Evaluating information content by factoid analysis: human annotation and stability

Simone Teufel
Computer Laboratory
Cambridge University, UK

Hans van Halteren
Language and Speech
University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Abstract

We present a new approach to intrinsic summary evaluation, based on initial experiments in van Halteren and Teufel (2003), which combines two novel aspects: comparison of information content (rather than string similarity) in gold standard and system summary, measured in shared atomic information units which we call *factoids*, and comparison to more than one gold standard summary (in our data: 20 and 50 summaries respectively). In this paper, we show that factoid annotation is highly reproducible, introduce a weighted factoid score, estimate how many summaries are required for stable system rankings, and show that the factoid scores cannot be sufficiently approximated by unigrams and the DUC information overlap measure.

1 Introduction

Many researchers in summarisation believe that the best way to evaluate a summary is extrinsic evaluation (Spärck Jones, 1999): to measure the quality of the summary on the basis of degree of success in executing a specific task with that summary. The summary evaluation performed in SUMMAC (Mani et al., 1999) followed that strategy. However, extrinsic evaluations are time-consuming to set up and can thus not be used for the day-to-day evaluation needed during system development. So in practice, a method for intrinsic evaluation is needed, where the properties of the summary itself are examined, independently of its application.

Intrinsic evaluation of summary quality is undeniably hard, as there are two subtasks of summarisation which need to be evaluated, information selection and text production — in fact these two subtasks are often separated in evaluation (Mani, 2001). If we restrict our attention to information selection, systems are tested by way of comparison against a "gold standard", a manually produced result which is supposed to be the "correct", "true" or "best" result.

In summarisation there appears to be no "one truth", but rather various "good" results. Human subjectivity in what counts as the most important information is high. This is evidenced by low agreement on sentence selection tasks (Rath et al., 1961; Jing et al., 1998), and low word overlap measures in the task of creating summaries by reformulation in the summarisers' own words (e.g. word overlap of the 542 single document summary pairs in DUC-02 averaged only 47%).

But even though the non-existence of any one gold standard is generally acknowledged in the summarisation community, actual practice nevertheless ignores this, mostly due to the expense of compiling summary gold standards and the lack of composite measures for comparison to more than one gold standard.

Other fields such as information retrieval (IR) also have to deal with human variability concerning the question of what "relevant to a query" means. This problem is circumvented by extensive sampling: many different queries are collected to level out the differences in query formulation and relevance judgements. Voorhees (2000) shows that the relative rankings of IR systems are stable across annotators even though relevance judgements differ significantly between humans. Similarly, in MT, the recent BLEU metric (Papineni et al., 2001) also uses the idea that one gold standard is not enough. Their ngram-based metric derived from four reference translations of 40 general news stories shows high correlation with human judgement.

Lin and Hovy (2002) examine the use of ngram-based multiple gold standards for summarisation evaluation, and conclude "we need more than one model summary although we cannot estimate how many model summaries are required to achieve reliable automated sum-

mary evaluation". In this paper, we explore the differences and similarities between various human summaries in order to create a basis for such an estimate and examine the degree of difference between the use of a single summary gold standard and the use of a consensus gold standard for two sample texts, based on 20 and 50 summaries respectively.

The second aspect we examine is the similarity measure which compares system and gold standard summaries. In principle, the comparison can be done via co-selection of extracted sentences (Rath et al., 1961; Jing et al., 1998), by string-based surface measures (Lin and Hovy, 2002), or by subjective judgements of the amount of information overlap (DUC, 2002). String-based metrics are superior to sentence co-selection, as co-selection cannot take similar or even identical information into account if it does not occur in the sentences which were chosen. The choice of information overlap judgements as the main metric in DUC reflects the intuition that human judgements of shared "meaning" of two texts should in principle be superior to surface-based similarity.

DUC assessors judge the informational overlap between "model units" (elementary discourse units (EDUs), i.e. clause-like units, taken from the gold standard summary) and "peer units" (sentences taken from the participating summaries) on the basis of the question: "How much of the information in a model unit is contained in a peer unit: 100%, 80%, 60%, 40%, 20%, 0%?" Weighted recall measures report how much gold standard information is present in the summaries.

However, information overlap judgement is not something humans seem to be good at, either. Lin and Hovy (2002) show the instability of the evaluation, expressed in system rankings. They also examined those cases where annotators incidentally had to judge a given model–peer pair more than once (because different systems returned the same "peer" sentence). In those cases, assessors agreed with their own prior judgement in only 82% of the cases.

We propose a novel gold standard comparison based on factoids. Identifying factoids in text is a more objective task than judging information overlap à la DUC. Our annotation experiments show high human agreement on the factoid annotation task. We believe this is due to the way how factoids are defined, and due to our precise guidelines. The factoid measure also allows

quantification of the specific elements of information overlap, rather than just giving a quantitative judgement expressed in percentages.

In an example from Lin and Hovy (2002), a DUC assessor judged *some* content overlap between *"Thousands of people are feared dead"* and *"3,000 and perhaps … 5,000 people have been killed."* In our factoid representation, a distinction between "killed" and "feared dead" would be made, and different numbers of people mentioned would have been differentiated. Thus, the factoid approach can capture much finer shades of meaning differentiation than DUC-style information overlap does. Futhermore, it can provide feedback to system builders on the exact information their systems fail to include or include superfluously.

We describe factoid analysis in section 2, a method for comparison of the information content of different summaries of the same texts, and describe our method for measuring agreement and present results in section 3. We then investigate the distribution of factoids across the summaries in our data sets in section 4, and define a weighted factoid score in section 5. In that section, we also perform stability experiments, to test whether rankings of system summaries remain stable if fewer than all summaries which we have available are used, and compare weighted factoid scores to other summary evaluation metrics.

2 Data and factoid annotation

We use two texts: a 600-word BBC report on the killing of the Dutch politician Pim Fortuyn (as used in van Halteren and Teufel (2003)), which contains a mix of factual information and personal reactions, and a 573-word article on the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait (used in DUC-2002, LA080290-0233).

For these two texts, we collected human written generic summaries of roughly 100 words. Our guidelines asked the human subjects to formulate the summary in their own words, in order to elicit different linguistic expressions for the same information. Knowledge about the variability of expression is important both for evaluation and system building.

The Fortuyn text was summarised by 40 Dutch students[1], and 10 NLP researchers (native or near-native English speakers), resulting in a total of 50 summaries. For the Kuwait text,

---

[1]Another 20 summaries of the same source were removed due to insufficient English or excessive length.

we used the 6 DUC-provided summaries, 17 ELSNET-02 student participants (7 summaries removed), and summaries by 4 additional researchers, resulting in a total of 20 summaries.

We use atomic semantic units called *factoids* to represent the meaning of a sentence. For instance, we represent the sentence *"The police have arrested a white Dutch man"* by the union of the following factoids:

```
FP20   A suspect was arrested
FP21   The police did the arresting
FP24   The suspect is white
FP25   The suspect is Dutch
FP26   The suspect is male
```

Factoids are defined empirically based on the data in the set of summaries we work with. Factoid definition starts with the comparison of the information contained in two summaries, and gets refined (factoids get added or split) as incrementally other summaries are considered. If two pieces of information occur together in all summaries – and within the same sentence – they are treated as one factoid, because differentiation into more than one factoid would not help us in distinguishing the summaries. In our data, there must have been at least one summary that contained either only FP25 or only FP26 – otherwise those factoids would have been combined into a single factoid "FP27 The suspect is a Dutch man". Factoids are labelled with descriptions in natural language; initially, these are close in wording to the factoid's occurrence in the first summaries, though the annotator tries to identify and treat equally paraphrases of the factoid information when they occur in other summaries.

