

Sentiment Annotation

in the NTU Multilingual Corpus (NTU-MC)

2nd Wordnet Bahasa Workshop (WBW2016)

Francis Bond, Tomoko Ohkuma,
Luis Morgado Da Costa, Yasuhide Miura, Rachel Chen,
Takayuki Kuribayashi, **Wang Wenjie**

January 15, 2016

Presentation Roadmap

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Concept-level Annotation
- 3 Chunk-level Annotation
- 4 The Annotation Tools
- 5 Q & A

- Sentiment annotation of NTU-MC
 - ▶ Concept level
 - ▶ Chunk level
- Goal: Look at how different languages encode sentiment
 - ▶ How the results compare to those of existing resources

- *The Adventure of the Speckled Band** (Arthur Conan Doyle)
 - ▶ English (original)
 - ▶ Chinese
 - ▶ Japanese
 - ▶ Next: Indonesian

Introduction: Corpus

Language	Sentences	Words	Concepts	Distinct Concepts
English	599	11,741	6,513	2,273
Chinese	619	12,662	8,367	2,547
Japanese	702	13,906	4,817	1,694

Introduction: Other Sentiment Corpora and Resources

- There exist other sentiment corpora and lexical resources
 - ▶ Stanford Sentiment Treebank (Socher et al., 2013)
 - ▶ Sentiwordnet (Baccianella et al., 2010)
 - ▶ MLSentiCon (Cruz et al., 2014)
- Few multi-lingual ones
- None for Asian languages

- Using IMI (A Multilingual Semantic Annotation Environment)
- One annotator per language
- Continuous Scale of [-100 to 100]
 - ▶ Seven (7) main steps:

Steps	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Score	-95	-64	-34	0	34	64	95

Sentiment Annotation in NTU-MC: Guidelines

Score	Example	Example	Example	Corpus Examples
95	fantastic	very good		perfect, splendidly
64	good	good		soothing, pleasure
34	ok	sort of good	not bad	easy, interesting
0	beige	neutral		puff
-34	poorly	a bit bad		rumour, cripple
-64	bad	bad	not good	hideous, death
-95	awful	very bad		deadly, horror-stricken

Concept-level Annotation

Concept-level Annotation

- Annotate concepts that show clear positive or negative sentiment:
 - ▶ Eg: Happy, sad, angry
- Context independent
- Concepts can be single- or multi-word expressions
 - ▶ Eg: *give rise* “produce”, *break down* “to no longer function”
- Modifiers such as **very** and **not** are not tagged

Correlation between the different language pairs:

Pair	ρ	# samples
Chinese-English	.70	3,204
Chinese-Japanese	.78	1,795
English-Japanese	.70	1,862

- Matched by concept, and get their average sentiment score per language
- Repeated by their minimum frequency in both languages

Concept-level Annotation: Cross-lingual Comparisons

- Agreement in polarity was high between languages
- But rarely identical — differences mainly in intensity/magnitude

Concept-level Annotation: Cross-lingual Comparisons (cont'd)

- Agreement in polarity was high between languages
- But rarely identical — differs **mainly in intensity/magnitude**
- 02433000—a “showing the wearing effects of overwork or care or suffering”
 - ▶ (EN) *drawn* and *haggard*: **-64** (average)
 - ▶ (CH) 憔悴 *qiáocuì*: **-34**
- 01386883—a “relatively large in size or number or extent”
 - ▶ (EN) *great*: **+45.2**
 - ▶ (JP) 大きい “big”: **+0** (neutral)

Concept-level Annotation: Cross-lingual Comparisons (cont'd)

- Agreement in polarity was high between languages
- But rarely identical — differs **mainly in intensity/magnitude**
- Inter-annotator differences; subjective
- Lemmata in the same synset might have slightly different sentiment ratings (Eg: *grotesque* and *fantastic* in 00967646-a)
- A lemma might have senses in other synsets, which might be more/less positive. This could cause cross-concept “bleeding”.
 - ▶ This cross-concept sensitivity might differ from language to language

Concept-level Annotation: Comparing to Other Resources

- Compared to **Sentiwordnet** and **MLSentiCon**
 - ▶ Both are automatically-generated resources
- Compared at synset level, for concepts that appear at least once in any language, and averaged over all occurrences.

Concept-level Annotation: Comparing to Other Resources (cont'd)

Correlation between the different resources:

Pair	ρ	# samples	
SentiWN-MLSenticon	.48	4,202	(.42 for all 121,861)
NTUMC-SentiWN	.41	4,202	
NTUMC-MLSenticon	.45	4,202	

They don't seem to agree very well!

Concept-level Annotation: Comparing to Other Resources (cont'd)

- None of the resources agree very well with each other
- The other resources agree more with each other than with NTU-MC
 - ▶ But only barely.

