

Ambiguity

Austin Hester
CS 5300 – NLP Presentation
April 4, 2024



What is Ambiguity?

- An **ambiguity** – a failure of the speaker to clarify their intended meaning from alternative interpretations.
 - The speaker's intended meaning of an utterance is unclear to the listener who is consciously aware of an ambiguity.
 - Almost every sentence is ambiguous in some way.
- **Lexical** ambiguity – a word has multiple definitions.
- **Syntactic** ambiguity – a phrase has multiple grammatical parses.
- **Semantic** ambiguity – a phrase has multiple meanings.
 - Naturally follows lexical and syntactic ambiguities.



BERT Shows Garden Path Effects

Tovah Irwin, Kyra Wilson, Alec Marantz.

Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 3220–3232, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2023.



Problem

Garden path sentence – a sentence which misleads with ambiguity at first until a syntactic inconsistency forces the reader to reconsider their interpretation. *Temporal ambiguity.*

The horse raced past the barn fell.

While I was surfing the internet went down.

The boat floated down the river sank.



Motivation

- Ambiguity is unavoidable in natural language.
- Garden path sentences provide insight into the processing of ambiguous structures.
 - Their self-correcting structures provide lessons on sentence parsing.
- Humans have difficulty parsing these sentences, so the researchers wanted to know if transformer models, such as BERT, also face the same challenge.



Q&A Implementation

- Comparison of role assignments between humans and four BERT-style models in a question answering task.
 - Standard and garden path sentences included.

	<i>Agent matrix - Who said thanks?</i>
	<i>Patient matrix - Who was thanked?</i>
	<i>Ambiguous argument - Who got a gift card?</i>
<i>Garden Path (GP)</i>	<div>The babysitter (who was) purchased a gift card thanked the parents.</div>
<i>Local Coherence (LC)</i>	<div>The parents thanked the babysitter (who was) purchased a gift card.</div>

Figure 1: Example questions and answers targeting correct entity identification.

	<i>Matrix action - What did the babysitter/parents do?</i>
	<i>Embedded action - What did the babysitter get?</i>
<i>Garden Path (GP)</i>	<div>The babysitter (who was) purchased a gift card thanked the parents.</div>
<i>Local Coherence (LC)</i>	<div>The parents thanked the babysitter (who was) purchased a gift card.</div>

Figure 2: Example questions and answers targeting correct action identification.



Q&A Results

- Humans and BERT models both show a **decline** in performance when faced with a question containing a “garden path”.
- Humans perform better at semantically connecting words further away from each other.
- Humans often guess when they don’t know; models restate the question.



Probe Implementation

- An internal probe uncovers the underlying semantic representations assigned by BERT for each question.
- This probe gives the researchers insight into the representations held at each hidden layer of the models' neural networks.



Probe Results

- The probe **confirms** that garden path sentences cause semantic confusion in BERT-style models.
- The different models assigned different representations for the same sentences, despite being fine-tuned with the same training data.
 - This shows that garden path sentences are inherently hard to parse regardless of language model.



Solution Quality

- **Sample Size**

- Fair at 4 models, <100 humans, and 100s of questions.

- **Study Design**

- Compares Q&A performance between humans and BERT-style models.
- Analyzes the semantic representations of the Qs as deciphered by the mode

- **Effect Size**

- Humans 14.9% better at locally coherent sentences.
- Models between 8.8% to 20.5% (average 15.5%) better at locally coherent sentences.
- No effect emerges.



Solution Quality

- **Data Analysis Methods**

- Only the highest-performing layer from each model used for analysis in the probe task, which adds some bias.

- **Consistency of Results**

- Consistent:
 - Demonstrating difficulty in parsing garden path sentences.
 - Inconsistent:
 - Internal semantic representations between BERT-style models.
 - Performance on certain types of questions between humans and models.
 - The layers at which each model performed their best.

- **Researchers' Interpretation**

- No significant statistical results found.
 - Similarity in performance between all subjects surprising.



Thank you!

Austin Hester