Our definition of atomicity implies that the "amount" of information associated with one factoid can vary from a single word to an entire sentence. An example for a large chunk of information that occurred atomically in our texts was the fact that Fortuyn wanted to become PM (FV71), a factoid which covers an entire sentence. On the other hand, a single word may break down into more than one factoids.

If (together with various statements in other summaries) one summary contains "was killed" and another "was shot dead", we identify the factoids

```
FA10   There was an attack
FA40   The victim died
FA20   A gun was used
```

The first summary contains only the first two factoids, whereas the second contains all three. That way, the semantic similarity between related sentences can be expressed.

When we identified factoids in our summary collections, most factoids turned out to be independent of each other. But when dealing with naturally occuring documents many difficult cases appear, e.g. ambiguous expressions, slight differences in numbers and meaning, and inference.

Another difficult phenomenon is attribution. In both source texts, quotations of the reactions of several politicians and officials are given, and the subjects often generalised these reactions and produced statements such as *"Dutch as well as international politicians have expressed their grief and disbelief."* Due to coordination of speakers (in the subject) and coordination of reactions (in the direct object), it is hard to accurately represent the attribution of opinions. We therefore introduce combinatorical factoids, such as " OG40 Politicians expressed grief" and "OS62 International persons/organizations expressed disbelief" which can be combined with similar factoids to express the above sentence.

We wrote guidelines (10 pages long) which describe how to derive factoids from texts. The guidelines cover questions such as: how to create generalising factoids when numerical values vary (summaries might talk about "200", "about 200" or "almost 200 Kuwaitis were killed"), how to create factoids dealing with attribution of opinion, and how to deal with coordination of NPs in subject position, cataphors and other syntactic constructions. We believe that written guidelines should contain all the rules by which this process is done; this is the only way that other annotators, who do not have access to all the discussions the original annotators had, can replicate the annotation with a high agreement. We therefore consider the guidelines as one of the most valuable outcomes of this exercise, and we will make them and our annotated material generally available.

The advantage of our empirical, summary-set-dependent definition of factoid atomicity is that the annotation is more objective than if factoids had to be invented by intuition of semantic constructions from scratch. One possible disadvantage of our definition of atomicity is that the set of factoids used may have to be adjusted if new summaries are judged, as a required factoid might be missing, or an existing one might require splitting. Using a large number of gold-standard summaries for the definition of factoids decreases the likelihood of this

happening.

3 Agreement

In our previous work, a "definitive" list of factoids was given (created by one author), and we were interested in whether annotators could consistently mark the text with the factoids contained in this list. In the new annotation cycle reported on here, we study the process of factoid lists creation, which is more time-consuming. We will discuss agreement in factoid annotation first, as it is a more straightforward concept, even though procedurally, factoids are first *defined* (cf. section 3.2) and then *annotated* (cf. section 3.1).

3.1 Agreement of factoid annotation

Assuming that we already have the right list of factoids available, factoid annotation of a 100 word summary takes roughly 10 minutes, and measuring agreement on the decision of assigning factoids to sentences is relatively straightforward. We calculate agreement in terms of Kappa, where the set of items to be classified are all factoid–summary combinations (e.g. in the case of Phase 1, N=153 factoids times 20 sentences = 2920), and where there are two categories, either 'factoid is present in summary (1)' or 'factoid is not present in summary (0)'. P(E), probability of error, is calculated on the basis of the distribution of the categories, whereas P(A), probability of agreement, is calculated as the average of observed to possible pairwise agreements per item. Kappa is calculated as $k = \frac{P(A)-P(E)}{1-P(E)}$; results for our two texts are given in Figure 1.

We measure agreement at two stages in the process: entirely independent annotation (Phase 1), and corrected annotation (Phase 2). In Phase 2, annotators see an automatically generated list of discrepancies with the other annotator, so that slips of attention can be corrected. Crucially, Phase 2 was conducted without any discussion. After Phase 2 measurement, discussion on the open points took place and a consensus was reached (which is used for the experiments in the rest of the paper).

