

Theoretical premise: Responsive exchange of knowledge and ideas  
(v9.5.3)

This document provides tag definitions and some illuminating examples.

Discursive moves that potentially promote the discussion (due to high responsiveness and exchange of new knowledge)	Visualization code	Tag
<p>Moderating /regulating /explicit offering structure and navigation of the discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “let’s go back to the discussion topic”</li> <li>- comments when the appropriateness of the discussion is at stake,</li> <li>- specific plea to focus on the discussion topic</li> <li>- “I’d suggest reading up to the table of contents to get a good grasp on the definition of power...ll, and If we manage to establish some common ground on this... I’ll give you some arguments towards some of the contracts you mentioned.”</li> <li>- “that was not what the OP meant”</li> </ul>	2	CA
<p>Request/invitation for clarification</p> <p>“I’m not sure I understand”, “did you mean...”, ... “if I understand you correctly...”</p>	3	CBA
<p>Request for / comment on the need or the lack of evidence/information. comment on/request for clarification on the methodology of the argument.</p> <p>“can you give me an example?” “do you have any reference that support...”, “based on what”?</p> <p>13. The_Real_Mongoose :&gt;&gt;&gt; That [a sources the previous speaker quoted] was published 17 years ago, and this is a rapidly changing field. One gets the impression that you went searching specifically for criticisms that might support your point</p>	15	CBO
<p>Clarification.</p> <p>When a speaker clarifies a previous utterance(a) of their own, (b) of others, when he or she feels something in the conversation was not understood.</p> <p>This is different than REP, b/c it has high addressivity to previous utterances.</p> <p>“Perhaps I need to clarify...I, I wasn’t understood”, “what I meant was...”</p>	11	CBK
<p>Answer*</p> <p>An informative answer of a question asked (not argumentative)</p> <p>*when hesitating between ANS and CBK (clarification), use CBK, ANS is when it is not about clarifying previous claim but rather answering a question</p>	17	ANS
<p>Counter argument</p> <p>A disagreement which is reasoned , a refutation.</p> <p>in CBE the reason refers to the core of the claim made in the previous response (if the reason refers to something ancillary that was said and the core of the argument is ignored code it as CBJ).</p> <p>Sometime the previous response can include several claims /ideas/reasons-- the current response could refer only to one of those. In this case make the judgement --if a main reason is addressed , code it as CBE (perhaps CBN)</p>	6	CBE
<p>Extension – building/extending previous argument (w/o negation or disagreement ).</p> <p>When the speaker takes the idea of the previous speaker and extends it.</p>	9	CBF
<p>Bringing up a new meaningful point , emerging from and relating to what was previously discussed.</p> <p>e.g., discussion of female roles in Star Wars transforms to a discussion on social agenda, and then to political agenda and racism</p>	18	CBN

Reasoning involves a personal statement e.g., “this has happened to me too” e.g., “ I do like to think I'm mentally competent enough to choose the most optimal life path regarding this matter, even if you think I'm mentally ill.”	8	CBL
moves with low responsiveness/ or nothing new		
Any event of low responsiveness to previous speaker plus a feeling that the conversation is going to a bad place (squabbling and quarreling ) . it can come alone or with addition to the following moves with low responsiveness.  example 1: 2. PennyLisa :>>> But this would incentivise fast food chains introducing healthy options because they're now less expensive to sell relative to the unhealthy food. Couple that with a small increase in welfare paid for by the higher taxes to cover it and everyone wins! Oh hang on, this is the USA. Bigger taxes are a commie plot right? 3. abutthole :>>> That last sentence just burnt up all desire I had to engage with you. (BAD+SA) 4. PennyLisa :>>> *shrug* that's been used plenty as an argument against government expansion in the USA.  example 2: the conversation is about the difference between the terms wage and earnings - 48 is coded BAD+SAC 47. Mitoza :>>> No, my accusation that your argument was dishonest, not my hypothetical accusation. The hypothetical was demonstrating why it was dishonest, and why you shouldn't have to correct me in order for your position not to be taken for granted. To be intellectually honest would be for me to not take your position for granted in the first place. Get it? <quote>Yeah I get that</quote> No, you don't get that, because you haven't retracted your dishonest statements. 48. goodolarchie :>>> <quote> No, you don't get that, because you haven't retracted your dishonest statements.</quote> Fine, I retract my assumption that you understand the difference between wages and earnings . You apparently don't as you just admitted that statement was dishonest (BAD +SAC)		BAD
Repetition* - one is going back in the discussion one indication is the use of “again”, the idea is that no real new knowledge or shade of knowledge is evident). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to code when one repeats previous statements</li> <li>if there is some sort of flavor of clarification add CBK</li> <li>make a judgment call between something that sound repetitive and yet there is certain amount of newness (e.g. same idea in different words or <b>one is entrenching (chewing its cud)</b> --the golden rules is that a third time the same idea is expressed is probably repetition---</li> </ul> example 1 - in response 10 speaker explicitly state it is a repetition:  8. jm0112358 :>>> <quote> Similarly, feeding a human who happens to be gay is different from catering an event specifically celebrating their marriage. They are different things.</quote> If the _only_ reason you're not catering an event celebrating their marriage is because they're a same-sex couple, then you're discriminating on the basis that they're a same-sex couple. If you	7	REP

