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Research Interests

• **Entity-centric Information Access** (2005-now)
  - Structured/Unstructured data (SIGIR 12), TRank (ISWC 13, WSemJ 16)
  - NER in Scientific Docs (WWW 14), Prepositions (CIKM 14)
  - IR Evaluation (ECIR 16 Best Paper Award, IRJ 2015, CIKM 17)

• **Hybrid Human-Machine Systems** (2012-now)
  - ZenCrowd (WWW 12, VLDBJ), CrowdQ (CIDR 13)
  - Human Memory based Systems (WWW 14, PVLDB)
  - Hybrid systems overview (COMNET, 2015)

• **Better Crowdsourcing Platforms** (2013-now)
  - Platform Dynamics (WWW 15)
  - Pick-a-Crowd (WWW 13), **Malicious Workers** (CHI 15)
  - Scale-up Crowdsourcing (HCOMP 14), Scheduling (WWW 16)
  - **Timeout** (HCOMP 16), **Environment** (UBICOMP 17)
FashionBrain: Understanding Europe’s Fashion Data Universe

Project Objectives:
- Novel Shopping Experience: **Make Images Searchable**
  - Product search and recommendation
- Shift Traffic away from Web Search Engines to Retailer's Mobile Apps
  - By providing custom shopping experiences and advanced search tools
- Detect Influencers and **Predict Fashion Trends**
  - Time Series Analysis; Social Media data
- **Share Insights** with Cross Industry Partner Network
  - Data Integration infrastructure based on HDFS and column stores

Project Duration 2017-2019. Funded under the H2020-ICT-14-2016 topic Big Data PPP: cross-sectorial and cross-lingual data integration and experimentation. Total cost: 2.9M EUR.

fashionbrain-project.eu
Crowdsourcing

• "Simply defined, crowdsourcing represents the act of a company or institution taking a function once performed by employees and outsourcing it to an undefined (and generally large) network of people in the form of an open call. This can take the form of peer-production (when the job is performed collaboratively), but is also often undertaken by sole individuals. The crucial prerequisite is the use of the open call format and the large network of potential laborers."

[Howe, 2006]
Incentives in Crowdsourcing

• **Extrinsic motivation** if task is considered boring, dangerous, useless, socially undesirable, dislikable by the performer.
  • Paid Crowdsourcing

• **Intrinsic motivation** is driven by an interest or enjoyment in the task itself.
  • Fun (enjoyment) / Games with a purpose
  • Community (belonging, desire to help)
  • Citizen Science
Paid Micro-Task Crowdsourcing

A Crowdsourcing Platform allows requesters to publish a crowdsourcing request (batch) composed of multiple tasks (HITs).

Programmatically Invoke the crowd with APIs or using a website.

Workers in the crowd complete tasks and obtain a monetary reward.
Amazon MTurk

Make Money by working on HITs

HITs - Human Intelligence Tasks - are individual tasks that you work on. Find HITs now.

As a Mechanical Turk Worker you:
- Can work from home
- Choose your own work hours
- Get paid for doing good work

Find an interesting task  Work  Earn money

Get Results from Mechanical Turk Workers

Ask workers to complete HITs - Human Intelligence Tasks - and get results using Mechanical Turk. Register Now

As a Mechanical Turk Requester you:
- Have access to a global, on-demand, 24 x 7 workforce
- Get thousands of HITs completed in minutes
- Pay only when you’re satisfied with the results

Fund your account  Load your tasks  Get results

Find HITs Now  Get Started
MTurk is a Marketplace for HITs
You must accept this HIT before working on it.

Data Collection Instructions:

Find the postal address for this Australian company:
- Search on Google, the company’s website, YellowPages or Facebook to find the correct postal address for the company below.
- Enter the full Australian postal address for the business.
- You may use the research links provided to help.
- Do not enter incomplete or incorrect details!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company name:</th>
<th>Stellar Electrical And Solar Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company website:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company YellowPages:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Facebook:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Australian Street Address (ONLY this field is required if complete):

Start typing Australian Street Address...
## MTurk is a Marketplace for HITs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requester name</th>
<th>Hits</th>
<th>Reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speechpad</td>
<td>23857</td>
<td>$172,994.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Liang</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>$7,320.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Vision</td>
<td>51187</td>
<td>$5,762.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford GSB Behavioral Lab</td>
<td>3749</td>
<td>$2,110.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Callison-Burch</td>
<td>8157</td>
<td>$2,064.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC.org Mechanical Turk</td>
<td>6591</td>
<td>$2,011.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VacationrentalAPI</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>$1,373.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Expertise</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>$1,303.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluejay Labs</td>
<td>13613</td>
<td>$1,288.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YL Testing</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>$1,236.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hybrid Human-Machine Systems

