

# COMMUNITY XPERIENCE DESIGN

A reflection on communities and crowdsourcing



**EINDHOVEN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, JUNE 2019**

Yaël van Engelen (S135793)

Jordy Alblas (1316613)

Yiwen Shen (1239664)

## Week 1: Encouraging contribution to online communities

### Reflection on the project

Chapter 2 discusses two types of **motivation** and how to enhance them. During our course project, both types of motivation were encountered in different moments of the process.

First of all, our concept was about donating money, which by itself is done out of **intrinsic motivation**. The point of donating is generally that you do not get something in return. We found that most people are hesitant to contribute to charities because they do not feel like a small donation makes a difference. An overall visibility of contributions should change this current experience (**design claim 2.1, 2.12**). We tried to apply 'complementary contributions' rather than substitute contributions (**design claim 2.35**) so that the collaboration of donation will encourage further contributions.

During the crowdsourcing of this project, Prolific and Mturk were used. These two platforms are paid, and thus motivated through **extrinsic factors**. However, we found that users on the Prolific platform have an interest in science, and might, therefore, be more **intrinsically motivated** to contribute to others' research. This intrinsic motivation might have contributed to our liking of this platform, as they were more likely to take the assignment seriously (not game the system, **design claim 2.25**).

During another iteration of this project, we used the platforms Facebook and Reddit. We specifically looked for groups within these platforms that supported charities that we were interested in. We believed that these specialists would have a different view, and since they were voluntarily reacting on us, also intrinsically motivated to help us (**design claim 2.3**).

In the final design, we used both intrinsic motivation of donating (**design claim 2.1, 2.12, 2.35**) and extrinsic motivation of status and privileges (**design claim 2.28**) which will only feel valuable by people that are already invested in the charity. This is done by showing identities related to donation campaigns, and the amount of money donated to a campaign by the size of the boat.

### Personal example 1

An example of contribution is given by one of our team members:

The first time I realized others could benefit from my efforts on Spotify, was when I searched for a playlist with Marvel Universe music from the movies without the cinematic songs. I was frustrated with the fact that I was unable to find a playlist like this, and decided to make one myself so that others could find mine when they would encounter the same problem. (**design claim 2.34**). Before this, I would listen to public playlists, as well as playlists from friends. It could be said that I made more use of the platform due to this

**“bond-based commitment” (design claim 3.15)** since I trusted the music taste of fellow users. Although I listen to music for a large part of each day, I wouldn't say that the genres I listen to would define my identity. In this way, Spotify doesn't evoke **“identity-based commitment”** with me. The service they provide is worth more to me than the connections I have on the platform. It does what I want it to, and there are few alternatives **(design claim 3.32/3.33)**. Therefore, **“need-based commitment”** is by far the most applicable for me here.

### **Personal example 2**

This chapter in the book also discusses that in order to increase the level of persuasion, many companies hire celebrities or people with higher social status and authority to present their product or company identity (Claim 2.9 & 2.11). Therefore, we realized that investing money on campaigns such as TV commercial or newspaper advertisement not only influences people's decision making but also creates a unique brand identity that attracts a certain group of people to encourage them to contribute. In Asia, especially in Japan, people have “Idol culture” which means that fans create a small community to support their idols. Their commitment to their idol is very high, they invest their time and money to organize an underground concert. People who have the same idol wear the same uniform and organize cheerleader activities to support their idol during the concert. **Design claim 2.12** advocates this phenomenon. Additionally, the fan community usually set a higher goal, for instance, to recruit more members or increase the influence of the community to compete with other communities **(design claim 2.13)**.

## Week 2: Encouraging commitment to online communities

### Reflection on the project

Gaining commitment from users is very important in an online community. Commitment is a building block for regulations, which keeps a community alive, and makes community members heavily involved: they do more, say more, and work harder. Chapter 3 discusses three types of commitment in order to keep a community growing and healthy. In our project, affective commitment and normative commitment were addressed.

In our project for this course, we looked into charity groups on Facebook and Reddit where we targeted people that were committed through their identity. Having the same goal or shared interests increases the level of **identity-based commitment (claim 3.5)**, and it is recommended to show this shared interest through a name and tagline, much like Reddit does for each subreddit (also **claim 3.7**). In the development of our mobile app concept, we tried to address **bond-based commitment** by designing the following features:

- 1) Each participant has a user profile page in the app (**claim 3.18**). Users have also access to edit their information in order to personalize their profile page to increase bond-based commitment.
- 2) The goal of our mobile app was announced on the first page, which is to save the ocean from plastic pollution. Next, we visualized boats moving on the ocean as a means of the employment of charities. Each donation was also displayed on the boats to show that a participant is having some success in achieving the bigger purpose (small donations add to a bigger whole). This served us to translate their commitment to the purpose into a normative commitment to the community (**claim 3.27**) where people will donate because they see others donated too.

