

# The Illinois-Columbia System in the CoNLL-2014 Shared Task on Grammatical Error Correction

Alla Rozovskaya, Kai-Wei Chang, Mark Sammons, Dan Roth, Nizar Habash

## The CoNLL-2014 Shared Task

Nowadays **\*phone**/phones **\*has**/have many functionalities, including **\*ø/a** camera and a Wi-Fi receiver.

- Extends last year's shared task
- CoNLL-2013 competition – **five error types** (account for about 50% of errors in the CoNLL data)
- CoNLL-2014 evaluates with respect to all errors (28 error types)
- *Our system ranked first on after-revisions data and second on before-revisions data*

## System Design and Goals

- Build a **robust** system that can make use of
- Cheap linguistic resources  
*E.g. native English data*
  - Available knowledge of the error patterns of specific language learners  
*Annotated learner data (training data of the shared task)*
  - Machine-learning methods
  - Inexpensive but reliable linguistic knowledge

## Adaptation (Overview)

- Learner errors are systematic
- *Adaptation* refers to developing models that utilize knowledge about typical mistakes
- Different notions of adaptation:
  - Priors method for NB (ACL'11)
  - Artificial errors for AP (NAACL'10)
  - Error inflation (BEA'12)

## The Illinois-Columbia System

- Based on the Illinois system that ranked first in the CoNLL-2013 shared task
  - Extends the Illinois system in several respects:
    - Targets additional error types
    - Model combination
    - Joint inference to eliminate inconsistent predictions
- Implements ideas proposed in our prior work in this area:
- Adaptation**, i.e. developing models that are aware of error patterns, using scarce annotation): NAACL'10, ACL'11
  - Algorithmic perspective**: ACL'11
  - Linguistically-inspired approach** to correcting open-class errors: EACL'14
  - Joint inference**: EMNLP'13

## The Illinois System

- Pre-processing: POS tagging and shallow parsing using the *Illinois POS tagger and chunker*

| Error     | Training data | Learn. algorithm | Adaptation                         | Ling. knowledge                                     |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Article   | Learner       | AP               | Error inflation (NAACL'10, BEA'12) | Features  |
| Prep.     | Native        | NB               | Priors method (ACL'11)             | -   |
| Noun      | Native        | NB               | -                                  | Candidate generation                                |
| Verb agr. | Native        | NB               | -                                  | Candidate generation, separate processing (EACL'14) |
| Verb form |               |                  |                                    |   |

## Novel Features in the Illinois-Columbia System

- Expanded set of errors
  - Word form errors
  - Mec (punc. and cap.)
  - Style
- Model combination
- Joint inference

## Performance of the Illinois-Columbia System on the Development Data

| Model                                 | F0.5                 |        |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| <i>The (baseline) Illinois system</i> | 33.17                |        |
| +Model combination                    | 34.92-               |        |
| +Additional errors                    | Word form            | 36.07* |
|                                       | Mec (punc. and cap.) | 36.52* |
|                                       | Style                | 37.09- |
| +Joint inference                      | <b>37.13-</b>        |        |

Modules marked with a "\*" helped on the test data, while those marked with a "-" hurt the performance

## New Errors: Word Form

Surveillance technology serves as a warning to the **\*murders**/murderers.

- Candidates**: which words should be corrected?
  - Confusion sets**: what are the possible alternatives for a given word?
  - Learning**: NB with adaptation trained on native data
- See paper for details on other error types

## Model Combination

- The Illinois system (2013) trains error-specific components on either learner or native data
- This year, we use model combination:
  - An AP classifier with rich features trained on learner data
  - A NB classifier with word n-gram features trained on native data

## Joint Inference

*Inconsistent predictions:*

They believe that **such situation** must be avoided.

*such situation → such a situations*

Following Rozovskaya&Roth'13, we use **joint inference** implemented on top of individually-learned models using the ILP formulation (Roth&Yih'04)