Mobile Information Filtering

M

Witold Abramowicz
The Pozañ University of Economics, Poland

Krzysztof Banaśkiewicz
The Pozañ University of Economics, Poland

Karol Wieloch
The Pozañ University of Economics, Poland

Paweł Żebrowski
The Pozañ University of Economics, Poland

INTRODUCTION

Information filtering techniques have been continuously developed to meet challenges arisen from new requirements of Information Society. These techniques gain even much more on importance in the facet of grater mobility of people. One of the most dynamic and compelling areas is the environment of wireless and mobile devices. Just recently, information filtering and retrieval have begun to take into consideration circumstances in which they are being used. As information needs of mobile users are highly dynamic, this points out the necessity of considering additional set of attributes describing user situation—context. This article presents an information filtering system for mobile users (mobileIF) being developed in the Department of Management Information Systems at The Poznań University of Economics. Architecture of the mobileIF is a result of research done in the field of contexts, their taxonomies and influence on information relevance in dynamic user's environment. The paper shows our approach to contexts, discusses time perspective on filtering systems and finally, describes mobileIF architecture and basic data flow within it. At last, we present our current research in fields related to the mobileIF system.

BACKGROUND

The process of providing a user with relevant information can be viewed in two different ways. On the one hand, it can be described as the process where single query is performed on a set of documents (information retrieval—IR). On the other hand, it can be understood as applying a set of queries to a single document (information filtering—IF). Although, the aim of both methods is serving users with relevant documents, the way of processing content in information retrieval and information filtering systems significantly differs from each other (Belkin & Croft, 1992). What is more, queries performed in IR represent short-term information needs, whereas profiles, representing information needs in filtering, stand for relatively constant interests in a particular subject (Baeza-Yates & Ribeiro-Neto, 1999). There are many different applications of IR and IF in various areas, however, majority of them utilizes similar techniques such as Boolean model, vector space, and probabilistic models, as well as some brand new ones, like neural network or Bayesian models. Baeza-Yates et al. (1999) provide exhaustive comparison of those techniques.

In the central point of our interests is information filtering domain, that could be divided itself into several additional subdomains according to methods used. The most important ones are content-based (cognitive) filtering and social (collaborative) filtering. The idea that stands for the content-based filtering is to select the right information (relevant to user) by comparing representations of information being searched to representations of user profiles' contents (Oard & Marchionini, 1996). This method of IF has turned out in many systems to be very effective, especially in dealing with textual objects. The latter one overcomes some limitations of content-based filtering (such as problems with filtering multimedia objects, difficult to use for novices, etc.). The collaborative filtering improves results of IF by taking advantage of judgements of multiple users who have similar interests on the read documents (Shardanand & Maes, 1995). Basis for this technique is the assumption that users who judged the same documents in the similar way to others in the group, will most probably proceed like that in future, while judging new documents.

Both of those methods have many specific advantages as well as some drawbacks. The natural way of evolution is combining these techniques in order to

achieve better results of filtering. Claypool, Gokhale, Miranda, Murnikov, Netes, and Sartin (1999) and Li and Kim (2003) proposed some hybrid methods.

There are many definitions of context provided in literature. Among them, several deserve special attention as stimulus to our further considerations. In one of the earliest definitions Schilit (1995) distinguishes the following types of context: computing context (network capacity, connectivity, communication costs, and available devices), user context (user's profile, location, people nearby, and social situation), and physical context (lightning, noise level, temperature, and traffic conditions). According to Schmidt, context is divided into two categories, namely: human factors (information of the user, social environment, and user's tasks) and physical environment (location, infrastructure, and conditions) (Schmidt, Beigl & Gellersen, 1999). Both presented definitions try to identify context by simple division of some characteristics into several groups of potentially distinct attributes. However, neither of them is suitable for inferring more aggregated and complex information. This inconvenience is reduced in the definition by Chen and Kotz (2000) who distinguish low-level and high-level context. The former group contains raw contextual information such as location, temperature etc. (mainly acquired from physical sensors), whereas the latter one is specified on the basis of supplied low-level contexts. More formal definition is provided by Dey and Abowd (1999) who argue "context is any information that can be used to characterize the situation of an entity. An entity is a person, place, or object that is considered relevant to the interaction between a user and an application, including the user and applications themselves."

