

# Turkish-English Neural Machine Translation Using an Encoder-Decoder Architecture with Attention Mechanism

<sup>1</sup>Aydin Yildiz, <sup>2</sup>Asst Prof. Adem Ozyavas

<sup>1</sup>Master Thesis Student, ISTANBUL AYDIN University Department of Computer Engineering, Florya, Istanbul, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Prof, ISTANBUL ATLAS University Department of Software Engineering, Kağıthane, Istanbul, Turkey.  
Corresponding Author: Aydin Yildiz

Submitted: 10-07-2022

Revised: 17-07-2022

Accepted: 21-07-2022

**ABSTRACT:** Neural machine translation (NMT) of natural languages has gained popularity in recent years. As a relatively new method of translation it addresses the problems faced with earlier methods but suffers from different types of problems. For instance, as the length of the source sentence increases, the quality of the translation drops. The most widely used architecture Encoder-Decoder is not an exception. To remedy the issue and increase the quality of translation, an attention mechanism is attached to this architecture which helps the translator remember the important keywords that will help during the translation. The proposed model is applied to a not-much-studied Turkish- English language pair. The results are encouraging. With more training data and modifications in the architecture to include more context should improve the quality of the machine translation. The BLEU scores of the machine-translated examples are shared in the tables in the proposed method section.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Early machine translations are performed using statistical methods. A good historical review can be found at [1]. IBM 1 and 2 are simple algorithms that paved the way for early work in the field of natural language translation. This trend of using statistical methods still continues but neural networks applications have emerged with considerable success in recent years. Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) have been recently applied as a method to natural language translations. The basic architecture of Neural Machine Translation (NMT) can be described as two Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) attached back to back.

The first one that encodes the source language sentence into a vector that extracts features from its input sentence, aka a context vector which is an abstract representation of the source language sentence. Then, this vector is fed into the second RNN which is to decode it into the target language sentence.

During decoding the translation is performed one word at a time. The first RNN is aptly called the Encoder and the one that is attached is called the Decoder.

Both Encoder and decoder generally have the same structure. For those interested in the structure of Encoder and Decoder neural networks can refer to [4]. As it can be seen that different types of recurrent neural networks (RNN) could be used with the fundamental ones being Long-Short-Term Memory (LSTM), Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) with considerable variations of those.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

El-Kahlout and Kemal Oflazer proposed a statistical translation method [12]. Their proposed work performed some morpheme analysis of suffixes of Turkish text in the training data in order to increase the success of the English-Turkish machine translation system with some minor improvements.

Yenitrez and Oflazer [13], in addition to the data obtained from superficial forms of the words, their morphological analysis on sentences produced new data on the word type, root, suffixes etc which took the statistical machine translation to a different level. Their method showed an improvement of 38%.

With the application of ANN in machine translation, their use has gained new momentum in this field. In addition to proposing new ANN models, many studies have been carried out that analyze existing models with ANN which help increase their speed and quality. Junczys-Dowmunt et al. [2] performed analysis on the existing translation languages developing a new faster decoder. They also compared the well-known rule-based and NMT systems. Niehue et al. [3] separated modeling and search algorithms in machine translation systems and analyzed the existing translation systems measuring their adequacy in terms of translation quality. They utilized NTM in their studies. Error that occurs in rule-based translation and its improvement in NMT are examined. The model of NMT is explained and its differences from the statistical machine translation is described. Improvements in the NMT model are believed to be promising. They created two models named TED and MSLT for comparison within NMT. In these models, a comparison has been made with Single and Ensemble systems. In the TED model, the BigVoc system was successful in the Single system. The performance of the Single system was also found to be better in the MSLT model. One of the most advanced and studied models, called the "Transformer", is proposed by Vaswani et al. [3]. The transformer model allows for further parallelization. It is a simple network architecture based on attention mechanisms. Like LSTM, the transformer is an architecture used to convert one string to another with the help of an Encoder and Decoder. However, it differs from existing models that can convert from array to array because it uses RNN. There have been many studies on the analysis of the converter model, increasing its speed and improving the translation quality [5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. There have been quite a bit of research focused on Recurrent Machine Translation and Transformer Machine Translation comparisons in terms of performance. Koehn et al. [9] discuss problems encountered in machine translation models, including the converter model. They claimed that increasing the size of the beam search decreases the translation quality after a certain beam value. Six NMT challenges are described and discussed briefly in the study which are domain mismatch, amount of training data, rare words, long sentences, word alignment, and beam search. These challenges are compared in the field of NMT

and SMT. A positive correlation was found between increasing the beam length parameter and the Bilingual Evaluation Understudy (BLEU) score which is one of the metrics used to measure the translation quality. Yang et al. [10] analyzed the available beam search variations and developed a method that increases the BLEU score at higher beam sizes. Huang et al. [11] worked and presented their results on another work on beam search. They were able to increase the BLEU score by 2 points in the Chinese-English translation.

