languages, is freely available for future research at Zenodo http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4731249 on a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

Acknowledgements

This research was made possible thanks to the financial support of the From Dust to Dawn: Multilingual Grammar Extraction from Grammars project funded by Stiftelsen Marcus och Amalia Wallenberg’s Minnesfond 2017.0105 awarded to Harald Hammarström (Uppsala University) and the Dictionary/Grammar Reading Machine: Computational Tools for Accessing the World’s Linguistic Heritage (DReaM) Project awarded 2018-2020 by the Joint Programming Initiative in Cultural Heritage and Global Change, Digital Heritage and Riksantikvarieämbetet, Sweden.

References


Robots who read grammars. Poster presented at Co-EDL Fest 2017, Alexandra Park Conference Centre, Alexandra Headlands, QLD.


Predicting and Explaining French Grammatical Gender

Saumya Yashmohini Sahai*
The Ohio State University, USA
sahai.17@osu.edu

Dravyansh Sharma*
Carnegie Mellon University, USA
dravyans@cs.cmu.edu

Abstract

Grammatical gender may be determined by semantics, orthography, phonology, or could even be arbitrary. Identifying patterns in the factors that govern noun genders can be useful for language learners, and for understanding innate linguistic sources of gender bias. Traditional manual rule-based approaches may be substituted by more accurate and scalable but harder-to-interpret computational approaches for predicting gender from typological information. In this work, we propose interpretable gender classification models for French, which obtain the best of both worlds. We present high accuracy neural approaches which are augmented by a novel global surrogate based approach for explaining predictions. We introduce auxiliary attributes to provide tunable explanation complexity.

1 Introduction

Grammatical gender is a categorization of nouns in certain languages which forms a basis for agreement with related words in sentences, and plays an important role in disambiguation and correct usage (Ibrahim, 2014). An estimated third of the current world population are native speakers of gendered languages, and over one-sixth are L2 speakers. Having a gender assigned to nouns can potentially affect how the speakers think about the world (Samuel et al., 2019). A systematic study of rules governing these assignments can point to the origin of and potentially help mitigate gender biases, and improve gender-based inclusivity (Sexton, 2020).

Grammatical gender (hereon referred to by gender) need not coincide with “natural gender”, which can make language acquisition more challenging. For example, Irish cailín (meaning "girl") is assigned a masculine gender. Works investigating the role of gender in acquiring a new language (Sabourin et al., 2006; Ellis et al., 2012) have found that the speakers of a language with grammatical gender have an advantage when acquiring a new gendered language. Automated generation of simple rules for assigning gender can be helpful for L2 learners, especially when L1 is genderless.

Tools for understanding predictions of statistical models, for example variable importance analysis of Friedman (2001), have been used even before the widespread use of black-box neural models. Recently the interest in such tools, reformulated as explainability in the neural context (Guidotti et al., 2018), has surged, with a corresponding development of a suite of solutions (Bach et al., 2015; Sundararajan et al., 2017; Shrikumar et al., 2017; Lundberg and Lee, 2017). These approaches typically explain the model prediction by attributing it to relevant bits in the input encoding. While faithful to the black box model’s “decision making”, the explanations obtained may not be readily intuited by human users. Surrogate models, which globally approximate the model predictions by a more interpretable model, or obtain prediction-specific explanations by perturbing the input in domain-specific ways, have been introduced to remedy this problem (Ribeiro et al., 2016; Molnar, 2019).

We consider a novel surrogate approach to explainability, where we map the feature embedding learned by the black box models to an auxiliary space of explanations. We contend that the best way to arrive at a decision (prediction) may not necessarily be the best way to explain it. While prior work is largely limited to the input encodings, by designing a set of auxiliary attributes we can provide explanations at desired levels of complexity, which could (for example) be made to suit the language learner’s ability in our motivating setting. Our techniques overcome issues in prior art in our setting and are completely language-independent, with potential for use in broader natural language processing and other deep learning explanations.
For illustration, we examine French in detail where the explanations require both meaning and form.

2 Related Work

We consider the problem of obtaining rules for assigning grammatical gender, which has been extensively studied in the linguistic context (Brugmann, 1897; Konishi, 1993; Starreveld and La Heij, 2004; Nelson, 2005; Nastase and Popescu, 2009; Vanklokhota, 2011), but these studies are often limited to identifying semantic or morpho-phonological rules specific to languages and language families. In computational linguistics, prediction models have been discussed in contextual settings (Cucerzan and Yarowsky, 2003) and the role of semantics has been discussed (Williams et al., 2019). Williams et al. (2020) use information-theoretic tools to quantify the strength of the relationships between declension class, grammatical gender, distributional semantics, and orthography for Czech and German nouns. Classification of gender using data mining approaches has been studied for Konkani (Desai, 2017). In this work we look at explainable prediction using neural models.

The noun gender can be predicted better by considering the word form (Nastase and Popescu, 2009). Rule-based gender assignment in French has been extensively studied based on both morphophonological endings (Lyster, 2006) and semantic patterns (Nelson, 2005). These studies carefully form rules that govern the gender, argue merits and demerits that often involve factors beyond what rules concisely explain the patterns. Further they are organized as tedious lists of dozens of rules, and evaluated only manually on smaller corpora (less than 8% the size of our dataset). Cucerzan and Yarowsky (2003) show that it is possible to learn the gender by using a small set of annotated words, with their proposed algorithm combining both contextual and morphological models. The encoding of grammatical gender in contextual word embeddings has been explored for some languages in Veeman and Basirat (2020). They find that adding more context to the contextualized word embeddings of a word is detrimental to the gender classifier’s performance. Moreover these embeddings often learn gender from contextual agreement, like associated articles, which are not suitable for explanation (Lyster, 2006). In contrast, here we will study the role of semantics in gender determination by learning an encoding of the lexical definition of the word, along with the role of form.

In modern applications of machine learning, it is often desirable to augment the model predictions with faithful (accurately capturing the model) and interpretable (easily understood by humans) explanations of “why” an algorithm is making a certain prediction (Samek et al., 2019). This is typically formulated as an attribution problem, that is one of identifying properties of the input used in a given prediction, and has been studied in the context of deep neural feedforward and recurrent networks (Fong and Vedaldi, 2019; Arras et al., 2019). The attributes are usually just input features (encoding) used in training. By studying how these features, or perturbations thereof, propagate through a network, one obtains faithful explanations which may not necessarily be easy to interpret. In this work, we consider explanations obtained using auxiliary attributions which are not used in training, but correspond to a simpler and more intuitive space of interpretations. We learn a mapping of feature embedding (learned by the black-box neural model) to this space, to approximate faithfulness, at the profit of better explanations. A similar local surrogate based approach is considered by (Ribeiro et al., 2016), but it involves domain-specific input perturbations (e.g. deleting words in text, or pixels in image inputs) for explanation.

3 Dataset

We extract French words, their definitions and phonetic representations from Dbinary (Sérasset, 2015), a Wiktionary-based multilingual lexical database. The words are filtered so that only nouns tagged with a unique gender are retained (for example voile which has senses with both genders is removed). For words with multiple definitions but the same gender, we retain the one that appears first as the semantic feature. We retrieve 124803 words, which are split 90-10-10 into train, validation and test sets respectively. The class distribution of the resulting dataset is not skewed, with 58% masculine and 42% feminine words.

4 Methods

4.1 Models

Baselines. We consider two baselines. The majority baseline always predicts the masculine gender, while the textbook orthographic baseline is based on the following simple rules — predict masculine unless the word ends in -tion, -sion, -tétion, -sion, -té.
-son, or -e, excepting -age, -me or -ège endings.

Semantic models (SEM). The definition of words is used to generate its semantic representation. These are tokenized on whitespace, and are then passed through a trainable embedding layer. These representations are passed through 2 layer bidirectional LSTM of size 25 each, with additive attention. The hidden representation is passed through fully connected layers, of sizes 1500, 1000 and 1. The last layer output is used to calculate cross entropy loss. The representations generated by the penultimate layer (size 1000) is the LSTM semantic embedding.

XLM-R semantic embedding is also generated for the definition using XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020). The [CLS] token is fine-tuned to predict the gender. The sequence of hidden states at the last layer represents the embedding.

Phonological model (PHON). To represent the phonology of a word, we use n-grams features, which are constructed by taking last n characters of the syllabized phoneme sequence (derived from Wiktionary IPA transcriptions) where n is in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} for an empirically set k. A logistic classifier is trained using these features to predict the gender.

Orthographic model (ORTH). To encode the orthography of a word, we use two models. As with phonology, we consider n-grams features, which are constructed here by taking last n characters of the word spelling where n is in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} for an empirically set k. A logistic classifier to predict the gender is trained using these features.

To generate dense representations for these features, the words are tokenized at character level. The tokens are passed through a 32 unit LSTM and then 2 fully connected layers of sizes 30 and 1. The output from the last layer is used to calculate cross entropy loss by comparing with the true gender labels. Once trained, the representation of penultimate layer (size 30) is used as the orthographic embedding.

Combined models. A logistic classifier is trained on the concatenated orthographic and semantic features embeddings to discriminate between genders. This is done for both types of semantic embeddings, from LSTM and XLM-R models. We also add phonemic n-gram sequences (n is a hyperparameter set to a jointly optimal value here) as an additional model. All models and their test and validation accuracies are summarized in Table 1.

4.2 Explainability

For each word, we calculate a set of easy-to-interpret auxiliary features, with semantic or orthographic connotations. Orthographic features are the top 1000 n-grams in a logistic regression fit. For semantic features, we calculate the scores of the meanings of the words by using word vectors implemented in SEANCE (Crossley et al., 2017). The assignment of words to psychologically meaningful space can lead to increased interpretability. SEANCE package reports many lexical categories for words based on pre-existing sentiment and cognition dictionaries and has been shown by Crossley et al. (2017) to outperform LIWC (Tausczik and Pennebaker, 2010). As SEANCE is only available for the English language, we use translation\(^1\) of the French definitions to English.

Global explanations. The global explanations are evaluated for i) masculine and feminine class predictions and for ii) classes generated by clustering the best performing combined model embeddings (Table 1). The embeddings are clustered using BIRCH (Zhang et al., 1996) into 10 clusters. The number of clusters are chosen to minimize the overall misclassification rate (calculated by assigning the majority predicted class to a cluster). Decision tree classifiers are fit using the interpretable features\(^2\) of about 25k samples (including those for which an explanation is to be generated) to predict the black box model’s gender prediction and the cluster of a word.

Local explanations. We extend the LIME approach of (Ribeiro et al., 2016) to our setting. A local decision tree classifier is trained on the k nearest neighbors of a given test point, to approximate the black box model on the neighborhood.

The size of the decision tree is a hyperparameter which may be reduced to improve interpretability (i.e. smaller, more easily understood explanations) at the cost of model faithfulness (Figure 3).

\(^1\)azure.microsoft.com/en-us/services/cognitive-services/translator/. The authors manually verified the accuracy of translations, the word error rate was less than 2% on a sample of 250 words.

\(^2\)Not to be confused with ‘interpretable’ and ‘uninterpretable’ features from formal linguistics (Svenonius, 2006).
5 Results and discussion

The best orthographic model achieves an accuracy of 92.5%, whereas the semantic model alone achieves only 77.23%. Combining the features from the two models leads to a gain in the accuracy of the classifier, to 94.01%. We can conclude that for French, the gender can be predicted robustly by the word orthography, but adding semantic information can further improve prediction. Adding phonology to the mix does not seem to help much. This may be attributed to the fact that phonological forms contain less information than the orthographical forms in French, e.g. *lit* /li/ (bed, m.) and *lie* /li/ (dregs, f.). Not only are the written forms phonetic here (i.e. pronunciation is typically unambiguous given spelling) but they often contain additional (e.g. etymological) information which may be missing in the spoken forms. A more detailed error analysis and comparison of model pairs is presented in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Val</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority baseline</td>
<td>57.76</td>
<td>57.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Textbook” ORTH rules</td>
<td>83.69</td>
<td>84.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM (SEM)</td>
<td>76.30</td>
<td>77.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLM-R-base (SEM)</td>
<td>77.29</td>
<td>78.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N-grams(PHON)]/logical</td>
<td>81.67</td>
<td>81.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N-grams(ORTH)]/logical</td>
<td>86.30</td>
<td>86.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N-grams(ORTH)+pos]/logical</td>
<td>92.50</td>
<td>92.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM(ORTH)/logistic</td>
<td>92.21</td>
<td>92.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM(ORTH)+N-grams(PHON)/logical</td>
<td>92.69</td>
<td>92.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM(ORTH)+XLM-R(SEM)/logistic</td>
<td>93.84</td>
<td>93.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM(ORTH)+LSTM(SEM)/logistic</td>
<td>94.01</td>
<td>94.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM(ORTH)+N-grams(PHON)+LSTM(SEM)/logistic</td>
<td>94.09</td>
<td>93.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Accuracy results of various models on test and validation sets.

We define a ‘good explanation’ to be one with high model fidelity (measured by F1) and if it involves fewer rules (more easily interpretable). This can be quantified in the case of decision trees as the length of path from root to leaf node, when making a prediction. A class with higher average decision tree path length for its sample is less interpretable.

We observe the trade-off between achieving interpretability and model accuracy for masculine and feminine classes (Figure 1) and for clusters generated via embeddings (Figure 2). The clusters are generated so that within a gender class, a distinction could be made for nouns that could have different rules, so that easier explanations per class could be generated. Both Figures 1 and 2 show that increasing size of the tree, always increases F1 score, but that comes at the cost of interpretability due to higher number of decision rules. Some example features that distinguish the different clusters are noted in Appendix B.

We see in Figure 1 that the explainability is higher for feminine nouns than masculine. This is consistent with the fact that there are many rules to indicate the feminine gender (such as words ending in *-ine, -elle, -esse*), whereas masculine gender is a default category leading to more complex, and harder to explain rules.

![Figure 1: Class-specific/overall explainability (interpretability vs. fidelity) trade-off.](image1)

![Figure 2: Cluster-specific explainability trade-off.](image2)

For the clusters, the misclassification rate for validation and testing set are 4.07% and 4.11% respectively, indicating that clusters mostly have one kind of gender. Figure 2 shows that some clusters (such as #2, #6, #7) are more explainable than the others (such as #1, #4), as latter show a poor F1 performance and low interpretability. Cluster #1 is majority feminine and #4 is majority masculine, indicating existence of exceptions in either gender. Identifying these clusters in the feature embedding can help in figuring out cases where the grammatical gender is assigned for formal reasons, in exception to semantic or morphonological rules. Moreover, these may be useful in designing a sys-
tem with human-in-the-loop curation, for example by identifying relevant new auxiliary attributes.

Figure 3: Explainability trade-off for local explanations for various neighborhood sizes.

The local explanations seem to outperform global ones, and the performance improves as we reduce the size of the local neighborhood considered. However, we note that this comes at some cost to consistency of explanations. For example, two local explanations for test points distant in the feature embedding may contain some contradictory rules. This is usually not an issue in typical applications of LIME which simply highlight part of the input as an explanation to provide some model justification. However, inconsistent rules can be of consequence in some applications considered here, for instance language learning where these contradictions are undesirable. Also, while per example explanations are larger on average for the global approach, we have the same rule for entire clusters, giving fewer rules overall.

6 Conclusion

Orthography predicts the grammatical gender in French with high accuracy, and adding semantic features can improve this prediction. The black-box embedding can be explained by simpler decision tree models over a given auxiliary explanation space, both locally and globally. Global explanations lead to fewer rules across examples but are more complex on individual instances. Explainable gender prediction can be useful to language learners and gender bias researchers. A cross-linguistic extension of our study is deferred to future work.
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Appendix

A Error analysis

We examine in detail the errors of all our models. Some salient observations are noted below. The errors of our baselines indicate their insufficiency but are easier to understand in isolation. For our models, it is perhaps best to look at interesting pairs of models and compare their errors.

ORTH+SEM vs. ORTH: Adding phonology did not seem to help much in predicting gender beyond...
Table 2: Top-10 features from decision tree with at most 500 leaf nodes for the clusters defined in Section 4.2.

orthography itself. Even though phonology alone (PHON) is more accurate than the best semantics (SEM) model in predicting gender (81% vs. 77%), semantics provide more useful additions over what orthography already encodes. For example, poix (meaning “pitch” or “tar”), polio (“polio”) and ardeur (“ardor”) are recognized as feminine with help from semantics (ORTH+SEM) but are classified incorrectly by the ORTH model. Similarly the meaning helps identify that brais (“crushed barley”), polyane (“plastic film”) and jurisconsulte (“law expert”) should be classified as masculine.

**ORTH vs. PHON:** Some examples which are correctly classified by the ORTH model but misclassified by the PHON model include meringue (“meringue”, f.), boulaie (“birch grove”, f.), coccyx (“coccyx”, m.) and explicit (“end of a chapter or book”, m.).

**ORTH+SEM:** Finally we look at errors of our best model (we consider ORTH+SEM as better than ORTH+SEM+PHON as it gets the same accuracy with fewer features). The list seems to include relatively rarer words, where it often seems hard to explain the gender assignment. Some examples are — myrsite (“Old medical wine”, m.), fomite (“inanimate disease vector”, m.) cholestrophane (“a chemical derived from caffeine”, f.), interpolateur (“interpolator”, f.).

### B Auxiliary features for global explanations

For the 10 clusters described for global explainability in section 4.2, we show the top-10 important features in Table 2. These features are generated by training a decision tree classifier that could have at most 500 leaf nodes. The importance of a feature in each cluster was defined by the number of times it appeared on the decision path of the samples. The features are a mix of orthographic features (generated from word endings) and semantic features (generated from SEANCE) \(^3\). We emphasize that the features noted here are determined as the most common features for examples in the cluster, and are therefore more likely to appear in explanations of examples from that cluster — the exact explanation for an example is determined by the appropriate decision tree path.

The Table 2 also shows the error rates per clusters, which are fraction of misclassified labels per cluster with respect of predictions from the combined black-box model.

[3]Feature descriptions may be found at the following link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SUfSYNyuawWT2i4tQkiyr2rxVeqnh3cQe/view
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Abstract

The outstanding performance of transformer-based language models on a great variety of NLP and NLU tasks has stimulated interest in exploring their inner workings. Recent research has focused primarily on higher-level and complex linguistic phenomena such as syntax, semantics, world knowledge, and common sense. The majority of the studies are anglocentric, and little remains known regarding other languages, precisely their morphosyntactic properties. To this end, our work presents Morph Call, a suite of 46 probing tasks for four Indo-European languages of different morphology: English, French, German and Russian. We propose a new type of probing task based on the detection of guided sentence perturbations. We use a combination of neuron-, layer- and representation-level introspection techniques to analyze the morphosyntactic content of four multilingual transformers, including their less explored distilled versions. Besides, we examine how fine-tuning for POS-tagging affects the model knowledge. The results show that fine-tuning can improve and decrease the probing performance and change how morphosyntactic knowledge is distributed across the model. The code and data are publicly available, and we hope to fill the gaps in the less studied aspect of transformers.

1 Introduction

In the last few years, transformer language models (Vaswani et al., 2017) have accelerated the growth in the field of NLP. The models have established new state-of-the-art results in multiple languages and even demonstrated superiority in NLU benchmarks compared to human solvers (Raffel et al., 2020; Xue et al., 2020; He et al., 2020). Their distilled versions, or so-called student models, have shown competitive performance on many NLP tasks while having fewer parameters (Tsai et al., 2019). However, many questions remain on how these models work and what they know about language. The previous research focuses on what knowledge has been learned during and after pre-training phases (Chiang et al., 2020; Rogers et al., 2020a), and how it is affected by fine-tuning (Gauthier and Levy, 2019; Peters et al., 2019; Misasi et al., 2020; Merchant et al., 2020). Besides, a wide variety of language phenomena has been investigated including syntax (Hewitt and Manning, 2019a; Liu et al., 2019a), world knowledge (Petroni et al., 2019; Jiang et al., 2020), reasoning (van Aken et al., 2019), common sense understanding (Zhou et al., 2020; Klein and Nabi, 2019), and semantics (Ettinger, 2020).

Most of these studies involve probing which measures how well linguistic knowledge can be inferred from the intermediate representations of the model. The methods range from individual neuron analysis (Dalvi et al., 2020; Durrani et al., 2020a), examination of attention mechanisms (Kovaleva et al., 2019; Vig and Belinkov, 2019), correlation-based similarity measures (Wu et al., 2020), to probing tasks accompanied by linguistic supervision (Adi et al., 2016; Conneau et al., 2018).

Despite growing interest in interpreting the models, morphology has remained understudied, specifically for languages other than English. The majority of prior works on this subject are devoted to the introspection of machine translation models, word-level embedding models, or transformers, fine-tuned for POS-tagging (see Section 2).

To this end, we introduce Morph Call, a probing suite for the exploration of morphosyntactic content in transformer language models. The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows. First, we propose 46 probing tasks in four Indo-European languages of different morphology: Russian, French, English, and German. Inspired by techniques for model acceptability judgments
(Warstadt et al., 2019a) and adversarial training (Alzantot et al., 2018; Tan et al., 2020b,c), we present a new type of probing tasks based on the detection of guided sentence perturbations. Since the latter is automatically generated, the tasks can be adapted to other languages. Second, we use complementary probing methods to analyze four multilingual transformer encoders, including their distilled versions. We examine how fine-tuning for POS-tagging affects the probing performance and establish count-based and non-contextualized baselines for the tasks. Finally, we publicly release the tasks and code\textsuperscript{1}, hoping to fill the gaps in the less studied aspect of transformers.

\section{Related Work}

A large body of recent research is devoted to analyzing and interpreting the linguistic capacities of pre-trained contextualized encoders. The most common approach is to train a simple classifier for solving a probing task over the word- or sentence-level features produced by the models (Conneau et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2019a). The classifier’s performance is used as a proxy to assess the model knowledge about a particular linguistic property. However, lately, the method has been criticized: is the property truly learned by the model, or does the model encode the property for the classifier to easily extract it given the supervision? Besides, a new set of additional classifier parameters can make it challenging to interpret the results (Hewitt and Liang, 2019; Hewitt and Manning, 2019b; Saphra and Lopez, 2019; Voita and Titov, 2020).

Nevertheless, the probing classifiers are widely applied in the field of model interpretation, including morphology. One of the first works on morphological content is carried out on machine translation models where the classifier is learned to predict POS-tags in multiple languages (Belinkov et al., 2017, 2018). The latest studies involving POS properties in transformers show that they are predominantly captured at the lower layers (Tenney et al., 2019b; Liu et al., 2019b; Rogers et al., 2020a), and can be evenly distributed across all layers (Durrani et al., 2020b). Amnesic probing explores how removing information at a particular layer affects the probe performance at the final layer (Elazar et al., 2020). This allows measuring the layer importance with respect to a linguistic property. The results claim that removing POS information may affect the performance more at the higher layers as compared to the lower ones.

Another line of research is devoted to various linguistic phenomena at the juxtaposition of morphology, syntax, and semantics. LSTM-based models and transformers are probed to capture subject-verb agreement in different languages (Linzen et al., 2016; Giuliani et al., 2018; Ravfogel et al., 2018; Goldberg, 2019). Recently, the agreement has been at the core of inflectional perturbations for adversarial training (Tan et al., 2020a), and linguistic acceptability judgments along with morphological, syntactic, and semantic violations (Warstadt et al., 2019b).

