Quality and Reliability of Network Community Information from User's Perspective

Xie Hui

Dongfang College, Shandong University of Finance and Economics, Tai'an, Shandong, 271000, China

xiehuisd@126.com

Keywords: User's perspective, network community, information quality, reliability.

Abstract: Based on the user's perspective, the research and evaluation of the quality and reliability of the network community information cannot be separated from the support of the grounded theory coding method. Usually, when users evaluate the quality and reliability of the network community information, only a single or a few evaluation indicators are used. The indicators used to evaluate the quality of community information and reliability differently. But now, users often use negative indicators as the first choice in the evaluation process. This paper discusses the quality and reliability of information in the network community, selects the evaluation index, determines the evaluation method, and effectively demonstrates the information quality and reliability of the network community based on the user's perspective.

1. Introduction

Under the current social environment, the user's network participation is relatively high, and the network community, such as micro-blog, bean petal and post bar, is also very active. For most network users, they not only produce network information, but also participate in the communication process of network information. Users often rely on their own cognition and experience to evaluate the quality of network information, and then affect their own information behavior. When studying the spread and diffusion of network information, we should scientifically evaluate the quality and reliability of information in the network community based on the user perspective, so that we can have a clear understanding of the development of Internet public opinion, so as to achieve the construction of related guidance mechanism.

2. Network community information quality and reliability

Usually, the researchers will use the long-term quality as the main definition of information reliability. When evaluating the quality of information, it is inseparable from the important index of reliability. Some researchers evaluate the reliability of the message through the judgement from the receiver, others define the information quality by user standard, and think that information has the characteristics of excellence or reality. In the process of concrete practice, the quality of information often depends on whether it is accurate, timely, and whether it is valuable to the user.

It is assumed that the quality of information is distinguished from the reliability of information, and its reliability depends mainly on whether it is credible or not. The related research holds that reliability is a comprehensive concept, which includes objective, accurate, good faith and many other aspects. For people with a higher reputation, the message it conveys is often a carefully screened, reliable [1].

In short, information content is the key factor to evaluate the quality of the network community information, and the reliability of the network community needs to pay attention to the information source. Therefore, in order to ensure the quality of data processing, we need to pay attention to information content when evaluating the quality and reliability of information in the network community based on user perspective, and reliability evaluation is based on the publisher itself.

3. Grounded theory

The application of the theoretical research method is more common. The specific implementation means by collecting, analyzing data and relying on established application methods to generate theoretical summary applicable to the field. The researchers can systematically analyze qualitative data through the root theory. In this process, we need to experience open, axial and selective three - level coding programs. Researchers often filter the key concepts in the first level coding, make them clear by annotation, and then extract the two level coding by testing, and get the three level coding. The evaluation of the quality and reliability of the network community information from the user's perspective is the [2] that is realized through this theory.

4. Design research project

4.1 Choice of evaluation index

Usually, the users are often limited by the constraints of the network environment and their own subjective factors, and the scope is very easy to define. People who have access to the Internet know that the information characteristics of the network community are related to the information publisher in addition to their own information content. The evaluation of the information quality of the network community refers to the evaluation of the information content, and the evaluation of the reliability of the information is the evaluation of the information publisher. The background, to obtain experimental data without trouble, can be obtained easily.

Based on the user perspective, to evaluate the network community information quality evaluation index, including information is accurate, comprehensive, objective, specific, effective and diverse; evaluation of information reliability, the index involved including the author's reputation, rationality, fairness, evidence of [3].

4.2 Determination of research methods

(1) Collection of data

The community web site, for example, was founded in March 2005. It is a very characteristic website on the Web2.0 website. It provides various services such as books, video recommendation, offline city activities, group discussion and so on. It combines taste, expression and communication, and is widely praised by users. In the second, third quarter of 2013, the number of independent users was 200 million. The core user group is urban youth with good educational background, including white collar and college students. Both the quality of the user and the loyalty of the user are high. After analysis and consideration, this article carefully selects the two plates of the bean film and the reading of the bean, and evaluates the information quality and reliability of the network community. Through information collection, a total of 15320 messages are collected.

(2) Processing data

First, the first level code. It is mainly used to identify the key concepts. Specific operation method is a new document, the copy of the collected information resources, and the author to the document, and combining with the research scope, marking key concepts, selection of key data, after the screening as a judge of the quality and reliability of the network community information basis. After the completion of the screening, there are 2541 pieces of information about the quality and reliability of the information published their own views and views [4].

Second, the two level code. Its role is to build a coding system that is related to the quality and reliability of the network community information. The grounded theory method to play a role in the encoding process, the specific operation method is focus on the part of the message, through the analysis and evaluation, the network community information quality and reliability index definition, have clear knowledge and understanding, taking this as the background, implementation of construction of encoding system. In the past researches, the index used by users is relatively limited and specific. In this study, we neglect this point and reestablish the coding system.

Third, third level coding. Depending on the known coding system, the obtained data are re coded

according to the actual situation. This process is very professional and relatively complex. The evaluation work is carried out with the help of the members of the group, which is based on the daily use of the users, and after the coding standard is completed. In this context, there is a need for a unified coding standard and evaluation index [5].

