

Utilizing Crowd Intelligence for Online Detection of Emotional Distress

Master's Thesis Presentation

Siddhant Goel

Advisor: Han Xiao

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Claudia Eckert

Chair for IT Security
Technische Universität München

March 12, 2013

Outline

- Introduction
 - Backdrop
 - Motivation
 - Problem Definition
- Theoretical Background
 - Machine Learning and Text Classification
 - Support Vector Machines
 - Ensemble Learning methods
- Experimental Results
 - Experiments
 - Results
- Conclusion and Future Work

Introduction

Backdrop

- Millions of people die every year because of suicide
- Most people are between 15 to 29 years old
- Rise of social media - Twitter, Facebook, Reddit, Wordpress
- Reddit - “/r/happy”¹ and “/r/suicidewatch”²
- People are not afraid of posting their inner feelings on the web

¹<http://www.reddit.com/r/happy>

²<http://www.reddit.com/r/suicidewatch>

Backdrop




Figure : Happiness on Twitter as a function of time

- 46 billion words collected over 33 months
- Negativity on Twitter has been on the rise
- Words include *death*, *hate*, and even *suicide*

Motivation



Figure : Last tweet of Twitter user “@CapitalSTEEZ_”³

- Some accounts have lots of followers, some don't
- Lives can be saved if there is a surveillance system of suicide
- Public sentiment information available on the web + No analysis possible
= Disconnect

³http://twitter.com/CapitalSteez_

Problem Definition

- Evaluate machine learning algorithms that can be used for identifying depressed emotions in pieces of text
- Build a web based system that can
 - tap into crowd intelligence to incrementally improve the classifiers
 - detect content on the web that indicates that its author is depressed or suicidal

Theoretical Background

Machine Learning

- Algorithms that can learn from data
- Construct a model from a given dataset, and then perform the required task on another dataset
- **Supervised learning** - Train the models on the training data, and predict on the test data
- **Unsupervised learning** - No distinction between training and test data

Text Classification

- Subset of machine learning algorithms (we focus on supervised text classification)
- Given some pieces of text, put future pieces of text into two or more categories
- Dataset $(\mathbf{x}_n, y_n)_{n=1}^N$ containing N instances
- Each instance (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n) is of the form $[(x_{n,1}, x_{n,2}, \dots, x_{n,D}), y_n]$
- Supervised learning - calculate y_n of test data given information about y_n from training data
- Unsupervised learning - calculate y_n given only information about \mathbf{x}_n

Support Vector Machines

- Fairly popular class of algorithms in binary classification
- Given training data in D dimensional space, find a decision boundary (hyperplane) that separates the two classes
- Maximize the distance of the boundary from any data point
- Decision function depends on a (usually small) subset of points called support vectors
- Distance function between two points is calculated using a kernel function

Linear kernel SVM





Figure : Classifying two subsets of a dataset using a linear kernel SVM

Kernel functions



$$x_3 = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$$




Figure : Dataset in 2D (cannot be classified using a linear kernel SVM)

Figure : Dataset transformed to 3D

Ensemble Learning

- Class of machine learning methods that combine models to obtain better predictions
- Performance not guaranteed to be better than constituent classifiers
- Ensemble methods still usually outperform individual classifiers
- Soft requirement - underlying models should be diverse
- Various strategies to combine models - *select best*, *voting*, *boosting*, *stacking*

Bagging

- Combine M classifiers to form a single classifier
- To predict, obtain predictions from all constituent classifiers, and take majority vote
- Requirement - classifiers should change for even small changes in underlying classifiers
- Two main approaches for training individual classifiers
 - Sample split - different samples for different classifiers
 - Feature split - different features for different classifiers

Boosting

- Assign each sample a weight value (same for all samples in the beginning)
- Train M classifiers successively
- Each classifier focuses more on samples that the previous classifier classified incorrectly
- For each classifier, calculate ϵ (measure of error) and α (decreases with ϵ)
- Final prediction = $\text{sign}(\sum_{m=1}^M \alpha_m y_m(\mathbf{x}_n))$

Stacking




Figure : Prediction using a stacking ensemble

- Outputs from first layer form the input for second layer
- Layer-1 classifiers can be trained using bootstrapping or selecting random features