### Personal example

Other examples of bond-based commitments are mobile games, such as Candy Crush, where you can invite friends for bonus points or assets in the game. Trying to get friends of friends in your community and facilitating their interaction increases commitment (**design claim 3.13** and **3.14**), and getting bonuses that are otherwise difficult to achieve adds another level of commitment (**design claim 3.34**). Another platform that uses parts of these bond-based commitments is Blind: a platform to anonymously get in touch with co-workers. Although much of the platform is built around posting and sharing content, you can also individually get in touch with users and engage in personal conversations (**design claim 3.16**). The same applies to many popular games: you can join group conversations, as well as chat individually to someone else. Also within WeChat, you can be part of a subcommunity, such as GoGoDutch: a group with Chinese people living in the Netherlands, that talk about everything related to the Netherlands, and talk to each one individually too.

Back to our concept, we additionally **made the purpose of the charity explicit (design claim 3.8)** by showing the overall goal for the donations. In order to **use competition (design claim 3.10)** and highlighting identity-based commitment, we considered showing the country of each charity campaign to see if your own nationality is doing better than other countries for instance, or how someone's campaign is doing better than others within the same country.

However, these features used to encourage contribution do not necessarily work for commitment. It is fair to say that the platform we created does not really commit users to use it for a long time. Perhaps this could happen through the change of visuals over time, to see that long term commitment gives results. Also, to really see the effects of these features, the application needs to be thoroughly tested for some time; something we didn't do in this project.

## Week 3: Regulating behavior in online communities

### Personal example 1

One of our team members: Within ggag, a platform where memes and jokes are shared publicly, comments of members on posts are visible to anyone. Many things are allowed, and the conversations can sometimes be harsh or insulting. There is little moderation from the makers of the platform. Members, instead, can up- or downvote posts and its comments to influence its visibility (**design claim 4.2, 4.4**). In order to understand what is appropriate, new users need to read through the comments. This shows them what is appropriate (**design claim 4.13**) and displays feedback on unwanted behavior (**design claim 4.16**). As a personal experience, I encountered comments that disapproved of the use of emojis. I realized that this must be a rule made up by the community (**design claim 4.22**), as it seemed like a joke at first. However, throughout the community, this rule is enforced in the comments. They go as far as calling the emoji icons 'cancer', which to me felt rather serious and threatening. A reason why this platform can be explicit and offensive might be because of the anonymity of its members (**design claim 4.25**). The user nicknames and often unrecognizable photos cause the users to hide behind secret identities and make them hard to trace. In the worst case, it is possible to report certain comments made by users of the platform (**design claim 4.32**).

In a study on Reddit Norm Violations (Chandrasekharan et al., 2018), 2.8 million comments that were removed by moderators across 100 top subreddits over 10 months were studied. Many implicit, unpublished norms are found by the researchers. The research points out that "norms for what is appropriate can vary widely from one community to another", both between different platforms (e.g. Reddit vs 4chan) as well as within Reddit's subreddits (a subreddit about science values high-quality sources much more than other subreddits where it is completely okay to quote Wikipedia articles). This shows how norms can differ throughout each community, and it can take a lot of time to be aware of this. As an example: in some subreddits, it is allowed to post questionnaires, in other it isn't. So you risk your post to be removed if you are not aware of this.

\* Chandrasekharan, Eshwar & Samory, Mattia & Jhaver, Shagun & Charvat, Hunter & Bruckman, Amy & Lampe, Cliff & Eisenstein, Jacob & Gilbert, Eric. (2018). The Internet's Hidden Rules: An Empirical Study of Reddit Norm Violations at Micro, Meso, and Macro Scales. Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction. 2. 1-25. 10.1145/3274301.

### Personal example 2

LOL (League of Legends) is a widely played game and players need to cooperate with each other in a team. A match usually takes place between two teams and each team contains several players who usually don't know each other. The LOL community has established a behavior policy named Summoner's code (The Summoner's Code, 2019) to regulate antisocial behaviors (design claim 15). When playing games, if one player is being reported

because he has violated the Summoner's code and created a negative experience in-game - such as insulting or harassing new players or other players -, his account will be blocked or even banned. He will lose all the assets and game levels.

