arXiv:2301.08549v1 [cs.CL] 20 Jan 2023

Transforming Unstructured Text into Data with Context Rule Assisted Machine Learning (CRAML)

Stephen Meisenbacher*†

Peter Norlander*‡

January 23, 2023

Abstract

Abstract: We describe a method and new no-code software tools enabling domain experts to build custom structured, labeled datasets from the unstructured text of documents and build niche machine learning text classification models traceable to expert-written rules. The Context Rule Assisted Machine Learning (CRAML) method allows accurate and reproducible labeling of massive volumes of unstructured text. CRAML enables domain experts to access uncommon constructs buried within a document corpus, and avoids limitations of current computational approaches that often lack context, transparency, and interpetability. In this research methods paper, we present three use cases for CRAML: we analyze recent management literature that draws from text data, describe and release new machine learning models from an analysis of proprietary job advertisement text, and present findings of social and economic interest from a public corpus of franchise documents. CRAML produces document-level coded tabular datasets that can be used for quantitative academic research, and allows qualitative researchers to scale niche classification schemes over massive text data. CRAML is a low-resource, flexible, and scalable methodology for building training data for supervised ML. We make available as open-source resources: the software, job advertisement text classifiers, a novel corpus of franchise documents, and a fully replicable start-to-finish trained example in the context of no poach clauses.

Keywords: labor markets, data creation, text classification, hybrid system, big data

*Equally contributing authors. We are grateful for support from the Economic Security Project Anti-Monopoly Fund; Loyola Rule of Law Institute; Loyola Quinlan School of Business; and Loyola University Chicago. We also thank Patricia Tabarani, Eric George, Steve Sauerwald, and Chris Erickson.

†Technical University of Munich, School of Computation, Information and Technology

‡Loyola University Chicago, Quinlan School of Business

1 Introduction

Advances in computational methods offer new ways to gain insight from large volumes of unstructured text, and yet these methods each have significant limitations, tradeoffs, and a lack clear guidelines [99]. Despite the advances in Natural Language Processing (NLP), Machine Learning (ML), Artificial Intelligence (AI) and more recently Deep Learning (DL), there is still "the herculean task of finding constructs using full-text search" [79, p. 547].

Unstructured text lack a schema, are not standardized, have multiple formats, and come from diverse sources [9]. Greater attention and systematic research is needed to develop processes to create structured data from unstructured text [45]. A lack of structured information is a barrier to understanding for researchers and organizations: "as much as 80% of an organization's data is 'dark"' [78]. For knowledge professionals, just-in-time access to domain specific document repositories is vital, but knowledge must first be codified [114]. Zettabytes (ZB) of new data are produced daily [20], and roughly 80% is unstructured [67]. While the manual expert labor required for qualitatively coding novel classification schemes is hard to scale, statistical packages, many information systems, and quantitative social scientists expect data to be codified and in a regular format: "tabular data – variables in columns, cases in rows" [80].

ML and AI are potential solutions, but require structured training data. Hand-coding by experts is required in many domains, but does not easily scale. To address the disjunction between these, we describe a method that bridges expert-built set of context rules scaled to classify unstructured text and build training data for machine learning. Context Rule Assisted Machine Learning (CRAML) is a hybrid method for structuring textual data from large-scale corpora into datasets ready for training ML models and quantitative research. CRAML begins with a workflow common in qualitative manual coding research, and ends with ML models trained on text input data shaped by a qualitative coding scheme. CRAML is useful for qualitative and quantitative social scientists: it empowers domain experts to efficiently mine volumes of text and scale classification schemata, and it yields tabular data that captures the occurrence of concepts within a corpus of documents.

This paper contributes to information systems research on the design of intelligent systems that can generate economic and social value from unstructured data [1]. By clearly defining the problem, managing the training data before AI is attempted, and affording users the opportunity to evaluate and adjust both inputs and outputs, CRAML addresses major concerns identified in research on AI [131]. This is the first paper to offer a thorough description of a versatile method with the potential to empower advanced users of an ordinary desktop computer to build machine learning classifiers and rectangular datasets from unstructured text according to the users' desired scheme. Expert built rule-assisted machine learning models have been described in the literature, and found to outperform benchmark methods and professional perception in critical cases such as detecting persons in states of emotional distress [35]. In addition to describing the method, we call and set new standards for transparency and interpretability of research on text-to-data machine learning, and demonstrate the high utility of this approach in three applications.

In this methods paper, we highlight the need for the CRAML tool and demonstrate its versatility through applications. First, we use CRAML to perform a simple literature review that highlights current approaches to analysis of large text corpora in five top management journals. Second, we release machine learning classifiers with the potential to enhance labor market efficiency, and set a new standard for transparency for research studying job advertisement text, where underlying data includes proprietary data obtained under license. We release ML classifiers, and the rules that created them, to enable other researchers using job advertisement text to replicate and interpret our approach. Last, we publish a new and massive document corpus of mandatory franchise disclosure

documents and present a start-to-finish analysis to enable a full replication of our process. We detect thousands more plausibly illegal "no poach clauses" that could violate state and federal antitrust law than found in earlier research [77]. We release a rectangular dataset that represents the prevalence of suspected no poach clauses that restrict the ability of franchise firms to recruit employees from other companies that belong to a franchise system. As part of the contribution of this work, we publish everything needed to fully replicate the no poach analysis: the original PDFs and the machine readable text of the franchise documents, CRAML software, the manually coded inputs that creates the structured, labeled data output, the training data, and a ML classifier to detect suspect no poach clauses.

Section 2 reviews the well-known challenges CRAML was created to address and illustrates the frequency of current approaches in the management literature. Section 3 introduces and provides detailed motivation for our solution in the context of job advertisement text. Methodological detail on CRAML and empirical analysis of franchise no poach agreements is in Section 4. A more technical methodology is described in Appendix C. Section 5 provides future directions and discussions.

2 The State of the Art

Across many fields of research, methods for analyzing unstructured text are needed. Below, we highlight literature in management, information systems, computational social science and computer science on: machine learning (ML), artificial intelligence (AI), natural language processing (NLP), topic modeling and Latent Dirichilet Allocation (LDA), linguistic inquiry and word counting (LIWC), computationally aided text analysis (CATA), and text or document corpora. We used the CRAML software to narrow our search for relevant literature. We obtained a corpus of 1,994 papers published from 2015-2021 in 5 top empirical management journals (Academy of Management Journal, Administrative Science Quarterly, Journal of International Business Studies, Organization Science, and Strategic Management Journal). Within the management literature corpus, we searched for papers that could illustrate the use of a method for turning unstructured text into data. In Appendix A, we provide additional detail on how CRAML can be used in bibliographic research.

2.1 Word Counting Approaches (LIWC, CATA)

Computer-aided text analysis (CATA) and Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) are two popular techniques used in the management literature. Experts develop lists of words or dictionaries that correspond to an overall construct and measure the occurrence of keywords inside specific documents [110, 109]. Researchers often use LIWC standard dictionaries to detect common constructs, such as positive / negative sentiment in a corpus of tweets [16]. Using these methods, researchers can also develop custom dictionaries to capture previously unstudied phenomena within an environment: for example, to measure how actors use specific cultural toolkits in a field of action [125]. Such efforts are typically first driven by deduction (keyword selection) and then interrogation of text (examining n-grams and short excerpts of text containing keywords) [90].

We developed keywords deductively (available in Appendix A) and narrowed our search for relevant papers using CRAML. CRAML output indicates whether each academic paper in the corpus contains keywords that fall within a given construct (or tag): we focused on a subset of 110 papers that contain reference to text data or a document corpus. Figure 1 shows that text corpus analysis and CATA along with it have grown over time; 88 of the 110 papers that mention a text corpus also refer to CATA.




Figure 1: Counting Words: The Growth of Management Papers Using Text Data and CATA, AI, ML, LDA, NLP

2.1.1 Limitations of Keyword-Based Approaches

Conceptual schemes that rely only on keywords are not very rich [46]. Constructs may not be well-captured by word frequency approaches used in CATA and LIWC programs; these methods perform less well than ML at tasks such as inferring personality [41]. Word counting assumes that all word occurrences equally contribute to the measurement of a construct - that every use of the keyword "artificial intelligence" or "machine learning" captures both papers that use an AI or ML method, as well as those that study or mention AI and ML phenomena. Because the method relies on exact matching and correct spellings, CATA and LIWC will fail to recognize concepts when faced with messy data or typos. Without the benefit of context surrounding the keywords, key meaning and accuracy are lost to the user. When describing the frequency of terms inside a document, CATA methods do not typically adjust for document length, although additional steps can be taken to make adjustments [66].

While keywords can start a search for relevant concepts, rules and qualitative coding pinpoint only the relevant text within the documents. Qualitative researchers who seek to inductively build theory typically begin by engaging in keyword search, but also engage in qualitative hand coding [84].

2.2 Unsupervised Learning (Topic Modeling and LDA)

Text clustering aims to solve the problem of information overload by simplifying a mass of text into a smaller number of meaningful categories. While many text clustering methods exist [10], a popular technique is *topic modeling*, which aims to learn "topics" from an unstructured collection of text documents. Data is often first heavily pre-processed (stemmed), stripped of common words, and converted into a document-term matrix, which leaves only the stems of latent keywords appearing. Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) assigns all words in a document to a topic, under the assumption that every part of every document contributes to some topic. LDA's versatility is that it is not domain-specific: it can be used to study hacker forums [129], why people retweet [56], online communities [18], and discourse on emerging technologies like blockchain [92]. LDA can also assist in inductive theorizing [111].

Of the 110 text corpus papers in the management literature, 11 papers discuss the use of this method, with 5 of these papers appearing in 2021. [36] use LDA to arrive at text-based measures of corporate dissimilarity from corporate annual reports, and use 25 crowd-sourced MTurkers to ensure themes are reliably identified for the top 25 of 125 latent topics chosen. [58] use LDA on annual reports and conduct a semantic network analysis to illustrate the connections and develop grounded theories of how firms interact with the legal environment. [73] use patent text to study the recombination in breakthrough innovation. [112] study abstracts within a citation network. [37] use topic models to analyze CEO text and synthesize analysis of topic models using machine learning analysis of CEO facial expressions.

2.2.1 Limitation: Meaningless Output

Latent themes that emerge inductively are meaningless and un-interpretable absent additional data (e.g., facial expression analysis to match themes (ibid)), or expert or crowd-sourced judgement. LDA assumes that *all* of the text in *every* document inside a text corpus is assigned to a theme. This is unwarranted if an expert has only a niche interest in a particular phenomenon. Papers we reviewed address this concern by limiting the scope of their corpus, or by extensively pre-processing to remove potential noise, but this also removes potentially relevant context and data. A second assumption of topic modeling approaches is that one must know the number of topics that exist within a collection of documents. This is non-trivial, particularly with massive corpora.

Finally, topic modeling imposes an assumption that a researcher be interested in an "unbiased" representation. Experts often disagree about the interpretation of text, and a quest for unbiased (as opposed to transparent and replicable) analysis may be misguided [97]. Ultimately, unsupervised computational methods face difficulty producing meaningful results in the absence of human involvement and expert interpretation [95].

2.3 The Modern ML Paradigm

Supervised machine learning (ML) models are widely used in many commercial applications: to evaluate candidates for employment [38], to support managers in giving employee feedback [120], to moderate text content on the internet, judge the sentiment of customer-written reviews [86], and to build proprietary datasets for financial and academic use. Widely available ML methods can train a model to learn academic constructs and scale such models over vast volumes of unstructured text. However, computational models of text often struggle to provide insights that are interpretable, and may be perceived as too difficult for low-resource users to access. Among 10 papers in the management corpus discuss ML, and four more that discuss AI, we could not locate any that describe the development of a new academic text classification model that is used to construct new data from unstructured text.

While general AI and ML tools rapidly advance, there is a great need for applications in specific domains, such as detecting banking fraud [4] or fake websites [3]. "Human-in-the-Loop" or hybrid systems are increasingly prominent.[1] The idea of human-in-the-loop for AI applications is promoted by [130] as a way to introduce responsibility into intelligent agents, as well as to increase interpretability. Likewise, human-in-the-loop for ML and NLP is particularly promising, both for data preprocessing and model learning [127]. Efforts to use AI and exclude domain experts are

[1]Hybrid systems are not novel, with discussions already spanning decades. For example, placing a human in the loop was proposed in the design of "socially intelligent agents" [43]. More recently, human involvement in security settings [40] and cyber-physical systems [107] have appeared in the computer science literature.

likely to fail, as shown in a study of how AI use in hiring decisions evolved into hybrid practices [28]. Many AI systems cannot (and arguably should not) be trained without human oversight, and thus such intervention is vital to incorporating the necessary human knowledge into these systems.

Even with a human-in-the-loop approach, challenges have been noted, for example by [128], which among others includes the ability to analyze the impact changes with iterative human intervention. For academics in management and information systems, incorporating the knowledge of domain experts into the process of building structured data is essential for both deductive and inductive study. Such domain knowledge is crucial to forming the essence of training data, which necessarily represents some aspect of the worldview of a human who chose to train a model from it.

For supervised ML, challenges lie not so much with the ML methods or models themselves, but with the paradigm for ML. The process by which ML models are built (i.e. how information is learned) is opaque at the outset. Supervised methods in the Modern ML paradigm, and existing tools for the ML pipeline, do not give experts the ability to easily create training data and thus train a simple model that can scale over vast quantities of text. As discussed by [7], much of the attention around Explainable AI (XAI) has been placed on "the way in which models behave," seeking meaning and interpretability in the outputs of models that can often be highly opaque. If, instead, experts could easily build and curate training datasets, there would be greater opportunity to build interpretable models accepted by experts and members of the relevant audience.

Labeled training data is the critical input to supervised ML models to code future, unseen text instances. What we call "the Modern ML Paradigm" for supervised learning of text data largely sees training data only as input, and holds the interpretability and explainability of ML model outputs as a post hoc concern. If building custom training datasets for text were easier, then resulting models can be interpreted – and modified – at the input stage. Expert-curated ML models could be interpretable and put into action in a domain, and escape some of the limitations of the modern ML paradigm: black boxes, proprietary training data, and un-reproducible, meaningless output that exclude participation from voices without supercomputers or advanced computer science knowledge.

2.3.1 Limitation: The Black Box of Supervised Learning

The "Black Box" refers to the mystery by which textual inputs are categorized by machines leading to certain outputs and are rooted in increasingly large model architectures and consequently, how computational models *memorize*, rather than truly *learn*. In turn, one is often hard pressed to decipher the behavior of a classifier, even with state of the art models – they simply reflect patterns observed during training.

Trust requires understanding "what the machines are doing" [33]. In the modern ML paradigm, attempts to "explain the black box" often come after the fact, which [12] calls "Post-hoc Explainability". Here, when faced with models that are not interpretable *by design*, one may try to boost explainability after the fact. As [12] writes, post-hoc approaches have become the *de facto* way of achieving some level of explainability with complex DL models.

Without understanding the data that goes into training the model, the explainability of the modern ML paradigm is limited. In a recent survey of explainability in supervised ML methods, [30] call for rethinking the problem from first principles, and encourage researchers to ask "What are we actually looking for? Do we really need a black box model?" For many experts, the immediate answer is no. Even a ML model with a high degree of predictive power is likely to be seen as undesirable if it does not produce interpretable results [97, 95].