Our work is closely related to (Edmiston, 2020) who explore morphological properties and subject-verb agreement in the hidden representations and self-attention heads of transformer models. However, there are several differences. First, we investigate the knowledge in multilingual transformers and their distilled versions instead of monolingual ones. Second, we carry out the experiments on an extended set of tasks, such as detecting syntactic and inflectional perturbations (see Section 3.2). Third, we apply several probing methods to analyze from different perspectives. Finally, we study the impact of fine-tuning for POS-tagging on the probe performance. Despite the similarities and differences, we find the studies complementary.

Finally, such benchmarks as LINSPECTOR (Şahin et al., 2020) and XTREME (Hu et al., 2020) provide means for evaluation of multilingual embedding models and cross-lingual transferring methods with regards to multiple linguistic properties, specifically morphology.

\section{Method}

\subsection{Morphosyntactic Inventories}

This paper investigates four Indo-European languages that fall under different morphological types: Russian, French, English, and German. Russian and French have fusional morphology, while English is an analytic language, and German exhibits peculiarities of fusional and agglutinative types. We consider the nominal morphosyntactic features of Number, Case, Person, and Gender. Even though the feature inventory is mostly shared across the languages, the latter differ significantly in their richness of morphology (Baerman, 2007).

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{1}https://github.com/morphology-probing/morph-call
The morphosyntactic inventories of the analyzed languages are outlined in Table 1.

3.2 Probing Tasks

Data We use sentences from the Universal Dependencies (UD) (Nivre et al., 2016) for all our probing tasks, keeping in mind possible inconsistency between the Treebanks (de Marneffe et al., 2017; Alzetta et al., 2017; Drogonova et al., 2018), and consequent inconsistency in dataset sizes across languages. All sentences are filtered by a 5-to-25 token range, and each task is split into 80/10/10 train/val/test partitions with no sentence overlap. The partitions are balanced by the number of instances per target class. Notably, the availability of the UD Treebanks in different languages allows for an adaptation of the method to the other ones. The used Treebanks are listed in Appendix A, and a brief statistics of the tasks is presented in Appendix B.

Task Description We construct four groups of probing tasks framed as binary or multi-class classification tasks: Morphosyntactic Features, Masked Token, Morphosyntactic Values and Perturbations.

Morphosyntactic Features probe the encoder for the occurrence of the morphosyntactic properties. The goal is to detect if a word exhibits a particular property based on its contextualized representation. Consider an example for the Russian sentence ‘The clock stopped in a month.’:

Chasy [MASK] cherez mesyats .  
Chasy ostanovilis’ [MASK] mesyats .

Morphosyntactic Values is a group of k-way classification tasks for each feature where k is the number of values that the feature can take (see Table 1). For instance, the goal is to identify whether the word girl is in the singular or plural form: ‘The girl has either pink or brown.’

Perturbations tasks test the encoder sensitivity to various sentence perturbations. Removing words from a text has recently been used to obtain adversarial attacks (Liang et al., 2017; Li et al., 2018), whereas inflectional perturbations have been applied for adversarial training of transformers (Tan et al., 2020b,c). In contrast, we extend the perturbations to probe the encoders for linguistic knowledge. To this end, we construct eight tasks that involve syntactic perturbations and inflectional perturbations in the subject-predicate agreement and deictic words. Note that we apply a set of language-specific rules to control the quality of the error generation procedure. To obtain the inflectional candidates, we make use of pymorphy2 for Russian (Korobov, 2015), lemminflect2 for English, and word paradigm tables from Wiktionary for French3 and German4.

Stop-words Removal involves corruption of a syntax tree by removing stop-words. We use lists of stop-words provided by NLTK library (Loper and Bird, 2002). Consider an example of the French sentence ‘Les Irakiens ont tout détruit à le Koweit’, where the bolded words correspond to the removed stop-words.

Article Removal is a special case of the previous task, revealing whether the encoders are sensitive to discarded articles. This task is only constructed for French, English, and German. Note that such perturbation may also strain the semantics of the sentence: ‘It’s on loan, by the way’.

Subject Number includes inflectional perturbations of the subject in the main clause with respect to the Number: ‘The girls has either pink or brown.’

http://github.com/bjascob/ LemmInflect
http://dumps.wikimedia.org/ frwiktionary/latest/
http://dumps.wikimedia.org/ dewiktionary/latest/
Table 1: Analyzed languages and their morphosyntactic feature inventories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature \ Language</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>{Sing, Plur}</td>
<td>{Sing, Plur}</td>
<td>{Sing, Plur}</td>
<td>{Sing, Plur}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>{Nom, Acc, Dat, Gen}</td>
<td>{Nom, Acc, Dat, Gen, Loc, Ins}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>{Masc, Fem}</td>
<td>{Masc, Fem, Neut}</td>
<td>{Masc, Fem, Neut}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Models

The experiments are run on the following multilingual transformer models released as a part of HuggingFace library (Wolf et al., 2019):

- **M-BERT** (Devlin et al., 2019) was pre-trained over concatenated monolingual Wikipedia corpora in 104 languages.
- **D-BERT** (Sanh et al., 2019) or DistilBERT is a 6-layer distilled version of M-BERT model.
- **XLM-R** (Conneau et al., 2019) was pre-trained over filtered CommonCrawl data in 100 languages (Wenzek et al., 2019).
- **MiniLM** (Wang et al., 2020) is a distilled M-BERT model that uses XLM-R tokenizer.

Each model under investigation has two instances for each language:

1. **Fine-tuned model** is a transformer model fine-tuned for POS-tagging. We use the UD Treebanks and HuggingFace library for fine-tuning. The data is randomly split into 80/10/10 train/val/test sets.
2. **Pre-trained model** is a non-tuned transformer model with frozen weights.

4.2 Probing Methods

**Probing Classifiers** We use Logistic Regression from scikit-learn library (Pedregosa et al., 2011) as a probing classifier. The classifier is trained over hidden representations produced by the encoders with the regularization parameter $L^2 \in [0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 4]$ tuned on the validation set. The performance is evaluated by the ROC-AUC score.

5 Morphosyntactic Features and Values: we take mean-pooled representations of the sub-word embeddings that correspond to a target word. Masked Token: we use embedding of a tokenizer-specific masked token. Perturbations: we use mean-pooled sentence representations.
Neuron Analysis  The neuron-level analysis allows retrieving a group of individual neurons that are most relevant to predict a linguistic property (Durrani et al., 2020a). Similarly, a linear classifier is trained over concatenated mean-pooled word/sentence representations using Elastic-net regularization (Zou and Hastie, 2005), and with $L^1$ and $L^2$’s $\in [0.1, \ldots, 1e^{-5}]$ tuned on the validation set. The weights of the classifier are used to measure the relevance of each neuron.

Correlation Analysis  Canonical correlation analysis ($\text{ckasim}$) is a representation-level similarity measure that allows identifying pairs of layers of similar behavior (Wu et al., 2020). We use [CLS]-pooled intermediate representations to analyze the encoders. The measure is computed with the help of the publicly available code\(^6\).

4.3 Baselines

We train Logistic Regression over the following count-based and distributive baseline features (see Section 4.2). We use N-gram range $\in [1, 4]$ for each count-based baseline. Count-based features include Char Number (length of a word/sentence in characters), TF-IDF over character N-grams, TF-IDF over BPE tokens (BertTokenizer), and TF-IDF over SentencePiece tokens (XLMRobertaTokenizer). We use multilingual tokenizers by HuggingFace library to split words/sentences into the sub-word tokens. The distributive baseline is mean-pooled monolingual fastText\(^7\) word/sentence embeddings (Bojanowski et al., 2017).

5 Results

5.1 Morphosyntactic Features

Probing Classifiers  We learn the probing classifiers to estimate the model awareness of the morphosyntactic properties (see Section 4.2). The results demonstrate that pre-trained models perform slightly worse than their fine-tuned versions (2-4%). We find that the awareness is distributed in a very similar manner despite the language differences, for the models of both instances (see Tables 6–7, Appendix D). Specifically, the performance on Number and Gender is reaching its plateau at the middle layers $[5–8]$ of 12-layer models, and at layer $[3]$ of D-BERT. The probing curves\(^8\) on Case are achieving their peak at the lower-to-middle layers $[4–5]$ and staying at the plateau towards the output layer. The only difference is observed on Person where the property is best inferred either across all layers (English, Russian) or at the lower-to-higher layers $[4–11]$ (French, German). The baseline features receive a strong performance, meaning that the occurrence of certain property may be inferred using the sub-word information (see Table 4, Appendix C).

\(^6\)https://github.com/johnmwu/contextual-corr-analysis
\(^7\)https://fasttext.cc/docs/en/crawl-vectors.html
\(^8\)We refer to a probing curve as to a graphical representation of the probing classifier performance.
5.2 Masked Token

**Probing Classifiers** The results of the probing classifier performance on Masked Token tasks are presented in Tables 8 (pre-trained models) and 9 (fine-tuned models) (see Appendix D). The task has appeared to be more challenging as opposed to Morphosyntactic Features (see Section 5.1). An interesting observation in this setting is that the performance of the models predominantly drops or becomes unstable after fine-tuning. For instance, BERT may lose almost 10% in the tasks for Russian, and D-BERT may drop 5% in the tasks for French. The probing curves tend to show rapid increases and decreases across the layers. An exception to this pattern is XLM-R which is less affected by fine-tuning and exhibits a more stable probing behavior. Nevertheless, the models demonstrate their capability to infer the properties from the context. XLM-R makes correct predictions in almost 70% of cases, while the performance of M-BERT and D-BERT is slightly worse, and MiniLM may struggle the most. Figure 1 outlines the results on Case task for Russian, best solved among the others. The middle-to-higher layers account for more correct predictions in the models of both instances. However, the higher layers [10 – 12] of 12-layer models and layer [6] of D-BERT may pertain to lower performance. A possible explanation is that the layers are affected by the objectives, i.e., Masked Language Modeling (pre-trained) or POS-tagging (fine-tuned). We find that the contextualized representations of a masked token produced by the final layers of pre-trained models may store the morphosyntactic properties. The probing curves demonstrate that the distribution of the properties may get affected by fine-tuning, or the knowledge can be partially lost, which is shown by the performance drops.

5.3 Morphosyntactic Values

**Property-wise Neuron Analysis** We apply property-wise neuron analysis to investigate the top-neurons per each morphosyntactic property (see Section 4.2). We find that some models require a larger group of neurons to learn a morphosyntactic property, and the number of these neurons may get changed after fine-tuning. We provide the results for each language in Appendix E. Figure 4 illustrates the distributions for pre-trained and fine-tuned models for French. While after fine-tuning the number of neurons on Person (M-BERT, D-BERT) and Number (XLM-R) has increased, Number and Gender are now handled by fewer neurons of the distilled models (D-BERT, MiniLM). A similar behavior is observed for Russian and English. Case (Russian), Gender (Russian) and Person (English) require more neurons (M-BERT), or fewer neurons over Person (Russian) and Number (Russian, English) (MiniLM, D-BERT). Notably, the fine-tuning phase does not affect the neuron distributions for German.

5.4 Perturbations

**Probing Classifiers** The results of the probing classifier performance on Perturbations tasks are presented in Table 10 (pre-trained models), and Table 11 (fine-tuned models) (see Appendix D). We find that the models perform on par with one another in the majority of the tasks. Notably, XLM-R is generally the most sensitive to the perturbations in each language compared to the other models. We find that the syntactic perturbations (Article Removal, Stopwords Removal) are better solved than the inflectional ones. Similarly, the count-based baselines receive the best performance on the syntactic perturbations since the latter are obtained over a limited set of words (see Table 5.
Appendix C). On the other hand, their performance is typically higher or close to random on the inflectional perturbations (see Table 5, Appendix C). We briefly describe the results in Appendix D for the sake of space.