Concept-level Annotation: Comparing to Other Resources (cont'd)

- Neutral (+0) in NTU-MC, but non-neutral in the other resources
 - ▶ *be* is +0.125 in *Sentiwordnet*
 - ▶ *April* is -0.125 in *MLSenticon*
- Strong score in NTU-MC, but neutral in the other resources
 - ▶ *Violence*, which is -64 in *NTU-MC*, was neutral in the other two resources

Chunk-level Annotation

Chunk-level Annotation

- Units larger than a concept (phrase, sentence)
- Context-dependent
- Chunks are “built up” with other chunks (usually contiguous), if there is a change of strength and/or polarity
- *Operators* (**very**, **not**, etc) can change the strength and/or polarity
- Words like **think**, **feel**, etc, reduce the strength of the sentiment
- Questions are rated neutral

Chunk-level Annotation: Examples

Example 1:

“Do they think this is very good?”

+64 good

+95 **very** good

Operator **very** increases strength

+95 this is very good

+90 they **think** this is very good

Think reduces* strength

+0 **Do** they think this is very good?

Questions are rated neutral

Chunk-level Annotation: Examples (cont'd)

Example 2:

“I do not understand”

+34 understand

-34 **not** understand Operator **not** flips polarity

-34 I do not understand Overall sentence senti-rating

Chunk-level Annotation: Examples (cont'd)

Example 3:

“It is not beautiful”

+64 beautiful

-34 not beautiful Polarity flips, but is not mirrored

-34 It is not beautiful Overall sentence senti-rating

Chunk-level Annotation: Examples (cont'd)

Example 4:

“The horse raced past the barn”

+0 The horse raced past the barn Neutral

Chunk-level Annotation: Annotator Agreement

Sentence correlation between the different languages:

Pair	ρ	# samples
English-Chinese	.55	561
English-Japanese	.61	450
Chinese-Japanese	.70	390

Only for sentences that aligned one-to-one.

Chunk-level Annotation: Annotator Agreement

- There was less agreement for chunk-level annotations
- Majority of the sentences were neutral (+0)
- Annotators found it hard to decide chunk boundaries
 - ▶ When in doubt, more-is-more approach adopted
 - ▶ Stanford's sentiment treebank creates chunks using every word in the sentence

Supra-Chunk Level Annotation?

- Devices operating above the surface chunk
- Eg: Sarcasm (can sometimes reverse polarity)
 - ▶ The sentences are tagged as if they are non-sarcastic.
 - ▶ However, annotators are instructed to indicate "SARCASM" in the comments box
- Pragmatics? [including questions?]

Supra-Chunk Level Annotation? (cont'd)

- Devices operating above the surface chunk
- Interlocutors can affect senti-rating
- Eg: **“He’s dead.”**
 - ▶ Sententially, rather morbid.
 - ▶ However!
 - ▶ More positive sentiment if “his” death is good news to the interlocutors.
- Presently, this is not taken into account when annotation is performed

- Greetings

- ▶ Good morning!, G'day!, Hello!
- ▶ Good evening vs. Good night
- ▶ Slightly positive in English
- ▶ Neutral in Japanese

- Interjections

- ▶ Good grief! Hell's Bells!
- ▶ Yikes! Zoinks! Great moons of Neptune!

Greetings, Interjections, Vituperatives, Curses

• Greetings

- ▶ Good morning!, G'day!, Hello!
- ▶ Good evening vs. Good night
- ▶ Slightly positive in English
- ▶ Neutral in Japanese

• Interjections

- ▶ Good grief! Hell's Bells!
- ▶ Yikes! Zoinks! Great moons of Neptune!

• Curses

- ▶ ****! *****!
- ▶ !@#, vs. ****?

Sentiment Annotation Demo

Sentiment Annotation Demo (S.A.D)

- Extend to other languages
 - ▶ Bahasa Indonesian being the most upcoming
- Extend to other texts
 - ▶ Other texts in the NTU-MC
 - ▶ Software reviews
- Reflect sentiment holder and/or targets of the sentiment
- Train and automate process

Q & A

References

- Baccianella, S., Esuli, A., and Sebastiani, F. (2010). Sentiwordnet 3.0: An enhanced lexical resource for sentiment analysis and opinion mining. In Chair), N. C. C., Choukri, K., Maegaard, B., Mariani, J., Odijk, J., Piperidis, S., Rosner, M., and Tapias, D., editors, *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'10)*, Valletta, Malta. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Cruz, F. L., Troyano, J. A., Pontes, B., and Javier Ortega, F. (2014). Building layered, multilingual sentiment lexicons at synset and lemma levels. *Expert Systems with Applications*.
- Socher, R., Perelygin, A., Wu, J. Y., Chuang, J., Manning, C. D., Ng, A. Y., and Potts, C. (2013). Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *EMNLP*.