

ACL 2016

**The 54th Annual Meeting of the  
Association for Computational Linguistics**

**Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Argument Mining**

August 12, 2016  
Berlin, Germany

©2016 The Association for Computational Linguistics

Order copies of this and other ACL proceedings from:

Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)  
209 N. Eighth Street  
Stroudsburg, PA 18360  
USA  
Tel: +1-570-476-8006  
Fax: +1-570-476-0860  
[acl@aclweb.org](mailto:acl@aclweb.org)

ISBN 978-1-945626-17-3

## Preface

This third edition of the Workshop on Argument Mining builds on the success of the first and second workshops held at ACL 2014 and NAACL 2015, with an increasing maturity in the work reported. The breadth of papers in the programme this year attests to the range of techniques, the diverse domains and the varied goals that are encompassed in argument (or argumentation) mining.

The focus of argument mining is to tackle the problem of automatic identification of arguments and their internal structure and interconnections. The papers collected here provide a rich exploration of the nature of argumentative structure that can be automatically identified, from identification of the presence of argument, through evidence relationships and types of evidence relationships, argument types and premise types, to highly demanding tasks such as enthymeme reconstruction.

One of the facets that makes argument mining such an exciting and demanding problem is that purely statistical approaches very rapidly reach performance maxima with more knowledge-intensive, linguistically-aware and structurally constrained approaches required as well. Combinations of statistical robustness and structural priors hold particular promise, with early results reported in several of the papers here.

As a very new area, argument mining is also working *ab initio* on challenges such as data availability, annotation standards, corpus definition and publication, as well as quantification, validation and evaluation of results. Again, several papers here are tackling these community-oriented, practical – but vitally important – problems. We are also very pleased to introduce for the first time a special track focusing on an ‘Unshared Task’ to bootstrap the process of shared data provision for the community. The contributions to this track will lead to a detailed panel discussion with a goal of establishing some initial momentum to what will hopefully become a regular part of the Argument Mining workshop series.

This year also sees a special track on Debating Technologies reflecting the thread of work in the area that focuses on applications of the techniques in solving real problems in man-machine communication, driven in part by commercial R&D and by IBM’s Debating Technology team in particular.

We were delighted with the quantity and quality of submissions, and as a result have developed a packed programme. The workshop attracted 31 submissions in total, of which 13 were accepted as full papers, four as short papers and a further three as contributions to the Unshared Task Panel. As the area continues to grow with an increasing number of groups turning their attention to the problems presented by argument mining, we look forward to seeing further growth in the workshop and the community that it supports.

CAR  
Dundee, June 2016



**Organizers:**

Chris Reed, University of Dundee (Chair)  
Kevin Ashley, University of Pittsburgh  
Claire Cardie, Cornell University  
Nancy Green, University of N.C. Greensboro  
Iryna Gurevych, Technische Universitat Darmstadt  
Diane Litman, University of Pittsburgh  
Georgios Petasis, N.C.S.R. Demokritos  
Noam Slonim, IBM Research, Israel  
Vern Walker, Hofstra University

**Program Committee:**

Stergos Afantenos, IRIT Toulouse  
Carlos Alzate, IBM Research, Ireland  
Kevin Ashley, University of Pittsburgh  
Katarzyna Budzynska, Polish National Academy of Sciences  
Elena Cabrio, University of Nice  
Claire Cardie, Cornell University  
Matthias Grabmair, University of Pittsburgh  
Nancy Green, University of N.C. Greensboro  
Iryna Gurevych, Technische Universitat Darmstadt  
Ivan Habernal, Technische Universitat Darmstadt  
Graeme Hirst, University of Toronto  
Ed Hovy, CMU  
Vangelis Karkaletsis, N.C.S.R. Demokritos  
Mitesh Khapra, IBM Research, India  
Valia Kordoni, Humboldt Universitat zu Berlin  
Jonas Kuhn, Stuttgart University  
John Lawrence, University of Dundee  
Joao Leite, FCT-UNL – Universidade Nova de Lisboa  
Ran Levy, IBM Research, Israel  
Beishui Liao, Zhejiang University  
Maria Liakata, University of Warwick  
Diane Litman, University of Pittsburgh  
Bernardo Magnini, FBK Trento  
Robert Mercer, University of Western Ontario  
Marie-Francine Moens, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven  
Huy Nguyen, University of Pittsburgh  
Smaranda Muresan, Columbia University  
Fabio Paglieri, CNR Italy  
Alexis Palmer, Saarland University  
Joonsuk Park, Cornell University  
Simon Parsons, Kings College London  
Georgios Petasis, N.C.S.R. Demokritos  
Craig Pfeifer, MITRE  
Chris Reed, University of Dundee  
Ariel Rosenfeld, Bar-Ilan University

