

# Improving Probabilistic Models in Text Classification via Active Learning\*

Mitchell Bosley<sup>†‡</sup>   Saki Kuzushima<sup>†§</sup>   Ted Enamorado<sup>¶</sup>   Yuki Shiraito<sup>||</sup>

This draft: December 11, 2021  
First draft: September 10, 2020

## Abstract

When using text data, social scientists often classify documents in order to use the resulting document labels as an outcome or predictor. Since it is prohibitively costly to label a large number of documents manually, automated text classification has become a standard tool. However, current approaches for text classification do not take advantage of all the data at one's disposal. We propose a fast new model for text classification that combines information from both labeled and unlabeled data with an active learning component, where a human iteratively labels documents that the algorithm is least certain about. Using text data from Wikipedia discussion pages, BBC News articles, historical US Supreme Court opinions, and human rights abuse allegations, we show that by introducing information about the structure of unlabeled data and iteratively labeling uncertain documents, our model improves performance relative to classifiers that (a) only use information from labeled data and (b) randomly decide which documents to label at the cost of manually labelling a small number of documents.

---

\*We thank Ken Benoit, Yaoyao Dai, Chris Fariss, Walter Mebane, Kevin Quinn, and audiences at the 2020 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 2021 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, 11th Annual Conference on New Directions in Analyzing Text as Data, seminar participants at the University of Michigan, for useful comments and suggestions.

<sup>†</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work.

<sup>‡</sup>Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan. Email: [mbosley@umich.edu](mailto:mbosley@umich.edu).

<sup>§</sup>Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan. Email: [skuzushi@umich.edu](mailto:skuzushi@umich.edu)

<sup>¶</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Washington University in St. Louis. Siegle Hall, 244. One Brookings Dr. St Louis, MO 63130-4899. Phone: 314-935-5810, Email: [ted@wustl.edu](mailto:ted@wustl.edu), URL: [www.tedenamorado.com](http://www.tedenamorado.com).

<sup>||</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan. Center for Political Studies, 4259 Institute for Social Research, 426 Thompson Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321. Phone: 734-615-5165, Email: [shiraito@umich.edu](mailto:shiraito@umich.edu), URL: [shiraito.github.io](http://shiraito.github.io).

# 1 Introduction

As the amount and diversity of available information have rapidly increased, social scientists often resort to multiple forms of data to answer substantive questions.<sup>1</sup> In particular, the use of text-as-data in cutting-edge social science research has exploded over the past decade. Document classification has been the primary task in political science, with researchers classifying documents such as legislative speeches (Peterson and Spirling, 2018), public statements of politicians (Airoldi et al., 2007; Stewart and Zhukov, 2009), news articles (Boydston, 2013), election manifestos (Catalinac, 2016), social media posts (King et al., 2017), treaties (Spirling, 2012), religious speeches (Nielsen, 2017), and human rights text (Cordell et al., 2021; Greene et al., 2019).

Two types of classification methods are commonly used: supervised and unsupervised algorithms. Supervised approaches use associations between word frequencies and labels from a set of hand-coded documents to categorize unlabeled documents, whereas unsupervised schemes cluster documents without needing labeled documents. Both of these methods have downsides, however: in the former, hand-coding documents is labor-intensive and costly, requires expert knowledge and reconciliation of disagreements between coders to ensure label validity; in the latter, the substantive interpretation of the categories discovered by the clustering process can be difficult, and performance is severely threatened when the data lacks the necessary structure such that signal can be distinguished from noise.

Active learning is a technique that reduces the cost of hand-coding in the supervised approach. It uses measures of label uncertainty to iteratively flag highly informative documents, and has been shown to reduce the number of labeled documents needed to train an accurate classifier, particularly when the proportion of the document class in the data is very low (Miller et al., 2020). However, current implementations of active learning have only been used to augment supervised approaches. That is, in each iteration of an active learning algorithm, only labeled documents are used to train the classifier that indicates which documents should be labeled.

Our innovation is to augment active learning with unsupervised clustering, exploiting the benefits of both approaches to improve the performance of text classifiers. We extend the mixture model from Nigam et al. (2000) to combine the information from both labeled and unlabeled documents within an active learning framework. In the model, latent clusters are *observed* as labels for labeled documents and *estimated* as a latent variable for unlabeled documents, and active learning iteratively provides observed labels for the documents that the cluster estimates are most uncertain about. We show that our model outperforms Support Vector Machines (SVM), a popular supervised learning model, when both models are using active learning to choose which documents to label. Furthermore, because our model is generative, it is straightforward to use a researcher’s domain expertise to improve classification. As an example, we show that classification performance is improved by iteratively upweighting keywords that the researcher identifies as being

---

<sup>1</sup>See e.g., Grimmer and Stewart (2013) for an excellent overview of these methods in Political Science. See also Appendix A.

highly associated with one of the possible document labels.

We provide a library for the statistical language  $R$  called *activeText* with the goal of providing researchers from all backgrounds easily accessible tools to minimize the amount of hand-coding of documents and improving the performance of classification models for their own work.

This research note proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we describe both the semi-supervised and active learning components of our model. In Section 3, we show the results from comparing our model to a popular alternative. In Section 5, we review the results, and discuss directions for future research. For an accessible primer on the use and interpretation of machine learning models for text classification, see the online Appendix B.

## 2 The Method

### 2.1 Model

Consider the task of classifying  $N$  documents as one of two discrete classification options. Let  $\mathbf{D}$  be a  $N \times V$  document feature matrix, where  $V$  is the size of features. We use  $\mathbf{Z}$ , a vector of length  $N$ , to represent the latent cluster assigned to each document. If a document  $i$  is assigned to the  $k$ th cluster,  $Z_i = k$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $K = 2$ , however, the mixture model behind our approach is quite flexible and can be extended to encompass more than two clusters (see Appendix sections C and D).

The following equations summarize our generative model:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi &\sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) \\
 Z_i &\stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(\pi) \\
 \eta_k &\stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k), \quad k \in \{0, 1\} \\
 \mathbf{D}_i | Z_i = k &\stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Multinomial}(n_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k)
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Where we first draw  $\pi = p(Z_i = 1)$ , the probability that any given document belongs to the positive class, from a Beta distribution with hyperparameters  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha_1$ . Given  $\pi$ , for each document indexed by  $i$ , we draw from a Bernoulli distribution the latent cluster assignment indicator  $Z_i$ . Then, we draw features for document  $i$  from a multinomial distribution governed by the vector  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k$ , where  $\eta_{vk} = p(D_{iv} | Z_i = k)$ , whose prior is the Dirichlet distribution.

We use the EM algorithm to estimate the parameters.<sup>2</sup> One important note on the estimation is that we down-weight information from unlabeled documents. The objective function to be maximized by the EM algorithm consists of the log prior, the log likelihood of labeled data, and the log likelihood of unlabeled data. Without weight, information from unlabeled data will dominate information from labeled data because the number of documents in the former is much larger than the latter typically. Therefore, we weight the log likelihood of unlabeled data by  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$

---

<sup>2</sup>For a full derivation of the EM algorithm, see Appendix C.

following Nigam et al. (2000). When the  $\lambda$  is equal to 1, the model treats each document equally, regardless of whether the document is labeled deterministically by a human, or probabilistically by the algorithm. As  $\lambda$  moves from 1 towards 0, the model increasingly down-weights the information that the probabilistically labeled documents contribute to the estimation of  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  and  $\pi$ , such that when  $\lambda$  is 0, the model *ignores* all information from the probabilistically labeled documents and therefore becomes a supervised algorithm (see Appendix C).

