Target-Centric Features for Translation Quality Estimation

Chris Hokamp and Iacer Calixto and Joachim Wagner and Jian Zhang
CNGL Centre for Global Intelligent Content
Dublin City University
School of Computing
Dublin, Ireland
{chokamp|icalixto|jwagner|zhangj}@computing.dcu.ie

Abstract

We describe the DCU-MIXED and DCU-SVR submissions to the WMT-14 Quality Estimation task 1.1, predicting sentence-level perceived post-editing effort. Feature design focuses on target-side features as we hypothesise that the source side has little effect on the quality of human translations, which are included in task 1.1 of this year’s WMT Quality Estimation shared task. We experiment with features of the QuEst framework, features of our past work, and three novel feature sets. Despite these efforts, our two systems perform poorly in the competition. Follow up experiments indicate that the poor performance is due to improperly optimised parameters.

1 Introduction

Translation quality estimation tries to predict the quality of a translation given the source and target text but no reference translations. Different from previous years (Callison-Burch et al., 2012; Bojar et al., 2013), the WMT 2014 Quality Estimation shared task is MT system-independent, i.e. no glass-box features are available and translations in the training and test sets are produced by different MT systems and also by human translators.

This paper describes the CNGL@DCU team submission to task 1.1 of the WMT 2014 Quality Estimation shared task.1 The task is to predict the perceived post-editing effort given a source sentence and its raw translation. Due to the inclusion of human translation in the task, we focus our efforts on target-side features as we expect that the quality of a translation produced by a human translator is much less affected by features of the source than by extrinsic factors such as time pressure and familiarity with the domain.

To build our quality estimation system, we use and extend the QuEst framework for translation quality estimation2 (Shah et al., 2013; Specia et al., 2013). QuEst provides modules for feature extraction and machine learning. We modify both the feature extraction framework and the machine learning components to add functionality to QuEst.

The novel features we add to our systems are (a) a language model on a combination of stop words and POS tags, (b) inverse glass-box features for translating the translation, and (c) random indexing (Sahlgren, 2005) for measuring the semantic similarity of source and target side across languages. Furthermore, we integrated (d) source-side pseudo-reference features (Soricut and Echihabi, 2010) and (e) error grammar features (Wagner, 2012), which were used first in MT quality estimation by (Rubino et al., 2012; Rubino et al., 2013).

The remaining sections are organised as follows. Section 2 gives details on the features we use. Section 3 describes how we set up our experiments. Results are presented in Section 4 and conclusions are drawn in Section 5 together with pointers to future work.

2 Features

This section describes the features we extract from source and target sentences in order to train prediction models and to make predictions in addition to the baseline features provided for the task.

We focus on the target side as we assume that the quality of the source side has little predictive power for human translations, which are included in task 1.1.

1A CNGL system based on referential translation machines is submitted separately (Biçici and Way, 2014).

2http://www.quest.dcs.shef.ac.uk/
2.1 QuEst Black-Box Features and Baseline Features
We use the QuEst framework to extract 47 basic black-box features from both source and target side, such as the ratio of the number of tokens, punctuation statistics, number if mismatched brackets and quotes, language model perplexity, $n$-gram frequency quartile statistics ($n = 1, 2, 3$), and coarse-grained POS frequency ratios. 17 of the 47 features are identical to the baseline features from the shared task website, i.e. 30 features are new. To train the language models and to extract frequency information, we use the News Commentary corpus (Bojar et al., 2013).

2.2 POS and Stop Word Language Model Features
For all languages, we extract probability and perplexity features from language models trained on POS tagged corpora. POS tagging is performed using the IMS Tree Tagger (Schmid, 1994).

We also experiment with language models built from a combination of stop words and POS tags. Starting with a tokenised corpus, and its POS-tagged counterpart, we create a new representation of the corpus by replacing POS tags for stop words with the literal stop word that occurred in the original corpus, leaving non-stop word tags intact. The intuition behind the approach is that the combined POS and stop word model should encode the distributional tendencies of the most common words in the language.

