

8 Conclusion

We have introduced a methodology for interpreting query reformulation behavior based around the three term actions *retention*, *removal* and *addition*. We directly applied our technique in an empirical analysis over TREC Session Track Data where we analyzed the origin of terms used in query reformulations. We identified the preceding query as the main source but also found that terms located in the impression itself were an additional source. We found that adjacent queries in session tended to be very similar but that there often isn't a set of core terms that are used throughout, instead the core terms change in the session as the information need changes.

We tested our methodology on well understood findings in click model research and found evidence of rank bias affecting reformulation behavior. We identified three user interaction based sources of terms (and discarded another based on dwell time) that are found in each impression and we tested from which sources users were able to locate terms to add to query reformulations. By matching query and impression terms in the term sources we defined a number of possible user behavior scenarios that a term could belong to.

We measured the effectiveness of the term actions per scenario to evaluate how good they were at not just predicting query reformulations, but effective ones. By interpreting the behavior of the user for given scenarios and their corresponding effective actions, we are able to understand a user's motivations for retaining, removing or adding terms. As future work, we can make inferences and predictions of evolving queries in session search leading to better query suggestion agents, user behavior models and more accurate click log mining.

References

- Cole MJ, Gwizdka J, Bierig R, Belkin NJ, Liu J, Liu C, Zhang X (2010) Linking search tasks with low-level eye movement patterns. ACM, ECCE '10, pp 109–116
- Cole MJ, Gwizdka J, Liu C, Bierig R, Belkin NJ, Zhang X (2011) Task and user effects on reading patterns in information search. *Interacting with Computers* 23(4):346 – 362
- Craswell N, Zoeter O, Taylor M, Ramsey B (2008) An experimental comparison of click position-bias models. ACM, WSDM '08, pp 87–94
- Granka LA, Joachims T, Gay G (2004) Eye-tracking analysis of user behavior in www search. ACM, SIGIR '04, pp 478–479
- Guan D, Zhang S, Yang H (2013) Utilizing query change for session search. ACM, SIGIR '13, pp 453–462
- Huang J, Efthimiadis EN (2009) Analyzing and evaluating query reformulation strategies in web search logs. ACM, CIKM '09, pp 77–86
- Jansen BJ, Spink A, Pedersen J (2005) A temporal comparison of altavista web searching: Research articles. *J Am Soc Inf Sci Technol* 56(6):559–570

- Jansen BJ, Booth DL, Spink A (2009) Patterns of query reformulation during web searching. *J Am Soc Inf Sci Technol* 60(7):1358–1371
- Jiang J, He D, Allan J (2014) Searching, browsing, and clicking in a search session: Changes in user behavior by task and over time. *ACM, SIGIR '14*, pp 607–616
- Jin X, Sloan M, Wang J (2013) Interactive exploratory search for multi page search results. In: *WWW '13*
- Joachims T, Granka L, Pan B, Hembrooke H, Gay G (2005) Accurately interpreting clickthrough data as implicit feedback. *ACM, SIGIR '05*, pp 154–161
- Kanoulas E, Carterette B, Hall M, Clough P, Sanderson M (2011) Overview of the trec 2011 session track. In: *TREC'11*
- Kanoulas E, Carterette B, Hall M, Clough P, Sanderson M (2012) Overview of the trec 2012 session track. In: *TREC'12*
- Kanoulas E, Carterette B, Hall M, Clough P, Sanderson M (2013) Overview of the trec 2013 session track. In: *TREC'13*
- Kim Y, Hassan A, White RW, Zitouni I (2014) Modeling dwell time to predict click-level satisfaction. *ACM, WSDM '14*, pp 193–202
- Kinley K, Tjondronegoro D, Partridge H, Edwards S (2012) Human-computer interaction: The impact of users' cognitive styles on query reformulation behaviour during web searching. *ACM, OzCHI '12*, pp 299–307
- Liu C, Gwizdka J, Liu J, Xu T, Belkin NJ (2010) Analysis and evaluation of query reformulations in different task types. In: *ASIST '10*
- Liu J, Belkin NJ (2010) Personalizing information retrieval for multi-session tasks: The roles of task stage and task type. In: *SIGIR '10*
- Liu Y, Miao J, Zhang M, Ma S, Ru L (2011) How do users describe their information need: Query recommendation based on snippet click model. *Expert Systems with Applications* 38(11):13,847 – 13,856
- Liu Y, Wang C, Zhou K, Nie J, Zhang M, Ma S (2014) From skimming to reading: A two-stage examination model for web search. *ACM, CIKM '14*, pp 849–858
- Marchionini G (2006) Exploratory search: From finding to understanding. *Commun ACM* 49(4):41–46
- Porter MF (1997) Readings in information retrieval. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., chap An Algorithm for Suffix Stripping, pp 313–316
- Robertson S, Zaragoza H (2009) The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Found Trends Inf Retr* 3(4):333–389
- Song R, Luo Z, Nie JY, Yu Y, Hon HW (2009) Identification of ambiguous queries in web search. *Inf Process Manage* 45(2):216–229
- Sparck Jones K (1988) Document retrieval systems. Taylor Graham Publishing, chap A Statistical Interpretation of Term Specificity and Its Application in Retrieval, pp 132–142
- White RW, Drucker SM (2007) Investigating behavioral variability in web search. *WWW '07*, pp 21–30