

## Forming consensus

- Aumann, R. J. (1976). Agreeing to Disagree. *The Annals of Statistics*, 4(6), 1236–1239.
- Banerjee, A. V. (1992). A simple Model of Herd Behavior. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107(3), 797–817.
- Betz, G. (2012). *Debate Dynamics: How Controversy Improves Our Beliefs (Synthese Library)* (p. 265). Springer. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com/Debate-Dynamics-Controversy-Improves-Synthese/dp/9400745982>
- Bonanno, G., & Nehring, K. (1997). Agreeing to disagree : a survey.
- DeGroot, M. H. (1974). Reaching a Consensus. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 69(345), 118–121.
- Douven, I., & Riegler, A. (2009). Extending the Hegselmann-Krause Model I. *Logic Journal of IGPL*, 18(2), 323–335. doi:10.1093/jigpal/jzp059
- Douven, Igor, & Kelp, C. (2011). Truth Approximation, Social Epistemology, and Opinion Dynamics. *Erkenntnis*, 75(2), 271–283. doi:10.1007/s10670-011-9295-x
- Eger, S. (2013). (Failure of the) Wisdom of the crowds in an endogenous opinion dynamics model with multiply biased agents, 56. Multiagent Systems; Adaptation and Self-Organizing Systems; Physics and Society. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1309.3660>
- Gu, Q., Santos, E., & Santos, E. E. (2013). Modeling Opinion Dynamics in a Social Network. doi:10.1109/WI-IAT.2013.84
- Hartmann, S., Martini, C., & Sprenger, J. (2009). Consensual decision-making among epistemic peers. *Episteme*, 6(2), 110–129.
- Hartmann, S., & Sprenger, J. (2009). Judgment Aggregation and the Problem of Tracking the Truth.
- Hendrickx, J. M., & Olshevsky, A. (2013). On symmetric continuum opinion dynamics, 23. Dynamical Systems; Multiagent Systems. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.0355>
- Huang, M., & Manton, J. H. (n.d.). Opinion Dynamics with Noisy Information.
- Hung, A. A., & Plott, C. R. (2001). Information Cascades : Replication and an Extension to Majority Rule and Conformity-Rewarding Institutions. *The American Economic Review*, 91(5), 1508–1520.
- Jiuhua Zhao, Qipeng Liu, & Xiaofan Wang. (2013). Opinion dynamics with popularity and similarity.
- List, C. (2005). Group knowledge and group rationality: a judgment aggregation perspective.
- List, C., & Goodin, R. E. (2001). Epistemic Democracy: Generalizing the Condorcet Jury Theorem. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 9(3), 277–306.
- List, C., & Petit, P. (2002). Aggregating Sets of Judgements: An Impossibility Result. *Economics and Philosophy*, 18, 89–110.
- List, C., & Pettit, P. (2004). Aggregating sets of judgments: two impossibility results compared 1. *Synthese*, 140, 207–235.
- Liu, Q., & Wang, X. (2013). Opinion dynamics with similarity-based random neighbors. *Scientific reports*, 3, 2968. doi:10.1038/srep02968
- Mäs, M., & Flache, A. (2013). Differentiation without Distancing. Explaining Bi-Polarization of

- Opinions without Negative Influence. *PloS one*, 8(11), e74516. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074516
- Mayo-Wilson, C. (n.d.-a). Values in Agent-Based Models of Scientific Communities. *Manuscript*.
- Mayo-Wilson, C. (n.d.-b). The Reliability of Testimonial Norms in Scientific Communities. *Manuscript*.
- Mirtabatabaei, A., Jia, P., Friedkin, N. E., & Bullo, F. (1999). On the Reflected Appraisals Dynamics of Influence Networks with Stubborn Agents.
- Pineda, M., Toral, R., & Hernández-García, E. (2013). The noisy Hegselmann-Krause model for opinion dynamics. *The European Physical Journal B*, 86(12), 490. doi:10.1140/epjb/e2013-40777-7
- Riegler, A., & Douven, I. (n.d.). Extending the Hegselmann-Krause Model II.
- Riegler, A., & Douven, I. (2012). Extending the Hegselmann-Krause Model III: From Single Beliefs to Complex Belief States. *Episteme*, 6(02), 145–163. doi:10.3366/E1742360009000616
- Rubinstein, A., & Wolinsky, A. (1990). On the Logic of “Agreeing to Disagree” Type Results. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 51, 184–193.
- Seidenfeld, T., Kadane, J. B., & Schervish, M. J. (1989). On the Shared Preferences of Two Bayesian Decision Makers. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 86(5), 225–244.
- Verma, G., Swami, A., & Chan, K. (2014). The impact of competing zealots on opinion dynamics. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 395, 310–331. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378437113009229>
- Wagner, C. (1982). Allocation, Lehrer models, and the consensus of probabilities. *Theory and Decision*, 14, 207–220.**
- Zhou, Y. (2013). Majority Rule for Belief Evolution in Social Networks. Artificial Intelligence; Physics and Society. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1309.0659>
- Zollman, K. J. S. (2008a). Social structure and the effects of conformity. *Synthese*, 172(3), 317–340. doi:10.1007/s11229-008-9393-8
- Zollman, K. J. S. (2011). Social network structure and the achievement of consensus. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*, 11(1), 26–44. doi:10.1177/1470594X11416766

## Network Structure

- Bala, Venatesh, & Goyal, S. (2001). Conformism and Diversity Under Social Learning. *Economic Theory*, 17, 101–120.
- Bala, Venkatesh, & Goyal, S. (1998). Learning from Neighbours. *Review of Economic Studies*, 65, 565–621.
- Börner, K., Maru, J. T., & Goldstone, R. L. (2004). The simultaneous evolution of author and paper networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101 Suppl , 5266–73. doi:10.1073/pnas.0307625100
- Fafchamps, M., Goyal, S., & van de Leij, M. (2004). Scientific Networks and Co-authorship. *Manuscript*.

- Gilbert, N., Ahrweiler, P., & Pyka, A. (2007). Learning in innovation networks: Some simulation experiments. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 378(1), 100–109. doi:10.1016/j.physa.2006.11.050
- Gilbert, N., Pyka, A., & Ahrweiler, P. (2001, June 30). Innovation Networks - A Simulation Approach. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/4/3/8.html>
- Goyal, S. (2003). Learning in networks : a survey.**
- Goyal, S., van der Leij, M., & Moraga-González, J. L. (2006). Economics: An Emerging Small World? *Journal of Political Economy*, 114, 403–412.
- Grim, P. (2003). Threshold Phenomena in Epistemic Networks. In *AAAI Fall Symposium* (pp. 53–60).
- Grim, P., Singer, D. J., Fisher, S., Bramson, A., Berger, W. J., Reade, C., ... Sales, A. (2013). SCIENTIFIC NETWORKS ON DATA LANDSCAPES: QUESTION DIFFICULTY, EPISTEMIC SUCCESS, AND CONVERGENCE. *Episteme*, 10(04), 441–464. doi:10.1017/epi.2013.36
- Lobel, I., & Sadler, E. (2013). Information Diffusion in Networks through Social Learning.
- Wang, T., Krim, H., & Viniotis, Y. (n.d.). Analysis and Control of Beliefs in Social Networks, 1–13.
- Zollman, K. J. S. (2009). The Epistemic Benefit of Transient Diversity.**
- Zollman, K. J. S. (n.d.). The Communication Structure of Epistemic Communities.
- Zollman, K. J. S. (2012). Network Epistemology: Communication in Epistemic Communities. *Philosophy Compass*

### **Reward systems**

- Boyer, T. (2013). Is a bird in the hand worth two in the bush? Or, whether scientists should publish intermediate results. *Synthese*. doi:10.1007/s11229-012-0242-4
- Bruner, J. P. (2013). POLICING EPISTEMIC COMMUNITIES. *Episteme*, 10(04), 403–416. doi:10.1017/epi.2013.34
- Dasgupta, P., & David, P. A. (1994). Toward a New Economics of Science. *Research Policy*, 23(5), 487–521.**
- Dasgupta, P., & Maskin, E. (1987). The Simple Economics of Research Portfolios. *The Economic Journal*, 97(387), pp. 581–595. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2232925>
- Goldman, A., & Shaked, M. (n.d.). An economic Model of Scientific Activity and Truth Acquisition.
- Strevens, M. (2003a). Further Properties of the Priority Rule.
- Strevens, M. (2003b). The Role of the Priority Rule in Science. *Journal of Philosophy*, 100, 55–79.**
- Strevens, M. (2006). The role of the Matthew effect in science. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 37(2), 159–170. doi:10.1016/j.shpsa.2005.07.009
- Strevens, M. (2012). Economic Approaches to Understanding Scientific Norms. *Episteme*, 8(02), 184–200. doi:10.3366/epi.2011.0015

