## Introduction to Machine Learning for Social Science

Class 11: Distinctive / Discriminating Words

Rochelle Terman

Postdoctoral Fellow Center for International Security Cooperation Stanford University

February 20, 2018

- Use lists of words to score documents, e.g. positive or negative.

- Use lists of words to score documents, e.g. positive or negative.

- Use lists of words to score documents, e.g. positive or negative.

Problem: How do generate dictionaries?

- Manually

- Use lists of words to score documents, e.g. positive or negative.

- Manually
- Crowd sourcing

- Use lists of words to score documents, e.g. positive or negative.

- Manually
- Crowd sourcing
- Statistical methods

- Use lists of words to score documents, e.g. positive or negative.

- Manually
- Crowd sourcing
- Statistical methods → discriminating words

Goal: Find words that distinguish one group of texts from another group of texts.

■ Comparing Republican, Democratic speeches → Partisan language

- Comparing Republican, Democratic speeches ~ Partisan language
- Comparing Liberal, Conservative books → Ideological language

- Comparing Republican, Democratic speeches → Partisan language
- Comparing Liberal, Conservative books → Ideological language
- Comparing in Toy advertising · Gendered language



- Comparing Republican, Democratic speeches ~ Partisan language
- Comparing liberal, conservative media → Ideological language
- Comparing in toy advertising ~> Gendered language

- Comparing Republican, Democratic speeches ~ Partisan language
- Comparing liberal, conservative media → Ideological language
- Comparing in toy advertising ~> Gendered language

Reasons:

- Comparing Republican, Democratic speeches ~ Partisan language
- Comparing liberal, conservative media → Ideological language
- Comparing in toy advertising ~> Gendered language

### Reasons:

1) Interesting in their own right

- Comparing Republican, Democratic speeches ~ Partisan language
- Comparing liberal, conservative media → Ideological language
- Comparing in toy advertising ~> Gendered language

### Reasons:

- 1) Interesting in their own right
- Create custom dictionaries for classification task.

- Comparing Republican, Democratic speeches ~ Partisan language
- Comparing liberal, conservative media → Ideological language
- Comparing in toy advertising ~> Gendered language

#### Reasons:

- 1) Interesting in their own right
- Create custom dictionaries for classification task.
- 3) Feature selection: inclusion of features in some subsequent analysis

- Comparing Republican, Democratic speeches ~ Partisan language
- Comparing liberal, conservative media → Ideological language
- Comparing in toy advertising ~> Gendered language

#### Reasons:

- 1) Interesting in their own right
- 2) Create custom dictionaries for classification task.
- 3) Feature selection: inclusion of features in some subsequent analysis

Method: Distinctive / Discriminating / Separating word scores.

### Preparing the Corpus

Our corpus: 6 novels by two authors, Jane Austen and Charlotte Bronte.

First create a DTM of the corpus.

What does "distinctive" mean?

■ Goal: find words (or features) distinctive to each corpus.

To the R code!

### What does "distinctive" mean?

- Goal: find words (or features) distinctive to each corpus.
- Requires a decision about what "distinctive" means.

To the R code!

### What does "distinctive" mean?

- Goal: find words (or features) distinctive to each corpus.
- Requires a decision about what "distinctive" means.
- There are a variety of definitions that we might use.

To the R code!

## Option 1: Unique usage

■ Distinctive = exclusive

## Option 1: Unique usage

- Distinctive = exclusive
- If Bront uses the word "access" and Austen never does, we should count "access" as distinctive.

### Option 1: Unique usage

- Distinctive = exclusive
- If Bront uses the word "access" and Austen never does, we should count "access" as distinctive.
- These words tend not to be terribly interesting or informative

■ Distinctive = difference in frequency

- Distinctive = difference in frequency
- Compare the number of times each author uses a word

- Distinctive = difference in frequency
- Compare the number of times each author uses a word
- Find the largest absolute difference.

- Distinctive = difference in frequency
- Compare the number of times each author uses a word
- Find the largest absolute difference.
- Doesn't take into account difference in total words.

■ Distinctive = difference in rates

- Distinctive = difference in rates
- Compare the average rate each author uses a word

Normalize DTM from counts to proportions: For each word *p* in an arbitrary corpus *c*:

$$\mu_p = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N p_i}{T}$$

where  $p_i$  is the number of times a p appears in document i, N is the total number of documents in c and T is the total number of words in c.

