Twitter Sentiment Analysis

Shikha Jain, Rashi Shrishrimal, Itisha Rajat Dewan



1. Introduction

With the enormous increase in web technologies, number of people expressing their views and opinions via web are increasing. This information is very useful for businesses, governments and individuals. With over 500+ million Tweets (short text messages) per day, Twitter is becoming a major source of information. Twitter is a micro-blogging site, which is popular because of its short text messages popularly known as Tweets. Tweets have a limit of 140 characters. Twitter has a user base of 240+ million active users and

thus is a useful source of information. Users often discuss on current affairs and share their personals views on various subjects via tweets. Out of all the popular social medias like Facebook, Google+, Myspace and Twitter, we choose Twitter because of the following reasons:

- 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, and even country presidents. Therefore, it is possible to collect text posts of users from different social and interests groups.
- Tweets are small in length, thus less ambiguous
- Tweets are unbiased in nature

We build models for two classification tasks: a 3-way classification of tweets into **positive, negative** and **neutral** classes. We experiment with the baseline model and feature based model. We do an incremental analysis of the features.

2. Timeline

The entire timeline was divided into two phases. The first phase comprised of creating a sentiment analysis tool based on unigrams only with various features. In the second phase, the leftover features were implemented and then the already unigram-feature was modified to check whether the performance upgrades or not. The entire project was successfully completed and the code for it can be found on GitHub. A report corresponding to the project was also hosted, and a video was also made.

3. Dataset

Twitter is a social networking that allows users to post real time messages, called tweets. Tweets are short messages, restricted to 140 characters in length. Due to the nature of this microblogging service, people use acronyms, make spelling mistakes, use emotions

and other characters that express special meanings. Following is a brief terminology associated with tweets.

- Target: Users of Twitter use the @ symbol to refer to other users on the microblog. Referring to other users in this manner automatically alerts them.
- Hashtags: Users usually use hashtags to mark topics. This is primarily done to increase the visibility of their tweets.
- Emoticons: These are facial expressions: pictorially represented using punctuation and letters; they express the user's mood.

The dataset consists of 8222 manually annotated tweets and was tested by using cross validation techniques.

4. Resources and libraries

Language used: Python

In this work we use following external resources:

- emoticons.py a library with function for assigning polarity to the emoticons from Christopher Potts' tokenizing script.
- Sentiment lexicon dictionary mpqa lexicon, etc.
- AFINN data

Tools / libraries used

- nltk (tokenize, sentiwordnet, pos_tag, treebank, etc)
- sklearn (svm and naive bayes)
- numpy
- Scikit, sklearn classification report

5. Feature Generation

Data was cleaned by removing those tweets which were not in english. It was then tokenized into words in order to create various features. Lemmatization ,stop words

removal from the tweets and Replacement of the acronyms with their full-forms by looking up at the acronyms dictionary was used in phase 1 but removed in phase 2 due to poor accuracy.

Each tweet was represented as a feature vector made up of the following groups of features:

- word n-grams: presence or absence of contiguous sequences of 1, 2, 3, and 4 tokens;
- 2. non-contiguous ngrams (ngrams with one token replaced by *);
- 3. character n-grams: presence or absence of contiguous sequences of 3, 4, and 5 characters;
- 4. all-caps: the number of words with all characters in upper-case;
- 5. POS: the number of occurrences of each part-of-speech tag;
- 6. hashtags: the number of hashtags
- 7. Punctuation: the number of contiguous sequences of exclamation marks, question marks, and both exclamation and question marks; whether the last token contains an exclamation or question mark;
- 8. emoticons: The polarity of an emoticon was determined with a regular expression adopted from Christopher Potts' tokenizing script: presence or absence of positive and negative emoticons at any position in the tweet;
- 9. whether the last token is a positive or negative emoticon;
- 10. elongated words: the number of words with one character repeated more than two times, for example, yaaaaaaaaaay';
- 11. ends with one of the punctuation marks: ? , !, ', ", etc.
- 12. A negated context affects the n-gram and lexicon features: we add NEG' suffix to each word following the negation word ('perfect' becomes 'perfect NEG'). The 'NEG' suffix is also added to polarity and emotion features ('POLARITY positive' becomes 'POLARITY positive NEG'). The list of negation words was adopted from Christopher Potts' sentiment tutorial.

Number of tokens	16469
------------------	-------

Number of stop words	3280
Number of English words	7867
Number of punctuation marks	2110
Number of capitalized words	941
Number of twitter tags	3547
Number of exclamation marks	2307
Number of negations	1817
Number of other tokens	2108

6. Classification

Phase 1

- 1. Gaussian Naive Bayes
- 2. Support Vector Machine with Polynomial kernel function with degree 2
- 3. Support Vector Machine with linear kernel

Classifier was modelled on the dataset. Tweets were preprocessed and passed onto a NLTK POS tagger. Features mentioned above from features 4 - 12 were calculated based on AFINN resources and sentiwordnet model of nltk. The features were then passed on to Gaussian Naive Bayes and Linear SVM classifier using 5 - fold cross validation.

Phase 2

4. Support Vector Machine with linear kernel and increased features

Features mentioned in the above section were used. External emoticons' library was used in order to identify the polarity of the sentiment. Also, external sentiment lexicons were used in order to identify the polarity of the words. The linear kernel and

the value for the parameter C = 0.005 were chosen by 5-fold cross-validation on the training data.

