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1. INTRODUCTION

We present a framework for assessing the quality of Web documents, and a baseline of three quality dimensions: trustworthiness, objectivity and basic scholarly quality. Assessing Web document quality is a “deep data” problem necessitating approaches to handle both data size and complexity.

Traditional quality assessment methodologies are tailored to physical documents such as books, and qualitatively evaluate their authors and other metadata. These practices need to be extended to respond to the specific nature of online sources. We propose a framework for identifying which characteristics of online sources can be used to signal their quality in different contexts, to benefit both scholars and laymen.

This framework enriches the documents analyzed with features from NLP and provenance. In this feature space, quality indicators are sought, to estimate quality assessments that different typologies of users provide in different contexts. We show a preliminary evaluation of employing three techniques for targeting three quality dimensions: crowdsourcing (trustworthiness), manual assessments (objectivity and basic scholarly quality), and best practices (basic scholarly quality). Estimation accuracy reaches 90%, but some quality dimensions are more difficult to estimate.

The paper develops as follows. Section 2 introduces related work. Section 3 presents the framework. Section 4 provides a preliminary evaluation, and Section 5 concludes.
document characteristics and their abstractions. We identify the following categories of signals: (a) Natural Language Processing Signals, i.e., the presence of entities and other NLP-based features; and (b) Provenance Signals, i.e., information about how data and enrichment came to be.

Quality Dimension Modeling. Given the informal definition of quality as “fitness for purpose”, various purposes are possible in different contexts, as well as diverse subjects will measure fitness differently. We will make use of crowdsourcing, nichesourcing [9] and machine learning to identify quality dimensions that are relevant in different contexts.

Signal Detection. Once we identify a set of candidate features and a set of quality dimensions, we build machine learning models to identify the features that hint at quality.

Quality Estimation. Once we identify quality signals, we aim at automating this process using machine learning.

Currently, the framework makes use of NLP analyses fromAlchemyAPI [1] and targets the set of quality dimensions described below. The framework code is available online1.

4. PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

We ran a preliminary analysis on a corpus of 47 Web documents about vaccinations,2 selected to guarantee diversity in sources (blogs, news, etc.) and manually assessed stance (pro, con, neutral). The documents were enriched with the following information categories fromAlchemyAPI: Taxonomy, Relation, Entity, Concept, Sentiment. Every element of each category is a column in the feature matrix. The relevance of the item in the document is a number between zero and one. Using these features, documents are classified according to the qualities described below using Support Vector Machine [7], preceded by Stochastic Gradient Descent [5] (“SGD-SVM”), to handle the large number of features used. On each setting, we run 10-fold cross validation (i.e., the dataset is split in 10 subsets; in round, 9 subsets are used as training set, and 1 as test set; the accuracy is averaged).

Trustworthiness Estimation. We use Web Of Trust (WOT) [18] website trustworthiness as a proxy for document trustworthiness. WOT collects website trust assessments from their users, along with motivations for distrust. This information is made available via an API that exposes aggregations of the collected judgments per category (e.g., trustworthiness, child safety), together with an estimated confidence score. We are interested in the trustworthiness score of the websites (for simplicity, we do not consider their confidence level). This score ranges from 0 to 100. To make the number of classes manageable, we aggregated them into 10 superclasses (corresponding to the websites which trustworthiness is between 0 and 10, etc.), and we obtain an accuracy on 66.25%. With 3 superclasses (trustworthiness between 0 and 33, etc.) accuracy is 70.33%.

Stance and Objectivity Estimation. Stance (e.g., neutral, pro, con a given topic) allows discriminating the most neutral Web documents from the most biased ones.

A Spearman rank-correlation test shows a weak correlation (0.4) between sentiment and stance. In fact almost all articles related to vaccinations show a negative sentiment, although for different reasons. Hence, we need to expand the search for features, and for algorithms to handle them.

We get an accuracy of 63.33% when estimating stance based on sentiment. We also use stance as a proxy for objectivity: “pro” or “con” (vaccinations) documents are considered less objective than the “neutral” documents. Accuracy is 90.67% when predicting objectivity based on sentiment. When considering all the features resulting from enrichment, the accuracy is 70% for stance and 90.67% for objectivity.

5. DISCUSSION

We introduce a framework and a baseline for the evaluation of quality assessment of Web documents, consisting of trustworthiness, objectivity, and basic scholarly quality. Documents enrichment is based on NLP analyses fromAlchemyAPI. The highest performance is achieved when estimating manually assessed objectivity. We will address possible inter-rater disagreement in the future.

Accuracy of trustworthiness prediction is about 70%. This result provides a decent starting point for future explorations. We use only the WOT trustworthiness scores, but we plan to take into consideration also their confidence in the future. We will also extend these assessments with others from similar services (e.g., Google Safe Browsing [11]).

The lowest performance is achieved when trying to predict the basic quality score. Hence, we will expand the feature set, and evaluate different automated reasoning methods. The checklist that we describe in Section 4 is meant to provide a quantitative quality score, but different users could provide different answers to those questions. For example, is the extensive use of links in a Web page to be considered equivalent to the use of a traditional bibliography? We will gather assessments from a number of scholars to help clarifying these issues. Following the CrowdTruth practices [14], we will identify and decompose controversial features. For example, if scholars disagree on the “bibliography” feature, we might evaluate also its type and length.

In the basic scholarly quality, all the questions weigh the same, but some could be more important than others. We aim at learning these weights from a set of assessments provided by scholars in different fields. This requires treating the scores as ordinal values (and no more as categories), and employing adequate machine learning algorithms.

In the future, we will extend the feature set by including, for instance, other NLP analyses and author reputation. Also, a series of crowdsourcing tasks will tell us which quality dimensions are more relevant in different contexts.
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1The code is retrievable at https://goo.gl/GrXpWj.
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