## Cheap, Fast and Good! Voting Games with a Purpose

### Karën Fort, Mathieu Lafourcade, Nathalie Le Brun

karen.fort@paris-sorbonne.fr

7 mai 2018









Developing voting games

The voting games

JeuxDeMots: a real game RezoJDM: the resulting lexical network

Developing voting games

The voting games

JeuxDeMots: associating ideas to create a lexical network one of the first GWAPs for NLP [Lafourcade, 2007]

Free associations, then more specific: hyperonyms, hyponyms, part\_of, synonyms, antonyms, agents, patients, ...



- more than 4,000 players
- ▶ 1,523,321 games played

## JeuxDeMots: a real game

Elaborated gamification features:

- timer
- play by pairs
- challenges between players
- "trials"
- "hot potatoes"
- words given as gifts, stolen, etc

## RezoJDM: the lexical network



- 2,767,200 nodes: terms, textual segments, usages, concepts, semantic information
- linked by 231,180,027 relations: typed, oriented, weighted



Developing voting games Common features Entries selection

The voting games

## A galaxy of (voting) games http://imaginat.name/JDM/Page\_Liens\_JDMv4.html



Note: Totaki, Tiercé lexical and top10 are not voting games

## Common features



- no registration needed
- ▶ very simple (≠ wordrobe [Bos and Nissim, 2015]):
  - predefined, limited number of answers
- colorful and fun buttons
- $\rightarrow\,$  easy to play on smartphones

## Selecting appropriate entries to be played

- identify a set of values that we want to tag the terms with: {positive, negative, neutral} (LikeIt)
- select of a term to tag:
  - 1. randomly choose a target T, which is already tagged
  - 2. there is p chance that we propose this term and 1 p that we propose one of its neighbors in the network (set p to 0.5)
- bootstrap by tagging manually, with a non neutral value, at least one word

Developing voting games

## The voting games Syntactic relations Semantic relations Higher level semantic relations When evaluation is possible

JeuxDeMots: a real game RezoJDM: the resulting lexical network

#### Developing voting games

Common features Entries selection

### The voting games

### Syntactic relations

Semantic relations Higher level semantic relations When evaluation is possible

# AskIt (2009) negative relations



- ▶ 25,000,000 votes
- ▶ 860,000 negative relations

# Yakadirou (2016) prepositions of place



#### 380,000 votes

27,000 place preposition annotated relations

JeuxDeMots: a real game RezoJDM: the resulting lexical network

#### Developing voting games

Common features Entries selection

#### The voting games

Syntactic relations

### Semantic relations

Higher level semantic relations When evaluation is possible

## Emot (2012) emotion/sentiment relations



- 24 million votes
- 120,000 terms
- 660,000 emotion/sentiment relations

# SexIt [Lafourcade and Fort, 2014]

sex/no sex relations (to create black lists)



- 410,000 votes
- 19,000 terms

# Selemo (2015) characteristics



- ▶ 23,000,000 votes
- ▶ 1,500,000 annotations

JeuxDeMots: a real game RezoJDM: the resulting lexical network

#### Developing voting games

Common features Entries selection

#### The voting games

Syntactic relations Semantic relations **Higher level semantic relations** When evaluation is possible

# ColorIt (2012) [Lafourcade et al., 2014]



- 3,700,000 votes
- 20,000 colorized terms
- 37,000 color relations

# PolitIt (2015) [Tisserant and Lafourcade, 2015] political relations



- ▶ 540,000 votes
- 8,900 politically tagged terms

JeuxDeMots: a real game RezoJDM: the resulting lexical network

#### Developing voting games

Common features Entries selection

#### The voting games

Syntactic relations Semantic relations Higher level semantic relations When evaluation is possible

# Evaluation: LikeIt (2012) [Lafourcade et al., 2015] polarities

- LikeIt: 25 000 terms polarized in 3 months, 150,000 votes
- to compare with Polarimots: 7,473 polarized words, 3 annotators [Gala and Brun, 2012]

Today:

- 150,000,000 votes
- 740,000 terms
- 1,700,000 polarities



Developing voting games

The voting games

## Benefits

For JeuxDeMots:

- enriching the network
- bringing new players

For the community:

what comes from the crowd goes back to the crowd:



## Limitations

- majority voting (no weighting)
- simplification (as in AMT)
- $\rightarrow\,$  compensated here by the main game

Note that the answers from the other players appear only after you play

## Perspectives

Why not a common platform:

- to develop voting games
- ► to share experience on GWAPs development
- to provide researchers without development skills with an opportunity to obtain data

?



## Annexes Bibliographie

## Bos, J. and Nissim, M. (2015).

Uncovering noun-noun compound relations by gamification. In <u>Proc. of the Nordic Conference of Computational Linguistics</u> (NODALIDA), pages 251–255, Vilnius, Lithuania.

## Gala, N. and Brun, C. (2012).

Propagation de polarités dans des familles de mots : impact de la morphologie dans la construction d'un lexique pour l'analyse d'opinions.

In <u>Actes de Traitement Automatique des Langues Naturelles</u> (<u>TALN 2012</u>), Grenoble.

## Lafourcade, M. (2007).

Making people play for lexical acquisition. In <u>Proc. of the 7th Symposium on Natural Language</u> <u>Processing (SNLP 2007)</u>, Pattaya, Thailand.

Lafourcade, M. and Fort, K. (2014). Propa-I: a semantic filtering service from a lexical network created using games with a purpose. In <u>Proc. of the International Conference on Language</u> Resources and Evaluation (LREC), Reykjavik, Iceland.

Lafourcade, M., Le Brun, N., and Joubert, A. (2015). Collecting and evaluating lexical polarity with a game with a purpose.

In <u>Proc. of the International Conference on Recent Advances in</u> Natural Language Processing (RANLP), Hissar, Bulgaria.

 Lafourcade, M., Le Brun, N., and Zampa, V. (2014). Crowdsourcing word-color associations.
In Proc. of the International Conference on Application of Natural Language to Information Systems (NLDB), Montpellier, France.

 Tisserant, G. and Lafourcade, M. (2015).
Politit, du crowd-sourcing pour politiser le lexique.
In Proc. of Etudier le Web politique : Regards crois Institut des Sciences de l'Homme, Lyon, France.