

Topic Ontologies for Arguments

Yamen Ajjour

Lebiniz University Hannover

y.ajjour@ai.uni-hannover.de

Johannes Kiesel

Bauhaus-Universität Weimar

johannes.kiesel@uni-weimar.de

Benno Stein

Bauhaus-Universität Weimar

benno.stein@uni-weimar.de

Martin Potthast

Leipzig University

martin.potthast@uni-leipzig.de

Abstract

Many computational argumentation tasks, like stance classification, are topic-dependent: the effectiveness of approaches to these tasks significantly depends on whether the approaches were trained on arguments from the same topics as those they are tested on. So, which are these topics that researchers train approaches on? This paper contributes the first comprehensive survey of topic coverage, assessing 45 argument corpora. For the assessment, we take the first step towards building an argument topic ontology, consulting three diverse authoritative sources: the World Economic Forum, the Wikipedia list of controversial topics, and Debatepedia. Comparing the topic sets between the authoritative sources and corpora, our analysis shows that the corpora topics—which are mostly those frequently discussed in public online fora—are covered well by the sources. However, other topics from the sources are less extensively covered by the corpora of today, revealing interesting future directions for corpus construction.

1 Introduction

The term “topic” refers to a text’s subject matter. A text can be about one or more topics; the relation underlying topics and texts is called “aboutness” (Yablo, 2014). Topics play a central role in argumentation, since they constrain or guide strategies and rhetorical devices by providing the accepted and expected universe of discourse. Also, the view of pragma-dialectics in argumentation emphasizes that argumentation is topic-dependent (van Eemeren, 2015): “The basic aspects of strategic maneuvering [...] are making an expedient

selection from the ‘topical potential’ available at a certain discussion.” Though debaters often use commonplace arguments across topics Bilu et al. (2019), this is only possible for related topics: a black-market argument, for example, applies to topics like banning drugs or banning guns. When developing computational models to extract, analyze, or generate arguments, however, one should thus ensure a wide topic coverage in model training to improve the model’s generalizability (e.g., as recently shown by Reuver et al., 2021).

A set of topics may be organized as a graph, sometimes called “topic space”. Information theorists and library scientists map hierarchical topic relations within ontologies (Hjørland, 2001). Here, topics are labeled with a subject heading, i.e., a phrase from a controlled vocabulary which concisely and discriminatively describes a topic. Library ontologies are not designed with argumentation tasks in mind, but other ontology efforts specifically address *argumentative* topic spaces. We identified and harnessed three authoritative sources of ontologic knowledge that cover global issues, controversies, and popular debates: the World Economic Forum’s “Strategic Intelligence” site, Wikipedia’s list of controversial topics, and Debatepedia’s debate classification system (cf. Section 4).

We contribute a comprehensive overview of argument corpora and their topic coverage as per the mentioned ontologies. The coverage of corpora that provide topic labels is manually assessed by aligning each label to the ontologies’ topics, computing the proportion of ontology topics covered by a corpus, and the distribution of corpus arguments in an ontology. Our analyses show that ex-

isting corpora focus on a subset of possible topics (cf. Section 5). For the corpora without topic labels, we categorize their argumentative texts by measuring the semantic relatedness of corpus documents to ontology topics. Given the 748 topic, this is a challenging classification, for which we achieve a remarkable F_1 of 0.59 (cf. Section 6).¹

Altogether, we lay the foundation for the study and systematic exploration of controversial topics within computational argumentation analysis. The identified authoritative resources already capture quite comprehensively their respective domains. Future work will have to extend our approach to other topic spaces, such as business, domestic, historic, and scientific argumentation spaces.

2 Related Work

Our review of related work focuses on the role of the variable “topic” in computational argumentation. Moreover, we briefly review topic ontologies and hierarchical topic classification.

2.1 Topics in Computational Argumentation

In computational argumentation, arguments are typically modeled as compositions of argument units, where an argument unit is represented as a span of text. Habernal and Gurevych (2016a) adopts Toulmin (1958)’s (1958) model, which defines six unit types, among which are “claim” and “data”. Wachsmuth et al. (2017) employ a more basic model of two units, which defines an argument as a claim or conclusion supported by one or more premises. These models capture arguments without explicitly identifying the topic they address. Levy et al. (2014) consider claims to be topic-dependent and study their detection in the context of a random selection of 32 topics from idebate.org. This work raises the question why topic-dependence has not been addressed more urgently until now.

Key tasks for computational argumentation include the mining of arguments from natural language (Moens et al., 2007; Al-Khatib et al., 2016), classifying their stances with regard to a thesis (Bar-Haim et al., 2017), and analyzing which arguments are more persuasive (Tan et al., 2016; Habernal and Gurevych, 2016a). Current approaches to these tasks rely on supervised classification. Daxenberger et al. (2017) show that supervised classifiers fail to generalize across domains (\sim topics). More recently, Stab et al. (2018) tweak Bi-

LSTM (Graves and Schmidhuber, 2005) to integrate the topic while jointly detecting (1) whether a sentence is an argument and (2) its stance to the topic. The designed neural network outperforms BiLSTM without topic integration in both tasks; the approach gives further evidence for the topic-dependence of argument mining and stance classification. Whether model transfer between more closely related topics works better is unknown. As a first step, Reuver et al. (2021) show that cross-topic stance-classification with BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) produces mixed results depending on the topics, but misses the relations between the topics. Gu et al. (2018) show that integrating the topic of an argument helps assessing its persuasiveness.

Topic plays a central role in argument retrieval and generation since it defines what arguments are relevant. Argument retrieval aims at delivering pro and con arguments on a given topic query. A major challenge in argument retrieval is the grouping of arguments that address common aspects of a topic. As shown by Reimers et al. (2019) and Ajjour et al. (2019a), integrating the topic is an important step while clustering arguments. For argument generation, Bilu et al. (2019) introduce an approach that matches an input topic against a list of topics that are paired with sets of topic-adjustable commonplace arguments (e.g., black-market arguments). In a similar vein, Bar-Haim et al. (2019) identify consistent and contrastive topics for a given topic with the goal of expanding the topic in a new direction (e.g., fast food versus obesity). Both approaches show the merit of utilizing argument topic ontologies in argument generation. Perhaps only abstract argumentation can be conceived of as topic independent, since it studies the structure and relations among arguments more than their language.

2.2 Topic Ontologies

In information science, an ontology is defined as “an explicit specification of a conceptualization” (Gruber, 1993). Topic ontologies are a specific type of ontologies which specify topics as nodes of a directed acyclic graph. An edge in the graph then implies an “is part of”-relation between the topics (Xamena et al., 2017). The effort in creating topic ontologies ranges from ad-hoc decisions (e.g., tags for blog posts) to extensive classification schemes for libraries. The oldest classification scheme that is still used today in libraries is the Dewey Decimal Classification. It has been translated into over

¹ Anonymized data at <https://zenodo.org/record/3928096>.

30 languages, and it contains several tens of thousands of classes. Most topic ontologies focus on a specific domain, such as the ACM Computing Classification System for computer science, or DMOZ for web pages.² The only topic ontology directly linked to arguments is that of Debatepedia.

2.3 Hierarchical Text Classification

Hierarchical text classification aims at classifying a document into a class hierarchy. Depending on how the hierarchical structure is exploited, classification can be done top-down (from higher classes downwards), bottom-up, or flat (ignoring hierarchical relations) (Silla and Freitas, 2011). Researchers usually train supervised classifiers for each class in the hierarchy (Sun and Lim, 2001).

3 Survey of Argument Corpora

To study arguments and computational argumentation tasks, researchers compile corpora with argumentative texts. To the best of our knowledge, Table 1 lists all corpora dedicated to argumentation to 2020. We review these corpora and their associated publications with regard to what are the sources of arguments, what is the granularity of the corpus, what is the size of the corpora in terms of their units, and which and how many different topics are covered in them. Reviewing all papers citing a corpus, we also analyzed how many experiments were carried out using them.

The most elaborate discussion of topic selection is given in Habernal and Gurevych (2016a), who chose six topics (homeschooling, public versus private schools, redshirting, prayers in schools, single sex education, mainstreaming) to focus on different education-related aspects. The broadest selection of topics is reported by the researchers of IBM Debater,³ who obtain arguments from Wikipedia. The only other work mentioning their source of topics stems from Stab et al. (2018), who randomly select 8 topics from two lists of controversial topics that originate from an online library and the debate portal ProCon.org, respectively. Peldszus and Stede (2015) predefine a set of topics and give writers the freedom to choose which one to write about, but nothing is said about where the set of predefined topics originate from. Conard et al. (2012) and Hasan and Ng (2014) explicitly select topics (1 and 4, respectively). For all other corpora with

topic labels, their authors do not argue on choosing topics, nor selection or sampling criteria. Neither do the authors of corpora without topic labels.

Altogether, it appears that the best practices in argumentation do not as of yet consider topic sampling as a prerequisite task to ensure coverage of a certain domain of interest, and diversity. Based on our review, we presume three basic topic selection directives are in use today: (1) *Manual selection*. Topics are manually defined or selected. Although the process may be random, when aiming for controversial topics, one may often end up with commonplace topics in Western culture (e.g., abortion, death penalty, gay marriage), despite them being still relevant and important today. (2) *Source-driven (greedy within a time-span)*. A source of argument ground truth is either exploited in its entirety, or a maximum subset fulfilling desired properties is used. Since argument-related ground truth is hard to come by, it is understandable that all available sources are being exploited. (3) *Source-driven (sampled)*. A source or argument ground truth is exploited and a subset is sampled. Here, it may be infeasible to exploit a source in its entirety. Al-Khatib et al. (2016b) randomly select 300 documents from three websites. Park and Cardie (2018) and Stab and Gurevych (2017) do not mention anything about their sampling process. In general, both source-driven corpus construction approaches inevitably incur the source's idiosyncracies of topic selection, both in terms of skew towards certain topics. Scaling up may or may not be a remedy for this problem.

We assess how many experiments have been reported on each of the corpora by collecting the publications referring to a corpus as per Google Scholar, focusing on conference and journal papers, but excluding books and web pages. We then check whether the cited corpus is mentioned in its data, experiment, or results section. As can be seen in Table 1, corpora with fewer topics tend to be used more often in experiments than those with larger amounts. In total, 82 experiments were carried out on argument corpora with no clearly defined topic selection directive. The skew towards smaller-scale experiments may affect generalizability.

4 Acquiring Argument Topic Ontologies

Topic ontologies provide for a knowledge organization principle, and, especially if widely accepted, also a standard. They are typically modeled as

