|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **uiucLogo2** | **University of Illinois**  **at Urbana–Champaign** | **Institutional Review Board Office**  528 East Green Street, Suite 203, MC-419  Champaign, IL 61820  tel: 217-333-2670 fax: 217-333-0405  E-mail: [irb@illinois.edu](mailto:irb@illinois.edu) Web: [www.irb.illinois.edu](http://www.irb.illinois.edu) | | |
|  | |
| **IRB-1 Temp** | |
| **Application for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects** | | | |  |
| This Section is for Office Use Only | | | | |
| UIUC IRB Protocol No. | | | Track: | |
| Exempt under 45 CFR §46.101(b) (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)  (6) | | | Reviewer 1: | |
| Expedite, Category (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) | | | Reviewer 2: | |
| **All forms must be completed, signed by the RPI, and submitted by FAX, Email, or single-sided hard copy.**  **Please type responses, handwritten forms will not be accepted.** | | | | |
| **Please, no staples!** | | | | |

Initial Submission, date of submission

Revised IRB-1, date of revised IRB-1

**1. RESPONSIBLE PROJECT INVESTIGATOR (RPI)** The RPI must be a nonvisiting member of UIUC faculty or staff who will serve as project supervisor at UIUC. **For other research team members [including those from other institutions], please complete the Research Team Attachment and provide with the completed application.** Include all persons who will be 1) directly responsible for the project’s design or implementation, 2) recruitment, 3) obtain informed consent, 4) involved in data collection, data analysis, or follow-up.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Last Name: Twidale** | | First Name: Michael B. | | | Academic Degree(s): PhD | |
| **Dept. or Unit: Grad. School of Lib. and Info. Sci.** | | Office Address: Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign | | | | Mail Code: 493 |
| **Street Address: 501 E. Daniel Street** | | City: Champaign | | State: IL | | Zip Code: 61820-6211 |
| **Phone: 217-333-3280** | **Fax: 217-244-3302** | | E-mail: twidale@illinois.edu | | | |
| **UIUC Status: Nonvisiting member of (Mark One)  Faculty**  **Academic Professional/Staff** | | | | | | |
| **Training**  **CITI Training, Date of Completion,** July 2013  **Additional training, Date of Completion[[1]](#footnote-1),** March 2015 | | | | | | |

**2. PROJECT TITLE**

|  |
| --- |
| Investigating the data quality effect of task design changes in paid crowd systems |

**3. FUNDING** Indicate whether this research is funded by, or application has been made for, a grant, contract, or gift.

**3A. STATUS**  Research is **not funded** and is **not pending** a funding decision (Proceed to Part 4).

Research is **funded** (funding decision has been made).

Funding decision is **pending**. Funding proposal submission date:

**3B. SOURCE(S)** If the research is funded or pending a funding decision, mark and name all sources:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Funding—check all that apply** | | **Name of Source** |
|  | **UIUC Department, College, or Campus**  (includes Research Board and Campus Fellowship Training Grants) |  |
|  | **Federal**  (from federal agencies, offices, departments, centers) |  |
|  | **Commercial Sponsorship**  (from corporations, partnerships, proprietorships) |  |
|  | **State of Illinois Department or Agency**  (from any state office or entity) |  |
|  | **Gift or Foundation (including UIF)**  (public or private foundations, not-for-profit corporations, private gifts) |  |

Check here if the funding is through a Training Grant:

**3C. PROPOSAL** Attach a complete copy of the funding proposal or contract.  Attached

Sponsor-assigned grant number, if known:

Title of Funding Proposal or Contract, if different from Project Title in Part 2:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**3D. FUNDING AGENCY OFFICIAL, IF ANY, TO BE NOTIFIED OF IRB APPROVAL**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Last Name: | | First Name: | | Salutation: | | | |
| Agency: | | Office Address: | | | | Mail Code: | |
| Street Address: | | City: | | | State: | | Zip Code: |
| Phone: | Fax: | | E-mail: | | | | |

**4. FINANCIAL INTERESTS:** Indicate below if any investigators or any members of their immediate families have any relationships, commitments, or activities with the sponsor of this research that might present or appear to present a conflict of interest with regard to the outcome of the research. (If a financial conflict of interest exists, please submit the UIUC approved conflict management plan. If you have questions about conflict of interest contact the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research at 217-333-0034.)

