<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Exercises:</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Visual change following exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is the data relevant to?</td>
<td>Group the data according to topic</td>
<td>Making an argument / constructed of facts</td>
<td>What facts to use / how to &quot;bucket&quot;</td>
<td>Topic icons appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How varied are your sources?</td>
<td>Group the data from same sources</td>
<td>Quality/robustness of argument</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source colors appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How biased are you sources?</td>
<td>Group the data according to bias in source</td>
<td>Evaluating sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Is this a hypothesis?</td>
<td>Group statements into hypothesis/not hypothesis</td>
<td>Recognize something that could be argued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Make an argument</td>
<td>Pick data from any source to support a hypothesis</td>
<td>Assemble varied, reliable, relevant data</td>
<td>Report relevant to exercises</td>
<td>4 sources / this bias / analysis / fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Make the opposite argument</td>
<td>Pick data from any source to make reverse argument</td>
<td>Hypothesis has to be a point of contention to support an argument</td>
<td>Report relevant to exercises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experience Flow:**

1-4 Data appears in blocks.

Instructions to sort.

Sorting mechanism

Feedback for success and failure.

New Sorting Icon appears

5 Take hypotheses from exercise 4

Instruction to select.

Data appears

Instruction to select (limit?).

Report generated

6 Opposite Hypothesis appears

Data appears

Instruction to select

Report generated

Outside VR: discuss reports from exercise 5 & 6

**Good Argument Characteristics**

- High reliability in sources
- Variety of categories of facts
- Hypothesis is an actual point of contention

**Palate of categories**

- Source: reliability / verified / unverified claims
- Source Type: (newspaper, op ed, govt report, blog, textbook…)
- Intended Audience: left, right, academic, public
- Categories of facts: technical, social, political, cultural, economic, environmental
- Topics / Tags: environmental impact, political climate, workforce (people), regional economics, global energy demand, education

**How do you judge conclusions?**

Conclusions can be

well argued / or not

Lots of data to support

Broadly agreed on / not

Lots of people agree with the conclusion

Biased / or not

Leveraging limited information

**Facts can be**

True or False

Where did the data come from? Sources or methodology