Evaluating a German Sketch Grammar: A Case Study on Noun Phrase Case

Kremena Ivanova*, Ulrich Heid*, Sabine Schulte im Walde*, Adam Kilgarriff°, Jan Pomikálek^{o⊳}

*Institute for Natural Language Processing, University of Stuttgart, Germany °Lexical Computing Ltd, Brighton, UK ▷Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

> {ivanovka,heid,schulte}@ims.uni-stuttgart.de, adam@lexmasterclass.com, xpomikal@fi.muni.cz

Marrakech, Morocco, May 28, 2008

Ivanova et al. (LREC 2008)

German Sketch Grammar

The Sketch Engine (Kilgarriff et al. 2004) A system for corpus exploration

• Input: preprocessed corpora,

e.g. tokenized, POS-tagged, lemmatized , ...

The Sketch Engine (Kilgarriff et al. 2004) A system for corpus exploration

• Input: preprocessed corpora,

e.g. tokenized, POS-tagged, lemmatized , ...

- Functions:
 - concordancing
 - collocation extraction with a *sketch grammar*, i.e.
 - a set of regular expression search patterns over the corpus

The Sketch Engine (Kilgarriff et al. 2004) A system for corpus exploration

• Input: preprocessed corpora,

e.g. tokenized, POS-tagged, lemmatized , ...

- Functions:
 - concordancing
 - collocation extraction with a *sketch grammar*, i.e.
 - a set of regular expression search patterns over the corpus
- Output: Word sketches

Sets of significant word pairs, grouped by grammatical relations, e.g. adjective + noun, verb + subject noun, coordinated elements, etc.

The Sketch Engine - word sketches

A sample word sketch: collection of cooccurrence data

Node word + 'collocates':

Word sketch for verb öffnen 'open':

Lemma of cooccurrence partner – frequency (in BNC) – significance

| subj | 3017 | 5.1 | obj-acc | 282 | 5.9 | adv | 140 | 5.2 |
|----------|------|-------|-------------|-----|-------|---------------|-----|-------|
| Tür | 238 | 49.37 | Tür | 39 | 36.24 | täglich | 12 | 22.68 |
| Pforte | 35 | 35.20 | Auge | 26 | 26.67 | versehentlich | 3 | 16.92 |
| Türe | 29 | 33.78 | Pforte | 7 | 22.71 | leicht | 6 | 13.89 |
| Tor | 62 | 32.34 | Wohnungstür | 3 | 21.61 | weit | 13 | 13.61 |
| Auge | 114 | 32.29 | Türe | 5 | 19.38 | gleichzeitig | 4 | 12.37 |
| Fenster | 49 | 28.69 | Datei | 4 | 12.23 | automatisch | 3 | 11.42 |
| Schleuse | 10 | 23.27 | Tor | 4 | 11.7 | | | |

Source: DeWaC, 10 million words

Regular expression-based: sequence patterns

Example: POS sequences

• Adjective + Noun combination: 2: [tag="ADJA"] 1: [tag=NN"]

Example: POS sequences

• Adjective + Noun combination: 2: [tag="ADJA"] 1: [tag=NN"]

- finds sequences adjective + noun

Example: POS sequences

- Adjective + Noun combination: 2: [tag="ADJA"] 1: [tag=NN"]
 - finds sequences adjective + noun
 - counts frequency, calculates significance

Example: POS sequences

- Adjective + Noun combination: 2: [tag="ADJA"] 1: [tag=NN"]
 - finds sequences adjective + noun
 - counts frequency, calculates significance
 - allows for display of pair in
 - * list of adjective collocates of a given noun (1:...), e.g. Dorf

| Modifyir | ng adjectives | Freq | Sign |
|-----------|---------------|------|-------|
| klein | 'small' | 274 | 37.68 |
| umliegend | 'surrounding' | 39 | 37.30 |
| malerisch | 'picturesque' | 20 | 28.96 |
| entlegen | 'remote' | 16 | 28.58 |

Example: POS sequences

- Adjective + Noun combination: 2: [tag="ADJA"] 1: [tag=NN"]
 - finds sequences adjective + noun
 - counts frequency, calculates significance
 - allows for display of pair in

