

Applied Natural Language Processing

Info 256 Lecture 8: Text classification (Sept. 20, 2023)

David Bamman, UC Berkeley

Project proposal — due 9/27

- Final project involving 1 to 3 students involving natural language processing -involving natural language processing in support of an empirical research
 question.
- Proposal:
 - outline the work you're going to undertake
 - motivate its rationale as an interesting question worth asking
 - assess its potential to contribute new knowledge by situating it within related literature in the scientific community. (cite 5 relevant sources)
 - who is the team and what are each of your responsibilities (everyone gets the same grade)



A mapping *h* from input data × (drawn from instance space \mathscr{X}) to a label (or labels) y from some enumerable output space \mathscr{Y}

 \mathscr{X} = set of all documents \mathscr{Y} = {english, mandarin, greek, ...}

x = a single document
y = ancient greek



h(x) = y $h(\mu \hat{\eta} v i v \, \check{a} \varepsilon i \delta \varepsilon \, \theta \varepsilon \dot{a}) = ancient grc$



Let h(x) be the "true" mapping. We never know it. How do we find the best h(x) to approximate it?

One option: rule based

if x has characters in unicode point range 0370-03FF: $\hat{h}(x) = greek$



Supervised learning

Given training data in the form of <x, y> pairs, learn $\hat{h}(x)$

Text categorization problems

| task | x | ¥ |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|
| language ID | text | {english, mandarin, greek,} |
| spam classification | email | {spam, not spam} |
| authorship attribution | text | {jk rowling, james joyce,} |
| genre classification | novel | {detective, romance, gothic,} |
| sentiment analysis | text | {positive, negative, neutral, mixed} |

Sentiment analysis

- Document-level SA: is the entire text positive or negative (or both/ neither) with respect to an implicit target?
- Movie reviews [Pang et al. 2002, Turney 2002]

Training data



"... is a film which still causes real, not figurative, chills to run along my spine, and it is certainly the bravest and most ambitious fruit of Coppola's genius"

Roger Ebert, Apocalypse Now

 "I hated this movie. Hated hated hated hated hated this movie. Hated it. Hated every simpering stupid vacant audience-insulting moment of it. Hated the sensibility that thought anyone would like it."

negative

Roger Ebert, North

Sentiment analysis

 Is the text positive or negative (or both/neither) with respect to an explicit target within the text?

Feature: picture

Positive: 12

- Overall this is a good camera with a really good picture clarity.
- The pictures are absolutely amazing the camera captures the minutest of details.
- After nearly 800 pictures I have found that this camera takes incredible pictures.

•••

Negative: 2

- The pictures come out hazy if your hands shake even for a moment during the entire process of taking a picture.
- Focusing on a display rack about 20 feet away in a brightly lit room during day time, pictures produced by this camera were blurry and in a shade of orange.

Hu and Liu (2004), "Mining and Summarizing Customer Reviews"

Sentiment as tone

• No longer the speaker's attitude with respect to some particular target, but rather the positive/negative tone that is evinced.

Sentiment as tone



Dodds et al. (2011), "Temporal patterns of happiness and information in a global social network: Hedonometrics and Twitter" (PLoS One)

Sentiment Dictionaries

- General Inquirer (1966)
- MPQA subjectivity lexicon (Wilson et al. 2005) http://mpqa.cs.pitt.edu/lexicons/ subj_lexicon/
- LIWC (Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count, Pennebaker 2015)
- AFINN (Nielsen 2011)
- NRC Word-Emotion Association Lexicon (EmoLex), Mohammad and Turney 2013

| pos | neg |
|-------------|---------------|
| unlimited | lag |
| prudent | contortions |
| superb | fright |
| closeness | lonely |
| impeccably | tenuously |
| fast-paced | plebeian |
| treat | mortification |
| destined | outrage |
| blessing | allegations |
| steadfastly | disoriented |

Sentiment as tone



Golder and Macy (2011), "Diurnal and Seasonal Mood Vary with Work, Sleep, and Daylength Across Diverse Cultures," *Science*. Positive affect (PA) and negative affect (NA) measured with LIWC.

