

Guidelines for “Normative (Polarity)” (2020-09-16)

The goal of this annotation task is to identify what types of reasons people use to support or attack a normative claim. You will be given short arguments, each of which has a claim C and a supporting/attacking premise P. For each argument, you need to choose how P justifies its support/attack.

ANNOTATION DETAILS

For each argument, the annotation field looks as follows:

The diagram illustrates the layout of the annotation field for a normative claim. It includes several components:

- ID:** 2091#1_2091#2653
- Claim:** C: The US Should Recognize Palestine as a State.
- Supporting/attacking premise:** P: They should recognize palestine, because it would help to stabilize the region. (Accompanied by a thumbs up icon)
- Whether P supports or attacks C:** P **supports** C's advocacy because
- Situation/action that C advocates for or objects to:** *The US Recognize Palestine as a State*
- Content of P's justification:** *it would help to stabilize the region*
- has:** ☒ positive ☐ negative
- consequence:** (Label for the justification content)
- Opposite support/attack label:** ☐

Below the form, three red boxes provide instructions:

- Does P focus on an implication of **ADVOCATING FOR** the situation in C or an implication of **OBJECTING TO** it?
- Does P present the justification content to be **POSITIVE** or **NEGATIVE**?
- Check if the given support/attack label should be reversed

You are given claim C and premise P, along with

- Whether P supports (👍) or attacks (👎) C.
- The situation or action that C advocates for or objects to.
- The main content of P's justification. It may describe a potential consequence, a property, or a norm/goal that should be achieved.

You should annotate

- Whether P focuses on an implication of **advocating for** the situation in C's advocacy/objection or an implication of **objecting to** it.
- Whether P presents the justification content to be **positive** or **negative**.
- If the given support/attack label should be reversed, which case is extremely rare. Check this box only if it is impossible to interpret P's justification with the given support/attack label. In this case, annotate A and B based on the corrected label.


(A) Polarity: Advocate vs. Object

Mark “**advocating for**” if P’s justification states an implication of the case where the **situation/action in C (NOT C’s overall stance)** is promoted. Note that “advocating for” here is independent of whether C advocates for or objects to the situation/action.

Mark “**objecting to**” if P’s justification states an implication of the case where **the situation/action in C (NOT C’s overall stance)** is not promoted. Again, “objecting to” here is independent of whether C advocates for or objects to the situation/action.

4650#902_4650#906

C: Eliminate all single-winner offices.

P:  Since the power in the executive branch of government would be determined either directly or indirectly by Proportional Representation, a broader range of views and parties could be represented. The executive branch would exhibit less of a "winner take all" character.

P **supports** C's objection because

- ☒ Advocating for
☐ Objecting to

all single-winner offices

has

- ☒ positive
☐ negative

consequence


Since the power in the executive branch of government would be determined either directly or indirectly by Proportional Representation, a broader range of views and parties could be represented

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P’s justification is based on a positive consequence of “single-winner offices”, that is, an implication of **advocating for** “all single-winner offices” which C objects to.

10134#1_10134#350

C: Hate speech should be legally protected.

P:  Moral standards may include some form of intolerance. Thereby, limiting freedom of speech would also limit freedom of religion.

P **supports** C's advocacy because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

Hate speech be legally protected

has

- ☐ positive
☒ negative

consequence

limiting freedom of speech would also limit freedom of religion

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P is stating a negative consequence of “limiting freedom of speech”, that is, an implication of **objecting to** “hate speech be legally protected” which C advocates for.

(B) Sentiment: Positive vs. Negative

There are two cases: (B-1) P's justification is a consequence or property; and (B-2) P's justification is a norm. Which case each argument belongs to is provided to you.

(B-1) P's justification is a consequence or property

Mark “**positive**” if P presents the justification content as a positive consequence/property.

Mark “**negative**” if P presents the justification content as a negative consequence/property.

Tip1. Consistency with Support/Attack

Although it may not strictly follow, there are some logical combinations of annotations due to the nature of argumentation. Use the following table as guidance.

Relation	C's Polarity	P's Polarity	P's Sentiment
Support	Advocate	Advocate	Positive
		Object	Negative
	Object	Advocate	Negative
		Object	Positive
Attack	Advocate	Advocate	Negative
		Object	Positive
	Object	Advocate	Positive
		Object	Negative

2091#1_2091#2653

C: The US Should Recognize Palestine as a State.

P: They should recognize palestine, because it would help to stabilize the region.



P **supports** C's advocacy because

- ☒ Advocating for
☐ Objecting to

The US Recognize Palestine as a State

- has ☒ positive
☐ negative

consequence

it would help to stabilize the region

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P presents “it would help to stabilize the region” as a **positive** consequence of advocating for “The US Recognize Palestine as a State”.

13517#3_13517#102

C: Physician-assisted death should never be allowed, no matter what the circumstances are.
P: A human owns himself. Forcing other people to stay alive for the benefit of your personal subjective moral imperative is enslavement.

P **attacks** C's objection because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

Physician-assisted death be allowed

has

- ☐ positive
☒ negative

property

Forcing other people to stay alive for the benefit of your personal subjective moral imperative is enslavement

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P presents “Forcing other people ... is enslavement” as a **negative** property of objecting to “Physician-assisted death be allowed” (i.e., forcing other people to stay alive contrasts physician-assisted death).

(B-2) P's justification is a norm

Mark “**positive**” if the first part of the annotation (i.e., advocating for objecting to the situation/action) is what the norm approves, advocates for, or is positively influenced by.

Mark “**negative**” if the first part of the annotation is what the norm disapproves, objects to, or is negatively influenced by.

Tip 1. How to tell whether the norm approves or disapproves?

Approving something X is often expressed with positive words as in “We should/must/need X”, “X is important”, etc.

Disapproving X is often expressed with negative words as in “We should/need not X”, “We should stop X”, “There is no reason to X”, “something is more important than X”, etc.


Tip 2. It may be easier to first check whether the norm approves or disapproves something, and then check whether that thing is consistent with advocating to or objecting to the given situation/action.

Tip3. Consistency with Support/Attack

Although it may not strictly follow, there are some logical combinations of annotations due to the nature of argumentation. Use the following table as guidance.

Relation	C's Polarity	P's Polarity	P's Sentiment
Support	Advocate	Advocate	Positive
		Object	Negative
	Object	Advocate	Negative
		Object	Positive
Attack	Advocate	Advocate	Negative
		Object	Positive
	Object	Advocate	Positive
		Object	Negative

29946#24_29946#25

C: Abstinence is never useful; people should have an orgasm whenever they feel like it.
P: There is no reason whatsoever to deny oneself a pleasure that is free of charge and easy to obtain.


P **supports** C's advocacy because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

people have an orgasm whenever they feel like it

has

- ☐ positive
☒ negative

influence on
the norm

There is no reason whatsoever to deny oneself a pleasure that is free of charge and easy to obtain

☐ Opposite support/attack label

The norm **disapproves** “deny oneself a pleasure”, which is the case of objecting to “people have an orgasm whenever they feel like it” (i.e., denying oneself a pleasure contrasts having an orgasm whenever they feel like it).

10098#1_10098#122

C: US and NATO should completely withdraw from all combat and peacekeeping roles in Afghanistan.

P: The West ought to combat terrorism around the world.



P **attacks** C's objection because

- ☒ Advocating for
☐ Objecting to

US and NATO all combat and peacekeeping roles in Afghanistan

has ☒ positive
☐ negative

influence on
the norm

The West ought to combat terrorism around the world

☐ Opposite support/attack label

The norm is **advocating** for “The West combat terrorism around the world”, which is the case of advocating for “US and NATO all combat and peacekeeping roles in Afghanistan”.

5637#1_5637#2727

C: Pregnant people should have the right to choose abortion.

P: Choosing abortion implies the termination of an innocent life. The growing child inside her womb did not choose to be conceived, and the developing child hasn't broken any laws; it is innocent. Our rights do not allow us to harm the innocent lives of others, because our rights also protect us from being harmed by others.



P **attacks** C's advocacy because

- ☒ Advocating for
☐ Objecting to

Pregnant people have the right to choose abortion

has ☐ positive
☒ negative

influence on
the norm

Our rights do not allow us to harm the innocent lives of others, because our rights also protect us from being harmed by others


☐ Opposite support/attack label

The norm **disapproves** “harm the innocent lives of others”, which refers to the case of advocating for “Pregnant people have the right to choose abortion” (i.e., pregnant people having the right to choose abortion could lead to harming the innocent lives of others).

3346#1_3346#5250

C: The US should adopt stricter gun control legislation, in the form of the policy defined in the discussion info (click top left menu => Info).

P: If we have a right to self-defense, we must then have a right to proportional self-defense.

 Thus, if a person is at risk of being threatened with a gun, they must be able to defend themselves with a gun.

P **attacks** C's advocacy because

- ☒ Advocating for
☐ Objecting to

The US adopt stricter gun control legislation in the form of the policy defined in the discussion info (click top left menu => Info)

has ☐ positive
☒ negative

influence on
the norm

If we have a right to self-defense, we must then have a right to proportional self-defense.

☐ Opposite support/attack label


The norm is **advocating** for “proportional self-defense”, which is the case of objecting to “The US adopt stricter gun control legislation” (i.e., self-defense contrasts stricter gun control legislation).

Note

- Your annotation should be based on the **provided** situation/action, NOT on C’s stance itself. Note that when C objects to a situation/action, promoting the given situation/action is opposite to promoting C’s stance itself.
- Your annotation should be based on the **provided** content of P’s justification, NOT on your own interpretation of what the main content of justification is supposed to be.
- Your annotation should be based on how **P** justifies its stance, NOT on justification that you think is logical.

More Examples

16592#1_16592#12

- C:** Drugs should not be directly marketed to customers.
P:  Advertisements in their current form are helping to spread knowledge about the side effects of the drugs.

P **attacks** C's objection because

- ☒ Advocating for
☐ Objecting to

Drugs be directly marketed to customers

has

- ☒ positive
☐ negative


consequence

Advertisements in their current form are helping to spread knowledge about the side effects of the drugs

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P is stating a positive consequence of “Advertisements in their current form”, which is “Drugs be directly marketed to customers”.

1229#1_1229#2881

- C:** Humans should stop eating animal meat.
P:  Moving from the consumption of meat in totality would signal a move from prioritizing our biological predispositions, as highly adapted persistence hunters, towards an emphasis on valuation of all life without regard for the occupied stratum of consciousness of the consumed. This is contradictory because of the difficulty in the determination of self-awareness of many types and complexities of life-forms, plants included, thus creating a difficulty in the determination of an objective boundary.

P **attacks** C's objection because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

Humans eating animal meat

has

- ☐ positive
☒ negative

consequence

Moving from the consumption of meat in totality would signal a move from prioritizing our biological predispositions, as highly adapted persistence hunters, towards an emphasis on valuation of all life without regard for the occupied stratum of consciousness of the consumed

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P is stating a negative consequence of “Moving from the consumption of meat in totality”, which is consistent with objecting to “Humans eating animal meat”.

24424#1_24424#60

- C:** Libraries should stop having a physical presence and instead only exist digitally (i.e. online).
P: Digital libraries would be more eco-friendly than physical libraries.



P **supports** C's objection because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

Libraries having a physical presence

has

- ☒ positive
☐ negative

consequence

Digital libraries would be more eco-friendly than physical libraries

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P is stating a positive consequence of “Digital libraries”, which is the case of objecting to “Libraries having a physical presence”.

2903#5_2903#659

- C:** As rehabilitation is harder to objectively measure than a reasoned length of punishment, it is necessary to focus primarily on the more concrete concept, i.e. punishment.
P: If we turn to rehabilitation instead of punishment, someone has to decide when an individual is rehabilitated. We've seen to many cases where this someone has argued that the inmate has been rehabilitated and then released the criminal, who start committing the same felonies as before going to prison.



P **supports** C's advocacy because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

focus primariiy on the more concrete concept, i.e., punishment

has

- ☐ positive
☒ negative

consequence

If we turn to rehabilitation instead of punishment, someone has to decide when an individual is rehabilitated

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P is stating a negative consequence of “we turn to rehabilitation instead of punishment”, which is consistent with objecting to “focus primarily on the more concrete concept, i.e., punishment”.

10133#1_10133#2

- C:** There should be a cap on university tuition fees in the UK.
P: Without a cap many students would be priced out of the market.