• Use Machines to scale over large amounts of data
• Keep humans in the loop
  • By means of Crowdsourcing
  • To make sure the quality of the data processing is good
• Crowd for Pre-processing vs Post-processing

Hybrid Image Search

Yan, Kumar, Ganesan, CrowdSearch: Exploiting Crowds for Accurate Real-time Image Search on Mobile Phones, Mobisys 2010.
Human Computation 101 - Summary

- Crowdsourcing is growing in popularity
- It is used both in industry and academia
- For a number of applications across disciplines

- Open questions:
  - How to make sure we get quality results back from a crowdsourcing platforms? (**Effectiveness**)
  - Can we optimize the cost and execution in paid micro-task crowdsourcing? (**Efficiency**)
Human Factors - Outline

• The effect of limiting **task time** (HCOMP 2016)
• Understanding **malicious behaviors** in paid crowdsourcing (CHI 2015)
• The **modus operandi** of crowd workers (UBICOMP 2017)
The Unexpected Benefits of Limiting the Time to Judge

Crowdsourcing Relevance Judgements

• Task: Given a Query, Document pair
  Is the doc
  highly relevant, relevant, partially relevant, not relevant?

• Ask multiple workers

• Aggregate answers to obtain a relevance label

Query: jaguar

Abc abc Cde Abc

- Highly relevant
- Relevant
- Partially relevant
- Not relevant
Our Research Question

Can we limit the time to judge to reduce the cost (\$\$) of creating IR test collections?

Hypothesis
Yes, but with quality loss
Our Experimental Setup

- **E1 Unbound time** (i.e., the standard approach)
  - 5 judgements per doc, 8 documents, 5 topics, 2 crowds = 400 workers

- **E2** Document shown for a **predefined amount of time**
  - 30, 15, 7, 3 seconds. Each worker to judge 8 docs

- **E3** Same timeout for all 8 documents (15 or 30 sec)

- **E4** Fixed budget: comparison between
  - more quick judgements
  - few slow judgements
E1: We Have All the Time in the World

• RQ: How much time do crowd workers take to judge the relevance of a document if no time constrain is set?
  • 5 workers to judge a permutation of 8 docs

Median: 13 sec
Mean: 24-25 sec
E1: We Have All the Time in the World

- No correlation of time with
  - Doc length
  - Doc readability
  - Topic
  - Relevance level
- Time vs Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E2: Faster! Faster! Sorry, Too Late

• Understand which is the minimum amount of time required to perform relevance judgments
• (max) timeouts: 30, 15, 7, 3 seconds
• Each worker to judge 8 docs, 2 for each timeout (one long, one short)
• Looking at Quality measures:
  • 3 and 7 secs are not enough
  • 15 slightly better than 30 (learning bias for position 1-2?)
E2: Faster! Faster! Sorry, Too Late

Time when document disappears

Time when judgement is made

Position of the document judged (1-8)

Variance across topics
E3: Selecting the Best Timeout

• We repeated E1 using 15 and 30 sec timeouts

• 15 seconds timeouts yield consistently better quality judgements
  • Than 30 seconds timeouts
  • Than no timeouts (E1 quality values)
Our Research Question

Can we limit the time to judge to reduce the cost (\textdollar\textdollar\textdollar) of creating IR test collections?

Hypothesis

Yes, and it improves the quality!

Yes, but with quality loss
E4: Many Fast&Furious or a Few Laid-Back?