Layer-wise Neuron Analysis Individual neuron analysis helps to observe how top-neurons are spread across the entire model, and identify the relevance of each layer by the number of its top-neurons⁹ (see Section 4.2). Figure 2 demonstrates the results for Predicate Gender task in Russian. The sensitivity to the perturbation tends to be distributed across all layers of both pre-trained and fine-tuned models (D-BERT, M-BERT, MiniLM). The exception is provided by XLM-R which localizes the knowledge at the middle-to-higher layers [6 – 11] (pre-trained), or in fewer layers but with larger groups of neurons [6 – 9] (fine-tuned). The models of both instances store the sensitivity to the incorrect subject case form (Subject Case, Appendix E) at the middle-to-higher layers (D-BERT: [3 – 5], M-BERT: [6 – 11], MiniLM: [4 – 8], XLM-R: [5 – 12]). Notably, the number of top-neurons in all models has decreased after the fine-tuning, and the information has been now more localized in two of them (MiniLM, XLM-R). A similar behavior of the models by language is observed on Subject Number (see Appendix E). The property is generally captured at the middle-to-higher layers of each pre-trained model for Russian, German and French (D-BERT: [2, 3 – 6], M-BERT: [6 – 12], MiniLM: [5 – 12]). The results are different for their fine-tuned versions, where the property gets more localized for Russian and German (D-BERT: [3 – 5], MiniLM: [5 – 7], XLM-R: [6 – 9], M-BERT: [6 – 11]), or captured by fewer neurons at the same layers for French. In contrast, the property is predominantly distributed across all layers of both pre-trained and fine-tuned models for English.

Correlation Analysis To analyze the encoders with ckasim, we take [CLS]-pooled representations of the original sentence (without the perturbation) and its perturbed version. The similarity measure is computed on the resulted pairs of representations. For each model M we explore three settings by combining different model instances (see Section 4.1): (i) (pre-trained M, fine-tuned M), (ii) (pre-trained M, fine-tuned M), (iii) (fine-tuned M, fine-tuned M). Figure 3 shows the most typical pattern achieved in the tasks. The biggest difference is observed over the combination (ii), where the perturbations are best captured at the lower-to-middle layers [1 – 6] (XLM-R, MiniLM), or across all the layers (M-BERT, DistilBERT). The middle-to-higher layers [7 – 12] tend to become more similar over combinations (i, iii) which may mean that they are able to restore the semantics of the perturbed sentences, being more robust to the perturbations as opposed to the lower ones.

Figure 3: ckasim results on Stopwords Removal task in German. X-axis=Model instance combinations. Y-axis=Layer index number (left), ckasim score (right).

6 Discussion

Morphosyntactic content across languages
The probing curves under layer-wise probing demonstrate that the multilingual transformers learn the morphosyntactic content in a greatly similar manner despite the language differences (see Section 5.1). The properties are predominantly distributed across the middle-to-higher layers [5 – 12] for each language. In contrast, Masked Token tasks represent a challenge for the models causing rapid increases and decreases in the performance across the layers (see Section 5.2). The overall pattern for each language is that a masked token’s properties are best inferred at the middle-to-higher layers. A possible reason for this is that the task requires incorporating syntactic and semantic information from the context since the target word remains unseen. The models demonstrate their sensitivity to Perturbations (see Section 5.4). While the syntactic perturbations are predominantly captured at the lower-to-middle layers [3 – 8], the inflectional ones are stored at the middle-to-higher

⁹We selected top-20% neurons using the neuron ranking algorithm (Durrani et al., 2020b).
layers [5 −12]. In contrast to other languages, the perturbation properties for English may be distributed across all layers of the models. The results are supported by the individual neuron analysis, an example of which is provided in Appendix E.

**Same properties require different number of neurons** Property-wise neuron analysis shows that Person and Case are learned using more neurons as compared to Number and Gender across the languages. Notably, the number of neurons required to learn a property may depend on the language. For example, D-BERT requires about 1000 neurons to learn Case in German and less than 1500 neurons to learn the property in Russian.

**Are students good learners?** A common method to compare pre-trained models and their distilled versions is based upon their performance on downstream tasks (Tsai et al., 2019), or NLU benchmarks (Wang et al., 2018, 2019). Still, little is investigated on what language properties are preserved after the knowledge distillation. We find that D-BERT and MiniLM mimic the behavior of their teachers under layer-wise probing (see Section 5.1), or display a similar perturbation sensitivity under cKasim (see Section 5.4). However, MiniLM tends to exhibit an uncertain behavior as opposed to their teacher (see Sections 5.2, 5.4).

**Effect of fine-tuning** The results show that the effect of fine-tuning for POS-tagging varies within a certain group of tasks. First, fine-tuned models may receive a better probing performance by 2-4% on Morphosyntactic Features tasks (see Section 5.1). Second, fine-tuning affects the way the properties are distributed or causes significant performance drops on Masked Token tasks, specifically at the higher layers (see Section 5.2). The impact on the property distribution is also demonstrated on Perturbations tasks under neuron-level probe (see Section 5.4). Besides, the analysis of top-neurons allows concluding that fine-tuning may affect localization (MiniLM, XLM-R) which is in line with (Wu et al., 2020). Finally, a number of neurons required to predict a property may increase (e.g., Russian: Case; French: Person), decrease (e.g., English: Number) or remain unchanged (German). We suggest that an interesting line for future work is to analyze the correlation between the number of neurons and the probe performance after fine-tuning. For instance, the results on Perturbation tasks indicate that some models may receive a better probing performance with fewer (XLM-R) or more neurons (D-BERT, M-BERT) (see Section 5.4). An exploration of fine-tuning for morphosyntactic analysis, specifically over UniMorph (Kirov et al., 2018) may be a fruitful avenue for future work.

**Distribution of knowledge may depend on language morphology** The analysis of the models under layer-wise and neuron-wise probing suggests that the behavior may depend on how morphologically rich a language is (see Sections 5.1, 5.4). The knowledge for English tends to be distributed across all layers of the models in contrast to the more morphologically rich languages that capture the properties at the middle-to-higher layers. The finding is in line with a few recent studies (Edmiston, 2020; Durrani et al., 2020b; Elazar et al., 2020) which contradict the common understanding that morphology is stored at the lower layers (Tenney et al., 2019a; Rogers et al., 2020b). We also find that the distribution of the properties varies based on the complexity of a probing task (see Sections 5.1, 5.2). An exciting direction for future work is to test this hypothesis on a more diverse set of morphologically contrasting languages. Besides, perturbing one aspect of a sentence can cause ambiguity elsewhere which is an interesting line for future exploration of the interdependence of the perturbations.

7 Conclusion

This paper proposes Morph Call, a suite of 46 probing tasks in four Indo-European languages that differ significantly in their richness of morphology: Russian, French, English, and German. The suite includes a new type of probing task based on the detection of syntactic and inflectional sentence perturbations. We apply a combination of three introspection methods based on neuron-, layer- and representation-level analysis to probe five multilingual transformer models, including their less explored distilled versions. The analysis of transformers’ understudied aspect contradicts the common findings on how morphology is represented in the models. We find that the knowledge for English is predominantly distributed across all layers of the models in contrast to more morphologically rich languages (German, Russian, French), which house the properties at the middle-to-higher lay-
The models demonstrate their sensitivity to the perturbations, and XLM-R tends to be the most robust among the others. We observe that distilled models inherit their teachers’ knowledge, showing a comparative performance and exhibiting similar property distribution on several probing tasks. Another finding is that fine-tuning for POS-tagging can affect the model knowledge in various manners, ranging from improving and decreasing the probing classifier performance to changing the information’s localization. We believe there is still room for exploring the models’ morphosyntactic content and the effect of fine-tuning, specifically across a more diverse set of languages and types of model architectures.
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Appendix

A Description of Treebanks

Below is a list of the UD Treebanks used in the experiments:


- **English**: EWT Treebank, GUM Treebank, the English portion of ParTUT, English-PUD, and English-Pronouns Treebank.

- **French**: French Question Bank, GSD French Treebank, the French portion of ParTUT, French-PUD, Sequoia and French Spoken Treebank, adapted from the Rhapsodie prosodic-syntactic Treebank.

- **German**: GSD German Treebank, HDT-UD Treebank, German-PUD and LIT German Treebank.
### B Dataset Statistics

Tables 1–3 provide a brief statistics on the partition sizes for each probing task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Dev</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>174 720</td>
<td>21 937</td>
<td>21 379</td>
<td>218 036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>51 465</td>
<td>6492</td>
<td>6374</td>
<td>64 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>533 898</td>
<td>66 984</td>
<td>66 984</td>
<td>668 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>74 450</td>
<td>9385</td>
<td>9191</td>
<td>93 026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>174 884</td>
<td>21 768</td>
<td>21 974</td>
<td>218 626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>436 303</td>
<td>54 692</td>
<td>53 932</td>
<td>544 927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>162 345</td>
<td>20 313</td>
<td>20 319</td>
<td>202 977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>47 001</td>
<td>5945</td>
<td>5735</td>
<td>58 681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>471 132</td>
<td>58 847</td>
<td>58 438</td>
<td>588 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>71 394</td>
<td>8853</td>
<td>8992</td>
<td>89 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>165 934</td>
<td>20 462</td>
<td>20 982</td>
<td>207 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>500 628</td>
<td>62 163</td>
<td>62 612</td>
<td>625 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>69 901</td>
<td>8840</td>
<td>8559</td>
<td>87 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Number of samples for each **Morphosyntactic Features** and **Masked Token** task. Languages: Ru=Russian, En=English, De=German, Fr=French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Dev</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>100 738</td>
<td>12 592</td>
<td>12 593</td>
<td>125 923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>21 568</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>26 960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>339 744</td>
<td>42 468</td>
<td>42 468</td>
<td>424 680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>33 339</td>
<td>4167</td>
<td>4168</td>
<td>41 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>92 320</td>
<td>11 540</td>
<td>11 540</td>
<td>115 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>252 182</td>
<td>31 523</td>
<td>31 523</td>
<td>315 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>15 748</td>
<td>11 540</td>
<td>11 540</td>
<td>19 685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>7255</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>9069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>184 788</td>
<td>23 099</td>
<td>23 099</td>
<td>230 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>6364</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>7956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>76 158</td>
<td>9520</td>
<td>9520</td>
<td>95 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>252 182</td>
<td>31 523</td>
<td>31 523</td>
<td>315 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>23 660</td>
<td>2957</td>
<td>2958</td>
<td>29 575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of samples for each **Morphosyntactic Values** task. Languages: Ru=Russian, En=English, De=German, Fr=French.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Dev</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>38 838</td>
<td>4855</td>
<td>4855</td>
<td>48 548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>12 627</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>15 784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>121 272</td>
<td>15 159</td>
<td>15 159</td>
<td>151 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>13 959</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>17 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop-words Removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>38 838</td>
<td>4855</td>
<td>4855</td>
<td>48 548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>12 627</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>15 784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>121 272</td>
<td>15 159</td>
<td>15 159</td>
<td>151 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>13 959</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>17 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>38 838</td>
<td>4855</td>
<td>4855</td>
<td>48 548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>12 627</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>15 784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>121 272</td>
<td>15 159</td>
<td>15 159</td>
<td>151 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>13 959</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>17 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>9293</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>11 622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>5 709</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>6005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Case</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>18 897</td>
<td>2344</td>
<td>2346</td>
<td>23 587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>7160</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>8 954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>26 415</td>
<td>4374</td>
<td>4375</td>
<td>35 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>2822</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>3531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate Number</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>5240</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>6530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate Gender</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>4414</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>5517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deixis Word Number</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Number of samples for each **Perturbation** task. Languages: Ru=Russian, En=English, De=German, Fr=French.
C Baseline Performance

