Review and Analysis of Emotion Detection from Tweets using Twitter Datasets

Vikas Maheshkar [a], Sachin Kumar Sarin [a]

[a] *Netaji Subhas University of Technology, Sec-3 Dwarka, Delhi, India-110078*

Abstract
Communication is a necessary part of our day-to-day lives, but understanding personal communication with emotion is not that easy. With the rapid growth in the field of semantic analysis and to find the sentiments in the text is quite a challenging job for the researchers. Detecting emotions in the sentiment analysis area is one of the most important applications and also serves as an advantage in the digital medium for efficient computing. In the current scenario, sentimental analysis or opinion mining of the twitter emotion detection data-set has derived much attention since the past 10 years. In this paper, Comparative study and Analysis of Emotion Detection from Tweets using Twitter Dataset has been taken into considerations for analysis purpose.

Keywords 1
Sentimental analysis, Emotion's detection, Natural Language Processing, Emotions Lexicon

1. Introduction

A language is a well-known tool for communicating and conveying information as well as transmitting emotions. In the current scenario, emotional identification is currently being studied extensively in psychiatry, psychology, cognitive sciences, computer sciences, and computational sciences, and several collaborative online diaries, journals, and individual blogs have been integrated into our daily lives, which helps meet critical social-interaction needs. Numerous social media sites have enabled the exchange of opinions among users all over the world that has promoted the use of popular social network site such as twitter, for communication. The users' tweets are highly unstructured, heterogeneous, and vulgar, and they cover a wide range of topics. So, to overcome that, researchers have extracted the data in the form of emotion Analysis, which is the process of analyzing or exploring tweets in order to enhance or add assistance to both primary and secondary communities. The researchers' aim is to improve users' sentiment codification techniques using these tweets so that they can predict implied attitudes in written text. From a structured input text, most common methods detect a unique sentiment or attitude [7]. This study looks at the issue of detecting multiple emotions from slang unstructured tweets data. This paper analysis uses Twitter and a case study to present a hybrid method for multiple emotion classification and Binary validity and Pattern Recognition techniques are used to observed these emotion classification models. The Binary significance technique uses four sentimental analysis Method: Naive Bayes (NB), Support Vector Machine classifier (SVM), and K Nearest Neighbour (KNN).

Users express their thoughts and feelings in a variety of ways on today's social networks, including Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, and many others, where millions of customers give reviews to share feelings, thoughts, and emotions on or around a specific topic in their daily lives. This provided an excellent opportunity for the researchers to examine the feelings of social networking client' behaviors.

WAC-2022: Workshop on Applied Computing, January 27 – 28, 2022, Chennai, India.
EMAIL: vikas.maheshkar@nsut.ac.in (Vikas Maheshkar)
ORCID: 0000-0001-9660-7517 (Vikas Maheshkar)
© 2022 Copyright for this paper by its authors.
Use permitted under Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).
CEUR Workshop Proceedings (CEUR-WS.org)

CEUR-WS.org/Vol-3142/PAPER_04.pdf

These massive amounts of data produced by social networks contain people's daily thoughts, beliefs, and emotions and various emotional analytical studies have been conducted on social media platforms over the years. Since people have such a diverse range of opinions, so determining the unique sentiment from social data can be difficult, therefore this emphasizes the importance of addressing these issues, and it opens up several avenues for upcoming analysis into the secret detection of user sentiment in general, or user emotions related to a particular subject. We investigated a Twitter dataset for emotion analysis and sentiment classification in this research paper. We analyzed an emotion network focused on user-posted texts by detecting emotions and feelings from tweets and their replies [27]. We identified prominent customers for both good and bad sentiments using the sentiment examination. Following that, we investigated how powerful individuals in an emotion network led to overall network shifts in emotion. Finally, we analyze previous recommendations techniques to compute a trusted network based on emotional likeness and impact. We observed text from reviews and feelings on specific recent topics to build our recast opinions since there were no current Twitter datasets that included both tweets and their replies. We observed both textual and consumer data. We performed analysis of our text of the previous based on their feelings and emotions. To identify powerful users of sentiment and feeling networks, characteristics that were based on text combined with some specific specification. To build clusters, users are grouped together based on their feelings, Finally, the classification model used user influence ratings to provide users with customized and generic recommendations. For a long time, researchers have used the Twitter network for various measurements and analyses [4]. Different researchers have experimented with emotions and feelings in tweets, influential user identification (using retweets, links, favorites, and other methods), user effect and recommendation generation (based on Twitter tweets). We analyze, in this article, we've come up with a few new concepts and mixed them with some old ones. The inclusion of tweet answers and reply-based criteria is the paper's main innovation. We surveyed the sentiment and feeling conveyed in comments, as well as the accuracy (i.e., if the response coincided in conjunction with initial message or not), value obtained (i.e., if the reply emotion matched the initial twitter message feeling or not), and feeling score (i.e., that whether response sentiment met the original tweet emotion or not) (that is, whether they respond emotion matched the initial tweet sentiment or otherwise). The re- searchers combined with some existing features in the model, to measure user impact scores, which were then propagated to recommendation generation. We will review and analyze previous work in this field, determine the research scope, comprehend the mechanism, and model used, and at last, analyze the model that will assist us in detecting a feeling conveyed through twitter messages [6]. We'll be working with the AIT-2018 dataset and some datasets too, and our approach is divided into several stages.

2. Sentiment Analysis

Inference extraction or assumption investigation is the area of focus in web mining that comprehends people's opinions, opposing a key area, about any occasion, and so on. It generates a massive problem area. There are also numerous names and tasks, such as concept inquiry, argument gathering, emotion quarrying, hypothesis prospecting, impact examination, objectivity investigation, questionnaire extraction, and etc. To identify powerful users of sentiment and feeling networks, characteristics that were based on text combined with some specific specification. To build clusters, users are grouped together based on their feelings, Finally, the classification model used user influence ratings to provide users with customized and generic recommendations. Twitter serves as a tenacious backup repository with a vast amount of data that can be used for conclusion analysis [22]. In view a great number of texts, which are often freely available, and the ease with which they may be obtained when compared to scraping websites from the internet, Twitter is quite useful for research. Using the Twitter API, data from Twitter is gathered for analysis. Machine Learning and Dictionary Based Approaches are two commonly used methodologies for the same. For deconstructing the concepts of documents supplied by multiple clients, we use a dictionary-based methodology. The material is then organized in its most extreme form. For example, following exams, Tweets are categorized into three groups: good, terrible, and impartial.

3. Literature Review

The data is mined using a variety of text mining tech- niques. Prabhsimran Singh, Ravindra Singh, and Karanjeeet Singh Kalhon [4, 10] investigated the government policy of demonetization from the perspective of common people, using a sentiment analysis method and Twitter data to collect Tweets using a specific hashtag (demonetization). Geo-location-based analysis (group wise sentiment messages are gathered). The meaning cloud emotion research API categorized into cheerful, sad, depressing, enthusiastic, impartial, and no information are the six categories.

Yuan and Huang [5] the issue was resolved problem of sentiment classification of polarity, which is a single of fundamental issues in emotion analysis. This analysis makes use of data from twitter dataset and online product reviews. This paper looks into sentence-level categorization as well as review- level categorization. This research and analysis make use of the Scikit-learn programme. Scikit-learn is a Python-based accessible software library. These classification techniques were chosen for categorization: Nave Bayesian, Random Forest, and SVM. Geetika Gautam and Divakar Yadav [7, 22] both contribute to the sentiment analysis for the classification of customer reviews. This task makes use of Twitter data that has already been labelled. In this paper, they used three supervised techniques to measure similarity: nave-Bayes, Max-entropy, and SVM, accompanied based on emotional analysis, that was employed in conjunction use all three approaches. They trained and classified the following models using Python and NLTK: naive- Bayes, Max-entropy, and SVM. The Naive-Byes approach outperforms the Max-entropy approach, and SVM with the model in unigrams outperforms SVM alone. Semantic analysis is used when the WordNet after the preceding is employed. The accuracy of the process improves. In this paper [19, 20], Yang use a Machine Learning approach to analyze Twitter data related to electronic goods. They created for a new function Vector categorizing messages and determining people's opinions on electronic items. As a result, Feature-Vector is made up of eight related functions, Special code word, emoticon, and count of defeatist reviews, the total amount of unfavorable keywords and the total positive comments keywords; emoji, and frequency of negative key- words; existence of argument, pos tag, and positive comments tags; count of pessimistic hashtags; and emblem of productive hashtags are the eight features that are used, MATLAB and built in functions are used to enforce the Naive-Bayes and SVM classifiers[20, 23]. The Maximum-Entropy program is used to enforce the Max-Entropy classifier. The output of all of the used classifiers is nearly identical. In this paper [25], Robinson suggested a more accurate model of sentiment analysis of Twitter data regarding upcoming Hollywood and Bollywood films [10]. We are correctly classifying these tweets with the aid of classifiers and Feature-Vectors such as SVM and Naive-Bayes. For each tweet's sentiment [20, 21]. The precision of Naive-Bayes is higher than that of SVM, but the accuracy and recall are slightly lower. SVM outperforms Naive Bayes in terms of precision. The Feature- Vector performs better than the chosen classifier in terms of sentiment analysis. If the number of people using the internet grows, the accuracy of classification may improve. The authors of [13] built a a collection of Tweets messages annotated it using a corpus annotation study. For the learning model, SVM kernels with several classes were employed. Unigrams, Bigrams, Personal, pronouns, and adjectives are among the features available. Word-net Sentimental affect and dependency–parsing functions, as well as the Word-net Affect emotion lexicon. To build a dataset, the authors in [5] first downloaded tweets from Twitter [15]. Then they get a model with expanded features based on the goal. They used Nave Bayes (NB), Support Vector Machine (SVM), Maximum Entropy (MaxEn), and Artificial Neural Networks to train four different supervised classifiers (ANN). The highest precision is obtained by combining SVM with Principal Component Analysis (PCA). The training dataset was first preprocessed and data similarity measures were taken by the authors of [14]. All of the emotion-labeled corpus is then clustered using semantic similarity. The authors used the SVM learning algorithm to train an emotion classifier after representing, during the training phase, each word is used as a feature tensor/vector. The first set of data is separated, and then features are extracted using the Porter stemming technique. The Unigram, Bigram, and Trigram features were used by the writers. The Weighted Log-likelihood Score technique is used to rank N- grams in relation to each Sentiment, as a result of which there is a feature extraction table. In their procedure, the authors employed, as a classifier, Multinomial Naive Bayes is used as a process that uses the highest-scoring n-grams and checks accuracy using several feature vectors. The author of [24] demonstrated a composite model for emotion recognition and analysis. This model incorporates features such as lexical keyword spotting, CRF-based emotion detection using NB, MaxEn, and SVM, and more. The authors of [16] employed a Hidden Markov Model to assess the emotional tone of the text. They viewed each sentence as a collection of short ideas, with every thought representing an happening that could result in a state shift. The writers of [2] attempted to identify statements on social media about a particular crisis. They chose rage as an example since this approach can be used with a variety of emotions. They received 1192 replies to a brief poll asking participants to share their thoughts on a piece of information via social media. They achieve a 90 percent accuracy in classifying rage in their dataset using this as a training collection. They chose their features based on logistic regression coefficients and used random forest as their key classifier [8].

