

**From T'es Qui to Qui Es-Tu:
A Naïve Bayesian Approach to Assessing Literate and Oral
Discourse in Non-standard French Language Data**

Schriftliche Hausarbeit
für die Bachelorprüfung der Fakultät für Philologie
an der Ruhr-Universität Bochum
(Gemeinsame Prüfungsordnung für das Bachelor/Master-Studium
im Rahmen des 2-Fach-Modells an der RUB vom 03. November 2016)

Vorgelegt von

Chandler, Christopher

Abgabedatum

31.08.2021

Prof. Dr. Stefanie Dipper

Prof. Dr. Ralf Klabunde

Abstract

An overlooked aspect of communication is conceptual discourse, where literacy corresponds conceptually to written language, and orality corresponds conceptually to spoken language. Non-standard French language data was obtained from eBay, SMS chats and Wikiconflits to explore how the conceptual is realized in different internet domains. Training data was automatically developed using classification sets that are typical of conceptual discourse. This was then used to train a naïve Bayes model to assign the most probable conceptual classification feature to a document. eBay and Wikiconflits displayed a high level of literacy, while SMS data showed a high level of orality during the classification phase. However, during the testing phase with the naïve Bayes, eBay and Wikiconflits texts displayed normal levels of literacy, with SMS texts having a low level of orality. This was due to texts in SMS chats being on average shorter than those of other corpora.

Main Table of Contents:

1.	Introduction	7
2.	Related Works	8
2.1.	Theoretical Linguistics	8
2.2.	Computational Linguistics	8
3.	Language as a Construct	9
3.1.	General Features of Language	9
3.2.	Medial Features	10
3.3.	Conceptual Features	11
4.	Styles and Registers	13
4.1.	Le Français	14
4.2.	Français Cultivé	15
4.3.	Français Familier	15
4.4.	Français Populaire	16
4.5.	Français Vulgaire	17
4.6.	Français Argotique	17
4.7.	Français Technique	18
4.8.	Combining Registers and Discourse	18
5.	The French Language Corpora	19
5.1.	Data Sets	19
5.2.	Pre-processing	20
6.	Methodology	21
6.1.	Classification Sets	21
6.2.	Bayes' Theorem	24
6.3.	Naïve Bayes as a Classifier	25
6.4.	A Worked Example	27
7.	System Evaluation	29
7.1.	Developmental Overhead	29
7.2.	Classification Sets and Naïve Bayes	29
7.3.	Sentence Tokenizer	30
7.4.	spaCy Module	31
8.	Results	32

8.1.	Development phase.....	32
8.2.	Training phase	33
8.3.	Testing phase	34
9.	Discussion	35
9.1.	Results of Classification Sets and Naïve Bayes	35
9.2.	Classification Set vs. Naïve Bayes	37
10.	Conclusion	38
11.	References	39

List of Figures:

Figure 1.	Bühler Organon-Modell	9
Figure 2.	Medium and Concept	11
Figure 3.	Spoken and Written vs. Graphic and Phonic	12
Figure 4.	Nähesprache and Distanzsprache.....	13
Figure 5.	French Registers.....	14
Figure 7.	Literacy and Orality	18
Figure 6.	Registers According to Literacy and Orality.....	18

List of Equations:

<i>Equation 1. Bayes' Theorem</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Equation 2. Bayes' Theorem Reversed.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Equation 3. Normalizing Constant</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Equation 4. Naïve Bayes' Classifier</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Equation 5. Argmax</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Equation 6. Argmax of Classification</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Equation 7. Model Probabilities.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Equation 8. Likelihood.....</i>	<i>26</i>

<i>Equation 9. Composition of Likelihood</i>	26
<i>Equation 10. Argmax of Likelihood</i>	26
<i>Equation 11. Calculating Argmax</i>	26
<i>Equation 12. MLE</i>	26
<i>Equation 13. Calculating Prior Probability</i>	27
<i>Equation 13. Ng Smoothing</i>	27

List of Tables:

Table 1. Classification Criteria for Literacy	23
Table 2. Classification Criteria for Orality	23
Table 3. Mini corpus	27
Table 4. Classification Values	28
Table 5. Classification Assignment	28
Table 6. MLE Values	28
Table 7. Evaluation of Training Classification Criteria for Literacy	30
Table 8. Evaluation of Classification of Orality	30
Table 9. Naïve Bayes Evaluation	30
Table 10. Sentence tokenization evaluation	30
Table 11. Spacy Accuracy	31
Table 12. Development Results of the Classification Data	32
Table 13. Top Development Classification Criteria for Wikiconflits	32
Table 14. Top Development Classification Criteria for SMS	32
Table 15. Naïve Bayes Development Results	33
Table 16. Training Results of the Classification Data	33
Table 17. Top Training Classification Criteria for Wikiconflits	34

Table 18. Top Training Classification Criteria for SMS.....	34
Table 19. Naïve Bayes Training Results	34
Table 20. Naïve Bayes Testing Results.....	34

List of Abbreviations:

CMRW	CMR-wikiconflits
CoMeRe	Corpora of Computer-Mediated Communication in French
FA	Français argotique
FC	Français cultivé
FRÉ	Français écrit
FF	Français familier
FPA	Français parlé
FP	Français populaire
FV	Français vulgaire
LP	Langue parlé
LT	Langues techniques
MLE	Maximum Likelihood Expectation
NLP	Natural Language Processing
OOV	Out-of-Vocabulary
POS-Tagging	Part of Speech Tagging

1. Introduction

Excluding other modes by which human communication can be realized such as via sign language, body language, whistling, human languages are generally expressed medially through either text or speech (Bader, 2002). Oral, i.e., spoken discourse, can be understood as a process which employs audible sounds to express meaning, whereas literate, i.e., written discourse, is the visual medium that uses written symbols (Bader, 2002). An aspect that is often overlooked is conceptual discourse. In other words, what is the actual conceptual intent that a speaker wishes to communicate with their message?

With these distinctions in mind, the concepts of written vs. spoken and literacy vs. orality arise. The former represents the medial aspect of language, whereas the latter represents the conceptual intent of a speaker. These two domains do not represent a natural dichotomy, as one might automatically assume, but rather, they are two sectors of language that regularly overlap (Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985).

To explore the conceptual discourse in a more practical sense, French language data from three main internet domains is to be used: eBay, Wikiconflits, and SMS data. SMS chats are the most likely candidate for representing orality due to their informal nature (Bader, 2002; Rehm 2002). These are then to contrast with the Wikiconflits chats, as the content therein pertains to scientific and intellectual communication (Poudat, Kun, et al., 2015), and can represent literacy (Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985). eBay postings are to be seen here as a control as they do not intrinsically represent one conceptual discourse style over another.

Determining the conceptual intent of a speaker's discourse is to be done using a multinomial naïve Bayes algorithm (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). A simple, but effective smoothing algorithm as proposed by Ng (1997) will be used to solve the out-of-vocabulary problem. Multinomial naïve Bayes, which will be referred henceforth as naïve Bayes, requires training data for it to be able to properly determine the conceptual discourse type of a given document. Therefore, classification sets must first be developed that can be used to automatically label documents according to their conceptual discourse type. This serves as the basis from which the naïve Bayes algorithm draws its training data and computes the discourse classification probabilities.

2. Related Works

2.1. Theoretical Linguistics

Koch and Oesterreicher (1985) constructed the medial-conceptual paradigm of written vs. spoken and literacy vs. orality by providing a situational context in which these two facets of language can occur. Koch and Oesterreicher (1985) also placed focus on sociolinguistic contexts regarding this paradigm by expounding upon the notions of *distanzsprache* and *nähesprache*, which are additional factors crucial to identifying the correct discourse type. Koch and Oesterreicher (2007) offered a more detailed explanation regarding the medial and conceptual discourse types by expanding their examples and explanations to include French, German and English.

Even though Müller (1975) predates Koch and Oesterreicher (1985), the notion of literacy and orality was already known to Müller (1975) who referred to them as *français parlé, message oral, languée* and *français écrit, message écrit, langue écrite, langage écrit* respectively. Müller (1975) explored this distinction and how it is realized chronologically, quantitatively, qualitatively, diatopically, and diastratically within the French language.

