

Effects of Language Modeling on Speech-driven Question Answering

Tomoyosi Akiba[†], Atsushi Fujii[‡], Katunobu Itou^{*}

[†] Toyohashi University of Technology
1-1 Hibarigaoka, Tenpaku-cho, Toyohashi, 441-8580, JAPAN
akiba@cl.ics.tut.ac.jp

[‡] University of Tsukuba
1-2 Kasuga, Tsukuba, 305-8550, JAPAN

^{*} Nagoya University
1 Furo-cho, Nagoya, 464-8603, JAPAN

Abstract

We integrate automatic speech recognition (ASR) and question answering (QA) to realize a speech-driven QA system, and evaluate its performance. We adapt an N-gram language model to natural language questions, so that the input of our system can be recognized with a high accuracy. We target WH-questions which consist of the topic part and fixed phrase used to ask about something. We first produce a general N-gram model intended to recognize the topic and emphasize the counts of the N-grams that correspond to the fixed phrases. Given a transcription by the ASR engine, the QA engine extracts the answer candidates from target documents. We propose a passage retrieval method robust against recognition errors in the transcription. We use the QA test collection produced in NTCIR, which is a TREC-style evaluation workshop, and show the effectiveness of our method by means of experiments.

1. Introduction

Question Answering (QA) was first evaluated extensively at TREC-8 [9]. The goal in the QA task is to extract words or phrases as the answer to a question, rather than the document lists obtained by traditional information retrieval (IR) systems. Speech interfaces have promise for improving the utility of QA systems, in which natural language questions are used as inputs. We enhanced our speech-driven IR system [5] to accept spoken questions.

In this paper, we evaluate the effects of language modeling on speech-driven question answering. In past literature, language models were evaluated independent of specific tasks. Perplexity is one of the common measures to evaluate language models, irrespective of the speech recognition accuracy. Word error rate (WER) is another common measure, which directly evaluates the accuracy of speech recognition. However, it is not clear that they can evaluate the performance of specific information processing systems using speech interfaces. Because question answering is one of the well-defined tasks and has been evaluated by formal evaluation workshops, e.g., TREC and NTCIR, we can evaluate components of

a system, in particular language modeling, through a rigorous method.

Section 2 describes our language modeling method for speech-driven question answering [2]. Section 3 describes our question answering engine [3]. Section 4 describes the experimental results.

2. Language Modeling for Question Answering

Question answering systems accept a question consisting of the part that conveys a topic and the part that represents a fixed phrase for question sentences. The following is an example question:

*seN / kyu- / hyaku / nana / ju- / roku / neN / ni
/ kasei / ni / naN / chakuriku / shita / taNsaki
/ wa / naN / to / yu- / namae / desu / ka
(What was the name of the spacecraft that
landed safely on Mars in 1976 ?)*

The first half of the question, i.e., “*seN kyu- hyaku nana ju- roku neN ni kasei ni naN chakuriku shita taNsaki wa* (the spacecraft that landed safely on Mars in 1976)”, conveys the topic, and can be recognized by an N-gram model trained with target documents (e.g., newspaper articles). The latter half of the question, i.e., “*naN to yu- namae desu ka* (What was the name?)”, is a fixed phrase typically used in interrogative questions, which is not very frequent in newspaper articles. Thus, we need a language model adapted to both types of expressions.

Note that recognizing the fixed phrases with high accuracy is crucial in question answering, because these phrases convey clues to determine the question and answer types. For example, a fixed phrase indicates that the answer should be the name of an object as in the previous example, while another question can potentially indicate that the answer should be the date of an event (e.g., “On what date was...”).

In this paper, we use our previous method [2], in which a language model for question answering are produced from a list of the fixed phrases typically used in interrogative questions. This method emphasizes the N-gram subset corresponding to the fixed phrases. This

method can be recast as a variant of maximum a posteriori probability (MAP) estimation, in which the N-gram subset of a background corpus is used as a posterior distribution.

