

Identifying Intensity of the Structure and Content in Tweets and the Discriminative Power of Attributes in Context with Referential Translation Machines

Ergun Biçici

AI Enablement

Huawei Türkiye R&D Center

Istanbul, Turkey

orcid.org/0000-0002-2293-2031

ergun.bicici@huawei.com

bicici.github.io

Abstract

We use referential translation machines (RTMs) to identify the similarity between an attribute and two words in English by casting the task as machine translation performance prediction (MTPP) between the words and the attribute word and the distance between their similarities for Task 10 with stacked RTM models. RTMs are also used to predict the intensity of the structure and content in tweets in English, Arabic, and Spanish in Task 1 where MTPP is between the tweets and the set of words for the emotion selected from WordNet affect emotion lists. Stacked RTM models obtain encouraging results in both.

1 Introduction

SemEval-2018 (Apidianaki et al., 2018) contained two prediction tasks that referential translation machine (RTM) models (Biçici, 2017a,b; Biçici and Way, 2015) can be applied to enable new modeling capabilities and provide new results for comparison. The trace of the shared information with tweets or social media to the audiences' world can be approached by the intensity of the content and structure used in text with Task 1 (Mohammad et al., 2018). The effectiveness of attributes to semantically separate two words from each other is the goal in Task 10 (Paperno et al., 2018), which can be used to improve natural language understanding systems. Table 1 lists the number of instances in the provided datasets. We use RTMs to model both tasks.

RTMs use `parfda` (Biçici, 2016a) to select both parallel and monolingual interpretants, data close to the task instances selected specifically for the task, to derive features measuring the closeness of the test sentences to the training data, the difficulty of translating them, and to identify translation acts between any two data sets using




Figure 1: RTM depiction: `parfda` selects interpretants close to the data using corpora; two MTPPS use interpretants, training data, and test data to generate features in the same space; learning and prediction use these features as input. Spheres are for feature spaces.

machine translation performance prediction system (MTPPS) (Biçici et al., 2013; Biçici, 2022) to build prediction models. Interpretants provide context and text for feature derivation to link translation source and target and training and test sets. RTMs are applicable in different domains and tasks and in both monolingual and bilingual settings. Figure 1 explains RTMs' model building process.

2 Predicting the Discriminative Power of Attributes

Capturing discriminative attributes task (Task 10) (Paperno et al., 2018) is looking at whether an attribute (e.g. red) can be used to discriminate between two other words (e.g. apple and banana) to complement semantic similarity efforts. The answer to whether the attribute can be used to discriminate the two words can be useful for semantic similarity with contextual dependency. The task is posed as a binary classification task: $f(w_1, w_2, a) \rightarrow 0 ? 1$. The target value to predict is either 0 or 1 and shows whether the attribute can be used for discrimination for the given context. Evaluation metric is F_1 . RTMs are used by cast-

		English	Arabic	Spanish	
train	Task 1	emotion	7102	3376	4544
dev	Task 1	emotion	1464	661	793
test	Task 1	emotion	71816	1563	2616
train	Task 1	valence	1181	932	1566
dev	Task 1	valence	449	138	229
test	Task 1	valence	17874	730	648
train		Task 10	17521		
dev		Task 10	2722		
test		Task 10	2340		

Task 1 emotion		English	Arabic	Spanish
train	anger	1701	877	1166
train	fear	2252	882	1166
train	joy	1616	728	1058
train	sadness	1533	889	1154
dev	anger	388	150	193
dev	fear	389	146	202
dev	joy	290	224	202
dev	sadness	397	141	196
test	anger	17939	373	627
test	fear	17923	372	618
test	joy	18042	448	730
test	sadness	17912	370	641

Table 1: Number of instances in the provided data. About 95% of the Task 1 emotion English test sets are not evaluated for the competition rankings and 1002, 986, 1105, and 975 instances were actually scored.

ing the task as MTPP between the words and the attribute and building predictors that use the distance between the predictions. We assume that the discriminative power increase when the attribute is similar to words with significant difference.

The stacked RTM model with combined prediction step (Figure 2) use the same model to predict the MTPP similarity of $w_1 \rightarrow a$ and of $w_2 \rightarrow a$ where the data is collected such that the first row for each attribute is for $w_1 \rightarrow a$ and the second is for $w_2 \rightarrow a$. Stacking is used to build higher level models using predictions from base prediction models where they can also use the probability associated with the predictions (Ting and Witten, 1999). The combined model in Figure 2 is adding the predictions as additional feature. We obtain an RTM representation vector for each of the instances by using the derived features and the combination of the prediction scores along with 5 additional features:

$$\hat{y}_1 \quad \hat{y}_2 \quad |\hat{y}_1 - \hat{y}_2| \quad (\hat{y}_1 + \hat{y}_2)/2 \quad \sqrt{\hat{y}_1 * \hat{y}_2} \quad (1)$$

After this filtering step, we run another learning and prediction on the concatenation of the features from both rows and the additional features.

