

COS960: A Chinese Word Similarity Dataset of 960 Word Pairs

Junjie Huang^{2*†}, Fanchao Qi^{1*}, Chenghao Yang^{3†}, Zhiyuan Liu¹, Maosong Sun¹

¹Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University

Institute for Artificial Intelligence, Tsinghua University

State Key Lab on Intelligent Technology and Systems, Tsinghua University

²School of ASEE, Beihang University ³Software College, Beihang University
qfc17@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, {hjj1997, alanyang}@buaa.edu.cn
{liuzy, sms}@tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Word similarity computation is a widely recognized task in the field of lexical semantics. Most proposed tasks test on similarity of word pairs of single morpheme, while few works focus on words of two morphemes or more morphemes. In this work, we propose COS960, a benchmark dataset with 960 pairs of Chinese word similarity, where all the words have two morphemes in three Part of Speech (POS) tags with their human annotated similarity rather than relatedness. We give a detailed description of dataset construction and annotation process, and test on a range of word embedding models. The dataset of this paper can be obtained from <https://github.com/thunlp/COS960>.

1 Introduction

Word similarity computation is a task to automatically compute similarity score between given word pairs, which is the most popular way to evaluate quality of word embeddings. (Faruqui et al., 2016) The task evaluates the correlation between model computed similarities and human judgement, where the higher correlation is, the more semantic information is captured by the model (Bakarov, 2018).

There are a large number of diverse dataset constructed to evaluate word similarity, most of which in English. Rubenstein and Goodenough (1965) make an attempt to compute word similarities in order to test the distributional hypothesis (Harris, 1954) and construct the first dataset RG65 including a list of 65 pairs of nouns with their human annotated similarity scores in range of 0-4. After that a series of similarity datasets come out with unique characteristics, including:

(1) focusing on word relatedness: WordSim-353 (Finkelstein et al., 2001), YP-130 (Yang and Powers, 2006), MEN (Bruni et al., 2012), MTurk-287 (Radinsky et al., 2011), MTurk-771 (Halawi et al., 2012);

(2) focusing on word true similarity: SimLex-999 (Hill et al., 2015), Simverb3500 (Gerz et al., 2016), Verb-143 (Baker et al., 2014);

(3) in Chinese: WordSim-297 (Jin and Wu, 2012), WordSim-240 (Wang et al., 2011), polysemous word (Guo et al., 2014), PKU-500 (Wu and Li, 2016);

(4) other highlights: two-word phrasal similarity (Mitchell and Lapata, 2010), rare words (Luong et al., 2013), words in sentential context (Huang et al., 2012), cross-lingual word similarity (Camacho-Collados et al., 2017), et.al.

In English, there are a number of datasets focusing on word *true similarity* which has wide applications on dictionary generation (Cimiano et al., 2005), machine translation (He et al., 2008; Marton et al., 2009) and language correction (Li et al., 2006). However, such a dataset focusing on word true similarity has been absent in Chinese for a long time. In addition, most of the datasets consist of single-word pairs, few of them consider the similarity of Multiword Expressions (MWEs) which is considered as a "pain in the neck" (Sag et al., 2002) for natural language processing (NLP).

Therefore, we introduce our COS960, a Chinese word similarity dataset of 960 word pairs, where each word is actually a two-word MWE. Each of the word pairs is annotated by 15 native speaker according to its true similarity rather than association. We also report the performance of a variety of word embeddings methods on our COS960 dataset. We hope our COS960 dataset can be helpful in NLP community.

* Indicates equal contribution

† Work done during internship at Tsinghua University

2 Dataset Construction

2.1 Data Preparation

Word Selection

To make sure our word pairs of two morphemes are truly existing Chinese words, we use a famous linguistic knowledge base HowNet as the source of words. We extract the word whose two morphemes and itself all appear in HowNet and form a dataset of such triples in a total number of 51,034.

