Typological Feature Prediction with Matrix Completion



Annebeth Buis anne.buis@colorado.edu

Mans Hulden mans.hulden@colorado.edu

MOTIVATION

• Typological features are informative to many cross-lingual tasks in NLP. Unfortunately typological data is often sparse or incomplete and generating it is costly. For example, in the World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS) the value of 80% of language-feature combinations is undefined.

WALS AND PREPROCESSING

• WALS (World Atlas of Language Structures, Dryer and Haspelmath) contains 144 features for 2,679 languages.

	Accuracy	Method
Georgi et al. (2010)	65.5%	Language clustering
Takamura et al. (2016)	75.5%	Logistic regression
without language family	73.0%	Logistic regression
Murawaki (2017)	74.5%	Bayesian model
Baseline 1	53.1%	Majority class
Baseline 2	65.7%	Logistic regression
Matrix completion	74.3%	IterativeSVD
without domain	61.6%	IterativeSVD

RESULTS

- WALS contains features in 11 domains: phonology, sign languages, morphology, nominal categories, nominal syntax, verbal categories, word order, simple clauses, complex sentences, lexicon and other. Meta-features (e.g., isocodes, language family, genus, etc.) were not included in the experiments.
- The original WALS matrix contains categorical feature values, which were binarized before running matrix completion. We excluded 214 languages for which only 1 feature value has been recorded in WALS.
- No additional preprocessing or excluded features.

MATRIX COMPLETION

- Matrix completion methods have been used extensively with **sparse** matrices and are able to learn more holistic patterns in the data than individual local predictors (such as our logistic regression) baseline).
- IterativeSVD (based on Troyanskaya et al., 2001) learns a low-rank approximation of the original matrix by using Singular Value Decomposition (SVD).

71.2%without language family IterativeSVD



EXPERIMENTS

- Leave-one-out-cross-validation to predict each language \times feature-combination that is currently in WALS.
- Results are compared against a majority class baseline and a logistic regression classifier.
- To test for robustness, 2 additional experiments:
 - 1. Leaving out features in the same domain (e.g., Phonology, Morphology, etc.)
 - 2. Leaving out languages with the same language family (e.g., Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic, etc.)

References

- Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath, editors. WALS Online. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Ryan Georgi, Fei Xia, and William Lewis. 2010. Comparing language similarity across genetic and typologically-based groupings. In Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics, pages 385–393.



- Prediction accuracy per language does not improve with more examples.
- Feature accuracy improves when more examples are available.

CONCLUSION

- Matrix completion outperforms the baselines on the WALS data and performs on par with previous work. Matrix completion requires minimal preprocessing and can easily be used with any typological database.

Yugo Murawaki. 2017. Diachrony-aware induction of binary latent representations from typological features. In Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, Taipei, Taiwan. Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing.

Hiroya Takamura, Ryo Nagata, and Yoshifumi Kawasaki. 2016. Discriminative analysis of linguistic features for typological study. In Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2016), pages 69–76.

Olga Troyanskaya, Michael Cantor, Gavin Sherlock, Pat Brown, Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, David Botstein, and Russ B Altman. 2001. Missing value estimation methods for DNA microarrays. *Bioinformatics*, 17(6):520–525.

• Our work has shown that treating WALS as a matrix is an effective approach. This should be further explored in future work.

Data and code are available at: github.com/annebeth/wals-matrix-completion.