2.1. Language Modeling by Emphasizing N-gram Subsets

Let S be a set of sentences. Let S_{FP} be a subset of S that consists of the sentences including the fixed phrases in a list. Let P be a language model of generating sentences (i.e., $s \in S$) obtained from a general-purpose background corpus. The aim of the language model adaptation for the fixed phrases is to obtain the adapted language model P' , which provides higher probability scores for sentence $\hat{s} \in S_{FP}$ but maintains the order relations on sentences $s \in S - S_{FP}$ as much as possible.

The adapted model P' is produced by the following two steps.

1. Revise the maximum likelihood estimates of P :

$$P_{ML(1)}(w_i), P_{ML(2)}(w_i|w_{i-1}), \dots \\ \dots, P_{ML(N)}(w_i|w_{i-N+1}^{i-1})$$

which are calculated for each value of $n(1 \leq n \leq N)$.

2. Apply the back-off smoothing to integrate the revised ML estimates $P'_{ML(n)}(w_i|w_{i-n+1}^{i-1})(1 \leq n \leq N)$.

For each value of $n(1 \leq n \leq N)$, the maximum likelihood estimates $P_{ML(n)}(w_i|w_{i-n+1}^{i-1})$ of N-gram probability P obtained from the background corpus are revised to P'_{ML} by the following procedure.

- (1). If the postfix $w_{i-k+1} \dots w_i(1 \leq k < n)$ of the word sequence $w_{i-n+1} \dots w_i$ is equal to the prefix $\hat{w}_p \dots \hat{w}_{p+k-1}$ of one of the fixed phrases $\hat{w}_p \dots \hat{w}_q$ then emphasize the P_{ML} as follows:

$$P'_{ML(n)}(\hat{w}_{p+k-1}|w_{p-n+k}^{p-1}\hat{w}_p^{p+k-2}) = \\ \beta_n(w_{p-n+k}^{p-1}\hat{w}_p^{p+k-2}) \cdot \\ \gamma P_{ML(n)}(\hat{w}_{p+k-1}|w_{p-n+k}^{p-1}\hat{w}_p^{p+k-2})$$

Otherwise, go to step (2).

- (2). If the word sequence $w_{i-n+1} \dots w_i$ is equal to the subsequence $\hat{w}_{i-n+1} \dots \hat{w}_i$ of one of the fixed phrases $\hat{w}_p \dots \hat{w}_q$ then emphasize only the longest N-gram probability $P_{ML(N)}$ as follows:

$$P'_{ML(N)}(\hat{w}_i|\hat{w}_{i-N+1}^{i-1}) = \\ \beta_N(\hat{w}_{i-N+1}^{i-1}) \cdot \gamma P_{ML(N)}(\hat{w}_i|\hat{w}_{i-N+1}^{i-1})$$

Otherwise, go to step (3).




Figure 1: Emphasizing trigram counts.

- (3). For all $n(1 \leq n \leq N)$, the revised probability is:

$$P'_{ML(n)}(w_i|w_{i-n+1}^{i-1}) = \\ \beta_n(w_{i-n+1}^{i-1}) \cdot P_{ML(n)}(w_i|w_{i-n+1}^{i-1})$$

Here, $\gamma(\geq 1)$ is a multiplier that emphasizes the selected N-grams, and $\beta_1(\epsilon) \dots \beta_N(w_{i-N+1}^{i-1})$ are normalized coefficients so that the probabilities add up to one.

This can be seen as the task adaptation process by maximum a posteriori probability (MAP) estimation [4], in which the N-gram subset corresponding to the fixed phrases is used as task specific data for adaptation. That is, P'_{ML} is equivalent to the maximum likelihood estimate calculated as follows,

$$P'_{ML(n)}(w_i|w_{i-n+1}^{i-1}) = \frac{C'_n(w_{i-n+1}^i)}{\sum_{w_i} C'_n(w_{i-n+1}^i)}$$

where the N-gram counts C'_n of each value of $n(1 \leq n \leq N)$ are obtained by emphasizing the selected subset of the original N-gram counts C , as shown in Fig. 1.

