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Abstract
This paper presents a novel gold standard of German noun-noun compounds \(G_{oSt-NN} \) including 868 compounds annotated with corpus frequencies of the compounds and their constituents, productivity and ambiguity of the constituents, semantic relations between the constituents, and compositionality ratings of compound–constituent pairs. Moreover, a subset of the compounds containing 180 compounds is balanced for the productivity of the modifiers (distinguishing low/mid/high productivity) and the ambiguity of the heads (distinguishing between heads with 1, 2 and >2 senses).
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1. Introduction
Compounds are combinations of two or more simplex words. They have been a recurrent focus of attention within theoretical, cognitive, and in the last decade also within computational linguistics. Our focus of interest is on German noun-noun compounds,\(^1\) such as Ahornblatt ‘maple leaf’, Feuerwerk ‘fireworks’, and Obstkuchen ‘fruit cake’, where both the grammatical head (in German, this is the rightmost constituent) and the modifier are nouns. More specifically, we are interested in the degrees of compositionality of German noun-noun compounds, i.e., the semantic relatedness between the meaning of a compound (e.g., Feuerwerk) and the meanings of its constituents (e.g., Feuer ‘fire’ and Werk ‘opus’).
The compositionality of noun-noun compounds has attracted much research across languages over the years. From a psycholinguistic point of view, researchers are interested in finding out how compound words are cognitively processed and represented in the mental lexicon. There is an ongoing debate about whether morphologically complex words are stored and processed as single units (full listing approach (Butterworth, 1983)), whether they are decomposed into their morphemes (Taft and Forster, 1975; Taft, 2004), or whether they can be accessed both ways: as whole forms and componentially (dual route models, cf. Caramazza et al. (1988), Baayen and Schreuder (1999)).

From a computational point of view, addressing the compositionality of noun compounds (and multi-word expressions in more general) is a crucial ingredient for lexicography and NLP applications, to know whether the expression should be treated as a whole, or through its constituents, and what the expression means. For example, studies such as Cholakov and Kordoni (2014); Weller et al. (2014); Cap et al. (2015); and Salehi et al. (2015) have integrated the prediction of compositionality into Statistical Machine Translation. Accordingly, research across languages has aimed for predicting the compositionality of noun compounds automatically. For example, Reddy et al. (2011) predicted the compositionality of 90 English noun–noun compounds via distributional information. Similarly, Schulte im Walde et al. (2013) assessed various types of distributional features to predict the compositionality of 244 German noun–noun compounds. Salehi and Cook (2013) and Salehi et al. (2014) explored multi-lingual dictionaries and distributional evidence to predict the compositionality of German and English noun–noun compounds.

Evaluating predictions of compositionality requires a gold standard of compositionality ratings, if the evaluation is not extrinsic. So in parallel to the emergence of computational systems predicting compositionality, there has also been an increase of gold standards to evaluate the predictions. Regarding noun compounds, Reddy et al. (2011) used heuristics about hypernymy and definitions in WordNet to induce
90 English noun–noun compounds. Schulte im Walde et al. (2013) relied on an existing selection of noun compounds (von der Heide and Borgwaldt, 2009) and used a subset of concrete two-part noun–noun compounds. The work by Salehi et al. used both those datasets.

This paper presents a novel gold standard for the compositionality of German noun-noun compounds. In the next Section 2, we outline the desired properties of the gold standard. Sections 3 and 4, describe in detail how we created the gold standard, and what its resulting properties are.

2. Desired Properties of the Gold Standard

In previous work (Schulte im Walde et al., 2013), we used a gold standard of German noun-noun compositionality ratings that was based on a selection of noun compounds by von der Heide and Borgwaldt (2009). The original target set contained 450 concrete, depictable German noun compounds, with judgements on the compositionality of all compound–constituent pairs. From the compound set by von der Heide and Borgwaldt, we disregarded compounds with more than two constituents as well as compounds where the modifiers were not nouns. Our final set comprised a subset of their compounds including 244 two-part noun-noun compounds.

\(^1\)See Fleischer and Barz (2012) for a detailed overview and Klos (2011) for a recent detailed exploration.
What is the motivation for creating a novel gold standard for the compositionality of German noun–noun compounds? We were interested in exploring factors that have been found to influence the cognitive processing and representation of compounds, such as

- **frequency-based factors**, i.e., the frequencies of the compounds and their constituents (e.g., van Jaarsveld and Rattink (1988), Janssen et al. (2008));

- the **productivity** (morphological family size), i.e., the number of compounds that share a constituent (de Jong et al., 2002); and

- semantic variables as the relationship between compound modifier and head: a teapot is a pot FOR tea, and a snowball is a ball MADE OF snow (Gagné and Spalding, 2009).

Consequently, we created a gold standard with a focus on two-part noun-noun compounds including

- compounds and constituents from various frequency ranges;

- compounds and constituents from various productivity ranges;

- compounds and constituents with various numbers of senses; and

- compounds with various semantic relations.

Optimally, the compound targets in the gold standard should be balanced according to all of the above criteria, to include a similar number of compounds and constituents across the conditions. The following section will describe details of the creation process, and to what extent we achieved such a balance.

3. **Creation of the Gold Standard**

We rely on one of the currently largest corpora for German to induce our new gold standard of German noun–noun compounds *G*host-NN: the web corpus *DECOW14AX*² (Schäfer and Bildhauer, 2012; Schäfer, 2015), henceforth: *decow*, containing 11.7 billion words. The creation pipeline to acquire a balanced gold standard from the web corpus includes the following steps:

1. corpus-based induction of a noun-noun compound candidate list;
2. addition of empirical properties to the compound candidates;
3. random but balanced selection of a core set of noun-noun compounds;
4. systematic extension of the core set to the full gold standard; and
5. annotation of the gold standard.

### 3.1. Corpus-based induction of candidate list

Relying on the *decow* corpus, we first extracted all words identified as common nouns by the *Tree Tagger* (Schmid, 1994), plus their lemmas. The noun lemmas were counted, resulting in a total of 365,786 lemma types and their corpus frequencies.

As we wanted to focus on two-part noun-noun compounds only, we applied the morphological analyser *SMOR* (Faaß et al., 2010) to the set of corpus lemmas, providing us potentially ambiguous morphological analyses for all 365,786 noun lemmas. From these, we extracted only those lemmas where *SMOR* predicted an analysis with exactly two nominal constituents. This set of two-part noun-noun compounds contained 154,960 compound candidate types for our new gold standard.

### 3.2. Enrichment of empirical properties

The complete set of 154,960 N-N candidates was enriched with empirical properties relevant for the gold standard:

- **corpus frequencies** of the compounds and the constituents (i.e., modifiers and heads), relying on *decow*;

- **productivity** of the constituents (modifiers and heads), i.e., how many compound types contained a specific modifier or head constituent;

- **number of senses** of the constituents (modifiers and heads) and the compounds, relying on GermaNet (Hamp and Feldweg, 1997; Kunze, 2000).

Overall, the 154,960 compound candidates included 7,061 different modifiers and 6,903 different heads.

Figure 5 shows the productivity of the constituents, by plotting the logarithm of the productivity against the number of constituents. For example, 332/361 modifiers/heads appeared in more than 100 different compounds; in contrast, there are approx. 1,388/1,434 modifiers/heads that appeared in only one compound.

**Figure 2** shows the number of senses of the modifier and head constituents, as a proportion of those constituent types that were included in GermaNet. Overall, GermaNet covered 26,444 of our 154,960 compound candidate types (17%); 6,683 of the modifier types (95%) and 6,550 of the head types (95%). A large proportion of compound types (97%) has only one sense in GermaNet. In comparison, 65% and 62% of the modifiers/heads have only one sense in GermaNet; 23%/24% have two senses, and below 10% have more than two senses.

### 3.3. Random but balanced compound selection

From the set of compound candidates we wanted to extract a random subset that at the same time was balanced across frequency, productivity and ambiguity ranges of the compounds and their constituents. Since defining and combining several ranges for each of the three criteria and for compounds as well as constituents would have led to an explosion of factors to be taken into account, we focused on two main criteria instead:

²[http://corporafromtheweb.org/decow14/](http://corporafromtheweb.org/decow14/)
We systematically extended the set of 20 noun-noun compounds for each criteria combination, by randomly selecting 5 out of the 20 selected compounds in the following subsection, we also created a subset of 1,208 compounds containing modifiers or heads with a corpus-frequency < 100. For reasons which will become clear below). While the extension procedure destroyed the coherent balance of criteria that underlied our random extraction described in the previous section, it ensured a variety of compounds with either the same modifiers or the same heads.

