

Leading Whitespaces of Language Models’ Subword Vocabulary Poses a Confound for Calculating Word Probabilities

Byung-Doh Oh

Department of Linguistics
The Ohio State University
oh.531@osu.edu

William Schuler

Department of Linguistics
The Ohio State University
schuler.77@osu.edu

Abstract

Word-by-word conditional probabilities from Transformer-based language models are increasingly being used to evaluate their predictions over minimal pairs or to model the incremental processing difficulty of human readers. In this paper, we argue that there is a confound posed by the subword tokenization scheme of such language models, which has gone unaddressed thus far. This is due to the fact that tokens in the subword vocabulary of most language models have leading whitespaces and therefore do not naturally define stop probabilities of words. We first prove that this can result in word probabilities that sum to more than one, thereby violating the axiom that $P(\Omega) = 1$. This property results in a misallocation of word-by-word surprisal, where the unacceptability of the current ‘end of word’ is incorrectly carried over to the next word. Additionally, language models’ such implicit prediction of word boundaries is incongruous with psycholinguistic experiments where human subjects directly observe upcoming word boundaries. We present a simple decoding technique to reaccount the probability of the trailing whitespace into that of the current word, which resolves this confound. As a case study, we show that this results in significantly different estimates of garden-path effects in transitive/intransitive sentences, where a comma is strongly expected before the critical word.

1 Introduction

Language models (LMs), which are trained to make predictions about upcoming words, are at the core of many natural language processing (NLP) applications. While most contemporary applications involve generating text by sampling from the LMs’ conditional probability distribution, the magnitudes of the probabilities they assign to each word in a given sentence have been important from two perspectives. The first is from the perspective of LM

interpretability, which aims to study their predictions and the linguistic knowledge encoded in their representations. A well-established paradigm in this line of research is what has been dubbed ‘targeted syntactic evaluation’ (Linzen et al., 2016; Gulordava et al., 2018; Marvin and Linzen, 2018), in which probabilities of critical words in minimal pairs (e.g. grammatical vs. ungrammatical sentences) are compared.

Moreover, in cognitive modeling, conditional probabilities from LMs are used to model the word-by-word reading times of human subjects, often under the theoretical link that the contextual predictability of a word determines its processing difficulty (Hale, 2001; Levy, 2008). Recent work in this line of research has evaluated surprisal estimates (i.e. negative log probabilities) from LMs and has shown that surprisal from larger Transformer-based model variants are less predictive of naturalistic reading times (Oh and Schuler, 2023; Shain et al., 2024; Steuer et al., 2023) and that surprisal greatly underpredicts the processing difficulty of garden-path constructions (van Schijndel and Linzen, 2021; Arehalli et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2024).

As such, while the use of word-by-word probabilities from LMs is popular in computational linguistics research, we argue that there is a confound for calculating them correctly that has gone unaddressed. This confound is posed by subword tokenization schemes (e.g. byte-pair encoding; Senrich et al., 2016) that are used to define the token-level vocabulary for training most contemporary LMs (e.g. AI@Meta, 2024; Google Gemini Team, 2024; Jiang et al., 2023). For languages that use whitespace orthography, these subword tokenization schemes often build the whitespace character directly into the front of the tokens, thereby resulting in *leading* whitespaces. As a consequence, the stop probability of a word (i.e. the probability of the *trailing* whitespace) is never explicitly calculated, and therefore the sum over the probabilities

of all possible whitespace words can exceed one.

We propose a simple and efficient decoding method that reaccounts the probability of the trailing whitespace into that of the current word, which resolves this confound. Regression results show that this results in significantly different surprisal-based estimates of garden-path effects in transitive/intransitive sentences, where LMs strongly expect a comma before the critical word.

2 Confound From Leading Whitespace and Whitespace-Trailing Decoding

This section provides a proof that the leading whitespace of the LMs’ subword vocabulary results in inconsistent word probabilities, describes a related confound, and proposes a simple decoding method for addressing it.

