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Abstract
Crowdsourcing platforms use various truth discovery algorithms to aggregate annotations from multiple labelers. In an online setting, however, the main challenge is to decide whether to ask for more annotations for each item to efficiently trade off cost (i.e., the number of annotations) for quality of the aggregated annotations. In this paper, we propose a novel approach for general complex annotation (such as bounding boxes and taxonomy paths), that works in an online crowdsourcing setting. We prove that the expected average similarity of a labeler is linear in their accuracy conditional on the reported label. This enables us to infer reported label accuracy in a broad range of scenarios. We conduct extensive evaluations on real-world crowdsourcing data from Meta and show the effectiveness of our proposed online algorithms in improving the cost-quality trade-off.

Introduction
Crowdsourcing refers to a broad collection of cost-efficient methods to acquire information from a large population of non-experts (Doan, Ramakrishnan, and Halevy 2011). Within crowdsourcing, a common task is to ask workers (aka reviewers or labelers) to provide a correct annotation (aka label) to a piece of information.

The annotations can be simple such as a yes/no answer to whether there is a car in a given photo, or a real number representing the future price of a commodity. However, in many crowdsourcing tasks, the responses from labelers may comprise of more complex annotations such as textual spans, bounding boxes, taxonomy paths, or translations.

These annotations are then aggregated to obtain the best possible estimation of some underlying correct answer. One typical approach to aggregate multiple annotations is to identify good labelers based on custom, domain-specific statistical models (see Related Work). While these specialized models were shown to be effective for their respective tasks, one key limitation for such approach is that a custom algorithm is needed for each type of complex annotation. Recent work has explored pairwise similarities between annotations as a general approach for identifying good labelers.

Challenges and Contributions
The focus of this paper is on a prevalent and practical crowdsourcing scenario where on the one hand, annotations can be complex, and on the other hand we must decide on-the-fly whether we should get an additional annotation for each item. In this setting, unfortunately, most of the truth discovery algorithms (mentioned above and surveyed in later sections) are inapplicable. We next briefly describe the online crowdsourcing process of interest to articulate the challenge.

From offline to online crowdsourcing The stylized truth discovery model often used in crowdsourcing literature assumes the existence of an a priori given set of question-items to annotate and a fixed group of workers, each assigned to annotate all or some of the items. The designed algorithm takes these observed annotations as offline input and outputs the best aggregated annotation for each item.

However, practical real-time crowdsourcing processes exhibit a distinct setup. As illustrated in Fig. 1, items arrive sequentially and the system determines when to stop collecting labels for each item. This decision can be informed by the annotations collected so far for this item, and by the knowledge learned from previous annotations for other items used as “training data”. The CLARA system developed at Meta...
tackles the same online crowdsourcing problem but only supports categorical labels (Nguyen et al. 2020). Task assignment, which selects labelers to annotate items, is an active area of research (Li et al. 2016; Hettiaachchi, Kostakos, and Goncalves 2022), but is out of the scope of this work, as it is addressed by a different system.

**Main contributions** Based on the Anna Karenina (AK) principle as explained above, we suggest an Online AK algorithm (OAK) that estimates the accuracy of each labeler by measuring the average similarity to all others on training data. OAK is an adaptation of the Proximity-based Truth Discovery (PTD) algorithm proposed by Meir et al. (2023) for the online crowdsourcing setting with general complex annotations. The main difference is the way average similarity is used, which is to decide on when to stop acquiring labels, rather than how to weigh collected labels.

Our main contribution is a Partition-based extension of OAK (POAK). Although POAK can be viewed as employing multiple instances of OAK for each reported label type, it offers a more effective means of handling dependencies within the data. From a theoretical standpoint, POAK deviates from the independence assumptions which underpin the AK principle theory presented in Meir et al. (2023). Therefore to provide theoretical foundations for the POAK algorithm, we establish a stronger version of the AK principle which encompasses per-reported-type estimations. From an empirical perspective, we show that the proposed algorithm substantially improves the cost-accuracy trade-offs compared with the baselines on several real-world datasets from various domains collected at Meta. We also propose a third variant, POAKI, which reduces the number of latent variables by incorporating item response theory (IRT) (Baker and Kim 2004).

