Turn off screen; need 10 min of set up for display issues.
Laptop on leg; do hands-on workshop
Lecture #4

Asynchronous online discussion: threads; some example formats and problems.

Now going to move to a more direct form of social interaction: discussion threads.

Let's start with a few examples to give you an idea of the range of formats such discussions can take.

You are all probably quite familiar with the post-comment structure:

The first example is you see on Facebook:
- the sequence of comments you see on many blogs and news sites;
- the post-comment structure that's on Facebook;
- which is a little more structured than one linear stream.

But there are other possibilities:

Wikipedia: 19M named accounts; ~3k active users and ~3k highly active users. (cite: Wikipedia)

Where are the conversations?

Article talk page → talk page → changes/edit ideas for the page

Spam, but there are indented conversations

→ edit interface

Indentation is done manually

You can see that in the signatures, there is often a link to that user's talk page.

Feels JorisVS

b/c of the "just edit" interface, they've posted rules
discussions: more or less consistent (hit Administrative Evil seems to have incorrect indentation)

Also note the warm, well, let's say cold tone at the end.
Unfortunately, things can be more unstructured. Snow Blizzards (aka Mark 91)

- Alternative Medicine edit (near bottom)

possibly to deal w/ notification msgs.

\[ \text{responses are on separate pages.} \]

\begin{itemize}
\item the Wiki dataset you have for your assignment is from user talk pages, and has been formatted for your convenience.
\end{itemize}

Then are other interesting discussions, also. FYI

- requests for adminship

people can be nominated and run for election as an admin, a position that entails extra work to do maintenance.

- latest RFs.

You can see some votes: people can support, oppose or be neutral.

- there's a current election being held: (tally is high on FS)

- (self) nomination
- mandated Q&A
- user-contributed Q&As

- the discussion: see individual votes

people can refer to other people's reasons ('per ...')

under oppose: some on directed @ the candidate ('you')

- and some responses, including by the candidate

incredibly rich source of different types of conversations that are goal-oriented.

(Froehle et al)

- survey posted to website about NLP problems, and a very short section on resources.

(observe?)

FB may be trying true-based interface, w/ indicator that OP has re-entered

(orange fix)
Let's move on to a much more explicitly structured site: Slashdot (running since '97) (score to be under-investigated)

- slashdot page

  stories are submitted and then posted by editors
  tags
  comments
  - all fairly conventional

- for an individual story:

  comment tree

  * you can pick any comment you'd like to reply to
  * you can get back to the parent of a comment you're looking @
  comments are moderated by moderators [this desc for wk]
  default score: +1 for registered users,
  0 for "anonymous coward"
  
  ...hope to check this out. Not just China.
  (can't see any now bc the filter is set to > 0)
  2 for "high karma" users,
  -1 for "low karma"

- further moderation happens by moderators (not elected, just
  selected to get moderation points, which they use up)
- can add/ subtract points from score by choosing
  descriptors

- scoring allows users to filter

- there's also a metamoderation system: on the descriptors "fair" or
  unfair.

- clearly lots of potential problems: predicting score, predicting tags,
  predicting descriptor of individual comments.
- what about the 'nature' of the entire conversation?

- Gomory 08: Fig 7 ("controversial")

- Fig 12: stringy: "guest book" vs. "interaction"?

- predicting re-entry vs. comment volume

→ WSDM '13 poster (abstraction of an example in FB when essentially the same text prompted different threads)

---
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