Course Proposal: Collective cognition

Lucas Gautheron

November 14, 2024

In what ways collective cognition subdues individual cognition? How should we go about solving problems in groups? When should we rely on hierarchy, and when should we facilitate self-organization? How can we reasonably resolve disagreements among peers? How to properly harness the benefits of diversity? What are the epistemic implications or selfishness? This course provides an interdisciplinary approach to these questions, drawing from wide perspectives including managerial and political science, social epistemology, cultural evolution, and complexity and decision theory, all brought under the umbrella of "collective cognition". Students will invited to transform the classroom itself into an experiment by self-organizing around a joint-project (related to collective cognition) and by reflecting upon their own process.

The goal of the course is twofold. The first aim is to familiarize students with research from disparate bodies of literature relevant to the broader theme of collective cognition. Throughout the course, students will be encouraged to draw connections between these bodies of work. The second goal of the course is to reflect upon the implications of the theoretical issues explored throughout the course for organizational and institutional design: what does collective cognition has to say about democracy, markets, and central planning?

In the process, students will:

- Understand the epistemic implications of organizational and institutional design for groups and societies.
- Learn to model situations of collective cognition using the appropriate frameworks(s): decision theory, game theory, Bayesian belief-updating and complex landscapes, etc.
- Learn empirical approaches to collective cognition using either experimental or observational behavioral data.
- Gain experience with the co-organization of a "large-scale" project.

Students are expected to be familiar with the fundamentals of Bayesian probability, decision theory (in particular probabilistic utility-maximizing decision theory), and game theory. They (or at several of them) should have some computational skills and experience with programming. It is fine, and even better, if students have heterogeneous skills and knowledge.

1 Plan (30 hours, incl. 6 hours of practical work)

The course is organized in four themes. The last theme is more open-ended. Students should be able to start working on their joint-probject before the end of the class.

1.1 From individual cognition to collective cognition (2h)

Collective cognition is key to humans' success, beyond their individual cognitive abilities. We review evidence that causal understanding plays a limited role in innovation and in the transmission and accumulation of culture, and that our ability to reason is more effective in a social context

than as an internal means of acquiring knowledge. Finally, we review the independence thesis, according to which collective cognition does not reduce to individual cognition in a simplistic way. These insights suggest a shift in focus from individual cognition to collective cognition.

- The collective brain as "the secret of our success" [1–4]
- The independence thesis in social epistemology: why collective rationality does not reduce to individual rationality [5]
- The landscape of issues in collective cognition.

In-class activities: reading, in-class discussion.

1.2 Division of labor and cooperation in collective cognition (6h+2h)

Collective cognition can be thought of as the process of diving up a cognitive task among multiple agents. Are there optimal ways of dividing up cognitive work in groups? How is such a division of labor even possible, if agents are motivated by the pursuit of their own interests And how do agents effectively navigate trade-offs involved in the division of cognitive labor (exploitation versus exploration, specialization versus adaptation, etc.)?

- Optimal task allocation and exploration/exploitation trade-offs in collective cognition [5, 6]
- Selfishness and cooperation in collective cognition [7–10]
- Inverse problems for collective cognition: reverse-engineering agents' division of labor using experimental or observational behavioral data [6, 11, 12]

In-class activities: 2h practical work session.

1.3 Diversity in collective problem-solving (8h+2h)

The efficiency of collective cognition stems in great part from its ability to leverage the diversity of information, knowledge, and skills possessed by individual agents. However, such diversity also raises a number of issues: are certain kinds of diversity detrimental to collective cognition? How to produce coherent collective judgments? How to avoid the polarization of epistemic agents into incompatible and irreconcilable views?

- The benefits of transient diversity: making space for individual and independent exploration [13–16]
- The Hong-Page model: high diversity can exceed high-ability [17]
- The wisdom of the crowds [18–20, 4, 9]
- Challenges and pitfalls of diversity (issues in judgment aggregation and group-decision [21, 22]; polarization [23]; the trade-off between diversity and coordination [24])

In-class activities: 2h practical work session.

