Comments Labeling

Orientation/Inclination/Attitude

Pro_Immigration

This position includes those sources explicitly stating that immigration is beneficial, citing reasons such as economic growth, addressing labor shortages, or solving demographic challenges like low birth rates.

- Es: *If there were not immigrants, Swedish population would be now <5 millions. :D*

It also includes those who emphasize the critical situations in immigrants' countries of origin, highlighting the need for asylum and humanitarian support. Sometimes this can be used as a sort of justification.

- Es: *Create more wars = create more immigrants. EU keeps funding places like Israel, also helped invade Afghanistan, Libya, Iraq... You reap what you sow.*

In other cases, this stance can be labeled by virtue of the message it's answering too. There are different cases

- Es: Message1: *I love melting pots* (Pro_Immigration)
  Message 2: *I agree* (Pro_Immigration)

- Es: Message1: *we should send all these arabs back to their countries* (Contra_Immigration)
  Message2: *you're just being racist* (Pro_Immigration)

The second example, although not explicitly supporting immigration, can be considered as "Pro_Immigration" since it's contrasting the position of "Contra_Immigration".

Contra_Immigration

This position refers to those explicitly stating that immigration is problematic, citing reasons such as economic burden, cultural or social disruption, security concerns, or strain on public services.

- Es: *Take it back!* 🥾 🛩️ ✋

It includes those who advocate for stricter immigration policies, border controls, or measures to reduce immigration.

- Es: *there is nothing far right to be pro stricter migration laws*

Also in this case, this stance can be inferred by virtue of the comment it's answering to. Like the previous case, there can be different "degree of expliciteness":

- Es: Message1: *We lost our homeland for fear of being called a racist.*
  Message2: *Same here in France!*
  - In this case, the second message it's implying that also in France there's an "invasion of immigrants"

- Es: Message1: *We lost our homeland for fear of being called a racist.*
  Message2: *Leftism corrupts everything it touches*
  - In this case, although it's not explicitly addressing the issue of immigration, being an answer to the previous comment, "Message2" blames left political correctness, working as a support argument for Message1.

- Es: Message1: *We lost our homeland for fear of being called a racist.*
  Message2: *Jewish*

- This example follows the same logic of the previous, implying that that "Message1" is saying is true, and (+) it's jewish's faults.

- Es: Message1: *I love melting pots*
  Message2: Shut up, you don't know what you're taling about!

Like before, in this last example, although not explicitly contrasting immigration, Message2 can be considered as "Pro_Immigration" since it's contrasting the position of "Contra_Immigration".

Other/None/Neutral

This position includes different cases.

1) Comments that do not explicitly support or oppose immigration but may discuss it in a balanced or neutral manner. It includes those who present immigration as a complex issue with both positive and negative aspects, without leaning strongly towards either pro- or contra-immigration stances. This category can also include informational or educational content that aims to provide an unbiased overview of immigration-related topics. This case is very rare, usually commenting people have a specific stance on the topic.

- *Es: Message1: Immigration started in these recent years.*

2) Comments for which it's hard to understand the stance, because of the way they're written (slang, abbreviations, inside jokes etc.).
- *Es: Message1: We lost our homeland for fear of being called a racist.*
  Message2: Casual Swedish move

- *Es: Message1: We lost our homeland for fear of being called a racist.*
  Message2: Who forced you to do it?

3) Comments that are just attacking the the other users, or the "opponent's argument" <u>without explicitly taking a stance on immigration</u>
- *Es: Message1 More than half of the UAE I wonder why they do not have problems or attacks like this?? Hhmmmm only in Europe?? You should know the answer if you are clever enough*
  Message2: @@Jouy195 who are you replying to? You have to tag who you are replying to, otherwise, there is no continuity. If you are clever enough, that is.

4) Comments for which it's hard to understand the stance, because of an issue with the Edge (see below):
- *Es: Message1: We lost our homeland for fear of being called a racist.*
  Message2: @@Itoshimi karma for what? and what country are you from?

Edge Issue

This checkbox is needed to keep track of the functionality of the heuristic used to create the chain of comments. For each comment_text that is being labeled (let's call it "edge_comment"), on the left, there's its "Parent_Comment", i.e. the one comment to which the "edge_comment" is related to.

The possible situations are the following:

1) The "Parent_Comment" is the "Top_Level_Comment" (the one originating the thread). In this case, the "edge_comment" *won't* have a username at the beginning of the text (@@username), since it's a direct reply to the "Top_Level_Comment".

- *Example:*
  Message1 (Top_Level): We lost our homeland for fear of being called a racist.
  Message 2 (edge_comment, Level1): Hehe hehe suckers
  - This case is correct → **No Check**
- *Example:*
  Message1 (Top_Level): We lost our homeland for fear of being called a racist.
  Message2 (edge_comment, Level?): @@neildear-wn9eo not all brits though!
  - *This case is an error → **CHECK***

2) The "Parent_Comment" is, at least, a second level comment (i.e. a comment to the Top_Level), or a comment of comment (there can be N levels). Despite the level of the comment, the text should start with the username to which the reply is addressed

- *Example:*
  Message1 (edge_comment, Level1) @@tomas3300 Highlighted reply is not a real person. This is just to drive far right attitude and google is assting with that. Whoever wrote this woundnt be able to point sweden on the map to save their life.. You can probably guess where they were educated.
  Message2 (edge_comment, Level2) @@calmstorm666 Explain yourself without google, or stfu.
  - This case is correct → **No Check**

- Example:
  Message1 (edge_comment, Level1) @@stormcalm I'm just trying to explain myself
  Message2 (edge_comment, level?) @@tomastractor yes, I love France!
  - This case is an error → **CHECK**

⚠️‼️
Even if there's an "Edge_Issue" the other labels (Stance and Sarcasm) must be put. In many case an edge_issue will make it hard to understand the meaning of the text, then just put "Other/None/Neutral". As said above, this label is just to test the strength of the heuristic for the graph.
⚠️‼️