

# Big Data and Automated Content Analysis (6EC)

## Week 6: »Supervised Approaches to Text Analysis«

### Monday

---

Anne Kroon

a.c.kroon@uva.nl, @annekroon

October 9, 2023

UvA RM Communication Science

# Today

## Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

You have done it before!

From regression to classification

## Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

One step back: (Traditional) non-SML approaches

Diving into SML

An implementation

Classifiers

Vectorizers

## Summing up

Revisiting the difference between the dictionary approach and the SML



*Everything clear from last week?*

This week, we will get a general overview of working with textual data. Due to a lack of time, I will introduce you to some of the basic concepts, point you to resources, and give you a practical, hands-on introduction.

# Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

---

# Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

---

You have done it before!

- 4

## Regression



## Regression

## Regression

# You have done it before!

## Regression

1. Based on your data, you estimate some regression equation  
$$y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p x_{ip} + \varepsilon_i$$
2. Even if you have some *new unseen data*, you can estimate your expected outcome  $\hat{y}$ !
3. Example: You estimated a regression equation where  $y$  is newspaper reading in days/week:  
$$y = -.8 + .4 \times \text{man} + .08 \times \text{age}$$
4. You could now calculate  $\hat{y}$  for a man of 20 years and a woman of 40 years – *even if no such person exists in your dataset*:

## Regression

- $$\hat{y}_{woman40} = -.8 + .4 \times 0 + .08 \times 40 = 2.4$$

This is  
Supervised Machine Learning!

... but ...

- We will only use *half* (or another fraction) of our data to estimate the model, so that we can use the other half to check if our predictions match the manual coding (“labeled data”, “annotated data” in SML-lingo)
  - e.g., 2000 labeled cases, 1000 for training, 1000 for testing — if successful, run on 100,000 unlabeled cases
- We use many more independent variables (“features”)
- Typically, IVs are word frequencies (often weighted, e.g.  $\text{tf} \times \text{idf}$ ) ( $\Rightarrow$  BOW-representation)







... but ...

- We will only use *half* (or another fraction) of our data to estimate the model, so that we can use the other half to check if our predictions match the manual coding (“labeled data”, “annotated data” in SML-lingo)
  - e.g., 2000 labeled cases, 1000 for training, 1000 for testing — if successful, run on 100,000 unlabeled cases
- We use many more independent variables (“features”)
- Typically, IVs are word frequencies (often weighted, e.g.  $\text{tf} \times \text{idf}$ ) ( $\Rightarrow$  BOW-representation)


# Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

---

From regression to classification

(quite confusingly, even if we use a logistic regression for the latter)

- 7



How many selected  
items are relevant?

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{true positives}}{\text{true positives} + \text{false positives}}$$

How many relevant  
items are selected?

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{true positives}}{\text{true positives} + \text{false negatives}}$$

## Some measures

- Accuracy
- Recall
- Precision
- $F1 = 2 \cdot \frac{\text{precision} \cdot \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}}$
- AUC (Area under curve)  
[0, 1], 0.5 = random  
guessing

# Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

---







## Supervised machine learning

- 10







# Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

---

One step back: (Traditional) non-SML approaches





*What would be the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches from the classification by Boumans and Trilling, 2016 for each of these tasks?*



*Imagine using a dictionary-based (list of keywords, list of regular expressions, or similar) approach to these tasks. How does the design (length, inclusiveness, etc.) of this list influence precision and recall?*



# Dictionary-based approaches for text classification

## good for

- distinct, manifest things  
(names of organizations,  
pronouns, swearwords (?),  
...)
- little room for interpretation/  
misunderstandings etc.
- “must-be-explainable-to-a-  
five-year-old”

## bad for

- latent constructs and  
concepts
- implicit things

Hence, *not* state-of-the-art for

- topics
- frames
- sentiment

# Dictionary-based approaches for text classification

## good for

- distinct, manifest things  
(names of organizations,  
pronouns, swearwords (?),  
...)
- little room for interpretation/  
misunderstandings etc.
- “must-be-explainable-to-a-  
five-year-old”

