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Designing for human action

- Much of the past 40 years: rational actor model drives the theoretical foundations

- Basic approach: set up the incentives on the assumption that all your potential contributors are uniformly
  - Rational
  - Self-interested (not required by rationality, but a useful simplification)
  - Have a utility function that is largely additive—by adding money, or brownie points, or threatening punishment when you can, you will get more activity
Workers resting: getting people to work requires “incentives” and monitoring.
Comparative efficiency at controlling opportunism
Performance Pay and Top-Management Incentives

Michael C. Jensen
Harvard University

Kevin J. Murphy
University of Rochester

Our estimates of the pay-performance relation (including pay, options, stockholdings, and dismissal) for chief executive officers indicate that CEO wealth changes $3.25 for every $1,000 change in shareholder wealth. Although the incentives generated by stock ownership are large relative to pay and dismissal incentives, most CEOs hold trivial fractions of their firms' stock, and ownership levels have declined over the past 50 years. We hypothesize that public and private political forces impose constraints that reduce the pay-performance sensitivity. Declines in both the pay-performance relation since the 1930s are consistent with this...
GM Fremont plant ==> NUMMI (Toyota Production System)

organizational: Taylorism => TPS
technical: Fordism; single task station => team stations
legal: National Labor Relations Act, opposotional => union negotiation
Toyota supplier relations => from *keiretsu* to long term relational contracting with trust

Big Three=> from competitive bidding to relational contracting with periodic defection (arbitrary price reduction demands; revealing design innovations to competitors to achieve lower bids)

Wagoner: “Stop Whining” (MacDuffie & Helper 2006).
Hiroshi Okuda scaled to estimated compensation levels 2005/2006
Hierarchy plus high-powered incentives vs.
More collaborative; team production; trust-based supplier relations; lower power monetary incentives at top
(Sabel 2006; Osterloh and Frey 2005)
Becker: Penalty * probability of detection = deterrence
Tough on crime ➔ community policing
Tough on crime ➞ community policing

**Technical**: walk, not car
**Organizational**: no-911; monthly community meetings; agenda setting
**Institutional**: more room for discretion?
**Social**: humanization; changing us/them boundaries; norms take central role; trust built over time...
Britannica ==> Wikipedia
Cooperative Human Systems

• An integrated approach
  • Technical, organizational, institutional, social
  • Mutually-reinforcing design characteristics or inconsistent

• Handoff to the best subsystem
  • Wireless
    • Handoff of complexity in number of emitters to regulator
    • Back to “market” through auctions
    • Back to equipment with unlicensed
    • Explorations of how to scale sharing/meshing
      • FoN
      • A social algorithm? At least for fixed points among neighbors?
Cooperative Human Systems

- An integrated approach
  - Technical, organizational, institutional, social
  - Mutually-reinforcing design characteristics or inconsistent
- Handoff to the best subsystem
  - Wireless
  - DRM
    - Effort to transfer enforcement to technical system
    - Conflict over degree to which technical system can perform a sufficiently nuanced arrangement
    - New, voluntary payment schemes push toward social constraints by releasing legal (CC) and technical (non-DRM, high quality) constraints
Cooperative Human Systems

- An integrated approach
- Evidence-based, behaviorally-realistic assumptions about human agents
  - Diverse motivations (diverse types?)
  - Non-separability of motivational effects
  - Sociality Enabling Systems Elements
Motivational Vectors

Material interests
money and what money can buy (including some aspects of status; moral fulfillment etc.)

Moral Commitments
psychology of morality (Greene; Hauser)
-Fairness (Fehr & Gaechter 2000)
-Right (Greene Trolley experiments)
-Virtue: self-image?

A discontinuous function, taking dominating values in some domains

Emotional needs/
Affective responses
Deci & Ryan (self-determination; relatedness)
Role of hate, disgust, etc. in regulating behavior (Hauser 2007)
Personality types

Social motivations/connections
-functional social capital (Granovetter 1974; Ben-Porath 1977; Coleman 1988)
-Social network effects: benchmarking, imitation (Fowler & Kristakis; Hanaki et. al)
-conformism
-Solidarity, “in-group bias,” relatedness; Tajfel etc. (but Yamagishi places in functional)
Diverse behaviors

● “Folk wisdom”
  • ~/< 30% *homo economicus*
  • ~/> 50% cooperators, both conditional and unconditional
  • Remainder too noisy

● No good basis to determine if stable “types” or probabilities of behavior for anyone

● No good data on how/whether these behaviors are learned, change over time, etc.
Motivational vectors

All susceptible to framing / situational construal / frame analysis
Both *within* each vector (what is the right thing to do here? Or what is the socially acceptable response) and *among* the vectors (e.g., Community Game vs. Wall Street Game (Lieberman et al 2004))

- Material interests
- Emotional needs/responses
- Social motivations/connections
- Moral Commitments
Misalignment mechanisms

• Normative framing
  • Explicit incentives can frame a decision as one where self-interest is the appropriate moral framework, as opposed to one where other-regarding moral commitments are appropriate (Gneezy & Rustichini 2000); can be modeled as self-signaling (Benabou & Tirole 2006)

• Interparty negative signaling
  • Use of explicit incentives by one party signals its beliefs about the other: trustworthiness (Fehr & Rockenbach 2002) or competence (Benabou & Tirole 2003)
Misalignment mechanisms

- Normative framing
- Interparty negative signaling
- Confounded social signaling
  - Explicit incentives can confound the social signal sent by a behavior; prosocial behavior can lose its social signaling effect (Benabou & Tirole 2006); or lose its salience as the characteristic to imitate in successful behavior (Hanaki et al 2007)
- Contrarian self assertion
  - Explicit incentives can be experienced as an effort to control the subject, and be met by rejection. Deci & Ryan 1985, 2000; Frey 1997
Misalignment mechanisms

- Normative framing
- Interparty negative signaling
- Confounded social signaling
- Contrarian self assertion
- Antisocial negative reciprocity

  - Explicit negative payoffs can lead to negative reciprocity (Fehr and Rockenbach 2002; or to antisocial self-costly harming, which is cross-culturally diverse (Gaechter et al 2006; Hermann et al 2008; Dreber et al 2008); total effect highly debated, but antisocial self-costly harming (a) exists, and (b) even well-functioning vendetta systems can spiral into Hatfields and McCoys
Misalignment mechanisms

- Normative framing
- Interparty negative signaling
- Confounded social signaling
- Contrarian self assertion
- Antisocial negative reciprocity
- Endogenous shifts in levels of prosociality
  - Explicit incentives systems can lower long-term payoffs to possessing or exhibiting a prosocial motivational profile (Bowles 1998; Bohnet et al 2001; Bar-Gill and Fershtman 2005)
Including misalignment in design

Titmuss-Arrow debate 1970/71

Give blood

Material Interests

Moral Commitments

Social Connections/s signals

Emotional needs/Affective responses

Do Not Give Blood
Including misalignment in design

Titmuss-Arrow debate 1970/71

Give blood

Material Interests

Moral Commitments

Social Connections/signal

Emotional needs/Affective responses

Do Not Give Blood
Including misalignment in design

Mellstrom and Johannsesson 2008
--baseline population voluntary donation system

Give blood

Material Interests

Moral Commitments

Social Connections/
signals

Emotional needs/
Affective responses

Do Not Give Blood
Including misalignment in design

Mellstrom and Johannsson 2008: offer 50SEK
-- only reaches significance in women (from 52% to 30%)
-- overall effect exists and trends in the “right” direction, but not significant (43% to 33%)

Give blood

[Diagram]

...Material Interests...

...Moral Commitments...

...Social Connections/sig...

...Emotional needs/Aff...

Do Not Give Blood
Including misalignment in design

Mellstrom and Johannsesson 2008:
--permitting donors to donate their proceeds to a charity, as well as donating the blood, cancelled out the negative effect.
--overall giving levels no higher at end than at beginning (44%)

Material Interests
Moral Commitments
Social Connections/ signals
Emotional needs/ Affective responses

Give blood

Do Not Give Blood
Targeting misalignment in design

- Discrete targets
- Subpopulation effects
- Susceptible to theoretical hypotheses
- Susceptible to experimental piloting
- Requiring observational validation
Example: Payments for Music

• Diadic relationship: artist-fan (UG; TG; DG)
• Public Goods Game: among fans as to who will pay for the music they all enjoy
• RIAA approach: *homo economicus*
  • Institutional system: © assertion, legal forcing
    • backed by thousands of individual law suits
  • Technical system: DRM
  • Organizational system: distribution contracts only through DRM-compliant systems
• Social system: failure. P2p widespread; hacking glorified; “stick it to the man”
Example: Payments for Music

- Voluntary donation sites
  - Radiohead; NIN; other, smaller
    - Far from universal donation
    - But substantial levels of participation; substantial returns to artists relative to baseline, given industry deals
  - Institutional: CC, usually NC
  - Technical: non-DRM; low quality or high
  - Organizational system: direct from artist site, or through trust-based distribution channels
  - Social system: *homo socialis reciprocans*
Example: Voluntary Site

Five years; ~75,000 transactions at the album-sales level; albums in high quality digital download with CC, so legal and technically trivial to redistribute full quality versions; any payment is “voluntary”; any payment above $5 strictly “generous”
## Example: Voluntary Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>48.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9.50</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Than Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>12.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Generous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15.50</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Love You</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18.50</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with Belsky, Kahr, & Brekelhammer (forthcoming)
Example: Payments for Music

- Sociality enabling system elements replace technical, legal, and organizational forcing mechanisms

- Where do we go to generate hypotheses that are theoretically and empirically grounded for design interventions?
Cooperative Human Systems

• An intellectual arc
  
  • Evolutionary biology: from group selection to selfish gene through kin altruism, and direct reciprocity, back to indirect reciprocity, multi level selection, and culture/gene-culture co-evolution
  
