

You are what you browse: A robust framework for uncovering political ideology

Rohit Ram

University of Technology Sydney
Sydney, Australia
rohit.ram@uts.edu.au

Marian-Andrei RizoIU

University of Technology Sydney & Data61, CSIRO
Sydney, Australia
marian-andrei.rizoIU@uts.edu.au

ABSTRACT

The political opinion landscape, in a democratic country, lays the foundation for the policies that are enacted, and the political actions of individuals. As such, a reliable measure of ideology is an important first step in a river of downstream problems, such as; understanding polarization, opinion dynamics modeling, and detecting and intervening in disinformation campaigns. However, ideology detection is an inherently difficult task, and researchers encounter two main hindrances when approaching an ideology pipeline. Firstly, the ground truth that forms the basis for ideology detection is often labor-intensive to collect and becomes irrelevant with time. Furthermore, these sources are often biased and not robust between domains. Secondly, it is not clear through what lens to view users to infer their ideology, given a small set of users where this ideology is known. In this work, we present an end-to-end political ideology pipeline, which includes; a domain-independent ground truth based on the slant of media users' share, a socially-informed lens allowing performant ideology inference, and an appropriate classifier methodology. We apply the pipeline to both the conventional use case of left-right ideology detection, and the detection of far-right users (who are often of more concern). The ideology detection pipeline can be applied directly to investigate communities of interest, and sets a strong footing for a plethora of downstream tasks.

1 INTRODUCTION

Disinformation campaigns on online social media platforms shift the opinions of a target population, often to achieve some social or political goal. The ability to detect, understand, and intervene in such campaigns is essential in mitigating the effects of disinformation; however, one must first be able to measure said opinions of a populace. Accordingly, there are three main research questions we would like to address concerning ideological identification.

The first relates to the choice of ideological ground truth and consequently, how the ideology of a user is defined within our models has important implications on the model's performance. There are a plethora of approaches to mining these opinions, and in particular, identifying an ideological stance on a topic; however, researchers have identified that some approaches are susceptible to overly optimistic results. Alkiek et al. [1] find that ideological ground-truths identified through different methods were heterogeneous and have different online behaviors, leading to difficulties with classification. Cohen and Ruths [6] points to the lack of representativeness of ideological ground-truths and suggests that the political elite and active users do not behave similarly to regular users. Furthermore, results are sometimes heavily reliant on specific data-generating procedures and are not very robust [16, 17].

Ideological ground-truths are generated either directly, through manual labeling of posts or users, or indirectly, through some proxy such as assigning labels based on the use of politically charged hashtags (e.g. #MAGA). In the prior case, this requires access to an expert with intimate knowledge of the domain to label large quantities of posts, which can be tedious and expensive. Furthermore, the label knowledge from this one domain does not necessarily transfer to another; potentially requiring labeling for every new dataset domain. In the latter case, deducing the partisanship of users through their hashtags is the standard approach [14]; however, there are significant limitations. Firstly, although more efficient than direct user labeling, manually labeling hashtags is tedious, undesirable, and still requires access to an expert. Furthermore, the political media cycle is short, and the language, discussion topics, and hashtags shift quickly. The labeled hashtags cannot be transferred between domains and can often become obsolete over time. Secondly, hashtags are susceptible to the nuances of language and may be used for rhetoric or irony, leading to misclassification. Hashtags are also vulnerable to 'hijacking' where the opposing ideology may adopt them (e.g. left-leaning abortion activists and right-leaning anti-vaxxers use #MyBodyMyChoice). As such our first research question is, **how do we generate an ideological ground truth that is stable (i.e. unlikely to change significantly in time), broadly domain agnostic (i.e. is not related to a particular topic, but instead to broader politics), and readily available (i.e., does not require expert labeling)?**