## bad for

- latent constructs and  
concepts
- implicit things

Hence, *not* state-of-the-art for

- topics
- frames
- sentiment

# Dictionary-based approaches for text classification

## good for

- distinct, manifest things  
(names of organizations,  
pronouns, swearwords (?),  
...)
- little room for interpretation/  
misunderstandings etc.
- “must-be-explainable-to-a-  
five-year-old”

## bad for

- latent constructs and  
concepts
- implicit things

Hence, *not* state-of-the-art for

- topics
- frames
- sentiment



## From dictionary approaches to SML

- Early days of sentiment analysis: list of positive words, list of negative words, count what occurs most
- You can even *buy* lists of words that are meant to measure constructs like “positive emotions” or even “analytic” or “authentic” language use from a psychologist (LIWC, Pennebaker et al., 2007)

## From dictionary approaches to SML

- Early days of sentiment analysis: list of positive words, list of negative words, count what occurs most
- You can even *buy* lists of words that are meant to measure constructs like “positive emotions” or even “analytic” or “authentic” language use from a psychologist (LIWC, Pennebaker et al., 2007)



*What do you think? Can this even work?*

## Bag-of-words dictionary approaches to sentiment analysis

### con

- simplistic assumptions
- e.g., intensifiers cannot be interpreted (“really” in “really good” or “really bad”)
- or, even more important, negations.



# Improving the BOW approach

## Example: Sentistrength (Thelwall et al., 2012)

- $-5 \dots -1$  and  $+1 \dots +5$  instead of positive/negative
- spelling correction
- “booster word list” for strengthening/weakening the effect of the following word
- interpreting repeated letters (“baaaaaad”), CAPITALS and !!!
- idioms
- negation

VADER by Hutto and Gilbert, 2014 works in a similar way. Even though this is much less naïve than LIWC, for instance, the problem remains: Can we construct a dictionary that, *irrespective of the context*, gives us a meaningful estimate of sentiment?

# Improving the BOW approach

## Example: Sentistrength (Thelwall et al., 2012)

- $-5 \dots -1$  and  $+1 \dots +5$  instead of positive/negative
- spelling correction
- “booster word list” for strengthening/weakening the effect of the following word
- interpreting repeated letters (“baaaaaad”), CAPITALS and !!!
- idioms
- negation

VADER by Hutto and Gilbert, 2014 works in a similar way. Even though this is much less naïve than LIWC, for instance, the problem remains: Can we construct a dictionary that, *irrespective of the context*, gives us a meaningful estimate of sentiment?

Such an *off-the-shelf* dictionary does not  
(and probably cannot) exist.