  • Economics: strong assumptions of self-interest and guile; mechanism design and efficiency; shifting to experimental and modeling away from self-interest; developing neuroeconomics
  
  • Political theory: from Downs, Olson, Hardin, to Ostrom on sustainable commons
  
  • Management science/organizational sociology: work on TPS, team production, networks since the 1980s; DiMaggio & Powell; Sabel; Adler; Heckescher
Contemporary forces

- End of Cold War reduces need for coherence between scientific individualism and political and identity conflicts
- Globalization and rapid innovation increase unpredictability and exposes shortfalls of models built on selfish rationality
- Widespread social practices of participating in and relying on effective and productive networked social practices familiarizes and renders cooperation a natural explanation
- Internal disciplinary dynamics provide more room for innovation and staking out new intellectual ground away from the well-trodden ground of selfish rationality
Cooperative Human Systems

• Building blocks
  • Communication
  • Who matters? I, thou, we, them
  • What is right, fair, and normal?
  • Calculation: material and social-relational
  • Social dynamics: trust, transparency, reputation, social networks, leadership, asymmetric contribution
Communication

- Widely accepted as improving cooperation in experiments
  - Sally 1995: meta-analysis of PD games; Ostrom, Walker Gardner 1994: communication without commitment, “cheap talk” has a large predictable effect
  - Face to face more effective than mediated; free text more effective than canned (Charness and Dufwenberg 2007; Bochet et al 2006; Putterman 2009 review)
- Central to practices of team production and cooperative management
Communication

Discussion

This page is definately improved and something really more can be done in order to make it a core article. And the fact that its one of the most important article in wiki. I have done my contributions on this i would expect others to do the same.

Kalivd 11:25, 21 April 2007 (UTC)

This is page is so poor an introduction to the subject area that to edit it would entail rewriting it completely. I recommend anyone approaching the topic to read "On Human Communication" by Colin Cherry.

Yeah, no kidding. I've been working on a new version offline, but it's coming slowly. I'll probably just post what I have and we can take it from there. -- Stephen Gilbert 21:04, 25 Oct 2003 (UTC)

Hmmm... I've done some incremental stuff - want to send me something offline and collaborate? Richard Pitt Nov. 16

I'd love to collaborate, but let's let others in on it too! Collaboration is Wikipedia's middle name. Er... don't ask me what its last name is...

I've tried to work your current contributions into my sketchy notes. If anything got lost in the transition, be sure to pull it from the history and add it. -- Stephen Gilbert 19:55, 22 Nov 2003 (UTC)

I've moved the outline here; it's more of a to-do list that article material. -- Stephen Gilbert

Stephen it is much better but still too many links and chapters. If this page is to be a proper page I think a general introduction saying something like that communication happens whenever data transfers from one sentient being to another would help a lot. --BozMo|talk 13:31, 28 Jun 2004 (UTC)

My name is Kyle Mullaney. I majored in Organizational Communication with an emphasis in Intercultural Communication. I would be happy to add my help in cleaning up this article.

Would it first be possible to make this into a category? Of course this page would be something of a gateway to the rest of the communication articles. It would have links to the various disciplines in the study of communication. It could contain a brief definition of communication. maybe from different aspects or other disciplines. For example the opening definition is to technical. I feel it should be more basic. Wow as I read further into the article I realize this would not even qualify for any textbook we used. It is overly somewhat technical and jumbled. I will work on that now. The
Communication

- NOT formal commitment (excluded in experiments, cheap talk)
- Framing: moral, social
- Humanization
- Coordination
- Cheap trust construction, facial decisions
- Negotiation of relevant preferences?
Communication

- Framing; frame analysis
- Ross et al, Wall Street/Community Game
  - Identical setup: finite PD
    - If “community game” 70% open & sustain coop
    - If “wall street game” 30% open & sustain coop
- Principles, policies, preferences are frame dependent
- We negotiate what is fair, right, or desirable
- Communication allows us to define what we want in context, and what it means to cooperate
Who matters: Empathy

• F2F large effect

• Bohnet & Frey: anonymous partner; silent identification; communication in PG & DG games
  • PG = anon => 12%; silent ID => 26%; comm => 78%
  • DG = anon => 26%; silent ID or comm => ~50%
  • Later: DG only;
    • anon => 26% on average of endow; 28% gave 0
    • silent facial ID => 35% of endow; 11% gave 0
    • personal info shared => ~50% of endow; 0 gave 0.
Who matters: Empathy

• F2F large effect

• Bohnet & Frey: anonymous partner; silent identification; communication in PG & DG games

• Neuroscience strongly suggestive
  • Rilling et al: fMRI studies light up differently when cooperating with computer than with human
  • Singer: empathetic pain experienced
  • Kosfeld; Zak: Oxytocin highly effective in empathy and trust creation; correlated with trusting play in experimental games
    • Achievable at a reduced level through human touch
Who matters: Empathy
Who matters: Empathy

litigation vs

mediation and restorative justice
Who matters: Empathy
Who matters: Empathy
Who matters: Empathy
Who matters: Solidarity/Group identity