2.2. Computational Linguistics

Ortmann and Dipper (2019) explored the ideas as proposed by various authors (Bader, 2002; Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985; Rehm, 2002) to be able to automatically identify literate and oral discourse in modern German texts. Ortmann and Dipper (2020) applied the same methodology to assess the literacy and orality regarding historical texts. Ortmann and Dipper (2020) did this by using a slightly altered feature set that was more fitting for historical texts, as the non-standardized nature of historical documents could not be properly analyzed using modern criteria (Ortmann & Dipper, 2020).

Bader (2002) provided a rounded, general approach on how to properly assess literacy and orality in texts in the same vein as Müller (1975). However, Bader (2002) applied the analysis to digital communication, e.g., e-mail, chat, newsgroups, forums, while also providing features to identify the precise nature of individual excerpts from said communication. Rehm (2002) offered a more restricted analysis by only detailing the nature, characteristics, and features of conceptual orality in written language on the internet, e.g., e-mail, chat data, websites, etc. at the time of publication.

3. Language as a Construct

3.1. General Features of Language

Language is something of which humans have been capable for around 100,000 years (Stein, 2014). Human language is first and foremost, the production of audible sounds, i.e., speech (Bader, 2002). Furthermore, language is the aggregation of conventions, norms, value, and opposition. The value of a given word, be it phonetic or graphic, is that it can be distinguished from another element (Stein, 2014). If there is a distinction between these two elements, then opposition is present (Stein, 2014). Should they have the same function, then it would be necessary to refer to them as variants of one another (Stein, 2014). This leads into the distinction of *langue* versus *parole*, *langue* being the virtual construct of a given language that could be realized by a speaker and *parole* being the actual realization of *langue* (Stein, 2014).

Independent of the medial and conceptual aspects of language is how exactly communication can work between speakers. The organon model, as seen in figure 1, models the way in which linguistic information is received and processed. Every communication process consists of the following: *sender*, *empfänger* and *gegenstände*

und *sachverhalte*. Sender is the speaker, with *empfänger* being the listener. *Gegenstände* and *sachverhalte* are the messages being transmitted. All three of these are connected through *Z* which represents the language, i.e., *sprachliches zeichen* (Stein, 2014). The *sprachliches zeichen* is what is

transmitted via language. It has three main functions: *Ausdruck*, *darstellung* and *appell*. The

ausdruck expresses the opinions and feelings of the speaker, which are the symptoms of the *sprachliches zeichen* (Stein, 2014). The *darstellung* is the symbol for the information while the *appell* elicits a desired response from the listener that is in line with the *sprachliches zeichen* (Stein, 2014). All three are present in every message, but generally one will dominate over the others (Bader, 2002).




Figure 1. Bühler Organon-Modell
(Stein, 2014, p. 1)

3.2. Medial Features

Spoken language can be understood as the phonetic expression of thought (Bader, 2002). This is in line with structural linguists, who saw spoken language superseding and being the precursor of written language (Stein, 2014). Due to the nature of spoken language being the primary factor chronologically speaking (Bader, 2002; Koch and Oesterreicher, 1985), it is the medium that is the most prominent and the one that has been object of great discussion, especially since the 20th century (Bader, 2002; Stein, 2014).

Spoken language is a spontaneous act that is directly coupled with transience (Bader, 2002). This real-time process prevents spoken language from becoming overly complex as it would overload the listener's ability to ascertain the meaning from the message (Ortmann & Dipper, 2019).

The speaker's ability to be able to process the linguistic information in real-time also has a direct impact on syntax meaning that the active voice and elliptical structures are preferable in spoken language as they are easier to process (Ortmann & Dipper, 2019). This is evident in the lexical aspect as spoken language makes frequent use of various particles, e.g., answer and modal particles, vague expressions, and interjections (Ortmann & Dipper, 2019).

If spoken language is the phonetic expression of thought, written language is then to be seen as a graphical depiction and recording of said thought (Bader, 2002; Stein, 2014). The reason as to why written language exists at all is explained by the fact that it is essential in transcribing thoughts and transporting messages over long temporal and physical distances (Bader, 2002).

Written language often contrasts with spoken language due the dichotomous nature of the language paradigm (Bader, 2002; Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985). Where spoken language is restricted to being less complex, written language can benefit from static properties of a textual medium (Ortmann & Dipper, 2019). This naturally carries over into the syntactical and lexical structure of any given written message. Syntactical and lexical properties can be expounded upon in writing in general without having to take the speaker's ability to process information into consideration (Ortmann & Dipper, 2019).

An important property is that an author of written language can express orality through the omission of characters, i.e., incorrect spellings, word contractions, or use of ellipsis dots, em dashes, or apostrophes (Ortmann & Dipper, 2019). The opposite is also true in that written language can also express literacy by strictly adhering to orthographic norms, employing complex syntactical structures, and using lexically complex constructions (Bader, 2002; Ortmann & Dipper, 2019).

3.3. Conceptual Features

Although it would be possible to see a dichotomy being present between literacy and orality, this is not strictly correct. The dichotomy does exist, but it only applies to the medial vs. conceptual (Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985). Regarding the medial representation specifically, a dichotomy is present. The other question remains though: What is to be done with the conceptual aspect of language? As the medial features of language directly contrast with those of the conceptual, they can be grouped together as seen in figure 2.

		Konzeption	
		Gesprochen	Geschrieben
Medium	Graphischer Kode	Faut pas le dire	Il ne faut pas le dire
	Phonischer Kode	[fopaldɪʁ]	[ilnəfplalədɪʁ]

Figure 2. *Medium and Concept*

(Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985, p. 17)

The medium is either the *phonischer kode*, i.e., phonic code or it is the *graphischer kode*, i.e., graphic code. This means that a message like *faut pas le dire* is medially representative of written language, but it is conceptually representative of orality. In this particular example, it is due to the omission of *il* and *ne*, which belong to standard French (Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985; Müller, 1975). The opposite of this applies as well where *il ne faut pas le dire* is representative of literacy and written language as it complies with the written norms set forth by the governing linguistic bodies of the French language (Müller, 1975).

The phonetic element plays an important role as well but is only relevant if the message is audible. As text is not a medium that can transport audio, the phonetic element does not necessarily apply here. It only applies indirectly if the speaker first starts with a phonetic message that is then transcribed graphically (Bader, 2002; Koch &

Oesterreicher, 1985). Koch and Oesterreicher (1985) see spoken and written language as being on a continuum with conceptual possibilities that have different levels which are exemplified in figure 3.

On the *phonisch*, i.e., phonic portion




Figure 3. *Spoken and Written vs. Graphic and Phonic*
(Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985, p. 18)

of figure 3, all the texts are medially spoken, but conceptually start off as being representative of orality and gradually transition into literacy. The results in the language in the following texts become more representative conceptually of written discourse. When observing the two poles, there is a difference between a *vertrautes Gespräch*, i.e., intimate conversation and a *vortrag*, i.e., presentation. The former represents spontaneous speech with the latter being prefabricated and then presented to an audience orally (Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985).

On the *graphisch*, i.e., graphic portion of the diagram, all documents represent possible graphic representations of speech, with d, an *abgedrucktes Interview*, i.e., prepared interview, being medially the most oral with, k, *Verwaltungsvorschrift*, i.e., an administrative regulation, being highly representative of literacy while still being medially oral.

Figure 3 demonstrates, what was tabularly presented in figure 2, which is that medial and conceptual discourse exist on a spectrum. An important element missing from figure 2 is how this relates to communication and discourse as was touched upon in figure 1. Figure 4 solves this dilemma, by presenting a dynamic, but combining figure 2 and 3 together.

Figure 4 addresses how close in terms of proximity and familiarity the speakers are to one another. *Nähesprache*, or *sprache der nähe*, is reserved for situations that are physical and familiar in nature (Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985). This includes, but is not limited to, communication that is spontaneous, face-to-face and familiarity with the communication partner.




Figure 4. *Nähesprache and Distanzsprache*
(Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985, p. 23)

Distanzsprache, or *sprache der distanz*, represents the opposite pole in that it depicts speech that includes, but is not limited to, communication that is detached, objective, unfamiliar, fixed topic, etc. Referring to figure 3 and figure 4, an intimate conversation is thus medially representative of spoken language, that is also conceptually representative of orality. The dynamic of the speakers is one of familiarity and closeness, and the speech can be assigned the label of *nähesprache*.