### III. THE PROPOSED METHOD

The proposed method uses a traditional encoder-decoder architecture with attention mechanism to improve the translation quality. Interested readers can refer to the seminal paper on the attention mechanism [4].

The following is the pseudo-code of the algorithm used for the Turkish-English translation. A more detailed description of the main steps follows the pseudo-code.

1. Read data file that contains the parallel corpus of text and preprocess the data
2. Create the NMT model using encoder, attention and decoder
3. Train the model
4. Make inferences

The file that contains the bilingual text is read first and parsed with the source and target sentences aligned into the parallel lists. Some preprocessing of the data follows such as lowercasing the words and removing numerical data, removing punctuation marks, etc... Two dictionaries are created, the first one for converting every word into a unique integer and the second from integer to their corresponding words used after the decoding process. As neural networks require their data to be in number form and the same length padding is used to convert all sentences to the same length integer values. Then a more dense representation of sentences are applied as a distributional representation of them. This is the last main step before supplying the data into the encoder.

Encoder, decoder and the attention structures are created following the traditional approach. For those interested in how this architecture works can refer to [4]. The model is trained with the converted data obtained from the text file. Because of the RAM limitations on the GPU, a batch size of 16 is utilized. Both the encoder and decoder structures used LSTM.

For the translation step, unseen data (except for a couple of randomly chosen ones from these seen data during training) are utilized for testing.

Some of the translation results are shown in the tables below. Table 1 starts with short sentences in the source language Turkish. Source sentences, their corresponding reference translations in English, the inferred translations by the model and the BLEU score are all shown in their respective rows. BLEU scores range between 0 and 1 inclusive; 1 denoting a perfect match (translation) and 0 no match between the reference translation and inferred one. Also to remedy the fact that BLEU score used from the Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK) of Python uses up to and including 4-grams and any missing n-gram would result in obtaining a score of 0, some smoothing function is utilized, namely, method1 from NLTK library.

As it can be seen in Table 1, BLEU scores are far from ideal. Even though “I have a bike” and its machine translation “I have a plane” has one word difference with a score of 0.4, “I’m reading a book” and its machine translation “ill’m reading a book” with the same one word difference has a BLEU score of 0.17. Also, “Are you insane?” and “Are you crazy?” have the same meaning but because BLEU does not take synonyms into account, its score resulted in a relatively low score for the translation even though the machine translation is almost perfect. Similar penalty for using a synonym can be seen in the third row where “allow” is used in

the machine translation instead of “let”. Also Still BLEU is the most widely used metric for machine translation evaluations so that it is used in this work.

Table 2 shows some translations performed by the proposed method employing longer and somewhat more complex source sentences. The three bold rows in the table are selected randomly from the training data. The reason for that is to see how the machine translation will be performed for the data seen during the training. As the table shows, the results are mixed. The rest of the source sentences are not used for training. The randomly selected source text “Kızarmış pirinçli etin nasıl yapılacağını öğrenmek zorunda kalacağım” is machine-translated in such a way that “need” is used instead of “will have to”. The translation semantically found the correct translation which is not reflected in the BLEU score. As expected, the BLEU scores become lower as the source sentence length becomes longer. After observing the training data it can be seen that machine translations are better with patterns frequently observed. For instance, “would you like to” pattern in English seen often in the training data is matched with the “ister misiniz” pattern in Turkish. There are quite a few sentences with it in the training data so that the learning is accomplished to a great extent.

Source Sentence	Reference Translation	Inferred (Machine) Translation	BLEU Score
Ben zenginim.	I'm rich.	I'm bananas.	0.22
Bir motosikletim var.	I have a bike.	I have a plane.	0.40
Kazanmana izin verdim.	I let you win.	I allow guests.	0.08
Kahveyi severim	I like coffee.	I like coffee.	1.00
Bir kitap okuyorum.	I'm reading a book.	ill'm reading a book.	0.17
Kayak yapmaya gittim.	I went skiing.	I went skiing.	1.00
Ben bir hayalperestim.	I'm a dreamer.	I'm not a fool.	0.09
Deli misin?	Are you insane?	are you crazy?	0.32