4. General Strategy for Sentiment Analysis

a) Preparation of a data Model:

Select a required dataset which includes all the necessary feature emotions for extraction that helps in the sentimental analysis.

b) Data Preprocessing:

Pre-processing a Tweet database requires removing all superfluous data, which including emoticons, special symbols, and blank spaces.

c) Vectorization:

Map words or phrases from vocabulary to a corresponding vector of real numbers which used to find word predictions, word similarities/semantics.

d) Model Preparation:

1. Select a model type.
2. Choose the classification approach you want to use.
3. Transfer the information from your Twitter handle.
4. Use dataset for training your algorithm by tagging it.
5. Train the Classifier to test and validate.

e) Visualization:

Visualization is very important step after your algorithm runs because it shows the result in a proper and better way. In the area of sentimental analysis there are many visualization tools that helps to structure your data in a better way. some tools are Talkwalker, HubSpot are used for visualization of emotion analysis.

5. Dataset

a) AIT-2018 Dataset

In the dataset (AIT-2018 Dataset), [26] the researchers used the SemEval-2018 Affect in Tweets Distant Supervision Corpus. These tweets were pulled from Twitter using the Twitter API and contained emotion-related words like’irate,’pique,’panic,’cheerful,’fondness,’amaze,’surprised,’ The researchers used the following technique to construct an informative data of users comments affluent in a specific emotion. The researchers selected 50 to 100 phrases that had been associated among each sentiment X at distinct levels of energy. For example, words like mad, upset, bothered, anger, irritated, unhappy, rage, animus, and so on were used. This dataset contains four emotion classes: rage, fear, joy, and sadness. Anger and disgust have been described as frustration, while joy and sorrow have been represented as joy. The dataset for the challenge was broken down into three languages: English, Arabic, and Spanish. In each language, there are five sub-task datasets. Only the EI-oc information is used. In which each review has an emotion associated with it, as well as the intensity of that tweet [3]. Customers can send immediate messages known as pinch messages using Twitter, a blog and social platform service. Tweets are 140-character messages. People employ initialism, forge precise omission, use winkey, and other characters that express definite explication because of the nature of this microblogging site (rapid and short messages). From a commercial source, they obtained 11,875 manually annotated Twitter data (tweets), They've made some of their information public. They gathered the information by preserving the live broadcast. During the streaming process, there were no restrictions on language, region, or anything else. In fact, the majority of the tweets in their database are in other languages. Before the annotation process, they employ Google translate to turn it to English. Each tweet is given a good, bad, indifferent, or rubbish grade by a human annotator. The term" junk" denotes that the tweet is incomprehensible to a human annotator as positive, negative, neutral or junk. Many of the tweets classified as" trash" were not correctly translated using Google translate, according to a careful assessment of a random sample of them. They observed tweets with a rubbish categorization for testing purposes. As a result, researchers observed an unbalanced sample of 8,753 tweets each from classes positive, negative and neutral).

b) Emotic

In our daily lives, it is critical to recognize people's emotions based on their frame of reference. This ability allows us to anticipate or forecast people's forthcoming activities, engage with them successfully, and be sympathetic and sensitive to them. As a result, in order to engage with humans correctly, a machine should have a similar capability of comprehending people's feelings. The examination of facial expressions is the focus of current emotion recognition research. Recognizing emotions, on the other hand, necessitates an awareness of the context in which a person is enmeshed. Sentiment analysis in contextual research has been problematic due to a lack of suf- ficient data to examine such a topic. As a result, the EMOTIC database [28] (from EMOTions in Context), which seems to be a collection of images of individuals in natural settings captioned with their obvious emotions is used. EMOTIC, or EMOTIon Recognition in Context, is a methodology for recognition of emotions in perspective collection of photographs of actual humans and circumstances whose apparent sentiments have been captured. It uses a long list of 26 emotional expres- sions to tag the photos, and it blends these observations with following three ongoing components: Valence, Arousal, and Dominance. The Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT) platform is used to categorize images in the dataset. The result is adatabase of 18,313 photos with 23,788 individuals captioned. This database may also facilitate the creation of systems capable of recognising detailed information about people's actual feelings and emotions. The EMOTIC dataset is a collection of photographs featuring individuals in actuality world locations that are labelled with their visible sentiments. It is entitled after EMOTions in Context. There are 23,571 photos in the collection and 34,320 people who've been categorized. Several of the images were actually handmade from the online platform utilizing Google's web browser.