3.5. Annotation of gold standard

For computational experiments, researchers can either use the well-balanced set of 20×9=180 compounds without much overlap in modifiers or heads, or the complete Giost-NN containing 868 compounds out of the larger, less-balanced set of 1,208 compounds. These two sets of compounds were annotated with two kinds of semantic information, (i) the semantic relations between the modifiers and the heads, and (ii) compositionality ratings.

3.5.1. Semantic relation annotation

In previous work, different kinds of annotation schemes have been used for compound relation annotation. Girju et al. (2005) annotated 282 English two-part noun compounds and 244 English three-part noun compounds with a list of eight prepositional paraphrases previously proposed by Lauer (1995), and also with a set of 35 semantic relations introduced by Moldovan and Girju (2003). Ó Séaghdha (2007) relied on a set of nine semantic relations suggested by Levi (1978), and designed and evaluated a set of relations that took over four of Levi’s relations (BE, HAVE, IN, ABOUT) and added two relations referring to event participants (ACTOR, INST(rument)) that replaced the relations MAKE, CAUSE, FOR, FROM, USE. The relation LEX refers to lexicalised compounds where no relation can be assigned. A set of 1,443 English noun compounds was annotated with his modified relation set. Dima et al. (2014) worked on German noun compounds and suggested to combine paraphrase- and property-based relation annotation.

We decided to apply the relation set suggested by Ó Séaghdha (2007) to our German noun compounds, for two reasons: (i) He had evaluated his annotation relations and annotation scheme, and (ii) his dataset had a similar size as ours, so we could aim for comparing results across languages. The three authors of this paper who are native speakers of German annotated the compounds with his modified relation set. The total set of target compounds after the systematic extension contained > 5,000 types; relying only on the set of 5×9 randomly selected compounds, it contained 1,208 types. The latter selection appeared as a reasonable size for a gold standard to be annotated for semantic criteria (see below).

The translations of the example compounds are hair washing, hair dress, hair care, floral glory, colour glory, respectively.
prox. 2,000 and 10 million token occurrences). Moreover, we have a log frequency between 5 and 7 (corresponding to a bias towards low or high values. The majority of nouns neither the modifier nor the head frequencies show a strong correlation by the log frequency of the compounds. We can see that the modifier and head frequencies confirm their independence: \( \rho = 0.1271, p < 0.001 \).

Figure 4 provides the same information regarding the ambiguity of modifiers and heads within compounds. We can see that we cover most combinations of modifiers and heads with ambiguities between 1 (monosemous) and 7. Again, their is no correlation (\( \rho = 0.0193, p = 0.2840 \)).

Figure 7 plots the log frequencies of the compounds, the modifiers/heads (blue dots) and the compositionality of the compound–head pair: the higher the productivity, the lower the compositionality.

5. Availability of the Gold Standard

We provide three resources based on the research in this paper. They are freely available for education, research and other non-commercial purposes:

3.5.2. Compositionality ratings

We set up two alternative ways to collect compositionality ratings for the compound–constituent pairs in \( G_{host-NN} \):

1. **Expert Ratings** On the one hand, 8 native speakers of German annotated all 868 gold-standard compounds with compositionality ratings on a scale from 1 (definitely semantically opaque) to 6 (definitely semantically transparent). Another 5 native speakers provided additional annotation for our small core subset of 5×9=180 compounds on the same scale. All 13 annotators were linguists or computational linguists and did not include any of the authors. Since annotators were allowed to omit judgements if they did not know a compound or a constituent, the actual number of ratings per compound–constituent pair was between 5 and 13.

2. **AMT Ratings** We started a collection of compositionality ratings for all 868 gold-standard compounds via Amazon Mechanical Turk\(^5\) (AMT). We randomly distributed the compounds over 40 batches, with 21–22 compounds each, in random order. In order to control for spammers, we also included four German fake compound nouns into each of the batches, in random positions of the lists. If participants did not recognise the fake words, all of their ratings were rejected. By February 2016, we collected between 7 and 15 ratings per compound–modifier and compound–head pair, for 168 of our 868 compounds. The collection is being continued until we have a similar number of ratings for the compound–constituent pairs of all 868 compounds.

