Twitter as a Corpus for Sentiment Analysis and Opinion Mining

Conference Paper · January 2010

Source: DBLP

2 authors, including:

Patrick Paroubek
French National Centre for Scientific Research
104 PUBLICATIONS **2,631** CITATIONS

Twitter as a Corpus for Sentiment Analysis and Opinion Mining

Alexander Pak, Patrick Paroubek

Université de Paris-Sud, Laboratoire LIMSI-CNRS, Bâtiment 508,
F-91405 Orsay Cedex, France
alexpak@limsi.fr, pap@limsi.fr

Abstract

Microblogging today has become a very popular communication tool among Internet users. Millions of users share opinions on different aspects of life everyday. Therefore microblogging web-sites are rich sources of data for opinion mining and sentiment analysis. Because microblogging has appeared relatively recently, there are a few research works that were devoted to this topic. In our paper, we focus on using Twitter, the most popular microblogging platform, for the task of sentiment analysis. We show how to automatically collect a corpus for sentiment analysis and opinion mining purposes. We perform linguistic analysis of the collected corpus and explain discovered phenomena. Using the corpus, we build a sentiment classifier, that is able to determine positive, negative and neutral sentiments for a document. Experimental evaluations show that our proposed techniques are efficient and performs better than previously proposed methods. In our research, we worked with English, however, the proposed technique can be used with any other language.

1. Introduction

Microblogging today has become a very popular communication tool among Internet users. Millions of messages are appearing daily in popular web-sites that provide services for microblogging such as Twitter[1], Tumblr[2], Facebook[3]. Authors of those messages write about their life, share opinions on variety of topics and discuss current issues. Because of a free format of messages and an easy accessibility of microblogging platforms, Internet users tend to shift from traditional communication tools (such as traditional blogs or mailing lists) to microblogging services. As more and more users post about products and services they use, or express their political and religious views, microblogging web-sites become valuable sources of people's opinions and sentiments. Such data can be efficiently used for marketing or social studies.

We use a dataset formed of collected messages from Twitter. Twitter contains a very large number of very short messages created by the users of this microblogging platform. The contents of the messages vary from personal thoughts to public statements. Table 1 shows examples of typical posts from Twitter.

As the audience of microblogging platforms and services grows everyday, data from these sources can be used in opinion mining and sentiment analysis tasks. For example, manufacturing companies may be interested in the following questions:

- What do people think about our product (service, company etc.)?

- How positive (or negative) are people about our product?

- What would people prefer our product to be like?

Political parties may be interested to know if people support their program or not. Social organizations may ask people's opinion on current debates. All this information can be obtained from microblogging services, as their users post everyday what they like/dislike, and their opinions on many aspects of their life.

In our paper, we study how microblogging can be used for sentiment analysis purposes. We show how to use Twitter as a corpus for sentiment analysis and opinion mining. We use microblogging and more particularly Twitter for the following reasons:

- Microblogging platforms are used by different people to express their opinion about different topics, thus it is a valuable source of people's opinions.

- Twitter contains an enormous number of text posts and it grows every day. The collected corpus can be arbitrarily large.

- Twitter's audience varies from regular users to celebrities, company representatives, politicians[4], and even country presidents. Therefore, it is possible to collect text posts of users from different social and interests groups.

- Twitter's audience is represented by users from many countries[5]. Although users from U.S. are prevailing, it is possible to collect data in different languages.

We collected a corpus of 300000 text posts from Twitter evenly split automatically between three sets of texts:

1. texts containing positive emotions, such as happiness, amusement or joy

2. texts containing negative emotions, such as sadness, anger or disappointment

3. objective texts that only state a fact or do not express any emotions

We perform a linguistic analysis of our corpus and we show how to build a sentiment classifier that uses the collected corpus as training data.

---

[1]http://twitter.com
[2]http://tumblr.com
[3]http://facebook.com

[4]http://www.sysomos.com/insidetwitter/politics
[5]http://www.sysomos.com/insidetwitter/#countries

funkeybrewster: @redeyechicago I think Obama's visit might've sealed the victory for Chicago. Hopefully the games mean good things for the city.
vcurve: I like how Google celebrates little things like this: Google.co.jp honors Confucius Birthday — Japan Probe
mattfellows: Hai world. I hate faulty hardware on remote systems where politics prevents you from moving software to less faulty systems.
brroooklyn: I love the sound my iPod makes when I shake to shuffle it. Boo bee boo
MeganWilloughby: Such a Disney buff. Just found out about the new Alice in Wonderland movie. Official trailer: http://bit.ly/131Js0 I love the Cheshire Cat.

