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ABSTRACT

APPLICATION OF k-NN and FPTC BASED TEXT CATEGORIZATION ALGORITHMS TO TURKISH NEWS REPORTS

Ufuk Ilhan
M.S. in Computer Engineering
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Halil Altay Güvenir
February, 2001

New technological developments, such as easy access to Internet, optical character readers, high-speed networks and inexpensive massive storage facilities, have resulted in a dramatic increase in the availability of on-line text-newspaper articles, incoming (electronic) mail, technical reports, etc. The enormous growth of on-line information has led to a comparable growth in the need for methods that help users organize such information. Text Categorization may be the remedy of increased need for advanced techniques. Text Categorization is the classification of units of natural language texts with respect to a set of pre-existing categories. Categorization of documents is challenging, as the number of discriminating words can be very large. This thesis presents compilation of a Turkish dataset, called Anadolu Agency Newsgroup in order to study in Text Categorization. Turkish is an agglutinative languages in which words contain no direct indication where the morpheme boundaries are, furthermore, morphemes take a shape dependent on the morphological and phonological context. In Turkish, the process of adding one suffix to another can result in a relatively long word, furthermore, a single Turkish word can give rise to a very large number of variants. Due to this complex morphological structure, Turkish requires text processing techniques different than English and similar languages. Therefore, besides converting all words to lower case and removing punctuation marks, some preliminary work is required such as stemming, removal of stopwords and formation of a keyword list.
This thesis also presents the evaluation and comparison of the well-known $k$-NN classification algorithm and a variant of the $k$-NN, called Feature Projection Text Categorization (FPTC) algorithm. The $k$-NN classifier is an instance based learning method. It computes the similarity between the test instance and training instance, and considering the $k$ top-ranking nearest instances to predict the categories of the input, finds out the category that is most similar. FPTC algorithm is based on the idea of representing training instances as their projections on each feature dimension. If the value of a training instance is missing for a feature, that instance is not stored on that feature. Experiments show that the FPTC algorithm achieves comparable accuracy with the $k$-NN algorithm, furthermore, the time efficiency of FPTC outperforms the $k$-NN significantly.

**Keywords:** text categorization, classification, feature projections, stemming, wildcard matching, stopword.
ÖZET

$k$-NN ve FPTC TABANLI METİN KATEGORİZASYON ALGORİTMALARININ TÜRKÇE HABERLERİ UYGULAMASI

Ufuk İlhan
Bilgisayar Mühendiliği, Yüksek Lisans
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Halil Altay Güvenir
Şubat, 2001

İnternet ulaşım kolaylığı, optik okuyucular, yüksek hızlı ağlar ve pahalı olmayan yüksek miktardaki bilgi depolama imkanlarındaki teknolojik gelişmeler, on-line metin ve makalelerine, elektronik posta ve teknik raporlara erişim kolaylığıyla büyük bir artışa neden oldu. On-line bilgi erişimindeki, bu önümüzdeki artış, kullanıcıların bilgileri organize etme ihtiyaçını yatırır.

Metin sınıflandırması (Text Categorization), gelişen tekniklerin ihtiyaçlarına bir çare olabilir. Metin sınıflandırması, önceden belirlenmiş kategorilere göre, doğal dil metinlerinin sınıflandırılmasıdır. Bu tezde, metin sınıflandırması üzerinde çalışmak için Anadolu Ajansı adlı Türkiye bir veri kümesinin deneysel sınıflandırması sağlanmıştır. Türkçe'de, bir kelimênin son ekine bir tane daha ekleyerek, nispeten uzun kelimeler elde edilebilir, üstelik, sadece bir tek Türkçe kelimeden çok miktarda değişik anlamlı kelimeler oluşturulabilir. Bu karmasık morfolojik yapı yuzünden, Türkçe, İngilizce ve benzer dillerden daha farklı metin özel işlem teknikleri gerektirir. Bu nedenle, bütün kelimelerin küçük harfe çevrilmesi ve noktalama işaretlerinin atılması dışında; görevdeleme, gerelsiz kelimelerin atlanması ve anıltar kelimine listesinin oluşturulması gibi, bazı ön hazırlıklar yapılması gerekli'dir.
Bu tezde, ayrıca, literatürde yaygın olarak bilinen \( k \)-en yakın komşu sınıflandırma algoritması (\( k \)-NN) ile \( k \)-NN’ın bir değişği olan FPTC algoritmasının Türkçe veri kümesi üzerinde değerlemesi ve karşılaştırılması da sunulmuştur. \( k \)-NN, bir örnek tabanı öğrenme yöntemdir. \( k \)-NN, tahmin ve test örnekleri arasındaki benzerliğe hesaplar ve girdi kategorilerini tahmin etmek için \( k \) adet üst sınırın en yakın örneklerini düşünerek, en benzer kategorileri bulur. FPTC algoritması ise, tahmin örneklerinin izdüşümlerinin, her bir öznitelik boyutunda ifade edilmesi fikri esasına dayanır. Eğer, bir tahmin örneğinin değeri, bir öznitelik için belli değilse, tahmin örneği, öznitelik içerisinde ifade edilmez. Yapılan değerlemeler sonucu, FPTC algoritması, \( k \)-NN’le karşılaştırılabilir bir doğruluk oranını başarımıştır, ayrıca, zaman verimliliği açısından, \( k \)-NN algoritmasına belirgin bir istisnahlık sağlamıştır.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

New technological developments, such as easy access to Internet, optical character readers, high-speed networks and inexpensive massive storage facilities, have resulted in a dramatic increase in the availability of on-line text-newspaper articles, incoming (electronic) mail, technical reports, etc. The enormous growth of on-line information has led to a comparable growth in the need for methods that help users organize such information.

Text Categorization may be the remedy of increased need for advanced techniques. Text Categorization is the classification of units of natural language texts with respect to a set of pre-existing categories. Reducing an infinite set of possible natural language inputs to a small set of categories is a central strategy in computational systems that process textual information.

Text Categorization has become important in two aspects. From the Information Retrieval (IR) point of view, information processing needs have increased with the rapid growth of textual information sources, such as Internet. Text Categorization can be used to support IR or to perform information extraction, document filtering and routing to topic-specific processing mechanisms. From the Machine Learning (ML) point of view, recent research has been concerned with scaling up (e.g. data mining). Text Categorization is a domain where large data sets are available and which provides an application field to ML. Indeed, manual categorization is known to be an expensive
and time-consuming task which results are dependent on variations in experts’ judgements [24].

There has been an recent outbreak of application and usage of Text Categorization, especially not only assigning subject categories to documents in support of text retrieval and library organization, but also aiding the human assignment of such categories. However, while routing messages, news stories or other continuous streams of texts to interested recipients; Text Categorization is used. As a component in natural language processing systems, to filter out non-relevant texts and parts of texts, to route texts to category-specific processing mechanisms or to extract limited forms of information and also as an aid in lexical analysis tasks, such as word sense disambiguation, are examples of usage areas of Text Categorization.

There are two basic selection steps while studying in Text Categorization. The first one is to select a categorization algorithm to evaluate the performance, the other is to select a sample data collection on which the algorithm is applied. In the following section, the dataset used in this thesis is introduced.

1.1 Anadolu Agency Dataset

Ideally, all researchers would like to use a common data collection and compare performance measures to evaluate their systems. The sample dataset is important for both the effectiveness and the efficiency of statistical text categorization. That is, researchers would like a training set which contains sufficient information for example-based learning of categorization, but is not too large for efficient computation. The latter is particularly important for solving large categorization problems in practical databases [39].

Nearly all researchers have been concerned with English or with languages morphologically similar to English. In such languages, words contain only a small number of affixes, or none at all, almost all of parsing models for them consider recognizing those affixes as being trivial, and thus do not make morphological analyses. This feature allows easy stemming of the words to
find their root words. On the other hand, agglutinative languages as Turkish, words contain no direct indication where the morpheme boundaries are, and furthermore morphemes take a shape dependent on the morphological and phonological context [26]. The establishment of independence for the new Turkic republics necessitates creating their own industry [3]. It is doubtless that there is a serious problem in Text Categorization evaluation because of the lack of standard Turkish dataset regarding to meet these requirements.

In this thesis, we will concern with Anadolu Agency News Dataset to meet the requirements. The dataset consists of nearly 200 000 unprocessed Turkish news documents (Fig 1.1), but only 2000 of them is processed for the present (Fig 1.2). Each news report contains a categorized number body, a headline text and news text body. The headlines are an average of 12 words long. The average length of a document body is 96 words. On average, 7 categories are assigned to each document. There are many "noisy" data which makes the categorization difficult to learn for a categorizer. The original A.A. (Anadolu Agency) dataset is unprocessed that is the categories were manually assigned to subjects using 78 subject categories. Each category label is represented by a number defined a subject. Word boundaries were defined by whitespace. Some preliminary work is required besides converting all words to lower case and removing punctuation marks because of the characteristics of Turkish language. The preprocessing work is described in more detail in Chapter 4.

1.1.1 The Characteristics of Turkish Language

Turkish is a member of the south-western or Oghuz group of the Turkic languages, which also includes Turkmen, Azerbaijani, Ghasghai and Gagaus. The Turkish language uses a form of Latin alphabet consisting of twenty-nine letters, of which eight are vowels and twenty-one are consonants. Unlike the main Indo-European languages, such as French, English and German, Turkish is an example of an agglutinative language, where words are formed by affixing morphemes to a root in order to extend its meaning or to create other classes of words. In Turkish, the process of adding one suffix to another can result in a relatively long word, which often contains an amount of semantic
ANKARA’DA OKULLARA KAR TATILI...

ANKARA (A.A) - Ankara’da kar yağışı nedeniyle okullar bugün tatil edildiği bildirildi.

Ankara Valiliği’nden yapılan açıklamada, Ankara’da iki gündür etkili olan kar yağışı sebebiyle merkez ilçelerinde bulunan ilköğretim, lise ve dengi okulların bugün tatil edildiği bildirildi.
(CÜN-SRP)
07:25 04/01/00

TRAİFİK KAZASI: 1 ÖLÜ...

ADANA (A.A) - Adana’da meydana gelen trafiğ kazasında bir kişi öldü.

Alman bilgiye göre, sürücünün kimliği ve plakası belirlenemeyen bir araç, Ziyaapaşa Bulvarı’nda yolun karşısına geçmek isteyen Şükrü Bulan’a (80) çarparak, ölüümü neden oldu.

Kaçan araç sürücüsünün yakalanmasına çalışıldığı bildirildi.
(DA-CÜN-SRP)
07:51 04/01/00

ARTÇI SARSINTILAR SÜRÜYOR...

İSTANBUL (A.A) - Diözce’de 12 Kasım 1999’da meydana gelen depremin artçı sarsıntıları sürıyor.

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Kandilli Rasathanesi ve Deprem Araştırma Enstitüsü’nden verilen bilgiye göre, bugün saat 02.28’de Diözce’de 3.2 büyüklüğünde bir artçı sarsıntı kaydedildi.
(MER-CÜN-İDA)
08:16 03/01/00

Figure 1.1: The Original Unprocessed News Report

information equivalent to a whole English phrase, clause or sentence. Due to this complex morphological structure, a single Turkish word can give rise to a very large number of variants. The experiments [8] show that the use of a stopword list and a stemming procedure can bring about substantial reductions in the numbers of word variants encountered in searches of Turkish text datasets; moreover, stemming appears to be superior. However, stemming in an agglutinative language is quite complex.

