

Enhancing Multi-Label Emotion Analysis and Corresponding Intensities for Ethiopian Languages

Tadesse Destaw Belay^{1,2}, Dawit Ketema Gete², Abinew Ali Ayele^{3,4}, Olga Kolesnikova¹
Grigori Sidorov¹, Seid Muhie Yimam⁴

¹Instituto Politécnico Nacional, ²Wollo University, ³Bahir Dar University, ⁴University of Hamburg.

Contact: tadesseit@gmail.com

Abstract

In this digital world, people freely express their emotions using different social media platforms. As a result, modeling and integrating emotion-understanding models are vital for various human-computer interaction tasks such as decision-making, product and customer feedback analysis, political promotions, marketing research, and social media monitoring. As users express different emotions simultaneously in a single instance, annotating emotions in a multilabel setting such as the EthioEmo (Belay et al., 2025) dataset effectively captures this dynamic. Additionally, incorporating intensity, or the degree of emotion, is crucial, as emotions can significantly differ in their expressive strength and impact. This intensity is significant for assessing whether further action is necessary in decision-making processes, especially concerning negative emotions in applications such as healthcare and mental health studies. To enhance the EthioEmo dataset, we include annotations for the intensity of each labeled emotion. Furthermore, we evaluate various state-of-the-art encoder-only Pretrained Language Models (PLMs) and decoder-only Large Language Models (LLMs) to provide comprehensive benchmarking.

1 Introduction

In the digital era, individuals increasingly share their opinions and emotions on various online platforms. These expressions can yield positive and negative outcomes, influencing social relationships, shaping public perceptions, and impacting decision-making processes (Ziems et al., 2024; Picard, 1997). How people convey their views and emotions is inherently diverse, often shaped by sociodemographic factors such as cultural background, personal experiences, communication styles, and emotional states (Picard, 1997). Even when individuals hold similar perspectives, their articulation of thoughts can vary significantly, adding layers of



Figure 1: Multi-label emotion in Ethiopian languages (EthioEmo) with its level of intensity. The languages of each text are in brackets.

complexity to the interpretation of textual expressions. Emotion classification thus emerges as one of the most challenging and subjective tasks in natural language processing. Unlike many other tasks, it requires assigning a text to the emotion label(s) that most accurately reflect the author’s or reader’s mental state. The ability to detect emotions in text has numerous applications, from identifying anger in customer feedback to evaluating the emotional well-being of individuals and societies (Liu, 2012).

It is critical to adopt systematic methodologies for organizing emotions in textual data in order to effectively analyze and interpret the complex and varied ways they are expressed. This involves employing structured annotation methods to categorize emotions and their intensities meaningfully.

There are two primary methods for annotating emotion datasets: *multi-class* and *multi-label*. In

the *multi-class* approach, a text is assigned to one or no emotion classes. In contrast, the *multi-label* approach allows a text to be associated with none, one, multiple, or all of the targeted emotion labels. The latest work by [Belay et al. \(2025\)](#) created a multi-label emotion dataset for four Ethiopian low-resource languages, namely Amharic (amh), Oromo (orm), Somali (som), and Tigrinya (tir). However, this multi-label emotion dataset is annotated without considering emotion intensity, and it did not include cross-language experimentation. Emotion intensity detection is an extension of emotion detection that quantifies the strength of the expressed emotion ([Mashal and Asnani, 2017](#)). This is especially important in multi-label emotion annotation, as each identified emotion may not be present with the same degree of intensity ([Firdaus et al., 2020](#)). As illustrated in [Figure 1](#), some texts have single emotion label with its corresponding intensity value, while others have double, or multiple emotions, each with its own intensity levels. Cross-language experimentation could explore whether emotion classification can be improved by transferring knowledge across languages.

In a multi-label emotion annotation context, the varying intensity of expressed emotions within a single text must be recognized. For instance, some emotions may be subtly present, while others dominate more prominently. This complexity highlights the importance of assessing intensity, as it provides a nuanced understanding of how emotions are expressed. Consider the sentence, *‘Although I’m incredibly excited about starting my new job, I feel a little sad about leaving my friends I made there.’* Here, the sense of happiness (joy) is pronounced and primary, whereas the feeling of sadness is secondary and less intense.

