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Abstract

This document is a proposal for the SemEval2016 Task 4 Sentiment Analysis in Twitter. It is made up of five subtasks, labeled A through E, covering both labeling tweets on a 3-point and 5-point scale as well as quantification and prediction of an entire grouping of Tweets. **(SITE THE PDF HERE)**. We approached this project by developing a classifier for the 5-point classification and quantification subtasks, then generalizing this for the 3-point subtasks.

Task Description

Twitter provides a convenient platform for us to share information, news, and opinions. As such, it can provide a rich dataset of Tweets about a variety of topics, such as politics, products, and many other areas. This has made it popular for various natural language processing research projects **(CITE BOOK OR PPT OR WILSON)**. This paper describes our approach to the SemEval2016 Task 4 challenges.

The SemEval2016 Task 4 are described as follows:

**Subtask A**: Given a tweet (irrespective of topic) and decide on a 3-point scale whether the tweet conveys a positive, negative, or neutral sentiment.

**Subtask B**: Subtask B is similar to Subtask A, but takes a given tweet and a topic, classifies a tweet on a binary scale, positive or negative, in regard to the given topic.

**Subtask C**: The same challenge as Subtask B, but evaluates the tweets on a 5-point scale: {very positive, positive, neutral, negative, very negative}.

**Subtask D:** Related to Subtask B, this task requires us to estimate the distribution of a set of tweets about a given topic across a binary positive or negative spectrum.

**Subtask E**: Similar to Subtask D but an extension of Subtask C, this task asks us to estimate the distribution of tweets about a topic across the 5-point scale (described earlier in Subtask C). The official description of the Subtasks may be read on SemEval2016’s Task4 website **(INSERT CITATION TO TASK PAPER/WEBSITE).**

Due to the similarities in these subtasks as well as the given data, we will approach Subtask A as a learning task to get familiar with the approaches of sentiment analysis, and then tackle Subtasks B and D together as well as Subtasks C and E together.

Approach

Our general approach to solving the problems of Subtasks A through E consists of Preprocessing, Annotating/Feature Abstraction, a processing through Neural Nets.

## Preprocessing

We prepared our data for use in our feature abstraction layer, by cleaning the data in the following ways:

Substituting all references to Twitter’s embedded shortened links (http://t.co…) to httptco **(GET THIS VERIFIED)**

**Removing the @ symbol from mentions toward other users**

While our preprocessing differs greatly compared to other groups (who included various techniques such as correcting potential typos, separating hashtags into their individual words, and expanding abbreviations) we believe there might be relevance in the manner of *how* someone refers to another entity and the abbreviations used that indicate positive, negative, or neutral sentiment. For example, if a person is happy with Microsoft, they might type Microsoft, utilizing correct capitalization whereas a negative sentiment tweet might ignore proper capitalization or spelling altogether. **INSERT REFERENCE TO RESEARCH PAPERS READ PREVIOUSLY**

After preprocessing we passed our tweets to our tokenization and feature abstraction layer. We assigned the following features to each token in a tweet.

1. The count of each punctuations from [“.”, “..”, “…”, “?”, “!”] are used in the sentence the token is a part of.
2. Whether or not the word in the token is spelled correctly.
3. Whether or not the token is a hashtag.
4. The part of speech of the token.

From this, we then took our tweets and passed them into a Neural Network to break down tweets that contain conjunctions, believing that depending on the conjunctions, either the LHS or RHS might hold more weight toward predicting the positivity/negativity of a tweet’s sentiment.

We then took all tweets lacking conjunctions and the tweet halves created from the above “splitting” on conjunctions and passed them into a second neural net, where we **some fancy terms on training**. We believe our approach on specifically splitting tweets up over conjunctions is a relatively unique to how teams approach this problem. We are aware that is has been used in some tools, such as VADER but haven’t seen much explicitly done over training on tweets with contractions (**INSERT REFERENCE**).

After training our model, we used the DevTest data to see how well our features could predict sentiments and estimate the distribution of positive and negative tweets.

# Preliminary Results

**INSERT SOME SHENANIGANS AND GRAPHS WE HAVEN’T DONE YET**

# Timeline
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