The stacked RTM model with separate prediction steps use separated feature sets with an initial prediction with each (Figure 3). Using separate predictors for each word need not achieve better performance than using a single predictor since the rows of words we compare need not belong to different groups due to their ordering in the dataset and the words may be only randomly positioned. However, both predictions can be useful as coming from two weaker predictors since half of the training instances were used to train each. The benefit of using separate feature sets is further specialization of $w_1 \rightarrow a$ and $w_2 \rightarrow a$ models with feature selection and partial-least squares from Section 4. As we see in Table 4, separated feature sets with two separate learning and prediction steps improve the performance.

The architectures of Figure 2 and Figure 3 are general enough to be useful for Task 1 as well and when we want to make use of the differences between the predictions for the same instances.

3 Predicting the Intensity of the Structure and Content in Tweets

Affect in tweets¹ task (Task 1) (Mohammad et al., 2018) is about predicting the intensity of the emotion expressed for tweets within sadness, joy, fear, or anger emotion categorizations or the valence (sentiment). The emotion within tweets is about how the tweeter wrote and valence or sentiment is about what the tweeter wrote. Intensity scores are obtained with best-worst scaling (bws) (Mohammad and Kiritchenko, 2018), which counts only the number of times a tweet is labeled as best or worst among 4 tweets where each is annotated by multiple workers. The scores are obtained with the percentage of counts scaled to $[-1, 1]$, which is later scaled to $[0, 1]$ for the task. bws can decrease the annotation effort to obtain the set of binary comparisons used to obtain reliably agreed labels.²

¹www.twitter.com

²bws is similar to inter-annotator agreement (IAA) τ , which is in $[-1, 1]$ and calculated as $IAA \tau = (C - D) / (C + D)$, where C is the number of concordant pairs and D is the number of discordant pairs. IAA τ is the same measure as “Kendall’s τ with ties penalized” used in (Bojar et al., 2013) (Task1.2), where it was used for measuring the correlation between quality estimation systems and human rankings. Oracle METEOR evaluation achieved $\tau = 0.23$ for ranking in




Figure 2: RTM with stacked combined prediction use a combined model to obtain feature representations and predictions for both $w_1 \rightarrow a$ and $w_2 \rightarrow a$, which are processed before additional learning and prediction.




Figure 3: RTM with stacked separate predictions use two different learning steps to obtain feature representations and predictions for either $w_1 \rightarrow a$ or $w_2 \rightarrow a$, which are processed before additional learning and prediction.

We model the task as MTPP of the tweets to the emotions to answer questions like “to what degree is this tweet showing the emotion of?”. Since a single emotion word need not provide enough context for semantic discrimination, we use sets of words for each emotion that express the same meaning using a subset of the WordNet affect emotion lists (Strapparava and Valitutti, 2004). The lexicon

2013’s quality estimation task (Task 1.2, see (Bojar et al., 2013)). We tried a randomized IAA (RIAA) τ (QLeap, DFKI, 2013–2016) where the calculations are similar to IAA τ , but all ties were converted into *better* and *worse* ranking randomly to obtain more robust results by distributing the ambiguous counts. This also helps normalization of the counts such that their sum are same for different models. A corresponding randomized bws would randomly assign the remaining pairwise comparison counts, where for 4 tweets only a single comparison would be left ambiguous, and the count can be distributed evenly.

used for English is in Appendix A. We obtained their translations to Arabic and Spanish using web translation sites³ to obtain the corresponding lexicon. We use the whole set of words corresponding to the emotion instead of the emotion word to translate to. For valence intensity tasks, we used both of the sets of words from emotions joy and sadness as a single sentence to translate to and we also used them as separate rows using Figure 2 and Figure 3 where the tweet’s MTPP is predicted to the sets of words of either joy or sadness (Table 10). We participate in the regression tasks of Task 1 to predict the emotion and valence intensity in Arabic, English, and Spanish tweets. The offi-

³e.g. translate.google.com or www.bing.com/translator

cial evaluation metric is Pearson’s correlation.⁴

4 RTM Models and Results

The RTM models used predictions from machine learning models including ridge regression (RR), k-nearest neighbors (KNN), support vector regression (SVR), AdaBoost (Freund and Schapire, 1997), and extremely randomized trees (TREE) (Geurts et al., 2006) in combination with feature selection (FS) (Guyon et al., 2002) and partial least squares (PLS) (Wold et al., 1984). We use averaging of scores from different models for robustness (Biçici, 2017b). Model implementations use `scikit-learn`.⁵ We optimize λ for RR, k for KNN, γ , C , and ϵ for SVR, minimum number of samples for leaf nodes and for splitting an internal node for TREE, the number of features for FS, and the number of dimensions for PLS. We use 500 estimators in the TREE model and also for AdaBoost along with exponential loss. We use grid search for SVR. We evaluate with Pearson’s correlation (r), mean absolute error (MAE), relative absolute error (RAE), MAER (mean absolute error relative), and MRAER (mean relative absolute error relative) (Biçici and Way, 2015). We use 7-fold cross-validation performance on the training set to rank models.

