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Abstract

Political stance detection has become an important task due to the increasingly polarized political ideologies. Most existing works focus on identifying perspectives in news articles or social media posts, while social entities, such as individuals and organizations, produce these texts and actually take stances. In this paper, we propose the novel task of entity stance prediction, which aims to predict entities’ stances given their social and political context. Specifically, we retrieve facts from Wikipedia about social entities regarding contemporary U.S. politics. We then annotate social entities’ stances towards political ideologies with the help of domain experts. After defining the task of entity stance prediction, we propose a graph-based solution, which constructs a heterogeneous information network from collected facts and adopts gated relational graph convolutional networks for representation learning. Our model is then trained with a combination of supervised, self-supervised and unsupervised loss functions, which are motivated by multiple social and political phenomena. We conduct extensive experiments to compare our method with existing text and graph analysis baselines. Our model achieves highest stance detection accuracy and yields inspiring insights regarding social entity stances. We further conduct ablation study and parameter analysis to study the mechanism and effectiveness of our proposed approach.

Introduction

Over the last decade we have witnessed an intensification of civil discourse and increasingly polarized political ideologies. As the Associated Press put it, “Americans are more divided than ever, gridlocked over social issues, race, gender and the economy.” The same trend of political polarization holds true for the rest of the world according to a recent study (Carothers and O’Donohue 2019). While we live in a time of echo chambers, partisan misinformation and campaigns for ideological extremes, political stances have become a dominant factor in daily activities. These unprecedented circumstances have called for research efforts to study individuals’ political perspectives and automatically detect them based on external information.

Traditionally, the task of political perspective detection focuses on detecting stances in natural language texts such as social media posts and news articles. For perspective mining in social media, (Xu et al. 2018) adopts self-attention networks to classify tweets. (Magdy et al. 2016) predicts user stances on major events with user interactions and network dynamics. (Jiang et al. 2011) uses sentiment analysis techniques to identify political perspectives expressed on Twitter. For perspective detection in news media, deep neural networks (Li and Goldwasser 2021; Yang et al. 2016; Jiang et al. 2019), bias features (Horne, Khedr, and Adali 2018) and linguistic features (Field et al. 2018) are adopted by various works. (Li and Goldwasser 2019) collects Twitter users that interact with certain news outlets and supplement news text with online graph structures for stance detection. (Pan et al. 2016) jointly leverages news text and social information to boost task performance.

Although existing works focus on identifying stances in news articles and tweets, they fail to recognize the fact that individuals and organizations are the actual producers of news and tweets. As a result, political perspectives expressed in texts are merely snapshots of these social entities’ stances. For example, Figure 1 presents two U.S. senators and their quotes with a time span of years.

Figure 1: Example of social entities which have quotes with consistent stances in a time span of years.
Table 1: List of social entity types included in our U.S. contemporary politics dataset for entity stance prediction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Joe Biden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>Elizabeth Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressperson</td>
<td>Kevin McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Ron DeSantis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Institution</td>
<td>the U.S. Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Party</td>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Justice</td>
<td>Amy Coney Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Term</td>
<td>117th Congress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dividends like them who actually take stances, not quotes or writings. That being said, research efforts should shift the focus of political stance detection from natural language texts to social entities.

In light of the fact that social entities are the true holders of political stances, we propose a novel task of entity stance prediction, which aims to identify individuals and organizations’ perspectives towards political ideologies. Specifically, we select social entities from contemporary U.S. politics and retrieve facts about them from Wikipedia to form the knowledge base for entity stance prediction. We then annotate these entities’ perspectives towards political ideologies with the help of domain experts. After defining the task, we propose to construct a heterogeneous information network to represent the social and political context. We then adopt relational graph convolutional networks to learn representations and train our model with three losses of different levels of supervision. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel task, entity stance prediction, to shift the focus of political perspective detection from texts to social entities since they actually take stances. We also collect and annotate a contemporary U.S. politics dataset for entity stance prediction.

- We propose a graph-based solution to the new task, which constructs a heterogeneous information network from social and political context, adopt graph neural networks and train the model with the combination of three differently supervised objectives to incorporate social phenomena and political insights.

- We conduct extensive experiments to compare our method with existing text and graph analysis techniques. Our model consistently outperform baselines, successfully addresses the task of entity stance prediction and yields new insights into the stances of unlabeled entities such as U.S. governors, states and political parties.

