

A Framenet and Frame Annotator for German Social Media

Eckhard Bick

University of Southern Denmark
eckhard.bick@mail.dk



Lexical semantic resource types

- ◆ WordNet (Fellbaum 1998)
 - extensive ontology, but no inherent method for disambiguation or annotation, better for nouns than verbs
- ◆ FrameNet (Baker et al. 1998, Johnson & Fillmore 2000, Ruppenhofer et al. 2010)
 - systematic classification of abstracted verb senses with semantically restricted "slot-filler" arguments: potential for disambiguation, but coverage problem at the token level
- ◆ PropBank (Palmer et al. 2005)
 - consecutive argument structure annotation of corpus verbs (propositions): better coverage and statistical balance, but less generalization than FrameNet
- ◆ VerbNet (Kipper et al. 2006)
 - less granularity, more limited set of roles and predicate classes

Frames: From resource to annotation

- ◆ **corpus-driven:** German SALSA framenet (Burchardt et al. 2006) and SHALMANESER parser (Burchardt et al. 2009)
 - 600 different frames, half specific to German, but coverage limited to the hand-annotated corpus
 - heuristic frame assignment for lexicon gaps, based on Word Net synsets
 - ML-based corpus annotation
- ◆ **parser-driven:** PFN-DE ("parser framenet", this paper)
 - unabridged lexicon, simple parsing-oriented framenet scheme
 - matches the valency lexicon and noun ontology of an existing morphosyntactic parser (GerGram)
 - supports a rule-based frame annotator that directly exploits GerGram's tags and dependency links
 - matches a similar system for Danish (Bick 2011), allowing comparable corpus annotation for our bilingual Social Media Corpus (XPEROHS, Baumgarten et al. 2019)

Cross-lingual framenet bootstrapping

- ◆ 1. step: **Danish-German verb sense matches** based on an MT dictionary (GramTrans, Bick 2007)
 - MT: verb polysemy resolution by listing arguments with semantic slot filler information
 - **valency patterns as an anchor for frame transfer:** harvest a Danish frame (including its selection restrictions) by matching the MT dictionary's argument list, choosing - for each translation - the frame with the same valency pattern
- ◆ 2. step: **manual checking** of the harvested frames
 - german valency patterns used to identify gaps in existing entries and as skeletons for verbs without an MT entry
- ◆ 3. step: **identifying frame lexicon gaps** in a preliminary annotation of the XPEROHS corpus
 - frequency-based manual frame additions
 - systematic check of construction verbs for idiomatic senses/constructions

PFN-DE: Lexicon size and granularity

◆ Frame lexicon size:

- 11,333 verb lemmas
- 14,695 different lemma+frame combinations
- 1.297 frames / lemma (1.237 semantic types / lemma), Zipfian distribution
- coverage: all entries in the parser lexicon have at least 1 frame), corpus: 1-2% lexical frame failure rate

◆ Frame types

- 483 types (almost all Danish frames also used for German)
- 1,700 different combinations of "atomic" frames, to capture additional lexical information (aspect, directionality, urgency), often triggered by prefixes:
 - *weiterlaufen* (run on) - fn:run&continue
 - *loslaufen* (start running) - fn:run&start
 - *verglimmen* (stop burning) - fn:burn&stop
- 7,316 distinct role/complement-specified "syntactic" frames

◆ Non-verbal predicates

- 1,400 nouns, 400 adjectives
- systematic frame transfer from verbs to deverbal nouns and participle adjectives
 - *erkranken* --> *Erkrankung* (falling ill): inherits 'sick' frame, preposition trigger (*Erkrankung an*) and §CAU argument role

Lexical support for the frame annotator: syntactic and semantic slot restrictions