Interpretants are selected from the corpora distributed by the translation task of WMT17 (WMT, 2017) and they consist of monolingual sentences used to build the LM and parallel sentence pair instances used by MTPPS to derive the features. We built RTM models using:

- 300 thousand sentences for training data
- 5 million sentences for LM

RTMs generate features for the training and the test set to map both to the same space where the total number of features in Task 1 becomes 492 and Task 10 becomes 117. The difference is due to the smaller context the attribute word provides and most of the sentence-level features become not useful including the sentence structure parsing features or word alignment features.

⁴The program for evaluation is at https://github.com/felipebravom/SemEval_2018_Task_1_Eval

⁵<http://scikit-learn.org/>

RTM results in the Task 1⁶ and Task 10⁷ competitions are in Table 2 and ranks are in Table 3 (Mohammad et al., 2018). 8 of the results obtain MRAER larger than 1 suggesting more work towards these tasks or subtasks. weight # models combine top # models’ predictions (Biçici, 2017b). The predictions for Task 10 were transformed to binary classes by thresholding with 0.5 and obtains 0.47 F_1 .

The top 5 features selected for Task 10 are listed in Table 7. 1&2gram wF_1 is F_1 score over 1-gram and 2-gram features with recall computed according to the sum of the likelihood of observing them among 1-grams or 2-grams correspondingly (wrec) and precision computed according to all corresponding counts in n -grams. wGM is weighted geometric mean of the arguments of F_1 . The features enable linking w_1 and a and w_2 and a and 8 of the top 10 features use n -gram features, which makes sense for linking words and we observe this even semantically for Task 10. The top 5 features selected for Task 1 are listed in Table 8. bpw is bits per word. WER is word error rate.

5 Experiments After the Challenge

We recalculated our results using 200 thousand training instances for Task 1, which also helps comparison with previous results (Biçici and Way, 2015) and an advanced IBM2 alignment model after the challenge. Table 4 lists the new results obtained after the challenge. The number of results with MRAER larger than 1 decreased to 5. The MRAER obtained by RTMs in STS in 2016 is 0.73 (Biçici, 2016b) and in quality estimation task for English to German in 2017 is 0.8 (Biçici, 2017a). Translation similarity distances alone can be useful to identify the discriminative power of attributes Table 9. The predictions for Task 10 were transformed to binary classes by thresholding with optimized thresholds on the training set. Prediction differences are used from the combined model or the separate model. Table 10 show that valence can be better predicted with MTPP towards the translation of the vocabulary of sadness rather than using the union of contrastive vocabulary sets of joy and sadness. Separate learning also improve the performance for English and Spanish valence prediction. Translation similarity dis-

⁶<https://competitions.codalab.org/competitions/17751>

⁷<https://competitions.codalab.org/competitions/17326>

Task				r	MAE	RAE	MAER	MRAER
English	Task 1	emotion	anger	0.104	0.1744	1.121	0.3849	1.106
English	Task 1	emotion	fear	0.063	0.169	1.156	0.3869	1.155
English	Task 1	emotion	joy	0.266	0.1859	1.193	0.3849	1.293
English	Task 1	emotion	sadness	0.233	0.1673	1.114	0.3543	1.165
English	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.168	0.1745	1.147	0.3781	1.182
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	anger	0.196	0.1407	0.988	0.3112	0.886
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	fear	0.125	0.1445	1.01	0.3152	0.904
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	joy	0.316	0.1431	0.949	0.4076	0.826
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	sadness	0.238	0.1452	0.99	0.3238	0.89
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.229	0.1434	0.981	0.3428	0.871
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	anger	0.211	0.171	1.007	0.3796	0.957
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	fear	0.35	0.1612	0.923	0.4543	0.837
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	joy	0.389	0.1596	0.9	0.471	0.838
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	sadness	0.415	0.1491	0.896	0.3968	0.833
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.34	0.1602	0.928	0.4273	0.858
ALL	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.216	0.1641	1.041	0.3878	1.021
English	Task 1	valence		0.161	0.2642	1.458	0.5155	1.674
Arabic	Task 1	valence		0.264	0.1921	0.958	0.5595	0.919
Spanish	Task 1	valence		0.272	0.1665	0.962	0.5302	0.85
ALL	Task 1	valence		0.117	0.2141	1.154	0.5333	1.185
English	Task 10			-0.045	0.5034	1.018	1.0954	0.994
			combined	F_1				
English	Task 10			0.47				

Table 2: Competition results on the test set.

	T1 EI-en	T1 EI-ar	T1 EI-es	T1 V-en	T1 V-ar	T1 V-es	T10
ranks	44	13	10	35	13	10	9
out of	50	15	17	39	15	15	9

Table 3: RTM ranks at SemEval-2018.

tances are also used for Task 1 in Table 10 where instead of learning a threshold to optimize for F_1 score, we fit a linear model, $ax + b$, to the distance between predictions.

5.1 Symbolic Grounding of Score Thresholds

We symbolically ground the score thresholds with respect to the statistics of the training set scores and use the corresponding linear mathematical equation in the form of $a\mu + b\sigma + c$ on the test set statistics to obtain a relative test set threshold. We observe up to 1% improvements in the prediction performance in Task 10 (Section 5).