The second research question relates to the mechanism for inferring the ideology of users. Generally, ideology detection has been limited to 'active' users and struggles to recover the ideology of users who rarely post [7, 17], which are often a large proportion (due to the long-tailed distribution of activity). Is it possible to infer the ideology of all users (even inactive users), from a small sample of known users? Some hypothesize that ideology diffuses through a social graph, and accordingly, users close within social graphs share similar ideologies [3]. Others make the simpler assumption that similar users will have similar ideologies; however, it is important to consider through what lens this similarity is viewed. Recent approaches hypothesize that a user's location in a local graph structure determines their ideology and use graph embedding techniques to detect political lean [9, 18, 19]. However, recovering the social graph is often infeasible for platforms such as Twitter. Other approaches hypothesize that a user's language betrays their ideological sociolect and use NLP techniques to recover stance on topics [8, 15]. It is unclear which of the lenses best represents the ideology of users. As such our second research question is, **can all user ideologies be inferred from a small**

set of labeled users and what lense is most appropriate for this inference?

The last research question relates to detecting extremism. Understanding the full breadth of ideology is important, however, we are often more concerned with extreme political ideologies. These ideologies can have significant security implications for a population. Due to the covert nature of online extremism, it is often studied through ethnographic investigation of extremist groups; however extremist opinions are often espoused by non-member users. Furthermore, extremists represent a small proportion of all users and often datasets contain only positive examples. Accordingly, our last research question is, **can far-right extremists be identified through their similarities with a small sample of far-right users?**

Our solution can be broadly delineated into four parts. We first generate the ground truths over a sample of our datasets. We then construct the homophilic lenses, which allow us to infer the ideology of others based on the small sample. Next, we describe particular classifiers required for the distinct classification scenarios. Finally, we describe the application of the pipeline to two use-cases, left-right ideology detection and far-right ideology detection.

In the first part, described in section 3.2, we generate two left-right ideologies and one far-right ideology ground truth. We generate the left-right ground truth via politically charged hashtags and by introducing a method for generating ground truth through users sharing media publications with a political slant. For the far-right ground truth, we employ a manually curated list of far-right users on Twitter. Hashtags are domain-specific, and manually-labeled users become irrelevant with time; however, the advantage of utilizing websites is that the bias of media websites is likely to be relatively persistent, so frequent media bias surveys are not required. Regardless, these surveys are often readily available. Part one addresses the first research question.

In the second part, described in section 3.3, we introduce the three lenses through which we represent users; lexical, topic-based, and endorsement-based. These lenses are designed to carry specific social information, relevant to the inference of ideology. In the third part, we describe two classification scenarios, and two architectures to deal with them; LightGBM and PU-SAR. Parts two and three address the second research question.

In the last part, described in section 4.1, we outline two use-cases of our pipeline; left-right and far-right ideology detection. Part four addresses the last research question.

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Classification Methodology

In this section, we outline the two classification methodologies used for our applications; *LightGBM* and a *PU-SAR* classifier.

General Classification. We assume that we can infer the ideology of unlabelled users from their similarity with labeled users; however, simple similarity metrics (e.g. Euclidean distance and cosine similarity) are unlikely to describe the similarity between the complex representations of users. Instead, we use a tree-ensemble method to learn how two user representations are related. This approach is flexible, scales well, and utilizes effective features in the user representations. We utilize the LightGBM gradient boosted

tree classifier [10], to classify political ideology. LightGBM performs consistently well on many social classification tasks and has been shown to find the most important features effectively when performing classification with high-dimensional examples.

Positive-Unlabeled Classification. There are many approaches to the positive-unlabeled (PU) classification problem, however, the majority make the selected completely at random (SCAR) assumption. This assumption suggests that the positive class is an unbiased sample of the distribution; however, the method for generating the far-right ground truth is likely to bias toward more extreme far-right users. Furthermore, many PU SCAR techniques assume that the class proportion is known apriori, which we do not know.

