



## NRC Publications Archive Archives des publications du CNRC

### **Sentiment analysis of short informal texts**

Kiritchenko, Svetlana; Zhu, Xiaodan; Mohammad, Saif M.

This publication could be one of several versions: author's original, accepted manuscript or the publisher's version. / La version de cette publication peut être l'une des suivantes : la version prépublication de l'auteur, la version acceptée du manuscrit ou la version de l'éditeur.

For the publisher's version, please access the DOI link below. / Pour consulter la version de l'éditeur, utilisez le lien DOI ci-dessous.

#### **Publisher's version / Version de l'éditeur:**

<https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.4272>

*Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 50, pp. 723-762, 2014-08-01*

#### **NRC Publications Record / Notice d'Archives des publications de CNRC:**

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/view/object/?id=f3c48029-99e0-48c7-9aaf-271e9715465b>

<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/voir/objet/?id=f3c48029-99e0-48c7-9aaf-271e9715465b>

Access and use of this website and the material on it are subject to the Terms and Conditions set forth at

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/copyright>

READ THESE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE USING THIS WEBSITE.

L'accès à ce site Web et l'utilisation de son contenu sont assujettis aux conditions présentées dans le site

<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/droits>

LISEZ CES CONDITIONS ATTENTIVEMENT AVANT D'UTILISER CE SITE WEB.

**Questions?** Contact the NRC Publications Archive team at

PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca. If you wish to email the authors directly, please see the first page of the publication for their contact information.

**Vous avez des questions?** Nous pouvons vous aider. Pour communiquer directement avec un auteur, consultez la première page de la revue dans laquelle son article a été publié afin de trouver ses coordonnées. Si vous n'arrivez pas à les repérer, communiquez avec nous à PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca.



# Sentiment Analysis of Short Informal Texts

**Svetlana Kiritchenko**

SVETLANA.KIRITCHENKO@NRC-CNRC.GC.CA

**Xiaodan Zhu**

XIAODAN.ZHU@NRC-CNRC.GC.CA

**Saif M. Mohammad**

SAIF.MOHAMMAD@NRC-CNRC.GC.CA

*National Research Council Canada*

*1200 Montreal Rd., Ottawa, ON, Canada*

## Abstract

We describe a state-of-the-art sentiment analysis system that detects (a) the sentiment of short informal textual messages such as tweets and SMS (message-level task) and (b) the sentiment of a word or a phrase within a message (term-level task). The system is based on a supervised statistical text classification approach leveraging a variety of surface-form, semantic, and sentiment features. The sentiment features are primarily derived from novel high-coverage tweet-specific sentiment lexicons. These lexicons are automatically generated from tweets with sentiment-word hashtags and from tweets with emoticons. To adequately capture the sentiment of words in negated contexts, a separate sentiment lexicon is generated for negated words.

The system ranked first in the SemEval-2013 shared task ‘Sentiment Analysis in Twitter’ (Task 2), obtaining an F-score of 69.02 in the message-level task and 88.93 in the term-level task. Post-competition improvements boost the performance to an F-score of 70.45 (message-level task) and 89.50 (term-level task). The system also obtains state-of-the-art performance on two additional datasets: the SemEval-2013 SMS test set and a corpus of movie review excerpts. The ablation experiments demonstrate that the use of the automatically generated lexicons results in performance gains of up to 6.5 absolute percentage points.

## 1. Introduction

*Sentiment Analysis* involves determining the evaluative nature of a piece of text. For example, a product review can express a positive, negative, or neutral sentiment (or polarity). Automatically identifying sentiment expressed in text has a number of applications, including tracking sentiment towards products, movies, politicians, etc., improving customer relation models, detecting happiness and well-being, and improving automatic dialogue systems. Over the past decade, there has been a substantial growth in the use of microblogging services such as Twitter and access to mobile phones world-wide. Thus, there is tremendous interest in sentiment analysis of short informal texts, such as tweets and SMS messages, across a variety of domains (e.g., commerce, health, military intelligence, and disaster management).

Short informal textual messages bring in new challenges to sentiment analysis. They are limited in length, usually spanning one sentence or less. They tend to have many misspellings, slang terms, and shortened forms of words. They also have special markers such as hashtags that are used to facilitate search, but can also indicate a topic or sentiment.

This paper describes a state-of-the-art sentiment analysis system addressing two tasks: (a) detecting the sentiment of short informal textual messages (message-level task) and

(b) detecting the sentiment of a word or a phrase within a message (term-level task). The system is based on a supervised statistical text classification approach leveraging a variety of surface-form, semantic, and sentiment features. Given only limited amounts of training data, statistical sentiment analysis systems often benefit from the use of manually or automatically built sentiment lexicons. *Sentiment lexicons* are lists of words (and phrases) with prior associations to positive and negative sentiments. Some lexicons can additionally provide a sentiment score for a term to indicate its strength of evaluative intensity. Higher scores indicate greater intensity. For example, an entry *great* (*positive*, *1.2*) states that the word *great* has positive polarity with the sentiment score of 1.2. An entry *acceptable* (*positive*, *0.1*) specifies that the word *acceptable* has positive polarity and its intensity is lower than that of the word *great*.

In our sentiment analysis system, we utilize three freely available, manually created, general-purpose sentiment lexicons. In addition, we generated two high-coverage tweet-specific sentiment lexicons from about 2.5 million tweets using sentiment markers within them. These lexicons automatically capture many peculiarities of the social media language such as common intentional and unintentional misspellings (e.g., *gr8*, *lovin*, *coul*, *holys\*\*t*), elongations (e.g., *yesssss*, *mmmmmmm*, *uugghh*), and abbreviations (e.g., *lmao*, *wtf*). They also include words that are not usually considered to be expressing sentiment, but that are often associated with positive/negative feelings (e.g., *party*, *birthday*, *homework*).

Sentiment lexicons provide knowledge on *prior* polarity (positive, negative, or neutral) of a word, i.e., its polarity in most contexts. However, in a particular context this prior polarity can change. One such obvious contextual sentiment modifier is negation. In a negated context, many words change their polarity or at least the evaluative intensity. For example, the word *good* is often used to express positive attitude whereas the phrase *not good* is clearly negative. A conventional way of addressing negation in sentiment analysis is to reverse the polarity of a word, i.e. change a word’s sentiment score from  $s$  to  $-s$  (Kennedy & Inkpen, 2005; Choi & Cardie, 2008). However, several studies have pointed out the inadequacy of this solution (Kennedy & Inkpen, 2006; Taboada, Brooke, Tofiloski, Voll, & Stede, 2011). We will show through experiments in Section 4.3 that many positive terms, though not all, tend to reverse their polarity when negated, whereas most negative terms remain negative and only change their evaluative intensity. For example, the word *terrible* conveys a strong negative sentiment whereas the phrase *wasn’t terrible* is mildly negative. Also, the degree of the intensity shift varies from term to term for both positive and negative terms. To adequately capture the effects of negation on different terms, we propose a corpus-based statistical approach to estimate sentiment scores of individual terms in the presence of negation. We build two lexicons: one for words in negated contexts (*Negated Context Lexicon*) and one for words in affirmative (non-negated) contexts (*Affirmative Context Lexicon*). Each word (or phrase) now has two scores, one in the Negated Context Lexicon and one in the Affirmative Context Lexicon. When analyzing the sentiment of a textual message, we use scores from the Negated Context Lexicon for words appearing in a negated context and scores from the Affirmative Context Lexicon for words appearing in an affirmative context.

Experiments are carried out to assess both, the performance of the overall sentiment analysis system as well as the quality and value of the automatically created tweet-specific lexicons. In the intrinsic evaluation of the lexicons, their entries are compared with the

entries of the manually created lexicons. Also, human annotators were asked to rank a subset of lexicon entries by the degree of their association with positive or negative sentiment and this ranking is compared with the ranking produced by an automatic lexicon. In both experiments we observe high agreement between the automatic and manual sentiment annotations.

The extrinsic evaluation is performed on two tasks: unsupervised and supervised sentiment analysis. On the supervised task, we assess the performance of the full sentiment analysis system and examine the impact of the features derived from the automatic lexicons on the overall performance. As a testbed, we use the datasets provided for the SemEval-2013 competition on Sentiment Analysis in Twitter (Wilson, Kozareva, Nakov, Rosenthal, Stoyanov, & Ritter, 2013).<sup>1</sup> There were datasets provided for two tasks, message-level task and term-level task, and two domains, tweets and SMS. However, the training data were available only for tweets. Among 77 submissions from 44 teams, our system placed first in the competition in both tasks on the tweet test set, obtaining a macro-averaged F-score of 69.02 in the message-level task and 88.93 in the term-level task. Post-competition improvements to the system boost the performance to an F-score of 70.45 (message-level task) and 89.50 (term-level task). We also applied our classifier on the SMS test set without any further tuning. The classifier obtained the first position in identifying sentiment of SMS messages (F-score of 68.46) and the second position in detecting the sentiment of terms within SMS messages (F-score of 88.00; only 0.39 points behind the first-ranked system). With post-competition improvements, the system achieves an F-score of 69.77 in the message-level task and an F-score of 88.20 in the term-level task on that test set.

In addition, we evaluate the performance of our sentiment analysis system on the domain of movie review excerpts (message-level task only). The system is re-trained on a collection of about 7,800 positive and negative sentences extracted from movie reviews. When applied on the test set of unseen sentences, the system is able to correctly classify 85.5% of the test set. This result exceeds the best result obtained on this dataset by a recursive deep learning approach that requires access to sentiment labels of all syntactic phrases in the training-data sentences (Socher, Perelygin, Wu, Chuang, Manning, Ng, & Potts, 2013). For the message-level task, we do not make use of sentiment labels of phrases in the training data, as that is often unavailable in real-world applications.

The ablation experiments reveal that the automatically built lexicons gave our system the competitive advantage in SemEval-2013. The use of the new lexicons results in gains of up to 6.5 percentage points over the gains obtained through the use of other features. Furthermore, we show that the lexicons built specifically for negated contexts better model negation than the reversing polarity approach.

The main contributions of this paper are three-fold. First, we present a sentiment analysis system that achieves state-of-the-art performance on three domains: tweets, SMS, and movie review excerpts. The system can be replicated using freely available resources. Second, we describe the process of creating the automatic, tweet-specific lexicons and demonstrate their superior predictive power over several manually and automatically created general-purpose lexicons. Third, we analyze the impact of negation on sentiment and propose an empirical method to estimate the sentiment of words in negated contexts by

---

1. SemEval is an international forum for natural-language shared tasks. The competition we refer to is SemEval-2013 Task 2 (<http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/semEval-2013/task2>).

creating a separate sentiment lexicon for negated words. All automatic lexicons described in the paper are made available to the research community.<sup>2</sup>

The paper is organized as follows. We begin with a description of related work in Section 2. Next, we describe the sentiment analysis task and the data used in this research (Section 3). Section 4 presents the sentiment lexicons used in our system: existing manually created, general-purpose lexicons (Section 4.1) and our automatic, tweet-specific lexicons (Section 4.2). The lexicons built for affirmative and negated contexts are described in Section 4.3. The detailed description of our supervised sentiment analysis system, including the classification method and the feature sets, is presented in Section 5. Section 6 provides the results of the evaluation experiments. First, we compare the automatically created lexicons with human annotations derived from the manual lexicons as well as collected through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk service<sup>3</sup> (Section 6.1). Next, we evaluate the new lexicons on the extrinsic task of unsupervised sentiment analysis (Section 6.2.1). The purpose of these experiments is to compare the predictive capacity of the individual lexicons without influence of other factors. Then, in Section 6.2.2 we assess the performance of the entire supervised sentiment analysis system and examine the contribution of the features derived from our lexicons to the overall performance. Finally, we conclude and present directions for future work in Section 7.

## 2. Related Work

Over the last decade, there has been an explosion of work exploring various aspects of sentiment analysis: detecting subjective and objective sentences; classifying sentences as positive, negative, or neutral; detecting the person expressing the sentiment and the target of the sentiment; detecting emotions such as joy, fear, and anger; visualizing sentiment in text; and applying sentiment analysis in health, commerce, and disaster management. Surveys by Pang and Lee (2008) and Liu and Zhang (2012) give a summary of many of these approaches.

Sentiment analysis systems have been applied to many different kinds of texts including customer reviews, news paper headlines (Bellegarda, 2010), novels (Boucouvalas, 2002; John, Boucouvalas, & Xu, 2006; Francisco & Gervás, 2006; Mohammad & Yang, 2011), emails (Liu, Lieberman, & Selker, 2003; Mohammad & Yang, 2011), blogs (Neviarouskaya, Prendinger, & Ishizuka, 2011; Genereux & Evans, 2006; Mihalcea & Liu, 2006), and tweets (Mohammad, 2012). Often these systems have to cater to the specific needs of the text such as formality versus informality, length of utterances, etc. Sentiment analysis systems developed specifically for tweets include those by Pak and Paroubek (2010), Agarwal, Xie, Vovsha, Rambow, and Passonneau (2011), Thelwall, Buckley, and Paltoglou (2011), Brody and Diakopoulos (2011), Aisopos, Papadakis, Tserpes, and Varvarigou (2012), Bakliwal, Arora, Madhappan, Kapre, Singh, and Varma (2012). A recent survey by Martínez-Cámara, Martín-Valdivia, Ureñalópez, and Montejaoráz (2012) provides an overview of the research on sentiment analysis of tweets.

