



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY  
DENMARK

## Information Quality in Information Interaction and Retrieval: Workshop Proposal for CHIIR 2022

van der Sluis, Frans; Smith, Catherine; Bogers, Toine; Meier, Florian

*Published in:*

Proceedings of CHIIR '22: ACM SIGIR Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval

*DOI (link to publication from Publisher):*

[10.1145/3498366.3505798](https://doi.org/10.1145/3498366.3505798)

*Creative Commons License*

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

*Publication date:*

2022

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

van der Sluis, F., Smith, C., Bogers, T., & Meier, F. (2022). Information Quality in Information Interaction and Retrieval: Workshop Proposal for CHIIR 2022. In *Proceedings of CHIIR '22: ACM SIGIR Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval* (pp. 371–373). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498366.3505798>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Information Quality in Information Interaction and Retrieval

Workshop proposal for CHIIR 2022

Frans van der Sluis  
Department of Communication  
University of Copenhagen  
Copenhagen, Denmark  
frans@hum.ku.dk

Catherine Smith  
School of Information  
Kent State University  
Kent, OH, United States  
csmit141@kent.edu

Toine Bogers  
Department of Communication & Psychology  
Aalborg University Copenhagen  
Copenhagen, Denmark  
toine@hum.aau.dk

Florian Meier  
Department of Communication & Psychology  
Aalborg University Copenhagen  
Copenhagen, Denmark  
fmeier@hum.aau.dk

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Evaluation of retrieval results; Content ranking; Users and interactive retrieval.**

## KEYWORDS

information quality, information interaction and retrieval, quality assessment, multiple-text comprehension

### ACM Reference Format:

Frans van der Sluis, Catherine Smith, Toine Bogers, and Florian Meier. 2022. Information Quality in Information Interaction and Retrieval: Workshop proposal for CHIIR 2022. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGIR Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval (CHIIR '22)*, March 14–18, 2022, Regensburg, Germany. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 3 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498366.3505798>

## 1 WORKSHOP TITLE AND FORMAT

**Full title:** Information Quality in Information Interaction and Retrieval (IQIR 2022)

**Workshop format:** Full-day workshop

## 2 ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

The explosive growth of user-generated content on the Web has shifted the responsibility for and burden of assessing the quality of information increasingly to the end user. Online information bypasses traditional gatekeepers of knowledge, which was initially well received as it had the potential to democratise the distribution of knowledge [22]. Recent campaigns on social media suggest that it indeed has become easier to raise awareness about social justice issues [e.g., 5, 9, but see [8, 15]]. Academic discourse has similarly shifted its focus away from information quality and the assessment thereof towards users' ability to assess whether a document and its source(s) seem credible [31]. Nevertheless, adapting to this new

responsibility appears to be challenging for users. Assessing the quality of information can prove to be an arduous task for an individual to perform for each document they encounter [16, 19, 21].

Search systems partly unburden users from their responsibility through their optimization for relevance, which both in conceptualisation and in practice includes a notion of quality. In contemporary conceptual models, relevance is considered equivalent to usefulness with respect to a task [24]. This implicitly subsumes a notion of quality: presumably, higher quality documents will also be more useful. In practice, relevance has been optimized for through expert-based (Cranfield) test collections, user (relevance) feedback, and through algorithmic proxies like PageRank. For example, Google employs experts to assess document quality based on the expertise, authoritativeness and trustworthiness of the content [11, sections 1-11]. At the same time, users provide implicit feedback about a document through their click behavior [1, 13] and through explicit signals through actions such as liking, flagging, and sharing.

Whilst search systems have undoubtedly become successful in offering their users relevant articles, they are arguably not as successful in offering quality. Societal and academic discussions have pointed at a perceived lack of quality in both search (e.g., the Google-Holocaust case [12]) and social media, as well as users' inability to recognise it [16]. In fact, 'fake news' is distributed farther, faster, deeper, and more broadly than truthful messages online [32], partially because it tends to be more ad-, eye-, or click-friendly [3, 10]. These discussions suggest not only that existing methods fail to offer sufficient safeguards against the spread of low-quality information, but also that they do not offer sufficient information in support of users' quality assessments. This raises the question as to how we can better support quality in interactive information retrieval. In line with CHIIR, we plan to explore this question with a particular interest in user-centered approaches.

### 2.1 Assessments and rankings

Quality assessments are currently mostly supported as an individual practice. Information systems typically aggregate individual feedback, such as 'likes' or tags. These aggregates foster a certain form of cooperation by making users aware of what others have liked or tagged [18]. They do not, however, foster collective decision making over how resources should be indexed and ranked, nor

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

CHIIR '22, March 14–18, 2022, Regensburg, Germany

© 2022 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9186-3/22/03.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3498366.3505798>

do they show users which considerations went into a particular ranking of information.

Some systems indirectly support quality assessments as a discursive, collective endeavour. For instance, users proactively discuss quality on online discussion fora [25] and in review websites. It remains hard, however, to appropriate these discursive elements for assessing and ranking information. Notable exceptions include: (i) Wikipedia, where editors discuss and decide on the quality of a document in a shared goal of improving the document [29, 30]; (ii) Question-answer sites, which offer voting and commenting mechanisms for users to collectively decide on the ranking of answers according to their quality [27]; and (iii) Attempts on integrating reviews in a search index, such as for book search [14]. With this workshop we intend to further discuss and explore the value of such discursive, collective elements for assessing and ranking information.

## 2.2 Signals of quality and comprehension

Traditionally, information literacy has been defined as skill for locating, accessing, evaluating, and using information [17]. Within that context, the notion of information quality is central to evaluation. As mentioned above, understanding how searchers use available information in assessing resource quality is an open research question. Equally important are research questions focused on how a user's process for evaluating quality contributes to their comprehension of the evaluated information, and how characteristics of the motivating task affect this process [7].

A robust research area in the learning sciences provides a theoretical and empirical framework for addressing these questions in the context of information retrieval. Research in *multiple-text comprehension* addresses questions focused on how readers use information in evaluating conflicting claims found within a text or across multiple texts [6]. Many of the areas and factors studied have direct parallels in research found in the CHIIR community. Of particular interest to the workshop are the effects of prior knowledge in a domain and of prior beliefs about topics and sources, as well as the role of explicit quality signals [20, 28]. These factors together influence the processes users undertake when attending to, evaluating, and using information about texts (i.e., knowledge-context [26]). During the workshop, we intend to explore prior findings from these areas and discuss how they can help researchers in interactive information retrieval design experiments and control for known factors.

## 3 RELEVANCE TO CHIIR

While the focus in information interaction and retrieval usually lies in the notion of relevance, user assessment of information quality when searching or using information has received significant attention before, also at CHIIR. In the past, CHIIR has had many contributions that studied the quality of retrieved or used information. Either directly, such as Aigner et al. [2], Muirhead [23], Wang et al. [33, 34], Zhang and Song [35], or indirectly, via addressing one of its attributes like completeness, accuracy, reliability, format, or timeliness [4].

We believe that, in light of emergent research themes at CHIIR, e.g., work on conversational search, search as learning, cognitive

biases, misinformation and fake news, or fairness and transparency of retrieval results, it is worth taking stock of different perspectives on information quality and their relation to these research themes. We aim to attract and discuss a wide range of ideas by embedding the workshop and the notion of quality within these broader research themes.

## 4 DESIRED KEY OUTCOMES

We expect the following outcomes of the workshop, including their dissemination:

- Accepted papers will be presented at the workshop and will be published open access at CEUR-WS.
- The organizers will compile a report on the results of the workshop to be submitted to SIGIR Forum or a similar venue.
- Authors of accepted papers will be invited to contribute to a collaboratively-written report that inventories different approaches to information quality along with research challenges and opportunities.

## 5 WORKSHOP ORGANIZERS

**Frans van der Sluis** (<https://comm.ku.dk/staff/?pure=en/persons/608897>) is an assistant professor at the Department of Communication at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark. He organized several seminars before in 2013 and 2020. His research focuses on the role of epistemic feelings and emotions during information interaction, with a particular interest in the stimulating roles of information complexity and epistemic uncertainties. In relation to this workshop, his particular interest is in designing information systems that can account for and reflect epistemic uncertainties and in evaluating how such designs affect users' feeling of confidence and curiosity.

