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**), and generate a set of (**question, answer, relevant parts**) triplets. There are two ways to generate such questions.

(1) 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".**

(2) ****New**** If there are **some parts of the claim that are not covered** by the **reasoning from fact-checkers**, you should also generate questions according to these parts. The fact-checkers may have skipped over facts that they thought were obvious or focused on one aspect, but we would like to know what the claim itself is conveying as well. You will select **relevant parts** from the **claim** in this case.

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 an 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.
From claim or reasoning: Reasoning

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."
From claim or reasoning: Reasoning

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: 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 ignoring critical facts would give a different impression

Our annotation paired with an explanation for our annotation:

Question: Were the stock purchases improper insider trading?
Answer: No
Relevant parts: 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.
From claim or reasoning: Reasoning

Why this was our answer: The first part of this sentence talks about that the the stock purchases and Biden's policy were misrepresented, but both the purchase and the policy are mentioned in the original claim. Therefore, we don't ask the questions about the two parts here. This sentence also mentions the claim gives a false impression that this purchase involves insider trading, so we ask the above question here.

New Question: Did Nancy Pelosi buy 1.3 million Tesla stock the day before Joe Biden signed an order about electric vehicles?
Answer: N/A
Relevant parts: Nancy Pelosi bought $1.25 million in Tesla stock the day before Joe Biden signed an order
From claim or reasoning: Claim

Why this was our answer: The claim itself talks about a purchase event, which really needs to be checked, even though it's not discussed extensively in the ruling. From the reasoning part, we can't be sure about the answer to this question, we have "N/A" for this example.

New Question: Does the executive order Biden signed require all federal vehicles to be electric?
Answer: N/A
Relevant parts: Joe Biden signed an order "for all federal vehicles" to be electric."
From claim or reasoning: Claim

Why this was our answer: Beyond the stock purchases, we need to check whether there actually was an order from Biden about electric vehicles. As the answer is not obvious from the reasoning part, we give "N/A" here.
Why this is the whole answer: We feel like these three 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.

Add questions from claim if the reasoning part doesn't cover everything: Sometimes the reasoning part only checks the most important aspects of the claim leaving some minor aspects unchecked. In such cases, you should add questions according to the claim to make sure all aspects in the claim is covered by the questions.

Your Qualification test:

Claim: William Barr stated on September 2, 2020 in a CNN interview: "We indicted someone in Texas, 1,700 ballots collected from people who could vote, he made them out and voted for the person he wanted to."

Reasoning from fact-checkers: Barr said that the Justice Department indicted someone in Texas for casting 1,700 fraudulent mail-in ballots in Texas.
Prosecutors investigated about 700 ballots — not 1,700 — for possible fraud.
But investigators never found evidence of widespread fraud, and the ballots under scrutiny were cast in favor of the candidates the voter supported.
"Everyone who voted in it, their vote counted," Chatham told the Morning News. "They weren't disenfranchised, and we made sure of this."

Question:

Answer:

Relevant parts:

From reasoning or claim:

Question:

Answer:

Relevant parts:

From reasoning or claim: