

The Relationships of Workers to Work, Peers, and Others

HCI and CSCW have largely framed themselves around supporting work rather than becoming an infrastructural layer enabling it. While all artifacts have politics, this shift into computational labor systems has directly impacted the lives and livelihood of workers. So, it is important to understand: what will the future look like for the workers who use these systems?

Crowd work's perspective

One of the initial questions that researchers asked was, who are the crowd workers and what draws them to crowd work? Early literature emphasized motivations like fun and spare change, but this narrative soon shifted to emphasize that many workers use platforms such as Amazon Mechanical Turk as a primary source of income [18, 13, 3]. Despite this, Mechanical Turk is a low-wage affair for most workers in the United States [13, 24, 10]. Thus, those who choose to opt out of the traditional labor force and spend significant time on Mechanical Turk are especially motivated by the opportunity for autonomy and skill variety [18]. Due to valuing autonomy, it is tempting to ascribe attitudes of “pity the workers” to Turkers, but this frame is increasingly rejected by workers and designers as patronizing [14].

Workers’ relationships with requesters are fraught. Workers are often blamed for any low-quality work, regardless of whether they are responsible [24, 26]. Some research is extremely open about this position, blaming unpredictable work on “malicious” workers [7] or those with “a lack of expertise, dedication [or] interest” [34]. Workers resent this position — for good reason. Irani and Silberman highlighted the information asymmetry between workers and requesters on AMT, leading to the creation of *Turkopticon*, a site which allows Turkers to rate and review requesters [15]. Dynamo then took this critique on information asymmetry and power imbalances a step further, designing a platform to facilitate Turkers acting collectively to bring about changes to their circumstances [33]. This unbridled power that requesters have over workers and the resultant stress and frustration that this generates has been part of the undercurrent of research into the tense relationships between workers and requesters [8, 33].

Researchers have also begun to appreciate the sociality of crowd workers. Because the platforms do not typically include social spaces, workers instead congregate off-platform in forums and mailing lists. There, Turkers exchange advice on high-paying work, talk about their earnings, build social connections, and discuss requesters [24]. Many crowd workers know each other through offline and online connections, coordinating behind-the-scenes despite the platforms encouraging independent work [9, 36]. However, the frustration and mistrust that workers experience with requesters does occasionally boil over on the forums. This behavior has come to be known as “mega-drama” amongst such workers [33]. Still, the study of these communities is made challenging because most of these platforms do not themselves include social affordances for workers [28].

Piecework's perspective

Early observers believed that workers were strongly motivated by the piecework model. Clark observed textile mill pieceworkers and reported, “When he works by the day the Italian operative wishes to leave before the whistle blows, but if he works by the piece he will work as many hours as it is possible for him to stand.” Workers’ situations were quite dire: Riis documented abhorrent working and living conditions of pieceworkers in New York City [32].

Soon, many worker organizations were weighing in on (or, more precisely, against) piecework and the myriad oversights it made in valuing workers’ time [17, 31]. As mounting attention increasingly revealed problems in piecework’s treatment of workers, the workers themselves began to speak out about their frustration with this new regime. Organizations representing railway workers, mechanical engineers, and others began to mount advocacy in defense of workers [17, 31].

Pieceworkers’ relationships with their employers eventually developed a pattern of using laborer advocacy groups [22, 1, 25, 16]. Collective action grew to become a central component of negotiating with managers [12, 29].

Less is known about how pieceworkers related to each other. For one thing, the research methods we typically associate with the exploratory study of cultures — Anthropology, and namely participant–observation, ethnography, etc. . . — didn’t exist quite as we know them at the turn of the 20th century, and wouldn’t for several more decades. Primary sources indicate that labor organizations wished for workers to identify as a collective group, “not only as railroad employees but also as members of the larger life of the community” [17]. Doing this, Ostrom and others argued, would facilitate collective action and perhaps collective governance [30, 12, 29]. Riis also contributed to this sense of shared struggle and endurance by documenting pieceworkers in their home–workplaces, literally bringing to light the grim circumstances in which pieceworkers lived and worked [32].

Comparing the phenomena

While historical pieceworkers could be looked down on, as the match-stick girls were characterized by “brashness, irregularity, low morality, and little education”, there was generally less written about quality concerns for historical pieceworkers than there is in modern crowd work. Why the difference? One possibility is that, through writing web scripts and applying them to many tasks, it is possible for a small number of spammers have an outsized influence. Historically, it was much harder for such workers to move and get new jobs — today, they can simply accept a different task on Mechanical Turk. Another possibility: online anonymity breeds distrust [6], and where pieceworkers could be directly observed by foremen, online workers are known by little more than an account ID.

