

Aggregated On–Demand Worker Profiles

Anonymized for Review

ABSTRACT

ACM Classification Keywords

H.5.3. Information Interfaces and Presentation (e.g. HCI):
Group and Organization Interfaces

Author Keywords

TODO

INTRODUCTION

1. on–demand work has grown significantly
2. task diversity is growing
3. new platforms continue to emerge
4. workers are struggling to signal quality:
 - (a) new workers — cold start problem
 - (b) old workers — too much noise
5. requesters have problems as well:
 - (a) requesters don’t know whom to trust and have to bootstrap their own trustworthiness evaluations (e.g. qualifications exams, tentatively and very cautiously trusting coarse heuristic data)
 - (b) requesters tend to undervalue workers — at least at first — leading to a “market for lemons”
6. a few problems frustrate the design of interventions
 - (a) platforms have little incentive to facilitate external agents of intervention
 - (b) the stakeholders that platforms are more interested in seem to be those with the money (i.e. requesters)
 - (c) on–demand workers gravitate toward these platforms in large part because of the transience and ephemeral nature of the work (therefore, working against that will meet with resistance (and possibly attrition) from the very workers who constitute the platform today)
7. in “conventional” work, the problem of signaling a worker’s quality was solved by using past worker performance as a proxy for future performance
8. on–demand work platforms have tried to do this with approval and rating systems, but they’re generally too vague to be useful
9. conventional work résumés usually allow the worker to emphasize and omit information that’s not relevant — **what if we facilitated that?**
10. we built a system that collected data from workers’ profiles on online crowdsourcing platforms (first AMT, then others), and parsed that data to present more meaningful analytic data on things like
 - (a) the nature of the task; objective (i.e. factually based and evaluable) versus subjective (e.g. survey)
 - (b) the type of requester; academic versus industry
 - (c) *others*
11. we also built a proof–of–concept qualifications management system abstracted from both our worker profile system and the work platform itself (to explore the potential to abstract worker qualifications and credentials from the system itself, allowing other parties to specialize in this task)
12. we evaluated this system from two perspectives:
 - (a) did requesters who used this system find that the worker data better–informed their qualifications management and worker solicitation? in other words, was the output of the work more reliably accurate when they relied on the analytic data that we provided versus the coarse approval/rejection rating?
 - (b) did *workers* benefit from having high level data providing some insight into their work trends? did this lead them to better work more quickly? did they take a more active role in the management of their reputation / “worker profile” / résumé?
13. we also explored whether the externalized worker qualification system worked effectively, and considered the potential advantages and disadvantages of a set of decoupled systems rather than an integrated one (market, qualifications assessment system, payment platform, etc. . .).