# CSE 5525 Speech and Language Processing (Spring 2017) Homework #1: Text Classification

Akshay Mehra

mehra.42@osu.edu

## Introduction:

This is the report for the first homework for Speech and Language Processing. In this homework, I have implemented Naïve Bayes and Perceptron Algorithms as presented in class. The report contains my results of running Naïve Bayes for various values of ALPHA (the smoothing factor) and number of iterations for the perceptron.

I have utilized the starter code provided for this assignment along with functions from python's Numpy and Scipy packages.

# **PART 1: Naïve Bayes**

The first part of the assignment asked to implement a Naïve Bayes Classifier and evaluate its performance on the Large Movie review dataset, for different values of the hyper-parameter alpha.

Below are my results

Hyper-Parameter (ALPHA)	Train Accuracy (%)	Test Accuracy (%)
0.1	97.768	81.132
0.5	95.876	82.148
1.0	94.512	82.284
5.0	90.665	82.772
10.0	88.912	82.816

In the second part of the assignment we had to print the probability of the reviews being positive or negative as predicted by the classifier (results have been rounded), for first 10 reviews in the test dataset.

S. No.	Movie Review (shortened to 7 lines for presenting in the report)	Actual Label	Hyper- Parameter (ALPHA)	Probability of being Positive	Probability of being Negative
1	I went and saw this movie last night after being coaxed to by a few	-1.0	0.1	0.2465	0.7535
	friends of mine. I'll admit that I was reluctant to see it because from what I knew of Ashton Kutcher he was only able to do comedy. I		0.5	0.009	0.991
	was wrong. Kutcher played the character of Jake Fischer very well, and Kevin Costner played Ben Randall with such professionalism.  The sign of a good movie is that it can toy with our emotions.		1.0	0.004	0.996
			5.0	0.002	0.998
	The sign of a good mone is diactic dail to financial emotions.		10.0	0.002	0.998
2	Actor turned director Bill Paxton follows up his promising debut, the	-1.0	0.1	0.01	0.99
	Gothic-horror "Frailty", with this family friendly sports drama about the 1913 U.S. Open where a young American caddy rises from his humble background to play against his Bristish idol in what was dubbed as "The Greatest Game Ever Played." I'm no fan of golf, and these scrappy underdog sports flicks are a dime a dozen (most		0.5	0.01	0.99
			1.0	0.01	0.99
			5.0	0.01	0.99
1	recently done to grand effect with "Miracle" and "Cinderella Man		10.0	0.01	0.99
3	As a recreational golfer with some knowledge of the sport's history,	-1.0	0.1	0.996	0.004
	I was pleased with Disney's sensitivity to the issues of class in golf in		0.5	0.986	0.014