Table 4 summarizes the results of the baseline models for Morphosyntactic Features tasks. Table 5 presents the performance of the baseline models for Perturbations tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>Char Num</th>
<th>TF-IDF Char</th>
<th>TF-IDF BPE</th>
<th>TF-IDF SP</th>
<th>fT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person</strong></td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Baseline results on Morphosyntactic Features tasks. SP refers to SentencePiece, and fT corresponds to fastText. Languages: Ru=Russian, En=English, De=German, Fr=French.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>Char Num</th>
<th>TF-IDF Char</th>
<th>TF-IDF BPE</th>
<th>TF-IDF SP</th>
<th>fT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop-words Removal</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td><strong>0.96</strong></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td><strong>0.98</strong></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td><strong>0.99</strong></td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td><strong>0.99</strong></td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td><strong>0.98</strong></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td><strong>0.98</strong></td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Removal</td>
<td>En</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td><strong>0.99</strong></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td><strong>0.97</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.97</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.97</strong></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td><strong>0.97</strong></td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td><strong>0.55</strong></td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td><strong>0.43</strong></td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td><strong>0.57</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td><strong>0.60</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Case</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td><strong>0.67</strong></td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate Number</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td><strong>0.64</strong></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate Person</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate Gender</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td><strong>0.62</strong></td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deixis Word Number</td>
<td>En</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td><strong>0.77</strong></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td><strong>0.72</strong></td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Baseline results on **Perturbation** tasks. **SP** refers to SentencePiece, and **fT** corresponds to fastText. Languages: Ru=Russian, En=English, De=German, Fr=French.
D Probing Classifiers

Morphosyntactic Features  Tables 6 – 7 summarize the results of the probing classifier on Morphosyntactic Features tasks for pre-trained and fine-tuned models. Figure 1 shows a few examples of the model behavior on the tasks. While Gender in German appears to be the most challenging property among the others for both pre-trained and fine-tuned models, Case in Russian is inferred by the models with great confidence.

Masked Token  Tables 8 – 9 outline the performance of the probing classifier on Masked Token tasks.

Perturbations  Tables 10 – 11 present the results of the probing classifier on Perturbations tasks for pre-trained and fine-tuned models. Figures 2 – 3 are the graphical representations of the probing classifier performance on Article Removal task for German, and Predicate Number task for French.

The overall pattern for the syntactic perturbations is that the sensitivity is captured at the lower-to-middle layers [3 – 8] of pre-trained models. In its turn, the inflectional properties are predominantly distributed at the middle-to-higher layers [5 – 12] of both pre-trained and fine-tuned models. However, fine-tuned versions may exhibit unpredictable behavior, an example of which we describe below. Figure 2 demonstrates the results on Article Removal task for German. While the probing curves of pre-trained models tend to be decaying after reaching their peak at the middle layers, they are confidently increasing towards the output layer after the fine-tuning phase. In contrast, a different behavior is observed on Predicate Number task for French (see Figure 3). The layers of many fine-tuned models lose their knowledge (MiniLM: [5 – 12], D-BERT: [5], M-BERT: [6 – 11], XLM-R: [7; 11 – 12]).

Figure 1: The performance of the probing classifier on Morphosyntactic Features tasks. Left: Gender in German (pre-trained). Middle: Gender in German (fine-tuned). Right: Case in Russian (fine-tuned).
Figure 2: The performance of the probing classifier on Article Removal perturbation task for German. X-axis=Layer index number. Y-axis=Accuracy score. Left: pre-trained models. Right: fine-tuned models.

Figure 3: The performance of the probing classifier on Predicate Number perturbation task for French. X-axis=Layer index number. Y-axis=Accuracy score. Left: pre-trained models. Right: fine-tuned models.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>D-BERT</th>
<th>MiniLM</th>
<th>BERT</th>
<th>XLM-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The results of the probing classifier on **Morphosyntactic Features** tasks for pre-trained models. The scores are averaged across all layers. Languages: **Ru**=Russian, **En**=English, **De**=German, **Fr**=French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>D-BERT</th>
<th>MiniLM</th>
<th>BERT</th>
<th>XLM-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The results of the probing classifier on **Morphosyntactic Features** tasks for fine-tuned models. The scores are averaged across all layers. Languages: **Ru**=Russian, **En**=English, **De**=German, **Fr**=French.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>D-BERT</th>
<th>MiniLM</th>
<th>BERT</th>
<th>XLM-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: The results of the probing classifier on **Masked Tokens** tasks for pre-trained models. The scores are averaged across all layers. Languages: **Ru**=Russian, **En**=English, **De**=German, **Fr**=French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>D-BERT</th>
<th>MiniLM</th>
<th>BERT</th>
<th>XLM-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td><strong>0.69</strong></td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td><strong>0.69</strong></td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td><strong>0.66</strong></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td><strong>0.55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: The results of the probing classifier on **Masked Tokens** tasks for fine-tuned models. The scores are averaged across all layers. Languages: **Ru**=Russian, **En**=English, **De**=German, **Fr**=French.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>D-BERT</th>
<th>MiniLM</th>
<th>BERT</th>
<th>XLM-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De</td>
<td>Article Removal</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deixis Word Number</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Number</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En</td>
<td>Article Removal</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stop-words Removal</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Number</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Article Removal</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate number</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>Stop-words Removal</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Case</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Gender</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Number</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Person</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: The results of the probing classifier on *Perturbations* tasks for pre-trained models. The scores are averaged across all layers. Languages: Ru=Russian, En=English, De=German, Fr=French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>Probing Task</th>
<th>D-BERT</th>
<th>MiniLM</th>
<th>BERT</th>
<th>XLM-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De</td>
<td>Article Removal</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deixis Word Number</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Number</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En</td>
<td>Article Removal</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stop-words Removal</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Number</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Number</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>Stop-words Removal</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Case</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Gender</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Number</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicate Person</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: The results of the probing classifier on *Perturbations* tasks for fine-tuned models. The scores are averaged across all layers. Languages: Ru=Russian, En=English, De=German, Fr=French.
E Individual Neuron Analysis

Property-wise analysis  Figures 4 – 7 depict property-wise neuron distribution for French, Russian, German and English.

Layer-wise analysis  Figures 8 – 10 demonstrate the results of the individual neuron analysis on Subject Number perturbation task for Russian, English and French.

Figure 4: Number of neurons per each property for French. Y-axis=Number of neurons. Left: pre-trained models. Right: fine-tuned models.

Figure 5: Number of neurons per each property for Russian. Y-axis=Number of neurons. Left: pre-trained models. Right: fine-tuned models.

Figure 6: Number of neurons per each property for German. Y-axis=Number of neurons. Left: pre-trained models. Right: fine-tuned models.
Figure 7: Number of neurons per each property for English. Y-axis=Number of neurons. Left: pre-trained models. Right: fine-tuned models.

Figure 8: The distribution of top neurons over Subject Number perturbation task for each model (Russian). X-axis=Layer index number. Y-axis=Number of neurons. Top: pre-trained models. Bottom: fine-tuned models.

Figure 9: The distribution of top neurons over Subject Number perturbation task for each model (English). X-axis=Layer index number. Y-axis=Number of neurons. Top: pre-trained models. Bottom: fine-tuned models.

Figure 10: The distribution of top neurons over Subject Number perturbation task for each model (French). X-axis=Layer index number. Y-axis=Number of neurons. Top: pre-trained models. Bottom: fine-tuned models.
### F POS-Tagging Performance

Tables 12 – 15 describe the results of the fine-tuning on POS-tagging task for each language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model / Metric</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-BERT</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DistilBERT</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiniLM</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLM-R</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Metrics of the models fine-tuned for POS-tagging task for German.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model / Metric</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-BERT</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DistilBERT</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiniLM</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLM-R</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Metrics of the models fine-tuned for POS-tagging task for English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model / Metric</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-BERT</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DistilBERT</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiniLM</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLM-R</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Metrics of the models fine-tuned for POS-tagging task for French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model / Metric</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-BERT</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DistilBERT</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiniLM</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLM-R</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Metrics of the models fine-tuned for POS-tagging task for Russian.
Abstract

While language identification is a fundamental speech and language processing task, for many languages and language families it remains a challenging task. For many low-resource and endangered languages this is in part due to resource availability: where larger datasets exist, they may be single-speaker or have different domains than desired application scenarios, demanding a need for domain and speaker-invariant language identification systems. This year’s shared task on robust spoken language identification sought to investigate just this scenario: systems were to be trained on largely single-speaker speech from one domain, but evaluated on data in other domains recorded from speakers under different recording circumstances, mimicking realistic low-resource scenarios. We see that domain and speaker mismatch proves very challenging for current methods which can perform above 95% accuracy in-domain, which domain adaptation can address to some degree, but that these conditions merit further investigation to make spoken language identification accessible in many scenarios.

1 Introduction

Depending on how we count, there are roughly 7000 languages spoken around the world today. The field of linguistic typology is concerned with the study and categorization of the world’s languages based on their linguistic structural properties (Comrie, 1988; Croft, 2002). While two languages may share structural properties across some typological dimensions, they may vary across others. For example, two languages could have identical speech sounds in their phonetic inventory, yet be perceived as dissimilar because each has its own unique set of phonological rules governing possible sound combinations. This leads to tremendous variation and diversity in speech patterns across the world languages (Tucker and Wright, 2020), the effects of which are understudied across many downstream applications due in part to lack of available resources. Building robust speech technologies which are applicable to any language is crucial to equal access as well as the preservation, documentation, and categorization of the world’s languages, especially for endangered languages with a declining speaker community.

Unfortunately, robust (spoken) language technologies are only available for a small number of languages, mainly for speaker communities with strong economic power. The main hurdle for the development of speech technologies for under-represented languages is the lack of high-quality transcribed speech resources (see Joshi et al. (2020) for a detailed discussion on linguistic diversity in language technology research). The largest multilingual speech resource in terms of language coverage is the CMU Wilderness dataset (Black, 2019), which consists of read speech segments from the Bible in ~700 languages. Although this wide-coverage resource provides an opportunity to study many endangered and under-represented languages, it has a narrow domain and lacks speaker diversity as the vast majority of segments are recorded by low-pitch male speakers. It remains unclear whether such resources can be exploited to build generalizable speech technologies for under-resourced languages.

Spoken language identification (SLID) is an enabling technology for multilingual speech communication with a wide range of applications. Earlier SLID systems addressed the problem using the phonotactic approach whereby generative models are trained on sequences of phones transduced from the speech signal using an acoustic model (Lamel and Gauvain, 1994; Li and Ma, 2005). Most current state-of-the-art SLID systems are based on deep neural networks which are trained end-to-end from a spectral representation of the acoustic sig-

---

*Equal contribution
nal (e.g., MFCC feature vectors) without any intermediate symbolic representations (Lopez-Moreno et al., 2014; Gonzalez-Dominguez et al., 2014). In addition to their ability to effectively learn to discriminate between closely related language varieties (Gelly et al., 2016; Shon et al., 2018), it has been shown that neural networks can capture the degree of relatedness and similarity between languages in their emergent representations (Abdullah et al., 2020).

Several SLID evaluation campaigns have been organized in the past, including the NIST Language Recognition Evaluation (Lee et al., 2016; Sadjadi et al., 2018), focusing on different aspects of this task including closely related languages, and typically used conversational telephone speech. However, the languages were not sampled according to typologically-aware criteria but rather were geographic or resource-driven choices. Therefore, while the NIST task languages may represent a diverse subset of the world’s languages, there are many languages and language families which have not been observed in past tasks. In this shared task, we aim to address this limitation by broadening the language coverage to a set of typologically diverse languages across seven languages families. We also aim to assess the degree to which single-speaker speech resources from a narrow domain can be utilized to build robust speech language technologies.