5.2 Symbolic Grounding of Prediction Score Statistics

We symbolically ground the predictions with respect to the statistics of the training set scores and use the corresponding linear mathematical equa-

tion on the test set statistics to obtain relative predictions on the test set. We observe up to ...% improvements in the prediction performance (Section 5).

5.3 Ranking Results

We would like to obtain robust sortings on the training set so that the sortings are reflected on the performance sorting on the test set. We compare the ranking differences that incur when we choose a metric to rank both the training and test set results. Section 5.2 compares the performance metrics we use using r_S , Spearman’s correlation, and ranking errors, which compute the squared error of normalized ranking differences (Equation (2)).

$$rankError = \sum_i (\text{rank}(i, \text{train})/n - \text{rank}(i, \text{test})/n)^2 \quad (2)$$

Task				r	MAE	RAE	MAER	MRAER
English	Task 1	emotion	anger	0.245	0.1689	1.086	0.3619	1.074
English	Task 1	emotion	fear	0.05	0.1526	1.044	0.413	0.952
English	Task 1	emotion	joy	0.028	0.1641	1.053	0.438	0.963
English	Task 1	emotion	sadness	0.004	0.1566	1.043	0.4064	0.944
English	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2245	0.1734	1.14	0.367	1.1693
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	anger	0.209	0.1413	0.992	0.3093	0.878
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	fear	0.173	0.1444	1.01	0.3112	0.905
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	joy	0.377	0.1417	0.94	0.4126	0.805
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	sadness	0.269	0.1442	0.983	0.3291	0.872
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2543	0.1428	0.9771	0.344	0.8545
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	anger	0.183	0.1706	1.005	0.3807	0.927
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	fear	0.398	0.1607	0.92	0.4548	0.846
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	joy	0.298	0.1676	0.945	0.4856	0.843
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	sadness	0.405	0.1513	0.909	0.3943	0.838
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.324	0.1627	0.9426	0.4311	0.8568
English	Task 1	valence		0.1326	0.1884	1.0399	0.525	0.9791
Arabic	Task 1	valence		0.2981	0.1879	0.9366	0.5637	0.8482
Spanish	Task 1	valence		0.2152	0.1684	0.973	0.5399	0.8317

Table 4: RTM results on the test set after the competition.

r_P is Pearson’s correlation and r_S is calculated using the same formula of r_P but using rankings where tied ranks are assigned the mean rank (Kokoska and Zwillinger, 2000). Equation (3) provides an approximate result when there are ties. r_S provides higher-level information than r_P since we use the rankings obtained.

$$r_P = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{y}_i - \bar{\hat{y}})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{y}_i - \bar{\hat{y}})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}$$

$$r_S \simeq 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^2}{n(n^2 - 1)} \quad (3)$$

Both r_S and r_P are invariant to scaling and we can use Equation (6) (Rodgers and Nicewander, 1988) for standardized \hat{y} and y where $xy = \frac{1}{2}(x^2 + y^2 - (x - y)^2)$ equivalence and $\sum_i \hat{y}_i = 1$ and $\sum_i y_i = 1$ are used. Since $-1 \leq r \leq 1$, the variance of the difference is in $[0, 4]$. Similarly, $r_P = \frac{1}{2}s_{\hat{y}+y}^2 - 1$, and thus correlation and $s_{\hat{y}-y}^2$ or $s_{\hat{y}+y}^2$ can be used to determine each other (Rodgers and Nicewander, 1988). Equation (3) is obtained using Equation (4) and assuming that ranks are

distinct.

$$r_P = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{y}_i y_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{y}_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2}} \quad (\text{for standardized input})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{y}_i y_i$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{y}_i^2 + y_i^2 - (\hat{y}_i - y_i)^2) \quad (4)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{y}_i - y_i)^2 \quad (5)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{2} s_{\hat{y}-y}^2 \quad (6)$$

MAER and MRAER are capped from below⁸ with $\epsilon = \mu_{|\hat{y}-y|}/2$, which is the measurement error and it is estimated as half of the mean absolute error or deviation of the predictions from the target mean. ϵ represents half of the score step with which a decision about a change in measurement’s value can be made. ϵ is similar to half of the standard deviation, σ , of the data but over absolute differences. For discrete target scores, $\epsilon = \frac{\text{step size}}{2}$.

We use standardized relative correlation measure (Biçici, 2016b). rMAER combines correla-

⁸We use $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor_\epsilon$ to cap the argument from below to ϵ .

Task				r	MAE	RAE	MAER	MRAER
English	Task 1	emotion	anger	0.245	0.1689	1.086	0.3619	1.074
English	Task 1	emotion	fear	0.05	0.1526	1.044	0.413	0.952
English	Task 1	emotion	joy	0.028	0.1641	1.053	0.438	0.963
English	Task 1	emotion	sadness	0.004	0.1566	1.043	0.4064	0.944
English	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2245	0.1734	1.14	0.367	1.1693
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	anger	0.209	0.1413	0.992	0.3093	0.878
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	fear	0.177	0.1443	1.009	0.311	0.905
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	joy	0.377	0.1416	0.939	0.4123	0.805
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	sadness	0.271	0.144	0.982	0.329	0.871
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2562	0.1428	0.9765	0.3439	0.8541
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	anger	0.183	0.1706	1.004	0.3807	0.926
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	fear	0.398	0.1607	0.921	0.4551	0.846
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	joy	0.297	0.1677	0.946	0.4857	0.842
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	sadness	0.405	0.1514	0.91	0.3944	0.837
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.3235	0.1627	0.9427	0.4313	0.8565
English	Task 1	valence		0.1332	0.1888	1.042	0.5254	0.9842
Arabic	Task 1	valence		0.3023	0.1874	0.9344	0.5628	0.8471
Spanish	Task 1	valence		0.2149	0.1684	0.973	0.5399	0.8321

Table 5: RTM results on the test set after the competition with symbolic grounding and scaling of predictions.

tion with MAER using a reciprocal function of negative values, f . rMRAER is defined similar to rMAER.

6 Conclusion

Referential translation machines obtain automatic prediction of semantic similarity using MTPP. We presented encouraging results with stacked RTM models for predicting the intensity of the structure and content in text with our novel MTPP modeling for translation to WordNet emotion lists and the discriminative power of attributes using stacked RTM models. Our results also enable comparisons of prediction results of RTMs in different natural language processing tasks (Biçici, 2017c).

References

2017. *Second Conf. on Machine Translation*. Copenhagen, Denmark.

Marianna Apidianaki, Saif M. Mohammad, Jonathan May, Ekaterina Shutova, Steven Bethard, and Marine Carpuat. 2018. 12th int. workshop on semantic evaluation (semeval-2018). In *12th Int. Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2018)*, New Orleans, USA.

Ergun Biçici. 2016a. [ParFDA for instance selection for statistical machine translation](#). In *Proc. of the First Conf. on Machine Translation (WMT16)*, pages 252–258, Berlin, Germany.

Ergun Biçici. 2016b. [RTM at SemEval-2016 task 1: Predicting semantic similarity with referential translation machines and related statistics](#). In *SemEval-2016: Semantic Evaluation Exercises - Inter. Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 758–764, San Diego, CA, USA.

Ergun Biçici. 2017a. [Predicting translation performance with referential translation machines](#). In *Proc. of the Second Conf. on Machine Translation (WMT17)*, pages 540–544, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Ergun Biçici. 2017b. [RTM at SemEval-2017 task 1: Referential translation machines for predicting semantic similarity](#). In *11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*, pages 194–198, Vancouver, Canada.

Ergun Biçici. 2017c. [RTM Performance Prediction Results](#). Comparison of RTM results for various prediction tasks.

Ergun Biçici. 2022. [Machine translation performance prediction system: Optimal prediction for optimal translation](#). *Springer Nature Computer Science*, 3.

Ergun Biçici, Declan Groves, and Josef van Genabith. 2013. [Predicting sentence translation quality using extrinsic and language independent features](#). *Machine Translation*, 27(3-4):171–192.

Ergun Biçici and Andy Way. 2015. [Referential translation machines for predicting semantic similarity](#). *Language Resources and Evaluation*, pages 1–27.

Task				r	MAE	RAE	MAER	MRAER	rMAER	rMRAER
without	MIX									
English	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2106	0.1755	1.1536	0.3687	1.1936	0.0795	0.4261
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.256	0.1428	0.9771	0.3442	0.852	0.0515	0.2447
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.3125	0.163	0.9445	0.432	0.8605	0.0564	0.2315
English	Task 1	valence		0.1203	0.1841	1.0164	0.5569	0.9296	0.0615	0.2367
Arabic	Task 1	valence		0.225	0.1927	0.9608	0.5702	0.8984	0.0615	0.1952
Spanish	Task 1	valence		0.2216	0.1683	0.9724	0.5416	0.8357	0.0533	0.187
with	MIX									
English	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2351	0.1693	1.1129	0.3648	1.1204	0.0722	0.3857
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2543	0.1428	0.9771	0.344	0.8545	0.051	0.2482
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.324	0.1627	0.9426	0.4311	0.8568	0.0548	0.2298
English	Task 1	valence		0.1326	0.1884	1.0399	0.525	0.9791	0.0674	0.2808
Arabic	Task 1	valence		0.2981	0.1879	0.9366	0.5637	0.8482	0.0604	0.198
Spanish	Task 1	valence		0.2169	0.1683	0.9726	0.5396	0.8313	0.052	0.19
with	MIX	symbolic	grounding							
English	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2105	0.1738	1.1423	0.3675	1.1705	0.0768	0.4116
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2546	0.1429	0.9772	0.3441	0.8542	0.051	0.248
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.324	0.1627	0.9427	0.4313	0.8563	0.0547	0.2293
English	Task 1	valence		0.129	0.1893	1.045	0.5274	0.9891	0.0688	0.2826
Arabic	Task 1	valence		0.3023	0.1875	0.9345	0.5632	0.847	0.0619	0.2002
Spanish	Task 1	valence		0.2171	0.1683	0.9726	0.5397	0.831	0.0521	0.1901
with	new MIX	symbolic	grounding							
English	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2355	0.1692	1.112	0.3648	1.1187	0.0719	0.3848
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.255	0.1428	0.977	0.3441	0.8528	0.0526	0.247
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.3236	0.1627	0.9427	0.4311	0.8567	0.0543	0.2296
English	Task 1	valence		0.1324	0.1881	1.0381	0.5251	0.9751	0.0665	0.2783
Arabic	Task 1	valence		0.2983	0.1879	0.9366	0.5637	0.848	0.0602	0.1978
Spanish	Task 1	valence		0.2175	0.1683	0.9725	0.5396	0.8308	0.0519	0.1899
with	fold MIX	symbolic	grounding							
English	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2355	0.1692	1.1119	0.3647	1.1185	0.0717	0.3844
Arabic	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.2555	0.1428	0.9771	0.344	0.8533	0.0526	0.249
Spanish	Task 1	emotion	ALL	0.324	0.1627	0.9426	0.4311	0.8568	0.055	0.2299
English	Task 1	valence		0.1321	0.1881	1.0381	0.5249	0.9752	0.0676	0.279
Arabic	Task 1	valence		0.2997	0.1877	0.9358	0.5638	0.8475	0.0597	0.1972
Spanish	Task 1	valence		0.2169	0.1683	0.9724	0.5397	0.831	0.0521	0.1898