\* *The Summoner's Code. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://na.leagueoflegends.com/en/game-info/get-started/summoners-code/>*

### **Personal example 3**

When reflecting on regulating behavior, we believe that it is beneficial to look at the screening of newcomers and the structure of social translucence (Erickson & Kellogg, 2000), rather than punishing bad behavior. Making sure the right people join the platform, getting them educated about existing social norms, and holding them accountable will make unwanted behavior on a platform unlikely. One example is LinkedIn: the amount of fake or unwanted responses is much lower on platforms with confirmed identities, rather than on more anonymous platforms such as Twitter. More than just identity, LinkedIn is focussed on professional identity. By misbehaving, someone would be seen as less professional, which is an unwanted result. This could be another reason that positive behavior is enforced by the design of LinkedIn. This can, of course, not be applied to every platform. Gaming platforms or platforms like 4chan, for example, thrive because of their anonymity. However, we need to be aware of these differences..

When contributors feel free to express themselves, the platform will become richer in content and diversity. We understand that for some, more fragile or serious platforms, active regulation is needed. Communities related to health, diseases or professional work environment are good examples of platforms where misbehavior is basically always unwanted.

\* Erickson, T., & Kellogg, W. A. (2000). Social translucence: an approach to designing systems that support social processes. *ACM transactions on computer-human interaction (TOCHI)*, 7(1), 59-83.

## Week 4: The challenges of dealing with newcomers

### Personal example 1:

One of our team members did an internship at an online platform called 'Sketchdrive'. This platform provides tools to give visual feedback on images, for instance, to enable online sketch classes with more meaningful feedback. As an intern at a start-up company, many of the responsibilities revolved around recruiting newcomers and marketing the platform.

In order to increase the users of this new platform, teachers were sought out to apply the tool within their classes. This way, large groups/classes were forced to join at once (**design claim 5.2, 5.5**). Within the marketing, the platform focussed on creative professionals on social media. One way to do this was by sharing content of the platform (which is closed to non-members and had mostly private content) to the outside world. This way newcomers had an idea of what happened within the community, and how this tool could be useful to them (**design claim 5.4, 5.11**). Next to this, related design and creative content, independent from the platform, was used to attract the right newcomers. This is something that we didn't read about in the book. This marketing tactic worked well to show the vision of the company. Lastly, endorsements from other teachers and educational systems were used to attract and convince others (**design claim 5.7**).

When newcomers joined the platform, they would often be asked to create their 'first project'. In this sequence of interactions, the most important tools of the platform were explained. This ensured that first time users were less likely to get frustrated with the uncertainty of using a new platform. Moreover, it would increase their future interactions and make them more confident about their capabilities within the platform (**design claim 5.20**).

### Reflection on the project

In our own design concept, there would be two ways a newcomer could arrive at the platform. The first would be an invitation from someone who started a campaign within the charity. This would most likely be word of mouth towards friends and family (**5.2, 5.3**), who would then be able to see the contributor's campaign and donations done to this particular event. The other way is when interested newcomers visit the platform. This would probably happen when they are interested in the charity and its purpose. Through the information of other contributors (social translucence), they can learn about the goals of the platform and decide if they want to join. The attractive user interface would be influential to these newcomers (**5.8**), as well as the information about previous contributors (**5.9**). By encouraging this second group of newcomers to create their own campaign, they would reveal themselves towards the community. This might help in keeping them around for further interactions (**5.19**) and might move them from lurkers to active contributors.





**Paper:** Lasecki, W. S., Kim, J., Rafter, N., Sen, O., Bigham, J. P., & Bernstein, M. S. (2015, April). *Apparition: Crowdsourced user interfaces that come to life as you sketch them.*

This paper explored the option of collaborative prototyping for interactive interfaces. We are questioning two distinct elements of this software: sketching as a communication tool, and the added value of human interaction in the process.

First off, we believe that sketching is an inefficient way of communication for many people that are not used to drawing, especially when working digitally. We expect this to be frustrating for users, as well as prone to misunderstanding. Where inexperienced sketchers make low-quality images, both computer and human computation can misunderstand what they are trying to convey. We believe that it would be quicker and more efficient to implement some simple building tools (boxes, image search and such) to add elements in this prototype software.

Secondly, we question the use of human computation in making interactive prototypes. Within UI and game Design, knowledge is essential for making informed decisions about prototypes. We believe that a crowdsourced audience will have insufficient knowledge to implement UI principles as good as the designers themselves. We are aware that crowds could be filtered to have design knowledge, but we would be very sad to see that the design community disappears behind screens to work for small amounts per min/hour, especially if also the quality notably drops. Of course, it is still very useful to use the input from the crowd for *inspiration* and recognition of important patterns to keep in mind.

So what else is the advantage of human computation over computers in this specific example? It would keep designers from having to learn new prototyping software, seeing a prototype come to life whilst only talking about it. However, this could also cause reduced knowledge of designers, since learning new software increases the awareness of the possibilities within Design. Currently, it allows multiple designers to work on the same interface, which should also be possible on shared prototyping software that doesn't involve online workers.