Then we split the dataset into four parts based on the POS tags of words, which are *noun*, *verb*, *adjective* and *other*. We use their POS tags annotated in HowNet and filter out the words which have more than one POS tags or no POS tag. The final number of each set is 30355, 12847, 3603, 4229 correspondingly. Here we only use the *noun*, *verb* and *adjective* sets.

Word Pair Generation

We pair the words in the each of the three above-mentioned sets pair by pair. Then we calculate the cosine similarity of each pair based on the word embeddings learned by GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) in Sogou-T corpus¹, and the dimension of word vectors is 200.

We further divide the word sets with three POS tags into five parts respectively according to the similarity range, including [1.0, 0.9], [0.9, 0.8], [0.8, 0.7], [0.7, 0.6], [0.6, 0.4]. Note that we don't take word pairs with cosine similarity lower than 0.4 into account because almost all the them are not really similar to each other. The number of word pairs in each set is shown in Table 1. Finally, we obtain 480 noun pairs, 240 verb pairs and 240 verb pairs.

	noun-noun	verb-verb	adjective-adjective
[1.0, 0.9]	96	48	48
[0.9, 0.8]	96	48	48
[0.8, 0.7]	96	48	48
[0.7, 0.6]	96	48	48
[0.6, 0.4]	96	48	48
total	480	240	240

Table 1: Number of MWE pairs with different cosine similarities in three sets.

¹Sogou-T is a corpus of web pages containing 2.7 billion words. <https://www.sogou.com/labs/resource/t.php>

2.2 Annotation Details

The total 960 pairs are randomly shuffled and divided into two parts, each of which contains 480 pairs of data. We recruit 30 native university students, and each of them is asked to annotate 480 pairs of words. Annotators are shown the definitions of each word and the categories in TongYi-CiCiLin as the reference and are asked to rate a similarity score in a range of 0-4 for each word pair.

Before formal annotation, annotators are asked to read the Annotation Guidebook which presents the differences of *similarity* and *relatedness*. To improve annotation quality, they are obliged to take an exam before annotating COS960, which consists of at least two word pairs for each POS tag and similarity level (35 in total).

During the process of annotation, they are welcome to discuss and raise questions when they are hesitating, which helps to advance the consistency of different annotation and improve annotation quality.

2.3 Post-processing

We calculate the Krippendorff's alpha between each two of the annotators and all their annotation is accepted. Finally, we use the average score of a single pair as the final similarity score and form our COS960.

3 Experiment

In this section, we provide experimental results of several existing word embedding models on our COS960 dataset.

3.1 Experimental Settings

To evaluate our COS960, we choose some typical word embedding models to test including: (1) Skip-Gram (Mikolov et al., 2013); (2) continuous-bag-of-words (CBOW) (Mikolov et al., 2013); (3) GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014); (4) CWE, a character-enhanced word embedding (Chen et al., 2015); (5) fasttext, enriched word vectors with subword information (Bojanowski et al., 2016); (6) cw2vec, a chinese embedding with stroke n-gram information (Cao et al., 2018). For hyperparameters, we set training epochs of every model to 5 and maintain the other default parameters of each model.

For evaluation protocol, we calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient, Spearman's rank cor-

relation coefficient and the square root of Pearson and Spearman’s rank correlation between cosine similarities of word pairs computed by word embeddings of models and human-annotated scores.

3.2 Experimental Results

Overall Results

The overall evaluation results on COS960 are shown in Table 2. From the table, we observe that:

	Spearman’s	Pearson	Square-Mul
Skip-Gram	76.2	71.0	73.6
CBOW	78.2	72.1	75.1
GloVe	75.0	72.0	73.5
CWE	72.1	65.9	69.0
cw2vec	75.4	68.1	71.7
fasttext	75.5	70.0	72.7

Table 2: Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient ($\rho \times 100$) between similarity scores assigned by compositional models with human ratings on all 960 pairs of words.

(1) CBOW achieves the best performance, which is better than the second best model by 2.1% on average.

