

A REVIEW OF PIECEWORK

The HCI community has used the term “piecework” to describe myriad instantiations of on-demand labor, but this reference has generally been offered in passing. As this paper principally traces a relationship between the historical piecework and the contemporary crowd work (or on-demand labor more generally), this casual familiarity with piecework may prove insufficient. We’ll more carefully discuss piecework in this section in order to inform the rest of the argument. Specifically, we will first define “piecework” as researchers in its field understand it, and second trace the rise and fall of piecework at a high level, identifying key figures and ideas during this time. This section is not intended to be comprehensive: instead, it sets up the scaffolding necessary for our later investigations of crowd work’s three questions: complexity limits, task decomposition, and worker relationships.

What is piecework?

Aligning on-demand work with piecework requires an understanding of what piecework is. While it has had several definitions over time, we can trace a constellation of characteristics that recur throughout the literature. We’ll follow this research, collecting descriptions, examples, and definitions of piecework, tracing an outline of *what piecework is*.

Raynbird provides a concise definition of piecework (which he also calls “measure work”, “grate work”, and “task work”) by contrasting with the “day-labourer”: “the chief difference lies between the day-labourer, who receives a certain sum of money . . . for his day’s work, and the task-labourer, whose earnings depend on the quantity of work done” [26]. Chadwick defines it through examples: “payment is made for each hectare which is pronounced to be well ploughed . . . for each living foal got from a mare; . . . for each living calf got” [6]. This framing offers a more intuitive sense; “payment for results,” as he calls it, is not only common in practice, but well-studied in labor economics as well [10, 33, 34, 15].

It’s worth acknowledging that “this distinction [between piece-rates and time-rates] was not completely clear-cut” [14]. Indeed, employers adopted piece-rate compensation in some aspects and time-rate compensation in others. The Rowan premium system, which essentially paid workers a base rate for time plus, potentially, an additional pay dependent on output [30]; this was just one of several alternatives to categorical time- and piece-rate remuneration paradigms. As Rowan’s premium system guaranteed an hourly rate regardless of the worker’s productive output *as well as* additional compensation tied to performance, workers under this regime were in some senses “task-labourers”, but in other senses “day-labourers”.

It may be worth thinking about piecework through the lens of its *emergent* properties to help understand it. Raynbird argues for the merits of piecework, pointing out that “piece work holds out to the labourer an increase of wages as a reward for his skill and exertion . . . he knows that all depends on his own diligence and perseverance . . . [and] so long as he performs his work to the satisfaction of his master, he is not under that control to which the day-labourer is always subject”. The argument that “task-labourers” enjoy freedom from control crops up in Raynbird’s and later Rowan’s works [26, 30].

We see this sense of independence in myriad times, locales, and industries. Satre offers a look into the lives and culture of “match-girls” — young pieceworkers, mostly women, who assembled matchsticks in the late 19th century. Of interest was their reputation “. . . for generosity, independence, and protectiveness, but also for brashness, irregularity, low morality, and little education” [31]. Hagan and Fisher document piecework from 1850 through 1930 in Australia, finding similar assertions of the freedom compositors of newspapers experienced as pieceworkers: “If a piece-work compositor . . . decided that he did not want to work on a particular day or night, the management recognised his right to put a ‘substitute’ or ‘grass’ compositor in his place” [13]. We therefore draw a *sense* of independence and autonomy inherent to piecework.

Piecework opened the door for people who previously couldn’t participate in the labor market to do so, and to acquire job skills incrementally. During World War II, women received training in narrow subsets of more comprehensive jobs, enabling work in capacities similar to conventional (i.e. male) workers [14]. Workers with specific skill subsets could be matched to suitable tasks. Women previously had virtually no opportunities to engage in engineering and metalworking apprenticeships as men did; now, they could be trained quickly on narrowly scoped tasks, demonstrate proficiency, and become experts.

