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Aims of sentiment analysis:

i) **Document level sentiment classification.** A positive or negative evaluation [Pang et al., 2002, Turney, 2002].

ii) **Subjectivity classification at sentence level.** A subjective or objective (factual) sentence [Wiebe et al., 1999].

iii) **Aspect and entity level.** Identification of the target of one positive or negative opinion [Hu and Liu, 2004].
Apart from basic resources, a corpus with subjective information for sentiment analysis is indispensable. Examples:

- **Linguistic knowledge**: analysis different linguistic phenomena related to sentiment analysis.
- **Statistic analysis**: extraction of patterns of different linguistic phenomena.

**The aim of this work**

Annotate the rhetorical structure of an opinionated corpus in Basque to check out the semantic orientation of rhetorical relations.
## Related works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Refae and Rieser, 2014]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,868 tweets in Arabic</td>
<td>Semantic orientation Grammatical features</td>
<td>Kappa: 0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Chardon et al., 2013]</td>
<td>SDRT</td>
<td>211 texts (movie revies, news reactions)</td>
<td>EDUs: subjectivity. Documents: subjectivity and discourse relations</td>
<td>Kappa. EDUs: 0.69, 0.44 Documents: 0.73, 0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Asher et al., 2009]</td>
<td>SDRT</td>
<td>+300 texts (movies, letters, reports)</td>
<td>Discourse and subjectivity annotation</td>
<td>Categorization: 95% Segmentation: 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Mittal et al., 2013]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>662 reviews in Hindi</td>
<td>Violating expectation conjunctions. Negation.</td>
<td>Discourse + negation, the accuracy: 50.45 to 80.21.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Theoretical framework: Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST)

Igerabidek genero beltzeko nobela kaleratu du,
Igerabide has published a black genre novel

Gustura irakurzen da nobela, protagonisten joko bikoitzza nola bukatuko ote den, nahiz eta amaiera horren zantzuaak aurretik eskaintzen dizkigun idazleak:

The novel is read with pleasure, (wanting to know) how the protagonist’s double play ends, although the writer offers us some traces of this ending:

Idazkerak ere laguntzen du aurrera plazeregatuz egiten, ortugatuz:

Writing style also helps moving forward with pleasure,

Zangotxaba / Juan Kruz Igerabide / E.rein,2014
Zangotxaba K. Altuna / Aizul,2014-09.
The Basque Opinion Corpus

- 240 opinion texts collected from different websites.
- Opinion texts of six different domains: sports, politics, music, movies, literature books and weather.
- Usefulness for sentiment analysis:
  - The first person: 1.21% in a Basque objective corpus (Basque Wikipedia) vs. 8.37% in the Basque Opinion Corpus.
  - 8.50% of the words correspond to adjectives in Basque Wikipedia and 9.82% in the corpus for study.
  - Negation, *irrealis blocking* and discourse markers also are in the corpus.
Methodology steps

1- Set the stage for the annotating work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>21 + 9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>10 + 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20 + 5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2- Annotation procedure and process.

- Following the annotation guidelines proposed by [Das and Taboada, 2018].
- Weather texts were annotated in 20 minutes while movie and literature texts were annotated in one hour.
3- **Measurement of inter-annotator agreement.**

Inter-annotator agreement was measured in two ways:

- The qualitative evaluation method [Iruskieta et al., 2015] using F-measure.
- In contrast with the qualitative evaluation, the manual evaluation did not take the central subconstituent factor into account.

4- **Semantic orientation extraction.**

- Use of the Basque version of the SO-CAL tool [Taboada et al., 2011].
- Extraction of the sentiment valence of 75 instances of CONCESSION and EVALUATION relations.
5- Results.

- Percentage of rhetorical relations with the same label annotated by two persons.
- Accumulated values of sentiment valences in nuclei and satellites in texts of different domains.
RST annotation: inter-annotator agreement

Type of rhetorical relation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Agreement (%)</th>
<th>Agreement (RR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>17 of 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>70 of 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>37.73</td>
<td>83 of 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39.81</td>
<td>170 of 427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sentiment analysis: sentiment valence of rhetorical relations

- We sum all the sentiment valence of words of CONCESSION and EVALUATION rhetorical relations.
- The results of the sum are given based on nuclearity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of sentiment valences</th>
<th>CONCESSION</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nucleus</td>
<td>Satellite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td>39.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>61.02</td>
<td>68.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114.41 (47.21%)</td>
<td>127.93 (52.79%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCESSION.

[S[Puntu ahulak izan arren,]_{-1.5} N[film erakargarri eta berezia da Victoria.]_{+6}+4.5 (ZIN19)  
[S[Although it has weak points,]_{-1.5} N[Victoria is an entertaining and special movie.]_{+6}+4.5

EVALUATION.

[N[Bada, erraz ikusten den filma da “The danish girl”.]_{+1}  
S[Atsegina da, hunkigarrina, entretenigarrina]_{+6}+7 (ZIN15).  
[N[So, “The danish girl” is a film easy to watch.]_{+1} S[It is nice, touching, entertaining.]_{+6}+7
Automatic evaluation in a more strict scenario (if and only if the central subconstituent is the same) following [Iruskieta et al., 2015]

- **Constituent (C)**. All the EDUs that compose each discourse unit or span.
- **Attachment point**. The node in the RS-tree to which the relation is attached.
- **N-S or nuclearity** Specification of the compared relations regarding direction (NS, NS or NN).
- **Relation**. The same type of rhetorical relation to the attachment point of two or more EDUs in order to get the same effect.
Results: inter-annotator agreement
Discussion: usefulness of the corpus for sentiment analysis

Results according to automatic evaluation concerning discourse annotation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>N-S</th>
<th>Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>20/37</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>9/37</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>84/155</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>67/155</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>112/221</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>88/221</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216/413</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>164/413</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: relevant RR disagreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELABORATION</td>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELABORATION</td>
<td>INTERPRETATION</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULT</td>
<td>ELABORATION</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPRETATION</td>
<td>JUSTIFICATION</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCESSION</td>
<td>CONTRAST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>CONTRAST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Usefulness of the corpus for sentiment analysis

- We can combine the subjectivity information with features of type of rhetorical relations to make a better sentiment analysis and classification.

1) Subjectivity extraction: words with sentiment valence tend to appear more in satellites than in nuclei.
### Discourse Information

1. **Concession**
   - **Result:** The semantic orientation of nucleus must be the semantic orientation of all the rhetorical relation.

2. **Evaluation**
   - **Result:** The weight must be assigned to the satellite because that part of the relation is more important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of RR</th>
<th>Nucleus</th>
<th>Satellite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>situation affirmed by author</td>
<td>situation which is apparently inconsistent but also affirmed by author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>a situation</td>
<td>an evaluative comment about the situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Inter-annotator agreement.
  - Annotation of a part of the Basque Opinion Corpus using RST.
  - The inter-annotator agreement: 39.81%.
  - The results of automatic tool regarding constituent and nuclearity are higher than 0.5 (inter-annotator agreement).

- The usefulness of the corpus for sentiment analysis.
  - Useful to extract subjectivity information of different rhetorical relations.
  - CONCESSION: the semantic orientation of the nucleus prevails.
  - EVALUATION: words with sentiment valence concentrate on satellite.
Future Work

- Building of extended annotation guidelines to annotate the corpus with more reliability.
- Annotation of the entire corpus.
- Analysis regarding the distribution of the subjective information in relations.
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