(2) All six methods have considerably high correlation scores with three evaluation protocols. This indicates that the cosine similarity of six evaluated word embeddings still correlates well with word true similarity, which contradicts with Hill et al. (2015).

(3) All six methods achieve highest score with the evaluation protocol of Spearman’s rank correlation. We attribute it to high annotation consistency that there are often more one word pairs in each similarity level.

Effect of POS tags

	Spearman’s	Pearson	Square-Mul
Skip-Gram	74.5	66.8	70.5
CBOW	77.0	69.7	73.2
GloVe	73.7	68.6	71.1
CWE	74.2	64.2	69.0
cw2vec	73.7	64.8	69.1
fasttext	74.9	66.4	70.5

Table 3: Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient ($\rho \times 100$) between similarity scores assigned by compositional models with human ratings on all 480 pairs of nouns.

We further present the performance of on COS960 in three POS tags, i.e. nouns in Table 3, verbs in Table 4 and adjectives in Table 5.

	Spearman’s	Pearson	Square-Mul
Skip-Gram	83.2	81.1	82.1
CBOW	84.8	80.7	82.7
GloVe	78.5	78.1	78.3
CWE	78.1	76.6	77.3
cw2vec	82.5	78.1	80.3
fasttext	82.9	80.5	81.7

Table 4: Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient ($\rho \times 100$) between similarity scores assigned by compositional models with human ratings on all 240 pairs of verbs.

	Spearman’s	Pearson	Square-Mul
Skip-Gram	80.0	77.0	78.5
CBOW	78.5	74.4	76.4
GloVe	77.7	76.8	77.1
CWE	71.6	67.9	69.8
cw2vec	77.0	70.5	73.7
fasttext	78.8	76.1	77.5

Table 5: Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient ($\rho \times 100$) between similarity scores assigned by compositional models with human ratings on all 240 pairs of adjectives.

From Table 3, 4 and 5, we find that:

(1) CBOW still performs best in nouns and verbs, which is consistent with overall results,

(2) Models have best average performance on verb pairs while perform worst on noun pairs.

4 Conclusion

In this paper we propose COS960, a Chinese word similarity dataset of 960 word pairs, where all selected words are MWEs with two component words. We also describe the process of the dataset construction in detail and perform evaluation on existing word embedding models. We hope this dataset will contribute to the development of distributional semantics in Chinese.

References

Amir Bakarov. 2018. A Survey of Word Embeddings Evaluation Methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.09536*.