Ownership, equity or stock options

Has been disclosed to the UIUC campus **OR**  has not been disclosed to the UIUC campus

Personal compensation such as royalties, consulting fees etc.

Has been disclosed to the UIUC campus **OR**  has not been disclosed to the UIUC campus

Intellectual property such as patents, trademarks, copyright, licensing, etc.

Has been disclosed to the UIUC campus **OR**  has not been disclosed to the UIUC campus

Other conflict of interest:

Has been disclosed to the UIUC campus **OR**  has not been disclosed to the UIUC campus

No conflicts exist

**5. SUMMARIZE THE RESEARCH.** In **LAY LANGUAGE**, summarize the objectives and significance of the research.

|  |
| --- |
| The proposed study looks at the effect of interface design on the data collected through paid crowdsourcing. Crowdsourcing is when disparate people connected through technology collaborate on or contribute to a common product; within this space, there is an area of ‘paid crowdsourcing’ where people can be paid for fractional contributions to a larger endeavor.  Paid crowdsourcing marketplaces have been growing in popularity as way to reach contributors for human-specific tasks broadly (many different people) and quickly. In public research spaces they allow scholars to, for example, generate custom evaluation or training datasets; in private technology sectors, paid crowds let companies get a hard-to-quantify opinion or judgment on-demand.  Since paid crowd contributors are semi-anonymous and self-selected, much preceding research has looked at identifying and correcting for cheaters and poor workers. In contrast, little earlier work has directly compared how the instrumentation choices by the requesting party affect the data that is contributed. This study does just that, studying the exact same data collection tasks collected in different ways.  To be clear: this study is *studying* paid crowdsourcing, not simply using it. It is significant because it formally studies a problem that have be informally observed by earlier research. |

**6. PERFORMANCE SITES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Including UIUC sites,describe ALL the research sites for this protocol. For each non-UIUC site, describe: Whether the site has an IRB. Whether the site has granted permission for the research to be conducted. Contact information for the site. If the site has an IRB, whether the site’s IRB has approved the research or planned to defer review to a UIUC IRB. | | For non-UIUC sites, documentation of IRB approval is: |
| 1. | Online – Amazon Mechanical Turk (http://www.mturk.com) | Attached  Will Follow  N/A |
| 2. |  | Attached  Will Follow  N/A |
| 3. |  | Attached  Will Follow  N/A |

List and describe any additional Performance Sites information on an attachment and check here:

**7. DESCRIBE THE HUMAN SUBJECTS**

**7A. SECONDARY DATA ONLY?** If this research *only* involves the analysis of data that *has already been collected* from human subjects and *no new data collection will occur,* check here:

**7B. MATERIALS OF HUMAN ORIGIN?** Will this research involve the collection, analysis, or banking of human biological materials (*e.g.,* cells, tissues, fluids, DNA)?  **Yes  No**  If yes attach **Appendix C**, the[*Biological Materials Form*](http://www.irb.uiuc.edu/?q=forms-and-instructions/bio-materials.html)*.*

**7C. ANTICIPATED NUMBERS** How many subjects, including controls, will you study in order to get the data that you need?

If you plan to study disproportionate numbers of a given sex, race, or minority group, provide scientific rationale in Part 11.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Site** | | **# Male** | **# Female** | **Total** |
| 1. | Mechanical Turk | Unknown | Unknown | 300 |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTALS** | |  |  |  |

List Anticipated Numbers for additional Performance Sites on an attachment and check here:

**7D. AGE RANGE** Mark all that apply. Researchers planning to include children in research projects involving *more than minimal risk* must provide written documentation of the benefits that are likely to accrue to a child participating in the project. This should include information gathered on adults, if it exists, or an explanation about why it does not exist.

0–7 years 8–17 years  18–64 years  65+ years

If applicable, written documentation of benefits for including children in ***more than minimal risk*** research is attached.

**7E. SPECIAL OR VULNERABLE POPULATIONS** Mark groups that will be targeted by design. Also indicate groups likely to be involved in the research even though they are not targeted by design.

