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.

|  | 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 |