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1. INTRODUCTION

Coordination and decision-making in Wikipedia happens, in part, at the article level, through discussions on an article’s Talk page. In recent years, Talk pages have been added more quickly than articles, growing at a rate of 11x, compared to a 9x growth rate for articles [8]. Over a 2.5 year period, [7] found that edits to Talk pages nearly doubled, from 11% to 19% of all page edits, while article edits nearly halved from 53% to 28% of all page edits.

While other studies have examined Talk pages, their scope has been limited, either in the manner of selection (e.g. 25 “purposefully chosen” articles from [8]), the sample size (e.g. [3] coded Talk pages for 9 articles, compared by discipline and rough page age), or the categories of articles chosen (e.g. [7] studied information quality discussions in featured and random articles). Purposefully chosen articles may obscure similarities and differences between categories of Talk pages; furthermore, small sample sizes may hide effects that a larger sample could reveal.

We report on a larger, in-progress study of Talk pages, consisting, in part, of a manual content analysis of 100 Talk pages. Analysis has been completed to date on three categories (comprising 60 articles, and 58 unique articles), making our pilot already comparable in size to Stvilia’s [7] analysis. Further, we use this analysis to discuss how structured and meaningful annotations, based on dedicated ontologies and Semantic Web technologies and added to Talk pages with a lightweight annotation process, could help to better classify the type of edits that happen in these pages. Consequently, decision-making and page management based on Talk page edits could potentially be streamlined.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Following the introduction, we review the state of the art of research on Wikipedia Talk pages. In Section 3 we explain our selection criteria and detail the five categories of articles to be analyzed. Section 4 discusses preliminary analysis of 58 articles in three of these categories. Section 5 discusses a lightweight annotation system for Talk pages based on Semantic Web technologies. We conclude with a discussion of future research.

2. RELATED WORK

In [7], the authors examined 60 discussion pages in their analysis of information quality. They tallied the types of info quality problems discussed in Talk pages, hand-coding the problems into the following categories: accessibility, accuracy, authority, completeness, complexity, consistency, informativeness, relevance, verifiability, volatility.

3. METHODOLOGY

We are currently undertaking a manual content analysis of Talk pages from 100 articles and a quantitative analysis of Talk pages from 5000 articles, with one-fifth of the sample from each of the following categories:

[8] studies Talk pages quantitatively, revealing that articles with Talk pages are more highly edited, and have more editors than articles without Talk pages. In particular, “94% of the pages with more than 100 edits have related Talk pages”. Further, they manually classify 25 Talk pages, chosen by hand to ensure a wide variety of topics. The dimensions used in their classification are further discussed in Section 4.1.

[3] studied various aspects of 9 articles and their discussion pages. Like [8], they found that requests/suggestions for editing coordination were the most common contribution to Talk pages. However, the remaining categories differ significantly in their prevalence between the two analyses, pointing for further needs for standardization of the categories, as well as a better understanding of other types of contributions to Talk pages. They detail the interaction between Talk page discussions and the article evolution, pointing out how Talk page comments from one editor may support actions of a subsequent editor, how editors use Talk pages to request assistance, and how bots provide justification for some of their edits on Talk pages. Timescales are of particular note; in the examples cited, discussions and relevant edits may be separated by “three hours” or by “six days” or more. The article also provides an example of how vandalism to articles may coincide with vandalism on Talk pages, and how Talk pages may draw attention to controversial sections of an article. However, during the observation period, “several of the issues raised in the Talk page discussions did not directly translate into article editing activity” [5].

Improvements to Talk pages in MediaWiki have been suggested since at least 2006, when a MediaWiki extension, LiquidThreads1 was developed as part of Google Summer of Code 2006, to add threaded comments, permalinks, archiving, and subscription features to while maintaining wiki syntax and formatting. A number of extensions allow MediaWiki’s discussion pages to function as issue trackers, bulletin boards, and guestbooks, as well as to make discussion pages more visible2.

Finally, there is a growing body of work about coordination in peer production, and in particular in Wikipedia. Much of this work throws light on the larger phenomena, and research on Talk pages often takes place in the context of coordination (e.g. [6]).
1. Articles with the most contributors in November 2009. We examined Talk pages for the articles with the most (372 to 77) contributors, to see whether coordination techniques changed as the number of editors grew.

2. Most-viewed articles of 2009. The most-viewed articles for a year are an indication of the topics attracting sustained attention; articles which are heavily viewed may also be heavily edited, such as “Deaths in 2009”, which appeared both in this category and the previous one.

3. Controversial articles. Controversial articles require significant coordination in order to come to consensus, and we expect increased discussion length and volume. Using a dedicated script, we randomly selected articles, using the categories given at the list of controversial articles. One topic randomly selected, “Berlin Wall”, also appeared in the “most contributors” group.

4. Featured articles. Articles must go through a review in order to attain Featured Article status, requiring nomination and subsequent coordination, some of which may occur on the Talk page. We expect discussion before editing to be the norm for these articles, which are selected in part based on their stability.

5. Random sample. We expect Talk pages to differ according to the age of the article, number of participants, frequency of editing, and type of article. A random sample may draw attention to other factors requiring further consideration, and will validate or call into question discoveries made on the other categories of articles.

First, we used the 11 classifications defined by [8], as represented in Table 1. The examples in that table all come from Wikipedia Talk pages that we analyzed.

### Content Analysis

Our content analysis used 15 non-mutually-exclusive classifications. We provide an example of each type below. In addition to existing classifications, we have added 4 new classifications. This adds a new dimension to the analysis because some of these classifications are widely used. However, since comments may be assigned several types (aside from the generic “Other” classification), our results can be compared to previous research.

#### 4.1 Classifications from Viégas

First, we used the 11 classifications defined by [8], as represented in Table 1. The examples in that table all come from Wikipedia Talk pages that we analyzed.

![Figure 1: Comment which proposes a new infobox, from the Swine influenza Talk page](image)

#### 4.2 Additional Classifications

Our classification began organically from the items in Talk pages we reviewed. These coalesced into a set of classifications, which we then compared with classifications used in [8] and [7]. While Stvilia’s classifications were narrowly focused around information quality, Viégas’ classifications were very similar to our own. Since they had already been used for at least two studies, and matched our own needs, we decided to adopt Viégas’ classifications. To

---


6. 1 from each of sports, philosophy, psychiatry, linguistics, entertainment, media/culture, environment, and technology. 2 from each of sexuality, religion, history, science/biology/health, politics/economics, and people.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests/suggestions for editing coordination</th>
<th>Ideas, comments, or suggestions involving editing the article.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>“Currently some of the refs are YYYY-MM-DD format and some are Month DD, YYYY. Which format do we want to standardize to? Staxringold talkcontribs 01:38, 3 November 2009 (UTC)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td>Questions asked by someone who doesn’t intend to edit the page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>“Where is Ligurian spoken in the Var ? Ericd 00:19, 26 Jun 2005 (UTC)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to vandalism</td>
<td>Mentions of vandalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>“I’ve semi-protected the article for another week, the signal-to-noise ratio of the IP edits seemed too low. Tim Vickers (talk) 18:06, 4 May 2009 (UTC)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to Wikipedia guidelines and policies</td>
<td>References to guidelines and/or policies of Wikipedia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>“The section I removed had no sources / references - if you have sources they’re no good being kept a secret :) WP:VERIFY, WP:CITE. Thanks/wangi 08:45, 5 July 2006 (UTC)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to internal Wikipedia resources</td>
<td>References to internal Wikipedia resources such as diffs, Talk page discussions, old version of a page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>“Would it be a good thing to re-add the links that were taken off in August? Somebody made them into a template that was subsequently deleted. The edit to recover the old links is here: [6] Star Garnet (talk) 19:51, 24 October 2009 (UTC)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-topic remarks</td>
<td>Remarks not relating to editing the article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>“PLATO IS THE BEST MAN ALIVE! LONG LIVE PLATO Preceding unsigned comment added by 69.6.101.167 (talk) 02:19, 8 December 2009 (UTC)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polls</td>
<td>Formal proposals followed by statements such as Support and Oppose, with justifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>“A month should be deleted from the “Deaths in [CURRENT YEAR]” page ONE WEEK after the month ends…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for peer review</td>
<td>Requests for peer review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>“Users hoping to elevate articles to featured status may solicit a peer review.” [8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information boxes</td>
<td>Special boxes with information, usually found at the top of a Talk page. Occasionally new info boxes for the article are proposed and may be discussed on the Talk page, for example, the Swine influenza page discusses such a template.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>See Fig. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>Images posted on the Talk page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>See Fig. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Describes items that don’t fit elsewhere. Unlike the other categories, this one is exclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example)</td>
<td>“This review is transcluded from Talk:Wiki/GA1. The edit link for this section can be used to add comments to the review.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Classifying comments in Talk pages
capture other features we were interested in, we added 4 new, non-
mutually-exclusive classifications as represented in Table 2.