In summary, piecework: 1) paid workers for quantity of work done, rather than time done, but occasionally mixed the two payment models; 2) afforded workers freedom in when and how much to work; and 3) structured tasks such that people who didn’t have the training to engage in the traditional labor force could still participate.

Viewing crowd work as a modern instantiation of piecework is relatively straightforward by this definition. First, platforms such as Mechanical Turk, Uber and TaskRabbit pay by the task, though some such as Upwork do offer hourly rates as well. Second, workers are attracted to these platforms by the freedom they offer to pick the time and place of work [21, 3]. Third, system developers as on Mechanical Turk typically assume no professional skills in transcription or other areas, and attempt to build that expertise into the work flow [23, 2]. Given this alignment, many of the same properties of piecework historically will apply to on-demand work as well. In the next section, we perform this application to three of the major questions in crowd work and gig work, identifying similarities and differences between historical piecework and modern on-demand work.

A Piecework Primer

In this section we’ll discuss the history of piecework at a high level to contextualize the observations and conclusions we later make, rather than provide a comprehensive historical account. In other words, it will frame piecework, in the early days of the Industrial Revolution & through the political and economic turmoil of the early and mid-20th century, and into the 21st century. While the previous section provided a *definition* of piecework, this section attempts to shine a light on the *zeitgeist* of piecework; as close to a *thick description* of piecework as we can afford [11].

Piecowork's history traces back further perhaps than most would expect. Grier describes the process astronomers adopted of hiring young boys to calculate equations in order to better-predict the trajectories of various celestial bodies in the 19th century [12]. George Airy was perhaps the first to rigorously apply piecowork-style decomposition of tasks to work; by breaking complex calculations into constituent parts, and training young men to solve simple algebraic problems, Airy could distribute work to many more people than could otherwise complete the full calculations.

Piecowork may have started in the intellectual domain of astronomical calculations and projections, but it found its foothold in manual labor. Piecowork took off on in farm work [26], in textiles [1, 28], on railroads [4], and elsewhere in manufacturing [31]. Fordism and scientific management thrust piecowork into higher gear, especially as mass manufacturing and a depleted wartime workforce forced industry to find new ways to eke out more production capacity. Hart and Roberts point out that the Second World War, which called millions of Americans to military service, necessitated the rapid training and employment of a labor pool that hadn't historically been utilized in industrial labor: women [14].

The early growth of piecowork led to discussion surrounding how best to manage piecoworkers [24, 7]. Despite this, workers' needs were mostly ignored, leading to frustration over poor working and living conditions (famously documented by Riis [28]). Discontent reached a crescendo when industry organizations representing railway workers, mechanical engineers, and other industries began to speak out on piecoworkers' behalves [18, 27].

Piecowork's popularity in the United States and Europe plummeted almost as quickly as it had climbed. Hart and Roberts's work substantively explores the precipitous decline of piecowork in the last third of the 20th century. In their work, Hart and Roberts offer a number of explanations for the sudden vanishing of piecowork. The salient suggestions include: 1) the emergence of more effective, more nuanced incentive models — rewarding teams for complex achievements, for instance; 2) the shifting of these industries (manufacturing, clothing, etc. . .) to other countries; and 3) the quality of “multidimensional” work becoming too difficult to evaluate [14].

Case studies in piecowork

We'll discuss the context and factual details of three instructive cases of piecowork to inform the three questions we investigate later — first, railroad and other industrial workers across the United States; second, Airy's employment of *human computers*; and third, domestic and farm work (in particular, the “match-girls”). We'll approach this by looking at familiar cases of decomposed, distributed work (industrial workers), and make our way backwards through the 20th and then 19th century, tracing the origins of the ideas that

[al2: I'm coming out of this with a sort of structure that *loosely* describes piecowork chronologically. Strictly speaking, I'm talking about each of these topics (let's call them **human computation**, **domestic and farm work**, and **industrial work**), and some of these things overlap with each other to some

extent, but for the most part Airy and the human computers came in the mid-19th century, farm work and the “domestic” work (like making matches) came around at the turn of the 20th century, and the industrial work (railroad workers, the WWII war effort, and the rise of the labor union movement) unfolded from the early 20th century onward.]

