

Evaluating the Role of Target Arguments in Rumour Stance Classification

Yue Li and Carolina Scarton


Department of Computer Science, The University of Sheffield
{yli381, c.scarton}@sheffield.ac.uk

Abstract

Considering a conversation thread, stance classification aims to identify the opinion (e.g. agree or disagree) of replies towards a given *target*. The *target* of the stance is expected to be an essential component in this task, being one of the main factors that make it different from sentiment analysis. However, a recent study shows that a target-oblivious model outperforms target-aware models, suggesting that *targets* are not useful when predicting stance. This paper re-examines this phenomenon for rumour stance classification (RSC) on social media, where a *target* is a rumour story implied by the source tweet in the conversation. We propose adversarial attacks in the test data, aiming to assess the models robustness and evaluate the role of the data in the models performance. Results show that state-of-the-art models, including approaches that use the entire conversation thread, overly relying on superficial signals. Our hypothesis is that the naturally high occurrence of target-independent replies in RSC (e.g. "this is fake" or just "fake") results in the impressive performance of target-oblivious models, highlighting the risk of *target* instances being treated as noise during training.

1 Introduction

Stance classification aims to automatically identify the type of an expressed opinion (usually in textual format) towards a single or multiple targets. It has played a key role in many Natural Language Processing (NLP) applications, such as argument mining (Lawrence and Reed, 2020), rumour analysis (Zubiaga et al., 2016), and information retrieval (Sen et al., 2018). As expected, the *target* of the stance plays a fundamental role in this task, which is one of the main differences between sentiment analysis and stance classification: the former can be framed as target-independent, while the latter has to provide the target either explicitly or implicitly (Küçük and Can, 2020). A *target* could



u1(Target): BREAKING NEWS: New York Times is reporting the Canadian soldier who was shot has died from their injuries. Heartbreaking.
u2(T-I): @u1 Canadian news contradicts this.
u3(T-D): @u1 CTV just said he is being treated and is stable?

Figure 1: Example of Target-Independent (T-I) and Target-Dependent (T-D) replies that *deny* a target.

be a person or an organisation in generic stance detection, and a rumour story or a claim in disinformation analysis. (Mohammad et al., 2016; Zubiaga et al., 2016; Ferreira and Vlachos, 2016).

However, previous work shows that target-oblivious BERT-based models achieve comparable or even better performance than target-aware models on many stance classification datasets, due to spurious sentiment- and lexicon-stance correlations in the training sets (Kaushal et al., 2021). Similar results are observed in other context-dependent NLP tasks, such as Natural Language Inference (premise-hypothesis pairs) and Argument Reasoning Comprehension (argument-warrant pairs), where models without background knowledge (premise or argument) achieve impressive performance due to spurious or superficial cues in the datasets (Poliak et al., 2018; Niven and Kao, 2019).

This paper further analyses the above phenomenon for rumour stance classification (RSC). RSC is framed as a different task from the traditional stance classification, since its aim is to support rumour verification (Zubiaga et al., 2018). Therefore, it is often defined as a four-class problem, with the addition of the query class, to the usual support, deny and comment classes. Following (Kaushal et al., 2021), we experiment with sentiment analysis in the RumourEval 2019 dataset (see Appendix A) and find that all classes contain a significant amount of tweets with negative sentiment, not only *denies*, contradicting their results and motivating a more in-depth analysis. Additionally, in contrast to the stance detection dataset (Con-

forti et al., 2020) studied by Kaushal et al. (2021), RumourEval contains real-world data that is naturally target independent (Figure 1). Thus, we compare different models for RSC in target-oblivious and -aware settings, including conversation-aware systems that model the full conversation structure. Adversarial attacks are proposed to investigate the impact of superficial signals into models’ performance and we show that target-oblivious models achieve competitive results when compared to their target/conversation-aware counterparts.

2 Evaluating the Target-Oblivious Model for Rumour Stance Classification

Data. We experiment with RumourEval 2019, the current largest English RSC dataset (Gorrell et al., 2019). It consists of conversation threads about rumour stories on Twitter and Reddit. This paper only considers the Twitter data split (5,568/6,702 and 1,066/1,827 in training and test sets respectively), aiming to exclude the impact of text length or writing style. Each conversation consists of a *source* tweet that initiates the rumour story, and direct and indirect *replies* to the *source* tweet. The *target* of stance is the rumour story implied by the *source* tweet. The stance of each tweet towards the rumour story is categorised into *support*, *deny*, *query* and *comment*. The dataset is highly imbalanced, with *supports*, *denies* and *queries* corresponding, respectively, to 14%, 7% and 7% of instances, while *comments* are 72%.

