

RoboCrowd: Scaling Robot Data Collection through Crowdsourcing

Suvir Mirchandani¹, David D. Yuan¹, Kaylee Burns¹, Md Sazzad Islam¹, Tony Z. Zhao¹, Chelsea Finn¹, Dorsa Sadigh¹

Abstract—In recent years, imitation learning from large-scale human demonstrations has emerged as a promising paradigm for training robot policies. However, the burden of collecting large quantities of human demonstrations is significant in terms of collection time and the need for access to expert operators. We introduce a new data collection paradigm, RoboCrowd, which distributes the workload by utilizing crowdsourcing principles and incentive design. RoboCrowd helps enable scalable data collection and facilitates more efficient learning of robot policies. We build RoboCrowd on top of ALOHA [1]—a bimanual platform that supports data collection via puppeteering—to explore the design space for crowdsourcing in-person demonstrations in a public environment. We propose three classes of incentive mechanisms to appeal to users’ varying sources of motivation for interacting with the system: material rewards, intrinsic interest, and social comparison. We instantiate these incentives through tasks that include physical rewards, engaging or challenging manipulations, as well as gamification elements such as a leaderboard. We conduct a large-scale, two-week field experiment in which the platform is situated in a university café. We observe significant engagement with the system—over 200 individuals independently volunteered to provide a total of over 800 interaction episodes. Our findings validate the proposed incentives as mechanisms for shaping users’ data quantity and quality. Further, we demonstrate that the crowdsourced data can serve as useful pre-training data for policies fine-tuned on expert demonstrations—boosting performance up to 20% compared to when this data is not available. These results suggest the potential for RoboCrowd to reduce the burden of robot data collection by carefully implementing crowdsourcing and incentive design principles.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the success of pre-training large models on massive Internet-scale datasets in fields such as natural language processing and computer vision, imitation learning (IL) has become a popular paradigm for training robot policies [1]–[5]. However, modern IL algorithms continue to have significant data requirements especially as tasks increase in number and variety—on the order of hundreds to thousands of demonstrations. For example, OpenVLA [5] was trained on 970K trajectories from the Open-X Embodiment dataset [6], much of which was collected by expert human operators over the course of thousands of hours. This underscores the need for scalable methods of collecting robot data.

Prior efforts to scale up real-world data collection range from leveraging videos of human activity [7], [8] to pooling demonstration data across different institutions [6], [9], [10]. While the former approach—tapping into internet scale videos—can provide useful visual representations [11]–[13], such methods often struggle in tasks beyond pick-and-place without substantial real robot data. On the other hand, pooling datasets across many tasks and embodiments [4], [6] has amortized the cost of




Fig. 1: Example of incentivizing demonstrations in RoboCrowd. The principal P consists of a robot teleoperation setup, a designer, and a scene they have designed. The scene contains tasks that an agent I (a crowd user) can attempt, guided by incentives put in place by the designer. For example, a material reward—e.g., a candy in a bin—can motivate I to produce a successful trajectory for a bin-picking task, which the designer can add to a dataset.

real-robot data collection to a degree, but expert operators are still required to collect data especially when new embodiments or tasks are added. Other works focus on how to reduce the time burden on data collectors or guide the collection strategy [14]–[16], but these methods do not address the fundamental problem that demonstrations are still solely collected by researchers or designated operators for the express purpose of training robot policies. This aspect of robot data collection drastically differs from other modalities such as text or images, where large volumes of data are *organically* produced by people in their daily activities and are *readily* available on the web. To explore ways to scale up robot data collection, we ask: *Who* can effectively collect robot data, and *how* might they be incentivized to do so?

To tackle this problem, we look to a large body of work outside of robotics which studies strategies for incentivizing people in crowdsourced data labeling tasks [17]–[22]. The goal of these works is to align the incentives of crowdworkers with researchers’ goals of labeling a given dataset—for example, *gamifying* the data labeling process [19] and aggregating data by tapping into the “wisdom of the crowd.” Our key idea is to build a system that leverages similar ideas for robot data collection—i.e., *aligning human incentives to provide robot demonstration data*. However, prior strategies in human-computer interaction are designed for applications that work well with web interfaces, and applying them to robotics introduces several challenges. First, robot teleoperation traditionally requires access to physical hardware which is not readily available to crowdworkers. Second, the robot platform must be capable of performing complex tasks—in order to be engaging to users, as well as to collect useful data. At the same time, the system must be intuitive to onboard, since the vast majority of potential data providers have no teleoperation experience. Further, the system must be safe for novice users to operate.

To address these challenges, we propose RoboCrowd, a framework for incentive design in the context of crowdsourced robot

¹Stanford University. Correspondence to suvir@cs.stanford.edu. Please see <https://robocrowd.github.io> for videos and appendices.

data collection. Our framework centers five key properties: public accessibility, capability, intuitiveness, safety, and gamification. Diving deeper into the incentive design problem, we incorporate three classes of incentives to appeal to users' varying sources of motivation for interacting with the system. These include *material rewards* (i.e., physical rewards from tasks), *intrinsic interest* (i.e., motivation from engaging tasks), and *social comparison* (i.e., comparison to other users). To instantiate the framework, we build upon ALOHA [1]—a bimanual platform for robot teleoperation—to satisfy our need for capable hardware, and situate the system in public spaces to enable access to general users. We design hardware enhancements and a user interface to make teleoperation intuitive and safe for non-experts. Fig. 1 illustrates an example of how incentives might shape user interactions with the system into useful data: a scene contains a bin of candies, and when a user successfully acquires a candy via teleoperation, they simultaneously contribute a trajectory to a bin-picking dataset.