1.4 Adaptive systems, self-organization, and hierarchies (6h+2h)

Collective problem-solvers are not necessarily static systems; they may continuously evolve and adapt to the nature of the tasks they purport to solve. In particular, highly complex tasks may demand sophisticated communication structures that would be hard to design by hand but may nevertheless spontaneously emerge through self-organization. Why do difficult tasks require complex structures to develop? How can self-organizing systems achieve success despite the lack of central oversight? What is the function of hierarchical structures in collective cognition?

- Collective problem-solvers and complex adaptive systems [25, 26]
- Specialization, modularity, and compositionality: how agents devise solutions that can be re-used and re-combined [27].
- Conflict, self-organization and hierarchies: the case of Wikipedia [28, 29]
- Markets and central planning in economics and organizations [30–33]

In-class activities: 2h practical work session.

1.5   Challenges in collective cognition (2h)

Collective cognition lies at the core of several major contemporary issues, such as the need to develop innovative technical and social solutions to climate change, the harms caused by online social media, and the disruptions caused by artificial intelligence.

- Collective stupidity: when groups are dumber than isolated agents [34, 35]
- Collective adaptation [36]
- Artificial intelligence [TBD].

In-class activities: 2h practical work session.

2   Evaluation

On the first day, students are asked individually to report their skill sets and domains of expertise (e.g. the programming languages or computational methods they might be familiar with, their favorite courses, etc.). Based on their feedback, the instructor(s) design(s) a joint-project for the class that no single student would be able to accomplish on their own given (i) the scale of the project and (ii) their distribution of skills. The joint-project is related to collective cognition and should involve several of the following tasks: designing formal models, collecting data, conducting an experiment, analyzing data, etc. The project should be rather open-ended in order to make room for creativity. Students will work collaboratively over more than half of the semester and produce a joint-report. In order to be evaluated individually, students hand out short individual reports (a) describing their own contribution and (b) reflecting upon how one or more issues raised during the class may have transpired during the course of the project and how they affected the outcome.

It is likely that students will encounter some of the following issues:

- Carefully balancing exploration (the conception and framing of an interesting project) and exploitation (its actual realization).
- Implementing an *optimal* allocation of tasks (given everyone's expertise).
- Implementing a *fair* allocation of tasks.
- Creating efficient communication structures.
- Devising efficient decision-making structures (which questions should be subject to the entire collective scrutiny? which decisions may be left out to smaller groups or individuals?).
- Ensuring that individual contributions are substantial even in case of collective failure.

Bibliography

[1]   M. Muthukrishna and J. Henrich. "Innovation in the collective brain". In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 371.1690 (2016).

[2]   H. Mercier and D. Sperber. *The Enigma of Reason*. Harvard University Press, 2017.

[3]   F. Hayek. "The use of knowledge in society". In: *The American Economic Review* 35.4 (1945).

[4]   J. Ober. *Democracy and knowledge: Innovation and learning in classical Athens*. Princeton University Press, 2008.

[5]   C. Mayo-Wilson, K. J. S. Zollman, and D. Danks. "The Independence Thesis: When Individual and Social Epistemology Diverge". In: *Philosophy of Science* 78.4 (2011).

[6]   R. Marjieh, A. Gokhale, F. Bullo, and T. L. Griffiths. *Task Allocation in Teams as a Multi-Armed Bandit*. 2024.

[7]   N. E. Leonard and S. A. Levin. "Collective intelligence as a public good". In: *Collective Intelligence* 1.1 (2022).

[8]   E. Kummerfeld and K. J. S. Zollman. "Conservatism and the Scientific State of Nature". In: *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 67.4 (2016).

[9]   B. de Courson, L. Fitouchi, J.-P. Bouchaud, and M. Benzaquen. "Cultural diversity and wisdom of crowds are mutually beneficial and evolutionarily stable". In: *Scientific Reports* 11.1 (2021).

[10]   H. Rubin and C. O'Connor. "Discrimination and Collaboration in Science". In: *Philosophy of Science* 85.3 (2018).

[11]   L. Gautheron. *Balancing Specialization and Adaptation in a Transforming Scientific Landscape*. 2024.

[12]   L. Gautheron. *"When her family finds [out] you are using the wrong metric…": dilemmas and trade-offs in the diffusion of scientific conventions*. 2024.

[13]   P. E. Smaldino, C. Moser, A. Pérez Velilla, and M. Werling. "Maintaining Transient Diversity Is a General Principle for Improving Collective Problem Solving". In: *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 19.2 (2023).

[14]   K. J. S. Zollman. "The Communication Structure of Epistemic Communities". In: *Philosophy of Science* 74.5 (2007).

[15]   K. J. S. Zollman. "The Epistemic Benefit of Transient Diversity". In: *Erkenntnis* 72.1 (2009).

[16]   P. Jenni, T. S. Virdee, L. Pontecorvo, and S. Liyanage. "Chasing Success: The ATLAS and CMS Collaborations". In: *Big Science, Innovation, and Societal Contributions*. Oxford University PressOxford, 2024, pp. 22–55.

[17]   L. Hong and S. E. Page. "Groups of diverse problem solvers can outperform groups of high-ability problem solvers". In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101.46 (2004).

[18]   L. Hong and S. E. Page. "Some microfoundations of collective wisdom". In: *Collective wisdom* (2012).

[19]   S. Page. *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies-new edition*. Princeton University Press, 2008.

[20]   H. Landemore. "Democratic reason: Politics, collective intelligence, and the rule of the many". In: (2012).

[21]   F. Dietrich and C. List. "Arrow's theorem in judgment aggregation". In: *Social Choice and Welfare* 29.1 (2007).

[22] J. P. Lightle, J. H. Kagel, and H. R. Arkes. "Information exchange in group decision making: The hidden profile problem reconsidered". In: *Management Science* 55.4 (2009).

[23] C. O'Connor and J. O. Weatherall. "Scientific polarization". In: *European Journal for Philosophy of Science* 8.3 (2018).

[24] R. Schimmelpfennig, L. Razek, E. Schnell, and M. Muthukrishna. "Paradox of diversity in the collective brain". In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 377.1843 (2021).

[25] S. Page. *Diversity and Complexity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

[26] J. H. Miller and S. E. Page. *Complex Adaptive Systems: An Introduction to Computational Models of Social Life: An Introduction to Computational Models of Social Life*. Princeton University Press, 2009.

[27] S. K. Ethiraj and D. Levinthal. "Modularity and innovation in complex systems". In: *Management science* 50.2 (2004).

[28] J. Yoon, C. Kempes, V. C. Yang, S. Lee, et al. "What makes Individual I's a Collective We; Coordination mechanisms & costs". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02113* (2023).

[29] S. DeDeo. "Conflict and Computation on Wikipedia: A Finite-State Machine Analysis of Editor Interactions". In: *Future Internet* 8.3 (2016).

[30] H. A. Simon. "Organizations and Markets". In: *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5.2 (1991).

[31] L. Phillips and M. Rozworski. *The people's republic of walmart: How the world's biggest corporations are laying the foundation for socialism*. Verso Books, 2019.

[32] D. Chisholm. *Coordination without hierarchy: Informal structures in multiorganizational systems*. Univ of California Press, 1992.

[33] O. E. Williamson. "Markets and hierarchies: some elementary considerations". In: *The American economic review* 63.2 (1973).

[34] C. O'Connor and J. O. Weatherall. *The Misinformation Age: How False Beliefs Spread*. Yale University Press, 2019.

[35] A. W. Lo and R. Zhang. "The wisdom of crowds versus the madness of mobs: An evolutionary model of bias, polarization, and other challenges to collective intelligence". In: *Collective Intelligence* 1.1 (2022).

[36] M. Galesic, D. Barkoczi, A. M. Berdahl, D. Biro, et al. "Beyond collective intelligence: Collective adaptation". In: *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 20.200 (2023).