²<https://dl.acm.org/ccs> and <https://dmoz-odp.org/>

³https://www.research.ibm.com/haifa/dept/vst/debating_data.shtml

Corpus	Authors	Source	Unit granularity	Units	Topics	Exp.
Manual selection						
Arguing Subjectivity	Conard et al. (2012)	Editorials	Editorial/blog	84	1	1
Argumentative Sentences	Eyal et al. (2020)	Wikipedia	Arguments	700	20	1
Argument Facet Similarity	Misra et al. (2016)	Debate portals	Argument	6,188	3	8
Claim and Evidence 1	Aharoni et al. (2014)	Wikipedia	Wikipedia article	315	33	18
Claim and Evidence 2	Rinott et al. (2015)	Wikipedia	Wikipedia article	547	58	12
Claim Generation	Gretz et al. (2020)	Generated text	Argument Unit	2,839	136	1
Claim Stance	Bar-Haim et al. (2017)	Wikipedia	Argument Unit	2,394	55	10
Claim Sentence Search	Levy et al. (2018)	Wikipedia	Argument unit	1,492,077	150	3
COMARG	Boltužić and Šnajder (2014)	Debate portals	Argument pair	2,298	2	3
Evidence Sentences	Schnarch et al. (2018)	Wikipedia	Argument unit	5,783	118	5
Evidence Sentences 2	Ein-Dor et al. (2020)	Wikipedia	Argument unit	29,429	221	3
Evidence Quality	Gleize et al. (2019)	Wikipedia	Argument pair	5,697	69	1
ICLE Essay Scoring	Persing et al. (2010)	Essays	Essay	1,000	10	11
Ideological Debates Reasons	Hasan and Ng (2014)	Debate portals	Argument	4,903	4	10
Internet Argument Corpus v2	Abbott et al. (2016)	Web	Discussion	16,555	19	18
Key Point Analysis	Bar-Haim et al. (2020)	Wikipedia	Argument	24,093	28	2
Micro Text v1	Peldszus and Stede (2015)	Essays	Essay	112	18	7
Micro Text v2	Skeppstedt et al. (2018)	Essays	Essay	171	35	1
Multilingual Argument Mining	Toledo-Ronen et al. (2020)	Wikipedia	Argument unit	65,708	347	2
Political Argumentation	Menini et al. (2018)	Presidential debate	Argument pair	1,462	5	3
Record Debating Dataset 2	Mirkin et al. (2018)	Debating	Speech	200	50	5
Record Debating Dataset 3	Lavee et al. (2019)	Debating	Speech	400	199	1
Record Debating Dataset 4	Orbach et al. (2019)	Debating	Speech	200	50	1
Record Debating Dataset 5	Orbach et al. (2020)	Debating	Speech	3,562	397	1
Sci-arg	Lauscher et al. (2018)	Scientific papers	Paper	40	1	3
UKP Sentential	Stab et al. (2018)	Web	Argument	25,492	8	13
UKP Aspect	Reimers et al. (2019)	Web	Argument pair	3,595	28	3
UKPConvArg1	Habernal and Gurevych (2016c)	Debate portals	Argument pair	11,650	16	10
UKPConvArg2	Habernal and Gurevych (2016b)	Debate portals	Argument pair	9,111	16	3
WebDiscourse	Habernal and Gurevych (2016a)	Web	Document	340	6	7
Webis-debate-16	Al-Khatib et al. (2016a)	Debate portals	Debate	445	14	3
Source-driven: greedy within a time-span						
AIFdb	Bex et al. (2013)	Web	Argument unit	67,408	n/a	7
Args-me	Ajjour et al. (2019b)	Debate portals	Argument	387,692	n/a	3
ChangeMyView	Tan et al. (2016)	Discussion forum	Post/comment	14,066	n/a	21
DebateSum	Roush and Balaji (2020)	Debating	Debate	187,386	n/a	1
Intelligence Squared Debates	Zhang et al. (2016)	Debate portals	Debate	108	n/a	3
Kialo	Kialo (2020)	Debate portals	Argument unit	331,684	n/a	3
Political Speech	Lippi and Torroni (2016)	Ministerial debate	Argument unit	152	n/a	1
USElecDeb60To16	Haddadan et al. (2019)	Presidential debate	Debate	42	n/a	1
Source-driven: sampled						
Argument Annotated Essays	Stab and Gurevych (2017)	Essays	Essay	402	n/a	28
E-rulemaking	Park and Cardie (2018)	Discussion forum	Argument	731	n/a	3
ECHR	Poudyal et al. (2020)	Law Case	Argument	743	n/a	1
Editorials	Al-Khatib et al. (2016b)	Editorials	Editorial	300	n/a	8
GAQCorpus	Ng et al. (2020)	Web	Argument	6,424	n/a	1
IDebate Persuasiveness	Persing and Ng (2017)	Debate portals	Argument	1,205	n/a	1

Table 1: Survey of argument corpora indicating data source, unit granularity, and size in terms of units and topics (if authors remarked on it). The unit granularity is the one in the corpus’ files, using premises and conclusions as one unit each and the best context-preserving unit for corpora featuring multiple granularities. We presume these topic selection directives from the corpus description: either *manual selection* by the authors, or *source-driven*—i.e., the topics in the selected source(s)—from the units of a specific *time-span* or by random *sampling*. Experiments (Exp.) denotes the count of papers that use the corpus in an experiment among those papers that cite the corpus’ paper.




Figure 1: Example for an assignment of arguments (bottom) to topics of a two-leveled ontology. Level 2 topics are subtopics of their linked Level 1 topics. Arguments linked to a Level 2 topic also pertain to its Level 1 upper-topics.

directed acyclic graphs, where nodes correspond to topics and edges indicate “is part of” relations; topics that are part of other topics are called their subtopics. A topic ontology is often displayed in levels, starting with the topics that are not subtopics of others, continuing recursively with each lower level of subtopics. Figure 1 shows an excerpt of a two-level topic ontology for arguments.

The identification of the topics to be included in an argument topic ontology, as well as their relations, requires domain expertise. Building an all-encompassing ontology thus requires experts from every top-level domain where argumentation of scientific interest is expected. In the following, we suggest and outline three authoritative sources of relevant topic ontologies, which comprise a wide selection of important argumentative topics.

World Economic Forum (WEF) The World Economic Forum is a not-for-profit foundation that coordinates organizations from both the public and the private sector to work on economical and societal issues. As part of their efforts, their “Strategic Intelligence” platform⁴ strives to inform decision makers on domestic and global topics, specifically global issues (e.g., artificial intelligence and climate change), industries (e.g., healthcare delivery and private investors), and economies (e.g., Africa and ASEAN). Domain experts for each topic curate a stream of relevant news articles which they each tag with 4-9 subtopics of their topic (e.g., the continuous monitoring of mental health).