The relationship between workers and employers has also shifted: while historically the management of workers had to be done through a foreman (who necessarily had an intuitive — perhaps sympathetic — relationship with workers), the foreman of the 20th century has largely been replaced by algorithms of the 21st century [21]. The result of this change is that the agents managing work are now cold, logical, and unforgiving. Where a person might recognize that the “attention check” questions proposed by Le et al. ensure that malicious and inattentive workers are stopped, some implementations of these approaches only seem to antagonize workers. More than 30 years ago, Anderson and Schmittlein wrote: “When performance is difficult to evaluate, imperfect input measures and a manager’s subjective judgment are preferable to defective (simple, observable) output measures” [2]. This frustration has only grown as requesters have had to rely on automatic management mechanisms. Only a few use the equivalent of human foremen [11, 19].

Relative to the mature state of collective action for pieceworkers offline, crowd workers have struggled to make their voices heard [33, 14, 15]. Both pieceworkers and crowd workers have struggled at times to form a collective identity necessary to organize. With workers joining and leaving the crowd labor force continuously, and with many part-time members, it is extremely difficult to corral the group to make a collective decision [33]. However, even when they can: whereas pieceworkers could physically block access to a site of production, online labor markets provide no facilities for workers to change the experience of other workers. This is a key limitation — without it, workers cannot enforce a strike.

Implications for crowd work

The decentralization and anonymization of crowd work will continue to make many of its social relationships a struggle. While some workers get to know each other well on forums [24, 9], many never engage in these social spaces. Without intervention, worker relationships and collectivism are likely to be inhibited by this decentralized design. One option is to build worker centralizing points into the platform, for example asking workers to vote on each others' reputation or allowing groups of workers to collectively reject a task from the platform [35].

The history of piecework further suggests that relationships between workers and employers might be improved if employers engaged in more human management styles. Instead of delegating as many management tasks as possible to an algorithm, it might be possible to build dashboards and other information tools that empower modern crowd work foremen [19]. If the literature on piecework is to be believed, more considerate *human* management may resolve many of the tensions we've discovered among among crowd workers.

Reciprocally, crowd work may be able to inform piecework research. There exists far less literature about pieceworkers' relationships than there does today about crowd workers' relationships. Crowd work research benefits from both the accessibility of digital platforms, as well as the firmer theoretical basis of Anthropology than existed at the turn of the 20th century, when piecework began to emerge. Malinowski, Boas, Mead and Boas and other luminaries throughout the first half of the 20th century effectively defined Cultural Anthropology as we know it today; *participant-observation*, the *etic* and the *emic* understanding of culture, and *reflexivity* didn't take even a resemblance of their contemporary forms until these works [23, 4, 27]. Modern crowd work may give us an opportunity to revisit open questions in piecework with a more refined lens.

References

- [1] John S Ahlquist and Margaret Levi. *In the interest of others: Organizations and social activism*. Princeton University Press, 2013.
- [2] Erin Anderson and David C. Schmittlein. "Integration of the Sales Force: An Empirical Examination". In: *The RAND Journal of Economics* 15.3 (1984), pp. 385–395. ISSN: 07416261. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2555446>.
- [3] Judd Antin and Aaron Shaw. "Social Desirability Bias and Self-reports of Motivation: A Study of Amazon Mechanical Turk in the US and India". In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '12. Austin, Texas, USA: ACM, 2012, pp. 2925–2934. ISBN: 978-1-4503-1015-4. DOI: [10.1145/2207676.2208699](https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2208699). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2207676.2208699>.
- [4] Franz Boas. *Race, language, and culture*. University of Chicago Press, 1940.
- [5] William Alexander Graham Clark. *Cotton Textile Trade in Turkish Empire, Greece, and Italy*. Vol. 10. US Government Printing Office, 1908.
- [6] Batya Friedman, Peter H. Khan Jr., and Daniel C. Howe. "Trust Online". In: *Commun. ACM* 43.12 (Dec. 2000), pp. 34–40. ISSN: 0001-0782. DOI: [10.1145/355112.355120](https://doi.org/10.1145/355112.355120). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/355112.355120>.
- [7] Ujwal Gadiraju et al. "Understanding Malicious Behavior in Crowdsourcing Platforms: The Case of Online Surveys". In: *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '15. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2015, pp. 1631–1640. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3145-6. DOI: [10.1145/2702123.2702443](https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702443). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2702123.2702443>.
- [8] Mary Gray. *Fixing the Chaotic Crowdworker Economy*. Aug. 2015. URL: <http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2015-08-12/fixing-the-chaotic-crowdworker-economy>.
- [9] Mary L. Gray et al. "The Crowd is a Collaborative Network". In: *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*. CSCW '16. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2016, pp. 134–147. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3592-8. DOI: [10.1145/2818048.2819942](https://doi.org/10.1145/2818048.2819942). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2818048.2819942>.
- [10] Neha Gupta et al. "Turk-Life in India". In: *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Supporting Group Work*. GROUP '14. Sanibel Island, Florida, USA: ACM, 2014, pp. 1–11. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3043-5. DOI: [10.1145/2660398.2660403](https://doi.org/10.1145/2660398.2660403). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2660398.2660403>.
- [11] Daniel Haas et al. "Argonaut: macrotask crowdsourcing for complex data processing". In: *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 8.12 (2015), pp. 1642–1653.
- [12] Russell Hardin. *Collective action*. Resources for the Future, 1982.
- [13] Panagiotis G Ipeirotis. "Demographics of mechanical turk". In: (2010).
- [14] Lilly C. Irani and M. Six Silberman. "Stories We Tell About Labor: Turkopticon and the Trouble with "Design"". In: *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '16. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2016, pp. 4573–4586. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3362-7. DOI: [10.1145/2858036.2858592](https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858592). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2858036.2858592>.
- [15] Lilly C. Irani and M. Six Silberman. "Turkopticon: Interrupting Worker Invisibility in Amazon Mechanical Turk". In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '13. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2013, pp. 611–620. ISBN: 978-1-4503-1899-0. DOI: [10.1145/2470654.2470742](https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2470742). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2470654.2470742>.
- [16] 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.

