

"Real-Time" Identification of MWE Candidates in Databases from the BNC and the Web

"Identifying and Researching Multi-Word Units"
British Association for Applied Linguistics Corpus Linguistics SIG
Oxford Text Archive
Oxford 21 April 2005

William H. Fletcher
United States Naval Academy
(2004-05 Radboud University of Nijmegen)
<http://pie.usna.edu>
<http://kwicfinder.com>

Objectives of Presentation

- Describe background and biases
- Define key terms elastically
- Outline my software applications
- Sketch range of uses and target audiences envisioned
- Show and compare MRR and MI
- Encourage feedback and suggestions for further development

Background and Biases

- Multimedia in CALL – user (interface)
- KWICFinder to...
 - Identify useful texts
 - Find examples of actual use for teaching and writing
 - Clarify linguistic questions
 - Explore emerging semantic fields
 - build web-based ad-hoc corpora
 - download free from KWICFinder.com

Background and Biases

- kfNgram *n*-grams, *phrase-frames*
free, flexible, GUI; fast even on large datasets (20MW)
- “Phrases in English” website
 - *n*-grams ($n = 1 - 8$)
 - phrase-frames: set of *n*-gram variants identical in all but one word
 - PoS-grams: set of *n*-gram variants with the same sequence of PoS tags
 - chagrams
 - now BNC; sub-corpora, MICASE and ANS to follow

Background and Biases

- Web as Corpus Search Engine Consortium
 - Initiative of Silvia Bernardini and Marco Baroni, University of Bologna, Forlì
 - Other WAC enthusiasts: Mr. Collocations Stefan Evert, Sebastian Hoffmann, Adam Kilgarriff and myself
 - Initial goal: gigaword Web corpus (800M English, 100M each German and Italian)

Background and Biases

- Emphasis on the **practical**: reasonable speed, acceptable precision and recall
- Motivations
 - on-the-fly subcorpora for PIE
 - kfNgramDB
 - overcome kfNgram limitations: static lists, straight frequency
 - managing KWICFinder ad-hoc Web corpora
 - better integration all three tools

Objective

Evaluate and compare statistical techniques to identify MWE **candidates** for...

- corpus database queries for MWEs with specific lexical items
- subsequent screening, either manually or with processing-intensive metrics deemed more effective than those used here

Terms

- **MWE** cover-term for multi-word units, salient collocations, formulaic expressions
- **Real-time / on-the-fly** with “tolerable” delay
- **Scalable** from kilo- to mega- and giga-corpora

In practice “real time” for (sub)corpora ≤ 25 MW

Target Audience kfNgramDB

- (Corpus) linguists
 - compare subcorpora in large linguistic databases
 - identify content domain and text-type for Web as corpus
 - learn database principles by example on PC
- Language professionals
 - teachers, advanced language learners: readings, instructional materials, examples; identify (MW)Es
 - writers (L2 / L1): organize / maintain exemplars for *imitatio*, personal corpus and reference materials
 - translators: domain-specific parallel / comparable corpora, possibly compiled ad-hoc from Web sources

Relational databases (RDMS) – Why?

- organize linguistic data, “rapid” retrieval
- sophisticated queries *relating* the content of one field or table to others
- filter / focus results by relevant criteria
- dynamic interactive datasets, not static list
- standard query language SQL: skills transfer to other RDMS
- several powerful RDMS systems are
 - free
 - multi-platform (develop on PC, deploy on *nix)

Relational databases – Which?

■ Microsoft Access

- + “wizards” - easy to learn
- + produces SQL queries adaptable to other RDMS
- + excellent front-end to other RDMSs (e.g. MySQL)
- Windows only (MS Office Pro Suite)

Relational databases – Which?

MySQL

- + free, fast, scalable
- + tight integration with PHP for Web interface
- ± powerful non-standard SQL extensions
- + active development, large, helpful user base
- + user-defined C functions callable in queries
(e.g. to calculate lexical association metrics)
- + embeddable in other applications
- + multiple platform

Which Lexical Association Metric?

“Gravity Counts for the boundaries of collocations”*

- Compares Mutual Information, T-score, Dice, Gravity Counts
- Gravity Counts take larger context into account
 - most useful for identifying collocation boundaries
 - *but data processing intensive*

* Daudaravičius, Vidas and Rūta Marcinkevičienė, *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 9:2 (2004), 321-348.

