

Standardness Fogs Meaning: A Position Regarding the Informed Usage of Standard Datasets

TIM CECH, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany

OLE WEGEN, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany

DANIEL ATZBERGER, Hasso Plattner Institute, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany

RICO RICHTER, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany

WILLY SCHEIBEL, Hasso Plattner Institute, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany

JÜRGEN DÖLLNER, Hasso Plattner Institute, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany

Standard datasets are frequently used to train and evaluate Machine Learning models. However, the assumed *standardness* of these datasets leads to a lack of in-depth discussion on how their labels match the derived categories for the respective use case. In other words, the standardness of the datasets seems to fog coherency and applicability, thus impeding the trust in Machine Learning models. We propose to adopt *Grounded Theory* and *Hypotheses Testing through Visualization* as methods to evaluate the match between use case, derived categories, and labels of standard datasets. To showcase the approach, we apply it to the 20 Newsgroups dataset and the MNIST dataset. For the 20 Newsgroups dataset, we demonstrate that the labels are imprecise. Therefore, we argue that neither a Machine Learning model can learn a meaningful abstraction of derived categories nor one can draw conclusions from achieving high accuracy. For the MNIST dataset, we demonstrate how the labels can be confirmed to be defined well. We conclude that a concept of standardness of a dataset implies that there is a match between use case, derived categories, and class labels, as in the case of the MNIST dataset. We argue that this is necessary to learn a meaningful abstraction and, thus, improve trust in the Machine Learning model.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → *Reasoning about belief and knowledge*; **Philosophical/theoretical foundations of artificial intelligence**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Explainable AI, Trust, Dataset Quality

1 INTRODUCTION

Big Data Datasets are a foundation of *Machine Learning (ML)*, especially for *supervised deep learning*. Traditionally, they are characterized by the five *V*'s: *Volume, Velocity, Variety, Veracity, and Value* [43]. Unfortunately, due to the *No-Free-Lunch Theorem (NFL)*, it is impossible to generalize from the performance of an ML model on one dataset to its performance on another one [1]. Nevertheless, to allow for limited comparable model evaluation, *standard datasets* are commonly used to benchmark ML models. Standard datasets are seen as Big Data¹ Datasets [3, 15, 17], created for one specific use case or application field, e.g., text classification or computer vision [43]. For text classification, one such standard dataset is the *20 Newsgroups* dataset [59, 73]; for computer vision, an example is the *MNIST (Modified National Institute of Standards and Technology)* dataset [18, 31].

¹If one conceptualizes a standard dataset as not being Big Data, it raises the question why ML models built for working with Big Data Datasets are evaluated on standard datasets. We follow Kitchin and McArdle [43] in recognizing the ambiguity in the term “Big Data” and therefore opt for a broader use of “Big Data” as is often done in practice.

Authors' addresses: Tim Cech, ttech@uni-potsdam.de, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Prof.-Dr.-Helmert-Str. 2–3, Potsdam, Brandenburg, Germany, 14482; Ole Wegen, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany, wegen@uni-potsdam.de; Daniel Atzberger, daniel.atzberger@hpi.de, Hasso Plattner Institute, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany; Rico Richter, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany, rico.richter.1@uni-potsdam.de; Willy Scheibel, Hasso Plattner Institute, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany, willy.scheibel@hpi.de; Jürgen Döllner, Hasso Plattner Institute, Digital Engineering Faculty, University of Potsdam, Germany, doellner@uni-potsdam.de.

In this paper, we argue that trust in ML models can only be achieved by getting an informed perspective onto the dataset used for training and evaluation. However, we perceive that standard datasets are often used uncritically based on their *standardness*, which fogs two possible breaking points:

- There could be a mismatch between labels and meaningful concepts. In literature, the term *class* is frequently used to address both, the labels and the implied concepts. We differentiate between those by using the term (*class*) *label* if we refer to the pre-defined mapping from data points to class names according to the dataset and the term *category* if we refer to the concept implied by the name of a class. For example, the `alt.atheism` label in the 20 Newsgroups dataset (allegedly) corresponds to the category of atheism regarding the content of a text. However, it could be that the label does not match the implied category, i.e., not all texts with the label `alt.atheism` actually deal with the topic of atheism.
- The dataset could be unsuitable for the targeted use case. For example, if the use case is the automatic classification of arbitrary texts with respect to their main topic, the 20 Newsgroups dataset might be unsuitable for training and testing. As all texts within the dataset come from mailing lists, an ML model trained on this data may not be able to generalize onto other text genres.

These two possible breaking points are often not discussed, relying on and appealing to the standardness of the used datasets, which, however, is an unclear characterization, especially since there is no process of how a dataset becomes “standard”. Often, this happens due to historical developments and the subsequent frequent use of a dataset, which provides no guarantee for the quality of labels and the applicability to specific use cases.

Therefore, we argue for the critical usage of standard datasets, as this is required for trustworthy reasoning about the quality of an ML model. According to Lazer et al. [46, p.1], the “[b]ig data hubris’ is the often implicit assumption that big data are a substitute for, rather than a supplement to, traditional data collection and analysis.” By focusing on the human understanding of the match between use case, derived categories, and class labels instead of quantifiable metrics, we aim to help alleviating this big data hubris. We argue that a standard dataset’s labels only convey *meaning* if they adhere to this match (see Figure 1). If this is not the case, the result is uninterpretable and untrustworthy, as it is unclear what the ML model learned [69]. Therefore, used datasets have to be closely examined and matched with the intended use case to understand how they influence ML models. For this, we propose to adopt interdisciplinary methods, namely *Grounded Theory* and *Hypotheses Testing through Visualization*. We exemplify this approach by applying it to the usage of the 20 Newsgroups dataset as a negative case (i.e., labels do not match categories and/or the dataset is not suitable for the targeted use case) and the MNIST dataset as a positive case (i.e., labels match categories and the dataset is suitable for the targeted use case).

In summary, as our main contribution, we question the term of *standardness* in relation to datasets, which often fogs the need to explicitly match use cases, categories and class labels in order to achieve explainability and trustworthiness. Additionally, we propose a quali-quantitative method [9] for dataset interrogation that combines a qualitative and a quantitative approach to increase trust in the evaluation results and, consequently, the quality of ML models trained on the respective datasets. In section 2, we will review literature on how to investigate the meaning of labels and foundations of the adopted methods. In section 3, we reflect upon the usage of the 20 Newsgroups and MNIST dataset in literature and describe some characteristics of those datasets. In section 4, we demonstrate the proposed quali-quantitative method by applying it to the two datasets. We summarize and discuss our findings in section 5 before concluding this paper in section 6.




Fig. 1. We argue that a data scientist must actively ensure the match between the use case, labels, and categories (dashed lines). The use case provides the context for deriving categories which should match the labels (solid lines).

2 RELATED WORK

In the following, we draw connections between our position and existing research regarding standard datasets, ML epistemology, and data quality and assessment.

Machine Learning Epistemology. Desai et al. [25, p.13] point out that supervised models mainly rely on inductive reasoning. Because of this, supervised models face the fundamental problem that they become outdated once the training data does not conform with the observed patterns any longer. We agree with this notion and want to add that ML research papers often lack statements about what they expect from a standard dataset, thus making this issue of outdated models harder to identify. For examining whether a model has learned meaningful concepts from the training data, visualization techniques can be used. Especially if the visualization is informed by prior qualitative findings, it can enrich the understanding of and trust in ML models [51, 55]. However, as recent work by Jeon et al. [38] points out, care has to be taken when using *Dimensionality Reduction (DR)* techniques in the context of visual analysis, as clusters in the two-dimensional plane can not easily be assumed to represent meaningful categories. More likely, categories are spanning an arbitrary structure in the high-dimensional space, making it difficult to find appropriate projections that lead to interpretable results. While we agree, we investigate the problem at a more fundamental level, asking whether a concrete class label represents a coherent category in the high-dimensional space at all. For this, we rely on benchmarking studies, e.g., Espadoto et al. [30] and Atzberger et al. [4], to choose appropriate methods for DR that lead to reliable representations.