Experimental Settings We fine-tune **BERTweet** (Nguyen et al., 2020), **BERT** (Devlin et al., 2019), **RoBERTa** (Liu et al., 2019) and **XLNet** (Yang et al., 2019b) and compare their performance within target-oblivious (T-O) and -aware (T-A) settings. In T-O, we train the model only using the *reply* tweet, whilst T-A treats the *source* tweet as the *target* and feed it together with the *reply* into the model. We compare the above models with the top two submitted systems in the RumourEval 2019 shared task: BLCU NLP (Yang et al., 2019a) and BUT-FIT (Fajcik et al., 2019). Both systems are conversation-aware¹, i.e. they model the conversation structure rather than only considering *source* and *reply* pairs. Since they are not publicly available, we reproduce other two conversation-aware systems: (1) **Hierarchical**

¹Conceptually, conversation-aware models are also target-aware, but in this paper we use "target-aware" to only denote models whose input is a pair of *source* and *reply*.

	Model	$wF2$	macro- $F1$
BERT-based models	<u>BERTweet (T-O)</u>	0.477	0.504
	BERTweet (T-A)	0.435	0.513
	RoBERTa (T-O)	0.431	0.469
	BERT (T-O)	0.422	0.450
	RoBERTa (T-A)	0.417	0.477
	<u>XLNet (T-A)</u>	0.400	0.434
	BERT (T-A)	0.374	0.438
Conversation-based models	<u>BLCU NLP</u>	0.371	0.524
	BUT-FIT	0.309	0.497
	Hierarchical BERT	0.235	0.425
	Branch-LSTM	0.150	0.379

Table 1: Results on the Twitter test set. Underline denotes the difference between the target-oblivious (T-O) and target-aware (T-A) versions of the same model is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$, t-test for $wF2$).

BERT (Yu et al., 2020), achieving state-of-the-art performance (Hardalov et al., 2022) on the RumourEval 2017 dataset (Derczynski et al., 2017); (2) **Branch-LSTM** (Kochkina et al., 2017), the winner of the RumourEval 2017 shared task and the baseline model for the 2019 task. Details about other experimental settings (e.g., hyperparameters and data pre-processing) appear in Appendix B.

Evaluation. Besides macro- $F1$, the official evaluation metric of RumourEval 2019, we adopt weighted $F2$ ($wF2$) which is more robust to RSC (Scarton et al., 2020).² Since we are assessing models’ performance with or without the *target*, we do not use the stance of the *source* in the test set.³

Results. We present the results on the Twitter test set in Table 1. Overall, the T-A version falls behind its oblivious counterpart for the same model, except for XLNet. Conversation-aware models suffer from poor performance over the *support* and *deny* classes,⁴ resulting in low $wF2$ scores. Also, the performance of target-aware models over each stance often experiences higher variance than its target-oblivious version (as shown in Appendix C).

3 Assessing Rumour Stance Classification Models with Adversarial Attacks

Adversarial attacks. The T-O models exhibit high performance especially on *deny* and *query*

²We use the same weights as (Scarton et al., 2020): *deny* = *support* = 0.40, *query* = 0.15 and *comment* = 0.05.

³We removed 56 *sources*: 50 *supports* and 6 *queries*.

⁴Most of the *supports* they correctly predict are *sources*, resulting in higher metrics reported in the original paper.

		BERTweet		Hierarchical BERT	
Attack	Version	$wF2$	macro- $F1$	$wF2$	macro- $F1$
Question Mark	T-O	0.464 (-2.64%)	0.504 (0.00%)	-	-
	T-A	<u>0.415 (-4.69%)</u>	0.498(-3.08%)	<u>0.210 (-11.01%)</u>	0.398 (-6.44%)
All Punctuation	T-O	0.450 (-5.66%)	0.510 (-1.19%)	-	-
	T-A	<u>0.407 (-6.43%)</u>	0.501 (-2.49%)	<u>0.185 (-21.60%)</u>	0.379 (-10.91%)
Negation-reply	T-O	0.243 (-49.14%)	0.237 (-53.03%)	-	-
	T-A	<u>0.272 (-37.55%)</u>	0.276 (-46.16%)	0.148 (-37.28%)	0.069 (-83.89%)
Negation-source	T-A	0.409 (-6.11%)	0.467 (-9.04%)	0.236 (+0.15%)	0.423 (-0.58%)

Table 2: Influence of each adversarial attack on Hierarchical BERT and target-aware and -oblivious BERTweet. The highest drop performance is in bold. Figures in parentheses are the percentage of performance change. Underline denotes the change of $wF2$ is statistically significant (p value < 0.05, paired t-test).

classes, hence, we employ adversarial attacks to investigate (1) how much the superficial signals contribute to the success of the T-O models and (2) whether the target- and conversation-aware models are free from such superficial dependency. The following two types of attacks are adopted, modifying all the examples in the Twitter test set.

