

Relative Counterfactual Contrastive Learning for Mitigating Pretrained Stance Bias in Stance Detection

Jiarui Zhang and Shaojuan Wu and Xiaowang Zhang and Zhiyong Feng

Tianjin University

{jiaruizhang, shaojuanwu, xiaowangzhang, zyfeng}@tju.edu.cn

Abstract

Stance detection classifies stance relations (namely, Favor, Against, or Neither) between comments and targets. Pretrained language models (PLMs) are widely used to mine the stance relation to improve the performance of stance detection through pretrained knowledge. However, PLMs also embed “bad” pretrained knowledge concerning stance into the extracted stance relation semantics, resulting in pretrained stance bias. It is not trivial to measure pretrained stance bias due to its weak quantifiability. In this paper, we propose Relative Counterfactual Contrastive Learning (RCCL), in which pretrained stance bias is mitigated as relative stance bias instead of absolute stance bias to overtake the difficulty of measuring bias. Firstly, we present a new structural causal model for characterizing complicated relationships among context, PLMs and stance relations to locate pretrained stance bias. Then, based on masked language model prediction, we present a target-aware relative stance sample generation method for obtaining relative bias. Finally, we use contrastive learning based on counterfactual theory to mitigate pretrained stance bias and preserve context stance relation. Experiments show that the proposed method is superior to stance detection and debiasing baselines.

1 Introduction

Stance is the relation between comments and targets that are explicitly mentioned or implied in the comments. Targets are entities, concepts, events, ideas, opinions, prostates, topics, etc. Stance detection aims to classify stance relation into three classes: {Favor, Against, Neither} (Mohammad et al., 2016; Küçük and Can, 2021; Augenstein et al., 2016). A wide range of applications can benefit from stance detection, e.g., veracity and rumor detection (Lukasik et al., 2019; Hardalov et al., 2022) debunks rumors by cross-checking the stances conveyed by the text of relevant comments.




Figure 1: The examples of stance detection datasets. The stance distribution of BERT and GPT-2 for the same target “Feminist Movement” is opposite, which reveals pretrained stance bias.

The comments may not directly mention whether the stance on the target is Favor or Against. Hence, stance detection models need to understand the stance relation semantics as well as the context semantics. It becomes difficult to extract stance relation semantics hidden in context semantics. Existing works extract such implicit relation through Pretrained Language Models (PLMs) taking advantage of pretrained knowledge in learning the specific task semantics (Zhang et al., 2020; Allaway and McKeown, 2020; Ji et al., 2023; XiPeng et al., 2020). PLMs use as much training data as possible to extract the common features of the context. They embed the pretrained knowledge into the stance relation semantics as common features and then improve the performance. However, training data often contains specific stances. As a result, the stance implied in pretrained knowledge inevitably changes the original stance of samples. It causes

pretrained stance bias, as a kind of bias in stance detection (Feng et al., 2023), which interferes with detecting “real stance”. As shown in Figure 1, for the same target, "Feminist Movement", the distribution tends to be against for BERT and favor for GPT-2.

Recently, there are some works about bias in stance detection. Some researches find that the differences in stance bias are perceptible by training or visualization methods (Palomino et al., 2022; Feng et al., 2023). SSR (Yuan et al., 2022b) incorporates the stance reasoning process as task knowledge to assist in learning genuine features and reducing dataset bias. PSA (Wu and Hooi, 2023) proposes a generalizable approach aggregating publisher posting records to learn veracity stance. However, existing approaches have less investigated to measure the pretrained stance bias brought by PLMs. Pretrained stance bias is weak quantifiability since absolute measurement requests a central point (taken as *anchor*) in stance semantic space.

In this paper, we propose Relative Counterfactual Contrastive Learning (RCCL) to measure and mitigate pretrained stance bias. Instead of absolute measurement, we turn to relative measurement via itself as an anchor for overtaking its weak quantifiability. Firstly, we apply the causal model to analyze the relationship between the pretrained model, the context, and the stance. It enables us to capture the pretrained stance bias as the direct causal effect of the text on the stance. Then, we employ a target-aware relative stance sample generation method, creating counterfactual samples that have a relative stance to the original samples. Finally, we use counterfactual contrastive learning to drive stance relation representation to change in the context stance space rather than the pretrained stance space. We use positive and negative samples as relative anchors, mitigating the pretrained stance bias while preserving the original context stance relation. Experiments show that our proposed method outperforms existing debiasing and stance detection baselines.