These 4 new classifications were designed to draw attention to
to other discussions we expected to take place. First, how often were
sources explicitly discussed? Second, how often did editors come
to discuss or contest reverts, removed material, or other controver-
sial new edits? Third, how often did an editor use the discussion
space to notify others about a new edit. Fourth, how often did edi-
tors use a Talk page to draw attention to another project?

We added these types because:

- Sources are heavily discussed in Talk pages, and some com-
  ments seem to be made solely to deposit a source. While
  many sources are on the open Web (and can be detected as
  external links), print resources, inexact references, and deep
  web resources may also be provided.

- Disagreements about article content often take place in the
  context of reverts to the page. Discussions about removing
  content or editing controversial material may also take place
  on the Talk page before the article is edited.

- The Talk page may be used to notify other editors about a
  recent edit, perhaps to provide further description, anticipate
  questions, or clarify that a suggestion has been implemented.
  Editors may also explain their own edits in discussions of
  reverts and edit wars.

- The Talk page is often seen as a site for communication with
  editors who have interest in or knowledge about a given topic.
  Requests for help, like Requests for information, draw on
  that perceived expertise.

4.3 Results of the Content Analysis

For the articles with the most contributors (Fig. 3(a)), the most
common elements of Talk page postings are coordination, refer-
ences to guidelines, indications of sources, discussions of reverts
and contentious edits, and off-topic remarks; the remaining clas-
sifications apply to fewer than 7% of postings on average. Four
classifications—references to vandalism, posting of images, recruit-
ing help, and peer review requests—each averaged less than
2% of postings in this category. Infoboxes are particularly signifi-
cant; one indication of their length is the “skip to table of contents”
infobox at the top of some Talk pages! On 11 discussion is archived
quickly, leaving mostly infoboxes on the Talk page. Seven of the 20
most-viewed articles were featured Articles12; roughly one-tenth of
a percent of Wikipedia articles are featured13. Almost all the arti-
cles had restricted editing14. Surprisingly, that contributes to the
relative frequency of images: unverified users may request particu-
lar edits, and subsequent notification of completion often contains a
checkmark (or X for non-completion). On a few pages15, revision,
selection, or addition of images was a point of discussion. Discus-
sions of vandalisms sometimes occurred in the context of protecting
or unprotecting a page; for instance a user might comment that IP
users made helpful edits, or that it had been awhile since unprotect-
ing the page had been tried.