Mutual Rank Ratio

1 of 4

- Paul Deane, Educational Testing Service, "A Nonparametric Method for Extraction of Candidate Phrasal terms", Association for Computational Linguistics 2005.
- "lexical association metric for knowledge-free extraction of phrasal terms", identification of MWUs in untagged text
- Based on ratio of "global" to "local" *shared ranks*
- Performance similar or superior to other metrics identifying 2- and 3-grams in WordNet...
...when n-grams including the top 160 ranked types are excluded

Mutual Rank Ratio

shared rank: “tied” items assigned same rank e.g.

- items 10-15 all have frequency 512
- shared rank is $(10 + 15) / 2 = 12.5$
- next item ranked 16 (*higher if shared*)

global and local rank

United Kingdom

- *local rank* of a specific n-gram (*LR*)
 - united kingdom
- *global rank* of phrase-frames of which *n*-gram is a variant (*GR*)
 - * kingdom (*the k., animal k., his k. ... united k.*)
 - united * (*u. kingdom, u. states, u. nations, u. distillers...*)

Mutual Rank Ratio

Formula

$$\text{MRR} = \frac{(\text{GR}_{\text{united}} * \cdot \text{GR}_{* \text{kingdom}})^{1/2}}{\text{LR}_{\text{united kingdom}}}$$

*n*th root of product of all Global (*phrase-frame*)
Ranks divided by Local (*n-gram*) Rank

Mutual Rank Ratio Pros & Cons

4 of 4

- + Easy to calculate, especially if n -grams and phrase-frames are already known (*PIE*, *kfNgram*)
- + Finds MWUs in untagged text \geq others*
- + Weighting reflects Zipfian distribution
- Excludes MWUs...
 - with top types (*state of the art*, *matter of principle*)
 - not in phrase-frames ("singletons")

* if most frequent types excluded

Mutual Information

- Popular metric for finding rare word pairs

- Formula *(after D & M)*

$$MI(x,y) = \log_2 (N \cdot f(x,y) / f(x) \cdot f(y))$$

N corpus size

$f(x,y)$ frequency of co-occurrence

$f(x), f(y)$ total frequency in corpus

- Calculated for pairs of words with frequency rank > 150 , span 2-4 words; n -grams with these pairs retrieved (could include *state of the art, matter of principle*)

Mutual Information Pros & Cons

2 of 2

- + Straightforward calculation with parameters needed for some other metrics
- + Finds “elusive” items, including singletons
- + Complements MRR
- Strong bias toward the infrequent:

Two co-occurring rare words will show a high score, but two co-occurring frequent words will show a low score. (*D & M 325*)

MRR and MI Compared

- Minimal overlap in MWEs (top 500 items < 20% shared; ranking very different)
- Complementary: both identify different sets of “interesting” MWE candidates
- Both
 - calculation on-the-fly in series of SQL queries alone impractical / intractable on PC for corpora > 5MW
 - hybrid approach with programmatic math faster, more scalable

MRR and MI Compared

Top-ranked 500 n -grams

- by MRR but not by MI
- by MI but not by MRR
- by both (<20% of total)

in

- MICASE (*MIchigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English, 1.8 MW*)
- EuroParl (*European Parliament transcripts, 500 KW*)

[Click for word lists](#)

MRR and “Singletons”

- In a large tagged corpus (BNC), Mutual Rank Ratio strands many MWE “singletons”, n -grams lacking a phrase-frame for at least one wildword position
- Frequent singletons should be reviewed for potential MWEs
- Singletons less problematic for smaller untagged corpora

[Click for word lists](#)

Toward Gigacorpora

- Today's RDMSs excel at locating and relating millions of records, but do not scale well into the billions
- Search engine technology points the way
- Doug Cutting's *Lucene* open source text indexer (Java) handles large plain-text collections
- Hybrid approach
 - Lucene to locate documents / passages
 - RDMS to manage text metadata, markup

“Real-Time” Identification of MWE Candidates

Reactions and suggestions
encouraged.

<http://www.kwicfinder.com/>

<http://pie.usna.edu>

fletcher@usna.edu