Possible topics for discussion based on reading #3:

- Harnessing the "Wisdom of Crowds" or collective intelligence
    - As well usability, sociability, & social capital
- Motivation for contributions
    - Deterring cheating the system
- Usability versus accessibility; including people with different needs and capabilities
- Understanding what domains and contexts might benefit from TMSP systems
- Necessary components and tools for social participation
- Factors that affects users and communities
- Social participation versus social loafing
- Recommendation systems and social voting systems
- Ensuring participants give and get something from the use of TMSP systems
- How do we integrate TMSP systems with certain domains (like medicine or social healthcare)
- Knowledgeware –disruption of a domain's current solutions; is a domain ready?
- Toolware & peopleware
- The living laboratory
- Examples of living laboratories and commentary on the systems

Possible topics for discussion based on Google+:

- Classification of design problems
    - Knowledgeware, toolware, & peopleware
- Understanding of TMSP systems involves a large diverse set of ideas and disciplines (2)
- The mantra "Fail fast and fail often" (3)*
    - Incentivizing innovation versus the realities of submitting proposals (Ed Chi)
- Social capital and its value to TMSP
- Behaviors that should be designed for versus the implementation of [social] policy
- The value of collective intelligence
    - Mob-rule mentality on social media sites
    - Voting, scoring, and badge systems
- The concept of the living laboratory and example implementations in other disciplines
    - Wikidashboard, mrtaggy, zerozero88, gswap, & movielens (Ed Chi)
    - The effects of living laboratory infrastructure on innovation and creativity
        - Data repositories
- Collaborative research centers
- Collaboration efforts between academia and the private sector; how much should we share? (2)*
- Introducing TMSP systems in public policy and open government
- Ethical, legal, and IP issues (3)*

* Time mentioned by class

Other topics of conversation?

Interesting Links:

Additional Related Readings (Not in References):

Kleinberg, J., Suri, S., Tardos, E., Wexler, T. "Strategic Network Formation with Structural Holes." ACM Sigecom Exchange, Vol. 7, No. 3 (November 2008)

- ■ Brief summarization of Structural Holes by Ron Burt: sociological studies state there is greater homogeneity in action, behavior, and thinking within a group rather than between groups and that people who act as a bridge between groups have a greater chance of being more innovative… which ultimately leads to the claim that they will be more successful in their endeavors.

Kittur, A. & Kraut, R. "Harnessing the wisdom of crowds in Wikipedia: Quality through coordination." CSCW 2008, November 8-12, 2008, San Diego, California,

- ■ A case study regarding the use of Wikipedia's coordination mechanisms, the "talk" page associated with article authorship, and how groups of editors/contributors exhibit two forms of coordination mechanisms: implicit and explicit. Explicit coordination being a conversation on the talk page between a core group of editors that result in the planning, organization, and early drafting of an article. Implicit coordination being the actions of the community of editors reacting to the explicit coordinating group. The article comments about the quality of Wikipedia entries and impact the size of an articles editing community has. This article can support various conversation regarding Wikipedia and some of the ideas introduced in Surowiecki's "The Wisdom of Crowds" [Reference 2] (Lastly, they utilize Amazon's Mechanical Turk Marketplace to judge quality of Wikipedia articles and authorship)

Beenen, G., Ling, K., Wang, X., Chang, K., Frankowski, D., Resnick, P., & Kraut, R. "Using social psychology to motivate contributions to online communities." CSCW 2004, November 6-10, 2004, Chicago, Illinois.

- ■ This study proposes several hypothesis related to social motivation for contribution and analyzes phenomena like "social loafing" in group work situations. The most powerful results of the study seem to be that primary motivation for contribution is making the importance and uniqueness of a person's contribution known to them, possibly through direct solicitation or other reminders. Users also contribute more if they know that they will receive a benefit as well as the community receiving a benefit versus knowledge of only one of these types of benefits. Finally, users even in group situations work better with explicit goals versus "do your best" goals that may encourage "social loafing".

Burke, M., Kraut, R., & Marlow, C. "Social capital on Facebook: Differentiating uses and users." CHI 2011, May 7-12, 2011, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

- This article discusses social capital and breaks it down into two forms: bridging and bonding. Bonding social capital is specifically the capital gained from your family, friends, and close relationships. Bridging capital, conversely, is the capital gained from your acquaintances and extended social network. The paper analyzes how users keep in contact with various people (direct messaging, broadcasting, and consumption). The study looks at predicting types of capital a user has with a connection through these actions and suggests how users use this information to make connections, strengthen connections, and get access to information through the bridging social capital network/nodes (which appears to be the primary result of high social capital) and coping resources provided by the bonding social capital network/nodes. This might be a good related reading to Granovetter's "The Strength of Weak Ties" [Reference 6]

The following two papers discuss the implementation of Living Laboratories in other domains (not specifically TMSP, which might make them less helpful):

Abowd, G., Atkeson, C., Bobick, A., Essa, I., MacIntyre, B., Mynatt, E., & Starner, T. "Living laboratories: The future computing environments group at the Georgia Institute of Technology." CHI 2000, April 1 – 6, 2000

- The group at GIT focuses on ubiquitous computing and has constructed classrooms, wearable computing devices, as well as a computerized home called "aware home" and an augmented office. These facilities and devices are actively being used, studied, and modified in an "as close to" production environment as possible.

Intille, S., Larson, K., Beaudin, J., Nawyn, J., Tapia, E., & Kaushik, P. "A living laboratory for the design and evaluation of ubiquitous computing technologies." CHI 2005, April 2-7, 2004, Portland, Oregon

- Same vein as the previous article with the exception that it is a more detailed look into an apartment similar to "aware home".