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Abstract

The goal of stance detection is to determine the viewpoint expressed in a piece of text towards a target. These viewpoints or contexts are often expressed in many different languages depending on the user and the platform, which can be a local news outlet, a social media platform, a news forum, etc. Most research on stance detection, however, has been limited to working with a single language and on a few limited targets, with little work on cross-lingual stance detection. Moreover, non-English sources of labelled data are often scarce and present additional challenges. Recently, large multilingual language models have substantially improved the performance on many non-English tasks, especially such with a limited number of examples. This highlights the importance of model pre-training and its ability to learn from few examples. In this paper, we present the most comprehensive study of cross-lingual stance detection to date: we experiment with 15 diverse datasets in 12 languages from 6 language families, and with 6 low-resource evaluation settings each. For our experiments, we build on pattern-exploiting training (PET), proposing the addition of a novel label encoder to simplify the verbalisation procedure. We further propose sentiment-based generation of stance data for pre-training, which shows sizeable improvement of more than 6% F1 absolute in few-shot learning settings compared to several strong baselines.

1 Introduction

As online speech gets democratised, we see an ever-growing representation of non-English languages. Yet, for stance detection, multilingual resources remain scarce (Joshi et al. 2020). While English datasets exist for various domains and of different sizes, non-English and multilingual datasets are often small —under a thousand examples (Lai et al. 2018, 2020; Lozhnikov, Derczynski, and Mazzara 2020; Alhindi et al. 2021)—, and focus on narrow, potentially country- or culture-specific topics, such as a referendum (Taulé et al. 2017; Lai et al. 2018), a person (Hercig et al. 2017; Darwish et al. 2020; Lai et al. 2020), or a notable event (Swami et al. 2018), with few exceptions (Vanvans and Sennrich 2020).

Traditionally, the task was addressed using models trained on mid-size datasets (Mohtarami et al. 2018). However, more recently, notable research progress was made in zero- and few-shot learning scenarios.

In particular, pattern-based training approaches (Brown et al. 2020; Schick and Schütze 2021a; Gao, Fisch, and Chen 2021) have been shown very effective in low-resource scenarios, and an ideal option for modelling cross-lingual stance. Yet, previous work mostly focused on single-task and single-language scenarios. In contrast, here we study their multilingual performance, and their ability to transfer knowledge across tasks and datasets. Moreover, a limitation of these approaches, especially for pattern-exploiting training, or PET, (Schick and Schütze 2021a), is the need for label verbalisation, i.e., to identify single words describing the labels. This can be inconvenient for label-rich and nuanced tasks. We overcome this by introducing a label encoder.

Other studies showed that multi-task and multi-dataset learning can improve the accuracy and the robustness of stance detection models (Schiller, Daxenberger, and Gurevych 2021; Hardalov et al. 2021a). Nonetheless, pre-training should not necessarily be performed on the same task; in fact, it is important to select the auxiliary task to pre-train on carefully (Poth et al. 2021). Auxiliary data from a similar task can also improve performance, and an appealing candidate for stance detection is sentiment analysis, due to its semantic relationship to stance (Ebrahimi, Dou, and Lowd 2016; Sobhani, Mohammad, and Kiritchenko 2016).

Our work makes the following contributions:

- We present the largest study of cross-lingual stance detection, covering 15 datasets in 12 diverse languages from 6 language families.
- We explore the capabilities of pattern training both in a few-shot and in a full-resource cross-lingual setting.
- We introduce a novel label-encoding mechanism to overcome the limitations of predicting multi-token labels and the need for verbalisation (single-token labels).
- We diverge from stance-to-stance transfer by proposing a novel semi-supervised approach to produce automatically labelled instances with a trained sentiment model, leading to sizeable improvement over strong baselines.
- We show that our newly introduced semi-supervised approach outperforms models fine-tuned on few shots from multiple cross-lingual datasets, while being competitive with pre-trained models on English stance datasets.
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2 Method

We propose an end-to-end few-shot learning, and a novel noisy sentiment-based stance detection pre-training.

2.1 Few-Shot Pattern-Exploiting Learning (PET)

PET and its variants (Schick and Schütze 2021a,b; Tam et al. 2021) have shown promising results when trained in a few-shot setting. They bridge the gap between downstream tasks like text classification and the pre-training of models by converting the dataset into a cloze-style question format that brings it closer to the masked language modelling objective. Using this technique, models with few hundred million parameters can outperform parameter-rich models such as GPT-3 (Brown et al. 2020) on various benchmark tasks (Wang et al. 2018) by fine-tuning on just 32 examples. Our motivation for adopting this framework is three-fold: (i) there has not been much prior work that puts these models under scrutiny in a cross-lingual setting, (ii) often, there is data scarceness for many languages, which is also the case with stance datasets (only three of our datasets contain more than 2,000 training examples, see Section 3), and (iii) the label inventories of different datasets are often shared or contain synonymous words such as pro, in favour, support, etc., which can be strong indicators for the model in both few-shot or full-resource settings (Augenstein, Ruder, and Søgaard 2018; Pappas and Henderson 2019; Chang et al. 2020; Rethmeier and Augenstein 2020; Hardalov et al. 2021a).

2.2 Cross-lingual Stance Pattern Training

Figure 1 shows the architecture of our model. First, we use a simplified PET with a pre-trained language model to predict the likelihood of each label to fill a special mask token in a sentence-based template (see Prompt below). To obtain a suitable representation (label embeddings) for the labels, we use a label encoder that averages the pooled vectors from the model’s token embeddings for each sub-word. Finally, we take the dot product of the label embeddings and the contextualised word embedding for the masked position to obtain the likelihood for each label to fit in.

Prior work (Qin and Eisner 2021; Logan IV et al. 2021; Lester, Al-Rfou, and Constant 2021) has studied aspects of PET such as prompt design, tuning, and selection. Here, we focus on the training procedure, and we leave the exploration of other aspects in a multilingual setting for future work.

Label Encoder A well-known challenge in PET is the need for a fixed number of positions for the label, e.g., a single mask is needed for words present in the dictionary such as Yes/No; however, we need multiple positions to predict more complex ones with multiple tokens such as Unrelated. Moreover, if different labels have different lengths, the model needs to ignore some of the positions, e.g., to predict a padding inside the sentence. The label inventory commonly contains words tokenised into multiple tokens. Schick and Schütze (2021a) proposed a simple verbalisation technique where the original labels are replaced with words that can be represented with a single token from the vocabulary, e.g., Favour → Yes, Against → No. Another possibility is to automatically detect such words, but this yields notable drop in performance compared to manual verbalisation by a domain expert (Schick, Schmid, and Schütze 2020).

Here, we propose a simple, yet effective, approach to overcome this problem. Instead of using a single token representation per label, we take the original label inventory and we tokenise all words, as shown in Figure 1. In the Label inventory box, we see four labels common for stance tasks and their tokens (obtained by the XLM-R’s tokenizer) – {‘against’}, {‘discuss’, ‘ing’}, {‘in’, ‘favour’}, and {‘un’, ‘related’, ‘to’}. For each token of a label, we extract the vector representation from the MLM pre-trained model’s (e.g., XLM-R) token embeddings $v^L_{TE} = \text{TokEmb}(L_t)$. Afterwards, we obtain the final label representation ($LE_L$) using an element-wise averaging for all $v^L_{TE}$ (see Eq. 1).

$$LE_L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=0}^{N} \text{TokEmb}(L_t); \forall L \in \{\text{Labels}\}$$ (1)

Note that for single tokens, this method defaults to the original MLM task used in learning BERT-based models (Devlin et al. 2019; Liu et al. 2019). The technique of averaging the embedding is shown to be effective with non-contextualised language models such as word2vec (Mikolov et al. 2013) and GloVe (Pennington, Socher, and Manning 2014) for representing entire documents or for obtaining a token-level representation with fastText (Joulin et al. 2017).