## 2.2 Active Learning

Our active learning algorithm (see Algorithm 1) can be split into the following steps: *estimation* of the probability that each unlabeled document belongs to the positive class, *selection* of the unlabeled documents whose predicted class is most uncertain, and *labeling* of the selected documents by human coders. The algorithm then iterates until one of three stopping conditions are met: (1) the model runs out of unlabeled documents to label; (2) the remaining unlabeled documents do not meet a particular uncertainty threshold; or (3) the maximum number of allowed active steps is reached. We also describe an optional keyword upweighting feature, where a set of user-provided keywords provide prior information about the likelihood that a word is generated by a given class to the model. These keywords can either be provided at the outset of the model, or identified during the active learning process.

### 2.2.1 Estimation

In the first iteration, the model is initialized with a small number of labeled documents.<sup>3</sup> The information from these documents is used to estimate the parameters of the model: the probability of a document having a positive label  $\pi$ , and the probability of generating each word given a class, the  $V \times 2$  matrix  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ . From the second iteration on, we use information from both labeled and unlabeled documents to estimate the parameters using EM algorithm, with the log likelihood of unlabeled documents being down-weighted by  $\lambda$ , and with the  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  and  $\pi$  values from the previous iteration as the initial values. Using the estimated parameters, we compute the posterior probability that each unlabeled document belongs to the positive class.

### 2.2.2 Selection

Using the predicted probability that each unlabeled document belongs to the positive class, we use Shannon Entropy to determine which of the probabilistically labeled documents that it was least certain about. In the binary classification case, this is the equivalent of calculating the absolute value of the distance of the positive class probability and 0.50 for each document. Using this criteria, the model ranks all probabilistically labeled documents in descending order of uncertainty. The  $n$  most uncertain documents are then selected for human labeling, where  $n$  is the number of documents to be labeled by humans at each iteration.

---

<sup>3</sup>While we assume that these documents are selected randomly, the researcher may choose any subset of labeled documents with which to initialize the model.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Active learning with EM algorithm to classify text

---

**Result:** Obtain the predicted classes of all documents at least with some certainty.

Initialize  $\mathbf{D}_{old}^l$  by sampling some documents randomly, and have humans label them ;

Initialize  $\mathbf{D}^u \leftarrow \mathbf{D} \setminus \mathbf{D}_{old}^l$ ;

[**Active Keyword**]: Initialize keyword matrix  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ , where each element  $\kappa_{v,c}$  takes the value of  $\gamma$  if the word  $v$  is a keyword for class  $c$ , otherwise 0.

**while** *Not all documents are classified with some certainty yet* **do**

(1) [**Active Keyword**]: Up-weight elements of the  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  prior using  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ ;

$\boldsymbol{\beta} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\kappa}$  ;

(2) Predict labels for each document in  $\mathbf{D}^u$  using EM algorithm;

(3) Sample  $n$  most uncertain documents in  $\mathbf{D}^u$  and have humans labels them;

$\mathbf{D}_{new}^l \leftarrow n$  most uncertain documents in  $\mathbf{D}^u$ ;

(4) [**Active Keyword**]: Sample  $m$  non-keywords most associated with each class and have humans label to create  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{new}$ ;

$\boldsymbol{\kappa} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{new}$ ;

(5) Update labeled and unlabeled documents;

$\mathbf{D}^l \leftarrow \mathbf{D}_{old}^l \cup \mathbf{D}_{new}^l$ ;

$\mathbf{D}^u \leftarrow \mathbf{D} \setminus \mathbf{D}_{old}^l$

**end**

---

### 2.2.3 Labeling

A human coder reads each document selected by the algorithm and imputes the ‘correct’ label. The newly-labeled documents are then added to the set of human-labeled documents, and the process is repeated from the estimation stage.

### 2.2.4 Active Keyword Upweighting

The researcher also has the option to use an active keyword upweighting scheme, where a set of keywords is used to provide additional information to the mixture model by incrementing elements of the  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  matrix associated with a keyword for a given class by  $\gamma$ , a scalar value chosen by the researcher (see Eshima et al. 2020 for a similar approach for topic models). To build the list of keywords associated with each class, the researcher is queried after a set interval of active learning iterations to label a set of candidate words as keywords or not.<sup>4</sup> To select candidate keywords with the active keyword approach, we calculate the log ratio that each word was generated by a particular class using the  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  parameter from the mixture model, and choose  $m$  words (that are not already part of the set of keywords) with the most extreme ratio for each class. Using the set of keywords for each class, we create a  $N \times C$  keyword matrix  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$  where each element  $\kappa_{v,c}$  takes the value of  $\gamma$  if word  $v$  is a keyword for class  $c$ , otherwise 0. Before we fit the mixture model in each active iteration, we perform a matrix sum  $\boldsymbol{\beta} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\kappa} + \boldsymbol{\beta}$  where  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is the  $N \times C$  matrix that summarizes the prior information about the likelihood that a given word is associated with a given class. The keyword approach therefore effectively upweights our model with prior information about words

---

<sup>4</sup>The researcher may combine also provide an initial set of keywords, and then iteratively labeling candidate words to add to the set of keywords.

that we think are likely to be associated with one class rather than another.

### 3 Applications

This section first shows the performance comparisons between active vs passive learning (random sampling at each active step) as well as semi-supervised learning vs supervised learning, when classifying documents for the following datasets: internal forum conversations of Wikipedia editors (positive class: toxic comment), BBC News articles (political topic), the United States Supreme Court decisions (criminal procedure), and Human Rights allegation (physical integrity rights allegation). It also shows that different specifications of our methods can further improve the performance depending on various data structures.

#### 3.1 Results

Figure 1 shows the results from four model specifications, each represents one of the combinations of active or passive learning, and semi-supervised or supervised learning. The first choice is between active learning (solid lines) vs passive learning (dashed lines). In the active sampling, we select the next set of documents to be labeled based on the entropy of the predicted probabilities of the classes when we use our mixture model, and they are selected based on the margin sampling when we use SVM as the underlying classification method. The second choice is between our semi-supervised learning (darker lines) vs an off-the-shelf supervised learning (lighter lines). For the supervised learning, we replicate the results from Miller et al. (2020) which uses SVM as the classifier. The rows correspond to different datasets and the columns correspond to various proportion with positive label documents in the corpus. The y-axis indicates the average out-of-sample F1 score (the harmonic mean of precision and recall) across 100 Monte Carlo iterations, and the x-axis shows the number of sampling steps. We label 20 documents at each sampling step.

