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Abstract

The Web has created new opportunities for interactive problem solving and design by large groups. In the context of robotics, we have shown recently that a crowd of non-experts are capable of designing adaptive machines over the Web. However, determining the degree to which collective contribution plays a part in these tasks requires further investigation. We hypothesize that there exist subtle yet measurable social dynamics that occur during the collaborative design of robots on the Web. To test this, we enabled a crowd to rapidly design and train simulated, web-embedded robots. We compared the robots designed by a socially-interacting group of individuals to another group whose members were isolated from one another. We found that there exists a latent quality in the robots designed by the social group that was significantly less prevalent in the robots designed by individuals working alone. Thus, there must exist synergies in the former group that facilitate this design task. We also show that this latent quantity correlates with the desired design outcome, which was fast forward locomotion. However, the quantity – when distilled into its component parts – is not more prevalent in one group than another. This finding demonstrates that there are indeed traces left behind in the machines designed by the crowd that betray the social dynamics that gave rise to them. Demonstrating the existence of such quantities and the methodology for extracting them presents opportunities for crafting interfaces to magnify these synergies and thus improve collective design of robots over the web in particular, and crowd design activities in general.

Introduction

The Web has led to novel modes of social participation and means for contribution to tasks that were previously limited to small groups of experts. New Web technologies, such as WebGL 3D graphics and Web-embedded physics engines, have made the interactive design of intelligent machines possible over the Web. Additionally, collective intelligence methods such as crowdsourcing have demonstrated that a crowd of individuals can complete problem-solving and design tasks while working in parallel. However, understanding the ways the crowd can collectively exhibit abilities that differ from that of an aggregate of individual contributions is underexplored. The present study addresses how the contributions of the crowd as a social entity can be measured as distinct from the contributions of isolated individuals working in parallel.

We have shown that the crowd is capable of collectively designing adaptive machines on the Web. Thus there is evidence that under some circumstances social synergy can arise in this domain. However, past studies have not uncovered the imprint left behind on the crowd-generated designs that result from this synergy.

We hypothesize that this social contribution is a measurable quantity. If this quantity is indeed measurable, then it could be actively managed. If it constructively contributes to the task at hand, it can be enhanced. If it is destructive,
it could be actively suppressed. In this study, we seek to demonstrate whether or not the quantity is measurable; and if so, whether it is constructive or destructive with respect to the design of robots. Developing automated means for the discovery of crowd contributions is the first step to actively manage crowd participation towards productive, collective outcomes.

Evidence indicates that humans may be biased, during design, by exposure to the physical environment in which we are embodied. For example, people may favor symmetric robot designs as symmetry is ubiquitous in nature. If incorporated into the physical characteristics of artificial organisms, these biases facilitate design (Wagy and Bongard (2015a)). However, we still do not know whether these biases arise individually or if the bias is reinforced by crowd behavior. If these biases are the result of social pressures, they could be actively enhanced or suppressed depending on whether they were beneficial to the desired design outcome.

Previous work suggests there may exist as-yet undiscovered latent contributions from the crowd (Wagy and Bongard (2015b)). However, the methods suffer from a deficiency; they obscure underlying features of the crowd-generated designs that may contribute to a positive outcome. Additionally, we do not know whether design features were indeed influenced by social processes. This stands in contrast to the present work, in which we demonstrate a method for deriving contributions as linear combinations of simple geometric values.

In the present work, we distill a latent geometric factor from robot designs using Singular Value Decomposition (SVD). We demonstrate that this value is more prevalent in a social design process than it is in designs resulting from the parallel effort of isolated individuals. Furthermore, we show that this latent factor has a beneficial effect on the objective of the design process.

**Methods**

In this study, we used a dataset of user-contributed robot designs (Wagy and Bongard (2015a)). Participants designed robots using an interactive tool available through their web-browser. When a user visited the study website, they were shown a 5 x 5 grid of dots. By clicking on a dot and dragging to another dot, they could draw line segments between dots (e.g., Fig. [1]). Line segments were only allowed between horizontally- or vertically-adjacent dots to constrain users from crossing segments in their designs. In order to enforce this constraint, the closest set of adjacent lines segments that approximate the diagonal line drawn by the user was shown as the user dragged lines between dots. For example, a line drawn from the top left dot to the bottom right dot was approximated by a zig-zag formation of smaller, adjacent segments between the top left and bottom right dots.

When a participant was finished designing a robot, she could click a "GO" button, which launched an instance of her design as a 3D robot in a physics simulation engine within her browser. The simulation contained only the robot and an infinite, flat ground upon which the robot could walk.

