

Weekly Project Report

Risk Status Report

- Last week I talked about the risk of operating from an entirely different paradigm, and thus having a paper with too much unknown information for the reader. That is looking better this week. The hypotheses for the 1st experiment are looking quite solid. Also, focusing simply on “measuring the truth” as the research problem, without touching too much on the fact that we’re doing so, because we’ve identified it as a root cause, will probably be the way to go.
- One of our central variables is the “correctness” of the SAA. Last week I talked about my concern that we didn’t come up with a standardized method to weigh rules, which would be one necessary requirement to be able to say that an argument is correctly analyzed. The approach at first will have to be case by case, until we’re able to recognize a pattern. After a session with Jack, we determined that it will suffice to specify what the “Master Claim-check” is, and explain *why* it is correct, on a case-by-case basis. This should also solve the high reliability – low validity problem.
- Regarding the participants needed for experiment 1: I already have written a draft email to Jimmy Wales. It is written in a much more informal tone than when I contacted Brendan Nyhan, and I feel that’s a good strategy, because that automatically sets an atmosphere of closeness. I’m also planning on sending it to him as a direct message on Slack instead of an email. I’m not very sure about how much I should already explain about the functioning of the TRS in the messages, so that it doesn’t become extremely long, but it still gets his attention. I’ll polish a some final details and send it to you for feedback.
- But: We really may need just a very small group. What we’re trying to show, is that with proper training, anybody can come up with the same results. What I have in mind right now is (as planned) only Jack & me at first, and maybe then only 2 more external coders would be sufficient. Jack and me alone isn’t enough because we’re so involved with the project, that it makes us automatically be biased, but we may need just a couple more. If those 2 are going to be Scott and Martha, we may consider also 2 more external to the project, because of the same bias.
- On Monday Jack pointed out that we may face the critique that the claims aren’t randomly selected. That could be a real issue, since we’re indeed selecting on purpose simple arguments, and with this we cannot claim that the tool yields

reliable and valid results for *all* types of claims. This is still something that we need to think more about.

Schedule Status Report

- As Jack mentioned, we're officially 1 week behind schedule. I had reported last week already to be behind schedule, and I was expecting to be able to finish the Research Designs of both experiments during this week. I didn't. The research design of experiment 1 is really starting to look solid, and I'm satisfied with it, but I haven't started working on the Research Design of experiment 2 yet. That's what I'll be doing this week, which was the plan for last week. All in all, I feel optimistic, because the extra time has been used to make sure we're doing quality work.

Areas I need help on

- In retrospective I can see that in designing the hypotheses for experiment 1, I encountered many theoretical questionings. Meetings with Jack proved to be super helpful to clear things out. I expect the same to happen with the design of experiment 2.
- Since I didn't start working on experiment 2, I also didn't focus much on the questionnaires and the feedback I was going to post on the forum on the surveys Jack did. This week I should get to finally do that. It's not crucial, but I think it will be useful.

Goals for the coming week

- Research Design for experiment (1 &) 2
- Contact Jimmy Wales
- Start writing protocol for claim checkers with Jack (?)
- Post my feedback on online questionnaires on the forum
- Design review meeting for experiment 1