

AgoraSpeech: A multi-annotated comprehensive dataset of political discourse through the lens of humans and AI

Pavlos Sermpezis^{1,*}, Stelios Karamanidis¹, Eva Paraschou¹, Ilias Dimitriadis¹, Sofia Yfantidou¹, Filitsa-Ioanna Kouskouveli¹, Thanasis Troboukis², Kelly Kiki², Antonis Galanopoulos³, and Athena Vakali¹

¹Data & Web Science Lab, School of Informatics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, 54124, Greece

²incubator for Media Education and Development (iMED), Athens, 10562, Greece

³School of Political Sciences, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 54124, Greece

*corresponding author: Pavlos Sermpezis (sermpezis@csd.auth.gr)

ABSTRACT

Political discourse datasets are important for gaining political insights, analyzing communication strategies or social science phenomena. Although numerous political discourse corpora exist, comprehensive, high-quality, annotated datasets are scarce. This is largely due to the substantial manual effort, multidisciplinary, and expertise required for the nuanced annotation of rhetorical strategies and ideological contexts. In this paper, we present *AgoraSpeech*, a meticulously curated, high-quality dataset of 171 political speeches from six parties during the Greek national elections in 2023. The dataset includes annotations (per paragraph) for six natural language processing (NLP) tasks: text classification, topic identification, sentiment analysis, named entity recognition, polarization and populism detection. A two-step annotation was employed, starting with ChatGPT-generated annotations and followed by exhaustive human-in-the-loop validation. The dataset was initially used in a case study to provide insights during the pre-election period. However, it has general applicability by serving as a rich source of information for political and social scientists, journalists, or data scientists, while it can be used for benchmarking and fine-tuning NLP and large language models (LLMs).

Background & Summary

Analyzing political discourse is essential for uncovering rhetorical strategies, ideological nuances, and communication patterns, now increasingly facilitated by the wealth of online content and Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools. Fully leveraging these advanced techniques requires robust data for training and methods for assessing their accuracy and reliability. Developing structured and annotated benchmarking datasets could revolutionize political science, by enabling deeper insights, offering new standards for assessing efficiency of AI techniques, and revealing new opportunities or even challenges that need to be addressed by future research.

Political discourse datasets: limitations, challenges, and motivation

In the context of political science, the availability of high-quality and meticulously labeled benchmark datasets holds immense value for advancing research in political discourse analysis. While such datasets exist for various purposes such as metaphor analysis^{1,2}, party affiliation classification³, topic identification⁴, and populism detection⁵ they typically suffer from limitations in the annotation quality and completeness, scale and generality^{6,7}. For example, few existing political speech corpora offer detailed, fine-grained annotations of rhetorical strategies⁸, emotional appeals, ideological positioning⁹, or persuasive techniques¹⁰. Moreover, many available datasets are either too small to allow for meaningful statistical analysis or suffer from inconsistencies in transcription, annotation, or quality control^{11,12}. These limitations hinders the reproducibility and scalability of research based on such datasets, and the depth of analysis that can be performed on the discourse.

Political speeches are a rich source of data for analyzing discourse, rhetorical strategies, ideological stances, and communication patterns across the political spectrum. Despite the abundance of political discourse available, there is a critical need for high-quality, annotated datasets that offer deep insights into the structure and substance of these speeches. The absence of high-quality annotations can be attributed to the substantial manual effort required for annotating large corpora of texts¹³. Furthermore, the domain-specific expertise demanded for accurate labeling, typically possessed by journalists or political scientists, often hinders the publication of such datasets. The meticulousness required in the labeling methodology is paramount, considering the potential societal impacts, as underscored by regulatory frameworks such as the AI Act's guidelines on high-risk

applications for the administration of justice and democratic processes¹⁴.

→ *In light of these gaps, the primary motivation for this paper is to present a comprehensive, high-quality annotated dataset of political discourse, designed for a wide range of applications, from topic classification to populism detection.*

LLMs as data annotators: effectiveness, opportunities and the need for benchmarking

Given the need for annotated datasets, why not leverage AI technologies to automate the annotation of existing corpora of public discourse?

In recent years, the landscape of Natural Language Processing (NLP), transformed by the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT, has expanded well beyond its conventional research applications¹⁵. LLMs can help augment human intelligence, from laymen crafting witty social media posts or eloquent cover letters to businesses streamlining customer interactions and developing engaging marketing content. Several studies have explored LLMs' potential to serve as an annotator for textual data, offering insights into different NLP tasks^{16,17}. For example, investigations have focused on using ChatGPT for misinformation and hate speech detection^{18,19}. Other studies have looked at ChatGPT for annotation in a multitude of NLP tasks ranging from sentiment analysis to stance, hate speech, and bot detection¹⁷. Their findings suggest that while ChatGPT shows promise in generating annotations akin to human judgments, *the accuracy of these annotations remains inconclusive*.

Moreover, it is important to note that most works are centered on user-generated content from social media. This distinction introduces unique characteristics compared to structured political discourse content^{20,21}. Assessing the annotation performance of LLMs in such tasks is not straightforward, due to the diversity of objectives, the subjectivity of natural language, the need for contextual and domain understanding, and the *lack of ground truth or highly-used quality benchmarks*^{22,23}. The role of benchmark datasets is important as standardized evaluation frameworks, to mitigate entry barriers for new researchers, facilitate comparisons, and foster collaborative work²⁴.

In the context of domain-specific benchmarks, the Human ChatGPT Comparison Corpus (HC3) compiles a number of question-and-answer datasets ranging from financial, medical, to psychological domains, and compares ChatGPT's responses to those of humans²⁵. However, to the best of the authors' knowledge, no other work with LLMs has specifically targeted textual data within the political science domain for multiple NLP annotation tasks. Yet, the latter is characterized by the use of rhetorical strategies, contextual sensitivity, ideological positions, and formalized structure, distinguishing political discourse from other textual formats²⁶.

