

### Natural Language Processing

Info 159/259

Lecture 2: Truth and ethics (Jan 21, 2021)

David Bamman, UC Berkeley

### Hwæt! Wé Gárde na in géardagum, þéodcyninga þrym gefrúnon, hú ðá æþelingas ellen

#### Natural Language Processing

Info 159/259 Lecture 5: Truth and ethics (Jan 21, 2021)

David Bamman, UC Berkeley

In-class questions: http://bit.ly/nlpqs

# Modern NLP is driven by annotated data

- Penn Treebank (1993; 1995; 1999); morphosyntactic annotations of WSJ
- OntoNotes (2007–2013); syntax, predicate-argument structure, word sense, coreference
- FrameNet (1998–): frame-semantic lexica/annotations
- MPQA (2005): opinion/sentiment
- SQuAD (2016): annotated questions + spans of answers in Wikipedia

## Modern NLP is driven by annotated data

- In most cases, the data we have is the product of human judgments.
  - What's the correct part of speech tag?
  - Syntactic structure?
  - Sentiment?

## Ambiguity

"One morning I shot an elephant in my pajamas"



Animal Crackers

### Dogmatism

Fast and Horvitz (2016), "Identifying Dogmatism in Social Media: Signals and Models"

Given a comment, imagine you hold a well-informed, different opinion from the commenter in question. We'd like you to tell us how likely that commenter would be to engage you in a constructive conversation about your disagreement, where you each are able to explore the other's beliefs. The options are:

- (5): It's unlikely you'll be able to engage in any substantive conversation. When you respectfully express your disagreement, they are likely to ignore you or insult you or otherwise lower the level of discourse.
- (4): They are deeply rooted in their opinion, but you are able to exchange your views without the conversation degenerating too much.
- (3): It's not likely you'll be able to change their mind, but you're easily able to talk and understand each other's point of view.
- (2): They may have a clear opinion about the subject, but would likely be open to discussing alternative viewpoints.
- (1): They are not set in their opinion, and it's possible you might change their mind. If the comment does not convey an opinion of any kind, you may also select this option.

### Sarcasm

"In many respects you know they honor President Obama. ISIS is honoring President Obama! He is the founder of ISIS. He's the founder of ISIS, O.K.! He's the founder, he founded ISIS and I would say the co-founder would be crooked Hillary Clinton. Co-founder, crooked Hillary Clinton. And that's what it's about."