A full version of the paper with additional results can be found online (Meir et al. 2024).

**Related Work**

**Competence estimation** Given that crowdsourcing workers may possess vastly different capabilities due to differences in their inherent competence, training, or effort, it is crucial for crowdsourcing models to learn and account for worker accuracy in order to enhance ground truth estimation (Ipeirotis et al. 2014; Zheng et al. 2017).

In its simplest form, worker competence is captured by a single real number which represents the ability that each worker correctly answers a task (Whitehill et al. 2009; Karger, Oh, and Shah 2011). For categorical labels, one common way to characterize workers’ performance is using a confusion matrix to model their ability to correctly label items of different categories (Dawid and Skene 1979; Raykar et al. 2010; Kim and Ghahramani 2012). Another line of work uses a multidimensional vector to model the diverse skill sets of each worker (Welinder et al. 2010; Zhou et al. 2012; Ma et al. 2015).

Naturally, estimation in the above approaches employs statistical analysis that assumes specific label structure—typically multiple-choice questions or a real-valued number—and usually also a particular noise model.

**Average similarity** The idea of using average similarity of workers as a rough proxy for their competence had also been analyzed in specific domains and applied in practice in Games with a Purpose (Von Ahn and Dabbish 2008). Benefits of the average similarity approach were demonstrated theoretically and empirically in specific offline domains including abstractive-summarization models (Kobayashi 2018) and binary labels (Kurvers et al. 2019).

**Complex annotations** As discussed above, the literature on aggregating complex annotations consists of many task-specific specialized models. Nguyen et al. (2017) propose a HMM-based model for aggregating sequential crowd labels, which was applied to named-entity recognition and information extraction applications. Lin, Mausam, and Weld (2012) introduce LazySUSAN to infer the correct answer of crowdsourcing tasks that can have a countably infinite number of possible answers. Branson, Van Horn, and Perona (2017) propose a model for several complex domains. Various other custom models were also proposed for different crowdsourcing applications such as co-reference (Pun et al. 2018; Li, Takamura, and Ananiadou 2020), sequence (Rodrigues, Pereira, and Ribeiro 2014), and translation (Zaidan and Callison-Burch 2011).

Recent work leverages pairwise similarity as a general abstraction for complex annotations. The multidimensional annotation scaling (MAS) algorithm (Braylan and Lease 2020) embeds the pairwise distances in a different space and estimates the competences that maximize the likelihood of observed distances. In a followup paper, the authors suggest a general way to aggregate complex labels (Braylan and Lease 2021). Kawase, Kuroki, and Miyauchi (2019) apply graph algorithms to find the ‘core’ of the similarity graph, which is assumed to contain the most competent workers. The simplest approach proposed by Meir et al. (2023) was shown to perform consistently well compared to the other approaches in an offline setting.

**Online crowdsourcing** The online crowdsourcing process that we focus on has been studied under different names in the literature including repeated labeling (Dai et al. 2013; Ipeirotis et al. 2014; Lin et al. 2014), adaptive stopping (Abraham et al. 2016), and incremental relabeling (Drutsa et al. 2020a,b), in which various sophisticated algorithms were developed to guide the relabeling process. However, all of these methods, including the recent CLARA system developed at Meta (Nguyen et al. 2020, 2022), only support simple categorical labels. To the best of our knowledge, our paper is the first to study a general approach for online crowdsourcing with general annotations.