This work contributes by: 1) Extending the EthioEmo dataset to incorporate emotion intensity annotations, thereby enriching the dataset’s applicability for nuanced emotion analysis, and 2) Evaluating pre-trained language models (PLMs) along with open-source large language models (LLMs) for their effectiveness in multi-label emotion classification, intensity prediction, and exploring the feasibility of cross-lingual learning within the four Ethiopian languages.

2 Related Work

Multi-label Emotion: Emotion is central to human nature, and as online interactions grow, peo-

ple express and respond to content in various ways. While emotion recognition is widely studied, merely identifying the type of emotion in text is often insufficient for decision-making. Analyzing the intensity of emotions provides deeper insights, leading to more informed and effective decisions ([Maruf et al., 2024](#)). Sentences or texts can simultaneously manifest multiple emotions, reflecting the complex emotional nuances conveyed ([Mashal and Asnani, 2017](#)), underscoring the necessity for multi-label emotion studies. Some of the most recent and well-known multi-label emotion datasets include SemEval-2018 Task 1 ([Mohammad et al., 2018](#)), GoEmotions ([Demszky et al., 2020](#)), EmoIn-Hindi ([Singh et al., 2022](#)), WASSA-2024 shared task ([Giorgi et al., 2024](#)), BRIGHTER ([Muhammad et al., 2025a](#)), and EthioEmo ([Belay et al., 2025](#)), both are the SemEval2025 Task 11 data ([Muhammad et al., 2025b](#)).

Intensity in Multi-label Emotion: In emotional expression, one emotion might be explicitly stated—clearly mentioned using emotion-related words—while another might be implicit, inferred from the broader context or behavior rather than being directly articulated. Accurately annotating the intensity of each labeled emotion is essential for advancing the capabilities of contemporary large language models (LLMs), as it presents an additional challenge for nuanced emotion recognition. Most multi-label annotated emotion datasets ([Mohammad et al., 2018](#); [Singh et al., 2022](#); [Giorgi et al., 2024](#); [Muhammad et al., 2025a](#)) include intensity ratings for the labeled emotions, allowing for a more fine-grained understanding of emotional expression. However, the EthioEmo dataset is annotated in multi-label settings without specifying the intensity of each corresponding emotion.

Incorporating intensity into multi-label emotion annotation is crucial for various applications, including mental health monitoring, sentiment analysis, and human-computer interaction, where understanding the strength of emotions can significantly enhance performance. Inspired by EthioEmo ([Belay et al., 2025](#)), which aims to create an emotion dataset for four Ethiopian languages, our work extends this effort by adding an intensity feature. To achieve this, we further annotated the EthioEmo dataset using three native language annotators to capture intensity variations in emotion expressions.

We utilized the Potato annotation tool¹ along with in-house annotation practices. Additionally, leveraging this enriched dataset, we conducted an extensive benchmarking evaluation using multilingual pre-trained language models (PLMs) and open-source large language models (LLMs) to assess their ability to handle nuanced emotional expressions with intensity distinctions.

Cross-Lingual Experimentation: Cross-lingual transfer learning has emerged as a promising approach to overcome the data scarcity issue in low-resource languages. Methods such as multilingual PLMs (Zhang et al., 2024) have been used to transfer knowledge from high-resource to low-resource languages. Highlighting the importance of cross-lingual emotion understanding, this study investigates the capabilities of LLMs and PLMs in facilitating knowledge transfer across languages (Kadiyala, 2024; Cheng et al., 2024). By utilizing cross-lingual approaches, one language can benefit from the resources and insights of another, thus enhancing model generalization over emotion-related tasks (Zhu et al., 2024). Navas Alejo et al. (2020) explored various cross-lingual strategies for emotion detection and intensity grading, illustrating how models can adapt across different languages. Building on these insights, our work specifically addresses the unique context of Ethiopian languages, which have been largely underrepresented in previous multilingual emotion analysis efforts.

This work extends the research of Belay et al. (2025) by focusing on the cross-lingual dimensions of emotion analysis. Specifically, it examines how knowledge from emotion detection and intensity prediction can be transferred between Ethiopian languages, which are characterized by distinct script systems: Amharic and Tigrinya use the Ge’ez script, while Afaan Oromo and Somali use the Latin script.

3 EthioEmo Dataset

We extend the intensity annotation of the previous work done by Belay et al. (2025); the data is publicly available in GitHub². The dataset is annotated by three annotators, except for Amharic (amh), which is annotated by a minimum of five. The final label is determined through a majority vote. The data was collected from social media

platforms such as news sites, Twitter, and YouTube comments and was annotated specifically for multi-label emotion classification. However, the dataset initially lacked intensity annotations for the corresponding emotions. For only Amharic, we annotate again with two more annotators, and the total Amharic emotion data is annotated by a minimum of five annotators.

To enhance the dataset, annotators were trained to assign an intensity label to each emotion category identified. The intensity scale comprised four levels: 0 (No intensity for any of the emotion classes), 1 (Slight), 2 (Moderate), and 3 (High). For the Oromo (orm), Somali (som), and Tigrinya (tir) datasets, three annotators participated, with agreement determined by a majority vote. For the Amharic dataset, additional input from two more annotators was incorporated, with agreement computed accordingly to ensure consistency and reliability in the annotations.

3.1 Multi-label Emotion

Each instance is annotated with a minimum of three annotators and takes a majority vote. More details on how the data were collected and annotated are presented in the previous work by Belay et al. (2025).

3.2 Emotion Intensity

We enhance the EthioEmo dataset by including annotations for the intensity of each identified emotion. The final intensity score for each emotion is aggregated and determined using the following formula, which considers the number of annotators:

$$\text{Avg} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N A_i}{N},$$

For five annotators (anno), the intensity of each emotion is decided by:

$$L_{\text{final}} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if Avg} \geq 0.6 \& \text{ Avg} < 1.5 \& \text{ anno} \geq 2 \\ 2, & \text{if Avg} \geq 1.5 \& \text{ Avg} < 2.5 \& \text{ anno} \geq 2 \\ 3, & \text{if Avg} \geq 2.5 \& \text{ anno} \geq 2 \\ 0, & \text{else 0} \end{cases}$$

For three annotators (orm, som, and tir), the intensity of each emotion is decided by:

¹<https://github.com/davidjurgens/potato>

²<https://semeval.github.io/SemEval2025/>




Figure 2: Emotion co-occurrence across the six basic emotions and languages

$$L_{\text{final}} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 0 \leq \text{Avg} < 1 \text{ \#when anno} = 3 \\ 1, & \text{if } 1 \leq \text{Avg} \leq 1.5 \\ 2, & \text{if } 1.5 < \text{Avg} \leq 2.5 \\ 3, & \text{if } \text{Avg} \geq 2.5 \end{cases}$$

Where:

- A_i is the intensity score provided by annotator i , where $A_i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.
- N is the total number of annotators.
- 0 = no intensity, neutral (no emotion class)
- 1 = low intensity of emotion
- 2 = medium intensity of emotion
- 3 = high intensity for of emotion

Emotion co-occurrence As shown in emotion co-occurrence Figure 2, consistently in all languages, the anger and disgust emotions are the most common emotions that appear together. Anger, disgust, and joy are the top three emotions with the highest intensity level, as they also have more statistics than other emotions, such as fear and surprise, shown in Figure 3.

4 Experiments

We select language models from different perspectives, such as Multilingual pre-trained language models (any multilingual and African languages-centric PLMs) and open-source LLMs.

