

# Eyes are the Windows to the Soul: Predicting the Rating of **Text Quality Using Gaze Behaviour**

## Introduction

#### Aim:

To predict the rating of different properties of text quality using text and gaze features.

#### **Eye-Tracking Terminology:**

- Interest Area A part of the screen which is of interest.
- 2. Fixation When the reader focuses on the screen.
- 3. Saccade Movement of the eye from one fixation to the next.
- 4. Regression Saccade to an earlier fixation.

#### **Properties:**

- Organization How well-structured the text is.
- Coherence How much sense the text makes.
- 3. Cohesion How well-connected the text is.

Each of these are scored on a scale of 1 to 4.

#### **Text Quality Rating:**

Sum of the organization, coherence and cohesion scores, scaled to a range of 1 to 10.

Quality = Organization + Coherence + Cohesion - 2

### **Dataset Details**

#### **Details of Texts:**

- 1. No. of texts = 30
- 2. Size of texts = 200 words (approximately)
- 3. Source of texts: Simple English Wikipedia (10 articles), online news articles (12 articles), Wikipedia (8 articles)

#### **Details of Annotators:**

- Number of annotators = 20
- 2. Age of annotators = 20 to 25

#### **Scoring details:**

- Scoring Range: 1 to 4
- 2. Inter-Annotator Agreement Metric: Gwet's AC2<sup>[4]</sup>

| Property     | Full  | Overall |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Organization | 0.610 | 0.519   |
| Coherence    | 0.688 | 0.633   |
| Cohesion     | 0.675 | 0.614   |
|              |       |         |

**Table**: Inter-Annotator Agreement (Gwet's AC2)<sup>[4]</sup> for the different properties – organization, coherence and cohesion. Quality score is calculated from these 3 properties. Full means participants who fully understood the text. Overall is without considering comprehension of the text.

Sandeep Mathias<sup>1</sup>, Diptesh Kanojia<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Kevin Patel<sup>1</sup>, Samarth Agrawal<sup>1</sup>, Abhijit Mishra<sup>4</sup>, Pushpak Bhattacharyya<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>CSE Department, IIT Bombay; <sup>2</sup>IITB-Monash Research Academy; <sup>3</sup>Monash University, Australia; <sup>4</sup>IBM Research, India

# Method

"Ronald Reagan was elected President in 1980. He defeated Jimmy Carter by winning 44 out of the 50 American states. During the Reagan Era, the country was facing through inflation, a bad economy, and the American foreign policy was not as good. When Ronald Reagan became president, he signed the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 which helped During Reagan's presidency, he also helped expand the American military. This also created more jobs, but also raised the deficit

In 1984, Reagan won in a major landslide by winning 49 out of the 50 American states. During his second term, Reagan focused on ending the Cold War. Reagan met four times with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, and their summit conferences led to the signing of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

Also during his second term, Reagan's Invasion of Grenada and bombing of Libya were popular in the US, though his backing of the Contras rebels was mired in the controversy over the Iran-Contra affair that revealed Reagan's poor ent style. Liberals are annoyed by the Reagan Era, while conservatives extremely like it and thought it was the

**Figure:** Sample text showing fixations, saccades and regressions. The circles denote fixations, and the lines are saccades. This is the output from SR Research Data Viewer software.

### **Collection of Gaze Data:**

- 1. The reader reads a text, and answers 2 comprehension questions about the text.
- 2. The reader then scores the text for organization, coherence and cohesion.
- The quality score of the text is got by adding the scores of each of the individual properties, and subtracting 2 from the sum.

The gaze features are collected using the SR-Research Eye-Tracker.