* list of adjective collocates of a given noun (1:...), e.g. Dorf

| Modifyir | Modifying adjectives | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|-----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| klein | 'small' | 274 | 37.68 | | | | | |
| umliegend | 'surrounding' | 39 | 37.30 | | | | | |
| malerisch | 'picturesque' | 20 | 28.96 | | | | | |
| entlegen | 'remote' | 16 | 28.58 | | | | | |

* list of noun nodes of a given adjective (2:...), e.g. klein

| Modified | Modified nouns | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|-----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Ausschnitt | 'extract' | 188 | 37.49 | | | | | |
| Junge | 'boy' | 325 | 33.91 | | | | | |
| Dorf | 'village' | 274 | 32.80 | | | | | |
| Meerjungfrau | 'mermaid' | 46 | 31.19 | | | | | |

Example: POS sequences

- Adjective + Noun combination: 2: [tag="ADJA"] 1: [tag=NN"]
 - finds sequences adjective + noun
 - counts frequency, calculates significance
 - allows for display of pair in

| * | list of adjectiv | e collocates | of a | given | noun | (1: |) e ø | Dorf |
|---|------------------|--------------|------|-------|------|-----|---------|------|
| | inst of aujectiv | e conocates | UI a | given | noun | (| J, C.g. | DUIT |

| Modifyin | Modifying adjectives | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|-----|-------|--|--|--|--|
| klein | 'small' | 274 | 37.68 | | | | |
| umliegend | 'surrounding' | 39 | 37.30 | | | | |
| malerisch | 'picturesque' | 20 | 28.96 | | | | |
| entlegen | 'remote' | 16 | 28.58 | | | | |

* list of noun nodes of a given adjective (2:...), e.g. klein

| Modified | Freq | Sign | |
|--------------|-----------|------|-------|
| Ausschnitt | 'extract' | 188 | 37.49 |
| Junge | 'boy' | 325 | 33.91 |
| Dorf | 'village' | 274 | 32.80 |
| Meerjungfrau | 'mermaid' | 46 | 31.19 |

• Simple model of a noun phrase as a POS sequence: DET? ADV* ADJA* NOUN

Ivanova et al. (LREC 2008)

Identifying grammatical relations, e.g. verb + object noun

Identifying grammatical relations, e.g. verb + object noun

 EN (configurational): by position wrt the verb: Subject < Verb < Object (Kilgarriff et al. 2004)

Identifying grammatical relations, e.g. verb + object noun

- EN (configurational): by position wrt the verb: Subject < Verb < Object (Kilgarriff et al. 2004)
- CHI: by position and particles

Kilgarriff et al. 2004) (Kilgarriff 2005)

Identifying grammatical relations, e.g. verb + object noun

- EN (configurational): by position wrt the verb: Subject < Verb < Object (Kilgarriff et al. 2004)
- CHI: by position and particles

(Kilgarriff 2005)

 CZ, SLO (inflecting): by inflectional affixes: SLO lépa híša ("beautiful house"): NOM-SG *lépi híši*: DAT-SG | LOC-SG (+ Prep.) (Kilgarriff et al. 2004, Krek/Kilgarriff 2006)

Sketch Grammars Identifying grammatical relations in German texts

Ivanova et al. (LREC 2008)

Identifying grammatical relations in German texts

• not via word order:

den Mitarbeiter_{Acc} lobt der Chef_{Nom} ("the boss speaks highly of the collaborator") Constituent order is relatively free in German

Identifying grammatical relations in German texts

• not via word order:

 $\begin{array}{l} \textit{den Mitarbeiter}_{Acc} \textit{ lobt der Chef}_{Nom} \\ ("the boss speaks highly of the collaborator") \\ Constituent order is relatively free in German \end{array}$

• not often via inflection:

 $\begin{array}{l} \textit{Hans}_{Nom/Acc} \textit{ lobt Maria}_{Nom/Acc} \\ \textit{weil der Chef}_{Acc} \textit{ der Firma}_{Gen/Dat} \textit{ in Berlin}_{PP} \textit{ empfahl}, \ldots \textit{zu} \ldots \\ \textit{Only ca. 21\% of all NPs are unambiguous wrt case (Evert 2004)} \end{array}$