7. Results

Accuracy for Phase 1 for 5-fold cross validation

<u>Linear Support Vector Machine Classification</u>

[58.02421 55.67212 60.123121 57.12312 59.8901]

Support Vector Machine with Polynomial kernel function with degree 2

[68.1289 69.2267 67.54231 68.3941 69.4294]

Maximum accuracy: 69.227

Phase 2 for 9-fold cross validation

Confusion matrix

```
[[2679 380 6]
[ 21 3926 1]
[ 128 376 705]]
```

Classification report

	precision	recall	f1-score	support	
positive	0.99	0.58	0.73	1209	
neutral	0.84	0.99	0.91	3948	
negative	0.95	0.87	0.91	3065	
avg / total	0.90	0.89	0.88	8222	

Maximum accuracy: 90

9 - Cross fold Validation

Confusion Ma /usr/local/l ction instead	lib/python2.7 ad. To find to recationWarn 0] 0] 03	/dist-pac			
	precision	recall	f1-score	support	
positive	1.00	0.61	0.76	178	
neutral	0.83	1.00	0.91	452	
negative	0.93	0.88	0.90	370	
avg / total	0.90	0.88	0.88	1000	
Cross Valida Confusion Ma [[314 43 [2 486 [17 53 8 Classificati	1] 0] 34]]	3			
	precision	recall	f1-score	support	
positive	0.99	0.55	0.70	154	
neutral	0.84	1.00	0.91	488	
negative	0.94	0.88	0.91	358	
avg / total	0.90	0.88	0.88	1000	
Confusion Ma [[260 49 [4 545	0] 0] 37]]		f1-score	support	
7000000200200	Si Caracana				
positive	1.00	0.61	0.76	142	
neutral	0.86	0.99	0.92	549	
negative	0.94	0.84	0.89	309	
avg / total	0.90	0.89	0.89	1000	

```
Cross Validation fold - 8
Confusion Matrix
[[366 42 1]
[ 3 426 0]
[ 18 51 93]]
Classification Report
           precision recall f1-score support
  positive
               0.99
                         0.57
                                  0.73
                                           162
   neutral
               0.82
                        0.99
                                  0.90
                                           429
  negative
                         0.89
                                  0.92
               0.95
                                            409
avg / total 0.90 0.89
                                 0.88
                                           1000
```

Confusion Ma	1] 0] 8]]	Asso		
	precision	recall	f1-score	support
positive	0.99	0.58	0.73	151
neutral	0.82	1.00	0.90	430
negative	0.96	0.90	0.93	419
avg / total	0.91	0.89	0.89	1000

ositive	Gas by my house	hit \$3	positive	Gas by my ho	use hit \$
negative	Theo Walcott is	still	negative	Theo Walcott	is still
negative	its not that I'	m a GSP	positive	its not that	I'm a GS
negative	Iranian general	says I	negative	Iranian gene	ral says
positive	with J Davlar 1	1th. Ma	positive	with J Davla	r 11th. M
negative	Talking about A	CT's &a	<pre>post tive</pre>	Talking abou	t ACT's &
neutral Why is	"Happy Valentine	s Day"	positive	Why is "Happ	y Valenti
negative	They may have a	SuperB	negative	They may hav	e a Super
neutral Im bri	nging the monster	load o	neutral Im b	ringing the mons	ter load
	software, retail	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH		e software, reta	
	@oluoch @victor			@oluoch @vic	The state of the s
	rire Nadal confirm	and the second s		ewire Nadal conf	
•	@MsSheLahY I di			@MsSheLahY I	
	p005 @addicted2ha			oup005 @addicted	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH
	US delisting MKO			n US delisting M	ALTERNATION OF THE PARTY OF THE
	Good Morning Be			Good Morning	
	: light-moderate r	1 10 27		ct light-moderat	
	One ticket left	Secretary section		One ticket l	
	AFC away fans o		The second secon	AFC away fan	CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE
	Why is it so ha			Why is it so	100
	of the NLCS and			1 of the NLCS a	
	rJavier the heat			vorJavier the he	
true_data	1,1	Тор	out/train0	1,1	Тор

8. Conclusion

We implemented a variety of features based on surface form and lexical categories. The sentiment lexicon features (both manually created and externally generated) along with ngram features (both word and character ngrams) led to the most gain in performance.

We manually investigated the phrases or messages which were wrongly labelled by the system. We saw that the label and the phrase/message are quite ambiguous in nature. For example, big enough maybe does not give any positive sense. Similarly the message Desperation Day (February 13th) the most well known day in all mens life. is sarcastic in nature. Thus annotation error and sarcasm present in tweets leads to error propagation. Also, the training set is small. We feel that improving the size of the training set and incorporating sarcasm detection will push the accuracy.

Some examples of wrongly labelled tweets:

Tweets	Label
I'm bringing the monster load of candy tomorrow,I just hope it doesn't get all squished	Positive
Never start working on your dreams and goals tomorrowtomorrow never comesif it means anything to U, ACT NOW!	Positive
My teachers call themselves givng us candywasn't even the GOOD stuff. I might go to Walmart or CVS tomorrow	Negative

9. References

- 1. http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/S14-2077
- 2. http://www.cs.columbia.edu/~julia/papers/Agarwaletal11.pdf
- 3. http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/S15-2078
- 4. http://research.microsoft.com/pubs/241894/main.pdf
- 5. http://www.qcri.com/app/media/2015