---

Figure 2: Illustration of annotating elected officials’ stances with the help of domain experts. SO, O, N, F, SF stands for strongly oppose, oppose, neutral, favor and strongly favor.

## Related Work

### Political Perspective Detection

Previous works focused on identifying political stances expressed in news articles and social media. Perspective detection in news media is often treated as text classification. Text analysis techniques such as linguistic features (Home, Khedr, and Adali 2018), multi-head attention networks (Li and Goldwasser 2021), convolutional neural networks (Jiang et al. 2019) and recurrent neural networks (Yang et al. 2016) are adopted to identify stances in news documents. Later proposals attempt to leverage information in addition to news text to boost task performance. (Li and Goldwasser 2019) supplements news with Twitter users who interact with various news outlets and form graph structures. (Pan et al. 2016) studies the problem of text representation learning with the help of social information.

Apart from news articles, perspective detection in social media are also generally treated as a text classification task on tweets and posts. Text analysis techniques such as neural attention networks (Du et al. 2017), sentiment analysis (Wang et al. 2016) and self-attention (Xu et al. 2018) are adopted to identify stances in social media posts. Other research efforts explored identifying user stances instead of individual tweets. (Stefanov et al. 2020) uses label propagation algorithms to propose a semi-supervised approach of identifying perspectives in social media. (Darwish et al. 2020) proposes to cluster users into different stance groups. (Magdy et al. 2016) predicts user perspectives based on the Twitter network dynamics and interactions between users.

### Graph Neural Networks

Graph neural networks have broadened the horizons of deep learning from structured data of images and text to unstructured data types such as graphs and manifolds. Graph convolutional networks (Kipf and Welling 2016) are among the first methods that effectively leverage graph-structured data. Graph attention networks (Velickovic et al. 2018) introduced the attention mechanism to graph neural networks. GraphSAGE (Hamilton, Ying, and Leskovec 2017) learns node embeddings by sampling and aggregating node features. Many works have also contributed to scaling graph neural networks (Chen, Zhu, and Song 2017)
Table 2: Summary of our collected entity stance prediction dataset of contemporary U.S. politics. SO, O, N, F and SF follow the definition in Figure 2 without further notice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#entity</th>
<th>1,069</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#liberal label</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#liberal SO-O-N-F-SF</td>
<td>143-214-76-26-318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#conservative label</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#conservative SO-O-N-F-SF</td>
<td>296-12-92-45-234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Wikipedia summary</td>
<td>1,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#sentences</td>
<td>10,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#tokens</td>
<td>154,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Five types of extracted relation between entities in their Wikipedia pages. These relations serve as different types of edges in our social and political context HIN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>party affiliation</td>
<td>Joe Biden affiliated to Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home state</td>
<td>Bernie Sanders from Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hold office</td>
<td>Ted Cruz is a senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elected tenure</td>
<td>Mitt Romney serves in 117th congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appoint</td>
<td>Donald Trump appoint Neil Gorsuch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Overview of our entity stance prediction method.

Entity Stance Prediction

Task Definition

Existing research on political perspective detection typically focuses on identifying stances in texts such as social media posts and news articles. In this paper, we propose a new task to identify political stances in social entities since they actually take stances towards political ideologies. We firstly define social entities:

**Definition 1.** Social entities are people or groups of people that share common characteristics.

For instance, elected officials, political parties, social organizations and geographical locations are considered social entities. We then define the task of entity stance prediction:

**Definition 2.** The task of **entity stance prediction** is to predict social entities’ stances towards issues or ideologies with their social and political context.

For instance, entity stance prediction models could learn to predict U.S. senators’ stances towards gun control or conservative values in general based on their home states, years in office, party affiliations and voting records.

Our proposed task aims to identify stances of social entities, which is closer to the root of the problem than detecting perspectives in text since social entities actually take stances and their produced texts are merely screenshots of their consistent stances. Apart from that, entity stance prediction results could also serve as external knowledge for relevant tasks such as fake news detection and sentiment analysis.

Data Collection

After defining the task of entity stance prediction, we collect and annotate a dataset for this task. Firstly, we narrow the scope of social entities to contemporary U.S. politics. Specifically, we select diversified entities that were active in the past decade and present them in Table 1. A wide range of social entities from elected officials, political parties to government institutions and geographical locations are covered in our dataset. We then retrieve Wikipedia pages of these entities to serve as social and political context. The task of entity stance prediction aims to predict their stances towards political ideologies based on this context.