• **Fixed budget:**
  - small timeout, more workers
  - Long timeout, less workers

• We compared 10 combinations with the same budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeslot(sec)</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7.9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>13.7</th>
<th>16.7</th>
<th>21.5</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>37.5</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Highest quality at 25-30 sec
Findings

• The first couple of judgments done by a worker are of lower quality.
• Judgements that take more than 30 seconds are of lower quality.
• Time-outs in relevance judgements HITs can increase quality.
• The best timeout to be used lies in the interval of 25-30 seconds and does not depend on topic, document, or crowd.
Discussion

• Crowdsourcing Relevance Judgements for IR Evaluation can be expensive to scale

• **Limiting the time** to judge can **control the cost**

• But can also **increase the quality**!
  • By inducing workers to look at the document for a predefined amount of time

• **Why? (Hypotheses)**
  • With a balance between boredom and stress -> “in the flow”
  • System I and System II thinking
Understanding Malicious Behaviors

Quality Control in Paid Crowdsourcing

- Diverse pool of crowd workers
- Wide range of behavior
- Various motivations

➢ Typically adopted solution to prevent/flag malicious activity: **Gold-Standard Questions**
Research Questions

RQ1: Do untrustworthy workers adopt different methods to complete tasks, and exhibit different kinds of behavior?

RQ2: Can behavioral patterns of malicious workers in the crowd be identified and quantified?
Design

• CrowdFlower Platform to deploy survey
• Survey questions
  • Demographics
  • Educational & general background
• 34 Questions in total
  • Open-ended
  • Multiple Choice
  • Likert-type
• Responses from 1000 crowd workers
  • Monetary Compensation per worker : 0.2 USD
RQ1 - Behavioral Patterns

**Ineligible Workers (IW)**

**Instruction:** Please attempt this microtask ONLY IF you have successfully completed 5 microtasks previously.

**Response:** ‘this is my first task’

**Fast Deceivers (FD)**

eg: Copy-pasting same text in response to multiple questions, entering gibberish, etc.

**Response:** ‘What’s your task?’ , ‘adasd’, ‘fgfgf gsd ljlkj’

**Rule Breakers (RB)**

**Instruction:** Identify 5 keywords that represent this task (separated by commas).

**Response:** ‘survey, tasks, history’, ‘previous task yellow’

**Smart Deceivers (SD)**

**Instruction:** Identify 5 keywords that represent this task (separated by commas).

**Response:** ‘one, two, three, four, five’

**Gold Standard Preys (GSP)**

These workers abide by the instructions and provide valid responses, but stumble at the gold-standard questions!
RQ2 - Distribution of Low-quality Workers

• passed the gold-standard: **Trustworthy workers (TW)**
• failed to pass the gold-standard: **Untrustworthy workers (UW)**
Tipping Point

• “the first point at which a worker begins to exhibit malicious behavior after having provided an acceptable response”
Findings

• Identified different types of malicious behavior exhibited by crowd workers.
• Measuring ‘maliciousness’ of workers to quantify their behavioral traits, and ‘tipping point’ to further understand worker behavior.
• This understanding helps requesters in effective task design, ensures adequate utilization of the crowdsourcing platform(s).
• Guidelines for efficient design of Surveys by limiting malicious activity.
  • Pre-screening (ineligible)
  • Validators (fast deceivers, rule breaker)
  • Psychometric approaches (smart deceivers)
Modus Operandi of Crowd Workers

Context

- Crowd workers are embedded in diverse work environments
- Work environment: hardware/software at disposal

- Usually requesters provide an undifferentiated task to all workers
- How do task UI elements and work environments interact?
Studies

• **Study I** - Survey on 100 people with questions about experience and problems related to UI
  • Problems with input (text areas, checkboxes, radio buttons), multimedia (audio, video), links, colors, buttons

• **Study II** – Measured performances of task design variants
  • 43 synthetic variations x 3 tasks x 50 judgements x 2 countries = 12 900 resp
  • American workers were faster than Indian workers
  • American workers outperformed Indian workers in audio transcription tasks (coping well with poor quality audio as well)
  • Workers with faster devices (laptops were found to be faster than desktops) provided higher quality responses (more tags, more unique tags)
Studies

- **Study III** – 1:1 interviews with workers who participated in study II
  - Different devices are used for different tasks
  - Internet speed and cost is a variable for task selection (e.g., multimedia content)

> “Sometimes the Internet fee is greater than the rewards I earn (due to) images, audios or videos in tasks.”

  -- CrowdFlower Worker from India

- Language proficiency has great impact on accuracy

- ModOp: a tool to check for crowdsourcing task design problems
Conclusions

• Paid micro-task crowdsourcing to build hybrid human-machine systems
• Human-in-the-loop systems means to consider human factors!

• Timeouts to increase efficiency and effectiveness of crowd work
  • Does it generalize to other task types?
• Malicious behaviors
  • Supervised worker type classification
• The effect of work environment on work efficiency and effectiveness
  • Build recommender systems / assign tasks based on complexity
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