4. Properties of the Gold Standard

The final part of this paper aims to illustrate that the new gold standard of German noun-noun compounds covers the ranges of its properties (frequency ranges, degrees of ambiguity, relation types, degrees of compositionality ratings) well, even though we could not balance the extraction according to all these properties.

Figure 4 shows the log frequencies of the compounds, the modifiers and the heads, for all 868 compounds and sorted by the log frequency of the compounds. We can see that neither the modifier nor the head frequencies show a strong bias towards low or high values. The majority of nouns have a log frequency between 5 and 7 (corresponding to approx. 2,000 and 10 million token occurrences). Moreover, there is no tight correlation\(^6\) between compound and modifier frequencies (\( \rho = 0.2345, p < 0.001 \)) and compound and head frequencies (\( \rho = 0.1451, p < 0.001 \)).

Figure 5 compares the log productivity scores of the modifiers and heads within the same compounds. While most compounds seem to include modifiers and heads with log frequencies between 1.5 and 2.8 (roughly corresponding to productivity scores between 30 and 650), other ranges are also covered sufficiently. The correlation between the modifier and head productivity scores confirms their independence: \( \rho = 0.1271, p < 0.001 \).

Figure 6 provides the same information regarding the ambiguity of modifiers and heads within compounds. We can see that we cover most combinations of modifiers and heads with ambiguities between 1 (monosemous) and 7. Again, their is no correlation (\( \rho = 0.0193, p = 0.2840 \)).

\(^5\)www.mturk.com

\(^6\)We rely on the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient \( \rho \) (Siegel and Castellan, 1988) to calculate correlations.
1. the set of 154,960 noun-noun candidate compounds and their constituents (cf. Section 3.1.), accompanied by corpus frequency, productivity and degree of ambiguity (cf. Section 3.2.);
2. the final gold standard $G_{1,ost}$-NN of 868 (out of 1,208) noun-noun compounds and their constituents, accompanied by corpus frequency, productivity, ambiguity, and annotated with semantic relations and compositionality ratings (cf. Section 3.5.); and
3. the carefully balanced $G_{1,ost}$-NN subsets of $20 \times 9$ and $5 \times 9$ compounds and their constituents, categorised according to our 9 criteria combinations for modifier productivity and head ambiguity (cf. Section 3.3.).

For computational experiments, researchers can either use the well-balanced set of $20 \times 9 = 180$ compounds without much overlap in modifiers or heads, or a larger, but less-balanced set of 868 compounds. The datasets are available from http://www.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/data/ghost-nn.

Table 2 provides some example compounds and their properties. They were chosen to illustrate the variety of property combinations across items, while at the same time they include compounds with common modifiers or heads.
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Figure 7: Log frequencies of compounds across relations types.

Figure 8: Compositionality ratings across relation types.