Several manually created sentiment resources have been successfully applied in sentiment analysis. The General Inquirer has sentiment labels for about 3,600 terms (Stone, Dunphy,

---

2. [www.purl.com/net/sentimentoftweets](http://www.purl.com/net/sentimentoftweets)

3. <https://www.mturk.com/mturk/welcome>

Smith, Ogilvie, & associates, 1966). Hu and Liu (2004) manually labeled about 6,800 words and used them for detecting sentiment of customer reviews. The MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon, which draws from the General Inquirer and other sources, has sentiment labels for about 8,000 words (Wilson, Wiebe, & Hoffmann, 2005). The NRC Emotion Lexicon has sentiment and emotion labels for about 14,000 words (Mohammad & Turney, 2010). These labels were compiled through Mechanical Turk annotations.

Semi-supervised and automatic methods have also been proposed to detect the polarity of words. Hatzivassiloglou and McKeown (1997) proposed an algorithm to determine the polarity of adjectives. SentiWordNet (SWN) was created using supervised classifiers as well as manual annotation (Esuli & Sebastiani, 2006). Turney and Littman (2003) proposed a minimally supervised algorithm to calculate the polarity of a word by determining if its tendency to co-occur with a small set of positive seed words is greater than its tendency to co-occur with a small set of negative seed words. Mohammad, Dunne, and Dorr (2009) automatically generated a sentiment lexicon of more than 60,000 words from a thesaurus. We use several of these lexicons in our system. In addition, we create two new sentiment lexicons from tweets using hashtags and emoticons. In Section 6, we show that these tweet-specific lexicons have a higher coverage and a better predictive power than the lexicons mentioned earlier.

Since manual annotation of data is costly, distant supervision techniques have been actively applied in the domain of short informal texts. User-provided indications of emotional content, such as emoticons, emoji, and hashtags, have been used as noisy sentiment labels. For example, Go, Bhayani, and Huang (2009) use tweets with emoticons as labeled data for supervised training. Emoticons such as :) are considered positive labels of the tweets and emoticons such as :( are used as negative labels. Davidov, Tsur, and Rappoport (2010) and Kouloumpis, Wilson, and Moore (2011) use certain seed hashtag words such as *#cute* and *#sucks* as labels of positive and negative sentiment. Mohammad (2012) developed a classifier to detect emotions using tweets with emotion word hashtags (e.g., *#anger*, *#surprise*) as labeled data.

In our system too, we make use of the emoticons and hashtag words as signals of positive and negative sentiment. We collected 775,000 sentiment-word hashtagged tweets and used 1.6 million emoticon tweets collected by Go et al. (2009). However, unlike previous research, we generate sentiment lexicons from these datasets and use them (along with a relatively small hand-labeled training dataset) to train a supervised classifier. This approach has the following benefits. First, it allows us to incorporate large amounts of noisily labeled data quickly and efficiently. Second, the classification system is robust to the introduced noise because the noisy data are incorporated not directly as training instances but indirectly as features. Third, the generated sentiment lexicons can be easily distributed among the research community and employed in other applications and on other domains (Kiritchenko, Zhu, Cherry, & Mohammad, 2014).

Negation plays an important role in determining sentiment. Automatic negation handling involves identifying a negation word such as *not*, determining the scope of negation (which words are affected by the negation word), and finally appropriately capturing the impact of the negation. (See work by Jia, Yu, and Meng (2009), Wiegand, Balahur, Roth, Klakow, and Montoyo (2010), Lapponi, Read, and Ovreid (2012) for detailed analyses of negation handling.) Traditionally, the negation word is determined from a small hand-

crafted list (Taboada et al., 2011). The scope of negation is often assumed to begin from the word following the negation word until the next punctuation mark or the end of the sentence (Polanyi & Zaenen, 2004; Kennedy & Inkpen, 2005). More sophisticated methods to detect the scope of negation through semantic parsing have also been proposed (Li, Zhou, Wang, & Zhu, 2010).

A common way to capture the impact of negation is to reverse the polarities of the sentiment words in the scope of negation. Taboada et al. (2011) proposed to shift the sentiment score of a term in a negated context towards the opposite polarity by a fixed amount. However, in their experiments the shift-score model did not agree with human judgment in many cases, especially for negated negative terms. More complex approaches, such as recursive deep models, address negation through semantic composition (Socher, Huval, Manning, & Ng, 2012; Socher et al., 2013). The recursive deep models work in a bottom-top fashion over a parse-tree structure of a sentence to infer the sentiment label of the sentence as a composition of the sentiment expressed by its constituting parts: words and phrases. These models do not require any hand-crafted features or semantic knowledge, such as a list of negation words. However, they are computationally intensive and need substantial additional annotations (word and phrase-level sentiment labeling) to produce competitive results (Socher et al., 2013). In this paper, we propose a simple corpus-based statistical method to estimate the sentiment scores of negated words. As will be shown in Section 6.2.2, this simple method is able to achieve the same level of accuracy as the recursive deep learning approach. Additionally, we analyze the impact of negation on sentiment scores of common sentiment terms.

To promote research in sentiment analysis of short informal texts and to establish a common ground for comparison of different approaches, an international competition was organized by the Conference on Semantic Evaluation Exercises (SemEval-2013) (Wilson et al., 2013). The organizers created and shared tweets for training, development, and testing. They also provided a second test set consisting of SMS messages. The purpose of having this out-of-domain test set was to assess the ability of the systems trained on tweets to generalize to other types of short informal texts. The competition attracted 44 teams; there were 48 submissions from 34 teams in the message-level task and 29 submissions from 23 teams in the term-level task. Most participants (including the top 3 systems in each task) chose a supervised machine learning approach exploiting a variety of features derived from ngrams, stems, punctuation, POS tags, and Twitter-specific encodings (e.g., emoticons, hashtags, abbreviations). Only one of the top-performing systems was entirely rule-based with hand-written rules (Reckman, Baird, Crawford, Crowell, Micciulla, Sethi, & Veress, 2013). Twitter-specific pre-processing (e.g., tokenization, normalization) as well as negation handling were commonly applied. Almost all systems benefited from sentiment lexicons: MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon, SentiWordNet, and others. Existing, low-coverage lexicons were sometimes extended with distributionally similar words (Proisl, Greiner, Evert, & Kabashi, 2013) or sentiment-associated words collected from noisily labeled data (Becker, Erhart, Skiba, & Matula, 2013). Those extended lexicons, however, were still an order of magnitude smaller than the tweet-specific lexicons we created. For the full results of the competition and further details we refer the reader to Wilson et al. (2013).

Some research approaches sentiment analysis as a two-tier problem: first a piece of text is marked as either objective or subjective, and then only the subjective text is assessed

to determine whether it is positive, negative, or neutral (Wiebe, Wilson, & Cardie, 2005; Choi & Cardie, 2010; Johansson & Moschitti, 2013; Yang & Cardie, 2013). However, this can lead to a propagation of errors (for example, the system may mark a subjective text as objective). Further, one can argue that even objective statements can express sentiment (for example, “the sales of Blackberries are 0.002% of what they used to be 5 years back”). We model sentiment directly as a three-class problem: positive, negative, or neutral.

Also, this paper focuses on sentiment analysis alone and does not consider the task of associating the sentiment with its targets. There has been interesting work studying the latter problem (e.g., Jiang, Yu, Zhou, Liu, & Zhao, 2011; Sauper & Barzilay, 2013). In (Kiritchenko et al., 2014) we show how our approach can be adapted to identify the sentiment for a specified target. The system ranked first in the SemEval-2014 shared task ‘Aspect Based Sentiment Analysis’.

### 3. Task and Data Description

In this work, we follow the definition of the task and use the data provided for the SemEval-2013 competition: Sentiment Analysis in Twitter (Wilson et al., 2013). This competition had two tasks: a message-level task and a term-level task. The objective of the *message-level task* is to detect whether the whole message conveys a positive, negative, or neutral sentiment. The objective of the *term-level task* is to detect whether a given target term (a single word or a multi-word expression) conveys a positive, negative, or neutral sentiment in the context of a message. Note that the same term may express different sentiments in different contexts. For example, the word *unpredictable* expresses positive sentiment in sentence “*The movie has an unpredictable ending*”; whereas, it expresses negative sentiment in sentence “*The car has unpredictable steering*”.

Two test sets – one with tweets and one with SMS messages – were provided to the participants for each task. Training and development data were available only for tweets. Here we briefly describe how the data were collected and annotated (for more details see the task description paper (Wilson et al., 2013)). Tweets were collected through the public streaming Twitter API during a period of one year: from January 2012 to January 2013. To reduce the data skew towards the neutral class, messages that did not contain any polarity word listed in SentiWordNet 3.0 were discarded. The remaining messages were annotated for sentiment through Mechanical Turk.<sup>4</sup> Each annotator had to mark the positive, negative, and neutral parts of a message as well as to provide the overall polarity label for the message. Later, the annotations were combined through intersection for the term-level task and by majority voting for the message-level task. The details on data collection and annotation were released to the participants after the competition.

The data characteristics for both tasks are shown in Table 1. The training set was distributed through tweet ids and a download script. However, not all tweets were accessible. For example, a Twitter user could have deleted her messages, and thus these messages would not be available. Table 1 shows the number of the training examples we were able to download. The development and test sets were provided in full by FTP.

---

4. Messages presented to annotators did not have polarity words marked in any way.



Table 1: Data statistics for the SemEval-2013 training set, development set and two testing sets. “# of tokens per mess.” denotes the average number of tokens per message in the dataset. “Vocab. size” represents the number of unique tokens excluding punctuation and numerals.

Dataset	Number of instances				# tokens per mess.	Vocab. size
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Total		
<b>Message-level task:</b>						
Training set	3,045 (37%)	1,209 (15%)	4,004 (48%)	8,258	22.09	21,848
Development set	575 (35%)	340 (20%)	739 (45%)	1,654	22.19	6,543
Tweet test set	1,572 (41%)	601 (16%)	1,640 (43%)	3,813	22.15	12,977
SMS test set	492 (23%)	394 (19%)	1,208 (58%)	2,094	18.05	3,513
<b>Term-level task:</b>						
Training set	4,831 (62%)	2,540 (33%)	385 (5%)	7,756	22.55	15,238
Development set	648 (57%)	430 (38%)	57 (5%)	1,135	22.93	3,909
Tweet test set	2,734 (62%)	1,541 (35%)	160 (3%)	4,435	22.63	10,383
SMS test set	1,071 (46%)	1,104 (47%)	159 (7%)	2,334	19.95	2,979

The tweets are comprised of regular English-language words as well as Twitter-specific terms, such as emoticons, URLs, and creative spellings. Using WordNet 3.0<sup>5</sup> (147,278 word types) supplemented with a large list of stop words (571 words)<sup>6</sup> as a repository of English-language words, we found that about 45% of the vocabulary in the tweet datasets are out-of-dictionary terms. These out-of-dictionary terms fall into different categories, e.g., named entities (names of people, places, companies, etc.) not found in WordNet, hashtags, user mentions, etc. We use the Carnegie Mellon University (CMU) Twitter NLP tool to automatically identify the categories. The tool was shown to achieve 89% tagging accuracy on tweet data (Gimpel, Schneider, O’Connor, Das, Mills, Eisenstein, Heilman, Yogatama, Flanigan, & Smith, 2011). Table 2 shows the distribution of the out-of-dictionary terms by category.<sup>7</sup> One can observe that most of the out-of-dictionary terms are named entities as well as user mentions, URLs, and hashtags. There is also a moderate amount of creatively spelled regular English words and slang words used as nouns, verbs, and adjectives. In the SMS test set, out-of-dictionary terms constitute a smaller proportion of the vocabulary, about 25%. These are mostly named entities, interjections, creative spellings, and slang.

The SemEval-2013 training and development data are used to train our supervised sentiment analysis system presented in Section 5. The performance of the system is evaluated on both test sets, tweets and SMS (Section 6.2.2). The test data are also used in the experiments on comparing the performance of sentiment lexicons in unsupervised settings (Section 6.2.1).

5. <http://wordnet.princeton.edu>

6. The SMART stopword list built by Gerard Salton and Chris Buckley for the SMART information retrieval system at Cornell University (<http://www.lextek.com/manuals/onix/stopwords2.html>) is used.

7. The percentages in the columns do not sum up to 100% because some terms can be used in multiple categories (e.g., as a noun and a verb).

Table 2: The distribution of the out-of-dictionary tokens by category for the SemEval-2013 tweet and SMS test sets.

Category of tokens	Tweet test set	SMS test set
named entities	31.84%	32.63%
user mentions	21.23%	0.11%
URLs	16.92%	0.84%
hashtags	10.94%	0%
interjections	2.56%	10.32%
emoticons	1.40%	1.89%
nouns	8.52%	25.47%
verbs	3.05%	18.95%
adjectives	1.43%	4.84%
adverbs	0.70%	6.21%
others	4.00%	15.69%

In addition to the SemEval-2013 datasets, we evaluate the system on a dataset of movie review excerpts (Socher et al., 2013). The task is to predict the sentiment label (positive or negative) of a given sentence, extracted from a longer movie review (message-level task). The dataset is comprised of 4,963 positive and 4,650 negative sentences split into the training (6,920 sentences), development (872 sentences), and test (1,821 sentences) sets. Since detailed phrase-level annotations are not available for most real-world applications, we use only sentence-level annotations and ignore the phrase-level annotations and the parse-tree structures of the sentences provided with the data. We train our sentiment analysis system on the training and development subsets and evaluate its performance on the test subset. The results of these experiments are reported in Section 6.2.2.