We deploy the system in a field experiment in which the robot is situated near a university café, where users participate in a self-guided, gamified data collection experience. We observe significant engagement with the system—over 200 individuals independently volunteered to provide a total of over 800 interaction episodes. We compile the crowdsourced interactions into a dataset and annotate each trajectory with quality scores and task labels. We additionally validate material rewards, intrinsic interest, and social comparison as incentive types for shaping user interactions with the robot—observing up to $2\times$ the amount of data collection time spent on tasks that have preferred physical rewards (when controlling for task type) and up to $4\times$ the amount of data collection time spent on tasks that are more engaging (when controlling for physical reward). We additionally observe a positive correlation between users' response to a leaderboard (social comparison mechanism) and their data quality and quantity. Finally, we analyze the usefulness of the crowdsourced data for training policies. We demonstrate that the crowdsourced data can serve as useful pre-training data when fine-tuning on expert demonstrations, boosting policy performance up to 20% compared to expert-only policies. To our knowledge, RoboCrowd is the first system to crowdsource real-robot demonstrations for imitation learning directly from a public audience—with the potential to enable a new avenue for scalable robot data collection.

II. RELATED WORK

In this section, we provide an overview of prior work in crowdsourcing data collection and labeling in robotics and other fields. **Crowdsourcing Non-robot Data.** Crowdsourcing is a well-studied technique in human-computer interaction, often used for collecting data labels from a large set of users, with a variety of applications from computer vision to natural language processing [22]–[31]. While many works utilize platforms such as Amazon Mechanical Turk [32] and Prolific [33] to pay crowdworkers for data labels, other works consider how to *incentivize* crowdworkers via other incentives beyond direct payment to gather data [20], [34]–[37]. For example, Games-with-a-Purpose (GWAPs) [19] utilize gamification—the use of game-like elements in non-game contexts [38]—to guide users to give higher quality data labels. In [19], two players try to agree on words to describe pictures

without otherwise communicating—resulting in quality image label data. Our work aims to investigate how incentive design can be adapted and applied to robot data collection—specifically, in the form of demonstrations collected via teleoperation.

Distributing Robot Data Collection. Crowdsourcing has been an attractive approach for collecting data in robotics in recent years. Prior works have attempted to crowdsource robot data via remote teleoperation in simulation or via web interfaces. RoboTurk [39], [40] develops a smartphone interface to allow crowdworkers on Mechanical Turk to collect demonstrations remotely, and shows the potential of using crowdsourced data to aid policy learning. Although this method alleviates the need for crowdworkers to physically interact with robot hardware, the ability to perform precise tasks can be limited (due to issues such as lack of depth perception, occlusion, etc.). It also presents challenges in recovering from failure states in real-world scenarios. Other works have utilized crowdsourcing to guide exploration in real-world reinforcement learning [41], [42] or to collect interaction data through high-level abstractions [43]–[45], but are again limited in the range of tasks that can be collected because they do not focus on low-level trajectory demonstrations.

Several works have developed new interfaces to make robot demonstration collection more distributed. Recent works [46]–[48] design new hardware interfaces—e.g., sensorized hand-held grippers or portable motion capture systems—to allow for demonstration collection in the real-world without needing access to a physical robot. However, crowdsourcing data with these interfaces is not immediately possible since it still requires data collectors to have access to this custom hardware. [49] presents an augmented reality tablet interface to collect robot data from everyday users, though it does not immediately extend to bimanual or dynamic tasks. In this work, rather than introducing a new teleoperation interface, we leverage an existing interface (puppeteering via ALOHA [1], which enables precise bimanual manipulation at a low-cost) and choose to situate it directly in a public space to make it accessible to data collectors. To make scaling up data collection possible, we design the system so it can be used by non-experts.

III. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we provide an overview of the problem of designing incentives for crowdsourcing data collection and the problem of imitation learning from collected demonstrations.

Crowdsourcing via Incentive Design. Crowdsourcing systems can be modeled as repeated principal-agent interactions. We adapt the notation from [50]. A principal P desires a pool of tasks \mathbb{T} to be completed by an agent (or set of agents) I with maximum quality at minimum cost. P and I each have utility functions, denoted as $J_P : A_I \times A_P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $J_I : A_I \times A_P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where A_I and A_P are the action spaces of the agent and principal respectively. An *incentive* $\gamma : A_I \rightarrow A_P$ maps between agent actions and principal actions. P aims to design γ to shape I 's actions in a way that maximizes J_P , noting that for any given γ , agents have utility $J_I(a_I, \gamma(a_I))$.

In the context of crowdsourcing robot data, P abstractly represents the data collection platform and its designer, and I represents a user in the presence of the platform. For the principal P , A_P encapsulates all actions that the robot can take and how the scene changes in response to robot actions. J_P corresponds to how *useful*

the data collected by I is to P towards constructing a crowdsourced dataset \mathcal{D} —considering how much data is collected, of what behaviors, and of what quality. In this work, we quantify these notions in several ways (number of demonstrations, length of demonstrations, human-labeled quality scores, and downstream policy learning performance). For the agent I , A_I defines I 's possible actions, such as the task choice and teleoperation actions. J_I is the utility derived by the agent from intrinsic and extrinsic factors when interacting with the robot. J_I is multifaceted and can vary widely for each I . In this work, we explore different facets of utility, such as the utility derived from receiving a physical reward as an outcome for completing a task, intrinsic interest in the task itself, and motivation driven by social comparison.

An incentive γ is a mapping from A_I to A_P . This mapping is induced by a set of decisions that P makes in developing the robot's *scene context*, such as the tasks available. To illustrate, consider a scene context consisting of a robot and a bin of physical rewards (e.g., candies), as in Fig. 1. In response to an agent action a_I (e.g., teleoperating the robot to handover a reward), the principal takes an action a_P (the robot moving as directed) which results in the agent receiving the reward. The reward is factored into the agent's utility $J_I(a_I, \gamma(a_I))$.

When the existence of an incentive γ affects I 's actions such that both J_I and J_P increase, the incentive is *aligned* between P and I . For example, if I prefers to receive a candy, and teleoperates the robot in order to acquire a candy, J_I increases by the value of one candy and J_P increases in that there is one more trajectory to include in the crowdsourced dataset \mathcal{D} . We instantiate incentives of different classes, and illustrate that they are effective mechanisms for shaping the quality and quantity of behaviors in \mathcal{D} . We next describe how policies can be learned from \mathcal{D} via imitation learning. **Imitation Learning.** Imitation learning (IL) aims to learn a policy π_θ parameterized by θ from a dataset \mathcal{D} composed of expert demonstrations. Each demonstration $\xi \in \mathcal{D}$ is a sequence of observation-action transitions $\{(o_0, a_0), \dots, (o_T, a_T)\}$. Most commonly, IL is instantiated as behavior cloning, which trains π_θ to minimize the negative log-likelihood of data, $\mathcal{L}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{(o, a) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\log \pi_\theta(a|o)]$. Since human-collected demonstrations may be diverse in practice, algorithms such as Action Chunking with Transformers (ACT) [1] are designed to model different modes of behavior. We provide an overview of ACT in Appendix VII. The success of this training paradigm hinges on the quality and quantity of trajectories in \mathcal{D} . We frame the creation of \mathcal{D} through the lens of crowdsourcing and incentive design.

IV. ROBOCROWD

In this work, we apply incentive design to the collection of robot demonstrations for imitation learning, and develop a system to collect robot demonstrations directly from the public. We propose three different incentive mechanisms to appeal to users' varying utility functions, and illustrate that incentives can impact the quantity and quality of data collected. Finally, we demonstrate the usefulness of the data for policy learning.

Enabling in-person crowdsourced teleoperation. While a sizeable body of work has studied crowdsourcing and incentive design in the context of data labeling, applying these ideas to robot demonstration collection introduces numerous challenges.

First, members of the public lack direct access to robots. Additionally, implementing incentives appropriate for real-world robot demonstrations—e.g., physical rewards and intrinsically interesting tasks—requires hardware that is capable of versatile tasks. Finally, the vast majority of potential users lack experience teleoperating robots, so the system must be easy and safe for users to use. Given these challenges, we establish a set of desired properties for our system to enable crowdsourcing robot data in the real world.

- P1 *Publicly Accessible.* The system should be open to members of the public, including non-roboticists.
- P2 *Capable.* The hardware should be capable of performing complex manipulation skills.
- P3 *Intuitive.* The system should be intuitive to novice users with a self-guided onboarding process.
- P4 *Safe.* The system should be safe for novice users to operate.

Designing incentive mechanisms. Given a system that crowdworkers can interact with, we design incentive mechanisms to shape these interactions into useful data. We expect that crowdworkers may vary in their utility functions J_I . Some may be motivated by extrinsic rewards for trying out the system; others may be intrinsically interested in challenging themselves with certain tasks. Still others—e.g., people who are more competitive—may be motivated by social comparison [51]. We therefore design for three incentive mechanisms:

- M1 *Material Rewards.* Designing a scene with material rewards means that for some agent actions a_I , P performs actions $\gamma(a_I) \in A_P$ such that I receives a physical object. For example, I teleoperating a bin-picking task results in P performing an action which delivers the reward to I .
- M2 *Intrinsic Interest.* Designing a scene for intrinsic interest expands A_P to include engaging or challenging tasks. For example, as the result of certain agent teleoperation actions a_I , P may perform fine-grained object manipulation $\gamma(a_I)$.
- M3 *Social Comparison.* Designing a scene to enable social comparison involves a mechanism along which agents can compare themselves. For example, the action a_I of teleoperating a successful trajectory can result in a principal action $\gamma(a_I)$ which awards the agent points and increases their position on a leaderboard.

P1-4 are prerequisites to crowdsourcing; our approach to effectively implementing M1-3 involves an additional characteristic:

- P5 *Gamified.* The system should permit gamified elements—e.g., the ability to track individual users and the ability to provide physical rewards.

The rest of this section explains how we meet these desiderata through our hardware and software design.