Views on Datasets and ML Models in Different Disciplines. As the term *Big Data* is only loosely defined in research [43], the dependent term of the *standard dataset* also remains unclear (e.g., what exactly denotes *variety* for standard datasets). Further, the view on standard datasets and ML models differs across separate disciplines. On the one hand, scientists with various backgrounds treat standard “data[-sets] as the media through which conversation, negotiation, and action can occur” [57, p.2], which is a qualitative view on the matter. Here, standard datasets are perceived as basis for automated decision-making and, thus, in a way exercise power over people or shape their perception of reality [37, 49]. A particular focus is placed upon the fact that it is impossible to separate ML models (and, therefore, implicitly their training datasets) from their societal context as they tend to be mystified by the public [27] and even programmers can usually not restrict their ML models to the computational context [65] or avoid making ethical decisions [54]. Furthermore, algorithm audits revealed that ML models have the potential to be racist and sexist [5], can threaten users [12], and can produce unfair and biased output [53]. In summary, the qualitative aspects of ML models and the underlying data is emphasized in this branch of research. On the other hand, a lot of computer science research is mainly focused on quantitative aspects of ML models. While, for example, the issues of biases [53] or explainability [64] are also acknowledged, the field of *Explainable AI (XAI)* that emerged in this context attempts to provide automatic explanations for opaque decision-making ML models on the basis of quantitative analysis. Therefore, XAI usually

remains in the field of inductive reasoning [25, p.13] and thus does not engage in a qualitative manual analysis of the data [9, 46, 69]. However, while XAI is profoundly model-centric [58], some research also attempts to understand noise in labels on a qualitative level [19]. We also propose to combine quantitative and qualitative methods for dataset assessment and, in particular, argue that due to the unclear definition and characteristics of standard datasets, every researcher should examine the used datasets carefully with respect to the targeted use case.

Alleviation of Dataset Issues. Confidence learning as a subfield of ML is concerned with potential errors in labels and how to mitigate their impact. The field is constituted by the observation that “Advances in learning with noisy labels [...] usually introduce a new model or loss function. Often this model-centric approach band-aids the real question: which data is mislabeled?” [58, p.1]. Typically, the noise in labels is modeled as a random variable to account for it during training [19, 56, 58]. On the one hand, we are concerned with the same phenomenon, namely that labels may be noisy. On the other hand, we emphasize that the noise we want to address is qualitative and, therefore, intractable by a simple mathematical quantification, e.g., by a random variable. We argue that manual investigation is required first to correctly model noise in labels. In particular, we want to determine whether the noise in labels is caused by a systemic, frequent gap between the alleged category (meaning) and the contents of the data or whether it is *real* noise in the mathematical sense.

Manual Data Assessment. Lewis et al. [50] suggested manual methods for investigating datasets. The authors argue that in addition to automated quantitative evaluation, one should use manual content evaluation to capture *latent features* that may not be as easily quantified [50, p.12]. Similarly, Blok and Pedersen [9] argue that qualitative methods from social science can complement the quantitative methods that are commonly used in computer science. In this regard, Cech et al. [14] have given a first impression of how such mixed methods can lead to new knowledge artifacts about ML models.

3 EXEMPLIFIED ANALYSIS OF HISTORY, CHARACTERISTICS, AND USAGE OF STANDARD DATASETS

We claim that, currently, the standardness of a dataset does not imply a certain data quality with respect to correct labels, noise, or diversity. We further claim that, nevertheless, researchers often use standard datasets without careful examination of their quality and in-depth discussion about why the datasets are appropriate for the intended use case. To underpin and exemplify these two claims, we first provide a descriptive analysis of two datasets, namely the 20 Newsgroups dataset and the MNIST dataset, to illustrate possible issues with these datasets in general, despite their standardness. For each dataset, we then review 15 research papers that make use of it and evaluate how well the use of the dataset is motivated and how well the dataset itself is interrogated. We included a paper if either a model on the dataset is evaluated or the dataset is heavily used otherwise. We chose the top papers according to Google Scholar with the cut-off date at 01-01-2015 to review reasonably recent research articles. We want to clarify that gathering sources by Google Scholar is not deterministic but often good enough to find pertinent references [33]. Therefore, our review is not replicable and can not be considered a systematic survey. Nevertheless, we settled for this method since, in our experience, computer science researchers still use Google Scholar to find relevant references and, as far as scientific literature is concerned, researchers are likely introduced to the datasets through papers they discovered using this search engine.

We assess each paper with respect to five categories, namely (1) whether the author(s) of the research paper gave a traceable reference to the dataset, (2) whether they explicitly chose a specific version of the dataset, (3) whether they analyzed the content of the dataset at all, (4) whether they

gave an example from the dataset, and (5) whether they performed an in-depth analysis of the contents for their use case. These categories characterize the level of detail in the interrogation of the dataset. The results of the review are shown in Table 1 and Table 2.

3.1 The 20 Newsgroups dataset

The 20 Newsgroups dataset contains texts sent via e-mail lists in the late 1990s curated by Ken Lang [39]. We obtained the 20 Newsgroups dataset from Jason Rennie's Home Page² since it often appears to be given as the source [10, 72]. Additionally, according to their respective documentation, the popular Python ML library Scikit-Learn³ and the dataset-sharing site Kaggle⁴ also state this source. According to Jason Rennie's website, three different versions of the dataset exist. The original dataset contains 19 997 documents, approximately evenly distributed over 20 categories. A second version with fewer headers and removed duplicates contains 18 846 documents. A third version with even less duplicates but maintained *From* and *Subject* header lines contains 18 828 documents. The website speculates that the dataset was gathered for Lang [45] though it was finally not included in the paper. This proposition is strengthened by other sources from the 90s, for example by Joachims [39].

The categories are constituted by the name of the respective mailing list. Each category contains a selection of e-mails from several threads that appear to be loosely connected. According to the header field *From*, the dataset contains posts from 8 644 unique e-mail addresses. Please note that we assumed that an author is uniquely identified by the content of the *From* line. We ignored the case where one author uses several aliases or e-mail addresses. Naturally, not all authors contributed equally to the dataset. Only 3 080, 1 659, and 293 authors contributed at least two, three, and ten posts, respectively. This corresponds to a share of 72 %, 57 %, and 27 % of the number of all posts from 36 %, 19 %, and 3 % of all authors, respectively. At the line level, the difference between the number of total lines (762 321) and lines of authors with at least two (601 304 lines corresponding to a share of 78 %), three (505 800 lines corresponding to a share of 66 %), and ten (258 885 lines corresponding to a share of 34 %) posts becomes even more apparent. Therefore, the language of only three percent of authors represents a disproportional share of around one-third of the text corpus. Furthermore, we also want to emphasize that much of the content comprises quotes from other e-mails, indicated by a starting right arrow symbol. Overall, over 16.5 % of all lines (126 202 lines) are quotes and not original content from the respective author. The high ratio of quotes results in texts that significantly differ from spoken language [22].

