

MAP Lexicon is Useful for Segmentation and Word Discovery in Child Directed Speech

Anand Raman
Computer Science Department
Massey University
Palmerston North
New Zealand
mailto:A.Raman@massey.ac.nz

Abstract

An efficient algorithm for segmenting child-directed speech into words has recently been proposed in the Machine Learning journal. This short technical note proposes some modifications to this algorithm. In particular, a slightly more conservative variation of the original approach is proposed that infers word boundaries based simply on the maximum a-posteriori lexicon. Results of empirical tests illustrating the value of the proposed modifications are also presented.

Keywords: Information theory, Speech segmentation, MDL

Running head: Word Discovery Using the *MAP* Lexicon

1 Introduction

A probabilistic model for segmenting child directed speech into words has recently been proposed in Brent (1999). While the model is valuable in developing a procedure by which to discover lost word boundaries in fluent child directed speech, it makes some complexity introducing assumptions that require the use of approximations in the process of evaluating alternative segmentations. One of these assumptions is that the entire corpus of observed speech is a single event in probability space. There is at present not much evidence in developmental studies suggesting that this is the way in which children segment utterances and learn new words. Indeed, it seems reasonable to suppose that a child will use the entire arsenal of resources at its disposal to try and make sense of each individual utterance directed at it and immediately make available any knowledge gleaned from this process for the next segmentation task. This paper proposes some modifications to the approach in Brent (1999) that make it more conservative by steering clear of this assumption. We show that it results in a simpler model that is still able to utilise Brent’s algorithm to good effect, producing competitive results. Specifically, we suspect that the dominant factor responsible for the superior performance of Brent’s Model Based Dynamic Programming (MBDP) approach over other algorithms is the ability to pick a segmentation that maximises the posterior probability of the lexicon. If we are able to isolate this factor, then further studies can devote greater attention and focus on the critically important and useful issues in Brent (1999) instead of getting lost in a maze of other, possibly irrelevant, mathematical details. This paper thus at-

tempts to make a hypothesis that it is the lexicon that is primarily responsible for helping to infer correct word boundaries. We attempt to substantiate this claim with empirical tests by comparing the performance of an algorithm that assumes this against MBDP.

2 Description of the present model

For the convenience of the reader, we restate the problem at hand here: Let a word be considered to consist of a sequence of phonemes followed by some trailing word delimiter and an utterance be considered to consist of a sequence of words with all word delimiters removed, but with an utterance delimiter inserted at the end of the utterance. Segmentation consists of the process of rediscovering the places from which these word delimiters were removed and reinserting them. Given such an utterance U which can be segmented into a number of possible word sequences, some probable and some very improbable, we seek to identify the most probable word sequence $\hat{W}$ among them. To this end, we hypothesise that there exists a lexicon L that guides the choice of word-boundary replacements within U and that $\hat{W}$ is that W which maximises *a posteriori* the probability of L , i.e. we seek that word sequence W which maximises the posterior probability $P(L|W)$. By Bayes rule, this posterior probability of the lexicon L , in light of a word sequence W is given by

$$P(L|W) = kP(W|L) \cdot P(L)$$

where k is some constant accounting for the average probability of all possible word sequences and $P(L)$ is the prior probability of the lexicon. Since we seek $\hat{W}$, the W that maximises this quantity,

$$\hat{W} = \arg \max_W P(W|L) \cdot P(L)$$

or equivalently,

$$\hat{W} = \arg \min_W -\log_2 P(W|L) - \log_2 P(L)$$

Furthermore, we assume that each utterance is segmented dynamically as it is presented and that L is invariant during the process of choosing a segmentation for the current utterance. However, after a segmentation is committed to, we assume the inferred words in the segmentation are immediately used to update L in preparation to segment the next presented utterance, i.e. $P(L)$ is invariant across the range of possible segmentations of U and so it bears no discriminative value for us. Hence,

$$\hat{W} = \arg \min_W -\log_2 P(W|L)$$

Now assume that L assigns a prior probability $P(w_i)$ to each word. If $W = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n$, the probability, then, of picking the word sequence W from L is the probability of picking just the words w_i from L in the right sequence. However, there is a hidden given in this process, which is the acoustic evidence present in