TABLE 1: Detail Initialisation of Twitter Reviews

observation	Raw Tweet
Actual Tweet	@Satisfying @TheAnimalVines I used my sense of taste to make Energy balls that is made with peanut butter regular basis.
Filtered Tweets	The peanut butter energy balls were something I used to make. My family had a great time all the time. My kitties, by the way,Continue to adore them. delicious joy joy dishes

6. Comparative Analysis

a. Data Collection

Twitter is currently one among the most popular successful platforms for social networking. People share their thoughts on various social, national, and international topics, as well as their everyday lives. They express themselves in 140- character bursts and, on occasion, audio and video files. Tweets are public postings. Posts can be liked, commented on, and retweeted by other users. On Twitter, users can follow or friend one another. Unlike all the other social networking sites, Twitter [21, 23], permits at one connection, that signifies that a single participant could join someone else without the latter responding. These experiences form a communication network. The database we observed during our studies is made up of a list of twitter posts, remarks, and other information, and retweets, as well as the user information associated with them. Several text datasets for sentiment and text sentiment analysis were used in related works, including 'Emotion in Text data set [17]', 'ISEAR [1]', 'SemEval [19]', 'EmoBank [20]', 'TREC [11]', and so on. However, since most current databases have only friend/follower or tweets links, we the users were unable to use them for our research. We analyzed an affective network based on the substance of the individuals, not about who is following whom, for our analysis. In addition, we observed the responses to those messages, as well as information about the people who replied and reviewers. We analyze that the users are connected depending on their interests and emotion on a particular issue for our emotion network. We investigated a few current events and problems to gather tweets with different emotions for our survey research, #Australia, #obama, #movie, #Diwali2017, #SummerBreak, #WinterBreak, #RoseDay2018, #intimidation, #WorldCup2018, #MensDay, #Awards2018 were the top search terms. We surveyed that the dataset was generated in a few simple steps: (i) gathering random reviews on a Identification, (ii) gathering user data (Customer Sno, location, sex, count of posts, count of followers, count of followees, count of likes), (iii) accumulating respond on each post, (iv) accumulating commenters' user details, (v) collecting details on the tweet, (vi) accumulate retweeters' customer knowledge Both of these measures were carried out again for each keyword [18]. While performing data collection by the researchers from Twitter, we observed a few issues. There are some of them: Some tweets had photographs and videos but didn't have much text. (ii) Even though tweets were written in English, many people left comments in other languages. (iii) Many comments were devoid of text, instead of sharing images or videos. (iv) In some situations, a tweeter responded to commentators with a large number of comments. Some people responded to each comment on their post, resulting in their tweets receiving twice the number of responses. (v) Some tweets received messages from accounts belonging to news organizations or business people, rather than from individuals. Those were essentially commercials for some kind of information. For illustration, in the #WomensDaytweets tweets, there were a few advertisements from news organizations working for gender equality, a few advertisements from business accounts promoting their cosmetics, and so forth.

(vi) The majority of consumers don't disclose their position. (vii) Although there were thousands of comments from some customers, but none of them were very noteworthy. They simply reply to other people's messages. (viii) Some few constructive and positive little details other than a quick mention of a few accounts. (ix) A few replies simply repeated the original tweet's random term. (e) A few communications and responses merely stated facts without expressing any emotions or sentiments.

(xi) A few responses were solely of smileys with no other information. (xii) a number of responses responded by asking non-emotional questions. (xii) If you're seeking for a creative outlet, some of the responses were utterly unexpected and out of context. For data collection, the pair of different kind of reviews, API and real facts extraction. Table 1 lists the characteristic of information, while Table 2 lists the properties of a customer data that can be uproot with the review's facts. There are some form and framework photos obtainable that aren't included in the tables. Because of the Twitter API rate limit, only 15 API calls are permitted each and every quarter-hour, limiting the group of information accumulate. From February 25 to March 8, 2018, we investigated 7246 tweets and answers. We investigated the information for 3607 users based on the tweets and answers. The dataset had minimal data since we analyzed each message and respond just as to feel, sentiment, and accuracy score. The text was tagged with agreement values of 'Agreed,' 'Disagreed,' and 'Random,' depending on whether the reply text agreed with the initial tweet or not. The text was tag along with appropriate sentiments such as" Positive,"" Negative," and" Neutral," as well as real emotions such as" Anger,"" Disgust,"" Fear,"" Joy,"" Sadness,"" Surprise," and" Neutral." The lack of proper data distribution among all sentiments and emotions was caused by the truancy of some further respond data, user opinion, feeling, and acceptance reason by the columnist by scrutiny and crafted annotating. By analyzing a different solution for the Twitter reviews and opinion lattice, we analyzed to take the early tread toward a customize community lattice advocate in this paper [21].

b. Pre-processing

The process of constructing the dataset is depicted in Table 2. To begin pre-processing, we analyze and does research on a Web browser to locate original tweets on a particular subject. While surveying the tweets, we observed them on the basis of particular attributes and feature class and only investigated authentic reviews (not retweets) on the subject. The first analysis phase yielded a specific review ID and review text, which were then used by a second analysis phase to determine and count of likes, retweets, and review period. There are no clear functions for collecting tweet responses. As a result, we began surveying tweet answers using a different type of analysis. The latter examined the review given to the user being the time of the review, using the tweet and user ID. It only saved texts that were valid for the criterion" in response to position id." Since no direct feature was used, analyzing tweet answers took the majority of the time. To speed up the process of collecting tweet answers, the researchers used a Web page scraper that scraped the tweet messages for responses. The researchers needed to collect user data as well for experiments. As a result, the researchers used a Web page scraper to retrieve data from users' Twitter accounts, including initial tweet users, retweeters, and repliers. The counts of reviews, likes, followers, followee, and position was all collected by them as user attributes (when available). Cleaning the collected data and annotating it according to feelings and emotions were also part of the data pre-processing process as per our survey. There were a lot of needless symbols and noise in the tweets and comments. The phases of pre-processing are depicted in Table 1. The following measures were taken during the data cleaning process: (i) All customer bring up (e.g., alice) were take-off from the facts and replaced with a connection between users in the network; (ii) all hashtags (only the #symbol) were abolish; and (iii) all emotag(e.g., :-), :-(etc.) were removed.(iv) and (v) all URLs were takeoff (i.e., http://a.com). After that, unsullied reviews and responses were annotated by them. Pragmatic, pessimistic, and impartial emotions were apportioned to all tweets and comments by the researchers. The researchers used AIT sentiment emotion model [9], that identifies some human feelings: anger, frustration, fear, joy, unhappiness, and surprise. These six emotions were used to annotate all tweets and comments. According to their agreement or disagreement on the tweet, the tweet responses were explicated with acceptance or disagreement. Here the researchers require Natural Language Processing (NLP) to process the text after annotating tweets and answers. The sentences' words were tokenized. Then, using a POS tagger, typical English stop words (such as am, as, the, and so on) were diminished, and words were marked according to related Parts-of-Speech (POS). Collection of only Noun, Adjective, Verb and Adverb (NAVA) words from all words is only preferred, since most of the contribution to a sentence is by them. So therefore, they removed the content that had been pre-processed. Therefore, they kept both of the NAVA and cleaned full text for further comparison in the classification process.

