

Word Meaning and Similarity

Word Similarity:
Distributional Similarity (I)

Problems with thesaurus-based meaning

- We don't have a thesaurus for every language
- Even if we do, they have problems with **recall**
 - Many words are missing
 - Most (if not all) phrases are missing
 - Some connections between senses are missing
 - Thesauri work less well for verbs, adjectives
 - Adjectives and verbs have less structured hyponymy relations

Distributional models of meaning

- Also called vector-space models of meaning
- Offer much higher recall than hand-built thesauri
 - Although they tend to have lower precision
- Zellig Harris (1954): “**oculist** and **eye-doctor** ... occur in almost the same environments....
If A and B have almost identical environments we say that they are synonyms.
- Firth (1957): “You shall know a word by the company it keeps!”

Intuition of distributional word similarity

- Nida example:

A bottle of **tesgüino** is on the table
Everybody likes **tesgüino**
Tesgüino makes you drunk
We make **tesgüino** out of corn.

- From context words humans can guess **tesgüino** means
 - an alcoholic beverage like **beer**
- Intuition for algorithm:
 - Two words are similar if they have similar word contexts.

The Term-Context matrix

- use smaller contexts
 - Paragraph
 - Window of 10 words
- A word is now defined by a vector over counts of context words

Sample contexts: 20 words (Brown corpus)

- equal amount of sugar, a sliced lemon, a tablespoonful of **apricot** preserve or jam, a pinch each of clove and nutmeg,
- on board for their enjoyment. Cautiously she sampled her first **pineapple** and another fruit whose taste she likened to that of
- of a recursive type well suited to programming on the **digital** computer. In finding the optimal R-stage policy from that of
- substantially affect commerce, for the purpose of gathering data and **information** necessary for the study authorized in the first section of this

Term-context matrix for word similarity

- Two **words** are similar in meaning if their context vectors are similar

	aardvark	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar	...
apricot	0	0	0	1	0	1	
pineapple	0	0	0	1	0	1	
digital	0	2	1	0	1	0	
information	0	1	6	0	4	0	

Should we use raw counts?

- For the term-context matrix
 - Positive Pointwise Mutual Information (PPMI) is common

Pointwise Mutual Information

- **Pointwise mutual information:**

- Do events x and y co-occur more than if they were independent?

$$\text{PMI}(X, Y) = \log_2 \frac{P(x, y)}{P(x)P(y)}$$

- **PMI between two words:** (Church & Hanks 1989)

- Do words x and y co-occur more than if they were independent?

$$\text{PMI}(\text{word}_1, \text{word}_2) = \log_2 \frac{P(\text{word}_1, \text{word}_2)}{P(\text{word}_1)P(\text{word}_2)}$$

- **Positive PMI between two words** (Niwa & Nitta 1994)

- Replace all PMI values less than 0 with zero

Computing PPMI on a term-context matrix

- Matrix F with W rows (words) and C columns (contexts)
- f_{ij} is # of times w_i occurs in context c_j

	aardvark	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar
apricot	0	0	0	1	0	1
pineapple	0	0	0	1	0	1
digital	0	2	1	0	1	0
information	0	1	6	0	4	0

$$p_{ij} = \frac{f_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^W \sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}$$

$$p_{i*} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^W \sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}$$

$$p_{*j} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^W f_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^W \sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}$$

$$pmi_{ij} = \log_2 \frac{p_{ij}}{p_{i*} p_{*j}}$$

$$ppmi_{ij} = \begin{cases} pmi_{ij} & \text{if } pmi_{ij} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$P_{ij} = \frac{f_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^W \sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}$$

apricot
 pineapple
 digital
 information

Count(w,context)

	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar
apricot	0	0	1	0	1
pineapple	0	0	1	0	1
digital	2	1	0	1	0
information	1	6	0	4	0

$p(w=\text{information},c=\text{data}) = 6/19 = .32$

$p(w=\text{information}) = 11/19 = .58$

$p(c=\text{data}) = 7/19 = .37$

$$p(w_i) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}{N}$$

$$p(c_j) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^W f_{ij}}{N}$$

	p(w,context)					p(w)
	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar	
apricot	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.11
pineapple	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.11
digital	0.11	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.21
information	0.05	0.32	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.58
p(context)	0.16	0.37	0.11	0.26	0.11	

		p(w,context)					p(w)
		computer	data	pinch	result	sugar	
$pmi_{ij} = \log_2 \frac{p_{ij}}{p_i * p_j}$	apricot	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.11
	pineapple	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.11
	digital	0.11	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.21
	information	0.05	0.32	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.58
	p(context)	0.16	0.37	0.11	0.26	0.11	

- $pmi(\text{information}, \text{data}) = \log_2 (.32 / (.37 * .58)) = .57$

	PPMI(w,context)				
	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar
apricot	-	-	2.25	-	2.25
pineapple	-	-	2.25	-	2.25
digital	1.66	0.00	-	0.00	-
information	0.00	0.57	-	0.47	-

Weighing PMI

- PMI is biased toward infrequent events
- Various weighting schemes help alleviate this
 - See Turney and Pantel (2010)
- Add-one smoothing can also help