U . This precludes all possible word orders except the ones implied by W . Thus $P(W|L)$ is just the product of the prior probabilities assigned to each w_i in W by L . That is,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{W} &= \arg \min_W -\log_2 \prod_{i=1}^n P(w_i|L) \\ &= \arg \min_W -\sum_{i=1}^n \log_2 P(w_i|L)\end{aligned}$$

Two points are worth noting about the above expression. Firstly, although it looks conspicuously similar to one that computes a maximum likelihood hypothesis for the lexicon by assuming a uniform prior over all possible lexicons, we carefully distinguish it from a ML hypothesis because the question of multiple prior lexicons does not arise. There is simply only one lexicon which decides a number of possible segmentations. This lexicon is the MAP lexicon from the previous segmentation and it may in fact not have the same probability as another possible lexicon which could have been a different prior hypothesis. Secondly, the expression also looks suspiciously similar to one that computes a naive Bayes classification of the segmentation by assuming that the words in a word sequence are conditionally independent of each other given the lexicon. Again, we seek to clarify that this is not the case, since we posit a hidden given, namely the acoustic evidence, which in fact precludes all possible word orderings except the one actually seen. This is the same as the approach taken in Brent (1999) where the intractable sum for the probability of $\overline{w}_m$ on page 79 is reduced to a more tractable one on page 80 by making exactly this assumption.

The above quantity can now easily be computed in Brent’s Dynamic Programming algorithm and consequently, that segmentation which maximises *a posteriori* the lexicon’s probability can be chosen.

3 The zero-frequency problem

There is one more issue that remains to be addressed before our hypothesis can be tested. It is that of computing $P(w_i|L)$ for novel words. For this, suppose for the moment that the prior probability of each w_i is estimated from its relative frequency in L . However, it becomes quickly evident that this assigns zero probability to any segmentation that contains a w_i as yet unrepresented in L . Several approaches have been proposed to address the general problem of estimating probabilities for unseen events. Recently, for instance, Dagan, Lee, and Pereira (1999) uses a similarity based model for estimating bigram probabilities. In a similar vein, we could have estimated the probability of previously unseen words from probabilities of similar words in similar contexts. However, it is difficult to do this in the relatively sparser vocabulary of child-directed speech. So we instead resort to simply using versions of the Katz back-off model (Katz, 1987). We attempt three alternative discounting schemes. Two of them are Methods A and C suggested and evaluated by Witten and Bell (1991). The third is a variation of these. In all three approaches, the aim is to reserve a portion of the probability space for previously unseen words, which we call *escape space*. When a novel word is encountered, its probability is the

proportion of this escape space determined by the probability of the novel word computed from a distribution over just novel words. In terms of adaptive text compression or coding theory, one could imagine encoding a novel word by first encoding an *escape* code and then encoding the novel word by means of some other prearranged alternate means. The difference between various schemes that utilise this technique is really in how much of the original probability space is reserved for the novel word, i.e. what the probability that an observed word is unfamiliar is.

The distribution we pick for novel words is one in which the probability of a word is given by the product of the probabilities of its individual phonemes in sequence followed by some sentinel phoneme. Note that the zero-frequency problem cannot recur here since the alphabet of phonemes is finite and known beforehand. So we can start off by assigning an equal and non-zero probability to each phoneme in the alphabet.

In Method A of Witten and Bell (1991), the probability of a novel word is $1/(n + 1)$ where n is the total number of words seen so far. In our context, this essentially says that the lexicon is one word larger than it actually is and that this word is the nominal representative of all novel words. Thus if c_i is the frequency in L of a familiar word w_i (i.e. $c_i \neq 0$) its prior probability is $c_i/(n + 1)$. The prior probability of a novel word w , likewise, is

$$\frac{\prod_{j=1}^k R(w[j])}{n + 1}$$

where k is the length of w including the trailing sentinel phoneme, and $R(w[i])$ refers to the relative frequency of the i th phoneme of word w computed from the total frequencies of phonemes (including the sentinel phoneme) in the alphabet as reflected in the lexicon. This, of course, requires us to maintain a table of phonemes for each of which we also maintain a count of the number of times it is seen in L .