# Boukes et al., 2020: Sentiment analysis of economic news

All tones combined (overall score)					
	F <sub>1</sub>		n (human coding)	precision	recall
Recession	0.26		4640	0.30	0.43
Damstra and Boukes (2018)	0.32		4640	0.52	0.45
LIWC	0.42		4640	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.48</b>
SentiStrength	0.42		4640	0.45	0.45
Pattern	0.41		4640	0.45	0.45
Polyglot	<b>0.43</b>		4640	0.44	0.44
DANEW	<b>0.43</b>		4640	0.46	0.45
Negative Tone					
	F <sub>1</sub>	n (predicted)	n (human coding)	precision	recall
Recession	0.00	6	1524	0.33	0.00
Damstra and Boukes (2018)	0.08	99	1524	<b>0.62</b>	0.04
LIWC	0.29	471	1524	<b>0.62</b>	0.19
SentiStrength	0.39	1158	1524	0.45	0.34
Pattern	0.30	692	1524	0.48	0.22
Polyglot	<b>0.42</b>	1158	1524	0.48	<b>0.37</b>
DANEW	0.36	794	1524	0.52	0.27
Neutral Tone					
	F <sub>1</sub>	n (predicted)	n (human coding)	precision	recall
Recession	<b>0.60</b>	4634	2008	0.43	<b>1.00</b>
Damstra and Boukes (2018)	<b>0.60</b>	4366	2008	0.44	0.96
LIWC	<b>0.60</b>	3750	2008	<b>0.46</b>	0.86
SentiStrength	0.55	3103	2008	0.45	0.70
Pattern	0.56	3260	2008	0.45	0.74
Polyglot	0.47	2231	2008	0.45	0.50
DANEW	0.53	2776	2008	<b>0.46</b>	0.63
Positive tone					
	F <sub>1</sub>	n (predicted)	n (human coding)	precision	recall
Recession	0.00	0	1108	0.00	0.00
Damstra and Boukes (2018)	0.14	175	1108	<b>0.53</b>	0.08
LIWC	0.29	419	1108	0.52	0.20
SentiStrength	0.22	379	1108	0.42	0.14
Pattern	0.30	688	1108	0.39	0.24
Polyglot	<b>0.39</b>	1251	1108	0.37	<b>0.42</b>
DANEW	0.36	1070	1108	0.37	0.35

# Boukes et al., 2020: Sentiment analysis of economic news

**Table A1.** Correlations between sentiment scores using different methods for headlines (above) and full texts (below).

	Headline							
	Manual coding	Recession	D & B	LIWC	SentiStrength	Pattern	Polyglot	DANEW
Manual coding	1.00 ***							
Recession	-	-						
Damstra and Boukes (2018)	0.16 ***	-	1.00 ***					
LIWC	<b>0.30 ***</b>	-	0.16 ***	1.00 ***				
SentiStrength	0.24 ***	-	0.08 **	0.26 ***	1.00 ***			
Pattern	0.22 ***	-	0.00	0.30 ***	0.22 ***	1.00 ***		
Polyglot	0.30 ***	-	0.19 ***	0.32 ***	0.37 ***	0.26 ***	1.00 ***	
DANEW	0.24 ***	-	0.04	<b>0.43 ***</b>	0.33 ***	0.23 ***	0.32 ***	1.00 ***
	Full text							
	Manual coding	Recession	D & B	LIWC	SentiStrength	Pattern	Polyglot	DANEW
Manual coding	1.00 ***							
Recession	-0.06 *	1.00 ***						
Damstra and Boukes (2018)	0.27 ***	-0.16 ***	1.00 ***					
LIWC	0.39 ***	0.02	0.27 ***	1.00 ***				
SentiStrength	0.17 ***	-0.01	0.10 ***	0.18 ***	1.00 ***			
Pattern	0.13 ***	-0.02	0.04	0.28 ***	0.12 ***	1.00 ***		
Polyglot	0.26 ***	0.05	0.17 ***	0.41 ***	0.21 ***	0.30 ***	1.00 ***	
DANEW	0.15 ***	0.06 *	0.05	0.36 ***	0.18 ***	0.29 ***	0.37 ***	1.00 ***

The word "recession" did not occur in headlines of our sample, as such, no correlation coefficient is available for the recession classifier; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .010$ , \*  $p < .05$ .

## Boukes et al., 2020: Sentiment analysis of economic news

- Dictionaries have low agreement with each other, and also with human coders
- Even their own dictionary didn't agree
- **This is not because these dictionaries are particularly bad!**. Main point: For such a complex and context-dependent task, a dictionary is just not the right tool.

## van Atteveldt et al., 2021: Extending Boukes et al., 2020 with SML

“manual coding (using undergraduate students) yields the best results

[...] A good second place is taken by crowd coding [...]

[...] machine learning performs worse than both students' manual coding and crowd coding. Reaching  $\alpha = 0.50$  for deep learning (CNN) and slightly worse for classical machine learning (SVM;  $\alpha = 0.41$ , NB;  $\alpha = 0.40$ ), machine learning still performs significantly better than chance. However, since these results are lower than generally accepted levels of inter-coder reliability [...]

