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## Motivation

The Reason Why?

- Language generalization problems
- Methods in morphological tasks sometimes be "old-fashioned"
- The era of Language Models
- Multilingual/Monolingual models



## Shared-Task <br> 2022 (MRL): Multilingual Clause-level Morphology

- Task1: Inflection

```
give + IND;FUT;NOM(1,SG);ACC(3,SG,MASC);DAT(3,SG,FEM) \longrightarrow I will give him to her
```

- Task2: Reinflection

I will give him to her

+ IND;FUT;NOM(1,SG);ACC(3,SG,MASC);DAT(3,SG,FEM) $\longrightarrow$ We don't give you to them
+ IND;PRS;NOM(1,PL);ACC(2);DAT(3,PL);NEG
- Task3: Analysis

I will give him to her $\longrightarrow$ give + IND;FUT;NOM(1,SG);ACC(3,SG,MASC);DAT(3,SG,FEM)

- Languages: Ger, Eng, Fra, Heb/Heb-unvoc, Rus, Swa, Spa, Tur


## Shared-Task

## Task1: Inflection

- Task: Inflection
give + IND;FUT;NOM(1,SG);ACC(3,SG,MASC);DAT(3,SG,FEM) $\longrightarrow$ I will give him to her
- Metric: Edit Distance (ED)
- Method: Vanilla Transformer [2] + Data Hallucination [1]
- Tricks: Batch Size 400 [3], layer normalization before self-attention and feed-forward layers [3]

| System | Inflection |
| :--- | :---: |
| Transformer Baseline | 3.278 |
| mT5 Baseline | 2.577 |
| KUIS AI | $\mathbf{0 . 2 9 2}$ |

Figure: Task1 Averaged Results

## Shared-Task

## Data Hallucination

- Good choice for low-resource languages.
- Add noise to the stem parts.
- Increase the training set with the hallucinated samples.

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { celebrate + IND;PRS;NOM(1,PL);NEG;ACC(3,SG,MASC) } \\
\text { cjuexua te + IND;PRS;NOM(1,PL)NEG;ACC(3,SG,MASC) } \\
\text { Example of Hallucinated Data (English) }
\end{array} \rightarrow \text { we don't celebrate him } \\
\text { we don't cjuexuate him. } \\
\text { cevap vermek + NEC;PST;NOM(3,SG);NEG;Q;DAT(3,PL) } \rightarrow \text { onlara cevap vermemeli miydi? } \\
\text { cevCp vDOme k + NEC;PST;NOM(3,SG);NEG;Q;DAT(3,PL) } \\
\text { Example of Hallucinated Data (Turkish) }
\end{array}
$$

## Shared-Task

## Task2: Reinflection

- Task: Reinflection

I will give him to her


- Metric: Edit Distance (ED)
- Method: Vanilla Transformer [1]
- Tricks: Batch Size 400 [2], layer normalization before self-attention and feed-forward layers [2]. We didn't use the input clause features.

| System | Reinflection |
| :--- | :---: |
| Transformer Baseline | 4.642 |
| mT5 Baseline | 2.826 |
| KUIS AI | $\mathbf{0 . 7 0 5}$ |
| Figure: Task2 Averaged Results |  |

## Shared-Task

## Task3: Analysis

- Task: Analysis

I will give him to her $\longrightarrow$ give + IND;FUT;NOM(1,SG);ACC(3,SG,MASC);DAT(3,SG,FEM)

- Metric: F1 Score
- Method: mGPT-based prefix tuning [1], [2]


Figure: Prefix Tuning example for Task3
[1] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation.

Number of Tokens:

- Eng: ~52B
- Deu: ~50B
- Spa: ~30B
- Heb: ~0.69B


## Submitted Detailed Results Table

Task3: Analysis

| Model | Transformer + D.A. |  | Transformer |  |  | Prefix Tuning |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metrics | $\mathrm{F} 1 \uparrow$ | $\mathrm{EM} \uparrow$ | $\mathrm{ED} \downarrow$ | $\mathrm{F} 1 \uparrow$ | $\mathrm{EM} \uparrow$ | $\mathrm{ED} \downarrow$ | $\mathrm{F} 1 \uparrow$ | $\mathrm{EM} \uparrow$ | $\mathrm{ED} \downarrow$ |
| Deu | 97.71 | 91.80 | 0.241 | 92.40 | 66.50 | 0.788 | 95.89 | 83.40 | 0.991 |
| Eng | 98.02 | 88.90 | 0.221 | 95.42 | 72.30 | 0.477 | 99.61 | 98.50 | 0.064 |
| Fra | 98.59 | 93.20 | 0.124 | 92.64 | 68.30 | 0.758 | 95.63 | 81.90 | 0.933 |
| Heb | 97.73 | 89.80 | 0.550 | 94.00 | 83.30 | 0.796 | 92.84 | 73.50 | 1.322 |
| Heb-Unvoc | 97.96 | 94.20 | 0.113 | 86.70 | 57.70 | 1.002 | 82.09 | 36.20 | 2.044 |
| Rus | 97.57 | 87.70 | 0.828 | 97.29 | 84.90 | 0.854 | 97.51 | 88.60 | 3.252 |
| Swa | 99.72 | 99.61 | 0.019 | 92.05 | 84.47 | 0.182 | 90.51 | 62.63 | 3.114 |
| Spa | 98.79 | 92.00 | 0.199 | 96.42 | 77.60 | 0.480 | 98.11 | 89.40 | 0.560 |
| Tur | 97.50 | 89.80 | 0.333 | 95.36 | 84.70 | 0.593 | 95.36 | 84.70 | 0.593 |
| Average | 98.18 | 91.89 | $\mathbf{0 . 2 9 2}$ | 93.14 | 74.72 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 . 1 7}$ | 77.65 | 1.430 |

## Conclusion

## Summary and Future Work

## - Summary

- No single method achieves best results in all tasks.
- Recent NLG methods provide promising results on morphological tasks.
- Data hallucination, multilingual models, and lightweight tuning methods are the game changers.


## - Future work

- Prefix-Tuning in all types of architectures (autoencoding, autoregressive, seq2seq).
- Hallucination for reinflection and analysis tasks.
- Github Code: https://github.com/emrecanacikgoz/mrl2022


## Q/A for 5 min. ?

## Appendix

## Transformer Architecture



Figure1: Our Vanilla Transformer Architecture

## Appendix <br> Prefix-Tuning

| Prefix | Source Input |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\Gamma_{\text {P1, P2 }}$ | Target |

[Prefix; x; y]
Figure: Auto-regressive Prefix-Tuning set-up

## Appendix mGPT Language Corpus

Afrikaans, Azerbaijani, Belarusian, Bengali, Chuvash, German, English, Basque, Finnish, Hebrew (modern), Hungarian, Indonesian, Japanese, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Kyrgyz, Latvian, Mongolian, Malay, Dutch, Polish, Romanian, Moldavan, Yakut, Swahili, Telugu, Thai, Turkish, Tuvinian, Urdu, Vietnamese, Yoruba, Arabic, Bashkir, Bulgarian, Buriat, Danish, Greek, Modern, Spanish; Castilian, Persian, French, Hindi, Armenian, Italian, Georgian, Korean, Lithuanian, Malayalam, Marathi, Burmese, Ossetian, Ossetic, Portuguese, Russian, Swedish, Tamil, Tajik, Turkmen, Tatar, Ukrainian, Uzbek, Kalmyk, Chinese

Figure: 60 different languages

## Appendix <br> mGPT Language Corpus



Figure: 60 different language statistics

## Appendix

## Extra Results

| Inflection | Deu |  | Eng |  |  | Fra |  |  | Heb |  |  | Rus |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Models | EM | ED | EM | ED | EM | ED | EM | ED | EM | ED | EM | ED |  |  |
|  | $80.8 \%$ | 0.645 | $92.1 \%$ | 0.129 | $92.4 \%$ | 0.270 | $92.5 \%$ | 0.488 | $92.8 \%$ | 0.763 | $95.2 \%$ | 0.083 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~T}+\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{N}=1000)$ | $89.8 \%$ | 0.467 | $96.6 \%$ | 0.132 | $94.0 \%$ | 0.273 | $93.6 \%$ | 0.289 | $93.6 \%$ | 0.709 | $\mathbf{9 9 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 0}$ |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~T}+\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{N}=5000)$ | $\mathbf{9 2 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 8 \%}$ | 0.907 | $99.3 \%$ | 0.018 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~T}+\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{N}=10000)$ | $89.7 \%$ | 0.474 | $96.8 \%$ | 0.130 | $94.6 \%$ | 0.159 | $95.2 \%$ | 0.181 | $\mathbf{9 3 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 . 7 \%}$ | 0.270 |  |  |

Figure 1: Results for varying number of hallucinated data for Task1

| Eng |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Models | EM | ED |
| GPT-2 | $83.5 \% \pm 0.007$ | $0.660 \pm 0.026$ |
| T5 | $90.4 \% \pm 0.016$ | $0.316 \pm 0.073$ |
| mGPT | $93.8 \% \pm 0.011$ | $0.121 \pm 0.070$ |

Figure 2: Results for monolingual vs. multilingual for Task1

