

-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Capturing Reliable Fine-Grained Sentiment Associations by Crowdsourcing and Best–Worst Scaling

Svetlana Kiritchenko and Saif M. Mohammad

National Research Council Canada



Introduction: Word–Sentiment Associations

Sentiment lexicon: a list of terms (usually single words) with association to positive (negative) sentiment

happy	0.9
awful	-0.9
award	0.6

Applications:

- sentence-, tweet-, message-level sentiment classification 0
- literary analysis 0
- detecting personality traits 0

Our goal: Manually capture fine-grained (real-valued) sentiment associations for single words and multi-word phrases



ouncil Canada

Motivation: Manually Obtained Sentiment Annotations

- Manually created lexicons are generally more accurate than automatically generated lexicons
- Uses (that cannot be fulfilled by automatic lexicons):
 - to create automatic lexicons
 - to directly evaluate automatic lexicons
 - linguistic analysis
 - help understand how sentiment is conveyed by words and phrases
 - how sentiment is perceived by native speakers



Motivation: Fine-Grained Sentiment Annotations

Existing manually created lexicons:

usually have only coarse levels of sentiment (positive vs. negative)

Obtaining real-valued sentiment annotations is challenging:

- higher cognitive load than simply marking positive, negative, neutral
- hard to be consistent across multiple annotations
- difficult to maintain consistency across annotators
 - 0.8 for one annotator may be 0.7 for another





Our Contributions

- Investigate the applicability and reliability of Best–Worst Scaling in sentiment annotation via crowdsourcing
- Create new fine-grained sentiment lexicons through manual annotation and Best–Worst Scaling
 - for different domains and languages
 - for words and also for phrases
- Show that the annotation method we use produces reliable sentiment scores with just two or three annotations per question
- Analyze the lexicons to gain new understandings of human perception of sentiment





Annotation Method

Best–Worst Scaling (Louviere & Woodworth, 1990): (a.k.a. Maximum Difference Scaling or MaxDiff)

If X is the property of interest (positive, useful, etc.),

give k terms (usually 4 or 5) and ask which is most X, and which is least X



- comparative in nature
- helps with consistency issues

Crowdsourcing:

Each 4-tuple is annotated by at least eight respondents



Best–Worst Scaling: Converting Responses to Real-Valued Scores

- Responses converted into real-valued scores for all the terms:
 - a simple counting procedure (Orme, 2009):

 $score(t) = \frac{\#most\ positive(t) - \#most\ negative(t)}{\#annotations(t)}$

The scores range from:

- -1 (least association with positive sentiment)
- to 1 (most association with positive sentiment)

terms can then be ranked by sentiment



New, Manually Created, Sentiment Lexicons

- We created three fine-grained sentiment lexicons:
 - SemEval-2015 English Twitter
 - 1,515 single words and negated phrases from English tweets (e.g., happeeee, can't wait, Imao, <33)
 - SemEval-2016 Arabic Twitter
 - 1,367 single words and negated phrases from Arabic (صدااااع, مش هيتحقق, # عشق, كارث, e.g.,
 - SemEval-2016 General English Sentiment Modifiers (aka) Sentiment Composition Lexicon for Negators, Modals, and Degree Adverbs)
 - 3,207 single words and phrases with negators, modals, and degree adverbs (e.g., *delightful, rather dangerous,* may not know)



ouncil Canada

Robustness of the Annotations

- Divided the Best–Worst responses for each question into two halves
- Generated scores and rankings based on each set individually
- The two sets produced very similar results:
 - Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient between the two rankings was 0.98 for all three lexicons
 - Pearson Correlation coefficient between the two sets of scores was 0.98 for all three lexicons





Analysis: Human Agreement vs. Sentiment Difference

- For word pair w₁ and w₂ such that score(w₁) > score(w₂), we calculate human agreement for score(w₁) > score(w₂)
- We plot average human agreement as a function of d = score(w₁) - score(w₂)





Analysis: Least Perceptible Difference



- Least perceptible difference aka just-noticeable difference
 - a concept from psychophysics
 - the amount by which something that can be measured (e.g., weight or sound intensity) needs to be changed in order for the difference to be noticeable by a human (Fechner, 1966)
- With our fine-grained sentiment scores, we can measure the least perceptible difference in sentiment
 - useful in studying sentiment composition (e.g., to determine whether a modifier significantly impacts the sentiment of the word it modifies)



Analysis: Measuring the Least Perceptible Difference

 Least perceptible difference in sentiment scores is a point d at which we can say with high confidence that the two terms do not have the same sentiment associations



Least Perceptible Differences in lexicons:

General English: 0.069 English Twitter : 0.080 Arabic Twitter : 0.087



Interactive Visualization for SCL-NMA



http://www.saifmohammad.com/WebPages/SCL.html#NMA





Lexicons Availability



The lexicons and their interactive visualizations are available at: http://www.saifmohammad.com/WebPages/SCL.html

Code for Best–Worst Scaling will be available at: http://www.saifmohammad.com/WebPages/BestWorst.html

The datasets were used as official test sets in:

- SemEval-2015 Task 10: English Twitter dataset http://alt.gcri.org/semeval2015/task10/
- SemEval-2016 Task 7: General English and Arabic Twitter datasets http://alt.gcri.org/semeval2016/task7/

We hope you will use Best–Worst Scaling for your next annotation project!



ouncil Canada