Wanrong He, Andrew Mao, and **Jordan Boyd-Graber**. **Cheater's Bowl: Human vs. Computer Search Strategies for Open-Domain QA**. *Findings of Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022, 9 pages.


```
    @article{He:Mao:Boyd-Graber-2022,
Title = {Cheater's Bowl: Human vs. Computer Search Strategies for Open-Domain QA},
Author = {Wanrong He and Andrew Mao and Jordan Boyd-Graber},
Journal = {Findings of Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing},
Year = {2022},
Location = {Abu Dhabi},
Url = {http://cs.umd.edu/~jbg//docs/2022_emnlp_cheaters.pdf},
}
```


Accessible Abstract: When the Covid pandemic it, trivia games moved online. With it came cheating: people tried to quickly Google answers. This is bad for sportsmanship, but a good source of training data for helping teach computers how to find answers. We built an interface to harvest this training data from trivia players, fed these into retrieval-based QA systems, showing that these queries were better than the automatically generated queries used by the current state of the art.

Links:

- Code [http://cs.umd.edu/~jbg/../downloads/cheater_code.zip]
- Data [http://cs.umd.edu/~jbg/../downloads/cheater_data.zip]
- Research Talk [https://youtu.be/DathPL3fRTI]

Downloaded from http://cs.umd.edu/~jbg/docs/2022_emnlp_cheaters.pdf

Contact Jordan Boyd-Graber (jbg@boydgraber.org) for questions about this paper.

Cheater's Bowl: Human vs. Computer Search Strategies for Open-Domain Question Answering

Anonymous EMNLP submission

Abstract

For humans and computers, the first step in answering an open-domain question is retrieving a set of relevant documents from a large corpus. However, the strategies that computers use fundamentally differ from those of humans. To better understand these differences, we design a gamified interface for data collection – Cheater's Bowl – where a human answers complex questions with access to both traditional and modern search tools. We collect a dataset of human search sessions, analyze human search strategies and compare them to state-of-the-art multi-hop QA models. We show that humans query logically, apply dynamic search chains and utilize world knowledge to boost searching. We demonstrate how human queries can improve the accuracy of existing systems and propose the future design of QA models.

1 The Joy of Search: Only for Humans?

A grand goal of artificial intelligence research is to design agents that can search for information to answer complex questions. Modern day question answering (QA) models have the ability to issue text-based queries to a search engine (Qi et al., 2019, 2021; Xiong et al.; Zhao et al., 2021; Adolphs et al.; Nakano et al.), and use multiple iterations of querying and reading to search for an answer. However, there is still a performance gap between machines and humans.

Dan Russell describes humans with virtuosic search ability in his book *The Joy of Search* (Russell), and describes search strategies that: use world knowledge; use parallel search chains, abandon futile threads; and use multiple sources and languages. However, while we can all admire Dan Russell's search skills, it does not answer the question: how far are computers' searches from humans'?

This paper tries to answer this question with a collection and comparison of human and computer search strategies. We create "Cheater's Bowl", an interface that gamifies answering questions, with the addition of tools such as a traditional search engine, a neural search engine, and modern QA models. We collect a dataset of human search sessions while using our interface to answer complex open-domain multi-hop questions (Section 3). We analyze the differences between human and computer search strategies and detail where current models fall short (Section 4). Substituting queries generated by models with human queries significantly improves model accuracy. We propose design suggestions for future QA models, and our dataset can serve as the foundation for training them (Section 5).

Our main contributions are the following:

- We create an interface for answering questions with access to modern tools.
- We collect a dataset of human search sessions.
- We compare human and computer strategies for QA, and show that humans apply dynamic search chains, utilize world knowledge and reason logically.
- We propose improvements for future query-driven QA models.

2 How Humans and Computers Search

To compare how humans and computers form queries to answer questions, we first need to have a level playing field and set up our vocabulary. Sometimes, we will need to speak abstractly about who is trying to answer the question without distinguishing between the human and the computer. In these cases, we refer to them as an "agent", which can be either the human or the computer. We assume that the agents do not know the answers directly and that they create text-based queries to find the answer (we discuss the alternatives, closed book QA, directly forming dense queries and other computer systems, in Section 6).

We assume that humans and computers, given an initial question, form a text query q_0. The ith query q_i retrieves a set of documents $\mathcal{D}_{i+1} = \{d_1, \ldots, d_{|\mathcal{D}_{i+1}|}\}$ from a large corpus of documents $\mathcal{D}$, where in our setting is all the paragraphs in Wikipedia pages. The retrieved documents provide additional information, allowing the agent to answer the question or compose a new query q_{i+1}. We denote $\mathcal{E}_i \subseteq \mathcal{D}_i$ as the set of documents that provide helpful information – evidences – for answering the question with answer a or composing subsequent queries $\{q_j | j > i\}$. It is possible that $\mathcal{E}_i \neq \mathcal{D}_i$ since not all of the retrieved documents are relevant to question answering, and an agent might only read a few of them. This process repeats until the agent answers the question. We represents the iterative question-answering process as action path: $A = (q_0, \mathcal{E}_1, q_1, \mathcal{E}_2, q_2, \cdots, \mathcal{E}_k, a)$.