- **Punctuation:** in RSC, the *query* stance is represented by interrogative sentences, frequently ending with question marks. Therefore, a model trained for this task may be reliant on punctuation marks. For testing this hypothesis, we compare the models after removing (i) question marks or (ii) all punctuation from the test set.
- **Negation:** we adopt the negation stress test proposed for NLI (Naik et al., 2018), which is also effective for stance classification (Schiller et al., 2021). We add "False is not true and" at the beginning of the (i) *source* or (ii) *reply* tweets.

Results. Overall, all the models are vulnerable to the attacks. Target- and conversation-aware models are not consistently more robust than target-oblivious models. Results for BERTweet and Hierarchical BERT are in Table 2. Other models’ results and a per stance analysis can be found in Appendix C. Since both attacks can influence the text length. We calculate the point biserial correlation coefficient (r_{pb}) between the number of tokens and model performance (whether a prediction is correct or not), achieving significantly small coefficients ($|r_{pb}| < 0.16$). This indicates that input length does not impact models’ performance.

Punctuation-based attacks. Question marks serve as a strong signal for the prediction of the *query* class. Consequently, other punctuation (e.g., period) is seen as a cue for *support* and *deny* classes, resulting in a model bias towards all punc-

uation marks. For instance, after removing question marks, the $F2$ score for the *query* class significantly drops, while the performance of the other three classes sometimes slightly rise. The dependency on punctuation varies across different models. In most of the cases, abandoning all the punctuation leads to performance drop over the *query*, *support* and *deny* classes. But we observe marginal improvement of the *support* class on the target-aware RoBERTa and XLNet. Overall, T-O versions of BERT and BERTweet exhibit the least decrease of $wF2$ scores under attacks for question marks and all punctuation respectively.

Negation-based attacks. Models are highly vulnerable to a negation attack towards the *reply* tweet, especially T-O models. XLNet T-O, although performing worse than its T-A version, shows stronger bias towards superficial negation terms. Surprisingly, the conversation-aware systems also heavily rely on the simple cue words in the *replies*. XLNet T-A is the most robust model in this case, although its $wF2$ score still drops by nearly 18%. Interestingly, the target- and conversation-aware models are considerably less impacted by the negation attack towards the *source* than the *reply*. It may be reasonable since the model would rely more on the negation in the *reply* rather than in the *target* to infer the stance. However, we notice that the influence of negation attack towards the *source* tweet is inconsistent, and could sometimes lead to misclassification into the *comment* or even the *support* class (shown in the Appendix C), suggesting the lack of reasoning between the *source* and *reply*.

4 The Role of Target Arguments in Dataset and Models

Unlike the analysis by Kaushal et al. (2021), here, we highlight that there is real-world data whose

stance is truly target-independent, especially in RSC where the *target* is given implicitly (Hardalov et al., 2022) and the replies under rumours on social media can be naturally vague (Figure 1 and Appendix D). Instead of "de-biasing" the dataset by removing these examples, we argue that the model should be able to handle both target-independent and -dependent cases. However, the presence of these target-independent tweets in the dataset can impact the learning process and evaluation, as we have discussed. So we further analyse the role of the target arguments in the dataset and target/conversation-aware models.

Dataset. Two annotators manually categorise the *reply* tweets (all of the *supports*, *denies*, *queries* and 50 randomly sampled *comments*) in both validation and test sets into target-independent or -dependent. Annotators did not have access to the *source* tweet and the tweets from validation and test sets are shuffled before annotation. Aiming to validate the annotations, annotators were also asked to classify the stance of the target-independent tweets. We then compare their assigned class with the gold standard label and, if they differ, we alter their annotation from target-independent to -dependent. The Inter-Annotator Agreement is 72.5%.

As shown in Table 3, the distribution of the target-independent tweets is imbalanced, with *denies* and *queries* showing more cases where context is not needed. It further explains why target-oblivious models are good at predicting *deny* and *query* classes. We also analyse whether the conversation-aware models are better at classifying target-dependent tweets, as it would be expected. However, almost all the correctly identified *denies* by Hierarchical BERT and Branch-LSTM are short target-independent tweets, containing strong signal words such as "false", "no", and "lie". In addition, these models fail in simple cases such as "@USER fake news". Therefore, we question the real usefulness of conversation-aware models, since the *deny* class is the most informative class for rumour verification on social media. Nevertheless, the test set itself does not contain *denies* that require complicated reasoning with the *source* or *parent* tweets, so the evaluation naturally favours T-O systems.

Models. Aiming to investigate the role of the *target* in the target/conversation-aware models, we experiment by masking the entire *source* tweet in the input during inference. As shown in Table 4, mask-

	Support	Deny	Query
Validation	20 (29%)	35 (51%)	42 (40%)
Test	12 (13%)	66 (72%)	17 (30%)

Table 3: The number of target-independent tweets in each stance in validation and test sets (proportion in brackets). The annotators did not identify any target-independent *comments*.