Among the four models, the combination of active learning with the mixture model (*Active Mixture* in Figure 1) performs the best with most of the specifications. The results on the Wikipedia corpus with 5% and 9% (population) positive labels and on the Supreme Court corpus with 5% positive labels highlight this most clearly. With other specifications, *Active Mixture* performs slightly better or as well as other models. The gain from active learning tends to be higher when the proportion of positive labels are small. When the proportion of the positive labels are 5%, active learning outperforms passive learning consistently. An exception is on the human rights corpus where active learning did not improve the performance even when the proportion of positive labels is 5%, and this is the case for both SVM and our mixture model. By contrast, *Active Mixture* tends to perform better than SVM at the initialization, though the difference shrinks as the number of labeled documents increase. The results on BBC corpus with 5% and 19% (population), Wikipedia, and Supreme Court highlight this point. The *Random Mixture* (dashed dark line) is above the *Random SVM* (dashed light line) at the beginning but they converge later. This makes sense because the relative contribution from unlabeled documents in the mixture model




Figure 1: **Comparison of Classification Results across Active Mixture, Active SVM, Random Mixture, and Random SVM** The rows correspond to different datasets and the columns correspond to various proportion with positive label documents in the corpus. The y-axis indicates the out-of-sample F1 score and the x-axis shows the number of sampling steps. 20 documents are labeled at each sampling step. The colors correspond to different classifiers: the darker lines show the results of our mixture model and the lighter lines the results of SVM. The line type shows different sampling schemes: the solid lines are for the active sampling and the dashed line are for the random sampling. In the active sampling, we select the next set of documents to be labeled based on the entropy of the predicted probabilities of the classes. *Active Mixture* performs the best with most of the specifications. Active learning often performs better than passive learning when the proportion of positive labels are small.

decreases as the size of labeled documents increases.

We also test the effect of implementing the keyword upweighting scheme described above. In Figure 1, active learning did not improve the performance on the human rights corpus even when the proportion of positive labels is 5%, and the F1 score was also lower than other corpora. One reason for the early poor performance of *Active Mixture* may be length of each document. Because each document of the human rights corpus consists of one sentence only, the average length of each document is shorter than other corpora.<sup>5</sup> This means that the information the models can learn from adding one labeled document is less in the human rights corpus compared to the other corpora. In situations like this, providing keywords in addition to document labels will be effective in improving the classification performance because it directly shifts the values of the word-class probability matrix,  $\eta$ , even when the provided keywords is not included in the labeled documents.

Figure 2 compares the performance with and without providing keywords. The darker lines show the results with keywords and the lighter lines without. We simulated the process of a user starting with no keywords for either class, and then being queried with extreme words indexed by  $v$  whose  $\eta_{vk}$  is the highest for each class  $k$ , with up to 10 keywords for each class being chosen based on the estimated  $\eta$  at a given iteration of the active process. To determine whether a candidate keyword should be added to the list of keywords or not, our simulated user checked whether the word under consideration was among the set of most extreme words in the distribution of the ‘true’  $\eta$  parameter, which we previously estimated by fitting our mixture model with the complete set of labeled documents.<sup>6</sup> The results suggest that providing keywords improves the performance when the proportion of positive labels is small. The keywords scheme improved the performance on the corpus with 5% or 16% (population) positive labels while it did not on the corpus with 50% positive labels.

Figure 3 illustrates how the word-class matrix  $\eta$  is updated with and without keywords across iterations. A subset of the keywords supplied are labeled and highlighted by black dots. The x-axis shows the log of  $\eta_{v1}/\eta_{v0}$ , where  $\eta_{v1}$  corresponds the probability of observing the word  $v$  in a document with a positive label and  $\eta_{v0}$  for a document with a negative label. The high value in x-axis means that a word is more strongly associated with positive labels. The y-axis is the log of word frequency. A word with high word frequency has more influence in shifting the label probability. In our mixture model, words that appear often and whose ratio of  $\eta_{vk^*}$  vs  $\eta_{vk}$  is high play a central role in the label prediction. By shifting the value of  $\eta$  of those keywords, we can accelerate the estimation of  $\eta$  and improve the classification performance.

One caveat is that we provided “true” keywords, in the sense that we used the estimated  $\eta$  from fully labeled dataset. In practice, researchers have to come up with the keywords using their prior substantive knowledge about the corpus. However, we believe that the keywords supplied to our

---

<sup>5</sup>With the population data, the average length of each document is 121 (BBC), 17 (Wikipedia), 1620 (Supreme Court), and 9 (Human Rights)

<sup>6</sup>Specifically, the simulated user checked whether the word in question was in the top 10% of most extreme words for each class using the ‘true’  $\eta$  parameter. If the candidate word was in the set of ‘true’ extreme words, it was added to the list of keywords and upweighted accordingly in the next active iteration.






Figure 2: **Classification Results with and without Keywords** The darker lines show the results with keywords and the lighter lines without. The classification methods is *Active Mixture* with 2 latent clusters for both lines. The columns correspond to various proportion of positive labels in the corpus. The y-axis indicates the out-of-sample F1 score and the x-axis show the number of sampling steps. Providing keywords improves classification performance with the human rights dataset.

simulation are what researchers with reasonable substantive knowledge about physical integrity right can come up easily. Indeed, the “true” keywords used in this simulation, such as “torture,” “beat,” and “murder,” match our substantive understanding of physical integrity right violation.

## 4 Discussion

### 4.1 Tuning the value of $\lambda$

The first practical question is how to choose the value of  $\lambda$ , which is the weight on the unlabeled documents relative to the labeled documents. Recall that we downweighted the information from unlabeled documents since we typically have much more unlabeled documents than labeled documents, and we want to rely more on the information from the labeled documents for prediction.

An important practical questions is how to select the value of  $\lambda$  that maximizes the performance. It is possible that we can adopt popular model selection methods (e.g. cross-validation) to choose the appropriate  $\lambda$  value during the model initialization process.<sup>7</sup> However, cross-validation may not be practical when the labeled data is scarce (or absent at the beginning of the process). Using our active learning approach is particularly, we have observed across a variety of applications that very small values (e.g., 0.001 or 0.01) seem to work the best on the corpora we used (see Appendix E).

### 4.2 Labelling Error

While our empirical applications assume that labellers are always correct, human labellers do make mistakes in labelling in reality. Future research can address this point by comparing the robustness to labelling error between supervised vs semi-supervised classifiers. Another direction is to develop

<sup>7</sup>Indeed, it may be beneficial to tune the lambda value *across* active learning iterations.




Figure 3: **Update of the Word-class Matrix ( $\eta$ ) with and without Keywords** The right figure shows the distribution of the estimated word-class matrix  $\eta$  with fully labeled corpus. The left figure shows how  $\eta$  is updated across active iterations. The top row shows the updating process of  $\eta$  with keywords and the bottom row without. The first column shows the initial values of  $\eta$ , the middle column shows  $\eta$  after 5 iterations (100 labels), and the left columns after 10 iterations (200 labels). The x-axis shows the log ratio of  $\eta_{v1}$  vs  $\eta_{v0}$ , where  $K = 2$  is linked to the positive class. If this value is high, a word  $v$  is more strongly associated with positive labels. The y-axis is the log of word frequency. A word with high word frequency has more influence in shifting the label probability. A subset of keywords are labeled and highlighted by black dots. Keywords scheme accelerates the learning process of  $\eta$  by upweighting the value of corresponding  $\eta_{vk}$  in the positive direction.

a new active learning algorithm that assign labellers based on their labelling ability. For instance, assigning the most competent labellers with the most uncertain or difficult documents will increase the marginal benefit of adding one label.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper we have described a new active learning algorithm that combines information from labeled and unlabeled documents in order to better select which documents to be labeled by a human coder. We have shown that across three diverse datasets, our model almost always outperforms the active SVM algorithm , and that when we use the  $\lambda$  to appropriately down-weight the information the model learns from unlabeled data, we frequently outperform the active Naive Bayes baseline as well.