Table 6: RTM results on the test set without symbolic grounding and scaling of predictions.

1&2-gram wrec
1&2&3-gram wGM
1&2-gram wGM
1&2-gram w F_1
1-gram wGM

Table 7: Top 5 features selected for Task 10

translation logprobability bpw
word alignment (1 - WER)
word alignment F_1 score
3gram w F_1
sentence number of characters

Table 8: Top 5 features selected for Task 1 Spanish

Ondřej Bojar, Christian Buck, Chris Callison-Burch, Christian Federmann, Barry Haddow, Philipp Koehn, Christof Monz, Matt Post, Radu Soricut, and Lucia Specia. 2013. Findings of the 2013 Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation. In *Eighth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 1–44, Sofia, Bulgaria.

Yoav Freund and Robert E Schapire. 1997. A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(1):119–139.

Pierre Geurts, Damien Ernst, and Louis Wehenkel. 2006. Extremely randomized trees. *Machine Learning*, 63(1):3–42.

Isabelle Guyon, Jason Weston, Stephen Barnhill, and Vladimir Vapnik. 2002. Gene selection for cancer classification using support vector machines. *Machine Learning*, 46(1-3):389–422.

Stephen Kokoska and Daniel Zwillinger. 2000. *CRC standard probability and statistics tables and formulae*. Taylor and Francis, Hoboken, NJ.

Saif M. Mohammad, Felipe Bravo-Marquez, Mohammad Salameh, and Svetlana Kiritchenko.

Setting	F_1	r	MAE	RAE	MAER	MRAER
combined	0.5169	0.035	0.4735	0.958	1.1397	0.95
separate	0.5006	0.014	0.4761	0.963	1.0317	0.939

Table 9: Task 10 test set results with translation similarity distance modeling.

Task 1		r	MAE	RAE	MAER	MRAER
English	tweet $\rightarrow V_{joy} \cup V_{sadness}$	0.1271	0.1973	1.0892	0.5248	1.0739
	tweet $\rightarrow V_{joy}$	0.2121	0.1922	1.061	0.5334	1.0907
	tweet $\rightarrow V_{sadness}$	0.2869	0.2027	1.1188	0.4552	1.1848
	combined	0.2536	0.1891	0.943	0.56	0.8583
	separate	0.2779	0.2477	1.3671	0.4883	1.5812
	separate+combined	0.269	0.1973	1.0892	0.5298	1.1598
	separate+combined	0.3555	0.176	0.9714	0.4542	0.9547 (MRAER)
Arabic	tweet $\rightarrow V_{joy} \cup V_{sadness}$	0.2398	0.1921	0.9576	0.5486	0.8903
	tweet $\rightarrow V_{joy}$	0.2127	0.1929	0.9616	0.565	0.8897
	tweet $\rightarrow V_{sadness}$	0.243	0.19	0.9471	0.5554	0.8649
	combined	0.2618	0.1896	0.9454	0.5805	0.8497
	separate	0.1985	0.194	0.9673	0.5804	0.8968
	separate+combined	0.1985	0.194	0.9673	0.5804	0.8968
	Spanish	tweet $\rightarrow V_{joy} \cup V_{sadness}$	0.2288	0.1679	0.97	0.5356
tweet $\rightarrow V_{joy}$		0.3764	0.1596	0.9218	0.5061	0.8442
tweet $\rightarrow V_{sadness}$		0.3259	0.1623	0.9376	0.5051	0.8657
combined		0.3096	0.1634	0.944	0.5228	0.8363
separate		0.3685	0.1601	0.9252	0.4986	0.8611
separate+combined		0.3331	0.1627	0.9397	0.5102	0.875

Table 10: Task 1 valence test set results with separate learning. Combined learning has twice the amount of training data and test data is also doubled accordingly.

2018. SemEval-2018 Task 1: Affect in Tweets. In *12th Int. Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2018)*, New Orleans, USA.

