Crossing Media Streams with Sentiment: Domain Adaptation in Blogs, Reviews, and Twitter



Yelena Mejova, Padmini Srinivasan University of Iowa

June 6, 2012 ICWSM

digg SHARE	S SHARE	CS SHARE
SHARE	•• SHARE	t SHARE
SHARE	You Tube SHARE	V SHARE
SHARE	SHARE	SHARE
I SHARE	SHARE	in Share
SHARE	f SHARE	SHARE
SHARE	SHARE	SHARE
PIANO	Be SHARE	SHARE
SHARE	SHARE	SIFIARE

ICWSM chatter

backchan.nl

1m

3m

4m

5m

Social grooming and task completion views of social networks in the same day. Where is the balance?

"Context collapse", when social circles collide. Worse for high "self-monitors" (Snyder, 1974), a.k.a. social chameleons.

There is no delete on the Internet! Your information still exists in a cache or an archive....

twitter



Simon Lindgren @simon_lindgren Oversharing on the one hand. Privacy concerns on the other. What is the motivation behind not sharing? #icwsm Expand

					5
0	• 11	27			
-		160	а.		
1.		110		2.0	l
	2.53				

Dr Sina Samangooei @sinjax 1m Reason I never use geolocated services on social networks. When it matters, battery life often matters more :-) #icwsm Expand



Simon Lindgren @simon_lindgren 2m don't disturb my circles! on boundary preservation and location sharing in social media (Xinru Page ics.uci.edu/~xpage/ at #icwsm) Expand



arie Boran @pixievondust

Great talk by pricole_ellison on Facebook, privacy and social capital, #icwsm Expand



Armando Alves @armandoalves

Challenge: How can we design social web services to maximize social capital while maintaining privacy #icwsm Expand



UX Feeder @UXfeeder

Delicious: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Weblogs and Social Media: bit.ly/LkFa7A [Research] Expand



Love this the from @munmun10: How would review ratings, particularly of deceptive reviews differ for systems driven by review incentive? E.g. eBay

Quite interesting talk by Song Feng. Recently we Japanese encountered a similar problem in a kind of Michelin guide called Tabelog, which led to losing the trust of many users. From this viewpoint, we hope this work well organized :)

google+





Questions

- Does sentiment on a topic differ between social media sources?
- To what extent can an SA classifier developed on one social medium can be transferred to another?



Why?

 Is one stream indicative of large picture? Unlikely



• Can we utilize information across streams?

Contributions

- Create a multi-source, multi-topic dataset
- Compare POS, NEG, MIX, NEU sentiments
- Cross-source adaptation experiments:
 - Single-source
 - Multiple-source
 - Mixed models
 - Voting models

Gathering Data

• Streams: Twitter, Blogs, Reviews

* Most popular

Topic Categories	Initial Topic Source
movies	IMDB
musical albums	Amazon
computer games	Metacritic
smart phones	CNet
restaurants	Yelp

For each stream: Starting from the top, for each topic: If # of returned results < 50 → discard topic, else keep topic If # of returned results > 100 → select 100 randomly Until each stream has min 500 documents retrieved

Gathering Data

Topic Categories	Reviews	Twitter	Blogs				
movies	IMDB	Searched using	Results from a				
musical albums	Amazon	Twitter Search API,	Google Blog Search				
computer games	Amazon	fewer than 10	heuristically				
smartphones	CNet	characters in	extracted, min				
restaurants	Yelp	length	length of 100 chars				

tag density – proportion of HTML tags of N consecutive tokens

Gathering Data



Labeling

- Twitter & Blogs
- Quality control
 - Obvious question
 - Enter first word of last tweet
- Majority out of 3
 - Topicality:
 - Yes, No, Can't Tell
 - Sentiment:
 - Positive, Negative, Mixed, None, Can't Tell