## 2 Task Description

While language identification is a fundamental speech and language processing task, it remains a challenging task, especially when going beyond the small set of languages past evaluation has focused on. Further, for many low-resource and endangered languages, only single-speaker recordings may be available, demanding a need for domain and speaker-invariant language identification systems.

We selected 16 typologically diverse languages, some of which share phonological features, and others where these have been lost or gained due to language contact, to perform what we call robust language identification: systems were to be trained on largely single-speaker speech from one domain, but evaluated on data in other domains recorded from speakers under different recording circumstances, mimicking more realistic low-resource scenarios.

### 2.1 Provided Data

To train models, we provided participants with speech data from the CMU Wilderness dataset (Black, 2019), which contains utterance-aligned read speech from the Bible in 699 languages, but predominantly recorded from a single speaker per language, typically male. Evaluation was conducted on data from other sources—in particular, multi-speaker datasets recorded in a variety of conditions, testing systems’ capacity to generalize to new domains, new speakers, and new recording settings. Languages were chosen from the CMU Wilderness dataset given availability of additional data in a different setting, and include several language families as well as more closely-related challenge pairs such as Javanese and Sundanese. These included data from the Common Voice project (CV; Ardila et al., 2020) which is read speech typically recorded using built-in laptop microphones; radio news data (SLR24; Juan et al., 2014, 2015); crowd-sourced recordings using portable electronics (SLR35, SLR36; Kjartansson et al., 2018); cleanly recorded microphone data (SLR64, SLR65, SLR66, SLR79; He et al., 2020); and a collection of recordings from varied sources (SS; Shukla, 2020). Table 1 shows the task languages and their data sources for evaluation splits for the robust language identification task.

We strove to provide balanced data to ensure signal comes from salient information about the language rather than spurious correlations about e.g. utterance length. We selected and/or trimmed utterances from the CMU Wilderness dataset to between 3 to 7 seconds in length. Training data for all languages comprised 4,000 samples each. We selected evaluation sources for validation and blind test sets to ensure no possible overlap with CMU Wilderness speakers. We held out speakers between validation and test splits, and balanced speaker gender within splits to the degree possible where annotations were available. We note that the Marathi dataset is female-only. Validation and blind test sets each comprised 500 samples per language. We release the data as derivative MFCC features.

### 3 Evaluation

The robust language identification shared task allowed two kinds of submissions: first, constrained submissions, for which only the provided training...
Table 1: Provided data with language family and macroarea information. IS0 shows ISO 639-3 codes. Training data (Train) for all languages is taken from CMU Wilderness dataset; validation and evaluation data (Eval) is derived from multiple data sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISO</th>
<th>Wilderness ID</th>
<th>Language name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Genus</th>
<th>Macroarea</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kab</td>
<td>KABCEB</td>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>Afro-Asiatic</td>
<td>Berber</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iba</td>
<td>IBATIV</td>
<td>Iban</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Malayo-Sumbawan</td>
<td>Papunesia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>SLR24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>INZTSI</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Malayo-Sumbawan</td>
<td>Papunesia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>SUNIBS</td>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Malayo-Sumbawan</td>
<td>Papunesia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>SLR36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jav</td>
<td>JAVRF</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Papunesia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>SLR35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eus</td>
<td>EUSEAB</td>
<td>Euskara</td>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>TCWWTC</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Dravidian</td>
<td>Southern Dravidian</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>SLR65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan</td>
<td>ERWWTC</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>Dravidian</td>
<td>Southern Dravidian</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>SLR79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel</td>
<td>TCWWTC</td>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>Dravidian</td>
<td>South-Central Dravidian</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>SLR66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hin</td>
<td>HNDSKV</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Indic</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por</td>
<td>PORARA</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rus</td>
<td>RUS7S6</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Slavic</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>EN1NIV</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mar</td>
<td>MARWTC</td>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Indic</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>SLR64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cny</td>
<td>CNHBSM</td>
<td>Chin, Hakha</td>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>Gur</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha</td>
<td>THATSV</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Tai-Kadai</td>
<td>Kam-Tai</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We received three constrained submissions from three teams, as described below.

Anlirika (Shcherbakov et al., 2021, composite)

The submitted system (constrained) consists of several recurrent, convolutional, and dense layers. The neural architecture starts with a dense layer that is designed to remove sound harmonics from a raw spectral pattern. This is followed by a 1D convolutional layer that extracts audio frequency patterns.
(features). Then the features are fed into a stack of LSTMs that focuses on 'local' temporal constructs. The output of the stack of LSTMs is then addition-

applied several augmentation techniques, namely shifting samples in range (-5ms; +5ms), MFCC perturbations (SpecAugment; Park et al., 2019), and adding background noise.

4 Results and Analysis

The main results in Table 2 show all systems greatly varying in performance, with the Lipsia system clearly coming out on top, boasting best accuracy and average F₁ score, and reaching the best F₁ score for nearly each language individually.⁶

All four systems’ performance varies greatly on average, but nevertheless some interesting overall trends emerge. Figure 1 shows that while the Anlirika and Lipsia systems’ performance on the different languages do not correlate with the baseline system (linear fit with Pearson’s $R^2 = 0.00$ and $p > 0.8$ and $R^2 = 0.02$ and $p > 0.5$, respectively), the NTR system’s struggle correlates at least somewhat with the same languages that the baseline system struggles with: a linear fit has $R^2 = 0.15$ with $p > 0.1$. More interestingly, in correlations amongst themselves, the Anlirika and Lipsia systems do clearly correlate ($R^2 = 0.57$ and $p < 0.001$), and the NTR system correlates again at least somewhat with the Anlirika system ($R^2 = 0.11$ and $p > 0.2$) and the Lipsia system ($R^2 = 0.19$ and $p > 0.05$).

Note that most systems submitted are powerful enough to fit the training data: our baseline achieves a macro-averaged F₁ score of .98 (±.01) on the training data, the Lipsia system similarly achieves .97 (±.03), the NTR system reaches a score of .99 (±.02). An outlier, the Anlirika system reaches only .75 (±.09). On held-out data from CMU Wilderness which matches the training data domain, the baseline achieves .96 F₁. This suggests an inability to generalize across domains and/or speakers without additional data for adaptation.

Diving deeper into performance on different languages and families, Figure 2 shows confusion matrices for precision and recall, grouped by language family. We can see the superiority of the Lipsia

---

⁵Each of the “wins” indicated by boldface in Table 2 is statistically significant under a paired-permutation significance test (note that as we are not in a multiple-hypothesis testing setting, we do not apply Bonferroni or similar corrections). There are no significant differences between the baseline and the Anlirika system for kab, ind, por, rus, and eng; between the baseline and the NTR system for sun; between the baseline and the NTR system for ind, iba, and cnh; between Anlirika and Lipsia on rus; between Lipsia and NTR on rus; between Anlirika and NTR on ind and rus.

---

⁶The submitted system actually predicts one out of 18 classes as two other languages that weren’t part of the eventual test set were included. The system predicted these two languages for 27 of 8000 test examples, i.e., $\approx 0.34\%$.

⁷The authors trained ResNet-50 from scratch.

⁸Although technically external noise data was used when augmenting the dataset, no language-specific resources were.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family: Afro-Asiatic</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kab</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family: Austronesian</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iba</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jav</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family: Basque</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eus</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hin</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rus</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mar</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family: Niger-Congo</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnh</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family: Tai-Kadai</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1, Macro Avg.</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1, Micro Avg.</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Accuracy | 29.9% | 13.7% | 53.1% | 6.3% |

Table 2: F1 scores, their macro-averages per family, and overall accuracies of submitted predictions on validation and test data (validation results are self-reported by participants). The Lipsia system performed best across nearly all languages and consistently achieves the highest averages.

Looking more closely at the clearly best-performing system, the Lipsia system, and its performance and confusions, we furthermore find that the biggest divergence from the diagonal after the sun/jav confusion is a tendency to label rus as por, and the second biggest divergence is that mar examples are also sometimes labeled as kan and tel; while the first one is within the same family, in the second case, these are neighboring languages in

Notably also rus, and eng (most notably also iba), despite balanced training data. In a similar pattern, the Anlirika predicts tam for many languages, in particular ind, the other two Dravidian languages kan and tel, por, rus, eng, cnh, and tha.

Interestingly, the other three systems all struggle to tell apart sun and jav, the Anlirika and baseline systems classifying both mostly as sun and the Lipsia system classifying both mostly as jav. Note that the baseline system tends to label many languages’ examples as sun (most notably mar, the test data for which contains only female speakers), eus (most notably also rus), and eng (most notably also iba), and the second biggest divergence is that mar examples are also sometimes labeled as kan and tel; while the first one is within the same family, in the second case, these are neighboring languages in.
Figure 1: Correlating submitted systems’ F₁ scores for our 16 languages on the test set. The lines are linear regressions as described in Section 4.

Figure 2: Visualization of Precision (P), Recall (R), and confusion matrices (scores are counts normalized by number of gold entries) for the Anlirika, baseline, Lipsia, and NTR system, grouped by language families.

5 Conclusion
This paper describes the SIGTYP shared task on robust spoken language identification (SLID). This task investigated the ability of current SLID models to generalize across speakers and domains. The best system achieved a macro-averaged accuracy of 53% by training on validation data, indicating that even then the task is far from solved. Further exploration of few-shot domain and speaker adaptation is necessary for SLID systems to be applied outside typical well-matched data scenarios.
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Abstract

This memo describes NTR-TSU submission for SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task on predicting language IDs from speech.

Spoken Language Identification (LID) is an important step in a multilingual Automated Speech Recognition (ASR) system pipeline. For many low-resource and endangered languages, only single-speaker recordings may be available, demanding a need for domain and speaker-invariant language ID systems. In this memo, we show that a convolutional neural network with a Self-Attentive Pooling layer shows promising results for the language identification task.

1 Introduction

Spoken Language Identification (LID) is a process of classifying the language spoken in a speech recording and is an important step in a multilingual Automated Speech Recognition (ASR) system pipeline.

Differences between languages exist at all linguistic levels and vary from marked, easily identifiable distinctions (such as the use of entirely different words) to more subtle variations, which might have been lost or gained due to language contact. The latter end of the range is a challenge not only for automatic LID systems but also for linguistic sciences themselves.

In this memo, we show that a convolutional neural network with a Self-Attentive Pooling layer shows promising results in low-resource setting for the language identification task. The system described herein is identical to the one simultaneously submitted for Low Resource ASR challenge at Dialog2021 conference, language identification track, although the dataset is completely different.

1.1 Previous work

The first works on LID date back at least to mid-seventies, when Leonard and Doddington (1974) explored frequency of occurrences of certain reference sound units in different languages.

Previously developed LID approaches include:

- Purely acoustic LID that aims at capturing the essential differences between languages by modeling distributions in a compact representation of the raw speech signal directly.
- Phonotactics LID rely on the relative frequencies of sound units (phoneme/phone) and their sequences in speech.
- Prosodic LID use tone, intonation and prominence, typically represented as pitch contour.
- Word Level LID systems use fully-fledged large vocabulary continuous speech recognizers (LVCSR) to decode an incoming utterance into strings of words and then use Written Language Identification.

In the latest 10 years, intermediary-dimensional vector representations similar to i-vector (Dehak et al. 2011a, 2011b, Kanagasundaram et al., 2011) and x-vector (Snyder et al., 2018) have been dominating the speech classification field, including LID. Additionally, starting from 2014 (Lopez-Moreno et
al., 2014), deep neural networks have been predominantly used for such tasks (see, for example, Bartz et al., 2017; Abdullah et al., 2020; Draghici et al., 2020, van der Merwe, 2020).

2 Model architecture

![Diagram of model architecture](image)

Figure 1: The model architecture

Similar to work of Koluguri et al., 2020, the model is based on 1D Time-Channel Separable convolutions, namely, the QuartzNet ASR architecture (Kriman et al., 2020) comprising of an encoder and decoder structures.