## 4. Sentiment Lexicons Used by Our System

### 4.1 Existing, General-Purpose, Manually Created Sentiment Lexicons

Most of the lexicons that were created by manual annotation tend to be domain free and include a few thousand terms. The lexicons that we use include the NRC Emotion Lexicon (Mohammad & Turney, 2010), Bing Liu’s Lexicon (Hu & Liu, 2004), and the MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon (Wilson et al., 2005). The NRC Emotion Lexicon is comprised of frequent English nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs annotated for eight emotions (joy, sadness, anger, fear, disgust, surprise, trust, and anticipation) as well as for positive and negative sentiment. Bing Liu’s Lexicon provides a list of positive and negative words manually extracted from customer reviews. The MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon contains words marked with their prior polarity (positive or negative) and a discrete strength of evaluative intensity (strong or weak). Entities in these lexicons do not come with a real-valued score indicating the fine-grained evaluative intensity.

## 4.2 New, Tweet-Specific, Automatically Generated Sentiment Lexicons

### 4.2.1 HASHTAG SENTIMENT LEXICON

Certain words in tweets are specially marked with a hashtag (#) and can indicate the topic or sentiment. Mohammad (2012) showed that hashtagged emotion words such as *#joy*, *#sad*, *#angry*, and *#surprised* are good indicators that the tweet as a whole (even without the hashtagged emotion word) is expressing the same emotion. We adapted that idea to create a large corpus of positive and negative tweets. From this corpus we then automatically generated a high-coverage, tweet-specific sentiment lexicon as described below.

We polled the Twitter API every four hours from April to December 2012 in search of tweets with either a positive-word hashtag or a negative-word hashtag. A collection of 77 seed words closely associated with positive and negative sentiment such as *#good*, *#excellent*, *#bad*, and *#terrible* were used (30 positive and 47 negative). These terms were chosen from entries for *positive* and *negative* in Roget’s Thesaurus<sup>8</sup>. About 2 million tweets were collected in total. We used the metadata tag “iso.language\_code” to identify English tweets. Since this tag is not always reliable, we additionally discarded tweets that did not have at least two valid English content words from Roget’s Thesaurus.<sup>9</sup> This step also helped discard very short tweets and tweets with a large proportion of misspelled words.

A set of 775,000 remaining tweets, which we refer to as *Hashtag Sentiment Corpus*, was used to generate a large word–sentiment association lexicon. A tweet was considered positive if it had one of the 30 positive hashtagged seed words, and negative if it had one of the 47 negative hashtagged seed words. The sentiment score for a term  $w$  was calculated from these pseudo-labeled tweets as shown below:

$$\textit{Sentiment Score}(w) = \textit{PMI}(w, \textit{positive}) - \textit{PMI}(w, \textit{negative}) \quad (1)$$

PMI stands for pointwise mutual information:

$$\textit{PMI}(w, \textit{positive}) = \log_2 \frac{\textit{freq}(w, \textit{positive}) * N}{\textit{freq}(w) * \textit{freq}(\textit{positive})} \quad (2)$$

where  $\textit{freq}(w, \textit{positive})$  is the number of times a term  $w$  occurs in positive tweets,  $\textit{freq}(w)$  is the total frequency of term  $w$  in the corpus,  $\textit{freq}(\textit{positive})$  is the total number of tokens in positive tweets, and  $N$  is the total number of tokens in the corpus.  $\textit{PMI}(w, \textit{negative})$  is calculated in a similar way. Thus, equation 1 is simplified to:

$$\textit{Sentiment Score}(w) = \log_2 \frac{\textit{freq}(w, \textit{positive}) * \textit{freq}(\textit{negative})}{\textit{freq}(w, \textit{negative}) * \textit{freq}(\textit{positive})} \quad (3)$$

Since PMI is known to be a poor estimator of association for low-frequency events, we ignore terms that occurred less than five times in each (positive and negative) group of tweets.<sup>10</sup>

8. <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/10681>

9. Any word in the thesaurus was considered a content word with the exception of the words from the SMART stopword list.

10. The same threshold of five occurrences in at least one class (positive or negative) is applied for all automatic tweet-specific lexicons discussed in this paper. There is no thresholding on the sentiment score.

A positive sentiment score indicates a greater overall association with positive sentiment, whereas a negative score indicates a greater association with negative sentiment. The magnitude is indicative of the degree of association. Note that there exist numerous other methods to estimate the degree of association of a term with a category (e.g., cross entropy, Chi-squared, and information gain). We have chosen PMI because it is simple and robust and has been successfully applied in a number of NLP tasks (Turney, 2001; Turney & Littman, 2003).

The final lexicon, which we will refer to as *Hashtag Sentiment Base Lexicon (HS Base)* has entries for 39,413 unigrams and 178,851 bigrams. Entries were also generated for unigram–unigram, unigram–bigram, and bigram–bigram pairs that were not necessarily contiguous in the tweets corpus. Pairs where at least one of the terms is punctuation (e.g., “,”, “?”, “.”), a user mention, a URL, or a function word (e.g., “a”, “the”, “and”) were removed. The lexicon has entries for 308,808 non-contiguous pairs.

#### 4.2.2 SENTIMENT140 LEXICON

The *Sentiment140 Corpus* (Go et al., 2009) is a collection of 1.6 million tweets that contain emoticons. The tweets are labeled positive or negative according to the emoticon. We generated the *Sentiment140 Base Lexicon (S140 Base)* from this corpus in the same manner as described above for the hashtagged tweets using Equation 1. This lexicon has entries for 65,361 unigrams, 266,510 bigrams, and 480,010 non-contiguous pairs. In the following section, we further build on the proposed approach to create separate lexicons for terms in affirmative contexts and for terms in negated contexts.

### 4.3 Affirmative Context and Negated Context Lexicons

A word in a negated context has a different evaluative nature than the same word in an affirmative (non-negated) context. This difference may include the change in the polarity category (positive becomes negative or vice versa), the evaluative intensity, or both. For example, highly positive words (e.g., *great*) when negated tend to experience both, polarity change and intensity decrease, forming mildly negative phrases (e.g., *not great*). On the other hand, many strong negative words (e.g., *terrible*) when negated keep their negative polarity and just shift their intensity. The conventional approach of reversing polarity is not able to handle these cases properly.

We propose an empirical method to determine the sentiment of words in the presence of negation. We create separate lexicons for affirmative and negated contexts. In this way, two sentiment scores for each term  $w$  are computed: one for affirmative contexts and another for negated contexts. The lexicons are created as follows. The Hashtag Sentiment Corpus is split into two parts: *Affirmative Context Corpus* and *Negated Context Corpus*. Following the work by Pang, Lee, and Vaithyanathan (2002), we define a negated context as a segment of a tweet that starts with a negation word (e.g., *no*, *shouldn't*) and ends with one of the punctuation marks: ‘,’, ‘.’, ‘:’, ‘;’, ‘!’, ‘?’. The list of negation words was adopted from Christopher Potts’ sentiment tutorial.<sup>11</sup> Thus, part of a tweet that is marked as negated is included into the Negated Context Corpus while the rest of the tweet becomes part of the Affirmative Context Corpus. The sentiment label for the tweet is kept unchanged

11. <http://sentiment.christopherpotts.net/lingstruc.html>

Table 3: Example sentiment scores from the Sentiment140 Base, Affirmative Context (AffLex) and Negated Context (NegLex) Lexicons.

Term	Sentiment140 Lexicons		
	Base	AffLex	NegLex
<b>Positive terms</b>			
great	1.177	1.273	-0.367
beautiful	1.049	1.112	0.217
nice	0.974	1.149	-0.912
good	0.825	1.167	-1.414
honest	0.391	0.431	-0.123
<b>Negative terms</b>			
terrible	-1.766	-1.850	-0.890
shame	-1.457	-1.548	-0.722
bad	-1.297	-1.674	0.021
ugly	-0.899	-0.964	-0.772
negative	-0.090	-0.261	0.389

in both corpora. Then, we generate the *Affirmative Context Lexicon (HS AffLex)* from the Affirmative Context Corpus and the *Negated Context Lexicon (HS NegLex)* from the Negated Context Corpus using the technique described in Section 4.2. We will refer to the sentiment score calculated from the Affirmative Context Corpus as  $score_{AffLex}(w)$  and the score calculated from the Negated Context Corpus as  $score_{NegLex}(w)$ . Similarly, the *Sentiment140 Affirmative Context Lexicon (S140 AffLex)* and the *Sentiment140 Negated Context Lexicon (S140 NegLex)* are built from the Affirmative Context and the Negated Context parts of the Sentiment140 tweet corpus. To employ these lexicons on a separate dataset, we apply the same technique to split each message into affirmative and negated contexts and then match words in affirmative contexts against the Affirmative Context Lexicons and words in negated contexts against the Negated Context Lexicons.

Computing a sentiment score for a term  $w$  only from affirmative contexts makes  $score_{AffLex}(w)$  more precise since it is no longer polluted by negation. Positive terms get stronger positive scores and negative terms get stronger negative scores. Furthermore, for the first time, we create lexicons for negated terms and compute  $score_{NegLex}(w)$  that reflects the behaviour of words in the presence of negation. Table 3 shows a few examples of positive and negative terms with their sentiment scores from the Sentiment140 Base, Affirmative Context (AffLex) and Negated Context (NegLex) Lexicons. In Fig. 1, we visualize the relationship between  $score_{AffLex}(w)$  and  $score_{NegLex}(w)$  for a set of words manually annotated for sentiment in the MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon. The x-axis is  $score_{AffLex}(w)$ , the sentiment score of a term  $w$  in the Sentiment140 Affirmative Context Lexicon; the y-axis is  $score_{NegLex}(w)$ , the sentiment score of a term  $w$  in the Sentiment140 Negated Context Lexicon. Dots in the plot correspond to words that occur in each of the MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon, the Sentiment140 Affirmative Context Lexicon, and the Sentiment140 Negated Context Lexicon. Furthermore, we discard the terms whose polarity category (positive or negative) in the Sentiment140 Affirmative Context Lexicon does not match their polarity in the MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon. We observe that when negated, 76% of the positive terms




Figure 1: The sentiment scores from the Sentiment140 AffLex and the Sentiment140 NegLex for 480 positive and 486 negative terms from the MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon. The x-axis is  $score_{AffLex}(w)$ , the sentiment score of a term  $w$  in the Sentiment140 Affirmative Context Lexicon; the y-axis is  $score_{NegLex}(w)$ , the sentiment score of a term  $w$  in the Sentiment140 Negated Context Lexicon. Each dot corresponds to one (positive or negative) term. The graph shows that positive and negative terms when negated tend to convey a negative sentiment. Negation affects sentiment differently for each term.

reverse their polarity whereas 82% of the negative terms keep their polarity orientation and just shift their sentiment scores. (This behaviour agrees well with human judgments from the study by Taboada et al. (2011).) Changes in evaluative intensity vary from term to term. For example,  $score_{NegLex}(good) < -score_{AffLex}(good)$  whereas  $score_{NegLex}(great) > -score_{AffLex}(great)$ .

We also compiled a list of 596 antonym pairs from WordNet and compare the scores of terms in the Sentiment140 Affirmative Context Lexicon with the scores of the terms' antonyms in the Sentiment140 Negated Context Lexicon. We found that 51% of negated positive terms are less negative than their corresponding antonyms (e.g.,  $score_{NegLex}(good) > score_{AffLex}(bad)$ ), but 95% of negated negative terms are more negative than their positive antonyms (e.g.,  $score_{NegLex}(ugly) < score_{AffLex}(beautiful)$ ).

These experiments reveal the tendency of positive terms when negated to convey a negative sentiment and the tendency of negative terms when negated to still convey a negative sentiment. Moreover, the degree of change in evaluative intensity appears to be term-dependent. Capturing all these different behaviours of terms in negated contexts by means of the Negated Context Lexicons empower our automatic sentiment analysis system as we demonstrate through experiments in Section 6. Furthermore, we believe that the Affirmative Context Lexicons and the Negated Context Lexicons can be valuable in other

applications such as textual entailment recognition, paraphrase detection, and machine translation. For instance in the paraphrase detection task, given two sentences “*The hotel room wasn’t terrible.*” and “*The hotel room was excellent.*” an automatic system can correctly infer that these sentences are not paraphrases by looking up  $score_{NegLex}(terrible)$  and  $score_{AffLex}(excellent)$  and seeing that the polarities and intensities of these terms do not match (i.e.,  $score_{AffLex}(excellent)$  is highly positive and  $score_{NegLex}(terrible)$  is slightly negative). At the same time, a mistake can easily be made with conventional lexicons and the polarity reversing strategy, according to which the strong negative term *terrible* is assumed to convey a strong positive sentiment in the presence of negation and, therefore, the polarities and intensities of the two terms would match.