Normalize DTM from counts to proportions: For each word *p* in an arbitrary corpus *c*:

$$\mu_{p} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{i}}{T}$$

where  $p_i$  is the number of times a p appears in document i, N is the total number of documents in c and T is the total number of words in c.

2 Take the difference between one author's proportion of a word and another's proportion of the same word.

$$\theta_p = \mu_{p,Bronte} - \mu_{p,Austen}$$

■ Normalize DTM from counts to proportions: For each word *p* in an arbitrary corpus *c*:

$$\mu_{p} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{i}}{T}$$

where  $p_i$  is the number of times a p appears in document i, N is the total number of documents in c and T is the total number of words in c.

**2** Take the difference between one author's proportion of a word and another's proportion of the same word.

$$\theta_p = \mu_{p,Bronte} - \mu_{p,Austen}$$

3 Find words with highest absolute difference.



### Difference in Averages: Problems

■ Favors more frequent words.

### Difference in Averages: Problems

- Favors more frequent words.
- Word 1: 30/1000 (Bronte); 25/1000 (Austen) → Score: 5/1000.

- Favors more frequent words.
- Word 1: 30/1000 (Bronte); 25/1000 (Austen) \sim Score: 5/1000.
- Word 2: 5/1000 (Bronte); .1/1000 (Austen) \( \simes \) Score: 4.9/1000.

- Favors more frequent words.
- Word 1: 30/1000 (Bronte); 25/1000 (Austen) → Score: 5/1000.
- Word 2: 5/1000 (Bronte); .1/1000 (Austen) \( \simes \) Score: 4.9/1000.
- Ignores cases when one author uses a word frequently and a another author barely uses it.

- Favors more frequent words.
- Word 1: 30/1000 (Bronte); 25/1000 (Austen) \( \simes \) Score: 5/1000.
- Word 2: 5/1000 (Bronte); .1/1000 (Austen) \( \simes \) Score: 4.9/1000.
- Ignores cases when one author uses a word frequently and a another author barely uses it.
- More generally: Differences in rates of frequent words > Differences in rates of rare words.

- Favors more frequent words.
- Word 1: 30/1000 (Bronte); 25/1000 (Austen) \( \simes \) Score: 5/1000.
- Word 2: 5/1000 (Bronte); .1/1000 (Austen) \( \simes \) Score: 4.9/1000.
- Ignores cases when one author uses a word frequently and a another author barely uses it.
- More generally: Differences in rates of frequent words > Differences in rates of rare words.

- Favors more frequent words.
- Word 1: 30/1000 (Bronte); 25/1000 (Austen) \sim Score: 5/1000.
- Word 2: 5/1000 (Bronte); .1/1000 (Austen) \( \simes \) Score: 4.9/1000.
- Ignores cases when one author uses a word frequently and a another author barely uses it.
- More generally: Differences in rates of frequent words > Differences in rates of rare words.

Adjustment: Divide the difference in authors' average rates by the average rate across all authors.

Other metrics for "distinctiveness":

■ Standardized mean difference (take into account variability)

- Standardized mean difference (take into account variability)
- Standard Log Odds (used in Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn, 2009)

- Standardized mean difference (take into account variability)
- Standard Log Odds (used in Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn, 2009)
- Many more!

- Standardized mean difference (take into account variability)
- Standard Log Odds (used in Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn, 2009)
- Many more!

Other metrics for "distinctiveness":

- Standardized mean difference (take into account variability)
- Standard Log Odds (used in Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn, 2009)
- Many more!

#### Other metrics for "distinctiveness":

- Standardized mean difference (take into account variability)
- Standard Log Odds (used in Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn, 2009)
- Many more!

#### How do we choose?

■ Depends on context, goal

#### Other metrics for "distinctiveness":

- Standardized mean difference (take into account variability)
- Standard Log Odds (used in Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn, 2009)
- Many more!

- Depends on context, goal
- Classification ~ accuracy, precision, recall

#### Other metrics for "distinctiveness":

- Standardized mean difference (take into account variability)
- Standard Log Odds (used in Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn, 2009)
- Many more!

- Depends on context, goal
- Classification ~ accuracy, precision, recall
- Qualitative inference → face validity, convergence, etc.

### Other metrics for "distinctiveness":

- Standardized mean difference (take into account variability)
- Standard Log Odds (used in Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn, 2009)
- Many more!

- Depends on context, goal
- Classification ~ accuracy, precision, recall
- Qualitative inference ~> face validity, convergence, etc.
- More on this later (at the end of slides)

Why do we care?

