

Building a User-Generated Content North-African Arabizi Treebank: Tackling Hell

Djamé Seddah¹ Farah Essaidi¹ Amal Fethi¹
Matthieu Futeral¹ Benjamin Muller^{1,2} Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez^{1,2}
Benoît Sagot¹ Abhishek Srivastava¹

¹Inria, Paris, France

²Sorbonne Université, Paris, France

firstname.lastname@inria.fr

Abstract

We introduce the first treebank for a romanized user-generated content variety of Algerian, a North-African Arabic dialect known for its frequent usage of code-switching. Made of 1500 sentences, fully annotated in morpho-syntax and Universal Dependency syntax, with full translation at both the word and the sentence levels, this treebank is made freely available. It is supplemented with 50k unlabeled sentences collected from Common Crawl and web-crawled data using intensive data-mining techniques. Preliminary experiments demonstrate its usefulness for POS tagging and dependency parsing. We believe that what we present in this paper is useful beyond the low-resource language community. This is the first time that enough unlabeled and annotated data is provided for an emerging user-generated content dialectal language with rich morphology and code switching, making it an challenging test-bed for most recent NLP approaches.

1 Introduction

Until the rise of fully unsupervised techniques that would free our field from its *addiction* to annotated data, the question of building useful data sets for under-resourced languages at a reasonable cost is still crucial. Whether the lack of labeled data originates from being a minority language status, its almost oral-only nature or simply its programmed political disappearance, geopolitical events are a factor highlighting a language deficiency in terms of natural language processing resources that can have an important societal impact. Events such as the Haïti crisis in 2010 (Munro, 2010) and the current Algerian revolts (Nossiter, 2019)¹ are massively reflected on social media, yet often in languages or dialects that are poorly re-

sourced, namely Haitian Creole and Algerian dialectal Arabic in these cases. No readily available parsing and machine translations systems are available for such languages. Taking as an example the Arabic dialects spoken in North-Africa, mostly from Morocco to Tunisia, sometimes called *Maghribi*, sometimes *Darija*, these idioms notoriously contain various degrees of code-switching with languages of former colonial powers such as French, Spanish, and, to a much lesser extent, Italian, depending on the area of usage (Habash, 2010; Cotterell et al., 2014; Saadane and Habash, 2015). They share Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) as their matrix language (Myers-Scotton, 1993), and of course present a rich morphology. In conjunction with the resource scarcity issue, the code-switching variability displayed by these languages challenges most standard NLP pipelines, if not all. What makes these dialects especially interesting is their widespread use in user-generated content found on social media platforms, where they are generally written using a romanized version of the Arabic script, called *Arabizi*, which is neither standardized nor formalized. The absence of standardization for this script adds another layer of variation in addition to well-known user generated content idiosyncrasies, making the processing of this kind of text an even more challenging task.

In this work, we present a new data set of about 1500 sentences randomly sampled from the romanized Algerian dialectal Arabic corpus of Cotterell et al. (2014) and from a small corpus of lyrics coming from Algerian dialectal Arabic Hip-Hop and Raï music genre that had the advantage of having already available translations and of being representative of Algerian vernacular urban youth language. We manually annotated this data set with morpho-syntactic information (parts-of-speech and morphological features), together with glosses and code-switching labels at the word

¹<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/01/world/africa/algeria-protests-bouteflika.html>

level, as well as sentence-level translations. Furthermore, we added an additional manual annotation layer following the Universal Dependencies annotation scheme (Nivre et al., 2018), making of this corpus, to the best of our knowledge, the first user-generated content treebank in romanized dialectal Arabic. This treebank contains 36% of French tokens, making it a valuable resource to measure and study the impact of code-switching on NLP tools. We supplement this annotated corpus with about 50k unlabeled sentences extracted from both Common Crawl and additional web crawled data, making of this data set an important milestone in North-African dialectal Arabic NLP. This corpus is made freely available under a Creative Commons license.²

2 The Language

As stated by Habash (2010), Arabic languages are often classified into three categories : (i) Classical Arabic, as found in the *Qur'an* and related canonical texts, (ii) Modern Standard Arabic, the official language of the vast majority of Arabic speaking countries and (iii) Dialectal Arabic, whose instances exhibit so much variations that they are not mutually understandable across geographically distant regions. As space is missing for an exhaustive description of Arabic language variations, we refer the reader to Habash (2010), Samih (2017) and especially to Saadane and Habash (2015) for a thorough account of Algerian dialectal Arabic, which is the focus of this work. In short, the key properties of North-African dialectal Arabic are:

- It is a **Semitic language**, non codified, mostly spoken;
- It has a **rich-inflexion system**, which qualifies this dialect as a morphologically-rich language (Tsarfaty et al., 2010), even though Saadane and Habash (2015) write that many properties present in Classical Arabic are absent from this dialect (*e.g.* it has simplified nominal and verbal case systems);
- It displays a **high degree of variability** at all levels: spelling and transliteration conventions, phonology, morphology, lexicon;
- It exhibits a **high degree of code-switching**; due to historical reasons and cultural influence of French in the media circles, the Algerian dialect, as well as Tunisian and Morocco, is known for its heavy use of French words.

²<http://almanach-treebanks.fr/NArabizi>

Gloss	Attested forms	Lang
why	wa3lach w3alh 3alach 3lache	NArabizi
all	ekl kal kolach koulli kol	NArabizi
many	beaucoup boucoup bcp	French

Table 1: Examples of lexical variation in *NArabizi*

As stated above, this dialect is mostly spoken and has even been dubbed with disdain as a *Creole* language by the higher levels of the Algerian political hierarchy.³ Still, its usage is ubiquitous in the society and, by extension, in social media user-generated content. Interestingly, the lack of Arabic support in input devices led to the rise of a romanized written form of this dialect, which makes use of alphanumeric letters as additional graphemes to represent phonemes that the Latin script does not naturally cover. Not limited to North-African dialectal Arabic, this non-standard “transliteration” concurrently emerged all over the Arabic-speaking world, and is often called *Arabizi*. Whether or not written in *Arabizi*, the inter-dialectal divergences between all Arabic dialects remain.