Why is SA hard?

- Sentiment is a measure of a speaker's private state, which is unobservable.
- Sometimes words are a good indicator of sentiment (love, amazing, hate, terrible); many times it requires deep world + contextual knowledge

"*Valentine's Day* is being marketed as a Date Movie. I think it's more of a First-Date Movie. If your date likes it, do not date that person again. And if you like it, there may not be a second date."

Roger Ebert, Valentine's Day



Supervised learning

Given training data in the form of <x, y> pairs, learn $\hat{h}(x)$

| х | У |
|----------------|----------|
| loved it! | positive |
| terrible movie | negative |
| not too shabby | positive |

 $\hat{h}(x)$

- The classification function that we want to learn has two different components:
 - the formal structure of the learning method (what's the relationship between the input and output?) → Naive Bayes, logistic regression, convolutional neural network, etc.
 - the representation of the data



Representation for SA

- Only positive/negative words in MPQA
- Only words in isolation (bag of words)
- Conjunctions of words (sequential, skip ngrams, other non-linear combinations)
- Higher-order linguistic structure (e.g., syntax)

"... is a film which still causes real, not figurative, chills to run along my spine, and it is certainly the bravest and most ambitious fruit of Coppola's genius"

Roger Ebert, Apocalypse Now

"I hated this movie. Hated hated hated hated hated this movie. Hated it. Hated every simpering stupid vacant audienceinsulting moment of it. Hated the sensibility that thought anyone would like it."

Roger Ebert, North

Bag of words

Representation of text only as the counts of words that it contains

| | Apocalypse now | North |
|---------|-------------------|-------|
| the | 1 | 1 |
| of | 0 | 0 |
| hate | 0 | 9 |
| genius | 1 | 0 |
| bravest | 1 | 0 |
| stupid | 0 | 1 |
| like | 0 | 1 |
| | | |

Bag of words

For short documents, a binary representation can often suffice: only notes the *existence* of word in the document and not its count.

| | Apocalypse now | North |
|---------|-------------------|-------|
| the | 1 | 1 |
| of | 0 | 0 |
| hate | 0 | X 1 |
| genius | 1 | 0 |
| bravest | 1 | 0 |
| stupid | 0 | 1 |
| like | 0 | 1 |
| | | |

Refresher

$$\sum_{i=1}^{F} x_i \beta_i = x_1 \beta_1 + x_2 \beta_2 + \ldots + x_F \beta_F$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^{F} x_i = x_i \times x_2 \times \ldots \times x_F$$

i=1

$$\exp(x) = e^{x} \approx 2.7^{x} \qquad \exp(x + y) = \exp(x) \exp(y)$$
$$\log(x) = y \to e^{y} = x \qquad \log(xy) = \log(x) + \log(y)$$

Binary logistic regression

$$P(y = 1 \mid x, \beta) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{F} x_i \beta_i\right)}$$

output space
$$\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$$

x = feature vector

| Feature | Value |
|---------|-------|
| the | 0 |
| and | 0 |
| bravest | 0 |
| love | 0 |
| loved | 0 |
| genius | 0 |
| not | 0 |
| fruit | 1 |
| BIAS | 1 |

β = coefficients

| Feature | β |
|---------|------|
| the | 0.01 |
| and | 0.03 |
| bravest | 1.4 |
| love | 3.1 |
| loved | 1.2 |
| genius | 0.5 |
| not | -3.0 |
| fruit | -0.8 |
| BIAS | -0.1 |

Multiclass logistic regression

$$P(Y = y \mid X = x; \beta) = \frac{\exp(x^{\top} \beta_y)}{\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp(x^{\top} \beta_{y'})}$$

output space $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, K\}$

x = feature vector

β = coefficients (one set for each output class)

| Feature | Value |
|---------|-------|
| the | 0 |
| and | 0 |
| bravest | 0 |
| love | 0 |
| loved | 0 |
| genius | 0 |
| not | 0 |
| fruit | 1 |
| BIAS | 1 |

