

Lecture #2

[scraps of paper  
arrange people in horseshoe around the screen  
black screen]

At posted, "rolling in" on Piazza

Agenda:

To what extent is there social interaction on review sites?

- ~~get to know each other~~, get used to talking in class
- Definition and annotation

~~Ethics is about language;  
social interaction, ethics~~

(b)

Since this is a class about language processing and social interaction, let's start with a warmup to get us all familiar with each other and comfortable talking in class.

So, first =, tell everyone your name, and what languages you speak

Then, will go around again, and this time you'll have to pick someone else, say their name; what langs they speak.

OK, now let's consider our main topic, which concerns review sites

→ screen, pg for Straight Man

~~Here's the Amazon pg~~

Let's quickly run through the features for a well-known review-agg. site

~~Amazon~~  
[Picked Straight Man b/c it's one of my favorite academic satires]  
We're going to be most interested in the customer reviews;  
~~what present the ear~~ ~~for entertainment~~  
~~user generated content~~

also b/c books are  
sths people can have  
interesting  
opinions about,  
and I myself  
am most interested  
in issues  
about which  
one can  
have  
complicated  
opinions.

There are 339 customer reviews, which is arguably too many to read

- each has stars, text, ~~more text~~, helpfulness stats,  
can vote on helpfulness  
can comment, user badges

~~(Get back to chart /  
Karakalios)~~

~~Now, we + for the moment, that just totally ignored the notion  
of social interaction and simply treated the user reviews as feedback  
for summarization!~~

- histogram of the star ratings

- quotes, "automatically chosen by our system b/c they are  
representative of what people are saying about them"

- interesting to ask what they are doing - ggjeger@ptd.pvtlog.net  
is not a top reviewer, not review has not been rated helpful  
many class counts.

~~Also some  
summary info  
about the whole  
body of reviews~~

Now, but since we ~~are~~ want more detail on what these 339 people had to say to us.  
→ clicking through to review page

- so can sort by helpfulness, ~~recency~~, or star rating

Let's also ask some questions about what's displayed per reviewer:

• why "real name" badge? but maybe pressure to be  $\oplus$ )

• why "Amazon verified purchase"? (10 out of 10 one  $\oplus$ , Pathos in Grache glasses)  
[Is non-purchase handy info? true]

• why location?

[TD?  
prove you're trustworthy?  
Show what community?  
some]

("show shards" from San Diego might not be trustworthy)

Now, what about types of social interaction?

- between "readers", "authors", if it's ok to divide

- it may, or may not, be useful to think of two potentially distinct groups:  
authors,  
readers.

are they  
why distinct?

Who are the consumers, are they  
professional?

- Gilbert; Karahalios seem to argue that authors don't read other reviews (and that pro reviewers did not like the implications) of reading other reviews, altho' perhaps phrasing played a role)

- [Pinch; Kester 2011]: top reviewers say: 42% look before  
53% look after  
5% never look

- much less likely to review an item that many others have

[Wu; Huberman 2010]: later opinions more likely to disagree  
(effort bc cost of expression is "high", i.e. must expend some effort)

Helpfulness ratings and comments are clear examples.

↳ seem sparse

↳ let's focus on this.

Now it may seem like a stretch to view clicking the yes button as an interesting social interaction, but let's leave that aside for a moment

At first blush this may seem like a sort of impoverished interaction, since author; user aren't interacting directly;

but let's get back to this point later  
we still have on indirect interaction

(blank the screen)

Exercise:

- ~~take a blank~~
  - on the blank side, write your name  
and, what generic features of a review make it  
helpful.
- on board
- ~~what~~ - to you
  - to others in general
- ~~must~~ (don't have to be computationally feasible)
  - ~~for each feature, any idea about capturing  
it computationally  
can it be captured comp~~

write neatly (for reasons we'll explain in a moment)

not  
|||

is  
|||

[altho' this was w/ equally weighting  
the factors]

<snap> <take and shuffle. who is yours? what langs they speak? what  
features?

show the 42/42 review, -

- helpfi according to their reviews?  
vote.

Annotation instructions hard to  
set right, crucial

Why did I ask you to commit to answers; have someone else read them?

Annotation/labeling is often an important part of ~~the task~~. this kind of research.  
Writing those instructions ~~carefully~~ carefully and test-running them can  
be crucial.

let's talk about some interesting features.

→ straight Man most critical helpful comment thread

• one factor: personal point of view? - Frank is against it

Aletheia Knights says, "I've had my own reviews criticized ... b/c ~~too~~ [too] 1st person pronouns."

• reflect the consensus?

Giltbert: Karahalios' ~~poor~~ interviewee  
Ghose; Ipeirotis: subjectivity  
(note the discussion  
contribution  
votes)

- reflect the consensus? - Giltbert: Karahalios interviewee: ~~not~~

"A completely unique review wouldn't serve any real purpose, would it?"

vs. Ghose; Ipeirotis: extreme reviews most helpful?

:  
gender?

On TMDB, Osterbacher CIKM ~~2007~~ 2010:

median utility ~~score~~ for reviews by ~~males~~: ~~0~~ 2/3  
--- --- --- females: 0

→ If we think about translating to the ~~for~~ more general case.

instead of product reviews, general forums for opinion expression

'helpfulness' - a proxy for importance, possibly influential, or what people think are important

about 10 min. over

{ Even framing of q is important:

sometimes "helpful to you" ← Amazon

skipped

vs. some study of presidential polling -

ask: who do you plan to vote for  
who do you think is going to win.

[I need to find source]