Railroad and other Industrial Workers

Piecowork might be most familiar to the HCI researcher in the context of the assembly line, which largely defined manufacturing through the 20th century. It was here that scientific management, Fordism, and Taylorism dramatically influenced how workers were managed and the ways in which workers were perceived and envisioned paradigmatically; it's here we'll start our overview of piecowork's history through case studies.

Piecowork through the 20th century centered around auto and other mass manufacturing, but found its way into the war effort during World War II. With the vast majority of men drafted into service, factories found themselves turning to a predominantly female workforce that had neither the formal training nor the years of apprenticeship experience that conventional workers would have had. Rather than attempting to train this new labor force in every aspect of industrial work, these women were trained for individual tasks and assigned to that task. One might reflect on the observation that “Rosie the Riveter”, an icon of 20th century America who represented empowerment and opportunity for women [16], was a piecoworker [8].

With Taylor's formalization of scientific management in *Taylorism* (and Henry Ford's eponymously named *Fordism*), piecowork in the early and mid-20th century surged, especially in industrial work. Scientific management promised that the careful measurement of workers would yield higher efficiency and output [32, 20]. While Brown points out that piecowork dramatically advanced the instrumented measurement of workers, in Taylor's time highly instrumented, automatic measurement of workers was all but impossible [4]. Instead, managers conducted “stop watch time studies” [22], using completion times to inform per-task compensation.

The 1930s represented a boom for piecowork on an unprecedented scale, especially among engineering and metalworking industries. Hart and Roberts characterize the 1930s — and more broadly the first half of the 20th century — as the “heyday” of the use of piecowork. They attribute this to the shortage of male workers, who would have gone through a conventional apprenticeship process affording them more comprehensive knowledge of the total scope of work.

Domestic and Farmhand Labor

When piecowork entered the American economy, it was not used for complex work. One reason for low complexity was workers' skills: it was infeasible to provide new piecoworkers with the comprehensive education that apprenticeships imparted [14]. So, initially piecowork in the United States arose for farm work, and as Raynbird and others discuss, the practice remained relatively obscure until it blossomed in the textile industry [26]. The complexity of the work remained low at the turn of the 20th century as piecowork saturated New York City [28]. However, writers of the time focused their attention

on wage [5] and management regimes [24] rather than training. Mass manufacturing, such as sewing garments [28] and making matchsticks [31], flourished under piecework systems in densely populated cities.

Workers' relationships with employers quickly soured. The match-girls strike of 1888 was one of the earliest and most famous successful worker strikes, and perhaps the beginning of "militant trade unionism" [31]. As Weyer, Webb, and Webb described, "the match-girls' victory turned a new leaf in Trade Union annals" [35]: in the 30 years after the match-girls strike, the Trade Union Movement enrollment grew from 20% of eligible workers to over 60%.

The match-girls strike foreshadowed both collective action victories and an emerging paradigm regarding worker management. Coal miners won a nationwide individual minimum wage after The Great Coal Strike of 1912 [29]. Garment workers in Philadelphia secured collective bargaining rights in 1915 after a prolonged strike and threat of a second [9]. It was in the midst of this time that Taylor published the work for which he would later be called "the father of scientific management" [19]. It was this framing on work & worker management that gave workers a concrete adversary — if not Taylor, then *Taylorism* — against which to rally [17, 25].

Airy's Computers

Some of the first systematic cases of what we would recognize as crowd work can be found in the study of astronomy. In the 19th century, the calculation of celestial bodies had become a competitive field with Airy needed to compute tables that would allow sailors to locate themselves by starlight from sea. This work ostensibly called for educated people who comprehensively understood mathematics. Airy realized that he could break the tasks down and delegate the constituent parts to "human computers" who "... possessed the basic skills of mathematics, including 'Arithmetic, the use of Logarithms, and Elementary Algebra' " [12]. As a result, many of Airy's computers had relatively rudimentary educations compared to the background of education that typically worked in the calculation of solar tables. Airy distributed tasks by mail, allowing work to be completed by a somewhat geographically distributed workforce, and paid for each piece of work completed. Airy also instituted a policy of firing his computers once they reached age 23.

