COMPUTER-AIDED GRAMMATICAL TAGGING OF SPOKEN ENGLISH

Jan Svartvik, University of Lund

Department of English Helgonabacken 14 S-223 62 Lund, Sweden

Abstract

The paper presents an outline of a system for grammatical tagging of the London-Lund Corpus of spoken English consisting of some 450 000 words. The material, all of which will be available on magnetic computer tape, and part of which is now available in both machinereadable and printed form, has been transcribed orthographically with prosodic marking for tone units, nuclei, stresses, pauses, etc (see Samples 1 and 2). Whereas there is now considerable agreement on the usefulness of a tagged corpus, there is as yet no consensus on the best type of tagging, let alone the procedure involved. The analysis proposed here is of course specifically aimed at tagging spoken English, but should be largely applicable also to written English.

The syntactic tagging will initially be based on surface properties, since we are interested in gaining information that is directly available through the signals that hearers use for decoding a message, ie their perceptual strategies. In this respect, the plan is no innovation. One computer discourse model which is intended "to tackle problems that a speaker evidently tackles" has recently been reported by Davey (1978.4). His model, however, is designed to produce, not understand. Another and more important difference between the SSE system and the Davey model and most other computer discourse models is that the latter have been devised to handle restricted and artificial universes of discourse, such as describing games or moving blocks. However, the work of Winograd (1972), for example, is directly relevant to our task, since it deals with wider aspects of language and makes impressive use of Halliday's systemic grammar for producing parsing algorithms.

One of our aims is to make the tagging procedure as automatic as possible. Specifically, we would like to see how far it is possible to carry out syntactic analysis based on graphic words and prosody (provided by the material) and word class tags (provided by a general-purpose dictionary). Given that no fully

automatic system for grammatical tagging exists, we propose to implement an interactive, semi-manual mode of analysis.

The paper will present word class tagging of types from the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, disambiguation of tokens and phrase tagging by means of a set of parsing algorithms. The basic unit of analysis will be the tone unit. In a previous study of Survey material of spoken English, it was found that the overall average length of a tone unit was 5.3 words and that "there was considerable correlation between the length of tone units and their grammatical contents" with a "high degree of co-extensiveness between tone units and grammatical units of group, phrase, and clause structure" (Quirk et al 1964).

The search for grammatical phrases will be from right to left within the tone unit. Since this search sequence is definitely unorthodox, some explanation may be called for. By and large, English phrase structure typically has the head to the right, as in

Verb phrases: will be DOING

Noun phrases: the nice little DOG

Adjective phrases: stunningly BEAUTIFUL

Assuming that a good number of the tone units consist of, at least, grammatical phrases, the nucleus will occur within the phrase and, more often than not, within the head of the phrase. Thus, it is likely that it will be linguistically rewarding as well as computationally economical to search from right to left. It seems that a left-to-right search method also runs into difficulties with solving left-recursion structures and predicting numerous alternatives.

The phrase recognition rules are to be applied in the following order:

(VPH) Verb phrases

(APH) Adverb phrases

(JPH) Adjective phrases

(NPH) Noun phrases

(PPH) Prepositional phrases

The typical features of this system are: taking tone units as the basis of grammatical analysis, choosing a general-purpose dictionary for word class tagging, making extensive use of phrase structure rules which are applied in a certain order and cyclically, and partly adopting an interactive mode of analysis.

Sample 1. Computer version of Text S.1.1: TUs 71-102.

_ F _ F _ F _ F _ F _ F _ F _ F _ F _ F		a:3 he should have had his	at the)) be ginning of M/ays .	(set)) the Coun thing ((hash t)) clones	2:3 I Gid get a !plostcard fr/om himm -	saying that [sim] the !thing is now :r/	ro that he will send it by the send . c	nest .	that's what he !slays# .	now . ! A he may	th/at#	#B# ou	t fray take a hell of a forg time to for	t he !puts it into the coiple	as [6:#] - !mh/at's his .	ickey "C\/ohr _cia# .	then ((it's)) rot so r\ac# -	:] !how are y	for * ((!h/aving#))*	arl - a I Taculon't w	e :\anyhom ƙ/eynarc#	E marke I marga	r the t/lenths	nd coming back on the	+10045+ 1 +24011	-1 s/e	+ y/es#+	#3: ***	, o	^t//il#	t Nany rate	-	題 日 日 日	
	- ,-	£.	1.1	-		-	4	11						11								-												i.A D
710 1 2		40 1 1	50 1 1	60.11	70 1 1	£ C 1 3	2 1 05	1 1 05	CC 1 1	10 1 2	10 1 1	1 1 32	20.1.1	40 1 1	50 1 1	60 1 1	70 1 1	80 1 1	50 1 1	2 1 00	CO 1 1	10 1 1	12	30 1 1	1 2 57	50 1 1	65 1 1	11 1 07	7 1 2	EC 1 1	1 1 35	נכנ ז ז	10 1 1	020 1 1
NAI	11 1	1 41	a)	41	<i>در</i> ا	Ŋ	•^	v	u 1	v	v	Ų	Ų	w	Ç	÷	v	IJ	w	v	Ų	ç	Ÿ	J	Ų	¥	¥	U	J	Ų	Ų	1-	~	~
 (_							•		Ť	•	•	
,, ,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,																			-										•	•	-	•	•	
# (V)		4	. 🕠	1>	w	O	٠	4	N	~	7	W 1	Ų	~	u.	55	ر د	5	62	C 3	7)	W)	90	2	ت	CS	10	-	17	6)	7 [<u>.</u>	v	~

Sample 2. Printed version of Text S.1.1: TUs 71-136.

- B 73 ||[mhm]
- A 74 [a:] he #should have had_his · dissertation YN 10 75 (at the) beliginning of MÄY 10 · 76 (but) the #damn thing (hasn't) CÓME 10 77 [a:] I #did get a ΔPÖSTCARD FRÓM him 10 78 #saying that [a:m] the Δthing is now ΔRÉADY 10 · 79 and that he will #send it by the Δend · of ΔJÜNE 10 · 80 #that's what he ΔSÄYS 10 · 81 #now · ΔA he may not · send it · quite as soon as · ΔTHÁT 10 82 and #6 10 83 it #may take a hell of a long time to ΔCÒME 10 · 84 #if he Δputs it into the Δdiplomatic BAG 10 85 #as [a:m] ΔWHÄT'S his Inname 10 · 86 Mickey #CÖHN ID did 10 · 87 #then (it's) not so BÄD 10 88 #but [a:] Δhow are YOU going to be PLÁCED 10 89 #for \$\pi\$ (ΔHÄVING 10) \$\pi\$
- B 90 *[2:] -* I ||wouldn't want it before the hend of June hANYHOW RÉYNARD 11 |
 91 be||cause I'm Agoing to MADRID 11 | 92 on the ||TENTH 11 | 93 and ||coming back on the TWENTY-NÍNTH 11 94 *[2:]* · I + shall + *||not
- A 95 WHI SÉEMW 96 + NYÉSM+
- >B 94 BE 10 97 alway from home athen 100 the liend of &- albout the end of August 10 --
 - A 101 x 1 m | m x 102 [5:]
 - B 103 so *lany time in JULY 104 land * AUGUST 105 lbut [at] + + +
- > B 105 Anot too far into 'August if *PÖSSIBLE® * 107 ||ŎTHERWISE® 108 I'll be || listuck until about [ðí:]
 - A 109 ☆||NŎ||☆
- >B 108 Δtwentieth · [a] I'm HIÓPING 110 to liget into SPĀIN 111 from albout the Δtwenty-· ΔĒΙGHTH of ÂUGUST 112 (to) unlitil about the Δtwentieth or Asomething of that kind of SEPTÈMBER 4 · * 113 but
 - A 114 ANYEAHSA
- - B 132 a[m]||hm]||**a**a
- > A 131 ARARÎVE îi 133 [a] I lithink that we amustn't worry too amuch AABOUT THIS ii
 134 live we limake it Aperfectly clear that apapers must be in on the affirst of
 AMÂY îi 4-4-135 [a:m]
 - B 136 x[m]\[hm] ■x