- ◆ e.g. *bestehen*: 5 meanings
 - 'pass' [an exam] (accusative-monotransitive): <FN:succeed/S§AG'H/O§TH'occ>
 - 'consist of' (PP-monotransitive: *b. aus*): <FN:consist/S§HOL'cc/P-aus§PART'cc|H>
 - 'insist on' (PP-monotransitive *b. auf*): <FN:demand/S§SP'H/P-auf§TH'cc|act>
 - 'be' (PP-monotransitive: *b. in*): <FN:be_copula/S§TH'ac|act/P-in§ATR'ac|act>
 - 'persist' (intransitive): <FN:persist/S§PAT'conv|build|inst>
- ◆ for complements other than np's and pp's, syntactic form or POS can be specified instead of semantic type:
 - 'fcl' – finite clause, 'icl' – non-finite clause, 'num' – numeral
- ◆ only 834 valency patterns were sense-ambiguous
 - --> 92-93% of verbs could in theory be sense-disambiguated using syntactic clues alone

Semantic roles

- ◆ 44 atomic semantic roles
- ◆ 88 combinations, e.g. §AG-EXP subj. of *zuhören* (*listen*)

| | Semantic role | surface verb args % | secondary v- args % | all surface args % |
|----------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| §TH | Theme | 18.88 | 20.67 | 36.17 |
| §ATR | Attribute | 8.13 | 1.32 | 8.91 |
| §LOC-TMP | Point in time | 8.64 | 0 | 6.33 |
| §MNR | Manner | 8.13 | 0 | 5.49 |
| §LOC | Location | 6.24 | 2.90 | 5.30 |
| §AG | Agent | 9.29 | 38.63 | 5.72 |
| §EXT | Extension | 1.89 | 0.05 | 3.04 |
| §META | Meta adverbial | 3.95 | 0 | 2.59 |
| §COG | Cognizer | 4.01 | 8.21 | 2.27 |
| §DES | Destination | 2.13 | 0.76 | 1.82 |
| §BEN | Beneficiary | 2.56 | 1.32 | 1.81 |
| §PAT | Patient | 2.44 | 4.33 | 1.61 |
| §REFL | Reflexive | 2.48 | 0 | 1.44 |
| §ID | Identity | 0.01 | 0 | 1.21 |
| §SP | Speaker | 1.95 | 6.57 | 1.17 |
| §CAU | Cause | 1.49 | 1.24 | 1.02 |
| §ACT | Action | 1.34 | 1.40 | 2.19 |
| §REC | Recipient | 0.94 | 0.94 | 1.75 |
| §EV | Event | 1.18 | 1.61 | 1.56 |
| §EXP | Experiencer | 1.32 | 2.63 | 1.31 |
| §DON | Donor | 0.12 | 0.31 | 0.07 |

Light / non-role complements

- ◆ verb particles -- syntactic dummy tag (MV<), no role
 - *sie machte das Licht **aus*** (she turned **off** the light)
lemma: "**aus**machen" (turn off), fn:deactivate
- ◆ support verbs: complement-based semantics and dependents -- full syntactic tag, dummy role (§INC)
 - *jmd. **Hilfe** leisten* (help sb.), fn:help, cp. nominal frame: *Hilfe für* (help for)
- ◆ PP incorporates (§INC on the noun, blocks other roles)
 - ***auf der Strecke** bleiben* (be lost, 'stay on the road'),
fn:disappear
 - ***in Kraft** treten* (come into effect, 'step into power'), fn:activate

The frame annotator

- ◆ run as an additional module after GerGram morphosyntactic annotation
- ◆ uses the same formalism as GerGram and DanGram (Constraint Grammar), with full structural and tag compatibility with both parsers
- ◆ frame choice triggered by syntactic and semantic clues (GerGram tags) in iterative disambiguation and mapping steps
 - e.g. <FN:**tell**/S§**SP**'H/D§**REC**'H/O§**MES**'fact|sem-s|fcl> (e.g. *melden*, *zutragen*)
 - presence of a finite clause object (O:fcl) triggers this frame, if there is no other frame with O:fcl for the same lemma
 - field-based assignment of roles:
 - subject (S) --> §SP (speaker)
 - fcl object (O) --> §MES (message)
 - dative object (D) --> §REC (receiver)

