9/2/14
lec. 3

(make copies)

Outline

Review "quality"/"helpfulness":

reviews considered independently → potentially also considering context (diff. connotations)

[intro] (1) prediction ~~in and of itself~~ : some ~~useful~~ features, techniques for biased labels.

[focus] (2) ~~predict~~ a lens for studying social influence / interesting techniques.
~~(3) for.~~
(naturally will talk about

(2) ~~Study~~ Using quality/helpfulness as a lens on social influence
↳ focus of this course

[Sipos, Ghosh, Joachims WWW '14]: (mis)-~~ordering of~~ ranking by community (topic)
(to some degree - also proprietary Amazon factors. tau = .84 for helpfulness vote vs. actual Amazon ranking
revs w/ ≥ 10 votes)

~~polarity~~
- "true" quality by "final" future ranking
technique for biased labels
- effect on helpfulness vote, and on whether they vote.

[Muchnik, Aral, Taylor, Science 2013]
- [non-ranking setting]
- overall, ~~seeing other pos~~ ⊕ ~~vote~~ increased prob. of ⊕ eval. ⊖: not much effect.
- manipulation study (~~"quality"~~ sidesteps true quality)
comment rating, so ranking is not a factor
opt-in
"the Web site performed" [not the experimenters

[Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, Kossinets, Kleinberg, Lee WWW '09]: effect of conformance to group opinion
cultural diffs in
: natural experiment: "plagiarized" reviews to sidestep true quality

[Cheng, Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, Leskovec ICWSM '14]: effect of evaluations on the author
: propensity matching: to 'natural' experiment, but requires measuring text quality to pair "similar" reviews.

post quality: evals drop significantly after a neg. eval.
risk is not significant after pos. eval.
(other controls in pairing: # words, # posts written, general ~~helpfulness~~ quality evaluations previously)