The opposite can be said of administrative regulation texts. There is great distance between the speakers, both in terms of familiarity and proximity. It is also not a message that can be communicated conceptually orally due to the very nature of the text. It can be assigned as being conceptually representative of literacy, while being medially spoken and thus belongs to *distanzsprache*. Using these parameters: medium, concept, and distance-proximity, a more detailed analysis of language is possible.

4. Styles and Registers

A speaker's linguistic choices often reveals information about their social and geographical background (Bieswanger & Becker, 2008). Registers, or styles, can be loosely defined as:

The function of language in a particular situation and the consideration of such factors as addressee, topic, location and the interactional goal rather than background

of the speaker. The exact definition of style and register is difficult. A common distinction is that style refers to the level of formality of an utterance or a text, whereas register refers to the choice of vocabulary in a specific communicative situation. (Bieswanger & Becker, 2008, p. 187)

Styles and registers are instrumental in determining literacy and orality since understanding how and when these registers are used allow for better identification of the conceptual discourse types in written language. Certain registers and styles are generally realized in specific situations akin to those presented in figure 3 and figure 4. The following sub-chapters depict specific French registers and how they map to conceptual discourse.

4.1. Le Français

French was historically seen as having a single register (Müller, 1975). This is not in the sense that there was no variation, but rather, that there




Figure 5. French Registers
(Müller, 1975, p. 184)

was one and only one correct way of using the French language referred to as *bon usage* (Müller, 1975). *Mauvais usage*, i.e., poor usage and *dites... ne dites pas*, i.e., say this, not that, dictated the correct usage of French for most of French language history (Müller, 1975). This was in part due to the academic body, Académie Française, who has been the governing body of the French language since its establishment in the 17th century (Müller, 1975).

Nevertheless, it is not necessarily feasible to entirely dictate what speakers of any given language do or say as this is directly antithetically to a defining character of language construct, which is that languages are in a constant state of change (Müller, 1975; Stein, 2014). This led to the development of various French registers as seen in figure 5 (Müller, 1975; Stein, 2014). French registers are classified as *français cultivé*, *français familier*, *français populaire*, *français vulgaire*, *français argotique* and *français technique* (Müller, 1975; Stein 2014).

4.2. Français Cultivé

Français cultivé, or FC, is often viewed in positive light and seen as the register that one should try to replicate seeing as this register is the highest register (Müller, 1975). It should not be used in banal or informal situations, otherwise the speaker risks being seen as pedantic and pretentious (Müller, 1975). It is used in official or ceremonial situations (Müller, 1975).

The most prominent feature of this register is the phonological component as it tends to consequently conserve sounds that are no longer used in the other registers (Müller, 1975). This includes such as phonetic opposition of certain sounds, the pronunciation of the schwa at the end of phonological words and more rigid syllable structure. This has to do with the desire to retain the literary tradition, which is often dependent on such archaisms (Müller, 1975).

Certain verb tenses such as *passé simple*, *passé antérieur*, *subjonctif imparfait* or verbal constructs such as *inversion* are characteristic of this register. The strict adherence to proper negation, e.g., *ne...pas*, *ne...point*, and *ne...guère* often appears with these verbal constructions (Müller, 1975).

It is often viewed as being representative of literacy as it retains the previously mentioned grammatical features, which are no longer used in contemporary speech either conceptually or medially (Müller, 1975). Whether spoken or written, it is considered artificial as it is a controlled process heavily reliant on proper word choice, intonation, and lengthy, detailed sentences (Müller, 1975).

4.3. Français Familier

Français familier, or FF, is a qualitative register that is often used in informal situations such as with family, job, daily routine, acquaintances, and people from one's inner social circle (Müller, 1975). It is a register that is indifferent to the social standing of the speaker, but it is used more frequently by those who have profited from a higher education than those who have not (Müller, 1975).

It is spontaneous in nature, and this is reflected in the fact that there is not a lot of emphasis placed on proper enunciation (Müller, 1975). This spontaneity is because FF, and français populaire by extension, are directly descended from Vulgar Latin, which

itself was primarily a spoken register of Latin, both medially as well as conceptually (Müller, 1975).

Statements and questions are generally formed through falling and rising intonation respectively even though questions using *est-ce que* are possible (Müller, 1975). The doubling of pronouns or referents, e.g., *moi je, ton père il*, and high use of topicalization, e.g., *cet homme, je l'ai vu très souvent* are typical of FF (Müller, 1975).

It makes high use of suffixes to denote agents and actors in speech context, e.g., *chançard, gueulard, and motard*. This also includes the diminutive suffixes such as *-et, ette, ot*. Reduplication is not only present among pronouns, but in nouns as well, e.g., *fla-fla, ronron, kif-kif* (Müller, 1975).

Due to its spontaneous nature, speakers tend to avoid overly complex expressions when communicating strong feelings. This leads to a high number of simplified expressions and atypically using adverbs as intensifiers (Müller, 1975). The register is often consigned to orality as it signalizes a nonchalant attitude and, as the name implies, a familiar atmosphere.

4.4. Français Populaire

Français populaire, or FP, is considered neither proper nor good French as it does not meet the requirements set by the norms or *bon usage* (Müller, 1975). Since it differs quite drastically from FC, it is often considered to be a language within a language (Müller, 1975). This is because it is not consistent with FC, but rather within itself and presents grammar and orthography that while deviant, are internally consistent. It, along with FF, arose as a language of the people, meaning those who belonged to neither clergy nor nobility and whose speech was more commonly referred to as *lanuge du peuple* (Müller, 1975). In classifying it as such, FP is representative of orality.

Since communication is more important than grammatical correctness for speakers of this register, FP tends to forgo the linguistic norms (Müller, 1975). Verbal phrases are often formed without their corresponding grammatical subjects (Müller, 1975). The appropriate auxiliary verbs, *avoir* and *être*, are used interchangeably, nominal congruence with respect to gender and number are either ignored or forgotten (Müller, 1975). The *subjunctif* is only employed when a strong desire is expressed as would be

the case with *vouloir*. Relative pronouns and conjunctions involving *que* tend to have a higher frequency for variability (Müller, 1975).

There is strong preference for neglecting the spelling, especially when the message is clear from morphology. The most prominent example of this is the willingness to drop the *ne* of *ne...pas* (Müller, 1975). The lexicon does not differ in form from FC, but rather in usage, i.e., that speakers use the same words, but differently, which leads to expressions being hyperbolic and suggestive (Müller, 1975). A great deal of the words that occur within FP are known to most speakers of French; They only make up a small portion of the language. Most of the words that appear in FP are from the 19th and 20th century, which mainly stem from dialects and français vulgaire (Müller, 1975).

4.5. Français Vulgaire

Français vulgaire, or FV, is the lowest register both in terms of prestige and formality, and therefore conceptually oral in nature, is often grouped together with français argotique (Müller, 1975). The difference is that it and its components are generally known to all speakers of French, whereas français argotique is restricted to certain milieus (Müller, 1975). Interjections, expressions of displeasure, and expletives are present throughout FV. It is avoided whenever possible as it is in direct opposition to social norms regarding etiquette. It is notable for its lack of scientific jargon, Latin loanwords, and euphemisms, but it is also incredibly adept at coining new words that employ the method of directness (Müller, 1975).

4.6. Français Argotique

Français argotique or argot in its original form was meant to specify the speech patterns of marginal groups and that of professional jargon. A defining feature of argot is that the speaker is intentionally trying to distance themselves socially. At the same time, it is used as a way of identifying insiders and outsiders (Müller, 1975). This is usually the reason why argot is considered to be cryptic language (Stein, 2014).

Argot employs metonym to a high degree by applying descriptions of food to refer to the body. It also displays a high willingness to import loan words from dialects as well as other languages (Goudailler, 2002). Argot is highly representative of orality as the need to record speech in a written form was completely secondary. Due to the written aspect of language not being important, argot is relatively unstable (Müller, 1975). The extreme

degree to which argot changes is also a defining feature (Goudailler, 2002). This is because it reflects the period in which the speakers live and not the continuing of a linguistic tradition (Stein, 2014).

4.7. Français Technique

Français technique, or FT, can be used to explain theoretical concepts to those who are from the same field, or a reduction in complexity is introduced, i.e., vulgarization, making it more readily available to those who are not of a scientific background (Müller, 1975). A defining trait of it is the need to develop new terminology as the field of science is ever growing. This is done using complex use of morphological constructions (Müller, 1975).