**Preliminaries**

**Labels** A label is an element of some predefined set $\mathcal{X}$, which can be either finite or infinite in nature. The most common problems are either categorical, where $\mathcal{X}$ is some finite set of exclusive alternatives (e.g. male/female, types of fruits, names of authors, etc.); or real-valued, where $\mathcal{X}$ are real numbers (representing temperature, price, etc). In this paper, ‘annotation’ and ‘label’ are used interchangeably.
Similarity The relation among different possible labels is captured by a similarity function \( s : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1] \). For example, a commonly used similarity for categorical labels is the Hamming similarity, that is, \( s(x, x') = 1 \) if \( x = x' \) and otherwise 0.

**Classic Truth Discovery**

In a classic truth discovery problem, input is given by a (possibly partial) \( n \times m \) table \( X \), where \( x_{ij} \in \mathcal{X} \) is the label reported for item \( j \leq m \) by worker \( i \leq n \). In addition, each item \( j \) has a true answer \( z^*_j \in \mathcal{X} \). A classic truth discovery algorithm is essentially a function mapping input tables to a vector of predicted answers \( \hat{z} = (\hat{z}_j)_{j \leq m} \).

**Evaluation** We evaluate the accuracy of an answer \( z_j \) by its similarity to \( z^*_j \). The accuracy of \( \hat{z} \) is simply the average over all items, i.e.: \( \text{ACC}(\hat{z}, z^*) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} s(\hat{z}_j, z^*_j) \).

**Average similarity and the AK principle** Given full input \( X \), the average similarity of worker \( i \) is

\[
\pi_i := \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i' \neq i} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} s(x_{ij}, x_{ij'}).\tag{1}
\]

The average similarity can be computed directly from the input data. In contrast, we often assume that each worker has some intrinsic, unobserved competence that determines her accuracy. We define the competence as \( c_i := E[s(x_i, z^*)] \), but note that for this to be well-defined, we need a specific noise model—a distribution connecting the ground truth \( z^* \) with the worker’s label \( x_i \).

For example, a common noise model for binary labels is the one-coin model (also known as the binary Dawid-Skene (1979) model), where \( x_{ij} = z^*_j \) with some fixed probability \( p_i \), independently for every item. Note that under the one-coin model and Hamming similarity, the competence of each worker \( i \) is exactly \( c_i = p_i \). For the one-coin model, a linear connection between \( c_i \) and \( E[\pi_i] \) was shown by Kurvers et al. (2019). In Meir et al. (2023), it is shown that this linearity holds for any label type, exactly or approximately, under a wide range of noise models as per the Anna Karenina principle. Their PTD algorithm is essentially:

1. Calculate \( \pi_i \) for each worker;
2. Apply a linear transformation to get \( \hat{c}_i \) from \( \pi_i \);
3. Get each \( \hat{z}_j \) by a weighted aggregation of the labels \( (x_{ij})_{i \leq n} \), where weights depend on \( (\hat{c}_i)_{i \leq n} \).

**Partial data** In general, every item may be labelled by a subset of workers. We denote by \( N_j := \{ i \in N : x_{ij} \text{ exists} \} \) the set of workers labelling item \( j \). Similarly, \( M_i := \{ j \in M : x_{ij} \text{ exists} \} \) is the set of items labelled by worker \( i \). We also denote \( M_{iv} := M_i \cap M_{iv'} \). Note that Eq. (1) only applies for full data. For a general partial matrix, we compute \( \pi_i \) by taking the average similarity over every label in every \( M_{iv} \).

---

*We explain below the extension to partial data.*

**Online Crowdsourcing**

In an online setting, there is no predefined set of items and workers. Instead, there is a dynamic pool of workers, and items arrive sequentially. Upon arrival of an item, we can ask for a label \( x_{ij} \) from worker \( i \). In this paper, we assume the decision on which worker to ask is made by a separate system that we have no control over. Therefore, an online truth-discovery system makes the following decisions for each item: (1) aggregate collected labels, (2) estimate the accuracy of individual/aggregated labels, and (3) decide whether we should stop labeling. See Fig. 1 for a diagram of the labeling process.