2.1 Proof of Inconsistent Word Probabilities

On languages that use whitespace orthography, the vocabulary V defined by the subword tokenization scheme consists of the set of tokens that begin with a whitespace V_B , and the set of tokens that do not begin with a whitespace V_I .¹ In the context of next-word prediction, the sample space is $\Omega = \{x_{1..n} \mid x_1 \in V_B, x_{2..n} \in V_I\}$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is the total number of subword tokens in each whitespace word as determined by the tokenizer.

Theorem Leading whitespaces of the LMs’ subword vocabulary can result in word probabilities that violate the [Kolmogorov \(1933\)](#) axiom that $P(\Omega) = 1$.


Existence Proof Let $P(x_1 = j) = 1$ and $P(x_2 = k \mid x_1 = j) = 1$, where $j \in V_B$ and $k \in V_I$. It follows from the chain rule of conditional probabilities that:

$$\begin{aligned} P(x_1 = j, x_2 = k) &= P(x_1 = j) \cdot P(x_2 = k \mid x_1 = j) \\ &= 1 \cdot 1 = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$


If word probabilities are simply defined as the product of the probabilities of the tokens within those words, then $P(x_1 = j) + P(x_1 = j, x_2 = k) > 1$, $P(\Omega) > 1$, and therefore the axiom is violated. ■

For example, given the minimal pair *I was a matron in France* and *I was a mat in France*, the LM tokenizes the two sentences as follows and calcu-

¹ $V = V_B \cup V_I$, and $V_B \cap V_I = \emptyset$. The subscripts respectively represent the ‘beginning’ and ‘inside’ of a whitespace-delimited word.



(a) Surprisal values calculated with leading whitespaces.



(b) Surprisal values calculated with trailing whitespaces.

Figure 1: Surprisal values calculated for the partial sentences *I was a matron in* and *I was a mat in* from the GPT-2 XL LM ([Radford et al., 2019](#)), with leading whitespaces (top; standard practice) and trailing whitespaces (bottom; proposed in this work).

lates the conditional probability of each token.²

$$I \text{ was } a \text{ mat ron in France} \quad (2)$$

$$I \text{ was } a \text{ mat in France} \quad (3)$$

The presence of leading whitespaces results in an incorrect allocation of word-by-word surprisal. As can be seen in Example 2, due to this tokenization, $P(\text{mat ron} \mid I \text{ was } a)$ is factorized into $P(\text{mat} \mid I \text{ was } a) \cdot P(\text{ron} \mid I \text{ was } a \text{ mat})$, and therefore it follows that $P(\text{mat ron} \mid I \text{ was } a) \leq P(\text{mat} \mid I \text{ was } a)$, despite the fact that *matron* is more acceptable than *mat* in the above context. Instead, part of the ‘unacceptability’ of *mat* is incorrectly carried over to $P(\text{in} \mid I \text{ was } a \text{ mat})$, where *in* competes for probability mass against the highly likely *ron* (Figure 1a).

2.2 Confound: Incongruity With Psycholinguistic Experimental Paradigms

Additionally, the presence of leading whitespaces in subword tokens makes the LM’s predictions incongruous with the self-paced reading paradigm, in which human readers directly observe the upcoming word boundary.

$$\textit{The cat sat on the mat ...} \quad (4)$$

²In the context of the LM’s tokens, ‘ $_$ ’ is used to denote the explicit whitespace character that is part of the token, and whitespace is used to delimit subword tokens.

In Example 4, when human readers see *mat*, they know that the next keystroke will reveal a new whitespace-delimited word (i.e. analogous to observing a token in V_B) and not transform it into e.g. *matron* (i.e. analogous to observing a token in V_I). In contrast, LMs define a probability distribution over both V_B and V_I given the sequence *The cat sat on the mat*.

While this confound is more apparent for the self-paced reading paradigm, this is also a potential confound for studying data collected through the typical eye-tracking paradigm. This is because native speakers of languages with whitespace orthographies have been shown to be sensitive to the location of upcoming whitespaces through parafoveal processing and utilize this information to plan eye movements (Pollatsek and Rayner, 1982; Rayner et al., 1998; Perea and Acha, 2009). Therefore, although information about word boundaries is not directly built into the design of the paradigm, it can be argued that human subjects engaged in the eye-tracking paradigm also face little uncertainty about upcoming word boundaries.