Add-2 Smoothed Count(w,context)

	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar
apricot	2	2	3	2	3
pineapple	2	2	3	2	3
digital	4	3	2	3	2
information	3	8	2	6	2

	p(w,context) [add-2]					p(w)
	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar	
apricot	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.20
pineapple	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.20
digital	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.24
information	0.05	0.14	0.03	0.10	0.03	0.36
p(context)	0.19	0.25	0.17	0.22	0.17	

	PPMI(w,context)				
	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar
apricot	-	-	2.25	-	2.25
pineapple	-	-	2.25	-	2.25
digital	1.66	0.00	-	0.00	-
information	0.00	0.57	-	0.47	-

	PPMI(w,context) [add-2]				
	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar
apricot	0.00	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.56
pineapple	0.00	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.56
digital	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
information	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.37	0.00

Using syntax to define a word's context

- Zellig Harris (1968)
 - “The meaning of entities, and the meaning of grammatical relations among them, is related to the restriction of combinations of these entities relative to other entities”
- Two words are similar if they have similar parse contexts
- **Duty** and **responsibility** (Chris Callison-Burch's example)

**Modified by
adjectives**

additional, administrative, assumed,
collective, congressional, constitutional ...

Objects of verbs

assert, assign, assume, attend to, avoid,
become, breach ...

Co-occurrence vectors based on syntactic dependencies

Dekang Lin, 1998 “Automatic Retrieval and Clustering of Similar Words”

- The contexts C are different dependency relations
 - Subject-of- “absorb”
 - Prepositional-object of “inside”
- Counts for the word cell:

	subj-of, absorb	subj-of, adapt	subj-of, behave	::	pobj-of, inside	pobj-of, into	::	nmod-of, abnormality	nmod-of, anemia	nmod-of, architecture	::	obj-of, attack	obj-of, call	obj-of, come from	obj-of, decorate	::	nmod, bacteria	nmod, body	nmod, bone marrow
cell	1	1	1		16	30		3	8	1		6	11	3	2		3	2	2

PMI applied to dependency relations

Hindle, Don. 1990. Noun Classification from Predicate-Argument Structure. ACL

Object of “drink”	Count	PMI
tea	2	11.8
liquid	2	10.5
wine	2	9.3
anything	3	5.2
it	3	1.3

- “Drink it” more common than “drink wine”
- But “wine” is a better “drinkable” thing than “it”

Word Meaning and Similarity

Word Similarity:
Distributional Similarity (I)

Word Meaning and Similarity

Word Similarity:
Distributional Similarity (II)

Reminder: cosine for computing similarity

$$\cos(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = \frac{\vec{v} \cdot \vec{w}}{|\vec{v}| |\vec{w}|} = \frac{\vec{v}}{|\vec{v}|} \cdot \frac{\vec{w}}{|\vec{w}|} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i w_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2}}$$


v_i is the PPMI value for word v in context i

w_i is the PPMI value for word w in context i .

$\text{Cos}(\vec{v}, \vec{w})$ is the cosine similarity of \vec{v} and \vec{w}

Cosine as a similarity metric

- -1: vectors point in opposite directions
 - +1: vectors point in same directions
 - 0: vectors are orthogonal
-
- Raw frequency or PPMI are non-negative, so cosine range 0-1



$$\cos(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = \frac{\vec{v} \cdot \vec{w}}{|\vec{v}| |\vec{w}|} = \frac{\vec{v}}{|\vec{v}|} \cdot \frac{\vec{w}}{|\vec{w}|} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i w_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2}}$$

	large	data	computer
apricot	1	0	0
digital	0	1	2
information	1	6	1

Which pair of words is more similar?

$$\text{cosine}(\text{apricot}, \text{information}) = \frac{1+0+0}{\sqrt{1+0+0} \sqrt{1+36+1}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{38}} = .16$$

$$\text{cosine}(\text{digital}, \text{information}) = \frac{0+6+2}{\sqrt{0+1+4} \sqrt{1+36+1}} = \frac{8}{\sqrt{38}\sqrt{5}} = .58$$

$$\text{cosine}(\text{apricot}, \text{digital}) = \frac{0+0+0}{\sqrt{1+0+0} \sqrt{0+1+4}} = 0$$

Other possible similarity measures

$$\text{sim}_{\text{cosine}}(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = \frac{\vec{v} \cdot \vec{w}}{|\vec{v}| |\vec{w}|} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i \times w_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2}}$$

$$\text{sim}_{\text{Jaccard}}(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \min(v_i, w_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N \max(v_i, w_i)}$$

$$\text{sim}_{\text{Dice}}(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = \frac{2 \times \sum_{i=1}^N \min(v_i, w_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N (v_i + w_i)}$$

$$\text{sim}_{\text{JS}}(\vec{v} || \vec{w}) = D\left(\vec{v} \middle| \frac{\vec{v} + \vec{w}}{2}\right) + D\left(\vec{w} \middle| \frac{\vec{v} + \vec{w}}{2}\right)$$

D: KL Divergence

Word Meaning and Similarity

Word Similarity:
Distributional Similarity (II)