Due to constraints on labeling capacity, in most practical tasks the number of collected labels per item is at most 3, and thus aggregation is rather straightforward. Therefore, our goal in this paper is to obtain a good estimation of the label accuracy. Moreover, we will focus on the first decision point as it is most crucial in our crowdsourcing tasks.

**Cost-quality trade-off** The main implication is that the task reduces to estimating label quality given available information. The performance is then measured by the system cost-quality trade-off: how many labels per item are needed to reach a certain level of quality. An example trade-off curve for the POAK algorithm is presented in Fig. 2. The selection of threshold is a case-by-case decision that hinges on labeling costs and the acceptable margin of error (Nguyen et al. 2020).

**Auditor labels** Some items may arrive with an ‘auditor label’, that we can think of as the ground truth. The decision on whether to ask for an auditor label on a particular item is done independently by a different system, and we assume these labeled items are a random sample from all items. We denote by \( M \) the set of all items, and by \( M^* \subseteq M \) the items for which an auditor label is available. The auditor label is denoted by \( z^*_j \) (i.e. it is considered to be the ground truth).

**Online algorithms** An online accuracy estimation algorithm is composed of two components (see Fig. 1):

1. A learning component that gets as its input a partial matrix \( X \), possibly with some auditor labels, and outputs a model \( \Theta \).

---

**Table 1: Common notations used in the paper. Lower-case letters \( n, m \) represent set sizes, e.g. \( m^*_i = |M^*_i| \).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( N, M )</td>
<td>Set of unique workers/items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_{ij} )</td>
<td>Observed label by worker ( i ) to item ( j )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z^*_j, \hat{z}_j )</td>
<td>True/estimated annotation for item ( j )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_i, \hat{c}_i )</td>
<td>True/estimated competence of worker ( i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z^*<em>{ij}, \hat{z}</em>{ij} )</td>
<td>Competence estimated from true labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M_i, M^*_i )</td>
<td>Items [with ground truth] labelled by ( i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M_{iv} )</td>
<td>Items labeled by both ( i ) and ( i' )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \pi_i )</td>
<td>Number of pairwise comparisons involving ( i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_i, m^*<em>i, m</em>{iv} )</td>
<td>Size of ( M_i, M^*<em>i, M</em>{iv} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \pi_i )</td>
<td>Average similarity of ( i ) to other workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. We explain below the extension to partial data.
Figure 2: Performance of the POAK algorithm on the Keypoints dataset, compared to a baseline that decides randomly on how many labels to use. Each point on the curve corresponds to the percentage of labels used and associated similarity at a given accuracy threshold. The star marker indicates that POAK achieves on-par accuracy with the baseline only using 81% of the labels. The shaded area (relative AUC) measures the improvement over the baseline.

An estimation component that gets as input a set of reported labels for a particular item \((x_{ij})_{i \in N_j}\) and has access to the model \(\Theta\). It outputs an aggregated answer \(\hat{z}_j\) with its estimated accuracy \(\hat{C}_j\).

**Online Anna Karenina Algorithm**

We start with a simple model that only includes the estimated competence of each worker. Note that a straightforward way to estimate the competence, is to consider the average accuracy over items with auditor label: \(\hat{c}_i^0 := \frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{j \in M_i^*} s(x_{ij}, y^*_j)\). Clearly, if \(M_i^*\) is sampled randomly from \(M_i\), then \(\hat{c}_i^0\) is an unbiased estimator of \(c_i\). However, typically auditor labels are expensive and hence \(M_i^*\) is small or empty.

**The Learning Component**

The first step is to calculate \(\pi_i\) for each worker. Note that under a full input matrix, all workers are treated the same as in Eq. (1). However in practice a worker may have co-labelled many items with some workers, and just a few with others, resulting in noisy pairwise similarity with the latter group. We therefore compute

\[
\pi_i := \frac{1}{|M_i|} \sum_{i' \neq i, j \in M_i} s(x_{ij}, x_{i'j})
\]

where \(\overline{m}_i := \sum_{i' \neq i} M_{ii'}\), that is, we average over all pairs of \(i\)'s label and another label of the same item.