<p>cater for weddings, but not for "gay weddings", that's exactly what you're doing. The fact that you might serve that couple in other contexts doesn't change that.</p> <p>9. Holophonist :&gt;&gt;&gt; I think you can need to re-read this comment chain. I'm explaining that there is a <b>**difference**</b> between not serving a person and not serving an event that celebrates an action or behavior. I don't care that you think it's similar <b>*in one specific way*</b>, what I'm doing is showing that there is a difference. And BTW, OP accepted and understood the difference.</p> <p>10. jm0112358 :&gt;&gt;&gt; <b>&lt;quote&gt; I'm explaining that there is a difference between not serving a person and not serving an event that celebrates an action or behavior.&lt;/quote&gt; And I'm explaining that if you're willing to serve an event that celebrates an action or behavior of an opposite-sex couple, but unwilling to provide the exact same service for the exact same event for a same-sex couple, you're denying service based the characteristics of the persons involved.</b></p> <p>11. Holophonist :&gt;&gt;&gt; <b>Like I said, I don't care what you think about that, because at this particular moment it's not what I'm talking about. I explained that there is a difference between the two scenarios, because there is. You might think it's bad <b>*anyway*</b>, but that's a different discussion. I said the analogy elucidates the difference between the two things and you said "No, it doesn't" You are incorrect.</b></p> <p>example 2 - The same things are repeated in 18, 20 and 22 - the last one was coded as rep.</p> <p>18. Tgunner192 :&gt;&gt;&gt; Notice how wages isn't listed as a synonym for earnings? You earn your wages, you don't wage your earnings.</p> <p>19. Mitoza :&gt;&gt;&gt; What are you talking about? It's the second listed. Earnings is listed as a synonym for wage as well. Shall I screenshot them for you and circle them in bright pink so that you can see them? That's also not how synonyms work at all. I'm not wasting anymore time on this actually. Goodbye.</p> <p>20. Tgunner192 :&gt;&gt;&gt; No, it did not. I looked it up before posting. In closing, I believe there is a difference between an earnings gap and a wage gap. You, apparently believe there is no difference yet still find it important to promote the difference a wage gap, I wonder why . . .</p> <p>21. Mitoza :&gt;&gt;&gt; I know I promised that I wouldn't waste any more time on this, but the alternative facts disgust me. <a href="http://imgur.com/a/pbca4">http://imgur.com/a/pbca4</a> Here's a screenshot. There is no difference, the only defense of there being one is your imagination. I don't know what the implication is that I insist on calling it a wage gap, because I've been describing the phenomenon accurately throughout this thread. I eagerly await your concession now that I've directly shown you the evidence. Or am I meant to circle it for you?</p> <p>22. Tgunner192 :&gt;&gt;&gt; <b>Earnings is listed as a synonym for wage but wage isn't listed as a synonym for earnings. Why is it so difficult for you to admit this? If you really believed they meant the same thing, you wouldnt care if I (or anyone else) referred to the difference between men and woman's pay as an earnings gap. But you do care and are trying everything you can to try to keep me from referring to it as an earnings gap, it's not working.(REP)</b></p>		
<p>Response to ancillary /distract the discussion (נטפל לטפל/מסיט את הדיון) often it is used to negate to the previous speaker, yet not referring to the core of what was said , but rather to the ancillary</p>	13	CBJ
<p>Ad hominem - when the reason to negation is the speaker and not the argument ("you have no right to make this claim because you did not serve in the army)</p>	4	CBB
<p>Negation/disagreement w/o reasoning</p>	5	CBD
<p>Agreement or convergence towards previous speaker</p>	12	CBG
<p>"Thanks for pointing that out. I'll be sure to be more careful of this in the future."</p>		

<p>11. The_Real_Mongoose :&gt;&gt;&gt; Whats the source of that quote? )CBO(</p> <p>12. electronics12345 :&gt;&gt;&gt;  <a href="https://www.scribd.com/document/31270608/effectiveness-of-second-language-instruction">https://www.scribd.com/document/31270608/effectiveness-of-second-language-instruction</a>  Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A Research Synthesis and Quantitative Meta-analysis Authors - John M. Norris, Lourdes Ortega  Its a meta-analysis about second language learning generally, but includes consciousness raising. (ANS, SRC)</p> <p>13. The_Real_Mongoose :&gt;&gt;&gt; That was published 17 years ago, and this is a rapidly changing field. One gets the impression that you went searching specifically for criticisms that might support your point rather than for the best and most recent information available. (CBO) And despite that, straight from the abstract:  &lt;quote&gt;sufficient data indicated that focused L2 instruction results in large target-oriented gains, **that explicit types of instruction are more effective than implicit types**,and that **Focus on Form and Focus on Forms interventions result in equivalent and large effects**.&lt;/quote&gt; Now if you're not well versed in the L2 literature, (or if you just did a ctr+f for consciousness raising) you probably wouldn't have understood the significance of these statements, but what this is saying is that L2 instruction is more effective when students are made consciously aware of the language that they are learning.</p> <p>14. electronics12345 :&gt;&gt;&gt; Honestly (SC) I searched for the most recent meta-analysis on the subject. If you have a more recent one - give it to me. I understand effect size, and effect size is important, but not more important than the underlying validity. If you cannot ascertain the validity of a study or meta-analysis, the p-values, the effect sizes, none of that matters. Also, if the most recent meta-analysis is really from 17 years ago, that's pretty bad.(CBG)</p>		
<p>Announcement that the issue is not solvable : “I have no evidence/ there is no one true answer “, “let’s agree to disagree”, “I’m out”, “I see what you’re saying we will never agree”. note that in CBZ there is certain legitimacy to the other’s voice (or at least his/her voice is not delegitimized/ignored) . this is not CBZ: “this is a waste of time. i’m off”</p> <p>3. Celtabria :&gt;&gt;&gt; If they shouldn't be punished for genetics and experiences though why should I be punished for their actions, metabolism and me being poor? Either way we argue one side is getting screwed - obese people from genetics and experiences, me and people like me from having to pay more because of obesity and health problems unrelated to us. But imo one is people's natural choices and ultimately in their control, the other is artificially put in place and screwing me over when to go to buy ramen noodles or crisps. Just stating I don't agree with it though and those are my reasons, I respect yours but I doubt we'll see eye to eye on this and won't be getting into a long debate. I see the merits of your side (CBZ)but from a selfish pov I don't feel like I should get punished for the actions of others, nor healthy people like me who occasionally enjoy a packet of crisps or a chocolate bar.</p> <p>4. HuntforMusic :&gt;&gt;&gt; Absolutely agree. I've thought about this quite a bit, and either way there will be a detractor from someone's life, neither of which can help it in the slightest (CBG). So are you for removing subsidies entirely? Or just against switching the current subsidies for meat/dairy to healthier foods?(CBA)</p>	16	CBZ

<b>Tone/style</b>		
Aggressive/blatant/unpleasant (which is not captured by SAB, SAC, SAS) (including intensifying qualifiers) , e.g., “this is stupid”, “I’m not suggesting that, it is already a known fact”		SA
Ridicule the other’s idea		SAB
Direct negative addressing of the other –accusing one in inappropriate behavior “you were rude to me”, “you are ridiculous”		SAC
Sarcasm/ cynicism + patronizing “Cool. Okay, so you're at least consistent. Lets keep pushing forward.”  <b>I'm stubborn. It's often very difficult to tell when someone is arguing in bad faith, or just struggling to be charitable. I'm going to keep going as of this point. I think there's a chance we can get to some common ground.</b>  “13. DawgDatsAGreatPost: >>> I did. As per Merriam-Webster: <quote> Gender: the state of being male or female.</quote> I only see two choices there. What? Merriam-Webster is "wrong" too? 14. EighthScofflaw: >>> <b>Good, I'm glad you read the whole definition.</b> <quote>(typically used with reference to social and cultural differences rather than biological ones)</quote> <b>Good job.</b> ”		SAS
Positive tone: respectful, flattering , socially unifying, empathetic , use of humor , thanking , attempts to reduce tension  “what you’re telling is awful”, “maybe I had to be more clear”, “we only exchange ideas, we don’t fight”		SC
Weakening qualifiers (e.g., “I’m not an expert in this topic...”, “I don’t want to sound rude” )		SE
Speaker’s reflection of his/her feelings. “I’m moved”, “I feel heart”		SF
<b>(Disagreement) strategies (to apply in addition to counter argument)*</b>  <b>These strategies usually accompany CBE, but can accompany other codes too</b>		
critical question - phrasing the (counter) argument as a question. Not all questions are critical questions. for example, if someone asked a question and then answered it herself, this is not OCQ. +	19	OCQ
softening the blow i.e. saying something nice before or after conveying the disagreement (if disagreement is because it is not relevant , code both)  Expressing superficial consent before objection.(when it feels the intension was to be nice rather than a real agreement) (as opposed to AGB that a consent is real, on a specific part of the claim)  2. C21H27Cl3N2O3 :>>> I never said I don't vote at all. I voted in every election since I turned 18 except for this presidential election, which includes congressional and local elections. 3. galacticsuperkelp :>>> <b>Okay, that's cool. I have no specific criticism for you, I don't know you and you seem nice. I think the act of showing up to vote is the critical point--beyond that you have a right to supreme privacy within the ballot box. What you don't have is a right to not be criticized if you stay home election day.</b> I think this is	20	OSB