Figure 1 includes results for the Fortuyn text as we have factoid–summary annotations by both annotators for both texts. The Kappa figures indicate high agreement, even in Phase 1 (K=.87 and K=.86); in Phase 2, Kappas are as high as .89 and .95. Note that there is a difference between the annotation of the Fortuyn

and the Kuwait text: in the Fortuyn case, there was no discussion or disclosure of any kind in Phase 1; one author created the factoids, and both used this list to annotate. The agreement of K=.86 was thus measured on entirely independent annotations, with no prior communication whatsoever. In the case of the Kuwait text, the prior step of finding a consensus factoid list had already taken place, including some discussion.

	Fortuyn text					
	K	N	k	n	P(A)	P(E)
Phase 1	.86	14178	2	2	.970	.787
Phase 2	.95	14178	2	2	.989	.779
	Kuwait text					
	K	N	k	n	P(A)	P(E)
Phase 1	.87	3060	2	2	.956	.670
Phase 2	.89	2940	2	2	.962	.663

Figure 1: Agreement of factoid annotation.

3.2 Agreement of factoid definition.

We realised during our previous work, where only one author created the factoids, that the task of defining factoids is a complicated process and that we should measure agreement on this task too (using the Kuwait text). Thus, we do not have this information for the Fortuyn text.

But how should the measurement of agreement on factoid creation proceed? It is difficult to find a fair measure of agreement over set operations like factoid splitting, particularly as the sets can contain a different set of summaries marked for each factoid. For instance, consider the following two sentences: (1) *M01-004 Saddam Hussein said ... that they will leave the country when the situation stabilizes.* and (2) *M06-004 Iraq claims it ... would withdraw soon.*

One annotator created a factoid "(P30) Saddam H/Iraq will leave the country soon/when situation stabilises" whereas the other annotator split this into two factoids (F9.21 and F9.22). Note that the annotators use their own, independently chosen factoid names.

Our procedure for annotation measurement is as follows. We create a list of identity and subsumption relations between factoids by the two annotators. In the example above, P30 would be listed as subsuming F9.21 and F9.22. It is time-consuming but necessary to create such a list, as we want to measure agreement only amongst those factoids which are semantically related. We use a program which maximises shared factoids between two summary sentences

	A1	A2		A1	A2
P30 ← F9.21 − a	1	1	P30 ← F9.22 − a	1	0
P30 ← F9.21 − b	0	0	P30 ← F9.22 − b	0	0
P30 ← F9.21 − c	1	0	P30 ← F9.22 − c	1	1
P30 ← F9.21 − d	0	0	P30 ← F9.22 − d	0	0
P30 ← F9.21 − e	1	0	P30 ← F9.22 − e	1	1

Figure 2: Items for kappa calculation.

to suggest such identities and subsumption relations.

We then calculate Kappa at Phases 1 and 2. It is not trivial to define what an 'item' in the Kappa calculation should be. Possibly the use of Krippendorff's alpha will provide a better approach (cf. Nenkova and Passonneau (2004)), but for now we measure using the better-known kappa, in the following way: For each equivalence between factoids A and C, create items { A – C – s | s ∈ S } (where S is the set of all summaries). For each factoid A subsumed by a set B of factoids, create items { A ← b – s | b ∈ B, s ∈ S}. For example, given 5 summaries a, b, c, d, e, Annotator A1 assigns P30 to summaries a, c and e. Annotator A2 (who has split P30 into F9.21 and F9.22), assigns a to F9.21 and c and e to F9.22. This creates the 10 items for Kappa calculation given in Figure 2.

Results for our data set are given in Figure 3. For Phase 1 of factoid definition, K=.7 indicates relatively good agreement (but lower than for the task of factoid annotation). Many of the disagreements can be reduced to slips of attention, as the increased Kappa of .81 for Phase 2 shows.

Overall, we can observe that this high agreement for both tasks points to the fact that the task can be robustly performed in naturally occurring text, without any copy-editing. Still, from our observations, it seems that the task of factoid annotation is easier than the task of factoid definition.

	Kuwait text				
	K	N	k	n	P(A)	P(E)
Phase 1	.70	3560	2	2	.91	.69
Phase 2	.81	3240	2	2	.94	.67

Figure 3: Agreement of factoid definition.

One of us then used the Kuwait consensus agreement to annotate the 16 machine summaries for that text which were created by different participants in DUC-2002, an annotation which could be done rather quickly. However, a small number of missing factoids were detected, for instance the (incorrect) factoid that Saudi Arabia was invaded, that the invasion happened on a Monday night, and that Kuwait City is Kuwait's only sizable town. Overall, the set of factoids available was considered adequate for the annotation of these new texts.


Figure 4: Average size of factoid inventory as a function of number of underlying summaries.

4 Growth of the factoid inventory

The more summaries we include in the analysis, the more factoids we identify. This growth of the factoid set stems from two factors. Different summarisers select different information and hence completely new factoids are introduced to account for information not yet seen in previous summaries. This factor also implies that the factoid inventory can never be complete as summarisers sometimes include information which is not actually in the original text. The second factor comes from splitting: when a new summary is examined, it often becomes necessary to split a single factoid into multiple factoids because only a certain part of it is included in the new summary. After the very first summary, each factoid is a full sentence, and these are gradually subdivided.

In order to determine how many factoids exist in a given set of N summaries, we simulate earlier stages of the factoid set by automatically re–merging those factoids which never occur apart within the given set of summaries.

Figure 4 shows the average number of factoids over 100 drawings of N different summaries from the whole set, which grows from 1.0 to about 4.5 for the Kuwait text (long curve) and about 4.1 for the Fortuyn text (short curve). The Kuwait curve shows a steeper incline, possibly due to the fact that the sentences in the Kuwait text

are longer. Given the overall growth for the total number of factoids and the number of factoids per sentence, it would seem that the splitting factors and the new information factor are equally productive.

Neither curve in Figure 4 shows signs that it might be approaching an assymptote. This confirms our earlier conclusion (van Halteren and Teufel, 2003) that many more summaries than 10 or 20 are needed for a full factoid inventory.[2]

5 Weighted factoid scores and stability

The main reason to do factoid analysis is to measure the quality of summaries, including machine summaries. In our previous work, we do this with a consensus summary. We are now investigating different weighting factors for the importance of factoids. Previously, the weighting factors we suggested were information content, position in the summaries and frequency. We investigated the latter two.

Each factoid we find in a summary to be evaluated contributes to the score of the summary, by an amount which reflects the perceived value of the factoid, what we will call the "weighted factoid score (WFS)". The main component in this value is frequency, i.e., the number of model summaries in which the factoid is observed.

When frequency weighting is used by itself, each factoid occurrence is worth one.[3] We could also assume that more important factoids are placed earlier in a summary, and that the frequency weight is adjusted on the basis of position. Experimentation is not complete, but the adjustments appear to influence the ranking only slightly. The results we present here are those using pure frequency weights.

We noted in our earlier paper that a good quality measure should demonstrate at least the following properties: a) it should reward inclusion in a summary of the information deemed

---

[2]It should be noted that the estimation in Figure 4 improves upon the original estimation in that paper, as the determination of number of factoids for that figure did not consider the splitting factor, but just counted the number of factoids as taken from the inventory at its highest granularity.

[3]This is similar to the relative utility measure introduced by Radev and Tam (2003), which however operates on sentences rather than factoids. It also corresponds to the pyramid measure proposed by Nenkova and Passonneau (2004), which also considers an estimation of the maximum value reachable. Here, we use no such maximum estimation as our comparisons will all be relative.