As such, we use the technique proposed by Bekker et al. [4], which works under the select at random (SAR) assumption, allowing for bias in the labeled users. Briefly, Bekker et al. [4] uses an expectation-maximization approach with two classifiers. The first classifier aims to determine whether an example is positive or negative. The second classifier aims to determine whether an example is labeled (and produces the probability of being labeled). During the expectation step, the class probabilities are recovered from the first classifier, with sample weights generated by the second classifier. During the maximization step, the classifiers are trained to assume these class probabilities are correct. Through repeated iterations, both classifiers are optimized, and the trained classifiers can be applied to label all data.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Datasets

In this work, we focus on two Twitter datasets related to Australia; the first is related to the popular political TV show, QandA, where Twitter participation is encouraged by the show during airings. The second is related to the Australian Black Summer bushfires, which gathered political discourse concerning climate change and features some misinformation-spreading behaviour.

3.2 Generating a Political Ideology Ground-Truth

Often stance detection approaches require manually labeling large sets of users or specific dataset-generating procedures. In our left-right ideology pipeline, we utilize two proxies, hashtags and websites, which betray the left-right ideologies of users who share them. Utilizing politically charged hashtags shared by a user is the typical approach for assigning ideology [7, 14]. Conversely, utilizing the bias of media websites shared by a user as a signal of stance is underutilized. The aim here is to recover the stance of a subset of users with little or no manual labeling of users, hashtags, or websites. We also desire that our method be robust over several Australian datasets. In addition, we exploit a manually labeled set of far-right users to serve as a ground truth.

Hashtags. Deducing the partisanship of users' through their hashtag usage is the standard approach [14]. Here an expert manually inspects the most common hashtags within the dataset and labels the political lean of the hashtag if evident. Such labeling requires intimate knowledge of the domain, as many hashtags are related to specific political events. Conversely, some hashtags are not partisan

and are provided by users; to designate the topic of the post (e.g. #AusVotes, #4corners), for searchability purposes (e.g. #QandA), or to add context (e.g. #excited). Hashtags have a label of -1 if left-leaning, 0 if non-partisan, and 1 if right-leaning. We define a user's/post's ideology as the average of the ideologies of the hashtags they share.

Political Websites. It is well-known that media publications have varying levels of slant. We assume users who share a website tend to share the publication's underlying ideology. We utilize a survey conducted by the Reuters Institute [11, 12] investigating the consumption of news media (in its various forms) by people from different countries; and includes auxiliary questions related to political leaning, trust in media, the perception of misinformation concerning particular topics and others. The survey includes many countries, including Australia, and records the specific news media usage of participants with respect to the most prominent publications. Following Bailo et al. [2], we generate political slant scores for publications from western English-speaking countries (i.e., Australia, US, UK, Canada).

Survey participants report their political leaning on a discrete seven-point scale and indicate the publications they read (from a comprehensive list). We assign numerical values to the scale, such that negative values indicate left-leaning and positive values indicate right-leaning. The ideology of a publication is defined as the average of the participants' ideologies who read it. In addition, we center the scores such that there are the same numbers of left-leaning and right-leaning publications. We further manually associate the website domains with publications to the ideological score of the publications.

Notably, the prominent publications within countries occasionally overlap (e.g., *Fox News* is prominent in both the US and Canada); however the slant associated with the publications might differ. Given our datasets are Australia, for overlapping publications we take a weighted-mean assigning weights 20:10:1:1 for Australia, the US, the UK, and Canada, respectively.

The Reuters survey includes only the most prominent news sources for each country; however, lesser-known publications often confer the most bias. Accordingly, we generate ideology scores for a broad range of media sources via the Allsides Media Bias dataset¹. We programmatically associate website domains with media sources and normalize the media bias scores (such that scores are between -1 and 1). A user's ideology is defined as the average of the ideologies of the domains they share.

One possible limitation of this approach is that users sometimes share media to denounce it; however, we assume this is not the primary behavior of users.