A. Hardware Design

We select ALOHA [1], a system for bimanual teleoperation, as the base platform for our system. ALOHA consists of two “follower” arms (ViperX) that are controlled via puppeteering with two “leader” arms (WidowX). We choose to use the ALOHA platform due to its low-cost, repairability, as well as its ability for collecting data for a wide task range. Fig. 2 illustrates a set of enhancements to outfit ALOHA for public use to achieve our desired properties and enable crowdsourcing. First, we implement




Fig. 2: **System Overview.** (Left) RoboCrowd uses the ALOHA robot [1], a bimanual teleoperation platform wherein users control 2 ViperX follower arms by puppeteering via 2 WidowX leader arms. Users can perform tasks in scenes put in place by the scene designer; tasks may include physical rewards that the user can bring to the End Zone and access via the Handover Region. (Right) Users are guided by a GUI on a tablet. Functionalities include an Interactive Tutorial to get acquainted with RoboCrowd, a Task Page to select among tasks, and a Leaderboard where users can compare their scores. For additional details, please see Appendix V.

mechanisms for user and robot safety (P4): (a) collision avoidance to prevent self-collisions, achieved via a parallel MuJoCo [52] simulator, as well as a visual-audial alarm when the robot is near collision; (b) plexiglass and vinyl film to cover all sides of the ALOHA workcell to enclose the puppet arms; (c) extended extrusion bars on the leader arms to increase the distance between users and leader arms; (d) mounting of scene props (such as bins and dispensers) to mitigate scene damage; and (e) a remote observation camera for the scene designer to periodically monitor the scene. We also include enhancements to increase the intuitiveness of the platform for members of the public (P3): (a) a tablet interface, described in the next section; (b) a mechanical stop for users to automatically terminate episodes by resting the puppet arms. To enable a gamified setup (P5), we utilize (a) an ID card reader to authenticate and track users and (b) demarcate an “End Zone” within scenes, where a user can place physical rewards and access them via a handover region at the bottom of the plexiglass casing. Given its ability to perform versatile tasks, ALOHA satisfies our capability goal (P2). We physically situate it in a public environment (Section V) to make it accessible to crowd users (P1).

B. Software Design

To make operating the robot intuitive (P2) for members of the public, we implement a tablet application to complement the hardware platform and guide users through the operation process (Fig. 2; right). The interface additionally features a variety of elements of gamification (P5) that we highlight below.

Onboarding. We develop an onboarding process for new users to sign-in and receive a tutorial to familiarize themselves with the platform. In pilot studies (Appendix VI) where users were asked to use the system but were not given further verbal instructions (to mimic organic encounters that crowd users might have), users reported a desire for “instant gratification” and wished to begin to use the robot as soon as possible rather than watching a video or reading instructions. Thus, we design our onboarding process to be efficient and interactive: users begin by tapping their university ID card on a card reader, which directs them to a Sign In page to create a *user profile*. Users are then directed to complete a



Fig. 3: **Scene Setup.** Illustration of BinScene, Bin+DispenserScene, and Bin+ZiplocScene, and the objects relevant to our 6 tasks (hi-chew, tootsie-roll, hershey-kiss, jelly-bean, hi-chew-bin, hi-chew-ziploc).

consent and an interactive tutorial to learn how to puppeteer the robot (Fig. 2; right). The tutorial contains four steps and takes less than one minute to complete. We detail the stages of the interactive tutorial in the Appendix V.

Performing Tasks. After completing the tutorial, users can choose to enter a *Task Page* where they see videos of different tasks they can complete in the scene (Fig. 2; right). These tasks can be presented in various ways; for example, marked with *levels of difficulty* (e.g., easy versus hard). In service of P5, we use gamified verbiage and elements throughout the interface (e.g. a *Start Playing* button, and a *countdown timer* on performing tasks). Specifically for M3, we implement a point system where users receive points for completing tasks, which are tallied and visible on a *Leaderboard Page*, where users can see how their scores rank compared to other users (Fig. 2; right). We describe implementation details of the software architecture in Appendix V.

V. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

We utilize RoboCrowd to collect a crowdsourced dataset over a two-week period in a public university café. We instantiate three types of incentive mechanisms (M1-M3) to appeal to users’ varying utility functions J_I , and design scenes in order to verify if these mechanisms can shape demonstration quantity and quality. This section details our experimental setup. We then analyze the data and discuss the results in Section VI.

Scene Design. On each day of crowdsourcing, two of six tasks are made available to users, with different pairs corresponding to different scenes (Fig. 3). BinScene contains bins with two types of

candies for single arm bin-picking tasks (hi-chew and tootsie-roll). Bin+DispenserScene contains the same bins with a single type of candy (hershey-kiss), as well as a cup dispenser and a jelly bean dispenser (jelly-bean). Bin+ZiplocScene contains the same bins with a single candy type (hi-chew-bin) as well as a closed Ziploc bag full of candies (hi-chew-ziploc).

Incentive Types. We select tasks to study 3 classes of incentives.

[M1] *Material Rewards.* We hypothesize that direct material rewards can influence which tasks users perform with the system. We design a simple scene context to test this (BinScene). There are two bins on the table, one containing Hi-Chews and the other containing Tootsie Rolls (Fig. 3). There are two bin-picking tasks available to the user on the Task Page: “pick up Hi-Chew” (hi-chew) and “pick up Tootsie Roll” (tootsie-roll). We hypothesize that users who engage with the robot will more often choose to interact with the Hi-Chew (which, in an offline survey, we find is more desired than the Tootsie Roll; see Appendix III). This incentive mechanism is an example of *extrinsic motivation*.