<p>something where going through the motions is important--even if it ends with you drawing a dick-pick on your ballot. The simple act of registering and receiving a ballot makes you an important statistic in democracy.</p> <p>2.        Trenks    :&gt;&gt;&gt;       Perhaps, but do they handle it better by willing themselves and gritting their teeth or do they develop a plan/habits/support to help them overcome it? I think OP is talking about the guys who don't actually have an addiction to alcohol saying "I can stop at 1 drink, why can't you? Sure, I feel like another drink sometimes, but I don't do it!" They don't actually feel the same urge so for them to say they just have more will power is disingenuous. <b>But as you said, impossible to measure most of these things.</b></p>		
<p>direct no /direct disagree e.g., "This is just not true"</p>	21	DNO
<p>rephrase and Attack Reframing the previous comment in a way that changes the original meaning/sheds light on the limitations of the argument.</p> <p>3.        cupcakesarethedevil       :&gt;&gt;&gt;       Strawman? No, that's literally how long and how much effort it takes to vote. <b>You are arguing that you shouldn't be criticized though and the easier a thing is to do, the weirder and more irrational you seem for refusing to do it.</b> You don't have to take a shower every day, you don't have to brush your teeth, you don't have to tie your shoes, you don't have to make eye contact, you don't have to respond when people try to talk to you, you don't have to vote, but avoiding doing very simple things like these that could obviously benefit you makes you seem very weird</p>	22	RAA
<p>I agree with part of what you say, but disagree with another part -I disagree only with one part of your text</p>	23	AGB
<p>Irrelevant - expressing that the focal point of the argument is irrelevant to the discussion (either explicit or implicit). explicit : "but this is not the issue", "what does it have to do with?" implicit:</p> <p>4.        sevenkindsofgender:&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;       Possibly, but this isn't addressing the view I set forward, I gave suggestions but I don't really know what the answer is. My view is that reddit has issues with women, and reddit isn't doing enough to make this a safe place for women.</p> <p>5.        ACrusaderA       :&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;       <b>But the goal of Reddit was never to make a safe space for women, or a safe space for anyone.</b></p>	24	IRR
<p>alternative option without directly refuting preceding utterances, offering an alternative (low responsiveness to previous claim)</p>	25	ALO
<p>Taking into account other participants' voices (e.g., foreseeing objections). "I know I'll probably have to eat my hat later...", "you'd say that I..." "what you say is wrong b/c...and even if you right about this point, you are still wrong b/c..."</p>	10	CDV
<p>Breaking the previous argument into small pieces and answering each piece separately without real coherence. Often , &lt;quoting&gt; a segment of previous text, adding a response , &lt;quoting&gt; another segment, adding a response, and so forth.</p> <p>No real coherence or one main argument –but rather a discreet response to each segment.</p> <p>in case there is a segment with internal coherence you can code this segment as well (e.g., after the small pieces comes a coherent argument).</p>		ADT

<p>using a specific source to support a claim (a hyperlink, a specific research and so forth) - use this code only if the specific source can be identified (or retrieved)  don't use if someone talk in "general terms", such as there are studies (not referring to these studies)</p> <p>All this aside, I see the soda companies absorbing the cost [ of taxes]. Going from 10000% to a little less would not be a factor to them, given that soda costs fraction of a fraction of a cent to produce. Especially because isolating out customers due to cost, would cost more than absorbing a small tax. If anything, taxing aluminum would be more effective than taxing sugar in this case.</p> <p>4. Lucas2616 :&gt;&gt;&gt; Cigarettes are not inelastic; see my response to /u/rationalguy2. The 10% soft drink tax in Mexico caused sales to go down by 6%.</p>		SRC
other - another strategy	26	OTH

\*If counter argument simply includes a refutation of the previous response then no strategy is added

<p>Other  (Indicate on the side all other codes-types you think are necessary)  response that includes only a hyperlink would be coded SG</p>		SG
Not Available - when it's not possible to tag the comment because the comment above it is deleted		NA