Extracting pronunciation rules for phonemic variants

Marelie Davel & Etienne Barnard

Human Language Technologies Research Group CSIR Meraka Institute / University of Pretoria



Overview

- Background
- Approach
 - Pseudo-phonemes
 - Generation restriction rules
 - Process
- Results
 - Benchmark system
 - Prediction of non-variants
 - Prediction of variants
- Conclusion



Background

- Pronunciation model:
 - Maps orthography to phonemic realisation of word
 - Multilingual requirement: Fast development of pronunciation models in resource-scarce languages
- Pronunciation variation:
 - Predictive rewrite rules
 - Incorporation of phonemic variants
- Inclusion of explicit pronunciation variants:
 - Difficult to ensure consistency
 - Difficult to use grapheme-to-phoneme rule extraction to generalise



Generating pseudo-phonemes

• Single model for two or more phonemes consistently occurring as variants of single word.

Word	Variants	Pseudo- phoneme	New pronunciation
animate	ae n I m ay t Φ	$p_1 = ay ax $	aenlm <i>p</i> 1tΦ
	ae n l m ax t Φ		
delegate	d eh l ih g ay t Φ	$p_1 = ay ax $	d eh l ih g p_1 t Φ
	d eh l ih g ax t Φ		
lens	l eh n z	$p_2 = s z $	lehnp ₂
	l eh n s		
close	klow z Φ	$p_2 = s z $	k Ι ow <i>p</i> ₂ Φ
	k I ow s Ф		me

Generation restriction rules

- Example: second
 - Valid: /s eh k ih n d/
 - Valid: /s ih k aa n d/
 - Invalid: /s ih k ih n d/
 - Invalid: /s eh k aa n d/
 - Valid combinations: always eh;ih and ih;aa
 - Use Default&Refine to extract rules



Process

- Align training dictionary
- Generate pseudo-phonemes
- Rewrite aligned dictionary in terms of pseudophonemes
- Use D&R to extract pronunciation prediction rules
- Use D&R to extract generation restriction rules
- Predict test word lists i.t.o pseudo phonemes using standard D&R rule extraction
- Expand dictionary according to pseudo-phoneme mappings and generation restriction rules
- Evaluate accuracy of expanded lexicon



Benchmark systems

- Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary (OALD)
- Excluding Part-of-Speech, Stress assignment

Approach	Word accuracy		Phoneme accuracy		Phoneme correctness	
CART [Black et al]	76.92	-	-	-	96.36	-
		σ_{10}		σ_{10}		σ_{10}
D&R: one variant	86.46	0.15	97.41	0.03	97.67	0.03
D&R: no variants	86.87	0.16	97.49	0.03	97.74	0.03



Prediction of non-variants

No detrimental effect on non-variant prediction

Approach	Word accuracy		Phoneme accuracy		Phoneme correctness	
D&R: no variants	86.93	σ ₁₀ 0.16	97.50	σ ₁₀ 0.03	97.75	σ ₁₀ 0.03
D&R: pseudo- phonemes	86.92	0.15	97.50	0.03	97.76	0.03



Prediction of variants

- 58% of expected variants correctly generated
- 67% of generated variants correct
- Examples of cross-validation sets:

Correct	Missing	Extra	% correct of expected	% correct of generated
58	43	23	57.43	71.60
56	40	20	58.33	73.68
64	45	32	58.72	66.67

- Some "extra" may be legitimate, e.g.:
 - increase: both /iy n k r iy s/ and /iy ng k r iy s/
 - Increased: only /iy n k r iy s t/ allowed



Conclusions

- Process allows for incorporation of variants without adjusting standard rule extraction algorithm
- Applicable to additional g-to-p frameworks
- Applicable to additional lexicons (Fonilex, CMU-dict)
- Can use process to identify inconsistent variants within a lexicon