- Organizational psych since early 1970s
  - Tajfel; Tajfel & Turner minimal group effects
  - Haslam: knowledge of group coupled with emotional significance of belonging
    - But: Yamagishi, reciprocity heuristic?
- Bowles & Gintis; Boyd & Richerson
  - Group selection in early human societies; support centrality of group identification
  - Fowler et al within political parties
  - Rand et al: plastic identities: from Obama/Clinton to Democratic, but only after DNC
Solidarity/Group identity
### Top teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Recent average credit</th>
<th>Total credit</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SETI USA</td>
<td>5267</td>
<td>655,110</td>
<td>420,080,314</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SETI Germany</td>
<td>10476</td>
<td>530,584</td>
<td>353,441,953</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L'Alliance Francophone</td>
<td>4155</td>
<td>309,169</td>
<td>189,003,711</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Knights Who Say NII</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>272,190</td>
<td>136,925,882</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BOINC Synergy</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>253,166</td>
<td>159,172,501</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Overclockers.com</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>218,999</td>
<td>102,258,295</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SETI@Netherlands</td>
<td>2448</td>
<td>209,130</td>
<td>149,148,788</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Czech National Team</td>
<td>3160</td>
<td>200,240</td>
<td>158,349,699</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Team China</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>191,908</td>
<td>61,100,500</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Team MacaN</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>176,748</td>
<td>90,606,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BroadbandReports.com Team Starfire</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>173,769</td>
<td>175,875,661</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AUSTRIA - NATIONAL - TEAM</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>169,068</td>
<td>39,325,598</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Team Art Bell</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>153,797</td>
<td>102,403,994</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Team 2th</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>145,651</td>
<td>97,411,428</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Planetary Society</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>144,798</td>
<td>92,705,244</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Team Starfire World BOINC</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>138,406</td>
<td>58,460,991</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SETI@Taiwan 🇹🇼</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>135,994</td>
<td>64,524,872</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Team AngAndTech</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>132,265</td>
<td>63,550,333</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UK BOINC Team</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>117,465</td>
<td>44,131,479</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Boone Community School District - Iowa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>114,904</td>
<td>19,867,181</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KWSN Orbiting Fortress
KWSN Distributed Computing Teams forum

Also check out our multi-project BOINC stats.

Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News &amp; Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KWSN &amp; BB related news, announcements, and information like BOARD RULES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: <strong>Moderators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wed Feb 14, 2007 3:47 pm Sir BaldyHead
| Thu Aug 05, 2004 9:35 am brooke |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Stat Page Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Links to Team Stat Pages, and other useful Info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: MacG, <strong>Moderators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New and Departing Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Members of KWSN, please post here with an Introduction. Departing members, drop us a note here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: <strong>Moderators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed Oct 31, 2007 12:00 pm belerus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KWSN Round Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly place to chat for all members of KWSN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: <strong>Moderators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Nov 03, 2007 4:41 pm mohoricss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KWSN S@H Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly Chat for KWSN Members and non-members about S@H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: <strong>Moderators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue Oct 30, 2007 9:04 pm Lloyd M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KWSN BOINC'ers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forum for the KWSN BOINC team, and discussion of BOINC projects (S@H-II, Predictor@Home, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: <strong>Moderators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Nov 04, 2007 3:09 pm Al Dante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.kwsnforum.com/viewforum.php?f=36&sid=009d2a4c41e6504a35f4c4e637d1560
Right, Fair, and Normal

• Focused on positive description of the creation and functioning of normative beliefs and drives
  • not a normative argument about what is, or ought to be seen as, right, fair, or normatively binding
Right, Fair, and Normal

- In economics now: Sen 1977
- In psychology, Campbell 1976; Greene 2008; Hauser 2006
- Most normal people, most of the time, will be tugged to doing what they perceive to be the right thing to do under the circumstances
  - Disgust, taboo responses suggest a discontinuous function
Newsvine Code of Honor

1. Above all else, respect others. Address issues and arguments and refrain from making personal attacks. If you see something disrespectful or inappropriate, report it - rather than further inflaming the situation. More +

2. Newsvine's primary purpose is to provide a place for people to share and discuss topics relating to the news. Self-promotion, seeding links to your own site, and advertising are not allowed. More +

3. Headlines should be supported by the information presented in the article itself, rather than used primarily as a means to draw attention. Chosen news types and tags should be accurate and informative - not used to provoke or make a statement. More +

4. As the host of your column, you are expected to foster healthy, open discussions by setting a good example. Be responsible for the content you submit and exercise impartiality when deleting comments and reporting abuse. More +

5. Acts that run contrary to the spirit and purpose of Newsvine, including attempts to circumvent the Code of Honor & User Agreement, are not allowed. More +

So that's the Code.