User Labelling. We use a list of far-right users generated manually by Bailo et al. [2]. They generate a list through a complex manual procedure. They started with a 'seed' user and programmatically recovered the 'Twitter lists' that this user belonged to. The authors use the intersection of all members of these lists with the users within their dataset, and manually check if these are far-right users, resulting in 208 far-right users. The authors have also further extended this list with 1288 far-right users. We use this list

as the ground truth (i.e. if a user is in the list then they are labeled far-right).

3.3 Homophilic Lenses

Homophily is the tendency of similar users to form ties and behave similarly. We utilize the similarities between users to infer the ideologies of unlabelled users. We construct homophilic lenses such that they might naturally signal the ideology of users. The salience of a lens concerning ideology will determine how well we can infer the ideology of unlabelled users from labeled users. This section details three lenses through which we can view online users as they relate to stance.

Lexical Lens. Language is a strong indicator of one's community and political ideology; since one's sociolect and ethnolect are formed through associations with others and language politics often reveal one's political leaning. Following recent state-of-the-art stance detection approaches [13], we utilise the Universal Sentence Encoder (USE) [5] to generate embeddings of users' posts. USE is a transformer-based model trained for the semantic textual similarity task, which learns expressive representations of sentences. Here, we encode posts as 512 dimensional vectors. Before feeding them through the encoder, we concatenate texts for larger granularities of stance detection. Also, due to potential data leakage, we preprocess text by removing URLs, hashtags, and mentions. The choice of USE here is arbitrary, as other state-of-the-art stance detection pipelines have also utilized large transformer-based models [15].

Hashtag Lens. Hashtags signal the topics that a user participates in, and accordingly their interests. Intuitively, users who share similar interests are likely to be politically similar. Users may also occasionally, directly reveal their political ideology through their hashtags (e.g., #MAGA). We construct a hashtag lens via the Term-Frequency Inverse Document Frequency (TF-IDF) embedding, where we treat posts, sliding windows, or users as documents and hashtags as words.

Resharing Lens. An axiom of recommender systems research is that similar users will consume similar things. For social media platforms, users 'consume' other users' content. We assume that retweeting is a signal of 'consumption'. We generate a multi-hot encoding for users based on the 1000 most retweeted tweets. We represent a user u_i as $h_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1000}$, where $h_i[j] = 1$ if u_i retweets the j th most retweeted tweet ($h_i[j] = 0$ otherwise). This approach is similar but distinct from the encoding given by Darwish et al. [7]. For the sliding window, we only encode the retweets within the window for each user. For the post-level granularity, this becomes a one-hot encoding (and is effectively label-propagation).

4 RESULTS

4.1 Use Cases

In this section, we outline the application of our pipeline to two use cases; left-right ideology detection and far-right ideology detection.

Left-Right Detection. For left-right ideology detection, we employ the hashtag and website ground truths introduced above and the LightGBM classifier, with manually tuned parameters.

Far-Right Detection. Oftentimes we're more concerned about the political extremes, as these groups can have severe security implications. Here we outline how we detect far-right ideologies

¹<https://www.allsides.com/media-bias/ratings>

Model	Ground-Truth	AUC ROC (OVO)	Granularity
USE	URL	0.996	Post
HT	URL	0.795	Post
RT	URL	0.500	Post
RT + HT	URL	0.786	Post
HT + USE	URL	0.991	Post
RT + USE	URL	0.993	Post
RT+HT+USE	URL	0.994	Post
USE	Hashtag	0.943	Post
HT	Hashtag	0.985	Post
RT	Hashtag	0.544	Post
RT + HT	Hashtag	0.981	Post
HT + USE	Hashtag	0.989	Post
RT + USE	Hashtag	0.936	Post
RT+HT+USE	Hashtag	0.989	Post

Table 1: The AUC-ROC(OVO) performance of various feature sets, at the post level of granularity. Green rows indicate the best performing feature set for a ground truth, while Red rows indicate invalid ablations due to data leakage.

(i.e. right-wing extremism). We employ the far-right ground truth described in section 3.2; however, in practice, only a small sample of users are labeled as far-right although there may be more within the unlabeled data. This is an example of a PU classification setup, and accordingly, we can apply PU-SAR to identify the far-right users.

