

Towards Argument Embeddings

Luke Thorburn

University of Melbourne, Australia

Abstract

Argument mining is a core natural language processing (NLP) task that provides a bridge between natural language and formal argumentation frameworks. Current research is constrained by available annotated corpora, which are small compared to those available for other NLP tasks. In light of recent empirical work suggesting the existence of scaling laws for neural language models, we argue that this constraint has led to insufficient regard for whether the architectures studied will scale well to larger models and datasets. We propose a new high-level architecture for end-to-end argument mining to serve as a blueprint for scalable argument mining systems, and introduce the concept of *argument embeddings*: representations of argument components that encode information about argumentative relations. Future work, including implementation and evaluation of the proposed model, is discussed.

1 Introduction

Argument mining—the automated extraction of the argumentative structure of text—is a core problem within the broader field of computational argumentation [Lawrence and Reed, 2020]. The development of reliable argument mining algorithms would create a link between existing corpora of non-fiction text and formal argumentation frameworks, enabling scalable evaluation of reasoning quality in information marketplaces (e.g. [van Gelder et al., 2019]) and the development of new tools for augmenting human reasoning. As a natural language processing (NLP) task, however, argument mining is relatively immature.

Existing corpora annotated for argumentation are small, on the order of 10^2 documents, and creating high-quality annotations is labour-intensive [Lawrence and Reed, 2020, Sec. 4]. Thus by necessity, argument mining research tends to focus on improving performance of relatively small models, rather than on scaling to larger models and training datasets. This is potentially shortsighted, as recent work elsewhere in NLP hints at the existence of scaling laws for the performance of neural models on NLP tasks [Kaplan et al., 2020, Hernandez et al., 2021], where the attainable test loss decreases predictably as model size and training data increase. If true, this suggests that efforts to improve the state-of-the-art in argument mining might best be directed towards scaling up the size of models and datasets used.

Such work will almost certainly require the creation of large, new datasets. But it also requires the development of model architectures that can best capitalise on increased scale as it becomes feasible. Desiderata for such architectures are listed below.

FLEXIBLE

Argument mining is variably defined [Wells, 2014]. The model should produce outputs sufficient for most conceptions of the task.

END-TO-END

All parameters in the model should be jointly trained, to avoid the compounding propagation of errors that occurs in pipeline approaches [Persing and Ng, 2016].

SEMI-SUPERVISED

As far as is possible, the model should benefit from transfer learning of unsupervised NLP tasks, which do not require costly annotated data.

CONTEXT-AWARE

The model should have access to relevant context.

EFFICIENT

Model training and inference should be as time and space efficient as possible.

Two of these desiderata merit further explanation.

By CONTEXT-AWARE, we mean that the model is not handicapped by limited access to the source document when performing argument mining sub-tasks. For example, in argument relation prediction, the task is to take two extracted phrases as input, and output the argumentative relation between them [Cocarascu et al., 2020]. Without further context, such as what text segued between the two phrases, this can be difficult even for human experts.

By FLEXIBLE, we mean that the model can produce outputs that constitute a solution to most variations on the task of argument mining. These include the positions of argument components within the source document, argument component classifications, and directed, typed relationships between argument components.

In this paper, we propose an additional output, argument embeddings¹, which are described in Section 2. Most current argument mining systems copy phrases verbatim (or almost verbatim) into the outputted argument maps. This is useful in contexts where it is important not to misrepresent the author. However, in practice this approach produces argument maps that are often inscrutable, due to the text fragments becoming ungrammatical when appearing *ex situ*, and there are many potential applications where argumentative ideas, rather than locutions, are the most relevant objects of analysis. Argument embeddings are a representation of such ideas.

To our knowledge, previous approaches to argument mining are not scalable, in that they do not satisfy the above desiderata. In Section 2 we introduce a new high-level architecture to serve as a blueprint for scalable argument mining systems, and in Sections 3 and 4 we discuss its implementation and evaluation.

¹Though more accurately described as argument *component* embeddings—being representations of propositions that serve as a premise, inference rule or conclusion—we use the phrase ‘argument embeddings’ for brevity.




Figure 1: A schematic of the proposed architecture.

2 Method

A schematic of our proposed model architecture can be found in Figure 1. It consists of two modules, corresponding to the subtasks of argument component identification and argument relation prediction, which are jointly trained as a single neural network.

Argument component identification is framed as a sequence-to-sequence task, mapping a document (a sequence of tokens) to a sequence of arguments (or argument components) in the order they appear in the source document. Unlike previous work, which has treated this task as a sentence classification or IOB sequence tagging task [Ramshaw and Marcus, 1999], this approach is more abstractive, closer to a form of summarisation or translation. The outputted arguments have two elements, a positional encoding referring to their position in the source text, and an argument embedding—a type of sentence or paragraph embedding [Le and Mikolov, 2014] which is trained to encode information about their relations to other arguments (e.g. support, attack, equivalence). The goal of argument embeddings is to produce an object that captures the meaning of an argument, independent of the words used to express it (Figure 2).

To predict argument relations of each type, argument embeddings pass through a feed-forward network, and are then used to produce a probabilistic adjacency matrix by taking inner products between every pair and applying a sigmoid function. The model is trained using a composite loss metric produced by combining loss metrics for the two subtasks.

This architecture has potential to fulfil the desiderata listed in Section 1. It is end-to-end, and produces most expected output objects. An exception is argument component types, which could be extracted by adding a classifier on top of the argument embeddings. Both token and argument embeddings could benefit from unsupervised pre-training (in the latter case, using sentence embeddings). The argument embeddings are contextual, so the model can access relevant context when performing relation prediction. The largest inefficiency is likely the use of full adjacency matrices, which grow quadratically with the number of arguments, but there is scope to substitute a more efficient relation prediction module.




Figure 2: Visual intuition for argument embeddings. The first two claims have similar meanings, so will have similar relations with other argument components, and hence have similar embeddings.

3 Implementation

Implementation of the proposed architecture poses a number of practical challenges. Here we briefly² describe how three such challenges can be addressed, namely (i) how to extract positional information from the identified arguments, (ii) how to output adjacency matrices of arbitrary dimensionality, and (iii) how to define a loss metric for variable-size outputs.

Positional decoding

Argument mining, if understood as the task of converting a document into an argument map, does not require that the positions of the identified arguments within the source document be included in the model output. That said, most existing datasets rely on positional annotations for evaluation.

In our model, arguments are output as a sequence containing one element for each occurrence of an argument in the text. To compute a loss for the subtask of argument component identification, we require that the elements of the outputted sequence encode the position of the span of text to which they correspond.

In the context of transformer models, positional encoding has been used to augment inputted tokens with information about their position within the input sequence. [Vaswani et al., 2017] use positional

²Space constraints prevent a comprehensive technical discussion. Please contact the author for more details.

encoding based on trigonometric functions, which have a linearity property that makes it easy for the transformer to learn to attend by relative positions [Shiv and Quirk, 2019, Sec 2.1]. However, it is not straightforward to decode these representations back into integer positions.

To address this, we have developed a variant on their encoding that is easy to decode, whilst retaining the linearity property. This new encoding exploits a correspondence between trigonometric functions and cyclical patterns in the coefficients of binary expansions of integers.

The model will need to output two encodings for each argument—the start and end positions—which it could learn to copy from the input sequence.

Adjacency matrices

Efficiently considering all $2 \times \binom{n}{2}$ possible directed relationships among a set of n arguments is a recurring challenge in argument mining. Our model is structured such that an $n \times n$ adjacency-type matrix can be obtained from transformed argument embeddings via a single matrix multiplication.

More precisely, we assume the probability a given relationship exists can be computed by applying a sigmoid function to the inner product between transformed versions of the two relevant argument embeddings (which are contextual). If successful, this approach would allow relatively efficient generation of full adjacency-type matrices, whilst fulfilling the context-aware desideratum.

Loss for variable-size outputs

Another challenge is that the number of argument components identified by the model may not equal the number of argument components in the training data, which presents difficulties for computing the loss metric for both subtasks. A baseline solution is to truncate or pad the training data as appropriate in order to compute a loss. Further, we intend to explore loss metrics used for set prediction tasks, such as Chamfer loss [Zhang et al., 2019], which are designed to handle outputs of variable size.

4 Evaluation

Though this model is ultimately designed for training on large annotated corpora of real-world texts, in the short-term we intend to use synthetic corpora that describe arguments about simplified abstract worlds, similar to the “blocks world” used by the SHRDLU natural language understanding program [Winograd, 1971]. Semi-automated generation of such corpora is relatively quick, and the argumentative ideas represented can come close to exhausting those relevant to their domain.

Evaluation will focus on two areas: the feasibility of key design elements (such as the inclusion of positional encodings in the outputted argument sequence) and the broader usefulness of argument embeddings. Is it possible, for instance, to construct an embedding space in which...

- ...semantically similar argument units have similar embeddings, regardless of the locution used to express them?
- ...a plausible chain of reasoning between two propositions can be generated by tracing a geodesic between their embeddings?
- ...the direction of the difference vector between the embeddings of a premise and a conclusion indicates the argument scheme employed?

‘Arithmetic’ properties such as these could be used to improve the interpretability of argument mining systems. Further, as argument embeddings form a common representation of argumentative ideas, they might be decoded into self-contained locutions to produce grammatical, well-formed argument maps.

5 Conclusion

In this article, we described a high-level neural architecture for scalable argument mining, which is designed to learn argument embeddings: numerical representations of argument components that encode information about argument relations. Our next steps are to implement a model instance and evaluate its performance, the feasibility of key design elements, and the broader utility of argument embeddings.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Hunt Lab for Intelligence Research at the University of Melbourne, and benefitted from conversations with Jacky Visser and Rory Duthie from the Centre for Argument Technology at the University of Dundee. Thank you also to the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback.

References

- [Cocarascu et al., 2020] Cocarascu, O., Cabrio, E., Villata, S., and Toni, F. (2020). A dataset independent set of baselines for relation prediction in argument mining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04970*.
- [Hernandez et al., 2021] Hernandez, D., Kaplan, J., Henighan, T., and McCandlish, S. (2021). Scaling laws for transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01293*.
- [Kaplan et al., 2020] Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T. B., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J., and Amodei, D. (2020). Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- [Lawrence and Reed, 2020] Lawrence, J. and Reed, C. (2020). Argument mining: A survey. *Computational Linguistics*, 45(4):765–818.
- [Le and Mikolov, 2014] Le, Q. and Mikolov, T. (2014). Distributed representations of sentences and documents. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1188–1196. PMLR.
- [Persing and Ng, 2016] Persing, I. and Ng, V. (2016). End-to-end argumentation mining in student essays. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1384–1394.
- [Ramshaw and Marcus, 1999] Ramshaw, L. A. and Marcus, M. P. (1999). Text chunking using transformation-based learning. In *Natural language processing using very large corpora*, pages 157–176. Springer.
- [Shiv and Quirk, 2019] Shiv, V. L. and Quirk, C. (2019). Novel positional encodings to enable tree-based transformers. In *NeurIPS*, pages 12058–12068.
- [van Gelder et al., 2019] van Gelder, T., de Rozario, R., and Saletta, M. (2019). Crowdsourcing citizen intelligence. In *Proceedings of the Technology Surprise Forum, Safeguarding Australia 2019*. National Security College, The Australian National University, & Defence Science and Technology (DST) Group, Australian Department of Defence. (Eds.).
- [Vaswani et al., 2017] Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., and Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03762*.
- [Wells, 2014] Wells, S. (2014). Argument mining: Was ist das? *CMNA14*.
- [Winograd, 1971] Winograd, T. (1971). Procedures as a representation for data in a computer program for understanding natural language. Technical report, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [Zhang et al., 2019] Zhang, Y., Hare, J., and Prügel-Bennett, A. (2019). Deep set prediction networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.06565*.