Guidelines for Dynamic Stance Annotation

[version   1.0]

Barcelona
Supercomputing
Center
Centro Nacional de Supercomputación

Table of contents

1 Introduction

The dynamic stance annotation task consists of annotating the stance of a message with respect to the message to which it responds. The type of data annotated are conversations in chat rooms, forums or social networks, where users interact and exchange opinions.

In the task, the annotator is presented with two texts, indicating which is the original message, and which is a response to that message. The annotator then has to answer the question "***What is the stance of the response with respect to the original comment?*** ". The annotator has to respond with one of the following possibilities:

- Agree

- Disagree

- Elaborate

- Query

- Unrelated

- Neutral

- NA

It is important to note that the response is not being evaluated on whether it shares the position of the author of the original message, but on the content of the message. Thus, in a media story, in which an action/stance is presented in a descriptive way, you will assess whether the response agrees with the action/stance (see Example 1).

2 Dynamic stance annotation

2.1 Annotation process

1) All four annotators make 400 annotations (all 4 annotate the same). There is an initial meeting to discuss confusing cases and reach consensus on how to annotate.

2) All scoring is done individually by the 4 scorers, but with a weekly meeting between them to discuss any queries. Any agreement reached must be in writing.

3) Upon completion of the scoring, in all instances where there is no consensus[1], an extra scorer shall choose 1 of the 4 scores given to that instance as the final score.

2.2 Annotation rules

2.2.1 RNA-1: Non applicable (NA) - incomprehensible text

If one or both texts are incomprehensible, the annotator may decide to give the annotation NA. However, this annotation should only be used as a last resort.

2.2.2 RNA-2: Non applicable (NA) - multilingual text

If any comment is wholly or partly in English or Spanish, the annotator may annotate it accordingly. If it is in another language, the correct annotation is NA.

2.2.3 RA-1: Agree

"Agree" will be given to a pair of texts if the response expresses a stance that is in agreement with the original message.

Example 1

Original Message: ""*Soon my music will live in a better place". Neil Young makes good on his threat and removes his music from Spotify because he believes the platform misinforms about covid vaccines".*

Reply: *"@USER Very upstanding, admirable."*

Annotation: *Agree*

Example 2

Original Message: *"It seems that hackers have managed to hack into the data of Pfizer and Moderna. To summarise: - the batches are not identical - there are batches with 50 times*

---

[1] Consensus is considered to exist if at least 3 of the 4 scorers have given the same category.

Dynamic Stance Annotation Guide v1.0

more reactions than others. - myocarditis seems to be more frequent than deaths from COVID".

Answer: *"@USER I have never doubted it, there has to be a large percentage that are well enough to be able to keep the farce going, otherwise it would get discovered very quickly and the whole thing would fall apart".*

Annotation: *Agree*

2.2.4 RD-1: Disagree

The stance should be annotated as "Disagree" if the response expresses a position or opinion that disagrees with the original message.

Example 3

Original Message: *"@USER Dear Ivan. In La Paz, at the moment there are about 16,000 people, potentially contagious. Don't let them talk to you. The only thing that works is: NO crowds, USE of chapsticks and VACCINATIONS !!!! If you stand firm in this: you succeed, otherwise you're screwed".*

Reply: *"@USER @USER Let's see if you can convince yourself once and for all "genius" vacunalover. The experimental substances you love so much are "good for nothing"!!!"*

Annotation: *Disagree*

Example 4

Original Message: *"Pfizer and Moderna vaccines do not harm pregnant women or foetuses and produce no side effects different from the rest of the immunised population".*

Reply: *"@USER It only produces abortions but only that!"*

Annotation: *Disagree*

2.2.5 RD-2: Disagree doubtful

If the response expresses doubt (questioning), but shows clear disagreement with the original message (e.g. use of irony, rhetorical questions, etc.), it will be annotated as "Disagree".

Example 5

Original Message: *"1,972 doctors suspended in Italy for not inoculating themselves, and threatened with sanctions if they speak ill of vaccines".*

Answer: *"What will happen when health workers start getting sick? ...then the system will collapse".*

Annotation: *Disagree*

Dynamic Stance Annotation Guide v1.0

Rationale: Given the last statement accompanying the question, it is clear that the answer is intended to show disagreement with the original message by pointing out possible external consequences of the original message.

Example 6

Original Message: *"This chart demonstrates the benefit of the #COVID19 vaccine. 60.5% of the world's population has already received at least one dose. * Open up vaccination, we need vaccine availability * Open up vaccination to children aged 5-15 years * Vaccine is safe".*

Answer: *"Mr. Dr. Francisco, would you sign a prescription and give an informed consent to any patient who asked you to do so, before being vaccinated with the vaccine that you are advising?"*

Annotation: *Query / Disagree*

Justification: In this case, both Query and Disagree would be valid depending on the annotator's interpretation. If the annotator understands that the question in the answer is intended to question the credibility of the original message, they should mark Disagree. If the annotator understands that it is a question that genuinely seeks more information, they should mark it as Query.

2.2.6 RE-1: Elaborate

The stance should be annotated as "Elaborate" if the response agrees with the original message but adds opinions on other points not mentioned in the original message.

Example 7

Original Message: *"@USER @USER That is raised, I mean if the study puts a deadline of more than ten weeks, I would not be surprised if it was to incite the idea of quarterly frequency. In fact recently I already read the first news of the fourth dose, yesterday that Pfizer will have the vaccine by March Ĥ "*

Reply: *"@USER @USER @USER for omicron, I heard that Moderna at the end of 2023 the combination against covid, influenza and flu.... And I say, why don't they promote effective antivirals and leave us with so many vaccines? Thank you very much for your attention."*

Annotation: *Elaborates*

Example 8

Original Message: *"Astrazeneca's vaccine does NOT make you test positive for antigen. You are welcome."*

Reply: *"@USER Astrazeneca, nor any vaccine".*

Annotation: *Elaborates*

Dynamic Stance Annotation Guide v1.0

Example 9

Original Message: *"@USER It's all so absurd.... The flu vaccine doesn't kill the flu either and it's OK, it's not compulsory to get it."*

Reply: *"@USER @USER Correct, in fact people who were vaccinated had a stronger flu".*

Annotation: *Elaborates*

Example 10

Original Message: *"In an unprecedented pandemic in modern history, vaccination against Covid should be mandatory. Vaccinations are mandatory for diseases that have been eradicated for decades and this one, which has spread worldwide causing deaths, social and economic damage, is not mandatory?"*

Reply: *"@USER Unfortunately it is not yet officially a vaccine, so it is complicated".*

Annotation: *Elaborates*

Example 11

Original Message: *"By the way, the benefits of vaccines are for Pfizer and the side effects are for you!!!"*

Answer: *"@USER Yeah well that happens with all drugs obviously."*

Annotation: *Neutral / Elaborates*

Rationale: It is not clear whether the response is pro- or anti-vaccine, as the original message appears to be. Instead of giving its opinion, the response provides new information that gives a new approach. In this case, it could be labeled both Neutral and Elaborates.

2.2.7 RQ-1: Query

The stance should be annotated as "Query'' if the response expresses doubts, questions or asks for further arguments/prove/evidence on the original message.

Example 12

Original Message: *"Argentina demands WHO authorisation of Sputnik V and Cansino vaccines".*

Reply: *"@USER Wasn't it easier to look for vaccines already authorised by the WHO?"*

Annotation: *Query*

Example 13

Original Message: *"We remind the population that from Thursday 27 January, we will be applying pediatric doses against #COVID19 to children between 5 and 11 years of age, in circuits 8-9 and 8-1, while in 8-6 booster doses for adults. #PanavaC19"*

Dynamic Stance Annotation Guide v1.0

Reply: *"@USER They changed the entry into force of the full vaccination schedule. A couple of weeks ago one was enacted where it said that the 3 vaccines as a full schedule would be effective from tomorrow. But someone mentioned to me that it would be postponed to 2/20/22?"*

Annotation: *Query*

2.2.8 RU-1: Unrelated

Annotated as "Unrelated" if the reply is on a different topic than the original message.

Example 14

Original Message: *"If the side effects "depend on each person", why is massive and indiscriminate vaccination recommended, why not give real data on pericarditis and myocarditis and minimise its danger?"*

Reply: *"@USER Good morning UmaÕ 3 "*

Annotation: *Unrelated*

Example 15

Original Message: *"Moderna could release data on the Omicron vaccine in March. Moderna is also developing a single-dose vaccine that combines a booster dose of Covid-19 with its experimental flu shot."*

Response: *"@USER And now what issue are you trying to avoid? The puerile campaign of the mirreycito Córdova for trying to "defend" his right to spend public money on eating at fancy restaurants?"*

Annotation: *Unrelated*

2.2.9 RN-1: Neutral response

It will be marked as "Neutral" if the response is on the same topic as the original message, but does not express any position or opinion.

Example 16

Original Message: *"Astrazeneca's vaccine does NOT make you test positive for antigen. You are welcome."*

Reply:*"@USER A question to get me out of my ignorance,why do you have to wait 6 months of between 2nd Dose and 3rd Dose(booster)Є Є Є Є tti q "*

Annotation: *Neutral*

Rationale: Although this is a question seeking more information on the subject of vaccinations, it does not ask about the original message (which talks about testing positive), but about another subject (the time between vaccinations).

2.2.10 RN-2: Neutral question

If the original message is a question that does not contain any stance or opinion the notation "Neutral" should be used.

Example 17

Original Message: "*I have two Sputnik and tomorrow they called me to put me on Pfizer as a third dose...Any experience in the ward? How did it hit them?*"

Reply: "*@USER My husband and daughter have that combination and they had no problems at all*".

Annotation: *Neutral*

3 Format of deliveries

The deliverable will be a CSV document containing the IDs of the two texts, other metadata and the two texts (provided in advance), together with five more columns containing the annotations of each of the annotators.

Two examples of the CSV columns are shown in the table below:

topic	2
post_id	3053292
comment_id	3053292_2_2
original_comment	"Solidarity with Palestine?with the radical Islamists and terrorists? with those who denigrate women and homosexuals, and moreover do not want democracy and attack the West? with those who kill innocent Israelis who live in their country after having suffered the terrible Holocaust? thank you but NO. first the CATALAN COUNTRIES, Europe and democracy"
answer_comment	"And OTAN, my friend, and OTAN!"
annotator_1	Elaborate
annotator_2	Elaborate
annotator_3	Elaborate
annotator_4	Agree
annotator_extra	None[2]

topic	1
post_id	2115655
comment_id	2115655_1_2
original_comment	"Yesterday in the sub I saw an advertisement of the party in which someone had written: "you are the ones that should go". Don't you find that this is really more xenophobic and, moreover, with an attitude of conquerors than the actual message? It is true that Catalonia is highly populated and people should distribute "
answer_comment	"Yes, a political party that defends an economic

---

[2] In this case, extra scoring is unnecessary, as 3 of the 4 scorers gave the same answer.

Dynamic Stance Annotation Guide v1.0

	system that causes concentrations of people and capital complains about immigration? If we are against concentration we should promote rural areas that have huge depopulation! Les Garrigues, for example, only has 20,000 inhabitants, half of which are concentrated in four municipalities (out of a total of 24 municipalities) and in an area of 797.61 square kilometres! And we are not the worst region, look at how many are in Pallars Sobirà or Ribagorça and how many rural nuclei there are for how many people. Duran doesn't want immigrants to leave, but to live in illegality, so that they have better working and living conditions and they can exploit them! "
annotator_1	Disagree
annotator_2	Elaborates
annotator_3	Disagree
annotator_4	Elaborates
annotator_extra	Disagree

Dynamic Stance Annotation Guide v1.0