

University of Groningen

Cross-lingual Learning of Semantic Textual Similarity with Multilingual Word Representations

Bjerva, Johannes; Östling, Robert

Published in:

Proceedings of the 21st Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics, NoDaLiDa

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bjerva, J., & Östling, R. (2017). Cross-lingual Learning of Semantic Textual Similarity with Multilingual Word Representations. In J. Tiedemann (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 21st Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics, NoDaLiDa* (pp. 211). [24] (Linköping Electronic Conference Proceedings). Linköping UP. <http://nodalida2017.se/program>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Cross-lingual Learning of Semantic Textual Similarity with Multilingual Word Representations

Johannes Bjerva

Center for Language and Cognition Groningen
University of Groningen
The Netherlands
j.bjerva@rug.nl

Robert Östling

Department of Linguistics
Stockholm University
Sweden
robert@ling.su.se

Abstract

Assessing the semantic similarity between sentences in different languages is challenging. We approach this problem by leveraging multilingual distributional word representations, where similar words in different languages are close to each other. The availability of parallel data allows us to train such representations on a large amount of languages. This allows us to leverage semantic similarity data for languages for which no such data exists. We train and evaluate on five language pairs, including English, Spanish, and Arabic. We are able to train well-performing systems for several language pairs, without any labelled data for that language pair.

1 Introduction

Semantic Textual Similarity (STS) is the task of assessing the degree to which two sentences are semantically similar. Within the SemEval STS shared tasks, this is measured on a scale ranging from 0 (no semantic similarity) to 5 (complete semantic similarity) (Agirre et al., 2016). Monolingual STS is an important task, for instance for evaluation of machine translation (MT) systems, where estimating the semantic similarity between a system’s translation and the gold translation can aid both system evaluation and development. The task is already a challenging one in a monolingual setting, e.g., when estimating the similarity between two English sentences. In this paper, we tackle the more difficult case of cross-lingual STS, e.g., estimating the similarity between an English and an Arabic sentence.

Previous approaches to this problem have focussed on two main approaches. On the one hand, MT approaches have been attempted (e.g. Lo et

al. (2016)), which allow for monolingual similarity assessment, but suffer from the fact that involving a fully-fledged MT system severely increases system complexity. Applying bilingual word representations, on the other hand, bypasses this issue without inducing such complexity (e.g. Aldarmaki and Diab (2016)). However, bilingual approaches do not allow for taking advantage of the increasing amount of STS data available for more than one language pair.

Currently, there are several methods available for obtaining high quality multilingual word representations. It is therefore interesting to investigate whether language can be ignored entirely in an STS system after mapping words to their respective representations. We investigate the utility of multilingual word representations in a cross-lingual STS setting. We approach this by combining multilingual word representations with a deep neural network, in which all parameters are shared, regardless of language combinations.

The contributions of this paper can be summed as follows: i) we show that multilingual input representations can be used to train an STS system without access to training data for a given language; ii) we show that access to data from other languages improves system performance for a given language.

2 Semantic Textual Similarity

Given two sentences, s_1 and s_2 , the task in STS is to assess how semantically similar these are to each other. This is commonly measured using a scale ranging from 0–5, with 0 indicating no semantic overlap, and 5 indicating nearly identical content. In the SemEval STS shared tasks, the following descriptions are used:

0. The two sentences are completely dissimilar.
1. The two sentences are not equivalent, but are on the same topic.

2. The two sentences are not equivalent, but share some details.
3. The two sentences are roughly equivalent, but some important information differs/missing.
4. The two sentences are mostly equivalent, but some unimportant details differ.
5. The two sentences are completely equivalent, as they mean the same thing.

