

How Would You Say It? Eliciting Lexically Diverse Data For Supervised Semantic Parsing



Abhilasha Ravichander, Thomas Manzini, Matthias Grabmair, Graham Neubig Jonathan Francis, Eric Nyberg

Language Technologies Institute, Carnegie Mellon University

Motivation -

Building dialogue interfaces for real-world scenarios often entails training semantic parsers starting from zero examples.

How do we build datasets that capture the variety of ways in which users phrase their queries?

Introduction

- Orienting a dialogue-capable intelligent system is accomplished by training its semantic parser with utterances that capture the nuances of the domain.
- Previous work[1] proposes a methodology that generates example natural language utterances for logical forms, which are then paraphrased by crowdworkers.
- Three main limitations:
 - Seed utterances may induce bias towards the language of the canonical utterance, specifically with regards to lexical choice.
 - Generic grammar suggested cannot be used to generate all the queries we may want to support in a new domain.
 - No check on the correctness or naturalness of the canonical utterances themselves, which may not be logically plausible.

Lexicon		Manua	
FOOD[bread]	→		
TOOD[STCGG]	,		
FRIDGE[refrigerator]	\rightarrow		
FOOD_STATE[expired state]	\rightarrow	expired state	
FOOD_STATE[count]	\rightarrow	count	
Grammar		Manua	
FRIDGE[x]	→ FRDG_NP["x"]		
FOOD[x]	→ FD_NP["x"]		
FD_NP[x] in the FRDG_NP[l]	→ FD_SING[(None,l,x,"getFood")]		
what is the FOOD_STATE[r] of the FD_SING[x] Q[x]	→ Q[(None,None,x,"checkState-"+"r")] → ROOT[x]		
Canonical & Logical Forms		Automat	
what is the expired state of the in t	he 🖟	?	
→ ROOT["(None, 'refrigerator', 'bread', 'g	_		
Crowdsourced Paraphrases		Crowdsource	
ROOT["(None, 'refrigerator', 'bread', 'getFo	od>c	heckState-expired state')"]	
"is the bread in the refrigerator mold	y?"		
"did the bread go bad?"			
"is the bread in the refrigerator expir	ed ye	t?"	
"is the bread in the fridge bad?"			

Results and Discussion

Representation	Vocab Size	TTR	Lexical Overlap
Text (Wang et al., 2015)	291	.044	5.50
Text-Image (ours)	438	.066	4.79

Table 1. Comparison of data creation methodology of [1] and this work.

Dataset	NL Types	MR Types	NL/ MR Ratio
GEO	283	148	1.91
ATIS	934	489	1.91
JOBS	387	226	1.71
OVERNIGHT	1422	199	7.14
SMARTHOME (Ours)	1356	83	16.33

Table 2. Number of word types in the language compared to the logical form. Larger ratio indicates more lexical diversity for the same complexity of the logical form.

System	SMARTHOME	OVERNIGHT	GEO	
Jaccard	18.0%	24.82%	40.7%	
Neural	30.3%	41.91%	60.2%	
Reranker	30.370	41.91 //	00.270	
Seq2Seq[2]	42.1%	75.8%	85.0%	

Table 3. Test accuracy results of different systems on the SMARTHOME dataset as compared to OVERNIGHT and GEO

Most errors stem due to the following types of queries in SMARTHOME, which are not present in OVERNIGHT or GEO:

Singular and plural forms (eg. radio/radios)

Each logical form shown to 5 Turkers for paraphrasing.

8294 unique paraphrases collected over 948 logical forms.

Each Turker asked to enter a total of 60 paraphrases.

- Unseen semantically equivalent phrases (eg. Does Bob not have energy should be mapped to the logical form for Is Bob tired).
- Indirect phrases (eg. Do i need to change the lights in the living room not mapping to the logical form for living room lights not working correctly).
- Complementary Terms (on/off).

Conclusion

- A mixture of text and images elicits more lexically diverse paraphrases from crowdworkers with limited loss of correctness.
- SMARTHOME dataset for semantic parsing.
- Domain, cardinality and complementary formulations also contribute to difficulty.

References

Acknowledgements

This research is supported by Robert Bosch LLC as part of a joint project with CMU on the development of a contextaware, dialog-capable personal assistant.



2) Jia, Robin, and Percy Liang. "Data recombination for neural semantic parsing.", ACL 2016. 3) Jekaterina Novikova, Oliver Lemon, and Verena Rieser. Crowd-sourcing nlg data: Pictures elicit better

data. In Proceedings of the 9th International Natural Language Generation conference, 2016.