2 Related Works

In this section, we discuss related works in two categories: stance detection and debiasing strategy.

2.1 Stance Detection

Stance detection aims to identify the attitude from a comment towards a certain target. Most early

stance detection research focused on online English forums and political debates. In 2016, Related shared tasks at conferences such as SemEval-2016 (Mohammad et al., 2016) and Catalan tweets (Taulé et al., 2017) have led to a surge in the number of studies on stance detection.

The earlier work only trained the model and made predictions on a single target (Augenstein et al., 2016). Stancy (Popat et al., 2019) leveraged BERT representations learned over massive external corpora and utilized consistency constraints to model target and text jointly. S-MDMT (Wang and Wang, 2021) applied the target adversarial learning to capture stance-related features shared by all targets and combined target descriptors for learning stance-informative features correlating to specific targets. TGA-Net (Allaway and McKeown, 2020) used learned scaled dot product attention to capture the relation between the target and other related targets and comments.

Unlike the above work, we focus on pretrained stance bias. To our knowledge, we are the first to introduce counterfactual reasoning to stance detection.

2.2 Debiasing Strategy

Recent debiasing techniques integrate the idea of counterfactual reasoning into their frameworks across multiple tasks such as question answering (Niu and Zhang, 2021), visual question answering (Niu et al., 2021), text classification (Qian et al., 2021), and recommendation (Ji et al., 2023). Recently, causal inference has also attracted increasing attention in natural language processing to mitigate the dataset bias (Udomcharoenchaikit et al., 2022).

As a common debiasing representation learning method, contrastive learning uses comparative learning to capture the subtle features of data. Recent research reveals some key considerations for better contrastive learning, such as heavy data augmentation (Lopes et al., 2020) and large sets of negatives (Chen et al., 2020). Some work also introduces counterfactual and causal ideas. Among the existing counterfactual contrastive learning methods, C2I (Choi et al., 2022) is similar to ours. It synthesizes “a set” of counterfactuals and makes a collective decision on the distribution of predictions on this set, which can robustly supervise the causality of each term. We also propose a novel contrastive learning framework guided by causal




Figure 2: (a) Causal graph for stance detection. (b) Interventional stance detection where we directly model $P(Y|do(X = \hat{x}))$.

inference for mitigating pretrained stance bias. Our negative samples and positive samples are generated from the original samples.

3 Methods

3.1 Problem Statement

Given a comment c , and a target t , let $D = \{x_i = (c_i, t_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ be a stance detection dataset with N examples, y_i is a stance label. The goal is to predict a stance label $\hat{y} \in \{Favor, Against, Neutral\}$ for each c_i and t_i . The context representation of c_i and t_i is x , encoded by the pretrained model T . T and a classifier $P(y|x; \theta)$ are fine-tuned for stance detection on the training dataset and then evaluated on the testing dataset.

3.2 Structural Causal Model for Stance Detection

SCM is represented as a directed acyclic causal graph $G = \{V, E\}$, where V denotes the set of variables and E represents the cause-and-effect relationships. The nodes denote the variables in the model, and the edges between nodes denote the causality. For example, if Y is a descendant of X , X is a potential cause of Y and Y is the effect. As the previous discussion, θ in fine-tuning is dependent on the pretrained model. This “dependency” can be formalized with a Structural Causal Model (SCM) (Pearl et al., 2016) as shown in Figure 2(a). The SCM for stance detection’s detailed implementations are:

- $T \rightarrow X$. We denote X as the context representation of comments and targets and T as the pretrained model. The connection means that the representation X is generated by T .
- $X \rightarrow M \leftarrow T$. M is a mediator variable that denotes the low-dimensional multi-source knowledge of comments, targets, and T . The branch $X \rightarrow M$ means the representation can

be denoted by linear or nonlinear projection onto the manifold base. Moreover, $T \rightarrow M$ denotes the semantic information embedded in M .

- $X \rightarrow Y \leftarrow M$. To simplify the description, we directly denote Y as the probability of predicting stances. X affects Y in two ways, the direct path $X \rightarrow Y$ and the mediation path $X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y$.