After determining the input of entity stance prediction, we annotate elected officials’ stances towards political ideologies with the help of domain experts. Specifically, AFL-CIO and Heritage Action are representative organizations on the left and right of the political spectrum. They score U.S. representatives and senators in a scale from 0 to 100 based on their voting records to evaluate how liberal or conservative elected officials are. We adapt our annotations from their scoreboards with a process illustrated in Figure 2.

In the end, we obtain a contemporary U.S. politics dataset for entity stance prediction. A summary of the dataset is pre-
Table 4: Performance of our model and competitive text and graph analysis baselines on the entity stance prediction dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Liberal Macro-F1</th>
<th>Conservative Macro-F1</th>
<th>Overall Metrics Accuracy</th>
<th>Macro-F1</th>
<th>Micro-F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear BoW</td>
<td>0.4990</td>
<td>0.6795</td>
<td>0.3338</td>
<td>0.6912</td>
<td>0.6849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias Features</td>
<td>0.2463</td>
<td>0.4872</td>
<td>0.1695</td>
<td>0.4559</td>
<td>0.4726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average WEs</td>
<td>0.3174</td>
<td>0.5256</td>
<td>0.2340</td>
<td>0.5147</td>
<td>0.5205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa</td>
<td>0.4936</td>
<td>0.6667</td>
<td>0.5004</td>
<td>0.7794</td>
<td>0.7192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LongFormer</td>
<td>0.4395</td>
<td>0.6538</td>
<td>0.4072</td>
<td>0.7206</td>
<td>0.6849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCN</td>
<td>0.5012</td>
<td>0.6795</td>
<td>0.5891</td>
<td>0.8235</td>
<td>0.7466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAT</td>
<td>0.5831</td>
<td>0.7564</td>
<td>0.5335</td>
<td>0.8088</td>
<td>0.7088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphSAGE</td>
<td>0.5518</td>
<td>0.7308</td>
<td>0.4809</td>
<td>0.7794</td>
<td>0.7534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransformerConv</td>
<td>0.5814</td>
<td>0.7564</td>
<td>0.5332</td>
<td>0.7941</td>
<td>0.7740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResGatedGraphConv</td>
<td>0.5111</td>
<td>0.7051</td>
<td>0.5793</td>
<td>0.8235</td>
<td>0.7603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>0.6167</td>
<td>0.7949</td>
<td>0.5913</td>
<td>0.8235</td>
<td>0.8082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Implementation details and hyperparameter settings of our political perspective detection model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>RoBERTa size</th>
<th>optimizer</th>
<th>batch size</th>
<th>GNN size</th>
<th>learning rate</th>
<th>max epochs</th>
<th>RNN Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1e-3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Leaky-ReLU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology

Overview

In this section, we present our proposal for the novel task of entity stance prediction. We firstly construct a heterogeneous information network to represent the social and political context. We then adopt text encoders and gated relational graph convolutional networks to learn representations for social entities. We train the model to conduct entity stance prediction with a combination of differently supervised loss functions to simulate social and political phenomena.

An overview of our method is presented in Figure 3.

Graph Construction

The task of entity stance prediction aims to predict social entities’ perspectives towards political ideologies with their social and political context. To better capture the interactions and relations between entities, we propose to construct a heterogeneous information network (HIN) from Wikipedia pages. Specifically, we take social entities in the dataset as nodes in the HIN. We then conduct named entity recognition (Peters et al. 2017) and coreference resolution (Lee, He, and Zettlemoyer 2018) to identify entity mentions across all Wikipedia pages. We search for keywords among entity mentions to extract five types of relations listed in Table 3. We then adopt extracted relations between entities as edges. As a result, we obtain the social and political HIN with 1,069 nodes and 9,248 edges.

Model Architecture

Let \( E = \{e_1, \ldots, e_n\} \) be \( n \) entities in the social and political context HIN and \( s_i \) be the Wikipedia summary of \( e_i \). Let \( R \) be the set of edge types in Table 3 and \( N_r(e_i) \) be the \( i \)-th entity’s neighborhood with regard to edge type \( r \). Firstly, we encode Wikipedia summary text \( s_i \) with the robust pre-trained language model RoBERTa (Liu et al. 2019),

\[
v_i = RoBERTa(s_i)
\]

where \( RoBERTa(\cdot) \) is the pre-trained text encoder and \( v_i \) denotes the representation of the \( i \)-th entity’s Wikipedia summary. We then transform it with a fully connected layer to serve as the initial features for nodes in the HIN.

\[
x_i^{(0)} = \phi(W_I \cdot v_i + b_I)
\]

where \( \phi \) is any non-linear function, \( W_I \) and \( b_I \) are learnable parameters of the neural network. We then propagate node messages and aggregate them with gated relational graph convolutional networks (gated R-GCN). For the \( l \)-th layer of gated R-GCN,

\[
u_i^{(l)} = \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{j \in N_r(e_i)} \frac{1}{|N_r(e_i)|} f_r(x_j^{(l-1)}) + f_s(x_i^{(l-1)})
\]

where \( f_s \) and \( f_r \) are parameterized linear functions for self loops and relation-\( r \) edges, \( u_i^{(l)} \) is the hidden representation for entity \( i \) at layer \( l \). We then calculate gate levels,

\[
g_i^{(l)} = \sigma(W_G \cdot [u_i^{(l)}, x_i^{(l-1)}] + b_G)
\]
where \( W_G \) and \( b_G \) are learnable parameters, \( \sigma(\cdot) \) denotes the sigmoid function and \([\cdot, \cdot]\) denotes the concatenation operation. We then apply the gate mechanism to \( u_i^{(l)} \) and \( x_i^{(l-1)} \),
\[
x_i^{(l)} = \tanh(u_i^{(l)}) \odot g_i^{(l)} + x_i^{(l-1)} \odot (1 - g_i^{(l)})
\]
where \( \odot \) is the Hadamard product operation. After \( L \) layer(s) of gated R-GCN, we obtain representation of entities as \( \{x_1^{(L)}, \cdots, x_n^{(L)}\} \). We then predict their stances towards liberal and conservative values,
\[
l_i = \text{softmax}(W_L \cdot x_i^{(L)} + b_L) \quad c_i = \text{softmax}(W_C \cdot x_i^{(L)} + b_C)
\]
where \( l_i \) and \( c_i \) are predictions of stances towards liberal and conservative values respectively, \( W_L, b_L, W_C \) and \( b_C \) are learnable parameters.

**Learning and Optimization**

We propose to train our model with a combination of unsupervised, self-supervised and supervised losses, which simulates the echo chamber phenomenon, ensures stance consistency and learns from entity annotations respectively.

**Unsupervised Loss: Echo Chamber** The unsupervised loss is motivated by the echo chamber phenomenon, where social entities tend to reinforce their narratives by forming small and closely connected interaction circles. We simulate echo chambers by assuming that neighboring nodes on the context HIN have similar representations while non-neighboring nodes have different representations. We firstly define the positive and negative neighborhood of entity \( e_i \),
\[
P_{e_i} = \{e \mid \exists r \in R \text{ s.t. } e \in N_r(e_i)\} \quad N_{e_i} = \{e \mid \forall r \in R \text{ s.t. } e \notin N_r(e_i)\}
\]

We then calculate the unsupervised loss,
\[
L_1 = - \sum_{e_i \in E} \sum_{e_j \in P_{e_i}} \log(\sigma(x_i^{(L)T} x_j^{(L)})) + Q \cdot \sum_{e_i \in E} \sum_{e_j \in N_{e_i}} \log(\sigma(-x_i^{(L)T} x_j^{(L)}))
\]

where \( x^T \) denotes the transpose of \( x \) and \( Q \) is the weight for negative samples.

**Self-supervised Loss: Stance Consistency** The self-supervised loss is motivated by the fact that liberal and conservative values lie on the two ends of the political spectrum. Individuals often take inversely correlated stances towards liberalism and conservatism. We firstly speculate entities’ stance towards the opposite ideology by taking the opposite of the predicted stance,
\[
\tilde{l}_i = \psi(D - \text{argmax}(l_i)), \quad \tilde{c}_i = \psi(D - \text{argmax}(l_i))
\]

where \( \psi \) is the one-hot encoder, \( \text{argmax}(\cdot) \) calculates the index with the largest value, \( D \) is the number of stance labels, \( \tilde{l}_i \) and \( \tilde{c}_i \) are self-supervised labels derived by stance consistency. We then calculate the self-supervised loss measuring stance consistency,
\[
L_2 = - \sum_{e_i \in E} \sum_{d=1}^{D} (\tilde{l}_i \log(l_i) + \tilde{c}_i \log(c_i))
\]