### Features

#### **Text-Based Features**

- 1. Length-based features
- 2. Complexity features
- 3. Stylistic features
- Word embeddings<sup>[5]</sup>
- Language modeling features
- Sequence features

#### Entity grid<sup>[1]</sup> features

### Evaluation Method: 70% Training & 30% Testing data split Classifier Used: Feed-forward neural network<sup>[2]</sup> Number of Epochs: 10000

#### **Gaze-Based Features**

- Fixation features
- 1. First Fixation Duration
- 2. Second Fixation Duration
- Last Fixation Duration
- 4. Dwell Time
- 5. Fixation Count
- Regression features
- 1. IsRegression
- 2. Regression Count
- 3. Regression Duration
- Interest area features 1. Run Count 2. Skip Count

Property Organizati Coherence Cohesion Quality

**Table**: *Results for the three feature sets on different properties.* 

Property

Organizatio

Coherence

Cohesion

Quality

Property Organizatio Coherence Cohesion Quality

141–148.

### Results

|     | Text  | Gaze  | Text + Gaze |  |
|-----|-------|-------|-------------|--|
| ion | 0.237 | 0.394 | 0.563       |  |
| e   | 0.261 | 0.285 | 0.550       |  |
|     | 0.120 | 0.229 | 0.451       |  |
|     | 0.230 | 0.304 | 0.552       |  |

|     | Comprehension | Text  | Gaze  | Text + Gaze |
|-----|---------------|-------|-------|-------------|
| ion | Full          | 0.319 | 0.319 | 0.563       |
|     | Partial       | 0.115 | 0.179 | 0.283       |
| е   | Full          | 0.255 | 0.385 | 0.601       |
|     | Partial       | 0.365 | 0.343 | 0.446       |
|     | Full          | 0.313 | 0.519 | 0.638       |
|     | Partial       | 0.161 | 0.155 | 0.230       |
|     | Full          | 0.216 | 0.624 | 0.645       |
|     | Partial       | 0.161 | 0.476 | 0.581       |
|     |               |       |       |             |

**Table**: Results for the three feature sets on different properties categorized on the basis of reader comprehension.

|     | Fixation | Regression | Interest Area |  |  |  |
|-----|----------|------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| ion | -0.102   | -0.017     | -0.103        |  |  |  |
| е   | -0.049   | -0.077     | -0.088        |  |  |  |
|     | -0.015   | -0.040     | 0.037         |  |  |  |
|     | 0.002    | 0.016      | -0.056        |  |  |  |

**Table:** *Difference* in *QWK*<sup>[3]</sup> scores when ablating each of the gaze behavior feature sets.



Texts with lots of fixations and regressions, as well as longer fixations and regressions tend to have lower scores, because the reader has to spend more time and effort in understanding it, compared to texts that are better written.

## **Conclusions and Future Work**

#### **Conclusions:**

1. Gaze features help in better prediction of subjective properties of text, like organization, coherence, cohesion and quality.

2. Gaze features are more reliable if we take into account the reader's comprehension of the text.

#### **Future Work:**

Using multi-task learning<sup>[6]</sup> in estimating gaze features and using those estimated features in our predictions.



[1] Regina Barzilay and Mirella Lapata. 2005. Modeling Local Coherence: An Entity-based Approach. In Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics.

[2] George Bebis and Michael Georgiopoulos. 1994. Feed-forward Neural Networks. *IEEE Potentials* 13(4):27–31.

3] Jacob Cohen. 1968. Weighted Kappa: Nominal Scale Agreement Provision for Scaled Disagreement or Partial Credit. Psychological Bulletin 70(4):213. [4] Kilem L Gwet. 2014. Handbook of Inter-rater Reliability: The Definitive Guide to Measuring the Extent of Agreement Among Raters. Advanced Analytics, LLC. [5] Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. 2013. Distributed Representations of Words and Phrases and their Compositionality. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. 3111–3119.

[6] Abhijit Mishra, Srikanth Tamilselvam, Riddhiman Dasgupta, Seema Nagar, and Kuntal Dey. 2018. Cognition-cognizant Sentiment Analysis with Multi-task Subjectivity Summarization Based on Annotators Gaze Behaviour. In Proceedings of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. 5884–5891.



**Figure:** *Relation between some of the different gaze features and the* score. The gaze features are (a) Regression Duration, (b) Second Fixation Duration, (c) Fixation Count and (d) Run Count.

Presented at the 56<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2018) on July 18, 2018.