Content Warning: Certain examples used in this response may be upsetting.

Crowdsourcing as method to supplement digital learning is becoming increasingly important to fill in the knowledge gaps created by the limitations of pure computer driven data. It is neither good nor bad, but necessary for us to continue along the current path of translating how we perceive reality into quantifiable data. But can all data be quantified? Should it be quantified? Or is there some type of arbitrary line that exists that separates data that should and should not be quantified? This short paper will answer ***NONE*** of these questions but instead will focus on two examples showcasing the different results crowdsourcing can produce. By engaging with two different scenarios, perhaps we can begin to form an answer to these questions.

Waze is a mobile application uses real time traffic data of its users to better predict driving routes. If one user reports a road obstruction, nearby users of the app will be asked to verify or deny the validity of this data. There is a trade off value between users and the app since the labour of collecting information is mostly passed off the consumers. Much like how iStock uses crowdsourcing instead of paying actual employees to take photos, Waze profits from the labour created by its users. However, in fairness to Waze, iStock charges users for access to its data at a markup that directly profits the company. Waze doesn't charge the user directly and instead relies on advertising as its primary source of revenue. The success of Waze as a project is reflected in its longevity as a communal tool for car drivers and is one of the largest examples of (arguably) successful crowdsourced data. But what happens when data curation is not handled appropriately?

In 2012, PepsiCo started an online contest called "*Dub the Dew*" in which it crowdsourced a decision on what to name it's next Mountain Dew flavor. Since this project had no limitations on who could participate and failed to offer any real incentive for the labour of its participants, things quickly fell apart. Before the experiment was taken down, the top five suggestions for name were as follows:

5. Gushin' Granny
4. Diabeetus
3. Fapple
2. Gushing Granny
1. Hitler did nothing wrong

This disaster from PepsiCo showcases one of the dangers in crowdsourcing in that you are left to the mercy and motives of data collectors. The thread of consideration between this incident and Lauren McCarthy's project lies in with the question of motivation. Few safeguards exist between bad actors manipulating data sets which leads to inaccurate or disastrous results. What was to stop people from giving McCarthy bad advice? Yes, a large enough data group could theoretically average out bad advice, but that's dependent on factors such as sample size, data requested, and filtration of results. Without knowing the motivations of those creating the crowd in crowdsourcing, we open ourselves to individuals creating a mob-mentality for their own means.