
MHC '18 - International Workshop on Mobile Human Contributions: Opportunities and Challenges

Niels van Berkel

The University of Melbourne,
Australia
niels.van@unimelb.edu.au

Simo Hosio

University of Oulu, Finland
simo.hosio@oulu.fi

Jorge Goncalves

The University of Melbourne,
Australia
jorge.goncalves@unimelb.edu.au

Katarzyna Wac

University of Geneva, Switzerland
katarzyna.wac@unige.ch

Vassilis Kostakos

The University of Melbourne,
Australia
vassilis.kostakos@unimelb.edu.au

Anna Cox

University College London,
United Kingdom
anna.cox@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

Ubicomp/HCI researchers are increasingly using smartphones to collect human-labelled data 'in the wild'. While this allows for the collection of a wide range of interesting data in authentic settings and surroundings, humans are notoriously inconsistent in the quality of their contributions. Improving the quality of data collected with mobile devices is a largely unexplored, but highly relevant field. The primary objective of this workshop is to share insights, ideas, and discoveries on the quality of mobile human contributions. The work presented in the International Workshop on Mobile Human Contributions (MHC '18) explores methods, tools, and novel approaches towards increasing the reliability of human data submissions with mobile devices.

Author Keywords

Human sensing; mobile devices; in situ; experience sampling; citizen science; crowdsourcing; data quality.

ACM Classification Keywords

H.5.m. Information interfaces and presentation (e.g., HCI): Miscellaneous.

Rationale

Smartphones and other personal mobile devices have established themselves as popular and capable research artefacts over the past decade [16]. Studies relying on mobile data collection yield higher ecological validity than laboratory studies, allow for longitudinal data collection, and can use people's own devices to collect additional contextual data [2,16]. Such *in situ* studies, in which mobile devices are used to collect human-labelled data in authentic settings, in users' real life, are increasingly common [2,10,14].

Despite the fact that research findings rely on the underlying quality of the participants' contributions, the accuracy of human labelled submission through mobile data collection remains a surprisingly underexplored area. In this workshop, we raise the question: "*How to increase data accuracy in mobile studies?*" This could be either prior, during, or following the data collection.

MHC '18 aims to contribute to a better understanding of human accuracy in mobile data collection, and thus provide not only a set of examples how data quality can be improved but also a useful methodological contribution to the field of ubiquitous computing.

Background

While it is well-known that human accuracy is subject to fluctuation over time and across contexts [2], common practice is to consider all mobile human data submissions as both accurate and equal to one another. Despite the current lack of interest in the accuracy of human submissions in mobile sensing, ubicomp and related disciplines have a long history of studying and improving the accuracy of human data submissions. For example, situated crowdsourcing has made use of

public displays to increase human accuracy by tapping into highly specific contextual knowledge [9]. Similarly, citizen science has seen an increase towards Open Data, enabling citizens to verify existing data and to contribute to any gaps in the data. In self-report studies, many researchers have embraced mobile devices to present questions, but the use of mobile sensors to link participant context to data quality remains underexplored [2,6]. No previous efforts have brought together insights from these various related domains to specifically focus on improving the quality of mobile human-contributed data collection.

With this workshop, we hope to raise awareness to the topic of data quality when collecting contributions from people through their personal mobile devices. We set to contribute methods and means to understand and improve data quality, either by designing better studies or using different filters during data analysis and cleansing. Our goal is not to only raise awareness of this issue, but to explore novel ways in which human accuracy in mobile data collection can be captured, analysed, and improved in lieu of ground-truth data.

MHC '18

A total of 11 papers were accepted to the workshop, summarised below in alphabetical order. Van Berkel et al. [1] identify and categorise solutions aimed at increasing the accuracy of human contributions prior, during, and following data collection. Berrocal & Wac [3] present *Peer-ceived Momentary Assessment*, a data collection method utilising the collective assessments by trusted peers to improve the accuracy of self-assessments. Buschek et al. [4] propose *Information Transmission* as a new perspective on Experience Sampling, in which the subjective and objective

information channel cooperate to reduce potential noise in either channel. De Masi & Wac [5] present a pilot study in which they investigate application usage by collecting information immediately following participant usage of the application, allowing for a more detailed insight into user experiences and expectations. Exler et al. [7] discuss their experiences with a crowd-funded dataset, *CrowdSignals*, and present lessons for future crowd-funded data collection efforts. Gong et al. [8] present *LBSLab*, a mini-application that runs inside of the popular mobile application WeChat. LBSLab allows for the collection of location-based information and offers an incentive mechanism to retain participants. The work by Liang et al. [11] explores the use of a blockchain mechanism to verify crowdsensing tasks, reducing the possibility of attacks and frauds. Maharjan et al. [12] collect and visualise contextual (smartphone) data in conjunction with ECG data to improve accuracy in ECG interpretation. Manea & Wac [13] propose *mQoL*, a mobile application which allows researchers to conduct longitudinal Quality of Life studies with a focus on scientifically valid data. Oppenlaender et al. [15] present *CampusTracker*, a mobile application build to assess a crowd's momentary willingness to work on paid crowdsourcing tasks. Finally, Schmidt et al. [17] offer guidelines to increase the accuracy of self-report data collected in Affective Computing-field studies.

References

- [1] Niels van Berkel, Matthias Budde, Senuri Wijenayake and Jorge Goncalves. 2018. Improving Accuracy in Mobile Human Contributions: An Overview In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267541>
- [2] Niels van Berkel, Denzil Ferreira and Vassilis Kostakos. 2017. The Experience Sampling Methods on Mobile Devices. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 50 (6). 93:91-93:40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3123988>
- [3] Allan Berrocal and Katarzyna Wac. 2018. Peer-vasive Computing: Leveraging Peers to Enhance the Accuracy of Self-Reports in Mobile Human Studies In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267542>
- [4] Daniel Buschek, Sarah Voikel, Clemens Stachl, Lukas Mecke, Sarah Prange and Ken Pfeuffer. 2018. Experience Sampling as Information Transmission: Perspective and Implications In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267543>
- [5] Alexandre De Masi and Katarzyna Wac. 2018. You're Using This App For What? A mQoL Living Lab Study. In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267544>
- [6] Kevin Doherty and Gavin Doherty. 2018. The construal of experience in HCI. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 110 (C). 63-74. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2017.10.006>
- [7] Anja Exler, Matthias Budde, Erik Pescara, Andrea Schankin, Till Riedel and Michael Beigl. 2018. Challenges and Lessons from Working with Data Collected by Crowdfunding in the Wild. In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267545>
- [8] Qingyuan Gong, et al. 2018. LBSLab: A User Data Collection System in Mobile Environments In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267546>

- [9] Simo Hosio, Jorge Goncalves, Niels van Berkel, Simon Klakegg, Shin'Ichi Konomi and Vassilis Kostakos. 2018. Facilitating Collocated Crowdsourcing on Situated Displays. *Human-Computer Interaction*. 1-37. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370024.2017.1344126>
- [10] Daniel Kahneman, Alan B. Krueger, David A. Schkade, Norbert Schwarz and Arthur A. Stone. 2004. A Survey Method for Characterizing Daily Life: The Day Reconstruction Method. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 306 (5702). 1776-1780. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1103572>
- [11] Danwei Liang, Jian An, Jindong Cheng and He Yang. 2018. The Quality Control in Crowdsensing based on Twice Consensuses of Blockchain In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267547>
- [12] Raju Maharjan, Per Bækgaard and Jakob E. Bardram. 2018. Leveraging Multi-modal User-labeled Data for Improved Accuracy in Interpretation of ECG Recordings. In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267548>
- [13] Vlad Manea and Katarzyna Wac. 2018. mQoL: Mobile Quality of Life Lab: From Behavior Change to QoL. In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267549>
- [14] G. Miller. 2012. The Smartphone Psychology Manifesto. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7 (3). 221-237. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612441215>
- [15] Jonas Oppenlaender, Kennedy Opoku Asare and Simo Hosio. 2018. CampusTracker – Assessing Mobile Workers’ Momentary Willingness to Work on Paid Crowdsourcing Tasks. In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267550>
- [16] Mika Raento, Antti Oulasvirta and Nathan Eagle. 2009. Smartphones: An Emerging Tool for Social Scientists. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 37 (3). 426-454. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124108330005>
- [17] Philip Schmidt, Attila Reiss, Robert Dürichen and Kristof Van Laerhoven. 2018. Labelling Affective States "in the wild": Practical Guidelines and Lessons Learned. In *Proc. Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Adjunct)*, ACM. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267305.3267551>