An ideal stance detection model should capture the true causality between X and Y to adapt to various cases. However, the traditional methods that use the correlation $P(Y|X)$ fail to do so because X is not the only potential cause of Y . Therefore, the increased probability of Y given X will be affected by the spurious correlation via the two paths: $T \rightarrow X$ and $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y$. According to causal theory, we can use the causal intervention $P(Y|do(X))$ instead of the likelihood $P(Y|X)$ for stance detection to exploit the true causality between X and Y as shown in Figure 2(b).

Then the model is inadvertently contaminated by the spurious causal correlation: $X \rightarrow M \leftarrow T$, a.k.a. a back-door path in causal theory. To decouple the spurious causal correlation, the back-door adjustment predicts an actively intervened answer via the $do(\cdot)$ operation:

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y | do(X = \hat{x})) &= \sum_k P(Y | X = \hat{x}, T = t)P(T = t) \\ &= \sum_k P(Y | X = \hat{x}, T = t, M = g(x, t))P(T = t) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where \hat{x} could be any counterfactual embedding as long as it is no longer dependent on T to detach the connection between X and T .

3.3 Relative Stance Samples Generation

The causal intervention operation wipes out the incoming links of a cause variable X , encouraging the model T to infer. We attempt to utilize a partially blindfolded counterfactual sample.

We first train a classifier f (e.g., fine-tuning a pretrained model) with stance detection dataset. Then, we generate relative stance samples by masking a fixed percentage of the input tokens, which is replaced by a special tag [MASK]. However, comments may contain targets or related words that directly refer to targets, and removing those tokens will make a big difference to the sample. To avoid




Figure 3: The overall architecture of relative counterfactual contrastive learning.

this, we will skip the target-related keywords while masking tokens. Inspired by the recent counterfactual sample study (Feder et al., 2021), we use NLTK¹ to extract target-related words that may destroy the sample. We only mask target-unrelated words. For each samples x_i , we generate a set of samples $S_i = \{\tilde{x}_{i,1}, \tilde{x}_{i,2}, \dots\}$. Then we use T5(Raffel et al., 2020) to fill the samples in S_i and obtain the new samples $\hat{S}_i = \{\hat{x}_{i,1}, \hat{x}_{i,2}, \dots\}$. Even if samples in \hat{S}_i share similar syntactic structures and words, the stance labels cannot be determined, which are counterfactual samples.

We use the classifier f to classify the stance label \hat{y}_i of generated samples:

$$\hat{y}_i = \arg \max_y \hat{p}(y | \hat{x}_i) \quad (2)$$

The final stance relation consists of context stance and pretrained stance. We mask part of the context and generate counterfactual samples with different stance labels, which makes the model more sensitive to context stance. Finally, we retrain the classifier with the original samples and the additional samples.

3.4 Counterfactual Contrastive Learning

The overall architecture of our model is shown in Figure 3. For each sample x_i , we generate a counterfactual sample set $\hat{S}_i = \{\hat{x}_{i,1}, \hat{x}_{i,2}, \dots\}$ where $\hat{x}_i = (\hat{c}_i, \hat{t}_i, \hat{y}_i)$ in Section 3.3. By learning to contrast with these samples, it is beneficial for the uniformity of stance relation rep-

resentations. We denote the stance-same samples as positive samples, $\hat{S}_i^+ = \{\hat{x}_{i,1}^+, \hat{x}_{i,2}^+, \dots\}$, while stance-different samples are negative samples $\hat{S}_i^- = \{\hat{x}_{i,1}^-, \hat{x}_{i,2}^-, \dots\}$. Then we use BERT to get their representations h_i , $\{h_{i,p}^+\}_{p=1}^P$ and $\{h_{i,q}^-\}_{q=1}^Q$, respectively. We adopt the following margin-based ranking loss for model training:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CONTRA} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \max(0, \Delta_m + \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p=1}^P s_\theta(h_i, h_{i,p}^+) - \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q s_\theta(h_i, h_{i,q}^-)), \quad (3)$$

where P, Q is the number of positive and negative samples, Δ_m is a margin value which we set to 1 in this work, and $s_\theta(\cdot)$ denotes the distance between the BERT representations.

3.5 Model Training

Formally, given a training set $\{x_i = (c_i, t_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ where c_i is comment (possibly a set of text pieces or a single piece), t_i is target, and $y_i \in Y$ is a label. The text classifier $f : c, t \rightarrow y$ maps an input (c_i, t_i) to the corresponding label \hat{y}_i . It is trained to minimize the cross-entropy loss \mathcal{L}_{CLS} between the predicted label \hat{y}_i and the ground-truth label y_i :

$$\mathcal{L}_{CLS} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i \log \hat{y}_i \quad (4)$$

Finally, the parameters of the model are trained

¹<https://www.nltk.org/>

Table 1: Data split statistics for SemEval-2016 Task 6 Sub-task A.