Make sure to check out the additional recommended guidelines to make you a better Viner as well.
Right, Fair, and Normal

Wikipedia:Neutral point of view

Neutral point of view is a fundamental Wikipedia principle. According to Jimmy Wales, NPOV is “absolute and non-negotiable.”

All Wikipedia articles and other encyclopedic content must be written from a neutral point of view (NPOV), representing fairly and, as much as possible, without bias all significant views that have been published by reliable sources. This is non-negotiable and expected on all articles, and of all article editors. For guidance on how to make an article conform to the neutral point of view, see the NPOV tutorial. For examples and explanations that illustrate key aspects of this policy, see Wikipedia:Neutral point of view/FAQ.

Wikipedia:Neutral point of view is one of Wikipedia's three content policies. The other two are Wikipedia:Verifiability and Wikipedia:No original research. Jointly, these policies determine the type and quality of material that is acceptable in the main namespace. Because the policies are complementary, they should not be interpreted in isolation from one another, and editors should try to familiarize themselves with all three. The principles upon which these policies are based are non-negotiable and cannot be superseded by other policies or guidelines, or by editors' consensus. Their policy pages may be edited only to improve the application and explanation of the principles.

Contents

1. Explanation of the neutral point of view
   1.1. The neutral point of view
   1.2. Bias
   1.3. A simple formulation
2. Achieving neutrality
   2.1. Article naming
   2.2. Article structure
   2.3. Undue weight
   2.4. A vital component: good research
   2.5. Balance
Right, Fair, and Normal

• Outcomes
  • Inequality aversion; relative to other individuals (Fehr & Schmidt 2001; Falk et al)
  • Relative to the group (Bolton and Ockenfels)
  • How well off the other in the interaction made themselves (Falk & Fishbacher)
  • Relative to what a selfless actor would have done (Charness & Rabin)
Right, Fair, and Normal

- Outcomes
- Culturally contingent; diverse
- Susceptible to framing
  - Luck and desert shift baseline in UG (Camerer 2003)
  - Market-integration correlated with baseline equal division preference (Henrich et al Foundations)
Right, Fair, and Normal

• Outcomes

• Intentions

• Where bad intentions excluded, e.g. Roll of dice; negative reciprocity triggered less (cumulative to outcomes) (Fehr & Schmidt)

• Equality, intention, and self-sacrifice

• UG: 20% reject even when proposer can only choose between 80:20/20:80 (Falk, Falkinger, & Fehr 2000)
Right, Fair, and Normal

- Outcomes
- Intentions
- Processes
  - Tyler 2003: procedural justice correlated with internalized compliance
  - Ostrom, Walker, Gardner 1994: agreed upon behaviour and sanctions followed without need to significant punishment
Right, Fair, and Normal

Download Formats

MP3  FLAC  Karaoke

The MP3 Store

All of the songs on this page are 192K MP3s - the quality is high enough that you can play them on whatever device you like. Some songs have cover art, but it's not in a format that I can use. Still, if you don't own a song, there's no harm in clicking the little play button. Click the info button and (sometimes) a bit of explanation from me. Each song was made based on that song, and you can submit a comment about my half-monkey-monster sculpture, etc.

You can pay with a credit card, PayPal or Google Wallet. I will email you a link with some download instructions. If you have any trouble with my store, you can send me an email.

Already Stole It?

No problem. If you'd like to donate some cash, you might consider buying something slightly more fun, such as a robot to go with your message. The most recent bunch of orders were

Jonathan Coulton

music shows store forums wiki you info contact

Stuff From You

This is stuff that you sent me - videos, images, covers, remixes, slash fiction about Kneesa Mountain lands, what have you. Below you'll find the most recently added stuff, and below that you'll find a section where you can search for specific things. If you'd like to contribute something related to a particular song, just go to that song's detail page and click the Submit User Content button. Also, you rule!

Recently Added

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Really Monkey</td>
<td>Images</td>
<td>Bill in Florida</td>
<td>26th Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skunk Guts</td>
<td>Images</td>
<td>Sarah B. &amp; J.</td>
<td>19th Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Monkey</td>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>Cmonkey9</td>
<td>9th Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When You Go</td>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>Cmonkey9</td>
<td>9th Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really Monkey</td>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>Cmonkey9</td>
<td>9th Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delicate Wonder</td>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>Notcros Media</td>
<td>9th Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crush Everything</td>
<td>Images</td>
<td>Tyler Lee</td>
<td>28th Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delicate Wonder</td>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>Leebugle25</td>
<td>28th Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crush Everything</td>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>Leebugle25</td>
<td>28th Sep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Right, Fair, and Normal

- Schelling norms at a minimum
- Self-reinforcing norms (McDowell gold-mines codes)
- Conformism and imitation
  - Anthropology: culturally-reinforced norms (Boyd & Richerson; Boyd and Henrich)
  - Social network effects (e.g. Obesity, Fowler & Kristakis)
  - As an imitation/learning effect (Hanaki et al 2007)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>48.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9.50</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Than Average</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>12.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Generous</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15.50</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Love You</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18.50</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Right, Fair, and Normal