Underspecification can result from training models on massive volumes of data and selecting the model(s) that achieve a desired predictive power [42]. Underspecification often leads to failure

when those models are used outside of the context in which they were trained. As [69] writes: "the process used to build most machine-learning models today cannot tell which models will work in the real world and which ones won't." [65] calls for greater interaction between humans and machines and for explainability when models are faced with new situations – a "sign of mastery."

2.3.2 Limitation: Proprietary Training Data and Methods

Seen from a different angle, black boxes may be valuable in order to protect trade secrets hidden behind such trained models [105]. Secrecy presents risks in the cases where "high-stakes" decisions are made by the models in question, having potentially significant societal or economic implications. Academic users often rely on commercial data providers that give little to no insight into their proprietary process for data creation. In our analysis of the management literature, 13 of the 100 text analysis papers, and 117 papers in total indicate the use of licensed, proprietary data or models. The problem identified by [81] is that such computational methods could become the "exclusive domain" of private companies and government agencies that operate contrary to the academic commitment to openness. The inadequacy of data-sharing paradigms for big data cast doubt regarding the veracity of ML models [82].

Private firms and academics typically advance the state of the art by breaking new records for the complexity of data, the size of models, and the number of parameters in a model. Many potential contributions from researchers who lack access to super-computing resources, the funds to buy large proprietary datasets, or access to confidential government data are excluded [32]. Our search for management papers that indicate proprietary data or models illustrate stable trends over time, but when big or secret data outputs become the criteria through which the quality of research is judged, only those with access can compete, and there may be less attention to "cumulative progress toward answering important questions" [44].

By reducing the need for humans to think, act, or belong (contribute, be included) in the public sphere, [72] write that ML systems can constrain and oppress, rather than achieve emancipatory goals. To deliver on the potential of ML, improvements needed include greater sharing of data, protections for privacy to enable more open data, intellectual property standards to reduce transaction costs, and approaches that enable genuine replication [75]. Pre-processing of datasets for supervised learning could be a core strength and contribution of social scientists in analyzing text data [45].[2] Despite advances, DiMaggio's (2015) call for greater systematic research to develop solutions for curation challenges and guidelines for pre-analysis and developing training data has largely been unmet.

2.3.3 Limitation: Meaningful Contributions to Knowledge

In a statement that rings true almost a decade after it was written, there is little evidence of computational social science in leading social science field journals [124], or in the management corpus reviewed here. Computational social science methods have advanced significantly, but it has yet to be demonstrated how computational scientific infrastructure can be applied to important social problems [82]. Disciplinary silos, privacy concerns, and unreliable, non-replicable, and proprietary

[2]One promising approach is computational grounded theory: a novel framework to use unsupervised machine learning to identify patterns, engage a human in interpretive refinement of patterns, and use computational methods to assess and confirm identified patterns [95]. This "human-centered computational exploratory analysis" is proposed to help social scientists benefit from unsupervised computational methods and enhance the transparency and reproducibility of content analysis [95].

data hamper the potential for computer science methods to provide meaningful insight into society's challenges [82].

The emergence of a computational social science apart from traditional academic disciplines speaks to the hope that ML and AI can advance knowledge. However, the possibilities of these technologies are lessened when such tools are perceived as beyond the reach of ordinary users [48]. Less than a decade old, some such initiatives, such as "data science for good", have been criticized for not giving the social sector "the opportunity to design for what we want" [101]. Without tools that enable domain experts to develop their own ML models, there is a risk that new interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary centers might lead to yet another siloed academic discipline as ill equipped to solve problems as others [5]. Future opportunities for AI identified by [21] include democratization, reducing requirements for data, and enhancing AI explainability and transparency.[3]

[122] attributes a "Hyper-Focus" in current ML research to three causes that have led it to lose "its connection to problems of import to the larger world of science and society." First, the (over)use of benchmark datasets, many of which are "synthetic", has "glaring limitations" and still make reproducability difficult. Only 1% of ML papers are applied to a specific domain and the rest use benchmark datasets.[4] By way of contrast, [79] report that 90% of research constructs are uncommon, suggesting that using pre-labeled standard benchmark data for training will miss entire vast areas of domain-specific knowledge. Secondly, the focus on "abstract metrics" like F-scores to determine model quality across domains is a "mirage" that masks the need to focus on impact and usefulness of a model. A final issue is the "lack of follow-through," suggesting that current computational research leaves little incentive for connection to sustained research agendas.

A related concern is the rapidly depreciating relevance of data that many ML models are trained on [82]. In the ML training process, models are trained "in the lab" on a training dataset, yet the environment in which models are deployed is dynamic. "Big data" research may apply only to specific users of a specific portal at a specific time in which a study is conducted [68, 100]. For that reason, online studies and experiments with large response rates may fail to produce reliable or general knowledge [27]. A static training process may simply not reflect the real world environment or its rapid evolution [15]. The velocity of internet-based data also creates a limitation for computational social scientists' conclusions [93]. Solutions to these obstacles include forming new multi-disciplinary, international journals that permit rapid publication of rigorous quantitative descriptions of rapidly evolving phenomena [94].

2.4 Seeking Explainable Tools for Social Science

To sum up the issues described in this section, each method reviewed has strengths, limitations, and tradeoffs for experts who seek to analyze unstructured text. For domain experts with an interest in specific phenomena, the methods reviewed so far do not allow for expert-led, targeted extraction of niche constructs hiding within corpora and the construction of standardized data. For many qualitative researchers, the systematic analysis and discovery of new patterns within domain-specific digitized records is a core contribution – the ability to find the diamond (a single topic) in the rough (lots of text). If qualitative hand-coded contributions could be easily scaled, it can address some issues found in the supervised ML domain.

[3]Emerging paradigms for low-resource Natural Language Processing (NLP) seek to eliminate barriers to accessing ML technology [71].

[4]Classic examples of these datasets include the Movie Review Dataset [87] or the Yelp Review Dataset. While use of standardized datasets may reduce the reproducibility crisis in ML [74], there is a tradeoff. As one might imagine, benchmark and standardized datasets have limited application to the real world; furthermore, many benchmark datasets are tailored for specific tasks, e.g. movie reviews are often used for sentiment analysis.

3 Context Rule Assisted Machine Learning (CRAML)

Enabling experts to create training data for niche classifiers to detect constructs that are relevant within a specific domain would address many of the problems identified with the modern ML paradigm, and the limitations of unsupervised computations methods. The CRAML method we present emphasizes explainability and has a contribution on each of the six dimensions that explain the performance of AI systems according to [13]: the models are specific to a single construct, the goals are clear, by limiting the chunk size and extracting text from documents in the corpus, the training and input data is intended to be context-specific, the output data is interpretable (a 0/1 binary classification), and the environment is also intended to be domain specific and expert-guided. By emphasizing the "human in the loop," CRAML gives qualitative and quantitative researchers control over the training data that is the key input to ML models. This offers new capabilities to control the analysis and measurement of phenomena found in massive volumes of unstructured text. This section briefly introduces the solution developed and explains how the solution addresses the problems described above.

3.1 A Framework for Unstructured Text Analysis

CRAML software gives users the tools to manipulate keywords to extract relevant data from massive corpora, create "tags" that seek to capture topics or themes, and subsequently, develop "context rule" sets that codify knowledge about the specific pieces of text that correspond to specific tags. The CRAML process yields tabular output that matches document-level metadata with a 0/1 indicator that symbolizes the occurrence of tags in a document [80].

Figure 2 provides a high-level overview of the CRAML framework. The CRAML process begins with the full text of a corpus of documents (Step 0). While metadata is not required, CRAML software is designed to combine characteristics extracted from the text with metadata at the document or record ID level.

In step 1, the researcher chooses keywords to extract from the corpus, and retrieves a "*chunk*": a block of text containing a user-selected number of words surrounding the keyword. The chunk length should contain the full "*context window*": all of the relevant context for a human to determine if the keyword-containing chunk is relevant or not for some binary classification schema. The user can extract all chunks from all of the documents in the corpus, or in low-resource environments, can randomly sample from the documents in order to perform Steps 2-4 on a smaller subset.

In step 2, the researcher analyzes the patterns within the chunks, studying n-grams that reveal the most common phrasings surrounding the keyword.

In step 3, the researcher writes "*context rules*" that elaborate an ever-more detailed scheme of binary classifications of the chunks. We refer to these binary classification schemata as "*tags*": each tag represents a topic or theme that the researcher defines by recognizing patterns in the extracted text and determining if each chunk is (tag=1), or is not (tag=0), illustrative of the tag. There is no limit on the number of tags a researcher can define. For each tag, there is no limit to the number of rules that can be defined using either exact text matching or regular expressions (RegEx).

In step 4, the researcher written context rules are applied or "*extrapolated*" over either the full extracted chunks or a sample of the extracted chunks to create a training dataset for ML modeling. Extrapolation labels each chunk with a 0 or 1 for each "tag," or binary classification scheme, and creates a dataset that can be used for training ML models. In step 5, common ML algorithms use the training dataset to tag the full extracted chunks, and the researcher identifies the best performing model. In the final step, the results are aggregated into a document-level database




Figure 2: A Simple View of the CRAML Process

of structured information: for any document within the text corpus, the researcher knows if the document contains a tag. Additional hand-coding by independent third-parties can validate that the training dataset extrapolation, and the ML results, are highly accurate.

Versatile tools for mixed approaches CRAML's pipeline incorporates a novel set of tools that provide an end-to-end solution to the challenge of structuring unstructured text data. However, researchers may appreciate its flexibility and multiple uses: a researcher may wish to pursue analysis using only pieces of the CRAML process. The proposed system is not a rigid algorithm, but rather a flexible pipeline of tools created to implement a research framework that was developed to address a specific research task. As [99] note, choosing between a dictionary, rules, or supervised machine learning involves tradeoffs, and no clear guidelines. In CRAML, particular steps and technologies can be interchanged according to the user's preference, skill set, and research challenge. A qualitative researcher can quickly sample and sift through text data and experiment with alternative classification schemes and definitions.[5] For another researcher, extraction could be a pre-processing step before engaging in a computational grounded theory project that uses unstructured NLP methods once the plausibly relevant themes are extracted based upon keywords. A third researcher may wish to extrapolate a full dataset without ML. A fourth researcher may wish to only sample a massive corpus, extract context windows around keywords, and inductively generate topics or themes with extracted text and have no desire to perform further computational avenues of analysis.

[5]Emerging paradigms for low-resource Natural Language Processing (NLP) seek to eliminate barriers to accessing ML technology [71]. Particularly with low-resource NLP, the availability of labeled data, i.e. text, become crucial.

3.2 A Bridge to Solving Real-World Problems

By positioning context rules as the crucial bridge between domain expert knowledge and structured datasets that represent embodied knowledge, CRAML provides a "traceability" from datasets classified by ML models back to the context rules that lead to them – and the humans who wrote those. By placing a focus on explainability at the first bridge from unstructured data to structured data(sets), the second bridge from training data to trained models becomes easier to cross. ML modeling "presumes a world of already existing (divine or rationalistic) rules, which only need to be formalised, in order to make sense to a machine (or an analytical philosopher for this reason)" [11]. Context rules in CRAML codify which text belongs to which topic or theme according to the user. To the extent such rules can be articulated consistently, then they can be extrapolated over unstructured text to create fully structured datasets to train ML models.

Rather than presuming unbiased training data, CRAML extends the user's worldview to the realm of ML models via expert-created context rules. Interpretive frameworks lend meaning to text and are a cornerstone of academic research. Scaling methods such as coding and grounded theory over large volumes of text contributes to theory development [117]. Rigorous manual content analysis by qualitatitve social scientists is often geared toward the induction of topics and themes, yielding new constructs, analytical frameworks, or mid-level theory of some phenomenon [59].[6] Alternatively, a quantitative or hypothesis-driven researcher might pursue evidence of a phenomena within a text corpus, quantify its frequency, and then analyze it.

In CRAML, the use of context rule sets serves as the foundation for representing the knowledge of a domain expert, without the need for explicitly annotating all unseen instances (i.e. documents). Through the extrapolation process, the hybrid CRAML framework requires manual work only in the crucial first stages, and leaves the remainder to automation. CRAML's initial step is similar to processes used in IS research: for example, to develop a specialized ontology of hypotheses, [85] couple rule-based approaches for extraction and word embeddings. The "human in the loop" contributes transparent manual codifications of text, which allow for the replicable and configurable construction of tabular datasets used either immediately for quantitative social science analysis, or to train ML models.[7] Because CRAML involves human expertise and gives control over training data to the user, the ML model that results from CRAML is interpretable as a product of a human-built and curated rule set that can be published, and then contested, examined, and modified by others. This mitigates concerns over black box ML models.

CRAML built models can have real-world applicability, because training data and ML-built datasets can be formed by domain experts who largely address Wagstaff's (2012) concerns regarding abstract metrics and lack of follow through. Empowering users to create novel, meaningful datasets and ML models in their worldview also enables rapid changes that can be put into action locally. This comes at a time where novel ML or DL approaches can be severely limited by available datasets, with no widely accepted approach to create novel ones as needed and in an efficient manner.

As a final response to the challenges introduced in the previous section, CRAML's methodological transparency is intended to address several of the problems with proprietary data and otherwise

[6]For scientific purposes, inductively derived analytical frameworks from text should be a) intra-subjectively reliable, b) inter-subjectively reliable, and c) fully reproducible [95]. This means that a single person should reach the same coding conclusion again and again, a second person should reach the same conclusion, and the methods, data, and analysis should be transparent enough to permit replication.

[7]Explainable and interpretable models can be built when users "steer learning" through feedback and interaction [65]. [7] writes that "explainability can only happen through interaction between human and machine." Of course, the creation of such hybrid system requires expert human labor. [105] writes that "[i]nterpretable models can entail significant effort to construct, in terms of both computation and domain expertise."

unreachable methods. With a standard desktop computer and open source software, CRAML enables interactive engagement with massive text corpora without prior programming knowledge (although users will find some programming knowledge helpful and advanced users may seek to customize the underlying code for niche purposes). At each crucial step of the framework, CRAML saves and shows the user the underlying data in CSV format in order to enable the interactivity essential to truly achieving a "human in the loop" and records each step of the process for replication and transparency purposes.

By making the framework as open and transparent as possible, and publishing the code base and the underlying data used here, we provide opportunities for users to test, harness, or modify the framework. CRAML software is available under a under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. The artifacts created and used by CRAML in the intermediate stages are extracts and samples of the plausibly relevant text from a document and document corpus using keywords and context windows. A user can control what information is extracted from the corpus, and thus remove sensitive data. Thus, CRAML can mitigate some privacy protection and sensitive information concerns that limit access to sensitive data. Other researchers working with big data have taken a similar approach by extracting only relevant pieces of larger documents [113]. By

3.3 An Application of CRAML: Job Advertisement Text

Job seekers face difficulties finding the right jobs, and employers face frictions in job search that represent additional recruitment costs. Search frictions harm both workers and employers by increasing the barriers to good matches in the labor market, and reducing competition for labor [29, 89]. A suite of ML classifiers that added niche filters to job search engines could benefit jobseekers, employers, and workforce agencies. With support from the National Science Foundation, the National Labor Exchange created the NLx Research Hub in 2021 to "increase the amount of actionable labor market information in the U.S. to facilitate the recruitment, hiring, and training opportunities of American workers" and "deepen partnerships between industry, government, and academia by enhancing the infrastructure to support the convergence of research, education, and talent pipelines."