## Week 5: Start a new online community

### Reflection

Communities exist in many different ways, and the design claims from chapter 6 can be recognized on multiple different platforms. Reddit for example, the 16th most popular site in the US (Alexa, 2019), is all about communities and it shows lots of great practices about how to manage communities and subcommunities (so-called subreddits). These subreddits for example sometimes relate to each other, which matches **design claim 6.2** in that a mixed-topic scope reduces expected match value. Also, Reddit shows currently active users (**design claim 6.41**) and potential interesting subreddits are suggested to users according to **design claim 6.10**, namely that in communities with many interaction spaces, recommender systems that help people navigate to spaces that best suit them increase the net benefits that people experience. Of course, inactive subreddits are not actively recommended very often because showing many of those affects visitors negatively (**design claim 6.7**).

Within existing platforms that *facilitate* communities, many subcommunities need to start from scratch. Nextdoor, for example, provides a platform for communities within neighborhoods to stay in contact with each other, but each sub-community has to be started (and promoted) by a local initiator. This is often done by the initiator who brings around flyers in neighborhoods to convince people to install the app, join the community (**design claim 6.16**) and interact with other neighborhoods by sharing content (**design claim 6.18**), such as things that are for sale or posting relevant questions. However, according to the book, it is very difficult to build new communities and make it relevant to users. Each Nextdoor community, for example, needs to think of early adopter benefits to attract many residents of the neighborhood to join, which is, of course, very hard. Content shared in Neighborhood 1 is not interesting for residents of Neighborhood 2: content needs to be relevant (**design claim 6.6**) for you, but that also makes communities on Nextdoor harder than communities on Reddit that are available for a global audience. Thus, the way you start a community really depends on the context: do you start a new platform from scratch (a website or application such as Reddit or the development of a completely new game), do you start a community within a facilitating platform (such as a new neighborhood on Nextdoor), or do you build sub-communities within already existing communities (a Dutch World of Warcraft clan/community under World of Warcraft gamers).

Although Nextdoor is a more difficult example because this is a platform that facilitates subcommunities, an example of one big community is Devrant. This platform is aimed at software developers to "share and bond over successes and frustrations with code, tech and life as a programmer". The platform has achieved quite an active community, and several interesting design claims can be found within the design of the platform. For example, users are encouraged to post about a certain tech-related topic that changes every week and is hand-picked by the owners of the app. This encourages users to post

content and gives inspiration for new topics to write about. Also, successful posts by a community member are rewarded with real goodies: either stickers or a squishy ball. This encourages users to actually post content and invest time in quality content, in particular early users that never had a popular post and want to get those goodies (which are highly valued within the community). Also, the only thing that is shown in the app is user-contributed content (**design claim 6.40**).

Another totally different example of starting a new community is the mobile game Polytopia. Developing games is very hard nowadays. Hundreds of new games are launched every day and almost all will miserably fail. So, it is - from a community-building perspective - even more interesting to see how successful games succeed. Polytopia is an indie-game, developed by a one-man studio. How did he build a successful game and community? Although this can't be answered in a few sentences (and it probably has to do with a lot of luck too), one example is that the developer kept the gaming community on Reddit up-to-date on the development of the game before launch. So, before the game was even playable, he already had a great fanbase. Secondly, players can invite others and share their own invite code to play against each other. Thirdly, real-life events are organized and people share photos and pictures of themselves with Polytopia-like game-attributes on the internet. Still, as said, it is uncertain why some games/platforms fail and why others become successful. Altogether it can be said that there are many aspects and design claims that play a role (you could, for instance, set-up a Kickstarter campaign and offer discounts or assets for early adopters [**design claim 6.32**], but it is also luck and finding relevant aspects that work for your specific community that define the success of a community).

\* Top sites - Alexa. Alexa.com. <https://www.alexa.com/topsites>. Accessed on: June 20th, 2019.

# Community Xperience Design

WHAT PROBLEM DO PEOPLE ENCOUNTER WHEN DONATING TO CHARITY?

## INTRODUCTION

WHAT PROBLEM DO PEOPLE ENCOUNTER WHEN DONATING TO CHARITY

**PROLIFIC**

25

RESPONDENTS



Problem finding

Scientific crowd

Paid

Possibility on demographics

Worker crowd

Limited screening possibilities

Paid

Random pieces of text copied from google, respondents with same answers

**MTURK**

15

RESPONDENTS



Interest in charity crowd

For free

Opportunity to have conversation

Lot of encouraging but less

**FB/REDDIT**

11

RESPONDENTS



Designer crowd

For free when you know designers

**USABILITY HUB**

10

RESPONDENTS



Limited options to testing

**RESULT**

IMAGE / CONCEPT