Finally, to obtain the label for each example, we take the dot product between the MLM representation for the masked token position, and each of the $LE_L$ vectors. There is no need for padding, as both representations are of the same dimensionality by design (Conneau et al. 2020).
Here, we must note that we select the candidates only from the task-related labels; however, we treat the task as a multi-label one, as we describe in more detail below.

**Training Objective** We use a standard binary-cross-entropy (BCE) loss for each label, where for positive examples, we propagate 1, and for negative ones, we propagate 0. We do not use the original MLM cross-entropy over the entire dictionary, as this will force the model to recognise only certain words as the correct labels, whereas their synonyms are also a valid choice. Moreover, such a loss will prevent further knowledge transfer between tasks and will degraded the model's ability to perform in a zero-shot setting.

\[
L_{LE} = \sum_{y^p \in y^p} \text{BCE}(p(y'|x), 1) + \sum_{y^n \in y^n} \text{BCE}(p(y'|x), 0)
\]

\[
L = \lambda \cdot L_{LE} + (1 - \lambda) \cdot L_{MLM}
\]

**Positive and Negative Sampling** The label encoder allows for sampling of positive and negative examples at training time. This can be useful for tasks such as stance detection, where label inventories can differ, but labels overlap semantically. Indeed, this holds for our datasets, as is apparent in Table 1, where we see semantically similar labels like support, agree, favor etc. across several datasets.

To obtain a set of synonyms for each label, we use two publicly available sources: (i) Google Dictionary suggestions\(^1\) and (ii) synsets of the English WordNet (Miller 1998). However, this is prone to noise, as a word can have multiple meanings, and building a high-quality lexicon would require a human annotator proficient in the target language. Thus, we use negative sampling, as unrelated words are also undesirable to predict by the model, rather than using these examples to enrich the positive labels lexicon.

### 2.3 Sentiment-Based Stance Pre-Training

We propose a novel semi-supervised method for pre-training stance detection models using annotations from a sentiment analysis model. This is motivated by the observation that there are two closely related tasks (the difference being that sentiment analysis does not have a target).\(^2\) To illustrate this, consider the sentence "I am so happy that Donald Trump lost the election.", which has a positive sentiment, but when expressed towards a specific target, e.g., Donald Trump, the expected label would be the opposite, i.e., negative, or more precisely, against. This requires the introduction of targets that can change the sentiment label. For further details on how we produce corresponding datasets, see Section 3.3.

We hypothesise that such pre-training could help, especially in a low-resource setting, similarly to pre-training on cross-domain stance datasets. We use the same model and pattern as for fine-tuning the cross-lingual stance models, a masked language modelling objective, and negative sampling to improve the language model’s performance and also to allow it to associate synonyms as the label inventories are very diverse (see Table 1).

---

\(^1\)http://github.com/meetDeveloper/freeDictionaryAPI

\(^2\)Note that we consider the basic, untargeted variant of sentiment analysis here, as more resources exist for it.

We do not do positive sampling as it requires high-quality synonyms, which can only be obtained using manual annotations, while our goal is to design a fully automatic end-to-end pipeline without a need for human intervention.

### 3 Datasets

We use three types of datasets: 15 cross-lingual stance datasets (see Table 1), English stance datasets, and raw Wikipedia data automatically annotated for stance. We use the cross-lingual ones for fine-tuning and evaluation, and the rest for pre-training only. Appendix B gives additional examples for the cross-lingual datasets shown in Table 7. Further quantitative analysis of the texts is shown in the Appendix in Table 5 and Figure 2.

#### 3.1 Cross-Lingual Stance Datasets

**ans** (Khouja 2020). The Arabic News Stance corpus has paraphrased or contradicting news titles from several major news sources in the Middle East.

