Companion image translation to Figure 1 in the alt.chi 2022 submission “Towards fair and pro-social employment of digital pieceworkers for sourcing machine learning training data”.

Table 1: a typed version of the post-it-notes the data workers recorded their impressions of the three platforms they tried. Data workers are labelled “A”, “B”, and “C” throughout. “A” used descriptive phrases, while “B” and “C” both used a scoring system (0-5) where 5 was the highest rating (additional interpretation for scoring provided for readability).

|  | Functional tasks (HITs were structurally sound when interacted with) | Pay (/taxes) | Security (with regard to requestors) | Task availability | Task refresh | Competition | Instruction level / detail | Qualification system | Task variety | Communication (availability of requestors) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CW | A: good  B: 2  C: 3 (mostly functional) | A: Not great  B: 2  C: 1 (very poor pay) | A: Bad  B: 1 (felt very unsafe)  C: 2 (felt mostly unsafe) | A: Bad  B: 0  C: 2 (low task availability) | A: Bad  B: 0 (low refresh rate)  C: 1 | A: Can’t tell  B: 0 (less competition)  C: 3 (more competition) | A: Decent  B: 0  C: 4 | A: Non-existent  B: 2 (poor)  C: 3 (fine) | A: Bad  B: 0 (very little task variety)  C: 2 (little task variety) | A: Did not try  B: 0 (extremely poor communication with requestors)  C: 2 (poor communication) |
| MW | A: good  B: 1  C: 1 | A: Not great  B: 2  C: 1 | A: Bad  B: 1  C: 0 | A: Ok-ish  B: 2  C: 1 | A: Ok  B: 1  C: 1 | A: Kind of high  B: 1  C: 0 | A: Ok  B: 0  C: 4 | A: Not sure  B: 1  C: 3 | A: Ok-ish  B: 2  C: 2 | A: Did not try  B: 0  C: 0 |
| AMT | A: iffy  B: N/A  C: 1.5 | A: Some room for making an ok wage  B: N/A  C: 1 | A: Bad  B: 2  C: 2 | A: Ok  B: 4  C: 3 | A: IDK  B: 4  C: 1 | A: Possibly high  B: N/A  C: 3 | A: Could be more simple  B: 1  C: 3 | A: Hard  B: 1  C: 5 | A: Ok  B: 3  C: 2 | A: Did not try  B: 0  C: 2 |