Workers who desire more flexible, remote jobs after COVID-19, disabled workers seeking specific working conditions, union workers, workers with a professional license, and veterans as well as veteran's spouses may all be underserved even while being preferred by specific employers. An employer can gain a competitive advantage by hiring workers who are otherwise discriminated against, but only in an efficient and competitive labor market [19]. Job seekers may easily become discouraged without information on whether, for example: a job is located near public transit, or whether an employer will interview an ex-felon, a teen, or a non-resident on a visa. If some employers seek to target and hire underserved audiences, but job ads never reach the workers, then research should aim to reliably identify which jobs might be especially relevant for a particular worker.

Research application CRAML was first developed using job advertisement text data to support research on the labor market. While the underlying text is confidential and licensed, we describe and release rules files and nine ML classifiers that achieved a high accuracy in detecting job characteristics and barriers to employment under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. The research implications of this work are not only immediate research papers, but a potential to release custom-built ML classifiers and create open tools for real-time

information systems that track changes in the labor market. Such application could improve both research and contribute to reducing barriers to employment in job advertisements. Ultimately, better data on employment practices obtained from job advertisement text and other sources of text information could have a profound impact on research capabilities in this field.[8]

In Appendix B, we provide a list of tags and the keywords extracted as part of an effort to identify specific barriers to employment, the accuracy of the models built, and discuss how the broader labor market research community can contribute to this effort.

4 A Step-by-Step, Replicable No Poach Classifier

We demonstrate the start-to-finish CRAML approach by applying it to an empirical context where the resulting analysis might be meaningful, transparent, and replicable. Toward this end, we contribute a new text corpus of 151,708 franchise documents, and the cleaned and pre-processed text we used in this analysis. We publish metadata that tracks which of 12,992 records a particular document corresponds to, and includes the effective date, company name, and unique ID. We also publish the rule sets that are the manual hand-coded input, enabling replication and scrutiny of the results. We also publish the training dataset and the ML model.[9]

4.1 Empirical and Data Context

"No poach" clauses in contracts are also referred to as collusive pacts or anti-competitive restraints on employee mobility, and have drawn interest from academics, regulators, and policy-makers. While anti-competitive language is contained in public documents, sometimes contrary to public policy, these documents are inaccessible for many: available only in massive, unsearchable collections of PDF documents on state agency websites. With subtle variations in language and no guide about where to look for these clauses, no poach clauses are diamonds in the rough: a few sentences in hundreds of thousands of documents with millions of pages. Indeed, such clauses were largely not known to exist by the relevant academic and policy community of interest until the release of a 2017 working paper published as [77]. The paper contained a limited sample and relied on a third party data provider to identify no poach clauses. Following the release of the working paper, eleven state attorneys general issued a letter in 2018 demanding the practice end, many franchises voluntarily ended the practice, and the State of Washington in 2018 first negotiated settlements with franchise companies in which many removed their no poach clauses.[10].

Both no poach and non-compete clauses are known to place downward pressure on wages [31, 17]. Given their importance in reducing opportunities for job mobility, there is great interest in descriptive statistics regarding the prevalence of these clauses. Overcoming the inaccessibility of the text within public documents was a significant challenge. We assembled a large collection of Franchise Disclosure Documents (FDDs) from the state of California by scraping PDF documents

[8] In ongoing work supported by the Russell Sage Foundation Future of Work Program and NLX, a job-advertisement level SQL database built from CRAML's classifiers using NLX data is now operational and new classifiers are under construction.

[9] The PDFs are hosted in partnership with DocumentCloud, and will be released upon publication. On DocumentCloud, where they can now be searched, discussed, and annotated. Additional items will be uploaded to a scholarly repository upon publication.

[10] See Washington State Attorney General Report, Letter from State Attorneys General. As Ashenfelter wrote, "it is instructive that the mere revelation of collusive agreements, whether legal or not, has so quickly provoked a strong response from both the antitrust authorities and the franchisors whose agreements contained these no-poach clauses" (qtd. in [77])

from the public web. These records exclude companies that may be exempt from filing, and may be missing observations due to limitations when accessing data from the web.[11]

In addition, we make available the machine-readable text corpus we build from the downloaded PDFs and the metadata that ties documents to specific company filings. For pre-processing, we used Python's Tika, and for files that could not be initially read with this, we used ABBYY Fine Reader. For the California corpus, we assembled 151,708 documents in 6.99 GB of cleaned machine-readable text that can be traced back to a total of 12,992 franchise records. We consider the record to be the unique ID that the state assigns to multiple documents from a franchise on a particular date. We trace each document back to a record with metadata that includes the name of the franchise, and the date of the filing.

4.2 The Construction of Training Data

4.2.1 Step 1: Extract Relevant Text to Reduce Information Overload




Figure 3: First process in the CRAML Framework – Extract Data

The extraction process encompasses taking the unstructured text files and preparing a cleaned dataset of only the text that is plausibly relevant that is ready for hand-coding. By reducing the size of the text files being worked with, and delimiting the extracts to the relevant text in the corpus, this step addresses challenges of computational resource intensity, and assists in sifting for relevant information in a large corpus. This is a manual, iterative process – a loop that is exited when

[11]While we were able to obtain and match the 151,708 documents to the 12,992 records via web scraping, we identified 16,216 franchise disclosure records from January 2013-July 2022, and are investigating additional methods to acquire any missing data, which we believe to be randomly distributed.

the user is satisfied that all of the relevant text is extracted from the corpus. Figure 3 illustrates the extraction process, which corresponds to Step 1 outlined in Figure 2. Two main software tools (extract.py and text_ex.py) aid the user in finding and exploring the relevant text.

We chose initial keywords "hire", "recruit", "employ", and "solicit" to explore if franchise documents contain a no poach clause. The initial keywords chosen suggested additional ideas for tags, which in turn, suggested new ideas for keywords. To aid in this process, a repeated N-gram exploration helped discover the contexts in which given keywords appear the most. This exploration prioritizes the extract, suggest new ideas for keywords, tags, rules, context windows. Because the full context was important to explore initially, the earliest exploratory extracts focused on the 20 words surrounding each keyword. Following all of the processes described below, a final context window of 13 words was selected (6 words to the left and right of the keyword). The goal when removing irrelevant or non-essential information is to reduce noise and build a highly focused ML classification model. In an iterative and flexible process, more keywords were subsequently added: for example, "poach", "non compet", "noncompet", "covenant" and "not to compete" simply restarted the process.

4.2.2 Step 2: From Rule Sets to (Training) Data via Extrapolation, Testing, and Validation

After the extraction process, an expert conceptualizes and defines the desired classifications, or *tags*, and builds a rule set for each tag in a manual and iterative fashion. Figure 4 details the iterative process of Step 2 in Figure 2 that involves validation, extrapolation, and the refinement of rule sets. This process concludes when the expert is satisfied that the extrapolated rules are valid on a sample of the text. The rule set is then "extrapolated" to the full extract from the corpus, yielding a structured dataset of accurately classified chunks – a training dataset, in other words. As described in the following section, the results of Step 2 can be used immediately for descriptive research regarding the contents of documents, or as a basis for training ML models.

The cycle begins with the initial creation of rule sets for each tag, which can be done manually by an individual researcher, or team of researchers. Constructing and designing accurate indicators requires researcher familiarity with ontological subtleties and appropriate construct validation and scale development methodology [126, 88]. Rules are written in a CSV file that contains a list of rules, the priority level of each rule, and the corresponding tag, assigned a 0 or 1. As earlier, the N-Gram tool may be helpful – doing this prioritizes the creation of rules that will "cover" the largest parts of the entire data. Priority level determines the order in which a rule is run. A earlier rule can be over-written by a subsequent priority rule.

Step 2 then involves the use of rule sets and the extrapolation algorithm (extrapolate.py) to validate the rules. In essence, the extrapolation process will convert the set of rules into an extended dataset, and will tag each chunk according to the user's encoding of each rule. The resulting dataset contains the unique document identifier, the extracted chunk matching a certain rule, and the defined encoding for this chunk. Note that this extrapolation is done individually for each rule set and tag, thus resulting in a training dataset for each rule set (file). A second software tool (validate.py) relates to the validation of the data that is the output of extrapolation. Once extrapolated, the expert tests the performance of the rules against actual chunks that are coded by those rules. The expert can export a strategic sample of chunks meant to ensure each rule is valid – choosing a random sample of N examples per rule. This enables independent hand-coders to score each chunk, which can then be re-imported to assess accuracy and performance of the rules.

For the franchise document data, allowing iterative exploration of keywords and adjustments to




Figure 4: Second process in the CRAML Framework – Build Rules

rules, we developed a set of over 500 rules and 6 tags to classify suspect anti-competitive clauses in the corpus. We first focused on finding all employee "no poach" clauses. As one rule for the no poach tag states: "*you may not seek to employ or retain any employee or independent contractor who is at any time employed by us.*" When examining similar extracted chunks, we found that many documents also contained language that went further than prohibiting an employer from soliciting another party's employee, but also prohibited an employer from hiring or employing. We create a separate tag these "no hire" clauses. Such "no hire" clauses, as in the following example from the no hire rule set, state that: "*party shall not hire or solicit to hire any person employed then or within the preceding year by the other party.*"

Independent validation in which a third researcher hand-coded 706 chunks indicates an initial 91% match between an independent third party and the extrapolation of rules, suggesting a high degree of inter-rater reliability in ability to detect characteristics of no poach clauses. While our emphasis here is to ensure that there is strong inter-rater reliability between the CRAML user and an independent observer in this test example, we do not claim perfect identification of all no poach clauses. For a regulator, additional scrutiny would be required, but the overarching goal is to identify plausibly relevant and/or problematic no poach language. The pipeline enables any observer to classify the documents according to any arbitrary schema. We emphasize that CRAML here enables content validation processes at the input stage to ML. Independent assessments of reliability are key to any conclusions.

Step 2 Results: A Labeled, Structured Dataset for Analysis Step 2 yields a dataset for training a ML classification model, or, if the underlying corpus is small enough (as is the case here), the rules can be applied to the entire dataset and reveal which filings contain which clauses

according to the specified rules.

4.2.3 Step 3: Training ML Classifiers to Build Structured Datasets

While the above analysis is based on an extrapolation of rules to all chunks in the dataset, CRAML yields data that a ML classifier can train. Although many algorithms exists for such a training process, the CRAML framework trains a binary classifier for each tag. In other words, each training dataset is created from a rules file, which contains one or more tags. Accordingly, each classifier can be traced back to a rule set to perform a 0/1 classification for the tags included therein. The training process is described in greater detail in Appendix C.

Once the classifier(s) are trained, they can be deployed to classify the original data, i.e. the entire unstructured text corpus, or can be used on other sources of data. This represents the completion of the CRAML framework, as one can now build a structured, labeled dataset from the unstructured text of a document corpus using a ML model. This entire final process is illustrated in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Third process in the CRAML Framework – Train Classifiers

4.3 Evaluating the Model

In this empirical context, we train a no poach classifier built with training data from California. We use the classifier to build datasets for both California, in order to obtain a comparison between the rules-based approach and the ML approach using the same data. The "no poach" classifier is built with training data from a 10% sample plus all of the no poach tag=1 observations in the full sample. In some cases, when the occurrence of positive or negative tags is very low, manual augmentations to training data such as this are required in order to receive acceptable model performance. We obtain an accuracy score of 0.99, precision of 0.97, recall of 0.96, and an overall F1-Score of 0.97.

The harmonic mean of precision and recall (or F1-score) is based upon a comparison between the ML output and the training dataset. A common statistic in ML, with a maximum score of 1 when precision and recall are perfect, and 0 when either precision or recall is zero, the F1 score suggests a high level of accuracy and recall between the training dataset and results.

Figure 6 displays the percent of all rule-detected and ML-detected no poach clauses in the California Corpus within each year for each record filed from years 2013-2022 (with partial data for 2022). The pattern depicted with the California data is similar to the rule-based analysis. It shows that from 2015-2017 over 60% of the records contained no poach clauses, after which there was a decline until the percent stabilizes below 40%. This suggests that the interventions that followed [77] had a large effect to decrease the prevalence of anti-competitive no poach language in franchise documents. The continued prevalence of these clauses, despite interventions from authorities, requires further investigation (in another paper): while the no poach clauses continue to exist, inspection of the text chunks reveals that while some remain the same as before the intervention of the Washington State Attorney General, while others now limit their applicability to more favorable jurisdictions and others restrict their application to highly compensated employees.




Figure 6: Analysis of Suspect No Poach Clauses in California Franchise Documents

Practical Note on Model Accuracy One noteworthy aspect of CRAML is that the above statistics reflect performance of the model at the "chunk" level. If an expert were looking to confirm that certain documents contain no poach clauses, the record is the level of analysis where they would want to begin their search. Given over 150,000 documents stored in nearly 13,000

records, this could be a daunting task. Moving to the level of the records, in California, the no poach classifier closely matches the rule-generated results, with only 22 false negatives and 672 false positives in 12,922 records. Thus, at the record level, ML model achieves a 0.95 F1-score, 0.996 recall, 0.91 precision, and accuracy of 0.946.

Further, an inspection of text chunks reveals that a significant portion of the false positives are in fact related to other language that accompanies no poach clauses and belong properly in the context of anti-competitive language in these documents: jurisdictional restrictions on no poach clauses, language that applies no poach clauses only to specific employees, and language that creates non-compete clauses. Precision at the level of the record would be 0.04 higher (0.95) if one considers these clauses to be relevant to a search for a broader construct of anti-competitive language. The results of CRAML are fully traceable to choices made in the construction of a rule set for the no poach classifier. As seen in Figure 6, the ML classifier identifies more suspected no poach clauses then the rules, and this increases in 2021. Additional research using this corpus is pinpointing fine-grained characteristics of language in these documents that restrict employee mobility.

A final note: if one were dissatisfied with the model performance and sought one with higher recall or lower accuracy, or a more or less specific definition of the no poach construct, it would possible to "steer learning" and achieve a desired result by changing rule sets and thus re-shaping the training data. If desired, a user could add or remove all jurisdiction, narrow, and non-compete language from the no poach rule set in order to achieve a more discriminating classifier. A user could also combine all of the rules to make a single classifier that memorizes a larger pattern related to all types of anti-competitive language that appear in the documents.

5 Discussion

The CRAML framework makes several contributions. First, the framework enables the systematic and structured process of creating novel datasets from unstructured text corpora. Second, the result harmonizes advanced, automated information extraction and ML techniques with the input and expertise from manual analysis performed by supervising researchers. The exploration and iterative process performed during the context rule creation stage involves work that is not only difficult to perform automatically, but also that will arguably never come close to matching the diversity and expertise of human experts with domain knowledge. As a result, this intermediate stage in the framework incorporates a human element that is lacking in modern classification frameworks.

5.1 Future Directions

5.1.1 Technical Improvements

Future research directions regarding the technical backbone of the CRAML framework should aim to bolster the extrapolation stage of the pipeline. Embeddings can be utilized to improve the transformation of context rules to datasets. With embeddings added to the extrapolation method, the need for training a ML classifier in the end may become obsolete.

A second area of future work involves building up tools to aid the domain expert in the initial, manual-driven stages of the CRAML process. Keyword extraction, topic modeling, automatic rule induction, and knowledge graphs could all be useful tools to support the domain expert express his or her worldview, as well as explore large text corpora in a richer way.

Although the focus is currently placed on ML techniques, the role of more advanced classifiers remains an open area of investigation. Deep Learning, in particular sequential models, could prove to

be powerful in boosting the predictive capability of models trained on CRAML-generated datasets. Of course, this would come with the added overhead of extra training and parameter tuning, which must also be taken into account for future endeavors.