**arabific** (Baly et al. 2018) consists of claim-document pairs with true and false claims extracted from a news outlet and from a fact-checking website, respectively. Topics include the Syrian War and other Middle Eastern issues.

**conref-ita** (Lai et al. 2018) contains tweet-retweet-reply triplets along with their stance annotation pertaining to a polarising referendum held in Italy in December 2016 to amend the Italian constitution.

**czech** (Hercig et al. 2017) provides stance-annotated comments on a news server in Czech on a proposed Smoking ban in restaurants and the Czech president Miloš Zeman.

**dast** (Lillie, Middelboe, and Derczynski 2019) includes stance annotations towards submissions on Danish subreddits covering various political topics.

**e-fra, r-ita** (Lai et al. 2020) consist of French tweets about 2017 French presidential election and Italian ones about the 2016 Italian constitutional referendum.

**hindi** (Swami et al. 2018) has Hindi-English code-mixed tweets and their stance towards demonetisation of the Indian currency that took place in 2016.

**ibereval** (Taulé et al. 2017) contains tweets in Spanish and Catalan about the Independence of Catalonia, collected as part of a shared task held at IberEval 2017.

**nlpc** (Xu et al. 2016) contains posts from the Chinese micro-blogging site Sina Weibo about manually selected topics like the iPhoneSE or the open second child policy.

**rustance** (Lozhnikov, Derczynski, and Mazzara 2020) includes posts on Twitter and Russian-focused media outlets on topics related to Russian politics. The extraction was done in 2017.

**sardistance** (Cignarella et al. 2020) includes textual and contextual information about tweets related to the Sardines movement in Italy towards the end of 2019.

**xtance** (Vannas and Sennrich 2020) contains questions about topics related to Swiss politics, answered by Swiss political candidates in French, Swiss German, or Italian, during elections held between 2011 and 2020.
We use 16 different English stance datasets from two recent large-scale studies on multi-task/multi-dataset stance detection (Schiller, Daxenberger, and Gurevych 2021; Hardalov et al. 2021a). We followed the same data preparation and data pre-processing as described in the aforementioned papers. The combined dataset contains more than 250K examples, 154K of which we used for training. The data comes from social media, news websites, debating forums, political debates, encyclopedias, and Web search engines, etc. The label inventory includes 24 unique labels. We refer the interested reader to the respective papers for further detail.

### 3.2 English Stance Datasets

We use Wikipedia as a source of candidate examples for constructing our sentiment-based stance dataset due to its size and diversity of topics covered. To study the impact that the language has on pre-training, we construct two datasets: English (enWiki) and multilingual (mWiki). The latter includes examples from each of the languages covered by some of our datasets. In particular, we use the Wikipedia Python API\(^5\) to sample random Wiki articles. For the multilingual setup, for each language, we sampled 1,000 unique articles\(^6\) (non-overlapping between the languages), a total of 11,000. For the English-only setup, we sampled the same number of articles, but only English ones. Next, to obtain the contexts for the datasets, we split the articles (with headings removed) at the sentence-level using a language-specific sentence splitting model from Stanza (Qi et al. 2020).

> We then annotated each context with sentiment using XLM-T, an XLM-R-based sentiment model trained on Twitter data (Barbieri, Anke, and Camacho-Collados 2021). We used this model as it covers all the datasets’ languages, albeit from a different domain. It produces three labels \{positive, negative, neutral\}, which we renamed to \{favor, against, discuss\} in order to match the label inventory common for stance tasks. To obtain a target–context pair, we assigned a target for each context, either the title of the article, or, if there was also a subheading, the concatenation of the title and of the subheading. In order to cover as much as possible of the stance label variety, we also included unrelated in the inventory, which we defined as ‘a piece of text unrelated to the target’: for this, we randomly matched targets and contexts from the existing tuples. The latter class also serves as a regulariser for the model, preventing it from overfitting to the sentiment analysis task, as it includes examples with positive or negative contexts that are not classified as such. The resulting distribution is unrelated (60%), discuss (13%), against (10%), favor (7%). Overall, this matches the class imbalance that is common for stance detection tasks (Pomerleau and Rao 2017; Baly et al. 2018; Lozhnikov, Derczynski, and Mazzara 2020).