#### 4.4 Negated Context (Positional) Lexicons

We propose to further improve the method of constructing the Negated Context Lexicons by splitting a negated context into two parts: the *immediate context* consisting of a *single* token that directly follows a negation word, and the *distant context* consisting of the rest of the tokens in the negated context. We refer to these lexicons as *Negated Context (Positional) Lexicons*. Each token in a Negated Context (Positional) Lexicon can have two scores: *immediate-context score* and *distant-context score*. The benefits of this approach are two-fold. Intuitively, negation affects words *directly* following a negation word more strongly than the words farther away. Compare, for example, immediate negation in *not good* and more distant negation in *not very good*, *not as good*, *not such a good idea*. Second, immediate-context scores are less noisy. Our simple negation scope identification algorithm can occasionally fail and include into negated context parts of a tweet that are not actually negated (e.g., if a punctuation mark is missing). These errors have less effect on immediate context. When employing these lexicons, we use an immediate-context score for a word immediately preceded by a negation word and use distant-context scores for all other words affected by a negation. As before, for non-negated parts of a message, sentiment scores from an Affirmative Context Lexicon are used. Assuming that words occur in distant contexts more often than in immediate contexts, this approach can introduce more sparseness to the lexicons. Thus, we apply a back-off strategy: if an immediate-context score is not available for a token immediately following a negation word, its distant-context score is used instead. In Section 6, we experimentally show that the Negated Context (Positional) Lexicons provide additional benefits to our sentiment analysis system over the regular Negated Context Lexicons described in the previous section.

#### 4.5 Lexicon Coverage

Table 4 shows the number of positive and negative entries in each of the sentiment lexicons discussed above. The automatically generated lexicons are an order of magnitude larger than the manually created lexicons. We can see that all manual lexicons contain more negative terms than positive terms. In the automatically generated lexicons, this imbalance is less pronounced (49% positive vs. 51% negative in the Hashtag Sentiment Base Lexicon) or even reversed (61% positive vs. 39% negative in the Sentiment140 Base Lexicon). The Sentiment140 Base Lexicon was created from an equal number of positive and negative tweets. Therefore, the prevalence of positive terms corresponds to the general trend in

Table 4: The number of positive and negative entries in the sentiment lexicons.

Lexicon	Positive	Negative	Total
NRC Emotion Lexicon	2,312 (41%)	3,324 (59%)	5,636
Bing Liu’s Lexicon	2,006 (30%)	4,783 (70%)	6,789
MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon	2,718 (36%)	4,911 (64%)	7,629
Hashtag Sentiment Lexicons (HS)			
HS Base Lexicon			
- unigrams	19,121 (49%)	20,292 (51%)	39,413
- bigrams	69,337 (39%)	109,514 (61%)	178,851
HS AffLex			
- unigrams	19,344 (51%)	18,905 (49%)	38,249
- bigrams	67,070 (42%)	90,788 (58%)	157,858
HS NegLex			
- unigrams	936 (14%)	5,536 (86%)	6,472
- bigrams	3,954 (15%)	22,258 (85%)	26,212
Sentiment140 Lexicons (S140)			
S140 Base Lexicon			
- unigrams	39,979 (61%)	25,382 (39%)	65,361
- bigrams	135,280 (51%)	131,230 (49%)	266,510
S140 AffLex			
- unigrams	40,422 (63%)	23,382 (37%)	63,804
- bigrams	133,242 (55%)	107,206 (45%)	240,448
S140 NegLex			
- unigrams	1,038 (12%)	7,315 (88%)	8,353
- bigrams	5,913 (16%)	32,128 (84%)	38,041

language and supports the Polyanna Hypothesis (Boucher & Osgood, 1969), which states that people tend to use positive terms more frequently and diversely than negative. Note, however, that negative terms are dominant in the Negated Context Lexicons since most terms, both positive and negative, tend to convey negative sentiment in the presence of negation. The overall sizes of the Negated Context Lexicons are rather small since negation occurs only in 24% of the tweets in the Hashtag and Sentiment140 corpora and only part of a message with negation is actually negated.

Table 5 shows the differences in coverage between the lexicons. Specifically, it gives the number of additional terms a lexicon in row X has in comparison to a lexicon in column Y and the percentage of tokens in the SemEval-2013 tweet test set covered by these extra entries of lexicon X (numbers in brackets). For instance, almost half of Bing Liu’s Lexicon (3,457 terms) is not found in the Sentiment140 Base Lexicon. However, these additional terms represent only 0.05% of all the tokens from the tweet test set. These are terms that are rarely used in short informal writing (e.g., *acrimoniously*, *bestial*, *nepotism*). Each of the manually created lexicons covers extra 2–3% of the test data compared to other manual lexicons. On the other hand, the automatically generated lexicons cover 60% more tokens in the test data. Both automatic lexicons provide a number of terms not found in the other.



Table 5: Lexicon’s supplemental coverage: for row X and column Y, the number of Lexicon X’s entries that are not found in Lexicon Y and (in brackets) the percentage of tokens in the SemEval-2013 tweet test set covered by these extra entries of Lexicon X. ‘NRC’ stands for NRC Emotion Lexicon, ‘B.L.’ is for Bing Liu’s Lexicon, ‘MPQA’ is for MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon, ‘HS’ is for Hashtag Sentiment Base Lexicon, ‘S140’ is for Sentiment140 Base Lexicon.

Lexicon	NRC	B.L.	MPQA	HS	S140
<b>NRC</b>	-	3,179 (2.25%)	3,010 (2.00%)	2,480 (0.09%)	1,973 (0.05%)
<b>B.L.</b>	4,410 (1.72%)	-	1,383 (0.70%)	4,001 (0.07%)	3,457 (0.05%)
<b>MPQA</b>	3,905 (3.37%)	1,047 (2.60%)	-	3,719 (0.07%)	3,232 (0.04%)
<b>HS</b>	36,338 (64.23%)	36,628 (64.73%)	36,682 (62.84%)	-	15,185 (0.59%)
<b>S140</b>	61,779 (64.13%)	62,032 (64.65%)	62,143 (62.74%)	41,133 (0.53%)	-

## 5. Our System

### 5.1 Classifier

Our system, NRC-Canada Sentiment Analysis System, employs supervised statistical machine learning. For both tasks, message-level and term-level, we train a linear-kernel Support Vector Machine (SVM) (Chang & Lin, 2011) classifier on the available training data. SVM is a state-of-the-art learning algorithm proved to be effective on text categorization tasks and robust on large feature spaces. In the preliminary experiments, a linear-kernel SVM outperformed a maximum-entropy classifier. Also, a linear-kernel SVM showed better performance than an SVM with another commonly used kernel, radial basis function (RBF).

The classification model leverages a variety of surface-form, semantic, and sentiment lexicon features described below. The sentiment lexicon features are derived from three existing, general-purpose, manual lexicons (NRC Emotion Lexicon, Bing Liu’s Lexicon, and MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon), and four newly created, tweet-specific lexicons (Hashtag Sentiment Affirmative Context, Hashtag Sentiment Negated Context (Positional), Sentiment140 Affirmative Context, and Sentiment140 Negated Context (Positional)).

### 5.2 Features

#### 5.2.1 MESSAGE-LEVEL TASK

For the message-level task, the following pre-processing steps are performed. URLs and user mentions are normalized to `http://someurl` and `@someuser`, respectively. Tweets are tokenized and part-of-speech tagged with the CMU Twitter NLP tool (Gimpel et al., 2011). Then, each tweet is represented as a feature vector. We employ commonly used text classification features such as ngrams and part-of-speech tag counts, as well as common Twitter-specific features such as emoticon and hashtag counts. In addition, we introduce several lexicon features that take advantage of the knowledge present in manually and automatically created lexicons. These features are designed to explicitly handle negation. Table 6

Table 6: Examples of features that the system would generate for message “GRRREAT show!!! Hope not to miss the next one :)”. Numeric features are presented in the format: <feature\_name>:<feature\_value>. Binary features are italicized; only features with value of 1 are shown.

Feature group	Examples
word ngrams	<i>grrreat, show, grrreat.show, miss_NEG, miss_NEG.the</i>
character ngrams	<i>grr, grrr, grrre, rrr, rrre, rrrea</i>
all-caps	all-caps:1
POS	POS_N:1 (nouns), POS_V:2 (verbs), POS_E:1 (emoticons), POS_.,:1 (punctuation)
automatic lexicon features	HS_unigrams_positive_count:4, HS_unigrams_negative_total_score:1.51, HS_unigrams_POS_N_combined_total_score:0.19, HS_bigrams_positive_total_score:3.55, HS_bigrams_negative_max_score:1.98
manual lexicon features	MPQA_positive_affirmative_score:2, MPQA_negative_negated_score:1, BINGLIU_POS_V_negative_negated_score:1
punctuation	punctuation_!:1
emoticons	emoticon_positive:1, <i>emoticon_positive_last</i>
elongated words	elongation:1
clusters	<i>cluster_11111001110, cluster_10001111</i>

provides some example features for tweet “GRRREAT show!!! Hope not to miss the next one :)”.

The features:

- word ngrams: presence or absence of contiguous sequences of 1, 2, 3, and 4 tokens; non-contiguous ngrams (ngrams with one token replaced by \*);
- character ngrams: presence or absence of contiguous sequences of 3, 4, and 5 characters;
- all-caps: the number of tokens with all characters in upper case;
- POS: the number of occurrences of each part-of-speech tag;
- hashtags: the number of hashtags;
- negation: the number of negated contexts. Negation also affects the ngram features: a word  $w$  becomes  $w\_NEG$  in a negated context;
- sentiment lexicons:
  - **Automatic lexicons** The following sets of features are generated separately for the Hashtag Sentiment Lexicons (HS AffLex and HS NegLex (Positional)) and the Sentiment140 Lexicons (S140 AffLex and S140 NegLex (Positional)). For each token  $w$  occurring in a tweet and present in the lexicons, we use its sentiment score ( $score_{AffLex}(w)$  if  $w$  occurs in an affirmative context and  $score_{NegLex}(w)$  if  $w$  occurs in a negated context) to compute:
    - \* the number of tokens with  $score(w) \neq 0$ ;
    - \* the total score =  $\sum_{w \in tweet} score(w)$ ;
    - \* the maximal score =  $max_{w \in tweet} score(w)$ ;

- \* the score of the last token in the tweet.

These features are calculated for all positive tokens (tokens with sentiment scores greater than zero), for all negative tokens (tokens with sentiment scores less than zero), and for all tokens in a tweet. Similar feature sets are also created for each part-of-speech tag and for hashtags. Separate feature sets are produced for unigrams, bigrams, and non-contiguous pairs.

- **Manual lexicons** For each of the three manual sentiment lexicons (NRC Emotion Lexicon, Bing Liu’s Lexicon, and MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon), we compute the following four features:

- \* the sum of positive scores for tweet tokens in affirmative contexts;
- \* the sum of negative scores for tweet tokens in affirmative contexts;
- \* the sum of positive scores for tweet tokens in negated contexts;
- \* the sum of negative scores for tweet tokens in negated contexts.

Negated contexts are identified exactly as described earlier in Section 4.3 (the method for creating the Negated Context Corpora). The remaining parts of the messages are treated as affirmative contexts. We use the score of +1 for positive entries and the score of -1 for negative entries for the NRC Emotion Lexicon and Bing Liu’s Lexicon. For MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon, which provides two grades of the association strength (strong and weak), we use scores +1/-1 for weak associations and +2/-2 for strong associations. The same feature sets are also created for each part-of-speech tag, for hashtags, and for all-caps tokens.

- 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;
- emoticons: The polarity of an emoticon is determined with a regular expression adopted from Christopher Potts’ tokenizing script:<sup>12</sup>
  - presence or absence of positive and negative emoticons at any position in the tweet;
  - whether the last token is a positive or negative emoticon;
- elongated words: the number of words with one character repeated more than two times, for example, *soooo*;
- clusters: The CMU Twitter NLP tool provides token clusters produced with the Brown clustering algorithm on 56 million English-language tweets. These 1,000 clusters serve as alternative representation of tweet content, reducing the sparsity of the token space.
  - the presence or absence of tokens from each of the 1000 clusters.

---

12. <http://sentiment.christopherpotts.net/tokenizing.html>

### 5.2.2 TERM-LEVEL TASK

The pre-processing steps for the term-level task include tokenization and stemming with Porter stemmer (Porter, 1980).<sup>13</sup> Then, each tweet is represented as a feature vector with the following groups of features:

- word ngrams:
  - presence or absence of unigrams, bigrams, and the full word string of a target term;
  - leading and ending unigrams and bigrams;
- character ngrams: presence or absence of two- and three-character prefixes and suffixes of all the words in a target term (note that the target term may be a multi-word sequence);
- upper case:
  - whether all the words in the target start with an upper case letter followed by lower case letters;
  - whether the target words are all in uppercase (to capture a potential named entity);
- stopwords: whether a term contains only stop-words. If so, a separate set of features indicates whether there are 1, 2, 3, or more stop-words;
- negation: similar to the message-level task;
- sentiment lexicons: for each of the manual sentiment lexicons (NRC Emotion Lexicon, Bing Liu’s Lexicon, and MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon) and automatic sentiment lexicons (HS AffLex and HS NegLex (Positional), and S140 AffLex and S140 NegLex (Positional) Lexicons), we compute the following three features:
  - the sum of positive scores;
  - the sum of negative scores;
  - the total score.

For the manual lexicons, the polarity reversing strategy is applied to negation.<sup>14</sup> Note that words themselves and not their stems are matched against the sentiment lexicons.

- punctuation: presence or absence of punctuation sequences such as ‘?!’ and ‘!!!’;
- emoticons: the numbers and categories of emoticons that a term contains<sup>15</sup>;
- elongated words: presence or absence of elongated words;
- lengths:
  - the length of a target term (number of words);

---

13. Some differences in implementation, such as the use of a stemmer, are simply a result of different team members working on the two tasks.