Model	Support	Deny	Query	Comment
BERTweet (T-A)	0.476±0.260	0.801±0.022	0.975±0.019	0.917±0.061
Hierarchical BERT	0.905±0.019	0.956±0.029	0.939±0.035	0.994±0.002

Table 4: The proportion of predictions in each class that are not influenced by masking the *target*. We show the mean and standard deviation (see Appendix C).

ing the *target* has minimum impact on target-aware BERTweet over the *deny*, *query* and *comment* predictions and, even for the *support* class, 48% of predictions stay the same on average – larger than the proportion of target-independent examples in the test set. The case is even more extreme for Hierarchical BERT. The results suggest that the target/conversation-aware model may behave like a target-independent model. The *source* tweets or conversations may be introducing noise, which would explain the failure of the conversation-based models in simple target-independent examples.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we evaluate target-aware and -oblivious models for rumour stance classification and adopt adversarial attacks to analyse the decision-making of the models. Our study shows that target- and conversation-aware models are not consistently more robust than target-oblivious models. All models highly rely on negation and question marks for *deny* and *query* classes. We also demonstrate the existence of target-independent tweets especially in *deny* and *query* classes, leading to the "success" of the target-oblivious model and poor reasoning between the *target* and *reply* in the target-aware models.

We suggest that: (1) Target-oblivious models could be adopted as a baseline for this task. (2) To avoid biased evaluation, the balance between target-aware and -oblivious examples in the test set should be considered. (3) The *target* should be modelled in a more flexible way, e.g., by framing the identification of target-independent and -specific stance

features as a pretext task (Liang et al., 2022).

Limitations

Our study is limited to English rumour stance classification and we are aware that stance may be expressed in different ways in other languages, therefore, further studies are needed to extend this work and its conclusions to languages other than English. Given its importance to the research community, we based our study on RumourEval 2019 dataset alone, however, it is expected that other datasets, potentially covering different events, may have a different stance distribution. In fact, we can already observe this phenomenon when comparing the validation and test sets (Table 3).

References

- Abeer ALDayel and Walid Magdy. 2021. [Stance detection on social media: State of the art and trends](#). *Information Processing & Management*, 58(4):102597.
- Francesco Barbieri, Jose Camacho-Collados, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Leonardo Neves. 2020. [TweetEval: Unified benchmark and comparative evaluation for tweet classification](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1644–1650, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Costanza Conforti, Jakob Berndt, Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, Chryssi Giannitsarou, Flavio Toxvaerd, and Nigel Collier. 2020. [Will-they-won't-they: A very large dataset for stance detection on Twitter](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1715–1724, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leon Derczynski, Kalina Bontcheva, Maria Liakata, Rob Procter, Geraldine Wong Sak Hoi, and Arkaitz Zubiaga. 2017. [SemEval-2017 task 8: RumourEval: Determining rumour veracity and support for rumours](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*, pages 69–76, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 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.
- Martin Fajcik, Pavel Smrz, and Lukas Burget. 2019. [BUT-FIT at SemEval-2019 task 7: Determining the rumour stance with pre-trained deep bidirectional transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 1097–1104, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- William Ferreira and Andreas Vlachos. 2016. [Emergent: a novel data-set for stance classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1163–1168, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Genevieve Gorrell, Elena Kochkina, Maria Liakata, Ahmet Aker, Arkaitz Zubiaga, Kalina Bontcheva, and Leon Derczynski. 2019. [SemEval-2019 task 7: RumourEval, determining rumour veracity and support for rumours](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 845–854, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Momchil Hardalov, Arnav Arora, Preslav Nakov, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2022. [A survey on stance detection for mis- and disinformation identification](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 1259–1277, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ayush Kaushal, Avirup Saha, and Niloy Ganguly. 2021. [tWT-WT: A dataset to assert the role of target entities for detecting stance of tweets](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3879–3889, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Elena Kochkina, Maria Liakata, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2017. [Turing at SemEval-2017 task 8: Sequential approach to rumour stance classification with branch-LSTM](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*, pages 475–480, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dilek Küçük and Fazli Can. 2020. [Stance detection: A survey](#). *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 53(1):1–37.
- John Lawrence and Chris Reed. 2020. [Argument mining: A survey](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 45(4):765–818.
- Bin Liang, Zixiao Chen, Lin Gui, Yulan He, Min Yang, and Ruifeng Xu. 2022. [Zero-shot stance detection via contrastive learning](#). In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 2738–2747.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019.

- Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2017. [Decoupled weight decay regularization](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*.
- Saif Mohammad, Svetlana Kiritchenko, Parinaz Sobhani, Xiaodan Zhu, and Colin Cherry. 2016. [SemEval-2016 task 6: Detecting stance in tweets](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2016)*, pages 31–41, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aakanksha Naik, Abhilasha Ravichander, Norman Sadeh, Carolyn Rose, and Graham Neubig. 2018. [Stress test evaluation for natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2340–2353, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dat Quoc Nguyen, Thanh Vu, and Anh Tuan Nguyen. 2020. [BERTweet: A pre-trained language model for English tweets](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 9–14, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Timothy Niven and Hung-Yu Kao. 2019. [Probing neural network comprehension of natural language arguments](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4658–4664, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Adam Poliak, Jason Naradowsky, Aparajita Haldar, Rachel Rudinger, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2018. [Hypothesis only baselines in natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 180–191, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Carolina Scarton, Diego Silva, and Kalina Bontcheva. 2020. [Measuring what counts: The case of rumour stance classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 925–932, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Benjamin Schiller, Johannes Daxenberger, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. [Stance detection benchmark: How robust is your stance detection?](#) *KI-Künstliche Intelligenz*, 35(3):329–341.
- Anirban Sen, Manjira Sinha, Sandya Mannarswamy, and Shourya Roy. 2018. [Stance classification of multi-perspective consumer health information](#). In *Proceedings of the ACM India Joint International Conference on Data Science and Management of Data*, pages 273–281.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. 2019. [Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*.
- Ruoyao Yang, Wanying Xie, Chunhua Liu, and Dong Yu. 2019a. [BLCU_NLP at SemEval-2019 task 7: An inference chain-based GPT model for rumour evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 1090–1096, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V Le. 2019b. [Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding](#). *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Jianfei Yu, Jing Jiang, Ling Min Serena Khoo, Hai Leong Chieu, and Rui Xia. 2020. [Coupled hierarchical transformer for stance-aware rumor verification in social media conversations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1392–1401, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arkaitz Zubiaga, Ahmet Aker, Kalina Bontcheva, Maria Liakata, and Rob Procter. 2018. [Detection and resolution of rumours in social media: A survey](#). *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 51(2):1–36.
- Arkaitz Zubiaga, Maria Liakata, Rob Procter, Geraldine Wong Sak Hoi, and Peter Tolmie. 2016. [Analysing how people orient to and spread rumours in social media by looking at conversational threads](#). *PloS one*, 11(3):e0150989.

A Sentiment Analysis for RumourEval 2019 Training Data

We use a RoBERTa-base model fine-tuned for sentiment analysis (Barbieri et al., 2020) to categorise the sentiment classes (positive, negative, neutral) for RumourEval 2019 training data. We randomly sample 10 tweets for each stance and manually annotate them. The agreement between manual and model annotation is 0.725. The distribution of sentiment in each stance is shown in Table 5.

	Support	Deny	Query	Comment
Negative	47%	57%	33%	46%
Neutral	44%	40%	64%	44%
Positive	9%	3%	3%	10%

Table 5: Sentiment distribution over stance in the training set. The dominate sentiment is in bold.

Kaushal et al. (2021) find that most of *denies* in RumourEval 2019 dataset have high negative sentiment, suggesting this correlation between sentiment and stance leads to the impressive performance of the target-oblivious model. But here, we show that negative sentiment not only dominates the *deny* class, but *support* and *comment* classes as well. The observation is consistent with findings by ALDayel and Magdy (2021) on SemEval 2016 stance detection dataset (Mohammad et al., 2016) where the three stances, *favor*, *against* and *none*, all skewed to negative sentiment. Furthermore, considering the stance distribution over sentiment, 68% of the negative tweets belong to the *comment* class, while only 9% of them are *denies*. Therefore, we hypothesise that the negative sentiment of *denies* cannot significantly contribute to the high performance of the target-oblivious model on RumourEval 2019 dataset.

B Pre-processing and Training Process

Pre-processing. User mentions, URLs and emojis are treated in the same way as in the pre-training of BERTweet (Nguyen et al., 2020). Hashtags are removed from tweets. Most of them are related to the name of the news events rather than the rumour story (the *target*), e.g., #CharlieHebdo. The max sequence length is set as 128. No input is truncated during tokenization.

BERTweet, RoBERTa, BERT, and XLNet. We use the *bertweet-base*, *bert-base-uncased*, *roberta-base*, and *xlnet-base-cased*. During fine-tuning, we employ the transformers library (Wolf et al., 2019) and adopt AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017). We introduce class weights in the loss function to treat the imbalance data problem. According to the distribution of Twitter training data, the weights of the *support*, *deny*, *query* and *comment* are 1.67, 3.15, 2.95, and 0.36 respectively. We also remove the cases from the training data where the stances are annotated for the *source* tweets, in order to avoid confusing the target-aware models due to *source* and *source* pairs. We use grid search for hyperparameter tuning, and the optimal hyperparameters are determined based on $wF2$ score on the official validation set (see Table 6 and 7 for details). We set the maximum epochs as 30 and use early stopping strategy. The best model checkpoint is selected according to the $wF2$ score on the official validation set. For each model, we repeat the fine-tuning process for five times with

different random seeds.

