Conference track «Strategic Communication»

Building trust in decentralized systems: A communication perspective

Научный руководитель – Макеенко Михаил Игоревич

Шилина Александра Геннадьевна

PhD

Московский государственный университет имени М.В.Ломоносова, Факультет журналистики, Кафедра теории и экономики СМИ, Москва, Россия

E-mail: alexandrashilina@mail.ru

Decentralized systems hold the promise of robust security and resilience by distributing control among many actors rather than relying on a single authority. However, the effectiveness of these systems hinges on cohesive community trust, which in turn depends on transparent, inclusive, and well-structured communication. Many blockchain projects have experienced governance breakdowns despite their decentralized ideals. The 2016 Ethereum DAO fork revealed how unresolved governance disputes could fracture communities [1]. Bitcoin's block size debate exposed how core developers and miners wield disproportionate influence, sidelining broader input [2]. More recently, governance struggles in DAOs, such as major token holders dominating MakerDAO [3] and Uniswap, highlight flaws in decentralized decision-making [4].

Based on interviews, participant observation, and textual analysis across 30 blockchain and peer-to-peer projects, we found that while cryptographic methods protect data integrity, they do not resolve social and organizational conflicts that arise from unequal power dynamics and misaligned incentives. Our research identifies three core challenges: power imbalances, lack of structured communication, and inefficient conflict resolution.

In conceptualizing an ideal version of a decentralized environment with excellent communication, we propose a model founded on clarity, inclusivity, and iterative feedback loops. Such a model would ensure that decisions are not only driven by technical consensus algorithms (e.g., Proof-of-Work, Proof-of-Stake) but also shaped by transparent dialogue among developers, end-users, and other stakeholders. Specific design features include:

- **Explicit guidelines for proposing and debating changes**: Standardized procedures for proposals, discussions, and implementation phases.
- **Archived and accessible discussions for newcomers and AI-assisted summarization:** A structured repository for governance decisions, supported by AI-generated documentation that highlights key arguments and historical integrity through on-chain records.
- **Multilingual support to engage a global audience**: AI-driven translation tools and community-driven moderation to ensure accessibility and participation.
- **Rotating leadership roles and diverse voting models:** Time-limited governance positions and quadratic or reputation-weighted voting [5] to prevent concentrated influence among core developers or major token holders.
- **Formalized conflict-resolution mechanisms**: Guided by neutral facilitators, to reduce prolonged disagreements and help maintain an atmosphere of mutual respect.
- **Balanced openness and security:** Publicly auditable decision-making logs through blockchain while using role-based permissions to protect sensitive information from social engineering risks.
- **Sybil resistance measures**: Identity-based reputation scoring via systems like Humanode cryptobiometrics [6] or Gitcoin Passport to prevent spam and manipulation.

Our research indicates that an ideal decentralized environment is one that recognizes governance as a social process: rigorous consensus protocols must be paired with communication practices that empower diverse voices, provide conflict-resolution pathways, and ensure transparency at every step. Such a holistic model strengthens user trust and paves the way for more resilient and widely adopted decentralized technologies.

References

1) Dhillon V. et al. The DAO hacked //blockchain enabled applications: Understand the blockchain Ecosystem and How to Make it work for you. – 2017. – С. 67-78.
2) De Filippi P., Loveluck B. The invisible politics of bitcoin: governance crisis of a decentralized infrastructure //Internet policy review. – 2016. – Т. 5. – №. 4.
3) Sun X., Stasinakis C., Sermpinis G. Decentralization illusion in Decentralized Finance: Evidence from tokenized voting in MakerDAO polls //Journal of Financial Stability. – 2024. – Т. 73. – С. 101286.
4) Han J., Lee J., Li T. A review of DAO governance: Recent literature and emerging trends //Journal of Corporate Finance. – 2025. – С. 102734.
5) Lalley S. P., Weyl E. G. Quadratic voting: How mechanism design can radicalize democracy //AEA Papers and Proceedings. – 2014 Broadway, Suite 305, Nashville, TN 37203 : American Economic Association, 2018. – Т. 108. – С. 33-37.
6) Kavazi D. et al. Humanode whitepaper: You are [not] a bot //arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.13189. – 2021.