14. In the experiments on the development dataset, these manual lexicon features showed better performance on the term-level task than the set of four features used for the message-level task.

15. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_emoticons](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_emoticons)

- the average length of words (number of characters) in a term;
- a binary feature indicating whether a term contains long words;
- position: whether a term is at the beginning, at the end, or at another position in a tweet;
- term splitting: when a term contains a hashtag made of multiple words (e.g., *#biggest-daythisyear*), we split the hashtag into component words;
- others:
  - whether a term contains a Twitter user name;
  - whether a term contains a URL.

The above features are extracted from target terms as well as from the rest of the message (the context). For unigrams and bigrams, we use four words on either side of the target as the context. The window size was chosen through experiments on the development set.

## 6. Experiments

This section presents the evaluation experiments that demonstrate the state-of-the-art performance of our sentiment analysis system on three domains: tweets, SMS, and movie review excerpts. The experiments also reveal the superior predictive power of the new, tweet-specific, automatically created lexicons over existing, general-purpose lexicons. Furthermore, they show that the Negated Context Lexicons can bring additional gains over the standard polarity reversing strategy of handling negation.

We begin with intrinsic evaluation of the automatic lexicons by comparing them to the manually created sentiment lexicons and to human annotated sentiment scores. Next, we assess the value of the lexicons as part of a sentiment analysis system in both, supervised and unsupervised settings. The goal of the experiments in unsupervised sentiment analysis (Section 6.2.1) is to compare the predictive capacity of the lexicons with the simplest setup to reduce the influence of other factors (such as the choice of features) as much as possible. Also, we evaluate the impact of the amount of data used to create an automatic lexicon on the quality of the lexicon. Then, in Section 6.2.2 we evaluate the performance of our supervised sentiment analysis system and analyze the contributions of features derived from different sentiment lexicons.

### 6.1 Intrinsic Evaluation of the Lexicons

To intrinsically evaluate our tweet-specific, automatically created sentiment lexicons, we first compare them to existing manually created sentiment lexicons (Section 6.1.1). However, existing manual lexicons tend to only have discrete labels for terms (positive, negative, neutral) but no real-valued scores indicating the intensity of sentiment. In Section 6.1.2, we show how we collected human annotated real-valued sentiment scores using the MaxDiff method of annotation (Louviere, 1991). We then compare the association scores in the automatically generated lexicons with these human annotated scores.

Table 7: Agreement in polarity assignments between the Sentiment140 Affirmative Context Lexicon and the manual lexicons. Agreement between two lexicons is measured as the percentage of shared terms given the same sentiment label (positive or negative) by both lexicons. The agreement is calculated for three sets of terms: (1) all shared terms; (2) shared terms whose sentiment score in S140 AffLex has an absolute value greater than or equal to 1 ( $|score(w)| \geq 1$ ); and (3) shared terms whose sentiment score in S140 AffLex has an absolute value greater than or equal to 2 ( $|score(w)| \geq 2$ ). Sentiment scores in S140 AffLex range from -5.9 to 6.8.

Lexicon	Number of shared terms	Agreement		
		All terms	$ score(w)  \geq 1$	$ score(w)  \geq 2$
NRC Emotion Lexicon	3,472	73.96%	89.96%	98.61%
Bing Liu’s Lexicon	3,213	78.24%	92.32%	99.45%
MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon	3,105	75.91%	90.26%	98.59%

### 6.1.1 COMPARING WITH EXISTING MANUALLY CREATED SENTIMENT LEXICONS

We examine the terms in the intersection of a manual lexicon and an automatic lexicon and measure the agreement between the lexicons as the percentage of the shared terms having the same polarity label (positive or negative) assigned by both lexicons. Table 7 shows the results for the Sentiment140 Affirmative Context Lexicon and three manual lexicons: NRC Emotion Lexicon, Bing Liu’s Lexicon, and MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon. Similar figures (not shown in the table) are obtained for other automatic lexicons (HS Base Lexicon, HS AffLex, and S140 Base): the agreement for all terms ranges between 71% and 78%. If we consider only terms whose sentiment scores in the automatic lexicon have higher absolute values, the agreement numbers substantially increase. Thus, automatically generated entries with higher absolute sentiment values prove to be more reliable.

### 6.1.2 COMPARING WITH HUMAN ANNOTATED SENTIMENT ASSOCIATION SCORES

Apart from polarity labels, the automatic lexicons provide sentiment scores indicating the degree of the association of the term with positive or negative sentiment. It should be noted that the individual scores themselves are somewhat meaningless other than their ability to indicate that one word is more positive (or more negative) than another. However, there exists no resource that can be used to determine if the real-valued scores match human intuition. In this section, we describe how we collected human annotations of terms for sentiment association scores using crowdsourcing.

**MaxDiff method of annotation:** For people, assigning a score indicating the degree of sentiment is not natural. Different people may assign different scores to the same target item, and it is hard for even the same annotator to remain consistent when annotating a large number of items. In contrast, it is easier for annotators to determine whether one word is more positive (or more negative) than the other. However, the latter requires a much larger number of annotations than the former (in the order of  $N^2$ , where  $N$  is the number of items to be annotated). MaxDiff is an annotation scheme that retains the comparative

aspect of annotation while still requiring only a small number of annotations (Louviere, 1991).

The annotator is presented with four words and asked which word is the most positive and which is the least positive. By answering just these two questions five out of the six inequalities are known. Consider a set in which a respondent evaluates:  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$  and  $D$ . If the respondent says that  $A$  is most positive and  $D$  is least positive, these two responses inform us that:

$$A > B, A > C, A > D, B > D, C > D$$

Each of these MaxDiff questions can be presented to multiple annotators. The responses to the MaxDiff questions can then be easily translated into a ranking of all the terms and also a real-valued score for all the terms (Orme, 2009). If two words have very different degrees of association (for example,  $A \gg D$ ), then  $A$  will be chosen as most positive much more often than  $D$  and  $D$  will be chosen as least positive much more often than  $A$ . This will eventually lead to a ranked list such that  $A$  and  $D$  are significantly farther apart, and their real-valued association scores are also significantly different. On the other hand, if two words have similar degrees of association with positive sentiment (for example,  $A$  and  $B$ ), then it is possible that for MaxDiff questions having both  $A$  and  $B$ , some annotators will choose  $A$  as most positive, and some will choose  $B$  as most positive. Further, both  $A$  and  $B$  will be chosen as most positive (or most negative) a similar number of times. This will result in a list such that  $A$  and  $B$  are ranked close to each other and their real-valued association scores will also be close in value.

The MaxDiff method is widely used in market survey questionnaires (Almquist & Lee, 2009). It was also used for determining relation similarity of pairs of items by Jurgens, Mohammad, Turney, and Holyoak (2012) in a SemEval-2012 shared task.

**Term selection:** For the evaluation of the automatic lexicons, we selected 1,455 high-frequency terms from the Sentiment140 Corpus and the Hashtag Sentiment Corpus. This subset of terms includes regular English words, Twitter-specific terms (e.g., emoticons, abbreviations, creative spellings), and negated expressions. The terms were chosen as follows. All terms from the corpora, excluding URLs, user mentions, stop words, and terms with non-letter characters, were ordered by their frequency. To reduce the subset skew towards the neutral class, terms were selected from different ranges of sentiment values. For this, the full range of sentiment values in the automatic lexicons was divided into 10 equal-size bins. From each bin,  $n_{aff}$  most frequent affirmative terms and  $n_{neg}$  most frequent negated terms were selected to form the initial list.<sup>16</sup>  $n_{aff}$  was set to 200 and  $n_{neg}$  was 50 for all the bins except for the two middle bins that contain words with very weak association to sentiment (i.e., neutral words). For these two middle bins,  $n_{aff} = 80$  and  $n_{neg} = 20$ . Then, the initial list was manually examined, and ambiguous terms, rare abbreviations, and extremely obscene words (243 terms) were removed. The resulting list was further augmented with 25 most frequent emoticons. The final list of 1,455 terms contains 1,202 affirmative terms and 253 negated terms; there are 946 words found in WordNet and 509 out-of-dictionary terms. Each negated term was presented to the annotators as a phrase ‘negator + term’,

16. Some bins may contain fewer than  $n_{aff}$  affirmative or fewer than  $n_{neg}$  negated terms. In this case, all available affirmative/negated terms were selected.

where the negator chosen was the most frequent negator for the term (e.g., ‘no respect’, ‘not acceptable’).

**Annotation process:** The term list was then converted into about 3,000 MaxDiff subsets with 4 terms each. The terms for the subsets were chosen randomly from the term list. No duplicate terms were allowed in a subset, and each subset was unique. For each MaxDiff subset, annotators were asked to identify the term with the most association to positive sentiment (i.e., the most positive term) and the term with the least association to positive sentiment (i.e., the most negative term). Each subset was annotated by 10 annotators. For any given question, we will refer to the option chosen most often as the *majority answer*. If a question is answered randomly by the annotators, then only 25% of the annotators are expected to select the majority answer (as each question has four options). In our task, we observed that the majority answer was selected by 72% of the annotators on average.

The answers were then converted into scores using the counting procedure (Orme, 2009). For each term, its score was calculated as the percentage of times the term was chosen as the most positive minus the percentage of times the term was chosen as the most negative. The scores were normalized to the range [0,1]. Even though annotators might disagree about answers to individual questions, the aggregated scores produced with this counting procedure and the corresponding term ranking are consistent. We verified this by randomly dividing the sets of answers to each question into two groups and comparing the scores and rankings obtained from these two groups of annotations. On average, the scores differed only by 0.04, and the Spearman rank correlation coefficient between the two sets of rankings was 0.97. In the rest of the paper, we use the scores and term ranking produced from the full set of annotations. We will refer to these scores as human annotated sentiment association scores.

**Comparing human annotated and automatic sentiment scores:** The human annotated scores are used to evaluate the sentiment scores in the automatically generated, tweet-specific lexicons. The scores themselves are not very meaningful other than their ability to rank terms in order of increasing (or decreasing) association with positive (or negative) sentiment. If terms  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are such that  $rank(t_1) > rank(t_2)$  as per both rankings (human and automatic), then the term pair  $(t_1, t_2)$  is considered to have the same rank order.<sup>17</sup> We measure the agreement between human and automatic sentiment rankings by the percentage of term pairs for which the rank order is the same.<sup>18</sup>

When two terms have a very similar degree of association with sentiment, then it is more likely that humans will disagree with each other regarding their order. Similarly, the greater the difference in true sentiment scores, the more likely that humans will agree with each other regarding their order. Thus, we first create several sets of term pairs pertaining to various minimal differences in human sentiment scores, and calculate agreement for each of these sets. Every set  $pairs_k$  has all term pairs  $(t_1, t_2)$  for which  $Human\ Score(t_1) \neq Human\ Score(t_2)$  and  $|Human\ Score(t_1) - Human\ Score(t_2)| \geq k$ , where  $k$  is varied from 0 to 0.8 in steps of 0.1. Thus,  $pairs_0$  includes all term pairs  $(t_1, t_2)$  for which  $Human\ Score(t_1) \neq Human\ Score(t_2)$ . Similarly,  $pairs_{0.1}$  includes all term pairs for which  $|Human\ Score(t_1) - Human\ Score(t_2)| \geq 0.1$ , and so on. The agreement for a

17. One can swap  $t_2$  with  $t_1$  without loss of generality.

18. The measure of agreement we use is similar to Kendall’s tau rank correlation coefficient.






Figure 2: Agreement in pair order ranking between automatic lexicons and human annotations. The agreement (y-axis) is measured as the percentage of term pairs with the same rank order obtained from a lexicon and from human annotations. The x-axis represents the minimal absolute difference in human annotated scores of term pairs ( $k$ ). The results for HS AffLex and HS NegLex are very close to the results for the HS Base Lexicon, and, therefore, the two curves are indistinguishable in the graph.

given set  $pairs_k$  is the percentage of term pairs in this set for which the rank order is the same as per both human annotations and automatically generated scores. We expect higher rank-order agreement for sets pertaining to higher  $k$ —sets with larger difference in human (or true) scores. We plot the agreement between the human annotations and an automatic lexicon as a function of  $k$  (x-axis) in Figure 2.

The agreement for  $pairs_0$  can be used as the bottom-line overall agreement score between human annotations and the automatically generated scores. One can observe that the overall agreement for all automatic lexicons is about 75–78%. The agreement curves monotonically increase with the difference in human scores getting larger, eventually reaching 100%. The monotonic increase is expected because as we move farther right along the x-axis, term pair sets with a higher average difference in human scores are considered. This demonstrates that the automatic sentiment lexicons correspond well with human intuition, especially on term pairs with larger difference in human scores.

## 6.2 Extrinsic Evaluation of the Lexicons

### 6.2.1 LEXICON PERFORMANCE IN UNSUPERVISED SENTIMENT ANALYSIS

In this set of experiments, we evaluate the performance of each individual lexicon on the message-level sentiment analysis task in unsupervised settings. No training and/or tuning is performed. Since most of the lexicons provide the association scores for the positive and negative classes only, in this subsection, we reduce the problem to a two-way classification task (positive or negative). The SemEval-2013 tweet test set and SMS test set are used for evaluation. The neutral instances are removed from both datasets.

To classify a message as positive or negative, we add up the scores for all matches in a particular lexicon and assign a positive label if the cumulative score is greater than zero and a negative label if the cumulative score is less than zero. Again, we use scores +1/-1 for the NRC Emotion Lexicon and Bing Liu’s Lexicon and scores +1/-1 for weak associations and +2/-2 for strong associations in the MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon. A message is left unclassified when the score is equal to zero or when no matches are found.