c. Sentiment and emotion detection

In prior investigations of sentiment identification from content, several researchers utilized various methodologies. Machine learning has been used in recent studies of both supervised [12,13] and unsupervised [4,24] classifiers. The field of Machine Learning is a good and risk-free option for a larger dataset, and training of the classifier quite a comprehensive task than constructing sentiment word dictionary definitions. Naive Bayes outperformed some other ML algorithms in the literature whenever it came to determining sentiment and emotion from content. As a result, during our studies, we investigated the Naive Bayes algorithm and we found that it is used to sort tweets into categories of respective sentiment and emotion groups. In the pre-processed text (including tweets and replies) the emotion and sentiment classifications are divided into training and test sets. Both of these characteristics, as well as the number of reviews, retweets, followers, and followers' followees, were used to compute the final effect score. A recommendation system that is used by the researchers compute the score to build a count of individuals who have indistinguishable feelings and thoughts on a specific topic. We analyzed the Naive Bayes method on our pre-processed text, we surveyed 3-fold, 5-fold, and 10- fold cross-validation (tweets and replies). The categorization was expanded to include both the NAVA and clean text. Words from each tweet and reaction are included in the feature set used by Naive Bayes. On the same dataset, we analyzed different types of classifiers like once to classify them based on their thoughts, and then again to classify them based on their related emotion.

Table 2: Emotion Code Word

Emoji	Emotion code-word
:), :), :-), (:, (:, (-:, :')	Twinkle
:D, : D, :-D, xD, x-D, XD	Giggle
:-(, : (, :(,):,)-:	Depressed
:'(, :'(, :"(	weep

7. Conclusion and Future Scope

The analysis of various emotions and sentiments revealed some fascinating human characteristics. Determining sentiment through word is challenging, and most reports suffer from a variety of flaws, including ambiguous language, numerous emotion-bearing texts, and text devoid of emotional terminology, to name a few. We have analyzed different datasets that contains the reviews of the Customers. These datasets give clear information about the customers reviews so that analysis can perform in the better way. Nonetheless, we've analyzed with a variety of methods for detecting emotion in tweets. Our analysis suggest that EmoSenticNet lexicon is better than that of WordNet. But even better outcomes are yet achievable. An algorithm that can automatically classify tweets would be a fascinating field of research for future work.

8. References

[1] R. Hirat and N. Mittal, "A Survey on Emotion Detection Techniques us- ing Text in Blogposts," International Bulletin of Mathematical Research, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 180–187, 2015.

[2] R. Sawyer and G.-M. Chen, "The Impact of Social Media on Intercul- tural Adaptation," 2012. S. Mohammad, F. Bravo-Marquez, M. Salameh, and S. Kiritchenko, "Semeval-2018 Task 1: Affect in Tweets," in Proceedings of the 12th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation, 2018, pp. 1–17.R. C. Balabantaray, M. Mohammad, and N. Sharma, "Multi-class Twitter Emotion Classification: A New Approach," International Journal of Applied Information Systems, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 48–53, 2012.

[3] M. Anjaria and R. M. R. Guddeti, "Influence factor-based opinion mining of Twitter data using supervised learning," in 2014 Sixth International Conference on Communication Systems and Networks (COMSNETS), 2014, pp. 1–8.

[4] S. Yuan, H. Huang, and L. Wu, "Use of Word Clustering to Improve Emotion Recognition from Short Text," Journal of Computing Science and Engineering, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 103– 110, 2016.

[5] B. Thomas, P. Vinod, and K. A. Dhanya, "Multiclass Emotion Extraction from Sentences," International Journal of Scientific amp; Engineering Research, vol. 5, no. 2, 2014.

[6] H. Yang, A. Willis, A. D. Roeck, and B. Nuseibeh, "A Hybrid Model for Automatic Emotion Recognition in Suicide Notes," Biomedical informatics insights, vol. 5, p. 8948, 2012.

[7] D. T. Ho and T. H. Cao, "A High-order Hidden Markov Model for Emotion Detection from Textual Data," in Pacific Rim Knowledge Acquisition Workshop, 2012, pp. 94–105.

[8] M. Hasan, E. Rundensteiner, and E. Agu, "Automatic emotion detection in text streams by analyzing Twitter data," International Journal of Data Science and Analytics, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 35–51, 2019.