Finally, [...] dictionaries [...] perform worse than the machine learning results and much worse than manual annotation [...] [and] approximate chance agreement”

# Vermeer et al., 2019: Satisfaction with brands

Category	Technique	Accuracy	Precision	Recall
<b>Satisfaction</b> ( <i>N</i> = 854)				
Sentiment analysis	LIWC	0.05	0.06	0.04
	P	0.04	0.04	0.04
	SN	0.07	0.07	0.08
Dictionary-based	D	0.15	0.30	0.10
Machine learning	BNB	0.38	0.44	0.34
	MNB	0.32	0.67	0.21
	LR	0.51	0.38	0.76
	SGD	0.49	0.38	0.69
	SVM	0.52	0.41	0.63
	PA	0.50	0.40	0.68
<b>Neutral</b> ( <i>N</i> = 760)				
Sentiment analysis	LIWC	0.13	0.16	0.10
	P	0.13	0.13	0.14
	SN	0.19	0.16	0.22
Dictionary-based	D	0.14	0.35	0.09
Machine learning	BNB	0.28	0.25	0.32
	MNB	0.15	0.34	0.10
	LR	0.37	0.25	0.74
	SGD	0.33	0.23	0.60
	SVM	0.36	0.24	0.69
	PA	0.34	0.24	0.60
<b>Dissatisfaction</b> ( <i>N</i> = 267)				
Sentiment analysis	LIWC	0.20	0.15	0.29
	P	0.19	0.12	0.40
	SN	0.22	0.14	0.54
Dictionary-based	D	0.09	0.41	0.05
Machine learning	BNB	0.26	0.20	0.40
	MNB	0.25	0.48	0.16
	LR	0.35	0.23	0.77
	SGD	0.39	0.32	0.48
	SVM	0.04	0.02	1.00
	PA	0.35	0.23	0.71

Note. LIWC Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count; P Pattern; SN Sentiment Net; D Dictionary-based; BN Bernoulli Naïve Bayes; MNB Multinomial Naïve Bayes; LR Logistic Regression; SGD Stochastic Gradient Descent; SVM Support Vector Machine; and PA Passive Aggressive. Performance scores  $\geq 0.60$  have been highlighted. Results merely derived from the test set.



SML is no panacea, but the most promising approach to analyzing large quantities of texts. Don't believe off-the-shelf packages that claim to do the work for you. (For small datasets, just do it by hand.)

# Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

---

Diving into SML

# SML to code frames and topics

Some work by Burscher et al., 2014 and Burscher et al., 2015

- Humans can code generic frames (human-interest, economic, ...)
- Humans can code topics from a pre-defined list
- But it is very hard to formulate an explicit rule (as in: code as 'Human Interest' if regular expression R is matched)

⇒ This is where you need supervised machine learning!

## SML to code frames and topics

Some work by Burscher et al., 2014 and Burscher et al., 2015

- Humans can code generic frames (human-interest, economic, ...)
- Humans can code topics from a pre-defined list
- **But it is very hard to formulate an explicit rule**  
(as in: code as 'Human Interest' if regular expression R is matched)

⇒ This is where you need supervised machine learning!

# SML to code frames and topics

Some work by Burscher et al., 2014 and Burscher et al., 2015

- Humans can code generic frames (human-interest, economic, ...)
- Humans can code topics from a pre-defined list
- **But it is very hard to formulate an explicit rule**  
(as in: code as 'Human Interest' if regular expression R is matched)

⇒ This is where you need supervised machine learning!