As a preliminary work in the thesis, we have also decided which words are in stemming word list, and then which words are in stopword list or keyword list.
1 7 78 | ankara okullara kar tatili | ankara kar yağışı okullarn tatil edildiği
ankara valiliği açıklanmadan ankara gündür etkili kar yağışı merkez ilçelerinde
ilköğretim lise dengi okullarn tatil edildiği
1 19 23 | trafik kazası ölü | adana meydana gelen trafik kazasında kişi öldü
sürücisinin kimliği plakası belirlenemeyen bir araç ziyapa bulu yolun
karsına geçmek isteyen şükru bulan çarparak ölmüne neden oldu kaça araç
sürücisinin yakalanmasına çalışıldığı bildirildi.
1 7 69 71 | artçı sarsıntları sürüyor | istanbul düzce kasım depremin artçı
sarsıntları sürüyor boğaziçi üniversitesi kandilli rasathanesi deprem araştırma
enstitüsü düzce büyükliklğünde artçı sarsıntı

Figure 1.2: The Preprocessed News Report

1.1.2 Wild Card Matching

Lovins [22] defines the stemming as a "procedure to reduce all words with the
same stem to a common form, usually by stripping each word of its derivational
and inflectional suffixes."

Stemming is generally achieved by means of suffix dictionaries that contain
lists of possible word endings, and this approach has been applied successfully
to many languages similar to English. It is, however, less applicable to an
agglutinative language such as Turkish, which requires a more detailed level of
morphological techniques that remove suffixes from words according to their
internal structure. Therefore, wild card procedure is used in the thesis. Wild
card matching allows a term to be expanded to a group of related words. e.g.,
the wild card, " BAKAN* ", comprises the words of which the sequences of
characters until asterisk matches with such as BAKANLIK, BAKANLAR. A
special wild card list (Table 1.1) as a dictionary is created and also the most of
the wild card words, derived from inflexional suffixes, resemble the stemming.
Stemming procedure is to reduce all words with the same root to a common
form, usually by stripping each word of its derivational and inflexional suffixes.
In wild card procedure, it is not a requirement to reduce with the same root,
generally, a character or a derivational suffix can remain beside the root.
However, the wild card words, derived from derivational suffixes, represent the
basic difference between the wild card procedure and the stemming.
1.1.3 Stopword and Keyword List

In order to provide efficiency, the evaluation of a wild card procedure, and formation of a stopword list containing non-formative words, and a keyword list is required. If a word is either a stopword (Table 1.2) or a keyword (Table 1.3), depends on some rules, the meaning of the word and the frequency of the word in the whole document. The frequency of occurrence of the words in the dataset are found by a method called term frequency [43]. The most frequently occurring words are mainly function words such as conjunctions, postpositions, pronouns, etc, and these words are selected for inclusion in the stopword list. Furthermore, some of the large number of low-frequency Turkish words are morphological variants of very commonly occurring function words; these former words are also included in the stopword list.

The aim of the thesis is to compile a Turkish dataset in order to study in Text Categorization and to evaluate and compare the performance of the FPTC, FBTC and k-NN classifier algorithms on this dataset.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEZA*</th>
<th>TERÖR*</th>
<th>EĞİT*</th>
<th>JEO*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CENAZE*</td>
<td>DEPREM*</td>
<td>FİLM*</td>
<td>İHALE*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVA*</td>
<td>DEVLET*</td>
<td>FUTBOL*</td>
<td>KURUM*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENİZ*</td>
<td>DUYURU*</td>
<td>FRANS*</td>
<td>TRAFİ*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYLAM*</td>
<td>KAÇT*</td>
<td>PATLA*</td>
<td>YÜKSEL*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BİRLÈŞ<em>M</em></td>
<td>KAÇIR*</td>
<td>SALDIR*</td>
<td>YÜKSELME*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BİRLÈŞT*</td>
<td>KALKIN*</td>
<td>TUTUK*</td>
<td>YIKT*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇEKİLD*</td>
<td>OYNA*</td>
<td>VURUL*</td>
<td>YIKIL*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3: Some Sample Keywords

1.2 Classifiers

Many classification algorithms, most of which are in fact machine learning algorithms, have been used for text categorization. A growing number of statistical learning methods have been applied to text categorization problem in recent years including regression models [41], nearest neighbor classifiers [42], Bayesian probabilistic classifiers [20, 25], decision trees [20, 25], inductive rule learning algorithms [1, 4, 28] and neural networks [27].

Text Categorization is the assignment of texts to one or more of a pre-existing set of categories, on the other hand, Text Classification is the assignment of texts to only one of a pre-existing set of categories. In classification, given a set of classification labels \( C \), and set of training examples \( E \), each of which has been assigned one of the class labels from \( C \), the system must use to predict the class labels of previously unseen examples of the same type [23].

A classifier makes a YES/NO decision for each category and if the classifier is able to produce a ranking list of \( m \) \( (m > 2) \) categories for each document as \( k \)-NN classifier, it is also used in Text Categorization. Given an arbitrary input document, the \( k \)-NN classifier ranks its nearest neighbor among the training documents, and uses the categories of the \( k \) top-ranking neighbors to predict the categories of the input document. The similarity score of each neighbor document to the new document being classified is used as the weight of each of its categories, and the sum of category weights over the \( k \) nearest neighbors are used for category ranking [38].
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This section contains a brief overview about classifiers, namely $k$-NN and FPTC, that are applied on A.A. Dataset in order to evaluate the performance of the dataset.

1.2.1 $k$-NN Classifier

Experiments regarding those works give promising results. However, most of algorithms are not scalable with the size of vocabulary (feature set), which is expressed in the order of tens of thousands. Here, each feature is a keyword and this requires reduction of feature set or training set in such a way that the accuracy would not degrade [12].

Among those algorithms, $k$-NN that is the nearest neighbor classifier and the most accurate and simplest one. It is based on the assumption that the most similar an unclassified instance should belong to the same class as the most similar instance in the training instance. To measure the similarity between two instances, several distance metrics have been proposed by Salzberg [31], of which the Euclidian distance metric is the most common.

$k$-NN is also scalable with the size of the feature set. In other words, it can be used to classify the documents having large feature sets while most of the algorithms can not be used because their space problem with those datasets. The $k$-NN algorithm is based on the idea that the less the distance of the two instances in the space, more similarity between them. Therefore, it finds the $k$ nearest instances in the instance space and assigns the category which is among these $k$ instances as the category of a tested instance. However, since it requires calculating the distance of the tested instance to all other instances in the training set, it is very inefficient in terms of time. Another major drawback of the similarity measure used in $k$-NN is that it uses all features in computing distances. In many document datasets, only smaller number of the total vocabulary may be useful in categorizing documents. A possible approach to overcome this problem is to learn weights for different features (or words in document data sets) [14].
1.2.2 Feature Projection Text Classifier

FPTC is another nearest neighbor algorithm that is developed to make kNN more time efficient [12]. It is an extension of the kNN algorithm and based on the idea of representing training instances as their projections on each feature dimension. During its training, it makes a prediction for each feature in all of the training documents. These predictions also give information about fruitfulness of a feature for classifying test instances. During its testing, the majority vote of each individual feature specifies the category of a test instance. Since the time complexity of FPTC algorithm is proportional to feature size of each training instance and is independent of the size of training set, it is more efficient than k-NN in terms of time.

1.3 Outline of the Thesis

In the next chapter, we present an overview of previous works regarding datasets and classifiers. In Chapter 3, the algorithms, which are used in the thesis for evaluation of dataset, are discussed and in Chapter 4, preprocessing work for Anadolu Agency Dataset is presented. The detailed description of characteristic properties of the methods are given in these chapters. Empirical evaluations of k-NN and FPTC algorithms, and the performance of them on the dataset are shown in Chapter 5, and the final chapter presents a summary of the results obtained from the experiments in the thesis. Also an overview of possible extensions to the work presented here is given as future work.
Chapter 2

Overview of Datasets and Classifiers

Much progress has been made in the past 10-15 years in the area of text categorization and in applying machine learning to text categorization. Text Categorization is at the meeting point between ML and IR, since it applies ML techniques for IR purposes. Many existing text categorization systems share certain characteristics. Namely, they all use induction as the core of learning classifiers. Moreover, they require a text representation step that turns textual data into learning examples. This step involves both IR and ML techniques. It is often difficult to detect statistically significant differences in overall performance among several of better systems whether one is employing knowledge engineering or supervised machine learning. One often finds comparisons being made on the basis of fractions of percentage point difference in some performance metric. Many methods, quite different in the technologies used, seem to perform about equally well overall [19].

To study in text categorization, one needs a pool of training data from which samples can be drawn, and a classification system against which the effects of different systems can be tested and compared [39]. On the other hand, the most serious problem in text categorization is the lack of standard data collections. Even if a common collection is chosen, there are still many ways to introduce inconsistent variations.
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In this chapter, some datasets and classifiers which are the most frequently used in Text Categorization, are reviewed. In the first section, we review classifiers including binary and \textit{m} - ary classifiers. In the second section, the most commonly used dataset collections in Text Categorization are discussed.

2.1 Classifiers

Many classification algorithms, most of which are in fact machine learning algorithms, have been used for text categorization. A growing number of statistical learning methods have been applied to text categorization problem in recent years including regression models [41], nearest neighbor classifiers [42], Bayesian probabilistic classifiers [20, 25], decision trees [20, 25], inductive rule learning algorithms [1, 4, 28] and neural networks [27].

This section briefly overview about classifiers dividing into two main types: independent binary classifiers and \textit{m}-ary classifiers.

2.1.1 Binary Classifiers

Independent binary classifier makes a YES/NO decision for each category, independently from its decisions on other categories. The best-known binary classifiers, Construe, Decision Tree, Naive Bayes, Neural Networks, DNF, Rocchio and Sleeping Experts, are briefly discussed in the following section.

2.1.1.1 CONSTRUE

\textbf{Construe} is an expert system developed at Carnegie Group and the earliest system evaluated in Reuters Corpus [15]. In spite of setting a landmark in Text Categorization research, Construe design is known to be an expensive and time consuming task, since it is one of the hand-crafted knowledge engineering systems [28].

Promising results were reported on a small subset of Reuters corpus by
Yang [41]. A major difference between the CONSTITUTE approach and the
other methods is the use of manually developed domain-specific or application-
specific rules in the expert system. Adopting CONSTITUTE to other application
domains would be costly and labor-intensive.

2.1.1.2 Decision Tree

Decision Tree is a well-known machine learning approach to automatic in-
duction of classification trees based on training data [23]. A decision tree is
constructed for each category using the recursive partitioning algorithm with
information gain splitting rule. A probability is maintained at each leaf rather
than a binary decision. Applied to text categorization, decision tree algorithms
are used to select informative words based on an information gain criterion,
and predict categories of each document according to the occurrence of word
combinations in the document. Evaluation results of decision tree algorithms
on the Reuters Text Categorization collection were reported in [20].

C4.5 classifier is one of the most known text categorization Decision Tree
algorithm which uses divide-and-conquer approach. This method was first
developed as an extension of ID3 (Information Dichotomizer 3) by Quinlan. It
progressed over several years and is now known as C4.5.

2.1.1.3 Neural Networks

Modern Neural Networks are descendants of the perceptron model and the
least mean square (LMS) learning systems of the 50s' and 60s'. The perceptron
model and its training procedure was presented for the first time by Rosenblatt
and the current version of LMS by Widrow and Hoff. The simplest perceptron
is a network that has an output node and an input layer that contains two or
more nodes. The node in the output layer is connected to all the nodes of the
input layer. The perceptron is a device that decides whether an input pattern
belongs to one of two classes. The mathematical model of the perceptron
corresponds to a linear discriminant.
There are two kinds of learning algorithms that can be used for training a neural network: supervised and unsupervised learning. In supervised learning, a set of examples that includes the set of input features and the expected output for each example is used. It is called supervised because during the training phase the weights of the network are adjusted until its output is closed to desired output. Backpropagation is the most prominent method of this approach. In unsupervised learning, only the value of the input features is in the hand, and the network performs a clustering or association procedure to learn the classes that are present in the training set. Examples of unsupervised neural networks are Kohonen networks and Hopfield networks [29].