5.1.2 Computational Social Science

CRAML is designed with flexibility and web-based sources of text in mind. A plug-in was created to integrate DocumentCloud (used by journalists and academics to post government documents) for the project related to no poach agreements. New plug-ins could draw data from web-based sources of text such as Twitter. Niche ML classifiers built from user-data in a specific domain could address content moderation challenges at scale [57, 62]. To address a concern in [101], government, civil society, and non-governmental organizations could develop context rule sets to capture text that is relevant to their interests and publish or license ML classifiers that provide useful feeds and classifications of information tracking on topics of societal concern. For academics, editors and reviewers could demand greater transparency when claims are made about data built form text.

Concerns with proprietary data sources and privacy can be partially addressed by the information extraction methods used here. While additional efforts are needed, including the potential development of further tools for differential privacy with text, the extraction process is a step toward efforts to protect individuals against identification and protect the data owner from violation of proprietary information and trade secrets. For example, researchers have been barred from accessing records due to privacy and confidentiality concerns, but with careful selection of keywords, analysts could code chunks of extracted text and classify every document in a corpus without ever accessing the full or confidential information.[12]

Finally, researchers in the humanities and social scientists can hopefully develop diverse and practical applications that uncover constructs and patterns currently "hidden" in unstructured text. The CRAML framework and software tools can be used to analyze text in any language. To the extent a construct is intra-subjectively reliable, it could be developed by a researcher into rules and scaled over vast amounts of unstructured text. To the extent that inter-subjective variance is high, we hope that by decreasing the time and effort needed to scale a framework, there will be many opportunities for diverse voices to produce contesting interpretative schemes that are transparent and replicable.

[12]For example, researchers could use CRAML software to track the 20th Century use of residential restrictive covenants that barred Black, Jewish, Asian and other ethnic groups from living in certain neighborhoods. County commissioners of deeds have either barred researchers or severely limited access to digitized records due to concerns. For one project focused on Hennepin County, see https://mappingprejudice.umn.edu/.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for support from the Economic Security Project Anti-Monopoly Fund; Loyola Rule of Law Institute; Loyola Quinlan School of Business; and Loyola University Chicago. All errors are the authors'.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest.

Supporting Information

See our Github repository for the full code base: `https://github.com/sjmeis/CRAML_Beta`.

References

[1] A. Abbas et al. *Text analytics to support sense-making in social media: A language-action perspective*. Publication Title: MIS Quarterly. par.nsf.gov, 2018. URL: https://par.nsf.gov/servlet

[2] A. Abbasi and H. Chen. "CyberGate: a design framework and system for text analysis of computer-mediated communication". In: *Mis Quarterly* (2008). Publisher: JSTOR. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/25148873.

[3] A. Abbasi et al. "Detecting fake websites: The contribution of statistical learning theory". In: *Mis Quarterly* (2010). Publisher: JSTOR. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/25750686.

[4] A. Abbasi et al. "Metafraud: a meta-learning framework for detecting financial fraud". In: *Mis Quarterly* (2012). Publisher: JSTOR. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/41703508.

[5] Andrew Abbott. *Chaos of Disciplines*. en. 01071. University of Chicago Press, Feb. 2001. ISBN: 978-0-226-00101-2.

[6] Daron Acemoglu and David H. Autor. "Skills, Tasks and Technologies: Implications for Employment and Earnings". In: *Handbook of Labor Economics*. Ed. by Orley Ashenfelter and David Card. Vol. Volume 4, Part B. Elsevier, 2011, pp. 1043–1171. URL: http://www.sciencedirec (visited on 12/10/2012).

[7] Amina Adadi and Mohammed Berrada. "Peeking Inside the Black-Box: A Survey on Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI)". In: *IEEE Access* 6 (2018), pp. 52138–52160. DOI: 10.1109/access.2018.2870052. URL: https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2018.28700

[8] Kiran Adnan and Rehan Akbar. "An analytical study of information extraction from unstructured and multidimensional big data". en. In: *Journal of Big Data* 6.1 (Oct. 2019), p. 91. ISSN: 2196-1115. DOI: 10.1186/s40537-019-0254-8. URL: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-0 (visited on 05/20/2022).

[9] Kiran Adnan and Rehan Akbar. "Limitations of information extraction methods and techniques for heterogeneous unstructured big data". en. In: *International Journal of Engineering Business Management* 11 (Jan. 2019). Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd STM, p. 1847979019890771. ISSN: 1847-9790. DOI: 10.1177/1847979019890771. URL: https://doi.or (visited on 05/20/2022).

[10] Charu C Aggarwal and ChengXiang Zhai. "A survey of text clustering algorithms". In: *Mining text data*. Springer, 2012, pp. 77–128.

[11] Clemens Apprich. "Secret Agents". In: *Digital Culture & Society* 4.1 (Mar. 2018), pp. 29–44. DOI: 10.14361/dcs-2018-0104. URL: https://doi.org/10.14361/dcs-2018-0104.

[12] Alejandro Barredo Arrieta et al. *Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, Taxonomies, Opportunities and Challenges toward Responsible AI*. 2019. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1910.1 URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.10045.

[13] A. Asatiani et al. *Challenges of explaining the behavior of black-box AI systems*. Publication Title: MIS Quarterly ... pure.itu.dk, 2020. URL: https://pure.itu.dk/portal/files/856872

[14] David Autor. *The "Task Approach" to Labor Markets: An Overview*. IZA Discussion Paper 7178. Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Jan. 2013. URL: http://econpapers.repec.org/pa (visited on 05/06/2013).

[15] Boris Babic et al. *When Machine Learning Goes Off the Rails*. Dec. 2020. URL: https://hbr.org/20

[16] E. Bachura et al. "THE OPM DATA BREACH: AN INVESTIGATION OF SHARED EMOTIONAL REACTIONS ON TWITTER." In: *MIS Quarterly* (2022). Publisher: search.ebscohost.com. URL: https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&sco

[17] Natarajan Balasubramanian et al. "Locked In? The Enforceability of Covenants Not to Compete and the Careers of High-Tech Workers". en. In: *Journal of Human Resources* 57.S (Apr. 2022). Publisher: University of Wisconsin Press, S349–S396. ISSN: 0022-166X, 1548-8004. DOI: 10.3368/jhr.monopsony.1218-9931R1. URL: http://jhr.uwpress.org/content/57/S (visited on 04/08/2022).

[18] S. Bapna, M. J. Benner, and L. Qiu. "Nurturing Online Communities: An Empirical Investigation." In: *MIS Quarterly* (2019). Publisher: search.ebscohost.com. URL: https://search.ebscoh

[19] Gary Becker. *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

[20] S. H. Begum and F. Nausheen. "A comparative analysis of differential privacy vs other privacy mechanisms for Big Data". In: *2018 2nd International Conference on Inventive Systems and Control (ICISC)*. 2018, pp. 512–516. DOI: 10.1109/ICISC.2018.8399125.

[21] H. Benbya, T. H. Davenport, and S. Pachidi. "Artificial intelligence in organizations: current state and future opportunities". In: *MIS Quarterly Executive* (2020). Publisher: papers.ssrn.com. URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3741983

[22] James Beniger. *The control revolution: Technological and economic origins of the information society*. Harvard university press, 2009. ISBN: 0-674-02076-6.

[23] Richard Biernacki. "Inside the Rituals of Social Science". en. In: *Reinventing Evidence in Social Inquiry: Decoding Facts and Variables*. Ed. by Richard Biernacki. Cultural Sociology. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US, 2012, pp. 1–26. ISBN: 978-1-137-00728-5. DOI: 10.1057/9781137007285_1. URL: https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137007285_1 (visited on 04/19/2022).

[24] Ann M. Blair. *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age*. en. Publication Title: Too Much to Know. Yale University Press, Nov. 2010. ISBN: 978-0-300-16849-5. DOI: 10.12987/9780300168495. URL: https://www.degruyter.com/document/do (visited on 04/11/2022).

[25] Nicholas Bloom and John Van Reenen. "Measuring and Explaining Management Practices Across Firms and Countries". en. In: *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122.4 (Nov. 2007). 00990, pp. 1351–1408. ISSN: 0033-5533, 1531-4650. DOI: 10.1162/qjec.2007.122.4.1351. URL: http://qje.oxfordjournals.org/content/122/4/1351 (visited on 05/23/2014).

[26] Nicholas Bloom et al. *The New Empirical Economics of Management*. Working Paper 20102. 00000. National Bureau of Economic Research, May 2014. URL: http://www.nber.org/papers/w2 (visited on 06/11/2014).

[27] Valerie C. Bradley et al. "Unrepresentative big surveys significantly overestimated US vaccine uptake". en. In: *Nature* 600.7890 (Dec. 2021). Number: 7890 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, pp. 695–700. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-04198-4. URL: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-04198-4 (visited on 05/25/2022).

[28] E. van den Broek, A. Sergeeva, and M. Huysman. "When the Machine Meets the Expert: An Ethnography of Developing AI for Hiring." In: *MIS Quarterly* (2021). Publisher: search.ebscohost.com. URL: https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&p

[29] Kenneth Burdett and Dale T. Mortensen. "Wage Differentials, Employer Size, and Unemployment". In: *Intenational Economic Review* 39.3 (1998), pp. 257–273.

[30] Nadia Burkart and Marco F. Huber. "A Survey on the Explainability of Supervised Machine Learning". In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 70 (Jan. 2021), pp. 245–317. DOI: 10.1613/jair.1.12228. URL: https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.12228.

[31] Brian Callaci et al. "The Effect of No-poaching Restrictions on Worker Earnings in Franchised Industries". In: *Available at SSRN* (2022).

[32] David Card et al. *Expanding Access to Administrative Data for Research in the United States*. en. SSRN Scholarly Paper 1888586. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, 2010. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.1888586. URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1888586 (visited on 05/25/2022).

[33] Davide Castelvecchi. "Can we open the black box of AI?" In: *Nature* 538.7623 (Oct. 2016), pp. 20–23. DOI: 10.1038/538020a. URL: https://doi.org/10.1038/538020a.

[34] Aaron K. Chatterji et al. "Do ratings of firms converge? Implications for managers, investors and strategy researchers". In: *Strategic Management Journal* 37.8 (2016). ISBN: 0143-2095 Publisher: Wiley Online Library, pp. 1597–1614.

[35] M. Chau et al. *Finding People with Emotional Distress in Online Social Media: A Design Combining Machine Learning and Rule-Based Classification.* Publication Title: MIS Quarterly. pweb.fbe.hku.hk, 2020. URL: https://pweb.fbe.hku.hk/~mchau/papers/MISQ2020.pd

[36] Jaeho Choi, Anoop Menon, and Haris Tabakovic. "Using machine learning to revisit the diversification–performance relationship". In: *Strategic Management Journal* 42.9 (2021). Number: 9 _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/smj.3317, pp. 1632–1661. ISSN: 1097-0266. DOI: 10.1002/smj.3317. URL: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/do (visited on 08/19/2021).

[37] Prithwiraj Choudhury, Ryan T. Allen, and Michael G. Endres. "Machine learning for pattern discovery in management research". In: *Strategic Management Journal* 42.1 (2021). Number: 1 _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/smj.3215, pp. 30–57. ISSN: 1097-0266. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3215. URL: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.co (visited on 12/12/2020).

[38] Lisa E. Cohen and Sara Mahabadi. "In the midst of hiring: Pathways of anticipated and accidental job evolution during hiring". In: *Organization Science* 33.5 (Sept. 2022). Number: 5 Publisher: INFORMS, pp. 1938–1963. ISSN: 1047-7039. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.2021.1516. URL: https://pubsonline-informs-org.proxy.cc.uic.edu/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc. (visited on 10/13/2022).

[39] Open Science Collaboration. "Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science". en. In: *Science* 349.6251 (Aug. 2015). 00091, aac4716. ISSN: 0036-8075, 1095-9203. DOI: 10.1126/science.a URL: http://science.sciencemag.org/content/349/6251/aac4716 (visited on 02/11/2016).

[40] Lorrie F Cranor. "A framework for reasoning about the human in the loop". In: (2008).

[41] Andrew D. Cutler et al. "Inferring Grandiose Narcissism From Text: LIWC Versus Machine Learning". en. In: *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 40.2 (Mar. 2021). Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 260–276. ISSN: 0261-927X. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X20936309. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X20936309 (visited on 10/29/2022).

[42] Alexander D'Amour et al. "Underspecification Presents Challenges for Credibility in Modern Machine Learning". In: *arXiv:2011.03395 [cs, stat]* (Nov. 2020). arXiv: 2011.03395. URL: http://arxiv.org/abs/2011.03395 (visited on 05/09/2022).

[43] Kerstin Dautenhahn. "The art of designing socially intelligent agents: Science, fiction, and the human in the loop". In: *Applied artificial intelligence* 12.7-8 (1998), pp. 573–617. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/088395198117550.

[44] Gerald F. Davis. "Editorial essay: What is organizational research for?" In: *Administrative Science Quarterly* 60.2 (2015). ISBN: 0001-8392 Publisher: Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, pp. 179–188.

[45] Paul DiMaggio. "Adapting computational text analysis to social science (and vice versa)". en. In: *Big Data & Society* 2.2 (Dec. 2015). Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd, p. 2053951715602908. ISSN: 2053-9517. DOI: 10.1177/2053951715602908. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/20539 (visited on 04/18/2022).

[46] Vincent J. Duriau, Rhonda K. Reger, and Michael D. Pfarrer. "A Content Analysis of the Content Analysis Literature in Organization Studies: Research Themes, Data Sources, and Methodological Refinements". en. In: *Organizational Research Methods* 10.1 (Jan. 2007). Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 5–34. ISSN: 1094-4281. DOI: 10.1177/1094428106289252. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106289252 (visited on 10/30/2022).

[47] empty. *20 Newsgroups Dataset*. Ed. by empty. 2008. URL: http://people.csail.mit.edu/jrenn

[48] I. Faik, M. Barrett, and E. Oborn. *How information technology matters in societal change: An affordance-based institutional logics perspective.* Publication Title: MIS quarterly. xwcbx.cn, 2020. URL: http://www.xwcbx.cn/zb_users/upload/2021/04/20210428161956793631 2

[49] Ronen Feldman. "Techniques and applications for sentiment analysis". In: *Communications of the ACM* 56.4 (Apr. 2013), pp. 82–89. ISSN: 0001-0782. DOI: 10.1145/2436256.2436274. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/2436256.2436274 (visited on 04/25/2022).

[50] Peer C. Fiss. "Building Better Causal Theories: A Fuzzy Set Approach to Typologies in Organization Research". In: *Academy of Management Journal* 54.2 (Apr. 2011). Publisher: Academy of Management, pp. 393–420. ISSN: 0001-4273. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2011.60263120. URL: https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/AMJ.2011.60263120 (visited on 04/11/2022).

[51] Samuel Fosso Wamba et al. "How 'big data' can make big impact: Findings from a systematic review and a longitudinal case study". en. In: *International Journal of Production Economics* 165 (July 2015), pp. 234–246. ISSN: 0925-5273. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.12.031. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0925527314004253 (visited on 04/25/2022).

[52] Marion Fourcade. "The Problem of Embodiment in the Sociology of Knowledge: Afterword to the Special Issue on Knowledge in Practice". en. In: *Qualitative Sociology* 33.4 (Dec. 2010), pp. 569–574. ISSN: 1573-7837. DOI: 10.1007/s11133-010-9173-x. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-010-9173-x (visited on 05/25/2022).