Line segments drawn in the grid of dots were translated into the physics simulation as 3D rectangular parallelepiped robot segments. Each dot that was adjacent to at least one line segment was invoked as a 3D cube in the physics simulation. Segments adjacent to a cube were connected to the respective cube with a hinge joint along the axis at the mid-point between adjoining cube and segment faces and in parallel with the ground and these body faces. In this way, the robot was able to push in the direction of the ground. However, as segments flexed and the robot body moved, the robot configuration did allow for sweeping motions across the ground by its members.

Every joint was actuated with a sinusoidal, displacement-controlled signal. All sinusoidal signals driving the hinge joints swept the same angle (±45°) at the same frequency (1.5 Hz). However, the phase of the signal could take on one of two possible values: 0° or 180°. A hill-climber search algorithm was used to define which of these phase values was assigned to each of the hinges in the robot created by the user. We will use the term *phase configuration* to refer to a single assignment of phase values to hinge joints for a particular robot body. A separate hill-climber algorithm was maintained for each robot design and for each group. Thus the first instance of a particular robot morphology within a group was assigned a random phase configuration. When that same user or another participant in the same group drew
and simulated an identical robot morphology, the robot was assigned a slightly altered version of the original phase configuration. Thus, each time a user clicked GO, they contributed one iteration of the hill-climber algorithm for a particular robot body.

Each robot design was simulated for 15 seconds of physics simulation time (for examples of robots in the web-embedded physics simulation, see Fig. 2). The distance that the robot traveled in these 15 seconds was recorded in a database along with the adjacency matrix that defined the connections.

Participants were asked to design a robot that could move as far as possible across the flat plane and within the allotted 15 seconds of simulation time. However, participants were unpaid volunteers so they were free to use the tool however they desired.

Participants were placed into either a control group or experimental group with an equal probability of being placed into either group. Participant IP addresses were recorded so that if they were to return to the site to design more robots, they would be placed in the same control or experimental group. In a panel at the top of the study website, the experimental group was shown 13 randomly chosen (2D) designs created by other users in their group. We refer to this group of robot designers as the social group because they were given the chance to utilize other users’ designs if they so desired. Every time a user returned to the site, they would be shown a potentially new random selection of 13 designs created by other users that were placed in the experimental group. The control group, which we will refer to as the independent group, was shown only their own past designs. Thus the user interfaces for the independent and social groups were identical apart from the content of the panels showing historical designs at the top of the site.

When the crowdsourced portion of the experiment was complete, we used the collected robot designs to compare the design preferences for users in the social and independent groups.

Since robot designs consisted of a series of points and edges joining these points, we were able to compute network metrics on the resulting dataset and derive a set of simple geometric measures from each robot designed by the crowd. These geometric measures included minimum, average and maximum degree measures; maximal matching; length of the shortest path; node connectivity; number of legs; number of segments; radius; transitivity; number of cliques; indicators of bipartiteness, regularity, whether the network is a tree and biconnectedness; and symmetry (computed as the maximum proportion of segments that are matched with another segment across either the horizontal, vertical or one of two diagonal axes of symmetry in the 2D design plane).

We then distilled this set of computed geometric measures for each robot morphology into just one representative value of its geometric features. We did this by using the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) [Rajaraman et al. 2012] dimensionality reduction technique to factorize the matrix of all descriptive geometric features into component singular values and matrices. We then used only the first singular value of the decomposition to obtain a one-dimensional representation of the geometric robot feature-space, which allowed us to represent each design by a single number that reflected all computed geometric features into one quantity. This reduced-dimensional representation of robot morphologies will henceforth be referred to as the latent factor representation of a particular robot’s morphology, or the latent factor in short.

Results

A sample of designs created by participants can be seen in Fig. 3. The T-shaped robot design in the center was the highest performing design overall (the best distance it was able to achieve was approximately 32 meters).

Summaries of team contribution are indicated in Table 1.

The distribution of distances achieved by the social group and that of the independent group can be seen in Fig. 4. The social group achieved higher distances than the independent group at a level that was statistically different (p < 0.0001; Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, D = 0.14151).

The minimum, mean and maximum values of the latent
Figure 3: A sample of robot designs by participants. The highest performing robot (with regard to distance-traveled) was the T-shaped robot in the center of the designs shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>2825</td>
<td>2984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unique Designs</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Social and independent group contributions.

Figure 4: Deciles of distances achieved by robot designs in the group working together (Social) and those achieved by individuals working in isolation (Independent). The median distance value is indicated by a black diamond.

Table 2: Latent factor range and ranges of values used to compute latent factor in designs by both groups.

Discussion

The only difference between the social group and the individual group was that the social group was able to see designs created by others in their group. Thus, if a quantity derived from the designs was more prevalent in the social group versus the independent group, then this quantity was the result of social dynamics.