None of the following special populations will be targeted

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Children (age < 18 years) |  | | |
| Neonates | Mentally disabled or cognitively impaired persons | | |
| Fetuses *(in utero)* | Adults with legal guardians | | |
| *in vitro* fertilization subjects | Persons with limited civil freedom (*e.g.,* prisoners) | | |
| Pregnant or lactating women | Specific racial or ethnic group(s)— describe: |  | |
| Inpatients | Low income or economically disadvantaged persons | | |
| Outpatients | UIUC Students—name subject pool, if applicable: | |  |
| Elderly (age > 65 years) | Other College Students—name subject pool, if applicable: | |  |
| Other (describe here): |  | | |

**7F.** If you checked any of the groups in question 7E, describe additional safeguards included in the protocol to protect the

rights and welfare of special or vulnerable populations.

|  |
| --- |
| **n/a** |

**8. Recruitment**

**8A-1 RECRUItING Procedures** Specifically describe the systematic procedures for finding and recruiting subjects or requesting pre-existing data or materials. 1) State whether any of the researchers are associated with the subjects (*e.g.,* subjects are students, employees, patients). 2) Name any specific agencies or institutions that will provide access to subjects or subject data. 3) Who will contact the prospective subjects? 4) Who gives approval if subjects are chosen from records? 5) Describe solicitation through the use of advertising (*e.g.,* posters, flyers, announcements, newspaper, radio, television, Internet), face-to-face interaction, direct mail or phone contact, classrooms, subject pools, health care registries, patient referrals, and institutional “gatekeepers,” as applicable.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. The researchers are not associated with the subjects in any way. 2. Since this study looks at online paid crowds, the recruitment will be done in a naturalistic setting: performing the research on an online paid crowd platform (Amazon Mechanical Turk, or MTurk) and allowing for their users/our subjects to self-select for the task. 3. The subjects will not be contacted: they will be shown the study task and given an opportunity to contribute. The researchers’ contact information will be provided in case they would like to withdraw their work afterward. There are no plan for follow-up contact after subjects complete the study task. 4. Tasks are only shown to potential subjects in the US, and only people that are workers on the Mechanical Turk system can access them (subject to Amazon’s restrictions, i.e. over 18), Anybody that can see the task is allowed to complete it, i.e. no subjects from this pool are screened. 5. No active recruitment: an example of our task will be accessible in the MTurk interface and subjects will seek us out. |

**8 A-2 Attach final copies of recruiting materials** including the final copy of printed advertisements and the final version of any audio/taped taped advertisements and check here: Attached  Will Follow

**8B. WITHHELD INFORMATION** Do you propose to withhold information from subjects prior to or during their participation?

Yes  No

If yes, describe what will be withheld, justify the withholding (address risks, provide rationale), describe the debriefing plan, and attach a labeled copy of a written debriefing form, to be provided to subjects.  Debriefing Attached  Will Follow

|  |
| --- |
| n/a |

**8C. PROTECTED HEALTH INFORMATION (PHI)** The IRB must address the privacy and use of health information that is created, received, or housed by health care providers, health plans, or health care clearinghouses and that identifies or could be used to identify an individual. During *either recruiting or data collection*, will you use or have access to such information that is related to the past, present or future health or conditions of a *living or deceased* individual, provision of health care to the individual, or the payment for the provision of health care to the individual?  Yes  No

**8D. SCHOOL-BASED RESEARCH** If subjects will be recruited from Illinois public or private elementary or secondary schools, additional deadlines and procedures apply. Criminal background clearances might be required. Special consideration must be given to the exclusion of protected populations. Please contact the Office of School–University Research Relations (OSURR) (217.244.0515 or <http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/BER/OSURR.html>) for more information. Mark one:

Illinois schools **will**be used  Illinois schools **will not** be used

**9. INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION CRITERIA** Address all four of the following items in explaining who will and will not qualify for participation and how that determination will be made: (1) Describe procedures to assure equitable selection of subjects. Justify the use of any special or vulnerable groups marked in Part 9E. Selection criteria that target one sex, race, or ethnic group require a clear scientific rationale. (2) List specific criteria for inclusion and exclusion of subjects in the study, including treatment groups and controls. (3) Name and attach copies of measures and protocols that will be used to screen applicants. (4) Explain how the inclusion/exclusion criteria will be assessed and by whom. If special expertise is required to evaluate screening responses or data, tell who will make this evaluation and describe their training and experience.

|  |
| --- |
| Inclusion criteria: we will pursue US-based paid crowd workers as subjects. This is to because cultural differences can contribute to undesired or unexpected biases in our study.  The geographic restriction is the only criteria we are applying, though the subject pool is all older than 18 years of age due to restrictions on the paid crowd community being studied. |

**10. RESEARCH PROCEDURES: Using LAYMAN’S LANGUAGE,** specifically describe what the participants (treatment groups and controls) will do and where the research activities will take place. Give approximate dates and durations for specific activities, including the total number of treatments, visits, or meetings required and the total time commitment.