**Supervised Loss: Entity Annotation** We annotated entities’ stances with the help of domain experts according to Figure 2. The supervised loss aims to train the model to correctly predict these known stances. Let \( E_L \) and \( E_C \) denote the liberal and conservative training set, \( \hat{l}_i \) and \( \hat{c}_i \) denote the ground-truth of liberal and conservative stances. We calculate the supervised loss as
\[
L_3 = - \sum_{e_i \in E_L} \sum_{d=1}^{D} \hat{l}_i \log(l_i) - \sum_{e_i \in E_C} \sum_{d=1}^{D} \hat{c}_i \log(c_i)
\]

**Overall Loss** We train our model with the three differently supervised losses and a regularization term,
\[
L = \lambda_1 L_1 + \lambda_2 L_2 + \lambda_3 L_3 + \lambda_4 \sum_{w \in \theta} w^2
\]

where \( \lambda_i \) is the weight of loss \( L_i \) and \( \theta \) are all learnable parameters in the model.
Experiments

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to compare our model with competitive text and graph analysis methods on the entity stance prediction dataset. We then present the task’s novel findings about social entities and conduct ablation study and parameter analysis to analyze the mechanism and effectiveness of our proposed approach.

Baselines

The task of entity stance prediction involves both textual data and graph structures to represent real-world context. We select representative methods from text and graph analysis techniques as baselines.

For the following text-based baselines, we encode Wikipedia summaries of entities with these methods and predict their stances with fully connected layers.

- **Linear BoW** encodes Wikipedia summaries with TFIDF unigram vectors extracted with the help of scikit-learn (Pedregosa et al. 2011).
- **Bias Features** are content based features drawn from a wide range of approaches described in political bias literatures (Horne, Khedr, and Adali 2018)
- **Average Word Embeddings (WEs)** uses an average of the pre-trained Glove (Pennington, Socher, and Manning 2014) word embeddings.
- **RoBERTa** is a pre-trained language model that could effectively encode text sequences. (Liu et al. 2019)
- **LongFormer** is short for long-document transformer, which aims to encode longer text sequences. (Beltagy, Peters, and Cohan 2020)

For the following graph-based models, we use them to conduct node classification in a supervised manner.

- **GCN** extends convolution to graphs, propagates node messages and learn representations. (Kipf and Welling 2016)
- **GAT** incorporates the attention mechanism in graph neural networks. (Velićković et al. 2017)
- **GraphSAGE** is a general and inductive framework that leverages node features to learn representations. (Hamilton, Ying, and Leskovec 2017)
- **TransformerConv** adopts a graph transformer network, which takes feature and label embeddings to learn node representations. (Shi et al. 2020)
- **ResGatedGraphConv** is a graph neural network framework that handles graphs of arbitrary length and size. (Bresson and Laurent 2017)

Implementation

We use pytorch (Paszke et al. 2019), pytorch lightning (Falcon 2019), torch geometric (Fey and Lenssen 2019) and the transformers library (Wolf et al. 2020) for an efficient implementation of our entity stance prediction model. We present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ablation Settings</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>Macro-F1</th>
<th>Micro-F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>0.8082</td>
<td>0.6037</td>
<td>0.8089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loss only $L_3$</td>
<td>0.7808</td>
<td>0.5643</td>
<td>0.7817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_1$ and $L_3$</td>
<td>0.7603</td>
<td>0.5191</td>
<td>0.7611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_2$ and $L_3$</td>
<td>0.7945</td>
<td>0.5597</td>
<td>0.7952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no edge 1</td>
<td>0.7877</td>
<td>0.5902</td>
<td>0.7881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no edge 2</td>
<td>0.7877</td>
<td>0.5712</td>
<td>0.7885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure no edge 3</td>
<td>0.7945</td>
<td>0.5880</td>
<td>0.7954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no edge 4</td>
<td>0.7808</td>
<td>0.5717</td>
<td>0.7815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no edge 5</td>
<td>0.7740</td>
<td>0.5501</td>
<td>0.7748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operator GCN</td>
<td>0.7603</td>
<td>0.5831</td>
<td>0.7808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operator GAT</td>
<td>0.7740</td>
<td>0.5901</td>
<td>0.7885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operator SAGE</td>
<td>0.7877</td>
<td>0.5804</td>
<td>0.7881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operator R-GCN</td>
<td>0.7808</td>
<td>0.5561</td>
<td>0.7815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: Task accuracy when our model is trained with different loss weights $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$.