Table 8 presents the results of unsupervised sentiment analysis for (1) manually created, general-purpose lexicons (NRC Emotion Lexicon, Bing Liu’s Lexicon, and MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon), (2) automatically created, general-purpose lexicons (SentiWordNet 3.0 (Baccianella, Esuli, & Sebastiani, 2010), MSOL (Mohammad et al., 2009), and Osgood Evaluative Factor Ratings (Turney & Littman, 2003)), and (3) our automatically created, tweet-specific lexicons (Hashtag Sentiment and Sentiment140 Lexicons). Only unigram entries are used from each lexicon. The automatic general-purpose lexicons are large, open-domain lexicons providing automatically generated sentiment scores for words taken from hand-built general thesauri such as WordNet and Macquarie Thesaurus.<sup>19</sup> The predictive performance is assessed through precision and recall on the positive and negative classes as well as the macro-averaged F-score of the two classes. Observe that for most of the lexicons, both precision and recall on the negative class are lower than on the positive class. In particular, this holds for all the manual lexicons (rows a–c) despite the fact that they have significantly more negative terms than positive terms. One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that people can express negative sentiment without using many or any clearly negative words.

The threshold of zero seems natural for separating the positive and negative classes in unsupervised polarity detection; however, better results are possible with other thresholds. For example, predictions produced by the Osgood Evaluative Factor Ratings (rows f) are highly skewed towards the positive class (recall of 95.42 on the positive class and 31.28 on the negative class), which negatively affects its macro-averaged F-score. To avoid the problem of setting the optimal threshold in unsupervised settings, we report the Area Under the ROC curve (AUC), which takes into account the performance of the classifier at all possible thresholds (see the last column in Table 8). To calculate AUC, the cumulative scores assigned by a lexicon to the test messages are ordered in the decreasing order. Then, taking every score as a possible threshold, the true positive ratio is plotted against the false positive ratio and the area under this curve is calculated. It has been shown that the AUC of a classifier is equivalent to the probability that the classifier will rank a randomly chosen positive instance higher than a randomly chosen negative instance. This is also equivalent to the Wilcoxon test of ranks (Hanley & McNeil, 1982).

All automatically generated lexicons match at least one token in each test message while the manual lexicons are unable to cover 10–20% of the tweet test set. Paying attention to negation proves important for all general-purpose lexicons: both the macro-averaged F-score and AUC are improved by 1–4 percentage points. However, this is not the case for the Hashtag Sentiment Base (rows g) and the Sentiment140 Base Lexicons (rows k). The polarity reversing strategy fails to improve over the simple baseline of disregarding negation on these lexicons.

---

19. The SentiWordNet 3.0 has 30,821 unigrams, the MSOL Lexicon has 55,141 unigrams, and the Osgood Evaluative Factor Ratings Lexicon contains ratings for 72,905 unigrams.

Table 8: Prediction performance of the unigram lexicons in unsupervised sentiment analysis on the SemEval-2013 tweet test set. ‘Cover.’ denotes coverage – the percentage of tweets in the test set with at least one match from the lexicon; P is precision; R is recall;  $F_{avg}$  is the macro-averaged F-score for the positive and negative classes; AUC is the area under the ROC curve.

Lexicon	Cover.	Positive		Negative		$F_{avg}$	AUC
		P	R	P	R		
<b>Manual general-purpose lexicons</b>							
a. NRC Emotion Lexicon							
- disregarding negation	76.30	84.77	58.78	56.83	34.61	56.22	70.66
- reversing polarity	76.30	86.20	59.61	59.02	35.94	57.58	72.83
b. Bing Liu’s Lexicon							
- disregarding negation	77.59	90.73	61.64	65.94	45.42	63.60	79.08
- reversing polarity	77.59	92.02	61.64	66.74	48.75	65.09	80.20
c. MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon							
- disregarding negation	88.36	82.90	71.56	58.57	38.10	61.49	73.01
- reversing polarity	88.36	84.56	71.06	60.09	43.09	63.71	75.33
<b>Automatic general-purpose lexicons</b>							
d. SentiWordNet 3.0							
- disregarding negation	100.00	82.40	71.76	44.93	59.73	64.00	71.51
- reversing polarity	100.00	85.08	71.12	47.42	67.22	66.54	75.15
e. MSOL							
- disregarding negation	100.00	77.18	74.43	38.66	27.79	54.06	63.44
- reversing polarity	100.00	77.35	74.30	41.70	30.95	55.66	63.80
f. Osgood Evaluative Factor Ratings							
- disregarding negation	100.00	75.65	97.65	74.31	17.80	56.99	75.30
- reversing polarity	100.00	78.41	95.42	72.31	31.28	64.88	80.11
<b>Automatic tweet-specific lexicons</b>							
g. HS Base Lexicon							
- disregarding negation	100.00	89.15	72.65	51.79	76.87	70.97	82.52
- reversing polarity	100.00	88.03	72.07	50.45	74.38	69.69	80.21
h. HS AffLex							
- disregarding negation	100.00	87.53	80.41	57.75	70.05	73.56	83.06
- reversing polarity	100.00	87.04	79.07	55.84	69.22	72.34	82.21
i. HS AffLex and HS NegLex	100.00	89.44	77.04	55.92	76.21	73.64	84.61
j. HS AffLex and HS NegLex (Posit.)	100.00	89.60	77.29	56.30	76.54	73.94	84.62
k. S140 Base Lexicon							
- disregarding negation	100.00	88.60	77.61	55.78	73.88	73.15	84.47
- reversing polarity	100.00	87.78	77.23	54.68	71.88	72.14	83.21
l. S140 AffLex							
- disregarding negation	100.00	85.96	86.45	64.02	63.06	74.87	84.94
- reversing polarity	100.00	87.19	85.31	63.56	67.05	75.75	86.04
m. S140 AffLex and S140 NegLex	100.00	89.65	83.21	63.03	74.88	77.37	86.88
n. S140 AffLex and S140 NegLex (Posit.)	100.00	89.79	83.33	63.31	75.21	77.59	87.14
- no tweet-specific entries	100.00	87.26	86.26	65.11	67.05	76.41	86.55

Compared to the Base Lexicons, the lexicons created only from affirmative contexts (rows h and l) are more precise and slightly improve the predictive performance. More substantial improvements are obtained by adding the Negated Context Lexicons (rows i and m). Furthermore, the Sentiment140 Negated Context (Positional) Lexicon (row n) offers additional gain of 0.26 percentage points in AUC over the regular Sentiment140 Negated Context Lexicon (row m). Overall, the Affirmative Context Lexicons and the Negated Context (Positional) Lexicons outperform the Base Lexicons by over 2 percentage points in AUC.

The automatically created general-purpose lexicons (rows d–f) have a substantially higher coverage; however, they do not show better performance than the manual lexicons. On the other hand, all our tweet-specific automatic lexicons demonstrate a predictive power superior to that of both, the manually and automatically created, general-purpose lexicons. The differences are especially pronounced for the Affirmative Context Lexicons and the Negated Context Lexicons. While keeping the level of precision close to that of the manual lexicons, the automatic tweet-specific lexicons are able to substantially improve the recall on both positive and negative classes. This increase in recall is particularly noticeable on the negative class where the differences reach forty percentage points.

To investigate the impact of tweet-specific subset of the vocabulary (e.g., emoticons, hashtags, misspellings) on the performance of the automatic lexicons, we conduct the same experiments on a reduced lexicon. Terms that are not punctuation, numerals, or stop words, and that are not found in WordNet have been removed from S140 AffLex and S140 NegLex (Positional) Lexicons. The performance of the reduced lexicon (last row of the table) drops about 0.6 percentage points in AUC demonstrating the value of tweet-specific terms. Nevertheless, the results achieved with the subset of S140 AffLex and S140 NegLex (Positional) Lexicons are still superior to that obtained with any other automatic or manual lexicon. This experiment suggests that the high-coverage automatic lexicons can also be successfully employed as general-purpose sentiment lexicons and, therefore, applied on other, non-tweet domains. In the next section, we show that the features derived from these lexicons are extremely helpful in automatic sentiment analysis not only on tweets, but also on SMS and movie review data. Furthermore, in (Kiritchenko et al., 2014) we demonstrate the usefulness of the lexicons in the domains of restaurant and laptop customer reviews.

In the unsupervised sentiment analysis experiments on the SMS test set (Table 9), one can see trends similar to the ones observed on the tweet test set above. The automatic lexicons built separately for affirmative and negated contexts (rows i and m) perform 3–6 percentage points better than the corresponding Base Lexicons in combination with the polarity reversing strategy (rows g and k). Moreover, the use of the Sentiment140 Affirmative Context Lexicon and Negated Context (Positional) Lexicon (row n) again results in higher performance than that obtained with any other manually or automatically created lexicon we used.

To get a better understanding of the impact of the amount of data used to create an automatic lexicon on the quality of the lexicon, we compare the performance of the automatic lexicons built from subsets of the available data. We split a tweet corpus (Hashtag Sentiment Corpus or Sentiment140 Corpus) into smaller chunks by the tweets' time stamp. Fig. 3 shows the performance of the Hashtag Sentiment Base, Hashtag Sentiment Affirma-

Table 9: Prediction performance of the unigram lexicons in unsupervised sentiment analysis on the SemEval-2013 SMS test set. The polarity reversing strategy is applied to negation for all lexicons except for the Negated Context Lexicons. ‘Cover.’ denotes coverage – the percentage of SMS in the test set with at least one match from the lexicon; P is precision; R is recall;  $F_{avg}$  is the macro-averaged F-score for the positive and negative classes; AUC is the area under the ROC curve.

Lexicon	Cover.	Positive		Negative		$F_{avg}$	AUC
		P	R	P	R		
<b>Manual general-purpose lexicons</b>							
a. NRC Emotion Lexicon	70.88	85.11	56.91	80.17	47.21	63.82	79.66
b. Bing Liu’s Lexicon	69.75	87.90	61.99	86.36	48.22	67.30	83.24
c. MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon	83.86	81.69	72.56	77.95	52.03	69.63	82.42
<b>Automatic general-purpose lexicons</b>							
d. SentiWordNet 3.0	100.00	77.36	79.88	73.87	70.30	75.32	81.34
e. MSOL	100.00	69.88	73.58	69.14	44.92	63.07	72.49
f. Osgood Evaluative Factor Ratings	100.00	66.15	95.33	87.01	39.09	66.02	84.01
<b>Automatic tweet-specific lexicons</b>							
g. HS Base Lexicon	100.00	88.41	41.87	56.20	93.15	63.47	75.49
i. HS AffLex and HS NegLex	100.00	92.03	46.95	58.90	94.92	67.44	81.67
j. HS AffLex and HS NegLex (Posit.)	100.00	92.00	46.75	58.81	94.92	67.31	82.05
k. S140 Base Lexicon	100.00	85.71	73.17	71.67	84.77	78.31	86.07
m. S140 AffLex and S140 NegLex	100.00	88.38	78.86	76.73	87.06	82.46	89.34
n. S140 AffLex and S140 NegLex (Posit.)	100.00	88.69	79.67	77.48	87.31	83.02	89.60

tive Context and Hashtag Sentiment Negated Context Lexicons, Sentiment140 Base, and Sentiment140 Affirmative Context and Sentiment140 Negated Context Lexicons built from these partial corpora as a function of the corpus’ size. As above, the performance of the lexicons is evaluated in terms of AUC in unsupervised sentiment analysis on the SemEval-2013 tweet test set. We can see that the Sentiment140 Lexicons generated from half of the available tweet set still have higher predictive power than the full Hashtag Sentiment Lexicons. Interestingly, both Hashtag Sentiment Lexicons seem to stabilize at the corpus’ size of 400,000–500,000 tweets whereas both Sentiment140 Lexicons stabilize at about 800,000 tweets. However, better results might still be possible with corpora that are orders of magnitude larger.

### 6.2.2 LEXICON PERFORMANCE IN SUPERVISED SENTIMENT ANALYSIS

In this section, we evaluate our supervised sentiment analysis system (described in Section 5) on a three-class problem (positive, negative, and neutral) on both the message-level task and the term-level task. We use the data provided for the SemEval-2013 competition. We examine the contribution of various feature groups, including the features derived from the sentiment lexicons: manually created lexicons (NRC Emotion Lexicon, Bing Liu’s Lexicon, and MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon) and our automatically created lexicons (Hashtag




Figure 3: Performance of the automatic tweet-specific lexicons in unsupervised sentiment analysis on the SemEval-2013 tweet test set for different sizes of the tweet corpora. “AUC” denotes the Area Under the ROC Curve.

Sentiment and Sentiment140 Lexicons). Finally, we compare the performance of different strategies to process negation.

For both tasks, we train an SVM classifier on the provided training data and evaluate the performance of the learned models on an unseen tweet test set. The same models are applied, without any change, to the test set of SMS messages. We evaluate the performance with the bottom-line evaluation measure used by the organizers of the SemEval-2013 competition – the macro-averaged F-score of the positive and negative classes:

$$F_{avg} = \frac{F_{pos} + F_{neg}}{2} \quad (4)$$

Note that this measure does not give any credit for correctly classifying neutral instances. Nevertheless, the system has to predict all three classes (positive, negative, and neutral) to avoid being penalized for misclassifying neutral instances as positive or negative. We report the results obtained by our system on the training set (ten-fold cross-validation), development set (when trained on the training set), and test sets (when trained on the combined set of tweets in the training and development sets). Significance tests are performed using a one-tailed paired t-test with approximate randomization at the  $p < .05$  level (Yeh, 2000).