As a review about Neural Network, the earliest works tried to apply feed-forward algorithms and represent the three basic elements of information retrieval system (documents, queries, and index terms) as individual layers in the neural network. The other important category of neural network applications involves more specific tasks such as conceptual clustering, document clustering and concept mapping. More extensive research about Reuters categorization were reported by Wiener [27].

2.1.1.4 Naive Bayes Classifier

Naive Bayes probabilistic classifiers are also commonly used in Text Categorization. The basic idea is to use the joint probabilities of words and categories to estimate the probabilities of categories in a given document. That is, Bayes Theorem is used to estimate the probability of category membership for each category and each document. Probability estimates are based on the co-occurrence of categories and the selected features in the training corpus, and some independence assumption.

The Bayesian classifier estimates the log probability that the essay belongs to the class of "good" documents, \( \log(P(C|Doc)) \), as follows:
The Naive part of such a model is the assumption of word independence. The simplicity of this assumption makes the computation of the Naive Bayes classifier far more efficient than the exponential complexity of non-naive Bayes approaches because it does not use word combinations as predictors. Evaluation results of Naive Bayes classifier on Reuters were reported by Lewis Ringuette [20] and Moulinier [25], respectively. And also there exists an extensive research reported by Larkey [18].

Rainbow is a Naive Bayes classifier for text classification tasks [23], developed by Andrew McCallum at CMU. It estimates the probability that a document is a member of a certain class using the probabilities of words occurring in documents of that class independent of their context. By doing so Rainbow makes the naive independence assumption [9].

More precisely, the probability of document \(d\) belonging to class \(C\) is estimated by multiplying the prior probability \(P(C)\) of class \(C\) with the product of the probabilities \(P(w_i|C)\) that the word \(w_i\) occurs in documents of this class. This product is then normalized by the product of the prior probabilities \(P(w_i)\) of all words.

\[
P(C|d) = P(C) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{P(w_i|C)}{P(w_i)} \tag{2.1}
\]
PropBayes algorithm [20] uses Bayes’ rule to estimate the category assignment probabilities, and then assigns to a document these categories with high probabilities. PropBayes estimates \( P(C_j = 1|D) \), the probability that a category \( C_j \) should be assigned to a document, based on the prior probability of a category occurring, and the conditional probabilities of particular words occurring in a document given that it belongs to a category. For tractability, the assumption is made that probabilities of word occurrences are independent of each other, though this is often not the case. Detailed research and comparison of PropBayes with Decision Tree algorithms are reported by Lewis [20].

2.1.1.5 Inductive Rule Learning in Disjunctive Normal Form

Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF) algorithms express their results as a logical formula in disjunctive normal form. DNF was tested in the RIPPER and CHARADE systems [4, 28], respectively. DNF rules are of equal power of decision trees in machine learning theory. Empirical results for the comparison between DNF and decision tree approaches, however, are rarely available in text categorization researches, except in an indirect comparison by Apte [1].

RIPPER is an algorithm for inducing classification rules from a set pre-classified examples. The user provides a set of examples, each of which has been labeled with the appropriate class. Ripper then looks at the examples and finds a set of rules that will predict the class of unseen examples.

More precisely, RIPPER builds a ruleset by repeatedly adding rules to an empty ruleset until all positive examples are covered. Rules are formed by first splitting the training data into two sets, a "growing set" and a "pruning set". And then greedily adding conditions to the antecedent of a rule with an empty antecedent until no negative examples are covered; after such a rule is found, the rule is simplified, by greedily deleting conditions so as to improve the rule’s performance on the "pruning" examples. In this phase of learning, different ad hoc heuristic measures are used to guide the greedy search for new conditions, and the greedy search for simplification.

After a ruleset is thus constructed, an "optimization" phase modifies the
ruleset so as to reduce its size and improve its fit to the training data. Each pass of the optimization involves looping over each rule \( R \) in the constructed ruleset, and attempting to construct a replacement for \( R \) that improves performance of the entire ruleset. To construct candidate replacements, a strategy similar to the one used to construct rules in the covering phase is used: a rule is grown, and then simplified, with the goal of simplification being now to reduce the error of the total ruleset on another held-out "pruning" set. There exists an extensive research in the literature, reported by Cohen [4, 5].

\textbf{\( k\)-DNF} learners are symbolic ML algorithms, that express the learned concepts as formula in disjunctive normal form; each disjunct has at most \( k \) literals. Production rule learners, such as \textsc{Charade}, are typical \( k\)-DNF learners. \textsc{Charade} is said to construct consistent descriptions of concepts, i.e., a description is generated when all examples covered by this description belong to the same concept. \textsc{Charade} relies on the simultaneous exploration of the description space and the instance space. The description space \( D \) is defined as the power-set of the set of descriptors, while the instance space is the power-set of the learning set. The inductive process combines descriptions in \( D \), beginning with simple descriptions. The algorithm stops when the instance space has been exhausted. This strategy enables redundant learning, since an example can be covered several times. Such learners are not noise-resistant. However, most ML techniques provide some means to take noise into account. An extensive research about comparison of Charade with other classification methods are available in the literature [24].

2.1.1.6 \textbf{Rocchio}

The \textbf{Rocchio} algorithm is a \textit{batch} algorithm. It produces a new weight vector \( w \) from an existing weight vector \( w_1 \) and a set of training examples [21]. However, Rocchio is a classic vector-space model method for document routing or filtering in information retrieval. Applying it to text categorization, the basic idea is to construct a prototype vector per category using a training set of documents. Given a category, the vectors of documents belonging to this category are given a positive weight, and the vectors of remaining documents are given a
negative weight. By summing up those positively and negatively weighted vectors, such a prototype vector is called centroid of the category. This method is easy to implement and efficient in computation, and has been used as a baseline in several evaluations [4, 21]. A potential weakness of this method is the assumption of one centroid per category, and consequently, Rocchio does not perform well when the documents belonging to a category naturally form separate clusters [38].

2.1.1.7 Sleeping Experts (EXPERTS)

EXPERTS are on-line learning algorithms recently applied to text categorization. It is based on a new framework for combining the "advice" of different "experts" (or in another word the predictions of several classifiers) which has been developed within the computational learning community over the last several years. Prediction algorithms in this framework are given a pool of fixed "experts" - each of which is usually a simple, fixed classifier - and build a master algorithm, which combines the classifications of the experts in some manner. Building a good master algorithm is thus a matter of finding an appropriate weight for each of the experts. The examples are fed one-by-one to the master algorithm, which updates the weight of different experts based on their prediction on that example.

On-line learning aims to reduce the computation complexity of the training phase for large applications. EXPERTS updates the weights of n-gram phrases incrementally.

2.1.2 m-ary Classifiers

M-ary classifier typically uses a shared classifier for all categories, producing a ranked list of candidate categories for each test document, with a confidence score for each candidate. The best-known m-ary classifiers, Linear Least Squares Fit (LLSF), Word, k-NN and k-NNFP, are briefly discussed in the following section.
2.1.2.1 Linear Least Squares Fit

LLSF is a mapping approach developed by Yang [38]. A multivariate regression model is automatically learned from a training set of documents and their categories. The training data are represented in the form of input/output vector pairs where the input vector is a document in the conventional vector space model (consisting of weights for words), and output vector consists of categories (with binary weights) of the corresponding document. By solving a LLSF on the training pairs of vectors, one can obtain a matrix of word-category regression coefficients. The matrix defines a mapping from an arbitrary document to a vector of weighted categories. By sorting these category weights, a ranked list of categories is obtained for the input document.

2.1.2.2 Word

Word is a simple, non-learning algorithm which ranks categories for a document based on word matching between the document and category names. The purpose of testing such a simple method is to quantitatively measure how much of improvement is obtained by using statistical learning compared to a non-learning approach. The conventional vector space model is used for representing documents and category names (each name is treated as a bag of words) and the SMART [30] system is used as the search engine.

2.1.2.3 k-Nearest Neighbor

Given an arbitrary input document, the system ranks its nearest neighbors among the training documents, and uses the categories of k top-ranking neighbors to predict the categories of the input document. There are two main methods for making a prediction training documents: majority voting and similarity score summing. In major voting, a category gets only one vote for each instance of that category in the set of k top-ranking nearest neighbors. However, the most similar category is the one that gets the highest score of
votes. In the latter, each category gets a score equal to the sum of the similarity scores of the instances of that category in the $k$ top-ranking neighbors. The most similar category is the one with the highest similarity score sum. In other words the less the distance of the two instances in the space, more similarity between them. The similarity score of each neighbor document to the new document being classified is used as the weight of each of its categories, and the sum of category weights over the $k$ nearest neighbors are used for category ranking. The similarity value between two instances is the distance between them based on a distance metric. In general, the Euclidian Distance Metric is the most commonly used.

2.1.2.4 $k$ Nearest Neighbor Feature Projection

$k$-NNFP technique is a variant of $k$-NN method [30]. The most important characteristic of $k$-NNFP technique is that the training instances are stored as their projections on each feature dimension and distance between two instances is calculated according a single feature. This allows the classification of a new instance to be made much faster than $k$-NN. Since each feature is evaluated independently if the distribution of categories over the data set is even, votes returned for the irrelevant features will not adversely affect the final prediction. That is, the voting mechanism reduces the negative effect of possible irrelevant features in classification. The more detailed expression is presented in the next chapter.

2.2 Data Collections

Dataset selection is important for both the effectiveness and the efficiency of statistical text categorization. That is, we want a training set which contains sufficient information for example-based learning of categorization, but is not too large for efficient computation. The latter is particularly important for solving large categorization problems in practical databases.

The amount of available training data is often nearly infinite [39]. But, the
Table 2.1: Different versions of Reuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>(prepared by)</th>
<th>UniqCate</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>(Labelled Test Docs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Version 1</td>
<td>(CGI)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>21450</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version 2</td>
<td>(Lewis)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14704</td>
<td>6746</td>
<td>(42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version 2.2</td>
<td>(Yang)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7789</td>
<td>3309</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>version 3</td>
<td>(Apte)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7789</td>
<td>3309</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version 4</td>
<td>(PARC)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9610</td>
<td>3662</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

most serious problem in Text Categorization evaluation is the lack of standard data collections. Even if a common collection is chosen, there are still many ways to introduce inconsistent variations [38].

Yang focus on the following questions regarding effective and efficient learning of text categorization [38]:

- Which training instances are most useful? Or, what sampling strategies would globally optimize text categorization performance?
- How many examples are needed to learn a particular category?
- Given a real-world problem, how large a training sample is large enough?

In the following sections, some of the most commonly used data collections in Text Categorization are reviewed.

2.2.1 Reuters

**Reuters** is the most commonly used collection for text categorization evaluation in the literature. The Reuters corpus consists over 20000 Reuters newswire stories in the period between 1987 to 1991. The original corpus (Reuters-22173) was provided by the Carnegie Group Inc. and used to evaluate their CONSTITUTE system in 1990 [15]. Several versions have been derived from this corpus by varying the documents in the corpus, the division between the training and test set, and the categories used for evaluation. Table 2.1 summarizes these versions [38].
Reuter's version 2 (also called Reuters-21450), prepared by Lewis [20], contains all of the documents in the original corpus (Version 1) except the 723 test documents. The documents are split into two chronologically contiguous chunks; the early one is used for training, and the later one for testing. A subset of 113 categories were chosen for evaluation. One peculiarity of Reuters-21450 is the inclusion of a large portion of unlabeled documents in both the training (47%) and test (58%) test sets. It is observed by Yang [38] that on randomly tested documents, in many cases, the documents do belong to one of those 113 categories but happen to be unlabelled. And Carnegie Group confirmed that Reuters does not always categorize all of their news stories. However, it is not known exactly how many of the unlabeled documents should be labelled with a category.