Finally, we augmented 50% of the examples by replacing the target (title) with the first sentence from the abstract of the Wikipedia page. We then added these new examples as additional examples to the original dataset. Our aim was also to produce long examples such as user posts, descriptions of events, etc., which are common targets for stance. The resulting dataset contains around 300K examples, which we split into 80% for training, 10% for development, 10% for testing, thus ensuring that sentences from one article are only included in one of the data splits.

\(^5\)[http://pypi.org/project/wikipedia/](http://pypi.org/project/wikipedia/)

\(^6\)We did not include articles in Hindi, as the hindi corpus contains texts in Latin, whereas the Wiki articles are in Devanagari.
4 Experiments

Models We evaluated three groups of models: (i) without any pre-training, i.e., baselines (see next); (ii) pre-trained on multiple English stance datasets (enstance), using automatically labelled instances using a sentiment model (\*Wiki), see Section 2.3; and (iii) multi-dataset learning (MDL), i.e., we included N examples from each dataset into the training data. We trained and evaluated on a single dataset, except in the case of MDL, where we trained and evaluated on everything. We chose the best model based on the macro-average F1 on all datasets. All models used XLM-R as their base.

Baselines In addition to our proposed models (Section 2), we compared to a number of simple baselines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority class baseline</th>
<th>Random baseline</th>
<th>Logistic Regression</th>
<th>XLM-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calculated from the distributions of the labels in each test set.</td>
<td>Each test instance is assigned a target label at random with equal probability.</td>
<td>A logistic regression trained using TF-IDF word unigrams. The input is the concatenation of separately produced vectors for the target and the context.</td>
<td>A fine-tuned XLM-R model predicting and back-propagating the errors using the special (&lt;s&gt;) token.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Quantitative Analysis

We first analyse the high-level few-shot performance of the proposed models using averaged per-dataset F1 macro.

Then, we zoom in at the dataset level and we analyse the models in the two most extreme training scenarios: few-shot with 32 examples, and full-resource training.

Few-Shot Analysis Table 2 shows results for different types of pre-training on top of the pattern-based model (Section 2). The top of the table lists baselines, followed by ablations of training techniques. Fine-grained performance per dataset is shown in Table 3 in Appendix C. We can see that the Pattern model outperforms the random baselines in all few-shot settings, except for zero. Moreover, there is a steady increase in performance when adding more examples. The performance saturates at around 256 examples, with the difference between it and all being 1.3 F1 points, whereas in subsequent pairs from previous columns the margin is 3.5–5 points.

The middle part of Table 2 shows ablations when using stance pre-training on top of the pattern-based model. We first analyse the models pre-trained using the sentiment-based Wikipedia dataset (Section 2.3). We study the impact of the language of the pre-training data by including two setups: enWiki, which contains English data only, and mWiki, with equally distributed data among all languages in the datasets. Both variants yield a sizeable improvement over the baselines in all few-shot settings, especially in the low-resource ones. The increase in F1 when using 32 examples is more than 6 points absolute on average; this also holds when training on all examples. The mWiki model outperforms the pattern baseline by 4 points and the enWiki by 1.4 points. The multilingual pre-trained model is universally better than the English pre-trained one. Moreover, we see a tendency for the gap between the two to increase with the number of examples reaching 2.6 points in all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Shots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern + Pre-training</td>
<td>25.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>30.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>28.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern + Pre-training</td>
<td>54.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>28.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern + Pre-training</td>
<td>61.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>35.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern + Pre-training</td>
<td>72.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Few-shot macro-average F1. The random and the majority class baselines use no training, and are constant. en/mWiki is pre-trained on our sentiment-based stance task using English or multilingual data. enstance is pre-trained on all English stance datasets. Multi-dataset learning (MDL) is trained on K examples from each dataset.