The log-probability and the perplexity of the target side are used as features. The development of these features was motivated by manual examination of the common error types in the training data. We noted that stop word errors (omission, mistranslation, mis-translation of idiom), are prevalent in all language pairs, indicating that features which focus on stop word usage could be useful for predicting the quality of machine translation. We implement POS and stop word language models inside the QuEst framework.

2.3 Source-Side Pseudo-Reference Features
We extract source-side pseudo-reference features (Albrecht and Hwa, 2008; Soricut and Echihabi, 2010; Rubino et al., 2012), for English to German quality prediction using a highly-tuned German to English translation system (Li et al., 2014) working in the reverse direction. The MT system translates the German target side, the quality of which is to be predicted, back into English, and we extract pseudo-reference features on the source side:

- BLEU score (Papineni et al., 2002) between back-translation and original source sentence, and
- TER score (Snover et al., 2006).

For the 5th English to German test set item, for example, the translation

(1) Und belasse sie dort eine Woche.

is translated back to English as

(2) and leave it there for a week .

and compared to the original source sentence

(3) Leave for a week.

producing a BLEU score of 0.077 using the Python interface to the cdec toolkit (Chahuneau et al., 2012).

2.4 Inverse Glass-Box Features for Translating the Translation
In the absence of direct glass-box features, we obtain glass-box features from translating the raw translation back to the source language using the same MT system that we use for the source-side pseudo-reference features. We extract features from the following components of the Moses decoder: distortion model, language model, lexical reordering, lexical translation probability, operational sequence model (Durrani et al., 2013), phrase translation probability, and the decoder score.

The intuition for this set of features is that back-translating an incorrect translation will give low system-internal scores, e.g. a low phrase translation score, and produce poor output with low language model scores (garbage in, garbage out).

We are not aware of any previous work using inverse glass-box features of translating the target side to another language for quality estimation.
2.5 Semantic Similarity Using Random Indexing

These features try to measure the semantic similarity of source and target side of a translation unit for quality estimation using random indexing (Sahlgren, 2005). We experiment with adding the similarity score of the source and target random vectors.

For each source and target pair in the English-Spanish portion of the Europarl corpus (Koehn, 2005), we initialize a sparse random vector. We then create token vectors for each source and target token by summing the vectors for all of the segments where the token occurs. To extract the similarity feature for new source and target pairs, we map them into the vector space by taking the centroid of the token vectors for the source side and the target side, and computing their cosine similarity.

2.6 Error Grammar Parsing

We obtain features from monolingual parsing with three grammars:

1. the vanilla grammar shipped with the Blipp parser (Charniak, 2000; Charniak and Johnson, 2005) induced from the Penn-Treebank (Marcus et al., 1994),
2. an error grammar induced from Penn-Treebank trees distorted according to an error model (Foster, 2007), and
3. a grammar induced from the union of the above two treebanks.

Features include the log-ratios between the probability of the best parse obtained with each grammar and structural differences measured with Parseval (Black et al., 1991) and leaf-ancestor (Sampson and Babarczy, 2003) metrics. These features have been shown to be useful for judging the grammaticality of sentences (Wagner et al., 2009; Wagner, 2012) and have been used in MT quality estimation before (Rubino et al., 2012; Rubino et al., 2013).

3 Experimental Setup

This section describes how we set up our experiments.

3.1 Cross-Validation

Decisions about parameters are made in 10-fold cross-validation on the training data provided for the task. As the datasets for task 1.1 include three to four translations for each source segment, we group segments by their source side and split the data for cross-validation between segments to ensure that a source segment does not occur in both training and test data for any of the cross-validation runs.

We implement these modifications to cross-validation and randomisation in the QuEst framework.