In Method C of Witten and Bell (1991), which is a more principled variation of A, novelty is seen as an event in its own right. Thus it is assigned a probability of not just $1/(n+1)$, but rather $r/(n+r)$ where r is the total number of times a novel word has been seen in the past, which in our case happily happens to be just the size of the lexicon (Each word in the lexicon must have been a novel word when it was first introduced). Thus the probability of a familiar word w_i under Method C is $c_i/(n+r)$ and that of a novel word w ,

$$\frac{r \prod_{j=1}^k R(w[j])}{n+r}$$

In the third method, which we call Method E (E standing for equiprobable), the hypothesis assumes that novel and familiar words are always equiprobable. Then each is assigned half the total probability space. Thus, the probability of a familiar word w_i is $c_i/2n$ and that of a novel word w is

$$\frac{\prod_{j=1}^k R(w[j])}{2n}$$

4 Method

A simple program implementing the above strategy was written and its performance was compared with that of Brent’s algorithm on the same data corpus. This consists of orthographic transcripts made by Bernstein-Ratner (1987) from the CHILDES collection (MacWhinney & Snow, 1985). The speakers in this study were nine mothers speaking freely to their children, whose ages averaged 18 months (range 13–21). Brent also transcribed the corpus phonemically ensuring that the number of subjective judgments in the pronunciation of words was minimised by transcribing every occurrence of the same word identically. For example, “look,” “drink” and “doggie” were always transcribed “lUk,” “drINK” and “dOgi” regardless of where in the utterance they occurred and which mother uttered them in what way. The corpus consists of a total of 9790 such utterances and 33397 characters including one space between each pair of words and one newline after each utterance.

Because of the very specific nature of the modifications proposed in this paper, it was found possible to even use Brent’s Dynamic Programming algorithm directly. For the benefit of the reader, this algorithm is presented in recursive form in Figure 1. An iterative version (the one actually implemented) is also shown in Figure 3. One can easily see that the running time of this algorithm is $O(mn^2)$ in the total number of utterances (m) and the length of each utterance (n) assuming an efficient implementation of a hash table allowing nearly constant lookup time is available. Since individual utterances typically tend to be small, especially in child-directed speech, the algorithm practically ap-

proximates to a linear time procedure. When implementations of the model described herein and the MBDP approach in Brent (1999) were timed on a 300 MHz Pentium computer running Linux 2.0.2 on the same 9790 utterance corpus, our program completed in 7.51 seconds, whereas MBDP took 54.67 seconds.

4.0.1 Algorithm: scoreUtterance

```

BEGIN
  Input (by ref) utterance u[0..n] where u[i] are the characters in it.

  bestSegpoint := n;
  bestScore := scoreWord(u[0..n]);
  for i from 0 to n-1; do
    subUtterance := copy(u[0..i]);
    word := copy(u[i+1..n]);
    score := scoreUtterance(subUtterance) + scoreWord(word);
    if (score < bestScore); then
      bestScore = score;
      bestSegpoint := i;
    fi
  done
  insertWordBoundary(u, bestSegpoint)
  return bestScore;
END

```

Figure 1: Recursive optimisation algorithm to find the best segmentation.