(For schools-based research where class time is used, describe in detail the activities planned for nonparticipants and explain where (*e.g.,* in a classroom, in a private area) both participants and nonparticipants will be located during the research activities. Include a concise description of procedures, locations, time commitments, and alternate activities on the relevant consent and assent forms.)

|  |
| --- |
| Subjects will complete one of three simple tasks, presented through different collection interfaces. The underlying tasks are (A) image retrieval relevance judgment (saying whether an image is relevant to a search query), (B) image tagging (applying descriptors to online images), and (C) image recommendation (showing subjects a set of images that a person likes, and asking them to recommend more images for the same person).    The goal of the study is to compare the makeup of the crowd contributed data – consistency, accuracy, variance – when collected through different designs of the collection interface. The different interfaces are:  First Task Conditions  1A) Baseline: typical task. A “task set” of ten items to encode is shown to subjects, along with a brief description of what is expected in the task.  1B) Training task: Subjects are guided more carefully through a pre-design task set. When a poor or incorrect contribution is made, the correct ‘answer’ (or example of a correct answer) is shown to the subject, with a written description of what made the answer correct.  Subsequent Task Conditions  2A) Baseline: same as baseline first task.  2B) Feedback interface: subjects are shown an estimate of their performance, based on comparison to other subjects and, when available, ground truth data.  2C) Timed Interface: subjects are given a minute-long timer to complete tasks, and are paid for how many they complete in that time. This is intended to capture more impulsive contributions by subjects.  **Conditions**  (A) For the relevance judgment task, the conditions are as follows:  2 first task set conditions x 3 subsequent task set conditions x 3 contributor subjects x 20 queries x 50 images  (B) For the image tagging task, the conditions are:  2 task conditions x 3 subsequent task conditions x 3 contributor subjects x ~500 images  (C) For the image recommendation task, the first/subsequent task designs being compared will be decided on based on preliminary results from the earlier two experiments. For each of the interface design conditions we choose to measure, we will collect data for:  3 target users for recommendation x 5 contributor subjects x 100 images to judge  **Time Estimates**  The estimated task completion times are: 30-40 seconds for (A) – a set of ten retrieval judgments; 50-60 seconds for (B) – a set of ten images tagged; and ~3 minutes for (C): 40 image recommendations. These are estimates based on our experience, but more accurate estimates will be measured through testing when determining proper payment for tasks.  **Task Type Descriptions**   1. For image retrieval relevance judgments, participants are shown a query (as in a web image search, compare to a search on Google Images), a description of what types of images are relevant to that query, and a set of 10 images. For each image in the set, participants rate whether the image is not/somewhat/very relevant to the query. 2. For the Image tagging task, participants are shown ten images and are asked to enter two words (‘tags’) that describe each image 3. For the image recommendation task, participants are shown a set of 10 images that an online user likes (using publicly available information from the website Pinterest), and a set of 40 images to perform recommendation over. Their task is to judge whether the target user (represented by the “liked’ images) would like or dislike each of the 40 images. |

**11. EQUIPMENT** Will any physical stimulation or physiological data acquisition equipment be used with the subjects?

Yes  No If yes, attach **Appendix A**, the [*Research Equipment Form*](http://www.irb.uiuc.edu/?q=forms-and-instructions/research-equipment.html)*.*

**12. DEVICES** Will any devices be used with the subjects?

Yes  No If yes, attach **Appendix B-1.**

**13. DRUGS AND BIOLOGICS** Will any drugs or chemical or biological agents be used with the subjects?

Yes  No If yes, attach **Appendix B-2**.

1. **MRI AT BIC** To use the Beckman Institute Biomedical Imaging Center (BIC) in human subject’s research, you must obtain *prior approval* from the BIC (217.244.0600; [bmrf@bmrl.bmrf.uiuc.edu](mailto:bmrf@bmrl.bmrf.uiuc.edu)) and use BIC-approved screening and consent forms. Attach:

BIC approval  Attached

BIC screening form  Attached

BIC consent form  Attached

**15. MEASURES** If subjects will complete questionnaires, surveys, interviews, psychological measures, or other measures, however administered, the IRB must review and approve the measures. List all such measures here and attach complete, labeled copies (including translations, if applicable) to this application:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Measure 1: |  | Attached  Will Follow |
| Measure 2: |  | Attached  Will Follow |
| Measure 3: |  | Attached  Will Follow |
| Measure 4: |  | Attached  Will Follow |

List additional Measures on an attachment and check here:

**16. SUBJECT REMUNERATION**

Will subjects receive inducements or rewards before, during, or after participation?  Yes  No

If yes, will payment be prorated for partial participation? Yes  No

If remuneration will be given, for each subject group:

(1) specify the form of remuneration, including $, course credit, lottery, gift certificate, or other;

(2) state the $ amount or the approximate $US value, or the course credit and its percentage of the final grade;

(3) explain the remuneration plan, including whether and how prorating will be made for partial participation;

(4) for lotteries, include (a) the number of prizes, (b) the nature and value of each prize, (c) the approximate odds of winning, (d) the date(s) of the drawing(s), and (e) how winners will be notified, by whom, and by when; and

(5) include all this information on the relevant consent forms.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. For all subjects, the remuneration will be in USD, provided in the exact same manner as all tasks are on the studied paid crowd platform: brokered through Amazon and assigned upon completion and requester approval (we will approve all tasks unconditionally). 2. Tasks are timed for remuneration purposes, and the amount paid will be modified with a goal of averaging $10-13/hour. We expect each set of tasks will pay $0.10-0.20, the exact amount first determined by timing some pilot tests amongst researchers. Tasks will be released in batches, and if the tasks are taking shorter or longer than expected, the payment value will be adapted for subsequent tasks. 3. If any tasks are submitted incompletely, subjects will still be paid the full amount offered at the start, but no longer accepted for further tasks. Because this study studies MTurk workers within the actual MTurk system, workers that change their minds and abort a task will not have any information collected, nor does the system enable us to remunerate them. 4. There are no lottery components to the study. All remuneration will be stated at the start of the task and dispersed. |
| Regarding the above, there are two special notes.  1. For one of task designs, the timed interface, the style of remuneration is not fixed. In this interface, we are observing a “quick” style of task completion, where we provide a $0.02 base payment and pay workers for each item of a task set that they complete within the 1-minute time limit. As above, the values will be determined around an ideal value hourly rate. We would like the best workers to perform in the $20-25 range, meaning we want them to earn approximately 0.33-0.4 for the one-minute task. Again, we hope to pilot test our finished system amongst ourselves to determine how many items a top worker will complete and subsequently the per-item payment to approximate this goal.  2. Though we hope to pay subject in full for incomplete contributions (noted above in #3), it is detrimental to the study to transmit this information in the consent language. Our motivation for the payment is in the spirit of fairness (not all incomplete submissions are intentionally incomplete), but sharing this policy can incentivize cheating, and subsequently is something that regular requesting parties would not promote (which in turn could notable change our study from a “real world” task). |

**17. SUBJECT OUTLAY** Will subjects incur costs for research-related procedures (*e.g.*, longer hospitalization, extra tests), use of equipment, lost compensation, or transportation (over 50 miles)? Yes  No If yes, describe here:

|  |
| --- |
| n/a |

**18. CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA** Answer each of the following to describe methods that will ensure the confidentiality of individually identifiable data. Confidentiality is required unless subjects give express, written permission to have their identifiable information published, presented, or shared.

**18A. CHECK IF USED IN DATA COLLECTION:**  Audio tapes/  Video tapes  Still photos  Other imaging

Digital voice

**18B. DATA COLLECTION** Explain how the data will be collected. If anonymous data collection is proposed, provide details of how investigators *will not have the ability to trace responses to subject identities.* For multiphase data collection or if multiple contacts will be made with subjects, specifically explain the subject tracking and coding systems.