Hierarchical BERT. We adopt the author’s implementation of the single task model⁵ for rumour stance detection and re-train it with RumourEval 2019 training set. We use the hyperparameters suggested by the authors. Due to memory limitations, we reduce the batch size from 2 to 1 and tune the learning rate (see Table 6 and 7). We repeat the training process for five times with different random seeds. In this model, the source tweet and its replies in a conversation thread are first concatenated in chronological order and then split into ten sub-threads. Each sub-thread is fed to the BERT model to learn a local representation, and an additional BERT layer is built on top to learn a global representation across all the sub-threads.

Branch-LSTM. We directly use the official model uploaded for RumourEval 2019 shared task.⁶ This model is a feature-based model, with features about punctuation (e.g., presence of question marks and periods), lexicons (e.g., count of negation and swear words) and attachments (e.g., presence of URL and hashtags), among others. As for word embeddings, it utilises the 300-dimensional Word2Vec model pre-trained on Google News corpus.⁷ Considering the tree structure of the conversation, each thread is split into branches by taking each leaf node reply with all its direct parent replies. The average of word embeddings are used to represent each reply in a branch, which is then fed into unidirectional LSTMs.

Model	Hyperparameters
BERTweet	Learning Rate: [1e-5,3e-5,5e-5,7e-5,1e-4], Batch size: [16,32]
BERT	Learning Rate: [1e-5,3e-5,5e-5,7e-5,1e-4], Batch size: [16,32], Dropout: [0.1,0.2,0.3]
RoBERTa	Learning Rate: [1e-5,3e-5,5e-5,7e-5,1e-4], Batch size: [16,32]
XLNet	Learning Rate: [1e-5,3e-5,5e-5,7e-5,1e-4,1e-6, 3e-6,5e-6,7e-6], Batch size: [16,32]
Hierarchical BERT	Learning Rate: [1e-5,3e-5,5e-5,7e-5,1e-4]

Table 6: Hyperparameter search for each model.

⁵<https://github.com/jefferyyu/DualHierarchicalTransformer>

⁶<https://github.com/kochkinaelena/RumourEval2019>

⁷<https://code.google.com/archive/p/word2vec/>

Model	Learning Rate	Batch Size	Dropout
BERTweet (T-O)	1e-5	32	-
BERTweet (T-A)	1e-5	32	-
BERT (T-O)	3e-5	16	0.2
BERT (T-A)	3e-5	32	0.2
RoBERTa (T-O)	1e-5	16	-
RoBERTa (T-A)	1e-5	32	-
XLNet (T-O)	5e-6	32	-
XLNet (T-A)	1e-5	16	-
Hierarchical BERT	3e-5	-	-

Table 7: Optimal hyperparameter for each model.




Figure 2: Confusion matrices for the target-oblivious model on official and adversarial test sets.

C Model Performance

Table 9 shows the performance drop under the adversarial attacks for the rest of the four models we do not report in the main content of the paper (BERT, RoBERTa, XLNet, and Branch-LSTM). Table 8 shows the performance over each stance on the official and adversarial test sets for all the models. We report F2 score rather than F1 score because recall is more important than precision for this task.

Take the best performing model BERTweet as an example, Figure 2 and 3 present the confusion matrices of the target-oblivious and -aware BERTweet models on the test sets. We show the results of the models that achieve the highest $wF2$ scores on the official validation set.

As discussed in the paper, the influence of negation attack towards *source* tweets is inconsistent. Figure 4b shows that fake negation in the *source* tweets leads to slight increase of misclassification of *comments* and *queries* towards the *support* class, in contradiction to the results in Figure 3e.




Figure 3: Confusion matrices for the target-aware model on official and adversarial test sets.




Figure 4: Examples of inconsistent impact of negation-based attack towards *source* tweets.

D Target-Independent and -Dependent Tweets

Table 11 presents examples of target-independent and -dependent tweets in RumourEval 2019 dataset. Most of the target-independent *supports* are retweets and quote tweets. Target-independent *denies* are tweets that clearly cast doubt. Most of the *queries* tend to be target-independent, but the annotator fails to pick out a large number of them because they are not informative (e.g., "@USER @USER blood clot?", "@USER WHAT?") or confused with *denies* (e.g., "@USER @USER @USER Are you on strong opiates or are you an idiot?"). However, they could still potentially be learnt by the model since they are all interrogative sentences and contain question marks. The examples also show that the prediction of target-independent *supports* and *denies* can be challenging, e.g., requiring numeric reasoning between *source* and *reply* tweets.

Model Name	Attack	Version	Support	Deny	Query	Comment
BERTweet	Official Test Set	T-O	0.246 (± 0.054)	0.584 (± 0.022)	0.752 (± 0.029)	0.636 (± 0.052)
		T-A	0.222 (± 0.109)	0.515 (± 0.048)	0.703 (± 0.070)	0.703 (± 0.111)
	Question Mark	T-O	0.253 (± 0.058)	0.591 (± 0.026)	0.629 (± 0.040)	0.656 (± 0.054)
		T-A	0.225 (± 0.108)	0.522 (± 0.053)	0.534 (± 0.077)	0.719 (± 0.113)
	All Punctuation	T-O	0.226 (± 0.053)	0.573 (± 0.039)	0.632 (± 0.038)	0.710 (± 0.046)
		T-A	0.212 (± 0.132)	0.511 (± 0.049)	0.536 (± 0.081)	0.753 (± 0.098)
	Negation-reply	T-O	0.034 (± 0.028)	0.365 (± 0.019)	0.517 (± 0.107)	0.106 (± 0.055)
		T-A	0.122 (± 0.122)	0.399 (± 0.049)	0.320 (± 0.133)	0.308 (± 0.254)
Negation-source	T-A	0.176 (± 0.110)	0.518 (± 0.045)	0.666 (± 0.080)	0.618 (± 0.172)	
BERT	Official Test Set	T-O	0.252 (± 0.112)	0.474 (± 0.069)	0.674 (± 0.037)	0.613 (± 0.121)
		T-A	0.166 (± 0.072)	0.444 (± 0.092)	0.656 (± 0.026)	0.642 (± 0.124)
	Question Mark	T-O	0.251 (± 0.109)	0.484 (± 0.074)	0.581 (± 0.061)	0.637 (± 0.125)
		T-A	0.169 (± 0.072)	0.445 (± 0.101)	0.534 (± 0.047)	0.671 (± 0.120)
	All Punctuation	T-O	0.236 (± 0.115)	0.417 (± 0.103)	0.581 (± 0.056)	0.671 (± 0.124)
		T-A	0.155 (± 0.069)	0.349 (± 0.142)	0.512 (± 0.033)	0.747 (± 0.067)
	Negation-reply	T-O	0.026 (± 0.030)	0.361 (± 0.030)	0.556 (± 0.124)	0.099 (± 0.161)
		T-A	0.072 (± 0.134)	0.357 (± 0.025)	0.552 (± 0.099)	0.192 (± 0.198)
Negation-source	T-A	0.169 (± 0.087)	0.476 (± 0.094)	0.658 (± 0.015)	0.598 (± 0.130)	
RoBERTa	Official Test Set	T-O	0.220 (± 0.032)	0.523 (± 0.016)	0.681 (± 0.017)	0.642 (± 0.060)
		T-A	0.205 (± 0.098)	0.513 (± 0.079)	0.637 (± 0.056)	0.673 (± 0.092)
	Question Mark	T-O	0.218 (± 0.032)	0.523 (± 0.021)	0.524 (± 0.030)	0.666 (± 0.066)
		T-A	0.208 (± 0.100)	0.510 (± 0.077)	0.450 (± 0.059)	0.694 (± 0.095)
	All Punctuation	T-O	0.181 (± 0.055)	0.516 (± 0.020)	0.543 (± 0.030)	0.719 (± 0.079)
		T-A	0.217 (± 0.112)	0.444 (± 0.105)	0.462 (± 0.066)	0.743 (± 0.056)
	Negation-reply	T-O	0.011 (± 0.025)	0.345 (± 0.006)	0.403 (± 0.230)	0.026 (± 0.038)
		T-A	0.083 (± 0.099)	0.375 (± 0.033)	0.327 (± 0.110)	0.132 (± 0.139)
Negation-source	T-A	0.155 (± 0.125)	0.523 (± 0.047)	0.615 (± 0.052)	0.581 (± 0.143)	
XLNet	Official Test Set	T-O	0.177 (± 0.052)	0.389 (± 0.035)	0.616 (± 0.052)	0.648 (± 0.043)
		T-A	0.262 (± 0.114)	0.415 (± 0.064)	0.672 (± 0.030)	0.564 (± 0.100)
	Question Mark	T-O	0.181 (± 0.049)	0.388 (± 0.042)	0.393 (± 0.082)	0.664 (± 0.040)
		T-A	0.262 (± 0.116)	0.412 (± 0.068)	0.506 (± 0.095)	0.588 (± 0.096)
	All Punctuation	T-O	0.178 (± 0.075)	0.357 (± 0.057)	0.382 (± 0.060)	0.720 (± 0.041)
		T-A	0.271 (± 0.116)	0.381 (± 0.060)	0.477 (± 0.070)	0.635 (± 0.095)
	Negation-reply	T-O	0.073 (± 0.066)	0.379 (± 0.019)	0.487 (± 0.056)	0.257 (± 0.145)
		T-A	0.152 (± 0.147)	0.390 (± 0.028)	0.642 (± 0.082)	0.299 (± 0.104)
Negation-source	T-A	0.175 (± 0.127)	0.432 (± 0.023)	0.673 (± 0.008)	0.413 (± 0.088)	
Hierarchical-BERT	Official Test Set	T-A	0.088 (± 0.010)	0.206 (± 0.079)	0.492 (± 0.091)	0.882 (± 0.011)
	Question Mark	T-A	0.085 (± 0.012)	0.204 (± 0.082)	0.331 (± 0.057)	0.890 (± 0.005)
	All Punctuation	T-A	0.076 (± 0.028)	0.152 (± 0.065)	0.324 (± 0.063)	0.901 (± 0.002)
	Negation-reply	T-A	0.039 (± 0.016)	0.329 (± 0.009)	0 (± 0.000)	0.052 (± 0.036)
	Negation-source	T-A	0.087 (± 0.022)	0.212 (± 0.070)	0.482 (± 0.089)	0.877 (± 0.009)
Branch-LSTM	Official Test Set	T-A	0.027	0.054	0.475	0.927
	Question Mark	T-A	0.027	0.054	0.044	0.934
	All Punctuation	T-A	0.027	0.040	0.044	0.935
	Negation-reply	T-A	0.000	0.302	0.377	0.840
	Negation-source	T-A	0.039	0.054	0.491	0.918

Table 8: Average F2 scores and standard deviations of each stance on the official and adversarial test sets. The best scores for each model are in bold.

Attack	Version	BERT		RoBERTa		XLNet		Branch-LSTM	
		$wF2$	macro- $F1$	$wF2$	macro- $F1$	$wF2$	macro- $F1$	$wF2$	macro- $F1$
Question Mark	T-O	-2.15%	+0.82%	<u>-5.69%</u>	-2.90%	<u>-8.92%</u>	-7.16%	-	-
	T-A	<u>-4.09%</u>	-0.06%	<u>-6.45%</u>	-3.95%	<u>-6.26%</u>	-2.56%	-42.99%	-30.47%
All Punctuation	T-O	<u>-9.56%</u>	-1.43%	<u>-8.14%</u>	-0.14%	<u>-12.53%</u>	-6.27%	-	-
	T-A	<u>-15.64%</u>	-2.18%	<u>-10.93%</u>	-4.29%	<u>-8.98%</u>	-2.65%	-46.46%	-31.79%
Negation-reply	T-O	-42.40%	-51.04%	-53.03%	-67.25%	-24.07%	-35.17%	-	-
	T-A	<u>-29.48%</u>	-40.02%	<u>-42.71%</u>	-56.69%	<u>-17.93%</u>	-23.81%	+46.53%	+0.87%
Negation-source	T-A	+3.20%	-1.75%	-5.78%	-9.15%	<u>-8.85%</u>	-13.85%	+4.47%	+1.21%

Table 9: Influence of each adversarial attack on Branch-LSTM and target-aware and -oblivious BERT, RoBERTa and XLNet. The highest drop performance is in bold. Underline denotes the change of $wF2$ is statistically significant (p value < 0.05, paired t-test).

Model	Support	Deny	Query	Comment
BERT	0.329±0.146	0.670±0.144	0.925±0.098	0.915±0.045
RoBERTa	0.512±0.202	0.656±0.147	0.918±0.061	0.902±0.089
XLNet	0.673±0.108	0.709±0.088	0.914±0.040	0.760±0.086

Table 10: The proportion of predictions in each class that would not be influenced by masking the *target*. We show the mean and standard deviation.

Stance	Source Tweet	Reply Tweet
Target-dependent replies		
Deny	267 days since Sick Hillary had a press conference.	@USER wha do you mean she had one with Anderson cooper over the telephone
Deny	BREAKING: At least 10 killed in shooting at French satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo, Paris prosecutor's office says. HTTPURL	@USER 11 killed
Support	Germanwings co-pilot had serious depressive episode: Bild newspaper HTTPURL	@USER The pilot was NOT FIT TO FLY !
Support	Report: Red Cross Was Stealing from Church Doorsteps to Redistribute or Sell Items for Profit? (VIDEO) HTTPURL	@USER @USER Stealing is stealing, regardless of how you want to dress it up.
Target-independent replies		
Deny	BREAKING: Illegal Muslim From Iran Arrested For Starting California Wildfire HTTPURL	@USER No source cited in this article, no date... I would not rely on this and neither should you.
Deny	Prince William and Harry donates \$ 100 million to Hurricane Harvey Victims – News 360 HTTPURL	@USER Fake news!!
Query	Black Lives Matter THUGS Blocking Emergency Crews From Reaching Hurricane Victims-HTTPURL via @USER	@USER @USER @USER Where and when ? Other links to ?
Support	Ongoing hostage situation in Sydney café. Major landmarks like the Sydney Opera House evacuated HTTPURL	Special Prayers for tonight "@USER: Ongoing hostage situation in Sydney café. HTTPURL"
Support	Mike Pence Disappointed God Has Never Asked Him To Kill One Of Own Children HTTPURL HTTPURL	@USER There's lot of truth in this

Table 11: Examples of target-independent and -dependent tweets