[53] Andreas Geiger, Philip Lenz, and Raquel Urtasun. "Are we ready for autonomous driving? The KITTI vision benchmark suite". In: *2012 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. ISSN: 1063-6919. June 2012, pp. 3354–3361. DOI: 10.1109/CVPR.2012.624807

[54] Andreas Geiger, Philip Lenz, and Raquel Urtasun. "Are we ready for autonomous driving? the kitti vision benchmark suite". In: *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) 2012*. IEEE. 2012, pp. 3354–3361.

[55] BARRY GERHART et al. "MEASUREMENT ERROR IN RESEARCH ON HUMAN RESOURCES and FIRM PERFORMANCE: HOW MUCH ERROR IS THERE AND HOW DOES IT INFLUENCE EFFECT SIZE ESTIMATES?" In: *Personnel Psychology* 53.4 (2000). _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb02418.x, pp. 803–834. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb02418.x. URL: https://onli

[56] H. Geva, G. Oestreicher-Singer, and M. Saar-Tsechansky. *Using retweets when shaping our online persona: Topic modeling approach*. Publication Title: MIS Quarterly. misq.umn.edu, 2019. URL: https://misq.umn.edu/skin/frontend/default/misq/pdf/appendices/20

[57] Tarleton Gillespie. "Content moderation, AI, and the question of scale". en. In: *Big Data & Society* 7.2 (July 2020). Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd, p. 2053951720943234. ISSN: 2053-9517. DOI: 10.1177/2053951720943234. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/205395172094 (visited on 04/25/2022).

[58] Simona Giorgi, Massimo Maoret, and Edward J. Zajac. "On the relationship between firms and their legal environment: The role of cultural consonance". In: *Organization Science* 30.4 (May 14, 2019). Number: 4, pp. 803–830. ISSN: 1047-7039. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.2018.1250. URL: http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.2018.1250 (visited on 07/20/2019).

[59] Barney G. Glaser and Anselm Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Aldine Transaction, June 1967. ISBN: 0-202-30260-1.

[60] Gary Goertz and James Mahoney. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. eng. Princeton University Press, 2012. ISBN: 978-0-691-14970-7. DOI: 10.23943/princeton/9780691149707.001.0001. URL: https://princeton.univer (visited on 04/11/2022).

[61] Joseph K. Goodman, Cynthia E. Cryder, and Amar Cheema. "Data Collection in a Flat World: The Strengths and Weaknesses of Mechanical Turk Samples". en. In: *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 26.3 (July 2013). 00473, pp. 213–224. ISSN: 1099-0771. DOI: 10.1002/bdm.1753. URL: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bdm.1753/ (visited on 06/08/2016).

[62] Robert Gorwa, Reuben Binns, and Christian Katzenbach. "Algorithmic content moderation: Technical and political challenges in the automation of platform governance". en. In: *Big Data & Society* 7.1 (Jan. 2020). Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd, p. 2053951719897945. ISSN: 2053-9517. DOI: 10.1177/2053951719897945. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/205395171 (visited on 04/25/2022).

[63] Nikolitsa Grigoropoulou and Mario L. Small. "The data revolution in social science needs qualitative research". In: *Nature Human Behaviour* (Mar. 2022). ISSN: 2397-3374. DOI: 10.1038/s415 URL: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01333-7.

[64] Gruss, Peter. "Open Access to Science and Culture". In: *Science* 303.5656 (Jan. 2004). Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 311–312. DOI: 10.1126/science.3 URL: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.303.5656.311 (visited on 04/11/2022).

[65] David Gunning et al. "XAI—Explainable artificial intelligence". In: *Science Robotics* 4.37 (2019), eaay7120. DOI: 10.1126/scirobotics.aay7120. eprint: https://www.science.o URL: https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/scirobotics.aay7120.

[66] Wei Guo, Metin Sengul, and Tieying Yu. "The impact of executive verbal communication on the convergence of investors' opinions". In: *Academy of Management Journal* 64.6 (Dec. 1, 2021). Number: 6 Publisher: Academy of Management, pp. 1763–1792. ISSN: 0001-4273. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2019.0711. URL: https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amj.2019.0 (visited on 12/22/2021).

[67] Khodor Hammoud et al. "Personal information privacy: what's next?" In: CEUR Workshop Proceedings. 2019.

[68] Eszter Hargittai. "Is Bigger Always Better? Potential Biases of Big Data Derived from Social Network Sites". en. In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 659.1 (May 2015). Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 63–76. ISSN: 0002-7162. DOI: 10.1177/0002716215570866. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716215570866 (visited on 04/19/2022).

[69] Will Douglas Heaven. *The way we train ai is fundamentally flawed*. Nov. 2020. URL: https://www.tec

[70] Michael A. Hedderich et al. *A Survey on Recent Approaches for Natural Language Processing in Low-Resource Scenarios*. 2020. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2010.12309. URL: https://arxiv.or

[71] Michael A. Hedderich et al. *A Survey on Recent Approaches for Natural Language Processing in Low-Resource Scenarios*. Tech. rep. arXiv:2010.12309. arXiv:2010.12309 [cs] type: article. arXiv, Apr. 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2010.12309. URL: http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.12 (visited on 05/25/2022).

[72] G. C. Kane et al. *Avoiding an oppressive future of machine learning: A design theory for emancipatory assistants*. Publication Title: MIS Quarterly. researchgate.net, 2021. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Amber-Young-7/publication/346955741_

[73] Sarah Kaplan and Keyvan Vakili. "The double-edged sword of recombination in breakthrough innovation". In: *Strategic Management Journal* 36.10 (Oct. 1, 2015). Number: 10, pp. 1435–1457. ISSN: 1097-0266. DOI: 10.1002/smj.2294. URL: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.pr (visited on 09/14/2015).

[74] Sayash Kapoor and Arvind Narayanan. *Leakage and the Reproducibility Crisis in ML-based Science*. 2022. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2207.07048. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.070

[75] Gary King. "Ensuring the Data-Rich Future of the Social Sciences". In: *Science* 331.6018 (Feb. 2011). Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 719–721. DOI: 10.1126/science.1197872. URL: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1197872 (visited on 04/11/2022).

[76] Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. en. Publication Title: Designing Social Inquiry. Princeton University Press, May 1994. ISBN: 978-1-4008-2121-1. DOI: 10.1515/9781400821211. URL: https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9781400821211/html (visited on 04/11/2022).

[77] Alan B. Krueger and Orley Ashenfelter. "Theory and Evidence on Employer Collusion in the Franchise Sector". en. In: *Journal of Human Resources* (Oct. 2022). Publisher: University of Wisconsin Press, p. 1019. ISSN: 0022-166X, 1548-8004. DOI: 10.3368/jhr.monopsony.1019-1048. URL: http://jhr.uwpress.org/content/early/2021/10/07/jhr.monopsony.1019-10 (visited on 02/21/2022).

[78] M. Lacity and L. Willcocks. "Becoming strategic with intelligent automation". In: *MIS Quarterly Executive* (2021). Publisher: aisel.aisnet.org. URL: https://aisel.aisnet.org/misqe/mis

[79] Kai R. Larsen and Chih How Bong. "A tool for addressing construct identity in literature reviews and meta-analyses". In: *Mis Quarterly* 40.3 (2016). ISBN: 0276-7783 Publisher: JSTOR, pp. 529–552.

[80] David Lazer and Jason Radford. "Data ex Machina: Introduction to Big Data". In: *Annual Review of Sociology* 43.1 (2017). _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053457, pp. 19–39. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053457. URL: https://doi.org/10 (visited on 04/19/2022).

[81] David Lazer et al. "Computational Social Science". In: *Science* 323.5915 (Feb. 2009). Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 721–723. DOI: 10.1126/science.1 URL: https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1167742 (visited on 04/11/2022).

[82] David Lazer et al. "Computational social science: Obstacles and opportunities". In: *Science* 369.6507 (Aug. 2020). Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 1060–1062. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaz8170. URL: https://www.science.org/doi/ful (visited on 04/11/2022).

[83] John Lees-Miller, John Hammersley, and R Wilson. "Theoretical maximum capacity as benchmark for empty vehicle redistribution in personal rapid transit". In: *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* 2146 (2010), pp. 76–83.

[84] H. Li, C. Zhang, and W. J. Kettinger. "DIGITAL PLATFORM ECOSYSTEM DYNAMICS: THE ROLES OF PRODUCT SCOPE, INNOVATION, AND COLLABORATIVE NETWORK CENTRALITY." In: *MIS Quarterly* (2022). Publisher: search.ebscohost.com. URL: https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=s

[85] J. Li, K. Larsen, and A. Abbasi. *TheoryOn: A design framework and system for unlocking behavioral knowledge through ontology learning*. Publication Title: MIS Quarterly. par.nsf.gov, 2020. URL: https://par.nsf.gov/servlets/purl/10282376.

[86] A. Xia Liu, Y. Li, and S. X. Xu. "Assessing the Unacquainted: Inferred Reviewer Personality and Review Helpfulness." In: *MIS Quarterly* (2021). Publisher: search.ebscohost.com. URL: https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=s

[87] Andrew L. Maas et al. "Learning Word Vectors for Sentiment Analysis". In: *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Portland, Oregon, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics, June 2011, pp. 142–150. URL: http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P11-1015.

[88] S. B. MacKenzie, P. M. Podsakoff, and N. P. Podsakoff. "Construct measurement and validation procedures in MIS and behavioral research: Integrating new and existing techniques". In: *MIS quarterly* (2011). Publisher: JSTOR. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/23044045.

[89] Alan Manning. *Monopsony in Motion: Imperfect Competition in Labor Markets*. en. Princeton University Press, Mar. 2003. ISBN: 978-0-691-11312-8.

[90] Aaron F. McKenny, Jeremy C. Short, and G. Tyge Payne. "Using Computer-Aided Text Analysis to Elevate Constructs: An Illustration Using Psychological Capital". en. In: *Organizational Research Methods* 16.1 (Jan. 2013). Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 152–184. ISSN: 1094-4281. DOI: 10.1177/1094428112459910. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/10944 (visited on 10/29/2022).

[91] John B. Miner. *Organizational Behavior 2: Essential theories of process and structure*. en. Google-Books-ID: qqZ_FDFoDcMC. M.E. Sharpe, 2006. ISBN: 978-0-7656-1525-1.

[92] S. M. Miranda, D. D. Wang, and C. A. Tian. *DISCURSIVE FIELDS AND THE DIVERSITY-COHERENCE PARADOX: AN ECOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE BLOCKCHAIN COMMUNITY DISCOURSE*. Publication Title: MIS Quarterly. researchgate.net, 2022. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dawei-Wang-3/publication/363261727_D

[93] Kevin Munger. "The Limited Value of Non-Replicable Field Experiments in Contexts With Low Temporal Validity". In: *Social Media + Society* 5.3 (Apr. 2019). Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd, p. 2056305119859294. ISSN: 2056-3051. DOI: 10.1177/2056305119859294. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119859294 (visited on 04/11/2022).

[94] Kevin Munger, Andrew M. Guess, and Eszter Hargittai. "Quantitative Description of Digital Media: A Modest Proposal to Disrupt Academic Publishing". en. In: *Journal of Quantitative Description: Digital Media* 1 (Apr. 2021). ISSN: 2673-8813. DOI: 10.51685/jqd.2021.000. URL: https://journalqd.org/article/view/2713 (visited on 04/25/2022).

[95] Laura K. Nelson. "Computational Grounded Theory: A Methodological Framework". en. In: *Sociological Methods & Research* 49.1 (Feb. 2020). Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 3–42. ISSN: 0049-1241. DOI: 10.1177/0049124117729703. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/004 (visited on 04/18/2022).

[96] Laura K. Nelson. "Leveraging the alignment between machine learning and intersectionality: Using word embeddings to measure intersectional experiences of the nineteenth century U.S. South". en. In: *Poetics*. Measure Mohr Culture 88 (Oct. 2021), p. 101539. ISSN: 0304-422X. DOI: 10.1016/j.poetic.2021.101539. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science (visited on 04/18/2022).

[97] Laura K. Nelson. "To Measure Meaning in Big Data, Don't Give Me a Map, Give Me Transparency and Reproducibility". en. In: *Sociological Methodology* 49.1 (Aug. 2019). Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 139–143. ISSN: 0081-1750. DOI: 10.1177/0081175019863783. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/0081175019863783 (visited on 04/18/2022).

[98] Nosek B. A. et al. "Promoting an open research culture". In: *Science* 348.6242 (June 2015). Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 1422–1425. DOI: 10.1126/scien URL: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab2374 (visited on 04/11/2022).

[99] Sheela Pandey and Sanjay K. Pandey. "Applying Natural Language Processing Capabilities in Computerized Textual Analysis to Measure Organizational Culture". en. In: *Organizational Research Methods* 22.3 (July 2019). Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 765–797. ISSN: 1094-4281. DOI: 10.1177/1094428117745648. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/10944 (visited on 10/29/2022).

[100] Juergen Pfeffer et al. "This Sample seems to be good enough! Assessing Coverage and Temporal Reliability of Twitter's Academic API". In: *arXiv:2204.02290 [cs]* (Apr. 2022). arXiv: 2204.02290. URL: http://arxiv.org/abs/2204.02290 (visited on 04/11/2022).

[101] Jake Porway. "Funding Data and AI That Serve the Social Sector". en. In: (2022). Publisher: Stanford Social Innovation Review. DOI: 10.48558/YKY9-RX35. URL: https://ssir.org/artic

[102] Eric A. Posner. *How Antitrust Failed Workers*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, Sept. 2021. ISBN: 978-0-19-750762-9.

[103] Charles C. Ragin. *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*. en. University of Chicago Press, Aug. 2000. ISBN: 978-0-226-70277-3.

[104] Joan Robinson. *The Economics of Imperfect Competition*. London, UK: Macmillan and Co. ltd., 1933.

[105] Cynthia Rudin. "Stop Explaining Black Box Machine Learning Models for High Stakes Decisions and Use Interpretable Models Instead". In: (2018). DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1811.10154. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.10154.

[106] Matthew J. Salganik et al. "Measuring the predictability of life outcomes with a scientific mass collaboration". In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117.15 (Apr. 2020). Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, pp. 8398–8403. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1915006117. URL: https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.19 (visited on 04/18/2022).

[107] Gunar Schirner et al. "The future of human-in-the-loop cyber-physical systems". In: *Computer* 46.1 (2013), pp. 36–45.

[108] Jeremy C. Short, Aaron F. McKenny, and Shane W. Reid. "More than words? Computer-aided text analysis in organizational behavior and psychology research". In: *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 5 (2018). ISBN: 2327-0608 Publisher: Annual Reviews, pp. 415–435.

[109] Jeremy C. Short and Timothy B. Palmer. "The Application of DICTION to Content Analysis Research in Strategic Management". en. In: *Organizational Research Methods* 11.4 (Oct. 2008). Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 727–752. ISSN: 1094-4281. DOI: 10.1177/10944281073 URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428107304534 (visited on 10/29/2022).

[110] Jeremy C. Short et al. "Construct validation using computer-aided text analysis (CATA) an illustration using entrepreneurial orientation". In: *Organizational Research Methods* 13.2 (2010). ISBN: 1094-4281 Publisher: Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, pp. 320–347.

[111] Yash Raj Shrestha et al. "Algorithm supported induction for building theory: How can we use prediction models to theorize?" In: *Organization Science* 32.3 (May 1, 2021). Number: 3 Publisher: INFORMS, pp. 856–880. ISSN: 1047-7039. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.2020.1382. URL: https://pubsonline-informs-org.proxy.cc.uic.edu/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.2020 (visited on 07/09/2021).