Wikipedia Wikipedia strives for a neutral point of view, but many topics of public interest are discussed controversially. Some editors thus curate a list of such controversial articles to highlight where special care is needed, grouped into 14 top-level topics (e.g., environment and philosophy) and

4-176 subtopics (e.g., creationism and pollution).⁵ Omitted is the “People” topic and articles on countries; their controversiality is not universal.

Debatepedia The debate portal’s goal is to create an encyclopedia of debates which are organized as “pro” and “con” arguments. A list of 89 topics helps visitors to browse the debates. The debates are contributed by anonymous web users, which makes the covered topics easily accessible. Topics in Debatepedia tend to address issues of Western culture. For example, the topic “United States” covers 306 debates while “Third World” covers 12 debates. The project is no longer maintained, but can be accessed through the Wayback Machine.⁶

The three ontologies are publicly accessible, and two of them are actively maintained and updated. Acquiring the ontologies is straightforward—not straightforward is to make use of them. A key task associated with every topic ontology is to categorize a given document. Having just a short string label describing a (potentially multifaceted) topic, such as “The Great Reset”, renders this task exceedingly difficult. Fortunately, domain experts have been pre-categorizing documents into the aforementioned ontologies. In particular, regarding the WEF, invited domain experts categorize news articles for every topic, regarding Wikipedia, the text of the associated wiki articles is available, as are the associated debates for Debatepedia.

Articles that are categorized into Level 2 topics are propagated up to their respective Level 1 topics. Table 2 shows the large differences between the ontologies. The WEF ontology contains the most topics and links the most documents, which contain the most tokens overall. The topics at Wikipedia Level 2 are just linked to a single article each, so every topic’s amount of text is smaller. The number

⁴<https://intelligence.weforum.org>

⁵https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:List_of_controversial_issues

⁶https://web.archive.org/web/20180222051626/http://www.debatepedia.org/en/index.php/Welcome_to_Debatepedia%21

of authors reflects the number of editors.

5 Topic Coverage

To assess the topic coverage of the argument corpora in light of the three ontologies, we map the topic labels of those corpora providing them to their matching ontology topics.

5.1 Topic Label Normalization

Table 1 lists 31 argument corpora that provide topic labels. Altogether 2,117 different labels have been assigned. They are concise descriptions of the main issues of an argument and have been provided by the corpus authors. The labels follow the style of the text register of the respective corpus: In essays, for instance, topics are usually thesis statements, while Wikipedia-derived corpora use article titles, and the topics of debate corpora include clichés such as “This house should”. Often, topic labels express a stance towards a target issue, e.g., “ban guns”. Five types of topic labels can be distinguished: concept, comparison of concepts, conclusion (includes claim and thesis), question, and imperative. We normalize the topic labels by converting all concepts to singular form, removing clichés, and dropping stance-indicating words such as “legalize”. Our normalization aims at retaining only the central target issue of a topic label and leads to 748 unique topic labels.

5.2 Mapping Topic Labels to Ontology Topics

Using the preprocessed topic labels as queries, we retrieve for each topic label the 50 top-most relevant topics in each level of the three ontologies. To facilitate the retrieval of ontology topics, we employ a BM25-weighted (Robertson et al., 2004) index of the concatenated documents for each topic. BM25 is a widely used modified version of TF-IDF (Croft et al., 2009). This enables us to narrow down the mapping of a topic label to a manageable size. Except for a handful of cases, 50 ontology topics can be retrieved for each topic label. The topic labels were then manually mapped to an ontology topic, if they form synonyms, or if the former is a subtopic of the latter—which thus indicates that all arguments in the corpus with that topic label are about the ontology topic. A topic label can thus be mapped to multiple ontology topics. For example, the topic label “plastic bottles” is mapped to “pollution” and “recycling” in Wikipedia Level 2.

5.3 Analysis of Topic Coverage

Table 2 shows general statistics of this mapping of corpora topic labels to ontology topics. Most of the topic labels (2,002 out of 2,117) are mapped to at least one Debatepedia topic while only 355 labels are mapped to WEF Level 2 topics. For Wikipedia Level 2, only 285 out of the 748 topics are actually covered by argument corpora. Already this first analysis suggests that existing argument corpora cover typically a small subset of possible argumentative topics that people are trained to debate. For those topic labels that can be mapped are mapped on average to 2.8 topics in Debatepedia, to 1.24 topics in Wikipedia Level 1, and to 1.48 topics in WEF Level 1. As discussed in Section 4, topics in Debatepedia focus on the Western culture and are easily accessible, whereas topics in WEF require deeper domain knowledge and have more global relevance. The broad coverage of Debatepedia’s topics indicates that the studied argument corpora focus on common topics that are easily approachable while global issues or those that need domain knowledge lack coverage.

For a more fine-grained analysis, Figure 2 illustrates the differences regarding the number of ontology topics covered by a corpus: while topics in Wikipedia Level 1 are covered well by some argument corpora, topics in Wikipedia and WEF Level 2 are covered only marginally. Note that topic coverage varies significantly between the corpora: the Claim Sentence Search dataset’s topics cover 93% of the Wikipedia Level 1 topics, while the Ideological Debates Reasons dataset covers only 14%. The colors show the topic granularity of the corpus; especially the Record Debating Dataset 3 dataset is fine-grained: as the highest value, 36 of its topics are mapped to the Wikipedia Level 1 category “Politics and Economics”.

Figure 3 shows how the set of the units of the 31 labeled corpora distribute over the top matching topics in Debatepedia, Wikipedia Level 1, and WEF Level 1. Distributions over Level 2 are omitted for brevity and can be found in the supplementary material. The distribution is significantly skewed: while the top ten topics in Debatepedia are matched by 340k to 150k corpora units, the top ten topics in WEF Level 1 are matched by 340k to 20k corpora units. The comparison between the three ontologies supports our previous finding that argument corpora cover easily accessible topics (e.g., “Media and Entertainment” and “Society”).




Figure 2: Proportion of ontology topics covered by at least n corpus topics (per ontology level and per corpus).