Yang created a new corpus from Reuters 2, called Reuters version 2.2, in order to facilitate an evaluation of the impact of these unlabeled documents on text categorization. The only difference among them is that all of the unlabeled documents have been removed.

Reuter's version 3 was constructed by Apte for their evaluation of the SWAP-1 by removing all of the unlabeled documents from the training and test sets and restricting the categories to have training set frequency of at least two [1, 38] Fig 2.1.

Reuter's version 4 was constructed by the research group at Xerox PARC, and was used for the evaluation of their neural network approaches [27]. This version was drawn by from Reuters version 1 by eliminating the unlabeled documents and some rare categories. Instead of taking continuous chunks of documents for training and testing, it slices the collection into many small chunks that do not overlap temporally. Those subsets are numbered, and the odd-numbered chunks are used for training and the even subsets are used for testing [38].
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KUWAIT INCREASES STAKE IN SIME DARBY.

KUALA LUMPUR, April 11 - The Kuwait Investment Office (KIO) has increased its stake in Sime Darby Bhd to 63.72 mln shares, representing 6.88 pct of Sime Darby’s paid-up capital, from 60.7 mln shares, Malayan Banking Bhd (MBKM:SL) said. Since last November, KIO has been aggressively in the open market buying shares in Sime Darby, a major corporation with interests in insurance, property development, plantations and manufacturing. The shares will be registered in the name of Malayan Banking subsidiary Mayban (Nominees) Sdn Bhd, with KIO as the beneficial owner.

YIELD RISES ON 30-DAY SAMA DEPOSITS.

BAHRAIN, April 11 - The yield on 30-day Bankers Security Deposit Accounts issued this week by the Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency (SAMA) rose by more than 1/8 point to 5.95913 pct from 5.79348 a week ago, bankers said. SAMA decreased the offer price on the 900 mln riyal issue to 99.50586 from 99.51953 last Saturday. Like-dated interbank deposits were quoted today at 6-3/8, 1/8 pct – 1/8 point higher than last Saturday. SAMA offers a total of 1.9 billion riyals in 30, 91 and 180-day paper to banks in the kingdom each week.

Figure 2.1: The Reuters Version 3 Dataset

2.2.2 Associated Press

The document of 371,454 items which appeared on the Associated Press (AP) newswire between 1988 and early 1993 were divided randomly into a training set of 319,463 documents and a test set of 51,991 documents. The headlines are an average of 9 words long, with a total vocabulary is 67,331 words. No preprocessing of the text was done, except for converting all words to lower case and remove punctuation. Word boundaries were defined by white-space. Titles were used, rather than the full text of the items, to minimize computation.
Categories to be assigned were based on the "keyword" from the "keyword slug line" present in each AP item. The keyword is a string of up to 21 characters indicating the content of the item. While keywords are only required to be identical for updated items on the same news story, in practice there is a considerable reuse of keywords and parts of keywords from story to story and year to year, so they have some aspects of a controlled vocabulary [10].

2.2.3 OHSUMED (Medline)

OHSUMED is a bibliographical document collection developed by William Hersh and colleagues at the Oregon Health Sciences University. It is a subset of the \textit{Medline} database consisting of 384,566 documents were manually indexed using subject categories (Medical Subject Headings or MESH) in the National Library of medicine. There are about 18,000 categories defined in the MESH and 14,321 categories present in the OHSUMED document collection. The average length of a document is 167 words. On average 12 categories are assigned to each document Fig 2.2.

In some sense, the OHSUMED corpus is more difficult than Reuters, because the data are more "noisy". That is, the word / category correspondences are more "fuzzy" in OHSUMED. Consequently, the categorization is more difficult to learn for a classifier [43].

2.2.4 USENET

Most work in classification has involved articles taken off a newswire or from a medical database. In these cases, correct topic labels are chosen by human experts. The domain of USENET newsgroup postings is another interesting testbed for classification Fig 2.3. The "labels" are just the newsgroups to which the documents were originally posted. Since users of the Internet must make this classification decision every time they post an article, this is a nice "real life" application of text categorization [35].

Contributors to USENET often vary in their use of terminology, stray from
the topic, or use unusual language. All of these qualities tend to make subject-based classification tasks from USENET more difficult than those of a comparable size from Reuters [33].

2.2.5 DIGITRAD

DIGITRAD is a public domain collection of 6,500 folk song lyrics. To aid searching, the owners of DigiTrad have assigned to each song one or more keywords from a fixed list. Some of these keywords capture information on the origin or style of the songs (e.g. "Irish" or "British") while others related to subject matter (e.g. "murder" or "marriage"). The latter type of keywords served as the basis for the classification tasks in the studies. The texts in DigiTrad make heavy use of metaphoric, rhyming unusual and archaic language. Since the lyrics do not often explicitly state what a song is about, it makes the categorization difficult for a categorizer.
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We treated a patient with pseudocyst of the auricle and reviewed the 113 cases previously published in the world literature. Pseudocyst of the auricle is an asymptomatic, noninflammatory cystic swelling that involves the anthelix of the ear, results from an accumulation of fluid within an unlined intracartilaginous cavity, and occurs predominantly in men (93% of patients). Characteristically, only one ear is involved (87% of patients), and the lesion is usually located within the scaphoid or triangular fossa of the anthelix. Previous trauma to the involved ear is uncommon. The diagnosis may be suggested by the clinical features, and analysis of the aspirated cystic fluid and/or histologic examination of a lesional biopsy specimen will confirm the diagnosis. Therapeutic intervention that maintains the architecture of the patient's external ear should be used in the treatment of this benign condition.

We conducted a retrospective review of 601 consecutive emergency department deaths. Nontrauma causes accounted for 77% of the deaths and this group had an average age of 64 years and a male to female ratio of 1.9:1. Trauma caused 23% of the fatalities and this group had a younger average age of 29 years and a male to female ratio of 4.6:1. The most common causes of nontrauma death were sudden death of uncertain cause (34%), coronary artery disease (34%), cancer (5%), other heart disease (4%), chronic obstructive lung disease (3%), drug overdose (3%), and sudden infant death syndrome (2%). The most common causes of trauma death were motor vehicle accidents (61%) and gunshot wounds (16%). The overall autopsy rate was 40%. Death certificates were often in error.

Figure 2.2: The Original OHSUMED Dataset
Hi all, I’m looking for a multidisciplinary graduate program in a-life and was wondering if the newsgroup had any recommendations. I am currently teaching 3D character animation, intro to programming, and courses in game development and VRML at the Savannah College of Art Design www.ca.scad.edu Thanks in advance.
greg.johnson@gjohnson@scad.edu

Subject: The Sims... anyone?
Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2000 03:42:01 -0600
From: jorn@mcs.com (Jorn Barger)
Organization: The Responsible Party (conservative left)
Newsgroups: comp.ai.games,comp.ai.alife
Did I already miss the big, excited thread about the Sims? I read where it’s the seller, so why aren’t people talking about it on csg and caa? Has anyone reverse-engineered a list of the ‘semantic’ variables? [Semi-unrelated issue that was what I really wanted to ask about when I peeked in] Do any social sims use a model where, before any act, they consider each other actor, and how the proposed act will affect them? I’m thinking it’s like ‘how much will this entangle our karmas?’ To the Sirens first shalt thou come, who bewitch all men... I edit the Net: URL:http://www.robotwisdom.com "...frequented by the digerati"
The New York Times

Figure 2.3: The Original USENET Messages
Chapter 3

Text Categorization Algorithms Used

Many machine learning algorithms have been applied to text categorization as briefly described in Chapter 2. And most of them give promising results, but some of them are not scalable with the size of feature set, which is expressed in order of tens of thousands. Scalability is a fundamental problem in text categorization. Since it requires reduction of feature set or training set in such a way that the accuracy would not degrade. However, the m-ary algorithms like k-NN can be used with large set of the features compared to the other existing methods.

As we mentioned in Chapter 1, the motivation behind the work of the thesis is to evaluate the Turkish language. Turkish is an agglutinative language, therefore it requires text processing techniques different than English and similar languages on text categorization. We apply two algorithms on the dataset, namely FPTC and k-NN classifiers for evaluation and comparison.

In this chapter we examine the description and complexity of algorithms, applied on the dataset. The description and complexity of FPTC algorithm is described in the first section. And in the second section, k-NN algorithm is discussed.
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3.1 The FPTC Algorithm

FPTC algorithm [12] is a variant of k-NN and a non-incremental algorithm that is all training instances are taken and processed at once. The main characteristic of the algorithm is that instances are stored as their projections on each feature dimension. If the value of a training instance is missing for a feature, that instance is not stored on that feature. However, another characteristic of the algorithm is that distance between two instances is calculated according to a single feature.

The distance between the values on a feature dimension is computed using $\text{diff}(f, x, y)$ metric as follows:

$$\text{diff}(f, x, y) = \begin{cases} 
|x_f - y_f| & \text{if } f \text{ is linear} \\
0 & \text{if } f \text{ is nominal and } x_f = y_f \\
1 & \text{if } f \text{ is nominal and } x_f \neq y_f
\end{cases}$$

However, since each feature is processed separately, this metric does not require normalization of feature values. If there are $f$ features, this method returns $f \times k$ votes whereas k-NN method returns $k$ votes.

A preclassification, separately on each feature, is performed in order to classify an instance. For a given test instance $t$ and feature $f$, the preclassification for $k = 1$ will be the class of the training instance whose value on feature $f$ is the closest to that of the $t$. For a larger value of $k$, the preclassification is a bag (multiset) of classes of the nearest $k$ training instances. In other words, each feature has exactly $k$ votes, and gives these votes for the classes of the nearest training instances. For the final classification of the test instance $t$, the preclassification bags of each feature are collected using bag union. Finally, the class that occurs most frequently in the collection bag is predicted to be the class of the test instances. In other words, each feature has exactly $k$ votes, and gives these votes for the classes of the nearest training instances [11].

All the projections of training instances on linear features are sorted in memory as sorted values. In Figure 3.1, the function $kBag(f, t, k)$, which returns a bag of size $k$ containing the classes of the $k$ nearest training instances to the
classify(t,k)
/* t: test instance, k: number of neighbors */
[1] begin
[2] for each class c
[3] vote[c] = 0

[4] for each feature f
[5] /* put k nearest neighbors of test instance t on feature f into Bag */
[6] Bag=kBag(f, t, k)
[7] for each class c
[8] vote[c] = vote[c] + count[c, Bag];

[9] prediction= UNDETERMINED /* class 0 */
[10] for each class c
[12] prediction=c

[13] return(prediction)

Figure 3.1: Classification in the FPTC Algorithm

instance t on feature f, computes the votes of a feature. As mentioned in Equation 3.1, distance between the values on a feature dimension is computed by using $\text{diff}(f, x, y)$ metric. Note that the bag returned by $k\text{Bag}(f, t, k)$ does not contain any UNDETERMINED class as long as there are at least $k$ training instances whose $f$ values are known. Then, the number of votes for each class is incremented by the number of votes that a feature gives to that class, which is determined by the count function. The value of $\text{count}(c, \text{Bag})$ is the number of occurrences of class $c$ in bag Bag.

There are two methods for finding the most similar instance: majority voting and similarity score summing.

In major voting, a category gets one vote for each instance of that category in the set of $k$ top-ranking nearest neighbors. Then the most similar category is the one that gets the highest amount of votes. In similarity score summing, each category gets a score equal to the sum of the similarity scores of the
instances of that category in the \( k \) top-ranking neighbors. The most similar category is the one with the highest similarity score sum.