Sometimes, e.g., by Albishre et al. [2] or Zhang and Yamana [76], the already mentioned paper by Lang [45] is given as the source. Curiously, Kou et al. [44] state that Joachims [39] collected the 20 Newsgroups dataset, which is doubtful since Joachims himself gives Lang as the original collector [39, p.13]. Saigal and Khanna [63, p.9] link to another website⁵ and additionally state without reference that the dataset was collected by Lang. Hsu [36] references the Scikit-Learn library as the source, which references the original website. Often, Jason Rennie's website is identified as the source of the dataset [10, 15, 59, 72, 73]. Seldom, the different versions of the dataset are mentioned to make transparent which version of the dataset was used (e.g., by Albishre et al. [2]). More often, the authors state that the dataset contains approximately 20 000 documents from 20 different classes which holds for all three versions of the dataset, e.g., in Pappagari et al. [59], Wang et al. [73], and Chandra [15]. Interestingly, the authors rarely, and then only briefly, discuss what they think the 20 Newsgroups contain. Usually, the discussion tends to be on the descriptive level.

²<http://qwone.com/~jason/20Newsgroups/>

³https://scikit-learn.org/stable/datasets/real_world.html#the-20-newsgroups-text-dataset

⁴<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/crawford/20-newsgroups>

⁵<https://www.ics.uci.edu/>

Paper	Source Given?	Explicit Choice?	States Content?	Example?	In-Depth?
Albishre et al. [2]	(yes)	yes	yes	(yes)	no
Asim et al. [3]	no	(yes)	no	no	no
Bodrunova et al. [10]	yes	yes	no	no	no
Chandra [15]	yes	no	no	no	no
Chen and Dai [17]	yes	yes	no	no	no
Hsu [36]	(yes)	yes	no	no	no
Kou et al. [44]	no	no	yes	no	no
Mauni et al. [52]	no	no	no	no	no
Pappagari et al. [59]	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Ruff et al. [61]	yes	no	no	no	no
Saigal and Khanna [63]	no	no	yes	no	no
Singh et al. [68]	yes	no	(yes)	no	no
Wang et al. [73]	yes	no	no	no	no
Wang and Yang [74]	yes	yes	no	no	no
Zhang and Yamana [76]	(yes)	yes	no	no	no

Table 1. An overview of the 15 reviewed ML research papers for the 20 Newsgroups dataset, assessed according to the defined categories. We used the entry *(yes)* if the property was given indirectly.

Paper	Source Given?	Explicit Choice?	States Content?	Example?	In-Depth?
Baldominos et al. [6]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Castro et al. [13]	yes	no	(yes)	yes	no
Chen et al. [18]	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Cheng et al. [20]	no	yes	yes	no	no
Cohen et al. [21]	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Garg et al. [31]	no	no	yes	yes	no
Garin and Tauzin [32]	no	no	no	yes	no
Kadam et al. [40]	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Karayaneva and Hintea [41]	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Kerenidis and Luongo [42]	yes	yes	no	no	no
Romanuke [60]	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Saadna et al. [62]	yes	yes	no	no	no
Serrano-Gotarredona and Linares-Barranco [67]	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Tabik et al. [70]	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Yadav and Bottou [75]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Table 2. An overview of the 15 reviewed ML research papers for the MNIST dataset, assessed according to the defined categories. We used the entry *(yes)* if the property was given indirectly.

It contains statements about the context and lists some example label names [44, 63]. Only in one case, an example document was shown, however, without discussion [2]. Furthermore, no reviewed paper discusses in detail why the usage of the 20 Newsgroups dataset is appropriate for the intended use case.

In summary, in the reviewed literature it remains unclear why the 20 Newsgroups dataset was used and why the authors validate their method on this dataset.

3.2 The MNIST dataset

The MNIST dataset contains 28x28 pixel images of hand-written digits from 2000 Census Bureau employees and 500 high school students in the 1990s [6, 75]. Baldominos et al. [6] state that the

dataset origins from the NIST special datasets 1 and 3 which were later combined into special dataset 19 [35, p.3]. In contrast to the 20 Newsgroups dataset, the history of the MNIST dataset is documented by the study of Yadav and Bottou [75]. According to them, Bottou et al. [11] introduced the dataset. However, since this conference paper was added in 2002 to the IEEE digital library⁶, eight years after it was originally published, the origin of the dataset is often wrongly contributed to LeCun et al. [47] of the same working group [6, 21, 67]. Since most papers reference LeCun et al. [47] as the dataset's source and LeCun's website⁷ claims that it contains the dataset referenced in LeCun et al. [47], we assume that this version of the dataset is the authoritative source. Notably, neither LeCun's website nor LeCun et al. [47] reference Bottou et al. [11]. We additionally want to note that according to Yadav and Bottou [75, p.3] "Although [Bottou et al. [11]] was the first paper mentioning MNIST, the creation of the dataset predates this benchmarking effort by several months." The dataset was already fully established when the 1994 paper was written [75, p.3 footnote 2]. Furthermore, parts of the dataset appear in other papers that predate the paper from 1994 [24, 48]. Consequently, Yadav and Bottou [75] state that the exact origin of the MNIST dataset remains unclear.

The categories of the dataset are constituted by forms filled out by the Census Bureau employees and the students. An example form is shown on the corresponding NIST dataset site⁸ or in Grother and Hanaoka [35]. Since this data was gathered in a highly controlled environment, the labels are much more reliable than the 20 Newsgroups dataset [35]. However, since the original form fields contained number sequences, each of these sequences had to be split to obtain a dataset of single digits. The algorithm by which the digit sequence was broken down and preprocessed into single digits could not be reverse-engineered by a team member from the original 1994 paper under the consultation of several other team members [75]. Further, the authors discovered bugs that resulted, for example, in a pixel shift for certain digits that impacted the model's testing error when corrected [75].

The results from the review in Table 2 are more promising compared to the results for the 20 Newsgroups dataset. Usually, the authors indirectly reference the single dataset version on LeCun's website [6, 13, 21]. Only once in Yadav and Bottou [75], the earlier 1994 paper is mentioned, which, however, did not publish the used dataset version [11]. Additionally, the actual contents of the dataset are discussed more frequently compared to the 20 Newsgroups dataset and example images are shown [6, 40, 75]. Castro et al. [13] only describe abstractly what the MNIST dataset is and mainly rely on the references LeCun et al. [47] and Yadav and Bottou [75]. With Yadav and Bottou [75] and Baldominos et al. [6], two papers discuss specifics of the dataset. Nevertheless, papers often fail to discuss in detail why they find the MNIST dataset appropriate for evaluating their model [13, 32, 62]. If the scope of a paper is limited to the usage of the MNIST dataset specifically, this may be not as important as for a more general use case. Nevertheless, it would be important to discuss, why this limitation leads to relevant results.

In summary, the MNIST dataset is better documented compared to the 20 Newsgroups dataset, even though some details must be considered lost in history. Also, the labels are more reliable since they were specifically captured by government employees and high school students in a dedicated form.

⁶<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/576879>

⁷<http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>

⁸<https://www.nist.gov/srd/nist-special-database-19>

```

1           An Introduction to Atheism
2           by mathew <mathew@mantis.co.uk>
3
4 This article attempts to provide a general introduction to atheism. Whilst I
5 have tried to be as neutral as possible regarding contentious issues, you
6 should always remember that this document represents only one viewpoint. I
7 would encourage you to read widely and draw your own conclusions; some
8 relevant books are listed in a companion article.
9
10 To provide a sense of cohesion and progression, I have presented this article
11 as an imaginary conversation between an atheist and a theist. All the
12 questions asked by the imaginary theist are questions which have been cropped
13 up repeatedly on alt.atheism since the newsgroup was created. Some other
14 frequently asked questions are answered in a companion article.
15
16 Please note that this article is arguably slanted towards answering questions
17 posed from a Christian viewpoint. This is because the FAQ files reflect
18 questions which have actually been asked, and it is predominantly Christians
19 who proselytize on alt.atheism.
20
21 So when I talk of religion, I am talking primarily about religions such as
22 Christianity, Judaism and Islam, which involve some sort of superhuman divine
23 being. Much of the discussion will apply to other religions, but some of it
24 may not.
25
26 "What is atheism?"

```

Fig. 2. Document 51 060 of the category alt.atheism. The text contains an article about atheism and therefore has a direct link to the category label.

4 METHODS FOR INTERROGATING DATASETS

We have exemplified that recent papers frequently omit the discussion of whether a dataset is suitable for evaluating a model. In the case of the 20 Newsgroups dataset, none of the considered papers critically discusses the usage of the dataset. In the case of the MNIST dataset, Yadav and Bottou [75] and Baldominos et al. [6] provide such a critical discussion, but in recent papers this discussion is either not reflected, e.g., in Kadam et al. [40] or Cheng et al. [20], or only briefly reflected, e.g., in Castro et al. [13]. In our opinion, this lack of discussion is often induced by relying on the standardness of a dataset. Instead, a dataset should be carefully evaluated and not used uncritically. For this evaluation, we now suggest to adopt two methods: Grounded Theory and Hypothesis Testing through Visualization. We demonstrate these methods on the 20 Newsgroups dataset and the MNIST dataset.

4.1 Grounded Theory

Grounded Theory is a qualitative method introduced to sociological research by Glaser and Strauss [34] and recently also discussed in computer science research [26]. Grounded Theory entails, among others, *Close Reading*, *Coding*, and *Theoretical Sampling* of datasets and literature [26, 29]. Close Reading describes the process of looking at data points in detail by engaging in manual evaluation [26]. Coding describes the process of mapping investigated data points to a predefined set of descriptive categories [29]. Theoretical Sampling, in contrast to random sampling, is the process of acquiring more data based on the current form of one’s theory [29]. This process is often not linear and requires readjustments of one’s theory so that it becomes compatible with the newly found data. This process is reiterated until no new knowledge emerges and, as such, the theory reaches so called *Theoretical Saturation* [26].

20 Newsgroups dataset case. Studies such as Asim et al. [3], Chandra [15], and Chen and Dai [17] use the 20 Newsgroups dataset for text classification tasks, consequently implicitly assuming that it constitutes an applicable representative of text datasets. Thus, we assume in the following that


```

1 >Why is it more reasonable than the trend towards obesity and the trend towards
2 >depression? You can't just pick your two favorite trends, notice a correlation
3 >in them, and make a sweeping statement of generality. I mean, you CAN, and
4 >people HAVE, but that does not mean that it is a valid or reasonable thesis.
5 >At best it's a gross oversimplification of the push-pull factors people
6 >experience.
7
8 I agree, I reckon it's television and the increase in fundamentalism.. You
9 think its the increase in pre-marital sex... others thinks its because
10 psychologists have taken over the criminal justice system and let violent
11 criminals con them into letting them out into the streets... others think
12 it's the increase in designer drugs... others think it's a communist plot.
13 Basically the social interactions of all the changing factors in our society
14 are far too complicated for us to control. We just have to hold on to the
15 panic handles and hope that we are heading for a soft landing. But one
16 things for sure, depression and the destruction of the nuclear family is not
17 due solely to sex out of marriage.

```

Fig. 3. Document 51 194 of the class label *alt.atheism*. The text is part of a discussion about whether the growing number of people identifying as atheists is correlated to the growing number of depression cases.

documents of the same label belong to the same category, which would be reflected by such texts being already similar on the surface. However, this might not be the case. To test the assumption, we apply Close Reading to some samples with the lexicographically first class label of the 20 Newsgroups, namely *alt.atheism*. Derived from the name of the class, we expect that this label represents the category of *atheism*. For the sake of the argument, let's assume that we randomly collect document 51 060 (shown in Figure 2) and find that it contains an introductory article about atheism. Therefore, it is safe to code this document as being concerned with atheism. Then, we use Theoretical Sampling to acquire further samples of the label *alt.atheism*. Because, the theory is concerned with all samples of this label, we can use an arbitrary sampling method in this case. We proceed with Coding the next (lexicographically ordered) 100 samples. During Coding we obtain document 51 194 (shown in Figure 3) and find that it is hardly connected to the category of atheism and, therefore, can not be coded as being part of the category of atheism. Now, we have two options: (1) Based on the current theory that class labels and categories are linked, we could exclude this sample from the category of atheism. This would require the introduction of a new label for this sample. (2) Otherwise, we have the option to refine the theory (that documents of the same label belong to the same category) to maintain the same label for both samples. Given that no reviewed work introduces new categories or codes (see Table 1), we opt for refining the theory and investigate how document 51 060 and document 51 194 can possibly belong to the same category. By manually reverse engineering the corresponding mailing list thread, we find that document 51 194 is part of a discussion about *if and if true how the growing number of people identifying as atheists is correlated with the growing number of depression cases*. This broader context explains the label of the document. However, as this context, which is not included in the dataset, is necessary for understanding how the document is connected to the atheism discourse in the 80s, the out-of-context document can not be considered as belonging to the category of atheism. Thus, an ML model trained on the dataset would not learn anything about atheism as understood in 2015 or later, which is the time covered by our literature review.

Further Coding, then, strengthens the theory that in 2015 the documents do not constitute a coherent category any more. After manually Coding the lexicographically first 100 documents in 11 codes from which only one represents the category of atheism⁹, we find that only 26 of the documents fit the category of atheism. Overall, from today's point of view, the only connection between the documents appears to be that they were posted to the same mailing list and not

⁹Dataset available with DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.8337723



Fig. 4. Some examples from the lexicographically first label representing the 0 category from the MNIST dataset. All investigated samples could be coded by us as representing zero even if some artifacts are present, as can be seen in the last example.

that they belong to the same category with respect to the text content. Therefore, any model that is trained with the implicit assumption that the label matches the category consequently produces meaningless results and it has to be doubted that the performance of an ML model for text classification on this “standard dataset” is a good indicator for its general quality. On the positive side, we found out that the used language in the documents is very diverse and heterogeneous with some documents using informal, short, and heated language and others using very formal and long-winded language which can be considered as real noise due to its independence from the topic of atheism.

MNIST dataset case. We apply the same method as before, starting again with the proposition that the MNIST dataset is a good representation of a computer vision dataset, suitable for benchmark studies on classification of image data, as done by Chen et al. [18], Garg et al. [31], and Karayaneva and Hintea [41]. We again investigate the lexicographically first label, representing the category 0 by name. Consequently, we would expect that all images represent zeros, meaning that the category would match the label. We code the first 100 lexicographically ordered samples with label 0 , by deciding for each image, whether it actually shows a zero or not (see examples in Figure 4). For all cases we can identify the image content as zero, with only rarely encountering minor artifacts, e.g., in the second to last example image in Figure 4 (image 451) or the last zero (image 34 486), which looks unusual but is still recognizable as a zero. Since all investigated samples can be coded to the proposed category, we can maintain the proposition that the (class) label 0 matches the category 0 .

4.2 Hypotheses testing through visualization

As Grounded Theory is a qualitative method by nature, it requires manual investigation per datapoint [26]. This is not feasible for the majority of data points in case of large datasets. Therefore, we complement this approach with an additional method that employs a quantitative technique to strengthen (or counter) the findings from the previous section. Statistical hypothesis testing is an established quantitative method in different research areas [28]. It starts from a so-called null hypothesis with a qualitative proposition and subsequently examines available data to find out, whether the null hypothesis has to be rejected, assuming a certain quantitative distribution. We want to take up this method as an analogy to propose *Hypothesis Testing through Visualization*, situated in the broader context of *VIS4GT (Visualization for Grounded Theory)* as introduced by Diehl et al. [26]. Based on a quantitative visualization technique of the data, we examine whether the data points follow the expectations with respect to the hypothesis. This mirrors the assumed quantitative distribution from the classical hypothesis testing. We argue that a purely qualitative hypothesis (obtained via Grounded Theory) is required first to mitigate the risk that the subsequent interrogation of the dataset is distorted by the quantitative visualization technique. Similar to a null hypothesis, we initially choose the opposite of the hypothesis we have found in the previous section (namely, that there is a direct match between class labels and categories). For visualization, we choose DR into a two-dimensional scatter plot. We follow two recent recommendations for best practices regarding selection of DR techniques [4, 30]. Atzberger et al. [4] focused on text data while Espadoto et al. [30] employed a more general approach. Therefore, we use the guidelines of




Fig. 5. The 20 Newsgroups dataset was reduced with t-SNE and LSI as proposed by Atzberger et al. [4]. The documents 51 060, 51 194, 52 910, and 53 449 are highlighted. They are wide-spread in the visualization and are also semantically dissimilar.




Fig. 6. The 20 Newsgroups dataset was reduced with t-SNE and LDA as proposed by Atzberger et al. [4]. The documents 51 060, 51 194, and 52 910, and 53 449 are highlighted. They are wide-spread in the visualization and are also semantically dissimilar.




Fig. 7. An example layout generated according to the guidelines of Espadoto et al. [30]. The MNIST dataset was reduced with t-SNE. The images 1, 21, 451, and 34 486 of category 0 are highlighted. Even the noisy image 451 clearly belongs to a visually well defined cluster and is semantically similar.

Atzberger et al. [4] for the 20 Newsgroups dataset (see Figure 5 and Figure 6) and the guidelines of Espadoto et al. [30] for the MNIST dataset (see Figure 7). While this approach may obtain a sub-optimal but still “good enough” layout, it mitigates the risk of over-optimization [66]. Otherwise, the interrogation may be not generalizable according to the NFL [1].

20 Newsgroups dataset case. We now want to find out, whether we should reject the theory that *the 20 Newsgroups dataset is a good representation for learning concepts from textual data*, by employing Hypothesis Testing through Visualization. As advised by Atzberger et al. [4], we used

```

1           Overview
2
3 Welcome to alt.atheism and alt.atheism.moderated.
4
5 This is the first in a series of regular postings aimed at new readers of the
6 newsgroups.
7
8 Many groups of a 'controversial' nature have noticed that new readers often
9 come up with the same questions, mis-statements or misconceptions and post
10 them to the net. In addition, people often request information which has
11 been posted time and time again. In order to try and cut down on this, the
12 alt.atheism groups have a series of five regular postings under the following
13 titles:
14
15     1. Alt.Atheism FAQ: Overview for New Readers
16     2. Alt.Atheism FAQ: Introduction to Atheism
17     3. Alt.Atheism FAQ: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)
18     4. Alt.Atheism FAQ: Constructing a Logical Argument
19     5. Alt.Atheism FAQ: Atheist Resources
20
21 This is article number 1. Please read numbers 2 and 3 before posting. The
22 others are entirely optional.
23
24 If you are new to Usenet, you may also find it helpful to read the newsgroup
25 news.announce.newusers. The articles titled "A Primer on How to Work With
26 the Usenet Community", "Answers to Frequently Asked Questions about Usenet"
27 and "Hints on writing style for Usenet" are particularly relevant. Questions
28 concerning how news works are best asked in news.newusers.questions.
29
30 If you are unable to find any of the articles listed above, see the "Finding
31 Stuff" section below.

```

Fig. 8. Document 52910 has the maximum distance to the supporting document 51060 after executing t-SNE and LSI as proposed by [4].

```

1 In article <1993Apr19.151120.14068@abo.fi> MANDTBACKA@FINABO.ABO.FI (Mats Andtbacka) writes:
2 >In <930419.125145.903.rusnews.w165w@mantis.co.uk> mathew writes:
3 >> I wonder if Noam Chomsky is reading this?
4 >
5 >     I could be wrong, but is he actually talking about outright
6 >_government_ control of the media, aka censorship?
7 >
8 >     If he doesn't, any quick one-stop-shopping reference to his works
9 >that'll tell me, in short, what he _does_ argue for?
10
11 "Manufacturing Consent," a film about the media. You alternative movie source
12 may have this; or to book it in your local alternative theatre, contact:
13
14 FILMS TRANSIT * INTERNATIONAL SALES
15 Jan Rofekamp
16 402 Notre Dame E.
17 Montreal, Quebec
18 Canada H2Y 1C8
19 Tel (514) 844-3358 * Fax (514) 844-7298
20 Telex 5560074 Filmtransmt1
21
22 (US readers: call Zeitgeist Films at 212 274 1989.)

```

Fig. 9. Document 53449 has the maximum distance to the supporting document 51060 after executing t-SNE and LDA as proposed by [4].

Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI) [23] and *Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA)* [8] for topic modeling and *t-stochastic neighbor embedding (t-SNE)* [71] for DR. We choose document 51060 again as a first representative supporting the proposition informed by the previous interrogation. Subsequently, we apply the guidelines from Atzberger et al. [4], resulting in a two-dimensional representation suitable for investigating the neighborhood of the currently considered supporting document 51060.

The resulting scatter plots are rather convoluted (see Figure 5 and Figure 6), as we would expect from the results of the previous section, namely that texts with the same label are actually only loosely connected with respect to their category, if connected at all. We then observe that the points representing samples from the label `alt.atheism` are widespread, again suggesting a loosely defined category. Investigating the immediate neighborhood of document 51 060, we find document 51 122 as the nearest document using the LDA model and document 52 499 for the respective LSI model. A manual investigation reveals that those documents are indeed quite well related to the category and therefore strengthen the proposition. However, document 51 194, which also previously countered the hypothesis, is not in the neighborhood of document 51 060, but over 200 times farther away than the respective closest document mentioned above (according to euclidian distance when using LSI). On investigation of the documents with the label `alt.atheism` that are the farthest away from document 51 060 (document 52 910 for LSI and document 53 449 for LDA), we find that their contents are indeed dissimilar from the considered document, as shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9. Document 52 910 is an FAQ for the mailing list and is not concerned with atheism and document 53 449 is a comment on a book by Noam Chomsky. However, the comment itself has no link to the contemporary category of atheism. By using multiple different topic models, as proposed by Atzberger et al. [4], we find different types of dissimilarities while still observing that semantically dissimilar documents are dissimilar in both layouts. The investigated documents counter the “Null Hypothesis” and, therefore, we have evidence that the convoluted layout indeed corresponds to imprecise class labels. Thus, we reject the hypothesis that the labels match the categories on the basis of reasoning over all samples due to the employment of a quantitative DR technique.

MNIST dataset case. Espadoto et al. [30, p.17] identify four DR techniques that work reasonably well for several types of data, among them also t-SNE. We choose this technique to simplify the comparison to the findings for the 20 Newsgroups dataset in the previous paragraph. Starting from the proposition that the MNIST dataset is not a suitable dataset for image classification due to semantically incoherent categories (opposite to the proposition in subsection 4.1), we visualize the dataset for further investigation (see Figure 7). In contrast to the 20 Newsgroups dataset, the cluster with label 0 is visually coherent. Even noisy images, such as image 451 (the second to last image in Figure 4), are located in the dense cluster of zeros. This observation matches the previous Coding from the Grounded Theory approach well and counters the “Null Hypothesis”. We then investigate one of the few samples that are located in another neighborhood, compared to the rest of the images with the label 0 : image 34 486 (last image in Figure 4). This data point is located in the neighborhood of the visual cluster that represent images containing a seven rather than a zero. By manual investigation, we find that this data point is indeed dissimilar to the other zeros we manually reviewed but still can be coded as belonging to the category 0 . Therefore, this case represents *real* noise that is qualitatively similar to the category but quantifiably dissimilar in the underlying value distribution. Such desirable noise is covered by the *Variety* criteria of Big Data [43]. Combined with the previous qualitative interrogation, we now have evidence that the visual coherent clusters are not qualitatively distorted by the DR technique. Therefore, again, we would reject the initial proposition. Consequently, we again strengthen the previous theory that in the case of the MNIST dataset, the labels match the categories.

5 DISCUSSION

By applying the proposed method, we have shown that the `alt.atheism` label of the 20 Newsgroups dataset is imprecise. Therefore, the data associated with this label is not suitable to learn from, especially in a meaningful fashion. A model that reaches high accuracy on correctly predicting the `alt.atheism` class label for a text has not learned a reliable understanding of the category of

atheism or any other coherent category. On the other hand, the MNIST dataset poses no such difficulties. We found that it has some quantifiable diversity in the class with the label 0 , however, a qualitative review revealed that this noise could still be subsumed under the category 0 . Therefore, we can conclude that this dataset is a meaningful standard dataset for the intended task of image recognition. Consequently, and only now, we can further conclude that performance increases from models trained on this dataset will mean an actually better solution of the use case and that the usual optimization towards accuracy is meaningful. On a more general level, the two provided examples show how the standardness of a dataset can fog its actual quality, i.e., whether the labels match the (implicitly) assumed categories. Further, data scientists may be misled to think that this standardness implies a fit to their use case, which, however, might have distinct requirements for categories and labels, not satisfied by the dataset at hand. Therefore, it is not advisable to simply rely on the standardness of a dataset, which typically only refers to its frequent use. Omitting the discussion about why a dataset is used is only acceptable if the dataset is proven to have a trivial match between labels and categories. In this case, the concept of *standardness* becomes associated with qualitative criteria, deepening the meaning of comparisons over such a standard dataset.

As shown, the proposed approach enables the assessment of datasets regarding use-case-specific quality criteria. Nonetheless, the approach is subject to threats to validity. The application of Grounded Theory is time consuming since it requires manual evaluation. Furthermore, it requires a clear understanding of the concepts to investigate, otherwise suboptimal codes could be chosen. In this paper, we were able to validate the concepts without domain experts. If the use case is more complex and domain specific, we encourage the involvement of domain experts to mitigate the risk of suboptimal Coding. A further limitation is that for every class label a lot of samples would have to be investigated until Theoretical Saturation is achieved. This is usually not feasible for a dataset with at least several thousands of samples. This is the reason why, in addition to Grounded Theory, we proposed a more quantitative method with Hypothesis Testing through Visualization to help overcoming this limitation by analyzing many samples at once. Unfortunately, every DR for a non-trivial dataset leads to some sort of distortion of the high-dimensional structure [38]. Therefore the observed patterns in the two-dimensional plane may not correspond to patterns in the original high-dimensional space. We mitigate this risk by using the result of large benchmark studies [4, 30] and combining it with the results from the Grounded Theory approach. This way, the qualitative approach mitigates some of the risks of the quantitative approach and vice versa [9]. The resulting quali-quantitative approach enables to reveal evidence which would remain hidden by a purely quantitative approach or not reasonably obtainable in time by a purely qualitative approach.

6 CONCLUSIONS

We observed that the standardness of a dataset is often derived from its usage frequency. By further associating the match between use case, derived categories, and class labels with the standardness of a dataset, one can obtain more trustworthy and meaningful results from an ML model. However, the degree of this match is often not discussed, as we demonstrated by reviewing recent literature. We encourage researchers to be more critical with their use of standard datasets and assess the quality of the dataset with manual methods. For this, we provided a quali-quantitative approach to dataset interrogation and demonstrated its application on two “standard” datasets.

As future work, we want to extend this method to enable dataset refinement [16]. For example, data scientists may want to introduce new labels to their datasets, e.g., by the use of label propagation approaches in low dimensional spaces [7], approaches to incorporate domain knowledge into a DR [51], or reverse engineering and correction of assumptions that were prevalent during gathering of a (standard) dataset [75]. Additionally, we want to extend our hypothesis testing analogy by

providing an analogon to the p-value. We envision such a p-value as another step towards the combination of human reasoning with the abstraction potential provided by artificial intelligence and visualization methods.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially funded by the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research through grant 01IS22062 (“AI research group FFS-AI”).

REFERENCES

- [1] Stavros P. Adam, Stamatios-Aggelos N. Alexandropoulos, Panos M. Pardalos, and Michael N. Vrahatis. 2019. No Free Lunch Theorem: A Review. In *Approximation and Optimization: Algorithms, Complexity and Applications*. Springer, Cham, 57–82. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12767-1_5
- [2] Khaled Albishre, Mubarak Albathan, and Yuefeng Li. 2015. Effective 20 Newsgroups Dataset Cleaning. In *Proc. IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence and Intelligent Agent Technology (WI-IAT '15, Vol. 3)*. IEEE, Singapore, 98–101. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WI-IAT.2015.90>
- [3] Muhammad Nabeel Asim, Muhammad Usman Ghani Khan, Muhammad Imran Malik, Andreas Dengel, and Sheraz Ahmed. 2019. A Robust Hybrid Approach for Textual Document Classification. In *Proc. International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR '19)*. IEEE, Sydney, 1390–1396. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDAR.2019.00224>
- [4] Daniel Atzberger, Tim Cech, Willy Scheibel, Matthias Trapp, Rico Richter, Jürgen Döllner, and Tobias Schreck. 2023. Large-Scale Evaluation of Topic Models and Dimensionality Reduction Methods for 2D Text Spatialization. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.11770> arXiv:2307.11770 [cs.CL] To be published at IEEE VIS 2023.
- [5] Paul Baker and Amanda Potts. 2013. “Why do white people have thin lips?” Google and the perpetuation of stereotypes via auto-complete search forms. *Critical Discourse Studies* 10, 2 (2013), 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.744320>
- [6] Alejandro Baldominos, Yago Saez, and Pedro Isasi. 2019. A Survey of Handwritten Character Recognition with MNIST and EMNIST. *Applied Sciences* 9, 15, Article 3169 (2019), 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app9153169>
- [7] Bárbara C. Benato, Jancarlo F. Gomes, Alexandru C. Telea, and Alexandre Xavier Falcão. 2021. Semi-supervised Deep Learning Based on Label Propagation in a 2D Embedded Space. In *Progress in Pattern Recognition, Image Analysis, Computer Vision, and Applications*. Springer, Cham, 371–381. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-93420-0_35
- [8] David M. Blei, Andrew Y. Ng, and Michael I. Jordan. 2003. Latent Dirichlet Allocation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 3 (2003), 993–1022.
- [9] Anders Blok and Morten Axel Pedersen. 2014. Complementary social science? Quali-quantitative experiments in a Big Data world. *Big Data & Society* 1, 2 (2014), 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951714543908>
- [10] Svetlana S. Bodrunova, Andrey V. Orekhov, Ivan S. Blekanov, Nikolay S. Lyudkevich, and Nikita A. Tarasov. 2020. Topic Detection Based on Sentence Embeddings and Agglomerative Clustering with Markov Moment. *Future Internet* 12, 9, Article 144 (2020), 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi12090144>
- [11] L. Bottou, C. Cortes, J.S. Denker, H. Drucker, I. Guyon, L.D. Jackel, Y. LeCun, U.A. Muller, E. Sackinger, P. Simard, and V. Vapnik. 1994. Comparison of classifier methods: a case study in handwritten digit recognition. In *Proc. 12th IAPR International Conference on Pattern Recognition, Vol. 3 – Conference C: Signal Processing (Cat. No.94CH3440-5)*, Vol. 2. IEEE, Jerusalem, 77–82 Vol.2. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPR.1994.576879>
- [12] Taina Bucher. 2012. Want to be on the top? Algorithmic power and the threat of invisibility on Facebook. *New media & society* 14, 7 (2012), 1164–1180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812440159>
- [13] Daniel C Castro, Jeremy Tan, Bernhard Kainz, Ender Konukoglu, and Ben Glocker. 2019. Morpho-MNIST: quantitative assessment and diagnostics for representation learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 20, 178 (2019), 1–29.
- [14] Tim Cech, Furkan Simsek, Willy Scheibel, and Jürgen Döllner. 2023. A Dashboard for Interactive Convolutional Neural Network Training And Validation Through Saliency Maps. In *EuroVis 2023 – Posters*. The Eurographics Association, Leipzig, 3 pages. <https://doi.org/10.2312/evp.20231054>
- [15] Andreas Chandra. 2019. Comparison of Feature Selection for Imbalance Text Datasets. In *Proc. International Conference on Information Management and Technology (ICIMTech '19, Vol. 1)*. IEEE, Jakarta/Bali, 68–72. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIMTech.2019.8843773>
- [16] A. Chatzimparmpas, F. V. Paulovich, and A. Kerren. 2023. HardVis: Visual Analytics to Handle Instance Hardness Using Undersampling and Oversampling Techniques. *Computer Graphics Forum* 42, 1 (2023), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cgf.14726>
- [17] Chuanshuai Chen and Jiazhu Dai. 2021. Mitigating backdoor attacks in LSTM-based text classification systems by Backdoor Keyword Identification. *Neurocomputing* 452 (2021), 253–262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2021.04.105>

- [18] Feiyang Chen, Nan Chen, Hanyang Mao, and Hanlin Hu. 2019. Assessing four Neural Networks on Handwritten Digit Recognition Dataset (MNIST). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1811.08278> arXiv:1811.08278 [cs.CV]
- [19] Pengfei Chen, Ben Ben Liao, Guangyong Chen, and Shengyu Zhang. 2019. Understanding and Utilizing Deep Neural Networks Trained with Noisy Labels. In *Proc. 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 97)*, Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov (Eds.). PMLR, Long Beach, 1062–1070.
- [20] Keyang Cheng, Rabia Tahir, Lubamba Kasangu Eric, and Maozhen Li. 2020. An analysis of generative adversarial networks and variants for image synthesis on MNIST dataset. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 79 (2020), 13725–13752. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-019-08600-2>
- [21] Gregory Cohen, Saeed Afshar, Jonathan Tanson, and André van Schaik. 2017. EMNIST: Extending MNIST to handwritten letters. In *2017 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN '17)*. IEEE, Anchorage, 2921–2926. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IJCNN.2017.7966217>
- [22] Kathryn Davidson. 2015. Quotation, demonstration, and iconicity. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 38, 6 (2015), 477–520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-015-9180-1>
- [23] Scott Deerwester, Susan T Dumais, George W. Furnas, Thomas K. Landauer, and Richard Harshman. 1990. Indexing by Latent Semantic Analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 41, 6 (1990), 391–407. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(199009\)41:6<391::AID-ASII>3.0.CO;2-9](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199009)41:6<391::AID-ASII>3.0.CO;2-9)
- [24] John Denker, W. Gardner, Hans Graf, Donnie Henderson, R. Howard, W. Hubbard, L. D. Jackel, Henry Baird, and Isabelle Guyon. 1988. Neural Network Recognizer for Hand-Written Zip Code Digits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 1 (1988), 323–331.
- [25] Jules Desai, David Watson, Vincent Wang, Mariarosaria Taddeo, and Luciano Floridi. 2022. The epistemological foundations of data science: a critical review. *Synthese* 200, 6 (2022), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-022-03933-2>
- [26] Alexandra Diehl, Alfie Abdul-Rahman, Benjamin Bach, Mennatallah El-Assady, Matthias Kraus, Robert S. Laramee, Daniel A. Keim, and Min Chen. 2022. Characterizing Grounded Theory Approaches in Visualization. *arXiv CoRR cs.HC*, 2203.01777 (2022), 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.01777>
- [27] M. C. Elish and danah boyd. 2018. Situating methods in the magic of Big Data and AI. *Communication Monographs* 85, 1 (2018), 57–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2017.1375130>
- [28] Frank Emmert-Streib and Matthias Dehmer. 2019. Understanding Statistical Hypothesis Testing: The Logic of Statistical Inference. *Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction* 1, 3 (2019), 945–961. <https://doi.org/10.3390/make1030054>
- [29] Steven Engler and Michael Stausberg. 2011. Grounded theory. In *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of Religion*. Routledge, London, 256–274.
- [30] Mateus Espadoto, Rafael M Martins, Andreas Kerren, Nina ST Hirata, and Alexandru C Telea. 2019. Toward a quantitative survey of dimension reduction techniques. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 27, 3 (2019), 2153–2173. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2019.2944182>
- [31] Adhesh Garg, Diwanshi Gupta, Sanjay Saxena, and Parimi Praveen Sahadev. 2019. Validation of Random Dataset Using an Efficient CNN Model Trained on MNIST Handwritten Dataset. In *Proc. 6th International Conference on Signal Processing and Integrated Networks (SPIN '19)*. IEEE, Noida, 602–606. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SPIN.2019.8711703>
- [32] Adélie Garin and Guillaume Tauzin. 2019. A Topological “Reading” Lesson: Classification of MNIST using TDA. In *2019 18th IEEE International Conference On Machine Learning And Applications (ICMLA)*. IEEE, Boca Raton, 1551–1556. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMLA.2019.00256>
- [33] Dean Giustini and Maged N Kamel Boulos. 2013. Google Scholar is not enough to be used alone for systematic reviews. *Online Journal of Public Health Informatics* 5, 2 (2013), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5210/ojphi.v5i2.4623> PMID: 23923099.
- [34] Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss. 2017. *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Routledge, London. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203793206>
- [35] Patrick J Grother and Kayee K Hanaoka. 1995. *NIST special database 19-hand-printed forms and characters database*. Technical Report. National Institute of Standards and Technology. <https://doi.org/10.18434/T4H01C>
- [36] Bi-Min Hsu. 2020. Comparison of Supervised Classification Models on Textual Data. *Mathematics* 8, 5, Article 851 (2020), 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.3390/math8050851>
- [37] L. Inrona and H. Nissenbaum. 2000. Defining the Web: the politics of search engines. *Computer* 33, 1 (2000), 54–62. <https://doi.org/10.1109/2.816269>
- [38] Hyeon Jeon, Yun-Hsin Kuo, Michaël Aupetit, Kwan-Liu Ma, and Jinwook Seo. 2023. Classes are not Clusters: Improving Label-based Evaluation of Dimensionality Reduction. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.00278> To be published at IEEE VIS 2023.
- [39] Thorsten Joachims. 1996. *A Probabilistic Analysis of the Rocchio Algorithm with TFIDF for Text Categorization*. Technical Report CMU-CS-96-118. School of Computer Science, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA.
- [40] Shivam S Kadam, Amol C Adamuthe, and Ashwini B Patil. 2020. CNN model for image classification on MNIST and fashion-MNIST dataset. *Journal of scientific research* 64, 2 (2020), 374–384.

- [41] Yordanka Karayaneva and Diana Hintea. 2018. Object recognition in python and MNIST dataset modification and recognition with five machine learning classifiers. *Journal of Image and Graphics* 6, 1 (2018), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.18178/joig.6.1.10-20>
- [42] Iordanis Kerenidis and Alessandro Luongo. 2020. Classification of the MNIST data set with quantum slow feature analysis. *Physical Review A* 101, 6 (2020), 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.101.062327>
- [43] Rob Kitchin and Gavin McArdle. 2016. What makes Big Data, Big Data? Exploring the ontological characteristics of 26 datasets. *Big Data & Society* 3, 1 (2016), 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716631130>
- [44] Gang Kou, Pei Yang, Yi Peng, Feng Xiao, Yang Chen, and Fawaz E. Alsaadi. 2020. Evaluation of feature selection methods for text classification with small datasets using multiple criteria decision-making methods. *Applied Soft Computing* 86, 105836 (2020), 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2019.105836>
- [45] Ken Lang. 1995. NewsWeeder: Learning to Filter Netnews. In *Machine Learning Proceedings 1995*. Morgan Kaufmann, Tahoe City, 331–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-1-55860-377-6.50048-7>
- [46] David Lazer, Ryan Kennedy, Gary King, and Alessandro Vespignani. 2014. The parable of Google Flu: traps in big data analysis. *science* 343, 6176 (2014), 1203–1205. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1248506>
- [47] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. 1998. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proc. IEEE* 86, 11 (1998), 2278–2324. <https://doi.org/10.1109/5.726791>
- [48] Y. LeCun, O. Matan, B. Boser, J.S. Denker, D. Henderson, R.E. Howard, W. Hubbard, L.D. Jacket, and H.S. Baird. 1990. Handwritten zip code recognition with multilayer networks. In *Proceedings of 10th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 2. IEEE, Atlantic City, 35–40. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPR.1990.119325>
- [49] Marc Lenglet. 2014. Algorithms and the manufacture of financial reality. In *Objects and Materials*. Routledge, London, 312–322.
- [50] Seth C. Lewis, Rodrigo Zamith, and Alfred Hermida. 2013. Content Analysis in an Era of Big Data: A Hybrid Approach to Computational and Manual Methods. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 57, 1 (2013), 34–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.761702>
- [51] Jie Li and Chun-qi Zhou. 2023. Incorporation of Human Knowledge into Data Embeddings to Improve Pattern Significance and Interpretability. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 29, 1 (2023), 723–733. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2022.3209382>
- [52] Humaira Zahin Mauni, Tajbia Hossain, and Raqeebir Rab. 2020. Classification of Underrepresented Text Data in an Imbalanced Dataset Using Deep Neural Network. In *Proc. IEEE Region 10 Symposium (TENSYPMP '20)*. IEEE, Dhaka, 997–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TENSYPMP50017.2020.9231021>
- [53] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine Learning. *Comput. Surveys* 54, 6, Article 115 (2021), 35 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3457607>
- [54] Brent Daniel Mittelstadt, Patrick Allo, Mariarosaria Taddeo, Sandra Wachter, and Luciano Floridi. 2016. The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society* 3, 2 (2016), 21 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679>
- [55] Katelyn Morrison, Donghoon Shin, Kenneth Holstein, and Adam Perer. 2023. Evaluating the Impact of Human Explanation Strategies on Human-AI Visual Decision-Making. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 7, CSCW1, Article 48 (2023), 37 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579481>
- [56] Nagarajan Natarajan, Inderjit S Dhillon, Pradeep K Ravikumar, and Ambuj Tewari. 2013. Learning with Noisy Labels. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 26. Curran Associates, Inc., Lake Tahoe, 1196–1204.
- [57] Gina Neff, Anissa Tanweer, Brittany Fiore-Gartland, and Laura Osburn. 2017. Critique and Contribute: A Practice-Based Framework for Improving Critical Data Studies and Data Science. *Big Data* 5, 2 (2017), 85–97. <https://doi.org/10.1089/big.2016.0050> PMID: 28632445.
- [58] Curtis Northcutt, Lu Jiang, and Isaac Chuang. 2021. Confident learning: Estimating uncertainty in dataset labels. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 70 (2021), 1373–1411. <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.12125>
- [59] Raghavendra Pappagari, Piotr Zelasko, Jesús Villalba, Yishay Carmiel, and Najim Dehak. 2019. Hierarchical Transformers for Long Document Classification. In *Proc. IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU '19)*. IEEE, Singapore, 838–844. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASRU46091.2019.9003958>
- [60] Vadim V. Romanuke. 2016. Training data expansion and boosting of convolutional neural networks for reducing the MNIST dataset error rate. *Research Bulletin of the National Technical University of Ukraine "Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"* 3, 6 (2016), 29–34. <https://doi.org/10.20535/1810-0546.2016.6.84115>
- [61] Lukas Ruff, Yury Zemlyanskiy, Robert Vandermeulen, Thomas Schnake, and Marius Kloft. 2019. Self-Attentive, Multi-Context One-Class Classification for Unsupervised Anomaly Detection on Text. In *Proc. 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. ACL, Florence, 4061–4071. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1398>
- [62] Yassmina Saadna, Ali Behloul, and Salih Mezzoudj. 2019. Speed limit sign detection and recognition system using SVM and MNIST datasets. *Neural Computing and Applications* 31 (2019), 5005–5015. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-018-03994-w>

- [63] Pooja Saigal and Vaibhav Khanna. 2020. Multi-category news classification using Support Vector Machine based classifiers. *SN Applied Sciences* 2 (2020), 458–470. Issue 3. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-020-2266-6>
- [64] Wojciech Samek and Klaus-Robert Müller. 2019. Towards Explainable Artificial Intelligence. *Explainable AI: Interpreting, Explaining and Visualizing Deep Learning* 1, 11700 (2019), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28954-6_1
- [65] Nick Seaver. 2017. Algorithms as culture: Some tactics for the ethnography of algorithmic systems. *Big Data & Society* 4, 2 (2017), 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717738104>
- [66] Michael Sedlmair, Tamara Munzner, and Melanie Tory. 2013. Empirical Guidance on Scatterplot and Dimension Reduction Technique Choices. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 19, 12 (2013), 2634–2643. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2013.153>
- [67] Teresa Serrano-Gotarredona and Bernabé Linares-Barranco. 2015. Poker-DVS and MNIST-DVS. Their History, How They Were Made, and Other Details. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 9 (2015), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2015.00481>
- [68] Gunjan Singh, Arpita Nagpal, and Vijendra Singh. 2023. Text Classification using Improved IWO-HAN. *Procedia Computer Science* 218 (2023), 1184–1195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.01.097> International Conference on Machine Learning and Data Engineering.
- [69] John Symons and Ramón Alvarado. 2019. Epistemic Entitlements and the Practice of Computer Simulation. *Minds and Machines* 29, 1 (2019), 37–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9487-0>
- [70] Siham Tabik, Daniel Peralta, and Andrés Herrera-Poyatos1 Francisco Herrera. 2017. A snapshot of image pre-processing for convolutional neural networks: case study of MNIST. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems* 10 (2017), 555–568. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ijcis.2017.10.1.38>
- [71] Laurens van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 9, 11 (2008), 2579–2605.
- [72] G. Varoquaux, L. Buitinck, G. Louppe, O. Grisel, F. Pedregosa, and A. Mueller. 2015. Scikit-Learn: Machine Learning Without Learning the Machinery. *GetMobile: Mobile Comp. and Comm.* 19, 1 (2015), 29–33. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2786984.2786995>
- [73] Daixin Wang, Peng Cui, and Wenwu Zhu. 2016. Structural Deep Network Embedding. In *Proc. International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, 1225–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939753>
- [74] Xinyi Wang and Yi Yang. 2020. Neural Topic Model with Attention for Supervised Learning. In *Proc. 23rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 108)*. PMLR, Online, 1147–1156. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v108/wang20c.html>
- [75] Chhavi Yadav and Leon Bottou. 2019. Cold Case: The Lost MNIST Digits. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc., Vancouver, 13443–13452.
- [76] Cheng Zhang and Hayato Yamana. 2021. Improving Text Classification Using Knowledge in Labels. In *Proc. IEEE 6th International Conference on Big Data Analytics (ICBDA)*. IEEE, Xiamen, 193–197. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICBDA51983.2021.9403092>

Received 15 September 2023; revised xx December 2023; accepted xx December 2023