3. Question Answering Engine

3.1. Question Answering as a Search Problem

The question answering process is often seen as the sequence of the question analysis, the relevant document (or passage) retrieval, answer extraction and answer selection processes. In this paper, we recast these processes as a search problem.

Question Answering Given query q and document set D , from all the substrings in D , $S = \{(d, p_s, p_f) | d \in D, p_s < p_f; p_s \text{ and } p_f \text{ are positions in } d\}$, by using an evaluation function $L(a|q)$ defined on $a \in S$, search the most appropriate answer \hat{a} such that $\hat{a} = \text{argmax}_{a \in S} L(a|q)$.

This defines the problem of finding a single best answer, which corresponds to the factoid question in TREC and the subtask 1 of NTCIR Question Answering Challenge (QAC).

3.2. Passage Retrieval

The evaluation function L is constructed in various aspects. One of them is the similarity between the question and the context of an answer candidate. Selecting




Figure 2: WERs on spoken questions (BASE: baseline method, EMP: our method).

the context, or passage retrieval, is one of the common research topics for question answering [8].

Because by definition speech-driven question answering accepts a result of speech recognition as an input, which often includes errors, the passage retrieval must be robust against those errors. We propose a dynamic passage retrieval method that can accept an input including misrecognized words.

Suppose, from given query q , we select the context of an answer candidate a , which belongs to sentence s_i of document $d = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_i \cdots s_n$. Let $s'_i = s_i - \{a\}$, h be the headline of d , and t be the string “*Kotoshi Kongetsu Kyou*” (this year, this month, today). Given a number $k > 0$, let $S_i = \{h, t, s_{i-k}, \cdots, s_{i-1}, s'_i, s_{i+1}, \cdots, s_{i+k}\}$. The optimal context \hat{C}_i is selected from $C_i \in 2^{S_i}$ by maximizing the following evaluation measure $F(C_i)$.

$$F(C_i) = \frac{1 + \beta^2}{\frac{\beta^2}{R(C_i)} + \frac{1}{P(C_i)}}$$

$$R(C_i) = \frac{\text{Score}(q \wedge C_i)}{\text{Score}(q)}$$

$$P(C_i) = \frac{\text{Score}(q \wedge C_i)}{\text{Score}(C_i)}$$

Here, $\text{Score}(A)$ is a sum of the IDFs (inverse document frequencies) of the elements in A and $\text{Score}(A \wedge B)$ is a sum of the IDFs of the elements appeared commonly in A and B .

We used $k = 1$ for our experiments. The measure F corresponds to the (weighted) F-measure often used in IR research. The recall is more influential than precision in calculating the F-measure, if the value of β is more than one. Because the recall is important for selecting answer candidates, we set $\beta = 2$.

4. Evaluation

4.1. NTCIR Question Answering Challenge

The test collection constructed in the first evaluation of Question Answering Challenge (QAC-1) [6], which was carried out as a task of NTCIR Workshop 3, was used as the test data for our evaluation. The task definition of QAC-1 is as follows.

Target documents are two years of Japanese newspaper articles, from which the answers of a given question must be extracted. The answer is a noun or a noun phrase, e.g., person names, organization names, names of various artifacts, money, size and date. Three subtasks were performed in QAC1, among which the subtask 1 is defined as follows.

System extracts at most five answers from the documents for each question. The reciprocal number of the rank is the score for the question. For example, if the second answer candidate is correct, the score is 0.5.

This definition is almost equivalent to the factoid question answering in TREC. The 200 queries were used for the formal evaluation, in which no answer was found for four questions in the target documents. Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) of the 196 queries was used to evaluate the performance of participant systems.

4.2. Experimental Results

The effects of language modeling on question answering were experimentally investigated. We extracted N-gram counts from newspaper articles in 111 months. The vocabulary size was 60,000. We produced a word network for the Japanese fixed phrases used for question




Figure 3: QA performance by spoken questions.

sentences. From the network, we extracted the 172 fixed phrases accepted by the network.

