Analysis

**Disclaimer**

Some of our input target data also didn’t make sense (sentence 267, 306, etc.). The target was completely unrelated to our input, so this may have contributed in creating unreliable results. It wasn’t too frequent though.

What could have also contributed to our results was the small vocabulary and corpus we used.

**Results**

Started to learn fluency pretty quickly. It learned to useです。た。These are used at the end of Japanese sentences as verbs. (Look from sentence line 100)

Started to learn katakana, used in Japanese usually for words of foreign origin. (sentence 200, 330, etc. ). (It would just get target katakana and put it in output, not for all cases though.)

It would get shorter inputs more correct.

It would, also, get more frequently used phrases more correctly like the one meaning human(人 sentence 303, 304)

Usually would guess the more frequently used Japanese words than the more rare ones. Thus, it would usually never guess a rare word correctly. (Sentence 258.)

It found it harder to pick up meaning than fluency.

Some cases learned to put I (私、俺) in the beginning.

Sometimes would add more words than expected (ie sentence 232).

**How It was scored.**

Scored output compared to target sentence using human evaluation.

Scored out of 1-5.

Adequacy

If they had any meaning in the sentence that wasn’t UNK, I gave it a 3 for meaning.

If the target sentence had UNK and the output sentence had UNK and that wasn’t the only thing there, it was given a 2 for meaning.

Fluency

Fluency was given about a 2 if it was proper sentence structure or for part of a sentence structure in the target.

Wouldn’t give fluency usually above a 2 if the meaning were completely incomprehensible.

**Conclusion**

The amount of data we had was small, so it could be the reason behind our output.

Furthermore, it could have been trained longer since it was only trained for 60 minutes.