6 Unit Categorization

The previous analysis is done on those argument corpora which contain topic labels. About a third of the argument corpora are thus excluded from that analysis. As a step toward assessing their topic coverage, we map the ontology topics for a unit (cf. Table 1) in an argument corpus by treating the unit as a (long) query in a standard information retrieval setup, where ontology topics are the retrieval targets. The documents categorized into each topic have been concatenated and used as the topic’s representation. Though the documents associated with a topic are not necessarily argumentative, they cover the salient aspects of the topic.

To retrieve topics for a corpus unit, we implement and evaluate the following approaches: Semantic Interpretation (SI) and SI with Text Embeddings (T2V-SI). The Semantic interpretation approach computes the semantic similarity of a unit and a topic as follows: it uses the cosine similarity of the TF-IDF vectors for the unit and the concatenated topic’s documents. This corresponds

to the semantic interpretation step that is at the core of the well-known ESA model (Gabrilovich and Markovitch, 2007). In Text2vec-SI, the similarity of topics and corpus units is calculated using BERT embeddings (Devlin et al., 2018). We follow the common approach to generate text embeddings, which is to take the dimension-wise average of the word embeddings for all tokens in the text.⁷ As a baseline, we implement a direct match approach, which assigns a unit an ontology topic if the topic’s text appears in the unit text (ignoring case).

For evaluation, we collect 34,638 pooled query relevance judgments (0.53 inter-annotator agreement as per Krippendorff’s α) on 104 randomly selected argument units as queries from 26 corpora. The annotation process is detailed in the appendix.

Based on the similarity scores of the approach, we derive Boolean labels that indicate whether a unit is or is not about one of the ontologies’ topics using two policies. The *threshold* policy labels a

⁷For efficiency, we limited the embeddings to 10,000 randomly sampled sentences for the topics that had more sentences associated with them.




Figure 3: Distribution of corpora units over the top matching topics in an ontology (31 labeled corpora).

Ontology	Acquired ontologies (Section 4)				Topic coverage (Section 5)					Unit categorization (Section 6)														
	Topics	Topic statistics			Mapped topic labels	Covered ontology topics				Direct match			Semantic interpretation						Text2vec-SI					
		Authors	Docs	Tokens		All	Min	Mean	Max	P	R	F	Policy	P	R	F	Policy	P	R	F				
WEF L1	137	334.1	940.7	490,576.6	1,239	87	1	1.48	5	0.38	0.23	0.29	$k = 12$	0.22	0.75	0.34	$k = 7$	0.19	0.53	0.28				
WEF L2	822	216.8	550.3	310,229.7	355	77	1	1.32	4	0.59	0.11	0.19	$k = 33$	0.21	0.70	0.33	$\theta = 0.93$	0.15	0.49	0.23				
WP L1	14	78,013.7	68.0	339,088.0	1,539	14	1	1.24	3	0.12	0.04	0.06	$k = 3$	0.32	0.65	0.43	$k = 2$	0.41	0.55	0.47				
WP L2	748	1,929.5	1.0	6,149.1	1,453	285	1	1.76	16	0.47	0.34	0.40	$\theta = 0.05$	0.54	0.64	0.59	$\theta = 0.89$	0.22	0.52	0.31				
DP	89	145.0	61.7	84,787.6	2,002	87	1	2.80	10	0.49	0.37	0.42	$\theta = 0.02$	0.52	0.61	0.56	$k = 23$	0.36	0.80	0.50				

Table 2: Statistics for each topic ontology level: for topics and topic documents (Section 4), Count of mapped topic labels of the analyzed corpora for each ontology level, Count of all covered ontology topics by the topic labels and the min, max, and mean count of covered ontology topics per topic label (Section 5), and the effectiveness of the approaches and baseline in unit categorization (in terms of precision, recall, and F_1 -score) (Section 6).

unit as about a topic if their similarity is above a threshold θ . The *top-k* policy labels a unit as about a topic if the topic is among the top- k topics with the highest similarity to the unit. We report the parameter of policy with which the approach achieved the highest F_1 -score on the pooled judgments.

Table 2 shows the results of this evaluation. The baseline produces different results across ontologies—it performs poorly for both the abstract topics in Wikipedia Level 1 and the specific topics in WEF Level 2. The semantic interpretation approach clearly outperforms the baseline for all ontologies in terms of the F_1 -score. The Text2vec approach outperforms the baseline and semantic interpretation on the most abstract topics (Wikipedia Level 1), but its performance is supbar to that of semantic interpretation on the other ontology levels.

7 Conclusion

The computational argumentation community faces a dilemma: Either carry on as before and risk topic bias, or go the extra mile to ensure topic represen-

tativity and create extra work for corpus authors. The latter option is further complicated by the fact that the space of controversial topics is not well explored to date, and that there are no widely accepted argument topic ontologies as of yet. In this paper, we give a glimpse into a future in which the argument topic space has been mapped and is accessible to corpus construction and designing experiments: We identified three authoritative sources of ontologic knowledge with respect to argument topics. For each ontology, we reveal the topic coverage of 31 argument corpora that are provided with topic labels by aligning the topic labels of a corpus to the ontologies topics. To assess the topic coverage of non-labeled corpora, we introduce an approach that identifies the ontology topics of an argumentative text, reaching an F_1 of 0.59.

Our analyses show that the topic coverage of the studied argument corpora is both limited to only a subset of the ontologies topics and skewed. The majority of topics that require domain knowledge such as those on mental health, philosophy, or in-

ternational security are marginally covered in the analyzed argument corpora. This renders existing argumentation technologies more suitable to teach people how to construct arguments than to support them taking decisions about complex topics. For a mature development of argumentation technology, a careful sampling and controlling of the topics should be employed while constructing corpora, designing experiments, or applying classifiers.

In future work, major tasks are to further explore the argument topic space regarding matters not yet covered by the existing topic ontologies and to unify the different ontologies. Besides “is part of”-relations between topics, other relation types may be considered as well, thereby inducing a topic knowledge base. However, already the work presented here can assist in selecting arguments for corpus construction and model training.

References

- Rob Abbott, Brian Ecker, Pranav Anand, and Marilyn Walker. 2016. [Internet Argument Corpus 2.0: An SQL Schema for Dialogic Social Media and the Corpora to go with it](#). In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16)*, pages 4445–4452. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Ehud Aharoni, Anatoly Polnarov, Tamar Lavee, Daniel Hershcovich, Ran Levy, Ruty Rinott, Dan Gutfreund, and Noam Slonim. 2014. A Benchmark Dataset for Automatic Detection of Claims and Evidence in the Context of Controversial Topics. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Workshop on Argumentation Mining (ArgMining 2014)*, pages 64–68. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yamen Ajjour, Milad Alshomary, Henning Wachsmuth, and Benno Stein. 2019a. Modeling Frames in Argumentation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2019)*. ACL.
- Yamen Ajjour, Henning Wachsmuth, Johannes Kiesel, Martin Potthast, Matthias Hagen, and Benno Stein. 2019b. Data Acquisition for Argument Search: The args.me corpus. In *42nd German Conference on Artificial Intelligence (KI 2019)*. Springer.
- Khalid Al-Khatib, Henning Wachsmuth, Matthias Hagen, Jonas Köhler, and Benno Stein. 2016. [Cross-Domain Mining of Argumentative Text through Distant Supervision](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL 2016)*, pages 1395–1404. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Khalid Al-Khatib, Henning Wachsmuth, Johannes Kiesel, Matthias Hagen, and Benno Stein. 2016b. [A News Editorial Corpus for Mining Argumentation Strategies](#). In *26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING 2016)*, pages 3433–3443. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Roy Bar-Haim, Indrajit Bhattacharya, Francesco Dinuzzo, Amrita Saha, and Noam Slonim. 2017. [Stance Classification of Context-Dependent Claims](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EACL 2017)*, pages 251–261. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Roy Bar-Haim, Lilach Eden, Roni Friedman, Yoav Kantor, Dan Lahav, and Noam Slonim. 2020. [From arguments to key points: Towards automatic argument summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2021)*, pages 4029–4039. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Roy Bar-Haim, Dalia Krieger, Orith Toledo-Ronen, Lilach Edelstein, Yonatan Bilu, Alon Halfon, Yoav Katz, Amir Menczel, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2019. [From Surrogacy to Adoption; From Bitcoin to Cryptocurrency: Debate Topic Expansion](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2019)*, pages 977–990. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Floris Bex, John Lawrence, Mark Snaith, and Chris Reed. 2013. Implementing the Argument Web. *Communications of the ACM*, 56:66–73. Crawled in Jan, 2020.
- Yonatan Bilu, Ariel Gera, Danel Hershcovich, Benjamin Sznajder, Dan Lahav, Guy Moshkovich, Anael Malet, Assaf Gavron, and Noam Slonim. 2019. [Argument Invention from First Principles](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2019)*, pages 1013–1026. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Filip Boltužić and Jan Šnajder. 2014. Back up your stance: Recognizing arguments in online discussions. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Argumentation Mining*, pages 49–58. The Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexander Conard, Janyce Wiebe, and Rebecca Hwa. 2012. Recognizing Arguing Subjectivity and Argument Tags. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on*

- Extra-Propositional Aspects of Meaning in Computational Linguistics (ExProM 2012)*, pages 80–88.
- Bruce Croft, Donald Metzler, and Trevor Strohman. 2009. *Search Engines: Information Retrieval in Practice*, 1st edition. Addison-Wesley, USA.
- Johannes Daxenberger, Steffen Eger, Ivan Habernal, Christian Stab, and Iryna Gurevych. 2017. [What is the Essence of a Claim? Cross-Domain Claim Identification](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2017)*, pages 2045–2056. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. [BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). *CoRR*, abs/1810.04805.
- Liat Ein-Dor, Eyal Shnarch, Lena Dankin, Alon Halfon, Benjamin Sznajder, Ariel Gera, Carlos Alzate, Martin Gleize, Leshem Choshen, Yufang Hou, Yonatan Bilu, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2020. [Corpus wide argument mining - A working solution](#). In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*, pages 7683–7691.
- Shnarch Eyal, Leshem Choshen, Guy Moshkovich, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2020. [Unsupervised expressive rules provide explainability and assist human experts grasping new domains](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 2678–2697. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Evgeniy Gabrilovich and Shaul Markovitch. 2007. [Computing semantic relatedness using wikipedia-based explicit semantic analysis](#). In *IJCAI 2007, Proceedings of the 20th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Hyderabad, India, January 6-12, 2007*, pages 1606–1611.
- Martin Gleize, Eyal Shnarch, Leshem Choshen, Lena Dankin, Guy Moshkovich, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2019. Are You Convinced? Choosing the More Convincing Evidence with a Siamese Network. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2019)*, pages 967–976.
- Alex Graves and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2005. Frame-wise phoneme classification with bidirectional lstm and other neural network architectures. *Neural networks : the official journal of the International Neural Network Society*, 18:602–10.
- Shai Gretz, Yonatan Bilu, Edo Cohen-Karlik, and Noam Slonim. 2020. [The workweek is the best time to start a family – a study of GPT-2 based claim generation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 528–544. Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas R. Gruber. 1993. A translation approach to portable ontology specifications. *Knowledge Acquisition*, 5:199–220.
- Yunfan Gu, Yhongyu Wei, Maoran Xu, Hao Fu, Yang Liu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2018. [Incorporating Topic Aspects for Online Comment Convincingness Evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Argument Mining (ArgMining 2018)*, pages 97–104. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ivan Habernal and Iryna Gurevych. 2016a. Argumentation Mining in User-Generated Web Discourse. *Computational Linguistics*.
- Ivan Habernal and Iryna Gurevych. 2016b. What makes a convincing argument? Empirical analysis and detecting attributes of convincingness in web argumentation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1214–1223. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ivan Habernal and Iryna Gurevych. 2016c. Which argument is more convincing? Analyzing and predicting convincingness of Web arguments using bidirectional LSTM. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2016)*, pages 1589–1599. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shohreh Haddadan, Elena Cabrio, and Serena Villata. 2019. Yes, we can! Mining Arguments in 50 Years of US Presidential Campaign Debates. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2019)*, pages 4684–4690.
- Kazi Saidul Hasan and Vincent Ng. 2014. Why are You Taking this Stance? Identifying and Classifying Reasons in Ideological Debates. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2014)*, pages 751–762.
- Birger Hjørland. 2001. [Towards a theory of aboutness, subject, topicality, theme, domain, field, content ... and relevance](#). *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 52(9):774–778.
- Kialo. 2020. Kialo. www.kialo.com. Crawled in Jan, 2020.
- Anne Lauscher, Goran Glavaš, and Simone Paolo Ponzetto. 2018. [An argument-annotated corpus of scientific publications](#). In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 40–46. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Tamar Lavee, Matan Orbach, Lili Kotlerman, Yoav Kantor, Shai Gretz, Lena Dankin, Michal Jacovi, Yonatan Bilu, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2019. Towards Effective Rebuttal: Listening Comprehension using Corpus-Wide Claim Mining. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Argument Mining 2017 (ArgMining 2017)*, pages 719–724.
- Ran Levy, Yonatan Bilu, Daniel Hershcovich, Ehud Aharoni, and Noam Slonim. 2014. [Context dependent claim detection](#). In *Proceedings of COLING 2014, the 25th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*, pages 1489–1500.
- Ran Levy, Ben Bogin and Shai Gretz, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2018. Towards an argumentative content search engine using weak supervision. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2066–2081.
- Marco Lippi and Paolo Torroni. 2016. Argument Mining from Speech: Detecting Claims in Political Debates. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2016)*, pages 2979–2985.
- Stefano Menini, Elena Cabrio, Sara Tonelli, and Serena Villata. 2018. Never Retreat, Never Retract: Argumentation Analysis for Political Speeches. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-second Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI) Conference of Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4889–4896. AAAI Press.
- Shachar Mirkin, Guy Moshkovich, Matan Orbach, Lili Kotlerman, Yoav Kantor, Tamar Lavee, Michal Jacovi, Yonatan Bilu, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2018. Listening Comprehension over Argumentative Content. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 719–724.
- Amrita Misra, Brian Ecker, and Marilyn Walker. 2016. [Measuring the similarity of sentential arguments in dialogue](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 276–287, Los Angeles. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marie-Francine Moens, Erik Boiy, Raquel Mochales Palau, and Chris Reed. 2007. Automatic Detection of Arguments in Legal Texts. In *Proceedings of the 11th International conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (ICAIL 2007)*, pages 225–230. Association for Computational Machinery.
- Lily Ng, Anne Lauscher, Joel Tetreault, and Courtney Napoles. 2020. [Creating a domain-diverse corpus for theory-based argument quality assessment](#). In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 117–126, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matan Orbach, Yonatan Bilu, Ariel Gera, Yoav Kantor, Lena Dankin, Tamar Lavee, Lili Kotlerman, Shachar Mirkin, Michal Jacovi, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2019. [A dataset of general-purpose rebuttal](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5591–5601, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matan Orbach, Yonatan Bilu, Assaf Toledo, Dan Lahav, Michal Jacovi, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2020. [Out of the echo chamber: Detecting counter-arguing debate speeches](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7073–7086, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joonsuk Park and Claire Cardie. 2018. A Corpus of e-Rulemaking User Comments for Measuring Evaluability of Arguments. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*.
- Andreas Peldszus and Manfred Stede. 2015. An annotated corpus of argumentative microtexts. In *Proceedings of the 2015 European Conference on Argumentation: Argumentation and Reasoned Action (ECA 2015)*.
- Isaac Persing, Alan Davis, and Vincent Ng. 2010. Modeling Organization in Student Essays. In *Proceedings of the 2010 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 229–239.
- Isaac Persing and Vincent Ng. 2017. Lightly-Supervised Modeling of Argument Persuasiveness. In *Proceedings of 2017 International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (IJCNLP 2017)*, pages 594–604.
- Prakash Poudyal, Jaromir Savelka, Aagje Ieven, Marie Francine Moens, Teresa Goncalves, and Paulo Quaresma. 2020. [ECHR: Legal corpus for argument mining](#). In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 67–75, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers, Benjamin Schiller, Tilman Beck, Johannes Daxenberger, Christian Stab, and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Classification and Clustering of Arguments with Contextualized Word Embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2019)*, pages 567–578. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Myrthe Reuver, Suzan Verberne, Roser Morante, and Antske Fokkens. 2021. Is Stance Detection Topic-Independent and Cross-topic Generalizable? – A Reproduction Study. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Workshop on Argumentation Mining (ArgMining 2021)*.