Machine learning techniques are becoming increasingly popular in Political Science, but frequently the barrier to entry remains too high for researchers without a technical background to make use of advances in the field. As a result, there is an opportunity to democratize access to these methods. Towards this, we continue to work towards publishing the R package *activeText* on CRAN. We believe that our model will provide applied researchers a tool that they can use to efficiently categorize documents in corpuses of varying sizes and topics.

## References

- Airoidi, E. M., Fienberg, S. E., and Skinner, K. K. (2007), “Whose ideas? Whose words? Authorship of Ronald Reagan’s radio addresses,” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 40(3), 501–506.
- Boydston, A. E. (2013), *Making the news: Politics, the media, and agenda setting* University of Chicago Press.
- Catalinac, A. (2016), *Electoral reform and national security in Japan: From pork to foreign policy* Cambridge University Press.
- Cordell, R., Clay, K. C., Fariss, C. J., Wood, R. M., and Wright, T. (2021), “Recording repression: Identifying physical integrity rights allegations in annual country human rights reports,” *International Studies Quarterly*, .
- Dempster, A. P., Laird, N. M., and Rubin, D. B. (1977), “Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 39(1), 1–22.
- Diermeier, D., Godbout, J.-F., Yu, B., and Kaufmann, S. (2012), “Language and ideology in Congress,” *British Journal of Political Science*, 42(1), 31–55.
- Eshima, S., Imai, K., and Sasaki, T. (2020), “Keyword assisted topic models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05964*, .
- Gillion, D. Q. (2016), *Governing with words: The political dialogue on race, public policy, and inequality in America* Cambridge University Press.
- Greene, K. T., Park, B., and Colaresi, M. (2019), “Machine learning human rights and wrongs: How the successes and failures of supervised learning algorithms can inform the debate about information effects,” *Political Analysis*, 27(2), 223–230.
- Grimmer, J., and Stewart, B. (2013), “Text as Data: The Promise and Pitfalls of Automatic Content Analysis Methods for Political Texts.,” *Political Analysis*, 21(3), 267–297.
- Hopkins, D. J., and King, G. (2010), “A method of automated nonparametric content analysis for social science,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(1), 229–247.
- King, G., Pan, J., and Roberts, M. E. (2017), “How the Chinese government fabricates social media posts for strategic distraction, not engaged argument,” *American political science review*, 111(3), 484–501.
- Larsen, M. D., and Rubin, D. B. (2001), “Iterative Automated Record Linkage Using Mixture Models.,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association.*, 96(453), 32–41.

- Lopez, J. C. A. D., Collignon-Delmar, S., Benoit, K., and Matsuo, A. (2017), “Predicting the Brexit vote by tracking and classifying public opinion using Twitter data,” *Statistics, Politics and Policy*, 8(1), 85–104.
- Miller, B., Linder, F., and Mebane, W. R. (2020), “Active Learning Approaches for Labeling Text: Review and Assessment of the Performance of Active Learning Approaches,” *Political Analysis*, pp. 1–20.
- Nielsen, R. A. (2017), *Deadly clerics: Blocked ambition and the paths to jihad* Cambridge University Press.
- Nigam, K., McCallum, A. K., Thrun, S., and Mitchell, T. (2000), “Text classification from labeled and unlabeled documents using EM,” *Machine learning*, 39(2-3), 103–134.
- Peterson, A., and Spirling, A. (2018), “Classification accuracy as a substantive quantity of interest: Measuring polarization in westminster systems,” *Political Analysis*, 26(1), 120–128.
- Roberts, M. E., Stewart, B. M., Tingley, D., Airoidi, E. M. et al. (2013), The structural topic model and applied social science, in *Advances in neural information processing systems workshop on topic models: computation, application, and evaluation*, Vol. 4, Harrahs and Harveys, Lake Tahoe, pp. 1–20.
- Settles, B. (2011), *Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning : Active Learning*, San Rafael: Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- Spirling, A. (2012), “US treaty making with American Indians: Institutional change and relative power, 1784–1911,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1), 84–97.
- Stewart, B. M., and Zhukov, Y. M. (2009), “Use of force and civil–military relations in Russia: an automated content analysis,” *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, 20(2), 319–343.

# A Table of Political Science papers that use text classification

	Class	Methods
<b>Public Statements</b>		
Airoidi et al. (2007)	Authorship	Poisson and Negative Binomial models
Stewart and Zhukov (2009)	Activist tone	Emsemble
Gillion (2016)	Race-related discourse	Emsemble
<b>Legislative Speeches</b>		
Peterson and Spirling (2018)	Party identification	SGD, Passive Aggressive, Penalized Logistic
Diermeier et al. (2012)	Ideology	SVM
<b>News Articles</b>		
Boydston (2013)	Policy issue coverage	Manual coding
<b>Election Manifestos</b>		
Catalinac (2016)	Particularistic policy	Topic model
<b>Social Media Posts</b>		
Lopez et al. (2017)	Leave or Remain EU	SVM
King et al. (2017)	Issue category	ReadMe (Hopkins and King, 2010)
<b>Treaties</b>		
Spirling (2012)	Harsness	PCA
<b>Religious Speeches</b>		
Nielsen (2017)	Jihadist	Structural Topic Model (Roberts et al., 2013)
<b>Human Rights Text</b>		
Cordell et al. (2021)	Rights allegation	SVM, Naive Bayes, Logistic, Emsamble
Greene et al. (2019)	Political Terror Score	SVM, Naive Bayes, Logistic, Random Forest, Emsamble

## B Using Machine Learning for Text Classification

In this section we introduce readers to several basic concepts in machine learning: the difference between supervised and unsupervised learning, between discriminative and generative models, and between active and passive learning.

Suppose that a researcher has a collection of social media text data, called a corpus, and wishes to classify whether each text in a corpus is political or not solely on the basis of the words used in a given observation. Critically, the researcher does not yet know whether any of the texts are political or not at this point. Suppose further that the researcher has chosen some scheme for translating the corpus into a matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  with  $n$  rows and  $m$  columns, where  $n$  is the number of observations and  $m$  is the number of features,<sup>8</sup> and that there exists a vector of true labels  $Y$ , where each element of  $Y$  indicates whether a given document is political or not. Then, we can rephrase the classification question as follows: given the matrix of text data  $\mathbf{X}$ , how might we best learn  $Y$ , that is, whether each document is political or not?

### B.1 Supervised vs. Unsupervised Learning

One of the first decisions that a researcher must make is whether to use a supervised or unsupervised approach to machine learning. The supervised approach to this problem would be to (1) obtain true labels of some of the documents using human coding; (2) learn the relationship between the text features encoded in the matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  and the true label encoded in the vector  $Y$  for the documents with known labels<sup>9</sup>; and (3) using the learned association between the text data and the known labels, predict whether the remaining documents in the corpus (that is, those that were not coded by a human) are political or not.