2.3 Proposed Solution: Whitespace-Trailing Decoding

This confound can be resolved by reaccounting the probability of the *trailing* whitespace as part of the word’s probability, in lieu of that of the *leading* whitespace as LMs currently do (Examples 2 and 3). To this end, we propose whitespace-trailing (WT) decoding. Given a word w_{t+1} that consists of subword tokens $x_{n_t+1..n_{t+1}}$, where n_t is the total number of subword tokens in $w_{1..t}$, $x_{n_t+1} \in V_B$, and $x_{n_t+2..n_{t+1}} \in V_I$, WT decoding reallocates the probability of the leading whitespace of each word to its previous word:

$$P(w'_{t+1} | w'_{1..t}) = P(w_{t+1} | w_{1..t}) \cdot \frac{P(x_{n_t+1+1} \in V_B | w_{1..t+1})}{P(x_{n_t+1} \in V_B | w_{1..t})}. \quad (5)$$

For instance, applying Eq. 5 to Example 3 yields:

$$P(mat_{_} | I_{_} was_{_} a_{_}) = P(_mat | I_{_} was_{_} a_{_}) \cdot \frac{P(_ | I_{_} was_{_} a_{_} _mat)}{P(_ | I_{_} was_{_} a_{_})}. \quad (6)$$

As WT decoding simply involves the factorization of whitespace probabilities by marginalizing over tokens in V_B and rearranging them, it requires

no modifications to the LM and minimal overhead.³ Additionally, the joint probability of the entire sequence, and therefore metrics like perplexity, changes minimally by a factor of the probability of the final trailing whitespace with WT decoding.

As can be seen in Figure 1b, incorporating the probabilities of trailing whitespaces correctly differentiates between *matron* and *mat* in this context, and removes the inherent relationship between the two probabilities that holds with leading whitespaces. Additionally, the ‘unacceptability’ of *mat* that was incorrectly carried over to *in* in Example 3 is now reflected in $P(mat_{_} | I_{_} was_{_} a_{_})$.

LM probabilities with trailing whitespaces are also better aligned with the self-paced reading paradigm where the upcoming word boundaries are directly observed. For example, the calculation of $P(mat_{_} | The_{_} cat_{_} sat_{_} on_{_} the_{_})$ precludes the prediction of tokens in V_I directly after *mat*, which correctly reflects the fact that the next keystroke in Example 4 will reveal a new whitespace word.

3 Case Study: Impact on Surprisal-Based Estimates of Garden-Path Effects

Eq. 6 shows that WT decoding will result in a decrease (or increase) in probability to the extent that the next token is unlikely to be in V_B proportional to the extent that the current token was likely to be in V_B . This experiment demonstrates that the confound posed by leading whitespaces affects surprisal-based estimates of garden-path effects in transitive/intransitive sentences (Mitchell, 1987; Gorrell, 1991), which is caused by syntactic disambiguation that takes place at the critical word (highlighted in magenta).

After the doctor left the room turned very dark ... (7)

The same critical word in the control counterpart is thought to be easier to process, as the verb *left* is unambiguous.

After the doctor left, the room turned very dark ... (8)

3.1 Procedures

We estimated surprisal-based garden-path effects from GPT-2 model variants (Radford et al., 2019) with and without WT decoding, using the data and

³We note that WT decoding does not resolve other issues with subword units that may be addressed by re-training LMs with different tokenization schemes (e.g. Nair and Resnik, 2023), which can however be expensive. Code for implementing WT decoding is available at: [this_anonymous_url](#).