- Ruty Rinott, Lena Dankin, Carlos Alzate Perez, Mitesh M. Khapra, Ehud Aharoni, and Noam Slonim. 2015. Show Me Your Evidence - an Automatic Method for Context Dependent Evidence Detection. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2015)*, pages 719–724.
- Stephen E. Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, and Michael J. Taylor. 2004. [Simple BM25 extension to multiple weighted fields](#). In *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM CIKM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, Washington, DC, USA, November 8-13, 2004*, pages 42–49. ACM.
- Allen Roush and Arvind Balaji. 2020. [Debatesum: A large-scale argument mining and summarization dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 1–7, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eyal Schnarch, Carlos Alzate, Lena Dankin, Martin Gleize, Yufang Hou, Leshem Choshen, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. 2018. Will it Blend? Blending Weak and Strong Labeled Data in a Neural Network for Argumentation Mining. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2018)*, pages 599–605.
- Carlos Silla and Alex Freitas. 2011. A survey of hierarchical classification across different application domains. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 22:31–72.
- Maria Skeppstedt, Andreas Peldszus, and Manfred Stede. 2018. More or less controlled elicitation of argumentative text: Enlarging a microtext corpus via crowdsourcing. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Argument Mining 2017 (ArgMining 2017)*, pages 155–163. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Christian Stab, Johannes Daxenberger, Chris Stahlhut, Tristan Miller, Benjamin Schiller, Christopher Tauchmann, Steffen Eger, and Iryna Gurevych. 2018. ArgumenText: Searching for Arguments in Heterogeneous Sources. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 21–25.
- Christian Stab and Iryna Gurevych. 2017. Parsing Argumentation Structure in Persuasive Essays. *Computational Linguistics*, 43(3):619–659.
- Aixin Sun and Ee-Pen Lim. 2001. Hierarchical Text Classification and Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2001 Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineer (IEEE) International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM 2001)*, pages 521–528. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chenhao Tan, Vlad Niculae, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Lillian Lee. 2016. [Winning arguments: Interaction dynamics and persuasion strategies in good-faith online discussions](#). In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW 2016)*, pages 613–624. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- Orith Toledo-Ronen, Matan Orbach, Yonatan Bilu, Artem Spector, and Noam Slonim. 2020. Multilingual argument mining: Datasets and analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings, EMNLP 2020*, volume EMNLP 2020 of *Findings of ACL*, pages 303–317. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Stephen Toulmin. 1958. *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge University Press.
- Frans H. van Eemeren, editor. 2015. *Reasonableness and Effectiveness in Argumentative Discourse*, volume 27 of *Argumentation Library*. Springer.
- Henning Wachsmuth, Nona Naderi, Yufang Hou, Yonatan Bilu, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Tim Alberdingk Thijm, Graeme Hirst, and Benno Stein. 2017. Computational Argumentation Quality Assessment in Natural Language. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EMNLP 2017)*, pages 176–187.
- Eduardo Xamena, Nérida Beatriz Brignole, and Ana Gabriela Maguitman. 2017. [A structural analysis of topic ontologies](#). *Information Science*, 421:15–29.
- Stephen Yablo. 2014. *Aboutness*. Princeton University Press.
- Justine Zhang, Ravi Kumar, Sujith Ravi, and Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil. 2016. Conversational Flow in Oxford-style Debates. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT 2016)*.

8 Limitations

The three topic ontologies which we used to assess the topic coverage of argument corpora come from recognized sources and cover different domains. Nevertheless, these topic ontologies might not fully cover all possible controversial topics that are relevant to argumentation (e.g., those topics related to private life). Having said that, we do believe that our paper sets a cornerstone for studying topic bias in argument corpora, which researchers can extend.

Another limitation of this study is the moderate effectiveness achieved by our approaches for unit categorization. Our approaches for unit categorization achieved moderate effectiveness because of the large space of controversial topics (about 742 for Wikipedia). Future research can improve upon our approach by utilizing the structure of the topic ontology using hierarchical classifiers. Hierarchical classifiers first map a document to one topic in the upper level and then consider only the subtopics of this topic for classification in the lower levels. In this way, the space of controversial topics in the lower levels can be largely reduced.

9 Appendix

9.1 Corpus Topic Labels Mapping to Level 2 Topics

For completeness, we Figure 4 show the two graphs that are omitted from Figure 2 of the paper as their fine-grained topics are less relevant for the discussion in Section 5.3.

9.2 Annotation Procedure for Unit Categorization

In order to assess the effectiveness of the approaches and baseline outlined in the paper, we employ a pooled evaluation, as it is standard for information retrieval evaluations, where there are too many instances for a complete manual annotation. We randomly sampled four units from 26 corpora, which were all annotated by three expert annotators. The annotators were instructed to label a topic as about the unit if they could imagine a discussion on the topic for which the unit would be relevant. For each unit, we annotated for aboutness only those topics which are among the five topics with the highest similarity to this unit according to at least one of the approaches. The employed assessment interface (see Figure 5) shows the unit (top left), the current topic (top right), as well as all topics

in the pool for that unit (bottom; the current topic is marked blue, whereas already annotated topics are marked green (about) and red (not about)). The same interface has been used for the topic label annotations.

To reduce biases, both the units and the topics were shown in a different and random order to each assessor. The annotation took about 40 hours. The annotation process resulted in an inter-annotator agreement of 0.53 in terms of Krippendorff's α and produced a total of 34,638 annotations of topic-unit pairs, about 2% of what would have been needed for a complete annotation.




Figure 4: Omitted graphs from Figure 2, Section 5.3

Document 3 of 104

Every day passengers are harassed by hooligans and drunks on the underground, trains and busses. Also the rules of the public transportation services are rarely observed. This is why we need more police presence in public transport, even if there are actually designated in-house security forces. Passengers would definitely feel safer then.

Topic: Cyberstalking

Cyberstalking is the use of the Internet or other electronic means to stalk or harass an individual, group, or organization. It may include false accusations, defamation, slander and libel. It may also include monitoring, identity theft, threats, vandalism, solicitation for sex, or gathering information that may be used to threaten, embarrass or harass. Cyberstalking is often accompanied by realtime or offline stalking. In many jurisdictions, such as California, both are criminal offenses. Both are motivated by a desire to control, intimidate or

Topic Suggestions

Media and culture	Religion in Ethics and Law	Cyberstalking	Religion	Circular Economy
Illicit Economy	Media and Entertainment	Sex, Sexuality, and Gender	Netiquette	Christian right
Behavioural	Environment	Identity	Digital Policy and Governance	Science
Sciences	Cities	Urban Aerial Mobility	Corruption and Impunity	Digital Economy and Society
Hate crime				

[Previous](#) [Next](#)

Figure 5: Assessment interface for topic labeling.