Figure 5: Correlation (Spearman's ρ) between summary rankings on the basis of two different sets of N summaries, for N between 1 and 50.

most important in the document and b) measures based on two factoid analyses constructed along the same lines should lead to the same, or at least very similar, ranking of a set of summaries which are evaluated. Since our measure rewards inclusion of factoids which are mentioned often and early, demand a) ought to be satisfied by construction.

For demand b), some experimentation is in order. For various numbers of summaries N, we take two samples of N summaries from the whole set (allowing repeats so that we can use N larger than the number of available summaries; a statistical method called 'bootstrap'). For each sample in a pair, we use the weighted factoid score with regard to that sample of N summaries to rank the summaries, and then determine the ranking correlation (Spearman's ρ) between the two rankings. The summaries that we rank here are the 20 human summaries of the Kuwait text, plus 16 machine summaries submitted for DUC-2002.

Figure 5 shows how the ranking correlation increases with N for the Kuwait text. Its mean value surpasses 0.8 at N=11 and 0.9 at N=19. At N=50, it is 0.98. What this means for the scores of individual summaries is shown in Figure 6, which contains a box plot for the scores for each summary as observed in the 200 drawings for N=50. The high ranking correlation and the reasonable stability of the scores shows that our measure fulfills demand b), at least at a high enough N. What could be worrying is the fact that the machine summaries (right of the dotted line) do not seem to be performing significantly worse than the human ones (left

Figure 6: Variation in summary scores in evaluations based on 200 different sets of 50 model summaries.

Figure 7: Variation in summary scores in evaluations based on 200 different sets of 10 model summaries.

of the line). However, an examination of the better scoring machine summaries show that in this particular case, their information content is indeed good. The very low human scores appear to be cases of especially short summaries (including one DUC summariser) and/or summaries with a deviating angle on the story.

It has been suggested in DUC circles that a lower N should suffice. That even a value as high as 10 is insufficient is already indicated by the ranking correlation of only 0.76. It becomes even clearer with Figure 7, which mirrors Figure 6 but uses N=10. The scores for the summaries vary wildly, which means that ranking is almost random.

Of course, the suggestion might be made that the system ranking will most likely also be stabilised by scoring summaries for more texts,

even with such a low (or even lower) N per text. However, in that case, the measure only yields information at the macro level: it merely gives an ordering between systems. A factoid-based measure with a high N also yields feedback on a micro level: it can show system builders which vital information they are missing and which superfluous information they are including. We expect this feedback only to be reliable at the same order of N at which single-text-based scoring starts to stabilise, i.e. around 20 to 30.

As the average ranking correlation between two weighted factoid score rankings based on 20 summaries is 0.91, we could assume that the ranking based on our full set of 20 different summaries should be an accurate ranking. If we compare it to the DUC information overlap rankings for this text, we find that the individual rankings for D086, D108 and D110 have correlations with our ranking of 0.50, 0.64 and 0.79. When we average over the three, this goes up to 0.83.

In van Halteren and Teufel (2003), we compared a consensus summary based on the top-scoring factoids with unigram scores. For the 50 Fortuyn summaries, we calculate the F-measure for the included factoids with regard to the consensus summary. In a similar fashion, we build a consensus unigram list, containing the 103 unigrams that occur in at least 11 summaries, and calculate the F-measure for unigrams. The correlation between those two scores was low (Spearman's $\rho = 0.45$). We concluded from this experiment that unigrams, though much cheaper, are not a viable substitute for factoids.

6 Discussion and future work

We have presented a new information-based summarization metric called weighted factoid score, which uses multiple summaries as gold standard and which measures information overlap, not string overlap. It can be reliably and objectively annotated in arbitrary text, which is shown by our high values for human agreement.

We summarise our results as follows: Factoids can be defined with high agreement by independently operating annotators in naturally occurring text (K=.70) and independently annotated with even higher agreement (K=.86 and .87). Therefore, we consider the definition of factoids intuitive and reproducible.