Systems that take into account context changes and adapt to them (to some degree) are defined as context-aware (Pascoe, 1999). Such adaptation may involve adjustment to user's device capabilities (e.g., screen resolution, memory, software attributes, network bandwidth, and user preferences). Context-aware information delivery system takes into account not only semantic information relevance, but also context of the user. Changes in context may suggest changes in user information needs. Information delivery systems that are based on these assumptions are often defined as context-aware retrieval (CAR) systems (Brown & Jones, 2001). Korkea-aho (2000) provides a wider spectrum of CAR application examples.

MOBILE INFORMATION FILTERING

Contextualization in MobileIF

A citizen of Information Society wants to be provided only with such information he or she requires. In case of filtering domain, user information needs are depicted by user profile that expresses rather long-term goals. On the contrary, active goals and current tasks can be supported by contextual information. It is obvious that the latter ones are more significant for mobile users as they can better adjust to their daily rapidly changing activities.

In order to fulfil this requirement, the system has to be able to process several types of user contexts. The notion of contextual information in mobileIF has to be examined from two different points of view.

In the first one, we distinguish two new groups of contexts that influence:

- User information needs (named as semantic contexts). They are used to more precisely define queries to the system obtained out of the user's profile. The context can extend the query with some additional concepts as well as narrow it down (Wen, Lao, & Ma, 2004).
- The way the information is delivered to mobile users (named as distributive context). Such contexts allow an adaptation of the filtering results in order to provide the optimal presentation and delivery. This may be done according to the capabilities of devices or user preferences (Costa, 2003; W3C, 2005).

From the second point of view, both described groups may address several dimensions that are crucial for mobileIF system.

- **Time:** The time context is connected with the occurrence of other contexts.
- **Location:** The location context is intrinsically linked to the geographical context, given by the street-network and other infrastructure, points of interest, environmental and topological features etc.
- **Resources:** They correspond to characteristics and capabilities of utilized resources (e.g., user devices).
- **Social Context:** This interpersonal context gives information about relationships between user and other persons or organizations
- **User Activities:** Describing the user's current tasks, and in a broader sense, the existence of specific conditions or steps in a process.

Related Content

Virtual Enterprises' Accounting Difficulties

Panayiotis Tahinakis, John Muylonakis, Nicolaos kProtogerosand Dimitrios Ginoglou (2008). *Electronic Commerce: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications (pp. 1827-1835).*

www.irma-international.org/chapter/virtual-enterprises-accounting-difficulties/9589

Internet Enterprise Service Design Based on Existing Architectural Knowledge

Paul de Vriezeand Lai Xu (2016). *Encyclopedia of E-Commerce Development, Implementation, and Management (pp. 818-826).*

www.irma-international.org/chapter/internet-enterprise-service-design-based-on-existing-architectural-knowledge/149004

A Comparative Account of Joined-Up Government Initiatives in Dutch and Belgian Social Security

Vincent M.F Homburg (2007). *International Journal of Cases on Electronic Commerce (pp. 1-12).*

www.irma-international.org/article/comparative-account-joined-government-initiatives/1511

Evolution of Trust in Business-to-Business E-Commerce

Pauline Ratnasingham (2008). *Electronic Commerce: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications (pp. 47-55).*

www.irma-international.org/chapter/evolution-trust-business-business-commerce/9452

Mobile Commerce Security and Payment Methods

Chung-wei Lee, Weidong Kouand Wen-Chen Hu (2008). *Electronic Commerce: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications (pp. 292-306).*

www.irma-international.org/chapter/mobile-commerce-security-payment-methods/9473