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Join us now at: crowdresearch.slack.com in #meetings

Email crowdresearch@cs.stanford.edu if you need an invite.
This week

- Reflections on your Getting Started milestones
- Hello, world!
- Focus: Macro/microtasking
- Focus: Open governance
- This week’s milestones
Our two core problems

- Trust
  - Will the other person do what they said they will?

- Power
  - Who determines whether a task is good, or the work is good?
Foundations and features

- **Foundations** will likely be the major contributions of our platform, and set the stage. We start here.

- **Features** will make the platform better, but can’t solve problems of trust and power. We add these later.
Being a Turkker
Your observations

• Difficult to get work!
• Difficult to get paid!

• …and difficult to even get approved to work!
As a worker

- Donna: “To get any rating you need to take any small job, do it well, and communicate with the requester.”

- Kevin: “[Upwork’s] test certification system is kind of messy.”

- Shirish: “Requirements from requestors most of the times lack a lot of information and are highly skewed on timelines”
As a worker

• Divya: “Easier [tasks] gave incredibly low pay back… $0.50 HITs […] have been pending for several days and one even got rejected without any explanation of the evaluation.”

• Ryan: “After completing some of these tasks (doing roughly an hour of work a day for 3 days) I still found myself far off from making any real money, about 50 cents.”
As a requester

- Kajal: “Posted a job and did set its end time to next day but still didn't get response for few hours even its end date was near.” (No reason why!)

- Shirish: “Milestone receivables are not properly vetted (can be due to lack of technical knowledge or proper visualization of the end result) and therefore are highly debated by requestor later”
As a requester

- Hiroshi: “I want some bidirectional personnel evaluation feature where workers can evaluate (vote?) requesters”

- Ryan: “Had to rework turk question in order to get accurate results, or any results at all, an indicator of this was varying answers on HITs that should have similar answers”
As a requesteur

- Ryan: “Had to rework turk question in order to get accurate results, or any results at all, an indicator of this was varying answers on HITs that should have similar answers”
  - Many similar responses!

- Angela: it was “daunting”. Wanted mentorship opportunities.
As a requester

- Angela: Fair pricing “may be one of the major stumbling blocks”. How do you choose?

- Surabhi: “The requesters have no means to know that people are those who they claim to be and possess the skills which they claim to possess”

- Karolina: “Sometimes managing and communicating takes longer than doing it yourself”
In summary…

• “While watching the interviews I found the main points for workers to be community, money, and finding work, while for requestors it was quality and time.”
An aside on related work

Great feedback!
An aside on names

(Let's set up a vote to see where we're at!)
Hello, world!
Starting to code
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Micro/macrotask

crowdsourcing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requester</th>
<th>HIT Expiration Date</th>
<th>Time Allotted</th>
<th>Reward</th>
<th>HITs Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Data Gurus</td>
<td>May 23, 2015 (15 hours 59 minutes)</td>
<td>6 minutes</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishwanath Kumar</td>
<td>Aug 1, 2015 (9 weeks 6 days)</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Quality</td>
<td>May 26, 2015 (3 days 2 hours)</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Requester Inc.</td>
<td>Jun 2, 2015 (1 week 2 days)</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post a Job

Category: Design & Multimedia
Subcategory: Video Production
Job Title: Make a video with PowerPoint

DESCRIPTION:

OBJECTIVE:
I am looking for an experienced multi-media person who can create a series of videos, based off provided mind-maps and audio tracks.

Job Specs:
You will need to create a PowerPoint or Keynote slide deck (incl. transitions and graphic) using the information from a provided mind-map, as page titles and bullets.

Once the slide-deck has been created, you will need to match/sync the transitions with a XX minute audio track to create a final video.

This is a very simple and quick task for someone who knows what they are doing.