4.2 Classifier Performance

section 4.2 and section 4.2 shows that the classifier trained with lexical features alone outperforms all others for both ground truth measures. Classifiers trained with a feature set including lexical features outperform the others. We excluded classifiers trained with hashtag features and tested on hashtag-based ground truth. The performance drops consistently from the post-granularity to the episode-granularity, which might be because users change stance over time or that their stance is issue-dependant.

We hereafter refer to the ‘pipeline’ as the pipeline using lexical features with a political website ground-truth.

4.3 Stance Analysis

A core desirable of the pipeline is that it can generalize to many datasets with no manual labeling. In this section, we perform an exploratory data analysis of the QandA and the bushfire datasets investigating ideology. We show how the pipeline identifies different characteristics between the datasets.

With datasets surrounding significant political issues, such as #QandA and the bushfire datasets, there are several interesting

Model	Ground-Truth	ROC AUC (OVO)	Granularity
USE	URL	0.956	Episode
HT	URL	0.714	Episode
RT	URL	0.500	Episode
RT + HT	URL	0.699	Episode
HT + USE	URL	0.939	Episode
RT + USE	URL	0.932	Episode
RT+HT+USE	URL	0.938	Episode
USE	Hashtag	0.902	Episode
HT	Hashtag	0.932	Episode
RT	Hashtag	0.573	Episode
RT + HT	Hashtag	0.924	Episode
HT + USE	Hashtag	0.949	Episode
RT + USE	Hashtag	0.896	Episode
RT+HT+USE	Hashtag	0.948	Episode

Table 2: The AUC-ROC(OVO) performance of various feature sets, at the episode level of granularity. Green rows indicate the best performing feature set for a ground truth, while Red rows indicate invalid ablations due to data leakage.

questions we’re interested in. The representation of ideologies online is important to the perception of ‘fairness’ on the platforms. Is one ideological group more represented online than the other? Does one ideology generate more content than the other? Furthermore, the temporal dynamics of ideology are important and give indications of the stability of ideologies within a population. We might ask, do the groups’ ideologies shift over time?

We begin by investigating the questions of ideological representation online. fig. 1, and fig. 2 show the user and post ideology distributions for the QandA, and Bushfire datasets, respectively. We can make several important observations concerning representation. Firstly, left-wing ideologies are more represented in terms of users and posts, within all scenarios. Secondly, the right-wing is more represented in terms of posts, than in terms of users (i.e. right-wing users are more active). Lastly, QandA contains a much smaller proportion of right-wing users than the bushfire datasets. This is unsurprising, as QandA is hosted on the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, which is widely considered left-leaning; however, this shows that the ideological groups talk about different topics online.

Next, we investigate the stability of ideologies over time. fig. 3 and fig. 4 show the distributions of left/right-leaning ideologies over time, and there are two important observations. Firstly, within the QandA dataset, the left-wing is generally more stable than the right. Furthermore, there is no trend in the shifts in ideology. Secondly, within the Twitter bushfire dataset, the ideologies trend towards the center. This could be because crises are often considered unifying events.

We have shown here that the pipeline can be easily applied to other datasets (i.e. the bushfire datasets) with minimal effort, and that important insight can be extracted through it.




Figure 1: Density distributions of the ideology scores of posts (left) and users (right) within QandA




Figure 2: Density distributions of the ideology scores of posts (left) and users (right) within the bushfires twitter dataset




Figure 3: Boxplots of the Ideology Scores of left-leaning and right-leaning users within QandA across episodes respectively.




Figure 4: Boxplots of the Ideology Scores of left-leaning and right-leaning users, within the twitter (left) and facebook (right) bushfires datasets across months.

