

Building an Argument Mining Pipeline for Tweets

Robin Schaefer

Applied Computational Linguistics
University of Potsdam, Germany

Abstract

The field of argument mining has grown notably in the recent decade. However, only little attention has been given to argumentation on social media. This paper presents first progress of a dissertation project on tweet-based argument mining. Specifically, we describe our argument model and argument mining pipeline. Further, we show first results both on argument corpus annotation, argument filtering and argument component detection and conclude with an outlook on planned future work.

1 Introduction

The field of argument mining (AM) [Stede and Schneider, 2018], which is situated at the interface of computational linguistics and computational argumentation, has grown notably in the recent decade. While the majority of research has focused on well-edited texts, less formal user-generated texts, e.g. from social media, have been investigated less frequently. Recent work, however, indicates that this is changing [Bauwelinck and Lefever, 2020, Lindahl, 2020, Schaefer and Stede, 2020].

In this paper, we present an ongoing dissertation project on tweet-based AM, which we motivate as follows: Twitter¹ is a microblogging platform that is frequently used for expressing views on a wide range of topics, including controversial issues like climate change [Veltri and Atanasova, 2017], which makes it an interesting data source for investigating AM on

user-generated data. Also, AM applications like argument ranking systems could provide insights on how users debate on Twitter. However, tweets tend to be relatively noisy due to language irregularities (e.g. typos) and social media conventions (e.g. hashtags) which form obstacles for AM systems trained on data from other domains [Šnajder, 2016].

Previous work² on tweet-based AM concentrated on the creation of annotated argument tweet corpora [Addaood and Bashir, 2016, Bosc et al., 2016a]. Additionally first attempts on AM sub-tasks, e.g. evidence detection, were presented [Addaood and Bashir, 2016, Bosc et al., 2016b, Dushmanu et al., 2017]. To date, however, no fully functional AM pipeline for tweets exists.

Developing an AM pipeline for tweets requires two-fold progress: 1. Argument components have to be modeled and annotated successfully; 2. An AM pipeline has to be developed. Creating new annotated corpora is of utmost importance, as so far limited annotated data resources restrict the potential of AM pipelines.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents our somewhat simplified argument model, i.e. the definitions of argument components. Section 3 describes the design of the AM pipeline and the methods that can be used to implement it. Section 4 discusses the already conducted work and presents first results (originally published in [Schaefer and Stede, 2020]). Section 5 concludes this paper with an outlook on planned future work.

¹<https://twitter.com/>

²For a recent review of the state of the art in tweet-based AM, see [Schaefer and Stede, 2021].

2 Argument Model

Not all tweets are written with an argumentative purpose. Also, if argumentation takes place it may have low complexity due to the constraint of 280 characters per tweet. This requires somewhat simplified argument component definitions. In general, we distinguish two basic components: *claim* and *evidence*. A claim is defined as a standpoint towards a topic, e.g. climate change. Evidence is described as a supportive or attacking statement with respect to the claim (e.g. [We have to limit CO2 emissions]_{claim}, [as too much CO2 has been shown to increase the greenhouse effect.]_{evidence} [Schaefer and Stede, 2020]). While traditionally a full argument requires at least one evidence unit in addition to a claim, we consider independent claims to be argumentative as well. This accounts for the reduced complexity of tweets. Evidence units, however, have to be linked to a claim. We refer to both components as *Argumentative Discourse Units* (ADU) [Peldszus and Stede, 2013].

We further decided on utilizing tweet pairs in a reply relation, which distinguishes this work from previous research. While the first tweet functions as context, only the subsequent tweet, the reply, is subject to actually mining argumentative structure, i.e. all presented annotation and AM results refer to the reply tweets. This design choice was based on the assumption that context could have a facilitating effect on argument annotation. Also it enabled us to further distinguish different evidence units with respect to the tweet the target claim occurs in: reply tweet, context tweet, or both. Finally, it accounts for the need of argumentation to be embedded in context.

3 Argument Mining Pipeline

AM is hardly considered as a single task. Instead successful AM requires a pipeline of components which focus on specific sub-tasks. The actual complexity of a given AM pipeline depends on its use case. For instance, while for some approaches mere claim detection may suffice, others may further require detection of relations between argument components. With re-

spect to tweet-based AM we consider the following tasks as relevant (see Figure 1): 1. (optional) corpus annotation³, 2. argument filtering (i.e. general argument detection) 3. ADU detection (claim and evidence detection), 4. relation detection, 5. output creation (argument ranking and graph building), and 6. argument quality assessment. To date, we have made first progress on corpus annotation, argument filtering and ADU detection.

