## **Cambridge ALTA**

#### INTRODUCTION

The number of non-native speakers of English is growing every year, and automated learner error detection and correction has recently become a popular application area for machine learning (ML) algorithms in natural language processing. Most previous research focuses on function words and casts the task as a multi-class classification problem. In our research, we look at error detection and correction for more challenging errors in **content words** and investigate how ML algorithms can be applied.

#### DATA & METHODS

♦ **Data** is extracted from the *Cambridge Learner Corpus* (*CLC*), and contains texts written by nonnative English speakers with the examples of the correctly as well as incorrectly chosen words.

♦ The task is to automatically distinguish between the two classes.

• **Previous research** has cast the task as multiclass classification, but focused on predefined set of classes (= number of potential corrections).

- Challenges for content words:
  - How many classes (e.g., as many as there are adjectives in English)?
  - Corrections depend on the original word: *\*big history* vs long history *\*big conversation* vs *long conversation* vs serious conversation
  - Confusions are caused by different reasons: *\*big anger* vs *great anger* [meaning] *\*classic dance* vs *classical dance* [form]

♦ **Method**: treat as *binary* classification (correct vs. incorrect); encode semantics in the features

#### REFERENCES

- [1] E. Kochmar and T. Briscoe. Detecting Learner Errors in the Choice of Content Words Using Compositional Distributional Semantics. 2014.
- [2] E. Kochmar and T. Briscoe. Capturing Anomalies in the Choice of Content Words in Compositional Distributional Semantic Space. 2013.



# DETECTING LEARNER ERRORS USING COMPOSITIONAL DISTRIBUTIONAL SEMANTICS

### **OBJECTIVES**

The focus and objectives of this research:

- 1. We automatically detect and correct **learner** errors in written English
- 2. We investigate errors in the choice of **content words**: *adjectives, nouns* and *verbs*
- 3. We take the meaning into account  $\rightarrow$  use compositional distributional semantics
- 4. We use machine learning (ML) algorithms to detect and correct errors

## ML FOR ERROR DETECTION

Features encode properties of semantic vectors. We use *Decision Tree* classifier with feature value binning.

Combinations	Accuracy	LB	UB
$AN_{-context}$	0.8113	0.7889	0.8650
$AN_{+context}$	0.6535	0.5084	0.7467
$VN_{-context}$	0.6577	0.5557	0.8217
$VN_{+context}$	0.6491	0.6086	0.8467

 Table 1: Results

LB = lower bound, majority class distribution UB = upper bound, inter-annotator agreement

Combinations	Precision	Recall	$\mathbf{F}_1$
$AN_{-context}$	0.8193	0.9762	0.8909
$AN_{+context}$	0.7500	0.2488	0.3736
$VN_{-context}$	0.6173	0.7226	0.6558
VN <sub>+context</sub>	0.7071	0.5898	0.6409

**Table 2:** Precision, recall and F<sub>1</sub>

#### FUTURE RESEARCH

There is an increasing need in error detection and correction algorithms for non-native speakers and writers. We plan to extend current research investigating *error types* other than those currently addressed, wider use of context (e.g., via topic mod-





elling), *feature engineering* and other feature types (e.g., neural network language models currently applied), and other machine learning algorithms. The next step is to apply an *error correction* algorithm to the errors identified.

{ EKATERINA KOCHMAR, TED BRISCOE } THE ALTA INSTITUTE, COMPUTER LABORATORY

#### SEMANTIC APPROACHES

	bloom	buy	garden	grow	tall	
rose	25	18	20	33	8	
flower	34	23	30	38	10	
house	0	40	24	5	21	

Figure 1: Distributional profiles

• **Distributional approach**: *"You shall know a word by the company it keeps"* (Firth)

We collect the word co-occurrences from data and build semantic vectors for words within combinations. Distributions capture word meaning.

**Compositional approach**: we create word combination vectors via composition of word vectors.

•  $(blue\_rose)_i = blue_i + rose_i$ •  $(blue\_rose)_i = blue_i \times rose_i$ 

## CONCLUSION

#### **CONTACT INFORMATION**

Web www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~ek358/ Email Ekaterina.Kochmar@cl.cam.ac.uk

♦ **Features**: extract features that describe the differences between the vectors for the correct and incorrect combinations:





• vector length

• *distance/cosine to input words* • *density of the neighbourhoods* • overlap between the neighbours for the combinations and for the input words



Figure 2: Distance to the input noun

• We have showed that our algorithm detects errors with high accuracy (close to *UB*) • There is still some room for improvement

• The features derived using semantics and capturing word meaning are <u>useful</u>

• The algorithm shows high precision  $\rightarrow$  it is reliable in practice

misclassification • Major source of where confusion occurs due to similarity in meaning:

*\*small speech* vs *short speech \*rise punctuality* vs *increase punctuality* 

Data ilexir.co.uk/media/an-dataset.xml