**Calibration and semi-supervised learning**

While \(\pi\) and \(c\) are positively correlated, there may be a better linear transformation between them than simply using identity. Indeed, if we have some additional statistical assumptions on the data we can analytically derive such a transformation (Kurvers et al. 2019; Meir et al. 2023), but having access to a small amount of audited labels allows us to take an easier and more general approach.

Recall that we have our preliminary competence estimation \(\hat{c}_i^0\) that is based on the supervised data. While on their own they may be too noisy, we can use them to calibrate the competence estimation, by computing the best linear transformation \(L\) from \(\pi\) to \(c^0\) using weighted linear regression.

For each \(i \in N\), set \(\hat{c}_i := (\hat{c}_i, \overline{m}_i)_{i \in N}\)

**Algorithm 1: OAK (LEARNING COMPONENT)**

**Input:** dataset \(X\)  
**Output:** model \(\Theta\)  
for \(i \in N\) do  
\[
\text{Set } \pi_i := \frac{1}{|M_i|} \sum_{i' \neq i} |M_{ii'}| \\
\text{Set } \pi_i := \frac{1}{|M_i|} \sum_{i' \neq i} \sum_{j \in M_i} s (x_{ij}, x_{i'j}) \\
\text{Set } \hat{c}_i^0 := \frac{1}{|M_i|} \sum_{j \in M_i^*} s (x_{ij}, y^*_j) \\
\]
end  
Find the best linear transformation \(L\) from \(\pi\) to \(c^0\) using weighted linear regression

**The Estimation Component**

Estimation in OAK is rather straightforward. Suppose that we have a new item \(j\) with labels \((x_{ij})_{i \in N_j}\). First, the algorithm calculates the current estimated label by aggregating all current labels \(\hat{z}_j := agg((x_{ij})_{i \in N_j})\). Recall that the aggregation function is decided up front. Then the algorithm predicts the accuracy of \(\hat{z}_j\) (denoted \(\hat{C}_j\)) using the model \(\Theta\). This estimation is then compared to a pre-defined threshold; see Fig. 1.

**Estimating accuracy of a single label**

The most important part is to estimate the accuracy of the first label, since asking for another label will at least double the cost. Here aggregation is trivial, as \(\hat{z}_j = x_{ij}\) for the first worker \(i \in N_j\).

The easiest estimation is just by setting \(\hat{C}_j := \hat{c}_i\), i.e. relying completely on the estimated competence of the reporting worker. To deal with small samples we apply additive smoothing, which shrinks the estimation towards the mean accuracy of the entire population, defined as \(\overline{c} := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in N_j} m_i \hat{c}_i\), see Alg. 2. The \(\gamma\) is a meta-parameter, set to 10 by default.

**Aggregated labels**

Estimating the accuracy of an aggregated label is tricky. A naive approach that returns the estimated accuracy of one worker only is missing important information: if the other reported labels are identical or similar, this is a strong positive signal, whereas if we know that other workers reported different labels this may suggest lower accuracy. The solution is detailed in the full version.
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Implementation

To justify the POAK algorithm, we need to show that \( \pi_{i}^{(l)} \) is linear in \( c_{i}^{(l)} \) in expectation. This is not a priori clear, as one of the assumptions in Meir et al. (2023) is that labels from workers are independent conditional on their accuracy—an assumption that is violated once conditioning on the reported label.

We therefore establish an alternative version of the Anna Karenina principle for conditional categorical labels. In particular we provide sufficient conditions to an exact linear relation between \( c_{i}^{(l)} \) and \( E[\pi_{i}^{(l)}] \), which is positive if (but not only if) the overall population accuracy is better than random guess.