Address the confidentiality of data collected via e-mail, databases, Web interfaces, computer servers, and other networked information, as applicable.

|  |
| --- |
| Data will be kept confidential, with subject identities protected by researchers. Since the data is collected through the paid crowd platform being studied, that platform will also hold the data; however, the subjects hold a relationship with the platform prior to our study, and our study does not collect any sensitive information about them.  Indeed, the only identifying information we receive is a user id, an obfuscated but not anonymous identifier for the user. We will not make use of this information to identify users, and will irreversibly encrypt it on researcher computers (outlined below). |

**18C. DATA SECURITY** Describe how and where the data be kept so that the data remain confidential.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Data will be collection on-site in the paid crowd platform being studied, Amazon Mechanical Turk. The platform keeps results within its custom system, accessible only to the subjects that have performed the task (only their contribution) and to the researchers (all the subjects’ contributions). Accounts are password protected. 2. A copy of results will be kept on the student researcher’s password-protected computer. The downloaded results data will have the obfuscated-but-not-quite-anonymous user id properly anonymized, by irreversible encrypting it. |

**18D. STAFF TRAINING** Describe the training and experience of all persons who will collect or have access to the data.

|  |
| --- |
| Michael Twidale is a scholar with an expertise in human-computer interaction, including relevant experience in user interface design research and computer supported cooperative work.  Peter Organisciak is a doctoral student with 6 years of experience in crowd research, namely user interviews with online community participants, and experiments performed in paid crowd contexts akin to the proposed study.  Both researchers have completed the required UIUC IRB training modules. |

**18E. DATA RETENTION** How long will the data be kept?

|  |
| --- |
| The data, with encrypted user ids, will be retained for three years following its collection on the student researcher’s current and potentially future password-protected computers. |

**18F. DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS** What is(are) the proposed form(s) of dissemination (*e.g.,* journal article, thesis or academic paper, conference presentation, sharing within industry or profession)?

|  |
| --- |
| The results will be reported on through the student researcher’s dissertation, and possible auxiliary journal articles or conference presentations following from the dissertation. |

**18G. PRIVACY** Describe provisions to protect the privacy interests of subjects.

|  |
| --- |
| User data will be stored on password protected data systems. User id will be irreversibly anonymized in the copy of the data retained by the researchers. In the copy held in the collection system (Amazon Mechanical Turk), the data will be protected by password. |

**18H. INDIVIDUALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION** Will any individually identifiable information, including images of subjects, be published, shared, or otherwise disseminated?  Yes  No

**If yes,** subjects must provide explicit consent or assent for such dissemination. Provide appropriate options on the relevant consent documents.

**19. INFORMED CONSENT:** University policy requires the execution of a comprehensive, written document that is signed by the subject (or the subject’s authorized representative) as the principal method for obtaining consent from subjects. The language in the document must be understandable to the subject or the subject’s legally authorized representative.

An investigator may request a Waiver or Alteration of Informed Consent or a Waiver of Documentation of Informed Consent (e.g., online consent, oral consent). If requesting a waiver please complete the appropriate waiver form at: [www.irb.illinois.edu](http://www.irb.illinois.edu) and submit it with the IRB Application for review.

**Children must *assent*** (or, voluntarily agree) to participation and a parent must separately consent on behalf of their child (*i.e.,* two different forms are generally required). Children under age 8 may assent either orally or passively, depending on their level of maturity. Children 8–17 years old should sign a written form unless the UIUC IRB approves a different process.

**19A. TYPE OF CONSENT** Check all that apply and attach one copy of each relevant form, letter, or script on university letterhead. Include translations, if consent will be obtained in a foreign language. Use headings, headers, or footers to uniquely identify each document and associate it with the subject group for which it will be used.

**Written** **informed consent (assent) with a document signed by**

adult subjects  parent(s) or guardian(s)  adolescents aged 8–17 years

**Waiver or Alteration of Informed Consent (Attach waiver form.)**

adult subjects  parent(s) or guardian(s)  adolescents aged 8–17 years

**Waiver of Documentation (signature) of Informed Consent (Attach waiver form.)**

adult subjects  parent(s) or guardian(s)  adolescents aged 8–17 years

**19B. USE OF PROXY** Will others (*e.g.,* next of kin, legal guardians, powers of attorney) act on behalf of adult subjects in giving consent to participate in this research?  Yes  No if yes, describe in Section 20D.