					Blogs				
Category	Total	Topical	Not top.	Other	Pos	Neg	Mix	None	Oth
Movies	423	184(44)	196(46)	43(10)	87 (47)	12(7)	29(16)	46(25)	10(5)
Music	462	243(53)	160(35)	59(12)	154(63)	8 (3)	19 (8)	51(21)	11(5)
Games	525	285(54)	187(36)	53(10)	154(54)	20(7)	32(11)	60(21)	19(7)
Phones	427	261(61)	136(32)	30(7)	130(50)	17(7)	33(13)	60(23)	21(8)
Rest-nts	355	138(39)	172(49)	45(12)	96(70)	2(1)	17(12)	15(11)	8(6)
Total	2192	1111(51)	851 (39)	230(10)	621(56)	59(5)	130(12)	232(21)	69(6)
					Twitter				
Category	Total	Topical	Not top.	Other	Pos	Neg	Mix	None	Oth
Movies	770	612(80)	126(16)	32(4)	182(30)	41(7)	16(3)	319(52)	54(9)
Music	740	731 (99)	3(0)	6(1)	263(36)	10(1)	10(1)	397(54)	51(7)
Games	495	473 (95)	14(3)	8(2)	128(27)	26(6)	42(9)	231 (49)	46(10)
Phones	482	479(99)	1(0)	2(1)	187(39)	99(21)	29(6)	142(30)	22(5)
Rest-nts	566	545 (96)	9(2)	12(2)	268(49)	14(3)	32(6)	200(37)	31(6)
Total	3053	2840 (93)	153(5)	60(2)	1028(36)	190(7)	129(5)	1289(45)	204(7)
					Reviews				
Category	Total	Topical	Not top.	Other	Pos	Neg	Mix	None	Oth
Movies	800	800(100)	_	_	612(77)	91(11)	97(12)	_	_
Music	772	772(100)	_	_	627(81)	84(11)	61(8)	_	_
Games	617	617(100)	_	_	504(82)	63(10)	50(8)	_	_
Phones	500	500(100)	_	_	316(63)	96(19)	88(18)	_	_
Rest-nts	900	900(100)	_	_	715(78)	70(8)	115(13)	_	_
Total	3589	3589(100)	_	_	2774(77)	404 (11)	411 (12)	_	_

number of documents (percentage)

all streams favor positive sentiment

				Blogs]
Total	Topical	Not top.	Other	Pos	Neg	Mix	None	Oth	1
423	184(44)	196(46)	43 (10)	87(47)	12 (7)	29 (16)	46(25)	10(5)	1
462	243(53)	160(35)	59(12)	154(63)	8 (3)	19 (8)	51(21)	11(5)	
525	285(54)	187(36)	53(10)	154(54)	20 (7)	32(11)	60(21)	19(7)	
427	261(61)	136(32)	30(7)	139(50)	17(7)	33 (13)	60(23)	21(8)	
35 <mark>5</mark>	138(39)	-172(49)	45(12)	96 (70)	2(1)	17(12)	15(11)	8 (6)	
2192	Blogs have	more (39)	223(10)	621(56)	59(5)	130(12)	232(21)	69(6)	1
r	nived senti	iment docs		Twitter					1
Total	Topical	Not top.	Other	Pos	Neg	Mix	None	Oth	1
7702	ibout movi	es126 (16)	32(4)	182(30)	41(7)	16 (3)	319(52)	54(9)	1
740	731 (99)	3 (0)	6 (1)	263(36)	10(1)	10(1)	397(54)	51(7)	
495	473(95)	14(3)	8(2)	128(27)	26(6)	42(9)	231(49)	46 (10)	
482	479(99)	1(0)	2(1)	187 (39)	99 (21)	29(6)	142(30)	22(5)	
566	545 (96)	9(2)	12(2)	268(49)	14(3)	32(6)	200 (37)	31(6)	
3053	Dhonoch	153(5)	60(2)	1028(36)	190(7)	129(5)	1289(45)	204(7)	1
	FIIUTIES II	ave unusua		Reviews					1
Total	negative #	# of docs in	$^{\rm O}$ ther	Pos	Neg	Mix	None	Oth	
800	Twitter &	Reviews	—	612(77)	91(11)	97(12)	Twitter cor	ntains tv	vic
772	772 (100)		—	627(81)	84(11)	61(8)	as many de	hcs with	n
617	617(100)	—	_	504 (82)	63 (10)	50 (8)			
500	500 (100)	_	_	316 (63)	96 (19)	88 (18)	sentiment	as blogs	5
900	900 (100)	_	_	715(78)	70 (8)	115 (13)	—	_	
3589	3589 (100)) –	_	2774(77)	404 (11)	411 (12)	—	_	1
	Total 423 462 525 427 355 219 70 70 70 70 70 70 495 482 566 3053 70 495 482 566 3053 70 495 482 566 3053 70 70 71 617 500 900 3589	Total Topical 423 184 (44) 462 243 (53) 525 285 (54) 427 261 (61) 355 138 (39) 219 Blogs have mixed sent 77 about movi 74 73 (95) 482 479 (99) 566 545 (96) 3053 Phones have Total negative for a sent 800 Twitter & a sent 772 617 617 617 (100) 500 500 (100) 900 900 (100) 3589 3589 (100	TotalTopicalNot top. 423 184 (44) 196 (46) 462 243 (53) 160 (35) 525 285 (54) 187 (36) 427 261 (61) 136 (32) 355 138 (39) 172 (49) 219 Blogs have moremixed sentiment docs 77 about movies 77 $about$ movies 74 3.0 495 473 (95) 14 (3) 482 479 (99) 1 (0) 566 545 (96) 9 (2) 3053 Phones have unusuaTotalnegative # of docs in 800 Twitter & Reviews 772 617 617 (100) 617 617 (100) $ 500$ 500 (100) $ 900$ 900 (100) $ 3589$ 3589 (100) $-$	TotalTopicalNot top.Other 423 184 (44) 196 (46) 43 (10) 462 243 (53) 160 (35) 59 (12) 525 285 (54) 187 (36) 53 (10) 427 261 (61) 136 (32) 30 (7) 355 138 (39) 172 (49) 45 (12) 219 Blogs have more 26 (10)mixed sentiment docs 71 Tot 71 6 (1) 495 473 (95) 14 (3) 8 (2) 482 479 (99) 1 (0) 2 (1) 566 545 (96) 9 (2) 12 (2) 3053 Phones have unusual (2) Total $negative \#$ of docs inther 800 Twitter & Reviews $ 772$ $ 617$ 617 (100) $ 900$ 900 (100) $ 3589$ 3589 (100)	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$

