

# Annotating Compositionality Scores for Irish Noun Compounds is Hard Work

Abigail Walsh<sup>1</sup>, Teresa Clifford<sup>1</sup>, Emma Daly<sup>1</sup>, Jane Dunne<sup>1</sup>, and Brian Davis<sup>1</sup>, Gearóid Ó Cleircín<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>ADAPT Centre, Dublin City University, <sup>2</sup>Fiontar & Scoil na Gaeilge, Dublin City University

<sup>1</sup>firstname.lastname@adaptcentre.ie <sup>2</sup>firstname.lastname@dcu.ie

## Abstract

Noun compounds constitute a challenging construction for NLP applications, given their variability in idiomaticity and interpretation. In this paper, we present an analysis of compound nouns identified in Irish text of varied domains by expert annotators, focusing on compositionality as a key feature, but also domain specificity, as well as familiarity and confidence of the annotator giving the ratings. Our findings and the discussion that ensued contributes towards a greater understanding of how these constructions appear in Irish language, and how they might be treated separately from English noun compounds.

## 1 Introduction

Red tape, black market, gold standard: noun compounds (NCs) such as these pose challenges for many Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks, including machine translation, information retrieval, text summarization, and others. The shades of meaning encapsulated in the above multi word expressions demonstrate a challenge to the principle of compositionality,<sup>1</sup> and make noun compounds a compelling linguistic feature to analyse in an NLP context.

In this paper, we examine the idiomaticity displayed by noun compounds (NCs) in Irish, building a corpus of varied domain text annotated with NCs and ratings of compositionality, domain specificity, annotator familiarity and confidence. A brief analysis is presented of the annotator judgements of these constructions, which are still largely unexplored for Irish. The annotation guidelines are presented, along with discussion on challenging cases which required particular attention. Annotation is still underway for the dataset, however the pilot task annotations are made available for public use,

<sup>1</sup>"the meaning of a (syntactically complex) whole is a function only of the meanings of its (syntactic) parts together with the manner in which these parts were combined"

along with a collection of Irish noun compounds of various levels of compositionality (the first of its kind).

## 2 Background

Understanding how complex linguistic expressions derive meaning from their constituent parts is crucial for the progress of modern Natural Language Processing (NLP) systems. Noun compounds (NCs) provide an interesting avenue for investigation; testing the capabilities of models in capturing the different levels of compositionality inherent to NCs. This offers an opportunity to better understand how language is encoded in these models. Additionally, NCs display a relatively fixed syntactic expression, have a high-degree of variability, require knowledge-intensive interpretation, and are frequently found across languages (Calzolari et al., 2002; Girju et al., 2005).

In Cordeiro et al. (2019), innovative methods for predicting the compositionality of compounds with unsupervised methods are introduced. Using distributional semantic models, they compare how well compositionality is captured in these vector embeddings when compared with human judgements, with the results showing idiomaticity correlates with human judgements for NCs in three languages. Following this, Garcia et al. (2021) present a curated dataset of English and Portuguese NCs, designed to assess idiomaticity at both the type and token level. Their experiments compare the ability of BERT- (Vaswani et al., 2017) and ELMo- (Peters et al., 2018) based models representing NCs in varied contexts with idiomaticity ratings given by human annotators. The results indicate that vector representations struggle to capture the variability often displayed by NCs. These experiments, along with others investigating the capacity of Large Language Models (LLMs) to handle high-level and abstract language features

(Bisk et al., 2019; Collins et al., 2022; Misra et al., 2023) reveal areas where such models still struggle to attain human-level language performance.

For minority languages, such as Irish, assessing the capacity of LLMs is limited by the lack of data, linguistic analysis, and other essential resources (Lynn, 2022). However, with the increasing dominance of these models across NLP applications, such evaluations of model capacity in both monolingual and multilingual contexts will become increasingly important. We follow the example of Reddy et al. (2011) and Farahmand et al. (2015), as well as those of the authors mentioned above, in developing a dataset of compositionality ratings for Irish NCs. Taking inspiration from the PARSEME Shared Tasks (Savary et al., 2017; Ramisch et al., 2018, 2020) we design annotation guidelines for the identification of noun compound candidates (NCCs) and annotate constructions in Irish data from varied domains, to better understand the distribution and features of NCs in the Irish language.

### 3 Defining NCs for Irish

Within the field of NLP, NCs are often treated in a similar fashion as other types of multiword expressions (MWEs) (Bauer, 2019), and there is some overlap with other constructions. For instance, Baldwin and Kim (2010) distinguish between NCs and nominal compounds, the latter including constructions with a non-nominal modifier (e.g. ‘connecting flight’). Both semantic and lexical idiosyncrasy are traits of NCs, but statistically idiosyncratic NCs may overlap with institutionalised phrases (Sag et al., 2002) (e.g. ‘traffic light’). Compound terminology (e.g. ‘hydrochloric acid’) and named entities (e.g. ‘London Bridge’) can appear similar to NCs; the former describe terms particular to some domain, and the latter are lexical units referring to a particular discrete entity (Nouvel et al., 2016) (usually a person, location or organisation). Definitions and terminology can vary, however, we consider a noun compound as any construction consisting of two or more words, where the head word is a noun, and the distribution of the construction is that of a noun.

Irish NCs were evaluated in the Universal Dependencies treebank by McGuinness et al. (2020). Discussions around the proper annotation of these constructions highlighted the importance of non-compositionality as a distinguishing feature of NCs, with the absence of a definite article and the pres-

ence of a cranberry word being other indicating features. The first feature is generally applicable to all NC candidates, and so we focus our analysis of NCs through this lens.

With our working definition of NCs, it remains an open question whether these constructions are a feature of the Irish language which is shared with English or other languages, or whether the syntactic structure of the Irish language lends itself to creating noun compound-like noun phrases (see Section 5.1).

#### 3.1 Translation of English NCs

As a complement to the annotation process, we analysed a list of two-word English NCs that had been translated into Irish. Out of 280 English NCs, only 30 NCs translated into equivalent two-word Irish NCs, with these being largely compositional compound terminology (e.g. *cúntas banc* ‘bank account’, *ráta breithe* ‘birth rate’). Non-compositional NCs tended to translate directly into a single word (e.g. *gealt* ‘nut case’) or required a literal translation to capture the same meaning in Irish (e.g. *umar na haimléise* (slough of-the-wretchedness) ‘rock bottom’).

### 4 Annotation Process

#### 4.1 Data and Preprocessing

The corpora came from two different sources: The **Dúchas** dataset (Bailiúchán na Scol, Ábhar Co. na Gaillimhe) (The Dúchas Project, 2016) contains digital files from the Irish Folklore Collection; which are transcriptions of folkloric materials collected by primary school students between 1937 and 1939. The sentences are in dialectal Irish with non-standard orthography, and some resources are transcribed by the public, which can lead to spelling errors.<sup>2</sup>

The **Universal Dependencies Irish Dependency Treebank** (UD-IDT) (Lynn and Foster, 2016) (v2.12) (Lynn et al., 2023) contains Irish in mixed domains (e.g. fiction, government, legal, news, web), originally sourced from *Nua-Chorpas na hÉireann* and a corpus of Irish public administration translations. The treebank contains gold-standard dependency parsed trees and includes morphological features and part-of-speech (POS) information.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Creative Commons licence (CC BY-NC 4.0).

<sup>3</sup>Creative Commons licence (CC BY-SA 3.0).

The INCEPTION platform (Klie et al., 2018),<sup>4</sup> was used to carry out the annotation. The data was uploaded in CoNLL-U format, which is the format of the UD-IDT. The Dúchas dataset was automatically processed using a script to extract whole sentences from sentence blocks, which were parsed with UDPipe<sup>5</sup> using the irish-idt-ud-2.12-230717 model.

## 4.2 Training Annotators

Recruiting and training annotators for this task presented challenges, in part because of the limited number of native speakers of Irish, most of whom are located in rural pockets of Irish-speaking or *Gaeltacht* areas, and the lack of required linguistic expertise among these speakers (such challenges and the required planning to overcome them are described in the [Digital Plan for the Irish Language Speech and Language Technologies 2023-2027](#)).

Three annotators were involved in the annotation process; two speakers at the C2 level, one of whom was a non-canonical Irish (L2) speaker (A1), and the other a Connemara Irish<sup>6</sup> (L2) speaker comparable to a native speaker (A2). The third annotator had high language proficiency at the B2 level in Munster Irish (A3).

As the annotators had varying levels of language proficiency and linguistic training, a tailored approach was necessary, considering both the specific linguistic characteristics of the Irish language as well as a deep understanding of the problem. Three pilot tasks were designed to simultaneously develop the annotation guidelines and train annotators in scoring compositionality, domain specificity, and annotator familiarity consistently.

The level of agreement between annotators was calculated using Cohen’s Weighted Kappa for each pair of annotators. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table ??, and provide a glimpse into the level of consensus among the annotators.

## 4.3 Annotation Guidelines

Following the refinement process of the pilot tasks, the annotation guidelines were developed into a descriptive document for the task of annotating noun

<sup>4</sup>Available at <https://inception-project.github.io/>.

<sup>5</sup>Available at <https://lindat.mff.cuni.cz/services/udpipe/>

<sup>6</sup>The three major dialects of spoken Irish are Munster, Connemara or Connacht, and Donegal or Ulster, named for the regions that they are spoken in.

	A1 v A2	A1 v A3	A2 v A3
Pilot 1	0.45	0.64	0.5
Pilot 2	0.54	0.31	0.3
Pilot 3 (6 pt)	0.54	0.42	0.51
Pilot 3 (5 pt)	0.41	0.42	0.55
Average	0.54	0.49	0.49

Table 1: Cohen’s weighted kappa scores for three annotators across the three pilot tasks. A1 stands for Annotator 1, etc. Pilot 1 stands for Pilot Task 1, etc. Pilot 3 (6 pt) stands for Inter annotator agreement (IAA) of compositionality scores using the six-point scale in Pilot Task 3, while Pilot 3 (5 pt) compares IAA using the five-point scale. Average refers to the macro-averaged IAA score across Pilot 1, Pilot 2 and Pilot 3 (6 pt).

compound candidates (NCCs) with compositionality scores, domain-specificity scores, annotator-familiarity scores, and annotator confidence scores. Additionally, annotators marked when the NCC was also a named entity. The guidelines offer instructions pertaining to each of the following metrics/steps:

**Determining the NCC:** The first step in annotation is to identify the noun compound candidate for additional annotation. It was decided early in the pilot tasks to limit our annotation of NCCs to constructions of only **two words**, these being contiguous words in a construction, one word of which was a noun or adjective dependent on the other word, a noun, and the construction must follow the distribution of a noun. We eliminated determiners from these constructions, and where a determiner was interleaved between the items of the construction, we did not consider this a valid candidate (e.g. *mí na meala* (month of-the honey) ‘honeymoon’) (see Section 5.1).

**Compositionality:** After selection of the NCC, a compositionality score is assigned from [0-5] (0 being totally non-compositional or opaque, 5 being totally compositional or transparent), scoring how closely each of the components of the construction behaves semantically within the construction when compared to either component occurring outside of this lexical context. For example, *mac tíre* (son of-land) ‘wolf’ was given a score of 0, *mac léinn* (son of-learning) ‘student’ was given a score of 1, and *mac dearthár* (son of-brother) ‘nephew’ would receive a score of 5.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup>The guidelines provide justification for the use of a six-point compositionality score, a decision which was explored

**Domain Specificity:** During the pilot tasks, the significance of domain in determining the typical usage of a word became readily evident. Intuitively, a more domain-specific term will display less variability, i.e. the meaning will be more consistent, and will aid delineation between compound nouns and multiword terminology. A score between [1-3] is assigned, indicating the level of domain knowledge necessary to understand the NCC. For example, *lucht éisteachta* ‘listener’ requires no specialised knowledge to understand and, is so is scored 1, while *lann ardluais* ‘high speed blade’ is a term requiring domain expertise to understand, and is scored 3.

**Annotator Familiarity:** Determining compositionality and domain specificity requires familiarity with the NCC. A score between [1-3] (unfamiliar to familiar) is therefore assigned based on how familiar annotators are with the NCC’s meaning and usage.

**Confidence:** Difficult annotation cases can indicate a gap in the clarity of the guidelines, an unusual construction, a lack of information or knowledge, or some other factor. A confidence score of [1-3] is thus assigned to rate the confidence of the annotator in identifying or annotating the NCC.

**Determining Named Entity:** The final step of annotation is to determine whether the NCC is also a named entity (NE) (i.e. whether it refers to a particular entity or not).

## 5 Preliminary Analysis

Annotation is still ongoing, however, some initial analysis and insights are presented on 200 sentences of the UD-IDT and 270 NCCs, with the pilot tasks containing a further 54 sentences across both datasets, and 105 NCCs.

### 5.1 Difficult Cases

Certain elements of the Irish language and the data added to the difficulty of the annotation tasks. Some of these are explored below.

**Definite Articles:** Irish language lacks an indefinite article (Christian-Brothers, 1999), and definite nouns can be used for description (e.g. *fear an phoist* (man of-the post) ‘post man’) or possession (e.g. *cat an fhir* (cat of-the man) the man’s cat), with annotators agreeing the latter constructions during the pilot tasks.

should not be considered NCCs. However, some constructions were a challenge to this dichotomy; for example, *toradh na talún* (fruit of-the land) ‘the fruits of the earth’ could be either attributive (i.e. ‘earth fruits’) or possessive (i.e. ‘the earth’s fruits’). To avoid disagreements, constructions containing a definite article were not annotated.

**Named Entities and Compositionality** While NEs were also annotated as NCCs, difficulties arose when applying compositionality ratings to these constructions, particularly for place names. NEs such as *Baile Átha Cliath* (town of-fords watted) ‘Dublin City’ were likely coined as descriptive of the area, and with the historical features that gave the area its name now missing, these names become non-compositional. Some place names, however, could be considered compositional in contemporary times (e.g. *Béal Feirste* (mouth-of tidal-ford) ‘Belfast’), however the compositionality of such constructions is debatable, as the historical meaning is likely not intended to be applied by most language users. NEs were, as such, assigned compositionality scores of 0 by default, with the possibility of such constructions being removed in the future.

**Annotator Familiarity:** During the pilot tasks, differences in annotator knowledge led to disagreements in the annotation. Domain-specific NCCs such as *measín aistriúchán* ‘machine translation’ require domain knowledge to assess compositionality of the components and the construction. Additionally, due to variable language proficiency, annotators may be unfamiliar with less common constructions and misinterpret their meaning. For example, the construction *i riocht éan* ‘in form-of bird’ initially was interpreted by annotators as an NCC, however, the construction *i riocht* actually forms the compound preposition ‘about to’, and so *riocht éan* should not be annotated as NCC. To analyse the impact of these cases further, annotator-familiarity was added as a metric.

### 5.2 Statistics

Pilot tasks indicate that the compositionality and domain-specificity of NCCs vary between the two datasets, as non-compositional NCCs tended to occur more regularly in the Dúchas data (average ratio of 0.36) than in the UD-IDT (average ratio of 0.12), and domain-specificity and confidence scores of NCCs tended to be lower in Dúchas (average of 1.68 and 1.75) than in UD-IDT (average

of 2.05 and 2.1). Examining the 270 NCCs annotated in the UD-IDT so far, compositionality scores average to 3.68, with 39 non-compositional (0-2) NCCs. Domain-specificity scores average to 1.8, with 224 NCCs annotated as non-domain-specific (1-2). Confidence scores average to 2.32, with 134 annotated as low-confidence (1-2).

Based on this preliminary analysis, Dúchas data may provide a valuable resource for collecting NCs that do not overlap with terminology, however, non-standard orthography and low annotator familiarity may contribute towards more challenging cases, resulting in low annotator confidence.

## 6 Conclusion and Future Work

The findings of this ongoing work are limited by the scarcity of existing data, and the limitations of the annotators themselves. We also reduce the problem so as to minimise disagreements (i.e. only considering two-word NCs, removing NCs containing a definite article), which narrows the applications of this research. Nevertheless, this work represents a valuable contribution towards better understanding of NCs in Irish, and has potential applications to researchers in other languages who may be attempting a similar task.

We present our effort in building a corpus of Irish text annotated for noun compounds, with ratings of compositionality, domain-specificity, annotator familiarity and confidence. This work forms a critical basis towards developing Irish-specific NC resources, which will enable further evaluation of LLM capacity in a multilingual context. We present our annotation guidelines, insights gleaned from the annotation process, and some preliminary analysis. A collection of Irish NCs gathered during this effort will be released alongside the annotated corpus. Further annotation and analysis may shed more light on the question of how NCs present and the precise qualities that determine an NC in Irish.

## 7 Acknowledgements

“The Schools’ Collection, Volume 0621, Page 413” by Dúchas © National Folklore Collection, UCD is licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0. This work is funded in part by the Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media.

## References

- Timothy Baldwin and Su Nam Kim. 2010. [Multiword expressions](#). In *Handbook of Natural Language Processing*.
- Laurie Bauer. 2019. [Compounds and multi-word expressions in English](#). *Complex Lexical Units: Compounds and Multi-Word Expressions*, pages 45–68.
- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Ronan Le Bras, Jianfeng Gao, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [PIQA: Reasoning about Physical Commonsense in Natural Language](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1911.11641.
- Nicoletta Calzolari, Charles J. Fillmore, Ralph Grishman, Nancy Ide, Alessandro Lenci, Catherine MacLeod, and Antonio Zampolli. 2002. [Towards best practice for multiword expressions in computational lexicons](#). In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’02)*, Las Palmas, Canary Islands - Spain. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Christian-Brothers. 1999. *Graiméar Gaeilge na mBráithre Críostaí*. An Gúm, Baile Átha Cliath.
- Katherine M. Collins, Catherine Wong, Jiahai Feng, Megan Wei, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. 2022. [Structured, flexible, and robust: benchmarking and improving large language models towards more human-like behavior in out-of-distribution reasoning tasks](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2205.05718.
- Silvio Cordeiro, Aline Villavicencio, Marco Idiart, and Carlos Ramisch. 2019. [Unsupervised compositionality prediction of nominal compounds](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 45(1):1–57.
- Meghdad Farahmand, Aaron Smith, and Joakim Nivre. 2015. [A multiword expression data set: Annotating non-compositionality and conventionalization for English noun compounds](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Multiword Expressions*, pages 29–33, Denver, Colorado. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marcos Garcia, Tiago Kramer Vieira, Carolina Scarton, Marco Idiart, and Aline Villavicencio. 2021. [Assessing the representations of idiomaticity in vector models with a noun compound dataset labeled at type and token levels](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2730–2741, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Roxana Girju, Dan Moldovan, Marta Tatu, and Daniel Antohe. 2005. [On the semantics of noun compounds](#). *Comput. Speech Lang.*, 19(4):479–496.
- Jan-Christoph Klie, Michael Bugert, Beto Boulosa, Richard Eckart de Castilho, and Iryna Gurevych. 2018. [The inception platform: Machine-assisted and](#)

- knowledge-oriented interactive annotation. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 5–9. Association for Computational Linguistics. Event Title: The 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING 2018).
- Teresa Lynn. 2022. Report on the Irish language. <https://european-language-equality.eu/deliverables/>. Technical Report D1.20, European Language Equality Project.
- Teresa Lynn and Jennifer Foster. 2016. Universal Dependencies for Irish. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Celtic Language Technology Workshop*, Paris, France.
- Teresa Lynn, Jennifer Foster, Sarah McGuinness, Abigail Walsh, Jason Phelan, and Kevin Scannell. 2023. Universal Dependencies Irish Dependency Treebank (v2.12).
- Sarah McGuinness, Jason Phelan, Abigail Walsh, and Teresa Lynn. 2020. Annotating MWEs in the Irish UD treebank. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Universal Dependencies (UDW 2020)*, pages 126–139, Barcelona, Spain (Online). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kanishka Misra, Julia Taylor Rayz, and Allyson Ettinger. 2023. Comps: Conceptual minimal pair sentences for testing robust property knowledge and its inheritance in pre-trained language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2210.01963.
- D. Nouvel, M. Ehrmann, and S. Rosset. 2016. *Named Entities for Computational Linguistics*. Cognitive science series. Wiley.
- Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Deep contextualized word representations.
- Carlos Ramisch, Silvio Ricardo Cordeiro, Agata Savary, Veronika Vincze, Verginica Barbu Mititelu, Archana Bhatia, Maja Buljan, Marie Candito, Polona Gantar, Voula Giouli, Tunga Güngör, Abdelati Hawwari, Uxoá Iñurrieta, Jolanta Kovalevskaitė, Simon Krek, Timm Lichte, Chaya Liebeskind, Johanna Monti, Carla Parra Escartín, Behrang QasemiZadeh, Renata Ramisch, Nathan Schneider, Ivelina Stoyanova, Ashwini Vaidya, and Abigail Walsh. 2018. Edition 1.1 of the PARSEME shared task on automatic identification of verbal multiword expressions. In *Proceedings of the Joint Workshop on Linguistic Annotation, Multiword Expressions and Constructions (LAW-MWE-CxG-2018)*, pages 222–240, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Carlos Ramisch, Agata Savary, Bruno Guillaume, Jakub Waszczuk, Marie Candito, Ashwini Vaidya, Verginica Barbu Mititelu, Archana Bhatia, Uxoá Iñurrieta, Voula Giouli, Tunga Güngör, Menghan Jiang, Timm Lichte, Chaya Liebeskind, Johanna Monti, Renata Ramisch, Sara Stymne, Abigail Walsh, and Hongzhi Xu. 2020. Edition 1.2 of the PARSEME shared task on semi-supervised identification of verbal multiword expressions. In *Proceedings of the Joint Workshop on Multiword Expressions and Electronic Lexicons*, pages 107–118, online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Siva Reddy, Diana McCarthy, and Suresh Manandhar. 2011. An empirical study on compositionality in compound nouns. In *Proceedings of 5th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 210–218, Chiang Mai, Thailand. Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing.
- Ivan Sag, Timothy Baldwin, Francis Bond, Ann Copestake, and Dan Flickinger. 2002. Multiword expressions: A pain in the neck for nlp. pages 1–15.
- Agata Savary, Carlos Ramisch, Silvio Cordeiro, Federico Sangati, Veronika Vincze, Behrang QasemiZadeh, Marie Candito, Fabienne Cap, Voula Giouli, Ivelina Stoyanova, and Antoine Doucet. 2017. The PARSEME shared task on automatic identification of verbal multiword expressions. In *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2017)*, pages 31–47, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- The Dúchas Project. 2016. National folklore collection: The schools’ collection (digitized).
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Preprint*, arXiv:1706.03762.