| Feature | β1 | β2 | β ₃ | β4 | β_5 |
|---------|-------|-------|----------------|-------|-----------|
| the | 1.33 | -0.80 | -0.54 | 0.87 | 0 |
| and | 1.21 | -1.73 | -1.57 | -0.13 | 0 |
| bravest | 0.96 | -0.05 | 0.24 | 0.81 | 0 |
| love | 1.49 | 0.53 | 1.01 | 0.64 | 0 |
| loved | -0.52 | -0.02 | 2.21 | -2.53 | 0 |
| genius | 0.98 | 0.77 | 1.53 | -0.95 | 0 |
| not | -0.96 | 2.14 | -0.71 | 0.43 | 0 |
| fruit | 0.59 | -0.76 | 0.93 | 0.03 | 0 |
| BIAS | -1.92 | -0.70 | 0.94 | -0.63 | 0 |

Binary logistic regression

| | BIAS | love | loved |
|---|------|------|-------|
| β | -0.1 | 3.1 | 1.2 |

| | BIAS | love | loved | a=∑ <i>x_iβ_i</i> | exp(-a) | 1/(1+exp(-a)) |
|----------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------------|
| X1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0.05 | 95.2% |
| X ² | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.2 | 0.015 | 98.5% |
| X ³ | 1 | 0 | 0 | -0.1 | 1.11 | 47.4% |

- As a discriminative classifier, logistic regression doesn't assume features are independent like Naive Bayes does.
- Its power partly comes in the ability to create richly expressive features without the burden of independence.
- We can represent text through features that are not just the identities of individual words, but any feature that is scoped over the entirety of the input.



• Features are where you can encode your own domain understanding of the problem.

feature classes unigrams ("like") bigrams ("not like"), higher order ngrams prefixes (words that start with "un-") has word that shows up in positive sentiment dictionary

| Task | Features |
|--------------------------|---|
| Sentiment classification | Words, presence in sentiment dictionaries, etc. |
| Keyword extraction | |
| Fake news detection | |
| Authorship attribution | |

| Feature | Value |
|---------|-------|
| the | 0 |
| and | 0 |
| bravest | 0 |
| love | 0 |
| loved | 0 |
| genius | 0 |
| not | 1 |
| fruit | 0 |
| BIAS | 1 |

| Feature | Value |
|------------------|-------|
| like | 1 |
| not like | 1 |
| did not like | 1 |
| in_pos_dict_MPQA | 1 |
| in_neg_dict_MPQA | 0 |
| in_pos_dict_LIWC | 1 |
| in_neg_dict_LIWC | 0 |
| author=ebert | 1 |
| author=siskel | 0 |

β = coefficients

| Feature | β |
|---------|------|
| the | 0.01 |
| and | 0.03 |
| bravest | 1.4 |
| love | 3.1 |
| loved | 1.2 |
| genius | 0.5 |
| not | -3.0 |
| fruit | -0.8 |
| BIAS | -0.1 |

How do we get good values for β?

Conditional likelihood



For all training data, we want the probability of the true label y for each data point x to be high

| | BIAS | love | loved | a=∑ <i>xiβi</i> | exp(-a) | 1/(1+exp(-a)) | true y |
|----------------|------|------|-------|-----------------|---------|---------------|-----------|
| X1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0.05 | 95.2% | 1 |
| X ² | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.2 | 0.015 | 98.5% | 1 |
| Х ³ | 1 | 0 | 0 | -0.1 | 1.11 | 47.5% | 0 |

Conditional likelihood



For all training data, we want the probability of the true label y for each data point x to be high

Pick the values of parameters β to maximize the conditional probability of the training data <x, y> using gradient ascent.

Evaluation

- For all supervised problems, it's important to understand how well your model is performing
- What we try to estimate is how well you will perform in the future, on new data also drawn from ${\boldsymbol{\mathscr X}}$
- Trouble arises when the training data <x, y> you have does not characterize the full instance space.
 - n is small
 - sampling bias in the selection of <x, y>
 - x is dependent on time
 - y is dependent on time (concept drift)





Experiment design



Multiclass confusion matrix

Predicted (ŷ)

| | | POS | NEG | NEUT |
|---------|------|-----|-----|------|
| | POS | 100 | 2 | 15 |
| True (y | NEG | 0 | 104 | 30 |
| | NEUT | 30 | 40 | 70 |

Accuracy

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}I[\hat{y}_i=y_i]$$

POS NEG NEUT



Precision

Precision(POS) =

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(y_i = \hat{y}_i = POS)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(\hat{y}_i = POS)}$$

True (y)



Precision: proportion of predicted class that are actually that class.