This manner of assessing semantic content of two sentences notably does not take important semantic features such as negation into account, and can therefore be seen as complimentary to textual entailment. Furthermore, the task is highly related to paraphrasing, as replacing an n -gram with a paraphrase thereof ought to alter the semantic similarity of two sentences to a very low degree. Successful monolingual approaches in the past have taken advantage of both of these facts (see, e.g., Beltagy et al. (2016)). Approaches similar to these can be applied in cross-lingual STS, if the sentence pair is translated to a language for which such resources exist. However, involving a fully-fledged MT system increases pipeline complexity, which increases the risk of errors in cases of, e.g., mistranslations. Using bilingual word representations, in order to create truly cross-lingual systems, was explored by several systems in SemEval 2016 (Agirre et al., 2016). However, such systems are one step short of truly taking advantage of the large amounts of multilingual parallel data, and STS data, available. This work contributes to previous work on STS by further exploring this aspect, by leveraging multilingual word representations.

3 Multilingual Word Representations

3.1 Multilingual Skip-gram

The skip-gram model has become one of the most popular manners of learning word representations in NLP (Mikolov et al., 2013). This is in part owed to its speed and simplicity, as well as the performance gains observed when incorporating the resulting word embeddings into almost any NLP system. The model takes a word w as its input, and predicts the surrounding context c . Formally, the probability distribution of c given w is defined as

$$p(c|w; \theta) = \frac{\exp(\vec{c}^T \vec{w})}{\sum_{c \in V} \exp(\vec{c}^T \vec{w})}, \quad (1)$$

where V is the vocabulary, and θ the parameters of word embeddings (\vec{w}) and context embeddings (\vec{c}).

The parameters of this model can then be learned by maximising the log-likelihood over (w, c) pairs in the dataset D ,

$$J(\theta) = \sum_{(w,c) \in D} \log p(c|w; \theta). \quad (2)$$

Guo et al. (2016) provide a multilingual extension for the skip-gram model, by requiring the model to not only learn to predict English contexts, but also multilingual ones. This can be seen as a simple adaptation of Firth (1957, p.11), i.e., you shall judge a word by the *multilingual* company it keeps. Hence, the vectors for, e.g., *dog* and *perro* ought to be close to each other in such a model. This assumes access to multilingual parallel data, as word alignments are used in order to determine which words comprise the multilingual context of a word. Whereas Guo et al. (2016) only evaluate their approach on the relatively similar languages English, French and Spanish, we explore a more typological diverse case, as we apply this method to English, Spanish and Arabic. We use the same parameter settings as Guo et al. (2016).

3.2 Learning embeddings

We train multilingual embeddings on the Europarl and UN corpora. Word alignment is performed using the Efmara word-alignment tool (Östling and Tiedemann, 2016). This allows us to extract a large amount of multilingual (w, c) pairs. We then learn multilingual embeddings by applying the *word2vecf* tool (Levy and Goldberg, 2014).

4 Method

4.1 System architecture

We use a relatively simple neural network architecture, consisting of an input layer with pre-trained word embeddings and a siamese network of fully connected layers with shared weights. In order to prevent any shift from occurring in the embeddings, we do not update these during training. The intuition here, is that we do not want the representation for, e.g., *dog* to be updated, which might push it further away from that of *perro*. We expect this to be especially important in cases where we train on a single language, and evaluate on another.

Given word representations for each word in our sentence, we take the simplistic approach of averaging the vectors across each sentence. The resulting sentence-level representation is then passed

through a single fully connected layer, prior to the output layer. We apply dropout ($p = 0.5$) between each layer (Srivastava et al., 2014). All weights are initialised using the approach in Glorot and Bengio (2010). We use the Adam optimisation algorithm (Kingma and Ba, 2014), jointly monitoring the categorical cross entropy of a one-hot representation of the (rounded) sentence similarity score, as well as Pearson correlation using the actual scores. All systems are trained using a batch size of 40 sentence pairs, over a maximum of 50 epochs, using early stopping. Hyperparameters are kept constant in all conditions.

4.2 Data

We use all available data from all previous editions of the SemEval shared tasks on (cross-lingual) STS. An overview of the available data is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Available data for (cross-lingual) STS from the SemEval shared task series.

Language pair	N sentences
English / English	3750
English / Spanish	1000
English / Arabic	2162
Spanish / Spanish	1620
Arabic / Arabic	1081

5 Experiments and Results

We aim to investigate whether using a multilingual input representation and shared weights allow us to ignore languages in STS. We first train and evaluate single-source trained systems (i.e. on a single language pair), and evaluate this both using the same language pair as target, and on all other target language pairs.¹ Secondly, we investigate the effect of bundling training data together, investigating which language pairings are helpful for each other. We measure performance between gold similarities and system output using the Pearson correlation measure, as this is standard in the SemEval STS shared tasks.

5.1 Single-source training

Results when training on a single source corpus are shown in Table 2. Training on the target language pair generally yields the highest

¹This setting can be seen as a sort of model transfer.

results, except for one case. When evaluating on Arabic/Arabic sentence pairs, training on English/Arabic texts yields comparable, or slightly better, performance than when training on Arabic/Arabic.

Table 2: Single-source training results (Pearson correlations). Columns indicate training language pairs, and rows indicate testing language pairs. Bold numbers indicate best results per row.

Test \ Train	Train				
	en/en	en/es	en/ar	es/es	ar/ar
en/en	0.69	0.07	-0.04	0.64	0.54
en/es	0.19	0.27	0.00	0.18	-0.04
en/ar	-0.44	0.37	0.73	-0.10	0.62
es/es	0.61	0.07	0.12	0.65	0.50
ar/ar	0.59	0.52	0.73	0.59	0.71

5.2 Multi-source training

We combine training corpora in order to investigate how this affects evaluation performance on the language pairs in question. In the first condition, we copy the single-source setup, except for that we also add in the data belonging to the source-pair at hand, e.g., training on both English/Arabic and Arabic/Arabic when evaluating on Arabic/Arabic (see Table 3).

Table 3: Training results with one source in addition to in-language data (Pearson correlations). Columns indicate added training language pairs, and rows indicate testing language pairs. Bold numbers indicate best results per row.

Test \ Train	Train				
	en/en	en/es	en/ar	es/es	ar/ar
en/en	0.69	0.68	0.67	0.69	0.71
en/es	0.22	0.27	0.30	0.22	0.24
en/ar	0.72	0.72	0.73	0.71	0.72
es/es	0.63	0.60	0.63	0.65	0.66
ar/ar	0.71	0.72	0.75	0.70	0.71

We observe that the monolingual language pairings (en/en, es/es, ar/ar) appear to be beneficial for one another. We therefore run an ablation experiment, in which we train on two out of three of these language pairs, and evaluate on all three. Not including any Spanish training data yields comparable performance to including it (Table 4).

Table 4: Ablation results (Pearson correlations). Columns indicate ablated language pairs, and rows indicate testing language pairs. The *none* column indicates no ablation, i.e., training on all three monolingual pairs. Bold indicates results when not training on the language pair evaluated on.

Test \ Ablated	en/en	es/es	ar/ar	none
	en/en	0.60	0.69	0.69
es/es	0.64	0.64	0.67	0.60
ar/ar	0.68	0.66	0.58	0.72

5.3 Comparison with Monolingual Representations

We compare multilingual embeddings with the performance obtained using the pre-trained monolingual Polyglot embeddings (Al-Rfou et al., 2013). Training and evaluating on the same language pair yields comparable results regardless of embeddings. However, when using monolingual embeddings, every multilingual language pair combination yields poor results.

6 Discussion

In all cases, training on the target language pair is beneficial. We also observe that using multilingual embeddings is crucial for multilingual approaches, as monolingual embeddings naturally only yield on-par results in monolingual settings. This is due to the fact that using the shared language-agnostic input representation allows us to take advantage of linguistic regularities across languages, which we obtain solely from observing distributions between languages in parallel text. Using monolingual word representations, however, there is no similarity between, e.g., *dog* and *perro* to rely on to guide learning.