→ *In total, despite their broad applicability, the evaluation of LLMs in annotation tasks for the political discourse domain remains a critical challenge, primarily hinging on the availability of high-quality benchmark datasets.*

Summary of contributions

In this paper, we present *AgoraSpeech*, a meticulously curated, high-quality dataset of 171 campaign speeches tailored for political discourse analysis. The dataset construction employs a two-step "hybrid intelligence" approach: initial automated annotation using ChatGPT, followed by thorough manual human annotation, elevating it to a robust benchmark for critical NLP tasks related to political discourse. To ensure a comprehensive understanding of political discourse, an interdisciplinary team of data journalists, political scientists, and data scientists contribute their expertise. In detail, the *AgoraSpeech* dataset's main contributions are as follows:

- **Annotated dataset for political discourse analysis:** The *AgoraSpeech* dataset comprises 171 speeches (with 5,279 paragraphs and 717,718 words) from six political party leaders, enriched with metadata, ChatGPT-generated annotations, and human-validated annotations *per paragraph* across six critical NLP tasks: text classification, topic identification, sentiment analysis, polarization and populism detection, and named entity recognition. In total the dataset contains 31,674 annotations, rendering it as a comprehensive benchmark for multidimensional political discourse analysis. The dataset is available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13957176>.
- **Human-in-the-loop validation of ChatGPT-based annotations:** We assess the performance of ChatGPT's annotations across all six NLP tasks, with validation provided by experts (data journalists and political scientists). This approach enables a thorough assessment of ChatGPT's performance, achieving high accuracy in sentiment analysis (93%) and text classification (89%), while it is less accurate in more complex tasks (e.g., 61% in topic classification).
- **Robustness, reproducibility, and code sharing:** To develop the *AgoraSpeech* dataset, we employ a methodology grounded in journalism, political science and data science to analyze the characteristics of political rhetoric²⁷. While our dataset focuses on Greek texts (translated into English), the methodology is adaptable to any language, ensuring the study's overall reproducibility. Moreover, we create an informative online tool with insightful interactive visualizations exploring the *AgoraSpeech* dataset, useful to journalists, researchers, and the general public²⁸. Along with the raw data, we have open-sourced supplementary scripts for exploratory data analysis (<https://github.com/DataLab-AUTH/AgoraSpeech-EDA>).




Figure 1. Indicative use cases for the AgoraSpeech dataset.

We compile the *AgoraSpeech* dataset intending to serve multiple-purpose scientific research and to offer valuable applications across several domains (see Figure 1). In *computational social science*, researchers can employ its rich content and methodology to analyze political discourse, gaining insights into language patterns, sentiment, and political strategies. *Data journalists* can utilize the dataset to investigate and report on political speeches and communication strategies. The dataset also provides *political scientists* with a powerful tool for examining global polarization, common political traits, and shared societal dynamics, including trends in populism and polarization. Additionally, it serves as a valuable resource for *data scientists* interested in refining language models and algorithms, contributing to advancements in NLP and model training.

Methods

This section provides an overview of the study’s methodology, including the data collection process, preprocessing steps, the prompts used for ChatGPT annotations, and the human-in-the-loop evaluation approach.

Study procedure

The study has strategically synchronized its launching with the onset of the first election period leading up to Greece’s parliamentary elections on May 21, 2023. During this period, we collect and analyze campaign speeches delivered by the leaders of the six political parties that held seats in the parliament. These political figures are (format: Lastname Firstname, Role and Political party):

- *Androulakis Nikos*, President of PASOK-Movement for Change
- *Koutsoumbas Dimitris*, Secretary General of the Communist Party of Greece
- *Mitsotakis Kyriakos*, Prime Minister and President of New Democracy
- *Tsipras Alexis*, President of SYRIZA
- *Varoufakis Yanis*, Secretary General of MeRA25
- *Velopoulos Kyriakos*, President of Greek Solution

Following the May 2023 elections, a so-called “one-day parliament” was formed, as no party managed to secure a majority to form a government. Consequently, a second round of elections was scheduled, leading up to the elections on June 25, 2023. The focus of our analysis remains on the same political leaders, excluding Yanis Varoufakis, whose party did not secure a seat in the one-day parliament.

This timeline enables us to build a robust methodology (see Fig. 2) collecting real-time political speeches and developing the insightful *AgoraSpeech* dataset. This dataset is a collaborative effort between data journalists, a political scientist, and data scientists, leveraging their interdisciplinary expertise for comprehensive political discourse analysis. Data journalists and the political scientist provide real-world insights and analyze the political rhetoric, while data scientists automate parts of the analysis through the use of ChatGPT and advanced political discourse analytics. Indicative outcomes of this collaboration are showcased in an informative online tool²⁸, demonstrating how *AgoraSpeech* can serve the wider public.




Figure 2. The study procedure for creating the *AgoraSpeech* dataset, from data acquisition and pre-processing to human-in-the-loop verification.

Data acquisition and pre-processing

To gather the campaign speeches (see Fig. 2(i)), we primarily source them from the press offices of the political parties, followed by their official websites and social media accounts. Additionally, speeches are supplemented with additional information from the Athens-Macedonian News Agency (ANA-MPA), the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation (ERT), and other local media when they are not fully available through party communication channels.

For this study, any public speech given by the political leaders mentioned earlier, in a public forum with an audience, and during the official pre-election period, is characterized as a campaign speech. However, brief statements or spontaneous talks (i.e., those under 15 minutes) as well as informal interactions with citizens were not included, only full-length campaign speeches that are entirely available are considered for analysis. An important point is that since Kyriakos Velopoulos did not give campaign speeches as defined here, his introductory remarks at various press conferences are analyzed instead, limiting the direct comparison of Velopoulos' speeches with those of other political leaders.

The analysis of the speeches is based on their written transcripts, whenever available (see Fig. 2(ii)). If the provided text is already divided into paragraphs according to topics, we retain this structure. If the speech is not pre-organized into paragraphs or is structured according to oral delivery, our team of data journalists edit and reorganize it by thematic paragraphs. In cases where no written versions of the campaign speeches are available, but audiovisual formats exist, we use Transkriptor, an AI-powered transcription tool (<https://transkriptor.com/>), to convert the audio into text. Finally, after collecting and formatting the speeches in Greek, we translate them into English (see Fig. 2(iii)), using a machine translation service, called DeepL (<https://www.deepl.com/>), through its API.

Speech analysis and prompting: ChatGPT annotations

After the required processing, the raw campaign speeches undergo NLP analysis to create the ChatGPT-based annotation benchmark (see Fig. 2(iv)). This paragraph-level analysis focuses on determining whether the leader primarily criticized political opponents or promoted their party's agenda, identifying the main topic or theme, assessing the dominant sentiment, detecting levels of political polarization and populism, and recognizing any named entities. Using an automated way, we prompt ChatGPT (the gpt-3.5-turbo model) to provide paragraph-based outputs for the following NLP tasks:

- **Text classification:** for assigning a value of either "criticism" or "political agenda", indicating if the political leader primarily criticized opponents or referred to their party's ideas, opinions, positions, or program proposals.
- **Topic classification:** for identifying the most likely theme discussed from a predefined list of 33 specific topics provided to ChatGPT by the data journalists. This list includes the following topics: abstention, accountability, agricultural policy, civil protection, corruption, culture, debt, democracy, economy, education, elections, employment, energy, entrepreneurship, environment, Europe, external affairs, health, human rights, housing, infrastructure, justice, labor, media, migration, national security, pandemic, pensioners, privatization, public sector, social state, transparency, tourism.
- **Sentiment analysis:** for assigning a value between -1 and 1, indicating the negativity, neutrality, or positivity of the paragraph, as will be later classified during the human annotation, according to a predefined scale set by the interdisciplinary authors' team.
- **Polarization detection:** for assigning a value between 0 to 1, indicating the level of political polarization within the paragraph (no/low, medium, or high), as will be later classified during the human annotation, according to a predefined scale set by the interdisciplinary authors' team.

