



# VU Research Portal

## The Vaccination Debate

Leemans, I.B.; Braake, Serge Ter; Van Son, Chantal; Ceolin, Davide; Aroyo, L.M.; Vossen, Piek; Noordergraaf, Julia

2018

### **document license**

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

### **citation for published version (APA)**

Leemans, I. B., Braake, S. T., Van Son, C., Ceolin, D., Aroyo, L. M., Vossen, P., & Noordergraaf, J. (2018). *The Vaccination Debate: An Exploration of Long Term Concept and Perspective Mining*. Paper presented at DHBenelux 2018, . [http://2018.dhbenelux.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/2018/05/TerBraakeEtAl\\_VaccinationDebate\\_DHBenelux2018.pdf](http://2018.dhbenelux.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/2018/05/TerBraakeEtAl_VaccinationDebate_DHBenelux2018.pdf)

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

### **E-mail address:**

[vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl](mailto:vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl)

# The Vaccination Debate: An Exploration of Long Term Concept and Perspective Mining

Serge ter Braake<sup>2\*</sup>, Chantal van Son<sup>1</sup>, Inger Leemans<sup>1</sup>, Davide Ceolin<sup>3</sup>, Lora Aroyo<sup>1</sup>,  
Rens Bod<sup>2</sup>, Julia Noordegraaf<sup>2</sup>, Piek Vossen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

<sup>2</sup> Universiteit van Amsterdam

<sup>3</sup> Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica (CWI)

\* corresponding author (sergeterbraake@gmail.com)

In this paper we will explore methods for long-term concept and perspective mining in the context of the QuPiD2 project (Quality and Perspectives in Deep Data).<sup>1</sup> We will analyze 250 years of vaccination debates, by using a mix of distant- and close reading, computational analyses and NLP techniques. Our aim is to map the variations and changes in perspectives in the vaccination debate both from a synchronic and diachronic perspective. For centuries, the debate was dominated by the dichotomy between a vast majority that was in favour of vaccination, versus a minority that was against the use of vaccinations. These debates showed remarkable consistency: the same arguments were repeated over and over again. Due to the internet revolution, the debate became larger and has a different dynamic, with group polarization and the formation of so-called ‘Echo Chambers’ where like minded people easily find each other and confirm each other’s beliefs. Digital analysis can help us distinguish the multiple perspectives and see how they relate to the previous ‘offline’ debates. We will present our methods for historical and contemporary concept- and perspective mining and aim to see how the vaccination debate changed over the centuries.

## Vaccination Debate: the first 250 years:

The artificial induction of immunity against smallpox existed in the Netherlands since the second half of the eighteenth century. Children were injected with human pox to induce an innocent version of the disease, rendering them immune to the serious version of the disease. Vaccinations were introduced in the Netherlands in 1799, following Edward Jenner’s scientific publication on the benefits of injections with cowpox. Even though Jenner’s findings were widely embraced as a blessing, internationally and in the Netherlands, skeptics and even furious adversaries remained. This situation of a vast majority of people that is ‘pro’ vaccinations and a minority that is ‘con’ still exists over 200 years later. The arguments pro and con have remained surprisingly the same as well. We will follow the first 250 years of the vaccination debate by looking at the situation in the Netherlands, by studying (digitized) old prints, ‘delphered’ newspaper articles, journals *De Gids* and *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* and other secondary sources, up until the advent of the internet in the late nineties.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://qupid-project.net/>

### **Contemporary Debate, Computational Perspectives Mining:**

In the 1990's, as a result of the internet revolution, the anti-vaccine minority was able to get themselves better heard and also was able to flock together more easily. In online communities information is spread easily and people run the risk of getting 'trapped' inside their own Echo Chambers of people affirming each other's beliefs. There is so much information available online that people tend to ignore the information that is contrary to what they think. This tendency is strengthened by algorithms that personalise the content people are presented with. At the same time, online communication seems to be imbued with a polarising tone. The increasing size and intensity of the vaccination debate, which possibly poses a risk to public health, warrants the use of computational methods to analyse what is going on and why.

The QuPiD2 tools enable us to look closely at the debate in an international and internet context, trying to dissect the arguments and perspectives automatically with NLP techniques. We decompose text into propositions that can be compared across texts, and determine the perspective of the author or quoted sources towards them. For example, we extract whether a proposition (e.g. "vaccinations cause autism") is true, false or uncertain according to some source using factuality detection. By aggregating and comparing those propositions and perspectives about vaccinations on the basis of the entities and concepts that are being mentioned in relation to them, we aim to obtain some insight into (patterns in) pro-vaccine and anti-vaccine world views and the types of claims and arguments that are most undisputed or controversial in the debate. Using this approach, we aim to see if the internet revolution has merely enlarged the debate, or also changed its nature with different perspectives and more rapid changes in the concept of vaccinations.

**Results:** Even though smallpox was eradicated in the 1970's, and many other vaccines against different diseases were invented since Jenner, the debate remained mostly the same. Opponents of vaccines claimed they had bad side effects, were unnatural and against God's Will. The stability in the debate prior to the internet revolution also is reflected by a stability in word co-occurrences in texts that deal with vaccinations. The biggest shifts we detect is vaccinations drifting away from words like 'cow' and 'smallpox', which is not very surprising because in 1800 vaccinations were a new weapon against smallpox that came from the cow, while it came to be used more widely for many diseases the following 200 years. The few negative voices against vaccinations (e.g. this one doctor, these few preachers) usually remained relatively isolated in their own small networks. Vaccine opponents were mostly known to live in religious communities, even though numerically, according to estimates in the 1970's, approximately five times as many lived widely spread outside these communities. Based on preliminary results we hypothesise that in the online debate of the 21st century the role of God has played a less prominent role, while a new element of conspiracy theories has come to the surface. More results will follow during DHBenelux.

## References

### Data

*Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen*, 1776-1876

*De Gids*, 1837-2000

A quick exploration of “Delphered” newspaper articles

Corpus of the online vaccination debate: <https://vaccinationcorpus.wordpress.com>

### Literature

**Ballard, Edward**, *On vaccination. Its value and alleged dangers. A prize essay* (London, 1868)

**Capadose, A.**, *Bestrijding der vaccine of de vaccine aan de beginselen der Godsdienst, der rede en ware geneeskunde getoetst.* (Amsterdam, 1823)

**Capadose, A.** *De koepok-inenting tegen de leer des bijbels strijdende of korte aanwijzing voor godvreezede ouders* (Amsterdam 1828)

**Chamorro-Premuzic, Tomas**, ‘How the web distorts reality and impairs our judgement skills’, *The Guardian*, 13 May 2014.

**Del Vicario, Michela**, Vivaldo, Gianna; Bessi, Alessandro; Zollo, Fabiana; Scala, Antonio; Caldarelli, Guido; Quattrociochi, Walter, ‘Echo Chambers: Emotional Contagion and Group Polarization on Facebook’, *SCIENTIFIC REPORTS*, vol. 6, 37825.

**Daniëls, C.E.**, *De kinderpokinenting in Nederland: meerendeels naar onuitgegeven bescheiden bewerkt: eene medisch-historische studie* (Amsterdam 1875).

**Gross, Gary and Kent Sepkowitz**, ‘The Myth of the Medical Breakthrough: Smallpox, Vaccination, and Jenner Reconsidered’, *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 3 (1).

**Douma, J. en W.H. Velema**, *Polio. Afwachten of afwerpen?* (Amsterdam, 1979)

**Hoeufft, Samuel**, *De inenting der pokjes* (Den Haag, 1770)

**Hulshoff, Maria Aletta**, *De koepok-inenting beschouwd, en tien bedenkingen overwogen: voor minkundigen* (Amsterdam, 1827).

**Janssens, Uta**, ‘Matthieu Maty and the Adoption of Inoculation for Smallpox in Holland’, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 55, Summer 1981 (2): 246-256.

**Matthes, H. J.**, *Leerreede ter aanprijzing van de koepokinenting* (Groningen, 1808)  
*Wet tot voorziening tegen besmettelijke ziekten van 4 December 1872 (Staatsblad no. 134): met de daarover vooral in de Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal gewisselde stukken en gehouden beraadslagingen*, Volume 1, 1 januari 1873.

