

Predicting Word Similarity 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 identify the similarity between two words in English by casting the task as machine translation performance prediction (MTPP) between the words given the context and the distance between their similarities. We use referential translation machines (RTMs), which allows a common representation for training and test sets and stacked machine learning models. RTMs can achieve the top results in Graded Word Similarity in Context (GWSC) task.

1 Grading the Similarity of Words within Context

Graded Word Similarity in Context (GWSC) task (Armendariz et al., 2020) is about the similarity of two words graded in continuous scale in two different contexts c_1 and c_2 defined by 60 words on average and the change in the word pair similarity (wps) when the context is changed from c_2 to c_1 . The subtasks are about unsupervised prediction of wps in both c_1 and c_2 and of the change in wps, which need not be found directly subtracting the two wpses. GWSC provides only the two words and the two contexts. The word pairs used are from SimLex999 dataset (Hill et al., 2015) in English, Croatian, Finnish, and Slovenian and we only participate in the task in English.

GWSC is a reverse engineering task in the sense that the actual wps in different contexts are being predicted as if read, scored, and evaluated by humans. SimLex999 scores are in the range $[0, 10]$ where 10 means the words are similar, 0 dissimilar, and 5 neutral. Additionally, with unsupervised learning, the task involves optimization before for obtaining the target scores that mimic wps and approach SimLex999 type similarity scores and after for obtaining consistent scores that fit in the score range and distance or the change in wps, which is a subtask of the task.

We obtain features to measure the inter and intra similarity of the two contexts, c_1 and c_2 . The intra similarity divides each context into 4 regions and builds an averaged similarity matrix using the semantic similarity databases to obtain the similarity of word pairs among words appearing in different regions. The inter similarity divides each context into 3 regions and again builds an averaged similarity matrix but computing for word pairs appearing in paired regions of the two contexts. Therefore, in the inter similarities, both the contexts and the words are paired. Intra word pair context is used for modeling the wps and inter word pair context is used for modeling the change in the similarity in two contexts. Both model semantic polarity or attraction and Figure 1 depicts both.

Intra context wps (intra-cwps) features measure the positive or negative semantic attraction between the regions surrounding the word pair. In language modeling, a similarly named feature, statistical lexical attraction (Yuret, 1998), refers to the gain in the information to encode a sequence of words by bits using the mutual information of the probability that some paired words occur more likely in the same relative positions. Statistical lexical attraction is about the relatedness of words, which can be turned into a binary classification task, related or not, but GWSC is about wps, which can be turned into a ternary classification task: similar, dissimilar, and neutral. The averaged intra-cwps scores approach the SimLex999 type of similarity.

Inter context wps (inter-cwps) features measure the contextual changes in the semantics surrounding the target word pair in the two contexts and they are used to model the change in wps even if both contexts have the same score. As mentioned, semantic relatedness and similarity are different and word pairs are




Figure 1: Intra and inter context wps averages. Intra score averages pairs with words on different sides of the context and inter averages all 3x3.

source	# of word pairs
Wordsim-353	203
SimLex999	1000
Simverb-3500	3500
MEN	3000
card-660	660
rw	2034

Table 1: wps data sources and sizes (WPSIMDAT).

separated accordingly in the Wordsim-353 dataset (Agirre et al., 2009). The wps datasets used (Hill et al., 2015; Agirre et al., 2009; Gerz et al., 2016; Luong et al., 2013; Pilehvar et al., 2018; Bruni et al., 2014) and their size are in Table 1. We refer to this combined dataset as WPSIMDAT. By using a monotonicity assumption, we obtain a nonminimal transitive closure of WPSIMDAT, which expanded its size to 110K pairs. The monotonicity assumption transitively computes the wps of $w_i \rightsquigarrow w_k$ if transitivity conditions in Table 2 hold.

Our processing use intra-cwps for modeling the target score and inter-cwps for modeling the change. As depicted in Figure 1, intra-cwps score averages pairs with words on different sides of the context and inter-cwps averages all 3x3. GWSC is an unsupervised learning task where the target similarity scores are provided only for the 10 word pairs in the practice data. The target wps is obtained with the overall average of intra-cwps. The third feature set is the inter wps change features and they are used to obtain a score for the change with the difference between the averaged wps difference of intra and inter regions where the average of two in the first context is subtracted from the average of two in the second context. The target change in wps is obtained with its average over the 6 scores using ternary region splits. For items without any word pairs found in WPSIMDAT, we use the output of a quadratic polynomial function, $ax^2 + bx + c$, that fits the intra-cwps scores. When intra-cwps scores are the same, we average the new score with the previous scores with weight 0.1 since the contexts are different and therefore we expect to observe nonzero change.