- **Populism detection:** for assigning a value between 0 to 1 to indicate the level of populism within the paragraph (no/low, medium, or high), as will be later classified during the human annotation, according to a predefined scale set by the interdisciplinary authors' team.
- **Named entities recognition:** for extracting a list of named entities in the paragraph, categorized as individuals, groups, organizations, political parties, locations, countries, or dates.

For accurately annotating the above-presented tasks, ChatGPT prompts are supplemented with additional contextual information, such as the speaker's name and definitions of key terms, to guide the model's responses and account for specific situations that might influence its output, aiming to bypass ChatGPT's inherent biases. Table 1 provides the prompts used for each NLP task. The selection of prompts (including the phrasing of questions and the contextual information) is done with an iterative trial-and-error process that led to the most efficient responses by ChatGPT.

Table 1. The list of prompts (questions and contextual information) used for the ChatGPT annotations.

Task	Prompt content
Text classification	<i>Context:</i> You will read a passage from a political speech of a Greek politician a month before the general elections. <i>Question:</i> For the following text respond only with one word, 'criticism' if the speaker criticizes his opponents, or 'political agenda' if the speaker talks about their political agenda or addresses the attendees.
Topic classification	<i>Context:</i> You are reading a passage from a pre-election speech of <Politician's name>, leader of the <Party Name> political party. When you read the term Tempi, this responds to the tragic accident occurred in northern Greece when two trains collided in the village of Tempi, leaving 57 people dead. <i>Question:</i> Which of the keywords [<List of Topics>] is closer to the main topic of the following text? Do not provide any explanation, just state the selected keyword. If none of the keywords is relevant, then state the word "other".
Sentiment analysis	<i>Question:</i> What is the sentiment of the following text in the range of -1 to 1, where -1 corresponds to negative, 0 to neutral and 1 to positive sentiment? Give me only a single number without any explanations.
Polarization detection	<i>Context:</i> <polarization definition>. <i>Question:</i> How polarized is the following text in the range of 0 to 1? Give me only a single number without any explanations.
Populism detection	<i>Context:</i> <populism definition>. <i>Question:</i> How much populism does the following text have in the range of 0 to 1? Give me only a single number without any explanations.
Named entities recognition	<i>Question:</i> List the named entities in the following text. List only the entities that belong to only of the types: person, group of people, organization, political party, location, country, date. Write each entry in a new line using the format [named entity, type, probability] separated with commas. Do not provide any other explanations or text.

For instance, when determining whether the text primarily criticized opponents or presented a political agenda, we provide in the prompt the clarification about the type of the given text (which we did not find helpful though for the other tasks). Similarly, when identifying the main topic the prompt is enriched with the political leader's name and status, as well as a description of the accident in Tempi (which we also found it unhelpful for the other tasks). In contrast, names are deliberately omitted when evaluating levels of polarization and populism to avoid ChatGPT's inherent bias. Moreover, to avoid stereotypical interpretations and normative bias, we do not rely on ChatGPT's pre-existing 'knowledge' when assessing polarization and populism, and we provide precise definitions crafted by an expert political scientist²⁹⁻³¹.

Human-in-the-loop verification: Experts annotations

Through the speech analysis and prompting process, six annotations are generated for each paragraph of every campaign speech, resulting in a comprehensive annotated corpus of 31,674 annotations. These annotations are now undergoing rigorous validation by domain experts (data journalists and a political scientist) (see Fig. 2(v)). This human-in-the-loop approach serves a dual purpose: it refines the output format of the ChatGPT annotations (e.g., for sentiment analysis) and assesses the accuracy and validity of ChatGPT's annotations. Although the analysis and prompting are based on English translations of the texts, the validation process is conducted using the original Greek texts. This approach allows annotators to identify and correct any inaccuracies. During the human annotation phase, any missing values from the ChatGPT analysis and prompting are supplemented with annotations provided by domain experts. The domain experts follow a structured set of steps for validating each NLP task in detail:

- **Text classification:** Data journalists review each paragraph alongside the ChatGPT-generated classification as either "criticism" or "agenda" and adjust the annotation if needed.
- **Topic classification:** Like above, data journalists review each paragraph alongside the ChatGPT topic annotation and correct it (or select a more specific topic in the case of "other") if needed.

- **Sentiment analysis:** The data journalists first categorize each paragraph’s value-based ChatGPT annotation as "negative" for scores between -1 and -0.34, "neutral" for scores between -0.33 and 0.33, and "positive" for scores between 0.34 and 1. If the ChatGPT sentiment annotation differs from the experts’ annotation, the original value is excluded and treated as missing data in the dataset, subsequent analyses, and visualizations. This approach is implemented to avoid numerical human adjustments, ensuring that the sentiment indicator’s average, used to classify the overall campaign speech as negative, neutral, or positive, remains unbiased.
- **Polarization & Populism detection:** The political scientist first categorizes each paragraph’s value-based ChatGPT annotation as "no/low" level for scores between 0 and 0.5, "medium" level for scores between 0.51 and 0.8, and "high" level for scores between 0.81 and 1. If the ChatGPT annotation (polarization or populism) level differs from the experts’ annotated level, the original value is adjusted, based on the experts’ annotation, to 0, 0.6, or 0.9, as appropriate for "no/low" level, "medium" level, and "high" level (of either polarization or populism) classification.
Remark: The majority of excerpts in the "no/low" level category had scores very close to 0. To avoid the potential introduction of extreme values through human intervention within this category, a corrective value of 0 was established for this specific class. Mean scores were used as the corrective values for the remaining categories.
- **Named entities recognition:** Many named entities appeared with slight variations, often due to differences in the original text, translation, or ChatGPT’s formatted output. To standardize these variations and ensure consistency, we created a lexicon for all entities that appeared at least twice in the speech corpus. All variations of each entity were then mapped to a single, unified representation.

The methods described above provide a robust and reproducible methodology, encompassing the entire process from campaign speech collection to analysis using ChatGPT, complemented by human-in-the-loop validation²⁷. While our use case focuses on Greek political speeches, the methodology is designed to be adaptable to other languages. This rigorous methodology has resulted in the creation of the *AgoraSpeech*, a high-quality dataset comprising 171 political speeches, divided into 5,279 paragraphs, totaling 31,674 annotations, all systematically evaluated through a human-in-the-loop approach.

Data Records

The *AgoraSpeech* dataset includes information, comprising text, metadata, and speech analysis results, on political speeches delivered during the two pre-election periods of the 2023 Greek National elections, which took place on May 21, 2023, and June 25, 2023.

Table 2. The number of campaign speeches per politician across each election period, along with the percentage per period.

Politician	1st elections period (2023-04-22 to 2023-05-21)	2nd elections period (2023-05-22 to 2023-06-25)	Total
Androulakis	16 (15.2%)	10 (15.2%)	26
Koutsoumpas	13 (12.4%)	14 (21.2%)	27
Mitsotakis	26 (24.8%)	19 (28.8%)	45
Tsipras	25 (23.8%)	19 (28.8%)	44
Varoufakis	18 (17.1%)	-	18
Velopoulos	7 (6.7%)	4 (6.1%)	11
<i>Total</i>	105	66	171

In total, the dataset contains 171 political speeches from six politicians. During the first election on May 21, the dataset encompasses 105 speeches, and for the second election on June 25, 66 speeches. Table 2 presents the specific number of speeches per politician and election period. It is important to note that Varoufakis is not included in the second pre-election period, as his party did not gain parliamentary representation following the first election.

Data access

The *AgoraSpeech* dataset is stored as a CSV file in Zenodo (<https://zenodo.org/>), a general-purpose open repository, and can be accessed online <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13957176>. Each row in the CSV file corresponds to a paragraph from a campaign speech, totaling 5,279 rows, while each column represents a specific type of information related to that paragraph, with 20 columns in total. The dataset provides multiple types of information for each paragraph. First, each paragraph is described by metadata, such as the politician’s name, the location of the speech, and other relevant details. Additionally, the paragraph is contextualized by its position within the full campaign speech, with the text available in both

Greek and English. Finally, the results of ChatGPT’s analysis across six NLP tasks are included, with each task creating a dedicated column. Table 3 offers a detailed overview of the features within the *AgoraSpeech* dataset.

Table 3. The three information types in the *AgoraSpeech* dataset: metadata, content, and analysis, accompanied by their features, a short description and values.

Information type	Feature name	Description	Values
Metadata	elections	The election period of the speech	"1st Elections 2023-05-21" or "2nd Elections 2023-06-25"
	speech_id	The ID of the speech	string in format: PoliticianName_YYYY_MM_DD_Location
	politician	The name of the politician that gave the speech	"Androulakis", "Koutsoumpas", "Mitsotakis", "Tsipras", "Varoufakis", or "Velopoulos"
	date (YYYY-MM-DD)	The date of the speech	string in format: YYYY-MM-DD
	location	The location where the speech took place	cities in Greece
Content	paragraph	The number of the paragraph in the speech	an integer (starting from 1)
	text	The text of the paragraph (in english)	english text
	text_el	The text of the paragraph (in Greek)	greek text
Analysis	criticism_or_agenda	Whether the text is identified as "political agenda" or "criticism"	"political agenda" or "criticism"
	topic	The main topic of the text	string from a predefined list of topics
	sentiment	The detected sentiment of the text	a float number between -1 (negative) and 1 (positive)
	polarization	The detected level of polarization in the text	a float number between 0 (none/low) and 1 (high)
	populism	The detected level of populism in the text	a float number between 0 (none/low) and 1 (high)
	named entities	The detected entities (people, locations, organizations, etc.) in the text	string values detected as entities along with metadata

Remark: Table 3 presents only 14 features (cf. the dataset contains 20 features). The first 8 features, i.e., metadata and content, are created before any annotations. The remaining 6 features correspond to NLP tasks, each appearing twice in the dataset: once as annotated by ChatGPT and once following verification through the human-in-the-loop process.

Use case: Elections political discourse

The *AgoraSpeech* dataset, collected during the 2023 Greek elections across two phases, has already been applied in a compelling real-world case study. The leader-specific and time-sensitive data between election periods offer valuable insights into the evolving political strategies of each leader over time. This analysis resulted in the creation of an informative online tool²⁸ that also functions as an exploratory dashboard for the dataset, allowing users to draw meaningful conclusions from various visualizations. For instance, the analysis disproved early expectations of heightened polarization and populism during the pre-election period, showing only occasional spikes, such as Koutsoumpas’ increased polarization during the second election, while Tsipras significantly reduced his populist rhetoric between the two rounds. This real-time analysis provided the public with a clearer understanding of the political landscape, helping voters make more informed decisions. Political scientists and journalists would have gained valuable insights to interpret shifting strategies, allowing for more accurate reporting and deeper analysis of election dynamics. For more detailed outcomes of the use case, we refer the interested reader to the online collection of journalistic articles in the online tool²⁸ and the discussion of the main findings presented in²⁷.

Technical Validation

In this section, we present the analyses and experiments conducted to evaluate the technical quality of the *AgoraSpeech* dataset. We begin with a comparative analysis between ChatGPT and human annotations, followed by assessing the accuracy of ChatGPT’s annotations in relation to human annotations. Lastly, we perform an exploratory analysis of the human annotations, which serves as a foundation and motivation for further investigation into the *AgoraSpeech* dataset.

Data validation: ChatGPT vs. Human annotations

As outlined in the *Methods* section, the annotation of the NLP tasks follows a two-step process. Initially, ChatGPT performs the annotation using tailored prompts enriched with contextual information (see Table 1), and in the second step, human experts cross-check and re-annotate all instances across the NLP tasks. To analyze the results of the two-step annotation process, Figure 3 presents the distribution of values across the NLP tasks, along with the total non-missing annotations, comparing the ChatGPT and human annotations. For the analysis and visualization, continuous features (sentiment, polarization, and populism) are transformed into categorical variables, as described in the *Methods* section. For the named entity recognition task,

since the values span a large range and the annotation by human experts follows a different process, its results are excluded from the following figures and are discussed later in the paper (see, e.g., Figure 9b).




Figure 3. The distribution of values across the NLP tasks, as assigned by ChatGPT annotations (orange/left bars) and after the human-in-the-loop annotation process (blue/right bars), for the overall dataset.

Text classification: Starting from the text classification into "criticism" or "political agenda" (see Figure 3a), the majority of paragraphs are labeled as "political agenda" in both annotation steps. However, ChatGPT assigns more paragraphs to "political

agenda" compared to human experts. This suggests that human experts re-annotate some instances initially classified by ChatGPT as "political agenda" into "criticism", highlighting a potential weakness in ChatGPT's ability to identify a critical tone or related terms in certain political speeches. Additionally, human experts annotate the 140 paragraphs that were missed by ChatGPT in the initial step of annotation.

