

A Word-Scale Probabilistic Latent Variable Model for Detecting Human Values

Takayama, Yasuhiro
Nat'l Institute of Technology, Tokuyama College

Tomiura, Yoichi
Department of Informatics, Faculty of Information Science and Electrical Engineering, Kyushu University

Ishita, Emi
Kyushu University Library

Oard, Douglas W.
iSchool/UMIACS University of Maryland

他

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/1833092>

出版情報 : ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM). 2014, pp.1-, 2014-12-06. ACM

バージョン :

権利関係 :

Errata of Takayam et al. 2014.

Takayama, Y., Tomiura, Y., Ishita, E., Oard, D. W., Fleischmann, K. R. and Cheng, A-S. 2014. A Word-Scale Probabilistic Latent Variable Model for Detecting Human Values, *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (ACM CIKM 2014)*, pp. 1489-1498.

Numerical values in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 are corrected as follows.

Table 2. Inter-annotator agreement and prevalence.

Original (numbers for original 9,890 sentences.)

Value	original		
	κ	# docs	# sentences
<i>wealth</i>	0.629	102	3,563
<i>social order</i>	0.683	102	2,859
<i>justice</i>	0.420	99	2,641
<i>freedom</i>	0.620	101	2,431
<i>innovation</i>	0.715	94	1,147
<i>honor</i>	0.430	80	352

Corrected (numbers for 8,860 sentences used in experiments.)

Value			
	κ	# docs	# sentences
<i>wealth</i>	0.621	102	3,156
<i>social order</i>	0.688	102	2,503
<i>justice</i>	0.423	99	2,267
<i>freedom</i>	0.628	101	2,155
<i>innovation</i>	0.714	94	1,018
<i>honor</i>	0.437	80	317

For Tables 3 to 5, cells with double rows in the following tables are corrected. The numbers of the upper rows in those cells are corrected ones, and numbers of the lower rows are original ones.

Table 3. Classifier effectiveness (micro-averaged without *honor*, 3×10-fold sentence cross-validation).

Method	Precision	Recall	F ₁
SVM(w)	0.7924	0.6802	0.7320
SVM(w, b)	0.7784	0.6988	0.7365
sLDA	0.7016	0.4821	0.5715
<i>LVM</i> (y _n = 0)	0.7916	0.6931	0.7391
<i>LVM</i>	0.8001 0.8000	0.7133 0.7132	0.7542

Table 4. Classifier effectiveness (micro-averaged without *honor*, 102-document cross-validation).

Method	Precision	Recall	F ₁
SVM(w)	0.7784	0.6638	0.7166
SVM(w, b)	0.7535	0.6809	0.7154
sLDA	0.6875	0.4591	0.5506
<i>LVM</i> (y _n = 0)	0.7910 0.7930	0.6785 0.6869	0.7305 0.7361
<i>LVM</i>	0.7866 0.7885	0.6902 0.6900	0.7353 0.7365

Table 5. Per-category effectiveness (102-document cross-validation, micro-averaged).

Value	Precision		Recall		F ₁	
	SVM(w)	<i>LVM</i>	SVM(w)	<i>LVM</i>	SVM(w)	<i>LVM</i>
<i>wealth</i>	0.7859	0.7908 0.7934	0.6977	0.7402 0.7392	0.7392	0.7646 0.7654
<i>social order</i>	0.8235	0.7803	0.7587	0.8174	0.7898	0.7984
<i>justice</i>	0.7275	0.7823 0.7800	0.5558	0.5483 0.5492	0.6302	0.6447 0.6446
<i>freedom</i>	0.7461	0.7911 0.7927	0.6654	0.6729 0.6742	0.7035	0.7272 0.7287
<i>innovation</i>	0.8139	0.7898 0.8023	0.5629	0.5756 0.5817	0.6655	0.6659 0.6744
<i>honor</i>	0.4324	0.5085 0.6051	0.2019	0.0946 0.2593	0.2753	0.1596 0.3631
average	0.7730	0.7849	0.6510	0.6737	0.7068	0.7251

Based on these corrections of Tables, the description in fifth paragraph in Section 6.2 is changed as follows.

The value *honor* is omitted from the averages in Tables 3-2 and 3-3 because we focus our analysis of those tables on relative comparisons between usable classifiers. As Table 3-4 shows, the recall for *honor* is too low (0.28 in SVM-0.26, and 0.16 in LVM meaning ~~about 3 of every 4 cases are missed~~) for practical application. ~~Table 3-4 also shows that our LVM achieves markedly better precision and recall (and thus better F₁) on *honor* than does SVM(w), so including *honor* in the micro-averages would not have changed the direction of the improvement that Tables 3-2 and 3-3 currently show.~~

In Figure 2, the missing symbol *W* is added to the right lower square.