Figure 2: Estimated effects of interest at each region for the transitive/intransitive garden-path construction, using surprisal from GPT-2 variants with and without WT decoding. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

following the procedures of Huang et al. (2024).⁴ First, to estimate a linking function between LM surprisal and human reading times, linear mixed-effects regression (LMER) models with the following formula were fit to self-paced reading times ($n = 995, 814$) of filler items from the Provo Corpus (Luke and Christianson, 2018) for each variant:

$$RT \sim \text{surp} + \text{surp_prev1} + \text{surp_prev2} + s(\text{length}) + \text{freq} + \text{freq_prev1} + \text{freq_prev2} + s(\text{index}) + (1 | \text{subject}) + (1 | \text{item}),$$

where length is word length in characters, index is the position of the word within the sentence, and the frequency predictors were log-transformed.

These modeling choices assume a linear relationship between surprisal and reading times (Shain et al., 2024; Wilcox et al., 2023), and that surprisal and log frequency from two previous words have a lingering influence on the current word (spillover effects). These LMER models were subsequently used to predict word-by-word reading times (in ms) for 24 items in the ambiguous condition (Example 7) and the unambiguous control condition (Example 8) of the transitive/intransitive construction, which were read by 2,000 subjects ($n=15, 915$):

The increase in the predicted reading times of the disambiguating critical word and two subsequent words due to the increase in surprisal across conditions was estimated using LMER models with the following formula to quantify the magnitude of surprisal-based garden-path effects at each word:⁵

$$\text{pred_RT} \sim \text{condition} + (1 | \text{subject}) + (1 | \text{item}).$$

⁴Huang et al. (2024) present results using GPT-2 Small and the LSTM LM from Gulordava et al. (2018).

⁵Both the ‘filler item’ and ‘reading time increase’ LMER

3.2 Results

The results in Figure 2 show addressing the confound posed by subword tokenization through WT decoding lowers the estimated magnitude of garden-path effects in the first and second spillover regions, the difference in which is significant at $p < 0.05$ level for all comparisons except GPT-2 Large in the second spillover region. This is due to the decrease in surprisal at the critical region of the ambiguous condition (*turned*), as the probability of its unlikely preceding whitespace⁶ is reaccounted for by the previous word (*room*). The resulting decrease in surprisal difference across conditions at the critical region is carried over to the two spillover regions. At the critical region itself, however, this decrease is not observed as the increase in surprisal difference of its previous word (*room*) cancels it out.

4 Conclusion

This work calls attention to an inconsistency and a confound that is inherent in word probabilities calculated from LMs trained with subword tokenization. These are posed by the fact that tokens have leading whitespaces in most models, meaning that the stop probability of a whitespace word is never explicitly calculated, which can result in word probabilities whose sum exceeds one. We proposed WT decoding as a solution for these issues, and demonstrated that addressing them results in lower surprisal-based estimates of transitive/intransitive garden-path effects. Other targeted syntactic constructions may similarly show systematic changes to probabilities of critical words.

More generally, addressing these issues will have the biggest impact on probabilities of words neighboring low-probability whitespaces, such as those at potential phrasal/clausal boundaries where LMs will likely predict a punctuation mark. While such cases may be rare in naturalistic corpora, resolving this confound will lead to qualitatively different predictions about the location and/or magnitude of processing difficulty at those words. Additionally, these issues may be more pronounced for LMs that are not able to predict word boundaries accurately, such as those trained on small amounts of data. Therefore, future studies using LM word probabilities should be wary of and control for them.

models have been simplified from the specifications in Huang et al. (2024) due to convergence issues.

⁶The LMs strongly expect a comma right after *room*.

Limitations

The confound in the connection between word-by-word conditional probabilities of Transformer-based language models and self-paced reading times identified in this work is supported by an experiment using language model variants trained on English text and data from human subjects that are native speakers of English. Therefore, the confound identified in this work may not generalize to other languages, in particular those that do not use whitespace orthography. Additionally, this work is concerned with the use of language models as cognitive models of human sentence processing, and therefore does not relate to their use in natural language processing applications, such as text generation, summarization, or question answering.

Ethics Statement

This work used data collected as part of previously published research (Huang et al., 2024; Luke and Christianson, 2018). Readers are referred to the respective publications for more information on the data collection and validation procedures. As this work focuses on studying the connection between conditional probabilities of language models and human sentence processing, its potential negative impacts on society appear to be minimal.