The number of factoids found if new summaries are considered does not tail off, but weighting of factoids by frequency and/or lo-

cation in the summary allows for a stable summary metric. We expect this can be improved further by including an information content weighting factor.

If single summaries are used as gold standard (as many other summarization evaluations do), the correlation between rankings based on two such gold standard summaries can be expected to be low; in our two experiments, the correlations were ρ=0.20 and 0.48 on average. According to our estimations, stability with respect to the factoid scores can only be expected if a larger number of summaries are collected (in the range of 20–30 summaries).

System rankings based on the factoid score shows only low correlation with rankings based on a) DUC-based information overlap, and b) unigrams, a measurement based on shared words between gold standard summaries and system summary. As far as b) is concerned, this is expected, as factoid comparison abstracts over wording and captures linguistic variation of the same meaning. However, the ROUGE measure currently in development is considering various n-grams and Wordnet-based paraphrasing options (Lin, personal communication). We expect that this measure has the potential for better ranking correlation with factoid ranking, and we are currently investigating this.

We also plan to expand our data sets to more texts, in order to investigate the presence and distribution of factoids, types of factoids and relations between factoids in summaries and summary collections. Currently, we have two large factoid-annotated data sets with 20 and 50 summaries, and a workable procedure to annotate factoids, including guidelines which were used to achieve good agreement. We now plan to elicit the help of new annotators to increase our data pool.

Another pressing line of investigation is reducing the cost of factoid analysis. The first reason why this analysis is currently expensive is the need for large summary bases for consensus summaries. Possibly this can be circumvented by using larger numbers of different texts, as is the case in IR and in MT, where discrepancies prove to average out when large enough datasets are used. The second reason is the need for human annotation of factoids. Although simple word-based methods prove insufficient, we expect that existing and emerging NLP techniques based on deeper processing might help with automatic factoid identification.

All in all, the use of factoid analysis and weighted factoid score, even though initially expensive to set up, provides a promising alternative which could well bring us closer to a solution to several problems in summarisation evaluation.

References

DUC. 2002. *Document Understanding Conference (DUC)*. Electronic proceedings, `http://www-nlpir.nist.gov/projects/duc/pubs.html`.

Jing, H., R. Barzilay, K. R. McKeown, and M. Elhadad. 1998. Summarization Evaluation Methods: Experiments and Analysis. In *Working Notes of the AAAI Spring Symposium on Intelligent Text Summarization*, 60–68.

Lin, C., and E. Hovy. 2002. Manual and automatic evaluation of summaries. In DUC 2002.

Mani, I. 2001. *Automatic Summarization*. John Benjamins.

Mani, I., T. Firmin, D. House, G. Klein, B. Sundheim, and L. Hirschman. 1999. The TIPSTER Summac Text Summarization Evaluation. In *Proceedings of EACL-99*, 77–85.

Nenkova, A., and R. Passonneau. 2004. Evaluating Content Selection in Summarization: the Pyramid Method. In *Proceedings of NAACL/HLT-2003*.

Papineni, K, S. Roukos, T Ward, and W-J. Zhu. 2001. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of ACL-02*, 311–318.

Radev, D., and D. Tam. 2003. Summarization evaluation using relative utility. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, 508–511.

Rath, G.J, A. Resnick, and T. R. Savage. 1961. The Formation of Abstracts by the Selection of Sentences. *American Documentation* 12(2): 139–143.

Spärck Jones, K. 1999. Automatic Summarising: Factors and Directions. In I. Mani and M. Maybury, eds., *Advances in Automatic Text Summarization*, 1–12. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

van Halteren, H., and S. Teufel. 2003. Examining the consensus between human summaries: initial experiments with factoid analysis. In *Proceedings of the HLT workshop on Automatic Summarization*.

Voorhees, E. 2000. Variations in relevance judgements and the measurement of retrieval effectiveness. *Information Processing and Management* 36: 697–716.