Target	#Train	Favor	Against	Neutral	#Test	Favor	Against	Neutral
AT	513	92	304	117	220	32	160	28
CC	395	212	15	168	169	123	11	35
FM	664	210	328	126	285	58	183	44
HC	689	118	393	178	295	45	172	78
LA	653	121	355	177	280	46	189	45
Total	2914	753	1395	766	1249	304	715	230

to minimize the both loss together as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{CLS} + \gamma \mathcal{L}_{CONTRA} \quad (5)$$

where γ are hyperparameters.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. In our experiments, we select three datasets in stance detection task: SemEval-2016 Task 6 Sub-task A dataset (Mohammad et al., 2016), UKP (Stab et al., 2018), and VAST (Allaway and McKeown, 2020) (mainly for few-shot and zero-shot experiments). Their data distribution are shown in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 5.

- The SemEval-2016 Task 6 Sub-task A dataset contains five targets as follows: “Atheism (AT)”, “Climate Change is a real Concern (CC)”, “Feminist Movement (FM)”, “Hillary Clinton (HC)” and “Legalization of Abortion (LA)”. It is widely used for stance detection tasks.
- The UKP dataset consists of eight different topics, including “Abortion (AB)”, “Cloning (CL)”, “Death Penalty (DP)”, “Gun Control (GC)”, “Marijuana Legalization (ML)”, “Minimum Wage (MW)”, “Nuclear Energy (NE)” and “School Uniforms (SU)”. We adopt the train, validation, and test splits provided by the original authors. The comments in UKP are longer, making classification more difficult.
- VAST is a zero-shot and few-shot stance detection dataset. It consists of a large range of targets covering broad themes, such as economy (e.g., ‘private corporation profit’), traffic (e.g., ‘alternative transportation’), and religion (e.g., ‘Mother Teresa’). The same comment contains multiple targets and has different stances for

Table 2: Data split statistics for UKP.

Target	Favor	Against	Neutral	Total
AB	680	822	2427	3929
CL	706	839	1494	3039
DP	457	1111	2083	3651
GC	787	665	1889	3341
ML	587	636	1262	2475
MW	576	551	1346	2473
NE	606	852	2118	3576
SU	545	729	1734	3008
Total	4944	6195	14353	25492

these targets in VAST. It can be used to test the robustness of RCCL in real-world situations with few data.

Following previous work, we adopt Macro-averaged $F1$ of each label to measure the testing performance of the models.

Baselines. We adopt two kinds of baselines to test the efficiency of RCCL comprehensively:

- **Stance Detection.** For stance detection, we use $BERT_{SEP}$ and $BERT_{MEAN}$ as the basic comparisons, which predicts the stance by appending a linear classification layer to the hidden representation of [CLS] token, or by appending a linear classification layer to the mean hidden representation over all tokens. We adopt some advanced stance detection models, including Stancy (Popat et al., 2019), S-MDMT (Wang and Wang, 2021) and TAPD (Jiang et al., 2022). We also compare our model with the following methods for VAST, including two models based on BiLSTM for cross-target stance detection (CrossNet (Xu et al., 2018), SEKT (Zhang et al., 2020)); one attention-based model (TGANet (Allaway and McKeown, 2020)). And a prompt learning framework for stance detec-

Table 3: Macro-averaged $F1$ on the SemEval-2016 dataset and UKP dataset.

Model	SemEval-2016						UKP								
	AT	CC	FM	HC	LA	ALL	AB	CN	DP	GC	ML	MW	NE	SU	ALL
BiLSTM	.605	.420	.516	.558	.591	.538	.470	.556	.489	.458	.535	.511	.491	.509	.502
BERT _{SEP}	.687	.441	.617	.623	.586	.591	.491	.669	.524	.516	.663	.649	.585	.634	.591
BERT _{MEAN}	.694	.525	.592	.646	.663	.624	.538	.686	.542	.511	.652	.664	.578	.578	.600
STANCY	.699	.537	.617	.647	.634	.626	.518	.675	.567	.502	.654	.662	.683	.629	.599
S-MDMT	.695	.525	.638	.672	.672	.640	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TAPD	.739	.593	.639	.700	.672	.669	.549	.719	.572	.517	.670	.699	.590	.641	.620
CL	.673	.484	.668	.621	.619	.613	.533	.690	.552	.509	.662	.671	.575	.600	.601
C ² L	.698	.603	.631	.691	.643	.655	.563	.701	.560	.554	.699	.657	.608	.633	.621
SSR	.632	.569	.597	.627	.573	.600	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RCCL(ours)	.715	.605	.687	.672	.702	.683	.588	.736	.592	.561	.702	.714	.628	.683	.651