The following list highlights some of the main properties of *Arabizi* compared to MSA written in the Arabic script.

- Unlike in MSA written in the Arabic script, where short vowels are marked using optional diacritics, all vowels are explicitly written;
- Digits are used to cope with Arabic phonemes that have no counterpart in the Latin script; for instance, the digit “3” is often used to denote the *ayin* consonant, because it is graphically similar to its rendition in Arabic script;
- No norms exist, resulting in a high degree of variability between people writing in *Arabizi*.

From now on, we will call *NArabizi* the Algerian dialect of Arabic when written in *Arabizi*, thereby simultaneously referring to the language variety and to the script itself. Table 1 presents several examples of lexical variation within *NArabizi*. Interestingly, this variability also affects the code-switched vocabulary, which is mostly French in the case of *NArabizi*. A typical example of *NArabizi* that also exhibits code-switching with non-standard French spelling can be seen in Example 1.

(1)

Source: salem 3alikoum inchalah le pondium et les midailles d’or

³<https://www.lesoirdalgerie.com/articles/2010/02/17/article.php?sid=95823&cid=2>

Norm.: *Assalamu alaykum inshallah le podium et les médailles d'or*

Trans.: *Peace be on you God willing [we will get] the podium and the gold medals*

3 Corpus

As other North-African Arabic dialects, *NArabizi* is a resource-poor language, with, to the best of our knowledge, only one available corpus developed by Cotterell et al. (2014) for language identification purposes.

3.1 Data Collection

Cotterell et al. (2014)'s corpus was collected in 2012 from an Algerian newspaper's web forums and covers a wide range of topics (from discussion about football events to politics). We collected the 9973 raw sentences from its GitHub repository⁴ and sampled about 1300 sentences. In addition, because they were available with translations in French and English, we included lyrics from a few dozen recent popular songs of various genres (Raï, hip-hop, etc.), leading to an additional set of 200 sentences. These 1500 sentences form the core of our *NArabizi* treebank annotation project. In order to make our corpus usable by modern, resource-hungry natural language processing techniques, we also used data-driven language identification models to extract *NArabizi* samples among the whole collection of the Common-Crawl-based OSCAR corpora (Ortiz Suárez et al., 2019) as well as 2 millions sentences of additional crawled web-data, resulting in 50k *NArabizi* sentences of high quality, to date the largest corpus of this language. This makes this collection a valuable test bed for low-resource NLP research.

3.2 Annotation Layers

Our *NArabizi* treebank contains 5 annotations layers: (i) tokenization, (ii) morphology, (iii) code-switching identification, (iv) syntax and (v) translation.

Tokenization Following Seddah et al. (2012) and their work on the French Social Media Bank, we decided to apply a light tokenization process where we manually tokenized only the obvious cases of wrongly detached punctuations and "missing whitespaces" (*i.e.* cases where two words are

contracted into one token).⁵

Morphological Analysis This layer consists of two sets of part-of-speech tags, one following the Universal POS tagset (Petrov et al., 2011) and the other the FTB-cc tagset extended to deal with user-generated content (Seddah et al., 2012). In cases of word contractions, we followed their guidelines and used multiple POS as in *cetaït* (``itwas'`)/PRON+VERB/CLS+V. In addition, we added several morphological features following the Universal Dependency annotation scheme (Nivre et al., 2018), namely gender, number, tense and verbal mood. Note that instead of adding lemmas, we included French glosses for two reasons: firstly for practical reasons, as they helped manual corrections done by non-native speakers of *NArabizi*, and secondly because of the non-formalized nature of this language, which makes lemmatization very hard, almost akin to etymological research as in the case of *garjoma/the throat* which can either originate from French *gorge* or be of Amazigh root.

Code-Switching identification Unlike other works in user-generated content for minority languages (Lynn and Scannell, 2019), we do not distinguish between inter- and intra-sentential code-switching and consider word-level code-mixing as lexical borrowing. We annotate code-switching at the word level with information about the source language, regardless of the *canonical-ness* of spelling.

Syntactic Annotations Here again we follow the Universal Dependencies 2.2 annotation scheme (Nivre et al., 2018). When facing sequences of French words with regular French syntax, we followed the UD French guidelines; otherwise, we followed the UD Arabic guidelines, following the Prague Arabic Dependency UD Treebank.

Translation Layer Our final layer is made up for sentence-level translations in French. It shall be noted that the validation of these translations often led to massive rewording, as the annotators came from different regions of Algeria and could diverge in their interpretations of a given sentence.

⁵We corrected in average one tokenization error (less frequently two) per sentence on the web forum parts. We noticed a high degree of variance. Some users displayed this behavior much more than others. This led some of our annotators to believe it resulted from an ill-functioning input device.

⁴https://github.com/ryancotterell/arabic_dialect_annotation




Figure 1: Annotation example: “mouto ya les égyptiens rana fi la coupe de monde m3a wladna erajala les vrais algeriens” [Die Egyptians! We are at the world cup with our children of Algeria, the real men!]. Code-switching is highlighted in blue.

A sample of 200 sentences was blindly translated (without access to the morpho-syntactic analysis) in order to favor further research on the fluency of machine translation for this dialect.

All annotations layers are displayed in Figure 1.

4 Extending Our Data Set With Noisy Unlabeled Data

The need for more data has never been more striking as they are needed for important tasks such as handling lexical sparseness issues via word embeddings, lexicon acquisition, domain adaptation via self-training, or fine-tuning pre-trained language models, its modern incarnation. The trouble with *NArabizi* is that it is a spoken language whose presence can be mostly found in informal texts such as social media. More importantly, the *Arabizi* transliteration process is also used by other Arabic dialects, making the data collection a *needle in a haystack* search task. We therefore present in this section the process we used to mine an additional set of 50k *NArabizi* sentences from two large corpora, one based on search query-based web-crawling and the other from a cleaned version of the CommonCrawl corpora, developed by Ortiz Suárez et al. (2019).

4.1 First method: SVM-based classifier

Using keywords-based web scrapping tools, we collected a raw corpus of 4 million sentences, called CrawlWeb, that *in fine* contained a mixture of French, English, Spanish, MSA and *Arabizi* texts. Since we are only interested in *NArabizi*, we designed a classifier to extract proper sentences from that raw corpus. The corpus we used as gold standard is made of 9k sentences of attested *NArabizi* from our original corpus and 18k of French

and English tweets. Using language identification (Lui and Baldwin, 2012), we convert each sentence from the gold-standard corpus to a feature vector containing language-identification scores and use it as input to a SVM classifier with a classical 80/10/10 split. With a precision and recall score of 94%, we filtered out 173k code-mixed sentences out of the CrawlWeb corpus. Preliminary experiments showed promising initial results, but further analysis pointed out a high level of noise in this initial set, both in terms of erroneous language identification and on the amount of remnant ASCII artifacts that could not easily be removed without impacting the valid *NArabizi* sentences.

4.2 Second method: Neural-based classification

The objectives of this method are twofold: (i) selecting data from CommonCrawl using a neural classifier and (ii) using this data set to intersect the data collected with the previous method. The idea is to ensure the quality of the final resulting unlabeled corpus.

Given the large number of noisy data in CommonCrawl, a “noise” class is added to the language classification model and is built according to several heuristics.⁶ That “noisy” class corpus is made of 40k sentences randomly selected among the result of the application of these rules to a short, 10M-sentence sample of CommonCrawl. We then trained a classifier using Fasttext (Joulin et al., 2016) on 102 languages, 40k sentences each, extracted from the CommonCrawl-based, language-classified OSCAR corpus, to which we added the 9k sentences of the *NArabizi* original corpus and

⁶These heuristics are presented in the Appendix for reproducibility.

the “noise” class. The final dataset is composed of 4,090,432 sentences and is split into 80% train, 10% development and 10% test sets. The classifier consists in a linear classifier (here logistic regression) fed with the average of the n -gram embeddings. n -grams are useful in this case as they enables the model to capture specific sequences of *NArabizi* characters such as lah, llah, 3a, 9a, etc. We choose to embed 2- to 5-grams. These parameters lead to precision and recall scores of 97% on the *NArabizi* test set.

After an intensive post-processing step (cf. Appendix A.2), this process results in a dataset of 13,667 sentences extracted from half the CommonCrawl corpus.⁷ To evaluate the quality of the resulting data set, we randomly picked 3 times 100 sentences, and genuine *NArabizi* sentences were manually identified, which allowed us to assess the accuracy of our corpus as reaching 97%. Table 2 presents the results of the evaluation of the two classification methods performed on both the development and test sets of the original *NArabizi* corpus.⁸ Results show that the fastText classifier and its n -gram features is more precise than its non-neural counterpart and its language-id feature vectors.

4.3 Corpus intersection

When applied to the CrawlWeb corpus, the Fasttext model extracted 44,797 unique Arabizi sentences while the SVM model extracted 83,295 unique Arabizi sentences. The intersection of both extractions amounts to 39,003 Arabizi sentences (with a 99% precision). This means that 44,292 sentences were classified as Arabizi by the SVM model and not by Fasttext. Among them, by random sampling, it can be stated approximately that 55% are indeed *NArabizi*. Mistakes are misclassified sentences (Spanish and English sentences, for instance) or sentences with only “noise” (such as symbols). 5,794 sentences were classified as *NArabizi* by the Fasttext model and not SVM. Among them, by random sampling, it can be stated that approximately 60% are indeed Arabizi. Errors are long sentences with only figures and numbers or sentences with many symbols (e.g. “ { O3 } ” or “!!!! !!!!”).

⁷Due to computing power limitation, we were not able to run our selection on the whole CommonCrawl.

⁸Note that the precision and recall are slightly different in both methods, but the rounding at the second decimal made them equal.

	F1-Score Arabizi
Fasttext	0.97
SVM Classifier	0.94

Table 2: F1-scores of both language classification models on the Arabizi class.

In order to ensure that the collected corpus contains as little non-*NArabizi* data as possible, we only release the intersection of the data we classified, to which we add the original *NArabizi* corpus (Cotterell et al., 2014) (after having removed the annotated data we extracted from it). Table 3 provides quantitative information about our corpora.

Dataset	#Sentences	#Tokens
Original source data	9,372	203k
Manually Annotated	1,434	22k
Unlabeled <i>NArabizi</i>	46,941	1.02M

Table 3: Corpus statistics

5 Pre-annotation Tool Development via Noisy Transliteration of an Arabic UD Treebank

In order to speed up the annotation process of our data, we decided to create a pre-annotation morphosyntactic and syntactic annotator trained on quasi-synthetic data obtained by “transliterating” a pre-existing Arabic (MSA) treebank, the Prague Arabic Dependency Treebank (PADT), into the *NArabizi* Latin script, together with data from the French GSD UD treebank. Both are taken from the UD treebank collection (Nivre et al., 2018).

Before it can be used as training data, the PADT needs to first be transformed into a form similar to *NArabizi*. Since the PADT corpus is a collection of MSA sentences with no diacritics, it is impossible to directly “transliterate” into *NArabizi*. We first diacritized it, in order to add short-vowel information, and then “transliterated” it into an *Arabizi*-like corpus. We describe this process in this Section. The results of the pseudo-*NArabizi* parser trained on the “transliterated” corpus are then presented in Section 6.2.

Random diacritics As vowels are always written in *Arabizi*, the PADT corpus needs to be diacritized before transliteration. Using an equiprobable distribution, diacritics were added randomly, and the text then transliterated using the probabil-

ity distributions we describe below. The BLEU score (Papineni et al., 2002) of this method on the small parallel corpus provides a baseline of 0.31.

Proper diacritization Using the Farasa software (Abdelali et al., 2016), PADT sentences are diacritized with 81% precision rate,⁹ then tokens aligned with corresponding diacritized words. The text is then transliterated the same way as before. The BLEU score of this version is 0.60. An example showing how this system visibly improves the transliteration can be seen in the “Prop. Diac.” output in Example 2.

(2)

Source: berlin tarfoudhou 7ousoul charika amrikia 3ala ro5sat tasni3 dabbabat ”léopard” al almania

Trans.: *Berlin refuses to authorize an American firm to produce the ”Leopard” German tank.*

Random diac.: brouliyani trfidh 7iswla chiroukou amiyirikyoui 3alia rou5soui tasaniya3i dhabouaboui louyiwibiariidha alalmaanouyou

Proper diac.: birlin tarfoudhou 7ousolou charikatin 2amiriqiatin 3alaa rou5sati tasni3i dabbatin ”lyuberid ” el2almeniati

System	BLEU score
Random diacritization	0.31
Proper diacritization	0.60

Table 4: BLEU score of both transliteration systems.

Transliteration Once diacritized, the corpus can be properly transliterated. Arabic letters are either consonant sounds or long vowels, each one may have several different transliterations in *NArabizi*, depending on the writer’s age, accent, education and first learned Western language. For example, the letter ت¹⁰ can be transliterated as “t” or “th”. A probability must be assigned for each possibility, and to make it as close as possible to what is produced by *NArabizi* speakers, a small parallel corpus of PADT sentences and their transliteration

⁹Other diacritization systems have better performances (Belinkov and Glass, 2015) but are either not maintained with the proper python packages, or come with a fee.

¹⁰Theh, U+062B.

by ten *NArabizi* speakers was assembled, and then each letter aligned with all its possible matches to get probability distributions.

6 Usability

In this section we describe preliminary experiments on part-of-speech tagging and statistical dependency parsing that show promising results while highlighting the expected difficulty of processing a low-resource language with a high level of code-switching and multiple sources of variability.

6.1 POS Tagging

The baseline POS tagger we used is alVWTagger,¹¹ a feature-based statistical POS tagger, which ranked 3rd at the 2017 CoNLL multilingual parsing shared task (Zeman et al., 2017). It is briefly described in (de La Clergerie et al., 2017). In short, it is a left-to-right tagger that relies on a set of carefully manually designed features, including features extracted from an external lexicon, when available, and a linear model trained using the Vowpal Wabbit framework.¹² In our case, we simply created an “external” lexicon by extracting the content of the training set. It contributes to improving the POS accuracy because it provides the tagger with (ambiguous, partial) additional information about words in the right context of the current word.¹³

	Dev		Test	
	All	OOV	all	OOV
OOV %		32.28		32.75
UPOS (a)	78.74	55.85	80.37	57.42
MFEATS (b)	88.10	70.04	87.17	69.12
(a)+(b)	72.61	40.94	73.87	43.50

Table 5: POS tagging results.

6.2 Early Parsing experiments

As stated earlier in this paper, *NArabizi* contains a high-level of code-switching with French and is closely related to MSA. We described in Section 5 how we built a mixed treebank based on the

¹¹Note that we performed a set of baseline experiments with UDPipe 2.0 (Straka and Straková, 2017) as well on a previous version of this data set. It reached only 73.7 of UPOS on the test set.

¹²https://github.com/VowpalWabbit/vowpal_wabbit/wiki

¹³Without this endogenous lexicon extraction step, the tagger performed slightly worse, although the difference is small.

French GSD UD treebank and our *Arabizi* version of the Prague Arabic Dependency Treebank. We trained the UDPipe parser (Straka and Straková, 2017) on various treebanks obtained by combining different proportions of the French GSD and our PADT-based pseudo-*Arabizi* treebank. We ran these parsers with already annotated gold parts-of-speech. The best scores were obtained with a model trained on a mix 30% of pseudo-*Arabizi* and 70% of French, which we call the MIX treebank, totaling 5,955 training sentences. We split this treebank into training, development and test sets, called MIX_{train/dev/test}, following a 80/10/10 split. We used a very small manually annotated *NArabizi* development dataset of 200 *NArabizi* sentences, called Arabizi_{dev}, to evaluate our parser. As shown in Table 6 (line “Mix”), despite good results on MIX’s development and training sets, MIX_{dev} and MIX_{test} respectively (see Table 6), this first parser did not performed very well when evaluated on Arabizi_{dev}. This performance level proved insufficient to speed up the annotation task. We therefore manually annotated 300 more *NArabizi* sentences (Arabizi_{train300}), to be used as additional training data. When added to MIX_{train}, parsing performance did improve, yet not to a sufficient extent, especially in terms of Labeled Attachment Score (LAS). It turned out that training UDPipe on these 300 manually annotated *NArabizi* sentences only (Arabizi_{train300}) produced better scores, resulting in a parser that we did use as a pre-annotation tool in a constant bootstrap process to speed up the annotation of the remaining sentences.

Training corpus	Dev		Test		Test <i>Arabizi</i>	
	LAS	UAS	LAS	UAS	LAS	UAS
MIX	87.67	89.42	87.69	89.44	39.28	51.52
MIX+ <i>Arabizi</i> ₃₀₀	87.42	89.20	87.44	89.22	55.54	65.36
<i>Arabizi</i> ₃₀₀	39.11	49.62	39.14	49.65	63.03	71.21

Table 6: Results of UDPipe (trained 100 epochs) on the preliminary test set.

7 Discussion

How interleaved are French and *NArabizi*? As stated before, *NArabizi* takes its root in Classical Arabic and in multiple sources of integration of French, MSA and Berber, the *Amazigh* language. As the *NArabizi* treebank contains more than 36% of French words, it is of interest to use recent methods of visualization to see how interleaved it is




Figure 2: Two-dimensional representation of Fasttext word embeddings for 300 words (100 for transliterated MSA - blue -, French - yellow - and *NArabizi* - red -) after PCA analysis

with some of its source languages. To this end, we extract words embeddings using fastText (Joulin et al., 2016) from a corpus made of the “transliterated” PADT described in Section 5, the French UD GSD and *NArabizi* original corpus (Cotterell et al., 2014). Two-dimensional representations of the resulting embeddings space for 300 selected words are shown in Figure 2 for embeddings of size 50 and 100.

We notice that the overall shapes of both representations are very similar, apart from a non significant x -axis reversal. On the first components, increasing the embedding size does not provide more information.

We also see that French and transliterated Arabic words are clearly separated into two clusters of low standard deviation, while *NArabizi* words are very spread out. Some fall within the French cluster, they correspond to French words present in this Algerian dialect. Others are in the middle of the Arabic cluster, these are the purely Arabic words of the dialect. Between the two, there are *Amazigh* words (*rak*, *mech*), arabized French words (*tomobile* < French *automobile*), Arabic words whose Berber pronunciation has resulted in an unexpected *NArabizi* rendering (*nta* instead of expected *enta* ‘you’, *mchit* instead of expected *machayt* ‘to go-2SING’).

What is the Impact of Code-Switching in POS-tagging performance? Given the large degree of interleaving between French and *NArabizi*, it is interesting to assess the impact of the French vocabulary on the performance of a POS-tagger trained on French data only. For these experiments, we use the StanfordNLP neural tagger (Qi et al., 2019), which ranked 1st in POS tagging at the 2018 UD shared task, trained on the UD French

ParTUT treebank, using French fastText vectors (Mikolov et al., 2018). In order to perform a meaningful evaluation, we split the *NArabizi* training set into 4 buckets of approximately 25% of its size in tokens, with an increasing proportion of identified *NArabizi* tokens. Results in Table 7 show a clear drop of performance between the sentences that contain more code-switching (59.55% of UPOS accuracy) and those with none (16.84%). This suggests that low-resource languages with a high-level of code-switching such as *NArabizi* can benefit from NLP models trained on the secondary language. The level of performance to expect from these cross-language approaches is yet to be determined.

% of <i>NArabizi</i> per sent. bucket set size (sent.)	<60	60-78	78-100	100
	322	286	283	276
StanfordNLP (French)	59.55	35.93	25.41	16.84

Table 7: POS tagging Performance with regard to code-mix proportion trained on UD French Partut treebank

8 Treebanking Costs

Following Martínez Alonso et al. (2016), we provide here the cost figures of this annotation campaign. We do not include the salaries of the permanent staff, nor do we include the overhead. These figures are meant as an indication of the effort needed to create an annotated data set from scratch. It shall be noted that even though the inter-annotator agreement gave us early indications on the difficulty of the tasks, it also acted as a metric in terms of language variability among annotators. None of them come from the same part of North-Africa and none of them has the same familiarity with the topics discussed in the web-forums we annotated. We had to constantly re-annotate sentences and update the guidelines every time new idiosyncrasies were encountered and most importantly accepted as such by the annotators. Compared to what was reported in (Martínez Alonso et al., 2016), the figures are here much higher (about 5 times higher), because unlike their work on French treebanks, we could not use preexisting guidelines for this language and because we could not keep the same team all along the project, so that new members had to be trained almost from scratch or to work on totally different layers.

Phase	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	p.m	Costs (k€)
Annotators	8	2	2	3		15	45
Jr Researcher		2	5			7	21
Confirmed					6	6	21
total	8	4	7	3	6	28	87

Table 8: Treebanking costs. The annotation phases are (i) Morphology/tokenization, (ii) Translation, (iii) Pre-annotation Syntax, (iv) Correction, (v) Final Syntax. P.M stands for person.month

9 Related Work

Research on Arabic dialects is quite extensive. Space is lacking to describe it exhaustively. In relation to our work regarding North-African dialect, we refer to the work of (Samih, 2017) who along his PhD covered a large range of topics regarding the dialect spoken specifically in Morocco and generally regarding language identification (Samih et al., 2016) in code-switching scenario for various Arabic dialects (Attia et al., 2019).

Unlike *NArabizi* dialects, the resource situation for Arabic dialects in canonical written form can hardly be qualified as scarce given the amount of resources produced by the Linguistic Data Consortium regarding these languages, see (Diab et al., 2013) for details on those corpora. These data have been extensively covered in various NLP aspects by the former members of the *Columbia Arabic NLP team*, among which Mona Diab, Nizar Habash, and Owen Rambow, in their respective subsequent lines of works. Many small to medium scale linguistics resources, such as morphological lexicons or bilingual dictionaries have been produced (Shoufan and Alameri, 2015). Recently, in addition to the release of a small-range parallel corpus for some Arabic dialects (Bouamor et al., 2014), a larger corpus collection was released, covering 25 city dialects in the travel domain (Bouamor et al., 2018).