Patrick Saint-Dizier, IRIT Toulouse  
Christian Schunn, University Pittsburgh  
Jodi Schneider, University Pittsburgh  
Noam Slonim, IBM Research, Israel  
Christian Stab, Technische Universität Darmstadt  
Manfred Stede, Universität Potsdam  
Benno Stein, Universität Weimar  
Henning Wachsmuth, Universität Weimar  
Marilyn Walker, University of California, Santa Cruz  
Vern Walker, Hofstra University  
Serena Villata, INRIA Sophia-Antipolis Mediterranee  
Lu Wang, Northeastern University  
Adam Wyner, University Aberdeen

## Table of Contents

<i>“What Is Your Evidence?” A Study of Controversial Topics on Social Media</i> Aseel Addawood and Masooda Bashir .....	1
<i>Summarizing Multi-Party Argumentative Conversations in Reader Comment on News</i> Emma Barker and Robert Gaizauskas .....	12
<i>Argumentative texts and clause types</i> Maria Becker, Alexis Palmer and Anette Frank .....	21
<i>Contextual stance classification of opinions: A step towards enthymeme reconstruction in online reviews</i> Pavithra Rajendran, Danushka Bollegala and Simon Parsons .....	31
<i>The CASS Technique for Evaluating the Performance of Argument Mining</i> Rory Duthie, John Lawrence, Katarzyna Budzynska and Chris Reed .....	40
<i>Extracting Case Law Sentences for Argumentation about the Meaning of Statutory Terms</i> Jaromir Savelka and Kevin D. Ashley .....	50
<i>Scrutable Feature Sets for Stance Classification</i> Angrosh Mandya, Advaith Siddharthan and Adam Wyner .....	60
<i>Argumentation: Content, Structure, and Relationship with Essay Quality</i> Beata Beigman Klebanov, Christian Stab, Jill Burstein, Yi Song, Binod Gyawali and Iryna Gurevych .....	70
<i>Neural Attention Model for Classification of Sentences that Support Promoting/Suppressing Relationship</i> Yuta Koreeda, Toshihiko Yanase, Kohsuke Yanai, Misa Sato and Yoshiki Niwa .....	76
<i>Towards Feasible Guidelines for the Annotation of Argument Schemes</i> Elena Musi, Debanjan Ghosh and Smaranda Muresan .....	82
<i>Identifying Argument Components through TextRank</i> Georgios Petasis and Vangelis Karkaletsis .....	94
<i>Rhetorical structure and argumentation structure in monologue text</i> Andreas Peldszus and Manfred Stede .....	103
<i>Recognizing the Absence of Opposing Arguments in Persuasive Essays</i> Christian Stab and Iryna Gurevych .....	113
<i>Expert Stance Graphs for Computational Argumentation</i> Orith Toledo-Ronen, Roy Bar-Haim and Noam Slonim .....	119
<i>Fill the Gap! Analyzing Implicit Premises between Claims from Online Debates</i> Filip Boltuzic and Jan Šnajder .....	124
<i>Summarising the points made in online political debates</i> Charlie Egan, Advaith Siddharthan and Adam Wyner .....	134
<i>What to Do with an Airport?</i> <i>Mining Arguments in the German Online Participation Project Tempelhofer Feld</i> Matthias Liebeck, Katharina Esau and Stefan Conrad .....	144

<i>Unshared task: (Dis)agreement in online debates</i>	
Maria Skeppstedt, Magnus Sahlgren, Carita Paradis and Andreas Kerren .....	154
<i>Unshared Task: Perspective Based Local Agreement and Disagreement in Online Debate</i>	
Chantal van Son, Tommaso Caselli, Antske Fokkens, Isa Maks, Roser Morante, Lora Aroyo and Piek Vossen.....	160
<i>Unshared Task: A Preliminary Study of Disputation Behavior in Online Debating Forum</i>	
Zhongyu Wei, Yandi Xia, Chen Li, Yang Liu, Zachary Stallbohm, Yi Li and Yang Jin .....	166