References

- AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#). Accessed from *GitHub*.
- Suhas Arehalli, Brian Dillon, and Tal Linzen. 2022. [Syntactic surprisal from neural models predicts, but underestimates, human processing difficulty from syntactic ambiguities](#). In *Proceedings of the 26th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 301–313.
- Google Gemini Team. 2024. [Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models](#). *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2312.11805v3.
- Paul Gorrell. 1991. Subcategorization and sentence processing. In R. C. Berwick, S. P. Abney, and C. Tenny, editors, *Principle-Based Parsing: Computation and Psycholinguistics*, pages 279–300. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Kristina Gulordava, Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Tal Linzen, and Marco Baroni. 2018. [Colorless green recurrent networks dream hierarchically](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1195–1205.
- John Hale. 2001. [A probabilistic Earley parser as a psycholinguistic model](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics on Language Technologies*, pages 1–8.
- Kuan-Jung Huang, Suhas Arehalli, Mari Kugemoto, Christian Muxica, Grusha Prasad, Brian Dillon, and Tal Linzen. 2024. [Large-scale benchmark yields no evidence that language model surprisal explains syntactic disambiguation difficulty](#). *Journal of Memory and Language*, 137:104510.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7B](#). *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Andrey Nikolaevich Kolmogorov. 1933. *Foundations of the Theory of Probability*. Julius Springer, Berlin.
- Roger Levy. 2008. [Expectation-based syntactic comprehension](#). *Cognition*, 106(3):1126–1177.
- Tal Linzen, Emmanuel Dupoux, and Yoav Goldberg. 2016. [Assessing the ability of LSTMs to learn syntax-sensitive dependencies](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:521–535.
- Steven G. Luke and Kiel Christianson. 2018. [The Provo Corpus: A large eye-tracking corpus with predictability norms](#). *Behavior Research Methods*, 50(2):826–833.
- Rebecca Marvin and Tal Linzen. 2018. [Targeted syntactic evaluation of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1192–1202.
- Don C. Mitchell. 1987. Lexical guidance in human parsing: Locus and processing characteristics. In M. Coltheart, editor, *Attention and Performance XII: The Psychology of Reading*, pages 601–618. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Sathvik Nair and Philip Resnik. 2023. [Words, subwords, and morphemes: What really matters in the surprisal-reading time relationship?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 11251–11260.
- Byung-Doh Oh and William Schuler. 2023. [Why does surprisal from larger Transformer-based language models provide a poorer fit to human reading times?](#) *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:336–350.
- Manuel Perea and Joana Acha. 2009. [Space information is important for reading](#). *Vision Research*, 49(15):1994–2000.

- Alexander Pollatsek and Keith Rayner. 1982. [Eye movement control in reading: The role of word boundaries](#). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 8(6):817–833.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#). *OpenAI Technical Report*.
- Keith Rayner, Martin H. Fischer, and Alexander Pollatsek. 1998. [Unspaced text interferes with both word identification and eye movement control](#). *Vision Research*, 38(8):1129–1144.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. [Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1715–1725.
- Cory Shain, Clara Meister, Tiago Pimentel, Ryan Cotterell, and Roger Levy. 2024. [Large-scale evidence for logarithmic effects of word predictability on reading time](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(10):e2307876121.
- Julius Steuer, Marius Mosbach, and Dietrich Klakow. 2023. [Large GPT-like models are bad babies: A closer look at the relationship between linguistic competence and psycholinguistic measures](#). In *Proceedings of the BabyLM Challenge at the 27th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 142–157.
- Marten van Schijndel and Tal Linzen. 2021. [Single-stage prediction models do not explain the magnitude of syntactic disambiguation difficulty](#). *Cognitive Science*, 45(6):e12988.
- Ethan G. Wilcox, Tiago Pimentel, Clara Meister, Ryan Cotterell, and Roger P. Levy. 2023. [Testing the predictions of surprisal theory in 11 languages](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:1451–1470.