

Department of Linguistics Franklin College of Arts and Sciences UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Quantifying Discourse Support for Omitted Pronouns

Shulin Zhang, Jixing Li, John Hale

CRAC 2022



(1)	这 zhe This <i>"This</i> i	是 shi is is the b	我 wo I est port	给 gei for trait I d	他 ta he drew for I	后来 houlai later him late	画 i hu dra r on."	a aw	出来 chulai out		最 zu be	好 ihao est		的 de DE	— 幅 yi fu one	画像。 huaxia drawin	ng g	
(2)	[我] wo [I] "Wher	六 liu Six n I was	岁 sui year six, gro	时, shi old own-up	大人们 daren growr os made	ר] וmen ו-ups <i>me lose</i>	使 shi make coura	我 wo e I ge in my	对 dui toware / painte	ds r care	我的 wode my eer."	9	画家 huajia painte	生》 she r car	≣ engya eer	失去 shiqu lose	了 le LE	勇气。 yongqi courage
(3)	[我] wo [I] "Exce	除了 chule excep pt that i	画 hu ot dr <i>had dr</i>	ia aw rawn b	过 guo PASS boas with	开着 kaizhe openin opening	e ng g and d	肚皮 dupi belly closing b	和 he and pelly,"	闭着 bizh clos	ing	肚尽 dup bell	Z ii y	的 de DE	蟒蛇, mang boa	she		
(4)	[我] wo [l]	后来 houla afterv	i vards	再 zai agai	没有 meiyo in not	bu	学 xue learn	过 guo PASS	画。 hua draw									

"I had never learned drawing afterwards."



What would make it possible for **zero** pronouns to be "**zero**"?









What would make it possible for **zero** pronouns to be "**zero**"?















Assumption:

Compared to non-zero pronouns, zero pronouns have higher discourse coherence supporting them to be resolvable, so that we would expect their verb-usage continuity to be higher than the non-zero cases.



	BERT "Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers"	GloVe "Global Vectors for word representation"	Word2Vec "Word to vector"
Vector size	768 base model	300	300
Training task	Masked LM, Next sentence prediction	Aggregated global word-word co-occurrence statistics from a corpus	Local statistics, whether words appear in similar contexts (Window size = 5)
Feature catching	Bidirectional and contextual features	Global statistical features	Local statistical features

Roadmap





Roadmap







• Discourse material:

- Chinese translation of Saint-Exupéry's The Little Prince
- \circ 2802 clauses, 16010 words
 - Each of the clauses includes a main verb, and they were divided by ending with punctuations (i.e. ", .; ?!")

Roadmap







• Dependency parsing

ID	word	S	V	0	V-agent	V-patient	character	det_character
56	这些							
50	this							
57	蟒蛇	蟒蛇					ch2 boa	
	boa							
58	把							
	BA							
59	E11							
	them			4				
60	町 DE							
	DE 独基版							
61	1日 3人 10月			猎获物				ch2_boa
	prey 不							
62	not							
-	力III							
63	add							
	咀嚼		HT 1155		57	61		
64	chew		咀嚼		boa	prey		
65	地					1 2		
65	DI							
66	囫囵							
00	roughly							
67	吞		吞		57	61		
	swalllow		н		boa	prey		
68	۲.							
	down							

Table 1: Annotation columns



• Semantic Role annotation

ID	word	S	V	0	V-agent	V-patient	character	det_character
56	这些 this							
57	蟒蛇 boa	蟒蛇					ch2_boa	
58	把 BA							
59	它们 them							
60	的 DE							
61	猎获物 prey			猎获物				ch2_boa
62	不 not							
63	加 add							
64	咀嚼 chew		咀嚼		57 boa	61 prey		
65	地 DI							
66	囫囵 roughly							
67	吞 swalllow		吞		57 boa	61 prey		
68	下 down							