Topic classification: Moving to the topic classification into one of the 33 predefined topics, Figure 3b depicts the most discussed topics, which follow a similar distribution between ChatGPT and human experts, except for the "Other" category. This suggests that human experts re-annotate some instances initially classified by ChatGPT as "Other" into more specific topics, highlighting a potential limitation in ChatGPT's ability to categorize text into narrower topics. Additionally, human experts annotate 97 paragraphs that were missed by ChatGPT in the initial step (due to technical or inaccuracy reasons), though annotations for 2 paragraphs remain missing.

Sentiment analysis: In terms of sentiment analysis and classification into "negative," "neutral," and "positive" (see Figure 3c), the distribution of values is similar between ChatGPT and human annotations, suggesting that ChatGPT is efficient for sentiment analysis in political discourse. The number of annotated paragraphs is lower after the human cross-check since human annotators left empty values when they observed an inaccuracy by ChatGPT to avoid bias in further analysis. This results in 343 missing values in the final annotations for the sentiment analysis task.

Polarization and Populism detection: Differences in polarization identification as "no/low", "medium", and "high" are evident (see Figure 3d), with the majority of paragraphs identified as "no/low" in both annotation steps. However, ChatGPT assigns more paragraphs to the "no/low" polarization level and fewer to the "medium" and "high" levels compared to human experts. This suggests that human experts re-annotate some instances initially classified as "no/low" by ChatGPT into "medium" and "high", highlighting a potential weakness in ChatGPT's ability to detect polarized tones in certain political speeches. Additionally, human experts annotate 93 paragraphs missed by ChatGPT in the initial step, though 2 paragraphs remain missing. Similarly, in the identification of populism levels (see Figure 3e), the majority of paragraphs are classified as "no/low" in both annotation steps. However, unlike polarization, ChatGPT assigns fewer paragraphs to the "no/low" populism level and more to the "medium" and "high" levels compared to human experts. This leads human experts to re-annotate some instances initially classified by ChatGPT as "medium" and "high" into "no/low," suggesting a tendency for ChatGPT to identify populist rhetoric where it may not exist at those levels. Additionally, human experts annotate 88 paragraphs missed by ChatGPT in the initial step, though 7 paragraphs remain missing.

Human experts re-annotated instances in text classification from "political agenda" to "criticism", in topic classification from the "Other" category to more specific categories, in polarization detection from "no/low" to "medium" or "high", and in populism detection from "medium" or "high" to "no/low".

In summary, the exhaustive human annotation process (31,674 annotations, in total, for all paragraphs and NLP tasks) aimed to address potential limitations in ChatGPT annotations, as those described above, since the efficiency of LLM-based annotations for political discourse has not been tested before. The findings from the comparative analysis in Figure 3 show that human annotation led to several corrections and differences for the final dataset. To obtain more insights into the efficiency of ChatGPT annotations, we perform a quantitative analysis, where we evaluate the accuracy of ChatGPT with respect to human annotations. Specifically, we calculate the accuracy as the fraction of paragraphs where ChatGPT's annotation remains unchanged by human reviewers, relative to the total number of paragraphs, as follows:

$$\text{accuracy (task X)} = \frac{\text{number of paragraphs where ChatGPT and human annotations for task X match each other}}{\text{total number of paragraphs}} \quad (1)$$

The accuracy results, expressed as percentages, are presented in Table 4, along with details about value ranges, classes, and the frequency of prevalent values for each NLP task. This frequency reflects the accuracy of a baseline "dummy" model, which would always select the most common among the final human annotations in each NLP task, providing a reference point for evaluating ChatGPT's performance. In an ideal scenario, where ChatGPT's annotations perfectly match those of human annotators, the accuracy would be 100%.

From Table 4, it is clear that ChatGPT demonstrates strong performance in text classification, achieving an impressive 89% accuracy in distinguishing between politicians critiquing their opponents and presenting their political agenda. However, in the more complex task of topic classification, where ChatGPT assigns a paragraph to one of 33 predefined topics, accuracy drops to 61%. While this may appear relatively low, it is important to consider the inherent difficulty of multiclass classification with 33 categories, ChatGPT still outperforms a baseline "dummy" model by almost threefold. Furthermore, in sentiment analysis, ChatGPT excels with a high accuracy of 93%, the highest among all tasks, demonstrating its reliability in identifying sentiment within political discourse. This aligns with recent research findings on ChatGPT's effectiveness in sentiment analysis^{17,32}. For polarization detection, ChatGPT also shows high accuracy (88%), though this performance is comparable to a "dummy" classifier, which would label most paragraphs as "no/low" due to the high prevalence of that category. A similar trend is

Table 4. Accuracy of ChatGPT annotations across the NLP tasks, along with details on the possible values (i.e., classes of the classification NLP task) and most common values.

NLP task	Values ranges and classes	Prevalent value	Accuracy
Text classification	"criticism", "political agenda"	political agenda (61%)	89%
Topic classification	predefined list of 33 topics	elections (25%)	61%
Sentiment analysis	"negative", "neutral", "positive"	positive (40%)	93%
Polarization detection	"no/low", "medium", "high"	no/low (88%)	88%
Populism detection	"no/low", "medium", "high"	no/low (97%)	93%

observed in populism detection, where ChatGPT achieves a high accuracy of 93%, but a "dummy" classifier would be even more accurate (97%) given that most paragraphs fall into the "no/low" populism category. These findings suggest that ChatGPT may not be ideal for unsupervised detection of nuanced political speech concepts like polarization or populism. In fact, ChatGPT tends to overestimate the levels of these attributes, likely offering results aligned with broader interpretations of these concepts, as opposed to the precise definitions used in political science.

ChatGPT demonstrates impressive performance with a 93% accuracy in sentiment analysis, high performance with 89% in text classification and 88% in polarization detection, and a competitive 61% in topic classification.

Detailed observations of human annotations

After the human-in-the-loop annotation process, the AgoraSpeech dataset contains a total of 31,674 high-quality human annotations across 5,279 paragraphs for six NLP tasks. These annotations can offer valuable insights for interdisciplinary political discourse analysis, not only for the dataset as a whole but also when broken down per politician. In this context, Table 5 provides descriptive statistics for all politicians included in the dataset, with a detailed breakdown for each. Moreover, the analysis, discussion and visualizations presented below, further highlight the richness and quality of the human annotations, and how they can be used to reveal key patterns in political discourse (here, for the Greek national elections in 2023).

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for all politicians and individually per politician.