Table 4: Ablation study on the proposed RCCL model

	Module				Sem16	UKP
	RSSG	IB	SS	CCL		
✓			✓		.683	.651
		✓		✓	.641	.586
			✓	✓	.669	.618
✓					.672	.634

tion. The results of these baselines are from the original work.

- **Bias Removal.** For bias removal, CL(Khosla et al., 2020) is a basic implementation of contrastive learning. We collect positive (or negative) contrastive pairs from a pool of the same (or different) class samples. C²L(Choi et al., 2022) is a causally contrastive learning method for text classification, which improves counterfactual robustness. SSR(Yuan et al., 2022a) is a debiasing strategy for stance detection. The results for CL and C²L are collected from our experiments.

Implementation Details. We use the pretrained uncased BERT as the embedding module. The learning rate is set to $1e-5, 3e-5, 5e-5$. The coefficient λ is set to $1e-5$. Adam is utilized as the optimizer. The batch size is 16, considering the computational resources and evaluation performance trade-offs. The temperature parameter τ is set to 0.07 for contrastive losses. γ is set to 0.1. We apply early stopping in the training process, and the patience is 5.

4.2 Overall Performance

The overall results in Table 3 show that our model (RCCL) outperforms all baselines and debiasing baselines on the SemEval-2016 dataset and UKP

dataset as well as Table 6 on the VAST dataset. We first evaluate that our approach contributes to the effectiveness and the robustness on unbalanced SemEval-2016 dataset. As shown in Table 3, SemEval-2016 is unbalanced between the Favor class and the Against class. Our RCCL outperforms all baselines and does not rely on biases in the original training data. Specifically, RCCL improves FM and LA by 8.0% and 9.2%, respectively, which are developed more than other targets. Both FM and LA are parts of women’s rights. It suggests that when the model better understands the causal correlation between the input context and the corresponding label, it is more robust against pretrained stance bias. Although there may be differences in the difficulty of samples corresponding to two different targets, our model achieves the best score on AT (.715) while the macro-f1 score is .605 on CC. The gap between AT and CC is narrowed. These experimental results indicate that our method effectively mitigates pretrained bias, focusing more on the stance of the context itself.

Our method achieves significant improvements on the UKP dataset, with a total score of .651. Across all eight targets, our method all obtains the highest scores. In the stance detection domain, TAPD scores .669 on the SEM dataset and .620 on the UKP dataset. Compared to TAPD, C²L scored lower on the SEM dataset and higher on the UKP dataset. Both methods outperform the base BERT model. It suggests that the UKP dataset is more susceptible to bias influence, with larger variations in learning performance due to changes in the size of the training set, indicating higher data variance.

CL and C²L, as debiasing methods, enhance the model’s robustness and stability. Some of the effectiveness of our method also stems from contrastive learning. Moreover, our method can be considered

a form of data augmentation. We generate counterfactual samples to complete the dataset. Since we select samples with high probability and filter labels after generating samples, this effectively mitigates the imbalance between categories, contributing to the overall performance.

Our experiments show that pretrained stance bias is removed as a relative bias rather than an absolute bias, which successfully preserves context stance relations. Our method achieves state-of-the-art performance whether compared with stance detection methods or debiasing methods.

4.3 Ablation Study

To verify the effectiveness of the two components: Relative Stance Samples Generation(RSSG) and Counterfactual Contrastive Learning(CCL), we conduct ablation study and the results shown in Table 4 demonstrates that they indeed improve performance.

For the selection of positive and negative samples, we test three modules. (1) RSSG: Relative Stance Samples Generation that is introduced in this paper. (2) IB: samples with different labels within the same batch as negative samples and samples with the same label as positive samples during training. (3) SS: searching the entire dataset to find semantically similar samples and dividing them as positive or negative based on whether their labels are the same. It is implemented by faiss².