After screening the remaining 2541 messages, together with the members of the group, the message is initially coded, the coding results are obtained, and they are tagged. After the first round of coding, people exchange data and carry out two coding. After the above operation, the results of the two codes are compared, and the differences are checked for many times, and the differences are eliminated through communication and demonstration. In this process, there may be differences such as the description of network community information such as "correctness" or "trustworthiness". These all need to be discussed, to get an accurate evaluation index. At the same time, in order to make the code more scientific and reliable, it is necessary to delete some ambiguous information. The three level coding is a complex work. During the operation, we need to check the code many times, making it more concise and concise, ensuring that the code can express the data accurately, and there is no ambiguity.

Finally, a descriptive statistical method is selected to analyze the data to ensure the scientificity and accuracy of the evaluation results. By counting the number of Posts and the percentage of participants, the percentage of users' evaluation indicators, we can record and count the indicators that are frequently used or frequently used.

5. Research results

After the completion of the network data collection, it also needs to be processed. A total of the encoded messages obtained in this process 2234. Among them, 1211 pieces of information related to the film of the bean were related to 1023 pieces of information related to the reading of the bean flap. In the execution of the statistics, we learned that, whether it was a bean film or a watercress reading, there were some publishers who wrote only one message. The results show that when users participate in online community activities or online topic interaction, the number of information generated is limited, and only a small number of users will publish a lot of information.

The network community has the characteristics of openness and virtuality, so the user often has the consciousness of defense and self protection in the process of participation, and the degree of trust is low. Compared with the positive standards, they often do the opposite and choose negative standards to evaluate the quality and reliability of network community information.

5.1 Evaluation of information quality

Analysis of relevant indicators through the evaluation of the quality of information related to the process of understanding, to the highest frequency of use of the evaluation index is whether comprehensive or special information; information quality evaluation in the process of using the lowest frequency index is the specific information or not; at the same time, in this process, users will ignore the use of certain evaluation index. The above contents fully explain the evaluation of the information quality of the network community from the user perspective. Only a few key indicators are applied in the process, and not every index will be involved. Whether it is a watercress or a watercress reading, users will choose a negative evaluation standard [6].

5.2 Evaluation of information reliability

From the user perspective evaluation of network community information and information quality based on reliability. When evaluating the reliability of information, users still take the negative standard as the primary choice. Among them, the more frequent evaluation indicators have the identifiability, the reputation of the publisher and the professional or not. By analyzing the research process and summarizing the research results, we can find that when evaluating publishers' reliability, they will rely on additional evaluation indicators such as honesty, expressive power and persuasiveness.

5.3 Demonstration of the relationship between information quality and information reliability

When analyzing the quality and reliability of the network community information from the user's perspective, in order to ensure the centrality of the data, there is no single statistics for each topic. For example, the number of information quality and information reliability evaluation indexes is 300 times at the same time, and the frequency is only 10 or 10 times, so as to ensure the accuracy and centrality of the research results. In this process, the author can apply the author's reputation, persuasiveness and dishonesty to the evaluation of the quality of information content.

The evaluation of the information quality of the network community is not easy, and it needs comprehensive and comprehensive consideration of all the indicators. In this process, the information bias by the author's reputation, persuasive and other indicators, if the user of the information that a lack of trust, its content is debatable, so the author's credibility and persuasion will be affected; the false information is directly related to the publisher's reputation, users often through false information that the publisher dishonest, thus affecting the reputation of the publisher; if users questioned the professional information, or that it is not convincing enough, that information is not professional, it is difficult to convince users to publish.

Evaluation of the reliability of the information, the information will be useless and the publisher of the bad reputation considerations on the same interface, if issued without a good reputation, its information content value will be reduced; if the publisher can not objectively treat certain information subject, its release content will be due to subjective, incidental color prejudice the publisher; there is no evidence, lack of information content authenticity, the two links can fully explain the evidence to determine the importance of information is true or not; the publisher is not professional, reputation can not be guaranteed, professional information content will be questioned, it weakened the reliability of the publisher. Therefore, by evaluating the quality and reliability of the network community information from the perspective of the user, the evaluation index applied in this process is very small [7].

6. Conclusions

In summary, this paper defines the reliability based on user perspective on community information quality and information network, to know whether the quality of information, or information content quality, among them are common; the reliability of the information depends largely on the publisher is not reliable, the two are closely related; Internet users in daily process, often the negative standard of network community information quality and reliable for evaluation; network community, generally anonymously communicate, related to the topic, thus increasing the difficulty of judging information quality and reliability. The evaluation process is professional and complex. Users are generally skeptical about the complex network information and trust is not high during the process of Internet access. Therefore, they will first choose the passive standard to evaluate the information of the network community.

References

[1] Shen Wang, Li He, et al. Research on information quality and reliability evaluation of online community -- Based on user perspective, [J]., modern library and information technology, 2013, 29 (1): 69-74.

[2] Sang Yuanxin, Fang Junwei, et al. Research on information quality evaluation model of network health community based on user experience research [J]. information exploration, 2017, (10): 19-25.

[3] Huang Yiga, Zhu Qinghua. Identification of network community user types and their relationships from the social role perspective [J]. information work, 2013, (2): 85-89.

[4] Zhou Jun, Mao Zhanwen. User community network identity construction in Douban for example [J]. contemporary communication (Chinese version), 2012 (1): 74-76.

[5] Deng Shengli, Fu Shaoxiong, etc. information media research on [J]. information science, affecting consumer health information search 2017, (4): 126-132.

[6] Li Jing, Lu Xiaoli, et al. Research on network information quality evaluation model based on user perspective [J]. library science research, 2017, (9): 38-42.

[7] Wang Haijun. Research on service quality evaluation of Web site based on user angle [J]. computer and network, 2012, 38 (18): 68-70.