[a2: THIS GOES LATER: This practice ensured two outcomes that arguably disfavored workers. First, it eliminated any potential to advance professionally, as workers' careers in this area ended relatively early in their careers, and without formal education in mathematics they struggled to find work for which their experience was meaningful. Second, it limited workers' ability to organize by ensuring that workers hardly spent sufficient time to successfully rally their peers.]

References

- [1] Peter Baker. "Production restructuring in the textiles and clothing industries". In: *New Technology, Work and Employment* 8.1 (1993), pp. 43–55. ISSN: 1468–005X. DOI: [10.1111/j.1468-005X.1993.tb00033.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-005X.1993.tb00033.x). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-005X.1993.tb00033.x>.
- [2] Michael S. Bernstein et al. "Soylent: A Word Processor with a Crowd Inside". In: *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. UIST '10. New York, New York, USA: ACM, 2010, pp. 313–322. ISBN: 978-1-4503-0271-5. DOI: [10.1145/1866029.1866078](https://doi.org/10.1145/1866029.1866078). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1866029.1866078>.
- [3] Robin Brewer, Meredith Ringel Morris, and Anne Marie Piper. "'Why Would Anybody Do This?': Understanding Older Adults' Motivations and Challenges in Crowd Work". In: *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '16. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2016, pp. 2246–2257. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3362-7. DOI: [10.1145/2858036.2858198](https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858198). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2858036.2858198>.
- [4] Charles Brown. "Firms' Choice of Method of Pay". In: *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 43.3 (1990), 165S–182S. DOI: [10.1177/001979399004300311](https://doi.org/10.1177/001979399004300311). eprint: <http://ilr.sagepub.com/content/43/3/165S.full.pdf+html>. URL: <http://ilr.sagepub.com/content/43/3/165S.abstract>.
- [5] Francis G Burton. *The Commercial Management of Engineering Works*. Scientific Publishing Company, 1899.
- [6] Edwin Chadwick. "Opening Address of the President of the Department of Economy and Trade, at the Meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, held at York, in September, 1864". In: *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* 28.1 (1865), pp. 1–33. ISSN: 09595341. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2338394>.
- [7] William Alexander Graham Clark. *Cotton Textile Trade in Turkish Empire, Greece, and Italy*. Vol. 10. US Government Printing Office, 1908.
- [8] Andrea Rees Davies and Brenda D Frink. "The origins of the ideal worker: The separation of work and home in the United States from the market revolution to 1950". In: *Work and Occupations* 41.1 (2014), pp. 18–39.
- [9] Boris Emmet. "Trade Agreements In The Women's Clothing Industries Of Philadelphia". In: *Monthly Review of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics* 6.1 (1918), pp. 27–39. ISSN: 23291354, 23291362. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41829256>.
- [10] David N Figlio and Lawrence W Kenny. "Individual teacher incentives and student performance". In: *Journal of Public Economics* 91.5 (2007), pp. 901–914.
- [11] Clifford Geertz. *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. Vol. 5019. Basic books, 1973.
- [12] David Alan Grier. *When computers were human*. Princeton University Press, 2013.
- [13] J. Hagan and C. Fisher. "Piece Work and Some of Its Consequences in the Printing and Coal Mining Industries in Australia, 1850-1930". In: *Labour History* 25 (1973), pp. 19–39. ISSN: 00236942. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27508091>.