Frame mapping and disambiguation

- ◆ 1. Frame template mapping (disambiguation through lemmatization)
 - *er nahm den Bus* (he took the bus), lemma: nehmen <FN:take/...>
 - *er nahm 5 kg zu* (he put on 5 kg), lemma: zu|nehmen <FN:increase/...>
 - *er nahm ihr die Aufgabe ab* (he relieved her of the task) lemma: ab|nehmen <FN:rid/...>
- ◆ 2. Frame template selection
- ◆ 3. Frame template removal
- ◆ 4. Role instantiation
- ◆ 5. Mapping of free roles

Selection and removal rules

- ◆ removal is simpler, safer and more robust than selection, because a single mismatch can trigger the former
- ◆ lexical matches are safest, e.g. *Wert* (worth) in:
 - *legen* <FN:mind/S $\text{\textcolor{blue}{SCOG}}$ 'H/O-Wert $\text{\textcolor{blue}{SINC}}$ /P-auf $\text{\textcolor{blue}{STH}}$ 'all>
- ◆ syntactic functions are relatively safe, but not always expressed (check for competing lower-valency frames)
- ◆ most important are semantic slot fillers, to disambiguate frames with identical valency skeletons
 - shallow noun ontology with 200 categories, e.g. <Hprof> (profession), <Hfam> (family member), <Hideo> (ideological), <sem-r> (readable), <sem-c> (concept), <sem-s> (sayable)
 - to allow for fuzzy matches, the grammar lumps tags into umbrella categories, e.g. 'HUMAN', 'THING', 'PLACE'
 - progressive relaxation of the matching algorithm:
 - precise match --> umbrella match
 - all slots match --> some matches --> one or no slot matches
 - highest number of syntactic matches

Exploiting (secondary) dependencies

- ◆ in order to constitute semantic rather than syntactic links, dependencies need to be raised for prepositions and transparent nouns
- ◆ dependency trees can only be used directly if roles manifest as surface constituents, and these need to be nouns to allow semantic matches
 - in 45% of cases, there is no, or only pronominal, surface representation
- ◆ improvement: assign secondary/additional dependency links for relatives, infinitive subjects, coordination etc.

| | filled slots (incl. secondary dep.) | filled slots (primary dep. only) |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| SUBJ | 74.5 % | 72.7 % |
| ACC | 73.1 % | 72.9 % |
| DAT | 60.3 % | 60.3 % |
| SC | 97.7 % | 97.7 % |

Annotation example

| Word | Lemma | Secondary tag, Frame | POS, morphology | Syntactic function | Semantic role | Dep. link |
|----------------------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Ich (<i>I</i>) | ich | | PERS | @SUBJ> | §COG | #1->2 |
| verstehe (<i>understand</i>) | verstehen | <mv><FN:comprehend> | V PR 1S FIN | @FS-STA | | #2->0 |
| nicht (<i>not</i>) | nicht | | ADV | @ADVL> | | #3->2 |
| warum (<i>why</i>) | warum | <clb><interr> | ADV | @ADVL> | §CAU | #4->7 |
| es (<i>there</i>) | es | | PERS | @S-SUBJ> | §TH-NIL | #5->7 |
| Eltern (<i>parents</i>) | Eltern | <HH> | N nG P ACC | @ACC> | §TH | #6->7 |
| | | | | R:c-subj:17 | R:sd-COG:17 | |
| gibt (<i>are</i>) | geben | <mv><FN:exist> | V PR 3S FIN | @FS-<ACC | §TH | #7->2 |
| , | , | | PU | @PU | | #8->0 |
| die (<i>that</i>) | die | <clb><rel> | INDP nG P NOM | @SUBJ> | | #9->17 |
| die (<i>the</i>) | die | <def> | ART F S ACC | @>N | | #10->11 |
| Erziehung (<i>education</i>) | Erziehung | <FN:teach> | N F S ACC | @ACC> | §ACT | #11->17 |
| ihrer (<i>their</i>) | sie | <poss> | DET nG P GEN | @>N | | #12->13 |
| Kinder (<i>children</i>) | Kind | <H> | N NEU P GEN | @N< | §BEN | #13->11 |
| möglichst (<i>as possible</i>) | möglich | <jcan> | ADV SUP | @>A | | #14->15 |
| früh (<i>early</i>) | früh | <atemp> | ADV | @ADVL> | §LOC-TMP | #15->17 |
| Fremden (<i>strangers</i>) | Fremder | <ADJ:jsoc><Q-><nadj> | N nG P ACC | @DAT> | §REC | #16->17 |
| überlassen (<i>leave</i>) | überlassen | <mv><FN:allow> | V INF | @FS-N< | §ATR | #17->6 |
| | | | | R:p-subj:6 | | |
| wollen (<i>want</i>) | wollen | <aux><FN:wish> | V PR 3P FIN | @AUX | | #18->17 |