2.1 Human Queries

How humans form queries when they search for an answer depends on many factors, as summarized by Allen (1991): the experience of the user searching for information, how much the user knows about the topic, and whether they are finding completely new information or navigating to a specific information source they have seen before. Beyond the intrinsic knowledge of particular users, users often have particular strategies that they favor. For example, users may copy/paste information into a document, keep multiple tabs open, or always turn to a particular source of information first (Aula et al., 2005).

2.2 Computer Systems

Thanks to the recent development of machine learning and natural language understanding, researchers have developed computer systems that can answer open-domain questions by generating text-based queries. GoldEn Retriever (Qi et al., 2019) generates a query q_k at reasoning step k by selecting a substring from current reasoning path R_k, which is the concatenation of the question Q and previously selected retrieval results at each reasoning step: $R_k = (Q, d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_k)$, $R_0 = (Q)$ (note that for questions with $n \geq 1$ clues/sentences, we use their concatenation as the full question $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, \cdots, Q_{n-1})$). GoldEn Retriever then select a document d_{k+1} from the set of documents $\mathcal{D}_{k+1}$ retrieved by q_k, append d_{k+1} to the current reasoning path and form an updated reasoning path R_{k+1}. IRRR (Qi et al., 2021) further advances GoldEn Retriever by allowing queries to be any subsequence of the reasoning path, though still much less flexible than human queries. At each step, these systems only select one document as the evidence for further actions, i.e., $\mathcal{E}_i = \{d_i\}$. Thus the action path $A = (q_0, \{d_1\}, q_1, \{d_2\}, q_2, \cdots, \{d_k\}, a)$.

3 Cheater's Bowl: Gamified Data Collection For Human Searches

3.1 Motivation

High-stakes trivia competitions are meant to be a test of who knows more about a particular topic. However, it has occasionally been plagued by cheater scandals (Tedlow, 1976; Trotter, 2013). The move to online trivia competitions during the Corona pandemic brought a new form of cheating to the fore: people would see a trivia question and quickly try to use a search engine to find the answer.

Some of the online discussion around online cheating revealed that some people actually enjoyed doing these quick dives for information. Thus, one of the goals of this paper is to see if we could (1) sublimate these urges into something more wholesome, (2) gather some useful data to understand human expert search. To answer these questions, we create an gamified interface (Figure 1)—which we call Cheater's Bowl—to help players find answers.

Because the people interested in this come from the trivia playing community, they know substantially more about the topics being asked about than, say, crowdworkers. This puts them closer to the "expert" category as discussed by Allen (1991). We draw our questions from the Quizbowl format (Boyd-Graber et al., 2012, QB), which are a sequence of clues with the same answer of decreasing difficulty (as decided by a human editor). We also include questions from HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), a popular dataset for multi-hop question answering. We filter the questions in two ways to ensure that both humans and computers are challenged. We discard all but the two hardest clues, which should be difficult for most humans (even our experienced player base). For computers, we try to answer all of these questions with current state-of-the-art BERT-based model on these data (Rodriguez et al.) with a single hop. If the model is able answer the question with any number of clues, we exclude it from the questions set used in data collection.



Figure 1: User interface for Cheater's Bowl, an interface to collect user traces as they try to answer difficult questions. Players see a question (top), can search for information (left), view information (center), and give their answer (top) with associated evidence (right).

3.2 Game Interface

The player is presented with a question, initially with only one clue. To start searching, the players have the option of typing their own queries in the search box, or clicking on a model-suggested query (from IRRR or GoldEn). The search engine returns results from two different retrievers: BM25, a sparse index based on lexical similarity; and DPR (Karpukhin et al., 2020) , which uses dense vector embeddings of passages. Both retrievers index and return paragraphs from Wikipedia pages. We use ElasticSearch (Gormley and Tong, 2015) to implement BM25, and for DPR, we directly use the pretrained model they provided.

Both retrievers return the top passages by cosine similarity. Players can click on the Wikipedia page titles of the passages; the full Wikipedia page is then shown in the main document display with the passage highlighted.

The popup tooltip provides shortcuts to directly query the search engine from highlighted text, record it as an evidence, or submit it as an answer. Players are encouraged to highlight and record text as evidence if it helped them find the answer. Note that even if a player does not record evidences, those paragraphs that the player have read which contains words in the queries or answer are automatically recorded as evidences.

If the player finds the the question difficult to answer, they are free to skip the question or ask the system to reveal another clue.[1]

Human-computer collaboration. In addition to the queries from GoldEn and IRRR, players also see IRRR's answers. Players can directly answer the question with suggested answers (but are encouraged to find evidence to back it up).