TABLE 4  
Classification Accuracy of Frames in Sources Outside the Training Set

	<i>VK/NRC</i> <i>→ Tel</i>	<i>VK/TEL</i> <i>→ NRC</i>	<i>NRC/TEL</i> <i>→ VK</i>
Conflict	.69	.74	.75
Economic Cons.	.88	.86	.86
Human Interest	.69	.71	.67
Morality	.97	.90	.89

*Note.* VK = Volkskrant, NRC = NRC/Handelsblad, TEL = Telegraaf




FIGURE 1 Relationship between classification accuracy and number of training documents.

FIGURE 1

Learning Curves for the Classification of News Articles and PQs




TABLE 1

## F1 Scores for SML-Based Issue Coding in News Articles and PQs

Issue	News Articles			PQs	
		All Words	Lead Only		All Words
Features	N	F1	F1	N	F1
Macroeconomics	413	.54	.63	172	.46
Civil rights and minority issues	327	.34	.28	192	.53
Health	444	.70	.71	520	.81
Agriculture	114	.72	.76	159	.66
Labor and employment	217	.43	.49	174	.58
Education	188	.79	.71	229	.78
Environment	152	.34	.44	237	.59
Energy	81	.35	.59	67	.66
Immigration and integration	150	.50	.57	239	.78
Transportation	416	.58	.67	306	.81
Law and crime	1198	.70	.69	685	.77
Social welfare	115	.33	.34	214	.54
Community development and housing	113	.45	.44	136	.72
Banking, finance, and commerce	622	.62	.67	188	.58
Defense	393	.59	.55	196	.71
Science, technology, and communication	426	.64	.59	57	.53
International affairs and foreign aid	1,106	.70	.64	352	.65
Government operations	1,301	.71	.72	276	.48
Other issue	3,322	.84	.80	360	.51
Total	11,089	.71	.68	4,759	.69

NOTE: The F1 score is equal to the harmonic mean of recall and precision. Recall is the fraction of relevant documents that are retrieved, and precision is the fraction of retrieved documents that are relevant.



## What does this mean for our research?

It we have 2,000 documents with manually coded frames and topics. . .

- we can use them to train a SML classifier
- which can code an unlimited number of new documents
- with an acceptable accuracy (at least for some of them)

Some easier tasks even need only 500 training documents, see Hopkins and King, 2010.

## What does this mean for our research?

It we have 2,000 documents with manually coded frames and topics. . .

- we can use them to train a SML classifier
- which can code an unlimited number of new documents
- with an acceptable accuracy (at least for some of them)

Some easier tasks even need only 500 training documents, see Hopkins and King, 2010.

# Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

---

An implementation

# An implementation

Let's say we have two list of tuples with movie reviews and their rating:

```
1 reviews_train = ["This is a great movie", "Bad movie", ... ...]
2 labels_train = [1,-1, ...]
```

And a second dataset with an identical structure:

```
1 reviews_test = ["Not that good", "Nice film", ... ...]
2 labels_text = [-1,1, .....]
```

Both are drawn from the same population, it is pure chance whether a specific review is on the one list or the other.

Based on an example from <http://blog.dataquest.io/blog/naive-bayes-movies/>

# Training a Naïve Bayes Classifier

```
1  from sklearn.naive_bayes import MultinomialNB
2  from sklearn.feature_extraction.text import CountVectorizer
3  from sklearn import metrics
4
5  # This is just an efficient way of computing word counts
6  vectorizer = CountVectorizer(stop_words='english')
7  features_train = vectorizer.fit_transform(reviews_train)
8  features_test = vectorizer.transform(reviews_test)
9
10 # Fit a naive bayes model to the training data.
11 nb = MultinomialNB()
12 nb.fit(features_train, labels_train)
13
14 # Now we can use the model to predict classifications for our test
15 ↪ features.
16 predictions = nb.predict(features_test)
17
18 print(f"Precision:\t{metrics.precision_score(labels_test, predictions,
19 ↪ pos_label=1, labels = [-1,1])}")
20 print(f"Recall:\t{metrics.recall_score(labels_test, predictions,
21 ↪ pos_label=1, labels = [-1,1])}")
```

# And it works!

Using 50,000 IMDB movies that are classified as either negative or positive,

- I created a list with 25,000 training tuples and another one with 25,000 test tuples and
- trained a classifier
- with precision and recall values  $> .80$

Dataset obtained from <http://ai.stanford.edu/~amaas/data/sentiment>, Maas, A.L., Daly, R.E., Pham, P.T., Huang, D., Ng, A.Y., & Potts, C. (2011). Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis. *49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2011)*

## Playing around with new data

```
1 newdata=vectorizer.transform(["What a crappy movie! It sucks!", "This  
  ↳ is awesome. I liked this movie a lot, fantastic actors","I would  
  ↳ not recommend it to anyone.", "Enjoyed it a lot"])  
2 predictions = nb.predict(newdata)  
3 print(predictions)
```

This returns, as you would expect and hope:

```
1 [-1  1 -1  1]
```

## But we can do even better

We can use different vectorizers and different classifiers.



# Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

---

## Classifiers

# Different classifiers

Typical options in a nutshell:

- Naïve Bayes
- Logistic Regression
- Support Vector Machine (SVM/SVC)
- Random forests

# Supervised Machine Learning for Text Classification

---

Vectorizers

1. CountVectorizer (=simple word counts)
2. TfidfVectorizer (word counts ("term frequency") weighted by number of documents in which the word occurs at all ("inverse document frequency"))

## 1 CountVectorizer

## 1 CountVectorizer

## 35

- $$tfidf_{t,d} = tf_{t,d} \cdot idf_t$$

$$idf_t = \log \frac{N}{n_t}$$

where  $N$  is the total number of documents and  $n_t$  is the number of documents containing term  $t$

## Different vectorizer options

- Preprocessing (e.g., stopwords removal)
- Remove words below a specific threshold (“occurring in less than  $n = 5$  documents”)  $\Rightarrow$  spelling mistakes etc.
- Remove words above a specific threshold (“occurring in more than 50% of all documents”)  $\Rightarrow$  de-facto stopwords
- Not only to improve prediction, but also performance (can reduce number of features by a huge amount)



## Which one would you (not) use for which purpose?

NB with Count

```
precision
```

recall

positive reviews:

0.87

0.77

negative reviews:

0.79

0.88

NB with TfIdf

```
precision
```

recall

positive reviews:

0.87

0.78

negative reviews:

0.80

0.88

## LogReg with Count

```
precision
```

recall

positive reviews:

0.87

0.85

negative reviews:

0.85

0.87

LogReg with TfIdf

```
precision
```

recall

positive reviews:

0.89

0.88

negative reviews:

0.88

0.89

## Summing up

---

## Summing up

---

Revisiting the difference between the dictionary approach and the SML

## What is our fitted classifier again?

Essentially, just a formula

$$p = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \dots + \beta_n x_n)}}$$

where  $\beta_0$  is an intercept<sup>1</sup>,  $\beta_1$  a coefficient for the frequency (or tf-idf score) of some word,  $\beta_2$  a coefficient some other word.

If our fitted *vectorizer* contains 5,000 words, we thus have 5,001 coefficients.

(for logistic regression in this case, but same argument applies to other classifiers as well)

<sup>1</sup>Machine Learning people sometimes call the intercept “bias” (yes, I know, that’s confusing)



*But isn't that then essentially very much like a dictionary, except that the words have different weights?*

In some sense, yes.

- But we don't pretend that we can construct the dictionary *a priori*.
- It's specifically tailored to our use-case.
- The weights are *really* essential here.



## 41

It is a rare and fine spectacle, an allegory of death and transfiguration that is neither preachy nor mawkish, a work of mature and courageous insight, northfork avoids arthouse distinction by refusing to belong to a kind. unlike the most memorable and accomplished film to impose an obvious comparison, wim wenders' 1987 wings of desire (der himmel über berlin), it sustains an ambivalence in a narrative spectrum spanning from the mundane to the supernatural. this story of earthly and celestial eminent domains in the american west withholds the fairytale literalness that marked its german predecessor in the ad hoc genre of angels shedding their wings with obsequious sentimentalism. its celestial transcendence, be it inspired by doleful faith or impelled by a fever dream, never parts ways with crud and rot. this firm grounding redounds to great credit for writers and directors mark and michael polish.



# ELI5

- Inspecting *all* coefficients of a ML model usually doesn't make much sense
- But that does not mean that we cannot understand how the model makes its predictions
- We can look at the most important coefficients
- We can look which words in a given text contributed most to its classification

## But have we solved all problems of dictionaries?

No.

For instance, the negation and/or intensifier problem.

Possible approaches

- $n$ -grams as features
- preprocessing (?)
- deep learning
- ...

⇒ But ultimately, it's just an empirical question how big the problem is!

## But have we solved all problems of dictionaries?

No.

For instance, the negation and/or intensifier problem.

Possible approaches

- $n$ -grams as features
- preprocessing (?)
- deep learning
- ...

⇒ But ultimately, it's just an empirical question how big the problem is!

## Summing up

---

A note on the input data



- It does not matter *how* you

- typical techniques:

- Reading text f

## Looking forward: Beyond classic SML

Note that classic SML is still based on word frequencies with weights (and hence cannot solve all problems we started off with). State-of-the art approaches like deep learning and transformers address this issue – but that's for another time.





*Any questions?*

## Next steps

---

I prepared exercises to work on *during* the  
Thursday meeting (alone or in teams):

[https://github.com/uvacw/teaching-bdaca/blob/  
main/6ec-course/week07/exercises/](https://github.com/uvacw/teaching-bdaca/blob/main/6ec-course/week07/exercises/)

Next monday: time for your individual  
questions about the final project. Sign up  
via Canvas!

# References

---



Boukes, M., van de Velde, B., Araujo, T., & Vliegenthart, R. (2020). What's the Tone? Easy Doesn't Do It: Analyzing Performance and Agreement Between Off-the-Shelf Sentiment Analysis Tools. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 14(2), 83–104.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2019.1671966>



Boumans, J. W., & Trilling, D. (2016). Taking stock of the toolkit: An overview of relevant automated content analysis approaches and techniques for digital journalism scholars. *Digital Journalism*, 4(1), 8–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2015.1096598>



Burscher, B., Odijk, D., Vliegenthart, R., de Rijke, M., & de Vreese, C. H. (2014). Teaching the computer to code frames in news: Comparing two supervised machine learning approaches to frame analysis. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 8(3), 190–206.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2014.937527>



Burscher, B., Vliegenthart, R., & De Vreese, C. H. (2015). Using supervised machine learning to code policy issues: Can classifiers generalize across contexts? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 659(1), 122–131.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716215569441>



Hopkins, D. J., & King, G. (2010). A method of automated nonparametric content analysis for social science. *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(1), 229–247.



Hutto, C. J., & Gilbert, E. (2014). Vader: A parsimonious rule-based model for sentiment analysis of social media text. *Eighth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.



Pennebaker, J. W., Booth, R. J., & Francis, M. E. (2007). Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count: LIWC.



Thelwall, M., Buckley, K., & Paltoglou, G. (2012). Sentiment strength detection for the social web. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(1), 163–173.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21662>



van Atteveldt, W., van der Velden, M. A., & Boukes, M. (2021). The Validity of Sentiment Analysis: Comparing Manual Annotation, Crowd-Coding, Dictionary Approaches, and Machine Learning Algorithms. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 00(00), 1–20.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2020.1869198>



Vermeer, S., Araujo, T., Bernritter, S. F., & van Noort, G. (2019). Seeing the wood for the trees: How machine learning can help firms in identifying relevant electronic word-of-mouth in social media. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 36(3), 492–508.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2019.01.010>