In contrast, an unsupervised approach would *not* obtain the true labels of some of the documents. Rather, a researcher using an unsupervised approach would choose a model that *clusters* documents from the corpus that have common patterns of word frequency.<sup>10</sup> Using this model, the researcher would choose the number of discrete clusters to divide the corpus into, and learn the relationship between the matrix of text data  $\mathbf{X}$  and each of the possible clusters in order to assign each document to a cluster. Using the assignment of documents to clusters, the researcher would then use some scheme to decide which of the clusters corresponds to the actual outcome of interest: whether a document is political or not.

The main advantage of a supervised approach over an unsupervised approach is the direct interpretability of results because a well-defined measure of the concept of interest exists. Consequently, it does not include the step of translating the clustering of documents to the classification

---

<sup>8</sup>Note that in the machine learning literature, the concept typically described by the term “variable” is communicated using the term “feature”.

<sup>9</sup>That is, learn  $P(Y_{\text{labeled}}|\mathbf{X}_{\text{labeled}})$ . This can be accomplished with a variety of models, including e.g. linear or logistic regression, support vector machines (SVM), Naive Bayes, k-nearest neighbor, and many more

<sup>10</sup>Examples of clustering algorithms include  $K$ -Nearest Neighbor (KNN) and Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA).

of documents as political or not.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, the main disadvantage of a supervised approach is that obtaining labels for the documents in the corpus is often costly. Researchers using an unsupervised approach instead will avoid this cost, since they do not require a set of labels *a priori*.

Semi-supervised methods have been developed to combine the strengths of supervised and unsupervised approaches, and are particularly useful in situations where there is a large amount of unlabeled data, and acquiring labels is costly. A semi-supervised model proceeds similarly to the supervised approach, with the difference being that the model learns the relationship between the matrix of text data  $\mathbf{X}$  and the classification outcome  $Y$  using information from both the labeled and unlabeled data. How exactly the information from the labeled and unlabeled data is balanced varies depending on the model used. In general, though, because a supervised approach learns the relationship between the labels and the data solely on the basis of the labeled documents, a classifier trained with a supervised approach may be less accurate than if it were provided information from both the labeled and unlabeled documents.

## B.2 Discriminative vs. Generative Models

In addition to choosing a supervised, unsupervised, or semi-supervised approach, a researcher must also choose whether to use a discriminative or generative model. When using a discriminative model (e.g., logistic regression, SVM, etc.), the goal is to directly estimate the probability of the classification outcomes  $Y$  given the text data  $\mathbf{X}$ .<sup>12</sup> In contrast, when using a generative model (e.g., Naive Bayes), learning the relationship between the  $Y$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  is a two-step process. In the first step, the likelihood of the matrix of text data  $\mathbf{X}$  and outcome labels  $Y$  is estimated given the data and a set of parameters  $\theta$  that indicate structural assumptions about how the data is generated.<sup>13</sup> In the second step, the researcher uses Bayes' rule to calculate the probability of the outcome vector given the features and the learned distribution of the parameters.<sup>14</sup>

The main benefit of a generative rather than discriminative model is that the researcher can include information they know about the data generating process by choosing appropriate functional forms.<sup>15</sup> This can help prevent overfitting when the amount of data in a corpus is small.<sup>16</sup> Conversely, because it is not necessary to model the data generating process directly, the main benefit of a discriminative rather than generative model is simplicity. Discriminative models are

---

<sup>11</sup>In most political science applications of unsupervised learning techniques, the author either is conducting an exploratory analysis and is therefore uninterested in classification, or performs an *ad hoc* interpretation of the clusters by reading top examples of a given cluster, and on that basis infers the classification from the clustering.

<sup>12</sup>That is, directly estimate  $p(Y|\mathbf{X})$ .

<sup>13</sup>That is,  $p(\mathbf{X}, Y|\theta)$  is directly estimated.

<sup>14</sup>That is,  $p(Y|\mathbf{X}; \theta)$ .

<sup>15</sup>This is particularly true when the researcher knows that the data has a complicated hierarchical structure since the hierarchy can be incorporated directly into the generative model.

<sup>16</sup>Overfitting occurs when a model learns to predict classification outcomes based on patterns in the training set that do not generalize to the broader universe of cases to be classified. A model that is overfitted may predict the correct class with an extremely high degree of accuracy for items in the training set, but will perform poorly when used to predict the class for items that the model has not seen before.



therefore appropriate in situations where the amount of data in a corpus is very large, and/or when the researcher is unsure about the data-generating process.<sup>17</sup>

### B.3 Active vs. Passive Learning

If the researcher in our running example decides to use a supervised or semi-supervised approach to predicting whether documents in their corpus are political or not, she must also decide whether to use a passive or active approach. As described in Section B.1, a researcher using a supervised (or semi-supervised) approach must choose to label some documents, and on the basis of the learned relationship between those documents and the classification outcome, predict whether the rest of the documents in the corpus are political or not. The difference between a passive and active approach to this process amounts to whether the researcher randomly chooses which documents to label (i.e., choose documents *passively*), or whether to use some selection scheme (i.e., choose documents *actively*).

An active approach is superior to a passive approach when (1) the information that some documents contribute to the model results in more accurate predictions than the information contributed by other documents would and (2) there is some way of predicting which unlabeled documents will provide the best information. When both of these conditions hold, an active approach will be more efficient than a passive one. Conversely, when either of these conditions does not hold (as when randomly selected documents provide as good or better information to the model as one chosen by a particular scheme), a passive approach is superior to an active one. Alternatively, if the active approach performs slightly better than the passive approach, but is computationally intensive and/or very time-consuming to run, then one may be better off using the passive approach.

Therefore, a good active learning scheme should be fast, and should reliably choose documents for labeling that provide more information to the model than a randomly chosen document. One of the most common active learning approaches is called *uncertainty sampling*, a process where documents are chosen for labeling based on how uncertain the model is about the correct classification category for each document in the corpus.<sup>18</sup> Thus, an active learning process using uncertainty sampling alternates between estimating the probability that each document belongs to a particular classification outcome, sampling a subset of the documents<sup>19</sup> that the model is most uncertain about for labeling, then estimating the probabilities again using the information from the newly labeled documents. This process continues until the researcher is satisfied with

---

<sup>17</sup>Another benefit of generative models is that they can yield better estimates of how certain we are about the relationship between the outcomes and features. This is the case when a researcher uses an inference algorithm like Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) that learns the entire distribution for each of the parameters, rather than only point estimates.

<sup>18</sup>This is just one of many possible approaches. See Settles (2011) for a broad review.

<sup>19</sup>Exactly how many objects to select and label at each active iterations is also a matter of debate. When both the document selection scheme and the model fit are fast, labeling a single document (that is, the document the model is most uncertain about) is optimal. On the other hand, if the model takes some time to fit, and there are a large number of documents that potentially need labeling, a batch approach is justifiable.