For an irrelevant feature \( f \), the number of occurrences of a class \( c \) in a bag returned by \( kBag(f, t, k) \) is proportional to the number of instances of class \( c \) in the training set. If majority voting is used in FPTC algorithm and the categories are equally distributed over the test instances and training set, then the votes of an irrelevant feature will be equal for each class, and the final prediction will be determined by the votes of the relevant features. If the distribution of the categories over the data set is not equally, then the votes of an irrelevant feature will be the highest vote for the most frequently occurring class.

If similarity score summing is used and the categories are equally distributed over the test instances then the similarity score sum of an irrelevant feature will be equal for each category and it will not be effective in the prediction phase. However, if the categories are not evenly distributed then the similarity score sum of an irrelevant feature will be higher for most frequently occurring class.

The FPTC algorithm handles unknown feature values by not taking them into account. If the value of a test instance for a feature \( f \) is missing, then feature \( f \) does not participate in the voting for that instance or in short, missing values are simply ignored. Needless to say that this is a natural approach regarding the real life, since if nothing is known about a feature, ignoring that feature is a normal behavior. Final voting is done between the features for which the test instance has a known value. That is, unknown feature values are simply ignored.

As mentioned before, because of storing all the training instances in the memory, the space required for training with \( m \) instances on a domain with \( n \) features is directly proportional to \( m \times n \).

All instances are not only stored on each feature dimension as their feature projections in the training phase, but also sorted once at the end. Let a dataset containing \( m \) instances and \( n \) features, the training time complexity of
the FPTC algorithm is $O(n \times m \times \log m)$.

The $kBag(f, t, k)$ function, to determine the votes of a feature, first finds the nearest neighbor of $t$ on $f$ and then next $k-1$ neighbors around the nearest neighbor. The time complexity of this process is $O(\log m + k)$. Since $m >> k$, the time complexity of $kBag$ is $O(\log m)$. The final classification requires the votes of each of $n$ features. Therefore, the classification time complexity of the FPTC algorithm is $O(n \times \log m)$ [11].

### 3.2 $k$-NN Algorithm

The $k$-NN classifier [7] classifier is the basis of many lazy learning algorithm and it is sure that $k$-NN is purely lazy. Purely lazy learning algorithms generally are characterized by three behaviors: [2]

1. **Defer**: They store all training data and defer processing until queries are given that require reply.

2. **Reply**: Queries are answered by combining the training data, typically by using a local learning approach in which (1) instances are defined as points in a space, (2) a similarity function is defined on all pairs of these instances, (3) a prediction function defines an answer to be a monotonic function of query similarity.

3. **Flush**: After replying to a query, the answer and intermediate results are discarded.

As a result, we can say that $k$-NN simply stores the entire training set and postpones all effort towards inductive generalization until classification time. $k$-NN generalizes by retrieving the $k$ least distance (most similar) instances of a given query and predicting their weighted-majority class as the query's class. Therefore, it is doubtless that the quality of $k$-NN prediction depends on which instances are assumed least distant, and which is determined by its distance function.
In the basic method, learning appears almost trivial—one simply stores each training instance, which is represented as a set of feature-value pair, in memory. The power of the process comes from the retrieval process. Given a new test instance, one finds the stored training case that is nearest according to some distance measure, notes the class of the retrieved case, and predicts the new instance will have the same class.

Training:
1 \( \forall x_t \in \text{Training Set} \)
2 \( \text{Store } x_t \text{ in memory} \)

Querying:
1 \( \forall x_q \in \text{Query Set} \)
2 \( \forall x_t \{ x_t \neq x_q \}: \text{Calculate } \text{Similarity}(x_q, x_t) \)
3 \( \text{Let } \text{Similar} \text{ be set of } k \text{ most similar instances to } x_q \text{ in Training Set} \)
4 \( \text{Let } \text{Sum} = \sum_{x_t \in \text{Similar}} \text{Similarity}(x_q, x_t) \)
5 \( \text{Then return the categories of instances in Similar, in decreasing order by the number of times the category is seen in Similar.} \)

Figure 3.2: The \( k \) Nearest Neighbor Regression

There is a variety of \( k \) nearest neighbor classifier approaches in the literature. Stanfill and Waltz [34] introduced the Value Added Metric (VAD)) to define similarity when using symbolic-valued features. Kelly and Davis [17] introduced the weighted \( k \)-NN algorithm and a recent work by Salzberg [32] has given the best case results or the nearest neighbor learning. An experimental comparison work the NN and Nested Generalized Examplers is presented by Wettschereck and Dietterich [36]. The algorithm, shown in Figure 3.2, is the simplest \( k \) nearest neighbor classifier approach. For a given query instance, \( k \) nearest (similar) training instances are determined by using the Cosine Similarity function.

\( k \)-NN classifies a new instance by a majority voting among its \( k \) (\( k > 1 \)) nearest neighbors using some distance metrics. If the attributes of the data are equally important, this algorithm is quite effective. However, it can be less effective when many of the attributes are misleading or irrelevant to classification. Because of the sensitivity to the number of irrelevant features, the accuracy of \( k \)-NN can be degraded.
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In spite of sensitivity to the number of irrelevant features, $k$-NN algorithm has several important properties which make suitable for our experiments:

1. $k$-NN is a $m$-ary classifier providing a global ranking of categories given a document. This allows a straight-forward global evaluation of per-document categorization performance, i.e., measuring the goodness of category ranking given a document, rather than per-category performance as is standard when applying binary classifiers to the problem [38].

2. $k$-NN classifier is context-sensitive in the sense that no independence is assumed between either input variables (terms) or output variables (categories). $k$-NN treats a document as a single point. A context-sensitive classifier makes better use of the information provided by features than a context-free classifier do, thus enabling better observation on feature selection [43].

3. $k$-NN is a non-parametric and non-linear classifier, that makes assumptions about the input data. Hence an evaluation using the $k$-NN classifier should reduce the possibility of classifier bias in the results [43].

$k$-NN classifier is intuitive and easy to understand, it learns quickly, and it provides good accuracy for a variety of real-world classification tasks. However, we know that $k$-NN has several weakness as the followings:

- Its accuracy degrades rapidly with the introduction of noisy data.
- Its accuracy degrades with the introduction of the irrelevant features.
- It has no ability to change the decision boundaries after storing the training data.
- It has large storage requirements, because it stores all training data in memory.
- It is slow during execution, because all of the training instances must be searched in order to classify each new input vector.
• Its distance functions are inappropriate or inadequate for applications with both linear or nominal attributes [37].

In the $k$-NN algorithm, the classification of a test instance requires the computation of its distance to $m$ training instance on $n$ dimensions. Therefore, the classification time complexity of the $k$-NN algorithm is simply $O(n \times m)$ assuming $m >> k$. 
Chapter 4

Preprocessing for Turkish News

Data preprocessing is the first operation on any set of data and consists of all the actions taken before the actual data analysis process start. However, it is usually a time consuming task and in many cases, is semi-automatic. Data preprocessing may be performed on the data for the following reasons:

- solving data problems that may prevent us from performing any type of analysis on the data,
- understanding the nature of the data and performing a more meaningful data analysis,
- extracting more meaningful knowledge from a given set of data.

Needless to say that identification of dataset has a crucial importance on preprocessing and in the thesis the data to be preprocessed is Turkish Anadolu Agency news reports. We had many time consuming difficulties not only because of ordinary data problems, preventing efficient use of the classifiers or which may result in generating unacceptable results, but also because of the morphological structure of Turkish language.

Unlike the main Indo-European languages, such as French, German and English, Turkish is an example of an agglutinative language, where words are formed by affixing morphemes to a root in order to extend its meaning or
to create other classes of words. In Turkish, the process of adding one suffix or affix to another, can result in relatively long words, which often contain an amount of semantic information equivalent to a whole English phrase, clause or sentence. Due to this complex morphological structure, a single Turkish word can give rise to a very large number of variants. Moreover, Turkish is a free constituent order language. The order of the constituents may change freely according to the discourse context and the syntactic role of the constituents is indicated by their case marking.

One of the important steps of preprocessing in natural language is parsing words and spell checking. Although many word parsers and spell checkers for English and some other languages have been developed, so far no such tool has been developed for Turkish.

The main aim of the preprocessing Turkish news reports in the thesis is not only solving data problems, such as noisy data, irrelevant or missing attributes in the dataset, but also changing the structure of data in order to prepare the data for a more efficient classification.

In order to apply text categorization on the A.A. dataset, we represent documents as feature vectors. Texts are represented using the conventional vector space model [30]. That is, each news report is represented as a feature vector whose dimensions are unique words in the dataset, and whose elements are feature weights. A feature is weighted using the term frequency technique.

In this chapter, preprocessing for Turkish news is presented. General steps, applied on the dataset during preprocessing is briefly discussed in the first section. The changing of the structure of dataset and filtering is examined in the second section. The third section presents preparation of wild card list and forming of stopword and keyword list. And the fourth section examines assigning weights to the features. Then assigning of categories is discussed in the last section.
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4.1 General Steps

Text Categorization is quite difficult due to certain characteristics of the A.A. dataset: texts are not naturally represented as a feature vector; there is a large number of features; there is a large number of documents; there is a large variation in the amount of information in each document; the documents are written in Turkish language and so many contain ambiguities; the information needed to correctly categorize may be completely implicit or hidden; the documents are written by humans and so many contain errors; the documents contain a host of tokens besides words, such as numeric information, abbreviations, etc. High dimensionality and noisy data are the main characteristics that make text categorization in the A.A. dataset very challenging. Therefore, preprocessing is inevitable in order to provide efficient categorization. General steps, followed during preprocessing, are as follows:

- All words in the dataset are extracted and sorted into a vocabulary list. The number of different words in the vocabulary list is 18256.

- The words which have the same meaning, but are affixed with different suffixes, especially inflexional suffixes, are gathered as a single word by using wild card matching.

- The irrelevant and non-informative words are gathered in a stopword list. The number of stopwords is 876. After removal of stopwords, there exists 7856 words remained in the feature vector Table 4.1.

- Each document was represented with term frequency of these 7856 features in that document.

4.2 Data Filtering

To change the structure of the news reports and filtering from punctuation are the main requirements in order to make an efficient preprocessing. The original Anadolu Agency news reports Fig 4.1 have many unnecessary bodies
| ab       | abc    | abd*    | abidjan  |
| abit     | abone* | abraham | abs      |
| acapulco | ad     | ada     | adalet*  |
| adana*   | adanm  | adapazar | aday*   |
| adedi    | adem   | adet*   | adil     |
| adjusting| adli*  | adt     | advar    |
| adiyaman | aecl   | aerospace | aesob   |
| af       | afet*  | affa    | affairs  |
| affan    | afgan* | afgif   | afkula   |
| afp      | afrik* | afyon   | afyondazkiri |
| baas     | babur  | babir   | back     |
| badem    | bademli| baden   | bafa     |
| bahadırh | bahar  | bahara* | bahardan |
| bahonar  | bahreyn| bahtmz  | bahçavan |
| bahutjan | balisetmekten | bak | baka |
| bakalm   | bakan* | bakiky  | bakiyesi |
| baklan   | baklava* | bakliyat | bako |
| baku     | baki*  | bakm*   | bakıncə |
| balup    | balar  | bakrky  | balarkıspor |
| bal      | balatası | baldo | balduk |
| cacharel | cadde* | cafér   | cahil*   |
| calıf*   | caizse | caja    | cakarta  |
| camp*    | cam    | cambaz  | cami*    |
| canbal   | camspor| can    | canavar* |
| cankurt* | cancer | candan  | canikli  |
| cantegril| canlı* | Cannes  | canpolat |
| caracas  | canım* | cap     | capone   |
| darbe*   | cardenäs| cargill | cari     |
| dargel*  | dargeıt| dar danelspor | daresi |
| darişıafa | darboğazım  | darp  | darjilaceze |
| davet*   | darcas | data    | daya*    |
| daya*    | david  | davos   | dayak*   |
| dağa*c   | dayapmaya | dayara | đağ     |
| da       | dag*   | dâr    | dagında  |
| eker     | dbp    | dcr     | dechastelain |
| ekimi*   | eki    | ekib*   | ekici    |
| ekonomisi| ekolojik | ekip*   | ekme*    |
| ekspertiz| ekspres| ekonomi* | ekosistem |
| ekli*    | ek生意 | ekki*   | ekvator  |

Table 4.1: The Sample Feature Vector
and in order to provide an efficient categorization some of them are removed or changed as follows:

- The main task in data filtering is to arrange each news report as a single line and separate each of them with a newline. Therefore, paragraphs and empty lines are removed Fig 4.2.