We also use wps semantic score using WordNet (Miller, 1995) and NLTK (Bird et al., 2009) provided Jiang-Conrath sense similarity measure using the information content from the WMT parallel corpora English side as the LM corpus. These WordNet similarity (WNSim) scores are mainly used as features to approximate wps score in both inter and intra models. In the prediction stage, we predict both intra-cwps and inter-cwps scores.

1.1 wps Features

We prepare 145 features for modeling semantic similarity (Table 3). Edit distance is the Levenshtein distance between strings, length is measured in characters, and maximum or minimum is between all

```

if ( $w_{j \circlearrowleft} w_k$ ) >  $w_{i \circlearrowleft} w_j \wedge w_{j \circlearrowleft} w_k > 5$ ):
  if ( $w_{i \circlearrowleft} w_j > 5$ ):
     $s = w_{i \circlearrowleft} w_j + (w_{j \circlearrowleft} w_k - w_{i \circlearrowleft} w_j)w_{j \circlearrowleft} w_k / 10$ 
     $w_{i \circlearrowleft} w_k = \min(s, 10)$ 
  if ( $w_{i \circlearrowleft} w_j < 5 \wedge w_{j \circlearrowleft} w_k > 5$ )
     $s = w_{i \circlearrowleft} w_j + (w_{j \circlearrowleft} w_k - w_{i \circlearrowleft} w_j)w_{j \circlearrowleft} w_k / 10$ 
    if  $s < 5$  then  $w_{i \circlearrowleft} w_k = \min(s, 10)$ 

```

Table 2: Transitivity conditions of WPSIMDAT.

type	description	#
inter	edit distance, length ratios for regions	30
inter	mean simlex for 3 regions and overall	4
inter	max of max WNsims	16
inter	mean of max WNsims	16
inter	mean of min WNsims	16
inter	min of min WNsims	16
inter	mean of mean WNsims	16
intra	edit distance, length ratios for regions	20
intra	mean of mean WNsims in c_1	1
intra	mean of mean WNsims in c_2	1
intra	ratio of mean WNsims in c_1/c_2	1
intra	mean of max WNsims in c_1	1
intra	mean of max WNsims in c_2	1
intra	ratio of max WNsims in c_1/c_2	1
intra	mean of min WNsims in c_1	1
intra	mean of min WNsims in c_2	1
intra	ratio of min WNsims in c_1/c_2	1
intra	multiplication of the three ratios	1
change prediction by the quadratic function		1

Table 3: There are 145 wps features.

word pairs in the corresponding context regions. Since we have 3x3 regions in inter-cwps, together with their row and column averages, we obtain 16 features. We also obtain the wps values after mean / min / max of the regional mean / min / max values since a single word can affect the semantics of the whole region or context.

1.2 Unsupervised Learning of Word Pair Similarity

Due to the unsupervised nature of the task, we are not provided the labels for the word pairs, which are actually from the SimLex-999 dataset we used to derive the features. Even though we did not use the wps scores directly from the dataset, their scores are indirectly included as a component averaged when calculating the intra and inter cwps scores. In the end, we find an artificial wps score that mimics the actual wps scores according to WPSIMDAT and to our contextual model of score averaging for wps and its difference in two different contexts. We refer to this score as awpss, artificial wps score. The scores of the training and test data are similar with mean, max, min on the training set are 5.7355, 10, 0.0686 and on the test set are 5.3704, 9.8, 0.417. The change in all of the 360 word pairs including the practice set is on average -0.55 and 0.94 in absolute terms in contrast, the change in the practice data is 1.159 on average and 1.771 after taking the absolute values of the change. The wps scores we obtain in the practice set is 5.725 , which are close where we achieve the best scores. Even though SimLex-999 wps values are used within the awpss computations, they were also not included specifically for the

English	prac. change	prac. score	eval. change	eval. score	post-eval. change	post-eval. score
ranks	1	3	13	9	4	5
out of	3	5	14	15	4	5

Table 4: RTM ranks in GWSC at SemEval-2020.

word pair in question for the two contexts but we included all word pairs found from WPSIMDAT in the computation. The rankings show that RTM can achieve top results in GWSC.