In order to test our system on a different domain, we conduct experiments on classifying movie review sentences as positive or negative (message-level task only). We use the dataset and the evaluation setup provided by Socher et al. (2013). We train the system on the training and development subsets of the movie review excerpts dataset and apply the learned model on the test subset. To compare with published results on this dataset, we use accuracy as the evaluation measure.

### 6.2.3 RESULTS FOR THE MESSAGE-LEVEL TASK

(a) **On the SemEval-2013 data:** The results obtained by our system on the SemEval-2013 message-level task are presented in Table 10. Our official submission on this task

Table 10: Message-level task: The macro-averaged F-scores on the SemEval-2013 datasets.

Classifier	Train. Set	Dev. Set	Test Sets	
			Tweets	SMS
a. Majority baseline	26.94	26.85	29.19	19.03
b. SVM-unigrams	36.95	36.71	39.61	39.29
c. Our system:				
c.1. official SemEval-2013 submission	67.09	68.72	69.02	68.46
c.2. best result	68.19	68.43	70.45	69.77

(row c.1) obtained a macro-averaged F-score of 69.02 on the tweet test set and 68.46 on the SMS test set. Out of 48 submissions from 34 teams, our system ranked first on both datasets.<sup>20</sup> After replacing the Base Lexicons with the Affirmative Context Lexicons and the Negated Context (Positional) Lexicons and with some improvements to the feature set, we achieved the scores of 70.45 on the tweet set and 69.77 on the SMS set (row c.2).<sup>21</sup> The differences between the best scores and the official scores on both test sets are statistically significant. The table also shows the baseline results obtained by a majority classifier that always predicts the most frequent class (row a). The bottom-line F-score is based only on the F-scores of the positive and negative classes (and not on neutral), so the majority baseline chooses the most frequent class among positive and negative, which in this case is the positive class.<sup>22</sup> We also include the baseline results obtained using an SVM and unigram features alone (row b).

Table 11 shows the results of the ablation experiments where we repeat the same classification process but remove one feature group at a time. The most influential features turn out to be the sentiment lexicon features (row b): they provide gains of 8–10 percentage points on all SemEval-2013 datasets. Note that the contribution of the automatic tweet-specific lexicons (row b.2) substantially exceeds the contribution of the manual lexicons (row b.1). This is especially noticeable on the tweet test set where the use of the automatic lexicons results in improvement of 6.5 percentage points. Also, the use of bigrams and non-contiguous pairs (row b.5) bring additional gains over using only the unigram lexicons.

The second most important feature group for the message-level task is ngrams (row c): word ngrams and character ngrams. Part-of-speech tagging (row d) and clustering (row e) provide only small improvements. Also, removing the sentiment encoding features like hashtags, emoticons, and elongated words (row f) has little impact on performance, but this is probably because the discriminating information in them is also captured by some other features such as character and word ngrams.

Next, we compare the different strategies of processing negation (Table 12). Observe that processing negation benefits the overall sentiment analysis system: all methods we test

20. The second-best results were 65.27 on the tweet set and 62.15 on the SMS set.

21. The contributions of the different versions of the automatic lexicons to the overall system’s performance are presented later in this subsection.

22. The majority baseline is calculated as follows. Since all instances are predicted as positive,  $F_{neg} = 0$ ,  $R_{pos} = 1$ , and  $P_{pos} = N_{pos}/N$ , where  $N_{pos}$  is the number of positive instances and  $N$  is the total number of instances in the dataset. Then, the macro-averaged F-score of the positive and negative classes  $F_{avg} = (F_{pos} + F_{neg})/2 = F_{pos}/2 = (P_{pos} * R_{pos})/(P_{pos} + R_{pos}) = P_{pos}/(P_{pos} + 1) = N_{pos}/(N_{pos} + N)$ .

Table 11: Message-level task: The macro-averaged F-scores obtained on the SemEval-2013 datasets when one of the feature groups is removed. Scores marked with \* are statistically significantly different ( $p < .05$ ) from the corresponding scores in row a.

Experiment	Train.	Dev.	Test Sets	
	Set	Set	Tweets	SMS
a. all features	68.19	68.43	70.45	69.77
b. all - lexicons	60.08*	58.98*	60.51*	59.94*
b.1. all - manual lexicons	66.59*	66.24*	69.52*	67.26*
b.2. all - automatic lexicons	65.17*	64.15*	63.89*	66.46*
b.3. all - Sentiment140 Lexicons	66.84*	66.80*	66.58*	67.61*
b.4. all - Hashtag Sentiment Lexicons	67.65*	67.82	67.64*	71.16*
b.5. all - automatic lexicons of bigrams & non-contiguous pairs	67.65*	66.84	67.44*	69.42
c. all - ngrams	64.07*	65.68*	67.49*	66.93*
c.1. all - word ngrams	66.64*	66.70*	68.29*	67.64*
c.2. all - character ngrams	67.64*	68.28	68.74*	69.11
d. all - POS	67.54*	67.64	70.47	68.42*
e. all - clusters	68.21*	68.33	70.00	68.56*
f. all - encodings (elongated, emoticons, punctuations, all-caps, hashtags)	67.99*	68.66	70.79	69.82

outperform the baseline of disregarding negation (row a.1). Employing the Affirmative Context Lexicons and the Negated Context Lexicons (row b) provides substantial improvement over the standard polarity reversing strategy on the Base Lexicons (row a.2). Replacing the Negated Context Lexicons with the Negated Context (Positional) Lexicons (row c) results in some additional gains for the system.

**(b) On the Movie Reviews data:** The results obtained using our system on the movie review excerpts dataset is shown in Table 13. Our system, trained on the sentence-level annotations of the training and development subsets, is able to correctly classify 85.5% of the test subset. Note that we ignore the annotations on the word and phrase level as well as the parse tree structure used by Socher et al. (2013). Even on a non-tweet domain, employing the automatically generated, tweet-specific lexicons significantly improves the overall performance: without the use of these lexicons, the performance drops to 83.9%. Furthermore, our system demonstrates the state-of-the-art performance surpassing the previous best result obtained on this dataset (Socher et al., 2013).

#### 6.2.4 RESULTS FOR THE TERM-LEVEL TASK

Table 14 shows the performance of our sentiment analysis system on the SemEval-2013 term-level task. Our official submission (row c.1) obtained a macro-averaged F-score of 88.93 on the tweet set and was ranked first among 29 submissions from 23 participating



Table 12: Message-level task: The macro-averaged F-scores on the Semeval-2013 datasets for different negation processing strategies. Scores marked with \* are statistically significantly different ( $p < .05$ ) from the corresponding scores in row c (our best result).

Experiment	Train. Set	Dev. Set	Test Sets	
			Tweets	SMS
a. Base automatic lexicons				
a.1. disregarding negation	66.62*	67.36	67.99*	65.29*
a.2. reversing polarity	67.61*	68.04	68.95*	66.96*
b. AffLex and NegLex	68.13*	68.41	69.95*	69.59
c. AffLex and NegLex (Positional)	68.19	68.43	70.45	69.77

Table 13: Message-level task: The results obtained on the movie review excerpts dataset.

System	Accuracy
a. Majority baseline	50.1
b. SVM-unigrams	71.9
c. Previous best result (Socher et al., 2013)	85.4
d. Our system	<b>85.5</b>

teams.<sup>23</sup> Even with no tuning specific to SMS data, our system ranked second on the SMS test set with an F-score of 88.00. The score of the first ranking system on the SMS set was 88.39. A post-competition bug-fix and the use of the Affirmative Context Lexicons and the Negated Context (Positional) Lexicons resulted in F-score of 89.50 on the tweets set and 88.20 on the SMS set (row c.2). The difference between the best score and the official score on the tweet test set is statistically significant. The table also shows the baseline results obtained by a majority classifier that always predicts the most frequent class as output (row a), and an additional baseline result obtained using an SVM and unigram features alone (row b).

Table 15 presents the results of the ablation experiments where feature groups are alternately removed from the final model. Observe that the sentiment lexicon features (row b) are again the most useful group—removing them leads to a drop in F-score of 4–5 percentage points on all datasets. Both manual (row b.1) and automatic (row b.2) lexicons contribute significantly to the overall sentiment analysis system, with the automatic lexicons consistently showing larger gains.

The ngram features (row c) are the next most useful group on the term-level task. Note that removing just the word ngram features (row c.1) or just the character ngram features (row c.2) results in only a small drop in performance. This indicates that the two feature groups capture similar information.

The last two rows in Table 15 show the results obtained when the features are extracted only from the context of the target (and not from the target itself) (row f) and when they are extracted only from the target (and not from its context) (row g). Observe that even

23. The second-best system that used no additional labeled data obtained the score of 86.98 on the tweet test set.

Table 14: Term-level task: The macro-averaged F-scores on the SemEval-2013 datasets.

Classifier	Train.	Dev.	Test Sets	
	Set	Set	Tweets	SMS
a. Majority baseline	38.38	36.34	38.13	32.11
b. SVM-unigrams	78.04	79.76	80.28	78.71
c. Our system:				
c.1. official SemEval-2013 submission	86.80	86.49	88.93	88.00
c.2. best result	87.03	87.07	89.50	88.20

Table 15: Term-level task: The macro-averaged F-scores obtained on the SemEval-2013 datasets when one of the feature groups is removed. Scores marked with \* are statistically significantly different ( $p < .05$ ) from the corresponding scores in row a.

Experiment	Train.	Dev.	Test Sets	
	Set	Set	Tweets	SMS
a. all features	87.03	87.07	89.50	88.20
b. all - lexicons	82.77*	81.75*	85.56*	83.52*
b.1. all - manual lexicons	86.16*	86.22	88.21*	87.27*
b.2. all - automatic lexicons	85.28*	85.66*	88.02*	86.39*
c. all - ngrams	84.08*	84.94*	85.73*	82.94*
c.1. all - word ngrams	86.65*	86.30	88.51*	87.02*
c.2. all - char. ngrams	86.67*	87.58	89.20	87.15*
d. all - stopwords	87.07*	87.08	89.42*	88.07*
e. all - encodings (elongated words, emoticons, punctuation, uppercase)	87.11	87.08	89.44	88.17
f. all - target	72.65*	71.72*	74.12*	69.37*
g. all - context	83.76*	83.95*	85.56*	86.63*

though the target features are substantially more useful than the context features, adding the context features to the system improves the F-scores by roughly 2 to 4 points.

The performance of the sentiment analysis system is significantly higher in the term-level task than in the message-level task. The difference in performance on these two tasks can also be observed for the SVM-unigrams baseline. We analyzed the provided labeled data to determine why unigrams performed so strongly in the term-level task, and found that most of the test target tokens (85.1%) occur as target tokens in the training data. Further, the distribution of occurrences of a target term in different polarities is skewed towards one polarity or other. On average, a word appears in target phrases of the same polarity 80.8% of the time. These facts explain, at least in part, the high overall result and the dominant role of unigrams in the term-level task. To evaluate the impact of different feature groups on the test data with unseen target terms, we split the SemEval-2013 tweet test set into three subsets. Every instance in the first subset, “targets fully seen in training”, has a target  $X$  ( $X$  can be a single word or a multi-word expression) with the following property: there exist instances in the training data with exactly the same target. The first subset

Table 16: Term-level task: The macro-averaged F-scores obtained on the different subsets of the SemEval-2013 tweet test set with one of the feature groups removed. The number in brackets is the difference with the scores in row a. Scores marked with \* are statistically significantly different ( $p < .05$ ) from the corresponding scores in row a.

Classifier	Targets fully seen in training	Targets partially seen in training	Targets unseen in training
a. all features	93.31	85.42	84.09
b. all - lexicons	92.96 (-0.35)	81.26 (-4.16)*	69.55 (-14.54)*
b.1. all - manual lexicons	92.94 (-0.37)	84.51 (-0.91)	79.33 (-4.76)*
b.2. all - automatic lexicons	92.98 (-0.33)	84.08 (-1.34)	79.41 (-4.68)*
c. all - ngrams	89.30 (-4.01)*	81.61 (-3.81)*	80.62 (-3.47)*

Table 17: Term-level task: The macro-averaged F-scores on the SemEval-2013 datasets for different negation processing strategies. Scores marked with \* are statistically significantly different ( $p < .05$ ) from the corresponding scores in row c (our best result).

Experiment	Train. Set	Dev. Set	Tweets	SMS
a. Base automatic lexicons				
a.1. disregarding negation	85.88*	86.37*	88.38*	86.77*
a.2. reversing polarity	86.85	86.48*	89.10*	88.34
b. AffLex and NegLex	86.89	86.60*	89.33	87.89
c. AffLex and NegLex (Positional)	87.03	87.07	89.50	88.20

comprises 55% of the test set. Every instance in the second subset, “targets partially seen in training”, has a target  $X$  with the following property: there exist instances in the training data whose target expression includes one or more, but not all, tokens in  $X$ . The second subset comprises 31% of the test set. Every instance in the third subset, “targets unseen in training”, has a target  $X$  with the following property: there are no instances in the training data whose target includes any of the tokens in  $X$ . The third subset comprises 14% of the test set. Table 16 shows the results of the ablation experiments on these three subsets. Observe that on the instances with unseen targets the sentiment lexicons play a more prominent role, providing a substantial gain (14.54 percentage points).