Experiment Results

The performance of our method and competitive baselines in the entity stance prediction task is presented in Table 4. We use macro and micro averaging F1 scores to evaluate methods’ ability to predict stances towards liberal and conservative ideologies. We also calculate the overall accuracy and balanced F1 scores defined as the harmonic mean of two F1 scores on the liberal and conservative labels. It is demonstrated that our model outperforms all text and graph analysis baselines. This indicates that our proposal for the entity stance prediction task is generally effective. Apart from that, graph neural network-based models generally outperform text analysis based models, which suggests that the graph structure of the context HIN is essential in the task of entity stance prediction.

Entity Stance Findings

An important objective of entity stance prediction is to predict entity stances that are not evaluated by domain experts. We analyze political stances of governors, states and political parties that are not annotated in the dataset and examine whether they follow conventional wisdom.

State Stances States are geographical zones in the United States. Conventional wisdom often classify these states into red, blue and swing states. We present our model’s predictions of state stances and compare them with results in the 2020 U.S. presidential election in Figure 4. It is illustrated that our stance predictions highly correlate with 2020 presidential election results. Our model also predicts that the ideological structures of traditional swing states, such as North Carolina and Ohio, are actually more conservative than expected. Predictions also suggest that among states that went to Republicans in 2020, Florida and Montana might be easier to flip due to their rather liberal context.

Governor Stances Political experts typically study and evaluate the stances of legislators, while state-level officials such as governors are also essential in governance and policy making. We present our model’s predictions of governor stances in all 50 U.S. states in Figure 5. It is no surprise that governors from partisan strongholds such as California and Utah hold firm stances. Conventional wisdom often assumes that in order to win electorally challenging or difficult races, one has to sacrifice political ideologies. However, our model’s predictions indicate exceptions to this rule, such as Andy Beshear (D-KY) and Ron DeSantis (R-FL).

Political Party Stances Elected officials in the United States are typically republicans or democrats. We illustrate the model’s prediction of party stances in Figure 6. It is illustrated that there are generally more moderates in the Republican party of the United States than the Democratic party.

To sum up, the task of entity stance prediction and our proposed model yields valuable insights about the political stances of governors, states and political parties. In fact, our proposal could evaluate any social entity, not necessarily in the politics realm, to predict their stances towards political ideologies given their social and political context.

Ablation Study

Our proposed entity stance prediction model constructs a HIN to represent social and political context, adopts gated relational graph convolution networks for representation learning and is trained with a combination of differently supervised losses. To examine these design choices and their contributions to the model’s performance, we conduct ablation study of graph structure, graph operator and loss functions and present the results in Table 6. It is demonstrated that our strategy to train the entity stance prediction model...
with different levels of supervision is generally effective. Besides, different edges in the context HIN and the gated R-GCN operator also contribute to our model’s performance.

Parameter Analysis

There are two significant sets of parameters in our proposed entity stance prediction model. Firstly, the weights of different losses $\lambda_1$ governs the training process of our model. Specifically, $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ determines the importance of auxiliary tasks of evaluating the phenomena of echo chambers and stance consistency on the social and political context HIN. We fix $\lambda_3 = 1$ and $\lambda_4 = 10^{-5}$ and train our model with different combinations of $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$. We present the results in Figure 7. It is illustrated that $0.02 \leq \lambda_1 \leq 0.1$ and $0.2 \leq \lambda_2 \leq 0.3$ would generally lead to an effective balance of differently supervised loss functions.

Secondly, the layer count of gated R-GCNs $L$ governs the range of message propagation and aggregation across the topological structure of the context HIN. We train our model with different $L$s and present the results in Figure 8. Figure 8 shows that $L = 2$ layers of gated R-GCN would lead to the best performance, where information in the context HIN are sufficiently but not excessively propagated and aggregated.

Conclusion and Future Work

Political stance detection is an important and challenging task, while previous efforts focus on identifying perspectives in social media and news articles. In this paper, we shift the focus from text to social entities and propose the novel task of entity stance prediction. We also collect and annotate a dataset regarding contemporary U.S. politics for the novel task. We then propose a graph-based approach to address the problem and conduct extensive experiments to evaluate different methods and gain insights about entity stances. In the future, we plan to broaden the scope of entity stance prediction to scenarios outside politics.

References