[M2] *Intrinsic Interest.* Users may also be *intrinsically* motivated in how they choose to interact with the system. We hypothesize that users prefer to spend time on tasks that are more qualitatively interesting and challenging. Therefore, we design Bin+ZiplocScene to contain a bin with Hi-Chews as well as a closed Ziploc bag with Hi-Chews inside. This scene features two available tasks: “pick up Hi-Chew from bin” and “open Ziploc, pick up Hi-Chew, close Ziploc.” With the same extrinsic reward, the latter task is *significantly* more challenging, yet may be more intrinsically interesting to users. We test this effect in Bin+DispenserScene as well, which contains a bin with Hershey Kisses as well as a cup dispenser and a dispenser containing Jelly Beans. The tasks available to the user in this scene are “pick up Hershey Kiss from bin” (hershey-kiss) and “take cup from dispenser and eject Jelly Bean into the cup” (jelly-bean). The latter task is again significantly more challenging; but note that it does not provide greater extrinsic reward according to our offline survey (see Appendix III).

[M3] *Social Comparison.* Users may vary in how they respond to gamification mechanisms for social comparison in the interface. To test the idea that gamified elements can shape the way certain users collect data, we include a leaderboard that tallies the number of “points” users achieve by completing tasks (Fig. 2). Using quantitative measurements to compare players, including via leaderboards, is a common method for provoking competition [53]. We hypothesize that users who choose to look at the leaderboard may give a higher quantity of data, stemming from social comparison as an incentive mechanism.

Data Annotation Pipeline. User interaction data are a mixture of task-relevant data, tutorial interactions, and “play” data. We manually annotate all interactions by whether the user was engaging in free play or task-relevant behavior, as well as quality scores on a scale of 0 (play data) to 3 (highest quality task data). We define these quality labels based on how smooth the user’s motions are, whether there is retrying behavior or extraneous movements, etc. Importantly, each interaction episode may include data relevant to different tasks and of various qualities, so we annotate with these labels at *every transition* per trajectory. For more details on the annotation pipeline and quality labels, please see Appendix V.




Fig. 4: **Dataset composition by number of time steps for each of our three scenes.** Different hues indicate different tasks. Tasks receive quality scores from 1 to 3 (higher is better) which are also indicated by brighter shades. Tutorial data receives a score of 1 or 2. Play data always receives a score of 0.

Metrics. We analyze the crowdsourced data using several metrics:

- *Quantity.* Our primary metric measures the number of timesteps a user spends performing a task.
- *Quality.* We utilize our data quality annotations, and additionally explore other data quality measures in Appendix III.
- *Usefulness for Policy Learning.* We study the utility of the crowdsourced data for policy learning via co-training and fine-tuning with expert demonstrations.
- *Self-reported Likert Ratings.* We survey users for self-ratings of intuitiveness, enjoyment, and how well the robot completed the task in the way they desired, and report results in Appendix III.

VI. RESULTS

In this section, we analyze the composition of the dataset, the effects of different incentive mechanisms, and the usefulness of the data for policy learning.

A. Usage Overview and Dataset Composition

We observe significant engagement with RoboCrowd over the two-week collection period: there were $N = 231$ unique users in total. On most days, more than two-thirds of these were new users that had not used the system on prior days. There were a total of 814 interaction episodes distributed throughout the period.

Our dataset is composed of 3 scenes (Fig. 3). We collect 129 interaction episodes in BinScene (Day 1), 381 in Bin+DispenserScene (Days 2-5), and 307 in Bin+ZiplocScene (Days 6-11). In aggregate, users spent 54.2% of interaction time performing the preset tasks in the scene, 9.6% on the interactive tutorial, and 36.1% on free-play. While we focus our learning experiments on task-relevant data in Section VI-C, this play data could be fruitful for training multitask policies in the future. In Fig. 4, we show the distribution of tasks and qualities over timesteps for each scene. Qualities are determined on a scale from 1–3 for task-relevant data and a scale of 1–2 for tutorial data based on the smoothness of the user’s motion and whether there is retrying behavior or extraneous movements. We detail the quality annotation rules in Appendix V, and illustrate sample trajectories in each scene in Appendix I.

B. Effects of Incentives on Data Quantity and Quality

Material Rewards. While BinScene contains two bin-picking tasks with nearly identical difficulty, users in aggregate spend 2× as many timesteps performing hi-chew compared to tootsie-roll. This suggests that users devote more interaction time to tasks where the direct material incentive is more preferred. We also see that users spend a significant amount of time (50.7%) in free-play with the system in BinScene, engaging in behaviors such as trying out more challenging tasks (e.g., attempting to

Task	Scene	# Exp.	Expert	Co-train	Fine-tune
hi-chew	B	30	37.5%	27.5%	42.5%
tootsie-roll	B	30	42.5%	25%	40%
hershey-kiss	B+D	60	20%	32.5%	35%
hi-chew-bin	B+D	80	20%	12.5%	40%
jelly-bean	B+Z	100	48.9 ± 18.6	8.9 ± 10.1	19.7 ± 29.7
hi-chew-ziploc	B+Z	100	5.4 ± 12.2	17.1 ± 15.8	22.1 ± 14.3