Table 1: Examples of Twitter posts with expressed users' opinions

1.1. Contributions

The contributions of our paper are as follows:

1. We present a method to collect a corpus with positive and negative sentiments, and a corpus of objective texts. Our method allows to collect negative and positive sentiments such that no human effort is needed for classifying the documents. Objective texts are also collected automatically. The size of the collected corpora can be arbitrarily large.

2. We perform statistical linguistic analysis of the collected corpus.

3. We use the collected corpora to build a sentiment classification system for microblogging.

4. We conduct experimental evaluations on a set of real microblogging posts to prove that our presented technique is efficient and performs better than previously proposed methods.

1.2. Organizations

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss prior works on opinion mining and sentiment analysis and their application for blogging and microblogging. In Section 3, we describe the process of collecting the corpora. We describe the linguistic analysis of the obtained corpus in Section 4 and show how to train a sentiment classifier and our experimental evaluations in Section 5. Finally, we conclude about our work in Section 6.

2. Related work

With the population of blogs and social networks, opinion mining and sentiment analysis became a field of interest for many researches. A very broad overview of the existing work was presented in (Pang and Lee, 2008). In their survey, the authors describe existing techniques and approaches for an opinion-oriented information retrieval. However, not many researches in opinion mining considered blogs and even much less addressed microblogging. In (Yang et al., 2007), the authors use web-blogs to construct a corpora for sentiment analysis and use emotion icons assigned to blog posts as indicators of users' mood. The authors applied SVM and CRF learners to classify sentiments at the sentence level and then investigated several strategies to determine the overall sentiment of the document. As the result, the winning strategy is defined by considering the sentiment of the last sentence of the document as the sentiment at the document level.

J. Read in (Read, 2005) used emoticons such as ":-)" and ":-(" to form a training set for the sentiment classification. For this purpose, the author collected texts containing emoticons from Usenet newsgroups. The dataset was divided into "positive" (texts with happy emoticons) and "negative" (texts with sad or angry emoticons) samples. Emoticons-trained classifiers: SVM and Naïve Bayes, were able to obtain up to 70% of an accuracy on the test set.

In (Go et al., 2009), authors used Twitter to collect training data and then to perform a sentiment search. The approach is similar to (Read, 2005). The authors construct corpora by using emoticons to obtain "positive" and "negative" samples, and then use various classifiers. The best result was obtained by the Naïve Bayes classifier with a mutual information measure for feature selection. The authors were able to obtain up to 81% of accuracy on their test set. However, the method showed a bad performance with three classes ("negative", "positive" and "neutral").

3. Corpus collection

Using Twitter API we collected a corpus of text posts and formed a dataset of three classes: positive sentiments, negative sentiments, and a set of objective texts (no sentiments). To collect negative and positive sentiments, we followed the same procedure as in (Read, 2005; Go et al., 2009). We queried Twitter for two types of emoticons:

- Happy emoticons: ":-)", ":)", "=)", ":D" etc.

- Sad emoticons: ":-(", ":(", "=(", ";(" etc.

The two types of collected corpora will be used to train a classifier to recognize positive and negative sentiments.

In order to collect a corpus of objective posts, we retrieved text messages from Twitter accounts of popular newspapers and magazines , such as "New York Times", "Washington Posts" etc. We queried accounts of 44 newspapers to collect a training set of objective texts.

Because each message cannot exceed 140 characters by the rules of the microblogging platform, it is usually composed of a single sentence. Therefore, we assume that an emoticon within a message represents an emotion for the whole message and all the words of the message are related to this emotion. In our research, we use English language. However, our method can be adapted easily to other languages since Twitter API allows to specify the language of the retrieved posts.