		Predicted	
		Yes	No
Actual	Yes	TP	FN
	No	FP	TN

Table 1: **Confusion Matrix:** A confusion matrix compares the results of a classification model to documents’ true labels. The upper-left quadrant is the count of True Positives (TP), the number of documents that the model predicts are the positive classification outcome that are in fact labeled as such. Correspondingly, the bottom-right quadrant is the count of True Negatives (TN), the number of documents that the model predicts to be negative which are in fact labeled negative in the validation set. The upper-right and bottom-left quadrants provide counts of False Negative (FN) and False Positives (FP), respectively.

the predictions generated by the model.

## B.4 Model Evaluation

But how does a researcher decide whether she is satisfied by the predictions generated by the model? In most circumstances, the best way to evaluate the performance of a classification algorithm is to reserve a subset of the corpus for validation, which is sometimes referred to as a validation and/or test set. At the very beginning of the classification enterprise, a researcher should put aside and label a set randomly chosen documents that the active learning algorithm does not have access to.<sup>20</sup> Then, after training the model on the remainder of the documents (often called the training set), the researcher should generate predictions for the documents in the validation set using the trained model. By comparing the predicted labels generated by the model to the actual labels, the researcher can evaluate how well the model does at predicting the correct labels.

A common tool for comparing the predicted labels to the actual labels is a *confusion matrix*. In a binary classification setting, a confusion matrix will be a 2 by 2 matrix, with rows corresponding to the actual label, and the columns correspond to the predicted label. Table 1 shows a confusion matrix. The upper-left quadrant is the count of True Positives (TP), the number of documents that the model predicts are the positive classification outcome that are in fact labeled as such. Correspondingly, the bottom-right quadrant is the count of True Negatives (TN), the number of documents that the model predicts to be negative which are in fact labeled negative in the validation set. The upper-right and bottom-left quadrants provide counts of False Negative (FN) and False Positives (FP), respectively. A false negative occurs when the model classifies a document as negative, but according to the validation set the document is classified as positive. Similarly, a false positive occurs when the model classifies a negative document as positive.

Using the confusion matrix, the researcher can calculate a variety of evaluation statistics. Some of the most common of these are accuracy, precision, and recall. Accuracy is the most

---

<sup>20</sup>It is important to use a set aside validation set for testing model performance, rather than a subset of the documents used to train the model, in order to avoid *overfitting*.

straightforward measure of model performance, as it is simply the proportion of documents that have been correctly classified. Precision is used to evaluate the false positivity rate, and is the proportion of the model’s positive classifications that are true positives. As the number of false positives increase, precision decreases; conversely, as the number of false positives decrease, precision increases. Recall is used to evaluate the false negativity rate, and is the proportion of the actual positive documents that are true positives. As the number of false negatives increase, recall decreases, and *vice-versa*. Accuracy, precision, and recall can be formally calculated as:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\text{TP} + \text{TN}}{\text{TP} + \text{TN} + \text{FP} + \text{FN}}$$

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FP}}$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FN}}$$

When the proportion of positive and negative labeled documents in a corpus is balanced, accuracy is an adequate measure of model performance. However, it is often the case in text classification exercises that the corpus is unbalanced, and the rate of positively labeled documents is low. When this is the case, accuracy does a poor job at model evaluation, and precision and recall should be considered. Consider the case when 99 percent of documents belong to the negative class, and 1 percent to the positive. A model which simply predicts that all documents belong to the negative class would have an accuracy score of 0.99, but would be poorly suited to the actual classification task. Conversely, the precision and recall scores of a model that predicts all negatives would be 0, which would accurately signal to the researcher that the model does a very poor job at classifying positive documents.

Precision and recall are not perfect measures of model performance, however. A model that classified all of the actual positives correctly (i.e., when there are no false positives) but classified all of the actual negatives incorrectly would get a perfect precision score. Similarly, a model that classified all documents as positive would have a perfect recall. Note, however, that in the case with the perfect precision score, recall would be extremely low. And in the case with the perfect recall score, precision would be extremely low. These examples illustrate the fact that there is a fundamental trade-off involved in controlling the false positivity and false negativity rates: you can have few false positives if you are content with an extremely high number of false negatives; and you can have few false negatives if you are content with an extremely high number of false positives.

Recognizing this trade-off, researchers often combine precision and recall scores in an effort to find a model that has the optimal balance of the two. One common way of combining the two is an F1 score, which is the harmonized mean of precision and recall. Formally, the F1 score is calculated as:

$$\text{F1} = 2 \cdot \frac{\text{Precision} \cdot \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}$$

The F1 score evenly weights precision and recall, and so a high F1 score would indicate that both the false negativity and false positivity rate are low. It is worth noting these evaluation measures (accuracy, precision, recall, and the F1 score) are computed using labeled data (“ground truth”), which in practice, are available only for a limited subset of the records. However, as described below, an additional advantage of probabilistic modeling is that it allows to estimate sample counterparts for these evaluation measures based on model parameters.

With all these concepts in mind, in the next section we describe our proposed approach, with a special focus on its flexibility to balance the tradeoffs of working with labeled and unlabeled data and informing parameter estimation via auxiliary information.

## C Detailed explanations about the EM algorithm to estimate parameters

Let  $\mathbf{D}^{lp}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}^{ln}$  and  $\mathbf{D}^u$  be the document feature matrices for documents with positive labels, documents with negative labels, and unlabeled documents, respectively. Also let  $N^{lp}$ ,  $N^{ln}$  and  $N^u$  be the number of documents with positive labels, negative labels, documents without labels. Likewise,  $\mathbf{C}^{lp}$  and  $\mathbf{C}^{ln}$  be the vectors of positive and negative labels. Then, the observed likelihood is the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& p(\pi, \boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C}^{lp}, \mathbf{C}^{ln}) \\
& \propto p(\pi) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\mathbf{D}^{lp}, \mathbf{C}^{lp} | \pi, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\mathbf{D}^{ln}, \mathbf{C}^{ln} | \pi, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \left[ p(\mathbf{D}^u | \pi, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \right]^\lambda \\
& = p(\pi) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \times \prod_{i=1}^{N^{lp}} p(\mathbf{D}_i^{lp} | Z_i = 1, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(Z_i = 1 | \pi) \times \prod_{i=1}^{N^{ln}} \left\{ p(\mathbf{D}_i^{ln} | Z_i = 0, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(Z_i = 0 | \pi) \right\} \\
& \quad \times \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{N^u} \left\{ p(\mathbf{D}_i^u | Z_i = 1, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(Z_i = 1 | \pi) + p(\mathbf{D}_i^u | Z_i = 0, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(Z_i = 0 | \pi) \right\} \right]^\lambda \tag{2} \\
& \propto \underbrace{\left\{ (1 - \pi)^{\alpha_0 - 1} \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{v0}^{\beta_{0v} - 1} \right\}}_{\text{prior}} \times \underbrace{\left\{ \pi^{\alpha_1 - 1} \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{v1}^{\beta_{1v} - 1} \right\}}_{\text{positive labeled doc. likelihood}} \times \prod_{i=1}^{N^{lp}} \left\{ \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{v1}^{D_{iv}} \times \pi \right\} \\
& \quad \times \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^{N^{ln}} \left\{ \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{v0}^{D_{iv}} \times (1 - \pi) \right\}}_{\text{negative labeled doc. likelihood}} \times \underbrace{\left[ \prod_{i=1}^{N^u} \left\{ \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{v0}^{D_{iv}} \times (1 - \pi) \right\} + \left\{ \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{v1}^{D_{iv}} \times \pi \right\} \right]^\lambda}_{\text{unlabeled doc. likelihood}}
\end{aligned}$$

We weight the part of the observed likelihood that refers to the unlabeled document with  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . This is done because we typically have much more unlabeled document than labeled documents. By downweighting the information from the unlabeled document (i.e., setting  $\lambda$  to be small), we can use more reliable information from labeled documents than from unlabeled documents.

---

**Algorithm 2:** EM algorithm to classify text

---

**Result:** Maximize  $p(\pi^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)} \mid \mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \mathbf{D}^u, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$   
**if** *In the first iteration of Active learning* **then**  
    Initialize  $\pi$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  by Naive Bayes;  
     $\pi^{(0)} \leftarrow \text{NB}(\mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \boldsymbol{\alpha});$   
     $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(0)} \leftarrow \text{NB}(\mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \boldsymbol{\beta});$   
**else**  
    Inherit  $\pi^{(0)}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(0)}$  from the previous iteration of Active learning;  
**end**  
**while**  $p(\pi^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)} \mid \mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \mathbf{D}^u, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$  *does not converge* **do**  
    (1) E step: obtain the probability of the class for unlabeled documents;  
     $p(\mathbf{Z}^u \mid \pi^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \mathbf{D}^u) \leftarrow \text{E step}(\mathbf{D}^u, \pi^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)});$   
    (2) Combine the estimated classes for the unlabeled docs and the known classes for the labeled docs;  
     $p(\mathbf{Z} \mid \pi^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \mathbf{D}^u) \leftarrow \text{combine}(\mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{D}^u, \mathbf{Z}^l, p(\mathbf{Z}^u \mid \pi^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \mathbf{D}^u));$   
    (3) M step: Maximize  $Q \equiv \mathbb{E}[p(\pi, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{Z}^u \mid \mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \mathbf{D}^u, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})]$  w.r.t  $\pi$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ ;  
     $\pi^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \text{argmax } Q;$   
     $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \text{argmax } Q;$   
    (4) Check convergence: Obtain the value of  $p(\pi^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t+1)} \mid \mathbf{D}^l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \mathbf{D}^u, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta});$   
**end**

---

We estimate the parameters  $\pi$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  using EM algorithm Dempster et al. (1977) and our implementation is presented as pseudocode in Algorithm 2. Note that by taking the expectation of the log complete likelihood function (Q function),

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\equiv \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \pi^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C}} [p(\pi, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C})] \\ &= (\alpha_0 - 1) \log(1 - \pi^{(t)}) + (\alpha_1 - 1) \log \pi^{(t)} + \sum_{v=1}^V \left\{ (\beta_{0v} - 1) \log \eta_{v0}^{(t)} + (\beta_{1v} - 1) \log \eta_{v1}^{(t)} \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{N^l} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^V D_{iv} \log \eta_{v1}^{(t)} + \log \pi^{(t)} \right\} + \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^V D_{iv} \log \eta_{v0}^{(t)} + \log(1 - \pi^{(t)}) \right\} \\ &\quad + \lambda \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{i0} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^V D_{iv} \log \eta_{v0}^{(t)} + \log(1 - \pi^{(t)}) \right\} + p_{i1} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^V D_{iv} \log \eta_{v1}^{(t)} + \log \pi^{(t)} \right\} \right] \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where  $p_{ik}$  is the posterior probability of a document  $i$  being assigned to the  $k$  th cluster,  $k = \{0, 1\}$ , given data and the parameters at  $t$  th iteration. If a document has a positive label,  $p_{i0} = 0$  and  $p_{i1} = 1$ .

If a document has no label,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{i0} &= 1 - p_{i1} \\ p_{i1} &= \frac{\prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{v1}^{D_{iv}} \times \pi}{\prod_{v=1}^V \{ \eta_{v0}^{D_{iv}} \times (1 - \pi) \} + \prod_{v=1}^V \{ \eta_{v1}^{D_{iv}} \times \pi \}} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Equation 4 also works as the prediction equation. The predicted class of a document  $i$  is  $k$  that maximizes this posterior probability.

In the M-step, we maximize the Q function, and obtain the updating equations for  $\pi$  and  $\eta$ . The updating equation for  $\pi$  is the following.

$$\pi^{(t+1)} = \frac{\alpha_1 - 1 + N^{lp} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{i1}}{\left(\alpha_1 - 1 + N^{lp} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{i1}\right) + \left(\alpha_0 - 1 + N^{ln} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{i0}\right)} \quad (5)$$

The updating equation for  $\eta$  is the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}_{v0}^{(t+1)} &\propto (\beta_{v0} - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{N^{ln}} D_{iv} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{i0} D_{iv}, \quad v = 1, \dots, V \\ \hat{\eta}_{v1}^{(t+1)} &\propto (\beta_{v1} - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{N^{lp}} D_{iv} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{i1} D_{iv}, \quad v = 1, \dots, V \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

## D EM algorithm for a model with multiple clusters

### D.1 Summary

The model outlined above assumes that there are two latent clusters, each linked to the positive and the negative class. However, this assumption can be relaxed to link multiple clusters to the negative class easily. In the world of mixture models, the simplest setup is to let  $K = 2$  since the classification goal is binary, and we can link each latent cluster to the final classification categories. A more general setup is to use  $K > 2$  even when a goal is a binary classification. If  $K > 2$ , but our focus is to uncover identify one cluster, we can choose one of the latent clusters to be linked to the “positive” class and let the all other latent clusters linked to the “negative” class (see e.g., Larsen and Rubin 2001 for a similar idea in the realm of record linkage). In other words, we collapse the  $K - 1$  latent clusters into one class for the classification purpose. Using  $K > 2$  makes sense if the “negative” class consists of multiple sub-categories. For instance, suppose researchers are interested in classifying news articles into political news or not. Then, it is reasonable to assume that the non-political news category consists of multiple sub-categories, such as technology, entertainment, and sports news. Using the number of clusters  $K > 2$  may help improve the classification performance in the situations like this. For instance, BBC corpus consists of 5 categories, politics, business, sports, technology, and entertainment, and the classification goal here is to identify documents with the politics category.

### D.2 Model

This section presents a model and inference algorithm when we use more than 2 latent clusters. The model presented in the main paper is a special case of the following model where the number of latent clusters is 2, i.e.  $K = 2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &\sim \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \\ Z_i &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \\ \eta_k &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k), \quad k = \{1, \dots, K\} \\ \mathbf{D}_i | Z_i = k &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Multinomial}(n_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Note that  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is now a probability vector of length  $K$ , and it is drawn from a Dirichlet distribution.