- All words in the news report are converted to lowercase and punctuation is removed. Word boundaries are defined by whitespace.
  - ANKARA'DA OKULLARA KAR TATİLİ...
  - TRAFİK KAZASI: 1 ÖLÜ...
  ankara'da okullara kar tatili
  trafik kazasi 1 ölü

- Apostrophe 's' and the affixes, combined to the apostrophe, are removed.
  Ziyapaşa Bulvar'ında yolun karşasına geçmek isteyen
  Sükrü Bulan'a (80)
  ziyapaşa bulvarı yolun karşasına geçmek isteyen
  sükrü bulan

- The abbreviation of Anadolu Agency is removed.
  ANKARA (A.A) ADANA (A.A)

- All tokens in parenthesis are removed.
  yolun karşasına geçmek isteyen Sükrü Bulan’a (80)

- All of the numeric values and information (bin, milyon) are removed.
  Ankara’da iki gün'dür etkili olan kar yağışı
  ankara gündeir etkili kar yağışı
  07:51 04/01/00

- All words in parenthesis are removed.
  İstanbul Ticaret Odası (ito)
- The abbreviations and cryptogram, related with the subject, in the parenthesis are removed.
  (DA-CÜN-SRP)

- Some of the misspelled words, because of dialect differences in Turkish, are corrected.
  trafik, ekonomik, trapçonspor, kagit, abiy.

- Each news report is divided into three bodies by the sign of (|):
  1. Categorization numbers are manually indexed using 78 subject categories.
  2. Headline text body which is an average of 12 words, is a short summary of news reports.
  3. Text body whose average length is 96 words, is the full description of the news report.

- Each category number boundary is defined by a whitespace Fig 4.2.

- Each category number is assigned sorted Fig 4.2. The detailed information about categories is in Section 4.1.3.

### 4.3 Wild Card

Wild card matching allows a term to be expanded to a group of related words. e.g., the wild card, 'DEPREM* ', comprises the words of which the sequences of characters until asterisk matches with. A special wild card list as a dictionary is created and the most of the wild card words, derived from inflexional suffixes, resemble the stemming. Stemming procedure is to reduce all words with the same root to a common form, usually by stripping each word of its derivational and inflexional suffixes. In wild card procedure, it is not a requirement to reduce with the same root, generally, a character or a suffix can be remained beside the root. However, the wild card words, derived from derivational suffixes, cause the basic difference between the wild card procedure and
ANKARA’DA OKULLARA KAR TATILI...

ANKARA (A.A) - Ankara’da kar yağışı nedeniyle okulların bugün tatil edildiği bildirildi.
Ankara Valiliği’nden yapılan açıklamada, Ankara’da iki gündür etkili olan kar yağışı sebebiyle merkez ilçelerinde bulunan ilköğretim, lise ve dengi okulların bugün tatil edildiği bildirildi.
(CÜN-SRP)
07:25 04/01/00

TRAFLİK KAZASI: 1 ÖLÜ...

ADANA (A.A) - Adana’da meydana gelen trafik kazasında bir kişi öldü.
Ağır bir şekilde yaralı, sürücünün kimliği ve plakası belirlenemeyen bir araç, Ziyaapaşa Bulvarı’nda yolun karşıması geçmek isteyen Sükrü Bulan’a (80) çarparak, ölümlü neden olduğu,
Kaçan araç sürücüsünün yakalanmasına çalıştığı bildirildi.
(DA-CÜN-SRP)
07:51 04/01/00

Figure 4.1: The Original News Report

The most frequently occurring words and some categorical keywords in the dataset are selected for inclusion in the wild card list Table 4.2.

One of the basic aspect of Turkish phonology is consonant harmony. In one respect, consonants in Turkish may be divided into two groups as voiceless (C, F, T, H, S, K, P, S) and the remaining voiced consonants. Turkish words mostly end with a voiceless consonant; especially, the voiced consonants B, C, D or G are rarely found as the final phonemes of the originally Turkish words. If

Figure 4.2: The Preprocessed News Report
there is one of these consonants at the end of a loan-word, it changes to a corresponding voiceless sound of P, Ç, T and K respectively. Therefore, if a root matching with other words, having different meaning than the word affixed to, exists, both of the words, ending with the voiceless and voiced consonants, are selected as a wild card.

e.g., İLAC and İLAÇ

If İLA* is selected as a wild card form in order to comprise both of the words and their extensions, then İLA also contains the words, having a different meaning, such as İLAN, İLAVE, İLAH, İLAHE, İLAHİYAT, İLAHİ

e.g., AĞAC and AĞAÇ

AĞA* is selected as a wild card to contain both of the nouns and their extensions, then AĞA also contain the words such as AĞA, AĞABEY, AĞALIK, AĞANSOY and AĞAR.

GURUP, GURUB, ARAP, ARAB, ARAC, ARAC, BORC, BORÇ, HESAP, HESAB are sample words in the aspect of consonant harmony. Therefore, in order to prevent wrongly reduction of the words, both of the words are selected separately as the wild card form, such as GURUP*, GURUB*, ARAP*, ARAB*, ARAC*, BORC*, BORÇ*, HESAP*, HESAB*, İLAC*, İLAC*, AĞAC* and AĞAC*.

However, some words, having consonant harmony aspect, only matches with related words or the words in the same class. Then, both type of the word may be selected in a single wild card.

e.g., KİTAP and KİTABİ match the wild card KİTA*.

e.g., KULÜP and KULÜBÜ match the wild card KULÜ*.

e.g., DERNEK and DERNEĞİ match the wild card DERNE*.
ÇOCUK  ÇOCUĞUN  ÇOCU*
GALİP  GALİBİYET  GALİ*
MENSUP  MENSUBU  MENSU*
BİÇAK  BİÇAĞIN  BİÇA*
CESET  CESEDİN  CESE*
MEKTUP  MEKTUBA  MEKTU*
MESLEK  MESLEĞİ  MESLE*
KÖPEK  KÖPEĞİN  KÖPE*

Table 4.3: Wild Card Form of Softened Voiceless Consonants

HAÇİM  HAÇMI NE  HAÇMİ*
AĞIZ  AĞZINDA  AĞZİ*
KAYIP  KAYBOLDU  KAYIP*  KAYB*
vakif  vakfi  vakif*  vakf*

Table 4.4: Wild Card Form of Dropped Vowels

e.g., KLİNİK and KLİNİĞİ match the wild card KLİNİ*.

In multi-syllabic words and in certain mono-syllabic roots, the final voiceless consonant P, Ç, T, K are mostly (not always) softened, (it changes B, C, D or Ğ respectively) when a suffix, beginning with a vowel, is attached Table 4.3.

Normally, Turkish roots are not flexed. However, there are some cases where some phonemes are changed by assimilation or various other deformations. These are individual cases and can be treated as exceptions. A root deformation occurs as a vowel ellipsis. When a suffix, beginning with a vowel comes after some nouns, which has a vowel (ı) or (İ) in its last syllable, this vowel drops. In that case, either two forms of the word or the most frequently occurring one is selected as a wild card Table 4.4.

Turkish suffixed can be classified as derivational and inflexional. Deriva-
tional suffixes are the suffixes which produce a new word having a different meaning than the word they are affixed to. Inflexional suffixes can be affixed to all of the roots in the class that they belong to.

Derivational suffixes are the most difficult part of the wild card procedure.
Since most of the derivational suffixes change the meaning and the class of the word they are affixed to. Thus, they make nouns from verbs, or verbs from nouns. Therefore, derivational suffixes make the thin line between the stemming and the wild card.

e.g.; EV, EVDE, EVLER, EVDEN, EVLERİMİZİN, EVDEKİLER, have the same root such as (EV) and by removing inflexional suffixes, it is easy for the stemming procedure. However, EVLİ, EVLENMEK, EVLENDIRMEK have the same root but, have the different meaning because of the derivational suffixes. EV* is not a correct decision since many words having a different meaning such as EVLİ, EVLENMEK, EVLENDIRMEK, EVRAK, EVLAT, EVLİYA, EVCİL, EVRİM, EVREN will be in a wrong reduction form by disappearing or reflecting an incorrect categorical meaning.

Then, the solution is not stemming. In order to provide efficiency, each word is a separate wild card as EVİ*, EVLEN*, EVCİL, EVLER*.

e.g.; İŞLEMLERİ, İŞLEDİĞİ, İŞLENEN, İŞLETMESİ have the same root (İŞLE), but various derivational suffixes give different meanings to the each word which are the keywords of different categories. Therefore, each word is formed by a different wild card such as İŞLEM*, İŞLED*, İŞLEN*, İŞLET*.

e.g.; The word (CAN) is a noun, however, many words can be derived from the word by the means of derivational suffixes such as CAN, CANLI, CANKURTARAN, CANLANMAK, CANDAN, CANAN, CANLI,CANLANDIRMAK. And also root word (PAZAR) can not be in a wild card form, since the derived words such as PAZARLAMA, PAZARCI, PAZARLANDİ, PAZARLIK, PAZARBAŞI, are the keywords of different categories.

The wild card form of the words which are affixed by a inflexional suffix, is much easier than the derived words. Since inflexional suffixes can be affixed to all of the roots in the class they belong to and does not change the class of the word they are affixed to.

e.g.; BORSA, BORSADA, BORSADAN, BORSALAR, BORSALARIN, BORSALARIMİZİN have the same root and the wild card BORSA* does not match a word having a different meaning. But, sometimes, in spite of its inflexional suffixes, getting a word to a wild card form is not available.

e.g.; KAMP, KAMPİN, KAMPTA, KAMPLAR, KAMPİnda, KAMPA have
the same root (KAMP) and the same meaning. However, KAMP* also comprises the words having a different meaning KAMPANA, KAMPİNG, KAMPANYA, KAMPÜS. Then it is not available to select the word KAMP as a wildcard (KAMP*). And also BURS, BURSLU, BURSLAR, BURSLARIN have the same root (BURS) and have the same meaning but, BURS* also comprises the word BURSA.

The morpheme of some words in Turkish prevent automatically removing of inflexional suffixes from the root. e.g., (-LER) and (-LAR) are inflexional suffixes giving a plural meaning to the root. However, the words as DOLAR, KİLER does not allow the removing of plural inflexional suffixes automatically.

In order to provide reduction and retrieve the information, literally matching terms procedure is used. The deficiency of the method is that because most terms have multiple meanings, many unrelated documents may be included in the answer set just because they matched some of the query terms. Against this deficiency, a dimensionality reduction algorithm may be used [16].

The use of a wildcard process and deciding which words are eliminated with a stopword list or gathered in a wildcard word with a keyword list, can bring about substantial reduction in the number of word variants regarding to Turkish dataset.

**Stopwords** are words which occur so frequently that they are not useful for distinguishing one document from another, since they are not useful for learning, they are removed Table 4.5.

The most frequently occurring words are mainly function words such as conjunctions, postpositions, pronouns, etc, and those words are selected for
inclusion in the stopword list. Moreover, some of the large number of low-frequency Turkish words are morphological variants of very commonly occurring function words; and these former words are also included in the stopword list.

**Keywords** are words which are the most commonly used and indicative for a category. Since they are distinguishable from one document to another and provide a reduction for Turkish variants of words, they are selected for inclusion in the keyword list. Keywords may be in the form of a wildcard Table 4.6.

The stopword and keyword list are created manually and both comprise wildcard words, in addition non-wild card words exist in stopword list.

Normally, Turkish roots are not flexed. However, there are some cases where some phonemes are changed by assimilation or various other deformations. An exceptional case related to the flexition of roots is observed in personal pronouns BEN (I) and SEN having datives BANA and SANA respectively. Because of deformations, it is a requirement to select separately most commonly used personal pronouns, demonstrative and relative pronouns as a non-wild card stopword Table 4.7.

Beside the pronouns, not only the name of the days (PAZARTEŞİ, SALI, . . . ) but also the months (MART, NİSAN, . . . ) are removed as a non-wild card in the stopword list. However, numeral words, most common used Turkish proper
names, some of the adverb clauses and prepositions are included in the stopword list as a non-wild card form Table 4.8.

There are four voices of verbs in Turkish: reflexive, reciprocal, causative and passive. Neither the reflexive nor the reciprocal are productive roots; thus, they can be considered as derivational suffixes. But also causative and passive forms sometimes can perform as a derivational one.

1. DÖVMEK, DÖVÜNMEK, DÖVÜLMEK, DÖVÜŞMEK, DÖVÜŞTÜRKMEK.
2. GÖRMEK, GÖRÜNMEK, GÖRÜLMEK, GÖRÜŞMEK, GÖRÜŞTÜRKMEK.
3. SEVMEK, SEVİNMEK, SEVİLMEK, SEViŞMEK, SEViŞTÜRKMEK.

There are two suffixes which give a verb a negative sense: -M(A) and [Y](A)M(A).

And the suffix [Y](A)M(A) is used to express impossibility: YAPMAM, YAPAMAM; OYNAMAM, OYNAYAMAM; SÖYLEMEM, SÖYLEYEMEM. However, the most important point is to decide which form of the verb is a stopword or a keyword. e.g.; The words (ULAŞMAK, ULAŞILMAK, ULAŞTIRILMAK, ULAŞAN, ULAŞAMAYAN, ULAŞMAYAN) have the same root (ULAŞ) and all of them are stopword, but if the verb is in a wild card form (ULAŞ*), some of the keywords (ULAŞTIRMA, ULAŞIM) are discarded from the dataset. Therefore, each form of a verb must be selected one by one to the keyword list (ULAŞTIRMA*, ULAŞIM*) or stopword list (ULAŞIL*, ULAŞTIRIL*, ULAŞA*, ULAŞM*) as a wild card.

The words (DUYUKLARI, DUYMADIKLARI, DUYGULU, DUYMALARI, DUYULDUĞU, DUYURULAR, DUYULMAMALI) have the same root (DUY), but only DUYURULAR is a keyword of a category, therefore, instead of selecting the root (DUY*) as a wild card, each of the words is taken in the stoplist separately such as DUYD*, DUYG*, DUYM*, DUYUL*, and in the keyword list as DUYURU*.

SATAN, SATACAĞIZ, SATAMAM, SATMAMALI, SATMALI, SATTIRMALI, SATILAN, SATILMAYAN, SATIŞ have the same root (SAT), but most of them
are irrelevant words except SATH which is a keyword for a category. Therefore, SATA*, SATM*, SATT*, SATIL* are in the stopword list, however, SATIS* is in the keyword list. Some example verbs for stopword list and keyword list exist in Table 4.9 and Table 4.10, respectively.

Main tense suffix is the obligatory suffixes for the verbs. There are nine tenses: definite past (-[D][I]), narrative past (-M[I]S), future (-[Y][A]CA[K]), aorist (-[I]R, -A[R], -R), progressive (-I]YOR, -M[A]KT[A]), conditional (-S[A]), optative (-[Y][A]), necessatice (-M[A]L[II]), and imperative. The last four are not tenses in strict sense of the term, but their place in the verb model is the same as main tense suffix [26]. In Turkish, verb sentences can be transformed into a noun, adjective, or adverb clauses by adding certain suffixes to the verb of the sentence. During the transformation, the obligatory suffixes of the verb, i.e., main tense and personal suffixes, are removed, and then participle suffixes are affixed. Selection process of words by stripping tense and participle suffixes, according to their importance on categories and dataset, is a time consuming task. However, usually, the behavior of tense and participle suffixes resembles inflexional suffixes. ÇATIŞMAK, ÇATIŞIR, ÇATIŞTI, ÇATIŞIYOR, ÇATIŞMIS, ÇATIŞACAK, ÇATIŞSA, ÇATIŞMALI, ÇATIŞMAYA, ÇATIŞAN, ÇATIŞMAYAN, ÇATIŞMAMAK, have the same
Table 4.10: Some Sample Keyword Verbs After Stopword Elimination

Because of deformations and matching with other words, it is sometimes not available to gather all tense forms of a verb in a wild card. e.g., BAKMA*, BAK, BAKYOR, BAKACAK, BAKİ, BAKŞA, BAKMİS, BAKMİŞTİ, BAKMADI, BAKİLDI, BAKİLYOR, BAKILSA, BAKILIR, BAKİLMİŞ, have the same root (BAK), but the wild card (BAK*) also comprise the words, (BAKAN, BAKANLIK, BAKIM, BAKIR) which have different meanings. Therefore, each tense form of the verb is taken separately in the stopword list such as BAKMA*, BAKT*, BAKIL, BAKİY*, and in the keyword list such as BAKAN*, BAKIM*. Different forms of verbs in the stoplist are in Table 4.11.

A keyword is the most frequently occurring indicative word for a category, but a stopword is the most frequently occurring word for the whole dataset. And also the number of verbs in the stopword list is more than the number of nouns, but, in contrast, the number of nouns in the keyword list is more than the number of verbs. In fact, each category has several keywords that indicates the category Table 4.12.
TABLE 4.11: Some Sample Tense Forms of Stopword Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>KEYWORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eğitim</td>
<td>eğit*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seçim</td>
<td>seç*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsa</td>
<td>borsa*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İhale</td>
<td>ihale*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Din</td>
<td>peygamber,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hükümet</td>
<td>hükmüt*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprem</td>
<td>deprem*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangın</td>
<td>itfaiye*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hukuk</td>
<td>mağ*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terör</td>
<td>terör*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çatışma</td>
<td>çatış*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Döviz</td>
<td>döviz*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parti</td>
<td>politik*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meclis</td>
<td>milletvek*,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.12: Some Sample Keywords of Categories
4.4 Categories

The most important and time consuming task of the preprocessing is to assign categories to documents. Since the original AA dataset is unprocessed that is the categories are not assigned, the documents are manually indexed using 78 subject categories. Each category is represented by a number, related to a subject Table 4.13.

In general, the structure of categories is flat, but a category hierarchy is requirement in order to provide an efficient categorization Table 4.13. Most of the categories are organized in a hierarchy. For example; $C_1$: Sports, $C_2$: Football, $C_3$: Basketball, $C_4$: Volleyball, and $C_5$: Athletics. Needless to say that all categories, football, basketball, volleyball and athletics are a branch of sports. However, some news reports require to be assigned the category sports except for the branches of sports. Then such news are assigned only the category sports. On the other hand, if a news report belongs to a particular category in the hierarchy, such as $C_2$: Football, since Football is the branch of Sports, the news report is also assigned to $C_1$: Sports.

Category boundaries are defined by whitespace and categorization numbers are assigned sorted. On average 7 categories are assigned to each document. That the way followed while manual categorizing is to research both the general subject of the document and the most commonly used keywords in the document.

4.5 Feature Values

In text categorization, instances are natural language documents and features or terms are the words. An instance can be represented with a set of word and word weight pairs. Each feature has a weight in a specific instance and this weight indicates the importance of that feature in the instance. Finding out the proper weight of features is a crucial process in an algorithm since it highly effects the accuracy of the algorithm. A successful feature weighting technique gives low weight to features of which almost every instance contains nearly the
| 1. İç       | 5. TERÖR       | 9. SANAT       | 13. MAGAZİN   |
| 2. DİŞ       | 6. ÇAÞIŞMA      | 10. VEFAT      | 14. TURÝZM   |
| 3. HUKUK     | 7. EĞİTİM       | 11. ANMA       | 15. DOÞA     |
| 4. ASAYIŞ    | 8. KÜLTÜR       | 12. BİLİM      | 16. SAÞLIK   |
| 17. TARIM    | 21. HAVAYOLLARI | 25. BM         | 29. PETROL   |
| 18. HAYVANLAR| 22. DEMÝRYOLLARI| 26. ORDU       | 30. ORTADOGU |
| 19. TRAFIK   | 23. KAZA        | 27. İHALE      | 31. BARAJ    |
| 20. DENIZ    | 24. AB          | 28. DİN        | 32. İÞME SUÝU|
| 33. SEÞİM    | 34. INSAN HAKLARI| 35. SANAYÝ   |             |
| 36. SPOR     |               |               |             |
| 37. FUTBOL   | 38. BASKETBOL  | 39. VOLEYBOL  | 40. HENTBOL  |
| 41. ATKETÝZM | 42. KAYAK      | 43. SU SPORLARI| 44. MINDER   |
| 45. BILARDO  | 46. RALLI      | 47. AT YARISI | 48. OLYMPIYAT|
| 49. EKONOMI  |               |               |             |
| 50. BORSA    | 51. DÖVIZ       | 52. IHRACAT    | 53. İTHALAT  |
| 54. ZAM      | 55. ENFLASYON  | 56. BANKACILIK | 57. TİCARET |
| 58. IMF      | 59. H AZINE     |               |             |
| 60. YÖNETIM  |               |               |             |
| 61. DEVLET   | 62. HÜKÜMET    | 63. PARTÝLER   | 64. BELEDİYE |
| 65. PARLAMENTO| 66. SÝVIL TOPLUM| 67. KURULUSLAR| 68. KONSEY  |
| 69. AFET     |               |               |             |
| 70. YANGIN   | 71. DEPREM     | 72. SEL        | 73. FİRTINA  |
| 74. AÇLIK    | 75. SALGIN     | 76. YANARDAG   |             |
| 77. TALIH OYUNLARI | 78. METEOROLOJİ |         |             |

Table 4.13: Categories
same amount. Since they are irrelevant to the categorization of the instances. Because of the importance of feature weighting process, a growing number of techniques have been developed and applied, e.g., term frequency (TF), inverse document frequency (IDF), term discrimination value, probabilistic term weighting, single feature accuracy and genetic algorithms.

Term frequency is the number of occurrences of a term in which a document occurs. In short, the more often a term occurs in a document, the more likely it is to be important for that document. However, because of the fact that, the number of occurrences of a term depends on the length of the instance, in general, it is normalized by the number of the terms in the instance.

As mentioned in Section 4.2, each news report is divided into three bodies. Headline text body is a short summary of the instance and in general, contains relevant features regarding to the instance. Therefore, while computing term frequency, all features in the text body have the same weight coefficient, in contrast, the features in the headline body have higher weight coefficient than the ones in the text body. The aim is to retrieve more relevant features in the instance.