- [17] 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=NNSNAQAATAAJ>.
- [18] Nicolas Kaufmann, Thimo Schulze, and Daniel Veit. "More than fun and money. Worker Motivation in Crowdsourcing—A Study on Mechanical Turk." In: *AM-CIS*. Vol. 11. 2011, pp. 1–11.
- [19] Anand Kulkarni et al. "Mobileworks: Designing for quality in a managed crowdsourcing architecture". In: *IEEE Internet Computing* 16.5 (2012), pp. 28–35.
- [20] John Le et al. "Ensuring quality in crowdsourced search relevance evaluation: The effects of training question distribution". In: *SIGIR 2010 workshop on crowdsourcing for search evaluation*. 2010, pp. 21–26.
- [21] Min Kyung Lee et al. "Working with Machines: The Impact of Algorithmic and Data-Driven Management on Human Workers". In: *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '15. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2015, pp. 1603–1612. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3145-6. DOI: [10.1145/2702123.2702548](https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702548). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2702123.2702548>.
- [22] Margaret Levi et al. "Union democracy reexamined". In: *Politics & Society* 37.2 (2009), pp. 203–228.
- [23] Bronislaw Malinowski. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. Routledge, 2002.
- [24] 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>.
- [25] Jamie K McCallum. *Global unions, local power: the new spirit of transnational labor organizing*. Cornell University Press, 2013.
- [26] Brian McInnis et al. "Taking a HIT: Designing Around Rejection, Mistrust, Risk, and Workers' Experiences in Amazon Mechanical Turk". In: *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '16. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2016, pp. 2271–2282. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3362-7. DOI: [10.1145/2858036.2858539](https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858539). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2858036.2858539>.
- [27] Margaret Mead and Franz Boas. *Coming of age in Samoa*. Penguin, 1973.
- [28] Vincent Miller. *Understanding digital culture*. Sage Publications, 2011.
- [29] Mancur Olson. *Logic of collective action public goods and the theory of groups* Rev. ed.. 1965.
- [30] Elinor Ostrom. *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge university press, 1990.
- [31] Frank Richards. "Is Anything the Matter with Piece-work". In: ASME. 1904.
- [32] Jacob August Riis. *How the other half lives: Studies among the tenements of New York*. Penguin, 1901.
- [33] Niloufar Salehi et al. "We Are Dynamo: Overcoming Stalling and Friction in Collective Action for Crowd Workers". In: *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '15. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2015, pp. 1621–1630. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3145-6. DOI: [10.1145/2702123.2702508](https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702508). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2702123.2702508>.
- [34] Victor S. Sheng, Foster Provost, and Panagiotis G. Ipeirotis. "Get Another Label? Improving Data Quality and Data Mining Using Multiple, Noisy Labelers". In: *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. KDD '08. Las Vegas, Nevada, USA: ACM, 2008, pp. 614–622. ISBN: 978-1-60558-193-4. DOI: [10.1145/1401890.1401965](https://doi.org/10.1145/1401890.1401965). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1401890.1401965>.
- [35] Mark E. Whiting et al. "Crowd Guilds: Worker-led Reputation and Feedback on Crowdsourcing Platforms". In: *CSCW: Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*. 2017.
- [36] Ming Yin et al. "The Communication Network Within the Crowd". In: *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web*. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee. 2016, pp. 1293–1303.