Figure 1: The distribution of the word frequencies follows Zipf's law

4. Corpus analysis

First, we checked the distribution of words frequencies in the corpus. A plot of word frequencies is presented in Figure 1. As we can see from the plot, the distribution of word frequencies follows Zipf's law, which confirms a proper characteristic of the collected corpus.

Next, we used TreeTagger (Schmid, 1994) for English to tag all the posts in the corpus. We are interested in a difference of tags distributions between sets of texts (positive, negative, neutral). To perform a pairwise comparison of tags distributions, we calculated the following value for each tag and two sets (i.e. positive and negative posts):

$$P_{1,2}^{T} = \frac{N_1^T - N_2^T}{N_1^T + N_2^T} \qquad (1)$$

where N_1^T and N_2^T are numbers of tag T occurrences in the first and second sets respectively.

4.1. Subjective vs. objective

Figure 2 shows values of P^T across all the tags where set 1 is a subjective set (mixture of the positive and the negative sets) and set 2 is an objective set (the neutral set). From the graph we can observe that POS tags are not distributed evenly in two sets, and therefore can be used as indicators of a set. For example, utterances (UH) can be a strong indicator of a subjective text. Next, we explain the observed phenomena.

We can observe that objective texts tend to contain more common and proper nouns (NPS, NP, NNS), while authors of subjective texts use more often personal pronouns (PP, PP$).

Authors of subjective texts usually describe themselves (first person) or address the audience (second person) (VBP), while verbs in objective texts are usually in the third person (VBZ). As for the tense, subjective texts tend to use simple past tense (VBD) instead of the past participle (VBN). Also a base form of verbs (VB) is used often in subjective texts, which is explained by the frequent use of modal verbs (MD).

In the graph, we see that superlative adjectives (JJS) are used more often for expressing emotions and opinions, and comparative adjectives (JJR) are used for stating facts and providing information. Adverbs (RB) are mostly used in subjective texts to give an emotional color to a verb.

Figure 3 shows values of P^T for negative and positive sets. As we see from the graph, a positive set has a prevailing number of possessive wh-pronoun 'whose' (WH$), which is unexpected. However, if we look in the corpus, we discover that Twitter users tend to use 'whose' as a slang version of 'who is'. For example:

> dinner & jack o'lantern spectacular tonight! :)
> *whose* ready for some pumpkins??

Another indicator of a positive text is superlative adverbs (RBS), such as "most" and "best". Positive texts are also characterized by the use of possessive ending (POS).

As opposite to the positive set, the negative set contains more often verbs in the past tense (VBN, VBD), because many authors express their negative sentiments about their loss or disappointment. Here is an example of the most frequent verbs: "missed", "bored", "gone", "lost", "stuck", "taken".

We have compared distributions of POS-tags in two parts of the same sets (e.g. a half of the positive set with another half of the positive set). The proximity of the obtained distributions allows us to conclude on the homogeneity of the corpus.

5. Training the classifier

5.1. Feature extraction

The collected dataset is used to extract features that will be used to train our sentiment classifier. We used the presence of an n-gram as a binary feature, while for general information retrieval purposes, the frequency of a keyword's occurrence is a more suitable feature, since the overall sentiment may not necessarily be indicated through the repeated use of keywords. Pang et al. have obtained better results by using a term presence rather than its frequency (Pang et al., 2002).

We have experimented with unigrams, bigrams, and trigrams. Pang et al. (Pang et al., 2002) reported that unigrams outperform bigrams when performing the sentiment classification of movie reviews, and Dave et al. (Dave et al., 2003) have obtained contrary results: bigrams and trigrams worked better for the product-review polarity classification. We tried to determine the best settings for the microblogging data. On one hand high-order n-grams, such as trigrams, should better capture patterns of sentiments expressions. On the other hand, unigrams should provide a good coverage of the data. The process of obtaining n-grams from a Twitter post is as follows:

1. Filtering – we remove URL links (e.g. http://example.com), Twitter user names (e.g. @alex – with symbol @ indicating a user name), Twitter special words (such as "RT"[6]), and emoticons.

---

[6]An abbreviation for retweet, which means citation or reposting of a message

Verbs in base form are used with modal verbs to express emotions

Subjective texts contain more personal pronouns

Utterances are strong indicators of a subjective text

Superlative adjectives are used more for expressing emotions and opinions, comparative adjectives are used for stating facts

Verbs in objective texts are usually in the third person and used more often in past participle

Authors of subjective texts usually write about themselves (verbs in first person) or address the audience (second person) and tend to use simple past tense

Objective texts contain more common and proper nouns

Figure 2: P^T values for objective vs. subjective

Superlative adverbs and possessive endings may indicate positive texts

Negative texts contain verbs in past tense to express loss or regrets

Twitter users use 'whose' as a slang for 'who is'

Figure 3: P^T values for positive vs. negative

2. Tokenization – we segment text by splitting it by spaces and punctuation marks, and form a bag of words. However, we make sure that short forms such as "don't", "I'll", "she'd" will remain as one word.

3. Removing stopwords – we remove articles ("a", "an", "the") from the bag of words.

4. Constructing n-grams – we make a set of n-grams out of consecutive words. A negation (such as "no" and "not") is attached to a word which precedes it or follows it. For example, a sentence "I do not like fish" will form two bigrams: "I do+not", "do+not like", "not+like fish". Such a procedure allows to improve the accuracy of the classification since the negation plays a special role in an opinion and sentiment expression(Wilson et al., 2005).

5.2. Classifier

We build a sentiment classifier using the multinomial Naïve Bayes classifier. We also tried SVM (Alpaydin, 2004) and CRF (Lafferty et al., 2001), however the Naïve Bayes classifier yielded the best results.

Naïve Bayes classifier is based on Bayes' theorem(Anthony J, 2007).

$$P(s|M) = \frac{P(s) \cdot P(M|s)}{P(M)} \qquad (2)$$

where s is a sentiment, M is a Twitter message. Because, we have equal sets of positive, negative and neutral messages, we simplify the equation:

$$P(s|M) = \frac{P(M|s)}{P(M)} \qquad (3)$$

$$P(s|M) \sim P(M|s) \qquad (4)$$

We train two Bayes classifiers, which use different features: presence of n-grams and part-of-speech distribution information. N-gram based classifier uses the presence of an n-gram in the post as a binary feature. The classifier based

on POS distribution estimates probability of POS-tags presence within different sets of texts and uses it to calculate posterior probability. Although, POS is dependent on the n-grams, we make an assumption of conditional independence of n-gram features and POS information for the calculation simplicity:

$$P(s|M) \sim P(G|s) \cdot P(T|S) \qquad (5)$$

where G is a set of n-grams representing the message, T is a set of POS-tags of the message. We assume that n-grams are conditionally independent:

$$P(G|s) = \prod_{g \in G} P(g|s) \qquad (6)$$

Similarly, we assume that POS-tags are conditionally independent:

$$P(T|s) = \prod_{t \in G} P(t|s) \qquad (7)$$

$$P(s|M) \sim \prod_{g \in G} P(g|s) \cdot \prod_{t \in G} P(t|s) \qquad (8)$$

Finally, we calculate log-likelihood of each sentiment:

$$L(s|M) = \sum_{g \in G} log(P(g|s)) + \sum_{t \in G} log(P(t|s)) \qquad (9)$$

5.3. Increasing accuracy

To increase the accuracy of the classification, we should discard common n-grams, i.e. n-grams that do not strongly indicate any sentiment nor indicate objectivity of a sentence. Such n-grams appear evenly in all datasets. To discriminate common n-grams, we introduced two strategies. The first strategy is based on computing the entropy of a probability distribution of the appearance of an n-gram in different datasets (different sentiments). According to the formula of Shannon entropy(Shannon and Weaver, 1963):

$$entropy(g) = H(p(S|g)) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} p(S_i|g) \log p(S_i|g) \qquad (10)$$

where N is the number of sentiments (in our research, N = 3). The high value of the entropy indicates that a distribution of the appearance of an n-gram in different sentiment datasets is close to uniform. Therefore, such an n-gram does not contribute much in the classification. A low value of the entropy on the contrary indicates that an n-gram appears in some of sentiment datasets more often than in others and therefore can highlight a sentiment (or objectivity). Thus, to increase the accuracy of the sentiment classification, we would like to use only n-grams with low entropy values. We can control the accuracy by putting a threshold value θ, filtering out n-grams with entropy above θ. This would lower the recall, since we reduce the number of used features. However our concern is focused on high accuracy, because the size of the microblogging data is very large. For the second strategy, we introduced a term "salience" which is calculated for each n-gram:

$$salience(g) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} 1 - \frac{\min(P(g|s_i), P(g|s_j))}{\max(P(g|s_i), P(g|s_j))} \qquad (11)$$