Statistical model We adopt the general Dawid-Skene model for categorical labels (Dawid and Skene 1979):

- Prior probabilities over labels, denoted by \( q^{(l)} \) with \( \sum_{l \leq k} q^{(l)} = 1 \);
• Worker types. A type is specified by a $k \times k$ confusion matrix $M_i$, where $M_i^{\tau \to \ell} := Pr[x_i = \ell|z^* = \tau]$. We require $\sum_{\ell \leq k} M_i^{\tau \to \ell} = 1$ for all $i, \tau$;

• Conditional independence among workers: $Pr[x_i = \ell|z^* = \tau, x_{i'}] = M_i^{\tau \to \ell}$.

Meir et al. (2023) imposes a strong restriction on the model where each $M_i$ depends only on the accuracy of $i$, which is a scalar parameter, in order to derive the corresponding linear relation. We make no assumption on the confusion matrices, and ask how expected conditional similarity behaves as function of the conditional accuracy $c_i^{(\ell)}$.

Denote by $p_i^{(\ell)} := M_i^{\tau \to \ell}$ the probability of $i$ correctly identifying label $\ell$. We define a partial type $M_i^{(-\ell)}$ which is $M_i$ without the column $M_i^{\tau \to \ell}$. Then we can fix the partial type, and ask how both $p_i^{(\ell)}$ and $c_i^{(\ell)}$ change as a function of the remaining latent variables, and in particular $p_i^{(\ell)}$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1 (Conditional Anna Karenina theorem for categorical data). Fix prior probabilities $q$, a category $\ell$, and a worker $i$ with partial type $M_i^{(-\ell)}$. Then there are constants $\alpha^{(\ell)}, \beta^{(\ell)}$ such that $E[p_i^{(\ell)}] = \alpha^{(\ell)} c_i^{(\ell)} + \beta^{(\ell)}$.

We present the key components of the proof here and defer the complete proof to the full version. First, we note that since $p_i^{(\ell)}$ is an average over comparisons to random labels reported by a random worker $i'$, we have (omitting the item subscript $j$):

$$E[p_i^{(\ell)}] = E_c[E[s(x_{i'}, x_i)|x_i = \ell]] = E_c[Pr[x_{i'} = \ell|x_i = \ell]].$$

Hence by linearity of expectation, it is sufficient to show the following proposition.

Proposition 2. $Pr[x_{i'} = \ell|x_i = \ell]$ is linear in $c_i^{(\ell)}$, for any worker type $M_i$.

Proof. We split to cases when $x_i$ agrees or disagrees with the truth $z^*$, and show that both terms are linear in $c_i^{(\ell)}$:

$$Pr[x_{i'} = \ell|x_i = \ell] = Pr[x_{i'} = \ell|z^* = \ell]c_i^{(\ell)}$$

$$+ \sum_{\tau \neq \ell} Pr[x_{i'} = \ell|z^* = \tau]Pr[z^* = \tau|x_i = \ell]$$

$$= p_i^{(\ell)}c_i^{(\ell)} + \sum_{\tau \neq \ell} M_i^{\tau \to \ell} q^{(\ell)} M_i^{\tau \to \ell}$$

$$= p_i^{(\ell)} c_i^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{Pr[x_i = \ell]} \sum_{\tau \neq \ell} q^{(\ell)} M_i^{\tau \to \ell} M_i^{\tau \to \ell}$$

The first term in Eq. (4) is obviously linear in $c_i^{(\ell)}$ since $M_i$ is fixed. For the second term, we first observe that each $q^{(\ell)} M_i^{\tau \to \ell} M_i^{\tau \to \ell}$ for $\tau \neq \ell$ is completely determined by the fixed terms $q, M_i$ and $M_i^{(-\ell)}$. It remains to show that

$$\frac{1}{Pr[x_i = \ell]}$$

is linear in $c_i^{(\ell)}$. Note that

$$c_i^{(\ell)} = \frac{q^{(\ell)} p_i^{(\ell)}}{Pr[x_i = \ell]}$$

$$Pr[x_i = \ell] = q^{(\ell)} p_i^{(\ell)} + \sum_{\tau \neq \ell} q^{(\tau)} M_i^{\tau \to \ell}$$

$$\forall Y, Z > 0, \frac{1}{Y + Z} = \frac{1}{Y} + \frac{1}{Z}$$

Finally, denote $Z := q^{(\ell)} p_i^{(\ell)}; Y = \sum_{\tau \neq \ell} q^{(\tau)} M_i^{\tau \to \ell}$, and note that $Y$ is a constant. We have

$$\frac{1}{Pr[x_i = \ell]} = \frac{1}{Y + Z} = \frac{1}{Y} + \frac{1}{Z} = \frac{1}{Y} c_i^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{Y}$$

as required.