Identifying grammatical relations in German texts

• not via word order:

 $\begin{array}{l} \textit{den Mitarbeiter}_{Acc} \textit{ lobt der Chef}_{Nom} \\ ("the boss speaks highly of the collaborator") \\ Constituent order is relatively free in German \end{array}$

• not often via inflection:

 $\begin{array}{l} \textit{Hans}_{Nom/Acc} \textit{ lobt Maria}_{Nom/Acc} \\ \textit{weil der Chef}_{Acc} \textit{ der Firma}_{Gen/Dat} \textit{ in Berlin}_{PP} \textit{ empfahl}, \ldots \textit{zu} \ldots \\ \textit{Only ca. 21\% of all NPs are unambiguous wrt case (Evert 2004)} \end{array}$

 \Rightarrow harder than in other languages

A Sketch Grammar for German Knowledge for the identification of grammatical relations

() {gender, number, case} of nouns \leftrightarrow inflectional affixes

A Sketch Grammar for German Knowledge for the identification of grammatical relations

- 1 {gender, number, case} of nouns \leftrightarrow inflectional affixes
- Preferential constituent ordering: verb-final constituent order model is more regular than others

A Sketch Grammar for German Knowledge for the identification of grammatical relations

- 1 {gender, number, case} of nouns \leftrightarrow inflectional affixes
- Preferential constituent ordering: verb-final constituent order model is more regular than others
- Constraints on subcategorization patterns, e.g.
 'No two identical grammatical functions in one sentence' (cf. 'coherence' in LFG)

Proportion between preprocessing (offline) and query (online)

1 Gender, number, case:

not annotated: STTS: "NN" (UPenn: "NNS" - "NNP")

- \rightarrow Need to identify these within the sketch grammar
- **2** Preferential constituent ordering under V-final:

 \rightarrow Search in a subset of the corpus sentences

- **3** Constraints on subcategorization patterns:
 - \rightarrow Implementation as patterns in the sketch grammar

Proportion between preprocessing (offline) and query (online)

1 Gender, number, case:

- not annotated: STTS: "NN" (UPenn: "NNS" "NNP")
 - \rightarrow Need to identify these within the sketch grammar
- **2** Preferential constituent ordering under V-final:
 - \rightarrow Search in a subset of the corpus sentences
- **3** Constraints on subcategorization patterns:
 - \rightarrow Implementation as patterns in the sketch grammar
- ⇒ To assess usefulness of these types of information: Different versions of the sketch grammar which include the different types of information

Versions of the grammar with different types of information (1/2)Conditions for the evaluation

Morphological restrictions: alternatives

Ivanova et al. (LREC 2008)

Versions of the grammar with different types of information (1/2) Conditions for the evaluation

Morphological restrictions: alternatives

• inflection:

case guessing from the form of affixes (affix sequences) $dem_{Dat} \ kleinen_{Dat} \ Haus_{Nom/Dat/Acc}$

Versions of the grammar with different types of information (1/2) Conditions for the evaluation

Morphological restrictions: alternatives

• inflection:

case guessing from the form of affixes (affix sequences) $dem_{Dat} \ kleinen_{Dat} \ Haus_{Nom/Dat/Acc}$

• *affix-gender*:

case and gender guessing from derivational affixes and inflectional affixes $den_{ACC-SG-MASC/DAT-PL-FEM}$ Schwierigkeiten_ANY-PL-FEM \Rightarrow subset of nouns with known agreement properties

Versions of the grammar with different types of information (2/2) Conditions for the evaluation

Structural restrictions: alternatives

Versions of the grammar with different types of information (2/2)Conditions for the evaluation

Structural restrictions: alternatives

• *no-structure(-constraints)*: extraction without any structural constraints

Versions of the grammar with different types of information (2/2)Conditions for the evaluation

Structural restrictions: alternatives

- *no-structure(-constraints)*: extraction without any structural constraints
- verb-final:

extraction only from verb-final sentences (= subclauses), according to constraints on subcategorization patterns

Versions of the grammar with different types of information (2/2)Conditions for the evaluation

Structural restrictions: alternatives

- *no-structure(-constraints)*: extraction without any structural constraints
- verb-final:

extraction only from verb-final sentences (= subclauses), according to constraints on subcategorization patterns

• all-clauses:

extraction from an explicit model of all verb position models (V1, V2, Vlast), according to subcategorization patterns

Evaluation: comparing versions of the Sketch Grammar Combining the restrictions

no affix-gender no structure × verb-final (R) with affix-gender (R) all-clauses (R)

inflection = minimum knowledge

- (1) inflection + no-structure
- (2) inflection + affix-gender + no-structure
- (3) inflection + verb-final
- (4) inflection + affix-gender + verb-final
- (5) inflection + all-clauses
- (6) inflection + affix-gender + all-clauses

- fewest restrictions (R)
- structural restrictions (R)
- most restr. (R)

Ivanova et al. (LREC 2008)

Evaluation: comparing versions of the Sketch Grammar Gold standard corpus

• 1000 randomly selected sentences from DeWaC

Evaluation: comparing versions of the Sketch Grammar Gold standard corpus

- 1000 randomly selected sentences from DeWaC
- Manual annotation for NP (one annotator):
 - start and end point
 - case
- Example:

 $[Ich]_{NPnom}$ musste [meine Arbeit]_{NPakk} schon sehr gut machen, um anerkannt zu werden .

'I had to do my work really well to be approved.'

Evaluation: comparing versions of the Sketch Grammar Gold standard corpus

- 1000 randomly selected sentences from DeWaC
- Manual annotation for NP (one annotator):
 - start and end point
 - case
- Example:

 $[Ich]_{NPnom}$ musste [meine Arbeit]_{NPakk} schon sehr gut machen, um anerkannt zu werden .

'I had to do my work really well to be approved.'

• Figures: NPs in the 1000 sentences

| Nominative | 1.709 |
|------------|-------|
| Genitive | 437 |
| Dative | 149 |
| Accusative | 618 |

Ivanova et al. (LREC 2008)

Evaluated per case and per condition:

Exception: Genitive not implemented under conditions 3 + 4:

No verb with genitive object in the corpus, we only consider genitives in NPs

| | N | | Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|----|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|--|
| Casa | | | incl. inflection | | | | | | incl. <i>inflection</i> + <i>affix-gender</i> | | | | | |
| Case | | 1 | 1 | | 3 | Į | 5 | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 6 | | |
| | | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | |
| Nominative | 1,709 | 85 | 28 | 7 | 76 | 26 | 65 | 43 | 53 | 9 | 81 | 28 | 60 | |
| Accusative | 618 | 64 | 24 | 6 | 37 | 18 | 41 | 51 | 30 | 6 | 35 | 14 | 45 | |
| Dative | 149 | 62 | 9 | 21 | 34 | 41 | 35 | 55 | 13 | 25 | 59 | 40 | 74 | |
| Genitive | 437 | 78 | 34 | | | 65 | 79 | 57 | 44 | | | 60 | 82 | |

| | N | | Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|----|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------------------|----|----|----|--|--|
| Case | | | incl. inflection | | | | | | | incl. inflection + affix-gender | | | | | |
| Case | | 1 | | 3 | | 5 | | 2 | | 4 | | 6 | | | |
| | | R | P | R | P | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | P | | |
| Nominative | 1,709 | 85 | 28 | 7 | 76 | 26 | 65 | 43 | 53 | 9 | 81 | 28 | 60 | | |
| Accusative | 618 | 64 | 24 | 6 | 37 | 18 | 41 | 51 | 30 | 6 | 35 | 14 | 45 | | |
| Dative | 149 | 62 | 9 | 21 | 34 | 41 | 35 | 55 | 13 | 25 | 59 | 40 | 74 | | |
| Genitive | 437 | 78 | 34 | | | 65 | 79 | 57 | 44 | | | 60 | 82 | | |