We used the N-gram model produced only from the newspaper articles as the baseline (*BASE*). For our proposed method, we emphasized the N-gram counts corresponding to the fixed phrases, and produced the adapted model (*EMP*). The magnification parameter γ was set to 50, which had been determined by our previous experiments [2].

All of the 200 questions in the QAC-1 test collection were used for our experiments. We produced our spoken question data set. The questions were read by four females (F001, F002, F003 and F004) and four males (M001, M002, M003 and M004). An existing LVCSR system [7] was used for the purpose of transcription.

The WERs of the results of speech recognition are shown in Figure 2. *BH* denotes WERs for an entire sentence, while *FH* and *LH* denote WERs for the first and latter halves of a sentence, respectively. We divided each sentence into the first and latter halves by using Japanese WH-words as the boundary (the latter half must include the WH-word), and investigated the WERs of both halves independently. Note that the latter halves roughly correspond to the fixed phrases used in interrogative questions. Figure 2 suggests that the proposed method (*EMP*) significantly decreased the WER for the fixed phrases (*LH*), while it did not decrease the WER for the other parts of the input sentences (*FH*).

Figure 3 shows the result of question answering using both text inputs, which correspond to the speech inputs with no error, and speech inputs by the eight speakers. For speech inputs, the best hypothesis from the LVCSR system was used as the input of the question answering engine. The result shows that the speech input decreased the performance almost by half. However, when using the proposed method of language modeling (*EMP*), the MRR was increased by 0.03 points on average.

We used the paired t-test for statistical testing, which

investigates whether the difference in performance is meaningful or simply due to chance. We found that the MRR values for *BASE* and *EMP* were significantly different (at the 5% level).

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a speech-driven question answering (QA) system and evaluated its performance, focusing mainly on the effects of language modeling. For evaluation purposes, we used the test questions in the NTCIR collection, read by eight human subjects. The experimental results showed that our language modeling method improved the accuracy of recognizing spoken questions and consequently the accuracy of question answering. At the same time, when compared with text-based QA, the performance of speech-driven QA system was not satisfactory from a practical point of view. Future work includes improving each module through a glass-box error analysis and extending our system to spontaneously spoken questions [1].

6. References

- [1] T. Akiba, A. Fujii, and K. Itou. Collecting spontaneously spoken queries for information retrieval. In *Proceedings of 4th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*, volume 4, pages 1439–1442, 2004.
- [2] T. Akiba, K. Itou, and A. Fujii. Adapting language models for frequent fixed phrases by emphasizing n-gram subsets. In *Proceedings of European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology*, pages 1469–1472, 2003.
- [3] T. Akiba, K. Itou, and A. Fujii. Question answering using “common sense” and utility maximization principle. In *Working Notes of 4th NTCIR workshop*, pages 297–303, 2004.
- [4] M. Federico. Bayesian estimation methods for n-gram language model adaptation. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Spoken Language Processing*, pages 240–243, 1996.
- [5] A. Fujii, K. Itou, and T. Ishikawa. Speech-driven text retrieval: Using target IR collections for statistical language model adaptation in speech recognition. In A. R. Coden, E. W. Brown, and S. Srinivasan, editors, *Information Retrieval Techniques for Speech Applications (LNCS 2273)*, pages 94–104. Springer, 2002.
- [6] J. Fukumoto, T. Kato, and F. Masui. Question answering challenge (QAC-1) question answering evaluation at NTCIR workshop 3. In *Proceedings of The third NTCIR Workshop*, 2003.
- [7] A. Lee, T. Kawahara, and K. Shikano. Julius — an open source real-time large vocabulary recognition engine. In *Proceedings of European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology*, pages 1691–1694, Sept. 2001.
- [8] S. Tellex, B. Katz, J. Lin, A. Fernandes, and G. Marton. Quantitative evaluation of passage retrieval algorithms for question answering. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGIR*, pages 41–47, 2003.
- [9] E. Voorhees and D. Tice. The TREC-8 question answering track evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 8th Text Retrieval Conference*, pages 83–106, 1999.