[112] Wesley D. Sine, Arkangel M. Cordero, and Ryan S. Coles. "Entrepreneurship through a unified sociological neoinstitutional lens". In: *Organization Science* 33.4 (July 2022). Number: 4 Publisher: INFORMS, pp. 1675–1699. ISSN: 1047-7039. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.2022.1586. URL: https://pubsonline-informs-org.proxy.cc.uic.edu/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc. (visited on 08/15/2022).

[113] Juan Luis Suárez et al. "Entrepreneurship Bias and the Mass Media: Evidence from Big Data". In: *Academy of Management Discoveries* 7.2 (June 2021). Publisher: Academy of Management, pp. 247–265. DOI: 10.5465/amd.2018.0177. URL: https://journals.aom.org/doi (visited on 10/29/2022).

[114] M. Subramani et al. “Capability Development through Just-in-Time Access to Knowledge in Document Repositories: A Longitudinal Examination of Technical Problem Solving.” In: *MIS Quarterly* (2021). Publisher: search.ebscohost.com. URL: https://search.ebscohost.com/logi

[115] H. Tanriverdi and K. Du. “Corporate Strategy Changes and Information Technology Control Effectiveness in Multibusiness Firms.” In: *MIS Quarterly* (2020). Publisher: search.ebscohost.com. URL: https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&sco

[116] I. Tavory and S. Timmermans. “Two cases of ethnography: Grounded theory and the extended case method”. In: *Ethnography* 10.3 (2009), p. 243.

[117] Hovig Tchalian. “Microfoundations and recursive analysis: A mixed-methods framework for language-based research, computational methods, and theory development”. In: *Microfoundations of institutions*. Emerald Publishing Limited, 2019. ISBN: 1-78769-128-4.

[118] David A. Teich. *Deep learning AI needs tools to adapt to changes in the data environment*. July 2020. URL: https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidteich/2020/07/16/deep-learni

[119] Peter A. Todd, James D. McKeen, and R. Brent Gallupe. “The evolution of IS job skills: A content analysis of IS job advertisements from 1970 to 1990”. In: *MIS quarterly* (1995). ISBN: 0276-7783 Publisher: JSTOR, pp. 1–27.

[120] Siliang Tong et al. “The Janus face of artificial intelligence feedback: Deployment versus disclosure effects on employee performance”. In: *Strategic Management Journal* 42.9 (2021). Number: 9 _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/smj.3322, pp. 1600–1631. ISSN: 1097-0266. DOI: 10.1002/smj.3322. URL: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/do (visited on 08/19/2021).

[121] Chris Urmson et al. “Autonomous driving in urban environments: Boss and the urban challenge”. In: *Journal of Field Robotics* 25.8 (2008), pp. 425–466.

[122] Kiri Wagstaff. “Machine Learning that Matters”. In: (2012). DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1206.4656. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/1206.4656.

[123] Nada Wasi and Aaron Flaaen. “Record linkage using Stata: Preprocessing, linking, and reviewing utilities”. In: *The Stata Journal* 15.3 (2015). ISBN: 1536-867X Publisher: SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, pp. 672–697.

[124] Duncan J. Watts. “Computational Social Science: Exciting Progress and Future Directions”. In: *The Bridge on Frontiers of Engineering* 43.4 (Dec. 2013). URL: https://nae.edu/106118/Comp (visited on 04/19/2022).

[125] Klaus Weber. “A toolkit for analyzing corporate cultural toolkits”. en. In: *Poetics*. Culture and classification in markets 33.3 (June 2005), pp. 227–252. ISSN: 0304-422X. DOI: 10.1016/j.poetic.2005.09.011. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/ar (visited on 10/30/2022).

[126] R. Weber. “CONSTRUCTS AND INDICATORS: AN ONTOLOGICAL ANALYSIS.” In: *MIS Quarterly* (2021). Publisher: search.ebscohost.com. URL: https://search.ebscohost.com/l

[127] Xingjiao Wu et al. “A survey of human-in-the-loop for machine learning”. In: *Future Generation Computer Systems* (2022).

[128] Doris Xin et al. “Accelerating human-in-the-loop machine learning: Challenges and opportunities”. In: *Proceedings of the second workshop on data management for end-to-end machine learning*. 2018, pp. 1–4.

[129] W. T. Yue, Q. H. Wang, and K. L. Hui. "See no evil, hear no evil? Dissecting the impact of online hacker forums". In: *Mis Quarterly* (2019). Publisher: ink.library.smu.edu.sg. URL: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sis_research/4377/.

[130] Fabio Massimo Zanzotto. "Human-in-the-loop artificial intelligence". In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 64 (2019), pp. 243–252.

[131] Zhewei Zhang et al. "Addressing the Key Challenges of Developing Machine Learning AI Systems for Knowledge-Intensive Work". In: *MIS Quarterly Executive* 19.4 (Dec. 2020). Publisher: Association for Information Systems, pp. 221–238. ISSN: 15401960. DOI: 10.17705/2msqe.000 URL: https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,sso&d (visited on 11/03/2022).

A Appendix A: Using CRAML for a Literature Review

Bibliographic research often begins with search for relevant papers using an academic search engine, but such search has a difficult time retrieving only the papers that use a specific empirical method or type of data, for example. To find papers that illustrate the challenges CRAML was created to address, we analyzed a corpus of all published papers from 5 top management journals from 2015-2021 (Academy of Management Journal, Administrative Science Quarterly, Journal of International Business Studies, Organization Science, and Strategic Management Journal). We first assembled the corpus and PDFs in Zotero, and then exported the metadata. We converted all PDFs from these journals to text, minimally cleaned the text (lower case, removing punctuation, replaced abbreviations), and used CRAML software to find relevant papers using keywords, tags, and rules.

We deductively generated list of tags and keywords. The keywords.json file contians the tags and keywords used to extract all keyword-containing chunks of text. The context window was set to 6 words, yielding chunks of text of a maximum length of 13 words. After retrieving 13 word chunks, we examined n-grams in CRAML and developed rules files for each tag in order to classify the chunks that were relevant to our search. The following headings present the rules files used to classify which papers in the management literature contain relevant concepts - keywords alone generated numerous false positives. We note that this effort could be much further refined. Given the small size of the corpus and the variety of tags, machine learning was not desirable or attempted. CRAML was highly useful to iteratively narrowing a search for relevant literature, and we stopped when the results produced the relevant papers. As seen in the notes on the rule sets, keyword based approaches alone are insufficient to narrowing accurately, and researchers can benefit from a process of refinement that is context-aware and rule-based.

A.1 "Is Text" rules: Papers drawing from Text Corpora

These rules that define the tag *istext* or "is text" identify papers that refer to a text corpus or text data. In the first priority of rule-based classification, chunks containing the keywords "text", "repository", "corpus", and "document" are initially coded 0 (not *istext*). The subsequent rule at priority level 1 classifies all chunks containing the exact matching text (e.g. "text analyis") 1 (is *istext*). Given the *istext* rules, the resulting metadata will report the papers that discuss text data and corpora equal to 1 for *istext*. The most relevant papers were found when combining the *istext* tag with additional tags described below.

Rule	Prio	istext
text	0	0
repository	0	0
corpus	0	0
document	0	0
text analysis	1	1
text corpus	1	1
textual corpus	1	1
text mine	1	1
text mining	1	1
prepared text	1	1
text based analys	1	1
text data	1	1

Figure 7: *istext* Rules

A.2 ML rules

To find papers that discuss supervised learning, we construct the simple *ML* tag. To make Figure 1, we focus only on observations where *istext* and *ML* are both equal to 1.

Rule	Prio	ML
learning	0	0
supervised learning	1	1
machine learning	1	1
deep learning	1	1

Figure 8: *ML* Rules

A.3 NLP Rules

We follow the same structure for the *NLP* tag for finding papers that use NLP. For NLP, we also use regular expressions to find any chunk containing mention of the term "embedding" and one or more of "word", "text", or "language."

Rule	Prio	NLP
nlp	0	1
natural language process	0	1
$REGEX :::(?=.*\bembedding\b)((?=.*\bword\b)\|(?=.*\btext\b)\|(?=.*\blanguage\b)).*$	1	1

Figure 9: *NLP* Rules

A.4 Proprietary rules

The keywords for proprietary data and models and the *proprietary* tag extracted a large number of irrelevant chunks. To limit the focus to non-transparency in data and models, we use regular expressions to combine our base priority keywords with the added terms "data" or "model" to capture the papers that use or refer to proprietary data or models.

Rule	Prio	proprietary
confidential	0	0
license	0	0
sensitive	0	0
proprietary	0	0
secret	0	0
$REGEX$ :::$(?=.*\backslash bdata\backslash b)((?=.*\backslash bconfidential\backslash b)\|(?=.*\backslash blicense)\|(?=.*\backslash bsensitive)\|(?=.*\backslash bproprietary\backslash b)\|(?=.*\backslash bsecret)).*$	1	1
$REGEX$ :::$(?=.*\backslash bmodel\backslash b)((?=.*\backslash bconfidential\backslash b)\|(?=.*\backslash blicense)\|(?=.*\backslash bsensitive)\|(?=.*\backslash bproprietary\backslash b)\|(?=.*\backslash bsecret)).*$	1	1

Figure 10: *Proprietary* Rules

A.5 Topic Modeling Rules

For the topic modeling tag *topic_model*, we look for papers with chunks of text that refer to unsupervised learning, Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA), and topic models.

Rule	Prio	topic_model
unsupervised	0	0
unsupervised learning	1	1
lda	1	1
topic model	1	1
latent dirichlet allocation	1	1

Figure 11: *Topic Model* Rules

A.6 AI Rules

For the tag *AI*, we look for papers with chunks of text that refer to artificial intelligence.

Rule	Prio	AI
artificial	0	0
ai	1	1
artificially intelligen	1	1
artificial intelligen	1	1
neural network	1	1

Figure 12: *AI* Rules

A.7 The Results

CRAML's extrapolate function yields a CSV file. Each row is a paper, and each column contains the metadata attributes of the paper (authors year, etc.) and each tag constructed in CRAML. For each paper, CRAML provides a 0/1 indicator of whether or not the paper contains a chunk corresponding to the rules files above. Here, we present a table that aggregates the result of the CRAML analysis by year and theme:

Because we are interested in particular in papers that use text corpora, to make the graph in Figure 1 and conduct our literature review, we filtered the metadata for only the papers that equal 1 for *istext*. CRAML allowed us to find "needles" in a "haystack" of publications, narrowing our search of the literature, allowing us to more closely examine the plausibly relevant papers, and read and incorporate relevant papers into our literature review. The data for Figure 1 that highlights the discussion of various text analysis techniques within these papers is presented below:

Year	Proprietary Data or Models	Topic Models or LDA	ML	NLP	AI	CATA	Text or Document Corpus
2015	19	2	0	1	0	53	7
2016	11	0	1	0	0	68	10
2017	18	0	0	0	2	69	9
2018	20	2	0	2	2	73	17
2019	13	3	2	1	3	82	18
2020	17	2	2	1	1	67	18
2021	19	6	7	3	2	80	31

Table 1: Total Papers by Year that Reflect Rule Sets

Year	Proprietary Data or Models	Topic Models or LDA	ML	NLP	AI	CATA	Text or Document Corpus
2015	1	2	0	1	0	6	7
2016	2	0	1	0	0	8	10
2017	0	0	0	0	0	6	9
2018	1	1	0	1	1	11	17
2019	3	2	1	1	1	10	18
2020	2	1	2	0	1	13	18
2021	4	5	6	3	1	19	31

Table 2: Subset of Papers Where *istext*=1 by Year

B Appendix B: Using CRAML to Build Classifiers from Job Advertisement Text

One advantage of CRAML is that a classifier can be trained and validated using proprietary information but can be made available to other academic researchers for transparency, validation, and replication while preserving underlying proprietary information. To illustrate, we describe and publish nine classifiers from job advertisement text and outline our process for building and validating these. We describe a process for building open source research datasets drawn from proprietary text data with transparent rules and discuss a growing research ecosystem to develop useful classifiers drawn from the text of job advertisements.

B.1 Building and Publishing New Classifiers from Job Ad Text

Below, we describe the construction and performance of classifiers already constructed using job advertisement text data. The following variables are constructed from a random forest ML algorithm that classifies each job advertisement 0/1 on a particular variable. These variables are otherwise coded 0, but are equal to 1 if the job advertisement indicates:

- Work From Home. A job with the opportunity to work-from-home, including both full-time and hybrid work-from-home jobs.
- Independent Contractor. A 1099 independent contractor job.
- Professional License Required. A job requiring a professional license or formal apprenticeship.
- Union Presence. A job within a collective bargaining unit or a job that involves negotiating and working with unions (labor relations jobs, e.g.).
- Citizenship Required. A job where the holder must be a U.S. citizen.
- Work Authorization Required. A job where the job holder must be legally authorized to work in the U.S.
- Visa Inclusivity. A job for which a firm is willing to sponsor a visa-holder for the position.
- Visa Exclusivity. A job for which a firm is not willing to sponsor a visa-holder for the position.
- EOE/AA Statement. A job ad that contains EOE/AA statement is present.

In building each classifier, close attention was paid to building reliable and valid measures. To construct each variable listed above, the 6 words before and after every appearance of a "keyword" (in column 2) of Table 3 were extracted from the text corpus of job advertisements.

Research assistants and one lead researcher hand-coded a sample of the most frequently occurring 13-word "text chunks" 0 or 1 for each variable we wanted in the finished dataset. Based upon the hand-coded sample, context rules were initially drafted. Table 4 illustrates the hand-coding and manual validation process. For the work from home variable, independent hand-coding generated 1,524 increasingly lengthy context rules. Following extrapolation to a training dataset drawn from a random sample, RAs performed an additional round of independent hand-coding to arrive at a total of 2,901 hand-coded chunks for the work from home variable that are matched to the training dataset. Comparing known "true positives" via hand-coding and known "true negatives"

1. Variable	2. Keyword(s)
Work From Home	“home", “remote", “telecommut", “telework", “virtual", “videoconferenc", “internet", “anywhere"
Independent Contractor	“contract”
Professional License Required	“licens", “credential", “certifi", “apprentice"
Union Presence	“collective", “bargain", “contract", “union"
Government Contractor	“affirmative", “opportunity", “eoe", “contract"
Citizenship Required	“citizen”
Work Authorization Required	“authoriz”
Visa Inclusive	“visa”, “1b”
Visa Exclusive	“visa”, “1b”

Table 3: Keywords for Initial Classifiers Built

1. Variable	2. Hand-coded Chunks	3. ML Sample N Matched with Hand-Coding
Work From Home	2,901	15,297
Independent Contractor	1,287	8,771
Professional License Required	11,107	15,665
Union Presence	5,357	14,254
Government Contractor	1,427	19,564
Citizenship Required	418	242
Work Authorization Required	890	1,888
Visa Inclusive	6,796	3,660
Visa Exclusive	6,764	1,613

Table 4: Hand-coding and Matched ML Sample for Initial Classifiers Built

from hand-coding to the training dataset, we are confident that the training dataset classifies at least 15,297 work from home chunks correctly. Because the process begins by feeding the training dataset all chunks containing the keywords, most chunks in the training dataset are equal to 0, and include many chunks containing irrelevant uses of the word “home”: “homework tutor”, “home healthcare”, and “homeland security”, e.g., all contain the keyword “home” after processing. This “negative sampling” of chunks is crucial for training ML models to distinguish between a 0 and 1. Because the focus is accuracy, or correctly identifying work from home jobs with a 1, it is possible that recall suffers, as this process misses isolated instances of work from home jobs with highly unusual text patterns.