Kai Ming Ting and Ian H. Witten. 1999. Issues in stacked generalization. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 10:271–289.

Saif M. Mohammad and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2018. Understanding emotions: A dataset of tweets to study interactions between affect categories. In *11th Edition of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conf.*, Miyazaki, Japan.

Denis Paperno, Alessandro Lenci, and Alicia Krebs. 2018. SemEval-2018 Task 10: Capturing discriminative attributes. In *12th Int. Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2018)*, New Orleans, USA.

QTLearn, DFKI. 2013–2016. [Quality translation by deep language engineering approaches](#). Grant no: 610516.

S. Wold, A. Ruhe, H. Wold, and III Dunn, W. J. 1984. The collinearity problem in linear regression. the partial least squares (pls) approach to generalized inverses. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 5:735–743.

Joseph Lee Rodgers and W. Alan Nicewander. 1988. Thirteen ways to look at the correlation coefficient. *The American Statistician*, 42(1):59–66.

Carlo Strapparava and Alessandro Valitutti. 2004. WordNet-Affect: An affective extension of WordNet. In *4th Int. Conf. on Language Resources and Evaluation*, pages 1083–1086. ELRA.

Task 1		r	MAE	RAE	MAER	MRAER
Task	Model	$a(x_1 - x_2) + b$				
English	combined					
	separate					
Arabic	combined	0.044	0.2	0.997	0.6069	0.876
	separate	-0.005	0.201	1.002	0.6096	0.884
Spanish	combined	0.056	0.1735	1.003	0.5539	0.841
	separate	-0.05	0.175	1.011	0.5547	0.855
Task	Model	$a(x_1 + x_2)/2 + b$				
English	combined					
	separate					
Arabic	combined	0.238	0.1908	0.951	0.5817	0.857
	separate	0.24	0.1907	0.951	0.5778	0.854
Spanish	combined	0.34	0.1641	0.948	0.5262	0.82
	separate	0.385	0.1603	0.926	0.5134	0.82

Table 11: Task 1 valence test set results with separate learning and prediction combinations.

$$\text{MAER}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\hat{y}_i - y_i|}{\lfloor |y_i| \rfloor_\epsilon}}{n} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{MRAER}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\hat{y}_i - y_i|}{\lfloor |\bar{y} - y_i| \rfloor_\epsilon}}{n} \quad (8)$$

$$\text{rMAER}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\hat{y}_i - y_i|}{\lfloor |y_i| \rfloor_\epsilon} f_{<0,\epsilon} \left(\frac{(\hat{y}_i - \bar{\hat{y}})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sigma_{\hat{y}} \sigma_y \lfloor |y_i| \rfloor_\epsilon^2} \right) \quad (9)$$

$$f_{<0,\epsilon}(x) = \begin{cases} \lfloor x \rfloor_\epsilon & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ \lfloor -2x \rfloor_\epsilon & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Metric	ranking error	r_S
r	0.0564	0.6614
MAE	0.1167	0.2997
RAE	0.1167	0.2997
MAER	0.1518	0.0892
MRAER	0.0947	0.4318
rMAER	0.0893	0.464
rMRAER	0.0869	0.4785

available at <http://web.eecs.umich.edu/~mihalcea/affectivetext/>.⁹

Table 12: Ranking errors and r_S with different metrics.

A English Lexicon used from WordNet Affect Emotion Lists

English lexicon used for identifying discriminative attributes (Task 10) as a subset of the WordNet affect emotion lists (Strapparava and Valitutti, 2004)

⁹The original lexicon was made available freely for research purposes. The lexicon in this section is for the publication and demonstration.

anger

torment pissed frustrated crucify pout grudge umbrageous incensed spitefulness execration exacerbate choleric infuriating displeas teasing aggression misogology maliciously riled ire baffled spiteful pestered enagement rag misanthropy misogynism harried grudging annoyance abominate displeased furious irritating wrothful nettlesome detest vexation hatred indignantly angry offense vindictiveness despising revengefully disdain belligerent murderousness stung misanthropical vividly madness irritation belligerently misogynic begrudge abhor temper indignation infuriated anger discouraged grievance condemn bitterness vexatious rancour resentment hate exasperating malign covetous enraged envious enviously jealous irascibility loathing displeasingly gravel odium grasping infuriate sulkiness outrage annoyed mad covetously vindictively belligerence prehensile enviousness scene harassment murderously enfiuriate wrathful hateful displeasure loathe the scorn maliciousness execrate venom enviably pique outraged heartburning malicious tantrum irritated envy frustration nettle harassed spleen brood enviable offend animosity despiteful maddening sore balked aggressive enmity vexed vex jealously resentfully angered galling pestering vindictive hackles umbrage bothersome score gall misanthropic vexing persecute aggressiveness indignant amuck oppress rancor jealousy annoying resentful covetousness frustrating outraged tantalize devil greedy hostilely wrathfully covet exasperation frustrate hostility misogyny incense rage cholera malevolently malignity malevolence vengefulness huffiness malevolent furiously chafe pesky begrudging huffy angrily harass wroth despise fury rife avaricious malefic bother abomination spite nettled antagonism aggravated hatefully aggravate hostile belligerency annoy maddened provoked exasperate malice plaguey vengefully displeasing lividity stew pestiferous evil wrath irritate infuriation grizzle aggravation abhorrence misoneism fit