	the early twentieth century. The movie depicted well the		1.0	0.979	0.021
	psychological battles that Harry Vardon fought within himself, from	-	5.0	0.949	0.051
	his childhood trauma of being evicted to his own inability to break		10.0	0.928	0.072
4	that glass ceiling that prevents him from being equal,  I saw this film in a sneak preview, and it is delightful. The	1.0			
4	cinematography is unusually creative, the acting is good, and the	-1.0	0.1	0.306	0.694
	story is fabulous. If this movie does not do well, it won't be because	-	0.5	0.05	0.95
	it doesn't deserve to. Before this film, I didn't realize how charming		1.0	0.04	0.966
	Shia Lebouf could be. He does a marvelous, self-contained, job as		5.0	0.027	0.973
	the lead. There's something incredibly sweet about him, and it		10.0	0.024	0.976
5	makes the movie even better  Bill Paxton has taken the true story of the 1913 US golf open and	-1.0	0.1	0.001	0.999
,	made a film that is about much more than an extra-ordinary game	-1.0	0.1		
	of golf. The film also deals directly with the class tensions of the	-		0.001	0.999
	early twentieth century and touches upon the profound anti-		1.0	0.003	0.997
	Catholic prejudices of both the British and American establishments.		5.0	0.017	0.983
	But at heart the film is about that perennial favourite of triumph against the odds		10.0	0.028	0.972
6	I saw this film on September 1st, 2005 in Indianapolis. I am one of	-1.0	0.1	4.911e-20	1.0
J	the judges for the Heartland Film Festival that screens films for their	- 1.0			
	Truly Moving Picture Award. A Truly Moving Picture "explores the	-	0.5	2.66e-19	1.0
	human journey by artistically expressing hope and respect for the	-	1.0	6.15e-19	1.0
	positive values of life." Heartland gave that award to this film. the contract of the co		5.0	8.74e-18	1.0
	/> This is a story of golf in the early part of the 20th century.  At that time, it was the game of upper class and		10.0	4.69e-17	1.0
7	Maybe I'm reading into this too much, but I wonder how much of a	-1.0	0.1	3.83e-31	1.0
,	hand Hongsheng had in developing the film. I mean, when a story is	-1.0			
	told casting the main character as himself, I would think he would	-	0.5	1.15e-14	1.0
	be a heavy hand in writing, documenting, etc. and that would make	-	1.0	1.42e-08	1.0
	it a little biased. br/>Buthis family and friends also may		5.0	0.994	0.004
	have had a hand in getting the actual details about Hongsheng's life. I think the best view would have been told from Hongsheng's		10.0	0.999	0.001
	family and friends' perspectives				
8	I felt this film did have many good qualities. The cinematography	1.0	0.1	1.0	3.43e-18
	was certainly different exposing the stage aspect of the set and	1.0	0.5	1.0	5.37e-17
	story. The original characters as actors was certainly an achievement	-			
	and I felt most played quite convincingly, of course they are playing	-	1.0	1.0	3.02e-16
	themselves, but definitely unique. The cultural aspects may leave many disappointed as a familiarity with the Chinese and Oriental	-	5.0	1.0	8.8e-14
	culture will answer a lot of questions regarding parent/child		10.0	1.0	2.3e-12
	relationships and the stigma that goes with any drug use				
9	This movie is amazing because the fact that the real people portray	-1.0	0.1	0.001	0.999
	themselves and their real life experience and do such a good job it's		0.5	0.001	0.999
	like they're almost living the past over again. Jia Hongsheng plays	-	1.0	0.001	0.999
	himself an actor who quit everything except music and drugs struggling with depression and searching for the meaning of life			0.001	
	while being angry at everyone especially the people who care for	-	5.0	+	0.999
	him most. There's moments in the movie that will make you wanna		10.0	0.001	0.999
	cry because the family especially the father did such a good job				
10	"Quitting" may be as much about exiting a pre-ordained identity as	-1.0	0.1	0.386	0.614
	about drug withdrawal. As a rural guy coming to Beijing, class and		0.5	0.384	0.616
	success must have struck this young artist face on as an appeal to		1.0	0.382	0.618
	separate from his roots and far surpass his peasant parents' acting success. Troubles arise, however, when the new man is too new,		5.0	0.3621	
	when it demands too big a departure from family, history, nature,			+	0.6379
	and personal identity. The ensuing splits, and confusion between		10.0	0.344	0.656
	the imaginary and the real and the dissonance between				

## **Code Snippet for Training Naïve Bayes**

```
def Train(self, X, Y):
    #TODO: Estimate Naive Bayes model parameters
    positive_indices = np.argwhere(Y == 1.0).flatten()
    negative_indices = np.argwhere(Y == -1.0).flatten()
    self.num_positive_reviews = len(positive_indices)
    self.num_negative_reviews = len(negative_indices)
    self.count_positive = csr_matrix.sum(X[np.ix_(positive_indices)], axis=0)
    self.count_negative = csr_matrix.sum(X[np.ix_(negative_indices)], axis=0)
    self.total_positive_words = csr_matrix.sum(X[np.ix_(positive_indices)])
    self.total_negative_words = csr_matrix.sum(X[np.ix_(negative_indices)])
    self.deno_pos = float(self.total_positive_words+ self.ALPHA * X.shape[1])
    self.deno_neg = float(self.total_negative_words+ self.ALPHA * X.shape[1])
    self.count_positive = (self.count_negative + self.ALPHA)
    self.count_negative = (self.count_negative + self.ALPHA)
    return
```