Once a strategic sample of the training dataset provides a perfect match with the hand-coded data, we use the training dataset to train a ML model that predicts, e.g., if a given job is work-from-home. We tested logistic regression, naïve Bayes, and random forest models, and found that random forests perform best. Table 5 presents the size of a strategically selected sample of ML results used to assess accuracy. This sample size varies for each variable, as each variable occurs

1. Variable	2. % of ML Sample Confirmed True Positives	3. F1 Score
Work From Home	92.1%	0.976
Independent Contractor	98.4%	0.994
Professional License Required	74.5%	0.890
Union Presence	67.4%	0.874
Government Contractor	39.6%	0.996
Citizenship Required	69.4%	0.976
Work Authorization Required	97%	0.994
Visa Inclusive	80.6%	0.890
Visa Exclusive	76.0%	0.874

Table 5: Percent of True Positives Confirmed by Hand-Matching and F-1 Scores

with different frequency in the raw data, and while initially drawn from a random sample of chunks containing the keywords, it is not random, but oversamples the most frequently occurring "positive" chunks.

Sample size needed to validate varies by the complexity of the rules needed to capture variation in the chunks that contain the keywords. For some variables, a large sample is necessary because of subtle variations in the text: there are many ways to indicate a "work from home" job, and as such, there are many keywords and many different types of chunks that contain the keyword. In complex cases, a domain expert must elaborate many rules to capture the variation in the text. For other variables, such as "citizenship required," among chunks containing the keyword "citizen," there is little variation in the text and only 63 context rules are required to handle the classification scheme envisioned. A smaller sample is acceptable in such cases because the frequency of key chunks in the sample of chunks are relatively large: correctly classifying the chunk "citizenship is required" 1 and almost everything else in the sample 0 captures most of the nuance. A very high proportion of the percentages in Column 2 of Table 5 not known to be true positives are true negatives.

The percent of known true positives in column 2 of Table 5 is based upon exact matches between hand-coded chunks and the results of a sample of ML tagged chunks. Finally, to assess the accuracy of the ML algorithm, column 3 reports the F-1 score.

While "work from home" is an omnibus measure of whether a job-holder can work from home, we earlier abandoned work on potential refinements such as hybrid work field jobs that permit work from home. Each step in this process has the potential for mistakes to slip into the classification process. While the ultimate validity rests on the opinion of other experts, the hand-coded files, the software, and large samples of text chunks can be published to encourage others' efforts. The data and software transparency will allow others to make their own models following their own process and could lead to better classifications.

In the process described above, we paid additional attention to *qualifiers*: words that have the ability to change the meaning of a text chunk in a significant manner. *Keep* words are just that – words that should be kept, even though they exist in a region to be trimmed away.

B.1.1 Building Open Source Datasets

The framework adopted and the CRAML software tool facilitates a pipeline for storing all (merged) classification output to a database of choice. In this particular application with the data mentioned here, a simple relational SQLite database with the following schema was used.

id INTEGER PRIMARY KEY
year INTEGER
month INTEGER
soc REAL
onet REAL
employer TEXT
sector REAL
fips TEXT
title TEXT

Figure 13: Example Database Schema (for Jobs)

Using this schema, a *jobs* database was created where the novel, complete, merged, and classified dataset is stored. An example snippet of this database's contents is shown in Figure 14.

id	vendor	effective-date	nopoach
app-7653	DHH Group Inc.	3/24/2017	1
app-15957	Apogee Learning LLC	9/20/2019	1
app-1853	The Agency Real Estate Franchising LLC	4/3/2015	1
app-7888	Winmark Corporation (Once Upon A Child)	3/28/2017	1
app-18366	Atomium Inc.	6/25/2020	1
app-23189	Vision Source LLC	3/11/2022	0
app-22302	Brinker International Payroll Company L P (Chili's)	11/1/2021	0
468744	Annex Brands Inc.	1/17/2013	0
app-14481	Gokhale Method Institute Inc.	4/11/2019	1
app-14643	Pizza Guys Franchises Inc.	7/22/2019	0

Figure 14: Random Sample from Jobs Database

Note that much of the data from the meta-data was left out for readability and for anonymization. The tag names have also been abbreviated, but they follow the same order as listed in Section B.1. In essence, these tag columns represent the codification of the original text data into a structured dataset. This dataset, in turn, can be used for further research and analysis.

B.2 Growing an Ecosystem for Labor Market Research from Text

The pipeline outlined above regarding the ML models and rule sets we released can be scaled and other researchers can build their own text to data classifiers of job advertisements. NLx Research Hub data is proprietary and licensed to academic users for academic use, as well as state workforce agencies for research purposes. Access to the full corpus of job advertisements and the associated metadata requires an application and compliance with a (free) licensing agreement in order to protect sensitive information. However, releasing de-identified extracts of keyword-containing chunks of the text of job ads could be both fair use and encourage a community of

academic researchers and citizens to develop ML classifiers. Such text chunks, and not the full corpus, are all that is needed to build a niche classifier. The process of constructing a ML classifier could be done entirely in CRAML without ever needing access to sensitive information.

Once built, if licensed for non-commercial academic use, scholars who obtain permission to access the underlying full text can use ML classifiers on the full text corpus and produce new open-source research datasets. Certain forms of data aggregation pose little risk: for example, occupation, state, commuting zone, and yearly summary data. With respect to firm-level data, aggregation is possible when exercising judgement to ensure no recent sensitive matters are publicly released (e.g. recent recruitment efforts that indicate adoption of a particular business strategy that might affect market valuation or competitors' strategy).

C Appendix C: The CRAML Pipeline

This appendix describes the CRAML methodology in detail with illustrations from the worked example introduced in Section 4.

C.1 Extraction Algorithm

In Algorithm 1, we present the algorithm to extract context windows from a set of text documents, i.e. a corpus. This represents the important first step for handling large-scale unstructured text corpora by first extracting the "candidate diamonds" from the rough, in order to allow for the precise analysis of a domain expert.

Algorithm 1 Extraction Algorithm

Require: **Text**: collection of text documents, **Keywords**: list of defined keywords
Ensure: list of extracted files (location)

```
all_contexts = {}
for raw_text in documents do                    ▷ Note: done in parallel (unordered)
    contexts = []
    id = generate id
    if any keyword in text then
        cleaned = clean(text)                   ▷ text replace and regex cleaning
        for sentence in cleaned do
            if any keyword in sentence then
                c = get_context(sentence)       ▷ get context window
                contexts.append(c)
    contexts = set(contexts)
    all_contexts[id] = contexts
df = pd.DataFrame(all_contexts)
df.to_csv()
return list of saved filenames
```

C.2 Keywords

As displayed in Algorithm 1, a list of defined keywords is required for extraction. The extraction algorithm will extract any chunk of text where one of the keywords appears, and store the chunk and metadata about its location in the corpus inside a CSV file for human analysis. Users must define a list of keywords for each *tag*, which are given further elaboration in Section C.5.

Note that the extraction algorithm pulls all chunks where keywords are exact matched to a string of text. For example, the keyword "employ" will extract all of the variants that contain that exact keyword (employment, employer, employee, unemployment, etc.).

C.3 The Output

The result of running Algorithm 1 is a CSV formatted dataset containing chunks of text, with a minimum of two fields: id and text. Note that additional fields may also be included. The ID matches the identification number from the original data, and text represents a delimited list

of *context windows* around extracted keywords. In this case, a context window with a defined parameter n refers the an extracted chunk of text with a maximum of n words to the right and left of the keyword. If a punctuation mark is reached before n, then the context window will be shorter. Thus, with a n of 12, context windows are a maximum of 25 word chunks. Context windows can be selected as either words or sentences; ie, a user can extract all keyword-containing sentences and the n sentences to the left and right of a keyword. A sample from one extracted CSV file in Table 6 illustrates this, with firm names changed:

id	**firm**	**text**
10D4977B-000	Acme Inc. 1	{you shall not hire or permit ...}
ADSPO15-0807	Acme Inc. 2	{will not hire an applicant...}
CHR21009-CHS	Acme Inc. 3	{a contractor shall not employ ....}
99999-001	Acme Inc. 4	{non solicitation agreements with ...}

Table 6: Illustrative extracted context windows with fictional company names

Note that for display purposes, only outputs relatively short in length were chosen. It is often the case that the extracted "text" is much longer in length, i.e. many contexts are extracted per contract. The output of the extract algorithm is an "intermediate" dataset of (ID, text) tuples, where the text is simply a long, '|' delimited string of all the extracted context windows. Looking at the example shown, one can see that in each extracted chunk of text, a keyword is present, along with its extracted context.

C.4 N-gram Exploration

The first step towards building up rule sets is having all of the plausibly relevant text extracted. The exploration of n-gram structures within the extracted data ensures that the context window is correct, and if so, serves as a first step for construction of rules described in the following section.

This is accomplished with the algorithm presented in Algorithm 2. The result with a given n is the a file with the enumerated occurrences of each relevant n-gram, sorted in descending order.

Algorithm 2 N-gram Exploration

Require: Parent Directory: where the extracted CSVs are located, **n**: desired n-gram size
Ensure: file with enumerated n-grams

```
global_counts = {}
for file in parent directory do
    for row text in file do
        split = text.split('|')
        for chunk in split do
            length = len(chunk.split())
            rules = chunk.split()[max(0, length/2 - n), min(length, length/2 + n)]
            global_counts.update(Counter(rules))
return global_counts.to_csv()
```

C.5 Rule Creation: Building the Bridge

From the previous step, a researcher is now enabled to obtain a general picture of what context windows appear with the unstructured text data, as well as their relative occurrences. Using this, the researcher follows two decision processes: (1) the creation of a tag set, and subsequently (2) the creation of a rule set for each tag. Both sets are defined below.

Tags A tag is a title given to a certain characteristic of a particular document. These tags can be easily and simply defined, and are binary in nature, i.e. 1 if true or 0 if not true. The collection of defined tags make up the *tag set*. Each tag in the tag set is assigned **either** 1 **or** 0 for **every** unique document (i.e. unique ID) in the original data. Specifically for the franchise document example, the following tag is defined:

- *nopoach* – a non-solicitation clause that prohibits one franchise from recruiting workers from the another franchise.

With this framework, one can define an arbitrary amount of tags; furthermore, exactly what these tags mean, ie. what definition they take on, is entirely up to the researcher. Binary classifications can be further broken down by defining additional "sub-tags". As demonstrated below, an examination of the context surrounding non-solicitation suggests further tags for future research. At the data analysis stage, these can be combined to create new measurements of concepts involving multiple tags. Crucially, the meaning that is assumed by each tag is defined via its rule set, which is discussed next.

- *nopoach_nohire* – a no poach clause that includes a no hire clause.
- *noncompete* – an employee non-compete clause.
- *jurisdiction* – language that limits the application of a no poach or non-compete to certain jurisdictions.
- *narrow* – language that limits the application of a no poach or non-compete to certain employees.
- *no_nopoach* – language that limits the use of no poach or non-compete clauses - stating that these clauses are not enforceable against employees.

Rules For each given tag, a researcher will now define a list of rules that encompasses the definition and characteristics of this tag. More concretely, a *rule* is a chunk of any number of words. Therefore, a rule can be a single word, or even an entire sentence (up to the maximum length of the extracted chunks, here 25). A single rule set, defined within a corresponding file, can contain one or more tags. If more than one tag is contained within a rule set, this means that the tags that are bundled together are related enough such that some rules more overlap, or some rules may define one tag, while precluding the other. For each tag contained within a rule set, this tag is defined for each given rule, i.e. is assigned either 1 or 0. Finally, every rule in all rule sets must be assigned a *priority* ("prio"), which indicates its relative order of operation compared to other rules within the same rule set. An example excerpt from a rule file is given in Table 7.

Priority is important in the sense that it defines a hierarchy of how text chunks might be assigned certain tags. From the above example, one starts with every chunk containing "hire" to be *nopoach*=0 at *prio*=0. When, however, one encounters "may not hire" within a piece of text, this then is a plausible indicator that *nopoach*=1. If a text chunk contains "may not hire" – the

rule	prio	nopoach
hire	0	0
shall not hire	1	1
will not hire	1	1
may not hire	1	1
you shall not hire or permit any third party or outside vendors to access or perform any service	2	0
may not hire an applicant who has a felony	2	0
will not hire any person regardless of medical marijuana card	2	0
shall not hire or promote anyone who may have contact with residents	2	0
not hire offer to hire or otherwise solicit any employee	3	1

Table 7: Excerpt from the rule set of the *nopoach* tag in formative stages

subsequent rule "may not hire" assigned priority *prio*=1 proceeds to classify it with *nopoach*=1. Upon examination, that rule turns out to have exceptions. Moving on to a higher priority rule, *prio*=2 can create exceptions to *prio*=1 rules: for example, with *prio*=2, a rule that states "may not hire an applicant who has a felony" overwrites the previous tag allocation, now assigning text chunks containing the string of text in the rule to *nopoach*=0. In this way, priority is important to handling iterative coding work and possibly overlapping or contradicting rules.

The final important aspect of rule creation comes with the use of Regular Expressions, denoted by rules with the "REGEX:::" qualifier prepended to the regular expression itself. Instead of simple text matching for a rule, regex rules will instead check to verify if a particular text chunk satisfies the regular expression or not. Their usage allows for generalization, in situations where contexts are variable in length and content, yet possess the same general meaning.

Once the researcher feels that the rule set is saturated, it is important to "prune" rules and validate them through repeated extrapolation and adjustment. Context windows should be no longer than the longest rule, which should be no longer than necessary to precisely capture the tag. The final rule sets used in the franchise document analysis are available online.

C.6 Extrapolation: Crossing the Bridge

With this collection of rule sets (for all defined tags) in hand, a tool is now needed to translate the rules contained within to a workable dataset. Such a tool is useful because it takes the manually coded *context rules* as input, and it then proceeds to "extrapolate" them into a training dataset from either a selected subset of extracted data files or the full dataset. Thus, we can *cross the bridge* from expert-created rules to structured, annotated datasets.

The Subset As mentioned, the extrapolation algorithm can operate on a selected subset of the entirety of the data, so as to create a representative training set, from which a robust, accurate classifier can be trained. This is accomplished by randomly and uniformly selecting documents from the original text files. In the case where a model will not be learned, i.e. where only the extrapolated dataset is desired, performing this sampling is not necessary.