1 Qualitative inference comparing 2 groups

# Why do we care?

- 1 Qualitative inference comparing 2 groups
- 2 Create custom dictionaries for classification task

### Federalist Papers:

- Canonical texts in study of American politics
- Designed to persuade citizens of New York to adopt constitution
- 77 essays, published from 1787-1799 in newspapers, published anonymously under the name Publius.

### Federalist Papers:

- Canonical texts in study of American politics
- Designed to persuade citizens of New York to adopt constitution
- 77 essays, published from 1787-1799 in newspapers, published anonymously under the name Publius.

Who wrote the Federalist papers? (Hostler and Wallace (1963)

### Federalist Papers:

- Canonical texts in study of American politics
- Designed to persuade citizens of New York to adopt constitution
- 77 essays, published from 1787-1799 in newspapers, published anonymously under the name Publius.

Who wrote the Federalist papers? (Hostler and Wallace (1963)

- Jay: wrote 5 essays
- Hamilton: wrote 43 papers
- Madison: wrote 12 papers
- Disputed (Hamilton or Madison?): Essays 49-58, 62, and 63

### Federalist Papers:

- Canonical texts in study of American politics
- Designed to persuade citizens of New York to adopt constitution
- 77 essays, published from 1787-1799 in newspapers, published anonymously under the name Publius.

Who wrote the Federalist papers? (Hostler and Wallace (1963)

- Jay: wrote 5 essays
- Hamilton: wrote 43 papers
- Madison: wrote 12 papers
- Disputed (Hamilton or Madison?): Essays 49-58, 62, and 63

Task: Identify authors of disputed papers

Method: Classify papers as Hamilton or Madison using dictionary methods

Training → papers Hamilton, Madison are known to have authored Test → disputed (i.e. unlabeled) papers

Preprocessing:

- Hamilton/Madison discuss similar themes
- Differ on the extent they use stop words
- Focus analysis on the stop words

# Word Weights: Standardized Mean Difference

For each word p, construct weight  $\theta_p^*$ ,

 $\mu_{p, {
m Hamilton}} = {
m Rate}(p)$  in subcorpus of Hamilton docs  $\mu_{p, {
m Madison}} = {
m Rate}(p)$  in subcorpus of Madison docs  $\sigma_{p, {
m Hamilton}}^2 = {
m Var}(p)$  in subcorpus of Hamilton docs  $\sigma_{jp {
m Madison}}^2 = {
m Var}(p)$  in subcorpus of Madison docs

We can then generate weight  $\theta_p^*$  as

$$\theta_p^* = \frac{\mu_{p, \text{Hamilton}} - \mu_{p, \text{Madison}}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{p, \text{Hamilton}}^2 + \sigma_{p, \text{Madison}}^2}}$$

# Trimming the Dictionary

- Trimming weights: Focus on discriminating words (very simple regularization)
- Cut off: For all  $|\theta_p^*| < 0.025$  set  $\theta_p^* = 0$ .

# Classification → Determining Authorship

For each disputed document i, compute discrimination statistic

$$Y_i = \sum_{p=1}^P \theta_p^* X_{ip}$$

 $Y_i \rightsquigarrow \text{classification (linear discriminator)}$ 

- Above midpoint in training set  $\rightarrow$  Hamilton text
- Below midpoint in training set  $\rightarrow$  Madison text

Findings: Madison is the author of the disputed federalist papers.

■ How do we choose between different "distinctive word" metrics?

- How do we choose between different "distinctive word" metrics?
- How do we chose between dictionaries?

- How do we choose between different "distinctive word" metrics?
- How do we chose between dictionaries?
- How do we evaluate our findings?

- How do we choose between different "distinctive word" metrics?
- How do we chose between dictionaries?
- How do we evaluate our findings?

Three evaluation strategies

- How do we choose between different "distinctive word" metrics?
- How do we chose between dictionaries?
- How do we evaluate our findings?

### Three evaluation strategies

■ Face validity (do these results make sense?)

- How do we choose between different "distinctive word" metrics?
- How do we chose between dictionaries?
- How do we evaluate our findings?

### Three evaluation strategies

- Face validity (do these results make sense?)
- Convergence (do different metrics lead to the same result?)

- How do we choose between different "distinctive word" metrics?
- How do we chose between dictionaries?
- How do we evaluate our findings?

### Three evaluation strategies

- Face validity (do these results make sense?)
- Convergence (do different metrics lead to the same result?)
- "Gold Standard" (do our results align with human coding?)