2.1 Encoder

The encoder used is QuartzNet BXR model shown in Figure 1, and has B blocks, each with R sub-blocks (Kriman et al., 2020). The first block is fed with MFSC coefficients vector of length 40. Each sub-block applies the following operations (Kriman et al., 2020):

- a 1D convolution,
- batch norm,
- ReLU, and
- dropout.

All sub-blocks in a block have the same number of output channels. These blocks are connected with residual connections (Kriman et al., 2020). We use QuartzNet 15*5, with 512 channels. All the convolutional layers have stride 1 and dilation 1 (Kriman et al., 2020).

2.2 Self-attentive pooling decoder

Similar to Cai et al., 2018, Chowdhury et al., 2018, we agree that not all frames contribute equally to the utterance level representation. Thus we use a self-attentive pooling (SAP) layer introduced by Cai et al., 2018 to pay more attention to the frames that are more important.

Namely, we first feed the frame level feature maps \( \{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_T\} \) into a fully-connected layer to get a hidden representation

\[
h_t = \tanh(Wx_t + b)
\]

Then we measure the importance of each frame as the similarity of \( h_t \) with a learnable context vector \( \mu \) and get a normalized importance weight \( w_t \) through a softmax function (Cai et al., 2018).

After that, the utterance level representation \( e \) can be generated as a weighted sum of the frame level feature maps based on the learned weights:

\[
e = \sum_{t=1}^{T} w_t x_t
\]

2.3 Loss Function

We have used cross-entropy loss function for this task.

3 Experiments

3.1 Datasets and tasks

For training models, speech data from the CMU Wilderness Dataset (Black, 2019) were used, which contain read speech from the Bible in 699 languages, but usually recorded from a single speaker. This training data were released in the form of derived MFCCs. The evaluation (validation, test) data come from different sources, in particular data from the Common Voice project, several OpenSLR corpora (SLR24 (Juan et al., 2014a, 2014b), SLR35, SLR36 (Kjartansson et al., 2018), SLR64, SLR66, SLR79 (He et al., 2020), and the Paradisec collection.

There are 16 languages in the released train data, 4000 utterances per language. Table 1 summarizes the languages in the dataset. Validation and test data consist of 8000 utterances, 500 for each language.
Table 1: Summary of languages in the dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISO 639-3 code</th>
<th>Language name</th>
<th>Genus Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kab</td>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>Berber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Malayo-Sumbawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>Malayo-Sumbawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jav</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eus</td>
<td>Euskara</td>
<td>Basque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel</td>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>South-Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hin</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Indic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Romance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rus</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mar</td>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>Indic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Kam-Tai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iba</td>
<td>Iban</td>
<td>Malayo-Sumbawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnh</td>
<td>Chin, Hakha</td>
<td>Gur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Optimization and training process

We have used the attention vector size of 256. Models were trained until they reached a plateau on a validation set. Training was done using the Stochastic Gradient Descent optimizer with initial learning rate of 0.005 and cosine annealing decay to $1e^{-4}$.

4 Results and Discussion

We have experimented with SpecAugment augmentation introduced by Park et al., 2019 and run experiments both with and without augmentation.

The system described above allowed us to achieve the following results on the validation set (see Table 2). Somewhat surprisingly, detection of most languages was better without SpecAugment, Sundanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Iban being exceptions. Iban did not detect at all without augmentation. We can hypothesize that SpecAugment is more favorable for Indo-European and Austronesian languages detection than for other language families. This hypothesis requires further research.

Looking at the confusion matrix (Figure 2) we can see that most language samples determined as English, Kabyle or Telugu, independent of the language family. This means that there are more prominent speech features that hinder the language identification. Given the nature of the training set, that may be related to the gender of the readers.
Table 2: Results on validation dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Without augmentation</th>
<th>With augmentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>precision</td>
<td>recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kab</td>
<td>0.0735</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>0.1102</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>0.0747</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jav</td>
<td>0.0692</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eus</td>
<td>0.1925</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>0.3108</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan</td>
<td>0.0339</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel</td>
<td>0.0298</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hin</td>
<td>0.0933</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por</td>
<td>0.0871</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rus</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>0.2065</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mar</td>
<td>0.3491</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha</td>
<td>0.2167</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnh</td>
<td>0.2039</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: The confusion matrix for the validation set
Table 3: Test set results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>precision</th>
<th>recall</th>
<th>f1-score</th>
<th>precision</th>
<th>recall</th>
<th>f1-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kab</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.1029</td>
<td>0.0668</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>0.1245</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.1458</td>
<td>0.2113</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>0.0767</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.0819</td>
<td>0.0926</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.0952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jav</td>
<td>0.0844</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.0753</td>
<td>0.0535</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.0506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eus</td>
<td>0.1607</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.0808</td>
<td>0.1194</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.0505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.3191</td>
<td>0.4234</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.3385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan</td>
<td>0.1642</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.0388</td>
<td>0.1795</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.0751</td>
<td>0.0446</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.0701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hin</td>
<td>0.2466</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.3231</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.0743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por</td>
<td>0.1518</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.1377</td>
<td>0.1765</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rus</td>
<td>0.1786</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.1497</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>0.1934</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.2624</td>
<td>0.1679</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.2405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mar</td>
<td>0.1565</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.0585</td>
<td>0.2024</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.0582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha</td>
<td>0.1587</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.0355</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.0295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iba</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnh</td>
<td>0.3556</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.2207</td>
<td>0.2562</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.15685</td>
<td>0.1264</td>
<td>0.1170</td>
<td>0.1663</td>
<td>0.1211</td>
<td>0.1119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the test set results (see Table 3) have exhibited no statistically significant differences between augmented and not augmented training.
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Abstract

This paper describes the model built for the SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task aimed at identifying 18 typologically different languages from speech recordings. Mel-frequency cepstral coefficients derived from audio files are transformed into spectrograms, which are then fed into a ResNet-50-based CNN architecture. The final model achieved validation and test accuracies of 0.73 and 0.53, respectively.

1 Introduction

In the SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task, participants are asked to predict language IDs from speech recordings. The novelty of this Shared Task consists in (i) the variety of the languages involved, which comprises very different language genera/families (see Table 1), and (ii) the use of speech form.

Indeed, many linguistics-related Shared Tasks seem to focus on a restricted number of related languages (often Indo-European ones) and model their spellings. In particular, this latter feature poses a number of theoretical and practical challenges, especially when some language comparison is involved, as in typological studies.

Writing systems, as is known, can highly diverge in what they represent, even when they are segmental scripts (not to mention that a language can be encoded in different writing systems, like, for example, Kabyle). If we consider the languages in the Shared Task dataset, it would be very hard to find a meaningful way to compare, for example, the Japanese writing system with the Portuguese one: the former could be written in the scriptio continua of its traditional script, while the latter’s alphabetical script distinguishes space-delimited tokens (mostly corresponding to morphosyntactic words). Interestingly enough, it is no less challenging to compare word-based scripts, in that there is no single definition of graphemic (let alone morphosyntactic) word across languages, and even within the same writing system, inconsistencies are not uncommon.

The use of language recordings instead of written documents should therefore ensure a more direct and consistent encoding of languages. Recordings also allow us to capture intonation structure, which is usually absent (or represented in a minimal form) in writing systems, despite its crucial role in conveying information (see Lambrecht, 1996 and, more in general, information structure studies).

On the downside, speech recordings are sensitive to idiolect variances, which a statistical model should however be able to properly address by not overfitting the training data. This is even more relevant for the SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task, in that its goal is to train a model being able to generalize to recordings of not only different people, but also very different genres/content.

In the following sections, I present the model I built to tackle the multiclass classification task at hand. In Section 2, the training and validation sets are described. Section 3 details the training phase of a number of models, including the ResNet-50-based CNN one, which I chose to participate in the SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task. Section 4 summarizes the results of the ResNet-50-based CNN model, while Section 5 contains some concluding remarks.

2 The training and validation sets

The training and validation sets are released by the organizers of the Shared Task as npy files containing mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs) computed from audio files. The training set consists of 72,000 readings of the New Testament (each of them usually corresponding to a verse), while the validation set consists of 8,000 instances from different sources.

18 languages are included in the training set (4,000 instances per language), while only 16 lan-

1Interestingly, though, Gorman et al. (2020) concerns mapping of graphemes onto phonemes.
2Nowadays, however, Javanese is more commonly written in a Latin script.
Table 1: Languages in the training dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Genus</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>eus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Bru</td>
<td>Katuic</td>
<td>Austro-Asiatic</td>
<td>bru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakha Chin</td>
<td>Gur</td>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>enh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Indic</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>hin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban</td>
<td>Malayo-Sumbawan</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>iba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Malayo-Sumbawan</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>ind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>jav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>Berber</td>
<td>Afro-Asiatic</td>
<td>kab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>Southern Dravidian</td>
<td>Dravidian</td>
<td>kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>Indic</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>por</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlax Romani</td>
<td>Romani</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>rmy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Slavic</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>rus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>Malayo-Sumbawan</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Southern Dravidian</td>
<td>Dravidian</td>
<td>tam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>South-Central Dravidian</td>
<td>Dravidian</td>
<td>tel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Kam-Tai</td>
<td>Tai-Kadai</td>
<td>tha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MFCCs are often used as features in ML. Basically, they allow leverage of sound frequencies, which can offer a richer representation than that of a pure sound waveform (see Xu et al., 2004 for more details and their computation).

3 Method

3.1 A baseline model

A baseline can be calculated by feeding a model directly with MFCCs. The training and validation data contain tensors whose second dimension length varies. A solution for that can be slicing/padding them as to get shape (39, 501), with \( x \in \{ x : x \in \mathbb{Z} \land 300 < x < 2729 \} \).

MFCCs are often used as features in ML. Basically, they allow leverage of sound frequencies, which can offer a richer representation than that of a pure sound waveform (see Xu et al., 2004 for more details and their computation).

At each time step, the relevant input vector \( x_t \) is multiplied by its weights and then added to the product of the (hidden) vector of the previous time step and its weights (\( b \) and \( c \) are the bias vectors, \( \tanh \) the activation function, and \( y_t \) the output vector).

The RNN model performs poorly (see Figure 1), since it cannot generalize at all. This is due not only to the model architecture, but also to the data mismatch between the sets, the validation data containing very different kinds of speech recordings. I therefore added part of the validation data (60%) to the training set and trained a new model with the same RNN architecture and hyperparameters. Figure 2 shows that this model returns very similar results: it also overfits the training data, the validation accuracy invariably remaining around 0.1.

Figure 1: Performance of the baseline model.

3.2 A CNN approach

MFCCs can be used to create spectrograms, which allow transfer of a sound waveform into the image domain. Spectrograms return a visual representation of the unfolding of a sound wave through time, and have proved to provide promising results in a variety of ML tasks (see, for example, Chourasia et al., 2021 and Reddy et al., 2021).
Using the default arguments of the function `specshow` (among which are `sr = 22050`, i.e., sample rate, and `hop_length = 512`) within the Python package `librosa`, the MFFCs are converted into images of shape (640, 480) (Figure 3 shows an example of a spectrogram).

The conversion allows one to take advantage of CNN architectures. In order to deal with the high variance of the model, 60% of the validation set is made part of the training set by stratified sampling: 300 instances of each language (i.e., 16 × 300) are randomly selected and added to the training set.

Two CNN architectures have been compared using the same dataset described above: a 3-layer CNN\(^3\) and ResNet-50 (He et al. 2016). Despite its moderately deep architecture (see Figure B), the 3-layer CNN model (with RMSProp optimizer and learning rate 0.001) quickly overfits the training data (Figure 4) and therefore, like the RNN model, proves to be inadequate for the task at hand.