The Extrapolation Algorithm The algorithm used to create a training data set for each tag is now defined. Note that this algorithm is run *per* tag, meaning that the eventual output is a training set for each tag, which will then be used to train a classifier for each tag. The algorithm pseudocode is outlined in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Extrapolation Algorithm

Require: Parent Directory: where the subset CSV files are located, **Rules File**: a rule set for a given tag or tags, **s**: sampling rate, **do_neg**: whether to perform negative sampling
Ensure: training data set for given tag(s)

```
results = []
for file f in subset do
    data = read_csv(f).sample(s)                          ▷ sample desired fraction of data
    for text in data do                                   ▷ each '|' delimted extracted line
        for rule r in rule set do
            match = []
            plus = 0                                      ▷ for negative sampling only
            for x in text.split('|') do
                if 'REGEX' in r then
                    if regex.search(r, x) then
                        match.append((x,1))
                        plus += 1
                    else if plus > 0 and do_neg == True then
                        if not any ru in x for ru in rule set then
                            match.append((x,0))
                            plus -= len(tags)             ▷ i.e. number of tags in rule set
                else
                    if r in x then
                        match.append((x,1))
                        plus += 1
                    else if plus > 0 and do_neg == True then
                        if not any ru in x for ru in rule set then
                            match.append((x,0))
                            plus -= len(tags)
            random.shuffle(match)
            for m in match do                             ▷ m[0] = text, m[1] = negative sample?
                results.append(text chunk, rule, priority-weighted length, tag encoding)
training = DataFrame(results)
training = training.sort(priority-weighted length).drop_duplicates(chunk)
return training as CSV
```

One important note about the extraction algorithm is the sampling rate. Since many files are included in the subset, running extrapolation on the entirety of this subset would result in quite large training datasets. To avoid this, only a random sampling of each subset file is taken, in order to ensure a manageable training dataset. Secondly, the concept of *negative sampling* is incorporated into the algorithm. Such a concept allows for "negative", non-keyword containing text chunks also to be included in the training data, in the case that a classifier that can discriminate between keyword- and non-keyword-containing instances is desired.

Ultimately, the main purpose of the extrapolation algorithm is to bridge the human-centric rule creation phase with the ensuing model training and classification stage. Concretely, the manually created rule sets that are the product of the former are converted to large, yet workable training data sets that are vital to the functioning of the latter. Thus, this transition from defined rule sets

to classifier training is facilitated by such an extrapolation method.

As described above, a user may need to augment the training data produced from CRAML in order to improve model performance. Poorly performing models may reflect that the underlying tags are not well-defined, and need additional refinement, or simply that there are not enough positive or negative cases in the corpus to build a reliable classification model.

C.7 Baseline Testing Cycle: Boosting Real-World Applicability

After an initial extrapolation, the expert engages in iterative testing to revise the rules to achieve a comprehensive and accurately coded dataset. The expert does this with output from the extrapolation. An excerpt (shortened for readability) of the *nopoach* rules is provided in Table 8.

id	chunk	rule	nopoach
527557	shall not recruit or hire any employee or former employee offranchisor or any	shall not recruit	1
781133	of offenders page of monitoring center staff vendors shall not employ felons in	shall not employ felons	0
272571	in item ahove you may not solicit customers from outside your territory without	may not solicit customers	0
487216	or our designee you will not hire third party or outside vendors to	you will not hire third party or outside vendors	0
792020	franchise lyou may not recruit or hire any employee or former employee of	may not recruit	1
714298	non solicitation of employees employee agrees that during	non solicitation of employees	1

Table 8: Some entries from the novel training data created for *nopoach* during testing

As can be seen, the extrapolated training data files contain the extracted text chunks, which rule "caught" the particular chunk, and finally the appropriate tag value. This file can be reviewed by the user to determine if the rules are working as intended. A sample of chunks that oversamples positive tags (=1) and provides a minimum number of cases per rule can also be sent at this point for blind review by third-party coders to validate and ensure inter-subject reliability.

In the Table 8 example, early rules such as "shall not recruit", "shall not employ", and "shall not hire" were later abandoned due to the multiple exceptions to these rules as seen in the Table. Instead, discrete statements that clearly stated that an employee shall not be recruited or solicited or hired were tagged *nopoach*=1

C.8 Validation: Involving Third-Party Independent Coders

Validation helps to ensure inter-rater reliability, accuracy, and precision. Involving third-parties at the stage at which rule sets are producing seemingly reliable results tests whether the tags are well-enough defined to be agreed to by third parties. The researcher gives an independent coder only a description of the desired tag, the text chunks, and deletes the rules and the CRAML-generated coding. The independent coder completes their review, and the researcher compares the results of the rule-set produced coding with the independent coder's coding. All discrepancies should be reconciled before proceeding further.

Based upon the performance displayed by this last step in the process, or by an externally imposed requirement to repeat the process, the researcher can choose to revisit the tags and rule sets, once again performing an exploration to search for more representative rules. It is important to emphasize the necessity of judgement in this phase, as the decision to repeat this process is a subjective one. Incorporating hand-coding by independent research assistants can help greatly. Moreover, the encoding, i.e. tag values, given to each particular rule must come from knowledgeable, grounded reasoning, especially in cases where certain keywords serve different meanings in possibly very disparate contexts. Therefore, it is in this cycle where the most manual effort is required, but also where the crucial foundation to the rest of the framework is built.

C.9 Model Training and Classification: Datasets in Action

The final stage in the proposed framework is the classification itself, i.e. the mapping of a particular text chunk to its corresponding tag set encoding (0/1 for each tag). In order to accomplish this, classification models must be learned from the rule sets discussed in the previous section. This process is now outlined.

The presence of context rules alone are not sufficient in the sense that they represent high precision classification rules that will always detect exactly what is described by the rules. The next step of using a classifier is to learn a model that not only detects these "simple" cases that can be caught by string matching or regular expressions, but rather one that can also learn in which *general* contexts keywords appear which cause a certain tag to be true. This, therefore, motivates the need for comprehensive training data.

The final step in the testing cycle involves the training of a baseline classifier to test the performance of this classifier on an unseen test set. In this case, a simple Naive Bayes classifier was chosen. First, training instances are converted to TF-IDF vectors (introduced in more detail later), and then a Naive Bayes classifier is trained for each tag. Finally, output metrics are displayed, namely Accuracy, Precision, Recall, and F1. Using these metrics, a researcher can (roughly) evaluate the current performance of the classifier, which indicates the strength ("representativeness") of the underlying training data, i.e. rules.

C.9.1 Flexibility in Machine Learning Methods

An important step towards the building of a general-purpose classification system was model selection. In particular, it becomes the task to identify the Machine Learning method best suited for the multi-label, binary classification task at hand. Crucial to note is this multi-label aspect, as it is certainly possible for a single document to have more than one tag attribute be present. As such, multiple candidates for classification models were chosen, all of which could handle this multi-label binary classification task. So far, only "shallow" Machine Learning models were tested.

The methods included:

- **Naive Bayes** – also used as the baseline classification method. Simple probabilistic classifiers using Bayes' theorem as a backbone. Relatively easy and efficient to train.
- **Logistic Regression** – classification technique utilizing the logistic function (and a classification threshold) to predict the value of a dependent variable.
- **Stochastic Gradient Descent Classification** – a misnomer in the sense that SGD does not actually perform the classification. Rather, SGD is used to optimize a linear model, in this case a Support Vector Machine.
- **Random Forest** – a classifier using an ensemble of Decision Trees.

In a test of the various methods on a sample classification task (for the *nopoach* tag), the classifiers performed as described in Table 9.

In the case of large text corpora, particular in the example of no poach clauses in state contracts, it may be the case that the positive cases, i.e. where a tag is assigned 1, are in the minority. As a result, the accuracy score becomes somewhat less important. More meaningful are the precision and recall scores. Essentially, precision measures the percentage of correctly identified positive cases, i.e. how many of the classified '1's are indeed truly positive cases. Recall measures that percentage of correctly identified positive cases among all positive cases in the true labels. Together, these two metrics can be succinctly summarized in the F1-score, which is the harmonic mean of the two.

	Acc.	Precision	Recall	F1
Naive Bayes	0.93	0.60	0.95	0.74
Logistic Regression	0.99	0.91	0.96	0.94
SGD SVM	0.98	0.91	0.92	0.92
Random Forest	**0.99**	**0.97**	**0.96**	**0.97**

Table 9: Performance of various ML classifiers

As can be observed from Table 9, the Random Forest model shows superior performance with regards to all metrics. The same outcome was observed across the board with various rule sets, or rather their corresponding training data. As a result, the Random Forest was chosen to be the classification method of choice for the purposes of this dataset.

With the respect to the general-purpose nature of this text classification framework, it is important to emphasize that the choice of classification method here will not necessarily be the optimal choice for other applications. In addition to this, the utilization of more advanced and powerful methods could certainly prove to be beneficial, and this remains a topic for future research. In the end, though, the framework allows for essentially any model to be used, as long as it can be properly stored and loaded for use in the process pipeline.

As part of the CRAML framework, the task of choosing a specific model is left to the user. This make sense due to the fact that different data, different domains, and different desired outcomes may require different models to be chosen. In the end, the focus of CRAML on the data *creation* process allows for a flexibility in the choice of model to train on this data. Further details on this process can be found in the CRAML documentation.

C.9.2 Outline of Model Training

In order to adapt the use of classification models such as Random Forests for the classification of novel text datasets such as the one described throughout the previous sections, some considerations must be made. They are described below.

TF-IDF is utilized to convert a database of unstructured text entities into a matrix of numerically-valued vectors. Concretely, for a dataset containing n *documents* and a vocabulary of m words, the resulting TF-IDF matrix is n x m in dimension. Through this vectorization of text, models can be trained and classification can now be performed.

As a point for future work, the utilization of more advanced (and potentially meaningful) text representations could lead to richer training data for the proposed CRAML framework.

Training - Grid Search With the training of ML models comes many tuneable parameters. In order to optimize the resulting classifier for each tag, a tuning stage was added into the framework, which determines the optimal parameters, e.g. for a Random Forest, given a particular dataset. Here it is important to emphasize the significance of this stage in the overall framework. As all potential incoming datasets may be different in nature, different parameter values may be needed to achieve the best performance possible. In order to best support the general-purpose nature of the proposed framework, performing fine-tuning of parameters is crucial.

Training - Purification As a final step to creating the classifiers for each tag, a purification process was run on the trained models, in order to reduce size, and as a result, classification time. This was accomplished via an available library, which eliminates unneeded dependencies and in the

case of Random Forests, prunes the trees according to certain criteria. The effects of this process were quite dramatic, reducing most models to at least half the size. The potential complexity of Random Forests, and thus the need for the purification process, is visualized in Figure 15, which display a pre-purification decision tree.




Figure 15: One of the decisions trees within the *nopoach* Random Forest

C.9.3 Classifier Integration

Once a model for each tag is trained, it is then stored in pickle format, so that it can be later loaded and utilized within the framework. To do this, the user must manually enter the filename of each saved model into a JSON formatted file, which maps each tag to its corresponding classifier.

Note how these tags match up with the mapping of tags to manually defined keywords. The naming convention used for the saved models was to specify the method used, the tag to be classified, the achieved F1-score, and the use of purification or not.

A significant decision that was made along the design process of the framework was whether to utilize the negative sampling scheme that was left as an option in the extrapolation process (Algorithm 3). This decision would most directly affect the function of the classifiers. More concretely, without negative sampling, the classifier for each tag would be to "classify a tag as 0 or 1, provided that the chunk to be classified contains a tag-defined keyword". On the other hand, performing the the negative sampling process introduces random, non-keyword-containing text chunks into the model training process, thereby learning these instances into the given model. Here, the classification task becomes "classify any given piece of text as 0 or 1, regardless of its content". With these two approaches in mind, it was ultimately decided to implement the former, thereby only advancing a text chunk to the classification stage if it indeed contained a keyword. If not, the classification was automatically made to be 0. It is quite important to stress that this design decision was made knowing the makeup of the textual data, as well as the characteristics of the tags to be classified. In the end, in order for a tag to be assigned a 1, a necessary condition is for it to contain a tag-specific keyword. Otherwise, it is not possible to obtain the classification of 1. The classification process, therefore, is in place to "weed out" keyword-containing text chunks that actually do not lead to the desired tag attribute. In other domains, i.e. with other text datasets created via this framework, this line of reasoning may not hold absolutely, and an argument could be made for the use of negative sampling. In this way, it is once again paramount for (a team of) researchers to define their tags thoroughly and explore the makeup of the underlying data.

One final component is the option of a preprocessing step for each classifier. The motivation is that in the text chunks, which are relatively large in length compared to the single keyword within, there might exist much information, i.e. words, that do not play a role in a particular tag at hand. Particularly with tags in which the pertinent information sits close to the keyword, any other irrelevant information will only serve to confuse the learning of a classification model. With this in mind, the proposed preprocessing step will serve to "trim" the left and right ends of a given text chunk, thus reducing the amount of text noise within this chunk. In this process, though, two considerations must be made. Firstly, if certain qualifier words, such as negations, exists within the regions to be trimmed, this could potentially be vital information lost. Secondly, there may be specific known words or phrases that appear that usually appear in the proximity of a keyword, yet might also be trimmed away. For these reasons, two more mappings, following the structure of previous ones where an entry exists for each tag, are defined. *Qualifiers* involves the words that have the ability to change the meaning of a text chunk in a signficant manner. *Keep* words are just that – words that should be kept, even though they exist in a region to be trimmed away.

With these definitions and the preprocessing steps, the pseudocode is outlined in Algorithm 4.

In the testing with this preprocessing stage, the $TRIM$ parameter was chosen to be 2, resulting in chunks of length 5, not including possibly kept words. In the end, this stage was excluded from the framework in the context of the job posting data, for with many tags there was actually an observed decline in classification performance. This sheds light on the importance of relatively faraway context words from the main keyword for many of the tags. Again, this may differ with other datasets, so testing with this preprocessing stage is recommended.

Algorithm 4 Preprocessing Algorithm

Require: **Training CSV**: file that contains the training data to be trimmed, **Tags**: tags to be processed, **Qualifiers**: for each tag, **Keeps**: for each tag, **TRIM**: target context size
Ensure: trimmed training data

```
new_data = []
for text in training data do
    index = get_index(text)                          ▷ get index of keyword within chunk
    for q in Qualifiers do
        found = search_for(q, text)                  ▷ find qualifiers in chunk
        if found then
            text = qual_prepend(found, text)         ▷ prepend all found qualifiers to words in chunk
    lower = max(0, index - TRIM)
    upper = min(len(text), index + TRIM)
    new_text = text.split()[lower:upper]
    keep = []
    for k in Keeps do
        if k in text then keep.append(k)
    new_text = keep + new_text
    new_data.append(new_text)
return new_data
```

C.10 Storing

The final process in the framework is to consolidate the classification results, merging them with the original data to be stored for later retrieval and analysis.

The framework facilitates for the storing of all classification outputs to a database of choice. In this particular application with the data mentioned here, a simple relational SQLite database with the schema in Figure 16 was used.

<u>id</u> TEXT PRIMARY KEY
vendor TEXT
effective-date DATE
type TEXT
text TEXT

Figure 16: Example Database Schema (for *nopoach*)

Using this schema, a *nopoach* database was created where the novel, complete, and classified dataset could be stored. An example excerpt of this database's contents is shown in Figure 17.

Note that some of the meta-data, including the text, was left out for readability. In addition, we mask the firm name here in order to avoid drawing attention to the specific detail as opposed to the results of the process. In essence, the tag column represents the codification of the original text data into a structured dataset. This dataset, in turn, can be used for further research and analysis.

id	vendor	effective-date	nopoach
app-7653	Acme Inc. 1	3/24/17	1
app-15957	Acme Inc. 2	9/20/19	1
app-1853	Acme Inc. 3	4/3/15	1
app-7888	Acme Inc. 4	3/28/17	1
app-18366	Acme Inc. 5	6/25/20	1
app-23189	Acme Inc. 6	3/11/22	0
app-22302	Acme Inc. 7	11/1/21	0
468744	Acme Inc. 8	1/17/13	0
app-14481	Acme Inc. 9	4/11/19	1
app-14643	Acme Inc. 10	7/22/19	0

Figure 17: Random Sample from the *nopoach* Database