5 CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose a robust ideological detection pipeline, which addresses several fundamental problems. Assuming that users’ website sharing behaviors betray their political ideology, we present a robust ground truth that is largely domain agnostic and requires no manual labeling. Furthermore, we show that by utilizing a socially informative lense of users, we are able to infer their ideology. Such research provides a reliable understanding of our online political landscape and is integral to downstream tasks, like modeling opinion dynamics.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kenan Alkiek, Bohan Zhang, and David Jurgens. 2022. Classification without (Proper) Representation: Political Heterogeneity in Social Media and Its Implications for Classification and Behavioral Analysis. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2] Francesco Bailo, Amelia Johns, and Marian-Andrei Rizoiu. 2022. Riding Information Crises: The Australian Far-right community in the Twittersphere. *Under Review* (2022).
- [3] Pablo Barberá. 2015. Birds of the same feather tweet together: Bayesian ideal point estimation using Twitter data. *Political analysis* 23, 1 (2015), 76–91.
- [4] Jessa Bekker, Pieter Robberechts, and Jesse Davis. 2019. Beyond the selected completely at random assumption for learning from positive and unlabeled data. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in*

- Databases*. Springer, 71–85.
- [5] Daniel Cer, Yinfei Yang, Sheng-yi Kong, Nan Hua, Nicole Limtiaco, Rhomni St John, Noah Constant, Mario Guajardo-Cespedes, Steve Yuan, Chris Tar, et al. 2018. Universal sentence encoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.11175* (2018).
- [6] Raviv Cohen and Derek Ruths. 2013. Classifying political orientation on Twitter: It’s not easy!. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, Vol. 7. 91–99.
- [7] Kareem Darwish, Peter Stefanov, Michaël Aupetit, and Preslav Nakov. 2020. Unsupervised user stance detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, Vol. 14. 141–152.
- [8] Momchil Hardalov, Arnav Arora, Preslav Nakov, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2021. Few-shot cross-lingual stance detection with sentiment-based pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.06050* (2021).
- [9] Valentin Hofmann, Janet B Pierrehumbert, and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. Modeling ideological agenda setting and framing in polarized online groups with graph neural networks and structured sparsity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08829* (2021).
- [10] Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifeng Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qijwei Ye, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2017. Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [11] Nic Newman, Richard Fletcher, Anne Schulz, Simge Andi, Craig T Robertson, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. 2021. Reuters Institute digital news report 2021. *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism* (2021).
- [12] Sora Park, Caroline Fisher, Kieran McGuinness, Jee Young Lee, and Kerry McLalum. 2021. *Digital news report: Australia 2021*. News and Media Research Centre (UC).
- [13] Ammar Rashed, Mucahid Kutlu, Kareem Darwish, Tamer Elsayed, and Cansin Bayrak. 2021. Embeddings-Based Clustering for Target Specific Stances: The Case of a Polarized Turkey. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, Vol. 15. 537–548.
- [14] Marian-Andrei Rizoiu, Timothy Graham, Rui Zhang, Yifei Zhang, Robert Ackland, and Lexing Xie. 2018. # DebateNight: The Role and Influence of Socialbots on Twitter During the 1st 2016 US Presidential Debate. In *ICWSM*.
- [15] Younes Samih and Kareem Darwish. 2021. A few topical tweets are enough for effective user stance detection. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*. 2637–2646.
- [16] Benjamin Schiller, Johannes Daxenberger, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Stance detection benchmark: How robust is your stance detection? *KI-Künstliche Intelligenz* 35, 3 (2021), 329–341.
- [17] Svitlana Volkova, Glen Coppersmith, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2014. Inferring User Political Preferences from Streaming Communications. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Baltimore, Maryland, 186–196. <https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/P14-1018>
- [18] Isaac Waller and Ashton Anderson. 2020. Community embeddings reveal large-scale cultural organization of online platforms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00590* (2020).
- [19] Zhiping Xiao, Weiping Song, Haoyan Xu, Zhicheng Ren, and Yizhou Sun. 2020. TIMME: Twitter ideology-detection via multi-task multi-relational embedding. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 2258–2268.