**TRAFIK KAZASI: 1 OLU…**

ADANA (A.A) - Adana’da meydana gelen trafik kazasında bir kişi öldü. Alınan bilgiye göre, sürücünün kimliği ve plakası belirlenemeyen bir araç, Ziya pasa Bulvar’ında yolun kaşasına geçmek isteyen Şükrü Bula’n’a (80) çarparak, ölmüne neden oldu.

Kaçan araç sürücüsünün yakalanmasına çalıştığı bildirildi.

---

**Figure 4.3: A Sample Instance**

The headline body of Fig 4.3 is related with a traffic accident and 1 person is dead. And the features in the headline are keywords, however, the text body implies the same subject in detail and also contains many irrelevant features. Therefore, in order to retrieve more relevant features, assigning a higher weight coefficient to the features in the headline is so reasonable Fig 4.4.
Figure 4.4: Term Frequency of an Instance
Chapter 5

Evaluation

This chapter is devoted to the empirical evaluations of the FPTC and \( k \)-NN algorithms on the real dataset. Anadolu Agency Newsgroup Dataset is used to compare the predictive power and computational complexity of those algorithms.

The \( k \)-NN classifier is an instance based learning method. It computes the similarity between the test instance and training instance, and considering the \( k \) top-ranking nearest instances to predict the categories of the input, finds out the category that is most similar. The FPTC is a variant of \( k \)-NN algorithm [12]. The main difference is that instances are projected on their features in the \( n \) dimensional space and distance between two instances is calculated according to a single feature. The Feature Based Text Categorization (FBTC) algorithm is an extension of the FPTC. The whole dataset is viewed as a matrix where each row is an instance and its columns are features. The values in the matrix are binary, 1 for presence of the feature and 0 for absence of the feature. In other words, the main difference is the feature weighting mechanism. Instead of taking term frequency of a feature, if the feature occurs in the instance, 1 is assigned as the weight of the feature, otherwise 0 is assigned.

The organization of the chapter is as follows: the performance measure that will be used to compare the methods in terms of predictive accuracy is briefly defined. Then, computational complexity comparison of the algorithms
in terms of time and space requirements is presented. In the third section, empirical evaluation including the aspects of the real dataset used in experiments, is mentioned. Finally, the chapter concludes by the evaluation results and the comparisons of algorithms.

5.1 Performance Measure

The performance measure is used to determine the predictive power of the algorithms and several measures for performance exist. One of the performance measures of a categorization algorithm is to find its accuracy. The most commonly used categorization accuracy metric is the percentage of correctly categorized instances over all test instances for a given dataset. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the k-NN and FPTC algorithms use category ranking to predict the categories of the input document. Category ranking can be evaluated using measures similar to the conventional measures for evaluating ranking-based document retrieval systems: recall, precision, and 11-point average precision. Given a categorizer whose input is a document, and whose output is a ranked list of categories assigned to that document, the recall and precision can be computed at any threshold on this ranked list:

\[
\text{recall} = \frac{\text{categories found and correct}}{\text{total categories correct}} \quad (5.1)
\]

\[
\text{precision} = \frac{\text{categories found and correct}}{\text{total categories found}} \quad (5.2)
\]

where "categories found" specifies some number of the categories from the beginning of the ranked list. This number can adjust according to the algorithms. In the k-NN algorithm, the relevant number is the parameter \( k \) and in the FPTC, it is the number of all categories. "Categories found and correct" means how many categories from the found categories agree with the actual categories given to the tested instance manually. "Total categories found" is the number of the total categories found and "Total categories correct" is the number of actual categories of the tested instance.
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After finding recall and precision for each test instance, the global evaluation of an algorithm can be found by interpolated 11-point average precision that is described below [38]:

- As the first step, for each document, compute the recall and precision at each position in the ranked list where a correct category is found.

- For each interval of recall values 0%, 10% ... 100% the left boundary of the interval is assigned to the highest precision value of that interval. For example, the highest precision value in the interval of 0% and 10% recall values is assigned to the recall value of 0%. If the interval value contains no precision value, then zero is assigned as the precision value to the left boundary of that interval. These precision values of recall values are called as representative precision value.

- For the recall value of 100% representative precision is either the exact precision value if such a data point exists, or the precision value at the closest point in terms of recall.

- The representation value of each recall values of 0%...100% is replaced with the highest representative precision value of that recall value or higher recall values. This process is called as interpolation.

- Average per-document data points over all the test documents, at each of the above recall thresholds respectively. This step results in 11 per-interval average precision scores.

- The average of these per-interval average precision scores specifies a single-numbered performance average, called global averaging.

Accuracy of an algorithm is the measure of correct categorizations on the test set of unseen instances. In order to find accuracy, while applying precision, recall and 11-point average precision, 10-fold cross-validation technique is used. The whole dataset is partitioned into 10 subsets. The nine of the subsets is used as the training set and the tenth is used as the test set, and this process is repeated 10 times once for each subset being the test set. Therefore, each instance appears once in the test set and nine times in the training and categorization is the average of these 10 runs.
5.2 Complexity Analyses

Since all the training instances are stored in the memory in both k-NN and FPTC algorithms, the space required for training with \( m \) instances on a domain with \( n \) features is proportional to \( m \cdot n \). That is, the space complexities of these algorithms are \( O(m \times n) \).

In the training, all instances are stored on each feature dimension as their feature projections in the FPTC algorithm. And then they are sorted once at the end. Since the sorting of \( m \) feature values has the time complexity of \( O(m \times \log m) \). For a dataset containing \( m \) instances and \( n \) features, the training time complexity of the FPTC is \( O(n \times m \times \log m) \). On the other hand, the \( k \)-NN algorithm has the time complexity of \( O(m \times n) \) for storing all instances in memory.

The \( kBag(f, t, k) \) function, to determine the votes of a feature, first finds the nearest neighbor of \( t \) on \( f \) and then next \( k - 1 \) neighbors around the nearest neighbor. The time complexity of this process is \( O(\log m + k) \). Since \( m >> k \), the time complexity of \( kBag \) is \( O(\log m) \). The final classification requires the votes of each of \( n \) features. Therefore, the classification time complexity of the FPTC algorithm is \( O(n \times (k + \log m)) \) [11].

In the \( k \)-NN algorithm, the classification of a test instance requires the computation of its distance to \( m \) training instance on \( n \) dimensions. Therefore, the classification time complexity of the \( k \)-NN algorithm is simply \( O(n \times m) \) assuming \( m >> k \).

5.3 Empirical Evaluation

In this section, we present an empirical evaluation of the FPTC algorithm on the A.A. dataset and the results will be compared with that of the \( k \)-NN algorithm.
5.3.1 Real-World Dataset

The FPTC and \( k \)-NN algorithms are evaluated on the A.A. real-world dataset. The processed dataset consists of nearly 2000 documents. A stopword list of 859 entries is used for stopword elimination. Each news report contains a categorized number body, a headline text and news text body. The headlines are an average of 12 words long. The average length of a document body is 96 words. On average 7 categories are assigned to each document. Text categorization is such an application area where datasets inevitably contain a high number of irrelevant features. Even after removal of stop words, many irrelevant features still exist and also there are many ”noisy” data which makes the categorization difficult to learn for a categorizer. The original A.A. (Anadolu Agency) dataset is unprocessed, that is, the categories were manually assigned to subjects using 78 subject categories. Each category label is represented by a number defined a subject. Word boundaries were defined by whitespace. Some preliminary work was required besides converting all words to lower case and removing punctuation marks because of the characteristics of Turkish language.

5.3.2 Experimental Results

An empirical evaluation of the FPTC algorithm is presented in order to show the evaluation and the comparison the performance of the FPTC with the \( k \)-NN categorizer algorithm on the A.A. real-world dataset. The parameter ”\( k \)” is defined as 10 in the experiments. The experiments also gives the opportunity of

- verifying the previously obtained results about the comparison of the FPTC and the \( k \)-NN algorithms in text categorization [12],

- observing the performance of the algorithms on the Turkish language.

The accuracy results of the FPTC and FBT algorithms for each cross-validation are given in Table 5.1 and Table 5.2, respectively. We can say that the FPTC algorithm gives promising results in the text categorization of the Turkish real-world dataset.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fold</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Training Time (ms)</th>
<th>Test Time (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>439180</td>
<td>18460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>441600</td>
<td>17630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>444450</td>
<td>17470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>446650</td>
<td>17090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>444780</td>
<td>18070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>433690</td>
<td>17410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>442700</td>
<td>18400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>442480</td>
<td>17860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>438090</td>
<td>17410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>447150</td>
<td>17740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>0.8612</td>
<td>442077</td>
<td>17754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: The Results of FPTC for each cross-validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fold</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Training Time (ms)</th>
<th>Test Time (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>429300</td>
<td>17740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>432540</td>
<td>18400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>431440</td>
<td>17080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>430840</td>
<td>18180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>431440</td>
<td>18180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>428590</td>
<td>17240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>426770</td>
<td>18510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>430560</td>
<td>18510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>424030</td>
<td>18510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>430390</td>
<td>17960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>0.7142</td>
<td>429590</td>
<td>18031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: The Results of FBTC for each cross-validation


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Training Time (ms)</th>
<th>Test Time (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPTC</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>439180</td>
<td>18460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBTC</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>429300</td>
<td>17740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$-NN</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>870920</td>
<td>63341280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: The Comparison of the Algorithms after the first fold cross-validation

According to the results in Table 5.3, the $k$-NN is slightly better than the FPTC algorithm in terms of accuracy, the difference between their accuracy is nearly 7%. However, the FPTC and the FBTC are much better than the $k$-NN algorithm in terms of time. During the testing of the instances, one fold cross-validation of the FPTC algorithm lasts only 18 seconds, whereas one fold cross-validation of $k$-NN lasts nearly 18 hours Table 5.3. According to the comparison of time efficiencies of the algorithms, the accuracy difference among the algorithms can be negligible.

In short, after the evaluation of the algorithms, the results show that the accuracy of the FPTC algorithm is so close to the accuracy of the $k$-NN algorithm, whereas the time efficiency of FPTC outperforms the $k$-NN significantly.
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Conclusion and Future Work

In this thesis, compilation and preprocessing of a new Turkish dataset, and also evaluation and comparison of the FPTC and the $k$-NN text categorization algorithms on the Turkish dataset are presented.

Unlike the main Indo-European languages, such as French, English and German, Turkish is an example of an agglutinative language, where words are formed by affixing morphemes to a root in order to extend its meaning or to create other classes of words. In Turkish the process of adding one suffix to another can result in relatively long words, which often contain an amount of semantic information equivalent to a whole English phrase, clause or sentence. Due to this complex morphological structure, Turkish requires text processing techniques different than English and similar languages. However, the Turkish real-world data collection on which the FPTC and the $k$-NN algorithms are applied, achieves comparable performance with the English or similar language data collections.

The FPTC algorithm has been compared with the $k$-NN algorithm in terms of categorization accuracy and time complexity on the Turkish dataset. The $k$-NN algorithm is a well-known text categorization algorithm and comparable good in accuracy, but not in scalability. The FPTC algorithm is a variant of $k$-NN and a non-incremental algorithm that is all training instances are taken and processed at once. The main characteristic of the algorithm is that
instances are stored as their projections on each feature dimension. If the value
of a training instance is missing for a feature, that instance is not stored on
that feature.

On the Turkish real-world dataset, the FPTC algorithm achieves compara-
bile accuracy with the k-NN algorithm. On the other hand, the average running
time of the FPTC algorithm is much less than that of the k-NN algorithm.

As a future work, we plan to increase the number of the processed Turkish
news reports in the dataset. And also a standard stopword list can be devel-
oped for the Turkish language. Another research direction is to increase the
prediction accuracy of the FPTC algorithm on the Turkish dataset. And the
effect of the missing and noisy feature values on the prediction accuracy of the
FPTC algorithm can be investigated as a future work.
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