Statistic	Overall	Androulakis	Koutsoumpas	Mitsotakis	Tsipras	Varoufakis	Velopoulos
Total number of speeches	171	26	27	45	44	18	11
Total number of paragraphs	5,279	883	707	1,385	1,601	525	170
Total number of words	717,718	132,620	98,807	147,709	185,139	124,716	28,727
Avg paragraphs per speech	31	34	26	31	36	29	16
Avg words per speech	4,197	5,101	3,660	3,282	4,208	6,929	2,612
Avg words per paragraph	136	150	140	107	116	238	161
Agenda percentage	61%	60%	52%	85%	54%	51%	29%
Criticism percentage	39%	40%	48%	15%	46%	49%	71%
Sum of unique topics of all speeches	33	32	31	31	31	28	27
Avg of unique topics per speech	13	16	10	12	14	11	9
Avg sentiment score	0.03	0.00	-0.25	0.46	-0.05	-0.27	-0.44
Avg polarization score	0.16	0.17	0.26	0.07	0.16	0.18	0.20
Avg populism score	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.02	0.09	0.09	0.05
Sum of unique entities of all speeches	7,763	1,605	1,531	2,050	2,597	1,911	600
Avg of unique entities per speech	123	138	105	100	130	193	79

Do politicians focus on presenting their agenda or on criticizing their opponents? (text classification)

For comparing the narrative strategies of six politicians, Figure 4 presents the fraction of paragraphs devoted to either criticism or political agenda. Mitsotakis stands out with 85% of his narrative dedicated to policy discussions and only 15% to criticism, suggesting a strong emphasis on outlining governance plans as prime minister. In contrast, Velopoulos is the most criticism-focused, with 71% of his speech dedicated to critique and only 29% focused on his own agenda. The other politicians show a more balanced approach. Androulakis devotes 40% to criticism and 60% to agenda, while Tsipras follows closely with 46% on criticism and 54% on agenda. Koutsoumpas leans slightly toward criticism (52%), and Varoufakis is nearly balanced, with 49% on criticism and 51% on agenda.




Figure 4. Fraction of the political speeches devoted to "criticism" vs. " political agenda" for each politician in the dataset.

Most politicians strike a balance between presenting their agenda and criticizing opponents, though Mitsotakis strongly focuses on his agenda, while Velopoulos prioritizes criticism, reflecting differing political strategies.

In what topics do politicians focus on? (topic classification)

For identifying the dominant topic in politicians’ campaign speeches, Figure 5 presents the distribution of paragraphs across various topics. Elections dominate the discussion at 25.5%, followed by the economy at 12.9%. Employment (6.2%), health (5.3%), and democracy (4.4%) also receive significant attention. In contrast, topics like corruption and national security, among others receive only around 2%, with migration and privatization discussed even less at 1.6%, indicating a focus on obvious topics while sidelining other significant issues.




Figure 5. The distribution of the 20 most frequent topics across the campaign speeches of the dataset overall.

Figure 6 compares the fraction of paragraphs devoted to the 5 most frequent topics -elections, economy, employment, democracy, and health- by the six politicians. Koutsoumpas and Mitsotakis prioritize elections, with 33% and 32% of their discourse, followed by Varoufakis (23%) and Tsipras (19%). Varoufakis leads on the economy (21%), while Mitsotakis, Tsipras, and Velopoulos focus on around 13%. Koutsoumpas stands out for employment (10%), with Varoufakis and Tsipras following, while Velopoulos shows the least attention (2%). On democracy and health, Varoufakis and Tsipras are more engaged (8%) respectively, while Mitsotakis and Varoufakis trail.

Overall, Koutsoumpas, Mitsotakis, and Tsipras place greater emphasis on widely discussed topics such as elections and the economy, focusing on the most timely and relevant issues. In contrast, Androulakis shows a more balanced approach, covering both the prominent topics and less-discussed but still important issues. Varoufakis, and especially Velopoulos, shift




Figure 6. The distribution of the 5 most frequent topics across the campaign speeches per politician.

their attention toward less discussed topics, despite giving some focus to democracy and elections, respectively. These patterns underscore the differing political priorities and communication strategies among the politicians.

Politicians’ speeches focus mainly on elections and the economy, with Koutsoumpas, Mitsotakis, and Tsipras emphasizing these topics, while Androulakis balances prominent and less-discussed issues, and Varoufakis and Velopoulos shift attention to less common topics.

What is the prevalent sentiment in politicians’ speeches? (sentiment analysis)

For revealing distinct differences in the sentiment of campaign speeches, Figure 7 presents the sentiment distribution among the paragraphs of the six politicians. Mitsotakis stands out with 74% of his speech having a positive tone, aligning with his prime minister position, and in sharp contrast to Velopoulos, whose discourse has 72% negative sentiment. Koutsoumpas also leans toward negative sentiments (57%). Varoufakis uses mostly neutral sentiment (39%), while Tsipras has the second-highest positive sentiment at 40%. Androulakis demonstrates a more even distribution of sentiment, with 36% negative, 26% neutral, and 38% positive, indicating a relatively balanced approach compared to his peers.




Figure 7. The distribution of sentiment in the campaign speeches within the dataset, broken down by each politician.

It is noteworthy the sharp contrast between Mitsotakis and Velopoulos, who represent opposite ends of the sentiment spectrum. Mitsotakis exhibits a positive sentiment level, highlighting his leadership, while Velopoulos adopts a negative tone, aligning with his oppositional role and his focus on criticism over agenda. Varoufakis stands out for his neutral tone, reflecting a more balanced, policy-driven approach, while Androulakis presents a moderate and balanced sentiment. These patterns

highlight how each politician's communication style reflects their political stance and strategies.

The prevalent sentiment in politicians' speeches varies widely, with Mitsotakis leaning heavily toward positivity, Velopoulos toward negativity, while Varoufakis and Androulakis adopt more neutral and balanced tones.

To what extent are politicians' speeches polarized? (polarization detection)

For identifying polarization discursive patterns in campaign speeches, Figure 8a presents the distribution of paragraph polarization levels for each politician, revealing clear differences. Mitsotakis stands out with the least polarized rhetoric, with 94% of his paragraphs being zero or low in polarization and only 6% falling into the medium and high categories, deeply connected to his strategy of promoting a positive message and avoiding criticizing his political adversaries. Koutsoumpas, in contrast, has the highest polarization, with only 78% of his content classified as zero or low-polarized, while 16% is medium and 6% highly polarized, reflecting a more confrontational style. The other politicians -Tsipras, Androulakis, Varoufakis, and Velopoulos- fall between these extremes, with 86% to 89% of their content being zero or low-polarized, and the remainder distributed between medium and high polarization, reflecting a more balanced but varied strategy.