3.2 Training

We use the QuEst framework to train our models. Support vector regression (SVR) meta-parameters are optimised using QuEst’s default settings, exploring RBF kernels with two possible values for each of the three meta-parameters $C$, $\gamma$ and $\epsilon$.\(^5\)

The two final models are trained on the full training set with the meta-parameters that achieved the best average cross-validation score.

3.3 Classifier Combination

We experiment with combining logistic regression (LR) and support vector regression (SVR) by first choosing the instances where LR classification is confident and using the LR class label (1, 2, or 3) as predicted perceived post-editing effort, and falling back to SVR for all other instances.

We employ several heuristics to decide whether to use the output of LR or SVR. As the LR classifier learns a decision function for each of the three classes, we can exploit the scores of the classes to measure the confidence of the LR classifier about its decision. If the LR classifier is confident, we use its prediction directly, otherwise we use the SVR prediction.

For the cases where one of the three decision functions for the LR classifier is positive, we select the prediction directly, falling back to SVR when the classifier is not confident about any of the three classes. We implement the LR+SVR classifier combination inside the QuEst framework.

4 Results

Table 1 shows cross-validation results for the 17 baseline features, the combination of all features and target-side features only. We do not show combinations of individual feature sets and baseline features that do not improve over the base-\(^5\)We only discovered this limitation of the default configuration after the system submission, see Sections 4 and 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>MAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basel.17</td>
<td>LR+SVR</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>LR+SVR</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>LR &gt; 0.5+SVR</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>LR+SVR</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>LR &gt; 0.5+SVR-r</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Cross-validation results for English to German. LR > 0.5 indicates that we require the LR decision function to be > 0.5. SVR-r rounds the output to the nearest natural number.

Performing a more fine-grained grid search for the meta-parameters \( C, \gamma \) and \( \epsilon \) after system submission, we were able to match the scores for the baseline features published on the shared task website.

### 4.1 Parameters for the Final Models

The final two models for system submission are trained on the full data set. We submit our best system according to MAE in cross-validation combining LR, SVR and rounding with all features (ALL) as DCU-MIXED. For our second submission, we choose SVR on its own (system DCU-SVR). For English-Spanish, we only submit DCU-SVR.

### 5 Conclusions and Future Work

We identified improperly optimised parameters of the SVR component as the cause, or at least as a contributing factor, for the placement of our systems below the official baseline system. Other potential factors may be an error in our experimental setup or over-fitting. Therefore, we plan to repeat the experiments with a more fine-grained grid search for optimal parameters and/or will try another machine learning toolkit.

Unfortunately, due to the above problems with our system so far, we cannot draw conclusions about the effectiveness of our novel feature sets.

A substantial gain is achieved on the MAE metric with the rounding method, indicating that the majority of prediction errors are below 0.5.\(^6\) Future work should account for this effect. Two ideas are: (a) round all predictions before evaluation and (b) use more fine-grained gold values, e.g. the (weighted) average over multiple annotations as in the WMT 2012 quality estimation task (Callison-Burch et al., 2012).

For the error grammar method, the next step will be to adjust the error model to errors found in translations. It may be possible to do this without a time-consuming analysis of errors: Wagner (2012) suggests to use parallel data of authentic errors and corrections to build the error grammar, first parsing the corrections and then guiding the error creation procedure with the edit operations inverse to the corrections. Post-editing corpora can play this role and have recently become available (Potet et al., 2012).

Furthermore, future work should explore the inverse glass-box feature idea with arbitrary target languages for the MT system. (There is no requirement that the glass-box system translates back to the original source language).

Finally, we would like to integrate referential translation machines (Bicici, 2013; Bicici and Way, 2014) into our system as they performed well in the WMT quality estimation tasks this and last year.
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\(^6\)The simultaneous increase on RMSE can be explained if there is a sufficient number of errors above 0.5: After squaring, these errors are still quite small, e.g. 0.36 for an error of 0.6, but after rounding, the square error becomes 1.0 or 4.0.
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