- Feedback mechanisms on normal behaviour
  - Minnesota tax experiments, honest feedback on high participation rates decreased deduction claims
  - Truthful? Goes to trust and trustworthiness
Calculation

• Cost
  • Modularity in peer production
  • In PD, where relative value of defection lower, more cooperation (Ostrom, Walker, Gardner; Camerer & Fehr 2006)

• Payoff: Punishment & reward
  • Vast literature
    • Fehr et al: sustains cooperation
    • Gaechter 2006; Hermann 2008: cross-culturally variable
    • Dreber et al 2008: potentially more harm than good where negative spirals possible
Calculation

• Cost

• Payoff: Punishment & reward
  • Substantial evidence of crowding out through misalignment of effects on different motivational vectors
  • But for this problem, much of traditional approaches could be unchanged, with only supplementation from newer literature
Join the Gomez PEER Community and turn your PC into a money-making machine.

Earn Cash Every Time You Are Online!
Sound too good to be true? It's not. You can earn cash for every minute your PC is on and connected to the Internet. By running the Gomez PEER, you will also help us provide the most realistic picture of Web performance.

To be eligible, you must meet certain program requirements, then download and install the Gomez PEER. It's as simple as that. Gomez is now selecting PEER participants from all over the world.

Since we have a limited number of slots available in the PEER Community, Gomez cannot activate everyone. However, users with the most system activity are much more likely to be activated. So, be sure to apply and start running the Gomez PEER today!

Click here to learn more, or apply to become a PEER and let your PC earn some money for a change!

Effective June 18, 2007, Gomez is making the following enhancements:

- Increasing the payments for processing time by 60%!

- Be rewarded simply for being online! Earn over $1 per month just for having your PC online 20 hours a day!*

- New $2 bonus for ALL referrals!
Top 10 Best Guitar Players of All Time

weshow.com — Watch here videos of the 10 best guitar players of all time. One of the most important instruments in modern music, the guitar is at the basis of popular rhythms such as rock and blues. Considered gods by many fans, guitar players have a role as crucial as that of many singers, when it comes to exciting the audience.

Cracking open the fourth-gen iPod nano [PICS]
crave.cnet.co.uk — It’s time to break open the latest iPod and explore what’s on the inside.

The Usual Suspects In Tech Support

IMAGE — po wenies.net (Comics & Animation) made popular

Top in All Topics

Stone (40,000 BC) vs iPhone (2008)
Customer Service: One Of The Worst Tips We Have Ever Received
The Man Behind the Whispers About Obama
Vote for Weblogs... to be at SXSW 2009

Posted Aug 29th 2008 2:30PM by Victor Agreda, Jr.

Voting ends on August 29, but in the remaining hours you have a shot of sending several top bloggers, editors and managers to SXSW Interactive 2009. Here's a look at the two proposed panels:

The Organic Audience: Growing a Fanbase by Communicating

Our Team

Brad Hill - Director
Felicia Perez - Program Director
Matt Heerema - Principal Designer
Ryan Block - Editor in Chief, Engadget
Josh Fruhlinger - Managing Editor, Engadget/Switched
Google Answers

Ask a question. Set your price. Get your answer.

More than 500 carefully screened Researchers are ready to answer your question for as little as $2.50 -- usually within 24 hours. Your satisfaction is completely guaranteed.

Find out what others are saying.

Step 1 - Enter your Question. Tips for great results.

Log in or
Create a Google Account

Search Google Answers for

Browse previously asked questions

Arts and Entertainment  Reference, Education and News
Business and Money  Relationships and Society
Computers  Science

Recently answered questions

Business information systems
Have these guys sent troops to 'Ope...
Home Theater Connections
Pod shovel
1. Who will answer my question?
   Your question will be answered by a Researcher. Google Answers Researchers are experts at locating hard-to-find information on the web, and through offline resources as well. Your question may also receive comments from other registered users who can volunteer suggestions and advice at no additional charge to you. Researchers must go through an application process that tests their research skills and the quality of their answers. Google also spot-checks their answers once they've been approved. If a Google editor sees a problem with an answer, that answer will be pulled and your question will be put back into the system. You are strongly encouraged to provide feedback on the quality of the response you receive by ranking the answer returned by the Researcher. If the Researcher's rating falls below a certain level or the Researcher has several returned questions, he or she will no longer be allowed to respond to questions as part of the Google Answers service.

2. What is the difference between a Google Answers Researcher and a registered user?
   Google Answers Researchers are screened and approved independent contractors who are paid for posting "answers" to the site. Registered users can ask questions and post comments to the site. However, they cannot post "answers." Users are neither paid for comments that they post, nor are they charged for comments that are posted to the questions that they ask.

3. Are Researchers experts in their field?
   All Google Researchers are tested to ensure that they are expert searchers with excellent communication skills. Some of them also have expertise in various fields. Your question may be answered by an expert in a particular field or by an expert searcher. Either way, if you are unsatisfied with your answer for any reason, you may apply for a full refund.

4. How does Google make sure Researchers provide high quality answers?
   Google Answers has a stringent process for screening Researchers before they're allowed to participate. Each applicant must write an essay explaining why he or she wants to take part in the program and successfully answer a number of test questions. Once Researchers begin answering live questions, you're encouraged to rate their responses to ensure they continue to provide useful information. If an individual's rating falls below an acceptable level, he or she will no longer be allowed to participate as a Researcher.
1. Who will answer my question?
   Your question will be answered by a Researcher. Google Answers Researchers are experts at locating hard-to-find information on the web, and through offline resources as well. Your question may also receive comments from other registered users who can volunteer suggestions and advice at no additional charge to you. Researchers must go through an application process that tests their research skills and the quality of their answers. Google also spot-checks their answers once they've been approved. If a Google editor sees a problem with an answer, that answer will be pulled and your question will be put back into the system. You are strongly encouraged to provide feedback on the quality of the response you receive by ranking the answer returned by the Researcher. If the Researcher's rating falls below a certain level or the Researcher has several returned questions, he or she will no longer be allowed to respond to questions as part of the Google Answers service.

2. What is the difference between a Google Answers Researcher and a registered user?
   Google Answers Researchers are screened and approved before being "posted" to the site. Registered users can ask questions and post "answers." Users are neither paid for comments that are posted to the questions that they ask.

3. Are Researchers experts in their field?
   All Google Researchers are tested to ensure that they have a certain level of expertise in a particular field or by an expert searcher. Either way, if you aren't satisfied, there is a money-back guarantee. You can apply for a full refund.

4. How does Google make sure Researchers provide useful answers?
   Google Answers has a stringent process for screening Researchers before they're allowed to participate. Each applicant must write an essay explaining why he or she wants to take part in the program and successfully answer a number of test questions. Once Researchers begin answering live questions, you're encouraged to rate their responses to ensure they continue to provide useful information. If an individual's rating falls below an acceptable level, he or she will no longer be allowed to participate as a Researcher.

Refaeli et al 2007: Money matters some, interestingness to the community matters at least as much
Welcome to Yahoo! Answers.

It's the one place where the world shares what they know to help each other out. And it's all for free.

With Yahoo! Answers you can:
Ask a Question.
Posting a question is easier than buttering your toast. After all, you're now part of the world's biggest think tank.
Go for it. Ask your question.

Answer a Question.
The depth of your knowledge is, well, deep. So dig some up. Share it. No matter who you are, you've got the real-life insight or scholarly nugget that will make someone's day.
Answer a question or two.
Google Answers is no longer accepting questions.

We're sorry, but Google Answers has been retired, and is no longer accepting new questions. Search or browse the existing Google Answers index by using the search box above or the category links below.

- Arts and Entertainment
- Business and Money
- Computers
- Family and Home
- Heath
- Reference, Education and News
- Relationships and Society
- Science
- Sports and Recreation
- Miscellaneous

Google Home - Answers FAQ - Terms of Service - Privacy Policy

©2008 Google
Harper/Refaeli groups 2008:
Money improves quality & quantity but community matters greatly, is sensitive to design, and seems to do better than lone expertise.
Calculation

- Free and open source software
  - Lakhani & Wolf; Ghosh et al
    - ~50% get paid, some directly, some indirectly; No obvious adverse effects
- Self reported motivations
  - Enjoyment intellectual stimulation (44%)
  - building skills (33%)
  - fairness, reciprocity—giving back to the community (28%)
  - pleasure of working in team (20%)
  - FOSS primary source of identity (80%)
Calculation

- Free and open source software
- Self reported motivations
- No crowding out
  - $ do not entail control, no rejection of autonomy (Lakhani & Wolf; O'Mahoney; Berdou)
The Guild

"The Guild" is a sitcom webisode about a group of online gamers, created by Felicia Day from "Buffy."

Visit the Channel and Subscribe!

Popular Now  Highest Rated  Most Viewed

Britain's Got Talent Semi Final - Signature - Suleman Mirza

Yesterday

Rated 3.97 | 2,353 Views | 1 Comments
Britain's Got Talent - Semi Final. The popular Michael Jackson impersonator, Suleman Mirza along with Madhu Singh (Signature) perform Thr...
From sajadhaider More Entertainment, Music & Dance

Light Saber Fight (China), Must Watch Video!

40 mins. ago

Rated 3.67 | 551 Views | 4 Comments | Producer Rewards: Cандidate
Amazing light saber fighter girls from China showing amazing talent.
From zorabian More Entertainment, Sports

Amazing Archer

Yesterday

Rated 3.63 | 9,616 Views | 9 Comments
This archer balances on her hands and then shoots an arrow with her feet.
From baserunner12345 More Entertainment

http://www.metacafe.com/top_videos/music_and_dance/
Metacafe's Producer Rewards™ program rewards you for creating and submitting great videos.

**How it works**
If your video has what it takes to entertain people, we want to license it and pay you for every view. Every time someone watches your video on Metacafe, you earn money.

**How you make money**
Metacafe will pay you $5 for every thousand views your video gets on our site. Payment starts after your video reaches 20,000 views and has a rating of 3.00 or higher - which tells us that the viewers like the video. On top of that, the license to Metacafe is a non-exclusive deal - you retain ownership of your video. Metacafe helps build your brand by marketing your content and making you money.

**What's the potential?**
With well over 1 million unique users per day watching over 400 million videos every month, Metacafe is perfectly placed to deliver the most receptive audience to the most entertaining content. Whether it's something spontaneous in your home or something you've scripted, if it entertains, it has a place on Metacafe.

**What are the requirements?**
For a video to qualify for Producer Rewards, you must own all the rights to the video and the video must meet certain content guidelines. Please see How Do I Qualify For Producer Rewards? for details.

**Get started now!**
Upload your video now to Producer Rewards and start earning
Still can’t decide? Take a coin, assign one channel to heads, one channel to tails, then flip it. Later, see a counselor about how you let coins shape your life.

Q: **How does the video submission process work?**
A: Once you submit a video, it’s converted into the format we use and distributed to our army of reviewers. These reviewers are fearless volunteers who dare to receive freshly submitted videos, view them without any warnings, rate them and report them if they violate Metacafe guidelines. This review process can take a few hours or up to seven days. Waiting’s a drag, but it’s a small price to pay for a clutter-free site. Plus, you’ll be notified of the video’s status throughout the process. (For more on the Review Process, see below.)

Q: **I requested the removal of a video; but now, when I try to resubmit the video, the site says that the file already exists. What’s up with that?**
A: Damn gremlins. Always gumming up the works when they don’t get their union-mandated snack breaks. If you encounter this problem, please contact us and we’ll remove the video file completely, enabling you to resubmit your video.

**Review Process:**

Q: **I received an e-mail that states, “Your submitted item is now being distributed for review.” Why can’t I find it on the site?**
A: Your video is still being reviewed by Metacafe reviewers. The e-mail is to let you know that the review process has just begun. If the video survives the review process, it will be released to the site for public consumption. You’ll get status reports throughout the process, which could take a few hours or up to seven days.

Q: **I received an E-mail that states, “Your video was found problematic due to...” What does that mean?**
A: The reviewers found problems with your video in terms of quality or content. The content team reviews items with this status and tries to release the ones that have been labeled wrongly.

Q: **My video was removed for being “copyrighted,” but this is my video. What’s going on?**
Trust

- A feature of a system or social state
  - different societies have different levels of trust and tolerance for betrayal (Bohent & Zeckhauser)
- A personal state susceptible to chemical manipulation
  - oxytocin study Kosfeld et al; Zak, massage...
- Feedback: in experimental trust games, trust is greeted with positive reciprocity
Trust

- A belief people hold about what others will do to them or for them when *not determined by the system of interaction*
  - e.g. credit card vs. “I'll pay you Friday”
- Risk is a precondition to trust
  - “confidence building measures” are a series of relatively low-stakes opportunities for mutual risk-taking with transparency built in to allow observation
  - “trusted systems” characterize confidence in the performance of a system, not trust in human beings
Transparency

- **Who** is doing **what**, to and **with whom**, to **what effect**, by **which mechanism**
  - Nowak & Sigmund (2005): did indirect reciprocity push cognitive development because of need to keep track of multiple layers of action and reciprocal response?
  - Fehr & Gaechter: Cooperation sustained sooner and longer in “Partner” than “Stranger” treatments
Transparency

- **Who** is doing **what**, **to and with whom**, **to** what effect, **by which mechanism**

- **Transparency of agents, actions, processes, and outcomes**
  - central to the discussion of common property regimes; Ostrom 1991; Smith 2000); law and social norms literature

- **Tension, if not conflict, between collaboration and privacy**
Transparency

• Transparency + Memory = Reputation
  • identity/reputation systems central to collaboration
    • work on trading networks (Greif; Bernstein)
    • not necessarily “real” identity; but stable (Resnick/Zeckhauser on eBay)
Leadership, asymmetry

- Leaders important in observational work
- Power law contributions are not free riding, but leadership
- Building flexibility into the system to accommodate diverse levels of contribution important
  - As opposed to focusing on eliminating “free riding,” find ways of harnessing and recognizing super-normal contributions
Network structures

- Imitation, learning, influence means that network structure of communications and contribution is important
  - Hanaki et al 2007; Jones & Brosnen 2009
  - Fowler & Christakis (happiness; obesity)
- Network reciprocity
  - Selective connection to create higher average payoffs from encounters within network. Nowak 2006
Cooperative Human Systems Design

- Integrated systems: technical, institutional, organizational, and social
  - Handoff between the various systems as necessary and feasible
- Diverse motivations: diverse types or probabilities of behaviour
- Several sources to formulate working hypotheses about intervention points
  - Sociality Enabling System Elements
- Need for experimentation and testing, both in the lab and in the wild