--	--	--	--

Table 1. Short Source Sentence BLEU Scores

Source Sentence	Reference Translation	Inferred (Machine) Translation	BLEU Score
doktora gitmek ister misin	wouldyouliketosee a doctor	wouldyouliketogotothesee	0.36
eve gelir gelmez uyudum	islept as soon as i gohome	islept as soon as i gohome	1.00
bir kitaba ihtiyacim var	I need a book	ihave a book of reading a book	0.06
bize gelmek ister misin	wouldyouliketocomewith us	wouldyouliketocomewith us	1.00
tom iyi bir dosttur	tom is a goodfriend	tom is a goodgardener	0.67
ona bir kedi getirdim	ibrought her a cat	ibrought a bag of guests	0.05
Tom'un bana yapmamı söylediği her şeyi yapamadım	iwas not ableto do everythingtomtold me to do	iwas not ableto do everythingtomtold me to do	1.00
O şarkının ismini hatırlayamamıştım	I was not ableto rememberthetitle of thatsong.	icouldhaveplayed her news on thatsong	0.04
Kızarmış pirinçli etin nasıl yapılacağını öğrenmek zorunda kalacağım	I willhavetolearn how tomakebeefriedrice	ineedtorearn how tomakebeefriedrice	0.68
arkadaşlarıma hoşçakal demek istiyorum	I wantto say goodbyetomyfriends	imeanthatthesameway it smells	0.00
alışveriş yapmak için süpermarkete gidiyorum	I am goingtothe supermarket to do shopping	i am goingtothe supermarket to do a shoppingbag	0.60
Eve varmama 10 dakika kaldı	It is 10 minutesbefore I gethome	itwas ten minuteshomeyougethome	0.07
paramı geri vermek istiyorum	i'dliketogiveyourmoneyback	i'dliketogiveyourmoneyback	1.00
evimin önünde kazalar gördüm	I sawaccidents in front of myhouse	isawmymovingfrontdoor	0.04

Table2. Longe Source Sentence BLEU Scores

#### IV. CONCLUSION

To the authors' knowledge, machine translation from Turkish to English is not studied much. Especially research showing translation results with

BLEU scores or any other metric did not exist in the literature. Therefore, applying an encoder-decoder architecture with the attention mechanism for Turkish-English language was enough of motivation. The proposed model is not a new one. On the contrary it is a well known model. This work is

intended to see the results of the application to a language pair that is not studied much. The results show that NMT with limited data achieved success to an acceptable extent. As mentioned above, the pattern pairs that more frequently exist in the training data helped the proposed NMT model to perform better. The NMT model is implemented using Python and Tensorflow with a Nvidia GPU. The parallel corpus text is obtained from <http://www.manythings.org/anki/> which contains text files of parallel text of many language pairs.

- [3]. Niehues, J. et al. (2017). Analyzing Neural MT Search and Model Performance. In: First Workshop on Neural Machine Translation, pp. 11–17.
- [4]. Vaswani, A. et al. (2017). Attention is All you Need. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-first Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS), pp. 5998–6008.
- [5]. Lakew, S. M., Cettolo, M., and Federico, M. (2018). A Comparison of Transformer and Recurrent Neural Networks on Multilingual Neural Machine Translation. In: Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, pp. 641–652.
- [6]. Kaiser, L. et al. (2018). Fast Decoding in Sequence Models Using Discrete Latent Variables. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), pp. 2395–2404.
- [7]. Shazeer, N. and Stern, M. (2018). Adafactor: Adaptive Learning Rates with Sublinear Memory Cost. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), pp. 4603–4611.
- [8]. Chen, M. X. et al. (2018). The Best of Both Worlds: Combining Recent Advances in Neural Machine Translation. In: Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 76–86.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Hutchins, J. (2007). Machine translation: A concise history. In Computer aided translation: theory and practice, C. S. Wai, Ed.
- [2]. Junczys-Dowmunt, M., Dwojak, T., and Hoang, H. (2016). Is Neural Machine Translation Ready for Deployment? A Case Study on 30 Translation Directions. In: CoRR abs/1610.01108.
- [9]. Koehn, P. and Knowles, R. (2017). Six Challenges for Neural Machine Translation. In: First Workshop on Neural Machine Translation, pp. 28–39.
- [10]. Yang, Y., Huang, L., and Ma, M. (2018). Breaking the Beam Search Curse: A Study of (Re-) Scoring Methods and Stopping Criteria for Neural Machine Translation. In: Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 3054–3059.
- [11]. Huang, L., Zhao, K., and Ma, M. (2017). When to Finish? Optimal Beam Search for Neural Text Generation (modulo beam size). In: Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 2134–2139.
- [12]. Durgar El-Kahlout, İ., ve Oflazer K., (2006) "Türkçe-İngilizce için istatistiksel bilgisayarlı çeviri sistemi." Fifteenth Turkish Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Neural Networks, Akyaka, Muğla, Türkiye
- [13]. Yeniterzi R., ve Oflazer K., (2010). "Syntax-to-morphology mapping in factored phrase-based statistical machine translation from English to Turkish." 48. Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Association for Computational Linguistics.