\[\square\]

Remark 3. The higher $\alpha^{(\ell)}$ is w.r.t $\beta^{(\ell)}$, the better we can separate good workers from poor ones. Note that a sufficient condition for $\alpha^{(\ell)}$ to be positive, is that $E_{M_i} [p_i^{(\ell)}]$ is higher than $E_{M_i} [M_i^{\tau \to \ell}]$ for all $\tau \neq \ell$, i.e., that the overall competence to identify $\ell$ is higher than the overall chance to incorrectly report a label as $\ell$.

Item Response Theory

Item Response Theory is a statistical model developed for standardized tests, which posits that the probability of answering a question correctly as a function of three factors of the question:

$$P^{IRT}(x_{ij}) = p_j^0 + \frac{1 - p_j^0}{1 + \exp(b_j(d_j - c_i))}$$

where $d_j, b_j, p_j^0$ correspond to item $j$’s difficulty, separation, and base rate; and $P^{IRT}$ is the probability that answer $x_{ij}$ is correct (Baker and Kim 2004). We adopt the concept and the formula but use it in two unusual ways:

• We assign the three ‘question factors’ mentioned above not to each item, but to each reported label type $\ell$.

• We do not restrict its usage to categorical data.

This means we define a model with $(3k+n)$ latent variables, compared to $(n \times k)$ for POAK, that captures the expected similarity of $x_{ij}$ to the ground truth, conditional on $x_{ij} \in \mathcal{X}_i^{(\ell)}$.

In the full version, we describe the POAK-IRT (or POAKI) algorithm, which first runs POAK and then reduce the number of parameters by finding the IRT parameters with the best fit.

We also prove that the common case of single-parameter workers with arbitrary priors on true answers is captured by our IRT model without any loss of precision.

Empirical Results

To showcase the effectiveness of our proposed methods, we conduct extensive numerical experiments on four complex annotation datasets and compare against several baselines.
Setup of Numerical Experiments

Baselines and datasets To evaluate the three variants of our proposed algorithms (OAK, POAK, and POAK-I), we consider several baseline methods and label aggregation methods (summarized in Tab. 2) including:

- SAD: Smallest Average Distance (Braylan and Lease 2020). For a job with multiple labels, select the label which has the smallest average distance to other labels.
- BAU: Best Available User (Braylan and Lease 2020). Given the (estimated) confidences of multiple labels for a job, select the label with the highest confidence. This aggregation method can be combined with any confidence estimation methods like ours.
- UNIFORM: Uniform averaging or majority voting. This is in contrast to the “weight” method where weights are determined by the estimated labeler confidence.

All methods are applied on four real crowdsourcing datasets obtained from Meta, covering a broad range of different labeling tasks. See basic information of the datasets in Tab. 3. For example, in the TAXONOMY dataset, each annotation is a subset of 26 predefined topics. The similarity of two annotations is their Jaccard similarity and aggregation is performed by majority voting on each topic.

Note that to use the POAK algorithm we need to somehow partition annotations into types. In all datasets we used a simple straightforward partition. E.g. in the TAXONOMY dataset we assign each singleton to a type and group all non-singletons into a separate type.

Comprehensive descriptions and partitioning details are included in the full version.