Figure 8. The distribution of polarization (8a) and populism (8b) in the campaign speeches within the dataset, broken down by each politician.

Politicians' speeches range in polarization, with Mitsotakis being the least polarized, Koutsoumpas the most, and the others adopting a more moderate approach.

Do politicians' speeches exhibit populism? (populism detection)

For identifying populism discursive patterns in campaign speeches, Figure 8b presents the distribution of paragraph populism levels for each politician, revealing a clear tendency toward zero or low populism across all six. At least 95% of their content falls within the no/low populism category, with Mitsotakis and Velopoulos, completely avoiding the use of typical populist discourse. Androulakis, Varoufakis, Tsipras, and Koutsoumpas' pre-election speeches also fall predominantly within the no/low populism category, with 98%, 97%, 96%, and 95%, respectively. Consequently, no politician articulated a fully developed populist discourse during the two pre-election campaigns. The analysis reveals only a limited number of populist discursive patterns, primarily identified in the speeches of Koutsoumpas and Tsipras, however, this does not mean that either adopted a populist strategy. This pattern highlights the absence of a strong populist discourse during the pre-election periods, with Mitsotakis and Velopoulos particularly notable for consistently avoiding any typically populist reference.


Politicians' speeches primarily exhibit zero or low levels of populism.

Do politicians often refer to specific entities? (named entities recognition)

For locating the most frequently mentioned named entities in campaign speeches, Figure 9a displays a word cloud where larger words indicate a higher frequency of mentions. Prominent terms like "Greece", "democracy", and "Mitsotakis" dominate,



(a) Dataset overall



(b) Individual politician

Figure 9. The 50 most frequently mentioned named entities across the campaign speeches of the dataset overall (9a) and the distribution of the 20 most frequent named entities break down by politician (9b).

highlighting a strong focus on the country, its political system, and current leadership. The prominence of "New Democracy," the ruling party, underscores its significant role in the discourse, while mentions of opposition parties like "SYRIZA" and "PASOK" indicate a competitive political landscape. Other frequently mentioned entities, such as "Greek people", "country", and "government", reflect a focus on national issues, while references to "Europe" and the "European Union" suggest discussions on Greece's international relations. The inclusion of "parliament", "elections", and "economy" points to the political context, driven by the upcoming elections. Finally, the campaign speeches address both long-standing concerns important to Greece, such as the "recovery fund", "national health system", "middle class", and "troika" as well as emerging issues like "Tempe" and "NATO".

Figure 9b compares the frequency of the most frequent named entities mentioned by each politician. All politicians frequently mention "Greece," "greek," "greek people," and "country". Additionally, "New Democracy" and "Mitsotakis," as the current prime minister and his party, along with "SYRIZA" as the main opposition, are mentioned by all politicians. The key difference lies in Mitsotakis' emphasis on governance and Greece's role in Europe, likely reflecting his position as head of the government. In contrast, the other politicians prioritize party-related entities, focusing on political parties and individual figures, likely indicating a more party- and criticism-centric discourse.

Political campaign speeches emphasize national identity ("Greece," "greek people") and party-related entities ("New Democracy", "Mitsotakis", "SYRIZA"), while also addressing governance issues ("recovery fund", "Europe") and timely topics ("Tempe").

How are campaign speeches characteristics related?

For exploring the relationships among all the above characteristics in political campaign speeches, Figure 10 presents a matrix displaying the correlations between all variable pairs. These correlations are computed using Spearman's correlation³³ for numerical variables and Cramér's V³⁴ for relationships between categorical variables and between categorical and numerical variables. The correlation values range from -1 to 1, where values closer to 1 indicate a strong positive correlation, meaning both variables increase together, and values closer to -1 suggest a strong negative correlation, where one variable increases as the other decreases.

The most notable finding is the strong positive correlation (0.7) between "sentiment" and "criticism or agenda", indicating that these two characteristics tend to move together in the dataset. Specifically, as political leaders focus more on presenting their agenda, the sentiment in their speeches becomes more positive, whereas when they criticize their opponents, negative sentiment tends to dominate. Additionally, several moderate correlations are observed. Notably, there is a negative correlation between "polarization" and both "criticism or agenda" (-0.35) and "sentiment" (-0.35), suggesting that more polarized speeches are associated with negative sentiment and a reduced emphasis on agenda-driven discourse. Another moderate correlation, but positive, is seen between "populism" and "polarization" (0.37) since both discourses have a dichotomic structure and an antagonistic dimension. Lastly, two other notable correlations include the relationship between "topic" and both "polarization" (0.29) and "sentiment" (0.28), suggesting that certain topics are more likely to be associated with polarized speech and specific sentiment levels.




Figure 10. The correlations between the characteristics of the campaign speeches across the entire dataset.

Sentiment is strongly correlated with criticism or agenda, while there are several moderate correlations, such as between polarization and both sentiment and criticism or agenda, and between populism and polarization, among others.

Limitations

In this study for developing the *AgoraSpeech* dataset, we faced several challenges that should be acknowledged:

Data sources: Part of the data sources for the speeches were in audio and video format, which were then transcribed to text. This could affect the effectiveness of tasks like sentiment analysis, which are limited to patterns in written text. Sarcasm and other emotional nuances are often conveyed through tone and intonation, which are absent in text-only data.

Translation: At the time of annotation, the ChatGPT model available was not proficient in understanding or generating responses in Greek. This necessitated translating the content from Greek to English, but future model versions might allow for native interaction in Greek, eliminating the need for translation. While well-established automated tools were used for transcription and translation, there is always a risk of losing meaning, nuance, or local language intricacies.

Paragraph-level analysis: The analysis was conducted at the paragraph level, which may result in missed context, particularly in complex tasks like detecting populism or polarization. These issues rely heavily on the broader context of a speech, and breaking it into paragraphs can obscure the nuances necessary for accurate analysis. This limitation is especially noticeable in ChatGPT annotations, where the lack of surrounding context can lead to misinterpretation.

ChatGPT prompting: At the time of the project, careful selection of prompts was crucial for the quality of responses. Newer models of ChatGPT are more effective and robust, eliminating the need for elaborate prompt fine-tuning.

Usage Notes

We provide the *AgoraSpeech* dataset with full open access to "enable third parties to access, mine, exploit, reproduce and disseminate (free of charge for any user) this research data" (https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/cross-cutting-issues/open-access-data-management/open-access_en.htm). We encourage everyone who uses the data to abide by the following code of conduct:

- abide by the guidelines for ethical research as described in the ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct³⁵;
- report any misuse, intentional or not, to the corresponding authors by mail within a reasonable time;
- analyze the *AgoraSpeech* dataset ethically, ensuring that it does not mislead, misrepresent, or contribute to biased or false narratives;
- include a proper reference on all publications or other communications resulting from using the *LifeSnaps* data.