• Character Role annotation

56这些 thisImage: second	cici
110 110 110 110 110 110 57 $\frac{9}{4}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ 58 $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ 59 $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ 60 $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ 61 $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ 62 $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ 63 $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$ $\frac{110}{100}$	
57辦影 boa端蛇 boach2.boa58把 BA </td <td></td>	
boa \square 58 $\boxed{\mathcal{H}}$ 59 $\boxed{\mathcal{C}\Pi}$ 59 $\boxed{\mathcal{C}\Pi}$ 60 $\boxed{\mathcal{D}E}$ 61 $\underbrace{\mathcal{T}X}$ \overrightarrow{Prey} $\underbrace{\mathcal{T}X}$ 62 $\boxed{\mathcal{T}}$ not $\boxed{63$ $\underbrace{\mathbf{M}}$	
58 H^{\perp} BA Image: Constraint of the second seco	
BA CA 59 En 60 DE 61 $Taxware Taxware Taxware <$	
59 1211 1 1 60 的 DE 1 61 猎获物 猎获物 Ch2.bo 62 不 1 63 加 1	
60 bh bh 61 $3\overline{x}\overline{y}\overline{y}$ $3\overline{x}\overline{y}\overline{y}$ 62 \overline{A} 63 $3\overline{m}$	
60 m DE Ch2.box 61 猎获物 prey 猎获物 ch2.box 62 不 63 加	
DE 描获物 措获物 Ch2.box 61 猎获物 費 合 Ch2.box 62 不 63 加	
61 指获物 猎获物 ch2.bo 62 不	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	a
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$\begin{array}{c c} & & & \\ \hline & & \\ 63 & & \\ add \end{array}$	
63 7/月 add	
add	
64 咀嚼 咀嚼 57 61	
chew boa prey	
65 地	
DI	
66 囫囵	
roughly	
67 吞 云 57 61	
swalllow boa prey	
68 下	
down	

Table 1: Annotation columns



- Character Role annotation
- Pro-drop annotation
 - Among all agent cases, 422 of them are dropped; only 16 cases of patient were dropped.
 - In the following analyses, we focused on the agent cases.

Roadmap







• Dynamic Character-Verb Usage Table

verb	回来
verb_id	16008
agent_character	ch4
pro_drop	False
ch1_prev_verbs	([只有,看到,想,用,画,画,让,画,放,放弃,当,泄,得,给,
ch2_prev_verbs	([咀嚼,吞,动弹,消化,消化,开,闭,闭,危险,闭,开,开,闭],
ch3_prev_verbs	([理解,看,懂,需要,解释,劝,靠,弄,懂,有,谈,认识,大人们,
ch4_prev_verbs	([朝,望,出现,给,像,没有,像,干,有,说道,回答,说,没有,
ch5_prev_verbs	([病, 需要, 像, 睡, 去, 用, 跑, 跑, 跑, 到, 跑, 走, 走, 吃, 吃
•••	
ch30_prev_verbs	([运载,发,往,朝着,开,过],[12123,12128,12133,1
ch31_prev_verbs	([寻找,回来,满意,住,追随,追随,睡觉,打哈欠,拥挤,知道,寻找,
ch32_prev_verbs	([说道, 贩卖, 卖, 说], [12334, 12339, 12359, 12372]).

Table 3: Example of Verb-Character table



verb	Come back
verb_id	16008
agent_character	ch4
pro_drop	False - Non-pro-drop
ch1_prev_verbs	Only have, see, want, use, draw, draw, let,
ch2_prev_verbs	chew , swallow, move, digest, digest, open,
ch3_prev_verbs	Understand, see, understand, need, explain, advise,
ch4_prev_verbs	Towards, watch, show up, give, alike, not have, alike,
ch5_prev_verbs	Sick, need, alike, sleep, go, use, run, run, run, walk, walk, eat, eat
ch30_prev_verbs	Carry, send, towards, drive, pass
ch31_prev_verbs	Seek, come, back, satisfy, live, follow,
ch32_prev_verbs	Say, sell, sell, say