- Simon Baker, Roi Reichart, and Anna Korhonen. 2014. An Unsupervised Model for Instance Level Subcategorization Acquisition. In *proceeding of EMNLP*.
- Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2016. Enriching Word Vectors with Subword Information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.04606*.
- Elia Bruni, Gemma Boleda, Marco Baroni, and Nam-Khanh Tran. 2012. Distributional Semantics in Technicolor. In *proceeding of ACL*.
- José Camacho-Collados, Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, Nigel Collier, and Roberto Navigli. 2017. SemEval-2017 Task 2: Multilingual and Cross-lingual Semantic Word Similarity. In *proceeding of SemEval@ACL*.
- Shaosheng Cao, Wei Lu, Jun Zhou, and Xiaolong Li. 2018. cw2vec: Learning Chinese Word Embeddings with Stroke n-gram Information. In *proceeding of AAAI*.
- Xinxiong Chen, Lei Xu, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Huan-Bo Luan. 2015. Joint Learning of Character and Word Embeddings. In *proceeding of IJCAI*.
- Philipp Cimiano, Andreas Hotho, and Steffen Staab. 2005. Learning Concept Hierarchies from Text Corpora using Formal Concept Analysis. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 24:305–339.
- Manaal Faruqui, Yulia Tsvetkov, Pushpendre Rastogi, and Chris Dyer. 2016. Problems With Evaluation of Word Embeddings Using Word Similarity Tasks. In *proceeding of RepEval@ACL*.
- Lev Finkelstein, Evgeniy Gabilovich, Yossi Matias, Ehud Rivlin, Zach Solan, Gadi Wolfman, and Eytan Ruppín. 2001. Placing Search in Context: the Concept Revisited. In *proceeding of WWW*.
- Daniela Gerz, Ivan Vulic, Felix Hill, Roi Reichart, and Anna Korhonen. 2016. SimVerb-3500: A Large-Scale Evaluation Set of Verb Similarity. In *proceeding of EMNLP*.
- Jiang Guo, Wanxiang Che, Haifeng Wang, and Ting Liu. 2014. Learning Sense-specific Word Embeddings By Exploiting Bilingual Resources. In *proceeding of COLING*.
- Guy Halawi, Gideon Dror, Evgeniy Gabilovich, and Yehuda Koren. 2012. Large-scale Learning of Word Relatedness with Constraints. In *proceeding of KDD*.
- Zellig S. Harris. 1954. Distributional Structure. *WORD*, pages 146–162.
- Xiaodong He, Mei Yang, Jianfeng Gao, Patrick Nguyen, and Robert Moore. 2008. Indirect-HMM-based Hypothesis Alignment for Combining Outputs from Machine Translation Systems. In *proceeding of EMNLP*.
- Felix Hill, Roi Reichart, and Anna Korhonen. 2015. SimLex-999: Evaluating Semantic Models With (Genuine) Similarity Estimation. *Computational Linguistics*, 41:665–695.
- Eric H. Huang, Richard Socher, Christopher D. Manning, and Andrew Y. Ng. 2012. Improving Word Representations via Global Context and Multiple Word Prototypes. In *proceeding of ACL*.
- Peng Jin and Yunfang Wu. 2012. SemEval-2012 Task 4: Evaluating Chinese Word Similarity. In *proceeding of SemEval@NAACL-HLT*.
- Mu Li, Muhua Zhu, Yang Zhang, and Ming Zhou. 2006. Exploring Distributional Similarity Based Models for Query Spelling Correction. In *proceeding of ACL*.
- Thang Luong, Richard Socher, and Christopher D. Manning. 2013. Better Word Representations with Recursive Neural Networks for Morphology. In *proceeding of CoNLL*.
- Yuval Marton, Chris Callison-Burchs, and Philip Resnik. 2009. Improved Statistical Machine Translation Using Monolingually-Derived Paraphrases. In *proceeding of EMNLP*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Gregory S. Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Distributed Representations of Words and Phrases and their Compositionality. In *proceeding of NIPS*.
- Jeff Mitchell and Mirella Lapata. 2010. Composition in Distributional Models of Semantics. *Cognitive science*, 34 8:1388–429.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D. Manning. 2014. Glove: Global Vectors for Word Representation. In *proceeding of EMNLP*.
- Kira Radinsky, Eugene Agichtein, Evgeniy Gabilovich, and Shaul Markovitch. 2011. A Word at a Time: Computing Word Relatedness Using Temporal Semantic Analysis. In *proceeding of WWW*.
- Herbert Rubenstein and John B. Goodenough. 1965. Contextual Correlates of Synonymy. *Commun. ACM*, 8:627–633.
- Ivan A. Sag, Timothy Baldwin, Francis Bond, Ann A. Copestake, and Dan Flickinger. 2002. Multiword Expressions: A Pain in the Neck for NLP. In *CI-Ling*.
- Xiang Wang, Yan Jia, Bin Zhou, Zhao Yun Ding, and Zheng Liang. 2011. Computing Semantic Relatedness Using Chinese Wikipedia Links and Taxonomy. *Journal of Chinese Computer Systems*, 32(11):2237–2242.
- Yunfang Wu and Wei Li. 2016. Overview of the NLPCC-ICCPOL 2016 Shared Task: Chinese Word Similarity Measurement. In *NLPCC/ICCPOL*.

Dongqiang Yang and David M. W. Powers. 2006. Verb Similarity on the Taxonomy of WordNet.