Code Availability

All code for reading, processing, and exploring the data is made openly available at (<https://github.com/Datalab-AUTH/AgoraSpeech-EDA>).

References

1. Ahrens, K., Zeng, H. & Wong, S.-h. R. Using a corpus of english and chinese political speeches for metaphor analysis. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)* (2018).
2. Charteris-Black, J. *Metaphor and gender in British parliamentary debates* (Springer, 2009).
3. Yu, B., Kaufmann, S. & Diermeier, D. Classifying party affiliation from political speech. *J. Inf. Technol. & Polit.* **5**, 33–48 (2008).
4. Dilai, I. & Dilai, M. Automatic extraction of keywords in political speeches. In *2020 IEEE 15th International Conference on Computer Sciences and Information Technologies (CSIT)*, vol. 1, 291–294 (IEEE, 2020).
5. Populismus corpus_03 (improved edition) (2020).
6. Card, D., Boydston, A., Gross, J. H., Resnik, P. & Smith, N. A. The media frames corpus: Annotations of frames across issues. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 438–444 (2015).
7. Wachsmuth, H. *et al.* Computational argumentation quality assessment in natural language. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, 176–187 (2017).
8. for Language, I. & Center, S. P. A. R. Greek parliament topic modeling visualization corpus (2020).
9. Kuzman, T. *et al.* Linguistically annotated multilingual comparable corpora of parliamentary debates in english ParlaMint-en.ana 4.0 (2023). Slovenian language resource repository CLARIN.SI.
10. Lehmann, P. *et al.* The manifesto data collection. manifesto project (mrg/cmp/marpor). version 2024a, [10.25522/manifesto.mpd.2024a](https://doi.org/10.25522/manifesto.mpd.2024a) (2024).
11. Di Bona, G. *et al.* Sampled datasets risk substantial bias in the identification of political polarization on social media. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19867* (2024).
12. Chen, E., Deb, A. & Ferrara, E. # election2020: the first public twitter dataset on the 2020 us presidential election. *J. Comput. Soc. Sci.* 1–18 (2022).
13. Li, M. *et al.* Coannotating: Uncertainty-guided work allocation between human and large language models for data annotation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15638* (2023).
14. Madiega, T. Artificial intelligence act. *Eur. Parliam. Eur. Parliam. Res. Serv.* (2021).
15. Brown, T. *et al.* Language models are few-shot learners. *Adv. neural information processing systems* **33**, 1877–1901 (2020).
16. Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. Chatgpt outperforms crowd-workers for text-annotation tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15056* (2023).
17. Zhu, Y., Zhang, P., Haq, E.-U., Hui, P. & Tyson, G. Can chatgpt reproduce human-generated labels? a study of social computing tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10145* (2023).
18. Huang, F., Kwak, H. & An, J. Is chatgpt better than human annotators? potential and limitations of chatgpt in explaining implicit hate speech. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023, WWW '23 Companion*, 294–297, [10.1145/3543873.3587368](https://doi.org/10.1145/3543873.3587368) (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023).
19. Sallam, M. *et al.* Chatgpt output regarding compulsory vaccination and covid-19 vaccine conspiracy: A descriptive study at the outset of a paradigm shift in online search for information. *Cureus* **15** (2023).
20. Baldwin, T., Cook, P., Lui, M., MacKinlay, A. & Wang, L. How noisy social media text, how diffrent social media sources? In *Proceedings of the sixth international joint conference on natural language processing*, 356–364 (2013).
21. Deng, Q., Hine, M. J., Ji, S. & Wang, Y. Understanding consumer engagement with brand posts on social media: The effects of post linguistic styles. *Electron. Commer. Res. Appl.* **48**, 101068 (2021).
22. Kiela, D. *et al.* Dynabench: Rethinking benchmarking in nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.14337* (2021).
23. Gu, Y. *et al.* Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Transactions on Comput. for Healthc. (HEALTH)* **3**, 1–23 (2021).
24. Harutyunyan, H., Khachatryan, H., Kale, D. C., Ver Steeg, G. & Galstyan, A. Multitask learning and benchmarking with clinical time series data. *Sci. data* **6**, 96 (2019).

25. Guo, B. *et al.* How close is chatgpt to human experts? comparison corpus, evaluation, and detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.07597* (2023).
26. Chilton, P. *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice* (routledge, 2004).
27. Troboukis, T. *et al.* Towards hybrid intelligence in journalism: Findings and lessons learnt from a collaborative analysis of greek political rhetoric by chatgpt and humans (2024). [2410.13400](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.13400).
28. iMEDD Lab. Elections 2023 - iMEDD Lab. <https://lab.imedd.org/en/elections-2023/> (2023).
29. Kiki, K. *et al.* How we analyze the campaign speeches of political leaders. <https://lab.imedd.org/en/pos-analyoume-tis-proeklogikes-omilies-ton-politikon-archigon/> (2023). IMEdD Lab.
30. Galanopoulos, A. Populism in pre-election political discourse in greece. <https://lab.imedd.org/en/populism-in-pre-election-political-discourse-in-greece/> (2023). IMEdD Lab.
31. Galanopoulos, A. Detecting polarization in the pre-election political discourse in greece. <https://lab.imedd.org/en/polarization-greek-political-speech/> (2023). IMEdD Lab.
32. Bang, Y. *et al.* A multitask, multilingual, multimodal evaluation of chatgpt on reasoning, hallucination, and interactivity. *arXiv:2302.04023* (2023).
33. Spearman, C. *The proof and measurement of association between two things* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961).
34. Cramér, H. *Mathematical methods of statistics*, vol. 26 (Princeton university press, 1999).
35. Gotterbarn, D. *et al.* Acm code of ethics and professional conduct (2018).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Nota Vafea, Katerina Voutsina, Stefania Ibrishimova, Athina Thanasi, Chrysoula Marinou, and Georgios Schinas (iMEDD) for their contributions to the human data annotation process. We also thank Christos Nomikos, Nikos Sarantos (iMEDD), and Dimitrios-Panteleimon Giakatos (Datalab) for their IT support and software development of the online tool, as well as Anatoli Stavroulopoulou for cross-checking the political speeches' translations.

Author Contributions Statement

P.S., S.K., I.D., T.T., K.K., A.G. and A.V. conceived and designed the study, P.S., S.K., I.D., T.T., K.K., and A.G. conducted the study, and P.S., S.K., I.D., E.P., S.Y., and F.K. processed, structured and analyzed the data and results. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.