

Evidence Type Annotation Guidelines for Change My View Data

Marieke van der Holt, Robin Snoek, Friso Stolk

March 2022

1 Introduction

This document describes the guidelines for annotating evidence types, specifically for the Webis ChangeMyView Corpus by Al-Khatib et al. (2020). The labels and definitions that are used are a combination of labels and definitions from previous research by Carlile et al. (2018), Al-Khatib et al. (2016) and Rinott et al. (2015).

2 Labels

In this section the labels and their definitions are described. Section 2.8 describes multi-sentence annotation using the *continue*-label. The example texts that are given come from real posts from the Webis ChangeMyView Corpus by Al-Khatib et al. (2020) and can therefore contain spelling or grammar mistakes.

2.1 Testimony

The unit gives evidence by stating or quoting that a proposition was made by some expert, witness, group, organization with some known expertise or authority on the topic or similar.

EXAMPLE: Ex soldier here from a country with compulsory service. The discipline you see in your ex soldiers friends comes from their experience as soldiers, you come in a boy, go out a man.

2.2 Statistics / Study

The unit gives evidence by stating or quoting the results or conclusions of qualitative or quantitative research, studies, empirical data analyses, or similar. A reference does not have to be given.

EXAMPLE: First off, only about 40% of men actually do military service, which means that the vast majority of all people do not get to enjoy the benefits of your proposition.

2.3 Common ground

The unit states common knowledge, a self-evident fact, an accepted truth (something that most people would agree on) or similar. It refers to general issues, not to specific events.

EXAMPLE: the quality of phones has gone up in the years since the iphone boom. before you would get \$150 phones for free with contract. now you get \$600-700 phones for \$100-200 with contract.

2.4 Anecdote

The unit gives evidence by stating personal experience of the author, an anecdote, a concrete example, an instance, a specific event, or similar.

EXAMPLE: Canada has accomplished it and it's working fabulously. They limit the amount of donations per person and corp, while also limiting the amount of money each candidate can spend on a campaign.

2.5 Definition

Provides a definition of a term or concept (or similar) to be used elsewhere in the argument.

EXAMPLE: In Psychology there is the concept of *Negative Attention*. The jist of it is that a child wants to be seen so badly that they forgo the interest in being seen in a good light just so that they can be the center of attention in any way shape or form.

2.6 Assumption

The unit states an assumption, conclusion, judgement, hypothetical situation, analogy or opinion of the author, a general observation, possibly false fact or similar. In order for readers to accept it, it would need to be supported by other units.

EXAMPLE: So a Japanese tourist might not even think that asking "Do you speak Japanese?" is a meaningful question.

2.7 Other

This label should be used when a sentence is evidence but does not fit any of the previously mentioned evidence types. This label should not be used when a sentence is not evidence. In that case, the sentence should not be labeled at all.

2.8 Continue (multi-sentence annotation)

An evidence type can consist of multiple sentences. In this case, the first sentence is labeled as the evidence type (for example 'anecdote') and the following sentences with 'continue'. An example of this can be seen below. The labels are shown in square brackets after each sentence.

EXAMPLE: What we should focus on is how parents are willingly bringing a child into this world who will struggle every single day of their life. [assumption] They will be made fun of constantly. [continue]

3 What and how to annotate

A unit is defined as one or more sentences that contain one argument. An evidence type that consists of multiple sentences should be annotated using the *continue*-label, as is described in section 2. If multiple arguments in a row have the same evidence type, these should be annotated separately, for example if there are three anecdotes given in a row, these should be annotated as three separate anecdotes, not as one. An argument should only be annotated with the main evidence type. However, if there are multiple main labels, all labels should be selected as shown in example 3.1.

3.1 Example: Multiple labels

Sometimes there is a case where multiple units can be selected. In this example: testimony and statistics.

John Doo wrote in 2002: That in 2002, 68 percent of the inhabitants of England drank more than one glass of alcohol per week

3.2 Example: False evidence

Whenever the data contains evidence which is not true, it should still be labeled as the type.

75% of people have been to the moon.

The statement is obviously not true, but the evidence should still be labeled as statistics/study.

3.3 Tips and tricks

- When you can append two sentences with the words because, its likely to be a continue label.
- questions in the beginning (none)
- questions that have some persuasiveness

3.3.1 ID's that are not right

- 2402
- 2447
- In many places in Germany you take a test in the 4th grade that determines what kind of secondary school you will go to.

References

- Al-Khatib, K., M. Völske, S. Syed, N. Kolyada, and B. Stein (2020, April). Webis changemyview corpus 2020 (webis-cmv-20).
- Al-Khatib, K., H. Wachsmuth, J. Kiesel, M. Hagen, and B. Stein (2016, December). A news editorial corpus for mining argumentation strategies. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*, Osaka, Japan, pp. 3433–3443. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee.
- Carlile, W., N. Gurrapadi, Z. Ke, and V. Ng (2018, July). Give me more feedback: Annotating argument persuasiveness and related attributes in student essays. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Melbourne, Australia, pp. 621–631. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rinott, R., L. Dankin, C. Alzate Perez, M. M. Khapra, E. Aharoni, and N. Slonim (2015, September). Show me your evidence - an automatic method for context dependent evidence detection. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Lisbon, Portugal, pp. 440–450. Association for Computational Linguistics.