N-gram	Salience	N-gram	Entropy
so sad	0.975	clean me	0.082
miss my	0.972	page news	0.108
so sorry	0.962	charged in	0.116
love your	0.961	so sad	0.12
i'm sorry	0.96	police say	0.127
sad i	0.959	man charged	0.138
i hate	0.959	vital signs	0.142
lost my	0.959	arrested in	0.144
have great	0.958	boulder county	0.156
i miss	0.957	most viewed	0.158
gonna miss	0.956	officials say	0.168
wishing i	0.955	man accused	0.178
miss him	0.954	pleads guilty	0.18
can't sleep	0.954	guilty to	0.181

Table 2: N-grams with high values of salience (left) and low values of entropy (right)

The introduced measure takes a value between 0 and 1. The low value indicates a low salience of the n-gram, and such an n-gram should be discriminated. Same as with the entropy, we can control the performance of the system by tuning the threshold value θ.
In Table 5.3. examples of n-grams with low entropy values and high salience values are presented.
Using the entropy and salience, we obtain the final equation of a sentiment's log-likelihood:

$$L(s|M) = \sum_{g \in G} log(P(g|s)) \cdot if(f(g) > \theta, 1, 0)$$
$$+ \sum_{t \in G} log(P(t|s)) \qquad (12)$$

where $f(g)$ is the entropy or the salience of an n-gram, and θ is a threshold value.

5.4. Data and methodology

We have tested our classifier on a set of real Twitter posts hand-annotated. We used the same evaluation set as in (Go et al., 2009). The characteristics of the dataset are presented in Table 5.4..

Sentiment	Number of samples
Positive	108
Negative	75
Neutral	33
Total	216

Table 3: The characteristics of the evaluation dataset

We compute accuracy (Manning and Schütze, 1999) of the classifier on the whole evaluation dataset, i.e.:

$$accuracy = \frac{N(\text{correct classifications})}{N(\text{all classifications})} \qquad (13)$$

We measure the accuracy across the classifier's decision (Adda et al., 1998):

$$decision = \frac{N(\text{retrieved documents})}{N(\text{all documents})} \qquad (14)$$

Figure 4: The comparison of the classification accuracy when using unigrams, bigrams, and trigrams

Figure 6: The impact of increasing the dataset size on the $F_{0.5}$-measure


Figure 5: The impact of using the attachment of negation words

Figure 7: Salience vs. entropy for discriminating common n-grams

The value of the decision shows what part of data was classified by the system.

5.5. Results

First, we have tested the impact of an n-gram order on the classifier's performance. The results of this comparison are presented in Figure 4. As we see from the graph, the best performance is achieved when using bigrams. We explain it as bigrams provide a good balance between a coverage (unigrams) and an ability to capture the sentiment expression patterns (trigrams).

Next, we examine the impact of attaching negation words when forming n-grams. The results are presented in Figure 5.

From the both figures, we see that we can obtain a very high accuracy, although with a low decision value (14). Thus, if we use our classifier for the sentiment search engine, the outputted results will be very accurate.

We have also examined the impact of the dataset size on the performance of the system. To measure the performance, we use F-measure(Manning and Schütze, 1999):

$$F = (1 + \beta^2) \frac{precision \cdot recall}{\beta^2 \cdot recall + recall} \qquad (15)$$

In our evaluations, we replace precision with accuracy (13) and recall with decision (14), because we deal with multiple

classes rather than binary classification:

$$F = (1 + \beta^2)\frac{accuracy \cdot decision}{\beta^2 \cdot accuracy + decision} \quad (16)$$

where $\beta = 0.5$ We do not use any filtering of n-grams in this experiment. The result is presented on Figure 6. As we see from the graph, by increasing the sample size, we improve the performance of the system. However, at a certain point when the dataset is large enough, the improvement may be not achieved by only increasing the size of the training data.

We examined two strategies of filtering out the common n-grams: salience (11) and entropy (10). Figure 7 shows that using the salience provides a better accuracy, therefore the salience discriminates common n-grams better then the entropy.

6. Conclusion

Microblogging nowadays became one of the major types of the communication. A recent research has identified it as online word-of-mouth branding (Jansen et al., 2009). The large amount of information contained in microblogging web-sites makes them an attractive source of data for opinion mining and sentiment analysis.

In our research, we have presented a method for an automatic collection of a corpus that can be used to train a sentiment classifier. We used TreeTagger for POS-tagging and observed the difference in distributions among positive, negative and neutral sets. From the observations we conclude that authors use syntactic structures to describe emotions or state facts. Some POS-tags may be strong indicators of emotional text.

We used the collected corpus to train a sentiment classifier. Our classifier is able to determine positive, negative and neutral sentiments of documents. The classifier is based on the multinomial Naïve Bayes classifier that uses N-gram and POS-tags as features.

As the future work, we plan to collect a multilingual corpus of Twitter data and compare the characteristics of the corpus across different languages. We plan to use the obtained data to build a multilingual sentiment classifier.

7. References

G. Adda, J. Mariani, J. Lecomte, P. Paroubek, and M. Rajman. 1998. The GRACE French part-of-speech tagging evaluation task. In A. Rubio, N. Gallardo, R. Castro, and A. Tejada, editors, *LREC*, volume I, pages 433–441, Granada, May.

Ethem Alpaydin. 2004. *Introduction to Machine Learning (Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning)*. The MIT Press.

Hayter Anthony J. 2007. *Probability and Statistics for Engineers and Scientists*. Duxbury, Belmont, CA, USA.

Kushal Dave, Steve Lawrence, and David M. Pennock. 2003. Mining the peanut gallery: opinion extraction and semantic classification of product reviews. In *WWW '03: Proceedings of the 12th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 519–528, New York, NY, USA. ACM.

Alec Go, Lei Huang, and Richa Bhayani. 2009. Twitter sentiment analysis. Final Projects from CS224N for Spring 2008/2009 at The Stanford Natural Language Processing Group.

Bernard J. Jansen, Mimi Zhang, Kate Sobel, and Abdur Chowdury. 2009. Micro-blogging as online word of mouth branding. In *CHI EA '09: Proceedings of the 27th international conference extended abstracts on Human factors in computing systems*, pages 3859–3864, New York, NY, USA. ACM.

John D. Lafferty, Andrew McCallum, and Fernando C. N. Pereira. 2001. Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. In *ICML '01: Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 282–289, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.

Christopher D. Manning and Hinrich Schütze. 1999. *Foundations of statistical natural language processing*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA.

Bo Pang and Lillian Lee. 2008. Opinion mining and sentiment analysis. *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.*, 2(1-2):1–135.

Bo Pang, Lillian Lee, and Shivakumar Vaithyanathan. 2002. Thumbs up? sentiment classification using machine learning techniques. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 79–86.

Ted Pedersen. 2000. A simple approach to building ensembles of naive bayesian classifiers for word sense disambiguation. In *Proceedings of the 1st North American chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics conference*, pages 63–69, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.

Jonathon Read. 2005. Using emoticons to reduce dependency in machine learning techniques for sentiment classification. In *ACL*. The Association for Computer Linguistics.

Helmut Schmid. 1994. Probabilistic part-of-speech tagging using decision trees. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on New Methods in Language Processing*, pages 44–49.

Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver. 1963. *A Mathematical Theory of Communication*. University of Illinois Press, Champaign, IL, USA.

Theresa Wilson, Janyce Wiebe, and Paul Hoffmann. 2005. Recognizing contextual polarity in phrase-level sentiment analysis. In *HLT '05: Proceedings of the conference on Human Language Technology and Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 347–354, Morristown, NJ, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Changhua Yang, Kevin Hsin-Yih Lin, and Hsin-Hsi Chen. 2007. Emotion classification using web blog corpora. In *WI '07: Proceedings of the IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence*, pages 275–278, Washington, DC, USA. IEEE Computer Society.