Roadmap









verb	Come back
verb_id	16008
agent_character	ch4 verb similarity
pro_drop	False - Non-pro-drop
ch1_prev_verbs	Only have see, want, use, draw, draw, let,
ch2_prev_verbs	chew , swallow, move, digest, digest, open,
ch3_prev_verbs	Understand, see, understand, need, explain, advise,
ch4_prev_verbs	Towards, watch, show up, give, alike, not have, alike,
ch5_prev_verbs	Sick, need, alike, sleep, go, use, run, run, run, walk, walk, eat, eat
ch30_prev_verbs	Carry, send, towards, drive, pass
ch31_prev_verbs	Seek, come, back, satisfy, live, follow,
ch32_prev_verbs	Say, sell, sell, say

- Verb similarity
 - = cosine similarity between two word embedding vectors Ο





Cosine Distance/Similarity

Item 2

Item 1

X1



verb	Come back
verb_id	16008
agent_character	ch4 + Accumulated verb
pro_drop	False - Non-pro-drop relevance for CH1: Distance-effect considered
ch1_prev_verbs	Only have see, want use, draw, draw let,
ch2_prev_verbs	chew , swallow, move, digest, digest, open,
ch3_prev_verbs	Understand, see, understand, need, explain, advise,
ch4_prev_verbs	Towards, watch, show up, give, alike, not have, alike,
ch5_prev_verbs	Sick, need, alike, sleep, go, use, run, run, run, walk, walk, eat, eat
ch30_prev_verbs	Carry, send, towards, drive, pass
ch31_prev_verbs	Seek, come, back, satisfy, live, follow,
ch32_prev_verbs	Say, sell, sell, say



- Verb similarity
 - = cosine similarity between two word embedding vectors

$$R(v_{prev}, v_{curr}) = \frac{v_{prev} \cdot v_{curr}}{||v_{prev}||||v_{curr}||}$$
(2)

• Verb-chain similarity

$$R_{weighted}([v_{prev_1}, ..., v_{prev_n}], v_{curr}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega(cl_prev_i, cl_curr) * R(v_{prev_i}, v_{curr})$$
(3)



- Verb similarity
 - = cosine similarity between two word embedding vectors





- Verb similarity
 - = cosine similarity between two word embedding vectors







Relevance Between History Verbs and Current Verb Based on Word Embeddings

.

Relevance Regressor	(Non-weighted relevance, Weighted relevance)
rel_glove_ch1	(81.89066125531684, 0.32419914580071807)
rel_glove_ch2	(1.8756812506219913, 0.001503683756709864)
rel_glove_ch32	(0.8230171383397842, 0.001262691669193839)
rel_bert_ch1	(176.59183087820725, 0.6119750732174682)
rel_bert_ch2	(4.919826668243348, 0.0027848581443943223)
rel_bert_ch32	(0.867459723760406, 0.001329274033713714)
rel_word2vec_ch1	(134.572604613474, 0.4595537826115222)
rel_word2vec_ch2	(2.8936049625643223, 0.0020496541891822087)
rel_word2vec_ch32	(0.9999583161919829, 0.0015334960473239322)
rel_baseline_ch1	(-0.771830408650495, 0.008005141647819333)
rel_baseline_ch2	(-0.008373434318707955, 5.9110606393949324e-05)
rel_baseline_ch32	(0.08827132539725344, 0.00013526127447238275)

Table A5: Example of relevance results for the last verb



Regressor Number	Regressor Name	Regressor Meaning	
1	verb	the work in the discourse esting	
2	verb-id	For each verb, there a	re 32 relevance
3	agent-character	values for all 32 story	cnaracters for
4	pro-drop	"Does the correct one	stand out?"
5 - 36	ch{1-32}-prev-verbs	eacn sto current verb	
37 - 68	rel-glove-ch{1-32}	relevance obtained by GloVe word embeddings]
69 - 100	rel-bert-ch{1-32}	relevance obtained by BERT word embeddings	
101 - 132	rel-word2vec-ch{1-32}	relevance obtained by Word2Vec word embeddings	
133 - 164	rel-baseline-ch{1-32}	relevance obtained by Baseline word vectors	
Table 4: Re	gressors obtained af	ter the relevance calculation	21