We derived a measurable latent factor from designs created by each group. We found that this latent value was significantly more prevalent in the social group than that in the individual group at a statistically significant level. Thus exposure to others’ designs resulted in increased prevalence of this factor.
A synergy is, by definition, a collective outcome that is greater than the sum of individual contributions. Demonstration of a synergy is not predicated on the collective outcome being constructive with respect to the objective of the efforts. However, there is evidence that the latent factor that we have distilled contributes constructively to robot design.

This latent, socially-transmitted value incorporated morphological symmetry, which has been shown to be beneficial for robot locomotion (Bongard and Paul (2000)). While the incorporation of symmetry in user designs alone was not significantly different in the social versus independent groups, the associated p-value ($p = 0.132$) indicates a trend that those in the social group may have favored symmetry in designs over those working independently. It is only by the incorporation of the number of legs in the design that differentiates the social tendency of design with the isolated design tendency.

It appears that there is a latent quantity that – through exposure to designs by other users – is increasing, consciously or otherwise in the social participants. And the social group does indeed design robots that, on average, outperform those designs by participants in the individual group. However, we cannot say with confidence that it is this latent value that leads to the improved performance. There may be other, undiscovered factors that lead to the superior performance by the social group. However, we did find that there is a positive correlation between the discovered latent factor and the distance that a robot is able to travel (Pearson correlation $= 0.2546499$). Thus, while we cannot say for certain that we found the latent factor that contributed to the success of the social group, we can say that – through the distillation of design decisions by a large group of non-expert contributors – we found a quantity that correlates with the desired problem outcome. And that this quantity is, in part, corroborated by findings scientific literature (Bongard and Paul (2000)) on locomotion

The social group designed robots that were capable of moving significantly farther than those designed by individuals in isolation. As can be seen in Fig. [4] the distribution of distances achieved the social group’s robots have a higher median value than the independent group. The distribution of distances achieved by the social group has a much higher spread in the upper deciles than the independent group. Here we are reporting the overall ability of the participants in the social group to the ability of the independent group to design robot bodies in tandem with their control strategy. This is in contrast to the performance of the robot morphologies that are independent of their control strategies as described in (Wagy and Bongard (2015a)). Thus users were able to work together to build robot body/brain combinations that outperformed the body/brain combinations of those that worked alone. This need not have been the case: well-known group pathologies such as groupthink (Janis (1972)) could have resulted in an echo-chamber effect. Users working together could have missed promising design possibilities due to a focus on limited regions of the space of possible designs. Also, the number of participants working collectively in this study (398) far exceeds the number of participants considered optimal for effective social interactions Dunbar (1992).

However, there could be a trivial reason for the social group’s superior design performance. As described in the Methods section, a hill-climber was assigned to each robot morphology; and each hill-climber instance was shared between members in a group. It is possible that the designs that received the most attention by the social group simply were given more attempts at finding a good control strategy by devoting more hill-climber iterations to the search for a good controller. Thus groupthink may have led the social group to focus on a single design’s control strategy rather than concentrating efforts on finding an optimal morphology. If this had been the case, we would have seen that the designs with the most hill-climber iterations are also the highest performing designs. However, this is not what we see in the results. Referring to Fig. [5] we do see that several designs in the social group benefited from many more hill-climber iterations than the independent group. But these designs were not among the high-performing instances. In contrast, many of the highest-performing designs are those that received 10 or less hill-climber iterations. This is much less than some designs, which received in excess of 100 iterations devoted

![Figure 5: Crowd designs with the highest latent factor values and corresponding symmetry and number of legs calculations.](Image)
to finding the best controller. Thus we can see that the robot morphology – not just the number of hill-climber iterations – was an important component of the robot’s performance. Therefore we believe that the social group did not rely solely on the focused search efforts for the best control strategy on a limited groups of designs.

Figure 6: Mean distance achieved by each robot design compared to the number of hill-climber iterations that that design received. A number of designs in the social group did receive substantially more iterations than those in the independent group, but they were not high-performing designs. In contrast, some of the highest-performing designs received very few iterations.

We claim here that the latent factor discovered is an indicator of synergy in the social group. This value is significantly more prevalent in the social group versus independent group. And the only difference between the two groups was the opportunity to synergize. Therefore the only ways that the latent factor could arise is through synergy or by chance. It is unlikely that the value arose by chance, as indicated by the statistical tests performed. However, it has been shown that crowdsourced work follows a heavy-tailed distribution (Swain et al., 2015). Most participants contribute very little to a crowdsourced activity and a single user or small group of users contributes vastly more than others. This study followed that same trend (see Figure 7). Therefore, it is possible that by chance the top contributing user in the social group favored the latent factor and biased the overall group towards prevalence of this value.