Evaluation We first randomly split each dataset into a training set and a test set. We then run the learning component (Alg. 1) of each variant to estimate labeler’s confidence. Given the learned confidence, we implement the estimation component (Alg. 2) to estimate the accuracy of the first label for each job in the test set, only inquiring the next label if the accuracy is below a given threshold. At each threshold, we calculate the cost and accuracy by averaging over all jobs in the test set, which corresponds to a point on the curve in Fig. 2. By varying the threshold, we are able to generate a cost-accuracy curve for each method as in Fig. 2.

This cost-accuracy curve of each algorithm is compared against the UNIFORM baseline which uses a biased coin-flip to decide whether to use one or all annotations. We evaluate the performance of all methods by computing the Relative Area Under the Curve (RAUC), represented as the shaded area in the illustrating example in Fig. 2.

Results

Comparison with the baselines Fig. 3 shows the RAUC results of the different methods on the four datasets.

The confidence-based methods POAK-Weight and OAK-Weight consistently outperform non-model based alternatives, SAD and UNIFORM, which justifies the usefulness of confidence estimation in improving the cost-quality trade-off curve. Averaging or majority voting proves to be more effective than selection across most of the settings. This finding is in line with a similar conclusion from Braylan and Lease (2021).

In addition, POAK outperforms OAK with POAK-Weight dominating all other methods. This implies that the competencies of labelers vary across different annotation types. The partition-based method can effectively learn and adjust for this heterogeneity. Finally, as the training sample size increases, the performance of all methods improves as expected as the methods can make more accurate estimations of labeler confidence.

Deep dive on POAK As POAK-Weight dominates all other alternatives, we dive deeper into the different variants of POAK, including POAK-I and POAK-IRT, to examine the effectiveness of calibration in confidence estimation. It turns out that data is not uniformly distributed across different annotation types. We tackle this by computing the POAK-I estimation in addition, using it as a baseline for smoothing instead of OAK. As shown in Fig. 4, both POAK-I and POAK-IRT outperform POAK, highlighting the value of calibration particularly when training sample is small. In addition, IRT-based regularization (purple curve) further improves over POAK-I by allowing for information sharing across partitions to prevent overfitting.

In addition to the performance evaluation, we also examine the predictive accuracy of POAK. Specifically, the predicted accuracy of labels and their true accuracy are highly correlated (Fig. 5). Furthermore, the estimation accuracy exhibits heterogeneity across different annotation types.

Conclusion

In this paper, we develop novel modeling approaches to improve the efficiency of online crowdsourcing processes.

Table 2: Summary of key characteristics of competing methods in our experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Conf.-based</th>
<th>Aggregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POAK-Weight</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Averaging/voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POAK-BAU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAK-Weight</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Averaging/voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAK-BAU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFORM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Averaging/voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Basic information of the real crowdsourcing datasets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Labelers Similarity Audit</th>
<th>Similarity measure</th>
<th>Audit labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEYPOINT</td>
<td>∼ 50</td>
<td>Gaussian similarity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXONOMY</td>
<td>∼ 500</td>
<td>Jaccard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREEPATH</td>
<td>∼ 70</td>
<td>Hierarchical Hamming</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUNDINGBOX</td>
<td>∼ 100</td>
<td>Image Jaccard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3For simplicity, the term “Weight” is omitted from names hereafter, given that all POAK variants use this aggregation method.
with complex annotations. The models proposed are task-independent and applicable to any complex annotation tasks in which the pairwise similarity between two arbitrary annotations can be defined. These models are based on the underlying Anna Karenina principle that good workers are similar to one another in their reported annotations.

We first extend previous work on PTD to propose OAK in the online setting and then introduce two extensions: (1) POAK which estimates the accuracy of complex annotations by first partitioning the observed annotations into types and then applying OAK to estimate workers’ per-type competence, and (2) POAK+ that reduces the number of parameters by using Item Response Theory.

We provide theoretical proofs that the Anna Karenina principle extends to per-reported-type estimations, which generalizes the results of Meir et al. (2023). We also provide extensive empirical results comparing the effectiveness of our methods on four real-world applications.
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