4.1 Scoring

To score the output of the algorithm, we again employed a procedure identical to the one in Brent (1999). Three scores are reported — precision, recall and lexicon precision. Precision is defined as the proportion of predicted words that are actually correct. Recall is defined to be the proportion of correct words that were predicted. Lexicon precision is defined to be the proportion of words in the predicted lexicon that are correct. In addition to these, the number of correct

4.0.2 Function: scoreWord

```
BEGIN
  Input (by reference) word w[0..k] where w[i] are the characters in it.

  score = 0;
  if lexicon.frequency(word) == 0; then {
    score = -log(lexicon.relativeFrequency(Escape));
    for each w[i]; do
      score -= log(phonemes.relativeFrequency(w[i]));
    done
  } else {
    score = -log(lexicon.relativeFrequency(w));
  }
  return score;
END
```

Figure 2: Function to compute MML of an input word.

and incorrect words in the predicted lexicon were also computed and printed, but they are not graphed here.

Precision and recall scores were computed incrementally and cumulatively within scoring blocks each of which consisted of 500 consecutive utterances. These scores are computed only for the utterances within each block scored and thus they represent the performance of the algorithm only on the block scored, occurring in the exact context among the other scoring blocks. Lexicon scores carried over blocks cumulatively.

5 Results, Discussion and Conclusion

The tests seem to support our hypothesis that the lexicon is indeed the dominant factor in determining word segmentations and that other factors are at best likely to distract the investigator from the more important and valuable aspects

4.0.3 Algorithm: scoreUtterance

```
BEGIN
  Input (by ref) utterance u[0..n] where u[i] are the phonemes in it.
  Array scoreUtterance[0..n];
  Array previousBoundary[0..n];

  for i from 0 to i-1; do
    scoreUtterance[i] := scoreWord(u[0..i]);
    prevBoundary[i] := -1;
    for j from 0 to i; do
      score := scoreUtterance[j] + scoreWord(u[j+1..i]);
      if (score < scoreUtterance[i]); then
        scoreUtterance[i] := score;
        prevBoundary[i] := j;
      fi
    done
  done
  for i from n to 1; do
    insertWordBoundary(u,prevBoundary[i]);
    i := prevBoundary[i];
  done
  return scoreUtterance[n];
END
```

Figure 3: Iterative version of Algorithm in Figure 1.

of MBDP. Further, it appears very likely that no significant advantage is gained by making the implausible assumption that the entire corpus of observed data be treated as a single event in probability space. Assuming that the lexicon is invariant during the process of discovering the best segmentation for a current utterance eschews considerable complexity, while at the same time not sacrificing any positive aspects of the performance. Indeed, as evidenced by the graphs in Figures 4–7, the simplified model performs mostly better than MBDP. The plots represent the performance of the various modified MBDP algorithms against the original MBDP algorithm. MAP-C represents our variation of MBDP that uses Method C to address the zero-frequency problem. Likewise for MAP-E. MBDP

represents Brent’s original Model Based Dynamic Programming algorithm.




Figure 4: Segmentation Precision

We thus believe we have identified a useful variation of MBDP that is now capable of performing as well or better while considering a much narrower range of parameters in deciding on the best segmentation of a presented utterance. Although we refrain from speculation at this stage, we have no doubt that it will not be too difficult to come up with a plausible cognitive developmental model that is also consistent with the model of speech segmentation proposed in this paper.




Figure 5: Segmentation Recall

References

- Bernstein-Ratner, N. (1987). The phonology of parent child speech. In Nelson, K., & van Kleeck, A. (Eds.), *Children's Language*, Vol. 6. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Brent, M. R. (1999). An efficient probabilistically sound algorithm for segmentation and word discovery. *Machine Learning*, 34, 71–105.
- Dagan, I., Lee, L., & Pereira, F. C. N. (1999). Similarity-based models of word co-occurrence probabilities. *Machine Learning*, 34, 44–70.
- Katz, S. M. (1987). Estimation of probabilities from sparse data for the language




Figure 6: Lexicon precision

model component of a speech recognizer. *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ASSP-35*(3), 400–401.

MacWhinney, B., & Snow, C. (1985). The child language data exchange system. *Journal of Child Language*, 12, 271–296.

Witten, I. H., & Bell, T. C. (1991). The zero-frequency problem: Estimating the probabilities of novel events in adaptive text compression. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 37(4), 1085–1091.




Figure 7: Run Time