[9] M. Hasan and E. Rundensteiner and E. Agu, "Emotex: Detecting Emotions in Twitter Messages," 2014. Seyeditabari, S. Levens, C. D. Maestas, S. Shaikh, J. I. Walsh,

[10] W. Zadrozny, C. Danis, and O. P. Thompson, “Cross Corpus Emotion Classification Using Survey Data,” This paper was presented at AISB, 2017.
[11] H. Binali, C. Wu, and V. Potdar, “Computational approaches for emotion detection in text,” in 4th IEEE International Conference on Digital Ecosystems and Technologies, 2010, pp. 172–177.
[12] C. Strapparava, A. Valitutti et al., “Wordnet-Affect: an Affective Exten- sion of WordNet,” in Lrec, vol. 4, 2004, p. 40.
[13] S. Poria, A. Gelbukh, A. Hussain, N. Howard, D. Das, and S. Bandy- opadhyay, “Enhanced SenticNet with Affective Labels for Concept- Based Opinion Mining,” IEEE Intelligent Systems, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 31–38, 2013.
[14] E. Cambria, D. Olsher, and D. Rajagopal, “SenticNet 3: A Common and Common-Sense Knowledge Base for Cognition-Driven Sentiment Analysis,” in Twenty-eighth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, 2014.
[15] D. Effrosynidis, S. Symeonidis, and A. Arampatzis, “A Comparison of Pre-processing Techniques for Twitter Sentiment Analysis,” in Interna- tional Conference on Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries, 2017, pp. 394–406.
[16] G. Jivani et al., “A Comparative Study of Stemming Algorithms,” Int. J. Comp. Tech. Appl, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 1930–1938, 2011.
[17] “Slang Dict,” https://floatcode.files.wordpress.com/2015/11/slang dict. doc, accessed: 2019- 05- 17.
[18] “Github - wolfgarbe/SymSpell,” https://github.com/wolfgarbe/SymSpell, accessed: 2019-05- 17.
[19] Y. Yang, X. Liu et al., “A re-examination of text categorization methods,” in Sigir, vol. 99, no. 8, 1999, p. 99.
[20] H. Zhang, “The optimality of naive bayes,” AA, vol. 1, no. 2, p. 3, 2004. [22] G. Forman and I. Cohen, “Learning from little: Comparison of classifiers given little training,” in European Conference on Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery. Springer, 2004, pp. 161–172.
[21] Y. Ng and M. I. Jordan, “On discriminative vs. generative classifiers: A comparison of logistic regression and naive bayes,” in Advances in neural information processing systems, 2002, pp. 841–848.
[22] S. Bird, E. Klein, and E. Loper, Natural Language Processing with Python, 1st ed. O’Reilly Media, Inc., 2009.
[23] D. Robinson, ” Text analysis of Trump’s tweets confirms he writes only the (angrier) Android half”, Variance explained, 2016.
[24] F. M. Shah, A. S. Reyadh, A. I. Shaafi, S. Ahmed and F. T. Sithil, ” Emotion Detection from Tweets using AIT-2018 Dataset,” 2019 5th In- ternational Conference on Advances in Electrical Engineering (ICAEE), 2019, pp. 575-580, doi: 10.1109/ICAEE48663.2019.8975433.
[25] P. Lucey, J. F. Cohn, T. Kanade, J. Saragih, Z. Ambadar and I. Matthews, ” The Extended Cohn-Kanade Dataset (CK+): A complete dataset for action unit and emotion-specified expression,” 2010 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition - Workshops, 2010, pp. 94-101, doi: 10.1109/CVPRW.2010.5543262.
[26] R. Kosti, J. M. Alvarez, A. Recasens and A. Lapedriza, ” EMOTIC: Emotions in Context Dataset,” 2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW), 2017, pp. 2309- 2317, doi: 10.1109/CVPRW.2017.285.
[27] R. Subramanian, J. Wache, M. K. Abadi, R. L. Vieriu, S. Win- kler and N. Sebe, ” ASCERTAIN: Emotion and Personality Recog- nition Using Commercial Sensors,” in IEEE Transactions on Affec- tive Computing, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 147-160, 1 April-June 2018, doi: 10.1109/TAFFC.2016.2625250.