Regarding the specific NLP modeling challenges of processing Arabic-based languages, as part of the morphologically-rich languages, recent advances in joint models have been addressed by Zalmout and Habash (2019) that recently efficiently adapted a neural architecture to perform joint word segmentation, lemmatization, morphological analysis and POS tagging on an Arabic dialect. Recent works on cross-language learning using the whole massively multilingual pre-trained language models artillery have started to emerge

(Srivastava et al., 2019). If successful, such models could help to alleviate the resource scarcity issue that plagues low-resources languages in the *more-than-ever* data hungry modern NLP.

10 Conclusion

We introduced the first treebank for an Arabic dialect spoken in North-Africa and written in romanized form, *NArabizi*. More over, being made of user-generated content, this treebank covers a large variety of language variation among native speakers and displays a high level of code-switching. Annotated with 4 standard morpho-syntactic layers, two of them following the Universal Dependency annotation scheme, and provided with translation to French as well as glosses and word language identification, we believe that this corpus will be useful for the community at large, both for linguistic purposes and as training data for resource-scarce NLP in a high-variability scenario. In addition to the annotated data, we provide around 1 million tokens (over 46k sentences) of unlabeled *NArabizi* content, resulting in the largest dataset available for this dialect. Our corpora are freely available¹⁴ under the CC-BY-SA license and the *NArabizi* treebank is also released as part of the Universal Dependencies project.

Acknowledgments

The work was partially funded by the French Research Agency projects ParSiTi (ANR-16-CE33-0021), SoSweet (ANR15-CE38-0011-01) and by the French Ministry of Industry and Ministry of Foreign Affairs via the PHC Maimonide France-Israel cooperation programme, as well as by the Sagot’s chair in the PRAIRIE institute funded by the French national agency ANR as part of the “Investissements d’avenir” programme under the reference ANR-19-P3IA-0001.

References

Ahmed Abdelali, Kareem Darwish, Nadir Durrani, and Hamdy Mubarak. 2016. Farasa: A fast and furious segmenter for arabic. In *HLT-NAACL Demos*.

Mohammed Attia, Younes Samih, Ali Elkahky, Hamdy Mubarak, Ahmed Abdelali, and Kareem Darwish. 2019. [POS tagging for improving code-switching identification in Arabic](#). In

Proceedings of the Fourth Arabic Natural Language Processing Workshop, pages 18–29, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yonatan Belinkov and James Glass. 2015. [Arabic diacritization with recurrent neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2281–2285, Lisbonne, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Houda Bouamor, Nizar Habash, and Kemal Oflazer. 2014. [A multidialectal parallel corpus of Arabic](#). In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’14)*, pages 1240–1245, Reykjavik, Iceland. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

Houda Bouamor, Nizar Habash, Mohammad Salameh, Wajdi Zaghouni, Owen Rambow, Dana Abdulrahim, Ossama Obeid, Salam Khalifa, Fadhl Eryani, Alexander Erdmann, and Kemal Oflazer. 2018. [The MADAR Arabic dialect corpus and lexicon](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

Ryan Cotterell, Adithya Renduchintala, Naomi Saphra, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2014. An Algerian Arabic-French code-switched corpus. In *Workshop on Free/Open-Source Arabic Corpora and Corpora Processing Tools Workshop Programme*, page 34.

Mona Diab, Nizar Habash, Owen Rambow, and Ryan Roth. 2013. LDC Arabic treebanks and associated corpora: Data divisions manual. Technical Report CCLS-13-02, Center for Computational Learning Systems, Columbia University.

Nizar Habash. 2010. *Introduction to Arabic Natural Language Processing*. Morgan and Claypool.

Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Matthijs Douze, Herve Jégou, and Tomas Mikolov. 2016. Fasttext. zip: Compressing text classification models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.03651*.