**19C. USE OF PROXY OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES** If a proxy is used in research conducted outside Illinois, provide justification (e.g., statement of an attorney or copy of applicable law) that the proxy is authorized under the laws of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted to consent to the procedures involved in this protocol.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**19D. CONSENT PROCESS** Describe when and where voluntary consent will be obtained, how often, by whom, and from whom. If cognitively impaired subjects (including children under age 8) will be involved, explain how the subject’s understanding will be assessed and how often; include the questions that will be asked or actions that will be taken to assess understanding.

Describe any waiting period between informing the prospective subject and obtaining the consent. Describe steps taken to minimize the possibility of coercion or undue influence. Indicate the language used by those obtaining consent.

Indicate the language understood by the prospective subject or the legally authorized representative.

If the research involves pregnant women, fetuses, or neonates, indicate whether consent will be obtained from the mother, father, or both. If the research involves children, indicate whether consent will be obtained from: Both parents unless one parent is deceased, unknown, incompetent, or not reasonably available, or when only one parent has legal responsibility for the care and custody of the child; or from one parent regardless of the status of the other parent.

|  |
| --- |
| *Consent language attached.*  The consent process will inform contributors of the study terms (see attached consent language) at the start of a task. Due to the nature of online interactions, completion and submission of the task will indicate consent: this will be reiterated at the end of the task before submission. Any unsubmitted tasks will not be transmitted to the researchers.  The paid crowd platform being used has its own agreement with subjects, making clear that any contribution is provided to a requester with all relevant privileges (3.1 of https://www.mturk.com/mturk/conditionsofuse).This language is legal and is insufficient for our purposes. Our additional consent form makes clear that contributors are subjects in a study, and that they are able to back out mid-contribution or pull out their contributions post-hoc by contacting the responsible researcher.  *The researchers are requesting a waiver of documentation (signature) of informed consent from the IRB.* The consent process will be conducted online and by completing the tasks, participants are implying their consent to participate. The study involves completing tasks that are not risky, so the study is no more than minimal risks. Informed consent would not be required outside of the research context. For example, if Amazon were collecting this data for quality improvement or to improve the experience of the Mechanical Turk workers, informed consent would not be required. A request for a waiver of documentation of informed consent is attached. |

**20. RISKS**

**20A. DESCRIPTION** Specifically describe all known risks to the subjects for the activities proposed and describe the steps that will be taken to minimize the risks. Include any risks to the subject’s physical well-being, privacy, dignity, self-respect, psyche, emotions, reputation, employability, and criminal and legal status. Risks must be described on consent forms.

|  |
| --- |
| Our study will not introduced subjects to any risks greater than they encounter every day.  There are two forms of risk that we will work to minimize: improper handling of identifiable information and mistreatment of participants due to unethical or improper use of the paid crowd platform.  Regarding identifiable information: our study design does not collect sensitive personal information, and the most critical piece of information is simply the ‘user id’, which can demonstrate that a person is a paid crowd worker. It has been found that the ‘user id’ on Mechanical Turk is not sufficiently anonymous [1]; for this reason, a) all user data will be kept on password protected systems and restricted to researchers, and b) user ids will be better anonymized by running the id through MD5 encryption. The researchers will not pursue any such information in our research.  As crowd researchers we are well aware of the risks encountered on this types of platforms, such as unfairly low remuneration, emotional distress due to broken or improperly tested tasks, rejection or work for unclear reasons, and misrepresentation of how long a task will take. We follow the Dynamo Guide for Academic Requesters [2] to minimize these risks: proper time estimates, reasonable remuneration based on those realistic time estimates, careful task testing, and no dishonesty or manipulation in our task design.  [1] Lease, Matthew and Hullman, Jessica and Bigham, Jeffrey P. and Bernstein, Michael S. and Kim, Juho and Lasecki, Walter and Bakhshi , Saeideh and Mitra, Tanushree and Miller, Robert C., Mechanical Turk is Not Anonymous (March 6, 2013). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2228728> or<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2228728>  [2] Guidelines for Academic Requesters: http://wiki.wearedynamo.org/index.php/Guidelines\_for\_Academic\_Requesters |

**20B. RISK LEVEL:**  **No more than minimal risk**

(the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated for participation in the proposed research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests).

**More than minimal risk**

**20C. Data Monitoring Plan:** If you checked that the research is more than minimal risk, describe the provisions for monitoring the data to ensure the safety of subjects (Who will periodically monitor harms and benefits experienced by subjects to ensure that the relationship of risks to potential benefits remains unchanged? How often will monitoring occur? What analyses will be performed? If appropriate, what criteria will be used to stop the research based on monitoring of the results?)

|  |
| --- |
| n/a |

**21. BENEFITS** Describe the expected benefits of the research to the subjects and/or to society.

|  |
| --- |
| This research will help requesters on paid crowd platforms, whether researchers or private industry workers, develop tasks that better collect what they hope to collect. This will benefit the workers on these platforms, including our subjects, by better accommodating the ways that humans actually work. It is also our hope that this study will encourage thinking about where the *requester* is responsible for the quality of data collected (via task design choices), counteracting an often adversarial relationship where paid crowd workers are treated with mistrust. |

**22. RISK/BENEFIT ASSESSMENT** Weigh the risks with regard to the benefits. Provide evidence that benefits outweigh risks.

|  |
| --- |
| Since the study presents no more than minimal risk than subjects, and has benefits for the paid crowd worker communities of which the subjects belong, the benefits clearly outweigh the risks. |

If additional Risk/Benefit information is attached, check here:

**23.** Is this a multi-center study in which the UIUC investigator is the lead investigator of a multicenter study, or the UIUC is the lead site in a multi-center study.  **Yes**  **No**

If yes, describe the management and communication of information obtained that might be relevant to the protection of subjects, such as: unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others, interim results and protocol modifications.

|  |
| --- |
| **n/a** |

**24. INVESTIGATOR ASSURANCES: The signature of the Responsible Project Investigator is required** (scanned or faxed signatures are acceptable). Other investigators are also responsible for these assurances and are encouraged to sign.

I certify that the information provided in this application, and in all attachments, is complete and correct.

I understand that I have ultimate responsibility for the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects, the conduct of this study, and the ethical performance of this project.

I agree to comply with all UIUC policies and procedures, the terms of its Federal Wide Assurance, and all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of human subjects in research.

I certify that

* the project will be performed by qualified personnel according to the UIUC IRB-approved protocol.
* the equipment, facilities, and procedures to be used in this research meet recognized standards for safety.
* no change will be made to the human subjects protocol or consent form(s) until approved by the UIUC IRB.
* legally effective informed consent or assent will be obtained from human subjects as required.
* Unanticipated problems, adverse events, and new information that may affect the risk–benefit assessment for this research will be reported to the UIUC IRB Office (217.333.2670; [irb@illinois.edu](mailto:irb@illinois.edu)) and to my Departmental Executive Officer.

* I am familiar with the latest edition of the UIUC *Handbook for Investigators*, available at [www.irb.illinois.edu](http://www.irb.illinois.edu), and I will adhere to the policies and procedures explained therein.
* student and guest investigators on this project are knowledgeable about the regulations and policies governing this research.
* I agree to meet with the investigator(s), if different from myself, on a regular basis to monitor study progress.
* if I will be unavailable, as when on sabbatical or other leave, including vacation, I will arrange for an alternate faculty sponsor to assume responsibility during my absence. I will advise the UIUC IRB by letter of such arrangements.

I further certify that the proposed research has not yet been done, is not currently underway, and will not begin until IRB approval has been obtained.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Michael B. Twidale |  |  | Peter Organisciak | March 19, 2015 |
| Responsible Principal Investigator | Date |  | Investigator | Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Investigator | Date |  | Investigator | Date |

**25. (OPTIONAL) DEPARTMENTAL ASSURANCE** To be completed by the RPI’s Departmental Executive Officer or their designee.

The activity described herein is in conformity with the standards set by our department and I assure that the principal investigator has met all departmental requirements for review and approval of this research.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Departmental Executive Officer (or designee) | Date |

**\***  For units that conduct **scientific merit review,** the signature above documents the following:

1. The research uses procedures consistent with sound research design.

2. The research design is sound enough to yield the expected knowledge.

1. Additional CITI modules may be required depending on subject populations or types of research. These include: (i) research enrolling children; (ii) research enrolling prisoners; (iii) FDA regulated research; (iv) data collected via the internet; (v) research conducted in public elementary/secondary schools; and, (vi) researchers conducted in international sites [↑](#footnote-ref-1)