- [14] Robert A Hart and J Elizabeth Roberts. "The rise and fall of piecework–timework wage differentials: market volatility, labor heterogeneity, and output pricing". In: (2013).
- [15] John S. Heywood, W. S. Siebert, and Xiangdong Wei. "Payment by Results Systems: British Evidence". In: *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 35.1 (1997), pp. 1–22. ISSN: 1467-8543. DOI: [10.1111/1467-8543.00038](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8543.00038). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8543.00038>.
- [16] Maureen Honey. *Creating Rosie the Riveter: class, gender, and propaganda during World War II*. Univ of Massachusetts Press, 1985.
- [17] Sanford M Jacoby. "Union–management cooperation in the United States: Lessons from the 1920s". In: *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 37.1 (1983), pp. 18–33.
- [18] B.M. Jewell. *The problem of piece work*. The Problem of Piece Work nos. 1-16. Bronson Canode Print. Co., 1921. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=NN5NAQAATAAJ>.
- [19] Robert Kanigel. *The One Best Way: Frederick Winslow Taylor and the Enigma of Efficiency*. Vol. 1. MIT Press Books 0262612062. The MIT Press, 2005. ISBN: AR-RAY(0x79a62d28). URL: <https://ideas.repec.org/b/mtp/titles/0262612062.html>.
- [20] Alain Lipietz. "Towards Global Fordism?" In: *New Left Review* 0.132 (Mar. 1982). Last updated — 2013-02-24, p. 33. URL: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1301937328?accountid=14026>.
- [21] David Martin et al. "Being a Turker". In: *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*. CSCW '14. Baltimore, Maryland, USA: ACM, 2014, pp. 224–235. ISBN: 978-1-4503-2540-0. DOI: [10.1145/2531602.2531663](https://doi.org/10.1145/2531602.2531663). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2531602.2531663>.
- [22] Milton J Nadworny. *Scientific management and the unions, 1900-1932; a historical analysis*. Harvard University Press, 1955.
- [23] Jon Noronha et al. "Platemate: Crowdsourcing Nutritional Analysis from Food Photographs". In: *Proceedings of the 24th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. UIST '11. Santa Barbara, California, USA: ACM, 2011, pp. 1–12. ISBN: 978-1-4503-0716-1. DOI: [10.1145/2047196.2047198](https://doi.org/10.1145/2047196.2047198). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2047196.2047198>.
- [24] George Pepler Norton. *Textile Manufacturers' Book-keeping for the Counting House, Mill and Warehouse: Being a Practical Treatise, Specially Designed for the Woollen and Worsted and Allied Trades*. Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Company, 1900.
- [25] Carleton Hubbell Parker and Mrs Cornelia Stratton Parker. *The Casual Laborer: And Other Essays*. Vol. 3. Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920.
- [26] Hugh Raynbird. *Essay on Measure Work, locally known as task, piece, job, or grate work (in its application to agricultural labour)*. 1847.
- [27] Frank Richards. "Is Anything the Matter with Piece-work". In: ASME. 1904.
- [28] Jacob August Riis. *How the other half lives: Studies among the tenements of New York*. Penguin, 1901.
- [29] D. H. Robertson. "A Narrative of the Coal Strike". In: *The Economic Journal* 22.87 (1912), pp. 365–387. ISSN: 00130133, 14680297. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2221944>.
- [30] James Rowan. "A Premium System of Remunerating Labour". In: *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers* 61.1 (1901), pp. 865–882.
- [31] Lowell J. Satre. "After the Match Girls' Strike: Bryant and May in the 1890s". In: *Victorian Studies* 26.1 (1982), pp. 7–31. ISSN: 00425222, 15272052. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3827491>.
- [32] Frederick Winslow Taylor. *The principles of scientific management*. Harper, 1914.
- [33] Martin L Weitzman. "The new Soviet incentive model". In: *The Bell Journal of Economics* (1976), pp. 251–257.
- [34] Martin L. Weitzman. "The "Ratchet Principle" and Performance Incentives". In: *The Bell Journal of Economics* 11.1 (1980), pp. 302–308. ISSN: 0361915X. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3003414>.
- [35] OW Weyer, Sidney Webb, and Beatrice Webb. *The History of Trade Unionism*. 1894.