P **supports** C's advocacy because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

a cap on university tuition fees in the UK

has

- ☐ positive
☒ negative

consequence

Without a cap many students would be priced out of the market

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P is stating a negative consequence of the case “Without a cap”, which is consistent with objecting to “a cap on university tuition fees in the UK”.

3346#1_3346#3401

- C:** The US should adopt stricter gun control legislation, in the form of the policy defined in the discussion info (click top left menu => Info).
P: Recent events have proven that the current regulatory landscape is not properly enforced.
 Why would anyone support more regs before those enforcement deficiencies are corrected?

P **attacks** C's advocacy because

- ☒ Advocating for
☐ Objecting to

The US adopt stricter gun control legislation in the form of the policy defined in the discussion info (click top left menu => Info)

has

- ☐ positive
☒ negative


property

Recent events have proven that the current regulatory landscape is not properly enforced

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P is stating a negative property of more regulations, that is, “stricter gun control”, by using a recent failure as an example “Recent events have proven that the current regulatory landscape is not properly enforced”.

2027#506_2027#512

- C:** Legalize all drugs, but only for mentally stable adults.
P:  Experiences of alcohol policy provide good lessons. Legal drinking age, for example, safeguards that only individuals that have reached a certain state of maturity are allowed to drink.

P **supports** C's advocacy because

- ☒ Advocating for
☐ Objecting to

Legalize all drugs only for mentally stable adults

has ☒ positive
☐ negative


property

Experiences of alcohol policy provide good lessons

☐ Opposite support/attack label

Although not explicit in P's justification, P is stating a positive property of "Legalize all drugs only for mentally stable adults" by using the "experiences of alcohol policy" as an example.

1764#5_1764#506

- C:** No-platforming should be abandoned because it is an assault on free speech.
P:  There are limits on free speech, such as in the case of hate speech. In these cases, no-platforming cannot be reasonably construed as a violation of free speech.

P **attacks** C's objection because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

No-platforming

has ☐ positive
☒ negative


property

There are limits on free speech, such as in the case of hate speech

☐ Opposite support/attack label

P is stating a negative property of "free speech", which is consistent with objecting to "No-platforming" (i.e., no-platforming suppresses free speech).

5637#1_5637#2419

- C:** Pregnant people should have the right to choose abortion.
- P:**  Individual freedom is the basis of the US constitution. Freedom of speech, religion, from self incrimination, and unlawful searches are all guaranteed. There is no right more fundamental then the choices we make about our own bodies. If we do not have that right, then none of the others matter. By allowing a woman to choose, you are not condoning the action, you are only ensuring that you will have the right to make your own choices.

P **supports** C's advocacy because

- ☒ Advocating for
☐ Objecting to

Pregnant people have the right to choose abortion

has

- ☒ positive
☐ negative


influence on
the norm

Individual freedom is the basis of the US constitution

☐ Opposite support/attack label

The norm is advocating for “individual freedom”, and “Pregnant people have the right to choose abortion” is one such case.

3346#1_3346#4975

- C:** The US should adopt stricter gun control legislation, in the form of the policy defined in the discussion info (click top left menu => Info).
- P:**  Education on the proper handling of firearms is what is needed. Educating the public on the facts of legal, responsible gun handling and ownership, not the he said/she said statistical opinions about the pros and cons of gun violence and crime, is tantamount in a gun-legal society.

P **attacks** C's advocacy because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

The US adopt stricter gun control legislation in the form of the policy defined in the discussion info (click top left menu => Info)

has

- ☒ positive
☐ negative

influence on
the norm

Education on the proper handling of firearms is what is needed

☐ Opposite support/attack label

The norm is advocating for “Education on the proper handling of firearms”, which refers to objecting to “stricter gun control legislation”.

17848#3_17848#39

C: Debate should be devoid of undue emotion. The visceral reactions to these words do not enhance human interaction, but rather devolve them.

P: Cursing is rude. Debate should be kept civil.



P **supports** C's objection because

- ☐ Advocating for
☒ Objecting to

Debate of undue emotion

has

- ☒ positive
☐ negative

influence on
the norm

Debate should be kept civil

☐ Opposite support/attack label

The norm is advocating for “Debate be kept civil”, which is the case of objecting to “Debate of undue emotion” (i.e., debate of undue emotion contrasts civil debate).