For pre-training on English stance data (enstance), even with 32 examples, we see a large increase in performance of 11 points absolute over the pattern baseline. This model is also competitive, within 3 points absolute on average, with respect to the baseline trained on the full dataset. Moreover, enstance outperforms the pre-training with automatically labelled stance instances (enWiki). Nevertheless, the en/mWiki models stay within 3–5 F1 points in all shots. The gap in performance is expected, as the enstance model is exposed to multiple stance definitions during its extensive pre-training, in contrast to the single one in the Wiki and its noisy labels. Finally, only enstance beats the random baselines even in the zero-shot setting, which demonstrates the difficulty of the task. We offer additional analysis of the zero-shot performance in Appendix C.3.

The bottom part of Table 2 shows results for multi-dataset learning (MDL). Here, the models are trained on N examples from each dataset, instead of N examples from a single dataset. The first row shows the results for the MDL Pattern model (without any pre-training). We can see that, in a few-shot setting, training on multiple datasets does not yield significant performance gains compared to using examples from a single dataset. Nonetheless, when all the data is used for training, F1 notably increases, outperforming the English stance model. Moreover, combining MDL with multilingual sentiment-based stance pre-training (MDL mWiki) yields an even larger increase: almost 9 F1 points higher than Pattern, 5 points higher than mWiki, and 1 point higher than enstance. We attribute the weaker performance of the MDL-based models in a few-shot setting and their strong performance in a full-resource learning scenario to the diversity of the stance definitions and domains of the datasets, i.e., MDL fails to generalise and overfits on the training data samples in the few-shot setting; however, when more data is added, it serves as a regularizer, and thus the model’s score improves. This was also observed in some previous work on English stance detection (Schiller, Daxenberger, and Gurevych 2021; Hardalov et al. 2021a).
This stems from the pre-training on the artificial stance task, as the model needs to adjust its weights to the new definition, without having to learn the generic stance task.
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5 Discussion

Our fine-tuning with few instances improves over random and non-neural baselines such as Logistic Regression trained on all-shots, even by more than 20 F1 points on average when training on just 32 instances. However, such models, especially when trained on very few examples, suffer from large variance and instability. In particular, for cross-lingual stance, the pattern-based model’s standard deviation (σ) varies from 1.1 (conref-it, nlpc) to 8.9 (ibereval-ca), with 3.5 on average when trained on 32 examples. Pre-training improves stability by reducing the variance, e.g., en/mWiki have a σ of 2.7 with a minimum under 1, which is more than 5% relative change even when compared to the highest F1 average achieved with 32 examples. The lowest σ is when the model is trained on all shots, and especially in the MDL models with 1.7, and in the mWiki variant with 1.4.

This variability can be attributed to the known instabilities of large pre-trained language models (Mosbach, Andriushchenko, and Klakow 2021), but this does not explain it all. Choosing a right set of data points is another extremely important factor in few-shot learning that calls for better selection of training data for pre-training and fine-tuning (Axelrod, He, and Gao 2011; Rudér and Plank 2017).

Another important factor is the inconsistency of the tasks in the training data. This is visible from our MDL experiments, where the tasks use a variety of definitions and labels. Even with more training examples, in comparison to single-task training (15xN examples), models tend to overfit. In turn, when sufficient resources are available, MDL shows sizeable improvements even without additional pre-training.

Having access to noisy sentiment-based stance data in the same languages helps, but transferring knowledge from a resource-rich language (e.g., English) from the same task (or set of task definitions) is even more beneficial, in contrast to the data’s (see Section 4.1) and label’s language (see Appendix C.5). Moreover, when using noisy labels from an external model, there is always a risk of introducing additional bias due to the training data and to discrepancies in the task definition (Waseem et al. 2021; Bender et al. 2021). We observed this for both the dasi and the rstance datasets.

