Division of cognitive labor

• The question

"How should the pursuit of knowledge be organized, given that (...) knowledge is pursued by many human beings, each working on a more or less well-defined body of knowledge and each equipped with roughly the same imperfect cognitive capacities, albeit with varying degrees of access to one another's activities?" [1]

Models

- Marginal contribution/reward models (Kitcher \rightarrow)
- Epistemic networks (Zollman \rightarrow)
- Epistemic landscapes (Weisberg & Muldoon \rightarrow)
- Functions of diversity & division of cognitive labor
- Resource allocation
- Error control
- Exploration-exploitation management
- Challenge: Richer articulation of cognitive collaboration needed

Modeling collaborative problem solving

- An individually intractable problem addressed by a collective of agents with heterogeneous abilities/resources
- Elements of collective problem-solving
- 1. Recursive division of a problem into sub-problems
- 2. Allocation of sub-problems to different groups/individuals
- 3. Combining individual solutions
- Feasibility of division of labor determined by:
- Research strategies employed by agents
- Difficulty of the problem (size & modularity of solution space)
- Decomposition scheme for division of labor

Modeling Collaborative Division of Cognitive Labor

Samuli Reijula, Jaakko Kuorikoski

University of Helsinki, University of Tampere

Binary string model

- Scientific research as collective search in a multi-dimensional landscape [2]
- Model template: Bit string model [3, 4]
- Solution to a complex problem: a string of 0/1s w/ interdependencies:

- Bit: One aspect of the solution
- Examples: Finding the structure of a macromolecule, building a space shuttle / software ...
- Cognitive diversity: Each agent has a different set of heuristics for manipulating the shared bit string
- Collective task: Find string with highest epistemic utility

Current results

- Target claim 1: "Arbitrary returns to additional problem solvers" [3] (figs 1 & 2)
- Target claim 2: "Diversity beats ability" [6] (fig 3)





• Parameters: n=20; flipsets/agent=3; tournament size = 1000

Tentative conclusions

- Trade-offs in managing complexity: time vs. reliability; tractability vs. optimality
- Overblown interpretations of claims about possibility (of arbitrary marginal returns) (TC1)
- Binary string model does not support diversity-beats-ability theorem (TC2)





Moderately difficult problems

• Types of solution spaces: (i) fully modular, (ii) partly modular, (iii) hierarchical, (iv) random

Bit#1	Bit#2	Bit#3	Value (V)
0	0	0	0
0	0	1	4
0	1	0	2
0	1	1	6
1	0	0	3
1	0	1	7
1	1	0	1
1	1	1	5

• This solution space has cover size 2: $\{Bit_1, Bit_2\}$ and $\{Bit_3\}$ can be solved separately - Optimal solutions to sub-problems: {10*} and {**1}

• Cover size (decomposability) provides a natural measure of problem complexity [5]

References

- [1] S. Fuller. Social epistemology.
- [2] H. A. Simon. pages 375-398, 1989.
- [3] L. Hong and S. Page.
- 2005.
- [5] S. E. Page. Complex Systems, 8(1):1–24, 1994.
- [6] L. Hong and S. E. Page.
- [7] F. D'Agostino.
- [8] S. A. Kauffman.
- [9] P. Kitcher.

Contact Information



Indiana University Press, 2002.

The scientist as problem solver. Complex information processing: The impact of Herbert A. Simon,

Problem solving by heterogeneous agents. *Journal of economic theory*, *97*(1):123–163, 2001.

[4] L. Marengo and G. Dosi. Division of labor, organizational coordination and market mechanisms in collective problem-solving. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 58(2):303–326,

Covers: a theory of Boolean function decomposition.

Groups of diverse problem solvers can outperform groups of high-ability problem solvers.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 101(46):16385-16389, 2004.

From the organization to the division of cognitive labor. Politics, Philosophy & Economics, 8(1):101–129, 2009. The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution.

Oxford University Press, U.S.A., New York, June 1993.

The division of cognitive labor. Journal of Philosophy, 87(1):5–22, 1990.

• samuli.reijula@helsinki.fi; @samulipo

• jaakko.kuorikoski@tuni.fi