¹⁴<http://almanach-treebanks.fr/NArabizi>

- Éric de La Clergerie, Benoît Sagot, and Djamé Seddah. 2017. [The ParisNLP entry at the ConLL UD shared task 2017: A tale of a #Parsing-Tragedy](#). In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2017 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 243–252, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marco Lui and Timothy Baldwin. 2012. [langid.py: An off-the-shelf language identification tool](#). In *The 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Proceedings of the System Demonstrations, July 10, 2012, Jeju Island, Korea*, pages 25–30. The Association for Computer Linguistics.
- Teresa Lynn and Kevin Scannell. 2019. Code-switching in irish tweets: A preliminary analysis. In *Proceedings of the Celtic Language Technology Workshop*, pages 32–40.
- Héctor Martínez Alonso, Djamé Seddah, and Benoît Sagot. 2016. From Noisy Questions to Minecraft Texts: Annotation Challenges in Extreme Syntax Scenarios. In *The 2nd Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text (W-NUT)*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Christian Puhersch, and Armand Joulin. 2018. Advances in pre-training distributed word representations. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*.
- Robert Munro. 2010. Crowdsourced translation for emergency response in haiti: the global collaboration of local knowledge. In *AMTA Workshop on Collaborative Crowdsourcing for Translation*, pages 1–4.
- Carol Myers-Scotton. 1993. [Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching](#). *Language in Society*, 22(4):475–503.
- Joakim Nivre, Mitchell Abrams, Željko Agić, Lars Ahrenberg, Lene Antonsen, Maria Jesus Aranzabe, Gashaw Arutie, Masayuki Asahara, Luma Ateyah, Mohammed Attia, Aitziber Atutxa, Liesbeth Augustinus, Elena Badmaeva, Miguel Ballesteros, Esha Banerjee, Sebastian Bank, Verginica Barbu Mititelu, John Bauer, Sandra Bellato, Kepa Bengoetxea, Riyaz Ahmad Bhat, Erica Biagetti, Eckhard Bick, Rogier Blokland, Victoria Bobicev, Carl Børstell, Cristina Bosco, Gosse Bouma, Sam Bowman, Adriane Boyd, Aljoscha Burchardt, Marie Candito, Bernard Caron, Gauthier Caron, Gülşen Cebiroğlu Eryiğit, Giuseppe G. A. Celano, Savas Cetin, Fabricio Chalub, Jinho Choi, Yongseok Cho, Jayeol Chun, Silvie Cinková, Aurélie Collob, Çağrı Çöltekin, Miriam Connor, Marine Courtin, Elizabeth Davidson, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Valeria de Paiva, Arantza Diaz de Ilarraza, Carly Dickerson, Peter Dirix, Kaja Dobrovoljc, Timothy Dozat, Kira Drostanova, Puneet Dwivedi, Marhaba Eli, Ali Elkahky, Binyam Ephrem, Tomaž Erjavec, Aline Etienne, Richárd Farkas, Hector Fernandez Alcalde, Jennifer Foster, Cláudia Freitas, Katarína Gajdošová, Daniel Galbraith, Marcos Garcia, Moa Gärdenfors, Kim Gerdes, Filip Ginter, Iakes Goenaga, Koldo Gojenola, Memduh Gökırmak, Yoav Goldberg, Xavier Gómez Guinovart, Berta González Saavedra, Matias Grioni, Normunds Grūzītis, Bruno Guillaume, Céline Guillot-Barbance, Nizar Habash, Jan Hajič, Jan Hajič jr., Linh Hà Mỷ, Na-Rae Han, Kim Harris, Dag Haug, Barbora Hladká, Jaroslava Hlaváčová, Florinel Hociung, Petter Hohle, Jena Hwang, Radu Ion, Elena Irimia, Tomáš Jelínek, Anders Johannsen, Fredrik Jørgensen, Hüner Kaşıkara, Sylvain Kahane, Hiroshi Kanayama, Jenna Kanerva, Tolga Kayadelen, Václava Kettnerová, Jesse Kirchner, Natalia Kotsyba, Simon Krek, Sookyoung Kwak, Veronika Laippala, Lorenzo Lambertino, Tatiana Lando, Septina Dian Larasati, Alexei Lavrentiev, John Lee, Phuong Lê Hồng, Alessandro Lenci, Saran Lertpradit, Herman Leung, Cheuk Ying Li, Josie Li, Keying Li, KyungTae Lim, Nikola Ljubešić, Olga Loginova, Olga Lyashevskaya, Teresa Lynn, Vivien Macketanz, Aibek Makazhanov, Michael Mandl, Christopher Manning, Ruli Manurung, Cătălina Mărănduc, David Mareček, Katrin Marheinecke, Héctor Martínez Alonso, André Martins, Jan Mašek, Yuji Matsumoto, Ryan McDonald, Gustavo Mendonça, Niko Miekka, Anna Missilä, Cătălin Mititelu, Yusuke Miyao, Simonetta Montemagni, Amir More, Laura Moreno Romero, Shinsuke Mori, Bjartur Mortensen, Bohdan Moskalevskyi, Kadri Muischnek, Yugo Murawaki, Kaili Müürisep, Pinkey Nainwani, Juan Ignacio Navarro Horñiacek,

- Anna Nedoluzhko, Gunta Nešpore-Bērzkalne, Luong Nguyễn Thị, Huyền Nguyễn Thị Minh, Vitaly Nikolaev, Rattima Nitisoroj, Hanna Nurmi, Stina Ojala, Robert Olúòkun, Adédayòstling, Lilja Øvrelid, Niko Partanen, Elena Pascual, Marco Passarotti, Agnieszka Patejuk, Siyao Peng, Cenel-Augusto Perez, Guy Perrier, Slav Petrov, Jussi Piitulainen, Emily Pitler, Barbara Plank, Thierry Poibeau, Martin Popel, Lauma Pretkalniņa, Sophie Prévost, Prokopis Prokopidis, Adam Przepiórkowski, Tiina Puolakainen, Sampo Pyysalo, Andriela Rääbis, Alexandre Rademaker, Loganathan Ramasamy, Taraka Rama, Carlos Ramisch, Vinit Ravishankar, Livy Real, Siva Reddy, Georg Rehm, Michael Rießler, Larissa Rinaldi, Laura Rituma, Luisa Rocha, Mykhailo Romanenko, Rudolf Rosa, Davide Rovati, Valentin Roşca, Olga Rudina, Shoval Sadde, Shadi Saleh, Tanja Samardžić, Stephanie Samson, Manuela Sanguinetti, Baiba Saulīte, Yanin Sawanakunanon, Nathan Schneider, Sebastian Schuster, Djamel Seddah, Wolfgang Seeker, Mojgan Seraji, Mo Shen, Atsuko Shimada, Muh Shohibus-sirri, Dmitry Sichinava, Natalia Silveira, Maria Simi, Radu Simionescu, Katalin Simkó, Mária Šimková, Kiril Simov, Aaron Smith, Isabela Soares-Bastos, Antonio Stella, Milan Straka, Jana Strnadová, Alane Suhr, Umut Sulubacak, Zsolt Szántó, Dima Taji, Yuta Takahashi, Takaaki Tanaka, Isabelle Tellier, Trond Trosterud, Anna Trukhina, Reut Tsarfaty, Francis Tyers, Sumire Uematsu, Zdeňka Urešová, Larraitz Uribe, Hans Uszkoreit, Sowmya Vajjala, Daniel van Niekerk, Gertjan van Noord, Viktor Varga, Veronika Vincze, Lars Wallin, Jonathan North Washington, Seyi Williams, Mats Wirén, Tsegay Woldemariam, Tak-sum Wong, Chunxiao Yan, Marat M. Yavrumyan, Zhuoran Yu, Zdeněk Žabokrtský, Amir Zeldes, Daniel Zeman, Manying Zhang, and Hanzhi Zhu. 2018. [Universal dependencies 2.2](#). LINDAT/CLARIN digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics (ÚFAL), Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University.
- Adam Nossiter. 2019. Algeria protests grow against president bouteflika, ailing and out of sight. In *New York Times* (March 01, 2019).
- Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez, Benoît Sagot, and Laurent Romary. 2019. [Asynchronous Pipeline for Processing Huge Corpora on Medium to Low Resource Infrastructures](#). In *7th Workshop on the Challenges in the Management of Large Corpora (CMLC-7)*, Cardiff, United Kingdom. Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318.
- Slav Petrov, Dipanjan Das, and Ryan McDonald. 2011. A universal part-of-speech tagset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1104.2086*.
- Peng Qi, Timothy Dozat, Yuhao Zhang, and Christopher D Manning. 2019. Universal dependency parsing from scratch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.10457*.
- Houda Saadane and Nizar Habash. 2015. A conventional orthography for Algerian arabic. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Arabic Natural Language Processing*, pages 69–79.
- Younes Samih. 2017. [Dialectal Arabic processing Using Deep Learning](#). Ph.D. thesis, Düsseldorf, Germany.
- Younes Samih, Suraj Maharjan, Mohammed Attia, Laura Kallmeyer, and Thamar Solorio. 2016. [Multilingual code-switching identification via LSTM recurrent neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Computational Approaches to Code Switching*, pages 50–59, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Djamel Seddah, Benoît Sagot, Marie Candito, Virginie Mouilleron, and Vanessa Combet. 2012. The French Social Media Bank: a Treebank of Noisy User Generated Content. In *CoLing*, Mumbai, India.
- Abdulhadi Shoufan and Sumaya Alameri. 2015. [Natural language processing for dialectal Arabic: A survey](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Arabic Natural Language Processing*, pages 36–48, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Abhishek Srivastava, Benjamin Muller, and Djamé Seddah. 2019. [Unsupervised Learning for Handling Code-Mixed Data: A Case Study on POS Tagging of North-African Arabizi Dialect](#). EurNLP - First annual EurNLP. Poster.