**Catherine Smith** (<http://www.catherinesmith.com>) is an associate professor at Kent State University in Kent, OH. Cathy was a co-organizer for HCIR symposia (2010-2013) and contributed to the subsequent development of CHIIR. She was a program co-chair for CHIIR 2021. Her research interests bridge information retrieval and human-computer interaction, centering on the processes involved in learning to search and the role of search systems in formal education. Generally, this involves research questions addressing design goals for an interactive retrieval system that enriches self-regulated learning and comprehension for its users. Aligned with the goals of this workshop, she is interested in the construct of *knowledge-context*, meta information used by searchers making sense of SERPs, including quality signals. She is particularly interested in how knowledge-context is used by learners engaged in multiple source use and multiple-text comprehension.

**Florian Meier** (<https://vbn.aau.dk/da/persons/142274>) is an assistant professor at the Department of Communication and Psychology at Aalborg University in Copenhagen, Denmark. His research interests lie in the intersection of Computational Social Science, Digital Humanities and Information Behavior. In line with this workshop, he is interested in how users and technology interact to ensure the information quality of content on commons-based peer production systems like the open-collaborative online encyclopedia Wikipedia.

**Toine Bogers** (<http://www.toinebogers.com>) is an associate professor at the Department of Communication & Psychology at Aalborg University Copenhagen in Copenhagen, Denmark. He was one of the general chairs of RecSys 2019 in Copenhagen and has extensive experience organizing workshops at CHIIR (SCST 2017, BIIR 2018-2019) and at other conferences (CBRecSys 2014-2016, ComplexRec 2017-2020). His general research interests concern applying information access technologies to unlocking large information collections (e.g., recommender systems, search engines) and studying information behavior—how people interact with information and their devices. In the context of this workshop, he is particularly interested in methods for assessing the varying quality of information need descriptions on discussion fora and how this translates to better ranking algorithms.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Eugene Agichtein, Eric Brill, and Susan Dumais. 2006. Improving web search ranking by incorporating user behavior information. In *Proceedings of the 29th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval - SIGIR '06*. ACM Press, New York, New York, USA, 19. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1148170.1148177>
- [2] Johannes Aigner, Amelie Durcharth, Thiemo Kersting, Markus Kattenbeck, and David Elsweiler. 2017. Manipulating the Perception of Credibility in Refugee Related Social Media Posts (*CHIIR '17*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 297–300. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3020165.3022137>
- [3] Hunt Allcott and Matthew Gentzkow. 2017. Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31, 2 (may 2017), 211–236. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.2.211>
- [4] Ofer Arazy and Rick Kopak. 2011. On the measurability of information quality. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 62, 1 (2011), 89–99. <https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/asi.21447>
- [5] Yarimar Bonilla and Jonathan Rosa. 2015. #Ferguson: Digital protest, hashtag ethnography, and the racial politics of social media in the United States. *American ethnologist* 42, 1 (feb 2015), 4–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12112>
- [6] Jason LG Braasch, Ivar Bråten, and Matthew T McCrudden. 2018. *Handbook of multiple source use*. Routledge.
- [7] M Anne Britt, Jean-François Rouet, and Amanda Durik. 2018. Representations and processes in multiple source use. In *Handbook of multiple source use*. Routledge, 17–33.
- [8] Bradley Carron-Arthur, John A. Cunningham, and Kathleen M. Griffiths. 2014. Describing the distribution of engagement in an Internet support group by post frequency: A comparison of the 90-9-1 Principle and Zipf's Law. *Internet Interventions* 1, 4 (oct 2014), 165–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.invent.2014.09.003>
- [9] Rosemary Clark-Parsons. 2019. "SEE YOU, I BELIEVE YOU, I STAND WITH YOU": #MeToo and the performance of networked feminist visibility. *Feminist Media Studies* (24 jun 2019), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2019.1628797>
- [10] Tarleton Gillespie. 2010. The politics of "platforms". *New Media & Society* 12, 3 (may 2010), 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444809342738>
- [11] Google. 2020. Search Quality Rating Guidelines. <https://static.googleusercontent.com/media/guidelines.raterhub.com/en/searchqualityevaluatorguidelines.pdf>
- [12] The Guardian. 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/mar/15/google-quality-raters-flag-holocaust-denial-fake-news>
- [13] Thorsten Joachims, Laura Granka, Bing Pan, Helene Hembrooke, and Geri Gay. 2005. Accurately interpreting clickthrough data as implicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the 28th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval - SIGIR '05*. ACM Press, New York, New York, USA, 154. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1076034.1076063>
- [14] Marijn Koolen. 2014. *Advances in information retrieval*. Lecture notes in computer science, Vol. 8416. Springer International Publishing, Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06028-6>
- [15] Scott Kushner. 2016. Read only: The persistence of lurking in Web 2.0. *First Monday* 21, 6 (10 jun 2016). <https://doi.org/10.5210/firstmonday.v21i6.6789>
- [16] Eun-Ju Lee and Soo Yun Shin. 2019. Mediated misinformation: questions answered, more questions to ask. *American Behavioral Scientist* (23 aug 2019), 000276421986940. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219869403>
- [17] Thomas P Mackey and Trudi E Jacobson. 2010. Reframing information literacy as a metaliteracy. *College & Research Libraries* (2010), crl-76r1.
- [18] Jens-Erik Mai. 2011. Folksonomies and the new order: authority in the digital disorder. *Knowledge Organization* 38, 2 (2011), 114–122. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2011-2-114>
- [19] Jens-Erik Mai. 2013. The quality and qualities of information. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 64, 4 (apr 2013), 675–688. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22783>
- [20] Matthew T McCrudden. 2018. Text relevance and multiple-source use. In *Handbook of multiple source use*. Routledge, 168–183.
- [21] Miriam J. Metzger, Andrew J. Flanagin, and Ryan B. Medders. 2010. Social and heuristic approaches to credibility evaluation online. *Journal of Communication* 60, 3 (19 aug 2010), 413–439. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01488.x>
- [22] Nicola Mößner and Philip Kitcher. 2017. Knowledge, democracy, and the internet. *Minerva* 55, 1 (mar 2017), 1–24.
- [23] Jessica Muirhead. 2019. Assessing Online Content Quality through User Surveys and Web Analytics (*CHIIR '19*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 433–436. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3295750.3298977>
- [24] Tefko Saracevic. 2007. Relevance: A review of the literature and a framework for thinking on the notion in information science. Part II: nature and manifestations of relevance. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 58, 13 (nov 2007), 1915–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20682>
- [25] Reijo Savolainen. 2011. Judging the quality and credibility of information in Internet discussion forums. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 62, 7 (jul 2011), 1243–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21546>
- [26] Catherine L. Smith and Soo Young Rieh. 2019. Knowledge-Context in Search Systems: Toward Information-Literate Actions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval - CHIIR '19*. ACM Press, New York, New York, USA, 55–62. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3295750.3298940>
- [27] Ivan Srba and Maria Bielikova. 2016. A comprehensive survey and classification of approaches for community question answering. *ACM Transactions on the Web* 10, 3 (16 aug 2016), 1–63. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2934687>
- [28] Helge I Stromso, Ivar Bråten, and M Anne Britt. 2010. Reading multiple texts about climate change: The relationship between memory for sources and text comprehension. *Learning and Instruction* 20, 3 (2010), 192–204. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [29] Besiki Stvilia, Michael B. Twidale, Les Gasser, and Linda C. Smith. 2005. *Information Quality in a Community-based Encyclopedia*. 101–113. [https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/9789812701527\\_0009](https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/9789812701527_0009)
- [30] Besiki Stvilia, Michael B. Twidale, Linda C. Smith, and Les Gasser. 2008. Information quality work organization in wikipedia. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 59, 6 (2008), 983–1001. <https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/asi.20813>
- [31] S. Shyam Sundar. 2008. The MAIN Model: A Heuristic Approach to Understanding Technology Effects on Credibility. *Digital Media, Youth, and Credibility* (2008), 73–100.
- [32] Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. 2018. The spread of true and false news online. *Science* 359, 6380 (9 mar 2018), 1146–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>
- [33] Yiwei Wang, Shawon Sarkar, and Chirag Shah. 2017. Investigating Information Seekers' Selection of Interpersonal and Impersonal Sources. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval* (Oslo, Norway) (*CHIIR '17*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 353–356. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3020165.3022151>
- [34] Yiwei Wang, Shawon Sarkar, and Chirag Shah. 2018. Juggling with Information Sources, Task Type, and Information Quality. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Human Information Interaction & Retrieval* (New Brunswick, NJ, USA) (*CHIIR '18*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 82–91. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3176349.3176390>
- [35] Yan Zhang and Shijie Song. 2020. Older Adults' Evaluation of the Credibility of Online Health Information. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval* (Vancouver BC, Canada) (*CHIIR '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 358–362. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3343413.3377997>