

Sentiment Analysis



Sentiment Analysis

*this movie was **great!** would **watch again** **+***

*the movie was **gross** and **overwrought**, but I **liked** it **+***

*this movie was **not** really very **enjoyable** **-***

- ▶ Bag-of-words doesn't seem sufficient (discourse structure, negation)
- ▶ There are some ways around this: extract bigram feature for "*not X*" for all X following the *not*



Pang et al. (2002)

	Features	# of features	frequency or presence?	NB	ME	SVM
(1)	unigrams	16165	freq.	78.7	N/A	72.8
(2)	unigrams	”	pres.	81.0	80.4	82.9
(3)	unigrams+bigrams	32330	pres.	80.6	80.8	82.7
(4)	bigrams	16165	pres.	77.3	77.4	77.1
(5)	unigrams+POS	16695	pres.	81.5	80.4	81.9
(6)	adjectives	2633	pres.	77.0	77.7	75.1
(7)	top 2633 unigrams	2633	pres.	80.3	81.0	81.4
(8)	unigrams+position	22430	pres.	81.0	80.1	81.6

► Simple feature sets can do pretty well!



Wang and Manning (2012)

► 10 years later
— revisited
Naive Bayes
vs. other
methods

Method	RT-s	MPQA
MNB-uni	77.9	85.3
MNB-bi	79.0	86.3
SVM-uni	76.2	86.1
SVM-bi	77.7	<u>86.7</u>
NBSVM-uni	78.1	85.3
NBSVM-bi	<u>79.4</u>	86.3
RAE	76.8	85.7
RAE-pretrain	77.7	86.4
Voting-w/Rev.	63.1	81.7
Rule	62.9	81.8
BoF-noDic.	75.7	81.8
BoF-w/Rev.	76.4	84.1
Tree-CRF	77.3	86.1
Kim (2014) CNNs	81.5	89.5

← Naive Bayes is doing well!

Ng and Jordan (2001) — NB can be better for small data

← Before neural nets had taken off — results weren't that great