Scoring system. Our goal is to create an interface that is both fun and useful for collecting relevant information. Players are rewarded for having the highest score, and they earn points by: (1) answering more questions, as each question adds to their score; (2) answering questions correctly (100 points for each correct answer); (3) answering quickly, as the possible points decrease with a timer (four minutes for QB questions, three for HotpotQA); (4) answering with fewer clues, as it makes the question easier (each clue removes ten points); (5) recording more evidence. Each recorded evidence is awarded 10 points.

3.3 The Player Community

We recruit 31 players from the trivia community who played the game over the course of the week. The top player answered 895 questions, and 13 players answered at least forty questions. After filtering out empty answers and repeated submission of a same player on the same question, we have collected 2545 questions-answering pairs from QB of which 1428 were correctly answered (56%), as well as 315 questions-answering pairs from HotpotQA, of which 225 were correctly answered (71.43%).

3.4 A Question Answering Example

To see how a player might answer the question with our interface, we present a question answering example with corresponding player actions (Figure 2). Answering this question requires figuring out who the main speaker was (Prem Rawat) and then figuring out his nationality to get to the final answer, India. The player answers the question by using two hops: first to "Millennium '73" and then to "Prem Rawat", and finally uses commonsense reasoning to answer "India". Player actions and seen paragraphs are automatically recorded through the process.

[1]For QB questions only with a maximum of one additional clue.

Question: "A 15-year-old religious leader originally from this country spoke at a highly anticipated event at which it was predicted that the Astrodome would levitate; that event was Millennium '73". **Answer**: "India".
(1) Query q_0 ="Millennium '73" (Substring of question)
(2) Select and read Wikipedia page: "Millennium '73". Manually record evidence d_1 =" It featured Prem Rawat, then known as Guru Maharaj Ji, a 15-year-old guru and the leader of a fast-growing new religious movement."
(3) Query q_1 ="Prem Rawat" (Substring from evidence d_1)
(4) Select and read Wikipedia page: "Prem Rawat". Manually record evidence d_2 ="Prem Pal Singh Rawat is the youngest son of Hans Ram Singh Rawat, an Indian guru."
(5) Answer a ="India" (Derived from evidence d_2)

Figure 2: An example of player actions for question answering with action path $A = (q_0, \mathcal{E}_1, q_1, \mathcal{E}_2, a)$, where $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{d_1\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_2 = \{d_2\}$. The player uses substring from question and evidence as queries, and derived final answer from an evidence. We highlight the source of actions in blue.

4 Human vs. Computer Search Strategies

4.1 Strategies in Common

Both humans and computers can search from the Wikipedia corpus using text-based queries, process the retrieval results, and give an answer. From data collected in Cheater's Bowl, both humans and computers often create queries from the question: 83.05% of human queries have at least one word from the question, while 84.61% of GoldEn queries and 99.75% of IRRR do. And both use terms from the evidence they find to create new queries: 14.47% of human queries have at least one word from retrieved evidence, while 19.13% of GoldEn and 28.30% of IRRR queries do. Both reformulate their queries based on the comprehension of previous evidence, which aims at retrieving different targets at different steps (Xiong et al.).

4.2 Strategy differences

Humans use fewer but more effective keywords. The most salient difference between human and computer queries is that human queries are shorter. Human queries contain 2.67 words on average (standard deviation of 2.46); while GoldEn Retriever contain 7.03±6.84 words, and IRRR words have 12.76±5.64. Human queries focus on proper nouns and short phrases as queries (Figure 3). Figure 1 shows that humans tend to select the most specialized term—e.g., the entity most likely to have a comprehensive Wikipedia page—which requires world knowledge. In contrast to humans' desire for precision, models seem to prefer recall with as many keywords as possible, hoping that it retrieves something useful for the next hop.

Humans use world knowledge to narrow search results. Unlike computers, humans sometimes use words that are not in the question or in evidence: 16.30% of queries have terms in neither evidence or question text (compared to 0% for both computer methods). In the first example in Table 1, the player's first query is derived from the question but adds "auxiliary", recognizing that "treating" a compound makes it an auxiliary in the reaction. Players also reported in the feedback survey that adding a subject category (for example, adding "chemist" when querying a person in chemical-related questions) can be useful for specifying search results. Although there are cases when players directly query terms closely related to the answer, in most cases, people use commonsense to help narrow the search scope or utilize domain-specific knowledge they have learned from previous searches. These patterns could be potentially learned by QA models.



Figure 3: Proportion of different part-of-speech tag used in queries. Part-of-speech tags are detected using Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK) (Bird et al., 2009).

Dynamic query refinement and abandonment. Although both humans and computers use query reformulation as a search strategy, how humans reform their queries is more advanced. Not all retrieved documents help lead to the answer: some are irrelevant, and some are even misleading. In cases when human agents have not found any helpful information from the documents $\mathcal{D}_i$ retrieved by query q_i, or when they are confused and unsure, the human agent does not need to use any document from $\mathcal{D}_{i+1}$ for making new queries, i.e. $\mathcal{E}_{i+1} = \emptyset$, but can instead write a new query q_{i+1} by adding more constraint words and deleting dis-

Question and answer	First query		
	Player	IRRR	GoldEn Retriever
Q: Evans et al. developed bisoxazoline complexes of this element to catalyze enantioselective Diels-Alder reactions. A: Copper	Evans auxiliary	Evans et al. developed bisoxazoline complexes element catalyze enantioselective Diels-Alder reactions	Evans et al.-
Q: This quantity's name is used to describe situations in which there exists a frame of reference such that two given events could have happened at the same location. A: time	frame of reference same location	quantity's name used describe situations exists frame reference two given events could happened location	quantity's name is used to describe situations
Q: Discovered in 1886 by Clemens Winkler, this element is used in glass in infrared optical devices, its oxide has been used in medicine, and its dioxide is used to produce glass with a high index of refraction. A: Germanium	Clemens Winkler	Discovered 1886 Clemens Winkler element used glass infrared optical devices oxide used dioxide used glass high index refraction	Discovered in 1886 by Clemens Winkler
Q: In ruling on these documents, the Court held that the "heavy presumption" against prior restraint was not overcome. A: Pentagon Papers	heavy presumption prior restraint	ruling documents Court held "heavy presumption" against prior restraint overcome	ruling on these documents, the Court
Q: One of this director's films introduced the cheery song "High Hopes," while another describes the presidential campaign of Grant Matthews. A: Frank Capra	high hopes song	One director's films introduced cheery song "High Hopes " describes presidential campaign Grant Matthews	director's films introduced the cheery song "High Hopes,"

Table 1: The first query for each question made by different agents. Human queries contain fewer keywords and focus more on precision, while computer queries focus more on recall.

tracting terms from q_i to restricts the search scope, or abandon q_i and write a completely new query. In Russell (2019), Daniel described querying "stoplight parrotfish sand" for finding out the relationship between parrotfish and geology, however, the results are too diffuse to be useful. He then modified his query to be "parrotfish sand" which yields good results.

However, for GoldEn Retriever and IRRR, even when irrelevant documents are retrieved from a bad query q_i, the model is compelled to select some $d_{i+1} \in \mathcal{D}_{i+1}$ as evidence, append to the reasoning path, and generate subsequent queries accordingly. As an example, to answer the question

> He lost the presidential election in 1930, which was not good enough for him as later that year he seized power at the head of an army-backed coup. (Answer: Getúlio Vargas (a Brazilian president))

IRRR queries "lost presidential election 1930 year seized power head army backed coup" but an article about Brazil is not in the returned results. IRRR then appends a paragraph from the irrelevant page about the Nigerian "Olusegun Obasanjo" to the reasoning path, leading to the next query "lost presidential election 1930 later year seized power head army backed coup Olusegun Obasanjo" which prevents finding a relevant Brazilian page.

Multiple search chains. We define a search chain as a chain of searches $(q_s, q_{s+1}, q_{s+2}, \cdots, q_t)$ where new searches are closely dependent on old ones, either by q_{i+1} being a refinement based on q_i or q_{i+1} is composed with evidences $\mathcal{E}_{i+1}$ retrieved from q_i. A search chain breaks when q_i is abandoned and q_{i+1} is a new query unrelated to previous evidence. While existing computer agents can only use a single search chain, human agents can use multiple search chains, either pre-planned parallel search chains that focus on different perspectives of the question, or starting a new one if previous chains failed to lead to the answer. When answering the question

> This modern-day country was once ruled by renegade Janissaries known as dahije, who massacred this country's elite, known as knez, in 1804. (Answer: "Serbia")

the player first makes a query about the mentioned title "knez", and next queries "Knyaz", which is a substring of the evidence retrieved by the first query. However, these queries failed to retrieve useful results since "knez" and "Knyaz" are common titles in ancient Slavic lands. The player then abandons this search chain and starts a new one by making the query "dahije", which allows the player to retrieve the Wikipedia page "Dahije" that includes the answer "Serbia".

Swapping Engines The *Joy of Search* is replete with searches over different sources: Google, Google Scholar, Google Earth, etc. While we only give players access to Wikipedia, we allow players to switch between ElasticSearch and DPR. In contrast to multi-hop systems which typically use trained, dense retrievers, players prefer ElasticSearch (87% of queries) over DPR. Some of this is probably familiarity: most search engines (including Wikipedia's) are term-based retrievers. In the post-task survey, players prefer ElasticSearch because it is most useful when looking for an exact Wikipedia page – the specific Wikipedia page always ranked top among search results. It is also helpful for checking answers: they often query an answer candidate for double-checking, which helps boost their answer accuracy. ElasticSearch is better for this specific strategy.

Beyond a Bag of Words. However, this is not always the case; when humans do use DPR, they adapt their query styles for better retrieval. Some players reported that they could retrieve desired results with natural language queries when using DPR. Those queries usually come from longer sequences in question and evidence. For example, when answering the question

> Mathilda Loisel goes into debt to replace paste replicas of these gemstones, one of which is "As Big as the Ritz" in an F. Scott Fitzgerald short story. (Answer: "Diamond")

the player queries ""As Big as the Ritz" in an F. Scott Fitzgerald short story." with DPR, which retrieves the Wikipedia page "The Diamond as Big as the Ritz" containing the answer.

Players also reported searching Google with natural language queries when finding answers to open-ended questions with various options, e.g., "How often should I wash my car?". In these scenarios, humans may search for relatively vague queries and synthesize an answer from multiple retrieval results. WebGPT (Nakano et al.) explores a similar setting by training GPT-3 (Brown et al.) to search queries in natural language, aggregate information from multiple web pages and answer open-ended questions. Due to the limitation of Cheater's Bowl where for most of the QB questions, the answer could be matched to a unique Wikipedia entity (Rodriguez et al.), players have the goal of finding one specified answer with minimal ambiguity, thus most querying deterministic keywords is a more appropriate query style.

5 Existing Models and Future Design

Although we present queries suggested by state-of-the-art multi-hop QA models to players, players would rather write their own queries (Figure 4). Most players understand why QA models query the way they do (Figure 5) and agree that queries retrieve helpful results, but players doubt the utility. This is an intrinsic difference between humans and models: human queries strive for a "direct hit" with two to three search results, as Jansen et al. have found that most humans only access results on the first page. In contrast, verbose model queries hope search results contain *something* helpful—it does not mind reading through a dozen search results. Another reason might be that QA models do perform much worse than human: for QB questions randomly given to players, 56.58% of the questions are correctly answered by players, while only 44.21% are correctly answered by IRRR. [2]



Figure 4: Source of player queries. Only a small proportion of queries are suggested by QA models.



Figure 5: Player feedback for queries suggested by QA models. Although most players understand why they make those queries, players doubt the utility.

[2] For questions randomly sampled from HotpotQA, human accuracy of 71.43% is slightly lower than IRRR accuracy of 79.02%. We consider this to be due to the synthetic construction of HotpotQA dataset lends itself to straightforward searches, and is much easier than QB questions to differentiate human and QA model performances.

5.1 Improve Existing Models with Human Actions

Though QA models failed to help humans advancing their searches, could the accuracy of the QA models increase if we replace computer queries with humans'?

We convert human queries into IRRR's format and ask IRRR to carry on querying and answering. More precisely, given the full action path $A = (q_0, \mathcal{E}_1, q_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \cdots, q_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}_k, a)$ of question Q, for each $0 \leq j \leq k-1$, we trim the action path that ends to a query q_j to form a partial human action path $A_j = (q_0, \mathcal{E}_1, q_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \cdots, q_j)$. We initialize the human reasoning path R with $R = (Q)$. For each $\mathcal{E}_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq j)$ in action path A_j, if $\mathcal{E}_i \neq \emptyset$, we append the most crucial document $d_i \in \mathcal{E}_i$ to the reasoning path R. Our order of priority for $d \in \mathcal{E}_i$ is that: source of player answer > source of some query > manually recorded by the player as evidence. We consider the converted human reasoning path $R_l = (Q, d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_l)$ to be the reasoning path of reasoning step l, where $l \leq j$ since there might be empty $\mathcal{E}_i$. Note that we result in $R_0 = (Q)$ from $A_0 = (q_0)$.

We compare how well do IRRR performs on the questions set $\mathcal{Q}_l$ for two settings: querying and answering from scratch (**scratch**) v.s. initializing the reasoning path R_l from the human reasoning path and using q_j as the next query (**init from human**). Here $\mathcal{Q}_l$ is the set of questions where partial human actions A_j could be converted to human reasoning path at reasoning step l $(0 \leq l \leq 2)$. Obviously $\mathcal{Q}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_0$. We have converted $|\mathcal{Q}_0| = 1122, |\mathcal{Q}_1| = 462, |\mathcal{Q}_2| = 195$ questions in total. The difficulty of questions in $\mathcal{Q}_2$ is, in general, greater than questions $\mathcal{Q}_0$ since humans use at least three queries for answering the questions in $\mathcal{Q}_2$, while using at least one query for $\mathcal{Q}_0$.

Initializing from human actions significantly improves the accuracy of the final answer (Table 2), outperforming querying from scratch by 10.26% for questions in $\mathcal{Q}_2$. The human queries can unlock reasoning paths that make previously unanswerable questions answerable within three steps. While humans cannot get much from computer queries, the reverse is certainly true. We further qualitatively analyze why human actions are helpful to models.

