STANCE ANNOTATION

Stance can be expressed in many different ways, for example by explicitly supporting or opposing the target, by supporting an entity aligned with or opposed to the target, by re-tweeting somebody else's tweet, etc. Thus after a few rounds of internal development and pilot annotations, we presented the following questionnaire to the annotators.

Q: From reading the tweet, which of the options below is most likely to be true about the tweeters stance or outlook towards the target:

1. We can infer from the tweet that the tweeter supports the target

   This could be because of any of reasons shown below:
   – *the tweet is explicitly in support for the target*
   – *the tweet is in support of something/someone aligned with the target, from which we can infer that the tweeter supports the target*
   – *the tweet is against something/someone other than the target, from which we can infer that the tweeter supports the target*
   – *the tweet is NOT in support of or against anything, but it has some information, from which we can infer that the tweeter supports the target*
   – *we cannot infer the tweeters stance toward the target, but the tweet is echoing somebody elses favorable stance towards the target (this could be a news story, quote, retweet, etc)*

2. We can infer from the tweet that the tweeter is against the target

   This could be because of any of the following:
   – *the tweet is explicitly against the target*
   – *the tweet is against someone/something aligned with the target entity, from which we can infer that the tweeter is against the target*
   – *the tweet is in support of someone/something other than the target, from which we can infer that the tweeter is against the target*
   – *the tweet is NOT in support of or against anything, but it has some information, from which we can infer that the tweeter is against the target*
   – *we cannot infer the tweeters stance toward the target, but the tweet is echoing somebody elses negative stance towards the target entity (this could be a news story, quote, retweet, etc)*

3. We can infer from the tweet that the tweeter has a neutral stance towards the target

   The tweet must provide some information that suggests that the tweeter is neutral towards the target – the tweet being neither favorable nor against the target is not sufficient reason for choosing this option. One reason for choosing this option is that the tweeter supports the target entity to some extent, but is also against it to some extent.

4. There is no clue in the tweet to reveal the stance of the tweeter towards the target (support/against/neutral)