Multilingual PLMs We evaluate the most common multilingual pre-trained language models: LaBSE (Feng et al., 2022), RemBERT (Chung et al., 2020), XLM-RoBERTa (Conneau et al., 2020), mBERT (Libovický et al., 2019), and mDeBERTa (He et al., 2021). The details are shown in Appendix A.3

African Language-centric PLMs We experiment

with fine-tuning various multilingual and African language models. Details of the pre-trained language models (PLMs) are:

- AfriBERTa (Ogueji et al., 2021): pre-trained on 11 African languages. It includes our four target languages.
- AfroLM (Dossou et al., 2022): a multilingual model pre-trained on 23 African languages, including amh and orm from Ethiopian languages.
- AfroXLMR (Alabi et al., 2022): adapted from XLM-R-large (Conneau et al., 2020) (has two versions: 61 and 76 languages) for African languages, including the four Ethiopian languages and high-resource languages (English, French, Chinese, and Arabic).
- EthioLLM (Tonja et al., 2024): multilingual models for five Ethiopian languages (amh, gez, orm, som, and tir) and English.

Large Language Models (LLMs) Based on their popularity in the open-source community, we evaluate the following open source LLMs: Qwen2.5-72B (Team, 2024), Dolly-v2-12B (Conover et al., 2023), Llama-3-70B (AI@Meta, 2024), Mistral-8x7B (Jiang et al., 2024), and DeepSeek-R1-70B (DeepSeek-AI, 2025). The model details are found in Appendix A.3.

5 Formulating Evaluation Tasks

Using the aforementioned language models, we evaluate the following emotion tasks: 1) multi-label emotion classification (zero-shot from LLMs), 2) emotion intensity prediction, and 3) multi-label emotion classification in cross-lingual Settings. For evaluation metrics, we used the Macro-F1 score (averaged across emotions) for multi-label emotion classification, and for intensity classification, we




Figure 3: Emotion intensity statistics across emotion label with three intensity levels (low, medium, and high of the corresponding emotion). Instances that have not been labeled in any of the given emotions are not included in the statistics, no emotion instances are for Amharic 1021, Oromo 1357, Somali 2156, and Tigrinya 1336.

used the Pearson correlation between predicted and actual intensity values.

6 Experiment Results

6.1 Multi-Label Emotion Classification

We fine-tuned and evaluated the pre-trained language models for each targeted language.

6.2 Emotion Intensity Prediction

Understanding and predicting emotions in text is a complex challenge in NLP. While emotion classification focuses on identifying discrete emotions, emotion intensity prediction requires assessing the strength or degree of an emotion in the text, making it a more subjective and difficult task than emotion classification. This subjectivity and complexity pose a greater challenge for low-resource languages, which are underrepresented in PLMs and LLMs and lack sufficient annotated data for effective model training. As all Ethiopian languages are not included during pretraining, mBERT performs worse; the small performance on Oromo and Somali are Latin script languages. LLMs

are performing worse, especially for intensity predictions of the emotions of Ethiopian languages than Emotion identification. For example, for Amharic intensity prediction task, Qwen2.5-72B perform 21.15%, Dolly-v2-12B 4.32%, Llama-3-70B 33.93%, Mistral-8x7B 13.22%, and DeepSeek-R1-70B perform 29.08%.

6.3 Cross-lingual Emotion Classification

Cross-lingual transferability is a widely used method for evaluating performance in downstream NLP tasks (Maladry et al., 2024). However, the evaluation of emotion classification across different languages spoken within the same country, particularly languages that utilize similar scripts—such as Amharic (amh) and Tigrinya (tir), as well as Somali (som) and Afan Oromo (orm)—has not been extensively studied. In this work, we conduct cross-lingual evaluations among four Ethiopian languages: Amharic, Oromo, Somali, and Tigrinya, accompanied by a detailed error analysis. Our experimental setup involves fine-tuning language models on datasets that include all languages except the target language being evaluated. We train

Models	amh	orm	som	tir	Avg.
<i>Monolingual Multi-Label Classification</i>					
LaBSE	66.51	41.49	43.99	48.88	50.22
RemBERT	60.15	47.54	48.31	50.37	51.59
mBERT	26.51	40.32	27.01	25.72	29.89
mDeBERTa	53.43	32.84	36.86	41.73	41.22
XLNet	63.73	37.42	33.51	13.32	37.00
EthioLLM	58.68	47.95	33.84	44.78	46.31
AfriBERTa	60.64	54.10	44.66	47.97	53.34
AfroLM	54.76	42.21	32.77	38.60	42.09
AfroXLM-R-61L	67.93	51.73	49.31	54.96	55.98
AfroXLM-R-76L	68.46	49.68	49.25	53.08	55.11
<i>Zero-Shot Multi-Label Classification from LLMs</i>					
Dolly-v2-12B	5.10	22.89	19.82	1.46	12.32
Mistral-8x7B	29.00	24.25	25.63	27.16	26.51
Qwen2.5-72B	37.82	31.56	28.55	31.13	32.27
DeepSeek-R1-70B	36.89	28.15	26.56	26.49	29.52
Llama-3-70B	42.84	29.84	32.49	32.93	334.53

Table 1: Average F1-Macro for monolingual multi-label emotion classification. Each model is trained and evaluated within the same language. Except LLMs, all experiments are the average of 5 runs.

Models	amh	orm	som	tir	Avg.
<i>Multilingual Language Models (MLMs)</i>					
LaBSE	47.79	16.53	25.70	32.10	30.53
RemBERT	52.73	24.15	24.85	37.63	34.84
mBERT	00.00	17.88	5.51	3.13	6.63
mDeBERTa	33.07	7.27	7.02	19.24	16.15
XLNet	53.63	17.34	18.39	15.95	26.33
EthioLLM	41.90	21.58	9.96	22.77	24.05
AfriBERTa	39.38	25.24	20.63	27.56	28.20
AfroLM	37.75	15.90	5.08	18.42	19.25
AfroXLM-R-61L	55.19	26.75	37.81	41.96	40.43
AfroXLM-R-76L	60.24	29.15	41.36	40.32	42.77

Table 2: Pearson correlation scores for intensity classification using MLMs. The best performance scores are highlighted in blue and orange, respectively.

the model on all languages except the target and then test it on the held-out language (Muhammad et al., 2025a).

As a cross-lingual result in Table 3 shows, likewise emotion classification and intensity prediction tasks, AfroXLM-R achieves better results for the cross-validation evaluations. The cross-lingual results are lower than when we compare the results to the monolingual emotion classification, Table 1 across all languages. When we compare the cross-lingual results across languages, Amharic and Tigrinya perform better in transfer, as they use the same Ethiopic (Ge’ez) script.

7 Results and Discussion

We compare the different parameters of open-source LLMs. Large language models (LLMs) within significant parameters such as Qwen2.5-

Models	amh	orm	som	tir	Avg.
<i>Cross-lingual Multi-Label Classification</i>					
LaBSE	44.11	20.77	35.18	40.13	35.55
RemBERT	42.65	20.87	31.32	33.39	31.81
mBERT	25.10	10.79	14.13	18.27	17.07
mDeBERTa	36.40	26.63	18.83	38.03	29.97
XLNet	23.52	23.69	26.98	38.63	28.21
EthioLLM	38.37	22.46	22.76	33.08	30.42
AfriBERTa	46.28	35.86	30.81	38.05	37.75
AfroLM	32.12	10.38	9.00	25.48	19.25
AfroXLM-R-61L	56.41	43.24	42.21	52.70	48.64
AfroXLM-R-76L	56.65	45.01	41.24	53.39	49.07

Table 3: Average F1-Macro for cross lingual emotion classification. The best performance scores are highlighted in bold

72B, Llama-3-70B, and DeepSeek-R1-70B perform poorly for low-resource Ethiopian languages. Amharic language has better representation in the explored language models among Ethiopian languages. Generally, African language-centric PLMs are better for emotion, intensity, and transferability between Ethiopian languages. We achieved the state-of-the-art results from AfroXLMR, the SOTA results from the shared task computation were 80%. We improved the original results from the paper (Belay et al., 2025); the best result from the original dataset was 67%.

During cross-lingual transfer learning experiments, excluding other Latin script languages during fine-tuning does not impact performance, while all are Afroasiatic languages. For instance, excluding Somali and Oromo and only training and testing with Tigrinya is effective, as both Amharic and Tigrinya use the same Ethiopic script. Training and testing solely with Amharic is comparable to training with Tigrinya, Oromo, and Somali; however, Oromo and Somali utilize the Latin script.

How does intensity help multi-label emotion classification? Lastly, we will make the emotion intensity data publicly available along with the original multi-label emotion data to improve the targeted languages further.

In future work, as we will release the annotator-level data, we recommend modeling the annotator-level data instead of making the majority vote, as making the majority vote is not the best way to decide the final gold label for subjective NLP tasks while it is the most common way of deciding the final label as of today.

Limitations

While it is common to annotate multi-label emotion using three raters, such as the GoEmotions dataset (Demszky et al., 2020), WRIME emotion intensity (Kajiwara et al., 2021) and others (Troiano et al., 2021; Suzuki et al., 2022), it is recommended that the more annotators, the higher the dataset’s quality. Based on our scope, we annotate the intensity using only a minimum of three raters. In the future, we will plan to release the data with the three annotator-level data and can expand with more annotators. The intensity is annotated using three annotators, while the BRIGHTER (Muhammad et al., 2025a) dataset intensity of the corresponding emotion is annotated by five. As annotating again using more annotators is advisable, we recommend using more annotators as more annotators result in more quality data.

Ethical Considerations

As we start from a previously annotated dataset (Belay et al., 2025), Emotion intensity annotation, perception, and expression are subjective and nuanced as they are strongly related to sociodemographic aspects (e.g., cultural background, social group, personal experiences, social context). Thus, we can never truly identify how one is feeling based solely on the given text snippets with absolute certainty. We ensure fair and honest analysis while conducting our work ethically and without harming anybody.

References

- AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#).
- Jesujoba O. Alabi, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Marius Mosbach, and Dietrich Klakow. 2022. [Adapting pre-trained language models to African languages via multilingual adaptive fine-tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 4336–4349, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Tadesse Destaw Belay, Israel Abebe Azime, Abinew Ali Ayele, Grigori Sidorov, Dietrich Klakow, Philip Slusallek, Olga Kolesnikova, and Seid Muhie Yimam. 2025. [Evaluating the capabilities of large language models for multi-label emotion understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3523–3540, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Long Cheng, Qihao Shao, Christine Zhao, Sheng Bi, and Gina-Anne Levow. 2024. [TEII: Think, explain, interact and iterate with large language models to solve cross-lingual emotion detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 495–504, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hyung Won Chung, Thibault Févry, Henry Tsai, Melvin Johnson, and Sebastian Ruder. 2020. [Rethinking embedding coupling in pre-trained language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2010.12821.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. [Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1911.02116.
- Mike Conover, Matt Hayes, Ankit Mathur, Jianwei Xie, Jun Wan, Sam Shah, Ali Ghodsi, Patrick Wendell, Matei Zaharia, and Reynold Xin. 2023. [Free dolly: Introducing the world’s first truly open instruction-tuned llm](#).
- DeepSeek-AI. 2025. [Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.12948.
- Dorottya Demszy, Dana Movshovitz-Attias, Jeongwoo Ko, Alan Cowen, Gaurav Nemade, and Sujith Ravi. 2020. [GoEmotions: A dataset of fine-grained emotions](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4040–4054, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bonaventure F. P. Dossou, Atnafu Lambebo Tonja, Oreen Yousuf, Salomey Osei, Abigail Oppong, Iyanuoluwa Shode, Oluwabusayo Olufunke Awoyomi, and Chris Emezue. 2022. [AfroLM: A self-active learning-based multilingual pretrained language model for 23 African languages](#). In *Proceedings of The Third Workshop on Simple and Efficient Natural Language Processing (SustaiNLP)*, pages 52–64, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fangxiaoyu Feng, Yinfei Yang, Daniel Cer, Naveen Ariavazhagan, and Wei Wang. 2022. [Language-agnostic BERT sentence embedding](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 878–891, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mauajama Firdaus, Hardik Chauhan, Asif Ekbal, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. 2020. [MEISD: A multi-modal multi-label emotion, intensity and sentiment dialogue dataset for emotion recognition and sentiment analysis in conversations](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.

- Linguistics*, pages 4441–4453, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Salvatore Giorgi, João Sedoc, Valentin Barriere, and Shabnam Tafreshi. 2024. [Findings of WASSA 2024 shared task on empathy and personality detection in interactions](#). In *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 369–379, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [Debertav3: Improving deberta using electra-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2111.09543.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L el io Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th eophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. [Mixtral of experts](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.04088.
- Ram Mohan Rao Kadiyala. 2024. [Cross-lingual emotion detection through large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 464–469, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tomoyuki Kajiwaru, Chenhui Chu, Noriko Take-mura, Yuta Nakashima, and Hajime Nagahara. 2021. [WRIME: A new dataset for emotional intensity estimation with subjective and objective annotations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2095–2104, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jindřich Libovický, Rudolf Rosa, and Alexander Fraser. 2019. [How language-neutral is multilingual bert?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:1911.03310.
- Bing Liu. 2012. [Sentiment Analysis and Opinion Mining](#), volume 5 of *Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- Aaron Maladry, Pranaydeep Singh, and Els Lefever. 2024. [Findings of the WASSA 2024 EXALT shared task on explainability for cross-lingual emotion in tweets](#). In *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 454–463, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abdullah Al Maruf, Fahima Khanam, Md. Mahmudul Haque, Zakaria Masud Jiyad, M. F. Mridha, and Zeyar Aung. 2024. [Challenges and opportunities of text-based emotion detection: A survey](#). *IEEE Access*, 12:18416–18450.
- Sonia Xylina Mashal and Kavita Asnani. 2017. [Emotion intensity detection for social media data](#). In *2017 International Conference on Computing Methodologies and Communication (ICCCM)*, pages 155–158.
- Saif Mohammad, Felipe Bravo-Marquez, Mohammad Salameh, and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2018. [SemEval-2018 task 1: Affect in tweets](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 1–17, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shamsuddeen Hassan Muhammad, Nedjma Ousidhoum, Idris Abdulmumin, Jan Philip Wahle, Terry Ruas, Meriem Beloucif, Christine de Kock, Nirmal Surange, Daniela Teodorescu, Ibrahim Said Ahmad, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Alham Fikri Aji, Felermimo D. M. A. Ali, Ilseyar Alimova, Vladimir Araujo, Nikolay Babakov, Naomi Baes, Ana-Maria Bucur, Andiswa Bukula, Guanqun Cao, Rodrigo Tufino Cardenas, Rendi Chevi, Chiamaka Ijeoma Chukwunke, Alexandra Ciobotaru, Daryna Dementieva, Murja Sani Gadanya, Robert Geislinger, Bela Gipp, Oumaima Hourrane, Oana Ignat, Falalu Ibrahim Lawan, Rooweither Mabuya, Rahmad Mahendra, Vukosi Marivate, Andrew Piper, Alexander Panchenko, Charles Henrique Porto Ferreira, Vitaly Protasov, Samuel Rutunda, Manish Shrivastava, Aura Cristina Udrea, Lilian Diana Awuor Wanzare, Sophie Wu, Florian Valentin Wunderlich, Hanif Muhammad Zhafran, Tianhui Zhang, Yi Zhou, and Saif M. Mohammad. 2025a. [Brighter: Bridging the gap in human-annotated textual emotion recognition datasets for 28 languages](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.11926.
- Shamsuddeen Hassan Muhammad, Nedjma Ousidhoum, Idris Abdulmumin, Seid Muhie Yimam, Jan Philip Wahle, Terry Ruas, Meriem Beloucif, Christine De Kock, Tadesse Destaw Belay, Ibrahim Said Ahmad, Nirmal Surange, Daniela Teodorescu, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Alham Fikri Aji, Felermimo Ali, Vladimir Araujo, Abinew Ali Ayele, Oana Ignat, Alexander Panchenko, Yi Zhou, and Saif M. Mohammad. 2025b. [SemEval task 11: Bridging the gap in text-based emotion detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2025)*, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Irean Navas Alejo, Toni Badia, and Jeremy Barnes. 2020. [Cross-lingual emotion intensity prediction](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Computational Modeling of People’s Opinions, Personality, and Emotion’s in Social Media*, pages 140–152, Barcelona, Spain (Online). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kelechi Ogueji, Yuxin Zhu, and Jimmy Lin. 2021. [Small data? no problem! exploring the viability of pretrained multilingual language models for low-resourced languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Multilingual Representation Learning*, pages 116–126, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Rosalind W. Picard. 1997. *Affective Computing*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Gopendra Vikram Singh, Priyanshu Priya, Mauajama Firdaus, Asif Ekbal, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. 2022. *EmoInHindi: A multi-label emotion and intensity annotated dataset in Hindi for emotion recognition in dialogues*. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 5829–5837, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.

Haruya Suzuki, Sora Tarumoto, Tomoyuki Kajiwar, Takashi Ninomiya, Yuta Nakashima, and Hajime Nagahara. 2022. *Emotional intensity estimation based on writer’s personality*. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: Student Research Workshop*, pages 1–7, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Qwen Team. 2024. *Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models*.

Atnafu Lambebo Tonja, Israel Abebe Azime, Tadesse Destaw Belay, Mesay Gemedo Yigezu, Moges Ahmed Ah Mehamed, Abinew Ali Ayele, Ebrahim Chekol Jibril, Michael Melese Woldeyohannis, Olga Kolesnikova, Philipp Slusallek, Dietrich Klakow, and Seid Muhie Yimam. 2024. *EthioLLM: Multilingual large language models for Ethiopian languages with task evaluation*. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 6341–6352, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.

Enrica Troiano, Sebastian Padó, and Roman Klinger. 2021. *Emotion ratings: How intensity, annotation confidence and agreements are entangled*. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis*, pages 40–49, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jinghui Zhang, Yuan Zhao, Siqin Zhang, Ruijing Zhao, and Siyu Bao. 2024. *Enhancing cross-lingual emotion detection with data augmentation and token-label mapping*. In *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 528–533, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Xiliang Zhu, Shayna Gardiner, Tere Roldán, and David Rossouw. 2024. *The model arena for cross-lingual sentiment analysis: A comparative study in the era of large language models*. In *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 141–152, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Jiaao Chen, Zhehao Zhang, and Diyi Yang. 2024. *Can large lan-*

guage models transform computational social science? Computational Linguistics, 50(1):237–291.

A Appendix

A.1 Hyperparameters

For the evaluation metrics of multi-label emotion classification, we use macro F1 score. For the evaluations of intensity, we used Pearson correlation scores. Fine-tuning hyperparameters of pretrained language models (PLMs) are epoch 3, lr = 5e-5, max-token 256, and batch size 8.

LLMs prompt for the zero-shot multi-label emotion classification:

"Evaluate whether the author of the following text conveys the emotion {{EMOTION}}. " "Think step by step before you answer. Finish your response with 'Therefore, my answer is ' " "followed by 'yes' or 'no'."

A.2 Emotion and intensity data statistics




Figure 4: Emotion statistics in number emotion labels for each instance

A.3 Model details and versions

- LaBSE - sentence-transformers/LaBSE (Feng et al., 2022)
- RemBERT - google/rembert (Chung et al., 2020)
- XLM-RoBERTa - FacebookAI/xlm-roberta-base (large) (Conneau et al., 2020)
- mDeBERTa - microsoft/mdeberta-v3-base (He et al., 2021)
- mBERT - google-bert_bert-base-multilingual-cased (Libovický et al., 2019)

- EthioLLM - EthioNLP/EthioLLM-1-70K
- AfriBERTa - castorini/afriberta_large
- AfroXLM-R - Davlan/afro-xlmr-large-61L (76L)
- AfroLM - bonadossou/afroLM_active_learning
- DeepSeek-R1-70 - deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B
- Mistral-8x7B - mistralai/Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1
- Llama-3-70B - meta-llama/Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct
- Qwen2.5-72B - Qwen/Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct
- Dolly-v2-12B - databricks/dolly-v2-12b