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Abstract

Online social networks have come out as effective crowdsourcing platforms in recent days. However, issues about how to exploit them need to be addressed. Here, we investigate the reliability and effectiveness of multimedia-involved behavioral testing via social network-based crowdsourcing, especially focusing on Facebook as a medium to recruit participants. By conducting a crowdsourcing-based experiment for a music recommendation problem, we show that different methods for advertisements yield different degrees of efficiency and that there are significant differences in behavioral patterns across genders and age groups. Also, we compare our experiment with other multimedia-involved crowdsourcing experiments built on Amazon Mechanical Turk, which suggest that social network-based crowdsourcing experiments can achieve comparable efficiency. Based on the analysis of the results, the advantages and disadvantages of social network-based crowdsourcing experiments and suggestions for successful experiments will be discussed. We conclude that social networks have the potential to serve as effective platforms for behavioral tests to gather in-depth data over time.

# Introduction

Currently, online crowdsourcing has been one of the most widely used methods to conduct large-scale behavioral experiments. Compared to the traditional way of performing offline experiments, crowdsourcing on the Internet can collect large data sources with minimal effort to recruit participants, establish the experimental environments and run the experiments (Wu et al., 2013). In addition, the quality of experimental results from crowdsourcing is almost the same as that from offline-recruited participants (Casler et al., 2013).

##

**[Humanities Passage]**

*2.1. Country (Music) Maleness is a Conflicted Identity.*

Country music can be perceived as opposing a norm, by valuing traditional masculinity and conservational values over mainstream diversity (Tremmel 1995; Knox 2000; Bernstein 2016). A claim that runs counter to this view is that rural conservative masculinity remains the most masculine ideal in the United States (O’Reilly 2016). This interplay between urban and country reflects [Connell](https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/8/6/176/htm#B10-socsci-08-00176)’s (1995) assertion that the dominant or hegemonic form of masculinity at a certain place or time will be contested with the masculine ideals that are glorified in the country genre. This exists in contrast not only to the feminine ideals present within the genre, but with the masculine images present in rock, rap and other genres. In effect, while country music maleness can be marginal or oppositional outside of the country music audience, it can, at the same time, be the hegemonic ideal within that audience.

According to Casey (2003), country music men were often negotiating an oppositional rockabilly masculinity that Elvis and his contemporaries forged on postwar America. This identity was a European, rural ideal in resistance to the “man in the suit”. The outlaw movement of the 70s carried on with this ethos, standing hard against mainstream rock music and the Nashville establishment (Kerry, 2014; Walton, 2016). Today, country performers similarly attempt to defy expectations, embracing a traditional yet stylized, rural identity in opposition to the urban metrosexual (Carroll et al., 2006).

[Peters](https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/8/6/176/htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22B50-socsci-08-00176) (2000) and [Ch](https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/8/6/176/htm#B9-socsci-08-00176)an (2000) split country music as a genre, into two forms being “hard” and “soft”, with “hard-shell” or “hard country” referring to specific artists who are seen as “outsiders”, and “soft” describing those that are “mainstream” country artists.. While mainstream, or “soft” country, is flirting with pop stylings, “hard” country remains true to, at the very least, some concept of its roots and continues to have any other country alternatives labeled as “not real country” (Peters, 2000; Regan, 2013).