3213 characters left
Create a marketplace that can support large, expert work

- While maintaining the ease and speed of traditional microtasking
- Maintain the submission approach from microtask markets, but find ways to make it accessible to both microtask and macrotask work
Implications are big…

• Today on Mechanical Turk, microtasks
  • “I need people to label my images”
• Today on oDesk/Upwork, macrotasks
  • “I need a copyeditor for my document”

• On our platform, both
  • “I need English speakers interested in learning Chinese to do an online user study testing my new language-learning website.”
Keep in mind: the worker’s view

• Why would an expert work here instead of elsewhere?
  • Programmer: if starting a high-quality job is as fast as showing up and picking one that I like. (5min!)
  • Copyeditor: same…
  • Microtask worker: same….but this one exists today!
What we need to decide

- Three main design tasks!
  - Posting jobs
    - Authoring the content of the request (HTML editor?)
    - Saying how much you’ll pay
    - Specifying what kinds of skills you want
  - Monitoring jobs
    - How do I see how far we are?
  - Reviewing jobs
    - How do I look at the results and pay?
Challenges

• How do we ensure high-quality results? Do you let an expert work for hours and submit? That seems risky. Should there be intermediate feedback mechanisms?

• How do you trust that someone is an expert?

• Does this look like AMT where any expert certified in an area can accept the task? Or is it a negotiation before I start?
Micro+macrotask: suggestion

• Workers have levels in expertise areas
  • Python programmer Level 3, Copyeditor Level 1, Microtask Level 5

• All tasks can be taken up without negotiation by anyone who qualifies, and worked on immediately
Suggestion: quality control

- For all task submissions on our marketplace, we require that requesters create at least one milestone.

- That milestone serves as a checkpoint:
  - If it's a microtask, it can be after 5% of tasks are complete
  - If it's a macrotask, it might be a description of what they should do first
Suggestion: quality control

- The results of that milestone can be used to select specific workers to qualify to work on the rest of the task, or just to launch the rest of the tasks with no qualification.

- The requester can add as many milestones along the way as they want; we suggest one every couple days.
Open governance
What we mean

• To encourage trust, people need to feel that their interests are represented

• How can we balance the needs of requesters, workers, and researchers (us)?

• And how do we do this without taking forever to make any decision, like Wikipedia?
Currently…

• Two different sets of people with potentially competing interests: workers and requesters

• Two leading models…
  • Direct voting: e.g., policy changes voted on directly by all workers and all requesters, and need support from both to pass
  • Leadership board: e.g., yearly elections of a panel of workers and requesters who can negotiate and vote on changes themselves
After much discussion and careful consideration, we have found the perfect solution for this problem. Stay tuned for the beta release!

LEADERSHIP BOARD

A leadership board, composed of visionary, trusted and popular workers (40%), r (20%), has the duty of looking at the platform community's most upvoted issues. research, comes up with a new solution, tests it and the problem is fixed. Everyone.

Problems Subforum

Anonymous Worker
Subject: Negative Reviews
20 -03 - 2015
16:33
This has 743 upvotes
I've noticed that workers' negative reviews are showing up first, this is affecting our chances to succeed in the platform. Is there any solution for that?
Thanks.
Anonymous Worker

Requester Ann
This has 122 upvotes
Hello
I have been using the dating subforum but have trouble meeting handsome workers and requestors in my area. I think the interface...

Platform Dev. Mike
This has 20 upvotes
Workers post their problems on the platform's public forum and social media. The complaint is upvoted by the community as something that needs to be addressed. After being the most upvoted problem, the issue is transferred to the "Brainstorming Subforum"
Next steps

• Which approach do we take?
Milestones
Reminder: how this will work

- Go to crowdresearch.stanford.edu and find the Week 2 milestones. We’ve collated them there.
- Claim at least one milestone via Trello.
  - It may involve collaboration across teams, or individual/team work.
  - It may involve design, usability, or coding.
  - Coordinate on Slack in the relevant channel for your milestones
- Complete and submit all milestones by Thursday 11:59pm Pacific
Example milestones this week

- Design the micro/macrotask workflow
  1. Authoring
  2. Monitoring
  3. Reviewing
- Collect votes and make a decision about open governance voting
- Hacking on requester profile, task dashboard, task creation workflow, and more