number of documents (percentage)





Blogs



Reviews



Twitter

















Sentiment in SM Streams is **Different**

Sentiment Score: % positive - % negative

		all docs			subjective docs		
	B/T	B/R	R/T	B/T	B/R	R/T	
movies	30.7	30.1	40.7	28.3	25.1	17.3	
music	26.2	24.3	38.2	19.7	27.7	20.8	
games	27.9	22.6	50.5	22.9	17.2	25.9	
phones	24.7	19.3	25.1	35.7	30.1	20.0	
rests	19.9	11.6	23.0	24.8	14.7	13.5	
all average	25.8	21.5	35.6	25.6	22.3	19.1	
all STD	13.2	16.3	19.9	17.0	15.0	16.8	

average difference between sentiment score for a topic

There are substantial differences between sentiments in these streams ICWSM 2012

Cross-Stream Adaptation

- Lingpipe logistic regression classifier
- Two tasks: detect NEG, detect POS
- 1,2,3-grams



Standard: (native model)

Adaptation:

(foreign model)

			Accuracy			Target F-score		
Task	Categ.	Target	Blogs	Reviews	Twitter	Blogs	Reviews	Twitter
POS	Games	Blogs	0.631	0.652†	0.543	0.763	0.824†	0.627
		Reviews	0.788	0.897	0.865	0.880	0.948	0.927
		Twitter	0.528	0.365	0.709	0.520*	0.646*	0.608*
	Movies	Blogs	0.655	0.638*	0.516*	0.783	0.790*	0.568
		Reviews	0.731	0.883	0.759*	0.844	0.941	0.861*
		Twitter	0.534	0.367	0.705	0.439	0.612*	0.581
	Music	Blogs	0.762	0.708	0.754*	0.857	0.848*	0.844*
		Reviews	0.856*	0.900	0.878	0.923*	0.949	0.937
		Twitter	0.670	0.380	0.787	0.558*	0.668*	0.714
	Phones	Blogs	0.635	0.608*	0.414	0.748	0.792*	0.410
		Reviews	0.769	0.815	0.279	0.869	0.905	0.465
		Twitter	0.570*	0.513	0.610	0.531*	0.637†	0.561
	Rest-nts	Blogs	0.800	0.814*	0.814*	0.893	0.905*	0.896*
		Reviews	0.882*	0.923	0.917*	0.938*	0.961	0.958*
		Twitter	0.548	0.539	0.696	0.651*	0.753*	0.741
NEG	Games	Blogs	0.815	0.794*	0.805*	0.302	0.140*	0.126*
		Reviews	0.783	0.814	0.809*	0.103	0.275	0.037
		Twitter	0.721	0.838*	0.859	0.181	0.119	0.383
	Movies	Blogs	0.777	0.672	0.783*	0.096	0.240†	0.179*
		Reviews	0.736	0.802	0.761*	0.192*	0.483	0.236*
		Twitter	0.844	0.800	0.905	0.282*	0.185	0.356
	Music	Blogs	0.888	0.810	0.884*	0.185	0.088*	0.000*
		Reviews	0.796	0.828	0.811	0.148	0.435	0.000
		Twitter	0.953	0.775	0.978	0.000*	0.152*	0.333
	Phones	Blogs	0.775	0.689	0.814†	0.038	0.250*	0.197*
		Reviews	0.616	0.698	0.622	0.141	0.513	0.294
		Twitter	0.637*	0.578	0.704	0.226*	0.440*	0.288
	Rest-nts	Blogs	0.866	0.837*	0.859*	0.222	0.000*	0.000*
		Reviews	0.764*	0.802	0.797*	0.186*	0.354	0.116*
		Twitter	0.863	0.874*	0.920	0.000	0.129*	0.418