Recall

Recall(POS) =

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(y_i = \hat{y}_i = POS)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(y_i = POS)}$$

True (y)

Predicted (ŷ) POS NEG NEUT 2 15 POS 100 NEG 0 104 30 30 40 70 NEUT

Recall: proportion of true class that are predicted to be that class.

Majority class baseline

- Pick the label that occurs the most frequently in the training data. (Don't count the test data!)
- Predict that label for every data point in the test data.

Challenging classification

 Peter M. Broadwell, David Mimno and Timothy R. Tangherlini (2017): Using classification to explore the boundaries between categories in Danish folk tales.

| | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mound dwellers |
|----|---|---|----|----|---|-----|----|-----|----|------|-----|----|------|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------|-----|---|----|-----|-----|------------|-----|----------|-----|---|----|----|----------|--------------------|
| | | 1 | | 5 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | • | 7 | 0 | 1 | T | 1 | | | | | | τ. | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | Ξ. | 7 | Elves |
| 1 | | | C. | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | Nissor |
| | | | | 6 | | | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | | Ξ. | | | | | 2 | | | | 2 | 2 | Traveling monsters |
| 2 | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Water spirits |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | 1 | Wiverps |
| | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | Ξ. | | | | | | | | | Warowolvoc |
| 2 | | | | | | | | Ľ. | | | | | _ | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | 2 | _ | | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | | _ | 2 | | 2 | Poligious |
| • | | 1 | | | | | | Γ. | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | • | | • | | | • | Death partants |
| • | | | | | | | | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | • | | | | - | • | | | | | | | | | • | | • | | Lights (portents |
| • | • | | | | | | | ٠ | ٢, | | 1 | | - | • | • | • | | • | • | | | • | • | • | • | • | | | - | • | | • | | • | • | Lights/portents |
| • | | | | | | | | | | | , | 2 | | • | • | | | | | | | - | | | | • | | | | • | | | | | | Churshee |
| • | | | | | | | • | | | | | | 9 | • | • | • | | | | | | • | | | | • | • | | | | | | | | | Churches |
| • | | | | | | | | | • | | ٠ | | | | • | • | | | • | | | • | | | • | • | | | | | • | | | • | | Farms/Towns |
| • | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | • | • | | ٢. | 1 | ٠ | ٠ | 1 | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ٠ | | Places |
| • | | | - | | | | | - | ٠ | • | | • | | | ٠ | 1 | | | | | | ٠ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Treasure |
| • | | | | | | | | | | ٠ | • | | | | | | | | ٠ | | | | | | | | | | | | ٠ | | | ٠ | ٠ | Kings |
| | | | | | | | | | | | • | ٠ | | | ۰ | | | | • | | | ۲ | ٠ | | ٠ | ٠ | | | | | • | | | ٠ | | Manor lords |
| | | | | | | | | | + | | • | | - | | • | | | • | | | | ٠ | | | | • | • | | | | | | | ٠ | ٠ | Ministers |
| • | ٠ | | | - | ٠ | - | ٠ | | | | | | | | ٠ | • | | | | | | ٠ | ٠ | | ٠ | • (| | | - 1 | | - 1 | | • | ٠ | ٠ | Witches |
| | | | | | | | ÷ | | | | | ٠ | • | | • | • | | | | • | | ٠ | ٠ | | | | | | | | | | | ٠ | | Robbers |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Strandings |
| • | | | | | | | | | | | | ٠ | ٠ | | | | | ٠ | | | | | | | | | • 1 | | | • | | • | | | | Plague |
| • | | | ٠ | | | | | • | • | | | ٠ | | ٠ | ٠ | • | • | ٠ | ٠ | | | | | • | | • | | | | | | | | ٠ | • | Hauntings |
| • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | 8 | | - | | | | | | | | | Female revenants |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ē | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Revenants/Land |
| • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ٠ | | | | | | 4 | | | - | | | | | | | | | Revenants/Places |
| • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | • | | | | | ъ | | | 6 | | | • | | | | • | | | ø | Devil |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ě | | | | - | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | • | ÷ | Cunning men |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | Illness |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | People |
| | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | • | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Agriculture |
| | | | | _ | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | | 7 | | | | | | | 7. | | | | | 5 | ā | ā | Villeinage |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | | | 5 | ă | Houses |
| | | 2 | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | Ξ | | | | 1 | | | | τ. | Ξ. | τ. | | 2 | Ξ. | | | | 7 | Social |
| 2 | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | - | | | | | | | | Ξ. | | | 4 | 11 | | Outdoor life |
| | 2 | | | - | | | | | | | | | Ξ | | 2 | | - | ž | | - | | ä | | 2 | - | 2 | Ξ. | Ξ. | - | 23 | Ξ. | - | | | | Forebears |
| - | Ē | - | 1 | ~ | < | ~ | ÷ | . – | Ē | | ~~~ | \ | - | ÷, | ÷ | - | 5 | 2 | - | ŭ | ÷ | Ŧ | - | - | - | - | ~ | _ | - | 2 | 2 | - | 6 | 2 | - | Torebears |
| 8 | ₹ | ŝ | 2 | a | ≶ | e e | ē | ē | à | . 9 | 2 | Ē | ้อ | ה' | S | a | | 1 | õ | Ť | a | <u> </u> | Ъ. | ē | ē | ĕ | '⊒ | 5 | ğ | 10 | ≧ | ㅎ | ğ. | Ĕ | ġ | |
| Ē | ß | ŝ | ž | ਛੋ | è | 2 | ō | at | Б | 2 | 5 | Э | 6 | a) | 20 | | E | ğ | 8 | | è | 5 | a l | è | è | ≦. | 3 | B - | H | <u>r</u> | ₽. | 5 | | đ | <u>n</u> | |
| đ | | ï | Ĭ | 2 | 3 | ٤ | ē | - 2 | 2 | S, S | 9 | 2 | ູ່ທັ | Ë | | Ч | č | ē | ē | ₫ | ē | ₫ | Ē | B | Ba | | 3 | ŝ | ē | 5 | L | ß | - | 2 | ĕ | |
| Q. | | | 5 | ŏ | S | 9 | s, | ö | 8 | | ß | 30 | • | e | | 0 | 2 | 5 | Ś | 2 | | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | P | | | <u> </u> | R | | | ۲ | P | |
| Š | | | ∃ | | | è | | a | ā | - | | Ň | | | | a | | | | S | | S | N | S | S | | Ę | | | e | | | | F | S | |
| 1 | | | õ | ŝ | | CA) | | B | E | | | SU | | | | S | | | | | | | en | 6 | P | | 5 | | | | | | | D | | |
| 2 | | | SL | | | | | S | S | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ar | Ы | a | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | ē | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | đ | - | ß | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | S | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Haiku

Whitecaps on the bay: A broken signboard banging In the April wind.

- Richard Wright

Long and So (2016), "Literary Pattern Recognition: Modernism between Close Reading and Machine Learning," Critical Inquiry

Three spirits came to me And drew me apart To where the olive boughs Lay stripped upon the ground; Pale carnage beneath bright mist.

— Ezra Pound

Activity

6.classification/Classification.ipynb

• Design features for predicting the genre of a movie

Parameters vs. Hyperparameters

Parameters whose values are *learned*

| Feature | β |
|---------|------|
| the | 0.01 |
| and | 0.03 |
| bravest | 1.4 |
| love | 3.1 |
| loved | 1.2 |
| genius | 0.5 |
| BIAS | -0.1 |

Hyperparameters whose values are *chosen*

| Hyperparameter | value |
|---------------------------|-------|
| minimum word frequency | 5 |
| max vocab size | 10000 |
| lowercase | TRUE |
| regularization strength | 1.0 |