HW 1 Due Nov. 13 Points 10

1. A student in NLP1 would like to build a simple *spelling corrector* to solve the problem of *their* vs. *there* in English. The model would take as input sentences like

3 Points

He saw their cat on the street.

He saw their was a cat on the street.

and for each instance of *there* or *their*, predict whether the true spelling should be *there* or *their*. So, the model should predict *their* for sentence 1 above, and *there* for sentence 2 above. For the second example the model would correct the spelling mistake in the sentence.

The student decides to use a language model for the task. Given a language model $p(w_1...w_n)$, s/he returns the spelling that gives the highest probability under the language model. So for example for the second sentence s/he implements the rule:

If p(He saw their was a cat on the street) > p(He saw there was a cat on the street)

Then Return their

Else Return there

- (a) The first language model the student tries is a uni-gram model. Assume that the student uses MLE (i.e. $p(w_i) = count(w_i)/N$, where $count(w_i)$ is the number of times a word occurs in a corpus and N is the total number of words in the corpus. Also assume that for every word v in the vocabulary, count(v) > 0). Write the general equation for sentence probability under the unigram model, i.e. $p(w_1 \dots w_n)$ Does this seem like a good solution to the *their* vs. *there* problem? Justify your answer.
- (b) Next, the student tries a bi-gram language model. Write the general equation for sentence probability under the bi-gram model. Why might this model be better than the model in the previous question?
- 2. Suppose we build a language model that makes use of the second order Markov assumption (a *trigram* language model), that is

$$P(w_1, w_2 \dots w_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} P(w_i | w_{i-2}, w_{i-1})$$

Give three examples of different constructions in English where this independence assumption is clearly violated.

3 Points

3. Suppose we want to train an HMM tagger for the task of Named Entity Recognition (NER). We are interested in only two kinds of named entities: persons (PER) and organizations (ORG), which include corporate and political entities. We have the following training data ¹

¹Slightly modified entry for Barack Obama from Wikipedia

Barack/PER Hussein/PER Obama/PER II/PER (born August 4 , 1961) is an American politician who is the 44th President of the United/ORG States/ORG .

He is the first African American to hold the office and the first president born outside the continental $United/ORG\ States/ORG$.

Born in Honolulu , Hawaii , Obama/PER is a graduate of Columbia/ORG University/ORG and Harvard/ORG Law/ORG School/ORG , where he was president of the Harvard/ORG Law/ORG Review/ORG .

Obama/PER was a community organizer in Chicago before earning his law degree . He worked as a civil rights attorney and taught constitutional law at the University/ORG of Chicago/ORG Law/ORG School/ORG between 1992 and 2004 .

In this data we show only the tags for the words belonging to the person and organization categories. Assume all other words (including punctuation) have the tag OTH, which is not shown.

4 Points

- (a) Give the transition probability matrix estimated from this training data using maximum-likelihood estimation. Don't forget to include beginning and end of sentence markers.
- (b) Using add-one smoothing, what are the estimates for P(Obama|PER) and P(Obama|ORG)?
- (c) Suppose we used four tags for this task: the three already mentioned, plus a LOC tag for locations. In a general text, will context always be able to disambiguate between the LOC and ORG tags?
- (d) Can you think of any sources of information that might help an automatic NER system perform better, but which are *not* used by an HMM tagger? Back up your answer with examples from the text here, or give examples that could occur in another text ².

²one question in this assignment adapted from M. Collins