| | N | Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|------------|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------------------|----|----|----|--|--|
| Case | | | incl. inflection | | | | | | | incl. inflection + affix-gender | | | | | |
| Case | | 1 | | 3 | | 5 | | 2 | | 4 | | 6 | | | |
| | | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | P | | |
| Nominative | 1,709 | 85 | 28 | 7 | 76 | 26 | 65 | 43 | 53 | 9 | 81 | 28 | 60 | | |
| Accusative | 618 | 64 | 24 | 6 | 37 | 18 | 41 | 51 | 30 | 6 | 35 | 14 | 45 | | |
| Dative | 149 | 62 | 9 | 21 | 34 | 41 | 35 | 55 | 13 | 25 | 59 | 40 | 74 | | |
| Genitive | 437 | 78 | 34 | | | 65 | 79 | 57 | 44 | | | 60 | 82 | | |

 Condition 1 vs. condition 2: ⊕ precision ⊖ recall Adding derivation-based gender-guessing

Ivanova et al. (LREC 2008)

| | N | Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|------------|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------------------|----|----|----|--|--|
| Case | | | incl. inflection | | | | | | | incl. inflection + affix-gender | | | | | |
| Case | | | 1 | | 3 | | 5 | | 2 | | 4 | 6 | | | |
| | | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | P | | |
| Nominative | 1,709 | 85 | 28 | 7 | 76 | 26 | 65 | 43 | 53 | 9 | 81 | 28 | 60 | | |
| Accusative | 618 | 64 | 24 | 6 | 37 | 18 | 41 | 51 | 30 | 6 | 35 | 14 | 45 | | |
| Dative | 149 | 62 | 9 | 21 | 34 | 41 | 35 | 55 | 13 | 25 | 59 | 40 | 74 | | |
| Genitive | 437 | 78 | 34 | | | 65 | 79 | 57 | 44 | | | 60 | 82 | | |

- Condition 1 vs. condition 2: ⊕ precision ⊖ recall Adding derivation-based gender-guessing
- Condition 1 vs. 3, 2 vs. 4: ⊕ precision ⊖ recall Verb-final clauses: ca. 20% of all corpus sentences Stronger changes than in condition 1 vs. 2

| | N | Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Case | | incl. inflection | | | | | | incl. inflection + affix-gender | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | 3 | | 5 | | 2 | | 4 | | 6 | |
| | | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | Р | R | P |
| Nominative | 1,709 | 85 | 28 | 7 | 76 | 26 | 65 | 43 | 53 | 9 | 81 | 28 | 60 |
| Accusative | 618 | 64 | 24 | 6 | 37 | 18 | 41 | 51 | 30 | 6 | 35 | 14 | 45 |
| Dative | 149 | 62 | 9 | 21 | 34 | 41 | 35 | 55 | 13 | 25 | 59 | 40 | 74 |
| Genitive | 437 | 78 | 34 | | | 65 | 79 | 57 | 44 | | | 60 | 82 |

- Condition 1 vs. condition 2: ⊕ precision ⊖ recall Adding derivation-based gender-guessing
- Condition 1 vs. 3, 2 vs. 4: ⊕ precision ⊖ recall Verb-final clauses: ca. 20% of all corpus sentences Stronger changes than in condition 1 vs. 2
- Cond. 4 vs. 6: better precision (!) and increased recall -recall: all-clauses is less restrictive than verb-final -precision: usefulness of explicit modelling?

Ivanova et al. (LREC 2008)

Evaluation: comparing versions of the Sketch Grammar Which German sketch grammar to choose?

So far: developer evaluation:

| Case | N | Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------------------|----|----|----|----|--|
| | | incl. inflection | | | | | | | incl. inflection + affix-gender | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | 3 | | 5 | | 2 | | 4 | | 6 | | |
| | | R | P | R | P | R | P | R | P | R | P | R | P | |
| Nominative | 1,709 | 85 | 28 | 7 | 76 | 26 | 65 | 43 | 53 | 9 | 81 | 28 | 60 | |
| Accusative | 618 | 64 | 24 | 6 | 37 | 18 | 41 | 51 | 30 | 6 | 35 | 14 | 45 | |
| Dative | 149 | 62 | 9 | 21 | 34 | 41 | 35 | 55 | 13 | 25 | 59 | 40 | 74 | |
| Genitive | 437 | 78 | 34 | | | 65 | 79 | 57 | 44 | | | 60 | 82 | |

• Best recall: condition 1: least constrained

• Best precision: condition 6: morph. + structural constraints

Evaluation: comparing versions of the Sketch Grammar Which German sketch grammar to choose?

