

Overcoming Language Variation in Sentiment Analysis with Social Attention

Yi Yang **Bloomberg LP**

Work performed at Georgia Tech with Jacob Eisenstein.

Bloomberg





"I would like to believe he's sick rather than just mean and evil."





"I would like to believe he's sick rather than just mean and evil."

"You could've been getting down to this **sick** beat."



I am sick and weak



THIS IS SO SICK THANK U





am sick and weak





THIS IS SO SICK THANK U





am sick and weak





THIS IS SO SICK THANK U





ALEX THIS IS SO SICK





am sick and weak





THIS IS SO SICK THANK U





ALEX THIS IS SO SICK





Personalized sentiment analysis

- **Goal**: personalized conditional likelihood, $p(y|\mathbf{x}, a)$.
 - \blacktriangleright x is the text, and a is the author.

Personalized sentiment analysis

Goal: personalized conditional likelihood, $p(y|\mathbf{x}, a)$. \mathbf{x} is the text, and a is the author.









Personalized sentiment analysis

Goal: personalized conditional likelihood, $p(y|\mathbf{x}, a)$. \mathbf{x} is the text, and a is the author.







Problem: we have labeled examples for only a few authors.

Homophily: neighbors have similar properties.

Homophily to the rescue?

Thelwall (2009); AI Zamal et al. (2012)



Homophily: neighbors have similar properties.



Homophily to the rescue?





Thelwall (2009); AI Zamal et al. (2012)



Pilot study: is classifier accu social network?

Pilot study: is classifier accuracy assortative on the Twitter

social network?



Whether a sentiment classifier tends to make consistent predictions for social neighbors.

Pilot study: is classifier accuracy assortative on the Twitter

$$\sum_{j \in G} \delta(y_i = \hat{y}_i) \delta(y_j = \hat{y}_j) \ + \delta(y_i \neq \hat{y}_i) \delta(y_j \neq \hat{y}_j)$$













Node

Personalization by ensemble

K $p(y|\mathbf{x}, a) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Pr(Z_a = k|a, G) \times \underbrace{p(y|\mathbf{x}, Z_a = k)}_{i=1}$ k=1ensemble weights basis models

Personalization by ensemble

Kk=1

Train each basis model with all the labeled data. Employ ConvNets as basis models.



Personalization by ensemble

Kk=1

- Train each basis model with all the labeled data. Employ ConvNets as basis models.
- Apply linguistic homophily:
 - Adopt similar ensemble weights for social neighbors.
 - De-correlate errors made by different basis models.



Network-driven personalization

- For each author, estimate a node embedding V_a (Tang et al., 2015).
- Nodes who share neighbors get similar embeddings.



Network-driven personalization

- For each author, estimate a node embedding v_a (Tang et al., 2015).
- Nodes who share neighbors get similar embeddings.
- Social attention:



$Pr(Z_a = k | a, G) = SoftMax(f(\mathbf{v}_a))$

Learning

Jointly train with cross-entropy loss: T $\ell(\Theta) = -\sum \mathbf{1}[Y^* = t] \log \Pr(Y = t \mid \mathbf{x}, a)$ t=1

Learning

Jointly train with cross-entropy loss: T $\ell(\Theta) = -\sum \mathbf{1}[Y^* = t] \log \Pr(Y = t \mid \mathbf{x}, a)$ t=1

Problem: network information tends to be ignored.

• Jointly train with cross-entr

$$\ell(\Theta) = -\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{1}[Y^* = t] \log \Pr(Y = t)$$

Pre-train basis models with instance-weighted losses: T $\ell_k = -\alpha_{a,k} \sum \mathbf{1}[Y^* = t] \log \Pr(Y = t \mid \mathbf{x}, Z_a = k)$ t=1

Learning

ropy loss:

 $= t \mid \mathbf{x}, a$

Problem: network information tends to be ignored.

Experiments

- SemEval Twitter sentiment analysis data.
 - 18,024 tweets
 - Follow, mention, retweet networks
 - Network expansion



Nakov et al. (2013); Rosenthal et al. (2015); Tang et al. (2012)



- SemEval Twitter sentiment analysis data.
 - 18,024 tweets
 - Follow, mention, retweet networks
 - Network expansion
- Ciao product review sentiment analysis data.
 - 100,000 reviews
 - User trust network

Nakov et al. (2013); Rosenthal et al. (2015); Tang et al. (2012)

Data



Results: SemEval Twitter data

Our implementation

CNN baseline F1: 68.4 Mixture of Random attention experts



Astudillo et al. (2015)



Results: SemEval Twitter data

Our implementation

CNN baseline	+ 0.0	+ 0.1
F1: 68.4	Mixture of	Randor
	experts	attentic



Astudillo et al. (2015)



Results: SemEval Twitter data

Our implementation

CNN baseline	+ 0.0	+ 0.1
F1: 68.4	Mixture of	Randor
	experts	attentic



Astudillo et al. (2015)



Variable sentiment words

More positive

- 1 banging loss fever broken <u>dear like</u> god <u>yeah wow</u> <u>fucking</u>
- 2 chilling cold ill sick suck
- 3 ass damn piss bitch shit
- 4 insane bawling fever weird cry lmao super lol haha hahaha
 5 ruin silly bad boring dreadful *lovatics* wish *beliebers ariana-*

More negative

- satisfy trust wealth strong lmao
- talent honestly voting win clever

ful *lovatics* wish *beliebers arianators kendall*

Results: Ciao review data

CNN baseline + 0.0F1: 74.4 Mixture of Random attention experts

Social attention

Tang et al. (2012)



Results: Ciao review data



+ 1.0

Random attention

Social attention

Tang et al. (2012)



Results: Ciao review data



Tang et al. (2012)



- Language variation poses challenges in sentiment analysis.
- Linguistic homopily alleviates the data sparsity issue for estimating personalized models.
- Social attention mechanism significantly improves accuracy.
- The socially-infused ensemble architecture can be applied to other tasks such as tagging, parsing, etc.

Conclusions and future work