

8. REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. Bradley and M. E. Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3-4):324–345, 1952.
- [2] H. P. Chan, T. Zhao, and I. King. Trust-aware peer assessment using multi-armed bandit algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web, Companion Volume*, pages 899–903, 2016.
- [3] L. de Alfaro and M. Shavlovsky. Crowdgrader: a tool for crowdsourcing the evaluation of homework assignments. In *The 45th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*, pages 415–420, 2014.
- [4] L. de Alfaro and M. Shavlovsky. Dynamics of peer grading: An empirical study. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Educational Data Mining*, pages 62–69, 2016.
- [5] S. Geman and D. Geman. Stochastic relaxation, gibbs distributions, and the bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 6(6):721–741, 1984.
- [6] P. Gutierrez, N. Osman, and C. Sierra. Collaborative assessment. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference of the Catalan Association for Artificial Intelligence*, pages 136–145, 2014.
- [7] M. I. Jordan. Graphical models. *Statistical Science*, pages 140–155, 2004.
- [8] C. E. Kulkarni, P. W. Wei, H. Le, D. J. hao Chia, K. Papadopoulos, J. Cheng, D. Koller, and S. R. Klemmer. Peer and self assessment in massive online classes. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.*, 20(6):33, 2013.
- [9] R. D. Luce. *Individual choice behavior: A theoretical analysis*. Courier Corporation, 2005.
- [10] H. Ma, H. Yang, M. R. Lyu, and I. King. Sorec: social recommendation using probabilistic matrix factorization. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 931–940, 2008.
- [11] C. L. Mallows. Non-null ranking models. i. *Biometrika*, pages 114–130, 1957.
- [12] F. Mi and D. Yeung. Probabilistic graphical models for boosting cardinal and ordinal peer grading in MOOCs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 454–460, 2015.
- [13] L. Page, S. Brin, R. Motwani, and T. Winograd. The pagerank citation ranking: bringing order to the web. 1999.
- [14] D. E. Paré and S. Joordens. Peering into large lectures: examining peer and expert mark agreement using peerscholar, an online peer assessment tool. *J. Comp. Assisted Learning*, 24(6):526–540, 2008.
- [15] C. Piech, J. Huang, Z. Chen, C. B. Do, A. Y. Ng, and D. Koller. Tuned models of peer assessment in MOOCs. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Educational Data Mining*, pages 153–160, 2013.
- [16] K. Raman and T. Joachims. Methods for ordinal peer grading. In *The 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1037–1046, 2014.
- [17] K. Raman and T. Joachims. Bayesian ordinal peer grading. In *Proceedings of the Second ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale*, pages 149–156, 2015.
- [18] F. P. Ribeiro, D. A. F. Florêncio, and V. H. Nascimento. Crowdsourcing subjective image quality evaluation. In *18th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pages 3097–3100, 2011.
- [19] F. P. Ribeiro, D. A. F. Florêncio, C. Zhang, and M. L. Seltzer. CROWDMOS: an approach for crowdsourcing mean opinion score studies. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pages 2416–2419, 2011.
- [20] M. S. M. Sajjadi, M. Alamgir, and U. von Luxburg. Peer grading in a course on algorithms and data structures: Machine learning algorithms do not improve over simple baselines. In *Proceedings of the Third ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale*, pages 369–378, 2016.
- [21] N. B. Shah, J. K. Bradley, A. Parekh, M. Wainwright, and K. Ramchandran. A case for ordinal peer-evaluation in MOOCs. In *NIPS Workshop on Data Driven Education*, 2013.
- [22] P. Singla and M. Richardson. Yes, there is a correlation: - from social networks to personal behavior on the web. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 655–664, 2008.
- [23] T. Walsh. The peerrank method for peer assessment. In *European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 909–914, 2014.
- [24] A. E. Waters, D. Tinapple, and R. G. Baraniuk. Bayesrank: A bayesian approach to ranked peer grading. In *Proceedings of the Second ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale*, pages 177–183, 2015.
- [25] F. L. Wauthier, M. I. Jordan, and N. Jojic. Efficient ranking from pairwise comparisons. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 109–117, 2013.
- [26] Q. Wu, H. Wang, Q. Gu, and H. Wang. Contextual bandits in a collaborative environment. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 529–538, 2016.
- [27] S. Yang, B. Long, A. J. Smola, N. Sadagopan, Z. Zheng, and H. Zha. Like like alike: joint friendship and interest propagation in social networks. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 537–546, 2011.
- [28] T. Zhao, J. Hu, P. He, H. Fan, M. R. Lyu, and I. King. Exploiting homophily-based implicit social network to improve recommendation performance. In *2014 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, pages 2539–2547, 2014.
- [29] T. Zhao, J. J. McAuley, and I. King. Leveraging social connections to improve personalized ranking for collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM International Conference on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 261–270, 2014.
- [30] C. Ziegler and J. Golbeck. Investigating interactions of trust and interest similarity. *Decision Support Systems*, 43(2):460–475, 2007.