In the next set of experiments, we compare the performance of different approaches to negation handling on the term-level task (Table 17). Similar to the message-level task, processing negation proves beneficial on the term-level task as well. All tested negation processing approaches show better results than the default strategy of disregarding negation (row a.1). The use of the Affirmative Context Lexicons and the Negated Context Lexicons (row b) and especially the Negated Context (Positional) Lexicons (row c) provides additional gains over the results obtained through the use of the polarity reversing method (row a.2).

## 7. Conclusions

We created a supervised statistical sentiment analysis system that detects the sentiment of short informal textual messages such as tweets and SMS (message-level task) as well as the sentiment of a term (a word or a phrase) within a message (term-level task). The system ranked first in both tasks at the SemEval-2013 competition ‘Sentiment Analysis in Twitter’. Moreover, it demonstrated the state-of-the-art performance on two additional datasets: the SemEval-2013 SMS test set and a corpus of movie review excerpts.

In this system, we implemented a variety of features based on surface form and lexical categories. We also included features derived from several sentiment lexicons: (1) existing, manually created, general-purpose lexicons and (2) high-coverage, tweet-specific lexicons that we generated from tweets with sentiment-word hashtags and from tweets with emoticons. Our experiments showed that the new tweet-specific lexicons are superior in sentiment prediction on tweets in both unsupervised and supervised settings.

Processing negation plays an important role in sentiment analysis. Many previous studies adopted a simple technique to reverse polarity of words in the scope of negation. In this work, we demonstrated that this polarity reversing method may not be always appropriate. In particular, we showed that when positive terms are negated, they tend to convey a negative sentiment. In contrast, when negative terms are negated, they tend to still convey a negative sentiment. Furthermore, the evaluative intensity for both positive and negative terms changes in a negated context, and the amount of change varies from term to term. To adequately capture the impact of negation on individual terms, we proposed to empirically estimate the sentiment scores of terms in negated context from large tweet corpora, and built two lexicons, one for terms in negated contexts and one for terms in affirmative (non-negated) contexts. By using these Affirmative Context Lexicons and Negated Context Lexicons we were able to significantly improve the performance of the overall sentiment analysis system on both tasks. In particular, the features derived from these lexicons provided gains of up to 6.5 percentage points over the other feature groups.

Our system can process 100 tweets in a second. Thus, it is suitable for small- and big-data versions of applications listed in the introduction. We recently annotated 135 million tweets over a cluster of 50 machines in 11 hours. We have already employed the sentiment analysis system within larger systems for detecting intentions behind political tweets (Mohammad, Kiritchenko, & Martin, 2013), for detecting emotions in text (Mohammad & Kiritchenko, 2014), and for detecting sentiment towards particular aspects of target entities (Kiritchenko et al., 2014). We are also interested in applying and evaluating the lexicons generated from tweets on data from other kinds of text such as blogs and news articles. In addition, we plan to adapt our sentiment analysis system to languages other than English. Along the way, we continue to improve the sentiment lexicons by generating them from larger amounts of data, and from different kinds of data, such as tweets, blogs, and Facebook posts. We are especially interested in algorithms that gracefully handle all kinds of sentiment modifiers including not only negations, but also intensifiers (e.g., *very*, *hardly*), and discourse connectives (e.g., *but*, *however*).



- Choi, Y., & Cardie, C. (2010). Hierarchical sequential learning for extracting opinions and their attributes. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL '10, pp. 269–274.
- Davidov, D., Tsur, O., & Rappoport, A. (2010). Enhanced sentiment learning using Twitter hashtags and smileys. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Posters*, COLING '10, pp. 241–249, Beijing, China.
- Esuli, A., & Sebastiani, F. (2006). SENTIWORDNET: A publicly available lexical resource for opinion mining. In *In Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*, LREC '06, pp. 417–422.
- Francisco, V., & Gervás, P. (2006). Automated mark up of affective information in English texts. In Sojka, P., Kopeček, I., & Pala, K. (Eds.), *Text, Speech and Dialogue*, Vol. 4188 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 375–382. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg.
- Genereux, M., & Evans, R. P. (2006). Distinguishing affective states in weblogs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Spring Symposium on Computational Approaches to Analysing Weblogs*, pp. 27–29, Stanford, California.
- Gimpel, K., Schneider, N., O'Connor, B., Das, D., Mills, D., Eisenstein, J., Heilman, M., Yogatama, D., Flanigan, J., & Smith, N. A. (2011). Part-of-speech tagging for Twitter: Annotation, features, and experiments. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL '11.
- Go, A., Bhayani, R., & Huang, L. (2009). Twitter sentiment classification using distant supervision. Tech. rep., Stanford University.
- Hanley, J., & McNeil, B. (1982). The meaning and use of the area under a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve. *Radiology*, 143, 29–36.
- Hatzivassiloglou, V., & McKeown, K. R. (1997). Predicting the semantic orientation of adjectives. In *Proceedings of the 8th Conference of European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, EACL '97, pp. 174–181, Madrid, Spain.
- Hu, M., & Liu, B. (2004). Mining and summarizing customer reviews. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '04, pp. 168–177, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Jia, L., Yu, C., & Meng, W. (2009). The effect of negation on sentiment analysis and retrieval effectiveness. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, CIKM '09, pp. 1827–1830, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Jiang, L., Yu, M., Zhou, M., Liu, X., & Zhao, T. (2011). Target-dependent Twitter sentiment classification. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL '11, pp. 151–160.
- Johansson, R., & Moschitti, A. (2013). Relational features in fine-grained opinion analysis. *Computational Linguistics*, 39(3), 473–509.
- John, D., Boucouvalas, A. C., & Xu, Z. (2006). Representing emotional momentum within expressive internet communication. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Internet and Multimedia Systems and Applications*, pp. 183–188, Anaheim, CA. ACTA Press.

- Jurgens, D., Mohammad, S. M., Turney, P., & Holyoak, K. (2012). Semeval-2012 task 2: Measuring degrees of relational similarity. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation, SemEval '12*, pp. 356–364, Montréal, Canada.
- Kennedy, A., & Inkpen, D. (2005). Sentiment classification of movie and product reviews using contextual valence shifters. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on the Analysis of Informal and Formal Information Exchange during Negotiations*, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Kennedy, A., & Inkpen, D. (2006). Sentiment classification of movie reviews using contextual valence shifters. *Computational Intelligence*, 22(2), 110–125.
- Kiritchenko, S., Zhu, X., Cherry, C., & Mohammad, S. M. (2014). NRC-Canada-2014: Detecting aspects and sentiment in customer reviews. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation, SemEval '14*, Dublin, Ireland.
- Kouloumpis, E., Wilson, T., & Moore, J. (2011). Twitter sentiment analysis: The Good the Bad and the OMG!. In *Proceedings of the 5th International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.
- Lapponi, E., Read, J., & Ovreliid, L. (2012). Representing and resolving negation for sentiment analysis. In Vreeken, J., Ling, C., Zaki, M. J., Siebes, A., Yu, J. X., Goethals, B., Webb, G. I., & Wu, X. (Eds.), *ICDM Workshops*, pp. 687–692. IEEE Computer Society.
- Li, J., Zhou, G., Wang, H., & Zhu, Q. (2010). Learning the scope of negation via shallow semantic parsing. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING '10*, pp. 671–679, Beijing, China.
- Liu, B., & Zhang, L. (2012). A survey of opinion mining and sentiment analysis. In Aggarwal, C. C., & Zhai, C. (Eds.), *Mining Text Data*, pp. 415–463. Springer US.
- Liu, H., Lieberman, H., & Selker, T. (2003). A model of textual affect sensing using real-world knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces, IUI '03*, pp. 125–132, New York, NY. ACM.
- Louviere, J. J. (1991). Best-worst scaling: A model for the largest difference judgments. Working Paper.
- Martínez-Cámara, E., Martín-Valdivia, M. T., Ureñalópez, L. A., & Montejoráez, A. R. (2012). Sentiment analysis in Twitter. *Natural Language Engineering*, 1–28.
- Mihalcea, R., & Liu, H. (2006). A corpus-based approach to finding happiness. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Spring Symposium on Computational Approaches to Analysing Weblogs*, pp. 139–144. AAAI Press.
- Mohammad, S. M. (2012). #Emotional tweets. In *Proceedings of the First Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics, \*SEM '12*, pp. 246–255, Montréal, Canada.
- Mohammad, S. M., Dunne, C., & Dorr, B. (2009). Generating high-coverage semantic orientation lexicons from overtly marked words and a thesaurus. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Volume 2, EMNLP '09*, pp. 599–608.

- Mohammad, S. M., & Kiritchenko, S. (2014). Using hashtags to capture fine emotion categories from tweets. *To appear in Computational Intelligence*.
- Mohammad, S. M., Kiritchenko, S., & Martin, J. (2013). Identifying purpose behind electoral tweets. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Issues of Sentiment Discovery and Opinion Mining, WISDOM '13*, pp. 1–9.
- Mohammad, S. M., & Turney, P. D. (2010). Emotions evoked by common words and phrases: Using Mechanical Turk to create an emotion lexicon. In *Proceedings of the NAACL-HLT Workshop on Computational Approaches to Analysis and Generation of Emotion in Text*, LA, California.
- Mohammad, S. M., & Yang, T. W. (2011). Tracking sentiment in mail: How genders differ on emotional axes. In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity and Sentiment Analysis, WASSA '11*, Portland, OR, USA.
- Neviarouskaya, A., Prendinger, H., & Ishizuka, M. (2011). Affect analysis model: novel rule-based approach to affect sensing from text. *Natural Language Engineering*, 17, 95–135.
- Orme, B. (2009). Maxdiff analysis: Simple counting, individual-level logit, and HB. Sawtooth Software, Inc.
- Pak, A., & Paroubek, P. (2010). Twitter as a corpus for sentiment analysis and opinion mining. In *Proceedings of the 7th Conference on International Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC '10*, Valletta, Malta.
- Pang, B., & Lee, L. (2008). Opinion mining and sentiment analysis. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*, 2(1–2), 1–135.
- Pang, B., Lee, L., & Vaithyanathan, S. (2002). Thumbs up?: Sentiment classification using machine learning techniques. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP '02*, pp. 79–86, Philadelphia, PA.
- Polanyi, L., & Zaenen, A. (2004). Contextual valence shifters. In *Exploring Attitude and Affect in Text: Theories and Applications (AAAI Spring Symposium Series)*.
- Porter, M. (1980). An algorithm for suffix stripping. *Program*, 3, 130–137.
- Proisl, T., Greiner, P., Evert, S., & Kabashi, B. (2013). Klue: Simple and robust methods for polarity classification. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2013)*, pp. 395–401, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.
- Reckman, H., Baird, C., Crawford, J., Crowell, R., Micciulla, L., Sethi, S., & Veress, F. (2013). teragram: Rule-based detection of sentiment phrases using sas sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2013)*, pp. 513–519, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.
- Sauper, C., & Barzilay, R. (2013). Automatic aggregation by joint modeling of aspects and values. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 46, 89–127.
- Socher, R., Huval, B., Manning, C. D., & Ng, A. Y. (2012). Semantic compositionality through recursive matrix-vector spaces. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP '12*, Jeju, Korea.



- Socher, R., Perelygin, A., Wu, J. Y., Chuang, J., Manning, C. D., Ng, A. Y., & Potts, C. (2013). Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP '13*, Seattle, USA.
- Stone, P., Dunphy, D. C., Smith, M. S., Ogilvie, D. M., & associates (1966). *The General Inquirer: A Computer Approach to Content Analysis*. The MIT Press.
- Taboada, M., Brooke, J., Tofiloski, M., Voll, K., & Stede, M. (2011). Lexicon-based methods for sentiment analysis. *Computational Linguistics*, 37(2), 267–307.
- Thelwall, M., Buckley, K., & Paltoglou, G. (2011). Sentiment in Twitter events. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(2), 406–418.
- Turney, P. (2001). Mining the web for synonyms: PMI-IR versus LSA on TOEFL. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth European Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 491–502, Freiburg, Germany.
- Turney, P., & Littman, M. L. (2003). Measuring praise and criticism: Inference of semantic orientation from association. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 21(4).
- Wiebe, J., Wilson, T., & Cardie, C. (2005). Annotating expressions of opinions and emotions in language. *Language resources and evaluation*, 39(2-3), 165–210.
- Wiegand, M., Balahur, A., Roth, B., Klakow, D., & Montoyo, A. (2010). A survey on the role of negation in sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Negation and Speculation in Natural Language Processing, NeSp-NLP '10*, pp. 60–68, Stroudsburg, PA, USA.
- Wilson, T., Kozareva, Z., Nakov, P., Rosenthal, S., Stoyanov, V., & Ritter, A. (2013). SemEval-2013 Task 2: Sentiment analysis in Twitter. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation, SemEval '13*, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.
- Wilson, T., Wiebe, J., & Hoffmann, P. (2005). Recognizing contextual polarity in phrase-level sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Human Language Technology and Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, HLT '05*, pp. 347–354, Stroudsburg, PA, USA.
- Yang, B., & Cardie, C. (2013). Joint inference for fine-grained opinion extraction. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL '13*.
- Yeh, A. (2000). More accurate tests for the statistical significance of result differences. In *Proceedings of the 18th conference on Computational linguistics - Volume 2, COLING '00*, pp. 947–953, Stroudsburg, PA, USA.