31

Roadmap







verb	Come back					
verb_id	16008					
agent_character	ch4					
pro_drop	False - Non-pro-drop					
ch1_prev_verbs	Only have, see, want, use, draw, draw, let,					
ch2_prev_verbs	chew , swallow, move, digest, digest, open,					
ch3_prev_verbs	Understand, see, understand, need, explain, advise,					
ch4_prev_verbs	Towards, watch, show up, give, alike, not have, alike,					
ch5_prev_verbs	Sick, need, alike, sleep, go, use, run, run, run, walk, walk, eat, eat					
ch30_prev_verbs	Carry, send, towards, drive, pass					
ch31_prev_verbs	Seek, come, back, satisfy, live, follow,					
ch32_prev_verbs	Say, sell, sell, say					



verb	Come back					
verb_id	16008					
agent_character	ch4					
pro_drop	False - Non-pro-drop					
ch1_prev_verbs	Only have, see, want, use, draw, draw, let, …					
ch2_prev_verbs	che Solionoo (ab4) $=$ (Dol. ab4 (Dol. ab4)					
ch3_prev_verbs	Rel_ch4 / Rel_ch2 +					
ch4_prev_verbs	Tow Rel_ch4 / Rel_ch3 +					
ch5_prev_verbs	Sici Rel_ch4 / Rel_ch31 +					
	Rel_ch4 / Rel_ch32) /32					
ch30_prev_verbs	Carry, send, towards, drive, pass					
ch31_prev_verbs	Seek, come, back, satisfy, live, follow,					
ch32_prev_verbs	Say, sell, sell, say					



• Correct character 's verb-chain-similarity salience

$$S(k) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{R_{weighted}(k)+1}{R_{weighted}(i)+1}\right)}{n+1}$$

(4)

• Correct character 's verb-chain-similarity salience

Correct character's accumulated Relevance

$$S(k) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{R_{weighted}(k) + 1}{R_{weighted}(i) + 1} \right)}{n+1}$$
(4)





• Correct character 's verb-chain-similarity salience

$$S(k) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{R_{weighted}(k)+1}{R_{weighted}(i)+1}}{n+1}$$
(4)
n+1 other character's accumulated Relevance



• Correct character 's verb-chain-similarity salience



(4)





Salience of the Correct Character based on Relevance

Regressor	Example value		
verb	回来 (come back)		
correct character	ch4		
pro-drop	False		
salience-glove-unweighted	45.761057		
salience-bert-unweighted	57.886974		
salience-word2vec-unweighted	56.125342		
salience-baseline-unweighted	1.087911		
salience-glove-weighted	1.206085	5	
salience-bert-weighted	1.522071		
salience-word2vec-weighted	1.427663	3	
salience-baseline-weighted	0.979743	3	

Table A6: Example of salience result of the last verb



Verb-id	pro-drop	Correct character salience
1	False	1.65
2	True	5.86
3	False	1.22
16007	True	4.12
16008	False	3.51



Roadmap





Results



- Character salience
 distribution:
 - non-pro-drop vs. pro-drop



(a) Salience distribution of word embedding models with verb distance weighted

(b) Salience distribution of word embedding models without verb distance weighted







• Ranged character salience group comparison:

		Correct character salience pro-drop >non-pro-drop (n = 422)							
Candidates' Range		range :	range = all range <10 clause		range <20 clause		range <30 clause		
		t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value
	GloVe	49090.319	0.063	51137.593	0.012*	52598.233	0.003**	52121.241	0.004**
Distance-	BERT	50555.45	0.023*	45310.076	0.029*	52105.854	0.005**	51582.819	0.008**
Weighted	Word2Vec	50358.954	0.025*	51268.800	0.011*	52747.81	0.002**	52246.569	0.004**
	Baseline	44656.318	0.496	44737.336	0.483	49199.853	0.060	47875.291	0.134
	GloVe	39345.494	0.959	44384.169	0.531	43818.383	0.606	43837.85	0.604
Distance-	BERT	42867.41	0.724	45310.076	0.411	45187.343	0.425	45220.75	0.421
Unweighted	Word2Vec	40865.782	0.898	45236.126	0.420	44672.755	0.494	44630.117	0.498
	Baseline	43149.674	0.690	45940.625	0.330	46398.831	0.275	45552.563	0.377

Table 3: Single-sided nonparametric two-sample Wilcoxon test between *pro*-drop and non-*pro*-drop salience values among three word embedding models and the baseline model: With candidates included as all candidates, candidates within 10 clauses, 20 clauses, and 30 clauses.





Logistic regression model predicting dropping behaviour: Ranged salience results

		Logistic Regression Model					
		Pro-drop Prediction Accuracy					
Candidate	Candidates' Range		range <10 clause	range <20 clause	range <30 clause		
	GloVe	0.518	0.535	0.527	0.539		
Distance-	BERT	0.538	0.532	0.536	0.546		
Weighted	Word2Vec	0.534	0.535	0.537	0.552		
	Baseline	0.497	0.489	0.495	0.498		
	GloVe	0.524	0.487	0.490	0.485		
Distance-	BERT	0.493	0.488	0.492	0.482		
Unweighted	Word2Vec	0.514	0.485	0.482	0.473		
	Baseline	0.485	0.485	0.485	0.485		

Table 4: *Pro*-drop prediction accuracy results of the Logistic Regression model from three word embedding models and one baseline model: salience value calculated based on all previous clauses and ranged clauses.



- Language models and their performances
 - Group t-test and logistic regression results are consistent: showing the performance ordering as: BERT > word2vec > GloVe
 - 1. BERT: bidirectional and contextual
 - 2. Word2Vec: local statistical features
 - 3. GloVe: global statistical features
- Ranged character salience improves t-test significance level and prediction accuracy
- Distance-weighted models show zero > non-zero salience effect; unweighted models do not show this effect



- Language models and their performances
 - Group t-test and logistic regression results are consistent: showing the performance ordering as: BERT > word2vec > GloVe
 - 1. BERT: bidirectional and contextual
 - 2. Word2Vec: local statistical features
 - 3. GloVe: global statistical features
- Ranged character salience improves t-test significance level and prediction accuracy
- Distance-weighted models show zero > non-zero salience effect; unweighted models do not show this effect



- Language models and their performances
 - Group t-test and logistic regression results are consistent: showing the performance ordering as: BERT > word2vec > GloVe
 - 1. BERT: bidirectional and contextual
 - 2. Word2Vec: local statistical features
 - 3. GloVe: global statistical features
- Ranged character salience improves t-test significance level and prediction accuracy
- Distance-weighted models show zero > non-zero salience effect; unweighted models do not show this effect



- Language models and their performances
 - Group t-test and logistic regression results are consistent: showing the performance ordering as: BERT > word2vec > GloVe
 - 1. BERT: bidirectional and contextual
 - 2. Word2Vec: local statistical features
 - 3. GloVe: global statistical features
- Ranged character salience improves t-test significance level and prediction accuracy
- Distance-weighted models show zero > non-zero salience effect; unweighted models do not show this effect

Conclusions



• This study quantifies character-verb usage continuity as an aspect of discourse that helps comprehenders resolve omitted pronouns. Omitted pronouns tend to show higher verb usage consistency compared to pronounced entities, and this effect is strengthened by clause recency.

Thank you!





Dr. Jixing Li





Prof. John Hale



Department of Linguistics Franklin College of Arts and Sciences UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA