

**Proposition Type Annotation Directions**

You will code each proposition based on the scheme laid out below. Consider the context of the full comment all together, and *interpret* the meaning of the slice, to make a coding decision about a sentence.

*Note: We are looking at the central meaning of the statements - “I think he is taller.” and “It seems that he is taller.” are all objective claims because “he is taller” is an objective claim. You can effectively ignore the underlined phrases, unless it involves an action, such as “I told her that he is taller.” (This should be coded as “Testimony”) The idea is that the main clause including the subordinating conjunction (e.g. “It seems that”) often serve as the writer’s confidence in saying the dependent clause (e.g. “he is taller”), whether it be objective or subjective. (Though, it’s not the case sometimes; “It’s interesting that he is taller.”)*

Please code each sentence as *one* of the following:

	Type	Description	Examples
U n v e r i f	<b>Policy : ‘p’</b>	Proposes a course of action to be taken. Often contains words like “should” “must” “needs to”, or starts with a verb. <a href="#">A natural response is. “Why (do you think so)?”</a>	Ex) “Peanuts should be banned from all airlines.” Ex) “Stop serving peanuts!” Ex) “I shouldn’t have to pay extra just to check my baggage.”
	<b>Value : ‘v’</b>	claim that is not objectively verifiable or opinion about the topic of discussion. <a href="#">A natural response is. “Why (do you think so)?”</a> / question asked to express on idea (i.e. rhetorical question)	Ex) “He is tall.” (Though height is quantitative, but the quality of being tall isn’t.) Ex) “I hate peanuts.” Non-ex) “have no clue how to use this site.” (subjective claim not directly related to the topic of discussion.)
V e r i f	<b>Fact : ‘f’</b>	claim that is objectively verifiable, i.e. there are generally agreed criteria for determining the validity of the statement. <a href="#">A natural response is. “Where is the evidence?”</a>  objective words: majority(“>50%”), minority(“<50%”), life-threatening(“can cause death”), etc.	Ex) “More people are killed each year by passenger cars than commercial trucks.” Ex) “Opponents of the ban suggest that <b>allergy sufferers simply avoid flying.</b> ” Non-ex) “It seems to be based on the widely held myth that <b>air inside the cabin is recycled;</b> ”
	<b>Testimony : ‘t’</b>	<a href="#">Fact proposition</a> about the writer’s past experience or present state that is relevant for the topic of discussion, and thus gives credence to the comment (i.e. makes the commenter more “qualified” to say what he/she says). <a href="#">A natural response is. “Where is the evidence?”</a>	Ex) “I was trapped on a very small aircraft, in the hot summer sun, for hours, with no ventilation.” Ex) “We run a retail store.” Non-ex) “I’d rather drive for days then risk dying in flight.” (a statement about the present state of the commenter, but it’s what he thinks, not what he is or does. Subjective Claim.)
	<b>Reference (to a source of evidence) : ‘r’</b>	URL, paper citation	
	<b>No annotation / Nonarg</b>	All else: greeting, things unrelated to the topic of discussion, non-rhetorical questions, etc.	

\* Please refer to “Toward Machine-assisted Participation in eRulemaking: An Argumentation Model of Evaluability” (2015) for more details.