# Workshop Program

**Friday, August 12, 2016**

**09:00–09:10** *Welcome*

**09:10–10:30** **Session I**

09:10–09:30 *“What Is Your Evidence?” A Study of Controversial Topics on Social Media*  
Aseel Addawood and Masooda Bashir

09:30–09:50 *Summarizing Multi-Party Argumentative Conversations in Reader Comment on News*  
Emma Barker and Robert Gaizauskas

09:50–10:10 *Argumentative texts and clause types*  
Maria Becker, Alexis Palmer and Anette Frank

10:10–10:30 *Contextual stance classification of opinions: A step towards enthymeme reconstruction in online reviews*  
Pavithra Rajendran, Danushka Bollegala and Simon Parsons

**10:30–11:00** *Coffee break*

**11:00–12:30** **Session II**

11:00–11:20 *The CASS Technique for Evaluating the Performance of Argument Mining*  
Rory Duthie, John Lawrence, Katarzyna Budzynska and Chris Reed

11:20–11:40 *Extracting Case Law Sentences for Argumentation about the Meaning of Statutory Terms*  
Jaromir Savelka and Kevin D. Ashley

11:40–12:00 *Scrutable Feature Sets for Stance Classification*  
Angrish Mandya, Advaith Siddharthan and Adam Wyner

12:00–12:15 *Argumentation: Content, Structure, and Relationship with Essay Quality*  
Beata Beigman Klebanov, Christian Stab, Jill Burstein, Yi Song, Binod Gyawali and Iryna Gurevych

12:15–12:30 *Neural Attention Model for Classification of Sentences that Support Promoting/Suppressing Relationship*  
Yuta Koreeda, Toshihiko Yanase, Kohsuke Yanai, Misa Sato and Yoshiki Niwa

**Friday, August 12, 2016 (continued)**

**12:30–14:00** *Lunch*

**14:00–15:30** **Session III**

14:00–14:20 *Towards Feasible Guidelines for the Annotation of Argument Schemes*  
Elena Musi, Debanjan Ghosh and Smaranda Muresan

14:20–14:40 *Identifying Argument Components through TextRank*  
Georgios Petasis and Vangelis Karkaletsis

14:40–15:00 *Rhetorical structure and argumentation structure in monologue text*  
Andreas Peldszus and Manfred Stede

15:00–15:15 *Recognizing the Absence of Opposing Arguments in Persuasive Essays*  
Christian Stab and Iryna Gurevych

15:15–15:30 *Expert Stance Graphs for Computational Argumentation*  
Orith Toledo-Ronen, Roy Bar-Haim and Noam Slonim

**15:30–16:00** *Coffee break*

**Friday, August 12, 2016 (continued)**

**16:00–17:30**    **Session IV - Debating Technologies and the Unshared Task Panel**

16:00–16:20    *Fill the Gap! Analyzing Implicit Premises between Claims from Online Debates*  
Filip Boltuzic and Jan Šnajder

16:20–16:40    *Summarising the points made in online political debates*  
Charlie Egan, Advaith Siddharthan and Adam Wyner

16:40–17:00    *What to Do with an Airport? Mining Arguments in the German Online Participation Project Tempelhofer Feld*  
Matthias Liebeck, Katharina Esau and Stefan Conrad

**17:00–17:25**    **Panel Discussion: Unshared Task**

*Unshared task: (Dis)agreement in online debates*  
Maria Skeppstedt, Magnus Sahlgren, Carita Paradis and Andreas Kerren

*Unshared Task: Perspective Based Local Agreement and Disagreement in Online Debate*  
Chantal van Son, Tommaso Caselli, Antske Fokkens, Isa Maks, Roser Morante, Lora Aroyo and Piek Vossen

*Unshared Task: A Preliminary Study of Disputation Behavior in Online Debating Forum*  
Zhongyu Wei, Yandi Xia, Chen Li, Yang Liu, Zachary Stallbohm, Yi Li and Yang Jin

**17:25–17:30**    **Closing Remarks**

**17:30**            **Close**