Argument Filtering. Given that many tweets are not created with an argumentative purpose, the implementation of a general argument detector is crucial. We consider this component as a filter that separates the data into argumentative and non-argumentative tweets. Only the argumentative sub-corpus will be used in subsequent steps. As this is basically a binary classification task, a supervised classification algorithm, like Support Vector Machines (SVM) or eXtreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost), may be used for training.

ADU Detection. Once argumentative tweets have been identified, the following component is responsible for detecting claim and evidence. These tasks may be treated in conjunction or independently. Depending on the purpose of the pipeline, it may be necessary to identify claim and evidence on the full tweet level or within tweets. For instance, an argument ranking application would likely require the detection of concrete ADU spans.

If claim and evidence detection is performed on the full tweet level, supervised classification, as for argument filtering, could be applied. For identifying ADU spans, sequence labeling approaches like Conditional Random Fields (CRF) are more appropriate.

Relation Detection. Relation detection (support vs attack) can be considered as another core task of AM. It can support ADU detection whenever ambiguity exists with respect to the relation between claim and evidence. Alternatively, relation detection may be applied to identify relations between full tweets [Bosc et al., 2016b].

³Corpus annotation itself is not part of the AM pipeline. However, it is a necessary task whenever supervised approaches are chosen and no suitable annotated data source exists.




Figure 1: Argument Mining Pipeline (*Corpus Annotation* technically is not part of the pipeline itself. *ADU Detection*, *Relation Detection* and *Output Creation* can be subject to *Argument Quality Assessment*).

Being again a classification task, any classification algorithm could be applied. Still, more recent approaches like an LSTM-based neural network have been used as well [Bosc et al., 2016b].

Output Creation. When developing an AM pipeline it is reasonable to consider different target applications, i.e. to devise opportunities how potential users of the pipeline may benefit from it. One possible output solution is *graph building*. Given a tweet set the objective would be to detect argument components and relations and derive a full argumentative structure, which could be visualized as a graph. As tweets are short in nature this requires taking into account information across tweet boundaries. Furthermore, it is possible to build graphs with full tweets as nodes as was proposed by [Bosc et al., 2016b].

Another potential application is argument ranking, which can be understood as a way to summarize argumentation. While the focus probably lies on claims, evidence may be accounted for as well. Here, we consider relation detection as of less importance. An argument ranking mechanism could be used for identifying the most important or frequent positions uttered in a discussion.

Argument Quality Assessment. Finally argument quality assessment plays an important role in an AM pipeline for tweets. As Twitter was not conceived as an argumentative platform per se, it is fair to as-

sume that argumentation may be lacking some quality standards. First, although we accept single claims as argumentative units, we still regard arguments backed up by evidence as of higher quality. Second, evidence units themselves may be of different quality as well. For instance, [Addaoud and Bashir, 2016] focused on the annotation and classification of several evidence types, e.g. news or expert opinion. Furthermore, argument quality assessment may revolve around fact recognition and source identification [Dusmanu et al., 2017].

Quality assessment may be applied to the following components: ADU detection, relation detection, and output creation (see Figure 1). For instance, depending on the respective evidence unit, support/attack can be of varying success which may have implications both for relation detection and graph building.

4 Results & Discussion

In this section we present and discuss first results both on the creation of an argumentative tweet corpus and the development of first versions of AM pipeline components. For more details the reader is referred to the original paper [Schaefer and Stede, 2020].

Corpus Annotation Results. To date we have conducted an annotation study with the objective of providing high quality ADU annotations

within tweets. Previous studies, in contrast, focused on annotations on the full tweet level [Addaood and Bashir, 2016, Bosc et al., 2016a].

Two expert annotators were presented with 300 German tweet pairs in a reply relation. Calculating inter-annotator agreement (IAA) using Cohen’s κ yielded the following scores: 0.38 (claim vs. evidence vs non-argumentative) and 0.45 (argumentative vs non-argumentative). We further derived full tweet annotations from the annotated ADU spans, which yielded the following Cohen’s κ scores per ADU type: 0.53 (argument, i.e. claim or evidence), 0.55 (claim), and 0.44 (evidence).

While the IAA scores surely leave room for improvement it is noteworthy that comparable annotation tasks led to similar results [Lindahl, 2020]. We attribute this to the relatively subjective nature of the task. Interestingly, scores for evidence annotation are reduced compared to the claim annotation results. We argue that this is related to our ADU definitions. Recall that evidence is always interpreted with respect to a claim. Thus, annotating evidence requires a more fine-grained decision which increases the task difficulty.

Approach	Target	F1 (weighted)
Classification	Argument	0.82
Classification	Claim	0.82
Classification	Evidence	0.59
Sequence Labeling	Argument	0.72
Sequence Labeling	Claim	0.59
Sequence Labeling	Evidence	0.75

Table 1: Classification & Sequence Labeling Results.