TABLE I: **Policy Performance.** Performance of policies trained on expert demonstrations (# Exp.), co-trained on crowd data, and pre-trained on expert+crowd data then fine-tuned on expert data. We conduct 40 trials for each cell. For the long-horizon tasks (jelly-bean, hi-chew-ziploc), we provide a normalized return (out of 100) rather than success rate (see Appendix IV for details).

unwrap the candies; see Appendix II). Thus, while material incentives can influence user demonstrations (e.g., higher material incentives can lead to more data), drivers of intrinsic motivation such as the difficulty of the task also play a role, as we discuss next.

Intrinsic Motivation. Interestingly, in Bin+DispenserScene, which contains a harder bin-picking task than in Scene A (hershey-kiss) and a challenging long-horizon candy dispensing task (jelly-bean), users spend only 35.3% of the time in free-play. Additionally, despite the fact that users do not generally prefer Jelly Beans over Hershey Kisses as a material reward, they still spend more ($1.5\times$) time performing the jelly-bean task. This suggests that intrinsic interest can influence users to allocate more time doing harder task compared to easier ones, or engaging in free-play. To probe whether this intrinsic motivation effect is present even when controlling for the material reward, we consider Bin+ZiplocScene. Here, the incentive is contained within a closed Ziploc bag which must be opened. The same incentive is available in the bin to be picked. Users spend $4.18\times$ as many timesteps on hi-chew-ziploc compared to hi-chew-bin, again suggesting that intrinsic motivation influences which tasks users perform in the scene.

Social Comparison. To examine how different people respond differently to explicit comparison mechanisms in the system, we record which users visit the Leaderboard Page, and conduct a Mann-Whitney U-test to compare the quantity and quality of demonstrations provided by Leaderboard visitors compared to other users. Fig. 5 illustrates the distribution of quality (number of interactions) and quality (mean quality score) conditioned on Leaderboard visitation. We find that that visitors of the Leaderboard provide significantly more demonstrations ($p < 0.001$) that are higher quality on average ($p < 0.05$).

C. Policy Learning with the Crowdsourced Data

In this section, we study how useful the crowdsourced data is for downstream policy learning. To complement the crowdsourced data, we collect a set of high-quality expert demonstrations for each task: 30 demonstrations for each of hi-chew and tootsie-roll, 60 for hershey-kiss, 80 for hi-chew-bin, and 100 for each of jelly-bean and hi-chew-ziploc.

In Table I, we compare different methods of mixing crowdsourced data and expert data on our six tasks. All policies use

ACT [1] with default hyperparameters. Training exclusively with the expert data on each task constitutes the *Expert* setting. *Co-train* refers to naïvely mixing data from a crowdsourced task (i.e., task-relevant data of any quality) with the expert data. We also compare to *Fine-tune*, which trains in two stages: first co-training on the crowd data and expert data and then fine-tuning on expert data only; for fair comparison, note that *Fine-tune* is trained for fewer total steps (150K) than both *Expert* and *Co-train* (200K). In most cases, the crowdsourced data provides performance improvements, especially for more complex tasks, but the specific results vary by task. For example, crowdsourced data for the bin-picking tasks can involve low-quality behaviors (i.e., regrasping behavior or grasping multiple items at a time), which may cause the *Co-train* to perform worse than *Expert*, but still provide a useful initialization for *Fine-tune*. We provide additional qualitative analysis of the trained policies in Appendix B.

We also demonstrate that the crowdsourced data can benefit downstream tasks.

In Table II, we train an expert-only ACT policy (50 demos) to convergence on a new task, tool-ziploc, which requires unzipping a Ziploc containing tools. The

TABLE II: Staged success rate for a policy pre-trained on hi-chew-ziploc crowd data and fine-tuned on 50 expert demos of tool-ziploc compared to expert-only tool-ziploc policy.

unzipping skill is shared with hi-chew-ziploc. We compare this expert-only policy to a policy trained with two stages (pre-training on crowdsourced hi-chew-ziploc data and then fine-tuning on the expert tool-ziploc data). This outperforms the expert-only policy by 20%, suggesting that crowdsourced data can be beneficial in downstream tasks with shared manipulation skills.

VII. DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

In this work, we propose a new paradigm for robot data collection via crowdsourcing and incentive design. We focus on three incentive types—material rewards, intrinsic motivation, and social comparison—but there are further avenues to explore within these categories as well (e.g., how physical rewards differ from monetary incentives). Crafting data collection schemes where people are motivated by external rewards, fun, interest, or competition is a general principle, and a rich area for future work would be to scale up our findings on incentive design in robot data collection to new tasks. For example, appealing to extrinsic motivation and social comparison could help craft a data collection scheme for a task such as packing groceries—where users are motivated by spaced rewards (getting to keep every N bags) or social comparison (getting points for more efficient packing). A variety of other incentive types (e.g., task novelty, collective effort, robot’s ability to learn from the data, etc.) could be applied to new settings as well. While crowdsourcing has the benefit of reducing data collection effort of individual researchers, it also presents challenges of data quality and heterogeneity. We hope that our dataset—collected from over 200 users with manual fine-grained quality annotations—can be helpful to future works seeking to understand the style and diversity of different human operators, and what the most effective ways are to leverage crowdsourced data during downstream policy learning.




Fig. 5: **Quantity and quality by leaderboard use.** Violin plot showing the distribution of quantity and quality of demonstrations for users who did and did not visit the leaderboard.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Zhao, V. Kumar, S. Levine, and C. Finn, “Learning Fine-Grained Bimanual Manipulation with Low-Cost Hardware,” in *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2023.
- [2] A. Brohan, N. Brown, J. Carbajal, *et al.*, “RT-1: Robotics Transformer for Real-World Control at Scale,” in *arXiv*, 2022.
- [3] A. Brohan, N. Brown, J. Carbajal, *et al.*, “RT-2: Vision-Language-Action Models Transfer Web Knowledge to Robotic Control,” in *arXiv*, 2023.
- [4] Octo Model Team, D. Ghosh, H. Walke, *et al.*, “Octo: An Open-Source Generalist Robot Policy,” in *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2024.
- [5] M. Kim, K. Pertsch, S. Karamcheti, *et al.*, “Openvla: An open-source vision-language-action model,” *arXiv*, 2024.
- [6] O. X.-E. Collaboration, A. O’Neill, A. Rehman, *et al.*, *Open X-Embodiment: Robotic Learning Datasets and RT-X Models*, 2023.
- [7] Y. J. Ma, S. Sodhani, D. Jayaraman, O. Bastani, V. Kumar, and A. Zhang, “VIP: Towards Universal Visual Reward and Representation via Value-Implicit Pre-Training,” *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- [8] S. Nair, A. Rajeswaran, V. Kumar, C. Finn, and A. Gupta, “R3M: A Universal Visual Representation for Robot Manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2022.
- [9] A. Khazatsky, K. Pertsch, S. Nair, *et al.*, “DROID: A Large-Scale In-The-Wild Robot Manipulation Dataset,” *arXiv*, 2024.
- [10] S. Dasari, F. Ebert, S. Tian, *et al.*, “RoboNet: Large-Scale Multi-Robot Learning,” in *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2019.
- [11] S. Nair, A. Rajeswaran, V. Kumar, C. Finn, and A. Gupta, “R3M: A universal visual representation for robot manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2022.
- [12] I. Radosavovic, T. Xiao, S. James, P. Abbeel, J. Malik, and T. Darrell, “Real-world robot learning with masked visual pre-training,” in *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2023.
- [13] S. Karamcheti, S. Nair, A. S. Chen, *et al.*, “Language-Driven Representation Learning for Robotics,” in *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2023.
- [14] S. Ross, G. J. Gordon, and J. A. Bagnell, “A Reduction of Imitation Learning and Structured Prediction to No-Regret Online Learning,” in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2010.
- [15] M. Kelly, C. Sidrane, K. Driggs-Campbell, and M. J. Kochenderfer, “HG-Dagger: Interactive Imitation Learning with Human Experts,” *International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2018.
- [16] K. Gandhi, S. Karamcheti, M. Liao, and D. Sadigh, “Eliciting Compatible Demonstrations for Multi-Human Imitation Learning,” in *Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2022.
- [17] R. Snow, B. O’Connor, D. Jurafsky, and A. Y. Ng, “Cheap and Fast - But is it Good? Evaluating Non-Expert Annotations for Natural Language Tasks,” in *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2008.
- [18] A. Sorokin and D. A. Forsyth, “Utility data annotation with Amazon Mechanical Turk,” in *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2008.
- [19] L. von Ahn and L. Dabbish, “Labeling images with a computer game,” in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2004.
- [20] M. S. Bernstein, D. S. Tan, G. Smith, M. Czerwinski, and E. Horvitz, “Collabio: a game for annotating people within social networks,” in *ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST)*, 2009.
- [21] J. Park, R. Krishna, P. Khadpe, L. Fei-Fei, and M. S. Bernstein, “AI-Based Request Augmentation to Increase Crowdsourcing Participation,” in *Proceedings of the Seventh AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing, HCOMP*, 2019.
- [22] R. Krishna, Y. Zhu, O. Groth, *et al.*, “Visual Genome: Connecting Language and Vision Using Crowdsourced Dense Image Annotations,” *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 2016.
- [23] N. Zhou, Z. D. Siegel, S. Zarecor, *et al.*, “Crowdsourcing image analysis for plant phenomics to generate ground truth data for machine learning,” *PLOS Computational Biology*, Jul. 2018.
- [24] S. Ørting, A. Doyle, A. van Hilten, *et al.*, “A Survey of Crowdsourcing in Medical Image Analysis,” *Human Computation*, 2019.
- [25] T. W. Cenggoro, F. Tanzil, A. H. Aslamiah, E. K. Karuppiyah, and B. Pardamean, “Crowdsourcing annotation system of object counting dataset for deep learning algorithm,” *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 2018.
- [26] M. van Vliet, E. C. Groen, F. Dalpiaz, and S. Brinkkemper, “Identifying and Classifying User Requirements in Online Feedback via Crowdsourcing,” in *Requirements Engineering: Foundation for Software Quality*, 2020.
- [27] B. Shmueli, J. Fell, S. Ray, and L.-W. Ku, “Beyond Fair Pay: Ethical Implications of NLP Crowdsourcing,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021.
- [28] N. Nangia, S. Sugawara, H. Trivedi, A. Warstadt, C. Vania, and S. R. Bowman, “What Ingredients Make for an Effective Crowdsourcing Protocol for Difficult NLU Data Collection Tasks?” *arXiv*, 2021.
- [29] S. Mishra, D. Khashabi, C. Baral, and H. Hajishirzi, “Cross-Task Generalization via Natural Language Crowdsourcing Instructions,” *arXiv*, 2022.
- [30] S. Lim, A. Jatowt, M. Färber, and M. Yoshikawa, “Annotating and Analyzing Biased Sentences in News Articles using Crowdsourcing,” in *Proceedings of the Twelfth*

- Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, May 2020.
- [31] L. B. Chilton, G. Little, D. Edge, D. S. Weld, and J. A. Landay, “Cascade: crowdsourcing taxonomy creation,” in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2013.
 - [32] K. Crowston, “Amazon Mechanical Turk: A Research Tool for Organizations and Information Systems Scholars,” in *Shaping the Future of ICT Research. Methods and Approaches*, 2012.
 - [33] S. Palan and C. Schitter, “Prolific. ac—A subject pool for online experiments,” *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 2018.
 - [34] L. Von Ahn, B. Maurer, C. McMillen, D. Abraham, and M. Blum, “recaptcha: Human-based character recognition via web security measures,” *Science*, 2008.
 - [35] E. Law and L. Von Ahn, *Human computation*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2011.
 - [36] H. Garcia-Molina, M. Joglekar, A. Marcus, A. Parameswaran, and V. Verroios, “Challenges in Data Crowdsourcing,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2016.
 - [37] J. Huynh, J. Bigham, and M. Eskenazi, “A Survey of NLP-Related Crowdsourcing HITs: what works and what does not,” *arXiv*, 2021.
 - [38] S. Deterding, D. Dixon, R. Khaled, and L. Nacke, “From Game Design Elements to Gamefulness: Defining “Gamification”,” in *Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning Future Media Environments*, 2011.
 - [39] A. Mandlekar, Y. Zhu, A. Garg, *et al.*, “RoboTurk: A Crowdsourcing Platform for Robotic Skill Learning through Imitation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2018.
 - [40] A. Mandlekar, J. Booher, M. Spero, *et al.*, “Scaling robot supervision to hundreds of hours with roboturk: Robotic manipulation dataset through human reasoning and dexterity,” in *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2019.
 - [41] M. Balsells, M. M. L. Torné, Z. Wang, S. Desai, P. Agrawal, and A. Gupta, “Autonomous Robotic Reinforcement Learning with Asynchronous Human Feedback,” *arXiv*, 2023.
 - [42] M. Torne, M. Balsells, Z. Wang, *et al.*, “Breadcrumbs to the Goal: Goal-Conditioned Exploration from Human-in-the-Loop Feedback,” *arXiv*, 2023.
 - [43] M. J.-Y. Chung, M. Forbes, M. Cakmak, and R. P. Rao, “Accelerating imitation learning through crowdsourcing,” in *International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2014.
 - [44] S. Van Waveren, E. J. Carter, O. Örnberg, and I. Leite, “Exploring non-expert robot programming through crowdsourcing,” *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, 2021.
 - [45] S. Chernova, N. DePalma, E. Morant, and C. Breazeal, “Crowdsourcing human-robot interaction: Application from virtual to physical worlds,” in *2011 RO-MAN*, 2011.
 - [46] S. Song, A. Zeng, J. Lee, and T. Funkhouser, “Grasping in the wild: Learning 6dof closed-loop grasping from low-cost demonstrations,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters (RA-L)*, 2020.
 - [47] C. Wang, H. Shi, W. Wang, R. Zhang, L. Fei-Fei, and C. K. Liu, “DexCap: Scalable and Portable Mocap Data Collection System for Dexterous Manipulation,” *arXiv*, 2024.
 - [48] C. Chi, Z. Xu, C. Pan, *et al.*, “Universal Manipulation Interface: In-The-Wild Robot Teaching Without In-The-Wild Robots,” *arXiv*, 2024.
 - [49] J. Wang, C.-C. Chang, J. Duan, D. Fox, and R. Krishna, “Eve: Enabling anyone to train robot using augmented reality,” *ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST)*, 2024.
 - [50] L. J. Ratliff, R. Dong, S. Sekar, and T. Fiez, “A perspective on incentive design: Challenges and opportunities,” *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 2019.
 - [51] A. W. Kruglanski and O. Mayseless, “Classic and current social comparison research: Expanding the perspective.,” *Psychological bulletin*, 1990.
 - [52] E. Todorov, T. Erez, and Y. Tassa, “Mujoco: A physics engine for model-based control,” in *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2012.
 - [53] B. Medler and B. Magerko, “Analytics of play: Using information visualization and gameplay practices for visualizing video game data,” *Parsons Journal for Information Mapping*, 2011.
 - [54] Z. Fu, T. Zhao, and C. Finn, “Mobile ALOHA: Learning Bimanual Mobile Manipulation with Low-Cost Whole-Body Teleoperation,” *arXiv*, 2024.