What is Learned in Visually Grounded Neural Syntax Acquisition

ACL 2020









Unsupervised Syntactic Parsing



Text-Based Syntax Acquisition Shen et al., 2018a, 2019; Kim et al., 2019; Havrylov et al., 2019; Drozdov et al., 2019, inter alia

Visually Grounded Neural Syntax Learner (VG-NSL) Shi et al., 2019

Our Work

Question: What does VG-NSL learn?

- Reduce the expressivity of the architecture
- Our significantly less expressive architectures learn similar models
- Observe that VG-NSL largely models noun concreteness

VG-NSL



VG-NSL



VG-NSL



Our approach: simplify each module to constrain the model



Our Simplified Variants

Experiments

- Follow the experimental setup of Shi et al., 2019.
 - Data: MSCOCO (Lin et al., 2014)
 - Gold trees: Benepar (Kitaev and Klein, 2018)
 - Token embeddings: fastText (Joulin et al., 2016)
- Evaluate parsing performance using F score
 - Based on overlaps of constituents in the model predictions and gold trees

Parsing Performance



■ Shi2019* ■ Ours (1-d,ws,mean) ■ Ours (2-d,ws,mean)

Average F-score

- Our variants consistently achieve comparable performance to VG-NSL across different training setup
- Our variants learn nearly identical models to VG-NSL



 The visualization of token embeddings shows a strong preference for separating nouns from other parts of speech

Noun Concreteness

Hypothesis: noun identification via concreteness plays a central role in VG-NSL performance

 Modify test-time captions to maximize the alignment between noun and concreteness



Noun Concreteness



- Parsing performance improves significantly
- Noun identification via concreteness provides an effective parsing strategy

Conclusion

- We introduce significantly less expressive variants of VG-NSL, maintaining similar performance and predictions
- We identify the key signal learned is noun concreteness
- Our method of analysis is general and applicable beyond parsing

Code: <u>https://github.com/lil-lab/vgnsl_analysis_cleaning</u>