The high influx of new words also come from English, which is a point of contention with those working with français technique, but often French words are substituted to combat this (Stein, 2014). The syntax and vocabulary are quite rigid, more so than that of FC, since precision in scientific fields is key (Müller, 1975). The syntactical structures are not per se complex, but it displays a high level of words that express causality which is to be expected as the goal is scientific in nature and conceptually literal (Müller, 1975).

4.8. Combining Registers and Discourse

Literacy and orality represent the binary feature set that is to be assessed. As the medium is apparent from the textual nature of the data set, it is assumed then that when the textual and medial discourse overlap, they represent literacy. If they are to diverge, then they represent orality. Therefore, it is possible to group the registers in a manner akin to figure 2 as seen in figure 6:




Figure 6. Registers According to Literacy and Orality

By grouping the registers in this manner, it is easier to ascertain where the overlap is medially and conceptually. Figure 6 can be further refined to allow them to be mapped to the conceptual as seen in




Figure 7. Literacy and Orality

figure 7. Registers by their very nature represent different conceptual discourse types.

It would not be reasonable or feasible to train a model to recognize the individual registers due to the high overlap between the various registers. However, by extracting characteristics and criteria from each register and grouping them according to their discourse type, it is possible to fit a model with criteria that allows it to automatically recognize literacy and orality.

5. The French Language Corpora

French is not a monolith, but a language that is spoken across many domains, age groups, and countries (Müller 1975; Stein, 2014). Whether a native speaker of Metropolitan French, a second-language speaker, or speaker of a given French dialect, this variation is present in France as well as outside of it (Stein, 2014). This poses a challenge since what is representative of conceptual discourse is to some extent dependent on the local and personal understanding of the language (Bader, 2002). The object language here in question is that of Metropolitan French, which is contemporary French as spoken in France. The methods and reasoning will therefore apply to this variant of French. However, there is no feasible way to know if a speaker is completely in line with French standard, registers, and styles. Since the internet is an open platform, and not bound to geographical constraints, it is plausible that speakers of other varieties or languages have partaken in the conversations.

5.1. Data Sets

The three primary data sets that are the focus of the linguistic analysis: eBay petites annonces (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019), CMR-wikiconflits (Poudat, Grabar, et al., 2015), and 88milsms (Panckhurst et al., 2016), which will be referred to as eBay corpus, Wikiconflits or Wiki corpus, and SMS corpus respectively.

The eBay corpus contains online listings from the online auction platform, eBay, and it was compiled by the department of Romance studies at the University of Potsdam with a collection of around 1256 online auction listings, which are split across four sub-corpora (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019). The first three sub-corpora deal with housing, vehicles, clothing, computer, telephones, children, collections, and leisure, while the last corpus deals with professional activities, e.g., stocks, shops, shipping (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019).

Wikiconflits contains discussions about IQ consisting of around 52 participants, 170 contributions, and 20,000 tokens (Poudat, Kun et al., 2015). As is often the case with sites like Wikipedia, the information presented may not be factually correct (Poudat, Kun et al., 2015). This does not necessarily pose a problem as the accuracy of the information is irrelevant with respect to its literacy and orality.

The SMS corpus is a collection of more than 88,000 SMS messages that were collected from speakers in the Montpellier area in France (Panckhurst, 2016). To comply with French data protection guidelines, the data had already been anonymized by Panckhurst et. al (2016). The SMS donors were asked to participate in a questionnaire, about the languages they speak, their telephone number, their profession, how they communicate through SMS, the frequency of their communication and what their opinions of SMS communication are (Panckhurst, 2016).

The selection of the corpora is as to provide three instances in which literacy and orality could appear. First and foremost, the SMS corpus are generally forms of informal communication, and because of this, they should contain data that is mostly representative of orality (Bader, 2002; Rehm, 2002). Secondly, the Wikiconflits documents contain discussions that generally relate to scientific and official matters (Poudat, Grabar, et al., 2015) and should therefore be representative of literacy (Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985). As the eBay texts are combination of both orality and literacy, they should fall somewhere in between the other two corpora in terms of conceptual discourse.

5.2. Pre-processing

The corpora (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019; Panckhurst et al., 2016; Poudat, Grabar, et al., 2015) were created with the goal of individual linguistic analysis in mind and so the data had been annotated and changed as little as possible by the respective institutions. This means that processes such as sentiment analysis, POS-tagging, tokenization were possible without interference from foreign analysis. They are available in the .xml format, and contain markers to identify author, date, time and title of the post. The eBay corpus was tagged with respect to typical features of ad postings such as abbreviations, misspellings, marketing language, slang, proper nouns, and

emoticons (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019). Before the individual entries could be properly processed, the corpus had to be first sub-divided.

The other two data sets, Wikiconflits and SMS, were already in one homogenous corpus and sub-division was therefore not necessary (Panckhurst et al., 2016; Poudat, Grabar, et al., 2015). However, all three of the data sets were then equally divided into three parts: development, training and test data sets.

Since files were in an .xml format, it was not possible to directly access the text, but rather through their respective tags. This was done by parsing them using the python module *beautifulsoup* (*Beautiful Soup Documentation*, n.d.). Once the textual data was exposed, the respective entries were tokenized into their respective sentences using a custom tokenizer that uses regular expressions to identify the end of sentences. Information related to parts of speech, morphological, and syntactical dependencies as well as tokens were subsequently ascertained from the sentences by using French spaCy modules (*French · SpaCy Models Documentation*, n.d.).

6. Methodology

6.1. Classification Sets

The methodology involved using a probabilistic algorithm to recognize literacy and orality in texts. However, before this could be done, training data had to be ascertained. Due to the lack of known or adequate training data, another classification system had to be employed by which a training data base could be built. From this database, probabilities could be calculated, and the conceptual discourse type of a given text could be made known.

Originally, a French-based classification set was meant to gauge the reliability of the language-independent classification sets as seen in table 1 and table 2. The validity of the language-independent classification criteria would be weighed against the language-dependent criteria set. This proved to be extremely ineffective since there were not enough unique words and criteria to push a sentence into one category over another. The result of this was that sentences were either wrongly classified or the number of unknown sentences was extremely high.

The second problem voids this solution as too many features were being deleted from a sentence which caused it to be unrecognizable by the language-independent

classification sets. The first classification set, as seen in table 1, relied heavily on sentence, word length, reduplication and emoticons, which are crucial for determining literacy and orality. Therefore, the features that would have been present in the other system were generalized and incorporated into the second classification system.

Problems that were touched upon earlier were present throughout the eBay and SMS corpora which was that the data was non-standard, this made the classification quite difficult as there was no way to guarantee uniformity (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019; Panckhurst et al., 2016). This was compounded by the fact that French is not exclusively used in all the data sets (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019; Panckhurst et al., 2016; Poudat, Grabar, et al., 2015). In the SMS and eBay corpus, there were traces of German and English since postings and conversation were on a national, and not always a local scale (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019; Panckhurst et al., 2016).

Various researchers (Bader, 2002; Ortmann & Dipper, 2019; Rehm, 2002) had provided a plethora of criteria by which one can automatically identify literacy and orality in discourse. These criteria focused on creating a system which is to be linguistically and chronologically independent. However, since French data was being classified, characteristics of the French registers were taken into consideration when developing the classification criteria. Based on these researchers (Bader, 2002; Ortmann & Dipper, 2019; Rehm, 2002), two distinct classification sets were created as seen in table 1 and in table 2.

A document was automatically analyzed according to both classification set. If a given criterion for a sentence was true, then it received points equal to the respective category as specified in table 1 and table 2. At the end of the analysis, two scores will have been calculated. The sums of the respective scores were then compared. The feature of the higher score was assigned to a sentence of a document. This means that if sentence received more point with respect to orality, then the sentence will be classified as such and vice-versa.

Criterion	Description	Point Amount
SEN_LEN	Sentence Length	The length of the sentence in character length
AVG_WORD_LEN	Average word length	The length of the average word length
THIRD_PERSON_EXPL	Dummy Subjects	The number of dummy subjects
NOM_SUBJ	Sentence Length	The number of nominal subjects
PRES_TENSE	Present tense verbs	The number of present tense verbs
ABBR_NO_VOWEL	Abbreviations without vowels	Count of abbreviations without vowels
NP_VB_RATIO	Noun to verb ration	Noun count plus verb count
LOW_VERB_HIGH_ADJ	Low number of numbers, but high number of adjectives	Verb and adjective count
CCONJ_VB_RATIO	More coordinating conjunctions than verbs	Coordinating conjunct plus verb count
SHORT_SEN_LENGTH_PRESENCE_OF_NUMBERS	Short sentences that consist of only numbers	Only one point

Table 1. Classification Criteria for Literacy

Criterion	Description	Point Amount
SEN_LEN	Sentence Length	The length of the sentence in character length
AVG_WORD_LEN	Average word length	The length of the average word length
VERB_SEN_LEN_RATIO	Short sentences without verbs, high number of pronouns	The number of verbs and pronouns that occur within the sentences
WORD_REDUPPLICATION	Occurrence of a word more than once in a text	The number of words that occur more than once
PRES_TENSE	Present tense verbs	The number of present tense verbs
HIGH_PUNCTION	High use of punctuation	The number of punctuation symbols
MULTI_CHAR_REDUPPLICATION	Using the same character multiple times	The number of symbols that occur more than once
WORD_WORD_REDUPPLICATION	Using the same word back-to-back	The number of times a word is used more than once back-to-back
ALL_CAPS	All caps	Words written in all caps
ISOLATED_VERBS	Only verbs in a sentence	The length of the sentence
EMOTIOCONS	The usage of emoticons in a sentence	The number of emoticons used in a sentence
ABBR	Abbreviations and acronyms	The number of abbreviations and acronyms as they occur in the text

Table 2. Classification Criteria for Orality

6.2. Bayes' Theorem

An efficient and well-known method of classifying a document is a group of classifiers known as naïve Bayes classifiers with multinomial and Bernoulli naïve Bayes classifiers being among the most common (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). The main difference between the two is that Bernoulli naïve Bayes models the presence or absence of features, whereas multinomial naïve Bayes counts the number of times a given feature occurs (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). They work well with binary classification and are most often employed in sentiment analysis, spam detection and authenticating authorship (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). The following explanation applies to the multinomial Bayes. The naïve Bayes' algorithm is a conditional probabilistic algorithm that is first and foremost based on the Bayes' theorem which is as seen in equation 1:

$$P(A|B) = \frac{P(B|A) \cdot P(A)}{P(B)}$$

Equation 1. Bayes' Theorem
(Carstensen et al., 2010, p. 122)

P represents the probability of an event with A and B representing two distinct events. $P(A|B)$ is the probability of event A given event B (Carstensen et al., 2010). Since Bayes' theorem is flexible (Manning & Schütze, 1999), the events can be swapped as seen in equation 2:

$$P(B|A) = \frac{P(A|B) \cdot P(B)}{P(A)}$$

Equation 2. Bayes' Theorem Reversed
(Manning & Schütze, 1999)

$P(A)$, as seen in equation 2, the normalizing constant guarantees that the equation has a probabilistic aspect to it (Manning & Schütze, 1999). $P(A)$ can be broken down into its individual elements as it is the combined probability of all events and is calculated as seen in equation 3:

$$P(A \cap B) + P(A \cap \bar{B})$$

$$P(A|B) \cdot P(B) + P(A|\bar{B}) \cdot P(\bar{B})$$

Equation 3. Normalizing Constant
(Manning & Schütze, 1999, p. 43)

\bar{B} represents not B, with \cap being the intersect between two respective events.

6.3. Naïve Bayes as a Classifier

A document classifier can be created by using Bayes' theorem as a basis. To make the explanation more suitable for text classifications, the variables have been changed, as seen in equation 4, but the base form of Bayes' theorem remains intact.

$$\hat{c} = \underset{c \in C}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(c|d) = \underset{c \in C}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{P(d|c) \cdot P(c)}{P(d)}$$

Equation 4. Naïve Bayes' Classifier
(Jurafsky & Martin, 2020, p. 57)

\hat{c} , the estimation of the correct class, represents the maximum posterior probability with d being the documents out of all classes $c \in C$ (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). However, as is often the case with NLP tasks, only the maximum argument is important, which consists of the product of the likelihood and prior probability (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). Both must first be computed as presented in equation 5:

$$\underset{B}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(B|A) = \frac{P(A|B) \cdot P(B)}{P(A)} = \underset{B}{\operatorname{argmax}} (A|B) \cdot P(B)$$

Equation 5. Argmax
(Manning & Schütze, 1999, p. 43)

Equation 5 can be converted to be in line with the variable labels of naïve Bayes' classifier, which produces the following as presented in equation 6:

$$\hat{c} = \underset{c \in C}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(c|d) = \underset{c \in C}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(d|c) \cdot P(c)$$

Equation 6. Argmax of Classification
(Jurafsky & Martin, 2020, p. 58)

In equation 6, there are two main probabilities that must first be ascertained and then be computed as seen in equation 7:

$$\hat{c} = \underset{c \in C}{\operatorname{argmax}} \overbrace{P(d|c)}^{\text{Likelihood}} \cdot \overbrace{P(c)}^{\text{prior}}$$

Equation 7. Model Probabilities
(Jurafsky & Martin, 2020, p. 58)

$P(c)$ is the prior probability of a given class. The likelihood, as in equation 8, is assumed to be in line with the bag-of-words principle, which states that the position of

the words within a given text is irrelevant as only number of times a word occurs is important (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020).

$$\hat{c} = \underset{c \in C}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(c|d) = \overbrace{P(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n | c)}^{\text{Likelihood}} \cdot \overbrace{P(c)}^{\text{prior}}$$

Equation 8. Likelihood
(Jurafsky & Martin, 2020, p. 58)

Thus, the naïve Bayes assumes that occurrence of the features, but not their position as laid out in equation 9:

$$P(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n | c) = P(f_1 | c) \cdot P(f_2 | c) \cdot \dots \cdot P(f_n | c)$$

Equation 9. Composition of Likelihood
(Jurafsky & Martin, 2020, p. 58)

By applying equation 9, the equation 10 results.

$$C_{NB} = \underset{c \in C}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(c) \prod_{f \in F} P(f | c)$$

Equation 10. Argmax of Likelihood
(Jurafsky & Martin, 2020, p. 58)

Equation 10 is a condensed form of equation 9. Equation 9 states that a product of all likelihood within a given text must be computed. To apply formula 10, it is only necessary to traverse all words in each document as detailed in equation 11:

$$C_{NB} = \underset{c \in C}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(c) \prod_{i \in \text{positions}} P(w_i | c)$$

Equation 11. Calculating Argmax
(Jurafsky & Martin, 2020, p. 58)

It is first necessary to train the model by calculating the probabilities of $P(c)$ and $P(f_i | c)$. This is done by using the frequencies in the training data to ascertain the MLE as presented in equation 12.

$$\hat{P}_{(c)} = \frac{N_c}{N_{doc}}$$

Equation 12. MLE
(Jurafsky & Martin, 2020, p. 59)

Equation 12 states that for a given number of documents, how many times does a given class occur within this document? Finally, to compute $P(f_i | c)$ as $P(w_i | c)$, the

frequency of a given word occurring within a given class is calculated, then divided by the sum of how often words within a given class occur as presented in equation 13.

$$\hat{P}(W_i|c) = \frac{\text{count}(w_i, c)}{\sum_{w \in V} \text{count}(w, c)}$$

Equation 13. Calculating Prior Probability
(Jurafsky & Martin, 2020, p. 59)

The problem here comes when a given word does not occur within a certain class, this means that the effective frequency is zero. To solve this problem, a smoothing algorithm must be applied. The most popular smoothing algorithm is LaPlace (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). Even though LaPlace is a simple, it is a highly ineffective method due to its simplicity and is used best only for exemplary purposes regarding smoothing (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). Ng (1997) offers a simple smoothing algorithm that works well with naïve Bayes classifiers, while achieving a relatively high accuracy compared to other smoothing algorithms. Therefore, the smoothing algorithm used in this paper is based on that of Ng (1997):

$$P(W_i|C_n) = \frac{C(w_n)}{N^2}$$

Equation 13. Ng Smoothing

As stated in equation 13, with all other parameters being equal, N here represents the amount of training data from a given corpus, the amount of which must be squared. This formula must be applied for each respective class in the corpus.

6.4. A Worked Example

For sake of simplicity, it is assumed in the following corpus, as seen in table 3, that the sentences have the following features as listed in the feature column.

Feature	Document
Training	
ORAL	Vous dites quoi ?
ORAL	Faut partir parce qu' il pleut .
ORAL	Je n' sais pas .
LIT	Il faut partir, car il pleut .
LIT	Elle m' a dit que j' étais une imbécile .
Test	? Vous dites imbécile

Table 3. Mini corpus

Examples taken from Müller (1975, p.185)

They have not necessarily been analyzed using the classification criteria as specified in table 1 and table 2, but rather were taken from Müller (1975) who assigned them specific registers, which can be seen in figure 6 and figure 7.

Therefore, these sentences do not necessarily represent the conceptual features assigned to them according to the classification criteria as seen in table 1 and table 2. Using these sentences as a small training corpus, it is possible to ascertain the most probabilistic classification of a sentence the *vous dites imbécile*.

	ORAL	LIT
Prior Probability	.60	.40
Smoothing	.12	.08

Table 4. Classification Values

	ORAL	LIT
Vous	0.3	0.08
Dites	0.3	0.08
Imbécile	.12	0.05
Prior Probabilitiy	0.60	.40
	0.00798	0.00128

Table 5. Classification Assignment

First, the prior probability of the respective features must be ascertained from the corpus in table 1 as seen in equation 7 and equation 8.

There are 5 documents in total, with 3 being ORAL and 2 being LIT. With this information, equation 12 can be applied. They produce the following results as seen in table 4.

Combined with the values in table 4, the MLE values for the respective tokens can be calculated according to equation 13. If a given word does not occur in a specific class, then the respective

smoothing probability must be added. The results of which are present in table 6.

The final step is simply to traverse the test sentence, as specified in table 3 and apply equation 11 by retrieving the respective values from table 6 and multiplying the

Token	LIT	ORAL
.	0.66	1.0
,	0.12	0.5
?	0.33	0.08
Elle	0.12	0.5
Faut	0.33	0.08
Il	0.12	0.5
Je	0.33	0.08
Vous	0.33	0.08
a	0.12	0.5
car	0.12	0.5
dit	0.12	0.5
dites	0.33	0.08
faut	0.12	0.5
il	0.33	0.5
imbécile	0.12	0.5
j'	0.12	0.5
m'	0.12	0.5
n'	0.33	0.08
parce	0.33	0.08
partir	0.33	0.5
pas	0.33	0.08
pleut	0.33	0.5
que	0.12	0.5
quoi	0.33	0.08
qu'	0.33	0.08
sais	0.33	0.08
une	0.12	0.5
étais	0.12	0.5

Table 6. MLE Values

respective products by their respective prior probabilities. The result, as seen in table 5, shows that the sentence is most likely ORAL based on the corpus as presented above.

7. System Evaluation

7.1. Developmental Overhead

As was the case with the corpora (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019; Panckhurst et al., 2016; Poudat, Grabar, et al., 2015) used in this project, most linguistic data is typically stored in an .xml format. The training files created by the program were saved as .csv files. Finally, the program had to also be able to accept .txt files as well as strings as these would be the most common way of training and inputting data into the system. The program is dynamic and allows for user input, which required the implementation of error correction and prevention.

The optimization of the program was done in two main steps: development, and training, with testing being done in the last phase. The training of the program varies depending on the amount of data being input into the system and the system resources.

The classification system used to create training data could theoretically be retrained to recognize any language supported by Spacy (*French · SpaCy Models Documentation*, n.d.). As for applying the algorithm to a domain other than literacy and orality, this would also heavily depend on the training data being supplied to the naïve Bayes.

Naïve Bayes is a relatively flexible algorithm that can be applied to a whole host of classification tasks and the limitation does not lie necessarily within the program, but rather within the training data made available (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). Therefore, if the program were supplied with slightly different parameters and training data, it could be restructured to recognize data with other binary classifications in mind, e.g., positive vs. negative, spam vs. not spam, detection between two languages (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020).

7.2. Classification Sets and Naïve Bayes

The original classification sets were to assign one point if a criterion in any given classification was met. However, this proved to be ineffective, as it treated all criteria equally. This often caused the sentences to be either assigned to the wrong category or

all of them to be assigned to only one category. The solution to this entailed weighting the criteria according to the importance and prevalence in the data set.

The first classification set, as seen in table 1, considered features that were prevalent throughout texts which often expressed a high degree of literacy. These were weighted according to their prevalence and importance. Using these criteria, training data was created, labeled and then evaluated. The results of this evaluation can be seen in table 7.

A second classification set, table 2, considered factors that often occurred in French texts expressing orality. This classification set was then tested and evaluated, the results of which can be seen in table 8.

Using a separate sub dataset within the development corpus, a training database was created. This database was then made available to the naïve Bayes algorithm. The results of this process can be seen in table 9.

The results of table 7, table 8 and table 9 were ascertained by manually creating a gold file for the respective systems.

7.3. Sentence Tokenizer

Since the data is non-standard, it was not always clear which sentences should be parsed and where they should be parsed. Data from all three corpora (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019; Panckhurst et al., 2016; Poudat, Grabar, et al., 2015) often lacked any meaningful punctuation or punctuation was used incorrectly in that there was often reduplication of certain symbols to create an emphatic impression. This was especially true of the SMS corpus, where conservative definitions of sentences do not necessarily apply

	Values (in Percent)
Accuracy	94
Error Rate	.05
Precision	1
Recall	69
F-Score	82

Table 7. Evaluation of Training Classification Criteria for Literacy

	Values (in Percent)
Accuracy	91
Error Rate	0.08
Precision	0.77
Recall	.31
F-Score	0,81

Table 8. Evaluation of Classification of Orality

	Values (in Percent)
Accuracy	94
Error Rate	0,05
Precision	1,0
Recall	0,88
F-Score	0,936
Cross Validation	78

Table 9. Naïve Bayes Evaluation

	Accuracy (in Percent)
eBay	100%
SMS	95%
Wikiconflit	94%

Table 10. Sentence tokenization evaluation

(Panckhurst et al., 2016). This includes, but is not limited to, beginning a sentence with capital letters or ending a sentence with punctuation such as a period, exclamation mark, or question mark (Bader, 2002; Rehm, 2002).

This resulted in sentences that were sometimes too long or too short, which skewed the results. Long sentences could not be parsed without syntactically and semantically analyzing the sentence. Due to this, some sentences were added together that should have been split by the author. The reverse, however, cannot necessarily be said. It was apparent from the data, such as eBay online postings, that bullet points, rather than sentences were the intent of the author (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019). Therefore, the decision was made to include bullet points as sentence markers as well. Dates and times were also seen as marking the end of sentences as many entries only contained such information (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019).

There was no explicit regex expression that split sentences containing only numbers but was rather a result of the way the authors formulated their sentences. With this information in mind, the accuracy as presented in table 10, is to be seen as indicator that the algorithm parses the sentences correctly, but not perfectly. The results can vary depending on the information given to the sentence parsing algorithm.

7.4. spaCy Module

The spaCy module was used for tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, syntactical dependencies, and assessing morphology (*French · SpaCy Models Documentation*, n.d.). Tokens included punctuation and non-letter symbols as

	Projected Accuracy	System Accuracy
Tokenization	100	100
POS	93	93%
Dependency	96	99%
Morphology	90	93%

Table 11. Spacy Accuracy

they were often essential in emoticons and reduplication. Therefore, no changes were made to the data to make it easier to be processed by spaCy as the linguistic nature of the data was to remain as unaltered as possible.

French · SpaCy Models Documentation (n.d.) states that tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, syntactical dependency tagging, and morphology tagging have an accuracy of 100% , 93%, 96% and 90% respectively. These values align with the actual values

obtained from a small data section of data from each development corpus set with a small deviation, the results of which can be seen in table 11.

The Wikiconflits and eBay data were easily processed by spaCy with minimal errors (Gerstenberg & Hewett, 2019; Poudat, Grabar, et al., 2015). This was due in part to the authors in the texts following orthographic norms and not using non-standard language excessively. A challenge posed to spaCy was that authors in the SMS chats often had incorrect spellings, made high use of emoticons or created new unknown abbreviations (Panckhurst et al., 2016). However, emoticons were classified as punctuation, rather than as emoticons, which caused spaCy to perform poorly compared to the other data sets, but the values were still within an acceptable range.

8. Results¹

8.1. Development phase

Using Wiki and SMS as training data, the data was labeled according to the classification sets mentioned in table 1 and table 2.

	Corpus ID	Sentences	Tokens	Documents	LIT	ORAL
Wiki	wikiconflits_0_53	345	6766	53	234	110
SMS	sms_0_29507	349	34454	150	129	218

Table 12. Development Results of the Classification Data

While creating the training data, the most relevant classification criteria were retrieved for Wikiconflits, table 13, and for SMS, table 14 respectively.

Feature	Classification Criteria
LIT	SEN_LEN
LIT	AVG_WORD_LEN
LIT	NP_VB_RATIO
ORAL	AVG_WORD_LENGTH
ORAL	MULTI_CHAR_REDUPPLICATION
ORAL	SEN_LEN

Table 13. Top Development Classification Criteria for Wikiconflits

Feature	Classification Criteria
LIT	SEN_LEN
LIT	NP_VB_RATIO
LIT	PRES_TENSE
ORAL	SEN_LEN
ORAL	ALL_CAPS
ORAL	AVG_WORD_LENGTH

Table 14. Top Development Classification Criteria for SMS

¹ The sentences that do not appear in the following results are not accounted for since they were classified as being unknown.

This means that it could not be determined if they were representative of literacy or orality

Sentence length, noun-to-verb-ratio, and average word length are decisive in determining the feature for the training data set for both corpora. After having acquired the training data using the classification set, it was entered into the naïve Bayes algorithm and trained on it. All four of the eBay sub-corpora were used as testing corpora. The results in table 15 show that all four of the eBay sub-corpora display a high rate of literacy with a low rate of orality.

	Corpus Id	Tokens	Sentences	Documents	LIT	ORAL
eBay	ebayfr-e05p_0_100	4929	380	100	361	8
eBay	ebayfr-e17p_0_100	6195	317	100	312	3
eBay	ebayfr-e17xp_0_100	21184	1028	100	995	32
eBay	ebayfr-e18v_0_100	9321	563	100	551	9

Table 15. *Naïve Bayes Development Results*

Even though all the corpora contained 100 documents, the number of sentences and tokens contained within vary significantly. Despite this, they are uniform in the way literacy and orality are distributed across the data.

8.2. Training phase

After the development phase and with only slight modification to the data and classification set, the model was then retrained using the same process on the second portion of the data without incorporating the results from the developmental phase. The modification included correcting errors in the code that would assign incorrect scores to the ratios.

The results of which mirror those of the development phase to a certain degree and can be seen in table 16. The Wikiconflits corpus again displays a high level of literacy while SMS displays a high level of orality. As during the development phase, the top classification criteria were retrieved from and can be seen in table 17 and table 18.

	Corpus Id	Tokens	Sentences	Documents	LIT	ORAL
Wiki	sms_29508_59014	8226	463	52	303	160
SMS	Wikiconflits_0_54_106	4138	458	255	140	317

Table 16. *Training Results of the Classification Data*

Feature	Classification Criteria
LIT	SEN_LEN
LIT	AVG_WORD_LEN
LIT	NP_VB_RATIO
ORAL	AVG_WORD_LENGTH
ORAL	MULTI_CHAR_REDUPPLICATION
ORAL	SEN_LEN

Table 17. Top Training Classification Criteria for Wikiconflits

Feature	Classification Criteria
LIT	NP_VB_RATIO
LIT	SEN_LEN
LIT	NOM_SUBJ
ORAL	SEN_LEN
ORAL	ALL_CAPS
ORAL	AVG_WORD_LENGTH

Table 18. Top Training Classification Criteria for SMS

These results do not differ from those of the development corpus. The process from the development phase was then repeated by retraining a new database with new training data created from the classification set as seen in table 1 and table 2. After that, the naïve Bayes was then tested again on the eBay corpus data.

	Corpus Id	Tokens	Sentences	Documents	LIT	ORAL
eBay	ebayfr-e05p_101_200	5225	315	100	283	32
eBay	ebayfr-e17p_101_200	6242	373	100	337	36
eBay	ebayfr-e17x_101_200	24477	1202	100	1112	89
eBay	ebayfr-e18v_0_100	9784	542	100	503	39

Table 19. Naïve Bayes Training Results

The results of the training phase, as seen in table 19, mirror those of the development phase as well. The sentences in the eBay corpora display a high level of literacy with a low level of orality.

8.3. Testing phase

	Corpus Id	Tokens	Sentences	Documents	LIT	ORAL
eBay	ebayfr-e05p_201_300	4063	249	100	229	20
eBay	ebayfr-e17p_201_300	4680	275	100	254	21
eBay	ebayfr-e17x_201_300	17155	922	100	830	922
eBay	ebayfr-e18v_201_300	9824	588	100	515	43
Wiki	wikiconflits_79_159	9172	487	53	441	46
SMS	sms_59015_88522	3523	342	250	293	49

Table 20. Naïve Bayes Testing Results

Using the training data created during the training phases as described in 8.2, the naïve Bayes was trained to assess the literacy and orality of each corpus. The results of which can be seen in table 20.

9. Discussion

9.1. Results of Classification Sets and Naïve Bayes

Various authors (Bader, 2002; Koch & Oesterreicher 1985; Ortmann & Dipper, 2019; Rehm 2002) proposed methods and ideas that are directly related to assessing literacy and orality. The use of naïve Bayes as a document classifier is also relatively common (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020), but has not been frequently applied to the aspects of conceptual communication.

An earnest attempt was made at ascertaining reliable French examples of literacy and orality. One of the most reliable and well-known sources of information regarding French philology comes from Müller (1975). This was initially set to be the source of much of the training data for the naïve Bayes. Müller (1975) offers readers prototypical texts of the respective French registers that can be graphed to respective discourse types. Despite this, it was the quantity, and not the quality of the texts, that proved to be a hindrance as Müller (1975) did not have enough training data for the naïve Bayes. Had more information been readily available by Müller (1975) or other similar sources, then less emphasis and time would have been placed on developing classification sets.

The classification sets relied heavily on naïve assumptions that often proved to be correct (see table 13, table 14, table 17, and table 18). More points were given to sentences that were longer, and fewer to sentences that were shorter. It was not uncommon for sentence length to be the decisive factor in determining literacy and orality. Sentences that were long tended to represent literacy as opposed to orality (see table 1). Upon manual inspection of the results, this turned out to be correct in most instances. However, sentence length was also highly dependent upon the user correctly using punctuation (Bader, 2002). If the author of the text incorrectly used punctuation, the sentence would be split prematurely and thus skewing the results.

The data between the development and the training phase was relatively consistent. The Wikiconflits corpus showed a high level of literacy as a lot of the discussions revolved around topics that were highly scientific and intellectual in nature (Poudat, Grabar, et

al., 2015). This entails high word length and high sentence length as seen in table 17. When orality did occur, then it was only in short bursts or small statements.

The SMS corpus during classification was highly representative of orality for various reasons. First, the authors of the documents were very familiar with one another, and this was reflected in the language used by them. Intimate conversations as specified in figure 3 are representative of orality and *nähesprache* as specified in figure 4. Furthermore, there were a high number of pronouns, nouns, proper nouns and redacted names².

Using the training data gathered using the classification set, the naïve Bayes was tested in multiple phases. It was initially only trained on the SMS and Wiki corpora, which were thought to represent orality and literacy respectively. Upon analyzing the eBay corpus, it was found to indeed have a high level of literacy, but a lower-than-expected level of orality (see table 15). This process was repeated in the training phase (see table 19) and produced the same level of results. The unexpected high literacy in eBay data can be attributed to buyers and sellers using an imbalanced combination of both. The postings had to be of a literal quality to attract buyers as literacy used in such business situations (Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985). That is to say that using it lends credence to the belief that one is being more serious and professional (Koch & Oesterreicher, 1985). However, some buyers did not want to exaggerate this and offset this discourse type by presenting part of their postings using orality. A blend of the two was thus inevitable.

In the final portion, training data that was created by the classification system (see table 16) was used on all corpora portions (see table 20). The naïve Bayes showed that all the texts had a high level of literacy. While this does line up with most of the corpora, there were some deviations. The biggest deviation in the testing results those of the SMS data which shows a high literacy and opposed to orality (see table 20). Another anomaly is that the ebay 17x eBay corpus as it shows literacy and orality equally (see table 20). Typical punctuation such as periods, exclamation marks, and question marks were used emphatically rather than syntactically. That is to say that they were more

² The names being redacted was part of the pre-processing done the respective institutions and was thus not part of this project.

often employed to express orality, rather than to mark the end of a sentence. Finally, many sentences lacked any coherent or predictable endings. This had the side-effect of the program classifying sentences as being literal when they were not, as long sentence length is a sign of literacy in the texts.

9.2. Classification Set vs. Naïve Bayes

The use of classification sets was essential as it provided more control and more speed with respect to building a necessary training data set. The naïve Bayes was then trained using this data and probabilistically assigned the literacy or orality to a given sentence. This approach provided objective criteria by which a training database could automatically be built and then given to a probabilistic classifier. The flaws of the naïve Bayes became evident as seen in table 20. The system had a heavy bias towards assigning literacy instead of orality. This bias does confirm the reality of Wikiconflits documents and eBay texts, but not with the SMS corpus.

There are a few reasons as to why this happened. The first and foremost being that the training corpus was small and somewhat imbalanced. While every precaution was taken to ensure that the corpus was as balanced as possible, e.g., not testing and training on the same documents, setting aside a portion of each corpus, using the same number of documents, it was not possible to create a perfectly balanced corpus, and this would have skewed the linguistic reality of the results.

The biggest advantage that a classification set has over the naïve Bayes is that the results do not become diluted as the training corpus grows. If the training corpus does not contain enough of a certain classification feature, then it logically follows that the naïve Bayes cannot assign a feature to a given document as the probabilities of doing so would be too low. To solve this imbalance, it might be worthwhile to employ a multinomial binary naïve Bayes, which places more emphasis on the presence or absence of a term as opposed to its frequency (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). The classification set does not suffer from this problem as it only considers what the qualities of the sentence are that it is being analyzed. Thus, it has nothing from which to remember probabilities from and can therefore not be influenced by imbalanced properties.

10. Conclusion

Using the spectral aspects of the discourse types, the French registers and their features were grouped accordingly. This information was applied to create a scoring system to classify sentences automatically and prototypically according to their conceptual discourse type. This was the training data for the naïve Bayes classifier, which assigned the most probable feature to documents from the eBay, Wikiconflits, and SMS corpora. The results of the preliminary classification results showed that literacy is prominent throughout the Wikiconflits and eBay corpus with orality being most prevalent in the SMS corpus. These results did not transfer over to the naïve Bayes classifier, which showed that there was a higher-than-expected bias towards literacy in the SMS corpus as opposed to orality.

Speakers in the Wikiconflits corpus limited themselves to expressing themselves literally. This was due in part to the precision of intellectual and scientific discourse as set forth by FC and FL. However, rebuttals and follow-up questions were often expressed in terms of orality. In the eBay corpus, literacy was fairly dominate, not due to the FT or FC, but rather employing a blend of FF and FC to sell their wares to potential customers. Orality was often used to give the potential buyer the feeling that they were being addressed by the author through the frequent use of capital letters and short descriptions.

While the texts of the authors in the other two corpora were often of a standard nature, the SMS corpus often lacked consistency with respect to orthographic conventions, e.g., improper use of punctuation, improper spelling, and neologisms. Therefore, determining literacy and orality within this corpus proved to be more than difficult than expected. Initial results showed that the SMS authors preferred orality over literacy with the naïve Bayes showing that there was preference for literacy.

The bias present in the naïve Bayes system shows that the conceptual is often much more difficult to define and determine than the medial representation of language due to the interplay between the two conceptual discourse types. The bias of the system could be resolved by either introducing a binary multinomial naïve Bayes, refining a non-probabilistic algorithm to recognize conceptual discourse or having native speakers build an appropriate training database.

11. References

- Bader, J. (2002). Schriftlichkeit und Mündlichkeit in der Chat-Kommunikation. *NETWORK*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.15488/2920>
- Beautiful Soup Documentation. (n.d.). *Beautiful Soup*. <https://www.crummy.com/software/BeautifulSoup/bs4/doc/>
- Bieswanger, M., & Becker, A. (2008). *Introduction to English linguistics* (2nd ed.). UTB.
- Carstensen, K.-U., Ebert, C., Ebert, C., Jekat, S., Klabunde, R., & Langer, H. (2010). *Computerlinguistik und Sprachtechnologie* (3rd ed.). Spektrum Akademischer Verlag.
- Gerstenberg, A., & Hewett, F. (2019). *A collection of online auction listings from 2005 to 2018* (anonymised) [Data set]. La-bank: Resources for Research and Teaching. <https://www.uni-potsdam.de/langage/la-bank/ebay.php>
- French · spaCy Models Documentation. (n.d.). *Spacy.io*. <https://spacy.io/models/fr>
- Goudailler, J.-P. (2002). De l'argot traditionnel au français contemporain des cités. *La linguistique*, 38(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.3917/ling.381.0005>
- Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2020). *Speech and language processing: An introduction to natural language processing, computational linguistics, and speech recognition* (3rd ed.). <https://stanford.io/3ACbkZ0>
- Koch, P., & Oesterreicher, W. (1985). Sprache der Nähe - Sprache der Distanz: Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch*, 36, 15–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15496/publikation-20410>
- Koch, P., & Oesterreicher, W. (2007). Schriftlichkeit und kommunikative Distanz. *Zeitschrift Für Germanistische Linguistik*, 35, 246–275. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15496/publikation-20391>
- Manning, C. D., & Schütze, H. (1999). *Foundations of statistical natural language processing*. The MIT Press
- Müller, B. (1975). *Das Französische der Gegenwart: Varietäten, Strukturen, Tendenzen*. Winter.
- Ng, H. T. (1997). Exemplar-based word sense disambiguation: Some recent improvements. *Second Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 208–213. <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W97-0323>

- Ortmann, K., & Dipper, S. (2019). Variation between different discourse types: Literate vs. oral. *Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on NLP For Similar Languages, Varieties and Dialects*, 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W19-1407>
- Ortmann, K., & Dipper, S. (2020). Automatic orality identification in historical texts. *Proceedings Of The 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, 1293–1302. <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.lrec-1.162>
- Panckhurst, R. (2016). A digital corpus resource of authentic anonymized French text messages: 88milSMS—What about transcoding and linguistic annotation? *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 21, 92–102. <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqw049>
- Panckhurst, R., Détrie, C., Lopez, C., Moïse, C., Roche, M., & Verine, B. (2016). *88milSMS. A corpus of authentic text messages in French (nouvelle version du corpus ISLRN : 024-713-187-947-8)* (Cmr-88milSMS-tei-v1) [Data set]. Banque de Corpus CoMeRe. <https://hdl.handle.net/11403/comere/cmr-88milSMS/cmr-88milSMS-tei-v1>
- Poudat, C., Grabar, N., Kun, J., & Paloque-Berges, C. (2015). *TEI-CMC version of wikipedia discussions associated to the article "Quotient intellectuel"* (Cmr-wikiconflits-qi_discu-tei-v1) [Data set]. CoMeRe Corpora Repository. https://hdl.handle.net/11403/comere/cmr-wikiconflits/cmr-wikiconflits-qi_discu-tei-v1
- Rehm, G. (2002). Schriftliche Mündlichkeit in der Sprache des World Wide Web. In A. Ziegler & C. Dürscheid (Eds.), *Kommunikationsform E-Mail* (pp. 263–308). Tübingen. <http://www.georg-rehm/pdf/Rehm-Muendlichkeit.pdf>
- Stein, A. (2014). *Einführung in die Französische Sprachwissenschaft* (4th ed.). J.B. Metzler.

Eigenständigkeitserklärung

I hereby declare that the work submitted is my own and that all passages and ideas that are not mine have been fully and properly acknowledged. I am aware that I will fail the entire course should I include passages and ideas from other sources and present them as if they were my own.

Hiermit versichere ich, dass ich die Arbeit selbständig angefertigt, außer den im Quellen- und Literaturverzeichnis sowie in den Anmerkungen genannten Hilfsmitteln keine weiteren benutzt und alle Stellen der Arbeit, die anderen Werken dem Wortlaut oder dem Sinn nach entnommen sind, unter Angabe der Quellen als Entlehnung kenntlich gemacht habe.

Ort/Place, Date/Datum

Name

Kamen, 14.08.2021

Christopher Michael Chandler