Let  $k^*$  be the index of the cluster linked to the positive class. The observed likelihood is the

following.

$$\begin{aligned}
& p(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C}^{lp}, \mathbf{C}^{ln}) \\
& \propto p(\boldsymbol{\pi}) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\mathbf{D}^{lp}, \mathbf{C}^{lp} | \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\mathbf{D}^{ln}, \mathbf{C}^{ln} | \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \left[ p(\mathbf{D}^u | \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \right]^\lambda \\
& = p(\boldsymbol{\pi}) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \times \prod_{i=1}^{N^{lp}} p(\mathbf{D}_i^{lp} | Z_i = k^*, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(Z_i = k^* | \boldsymbol{\pi}) \\
& \quad \times \prod_{i=1}^{N^{ln}} \sum_{k \neq k^*} \left\{ p(\mathbf{D}_i^{ln} | Z_i = k, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(Z_i = k | \boldsymbol{\pi}) \right\} \times \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{N^u} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ p(\mathbf{D}_i^u | Z_i = k, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(Z_i = k | \boldsymbol{\pi}) \right\} \right]^\lambda \quad (8) \\
& \propto \underbrace{\prod_{k=1}^K \left\{ \pi_k^{\alpha_k - 1} \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{vk}^{\beta_{kv} - 1} \right\}}_{\text{prior}} \times \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^{N^{lp}} \left\{ \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{vk^*}^{D_{iv}} \times \pi_{k^*} \right\}}_{\text{positive labeled doc. likelihood}} \\
& \quad \times \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^{N^{ln}} \sum_{k \neq k^*} \left\{ \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{vk}^{D_{iv}} \times \pi_k \right\}}_{\text{negative labeled doc. likelihood}} \times \underbrace{\left[ \prod_{i=1}^{N^u} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{vk}^{D_{iv}} \times \pi_k \right\} \right]^\lambda}_{\text{unlabeled doc. likelihood}}
\end{aligned}$$

The Q function (the expectation of the complete log likelihood) is

$$\begin{aligned}
Q & \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z} | \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C}} [p(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C})] \\
& = \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ (\alpha_k - 1) \log \pi_k^{(t)} + \sum_{v=1}^V \left\{ (\beta_{kv} - 1) \log \eta_{vk}^{(t)} \right\} \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{N^{lp}} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^V D_{iv} \log \eta_{vk^*}^{(t)} + \log \pi_{k^*}^{(t)} \right\} + \sum_{i=1}^{N^{ln}} \sum_{k \neq k^*} p_{ik} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^V D_{iv} \log \eta_{vk}^{(t)} + \log \pi_k^{(t)} \right\} \quad (9) \\
& \quad + \lambda \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} \sum_{k=1}^K p_{ik} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^V D_{iv} \log \eta_{vk}^{(t)} + \log \pi_k^{(t)} \right\} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

The posterior probability of  $Z_i = k$ ,  $p_{ik}$ , is

$$p_{ik} = \frac{\prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{vk}^{D_{iv}} \times \pi_k}{\sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \prod_{v=1}^V \eta_{vk}^{D_{iv}} \times \pi_k \right]} \quad (10)$$

M step estimators are The updating equation for  $\pi$  is the following.

$$\hat{\pi}_k \propto \begin{cases} \alpha_k - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{N^{ln}} p_{ik} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{ik} & \text{if } k \neq k^* \\ \alpha_k - 1 + N^{lp} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{ik^*} & \text{if } k = k^* \end{cases} \quad (11)$$






Figure 4: **Classification Results with 2 and 5 Clusters.** The darker lines show the results with 5 latent clusters and the lighter lines show 2 latent clusters. The columns correspond to various proportion of positive labels in the corpus. The y-axis indicates the out-of-sample F1 score and the x-axis show the number of sampling steps. Using multiple clusters improves the classification performance when the number of latent clusters matches the data generating process.

The updating equation for  $\eta$  is the following.

$$\hat{\eta}_{vk} \propto \begin{cases} (\beta_k - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{N^{ln}} p_{ik} D_{iv} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{ik} D_{iv} & \text{if } k \neq k^* \\ (\beta_k - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{N^{lp}} D_{iv} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N^u} p_{ik^*} D_{iv} & \text{if } k = k^* \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Note that we downweight the information from unlabeled document by  $\lambda$ , to utilize more reliable information from labeled documents.

### D.3 Results

Figure 4 shows the results of 2 and 5 latent clusters. The darker lines show the results with 5 latent clusters and the lighter lines show the results with 2 latent clusters. Overall, the model with 5 clusters performs better or as well as the model with 2 clusters. The gain from using 5 clusters is the highest when the proportion of positive label is small and when the size of labeled data is small.

Figure 5 shows the results when the multi-cluster and keyword upweighting approaches are combined.




Figure 5: **Classification Results with Multiple Clusters and Keywords.** The rows correspond to different datasets and the columns correspond to various proportion of positively labeled documents in the corpus. The y-axis indicates the out-of-sample F1 score and the x-axis show the number of sampling steps. The linetype show whether keywords are supplied: the solid lines show the results with keywords and the dashed lines without keywords. The colors show the number of latent clusters in the mixture model: the darker lines show the results with 5 latent clusters and the lighter lines with 2 latent clusters. Using 5 clusters leads to as good or slightly better performance than using 2 clusters. The performance improvement is the largest with the BBC corpus, which consists of 5 news topic categories. Likewise, our mixture models with keywords leads to as good or better performance than the models without keywords. The improvement is the largest with the human rights corpus, where the number of words per document is the smallest.

## E Additional Results

To complement the results presented in Figure 1 in the main text, Table E presents the results (across datasets) of fitting our model at the initial (iteration 0) and last active step (iteration 30). It is clear from the table that the improvements our approach brings in terms of F1-score are due to substantial gains in both precision and recall. Furthermore, after labeling 600 documents (20 per iteration), uncertainty sampling outperforms random sampling across evaluation metrics, which empirically validates the promise of active learning in terms of text classification.

Table 2: Classification Performance: Uncertainty vs Random Sampling with  $\lambda = 0.001$

Dataset	Active Step	Uncertainty Sampling			Random Sampling		
		Precision	Recall	F1-score	Precision	Recall	F1-score
Wikipedia	0	0.71	0.13	0.22	0.71	0.13	0.22
	30	0.71	0.54	0.61	0.45	0.56	0.50
BBC	0	0.33	0.86	0.48	0.33	0.86	0.48
	30	0.92	0.96	0.94	0.92	0.94	0.93
Supreme Court	0	0.46	0.98	0.63	0.46	0.98	0.63
	30	0.85	0.91	0.88	0.75	0.96	0.84
Human Rights	0	0.61	0.01	0.02	0.61	0.01	0.02
	30	0.53	0.42	0.47	0.46	0.44	0.45

Similarly, and as noted in the main text, our results appear to be not too sensitive to the selection of the weighting parameter  $\lambda$ , provided that its value remains small. Figure 6 confirms this finding. After 30 active steps, the performance of our mixture model is better in terms of F1-score when  $\lambda = 0.001$  if compared to  $\lambda = 0.01$




Figure 6: **Classification Results with 2 Clusters and  $\lambda = 0.01$  vs  $\lambda = 0.001$ .** The darker lines show the results with  $\lambda = 0.001$  and the lighter lines show  $\lambda = 0.01$ . The columns correspond to various proportion of positive labels in the corpus. The y-axis indicates the out-of-sample F1 score and the x-axis show the number of sampling steps. The smaller the value of  $\lambda$  the better the performance of our model.