### **Theory choice and exploration**

- Alexander, J. M. (2012). Preferential Attachment and the Search for Successful Theories. *Philosophy of Science*, 1–16.
- Brock, W. A., & Durlauf, S. N. (n.d.). A formal model of theory choice in science. In *Science Bought and Sold: Essays in the Economics of Science*.
- Hong, L., & Page, S. E. (2004). Groups of diverse problem solvers can outperform groups of high-ability problem solvers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101(46), 16385–9. doi:10.1073/pnas.0403723101
- Kitcher. (n.d.). The Organization of Cognitive Labor. In *The Advancement of Science*.**
- Kummerfeld, E., & Zollman, K. J. S. (2012). Conservatism and the Scientific State of Nature. *Manuscript*.
- Kunz, J. (2011, October 31). Group-Level Exploration and Exploitation: A Computer Simulation-Based Analysis. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/18.html>
- Mayo-wilson, C., Zollman, K. J. S., & Danks, D. (2011). The Independence Thesis : When Individual and Social Epistemology Diverge. *Philosophy of Science*, 78(4), 653–677.**
- Mayo-Wilson, C., Zollman, K. J. S., & Danks, D. (2012). Wisdom of crowds versus groupthink: learning in groups and in isolation. *International Journal of Game Theory*. doi:10.1007/s00182-012-0329-7
- Muldoon, R. (2013). Diversity and the Division of Cognitive Labor. *Philosophy Compass*, 8(2), 117–125. doi:10.1111/phc3.12000
- Muldoon, R., & Weisberg, M. (2010). Robustness and idealization in models of cognitive labor. *Synthese*, 183(2), 161–174. doi:10.1007/s11229-010-9757-8
- Roorda, J. (1997). Kitcher on Theory Choice. *Erkenntnis*, 46, 215–239.
- Weisberg, M., & Muldoon, R. (2009). Epistemic Landscapes and the Division of Cognitive Labor. *Philosophy of Science*, 76(April), 225–252.**

## Journals

- Besancenot, D., Huynh, K., & Faria, J. (2012). Search and research: the influence of editorial boards on journals quality. *Theory and Decision, forthcoming*, 1–16. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11238-012-9314-7>
- Ellison, G. (2002). Evolving Standards for Academic Publishing: A q-r Theory. *Journal of Political Economy*, 110(5), pp. 994–1034. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/341871>
- Faria, J. R. (2005). The Game Academics Play: Editors versus Authors. *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 57(1), 1–12. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8586.2005.00212.x
- Heintzelman, M., & Nocetti, D. (2009). Where Should We Submit Our Manuscript? An Analysis of Journal Submission Strategies. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy*, 9(1), 39.
- Takács, F. S. and K. (2011, October 31). Social Simulation That “Peers into Peer Review.” JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/3.html>
- Zollman, K. J. S. (2012). Optimal Publishing Strategies. *Episteme*, 6(02), 185–199. doi:10.3366/E174236000900063X

**Etc. (I don't know these, or can't categorize them)**

- Ahrweiler, P. (2011, October 31). Modelling Theory Communities in Science. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/8.html>
- Ahrweiler, P., Pyka, A., & Gilbert, N. (2004). SIMULATING KNOWLEDGE DYNAMICS. In *Industry and Labor Dynamics: The Agent-based Computational Economics Approach* (pp. 1–13).
- Bruce Edmonds, N. G. P. A. and A. S. (2011, October 31). Simulating the Social Processes of Science. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/14.html>
- Chattoe-Brown, E. (2011, October 31). Two Challenges in Simulating the Social Processes of Science. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/1.html>
- Edmonds, B. (2005). Artificial Science -- A Simulation to Study the Social Processes of Science, (0161), 1–11.
- Htike, K. W. W. (2013). Analysis of Division of Cognitive Labor Models with Parameter Inaccuracy: Case Studies. *Journal of Information and Computational Science*, 10(14), 4349–4358. doi:10.12733/jics20102250
- Manhart, W. B. and K. (2011, October 31). A Social Process in Science and Its Content in a Simulation Program. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/11.html>
- Matthew Francisco, S. M. and S. Š. (2011, October 31). Conference Models to Bridge Micro and Macro Studies of Science. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/13.html>
- Meyer, M. (2011, October 31). Bibliometrics, Stylized Facts and the Way Ahead: How to Build Good Social Simulation Models of Science? JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/4.html>
- Naveh, I., & Sun, R. (2006). A cognitively based simulation of academic science. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory*, 12(4), 313–337. doi:10.1007/s10588-006-8872-z
- Neylon, S. P. and C. (2011, October 31). Science as a Social System and Virtual Research Environment. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/10.html>
- Payette, N. (2011, October 31). For an Integrated Approach to Agent-Based Modeling of Science. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/9.html>
- Vaesen, K., & Houkes, W. (2013). Modelling the truth of scientific beliefs with cultural evolutionary theory. *Synthese*. doi:10.1007/s11229-013-0257-5
- Yilmaz, L. (2011, October 31). Toward Multi-Level, Multi-Theoretical Model Portfolios for Scientific Enterprise Workforce Dynamics. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/2.html>
- Zollman, K. (2011, October 31). Computer Simulation and Emergent Reliability in Science. JASSS. Retrieved from <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/14/4/15.html>