Argument Mining Results. So far our work focused on the development of general argument, claim and evidence detectors, i.e. on the first two steps of the pipeline. Note, however, that to date our models have not been trained as part of an actual pipeline, e.g. a claim detector has not been trained on a fully argumentative tweet set. We experimented with two approaches (supervised classification and sequence labeling) and used our full tweet annotations

and ADU span annotations, respectively. Classification results are yielded by XGBoost classifiers, while for sequence labeling we applied CRF. For feature extraction we fine-tuned pre-trained BERT embeddings [Devlin et al., 2019].

We trained first versions of a general argument detector using the respective target annotation layer of the data. Our models achieved promising F1 scores of 0.82 (classification) and 0.72 (sequence labeling). As noted previously, an argument detector does not require to be trained on ADU spans, if it is to be used as a simple filter component. Given that classification yielded better results, we propose to implement an argument filter based on supervised classification.

Furthermore we trained claim and evidence detectors using the annotated data. Again, we applied both classification and sequence labeling approaches. However, we consider sequence labeling, i.e. the detection of ADU spans, as more appropriate for a full AM pipeline. The claim detector model yielded F1 scores of 0.82 and 0.59 for classification and sequence labeling, respectively. Evidence detection showed a reverse pattern with F1 scores of 0.59 for classification and 0.75 for sequence labeling.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we presented first progress of a dissertation project on tweet-based AM. We designed an AM pipeline that consists of four dependent steps: argument filtering, ADU detection, relation detection, and output creation. So far, first results on argument filtering and ADU detection have been achieved. In addition, progress on argument annotation was made.

Currently we work on refining our annotation scheme to achieve more sophisticated IAA scores. We also investigate alternative ways to model argument components. Specifically, we are interested in identifying major claims, i.e. the central statement of a tweet. This may support the implementation of target applications like argument ranking. As the annotated sub-corpus is rather small, we plan to annotate more data with the revised annotation scheme.

With respect to the AM pipeline, in the near future we plan to improve the argument filter and ADU

detection components. This includes optimizing the used models and hyperparameters.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Manfred Stede for his advice and support and Polina Krasilnikova for assisting with corpus annotation.

References

- [Addawood and Bashir, 2016] Addawood, A. and Bashir, M. (2016). “What is your evidence?” A study of controversial topics on social media. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Argument Mining (ArgMining2016)*, pages 1–11, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Bauwelinck and Lefever, 2020] Bauwelinck, N. and Lefever, E. (2020). Annotating topics, stance, argumentativeness and claims in Dutch social media comments: A pilot study. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 8–18, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Bosc et al., 2016a] Bosc, T., Cabrio, E., and Villata, S. (2016a). DART: A dataset of arguments and their relations on Twitter. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16)*, pages 1258–1263, Portorož, Slovenia. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- [Bosc et al., 2016b] Bosc, T., Cabrio, E., and Villata, S. (2016b). Tweeties squabbling: Positive and negative results in applying argument mining on social media. In *Computational Models of Argument - Proceedings of COMMA 2016, Potsdam, Germany, 12-16 September, 2016*, volume 287 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 21–32. IOS Press.
- [Devlin et al., 2019] Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. (2019). BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Dusmanu et al., 2017] Dusmanu, M., Cabrio, E., and Villata, S. (2017). Argument mining on Twitter: Arguments, facts and sources. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2317–2322, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Lindahl, 2020] Lindahl, A. (2020). Annotating argumentation in Swedish social media. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 100–105, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Peldszus and Stede, 2013] Peldszus, A. and Stede, M. (2013). From argument diagrams to argumentation mining in texts: A survey. *Int. J. Cogn. Inform. Nat. Intell.*, 7(1):1–31.
- [Schaefer and Stede, 2020] Schaefer, R. and Stede, M. (2020). Annotation and detection of arguments in tweets. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 53–58, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Schaefer and Stede, 2021] Schaefer, R. and Stede, M. (2021). Argument mining on Twitter: A survey. *it - Information Technology*, 63(1).
- [Stede and Schneider, 2018] Stede, M. and Schneider, J. (2018). *Argumentation Mining*, volume 40 of *Synthesis Lectures in Human Language Technology*. Morgan & Claypool.
- [Veltri and Atanasova, 2017] Veltri, G. A. and Atanasova, D. (2017). Climate change on twitter: Content, media ecology and information sharing behaviour. *Public Understanding of Science*, 26(6):721–737.
- [Šnajder, 2016] Šnajder, J. (2016). Social media argumentation mining: The quest for deliberateness in raucousness.