Experimental Results

Experiments

Evaluation of algorithms


Approach

- Implement all the models in MATLAB
- Extract n-grams (size upto 2) out of the Kaggle dataset
- Use tf-idf information as feature values
- Input matrix - 6182 rows and 23175 columns
- **SVM, Bagging, Boosting, Stacking** - obtain accuracy (10-fold cross validation) against number of samples
- **SVM** - Growth of number of support vectors with the number of samples
- **Bagging** - Accuracy against number of underlying models
- Start with 100 samples, and continue adding 100 samples on each iteration until no more samples are left

Results

Evaluation of algorithms

Support Vector Machines




- Linear kernel accuracy - 79.02%
- Polynomial/RBF/Sigmoid kernel accuracy - 34.39%
- Having more features implies no need for a kernel function

Figure : Accuracy v/s Number of instances

Evaluation of algorithms

Support Vector Machines




- 100 samples - 90% support vectors
- 6182 samples - 60% support vectors
- Less support vectors implies that the classification is easy

Figure : Number of support vectors v/s
Number of instances

Evaluation of algorithms

Bagging




- 9 linear kernel SVMs underneath
- Performance ultimately governed by how SVMs perform
- Average accuracy on all 6182 samples = 79.65%

Figure : Accuracy v/s Number of instances

Evaluation of algorithms

Bagging




- Accuracy “stabilizes” slowly with the number of models
- Each model is assigned a random subset of samples
- Increase in number of models *implies* Subsets overlap *implies* Performance stabilizes

Figure : Accuracy v/s Number of models

Evaluation of algorithms

Boosting




- 9 linear kernel SVMs trained successively on each iteration
- Average accuracy = 72.84%

Figure : Accuracy v/s Number of instances

Evaluation of algorithms

Stacking



- 9 linear kernel SVMs at first level
- Average accuracy = 79.48%

Figure : Accuracy v/s Number of instances

Web based system

Approach

- Implement all the models in Python, and web interface in Django
- No training data available => build our own
- Training data
 - comes from Reddit
 - “/r/happy” - users posts their happy moments
 - “/r/suicidewatch” - users post when they want to commit suicide
 - pull 500 stories from each, every day
- Prediction data
 - should be the general sentiment of the overall public
 - hence, Twitter
 - pull 100 tweets every 3 hours

Web based system

Data consolidation frequencies

Task	Frequency
Fetch 1000 posts from Reddit	24 hours
Fetch 100 tweets from Twitter	3 hours
Re-assign labels to previous tweets and update statistics	24 hours

Web based system

Architecture




Figure : Landing page

- two sections - *Ratings* and *Monitoring*
- *Ratings* - used to build the training data
- *Monitoring* - used to monitor the status of the models and check distressed tweets

Web based system

Ratings module




Figure : Landing page of the Ratings module

- taps into crowd intelligence
- automated scripts fetch 1000 posts from Reddit every day
- displays the first unlabelled post
- users can then assign labels to stories
- this builds the training data

Web based system

Monitoring module





Figure : Landing page of the Monitoring module

- displays the top 5 tweets that were classified as depressed by all the classifiers
- links for checking the status of individual classifiers
- two types of phrases -
 - **Direct** - *“thoughts of suicide make me happy”, “I have a rope around my neck”*
 - **Indirect** - *“I don’t know anything anymore”, “Need someone to talk to”*

Web based system

Monitoring module



For each classifier -

- displays the overall level of distress (in %) on Twitter
- each bubble displays
 - the number of stories that were found depressed on that particular day
 - the first tweet from that day which was depressed (no confidence values, yet)

Figure : Statistics of the bagging classifier

Conclusion and Future Work

Conclusion

- An evaluation of Support Vector Machines and Ensemble Learning methods (Bagging/Boosting/Stacking) in the domain of text classification
- Bagging outperformed Stacking outperformed SVM outperformed Boosting
- A web based system that can detect emotional distress on Twitter
- No labels implies qualitative evaluation is difficult except observation
- Observed results seem to be reasonable

Future Work

- Fetch more tweets
- Increase the crowd intelligence involved
- Relabelling process (decreases wastage of resources)
- Select best performing model
- Store confidence values

Thank you!

Questions?