Evaluation: Data

- ◆ Corpus: 2 years of Twitter (~ 2 billion words)
 - extraction of all main verb-lemmas and their semantic class frame ($f \geq 1000$ for noise reduction)
 - 8894 lemma-frame combinations (= 202.4 million tokens)
 - Manual check for non-German words and POS errors: 7,726 real German verb frames, representing 6,127 lemmas and 193.4 million tokens
 - = half the German verb lexicon (= 99.9% token coverage according to Zipf's law)
 - 1.245 frame classes / verb lemma, ca. = lexicon distribution and therefore likely to be representative in spite of the frequency cut-off
 - ambiguity higher at the token-level: 3.126 frame senses / verb

Evaluation: Ambiguity and coverage

◆ coverage failures

- token level: 1.11% no frame + 0.25% no surviving frame
- type level: 5.88% (impact of very rare verbs)

◆ frame ambiguity

- higher at the token-level: 3.126 frame senses / verb
- unevenly distributed: 78.6% monosemous verbs, 10 most frequent verbs (10.36% of all verb tokens) are very ambiguous:

| verb lemma | token count | frame senses |
|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| lassen | 2824239 | 11 |
| geben | 2455458 | 10 |
| machen | 2124256 | 34 |
| spielen | 1457122 | 4 |
| nehmen | 1416502 | 24 |
| sehen | 1414451 | 5 |
| kommen | 1251055 | 13 |
| bleiben | 1250034 | 3 |
| haben | 1237781 | 8 |
| halten | 1226771 | 17 |

Evaluation: Performance

- ◆ random sample of tweets (9,054 parser tokens) annotated and manually evaluated
 - 884 main verb tags
 - 20 wrong POS, 1 wrong lemma, 1 aux/mv error), often due to spelling errors in the word or its context
 - 8 verbs not recognized as such
- ◆ frame tagger performance
 - coverage: 99% (1 verb OOV, 8 cases where the correct frame was not among the ones listed in the lexicon)
 - recall / precision:

| | R | P | F-score |
|-------------------------------|----------|----------|----------------|
| total incl. POS errors | 90.7% | 96.5% | 93.6 |
| ignoring POS errors | 93.0% | 97.4% | 95.2 |

- ◆ comparison
 - English Twitter out-of-domain (Hartmann et al. 2017): 62.17% full frame identification
 - German SHALMANESER (Burchardt et al. 2009): 79% correct WSD
 - in-domain German SRL test data (CoNLL 2009):
 - without linguistic features (Do et al. 2018): F=73.5
 - with syntax-aware neural networks (Cai & Lapata 2019): F=82.7%

Conclusions and outlook

- ◆ New resource: a German framenet intended for direct integration into a parser pipeline
 - valency-based, "framenet light" approach
 - bilingual compatibility Danish-German
 - coverage on par with morphosyntactic parsing
 - robust frame sense annotation (F=93.6 for social media data)
- ◆ Future work
 - add missing senses to existing verb entries (now: precision better than recall)
 - reduce underlying tagging errors for POS and dependency in the face of non-standard orthography
 - test the assumption that other domains *without* orthographical problems should work as well, given the general nature of the underlying morphosyntactic parser
- ◆ Cross-lingual aspects
 - It might be possible to generalize the Danish-German parser interoperability and dictionary-based bootstrapping to further (related?) languages. Thus, work is ongoing for a compatible Portuguese framenet and annotator.

Info: **framenet.dk**
Demo: **visl.sdu.dk/de**

contact: *eckhard.bick@mail.dk*