## **Code Snippet for predicting using Naïve Bayes**

```
def PredictLabel(self, X):
    #TODO: Implement Naive Bayes Classification
    self.P positive = log(float(self.num positive reviews)) -
log(float(self.num positive reviews + self.num negative reviews))
    self.P negative = log(float(self.num negative reviews)) -
log(float(self.num positive reviews + self.num negative reviews))
   pred labels = []
    sh = X.shape[0]
    for i in range(sh):
        z = X[i].nonzero()
        sum positive = self.P positive
        sum negative = self.P negative
        for j in range(len(z[0])):
            row index = i
            col index = z[1][j]
            times = X[row index, col index]
            P pos = log(self.count positive[0, col index]) -
log(self.deno pos)
            sum positive = sum positive + times * P pos
            P neg = log(self.count negative[0, col index]) -
log(self.deno neg)
            sum negative = sum negative + times * P neg
        if sum positive > sum negative:
            pred labels.append(1.0)
            pred labels.append(-1.0)
    return pred labels
```

## **Code Snippet for predicting probability**

```
def LogSum(self, logx, logy):
    # TO Do: Return log(x+y), avoiding numerical underflow/overflow.
   m = max(logx, logy)
   return m + log(exp(logx - m) + exp(logy - m))
def PredictProb(self, test, indexes):
    for i in indexes:
        # TO DO: Predict the probability of the i th review in test being
positive review
       # TO DO: Use the LogSum function to avoid underflow/overflow
       predicted label = 0
        z = test.X[i].nonzero()
        sum positive = self.P positive
        sum negative = self.P negative
        for j in range(len(z[0])):
            row_index = i
            col index = z[1][j]
            times = test.X[row index, col index]
            P pos = log((self.count positive[0, col index]))
            sum positive = sum positive + times * P pos
            P neg = log((self.count negative[0, col index]))
            sum negative = sum negative + times * P neg
        predicted prob positive = exp(sum positive -
self.LogSum(sum positive, sum negative))
        predicted prob negative = exp(sum negative -
self.LogSum(sum positive, sum negative))
        if sum positive > sum negative:
            predicted label = 1.0
        else:
            predicted label = -1.0
        #print test.Y[i], test.X reviews[i]
        # TO DO: Comment the line above, and uncomment the line below
        print test.Y[i], predicted_label, predicted_prob_positive,
predicted_prob_negative, test.X_reviews[i]
```

# **PART 2: Perceptron**

This part of the assignment required to implement the Perceptron and Averaged Algorithm and evaluate its performance on the Large Movie Review dataset. It also asked to tune the hyperparameter (the number of iterations).

Below are the results for the Perceptron and Average Perceptron

Iterations	Perceptron Accuracy (%)		Averaged Perceptron Accuracy (%)	
	Train	Test	Train	Test
1	75.04	74.23	85.92	83.84
10	95.04	86.11	94.16	87.2
50	99.7	86.2	98.9	87.1
100	99.9	86.2	99.8	86.8
1000	100	86.1	99.89	86.77

The last part of the assignment asks to print the most positive and the most negative words in the corpus using the weights assigned to each word by the averaged perceptron algorithm.

Below are the results for it (after 10 iteration)

Positive Words	Weight	Negative Words	Weight
excellent	132.173	worst	-263.23
perfect	129.01	waste	-236.81
favorite	114.624	poorly	-177.46
wonderful	105.269	boring	-152.52
amazing	104.369	awful	-147.64
loved	102.437	annoying	-142.74
subtle	97.541	worse	-131.96
easy	96.8802	fails	-128.31
7	95.4269	dull	-126.78
wonderfully	93.8305	lame	-126.49
rare	93.4065	poor	-126.36
highly	92.8701	disappointing	-115.51
superb	92.5654	pointless	-115.23
funniest	89.3295	awful.	-114.96
!	87.8333	save	-111.95
noir	85.9518	bad.	-110.99
tony	85.7079	lacks	-110.15
great	83.2553	badly	-109.81
fantastic	82.425	supposed	-109.33
atmosphere	82.2412	nothing	-107.09