6 Related Work

Stance Detection Recent studies on stance detection have shown that mixing cross-domain English data improves accuracy and robustness (Schiller, Daxenberger, and Gurevych 2021; Hardalov et al. 2021a,b). They also indicated important challenges of cross-domain setups such as differences in stance definitions, annotation guidelines, and label inventories. Our cross-lingual setup adds two more challenges: (i) data scarcity in the target language, which requires learning from few examples, and (ii) need for better multilingual models with an ability for cross-lingual knowledge transfer.

Cross-Lingual Stance Detection There have been many efforts to develop multilingual stance systems (Taulé et al. 2017; Mohtarami, Glass, and Nakov 2019; Vanmvas and Senrich 2020; Zotova et al. 2020; Agerri et al. 2021). However, most of them consider 2–3 languages, often from the same language family.

Thus they offer limited evidence for the potential of cross-lingual stance models to generalise across languages. A notable exception is Lai et al. (2020), who worked with five languages, but restricted their study to a single family of non-English languages and their domain to political topics only. Our work, on the other hand, spans six language families and multiple domains from news (Khouja 2020) to finance (Vamvas and Senrich 2020).

Stance and Sentiment Sentiment Analysis has a long history of association with stance (Somasundaran, Ruppenhofer, and Wiebe 2007; Somasundaran and Wiebe 2010). Sentiment is often annotated in parallel to stance (Mohammad et al. 2016; Hercig, Krejzl, and Král 2018) and has been used extensively as a feature (Ebrahimi, Dou, and Lowd 2016; Sobhani, Mohammad, and Kiritchenko 2016; Sun et al. 2018) or as an auxiliary task (Li and Caragea 2019; Sun et al. 2019) for improving stance detection. Missing from these studies, however, is leveraging sentiment annotations to generate noisy stance examples, which we explore here: for English and in a multilingual setting.

Pattern-Based Training Recently, prompt or pattern-based training has emerged as an effective way of exploiting pre-trained language models for different tasks in few-shot settings (Petroni et al. 2019; Schick and Schütze 2021a; Lin et al. 2021). Brown et al. (2020) introduced a large language model (i.e., GPT-3), which showed strong performance on several tasks through demonstrations of the task. Schick and Schütze (2021a,b) proposed Pattern-Exploiting Training (PET), a novel approach using comparatively smaller masked language models through Cloze-style probing with task-informed patterns. Tam et al. (2021) built on PET, with an additional loss that allows them to circumvent the reliance on unsupervised data and ensembling. There have been studies on aspects of prompt-based methods such as performance in the absence of prompts (Logan IV et al. 2021), quantifying scale efficiency (Le Scao and Rush 2021), learned continuous prompts (Li and Liang 2021; Lester, Al-Rfou, and Constant 2021; Qin and Eisner 2021), or gradient-based generated discrete prompts (Shin et al. 2020). Liu et al. (2021) offer a survey of prompt-based techniques. We study the potential of PET methods in a few-shot setup, and we evaluate them in a cross-lingual setting.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

We presented a holistic study of cross-lingual stance detection. We investigated PET with different (pre-)training procedures and we extended it with a label encoder that mitigates the need for translating labels into a single verbalisation. We further introduced a novel methodology to produce artificial stance examples using sentiment annotations. We demonstrated sizeable improvements on 15 datasets: more than 6 F1 points absolute in a low-shot, and 4 F1 points in a full-resource scenario. Finally, we studied the impact of multi-dataset learning and pre-training with English stance data, which further boosted the performance by 5 F1 points.

In future work, we plan to experiment with more sentiment-based models and stance task formulations, as well as with different prompt-engineering techniques.
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