So far: developer evaluation:

| Case | N | Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | incl. inflection | | | | | | incl. inflection + affix-gender | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | 3 | | 5 | | 2 | | 4 | | 6 | |
| | | R | P | R | P | R | P | R | P | R | P | R | P |
| Nominative | 1,709 | 85 | 28 | 7 | 76 | 26 | 65 | 43 | 53 | 9 | 81 | 28 | 60 |
| Accusative | 618 | 64 | 24 | 6 | 37 | 18 | 41 | 51 | 30 | 6 | 35 | 14 | 45 |
| Dative | 149 | 62 | 9 | 21 | 34 | 41 | 35 | 55 | 13 | 25 | 59 | 40 | 74 |
| Genitive | 437 | 78 | 34 | | | 65 | 79 | 57 | 44 | | | 60 | 82 |

• Best recall: condition 1: least constrained

• Best precision: condition 6: morph. + structural constraints

User evaluation: "Clients" would have to decide (ongoing work)

- Lexicographers: need high-precision data (\rightarrow condition 6)
- NLP researchers: may prefer large amounts of candidates (\rightarrow cond. 1)

But: decision to be taken on Word Sketches, not on precision/recall

Evaluation for lexicography Sample word sketch

Word sketch for noun Pflanze 'plant'

| attr-adj | 1566 | 2.0 | subj-of | 905 | 2.5 |
|--------------------------|------|-------|----------|-----|-------|
| gentechnisch | 94 | 47.14 | wachsen | 26 | 24.45 |
| verändert | 100 | 42.3 | gedeihen | 6 | 18.46 |
| genmanipuliert | 30 | 39.44 | anbauen | 5 | 18.30 |
| fleischfressend | 16 | 35.93 | werden | 73 | 15.91 |
| transgen <mark>en</mark> | 16 | 34.59 | können | 44 | 15.15 |
| exotisch | 24 | 30.00 | sollen | 30 | 15.03 |
| transgen <mark>er</mark> | 8 | 28.45 | gießen | 4 | 14.52 |

We have presented

- a methodology for testing and evaluating (sketch) grammars for data extraction from corpora: applicable also to other languages
- a draft sketch grammar for German with different types and portions of linguistic knowledge

We have presented

- a methodology for testing and evaluating (sketch) grammars for data extraction from corpora: applicable also to other languages
- a draft sketch grammar for German with different types and portions of linguistic knowledge

We have presented

- a methodology for testing and evaluating (sketch) grammars for data extraction from corpora: applicable also to other languages
- a draft sketch grammar for German with different types and portions of linguistic knowledge

Next

• further restrict the grammar, to improve precision, with a view to lexicographic use

We have presented

- a methodology for testing and evaluating (sketch) grammars for data extraction from corpora: applicable also to other languages
- a draft sketch grammar for German with different types and portions of linguistic knowledge

- further restrict the grammar, to improve precision, with a view to lexicographic use
- integrate lexical resources (e.g. on noun gender), to improve precision and to compensate for flat tagset

We have presented

- a methodology for testing and evaluating (sketch) grammars for data extraction from corpora: applicable also to other languages
- a draft sketch grammar for German with different types and portions of linguistic knowledge

- further restrict the grammar, to improve precision, with a view to lexicographic use
- integrate lexical resources (e.g. on noun gender), to improve precision and to compensate for flat tagset
- possibly use more deeply preprocessed data

We have presented

- a methodology for testing and evaluating (sketch) grammars for data extraction from corpora: applicable also to other languages
- a draft sketch grammar for German with different types and portions of linguistic knowledge

- further restrict the grammar, to improve precision, with a view to lexicographic use
- integrate lexical resources (e.g. on noun gender), to improve precision and to compensate for flat tagset
- possibly use more deeply preprocessed data
- evaluate quality of word sketches from a lexicographic viewpoint