Better selection of keywords. For questions where IRRR answers correctly with human initialization but fails alone, 91.48% of the first queries are substrings or derived from the question. Models select more keywords (Section 4.2); however, this strategy might fail when the retrieval results are too diffuse. In the last example from Table 1, the first IRRR query retrieves weakly related documents, and IRRR appends a paragraph from "Cultural impact of the Beatles" to the reasoning path. Since IRRR can only use a single search chain, the second and third query follows previous evidence and retrieves more irrelevant documents. In comparison, the player query "high hopes song" allows IRRR to find "High Hopes (Frank Sinatra song)" and use it as evidence. That paragraph contains key information—the film *A Hole in the Head*—which unlocks the film's director, Frank Capra.

Questions	Scratch	Init from human
$\mathcal{Q}_0$	44.21%	50.45%
$\mathcal{Q}_1$	38.10%	42.42%
$\mathcal{Q}_2$	27.69%	37.95%

Table 2: IRRR answer accuracy of querying from scratch v.s. initializing from human actions.

World Knowledge. A small proportion of human queries "improves" the model accuracy because it directly includes the answer or shortcuts to the answer. As an example, the first human query for the question

> The first one of these to be directly observed was obtained by the solution of TBF in an antimony-based superacid.

is "George Olah", the researcher who researches "superacids" and is known by the player. IRRR uses this shortcut to find the answer "carbocations" on the Wikipedia page "George Andrew Olah".

5.2 Design Suggestions for Future Models

Based on the strategic differences between human and QA models, we propose improvements for future query-driven QA models.

Retriever-Aware Queries. The model should be able to interact with the retrieval system, dynamically refine imperfect queries based on retrieval results and abandon search chains that cannot lead to the answer. Query refinement could be achieved by deleting and adding words, using search operators (Adolphs et al.), or adding masks to tokens for dense queries (Zhang et al., 2021). If retrieval results are irrelevant to the question, the model should discard the results: $\mathcal{E} = \emptyset$, avoiding the

introduction of noise for future query generation. Models should be able to dynamically select search engines and specify search sources suitable for each query.

Incorporate Common Sense and World Knowledge Instead of using substring or subsequence from questions and previous evidence as queries, the model should also be able to query other words and terms it considers helpful, either by using a language model, knowledge base, or selecting from a set of commonly useful terms.

Check Your Work. Models should explicitly query candidate answers to check their correctness, a simple yet effective strategy humans use.

A model that satisfies the above design principles could be implemented using reinforcement learning with well-defined reward functions. Given human action data collected in Cheater's Bowl, such a model could be trained by behavior cloning.

6 Related Work

Human Usage of Search Engines. Our work is similar to previous research that analyzes the behavior of humans using search engines. O'Day and Jeffries discovered that it is crucial to reuse the results from the previous searches to address the information need. Lau and Horvitz evaluated the logs of the Excite search engine and found that each information goal requires 3.27 queries on average. Jansen et al.; Huang and Efthimiadis have found that contextual query refinement is a widely used strategy. Queries are refined by incorporating background information and evidence from past search results, which usually include examining results titles and snippets. Our work provides many of the same features as these previous papers but adds neural models to retrieve passages, AI-suggested queries and answers. Our analysis is focused on comparing human and computer search strategies and how they may benefit each other in search. In addition, our task gamifies the search task and uses specially designed QB questions, which is intended to make the task more challenging.

Question Answering Agents. Previous work has explored agents that issue interpretable text-based queries to a search engine to answer questions. GoldEn Retriever (Qi et al., 2019) generates a query by selecting a span from the reasoning path, and IRRR (Qi et al., 2021) further advances the GoldEn Retriever by allowing queries to be any subsequence of the reasoning path. (Adolphs et al.) train an agent using reinforcement learning to interact with a retriever using a set of search operators. WebGPT (Nakano et al.) is a large language model based on GPT-3 (Brown et al.) that searches queries in natural language, and aggregate information from multiple web pages to answer open-ended questions.

Alternative Models In this work, we only compare human search strategies with computer systems that answer questions by searching text-based queries. Modern retrievers are able to directly perform vector similarity search of the encoded question with the corpus (Karpukhin et al., 2020; Xiong et al.; Zhao et al., 2021), or hop through different documents by following structured links (Asai et al.; Zhao et al.), or resolving coreference (Chen et al.). However, we consider that vector-based queries are confusing black boxes for human players. Thus, computer systems using vector-based queries could hardly collaborate with humans. Most players reported utilizing the interwiki links in Wikipedia pages and directly jumping to other Wikipedia pages. We consider that following structured links or resolving coreference could be equivalently achieved by text-based query-generation systems through querying the corresponding term and selecting the corresponding Wikipedia page. Although computer agents might perform different strategies with different models and systems, only humans are all-purpose agents that can combine all the strategies and perform flexible searching.