## After 50 iterations

Positive Words	Weight	Negative Words	Weight
wonderfully	169.175	worst	-261.07
7	152.197	waste	-254.65
subtle	138.92	poorly	-247.11
rare	138.124	awful.	-183.52
7/10	134.585	fails	-183.52
refreshing	132.403	boring	-179.55
favorite	131.246	disappointing	-169.69
perfect	129.97	annoying	-166.26
excellent	128.012	lame	-164.19
funniest	127.514	lacks	-157.73
perfect.	122.003	terrible.	-151.71
amazing.	121.787	dull	-151.32
noir	121.472	awful	-146.65
highly	120.425	pointless	-146.2
superb	119.219	badly	-144.01
captures	118.911	worse	-139.67
8	117.234	mildly	-137.54
delightful	116.613	save	-135.18
surprisingly	116.351	annoying.	-134.06
perfect	115.446	disappointment	-128.61

After 100 iterations

Positive Words	Weight	Negative Words	Weight
wonderfully	187.354	poorly	-271.62
7	164.304	worst	-267.19
07/10	158.717	waste	-256.61
rare	153.551	awful.	-202.82
refreshing	150.008	fails	-197
subtle	147.056	boring	-187.27
perfect.	140.869	disappointing	-180.15
amazing.	136.819	annoying	-174.56
favorite	135.566	lacks	-172.55
noir	134.068	lame	-168.66
funniest	133.956	terrible.	-164.46
highly	133.914	dull	-152.54
perfect	130.863	pointless	-151.53
surprisingly	129.797	04/10	-151.26
delightful	129.407	annoying.	-149.82
8	128.823	badly	-149.17
excellent.	128.662	disappointment	-148.84
captures	128.608	awful	-147.96
excellent	127.284	mildly	-147.29
perfect	126.323	worse	-142.78

# After 1000 iterations

Positive Words	Weight	Negative Words	Weight
wonderfully	189.82	poorly	-275.35
7	166.855	worst	-267.66
07/10	163.264	waste	-257.02
rare	156.12	awful.	-205.82
refreshing	152.793	fails	-200.23
subtle	148.165	boring	-188.79
perfect.	144.033	disappointing	-182.1
amazing.	139.461	annoying	-175.81
favorite	136.996	lacks	-175.06
noir	136.762	lame	-170.13
highly	136.238	terrible.	-167.1
funniest	135.79	04/10	-155.95
perfect	133.527	annoying.	-152.77
surprisingly	131.942	dull	-152.67
excellent.	131.921	pointless	-152.5
delightful	131.633	disappointment	-151.64
8	131.206	badly	-150.95
captures	130.193	mildly	-149.45
superb	127.372	awful	-149.33
excellent	127.108	weak	-143.98

#### **Code Snippet for Training Perceptron and Averaged Perceptron**

```
def ComputeAverageParameters(self):
    #TODO: Compute average parameters (do this part last)
    self.weight = self.weight - (self.for avg weight / float(self.penalty))
    return
def Train(self, X, Y):
    #TODO: Estimate perceptron parameters
    ite = self.N ITERATIONS
    examples = self.examples
    activation = 0
    weight transpose = np.zeros([X.shape[1],1])
    for i in range(ite) :
        converged = 1
        for j in range(examples):
            term = (X[j].dot(weight transpose))
            activation = 0
            if(term > 0.0):
                activation = 1.0
            elif term < 0.0 :</pre>
                activation =-1.0
            if Y[j] != activation:
                weight_transpose += (Y[j] * X[j].transpose())
                self.for avg weight += Y[j] * self.penalty * X[j]
                converged = 0
            self.penalty += 1
        if converged == 1:
            break
    self.weight = weight transpose.transpose()
    return
```

## **Code Snippet for Predicting**

```
def Predict(self, X):
    #TODO: Implement perceptron classification
    pred_labels = []
    examples = X.shape[0]
    weight_transpose = self.weight.transpose()
    for j in range(examples):
        if (X[j].dot(weight_transpose)) > 0:
            pred_labels.append(1.0)
    else:
        pred_labels.append(-1.0)

return pred_labels
```

# **Conclusion**

From the above results using ALPHA = 10 yields the highest accuracy of about 82% in the Naïve Bayes Classifier. For the perceptron, we notice that the algorithm converges at about 118 iterations indicating that the data is linearly separable. The most positive and negative words also give us a good indication that the algorithm is correctly able to learn positive and negative words present in the reviews. In general, the performance of the average perceptron is higher than Naïve Bayes and is about 87%. We notice in the perceptron that increasing number of iterations does not always improve the test accuracy which is in line with the results of early stopping.