Surprisingly, controversial articles did not have significantly more
discussion overall16. However, some discussions became repeti-
tive, with participants cycling through the same arguments without
convincing each other. Wording and naming proved important in
many cases: phrasings were more carefully discussed and new con-
tentious material was often removed to the Talk page. Furthermore,
many of these articles had been renamed or recently had a move
proposed, perhaps because in some controversies naming indicates
differences between perspectives. Sources were often discussed in
general terms, for instance in the context of claims of systematic
bias; individual sources were less frequently posted or discussed
on the Talk page.

Completion of the analysis will prove instructive, for considering
whether controversial articles do have more discussion than ran-
dom pages. Other groupings of controversial articles could be con-
sidered, for instance by limiting to pages with significant current
editing of the article and/or Talk page, or by examining articles
undergoing neutral point of view disputes17, which an editor has
identified as possibly biased.

Our analysis proceeds with Featured Articles (over ten times
larger than other Talk page according to [7]) and random articles.
Based on our preliminary research, we notice that throughout Wikipedia,
different standards are applied by the individual editors who gather
on Talk pages. The number of repeat editors and the extent to which
individual editors are mutually engaged in conversation varies widely.
So does the timescale of comments: If many editors watch a page,
responses could come in minutes, but for other Talk pages, months
or years might pass between comments. Comments may serve
not only to advance particular arguments, but also to improve the
discussion, and some otherwise off-topic comments may serve to
lighten the mood (i.e. to change the topic after a difficult discus-

Talk:Michael_Jackson&oldid=341362256
12By contrast, there were no featured articles in the most contribu-
tors and controversial selection; one featured list was in the most
contributors list
14http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:
Featured_article_statistics
“Watchmen”, “Slumdog Millionaire”, and “Deaths in 2009” were
not semi-protected when reviewed
16One article, Barack Obama, was further on article probation,16
which provides consequences for unhelpful editing.
17Swine Influenza, 2009 Great Britain and Ireland floods, World
War II.
18In fact, one selected Talk page, for Sex offender, had no archives
and no info boxes, indicating a very limited amount of past discus-
sion and coordination.
Table 2: Additional classifications for comments in Talk pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of message:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(If this node is a Message.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ None ☑ Idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Question ☑ More ☑ Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Note ☑ News ☑ Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Warning ☑ Ok ☑ Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Feedback ☑ Sad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: HyperNews, an early implementation of hypertext news, asks users to indicate the “kind of message” they are posting.

5. OPPORTUNITIES FOR SEMANTIC WEB

Structured and meaningful annotations, based on dedicated ontologies and Semantic Web technologies [2] and added to Talk pages with a lightweight annotation process, could help to better classify the type of edits that happen in these pages. Annotations could enable new ways to browse Talk pages based on the comment types, for instance to instantaneously list all requests for help on a particular set of pages, aiming to recruit volunteers for editing. Consequently, decision-making and page management based on Talk page edits could potentially be streamlined.

Regarding the annotation process, the user would be asked to add the comment type, chosen from a short list, when submitting a Talk page comment. Such annotations have already been used successfully in some systems, for instance the HyperNews webboards[1]

References to sources outside Wikipedia

“Exclusive! Mighty Stef records football protest song”Hot Press. Not sure where to put it but I’ll leave it here as somebody might find it useful….—candlewicke 20:53, 27 November 2009 (UTC)"

References to reverts, removed material, or controversial edits

“I noticed some people edit the page into what it will be in 10 minutes but someone is reverting it…just let it be. The Fear (talk) 02:13, 11 November 2009 (UTC)”

Reference to edits the discussant made

“Added the About.com review since the review was part of the reception section.—Sevilledade (talk) 04:29, 3 December 2009 (UTC)”

Requests for help with another article, portal, etc.

“This is just to invite attention to the page Facebook statistics just created; of all interested editors. I have just placed a merge to tag in it. Thanks. Arjun#talk 17:53, 27 December 2009 (UTC)”

6. FUTURE WORK

Our immediate plans include completing the content analysis for featured and random articles and completing a quantitative analysis with particular focus on the relationship between Talk page editing and article editing. By marking up a testbed of Talk pages, and creating a JavaScript plugin, we will also be able to conduct user tests to evaluate the potential both for uptake and for use of the resulting data.

