Arguing on the Web 2.0

Proposal: We need a better basis for democratic decisionmaking
participation

Assumption: Large scale communications helps to reach better decisions because beneficial information is likely not to be forgotten (cf. Page Scott, "diversity")
better decisions

Projekt A: The argumentative knowledge-database

How can we benefit from the wisdom of the crowd for better decisions and participation?

The Argument Web: Let's create a Wikipedia of Arguments!
better decisions, participation

How to create?

Transform written messages (e.g. comments in a forum) into argument diagrams

How can we analyse huge volumes of data for arguments?

Argument Mining & NLP

Which kind of messages should we take into consideration?

See (lower right): specifities of internet-communication

"Even if someone discusses problems of his personal relationship on an online forum, there will be some aspects of that discussions which can be generalized for use in other cases."

Collaborative Argument Mapping (e.g., Deliberatorium)

How to create a self-organizing teams of editors?

Invent taskrouting-tools for managing the argument web

What kind of tasks should or can be split an delegated?

Guide ideation towards gaps or pareto front

Detecting and fixing balcanization

What are people's actually incentives to engage in such an activity?

Look for specifities of internet-communication (see lower right)

How to make use of the argumentative knowlege-base?

Collaborative argument evaluation: See "judgement" (on the right)

Individual use: Build decision support systems that make use of the database (e.g., MARKOS-project).

Use plattforms for open innovation
better decisions

How to filter ideas?

(...)

Concerning argument reconstruction and diagramming:

What is a good reconstruction of an argument?

What is a good reconstruction of argumentative processes on the web?

Look for specifities of internet-communication

How can argument reconstructions lead to judgements and decisions?

Project B: Rational Civics

Assumption: Internet users should be more engaged in rational practices which take advantage of the potential that the internet offers.
education, engagement, participation

How can we promote more rationality?

Again: Let's create a Wikipedia of Arguments!

What we need: "Not only an informative space": Personal narratives. Finding together. Empowerment. The "Wikipedia of debates" cannot provide this.
engagement

"One problem with online argumentation: in offline dialogical settings, feedback mechanism are used to tailor arguments to a specific respondent. This approach, which has beneficial effects (because it makes people accept arguments), is hardly available when engaging in large-scale online argumentation or when communicating via argument maps" (Hugo Mercier)

Enable deliberation with adequate tools
education, engagement

Deliberation is conducive to good decisions.

How?

Use argumentation techniques to stimulate deliberation which is conducive to good decisions.

"We need a doodle for arguments" (Collaboration in virtual teams)

Establish better educational resources
education

Rational public discourse & politics leads to TRUTH

There are many known types of situations where argumentative discourse doesn't lead to truth, but to polarization and confirmation of existing positions

For many problems in democratic decisionmaking a single best option or true option does not exist. Therefore, it cannot be expected (a) that rational discourse will lead to a consensus and (b) that rational discourse will converge on the 'truth'. (Keyword: epistemic democracy)

Better satisfaction of informed/deliberated preferences on an individual basis

---

Task: Evaluating Arguments

We want to profit from the collective judgement of internet users in evaluating arguments. How can we do that?

How can judgement on complex issues be harvested?

Nonlinear negotiation: Approach for reaching group-decisions on interconnected issues

Where does the crowd deliver good performance in evaluating arguments?

Investigate which heuristics people use. Then test performance of these heuristics.
better decisions

What are the heuristics that people use in order to evaluate arguments?

(...)

Investigate where users trust the wisdom of the crowd more then the expert
participation

Democratic Participation

Better Decisions.

Point of information: Specifities of online-communication. What (if anything) is peculiar about deliberation in the web?

Online deliberation has the structure of a polylogue

Web deliberation follows the same patterns as other forms of deliberation. See for instance Walton's typology

Online-argumentative discourse is organized by powerful interest-groups

Walton's typology of dialogues is not apt for understanding messages on the web

Deliberative action on the web can be classified according to five categories (which all are not part of Walton's typology):
_recreation
_information
_instruction
_discussion
_reccommendation
(Source: Sharoff 2011)

EXPLORAT
Facilitation & Consulting