For the single-source training, we in one case observe somewhat better performance using other training sets than the in-language one: training on English/Arabic outperforms training on Arabic/Arabic, when evaluating on Arabic/Arabic. We expected this to be due to differing data set sizes (English/Arabic is about twice as big). Controlling for this does, indeed, bring the performance of training on English/Arabic to the same level as training on Arabic/Arabic. However, combining these datasets increases performance further (Table 3).

In single-source training, we also observe that certain source languages do not offer any generalisation over certain target languages. Interestingly, certain combinations of training/testing language pairs yield very poor results. For instance, training on English/English yields very poor results when evaluating on English/Arabic, and vice versa. The same is observed for the combination Spanish/Spanish and English/Arabic. This may be explained by domain differences in training and evaluation data. A general trend appears to be that either monolingual training pairs and evaluation pairs, or cross-lingual pairs with overlap (e.g. English/Arabic and Arabic/Arabic) is beneficial.

The positive results on pairings without any language overlap are particularly promising. Training on English/English yields results not too far from training on the source language pairs, for Spanish/Spanish and Arabic/Arabic. Similar results are observed when training on Spanish/Spanish and evaluating on English/English and Arabic/Arabic, as well as when training on Arabic/Arabic and evaluating on English/English and Spanish/Spanish. This indicates that we can estimate STS relatively reliably, even without assuming any existing STS data for a given language.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

Multilingual word representations allow us to leverage more available data for multilingual learning of semantic textual similarity. We have shown that relatively high STS performance can be achieved for languages without assuming existing STS annotation, and relying solely on parallel texts. An interesting direction for future work is to investigate how multilingual character-level representations can be included, perhaps learning morpheme-level representations and mappings between these across languages. Leveraging approaches to learning multilingual word representations from smaller data sets would also be interesting. For instance, learning such representations from only the new testament, would allow for STS estimation for more than 1,000 of the languages in the world.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the Center for Information Technology of the University of Groningen for providing access to the Peregrine high performance computing cluster.

References

- Eneko Agirre, Carmen Banea, Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre, Rada Mihalcea, German Rigau, and Janyce Wiebe. 2016. Semeval-2016 task 1: Semantic textual similarity, monolingual and cross-lingual evaluation. In *Proceedings of SemEval*, pages 497–511.
- Rami Al-Rfou, Bryan Perozzi, and Steven Skiena. 2013. Polyglot: Distributed word representations for multilingual nlp. *CoNLL-2013*.
- Hanan Aldarmaki and Mona Diab. 2016. GWU NLP at SemEval-2016 Shared Task 1: Matrix factorization for crosslingual STS. In *Proceedings of SemEval 2016*, pages 663–667.
- Islam Beltagy, Stephen Roller, Pengxiang Cheng, Katrin Erk, and Raymond J Mooney. 2016. Representing meaning with a combination of logical and distributional models. *Computational Linguistics*.
- John R Firth. 1957. *A synopsis of linguistic theory, 1930-1955*. Blackwell.
- Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. 2010. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *Aistats*, volume 9, pages 249–256.
- Jiang Guo, Wanxiang Che, David Yarowsky, Haifeng Wang, and Ting Liu. 2016. A representation learning framework for multi-source transfer parsing. In *Proc. of AAAI*.
- Diederik Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Omer Levy and Yoav Goldberg. 2014. Dependency-based word embeddings. In *ACL*, pages 302–308.
- Chi-kiu Lo, Cyril Goutte, and Michel Simard. 2016. Cnrc at semeval-2016 task 1: Experiments in crosslingual semantic textual similarity. *Proceedings of SemEval*, pages 668–673.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Robert Östling and Jörg Tiedemann. 2016. Efficient word alignment with markov chain monte carlo. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics*, 106(1):125–146.
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey E Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1929–1958.