Figure 9: Productivity and compositionality ratings of modifiers and heads.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Productivities</th>
<th>Ambiguities</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stadthotel</td>
<td>city hotel</td>
<td>Stadt city</td>
<td>Hotel hotel</td>
<td>3,405 4,053,206 1,199,856</td>
<td>543 59</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>3.35 3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtrand</td>
<td>suburb</td>
<td>Stadt city</td>
<td>Rand border</td>
<td>25,099 4,053,206 523,473</td>
<td>543 98</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td>4.94 4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtwerk</td>
<td>public services</td>
<td>Stadt city</td>
<td>Werk plant</td>
<td>107,754 4,053,206 1,354,148</td>
<td>543 366</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>ACTOR</td>
<td>3.81 3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenenergie</td>
<td>solar energy</td>
<td>Sonne sun</td>
<td>Energie energy</td>
<td>25,398 832,636 1,191,333</td>
<td>155 30</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4.58 5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenkönig</td>
<td>Sun King</td>
<td>Sonne sun</td>
<td>König king</td>
<td>2,680 832,636 494,221</td>
<td>155 109</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>LEX</td>
<td>1.94 5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenmasse</td>
<td>sun mass</td>
<td>Sonne sun</td>
<td>Masse mass</td>
<td>3,433 832,636 468,284</td>
<td>155 108</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td>4.56 4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenscheibe</td>
<td>solar disc</td>
<td>Sonne sun</td>
<td>Scheibe slice</td>
<td>3,155 832,636 364,567</td>
<td>155 96</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>4.56 3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenseite</td>
<td>sunny side</td>
<td>Sonne sun</td>
<td>Seite side</td>
<td>7,279 832,636 5,508,445</td>
<td>155 256</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>4.00 4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenstrahl</td>
<td>sunbeam</td>
<td>Sonne sun</td>
<td>Strahl beam</td>
<td>44,612 832,636 32,182</td>
<td>155 27</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td>5.13 4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenuhr</td>
<td>sundial</td>
<td>Sonne sun</td>
<td>Uhr clock</td>
<td>8,407 832,636 4,070,590</td>
<td>155 63</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>INST</td>
<td>3.75 5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanshose</td>
<td>jeans</td>
<td>Jeans jeans</td>
<td>Hose trousers</td>
<td>2,971 66,789 273,665</td>
<td>19 61</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>5.25 5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latzhose</td>
<td>overall</td>
<td>Latz bib</td>
<td>Hose trousers</td>
<td>3,296 5,324 273,665</td>
<td>1 61</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td>3.54 5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strumpfhose</td>
<td>tights</td>
<td>Strumpf stockings</td>
<td>Hose trousers</td>
<td>20,535 26,331 273,665</td>
<td>13 61</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>4.35 4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchspiel</td>
<td>parish</td>
<td>Kirche church</td>
<td>Spiel game</td>
<td>6,583 1,761,187 4,122,168</td>
<td>319 403</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>LEX</td>
<td>4.44 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machtspiel</td>
<td>power game</td>
<td>Macht power</td>
<td>Spiel game</td>
<td>4,408 806,162 4,122,168</td>
<td>169 403</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>ABOUT</td>
<td>4.63 3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritterspiel</td>
<td>knights' tournament</td>
<td>Ritter knight</td>
<td>Spiel game</td>
<td>2,365 115,484 4,122,168</td>
<td>47 403</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>ACTOR</td>
<td>3.94 4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testspiel</td>
<td>tryout</td>
<td>Test test</td>
<td>Spiel game</td>
<td>37,800 660,169 4,122,168</td>
<td>100 403</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>4.25 5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauerspiel</td>
<td>fiasco</td>
<td>Trauer grief</td>
<td>Spiel game</td>
<td>10,763 134,379 4,122,168</td>
<td>77 403</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>ABOUT</td>
<td>3.06 2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windspiel</td>
<td>wind chimes</td>
<td>Wind wind</td>
<td>Spiel game</td>
<td>2,284 551,317 4,122,168</td>
<td>88 403</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4.31 2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterspiel</td>
<td>winter games</td>
<td>Winter winter</td>
<td>Spiel game</td>
<td>16,067 721,552 4,122,168</td>
<td>207 403</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>4.43 5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würfelspiel</td>
<td>game of dice</td>
<td>Würfel dice</td>
<td>Spiel game</td>
<td>4,408 80,371 4,122,168</td>
<td>14 403</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4.94 5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergkette</td>
<td>mountain chain</td>
<td>Berg mountain</td>
<td>Kette chain</td>
<td>8,799 564,178 207,479</td>
<td>205 139</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>5.13 2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halbkette</td>
<td>necklace</td>
<td>Hals neck</td>
<td>Kette chain</td>
<td>8,707 271,703 207,479</td>
<td>39 139</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>3.94 5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handelskette</td>
<td>trade chain</td>
<td>Handel trade</td>
<td>Kette chain</td>
<td>6,509 428,611 207,479</td>
<td>240 139</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4.75 3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelkette</td>
<td>hotel chain</td>
<td>Hotel hotel</td>
<td>Kette chain</td>
<td>6,410 1,199,856 207,479</td>
<td>134 139</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>5.00 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menschenkette</td>
<td>human chain</td>
<td>Mensch human</td>
<td>Kette chain</td>
<td>6,583 8,884,087 207,479</td>
<td>191 139</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>4.94 3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produktionsschneekette</td>
<td>production chain</td>
<td>Produktion production</td>
<td>Kette chain</td>
<td>2,738 579,419 207,479</td>
<td>244 139</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td>4.69 3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneekette</td>
<td>snow chains</td>
<td>Schnee snow</td>
<td>Kette chain</td>
<td>5,167 324,839 207,479</td>
<td>95 139</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4.19 4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeichenkette</td>
<td>string</td>
<td>Zeichen character</td>
<td>Kette chain</td>
<td>8,836 749,903 207,479</td>
<td>62 139</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>4.34 2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Example compounds in Gost-NN and their properties.