1. What is the difference between a rule-based system and a machine learning system?

A rule-based system is implemented as a set of rules, which is usually executed in some sequential or conditional flow, which means the exact steps of execution is known.

A machine learning system includes some kind of model which can be updated iteratively and used to predict a value; this can be singular or multi-dimensional. Mathematically, this equates to learning a function f(x) = y where x and y can be singular or multi-dimensional.

For real-world problems, there are too many unknowns for a rule-based system to be useful for solving these problems, whereas a machine learning system can be used heuristically.

1. What is the difference between unsupervised and supervised learning?

The major difference is the input data, where data for supervised learning includes labels for the ground truth, whereas data for unsupervised learning doesn’t include these labels. The reason for unsupervised learning is that data is expensive to label, since it requires human interaction, and so unsupervised learning can be used on extremely large, unlabelled datasets. But it’s limited in output, since it can’t predict values or classifications, but can cluster or autoencode data. The mid-ground is hybrid learning, where some data is labelled but most isn’t, meaning predictions can be made while learning on mostly unlabelled data.

1. What do we mean when we say that a machine learning system is overfitting?

An initial machine learning model is said to be simple, that is it doesn’t adequately represent the input data. Through training and updating of the model, it is said to become more complex, that is a closer representation of the data. The issue is that a model can become overly complex, and while it may fit the training data well, it does not when new data is introduced. This is called overfitting, where the training error is very low, but the validation error is very high. Regularisation and early stopping are two methods to combat this.

1. Part 1 question 2.1 - include all steps
2. Part 1 question 2.2 – include Python snippets and RMSE performance

Train an SVM binary classifier using the Hateval dataset (available in Learning Central). The task consists of predicting whether a tweet represents hate speech or not. You can preprocess and choose the features freely. Evaluate the performance of your classifier in terms of accuracy using 10-fold cross-validation. Write a table with the results of the classifier (accuracy, precision, recall and F-measure) in each of the folds and write a small summary (up to 500 words) of how you preprocessed the data, chose the feature/s, and trained and evaluated your model (35%)

For data pre-processing, I chose to represent each sentence as a vector of word frequency. That is, I first created a dictionary of all the words in the training set and ordered by frequency in descending order. Only the top 1000 most frequently used words were used, so each data item is represented as a 1000-feature vector, where the n-th element in the vector is the frequency of the n-th word in the dictionary found in the data item.

Before this though, each data item was first lemmatised, which unlike stemmatisation depends on correctly identifying the intended part of speech. This helped simplify the dictionary, since ‘going’, ‘went’ and ‘gone’ would all be changed to ‘go’.

For feature selection, I introduced the chi-squared test method, which removes features that appear to be irrelevant to the label. In this case, I selected the 500 most relevant features from the 1000 features the word frequency dictionary gave us. Since the chi-squared requires that vector elements be non-negative, I also made a copy of the vectorised dataset and standardised the data, that is to change the mean of each feature to be 0 and the standard deviation to be 1. This meant I could compare feature selection against data standardisation.

The first training and evaluation stage didn’t involve cross-validation, instead I trained three separate Support Vector Machines (sklearn.svm.SVC), the first was trained on just the vectorised data, the second was trained on the standardised data, and the third was trained on the feature-selected data using chi-squared. The reason for this was to see quickly if there was any difference in the accuracy, precision etc. when tested on the test set. What could be seen was that the first model was slightly below (as little as 1%) in most scores, whereas the standardised data and feature-selected data scored almost exactly the same. However, going forward I decided that the feature-selection would be more appropriate than standardisation, since less features means faster training of the model and faster prediction.

Next, cross-validation was done with 10-fold and a list of parameter values for chi-squared feature size, from 1000 i.e. all features to 10. The accuracy, precision, recall and f1-score were recorded for each fold, and below is that table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chi-squared size | Accuracy | Recall | Precision | F1 Score |
| 1000 | 0.813333 | 0.731844 | 0.784431 | 0.757225 |
| 750 | 0.798889 | 0.678977 | 0.778502 | 0.725341 |
| 500 | 0.79 | 0.671795 | 0.811146 | 0.734923 |
| 250 | 0.773333 | 0.689744 | 0.764205 | 0.725067 |
| 150 | 0.758889 | 0.630556 | 0.729904 | 0.676602 |
| 100 | 0.772222 | 0.671756 | 0.776471 | 0.720327 |
| 75 | 0.763333 | 0.656863 | 0.785924 | 0.715621 |
| 50 | 0.756667 | 0.613514 | 0.749175 | 0.674591 |
| 25 | 0.748889 | 0.552083 | 0.796992 | 0.652308 |
| 10 | 0.718889 | 0.449735 | 0.790698 | 0.573356 |

10-fold was used again for gaining a better average for these scores by keeping parameter values static. Below are the tables for feature size = 1000 and 500

Feature size = 1000

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K-fold | Accuracy | Recall | Precision | F1 Score |
| 1 | 0.778889 | 0.680441 | 0.74848 | 0.712843 |
| 2 | 0.785556 | 0.669231 | 0.80308 | 0.73007 |
| 3 | 0.764444 | 0.635359 | 0.74194 | 0.684524 |
| 4 | 0.781111 | 0.678378 | 0.76292 | 0.718169 |
| 5 | 0.782222 | 0.640506 | 0.8241 | 0.720798 |
| 6 | 0.782222 | 0.669065 | 0.82789 | 0.740053 |
| 7 | 0.79 | 0.689474 | 0.78679 | 0.734923 |
| 8 | 0.783333 | 0.686486 | 0.76276 | 0.722617 |
| 9 | 0.78 | 0.661017 | 0.75 | 0.702703 |
| 10 | 0.784444 | 0.672775 | 0.78834 | 0.725989 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Average | 0.781222 | 0.668273 | 0.77963 | 0.719269 |

Feature size = 500

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K-fold | Accuracy | Recall | Precision | F1 Score |
| 1 | 0.758889 | 0.634465 | 0.759375 | 0.691323 |
| 2 | 0.802222 | 0.705722 | 0.787234 | 0.744253 |
| 3 | 0.786667 | 0.661417 | 0.8 | 0.724138 |
| 4 | 0.775556 | 0.67013 | 0.774775 | 0.718663 |
| 5 | 0.781111 | 0.685237 | 0.745455 | 0.714078 |
| 6 | 0.787778 | 0.656992 | 0.803226 | 0.722787 |
| 7 | 0.801111 | 0.708108 | 0.786787 | 0.745377 |
| 8 | 0.784444 | 0.672872 | 0.780864 | 0.722857 |
| 9 | 0.757778 | 0.678947 | 0.728814 | 0.702997 |
| 10 | 0.784444 | 0.679901 | 0.80826 | 0.738544 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Average | 0.782 | 0.675379 | 0.777479 | 0.722502 |

Below is the result of the test set using a model with a feature size of 500 after using chi-squared.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | precision | recall | f1-score | support |
| 0 | 0.79 | 0.86 | 0.83 | 1566 |
| 1 | 0.78 | 0.68 | 0.73 | 1135 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| accuracy |  |  | 0.79 | 2701 |
| macro avg | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 2701 |
| weighted avg | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 2701 |