

What are the questions fact-checkers were trying to answer to verify political claims?

Thank you for participating in this task! The goal of this task is to identify the reasoning process of a fact-checker when checking complex claims made by politicians.

You will be given a **claim** (to be fact-checked), paired with a few paragraphs written by a professional fact-checker verifying the claim (we call this **reasoning from fact-checkers**).

Your task is to generate the **questions** answered in “**reasoning from fact-checkers**”, specifically binary (yes/no) questions, paired with **their answers** and select **relevant parts** from the “**reasoning from fact-checkers**”.

Below we provide several examples to help you better understand the task:

Claim: Barry DuVal stated on September 25, 2015, in an interview: "We're the only major oil-producing nation in the world with a self-imposed ban on exporting our crude oil to other nations."

Reasoning from fact-checkers: "DuVal said the U.S. is the only major oil-producing nation in the world that bans export of its crude oil. Two experts we contacted agreed with DuVal's statement, and officials at the EIA said they're not aware of any other country with similar export restrictions. But the ban is not absolute -- a small portion of U.S. crude is exported to Canada." So we rate his DuVal's statement Mostly True.

Our annotation paired with explanation for our annotation:

Question: Is the U.S. the only major oil-producing nation to ban exports of crude oil?

Answer: Yes

Relevant parts: Two experts we contacted agreed with DuVal's statement, and officials at the EIA said they're not aware of any other country with similar export restrictions.

Why this was our answer: The first sentence of the justification is just a restatement of the claim, so we don't write any questions about the first sentence. The next sentence of the justification then tackles this head-on. The main point of the sentence is that the U.S. is the only country that has a ban on exporting our crude oil. This also reflects what's expressed in the original claim. The fact-checker seems to be addressing this core question first.

Question: Is the U.S. ban on crude oil export a complete ban?

Answer: No

Relevant parts: But the ban is not absolute -- a small portion of U.S. crude is exported to Canada."

Why this was our answer: The fact-checker went beyond the core claim to provide additional insight. Although it is not explicitly mentioned in the original claim, the fact-checker felt that answering this question was important to give more context to the claim.

The question "Is a small portion of US crude exported to Canada?" would not be as good. Since Canada is not present in the original claim, this was probably not what the fact-checker set out to answer; they only discovered it after doing their research.

Claim: Nathan Deal stated on September 9, 2016 in education conference: "We have almost 68,000 Georgia students who are required by law to attend a chronically failing school."

Reasoning from fact-checkers: "Deal said there are, "almost 68,000 Georgia students who are required by law to attend a chronically failing school." We ran the numbers -- and he's right. There are about 68,000 students in these failing schools. But his administration sets the standard, its numbers are out of date and there are other options. Opponents also claim some of these "chronically failing" schools have made gains in recent years. We rate his claim Mostly True.

Our annotation paired with explanation for our annotation:

Question: Are there 68,000 Georgia students who are required by law to attend a chronically failing school?

Answer: Yes

Relevant parts: We ran the numbers -- and he's right. There are about 68,000 students in these failing schools.

Why this was our answer: This question is central to the claim, and the fact-checker is addressing it up front. The focus here is whether 68,000 Georgia students are required by law to attend a chronically failing school. Although the justification doesn't explicitly mention "by law", we put it in the question following the original claim.

Question: Are the failing schools actually doing that badly?

Answer: No

Relevant parts: But his administration sets the standard, its numbers are out of date and there are other options. Opponents also claim some of these "chronically failing" schools have made gains in recent years.

Why this was our answer: This question is trickier to frame. The highlighted part talks about "the number is out of date" and "the failing schools have made gains in recent years." However, all of this seems to be addressing the fact that the schools are "failing", and whether the "failing" schools are really bad.

Note that a question like "Are the failing schools making gains?" is okay, but this is really a more specific question than the one we posed. Most likely the fact-checker did not set out with this question in mind.

Why this is the whole answer: We feel like these two questions covered the reasoning that the fact-checker wrote. It seems like these were the two most salient aspects they addressed.

Based on the instructions and the examples above, we provide a qualification test below. According to the **claim** and its **reasoning from fact-checkers**, write down one or more binary questions (answerable by yes/no) that are answerable by the reasoning part. You should also provide an answer to your question -- yes/no. Also, you should copy-paste the justification text you used to generate the question (usually one sentence).

Keep in mind:

The **questions** you generate should ideally be **motivated by the original claim**. This claim was what the fact-checkers were checking, so it was the starting point for their analysis.

The **questions** should not be overly specific. For example, if the analysis describes how unemployment fell by 5% over a six-year time period, the question "Did unemployment fall over this period?" is better than "Did unemployment fall by 5% over a six-year time period?" The first question is probably the one that the fact-checker set out to answer, and the specific statistics are just part of that answer to the question.

Write questions that stand alone: if there are explicit mentions of time/location/people/entities in the question, prefer using the full names. For example, "this year" should be replaced with the actual year; "he/she/they/it" should be replaced with the actual person or organization.

Your Qualification test:

Claim: A Facebook post stated on January 31, 2021: "Nancy Pelosi bought \$1.25 million in Tesla stock the day before Joe Biden signed an order "for all federal vehicles" to be electric."

Reasoning from fact-checkers: "An image shared on Facebook claims that Nancy Pelosi bought \$1.25 million in Tesla stock the day before Biden signed an order "for all federal vehicles" to be electric, implying that she sought to profit from inside information about new government policies. The House speaker did report transactions involving Tesla stock, but the post misrepresented the purchases and Biden's policies to create the false impression that the transactions represented improper insider trading in Tesla shares. The statement contains an element of truth, but ignore critical facts would give a different impression

Question:

Answer:

Relevant parts:

Question:

Answer:

Relevant parts: