

# Normative Reasoning

## Overview and Challenges

February 15, 2020

# Table of Contents

- ▶ Basic Notions
- ▶ Normative Systems
- ▶ Excursion: Bayesian Networks
- ▶ Challenges

# Basic Notions

## What is normative reasoning?

Normative reasoning is to reason about evaluation or value judgement.

A norm in this context is a standard for evaluating and judging behaviour or outcomes as good (desirable, permissible etc.) or bad (undesirable, impermissible etc.).

# Basic Notions

## What is normative reasoning?

Normative reasoning is to reason about evaluation or value judgement.

A norm in this context is a standard for evaluating and judging behaviour or outcomes as good (desirable, permissible etc.) or bad (undesirable, impermissible etc.).

Disclaimer:

- ▶ We will choose this particular definition for our presentation. There are other definitions of normative.
- ▶ We make a distinction between beliefs and intentions.

# Basic Notions

## Practical reasoning versus normative reasoning

Practical reasoning is to reason so that the conclusion is an intention. In pure normative reasoning we only reason about normative beliefs. We can of course mix both.

# Basic Notions

## Practical reasoning versus normative reasoning

Practical reasoning is to reason so that the conclusion is an intention. In pure normative reasoning we only reason about normative beliefs. We can of course mix both.

Example:  $\phi$  some verb, P some person

P ought to  $\phi$

so P shall  $\phi$

# Basic Notions

## Practical reasoning versus normative reasoning

Practical reasoning is to reason so that the conclusion is an intention. In pure normative reasoning we only reason about normative beliefs. We can of course mix both.

Example:  $\phi$  some verb, P some person

P ought to  $\phi$

so P shall  $\phi$

The application of normative and practical reasoning is one reason that motivates the study of those systems in machine ethics.

# Normative Reasoning

## Approaches to normative reasoning

Normative theories cannot tell which beliefs are right but rather what beliefs are *consistent*.

*consistent*: does not entail a contradiction/ has a model where



# Normative Reasoning

## Approaches to normative reasoning

It is convenient to differentiate three different approaches to formalize normative reasoning:

- ▶ Logic - consequence of belief
- ▶ Probability theory - degrees of belief
- ▶ Rational choice theory - valuing choices

# Normative Reasoning

## Approaches to normative reasoning

It is convenient to differentiate three different approaches to formalize normative reasoning:

- ▶ Logic - consequence of belief
- ▶ Probability theory - degrees of belief
- ▶ Rational choice theory - valuing choices

Motivations:

- ▶ A.I.
- ▶ Standard of comparison for actual behaviour
- ▶ Descriptive theories on reasoning
- ▶ Philosophy

# Normative Reasoning

## Approaches to normative reasoning

*absolutism vs. pluralism:*

Normative systems can often be embedded into each other but differ in expressiveness as in utility for a predefined purpose.

# Normative Reasoning

## Approaches to normative reasoning

*absolutism vs. pluralism:*

Normative systems can often be embedded into each other but differ in expressiveness as in utility for a predefined purpose.

Examples:

- ▶ Logic: proof verification
- ▶ Probability theory: recurring events
- ▶ Rational choice theory: optimization, microeconomy

# Normative Reasoning

## Logic

Extremely good to model beliefs on a local level but problems arise when background knowledge is required.

# Normative Reasoning

## Logic

Extremely good to model beliefs on a local level but problems arise when background knowledge is required.

Example:

All general statements are false.

P is a general statement.

P is false.

What happens if we assume the opposite of the conclusion to be true?

# Normative Reasoning

## Logic

Extremely good to model beliefs on a local level but problems arise when background knowledge is required.

Example:

All general statements are false.

P is a general statement.

P is false.

What happens if we assume the opposite of the conclusion to be true?

Logic detects the inconsistency but does not tell us what went wrong.

# Normative Reasoning

## Probability

How can we model different degrees of belief?



# Normative Reasoning

## Rational Choice

Setting: An individual has a set of choices which is *complete* and *transitive*. We furthermore assume our *rational agent* always makes a cost-benefit-analysis and will always choose the optimum.

Advantage: compact & tractable

# Normative Reasoning

# Normative Reasoning

## Challenges

- ▶ How to effectively model the entanglement of knowledge?  
(Frame Problem)

# Normative Reasoning

## Challenges

- ▶ How to effectively model the entanglement of knowledge?  
(Frame Problem)
- ▶ How to deal with inconsistency?

# Normative Reasoning

## Challenges

- ▶ How to effectively model the entanglement of knowledge?  
(Frame Problem)
- ▶ How to deal with inconsistency?
- ▶ How to effectively model and compute normative reasoning?

# Sources I



Nick Chater, Mike Oaksford

Normative Systems: Logic, Probability, and Rational Choice

[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199734689.013.0002](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199734689.013.0002)



John Broome

Normative Practical Reasoning I

[10.1111/1467-8349.00085](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8349.00085)



R. Philippen and P. McNamara

Handbook of Deontic Logic and Normative Systems, Volume 1, Chapter 1

[College Publications 2013, ISBN 978-1-84890-132-2](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781848901322)



Paul McNamara

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Deontic Logic

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-deontic/>

# Sources II



Jan Broersen, Stephen Cranefield, etc.

Normative Reasoning and Consequence

[10.4230/DFU.Vol4.12111.33](#)



Jonathan Levin, Paul Milgrom

Introduction to Choice Theory

<http://web.stanford.edu/jdlevin/Econ%20202/Choice%20Theory.pdf>