1.3 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 valance (sentiment). The emotion within tweets is about how the tweeter wrote and valance 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

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 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 valance intensity tasks, we used both of the sets of words from emotions joy and sadness as a single sentence to translate to for the tweet’s MTPP. Task 1 predicts the emotion and valance intensity in Arabic, English, and Spanish tweets where the evaluation metric is Pearson’s correlation.⁴

1.4 Predicting the Attributes that Discriminate the Semantics

Capturing discriminative attributes task (Task 10, SemEval-2018) (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: $f(w_1, w_2, a) \rightarrow 0 ? 1$ where F_1 is used for evaluation of target predictions that are either 0 or 1 showing whether the attribute can be used for discrimination for the given context. RTMs are used via casting 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. We apply similar approach in GWSC where we use the correponding contexts instead of the attribute and add a row for each: $w_1 \rightarrow c_1, w_2 \rightarrow c_2$.

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 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.

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

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




Figure 2: 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 where spheres represent feature spaces.

2 Stacked RTM Models for Predicting the Discriminative Power of Attributes

We use referential translation machine (RTM) models (Biçici and Way, 2015) for predicting wps in GWSC, which use `parfda` (Biçici, 2016a) to select both parallel and monolingual data close to the task instances selected specifically for the task, which are referred as interpretants, 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 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. Interpretants are selected from the corpora distributed by the news translation task of WMT (WMT, 2017; Bojar et al., 2019) 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:

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

RTMs are applicable in different domains and tasks and in both monolingual and bilingual settings. Figure 2 explains RTMs’ model building process where machine learning models including ridge regression (RR), 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) are used. We use averaging of scores from different models for robustness (Biçici, 2017). Model implementations use `scikit-learn`.⁵ We optimize λ for RR, γ , C , and ϵ for SVR using grid search, 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. 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 on the training set to rank models.

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 (Mohammad et al., 2018) becomes 492 and Task 10 becomes 117 (Paterno et al., 2018). 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.

⁵<http://scikit-learn.org/>




Figure 3: RTM with stacked combined prediction use a combined model to obtain feature representations and predictions for $w_1 \rightarrow a$ and $w_2 \rightarrow a$, which are processed before additional learning and prediction.

1&2-gram wrec
 1&2&3-gram wGM
 1&2-gram wGM
 1&2-gram wF_1
 1-gram wGM

Table 5: Top 5 features selected for Task 10

The stacked RTM model with combined prediction step (Figure 3) use the same model to predict the MTPP similarity of the translations of w_1 or w_2 to a , $w_1 \rightarrow a$ 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 $w_2 \rightarrow a$ where a provides the context. 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 3 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.

RTM results in the Task 1⁶ and Task 10⁷ competitions are in Table 8 and ranks are in Table 7 (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, 2017). 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 5. 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 6. bpw is bits per word. WER is word error rate.

Table 8 lists the latest results obtained after the challenge. The number of results with MRAER larger than 1 decreased to 2 from 8. 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 0.76 (Biçici, 2019). The predictions for Task 10 were transformed to binary classes by thresholding with optimized thresholds on the training set.

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

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

translation logprobability bpw
word alignment (1 - WER)
word alignment F_1 score
3gram wF_1
sentence number of characters

Table 6: Top 5 features selected for Task 1 Spanish

	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 7: RTM ranks at SemEval-2018.

3 Conclusion

Referential translation machines obtain automatic prediction of semantic similarity using MTPP. We presented encouraging results with stacked RTM models for GWSC with our novel MTPP modeling for translation to context, for predicting the intensity of the structure and content in text with MTPP modeling for translation to WordNet emotion lists, and for 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.

References

- Eneko Agirre, Enrique Alfonseca, Keith Hall, Jana Kravalova, Marius Paşca, and Aitor Soroa. 2009. A study on similarity and relatedness using distributional and WordNet-based approaches. In *Proc. of Human Language Technologies: The 2009 Annual Conf. of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 19–27, Boulder, Colorado, June.
- Carlos Santos Armendariz, Matthew Purver, Matej Ulčar, Senja Pollak, Nikola Ljubešić, Marko Robnik-Šikonja, Mark Granroth-Wilding, and Kristiina Vaik. 2020. SemEval-2020 Task 3: Predicting the (graded) effect of context in word similarity. In *14th Int. Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2020)*, Barcelona, Spain, 12.
- Ergun Biçici and Andy Way. 2015. Referential translation machines for predicting semantic similarity. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, pages 1–27.
- 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. 2016a. ParFDA for instance selection for statistical machine translation. In *Proc. of the First Conf. on Machine Translation (WMT16)*, pages 252–258, Berlin, Germany, 8.
- 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, 6.
- Ergun Biçici. 2017. 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, 8.
- Ergun Biçici. 2019. RTM stacking results for machine translation performance prediction. In *Proc. of the Fourth Conf. on Machine Translation (WMT19)*, Florence, Italy, 8.
- Ergun Biçici. 2022. Machine translation performance prediction system: Optimal prediction for optimal translation. *Springer Nature Computer Science*, 3.
- Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. 2009. *Natural Language Processing with Python: Analyzing Text with the Natural Language Toolkit*. O’Reilly.

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 8: RTM results on the test set.

- 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, 8.
- Ondřej Bojar, Christian Federmann, Mark Fishel, Yvette Graham, Barry Haddow, Matthias Huck, Philipp Koehn, Christof Monz, Mathias Müller, and Matt Post. 2019. Findings of the 2019 conf. on machine translation (WMT19). In *Proc. of the Fourth Conf. on Machine Translation*, pages 1–61, Florence, Italy, August. Association for Comp. Ling.
- Elia Bruni, Nam-Khanh Tran, and Marco Baroni. 2014. Multimodal distributional semantics. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 49:1–47.
- 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, 8.
- Daniela Gerz, Ivan Vulić, Felix Hill, Roi Reichart, and Anna Korhonen. 2016. SimVerb-3500: A large-scale evaluation set of verb similarity. In *Proc. of the 2016 Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2173–2182, Austin, Texas, 11.
- 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.
- Felix Hill, Roi Reichart, and Anna Korhonen. 2015. SimLex-999: Evaluating semantic models with (genuine) similarity estimation. *Computational Linguistics*, 41(4):665–695, 12.
- Thang Luong, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. 2013. Better word representations with recursive neural networks for morphology. In *Proc. of the Seventeenth Conf. on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 104–113, Sofia, Bulgaria, 8.
- George A. Miller. 1995. WordNet: A lexical database for English. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(11):39–41, November.
- 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.

Saif M. Mohammad, Felipe Bravo-Marquez, Mohammad Salameh, and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2018. SemEval-2018 Task 1: Affect in Tweets. In *12th Int. Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2018)*, New Orleans, USA, 6.

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, 6.

Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, Dimitri Kartsaklis, Victor Prokhorov, and Nigel Collier. 2018. Card-660: Cambridge rare word dataset - a reliable benchmark for infrequent word representation models. In *Proc. of the 2018 Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1391–1401, Brussels, Belgium, 11.

QTLearn, DFKI. 2013–2016. Quality translation by deep language engineering approaches. Grant no: 610516.

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.

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

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

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.

Deniz Yuret. 1998. *Discovery of linguistic relations using lexical attraction*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA.

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) available at <http://web.eecs.umich.edu/~mihalcea/affectivetext/>.⁸

anger

torment pissed frustrated crucify pout grudge umbrageous incensed spitefulness execration exacerbate choleric infuriating displeasure teasing aggression misogyny maliciously riled ire baffled spiteful pestered enagement rag misanthropy misogyny harried grudging annoyance abominate displeased furious irritating wrathful nettlesome detest vexation hatred indignantly angry offense vindictiveness despising revengefully disdain belligerent murderousness stung misanthropical lividly madness irritation belligerently misogynic begrudge abhor temper indignation infuriated anger discouraged grievance contempt 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 infuriate wrathful hateful displeasure loathe scorn maliciousness execrate venom enviably pique roiled 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 choleric malevolently malignity malevolence vengefulness huffiness malevolent furiously chafe pesky begrudging huffy angrily harass wrath despise fury rile 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 monstrously 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

⁸The original lexicon was made available freely for research purposes. The lexicon in this section is for the publication and demonstration.

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 weebegone 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 hangdog heartbreak demoralising woeefully 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