We investigated whether the designs by the top-contributing participant in the social group biased the comparison of the latent factor between the groups. We removed the social group member that contributed the most designs from the social group and compared the mean latent factor values for users in each group. Even without this top contributor, we found significantly more of the latent factor in the social group versus the independent group ($p = 0.011$ Kolmogorov-Smirnov test).

Figure 7: Contributions to this study follow a heavy-tail distribution. The number of designs contributed by most users was small whereas the number of designs contributed by one very enthusiastic user was very high.

Note that the designs with the highest scores of the latent factor are those that maximize both the symmetry measure – a maximum of 1.0 – and the number of legs. The maximum number of legs found in designs created by the crowd was 12. 12 legs is also the maximum number of legs possible when designing single-component, connected robots in this design space. In fact, 8 unique members of the social group drew designs that maximized the number of legs quantity; whereas no users in the individual group drew designs that maximized this quantity. The maximum number of legs found in the independent group was 11. Thus, the designs that maximize the latent factor (Fig. 5) are those with the most legs possible. However, despite having the highest possible symmetry score, the top performing design of all designs only has 3 legs (the largest, T-shaped design in Fig. 7). We cannot say that the best design was the result of this increased latent factor in the social group. Whether the prominence of the latent factor influenced the creation of the best designs requires further exploration. Future work will address the progression of features that lead to specific, optimal outcomes such as the T-shaped robot in Fig. 3.

We can get a sense of the participation of users that contributed to the top designs by looking at Table 4. Repeating numbers across rows in the table indicate that the same user contributed multiple hill-climber runs to a particular design. Two patterns can be seen in these top 10 designs. The top
design (Design Rank = 1) ranking design was created by a user that only contributed 9 runs total to the overall experiment. Similarly, the first five contributions of the sixth and eighth ranking designs were by the same user. However, in almost all other designs in these top 10 designs (with just one exception: the seventh ranked design), we see that the designs were created by a user with lower numbers of total contributions and then picked up by users who contributed more overall to the experiment. For example, the second best design was created by a user who contributed just 4 runs to the experiment. Then a user that contributed 25 runs picked up the design and then a user that devoted 25 runs drew that same robot to contribute a run to the hill-climber. This pattern of contributions could be the result of various social dynamics. It may be that a design that is initially promising may have caught the attention of those users that are more participatory. Or this could be a general pattern of behavior for any design created socially. However, if we examine the same table for the worst-performing designs (Table 3 the pattern is not as prevalent. But we do see this pattern in the eighth and ninth worst designs. Future work will investigate these social dynamics that contribute to specific robot designs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>User 1</th>
<th>User 2</th>
<th>User 3</th>
<th>User 4</th>
<th>User 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Total number of runs contributed by each of the first 5 users to work on the top ranking designs. Repeating numbers indicate the same user contributing runs to the design. The best design is at the top and the tenth best design is at the bottom.

Additionally, the mean value of this latent factor over the course of time (as measured in number of designs contributed by each group) can be seen in Fig. [8]. This figure strongly suggests a slow increase in the social group’s usage of the latent factor, whereas it appears that this value fluctuates over time for the independent group. More data is required to evaluate whether this trend continues in order to verify that this is indeed a trend; but the steady increase of this quantity in the social group is suggestive.

**Conclusion and Future Work**

In this study, anonymous Web participants designed robots in their browsers. Our hypothesis was that there exists a measurable quantity derived from the social design of adaptive machines. Using the designs created by study participants, we derived a latent geometric quantity through a dimensionality reduction technique. We compared the prevalence of this derived latent value in the social and individual groups. We found that this value was more prominent in a group of participants working socially than those working in isolation. We observed that this value followed an increasing trend in the social group designs whereas the quantity fluctuated in the designs created by the independent group.

The latent value that we uncovered is derived from the symmetry and number of limbs in robot designs. That this value was derived in part from symmetry corroborates previous work on social design of adaptive machines over the Web. The latent value was shown to have a positive correlation with the desired outcome in robot designs, which was
that of fast forward locomotion. Thus, the social quantity may have played a role in the superior outcome in social design of robots. Further work is required to demonstrate how such aggregate social quantities influence specific designs, such as those that are among top performers.

Deriving such measurable social quantities can be useful for their incorporation into automated methods. In future work, we will use crowdseeding (Wagy and Bongard (2015b)) to enable machine design of robots by incorporating the SVD-derived objective into a design objective.

Additionally, we would like to utilize the methodology introduced here to analyze crowd designs in order to provide immediate feedback to the crowd. By providing feedback to the crowd during the social design process, we may be able to capitalize on crowd preferences and biases in real-time to thus accelerate the search process.

This technique may be useful more broadly in social and human computing. But understanding whether social design preferences are destructive or constructive in other domains is critical to determining the general utility of such methods.
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