<u>underlined</u> – native **bold** – best * - same as best (p<0.01) dagger – better than native

- Native classifiers perform the best
- Many foreign classifiers perform as well as native
- Some foreign classifiers outperform native

Adapting from a single stream

		Accuracy		F-sc	core	Either
Source	Target	NEG	POS	NEG	POS	All
Blogs	Blogs	4	3	3	1	7
	Reviews	1	2	2	2	4
	Twitter	1	1	3	4	7
Reviews	Blogs	2	4	5	5	10
	Reviews	5	5	5	5	10
	Twitter	2	0	3	5	9
Twitter	Blogs	5	3	5	2	8
	Reviews	3	2	2	2	5
	Twitter	5	5	4	3	10
	Best possible	5	5	5	5	10

best or same as best classifiers

Reviews > Twitter > Blogs

Adapting from multiple streams

- Two-source mixed model
- Three-source mixed model
- Three-source voting model

Mixed Model

train one model on documents from several sources



Voting Model

train several models, each from different source



Adapting from multiple streams

		Accuracy		F-score		Either
Source Model	Target	NEG	POS	NEG	POS	All
Mixed $R + T$	Blogs	3	5	5	5	10
Mixed B + T	Reviews	1	0	2	0	2
Mixed B + R	Twitter	3	2	4	4	6
Mixed all	Blogs	5	5	5	4	10
Mixed all	Reviews	5	4	5	5	10
Mixed all	Twitter	5	3	5	1	8
Voting all	Blogs	4	5	5	4	10
Voting all	Reviews	5	3	4	4	9
Voting all	Twitter	5	5	2	5	10
	Best possible	5	5	5	5	10

number of runs as good as native

Mixed == Voting

Topic-independent adaptation

			Accuracy							
		Single-source			Mi					
Classifier	Target	Blogs	Reviews	Twitter	2 source	3 source	Voting			
NEG	Blogs Reviews Twitter	$\frac{0.817}{0.662} \\ 0.791$	$\frac{0.732}{0.768}\\\overline{0.762}$	$\frac{0.773}{0.642}\\ \frac{0.862}{0.862}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.788 \\ 0.636 \\ 0.816 \end{array}$	0.801* 0.735 0.883†	0.804^{*} 0.715 0.852^{*}			
POS	Blogs Reviews Twitter	$ \begin{array}{r} 0.628 \\ \overline{0.790} \\ 0.620 \end{array} $	$\frac{0.683^{\dagger}}{0.881}$	0.623* 0.873* 0.692	0.660^{*} 0.821 0.631	0.659^* 0.881^* 0.654	0.688† 0.878* 0.655			

			Target F-score							
		Single-source			Mi					
Classifier	Target	Blogs	Reviews	Twitter	2 source	3 source	Voting			
NEG	Blogs	0.232	0.282^{*}	0.325^{+}	0.202^{*}	0.273^{*}	0.256^{*}			
	Reviews	0.230	0.446	0.434^{*}	0.304	0.522^{+}	0.396			
	Twitter	0.141	0.311	0.450	0.251	0.354	0.352			
POS	Blogs	0.743	0.835^{+}	0.721*	0.752^{*}	0.747^{*}	0.811†			
	Reviews	0.880*	0.938	0.934^{*}	0.901	0.939^{*}	0.937^{*}			
	Twitter	0.565^{*}	0.669^{*}	0.668	0.551	0.484	0.652^{*}			

Cross-Topic Adaptation

(not in paper)



- Does not work: native << foreign
- Twitter suffers the most

– Twitter users write differently?

Conclusions

- Streams differ in sentiment
- Cross-stream classification is possible!
- Reviews > Twitter > Blogs
- Combining streams and topics is beneficial



* within the limits of this study

More questions

- Other topical categories
 - Politics
 - Disasters
- Multimedia websites
 - YouTube
 - Flickr
- No popularity bias

2	



Yelena Mejova now Yahoo! Research



Padmini Srinivasan University of Iowa



Adapting from multiple streams



accuracy with 99% confidence intervals