While we have started by analyzing the comments added to Talk pages, another approach would be to start from modeling user tasks, to determine what information might be needed to support those [20]


5 http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-sparql-query/

22 http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-rdf-primer-20040210/
tasks. Coordination is consistently the most common aspect of Talk page comments, and categorizing coordination according to what the writer is trying to accomplish (e.g. add a section, remove uncited material, reword the lede) could be fruitful. Further exploration and refinement of some existing categories could also be helpful; for instance, edit notifications sometimes indicate completion of a task suggested on the Talk page, but in other cases they open a debate or generate further discussion. These differences might also help suggest alternative rationales and mechanisms for archiving Talk page discussions, beyond current approaches, which are mainly based on time elapsed or number of discussions, as with existing bots.

Some recent research has also examined Wikia and the differences in coordination [5]. While Wikipedia is considered a single community, Wikia is construed as a set of over 6000 wikis, with less reliance on guidelines and policies, and smaller, topic-centered communities. This suggests further comparison of Wikia and Wikipedia Talk pages, especially to improve our understanding of the “state-change”-like differences that appear in Talk pages, depending on factors such as the number of users editing the article and the Talk page, whether the article is protected, and so forth. Aniket and Kittur, for instance, suggest community size and type as relevant factors [5]. Further “state change” factors within Wikipedia may be suggested by the quantitative analysis we are also pursuing.

Other research could explore how to reduce the overhead of discussion. Talk pages use varies by type of editor, and may place a particular burden on subject experts; [9] says “when substantive experts contribute to content pages, their contributions are likely to be more costly (take more time and thought, and are more likely to require explanation, justification and discussion on the content Talk pages).” The unlimited nature of debate adds to the burden. As Wikipedia user Hans Adler explains: “That’s the problem with endless discussions: They get even longer because you have to repeat every argument each time someone asks who (understandably) didn’t read everything.” Naturally, users tire of repeated discussion, and newly-revived conversations are sometimes cut off quickly by long-standing page editors. Unfortunately, avoiding such repetition by claiming consensus is disingenuous: new users may have valid counterarguments. Summarizing long-standing debates with argumentation visualization, which is both easier to parse and more rhetorically effective than prose [4] seems particularly promising. Dialogue maps may be a useful technique for sharing a visual overview of these arguments, especially if they can be semi-automatically generated.

7. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented preliminary results from our content analysis of 58 Talk pages in three categories: articles with the most editors, most views, and controversial articles. To structure this analysis we augmented Viégas’s classification with 4 new classifications of Talk page comments. The most common types of discussions vary by article type, but include Requests/suggestions for editing coordination, References to Wikipedia guidelines and policies, References to sources outside Wikipedia, and References to reverts, removed material, or controversial edits. The most helpful or most common discussion types could form the basis of a lightweight ontology. When entering a comment, Wikipedia editors could indicate the type of comment from a short list presented in a simple interface such as a radio button or checkmarks. As a result, the system could display comments in a more appropriate spot, for instance to instantaneously list all requests for help on a particular set of pages, aiming to recruit volunteers for editing.

While our study is in progress, one aspect not discussed in previous analyses is worth particular mention. We are surprised that many controversial articles do not have significant discussion, at least compared to articles with the most editors and most views.

Comparison with random articles will be instructive, since the most views category includes many Featured Articles, which tend to have highly developed Talk pages.

Further, controversial articles point to another factor: there seems to be significant variance between discussion threads on their Talk pages. While numerous discussions might consist of a single comment, or a small number of comments, other discussions are long and complex, sometimes stimulating further discussion on additional topics (e.g., see \(^\text{26}\), which has six discussion threads but yields 19 printed pages; yet almost all the comments are in two threads, both on Madoff. These threads were created by the same user, one month apart.) Our continuing analysis should yield more information.
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