**Assignment 2A – all students**

We ask that you complete two tasks this week: (1) continue working on the literature review; and (2) rate the proposed new tasks.

**1. Literature review**

The group has already compiled an impressive collection of papers, but there are likely still more to find. **Each individual should identify and summarize at least one paper on the wisdom of crowds**. Your team can and should work together to ensure that each individual is able to contribute a paper to the effort.

As we have such a large group of collaborators, it is vital that everyone follows the formatting conventions. Please review each of your entries (from this week and last week) to ensure that you’ve followed the conventions, as noted in the “instructions” tab. Some specific issues to address include:

*Literature Review Tab*

* Fix incomplete entries. Please ensure that **all** fields are populated
* Add your email address and the paper name for each of your submissions. (We just added these two fields this week.)
* Ensure that each paper takes up only one row
* Delete duplicate entries (i.e., ensure the same paper isn’t listed twice)
* Delete empty rows

*Past Studies Tab*

* Ensure that **all** fields are populated
* Ensure that the “task” column describes the wisdom of crowds task, and is not simply a summary of the paper. For example, it should be something like “predict movie revenues”, and not “test of social influence.” Note that not every paper will have appropriate tasks to record.
* Delete empty rows
* Delete duplicate entries (i.e., ensure tasks from the same paper aren’t listed twice)

*GitHub*

* Add (or move) all papers that you have reviewed to the “papers” directory.
* Name (or rename) papers according to the convention “LastnameYear.pdf”, as described in the “instructions” tab. If you rename any papers, be sure to update references to that paper in the other tabs.
* Do not unnecessarily create branches of the repository or issue pull requests. You are all collaborators, which means that you can directly push to the master branch. Every individual should push his or her own contributions to the repository, as we use the git log as a way to monitor individual progress.

**2. Rating new domains**

We were very impressed with the quality of your ideas! Now we need to select the best ones to incorporate into the experiment. To do so, we ask that you each rank the tasks generated by the group according to the following instructions.

1. In the GitHub repository, navigate to the “hw/assignment\_2/submissions” folder, and look for the file named with your GitHub user id.

2. Read through the file and modify **ONLY THE FIRST COLUMN.** Do not make any changes to the other columns. You should rate each idea with either a 0 or a 1 depending on if you find it to be a good idea (rating = 1) or not (rating = 0). Take into account the following criteria when up-voting or down-voting an idea:

1. Is it feasible to implement in our online platform? In particular, some of the proposed tasks require surveying people in specific locations, but we will likely have little control on which types of people ultimately participate in our experiment.
2. Can we determine the correct answer? It is very important for us to be able to compare the crowd estimate with the true value. For this reason, long-range predictions (e.g., who will be President of the United States in 10 years) are not feasible. Similarly, the task is not feasible if we simply can’t find the appropriate data to determine the true answer.
3. Will most people understand the question? We want to avoid questions that require specific technical knowledge, since our participants are drawn from the general population.
4. Is the question ethical? Please ensure that the proposed tasks are not controversial or insensitive, as we do not want to offend anyone.
5. Is it interesting? This is a more subjective criterion, but still important. You will be in charge of implementing some of the selected ideas, so it is to your benefit to up-vote ideas that you find interesting. Also ask yourselves whether a survey participant would enjoy answering the question.

**IMPORTANT NOTES:**

* **ONLY MODIFY THE RATING COLUMN**
* **ONLY MODIFY THE FILE ASSIGNED TO YOU**
* **AFTER RATING THE TASKS, PUSH YOUR UPDATED FILE TO THE REPOSITORY**

**Assignment 2B – Platform Design Challenge**

Over the next couple of weeks, each team will work on:

1) Designing the architecture for the platform

2) Developing a working prototype

Once the working prototypes are complete, the three platforms will compete to run the experiments. All students will vote to elect the best prototype. We expect that all three finished products to be of excellent quality, so do not be dismayed if your platform will not be chosen. This is an opportunity to showcase your web design skills and have a finished product to add to your portfolio.

**Required Languages:**

* PHP for scripting
* MySQL for back-end data management

**Suggested:**

* Javascript AJAX to ensure fast response times

### Please consider the following design considerations

### Data storage

### Types of files, downloading capability

### End-user features

### Log-in

### Anonymity of answers

### Tracking progress of experiments (e.g. % completed)

### Conformity across experiments

* + Will the applications written for your platform maintain a seamless look and feel?

### Capability to show user the crowd guesses so far

### Real-time analysis statistical analysis

### Modularity

### How will teams interface with the platform and set up their own experiments?

### Integration points

### How much customization will be provided?

### Layout

### Intuitive, clean interface

**Submission**

Please submit a proposal outlining how your platform will address each of the issues above, and any others you feel are pertinent. Feel free to use whatever means you deem most suitable: be it in the form of a sketch or text description.