Notes from meeting with David:

Focus on examples of contingency checking about other people:

* Chess
* Tennis
* Joint cooking
* Turing test
* Ordering at Chipotle
* Conversation

Counterexample (in a sense): videogames where the structure of the environment is set up such that it is impossible to not coordinate and cooperate in many ways because the environment will not allow it.

Read the Turing Test paper

Three types of responses:

1. There are things that are expected
2. There are things that are not expected, but are consistent
3. There are things that are inconsistent

Ex: when cooking, if I ask you to beat the eggs, you could:

1. Crack the eggs in the bowl and beat them (expected)
2. Crack the eggs in the bowl and go to the restroom, and I will beat them instead (not expected, but consistent)
3. Crack the eggs in a frying pan and cook them over easy. (inconsistent)

The same is true with other cases such as language.

We can explore these examples using contingency tables and similar discrete structures whilst keeping open the idea that there people do not have discrete decision lists, but models of the world in which they more continuously predict and model consistent actions.

Such models enable us to establish conceptual alignment as well as to establish coordination in a broader sense. They also relate to modeling an understanding of the non-agentic external world.

What are the differences between modeling the non-agentic external world and the agentic external world?

What is added to coordinating actions in order to reason about the internal representations of another?

* Does it require inference about similarity with respect to the relations between the external actions and the internal states and causes behind the actions?
* Does it require generalization across instances and uses of the concepts?

Language is almost always learned in context. How do we learn to separate the components of the language into componential meanings? Meanings clearly do not lie in the word or even in the expression, but in the context and the expression system. The words do not have explicit and discrete meanings, but they play roles in the generation of meanings. An important question in language learning is how do we learn to assign credit to the components of the meaning such that they can be used in novel scenarios with predictable effects? Is there a version of cross-situational language learning that can model how this works and how meaning components become associated with words and with sentences and with expressions and with different size structures in general?

When you learn word meanings, you learn them from another person.

How do we learn what the word “thoroughly” means?

Explore these contingency relations in these circumscribed areas and then later apply it to language.

Investigate “repairs” to coordination.

Read some of the scripts literature to make sure that I am not repeating their mistakes.

Moves in the game:

“compensate” “negotiate” “repair” “power” “dominance” “stalemate” “dropping out” “questions” “ignoring” “denial”

He says: “maybe you want a taxonomy of questions”

**A big prior is that the people want to cooperate**

Giving the benefit of the doubt is also a strategy often employed. Helps the appearance of coordination, may hurt coordination.

**Develop a concept of “margin of error.” How far can they be off whilst the system continues to work. How far can the alignment be off and the system still work?**