fear

atrocious anxiously diffidently coldheartedness cruelty frightening hesitantly chill dreadfully scarily panic foreboding hideous panicky hesitancy timidness hesitance cower intimidation ruthlessness dreaded alarm suspense intimidate chilling dreadful horrify diffidence alert fearful presentiment creep apprehension hysterical uneasily anxious bashfully horribly timid apprehensive ugly hardheartedness cringe unkind browbeaten horrifying fawn shadow unassertiveness horrifyingly dread awfully intimidated frightful afraid apprehensiveness outrageous premonition panicked shy scary frighten hysterically heartlessly pitilessness shyly frighteningly fearfulness diffident monstrosly dismay timorous fear horrified timorousness unassertive fright cruelly scared consternation affright apprehensively dire timidity heartlessness heartless timidly scarey hysteria alarmed horrific cowed presage shyness mercilessness awful trepidation hideously unsure scare bullied frightened horridly fearsome crawl creeps direful terrified fearfully suspensive shuddery

sadness

disconsolate sorrow guilt dolorous demoralization weight dispirit remorse oppression heartbreaking sorrowfully drear grievously ruefulness sorry oppressed despondently despondency wretched woefulness dreary desolation bereft downcast attrition forlornly sadness plaintive pitiable woebegone penitently pitying desolate heartsickness demoralize dispiritedness dysphoria depressive loneliness persecuted remorsefully sadly dark joylessly regretful despairingly tyrannical suffering sadden ruthfulness distressed melancholic sad bored discouraged disheartening regret penitentially plaintively heartache forlorn tearfulness lachrymose ruefully cheerlessness forlornness gloomily oppressive contrite shamefaced heartrending drab plainiveness melancholy gloomful mournfulness penance brokenheartedness saddening repentant dysphoric depress mourning heartsick repentantly heavyhearted doleful aggrieve contritely hapless rue contrition downheartedness depression tyrannous piteous pitiful uncheerful demoralized laden tearful grievous woeful gloomy penitence godforsaken repent penitent rueful pathetic miserably dolefully bad oppressiveness dismay repentance cheerless dingy heavyheartedness joyless grim grief persecute bereaved grieving grieve disconsolateness lamentably unhappiness guilty oppress helplessness weeping misery oppressively deject handgog heartbreak demoralising woefully depressed uncheerfulness contriteness dispirited joylessness disheartened poor gloominess depressing remorseful down unhappy low weepiness mournful deplorably blue glum despondent harass gloom downhearted dolefulness mournfully demoralizing woe downtrodden compunction shamed sorrowing dolourous misfortunate dismal sorrowful glooming sorrowfulness cheerlessly dispiriting

joy

kick identification amicably anticipation cheerfully favourably eager close gratifying suspenseful triumphant captivation beaming protectiveness devoted zest ardour satisfy exhilarating occupy preference exciting happily penchant compatibly jubilancy tenderness near exultingly approved satisfactory merry becharm crush admire joy exult jolly admiration adoration complacent pleased eagerly anticipate fondness regard kindhearted proudly happiness entrance rapport enamoredness affectional keenness closeness praiseworthy hilariously festive affect appreciated exultant elation exhilaration protective prideful gloat impress liking unworried pride friendly soothe move thrill gratify enthusiastically catch gleefully joyous excitement teased titillate gleefulness joyousness uproarious goodwill gaiety great worship worry glad favorably comfortably taste exhilarate perkiness uplift empathy satisfying hearten attachment comfort gratifyingly beguile commendable fulfil affection tender fulfillment titillation sunny jocularity stimulating warmth concern cheer enthralling joyfully comfortableness entranced approving mirthfully content comforting jubilantly predilection jocund console euphoria satisfactorily merrily satisfied partiality strike kindly gladfulness enjoy solace good fascination love zealous sympathetically benevolent fulfilment affectionateness devotedness gladdened riotously buoyancy benevolently enthralled adorably beneficent hilarity amorous warmhearted likable weakness belonging carefree avidness carefreeness affective captivate barrack recreate sympathetic protectively euphoriant urge friendliness jubilant comfortable benefic intimacy admirably enthusiasm respect sympathy esteem bang emotive enchant approval charm favour satisfyingly amative fascinating gloating fancy brotherlike hilarious loyalty lovingly capture bewitching satisfiable benefited compatibility lovesome identify beneficially zeal cheery revel favourable jubilation fulfill happy lovingness gayly brotherhood jollity congratulate complacence satisfaction lightsomeness romantic intoxicate joyously triumph charitable devotion heart ebullient benevolence exhilarated exuberance approve contented captivated exuberant euphoric exultantly festal rush cheerful endearingly tickle jubilation complacency gladsomeness enthusiastic delighted triumphal joyful affectionate gloatingly charmed eagerness empathic amicability amatory flush kid charge screaming rejoice relish entrancing fondly expansively exuberantly contentment inspire fond like suspensive likeable amicable triumphantly expectancy