7 Conclusion

Open-domain and multi-hop QA is an important problem for both humans and computers. Towards the goal of comparing how human and computer agents search and answer complex questions, we created an interface with the purpose of collecting human data on answering questions with access to tools such as traditional and neural search engines, question answering models that suggest queries and answers. We find that humans often use shorter queries, apply dynamic search chains, and use world knowledge. We believe that future QA models should have the ability to generate novel queries, "discard" irrelevant results, and explicitly check the answers. A question-answering agent could be ultimately trained on our collected dataset using reinforcement learning.

Limitations

The first limitation of this work is that we only provide Wikipedia as the single source for information retrieval because Wikipedia is the common retrieval source used in open-domain QA models; hence we failed to directly illustrate the human behavior of searching over multiple sources. The second limitation is that for human-AI collaboration, we mainly use IRRR and GoldEn Retriever as the representative of AI models since they are state-of-the-art multi-hop QA models that generate text-based queries. QA models that use different strategies could be further explored and compared with human strategies.

Ethical Concerns

We took steps to ensure our data collection process adhered to ethical guidelines. Our study was IRB-approved. We paid players who actively participated in the gamified data collection process ($130 for awarding top players and $25 for the raffle). We got feedback from the online trivia community before and after launching our game (Appendix A). We will release our data to the public domain.

References

Leonard Adolphs, Benjamin Boerschinger, Christian Buck, Michelle Chen Huebscher, Massimiliano Ciaramita, Lasse Espeholt, Thomas Hofmann, Yannic Kilcher, Sascha Rothe, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, and Lierni Sestorain Saralegui. Boosting Search Engines with Interactive Agents.

Bryce Allen. 1991. Topic knowledge and online catalog search formulation. *The Library Quarterly*, 61(2):188–213.

Akari Asai, Kazuma Hashimoto, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. Learning to Retrieve Reasoning Paths over Wikipedia Graph for Question Answering.

Anne Aula, Natalie Jhaveri, and Mika Käki. 2005. Information search and re-access strategies of experienced web users. In *Proceedings of the 14th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 583–592.

Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. 2009. *Natural Language Processing with Python*, 1st edition. O'Reilly Media, Inc.

Jordan Boyd-Graber, Brianna Satinoff, He He, and Hal Daume III. 2012. Besting the quiz master: Crowdsourcing incremental classification games.

Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.

Jifan Chen, Shih-ting Lin, and Greg Durrett. Multi-hop Question Answering via Reasoning Chains.

Clinton Gormley and Zachary Tong. 2015. *Elasticsearch: the definitive guide: a distributed real-time search and analytics engine*. " O'Reilly Media, Inc.".

Jeff Huang and Efthimis N. Efthimiadis. 2009. Analyzing and evaluating query reformulation strategies in web search logs. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, CIKM '09, page 77–86, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

Bernard J. Jansen, Danielle L. Booth, and Amanda Spink. 2009. Patterns of query reformulation during web searching. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.*, 60(7):1358–1371.

Bernard J. Jansen, Amanda Spink, and Tefko Saracevic. 2000. Real life, real users, and real needs: a study and analysis of user queries on the web. *Information Processing & Management*, 36(2):207–227.

Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6769–6781, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Tessa Lau and Eric Horvitz. 1999. Patterns of search: Analyzing and modeling web query refinement. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on User Modeling*, UM '99, page 119–128, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.

Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, Xu Jiang, Karl Cobbe, Tyna Eloundou, Gretchen Krueger, Kevin Button, Matthew Knight, Benjamin Chess, and John Schulman. WebGPT: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback.

Vicki L. O'Day and Robin Jeffries. 1993. Orienteering in an information landscape: How information seekers get from here to there. In *Proceedings of the INTERACT '93 and CHI '93 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '93, page

438–445, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

Peng Qi, Haejun Lee, Tg Sido, and Christopher Manning. 2021. Answering open-domain questions of varying reasoning steps from text. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3599–3614, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Peng Qi, Xiaowen Lin, Leo Mehr, Zijian Wang, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. Answering complex open-domain questions through iterative query generation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2590–2602, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Pedro Rodriguez, Shi Feng, Mohit Iyyer, He He, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. Quizbowl: The Case for Incremental Question Answering.

Daniel M. Russell. *The Joy of Search: A Google Insider's Guide to Going Beyond the Basics*. MIT Press.

Daniel M. Russell. 2019. *The Mystery of the Parrotfish, or Where Does That White Sand Really Come From? How to Triangulate Multiple Sources to Find a Definitive Answer*. The MIT Press.

Richard S. Tedlow. 1976. Intellect on television: The quiz show scandals of the 1950s. *American Quarterly*, 28(4):483–495.