Milan Straka and Jana Straková. 2017. [Tokenizing, pos tagging, lemmatizing and parsing ud 2.0 with udpipe](#). In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2017 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 88–99, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Reut Tsarfaty, Djamé Seddah, Yoav Goldberg, Sandra Kübler, Marie Candito, Jennifer Foster, Yannick Versley, Ines Rehbein, and Lamia Tounsi. 2010. Statistical parsing of morphologically rich languages (spmrl): what, how and whither. In *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2010 First Workshop on Statistical Parsing of Morphologically-Rich Languages*, pages 1–12. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Nasser Zalmout and Nizar Habash. 2019. Joint diacritization, lemmatization, normalization, and fine-grained morphological tagging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02267*.

Daniel Zeman, Martin Popel, Milan Straka, Jan Hajič, Joakim Nivre, Filip Ginter, Juhani Luotolahti, Sampo Pyysalo, Slav Petrov, Martin Potthast, Francis Tyers, Elena Badmaeva, Memduh Gokirmak, Anna Nedoluzhko, Silvie Cinková, Jan Hajič jr., Jaroslava Hlaváčová, Václava Kettnerová, Zdeňka Uřešová, Jenna Kanerva, Stina Ojala, Anna Missilä, Christopher D. Manning, Sebastian Schuster, Siva Reddy, Dima Taji, Nizar Habash, Herman Leung, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Manuela Sanguinetti, Maria Simi, Hiroshi Kanayama, Valeria de Paiva, Kira Droганova, Héctor Martínez Alonso, Çağrı Çöltekin, Umut Sulubacak, Hans Uszkoreit, Vivien Macketanz, Aljoscha Burchardt, Kim Harris, Katrin Marheinecke, Georg Rehm, Tolga Kayadelen, Mohammed Attia, Ali Elkahky, Zhuoran Yu, Emily Pitler, Saran Lertpradit, Michael Mandl, Jesse Kirchner, Hector Fernandez Alcalde, Jana Strnadová, Esha Banerjee, Ruli Manurung, Antonio Stella, Atsuko Shimada, Sookyoung Kwak, Gustavo Mendonça, Tatiana Lando, Rattima Ni-

tisaroj, and Josie Li. 2017. [CoNLL 2017 shared task: Multilingual parsing from raw text to universal dependencies](#). In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2017 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 1–19, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Appendix

A.1 Class-noise for our language classifier

Given the large number of noisy data in Common Crawl, a class noise is added to the classification model we presented section 4.2 and is built according to the following empirical rules :

- If the word "url" appears more than two times, the sentence is added to class noise.
- If the sentence has more than four " [" , the sentence is added to class noise.
- The same rule as above works for " " , " " , " { " or " } " symbols.
- If the word "http" appears more than two times, the sentence is added to class noise.
- If more than two "@" character, the sentence is added to class noise in order to capture sentences with email address or tweets with only mentioned people.
- If the phrase "WARC-Refers-To" appears, the sentence is added to class noise.

A.2 Post-processing steps

- Get unique sentences (about 20K sentences).
- The model is likely to classify as Arabizi sentences which contain any letter repeated a lot of times in a row (e.g. "iiiiiii.", "uuuuuu.", "fffff.."). These sentences are deleted from the dataset.
- Due to the n-gram embeddings, "lah" is considered as a marker of Arabizi, so a lot of sentences containing "blah" are classified as Arabizi. If this phrase appears more than 5 times, the sentence is deleted.
- Figures and numbers are widespread in Arabizi (particularly "3" and "9"), so the model classifies too many sentences which contains only numbers. Therefore, sentences which have more "number of figures" characters than 80% of the number of characters (excluded figures) are deleted.