ResNet-50 is an extremely deep CNN architecture, which tries to overcome the degradation problem using residual learning. An input $x$ is added to an output, so that a function $H(x)$ is redefined as

$$H(x) = F(x) + x,$$

which is hypothesized to make learning easier (He et al., 2016, p. 2). In Figure 5, one residual unit of ResNet-50 is shown: the layer `conv2_block1_out` is added to the layer `conv2_block2_3_bn` within the layer `conv2_block2_add`, as the same shape of the two layers shows (120, 160, 256).

\(^3\)3 refers only to the CNN layers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Bru</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakha Chin</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlax Romani</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Precision, recall, and F1 scores calculated on the validation set (ResNet-50-based model).

which is called after the number of the CNN layers and fully connected layers it contains. ResNet-50 has 50 of them, and according to the results reported by Xu et al. (2004), it performed better than ResNet-34, but worse than ResNet-101 and ResNet-134, in an ImageNet classification task (in reference to top-one and top-five error rates).

The ResNet-50 architecture has been employed to fit the training data of the SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task, without, however, transfer learning, in that the original weights were computed on completely different kind of data, and therefore are unlikely to be any useful. Of course, experimenting with different ResNet and non-ResNet architectures, as well as with different sets of hyperparameters, would be useful; the sizes of the architectures and the amount of training time needed to do that, however, made me focus only on ResNet-50, which turned out to return good results without requiring much optimization.

In order to accommodate the data of the SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task, the top layer was substituted with one allowing for the shape \((480, 640, 3)\), while the output layer was replaced by a densely connected layer outputting an 18-dimensional vector, i.e., a probability score for each of the 18 languages. The Adam optimizer with learning rates of 0.0001 (first 7 epochs) and 0.000001 (8th epoch) was chosen.

4 Results and Discussion

The ResNet-50-based model provides good training and validation accuracy scores (0.98 and 0.73, respectively). Importantly, both accuracy scores grow during training, and both loss scores get smaller and smaller. In Figure 6, the algorithm seems to have converged. However, the final accuracy score (0.53) calculated on the test set released by the organizers seems to suggest that some overfitting has occurred.

Figure 6: Performance of the ResNet-50-based CNN model.

The confusion matrices (Appendix C and D), the heatmaps (Appendix E and F), as well as the tables containing precision, recall, and F1 scores (Table 2 and 3), show that the model performs well, with a few exceptions. Sundanese is very often misclassified as Javanese. Appendix D reveals a more complex picture: English, Portuguese, Russian, and Thai are often also misclassified as Kabyle. Similarly, the model often associates Telegu with Kannada and Marathi. On the contrary, it can identify Iban very well. These results require further future investigation to ascertain whether these misclassifications can be ascribed to similarities between the languages.

Notably, the rows for Eastern Bru and Vlax Romani are not available in the heatmaps (Appendix E and F) because the languages are absent in both the validation and test sets.

Tweaking the hyperparameters and especially experimenting with deeper ResNet architectures could probably lead to an improvement of the results.

5 Conclusions

In the present paper, a ResNet-50-based CNN model has been presented, which was used to fit the data of the SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task. Attempts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Bru</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakha Chin</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlax Romani</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Precision, recall, and F1 scores calculated on the test set (ResNet-50-based model).

to tackle the task with relatively simple RNN and CNN architectures were unsuccessful. ResNet-50, however, proved to offer a robust architecture to train linguistic data for language ID prediction. The task at hand was challenging because the training data differ considerably from the validation data, and therefore any model needs strong ability to generalize. The ResNet-50-based CNN model proposed in this article shows good validation and test accuracies (0.73 and 0.53, respectively). Notably, Sudanese is very often misclassified as Javanese.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bru</th>
<th>cnh</th>
<th>eng</th>
<th>eus</th>
<th>hin</th>
<th>iba</th>
<th>ind</th>
<th>jav</th>
<th>kab</th>
<th>kan</th>
<th>mar</th>
<th>por</th>
<th>rus</th>
<th>sun</th>
<th>tam</th>
<th>tel</th>
<th>tha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bru</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jav</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D Confusion matrix for the test data (ResNet-50-based model).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bru</th>
<th>cnh</th>
<th>eng</th>
<th>eus</th>
<th>hin</th>
<th>iba</th>
<th>ind</th>
<th>jav</th>
<th>kab</th>
<th>kan</th>
<th>mar</th>
<th>por</th>
<th>rus</th>
<th>sun</th>
<th>tam</th>
<th>tel</th>
<th>tha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bru</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jav</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kab</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rmy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

class error rate: 0.71
E Heatmap with validation set error rates (ResNet-50-based model).
F Heatmap with test set error rates (ResNet-50-based model).
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Abstract

The paper presents Anlirika’s submission to SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task on Robust Spoken Language Identification. The task aims at building a robust system that generalizes well across different domains and speakers. The training data is limited to a single domain only with predominantly single speaker per language while the validation and test data samples are derived from diverse dataset and multiple speakers. We experiment with a neural system comprising a combination of dense, convolutional, and recurrent layers that are designed to perform better generalization and obtain speaker-invariant representations. We demonstrate that the task in its constrained form (without making use of external data or augmentation the train set with samples from the validation set) is still challenging. Our best system trained on the data augmented with validation samples achieves 29.9% accuracy on the test set.

1 Introduction

Among approximately 7,000 world languages, over 43% are oral only and do not exhibit any writing system. Still, even in less exotic cases language processing systems may have to solely rely on vocal representations. Spoken language identification (SLI) is essential sub-task in many approaches to multilingual automated speech recognition and machine translation. In addition, it also has practical applications as a standalone task. Automated assignment of a call center operator to a client is one of possible use case scenarios.

The paper provides a description of “Anlirika” system¹ that was submitted to SIGTYP 2021 Shared Task on Robust SLI (Salesky et al., 2021). In terms of the task, systems are trained to predict a language class (id) from an audio signal. Importantly, the task aims at development of robust systems that can generalize well to new domains and speakers. Many languages are under-resourced, and the situation when the language data exist only for a very limited number of speakers or domains is common. For instance, the largest multilingual SLI dataset, namely CMU Wilderness (Black, 2019), has been derived from the Bible in ≈ 700 languages and lacks speaker diversity. Therefore, it is essential for a system to be speaker-invariant and robust.

2 Related Work

Most work on SLI focused on Indo-European languages such as English, German, Russian, French, Hindi. It is also common to transform raw audio signal into the log-Mel spectra or MFCC features. Recent approaches such as Bartz et al. (2017), Revay and Teschke (2019), and Shukla et al. (2019) make use of various convolution-based neural architectures. For instance, Bartz et al. (2017) proposed a hybrid model that used convolutional layers to extract spatial features and recurrent units (bidirectional LSTMs) tp capture temporal characteristics. Revay and Teschke (2019) explored the ResNet-50 (He et al., 2016) architecture dynamically adapting learning rate.

3 Dataset

The dataset comprises 16 typologically diverse languages from Afro-Asiatic, Austroasiatic, Basque, Dravidian, Indo-European, Niger-Congo, and Tai-Kadai families. The training data is derived from the CMU Wilderness dataset (Black, 2019) which represents a single domain (speech utterances from the Bible) and has predominantly a single speaker per language. The validation and test sets were collected from multiple corpora such as Common Voice (Ardila et al., 2019) and present a variety of recording conditions with multiple speakers per language. The length of each speech utterance ranged

---

¹The code is available at https://github.com/andreas-softwareengineer-pro/speech-language-classifier
between 3 and 7 seconds. The training data contained 4,000 utterances per language, while validation and test sets comprised 500 samples each. Importantly, the utterances were provided in the form of Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCC) features rather than raw audio signal.

4 Architecture

As illustrated on Figure 1, we used a multi-layer neural network solution with two dense layers, one CNN and 1–7 LSTM layers. The design of neural layer stack is motivated by the following general vision of how a sample should be processed:

- We suggest that a raw spectral pattern first needs to be multiplied by a square matrix in order to remove sound harmonics. That is why we are using a dense layer as the front one;
- Then we try to recognize features related to the spectral line shape. Therefore, we use a one-dimensional CNN (convolving by input feature vector index [frequency]);
- Then we recognize “local” temporal constructs with a stack of LSTMs;
- We use yet another LSTM to reduce temporal patterns into a single-vector representation (only the final time step output goes to the next layer);
- Finally, we classify it into one of 16 languages with a dense layer.

The layer stack we used is summarized in Table 1.

4.1 Batching mechanism

We employed a batched learning process with a fixed number of processed samples per batch (64) and with variable number of time steps. Such a mechanism works as follows. An initial batch is filled with randomly chosen samples. The number of temporal steps in the batch is determined by the shortest sample currently present in a given batch. Once a batch is fed forward through the neural network layers:

1. The samples which ends happen to be aligned with the end of the batch, are done now (within a given epoch). We replace them with next randomly chosen training samples when forming the next batch. If a sequential layer contains hidden states (which is true for the LSTMs in our model), zero hidden states are supplied to the respective threads of batch. Final prediction values for such threads are used to calculate the loss;
2. The samples which do not fit within the batch length, are passed to the next batch for further processing, having their already-processed prefixes removed. Start hidden states for the respective threads are initialized with the values of final hidden states computed in the preceding batch, as shown with blue arrows in Figure 2.

This process repeats until all the samples are pro-
cessed, i.e. a training epoch is done. Some trailing batches may be underpopulated with threads, in which cases output values of unused threads are ignored. Figure 2 summarises the description above.

A drawback of such a batching technique is constraining of temporal depth when the backpropagation through time takes place in LSTM layers. A batch is typically much shorter in time steps than a sample. Therefore, a single backpropagation operation (that cannot run across batches) may modify less weights than it would be expected without batching. We regarded this effect as minor, however, its influence to the overall learning capability is yet to be investigated.

5 Experiments

We varied $N_L$, the number of extra sequential LSTM layers (which outputs were concatenated to the output of the CNN layer). We tried the following options: \{0,2,4,6\}. A number of units in each LSTM layer was chosen from \{200,300\}. We used equal numbers of units across all the LSTM layers present in the model.

**Using the original train set.** A learning dynamic we observed in our experiment was generally slow. In most trials the model failed to learn with the learning rate value greater than $4 \cdot 10^{-4}$. With lower learning rates, it trained at an extremely slow pace gaining about 0.1% train set accuracy per epoch. At the time of this report writing, we achieved an overall accuracy value of about 12% at validation set. It is curious to note that accuracy figures for train and validation sets did not correlate as expected, the fact that may indicate significant difference in domains. Typically, a predicted distribution of languages was limited to 2-3 classes,
the list of which was volatile. We also noticed that the model converged much faster at small subsets of training sets (50-500 samples).

Augmenting training data with validation set samples. A quite different picture was observed when we combined training and validation sets and randomly split them again into training and validation portions. A much superior accuracy of 74% on validation set was achieved. The confusion matrix is shown on Figure 3. Such a relatively high prediction accuracy is not surprising, as a validation holdout is likely to share speaker identities with the respective training subset, the fact that leads to a significant loosening of required generalization ability. However, a drastic improvement in convergence dynamics remains a noticeable and unexpected effect.

Tuning of hyperparameters. A choice of $N_L = 2$ was found to be producing the highest accuracy. Increasing $D_L$ from 200 to 300 didn’t lead to any significant difference in performance.

Shared task submission. The final submitted version was trained on an augmented set. The performance figures are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Acc.</th>
<th>F1, Micro Avg</th>
<th>F1, Macro Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Aggregated performance metrics for the final model version

6 Conclusion & future work

To address the task of language classification in speech samples, we implemented and explored a neural network model. The model’s architecture was inspired by an idea of phoneme sequence recognition. Our experiments are yet in progress, still it is clear that the generalization across domains appears to be the main challenge.

Following a maxim of keeping model as light as possible, we are going to explore architecture modifications that directly enforce some kind of phonetic generalization, for instance, by insertion of “bottlenecks” (layers with low output size).
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