

Lecture 13: Annotation

Nathan Schneider

(with material from Henry Thompson, Alex Lascarides)



ANLP | 23 October 2017

Annotation

Why “gold” \neq perfect

Quality Control

Factors in Annotation

Suppose you are tasked with building an annotated corpus. (E.g., with part-of-speech tags.) In order to estimate **cost** in time and money, you need to decide on:

- ▶ Source data (genre? size? licensing?)
- ▶ Annotation scheme (complexity? guidelines?)
- ▶ Annotators (expertise? training?)
- ▶ Annotation software (graphical interface?)
- ▶ Quality control procedures (multiple annotation, adjudication?)

Annotation Scheme

- ▶ Assuming a competent annotator, some kinds of annotation are straightforward for most inputs.
- ▶ Others are not.
 - ▶ Text may be ambiguous
 - ▶ There may be gray area between categories in the annotation scheme

You play annotator

Noun or adverb?

- ▶ **Yesterday** was my birthday .
- ▶ **Yesterday** I ate a cake .
- ▶ He was fired **yesterday** for leaking the information .
- ▶ I read it in **yesterday** 's news .
- ▶ I had not heard of it until **yesterday** .

You play annotator

Verb, noun, or adjective?

- ▶ We had been **walking** quite briskly
- ▶ **Walking** was the remedy, they decided
- ▶ In due time Sandburg was a **walking** thesaurus of American folk music.
- ▶ we all lived within **walking** distance of the studio
- ▶ a woman came along carrying a folded umbrella as a **walking** stick
- ▶ The **Walking** Dead premiered in the U.S. on October 31, 2010, on the cable television channel AMC

Annotation: Not as easy as you might think

Pretty much any annotation scheme for language will have some difficult cases where there is gray area, and multiple decisions are plausible.

- ▶ Because human language needs to be **flexible**, it cuts corners and is reshaped over time.
- ▶ Not just syntax: wait till we get to semantics!

Annotation Guidelines

However, we want a dataset's annotations to be as clean as possible so we can use them reliably in systems.

Documenting conventions in an annotation manual/standard/guidelines document is important to help annotators produce **consistent** data, and to help end users interpret the annotations correctly.

Annotation Guidelines

- ▶ Penn Treebank: 36 POS tags (excluding punctuation).
- ▶ Tagging guidelines (3rd Revision): 34 pages
 - ▶ “The temporal expressions *yesterday*, *today* and *tomorrow* should be tagged as nouns (NN) rather than as adverbs (RB). Note that you can (marginally) pluralize them and that they allow a possessive form, both of which true adverbs do not.” (p. 19)
 - ▶ An entire page on nouns vs. verbs.
 - ▶ 3 pages on adjectives vs. verbs.
- ▶ Penn Treebank bracketing (tree) guidelines: >300 pages!

Annotation Quality

But even with extensive guidelines, human annotations won't be perfect:

- ▶ Simple error (hitting the wrong button)
- ▶ Not reading the full context
- ▶ Not noticing an erroneous pre-annotation
- ▶ Forgetting a detail from the guidelines
- ▶ Cases not anticipated by or not fully specified in guidelines (room for interpretation)

“Gold” data will have some tarnish. How can we measure its quality?

Inter-annotator agreement (IAA)

- ▶ An important way to estimate the reliability of annotations is to have multiple people independently annotate a common sample, and measure **inter-annotator/coder/rater agreement**.
- ▶ **Raw agreement rate**: proportion of labels in agreement
- ▶ If the annotation task is perfectly well-defined and the annotators are well-trained and do not make mistakes, then (in theory) they would agree 100%.
- ▶ If agreement is well below what is desired (will differ depending on the kind of annotation), examine the sources of disagreement and consider additional training or refining guidelines.
- ▶ The agreement rate can be thought of as an upper bound (**human ceiling**) on accuracy of a system evaluated on that dataset.

IAA: Beyond raw agreement rate

- ▶ Raw agreement rate counts all annotation decisions equally.
- ▶ Some measures take knowledge about the annotation scheme into account (e.g., counting singular vs. plural noun as a minor disagreement compared to noun vs. preposition).
- ▶ What if some decisions (e.g., POS tags) are far more frequent than others?
 - ▶ If 2 annotators both tagged *hell* as a noun, what is the chance that they agreed **by accident**? What if they agree that it is an interjection (rare tag)—is that equally likely to be an accident?
 - ▶ **Chance-corrected** measures such as Cohen's kappa (κ) adjust the agreement score based on label probabilities. (Cohen's assumes 2 raters, categorical labels)
 - ▶ ...but they make modeling assumptions about how “accidental” agreement would arise; important that these match the reality of the annotation process!

Cohen's κ

- ▶ 2 raters (annotators A and B), categorical labels (y_1, y_2, \dots)
- ▶ From interannotator confusion matrix, compute:
 - ▶ Observed probability of agreement (i.e., raw agreement rate):
 $p_o = \hat{P}(A = B = y_1) + \hat{P}(A = B = y_2) + \dots$
 - ▶ Expected agreement **by chance** if annotators' decisions were independent:
 $p_e = \hat{P}(A = y_1)\hat{P}(B = y_1) + \hat{P}(A = y_2)\hat{P}(B = y_2) + \dots$
- ▶ Agreement above chance:

$$\kappa = \frac{p_o - p_e}{1 - p_e}$$

- ▶ Interpretation of κ is subjective.
 - ▶ Landis and Koch (1977): 0–0.20 is “slight” agreement, 0.21–0.40 is “fair”, 0.41–0.60 is “moderate”, 0.61–0.80 is “substantial”, and 0.81–1 is “almost perfect”
- ▶ Assumes that chance is random guessing according to one's overall preferences—not always realistic!
- ▶ Tends to underestimate agreement for rare labels.

Crowdsourcing

- ▶ Quality control is even more important when eliciting annotations from “the crowd”.
- ▶ E.g., **Amazon Mechanical Turk** facilitates paying anonymous web users small amounts of money for small amounts of work (“Human Intelligence Tasks”).
- ▶ Need to take measures to ensure annotators are qualified and taking the task seriously.
 - ▶ Redundancy to combat noise: Elicit 5+ annotations per data point.
 - ▶ Embed data points with known answers, reject annotators who get them wrong.

Universal POS Tags, v2

with English examples

ADJective: the **third oldest Persian** cat is **hungry**

ADPosition: that cat **of** yours sits **on** the mat **during** the storm

ADVerb: he fishes **very well; indeed, how** has he grown **up so quickly?**

AUXiliary: he **is** a cat; we **must have been** eating

Coordinating CONJunction: fish **and** birds look delicious, **but** Whiskers is vegetarian

DETerminer: I saw **that** cat—it was **a** lot bigger than **all the** others, but **no** monster

INTerJection: **yes, hello there—ouch!** **NOUN**: the **cat** is playing with a **rubber ball**

NUMeral: cats have **nine (9)** lives **PART**icle: Jon 's cat does **n't** like **to** get wet

PRONoun: **it** seems **my** cat is **somebody who** licks **himself** when **there** are odors

PROPerNoun: **Whiskers** represents the **White House** at the **UN** in **New York**

PUNCTuation: “ **Where did you go ?** ” I asked the cat .

Subordinating CONJunction: he knows **that** he is the king **because** he gets the best chair

SYMbol: **\$ 100 whiskers@un.org =^._.^= ^..^)**~

VERB: cats **have** 9 lives to **live** and are always **eating**

X (other): **c'est la vie**