Keenan Trotter. 2013. Harvard and the question of quiz bowl cheating. *The Atlantic*.

Wenhan Xiong, Xiang Li, Srini Iyer, Jingfei Du, Patrick Lewis, William Yang Wang, Yashar Mehdad, Scott Yih, Sebastian Riedel, Douwe Kiela, and Barlas Oguz. Answering Complex Open-Domain Questions with Multi-Hop Dense Retrieval.

Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2369–2380, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Chen Zhang, Yuxuan Lai, Yansong Feng, and Dongyan Zhao. 2021. Extract, integrate, compete: Towards verification style reading comprehension. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2976–2986, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Chen Zhao, Chenyan Xiong, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Hal Daumé III. 2021. Multi-step reasoning over unstructured text with beam dense retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4635–4641, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Chen Zhao, Chenyan Xiong, Corby Rosset, Xia Song, Paul Bennett, and Saurabh Tiwary. Transformer-XH: Multi-evidence Reasoning with Extra Hop Attention.

A Player Feedback Survey

We gathered valuable feedback from our players about the data collection experiment, both to understand our human strategies, and improve our system to be more enjoyable. We sent them a questionnaire with the following questions:

- Which search engine do you prefer?
- How do you like these search engines?
- How often do you search for things from these sources? (1 to 5):
  - Original question
  - Wikipedia page (resulted from previous search)
  - AI-suggested queries
  - My own knowledge about the question
- Please rate how much you agree with each of the statements (1 to 5):
  - The AI-suggested queries boosted my searching experience.
  - The AI-suggested queries can retrieve helpful Wikipedia passages.
  - The AI-suggested queries are reasonable. I understand why AI makes those queries.
- Select the search strategies you have applied. (List of strategies)
  - Search (multiple) keywords/specialized terms
  - Utilize the links in Wikipedia pages, directly jump to another page
  - Use world knowledge about the question/domain
  - Learn domain-specific knowledge from the results, and use them in future search
  - Add proper words to restrict the range of results (for example, the subject category like "philosophy", "chemistry", name of the topic, ...)
  - Try name variants, e.g., Matthew C Perry → M. C. Perry
  - Refine the previous query if it doesn't yield any helpful results
  - At the beginning/when unclear, make simple & broad query (e.g. a single noun or phrase)
  - Search candidate answer to verify its correctness
  - Chain of searches: next query is based on previous search results
  - Parallel searching chains: use multiple separate search chains.
  - Search in multiple search engines.
  - Search in multiple languages
- Could you tell us more about your search strategy, and why you use it?
- What feature would you like to see included in this app? Is there a feature that will make finding answers easier, but we don't have it yet?
- Any other feedback for Cheater's Quizbowl?

Overall we received 13 responses.

The large majority (13) of respondents preferred ElasticSearch over DPR (2), with most saying ElasticSearch better met their expectations: the Wikipedia page in their queries always ranked top. The two players who also like DPR consider DPR can retrieve what they are looking for when using natural language queries.

As is shown in Figure 6, players mostly queries from the original question, and also from the previous retrieval results. Players seldomly use queries suggested by the QA models.



Figure 6: Source of player queries. Respondents reported that they seldomly use queries suggested by the QA models.

Most respondents didn't find the AI suggested queries useful, but most thought they were sensible, and sometimes retrieved relevant passages (Figure 5).

The majority of respondents used the following strategies: clicking on Wikipedia links, refining the previous query, searching the candidate answer

to validate it, creating a search chain where the next query is based on the previous passages, using multiple search chains, and using world knowledge. All strategies listed above received at least two respondents claiming that they have used it.

People also reports diverse strategies they have applied. Interesting responses includes

> I think the inclination toward keyword search has to do with the desire for "the" answer rather than "an" answer. I definitely use natural language queries in normal searches, but usually when I am looking for a subjective answer, or a variety of options. I might google something like "how often should I wash my car" or "what's the best teapot" - questions that have possible answers, but not a single objectively correct answer. In those cases I'm happy to sort through many responses to synthesize an answer. But in Quizbowl (and especially in this case given the time/search constraints) I don't want to spend time typing a long query, or paraphrasing what's in the question, and I definitely don't want to risk getting answers that are contradictory or ambiguous. The goal is to search something specific and uniquely identifying that leads clearly to a single correct answer and keywords just seem so much safer for that goal.

> Check the AI suggestions, and use one of them if they seem sensible, or type my own. Then develop it from there, based on the top results and seeing if there are any leads.

> I used different strategies for different questions. I figured out quickly that the AI-generated queries were mostly not helpful for me unless they were one person's name. In those cases I found myself scanning biographical entries from the beginning and eventually getting a clue that would help me find an answer. Adding a subject category like philosophy or chemistry in the initial search was often useful. Questions about the content of literary texts and visual art were really difficult to search; I could get closer to the answer but not all the way there.