The performance of the model has decreased overall from the experimental results. Compared to the other methods of selecting positive and negative samples, our proposed method RSSG performs the best (.683 and .651), with SS being the second-best(.669 and .618), and IB being the least effective (.641 and .586). As suggested by (Robinson et al., 2021), good negative samples should have different labels that are difficult to distinguish with anchors while their semantic representations are close. RSSG can not only exhibit semantic similarity but also contain dissimilarity in the most critical feature dimensions that need to be distinguished. It makes the model more sensitive to differences in context stance relation, contributing to better outcomes.

Meanwhile, we also test the role of counterfactual contrastive learning (CCL) in our overall model. The results indicate that if we use the generated counterfactual samples as augmentation

Table 5: Data split statistics for VAST.

	Train	Dev	Test
# Examples	13477	2062	3006
# Unique Comments	1845	682	786
# Zero-shot Targets	4003	383	600
# Few-shot Targets	638	114	159




Figure 4: (a) The macro-f1 with data augmentation. (b) The macro-f1 with contrastive learning.

data without any processing, the model’s accuracy drops to .672 and .634. Because data augmentation reaches a bottleneck after a certain size, additional augmented data does not lead to further improvements. Contrastive learning can break the bottleneck and learn the discriminative and robust features.

4.4 Hyperparameter Analysis

The number of generated samples. Figure 4 illustrates the influence of the number of positive samples and negative samples on the final results. Whether using generated samples for contrastive learning or data augmentation, more samples generally lead to better performance. However, the overall effectiveness of data augmentation is lower than that of contrastive learning. The analysis of experimental results suggests that the model is particularly sensitive to negative samples. When the number of negative samples is 1 and the number of positive samples is 8, the macro-F1 score is .669. However, when the number of positive samples is 1 and the number of negative samples is 8, the macro-F1 score is .651. Negative samples enhance the diversity of the original dataset due to different labels. Contrastive learning is more sensitive to negative samples than data augmentation. In contrastive learning, the objective is to make the features of all positive samples as similar as possible without negative samples. The selection of negative samples is a fundamental task in contrastive

²<https://github.com/facebookresearch/faiss>

Table 6: Macro-averaged $F1$ on the VAST dataset.

Model	Zero-Shot				Few-Shot				All			
	Favor	Against	Neutral	All	Favor	Against	Neutral	All	Favor	Against	Neutral	All
Cross-Net	.462	.434	.404	.434	.508	.505	.410	.474	.486	.471	.408	.454
SEKT	.504	.442	.308	.418	.510	.479	.215	.474	.507	.462	.263	.411
BERT _{SEP}	.414	.506	.454	.458	.524	.539	.544	.536	.473	.522	.501	.499
BERT _{MEAN}	.546	.584	.853	.660	.543	.597	.796	.646	.545	.591	.823	.653
TGA-Net	.568	.585	.858	.666	.589	.595	.805	.663	.573	.590	.831	.665
CL	.602	.612	.880	.702	.644	.622	.835	.701	.629	.617	.857	.701
C ² L	.608	.654	.875	.726	.600	.665	.839	.702	.606	.649	.886	.713
RCCL(ours)	.635	.664	.894	.731	.637	.678	.860	.725	.636	.671	.877	.728




Figure 5: The relationship between macro-F1 and masked ratio across different datasets. While the masked ratio is too high, we will fill in a part of random blanks at a time, iteratively until all masks are filled.

learning.

Masked Ratio. Figure 5 illustrates the influence of the masked ratio on the final results. We conduct tests on two datasets: VAST, a dataset containing long texts with an average comment length of 271 characters across five sentences per sample; Semeval-2016, a dataset consisting of short texts, each sample comprising only one sentence. VAST peaks at .728 when the masked ratio is 0.08. In contrast, Semeval-2016 achieves its peak at .673 with a masked ratio of 0.2. Datasets with larger sentence lengths should have a smaller masked ratio, and respectively, datasets with smaller sentence lengths should have a larger masked ratio.

4.5 Few-shot and Zero-shot Experiments

In many practical applications, training data is often too scarce. As a stress test for this data scarcity scenario, we trained our approach using the VAST dataset and evaluated it in the official test set. The overall results of our approach and baselines are shown in Table 6. In order to evaluate our model properly, we respectively calculate the results on

three scenarios: Zero-Shot, Few-shot, and All. Our approach achieves the best performance in all scenarios. It illustrates the effectiveness of our approach. RCCL has a more robust performance against data scarcity.

Among the results, CL works poorly when there is not enough data because it establishes control groups of different qualities, which limits the quality of causality estimates in data scarcity scenarios. C²L performs better in Zero-shot than Few-shot. Because data augmentation reaches a bottleneck when there is a sufficient amount of data. The growth of accuracy is limited. In the Zero-shot scenario, data is scarcer in the VAST dataset. On the other hand, our method is also a form of data augmentation. We expanded the dataset in situations of data scarcity. We enrich the labels corresponding to a certain target and complete the dataset, which is the source of our effectiveness. Then, we overcome the bottleneck of data augmentation by contrastive learning. RCCL consistently performs well regardless of the size of a given dataset, demonstrating the advantages of RCCL.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel contrastive learning framework for stance detection by mitigating pretrained stance bias to obtain “real stance” dependent to context features without bias. We firstly discover that relative stance samples with relative bias benefit removing absolute bias and our proposed counterfactual approach can effectively measure pretrained stance bias which are challenges in stance detection. We believe that our work could inspire researchers working on various bias caused by PLMs to develop an alternative way in removing all bias finally. Pretrained language models hardly avoid bias including stance bias, we are interested to investigate whether our work is still available in more LLMs in future work.

Limitations

The limitations of our current paper are as follows: (1) These results are evaluated in English; (2) The experiments are limited to BERT and its variants; and (3) The paper focuses only on stance bias. In the future, we expect these limitations above (different languages, GPT-based language models and other bias such as gender biases or sentiment biases) to be addressed.

Ethics Statement

The expressions of social comments and the stance towards targets in the paper do not represent the authors' stance. The datasets used in the paper are either open-source or used with the original authors' permission. This work specifically focuses on a targeted investigation of a particular type of bias, not encompassing all forms of bias.

References

- Emily Allaway and Kathleen McKeown. 2020. [Zero-Shot stance detection: A dataset and model using generalized topic representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8913–8931, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Isabelle Augenstein, Tim Rocktäschel, Andreas Vlachos, and Kalina Bontcheva. 2016. [Stance detection with bidirectional conditional encoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 876–885, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2020. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *Proceeding of 2020 International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR.
- Seungtaek Choi, Myeongho Jeong, Hojae Han, and Seung-won Hwang. 2022. C2I: Causally contrastive learning for robust text classification. In *Proceedings of the 2022 AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 10526–10534.
- Amir Feder, Nadav Oved, Uri Shalit, and Roi Reichart. 2021. Causalm: Causal model explanation through counterfactual language models. *Computational Linguistics*, 47(2):333–386.
- Shangbin Feng, Chan Young Park, Yuhan Liu, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023. [From pretraining data to language models to downstream tasks: Tracking the trails of political biases leading to unfair NLP models](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 11737–11762, Toronto, Canada. 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.
- Jianchao Ji, Zelong Li, Shuyuan Xu, Max Xiong, Juntao Tan, Yingqiang Ge, Hao Wang, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. Counterfactual collaborative reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 249–257.
- Yan Jiang, Jinhua Gao, Huawei Shen, and Xueqi Cheng. 2022. [Few-shot stance detection via target-aware prompt distillation](#). In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, page 837–847, New York, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Prannay Khosla, Piotr Teterwak, Chen Wang, Aaron Sarna, Yonglong Tian, Phillip Isola, Aaron Maschiot, Ce Liu, and Dilip Krishnan. 2020. Supervised contrastive learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:18661–18673.
- Dilek Küçük and Fazli Can. 2021. Stance detection: Concepts, approaches, resources, and outstanding issues. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2673–2676, New York, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Raphael Gontijo Lopes, Sylvia J Smullin, Ekin D Cubuk, and Ethan Dyer. 2020. Affinity and diversity: Quantifying mechanisms of data augmentation. *CoRR*.
- Michal Lukasik, Kalina Bontcheva, Trevor Cohn, Arkaitz Zubiaga, Maria Liakata, and Rob Procter. 2019. Gaussian processes for rumour stance classification in social media. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 37(2):1–24.
- 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.
- Yulei Niu, Kaihua Tang, Hanwang Zhang, Zhiwu Lu, Xian-Sheng Hua, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021. Counterfactual vqa: A cause-effect look at language bias. In *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12700–12710.

- Yulei Niu and Hanwang Zhang. 2021. [Introspective distillation for robust question answering](#). In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 16292–16304. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Alonso Palomino, Khalid Al Khatib, Martin Potthast, and Benno Stein. 2022. Differential bias: On the perceptibility of stance imbalance in argumentation. In *Findings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing.*, pages 411–421, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Judea Pearl, Madelyn Glymour, and Nicholas P Jewell. 2016. Causal inference in statistics: A primer. Wiley.
- Kashyap Papat, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Andrew Yates, and Gerhard Weikum. 2019. [STANCY: Stance classification based on consistency cues](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 6413–6418, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chen Qian, Fuli Feng, Lijie Wen, Chunping Ma, and Pengjun Xie. 2021. [Counterfactual inference for text classification debiasing](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5434–5445, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551.
- Joshua David Robinson, Ching-Yao Chuang, Suvrit Sra, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2021. Contrastive learning with hard negative samples. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Learning Representations*, pages 1–29, Australia. OpenReview.net.
- Christian Stab, Tristan Miller, Benjamin Schiller, Pranav Rai, and Iryna Gurevych. 2018. [Cross-topic argument mining from heterogeneous sources](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3664–3674, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mariona Taulé, Maria Antònia Martí, Francisco Manuel Rangel Pardo, Paolo Rosso, Cristina Bosco, and Viviana Patti. 2017. Overview of the task on stance and gender detection in tweets on catalan independence. In *Proceedings of the 2th Workshop on Evaluation of Human Language Technologies for Iberian Languages*, pages 157–177, Murcia, Spain. CEUR-WS.org.
- Can Udomcharoenchaikit, Wuttikorn Ponwitararat, Patomporn Payoungkhamdee, Kanruethai Masuk, Weerayut Buaphet, Ekapol Chuangsuwanich, and Sarana Nutanong. 2022. [Mitigating spurious correlation in natural language understanding with counterfactual inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11308–11321, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Limin Wang and Dexin Wang. 2021. Solving stance detection on tweets as multi-domain and multi-task text classification. *IEEE Access*, 9:157780–157789.
- Jiaying Wu and Bryan Hooi. 2023. [Probing spurious correlations innbsp;popular event-based rumor detection benchmarks](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, page 274–290, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- QIU XiPeng, SUN TianXiang, XU YiGe, SHAO YunFan, DAI Ning, and HUANG XuanJing. 2020. [Pre-trained models for natural language processing: A survey](#). *SCIENCE CHINA Technological Sciences*, 63(10):1872–1897.
- Chang Xu, Cécile Paris, Surya Nepal, and Ross Sparks. 2018. [Cross-target stance classification with self-attention networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 778–783, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jianhua Yuan, Yanyan Zhao, Yanyue Lu, and Bing Qin. 2022a. [SSR: Utilizing simplified stance reasoning process for robust stance detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6846–6858, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Jianhua Yuan, Yanyan Zhao, and Bing Qin. 2022b. Debiasing stance detection models with counterfactual reasoning and adversarial bias learning. *CoRR*, abs/2212.10392.
- Bowen Zhang, Min Yang, Xutao Li, Yunming Ye, Xiaofei Xu, and Kuai Dai. 2020. [Enhancing cross-target stance detection with transferable semantic-emotion knowledge](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3188–3197, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Appendix

A.1 VAST Challenge

The results of VAST challenge are shown in Table 7. (1) Imp, the comment contains the target, and the label is non-neutral, (2) mlT, there are other examples with the same text and different targets,

Table 7: Accuracy on varying phenomena in VAST.

Model	Imp	mIT	mIS	Qte	Sarc
BERT-joint	60.0	61.0	54.1	62.5	58.7
TGA-Net	62.3	62.4	54.7	66.1	63.7
BERT-GCN	61.9	62.7	54.7	66.8	67.3
CKE-Net	62.5	63.4	55.3	69.5	68.2
BS-RGCN	62.1	64.7	55.6	70.1	71.7
Ours	64.7	66.3	59.0	71.7	73.8

(3) mIS, a comment is in examples with different and non-neutral, stance labels, (4) Qte, the example contains quotes, and (5) Sarc, the example contains sarcasm. Imp examples require the model to recognize concepts related to the unmentioned target in the comment. Besides, our approach does well on mIS examples (accuracy 66.3%). Quotes are challenging because they may repeat text with the opposite stance to what the author expresses themselves. Our approach also performs well in the Qte (accuracy 71.7%).