

# Strategic Argumentation to deal with Interactions between Intelligent Systems and Humans

Andreas Brännström

Department of Computing Science, Umeå University, Sweden

## Abstract

Collaborative intelligence between humans and intelligent systems relies heavily on the skills of humans and intelligent systems for reaching agreements. This requires complex dialogue processes, which include human reasoning based on common sense and goal-oriented decision-making performed by the intelligent systems, considering the human's dynamic goals and changing beliefs. This project aims to approach these challenges by studying non-monotonic reasoning techniques in the setting of strategic interaction between intelligent systems and humans. To capture the underlying logic of human reasoning, cognitive theories in logical formalizations are explored, e.g., in abstract argumentation or answer set programming. These reasoning architectures will support the decision-making process of rational agents that aim to join a given dialogue-based interaction with humans. With a particular focus on applications of persuasive technology, we see strategic argumentation as a process of decision-making for changing mental states of human agents.

## 1 Introduction

The human mind is in constant change, shaped by dynamic goals and changing beliefs, influenced by values, norms, perceptions of the environment and reflections of past and future events [Paglieri, 2007]. Intelligent systems designed to collaborate with humans must be able to model the human's perspec-

tive of the world and account for the human's underlying reasoning and beliefs, in order to interact meaningfully. This project explores these challenges for providing human-aware strategic decision-making and theory of mind capabilities to intelligent systems in interaction with humans, with a particular focus on applications for human behavior-change. To model human reasoning, cognitive theories are formalized in logic-based computational architectures using non-monotonic reasoning techniques, e.g., abstract argumentation [Kowalski and Toni, 1996] or answer set programming [Gelfond and Kahl, 2014]. Interaction strategies will support the decision-making process of rational agents [Georgeff and Rao, 1991] that aim to join a given dialogue-based interaction with humans.

In ongoing work [Brännström et al., 2020], we model a rational intelligent agent that plans its actions for encouraging a human to act in a social virtual reality (VR) environment (see Figure 1 [Brännström et al., 2021]).



Figure 1: Virtual cafeteria environment.

This is an interactive aid for children with autism for practicing social situations that usually are perceived as stressful to these individuals. A virtual school cafeteria is modelled. In this environment, there are sounds of people eating and talking, and the space is populated by avatars representing people. A variety of social tasks are involved, such as entering the queue, picking food, and sitting down by a table.

In order to persuade the human user to execute specific actions, the agent adapts the virtual environment by adjusting motivators in the environment. The agent's model of the human is based on the theory of planned behavior (TPB) [Ajzen et al., 1991], a cognitive theory for explaining and predicting an individual's intention to engage in a behavior. These predictions are based on the individual's attitude (A), subjective norm (SN) and perceived behavioral control (PBC) in that behavior, aggregated from the human's underlying motivational beliefs about the behavior.

The agent observes the user's actions in the environment, reasons about them, and responds by appropriate adaptations of the environment to encourage human actions, such as entering the queue to pick food, or to proceed to find a table. The system's decision process can be based on argumentation, deliberating about pros and cons in relation to the user's actions and elicited mental states, following the theoretical cognitive framework of TPB. In such a way, the system makes decisions based on arguments in order to adapt the environment and make changes in its theory of mind of the user. Arguments can be seen as (1) actions of the user, (2) estimated mental states of the user, i.e., A, SN, and PBC, (3) observations of the environment, e.g., amount of people, and (4) adaptive actions to change the environment, executed by a planner agent. We see strategic argumentation as a process of decision-making for changing mental states of the human agent.

Such an interaction can be understood as a long-term interchange of arguments between rational agents, e.g., an artificial agent and a human agent. A long-term interaction is a game of incomplete knowledge in which goals and beliefs of human agents can be private, and future actions are uncertain

[Governatori et al., 2014]. Consequently, the rational agent has knowledge gaps about a human's behavior. The agent has to acquire additional knowledge, reason to draw conclusions that fill the gaps, to make joint plans with the human. This is a complex task as the mental model of the human is based on interpretations of observed behavior that can be partially observable, dynamically changing, and ambiguous. Furthermore, the human's plans and goals can change during the interaction. Thus, the human's mental state must be determined through an indirect reasoning process where indicators to behavior are inferred through models of human reasoning. The agent's actions must be planned in relation to the estimated human behavior by making alternative hypotheses about the human's dynamic goals, i.e., predict the actions that the human might perform in the future [Chakraborti, 2018]. For this reason, the agent must be able to model human reasoning and requires strategies for choosing suitable arguments in every state of the interaction. Most of the current dialogue-based frameworks only consider complete knowledge. In these approaches, the commitments of a dialogue are inferred at the end of the dialogue, e.g., by considering argumentation semantics [Dung, 1995]. Furthermore, the problem of identifying most suitable utterances in an ongoing dialogue game is not taken into consideration [Amgoud and Prade, 2004]. This means that agents usually have no strategies for deciding which actions to perform in a dialogue-based interaction.

Strategic argumentation takes place in multi-agent systems where agents aim to reach a common understanding for decision-making or for convincing other agents of specific beliefs or intentions. A rational agent can, by modelling another agent's reasoning and beliefs, conduct strategic argumentation techniques as a process of decision-making in the interaction. To approach agent modelling in terms of human reasoning, an overall challenge and aim of this project is to formalize theories from Cognitive Science into formal computational models that can be utilized by intelligent software agents in strategic interaction with humans.

## 2 Method

Based on cognitive theories, formal models are defined and placed in the setting of specific use-cases. In this process, qualitative research methods such as Grounded theory [Sbaraini et al., 2011] are conducted, involving participatory design methods with experts and users. Knowledge of the specific domain is acquired and a use-case specific theory is shaped that captures relevant aspects of the human domain. This process verifies relationships and principles in the specific domain that corresponds to relevant cognitive frameworks. This is an iterative process that integrates formal modelling with data-collection and qualitative analysis. Through the explicit data of specific use-cases we can define goals, values, norms, attitudes in terms of arguments and argumentation semantics. These results will help to define decision processes of rational agents which are integrated in dialogue system environments and evaluated in interaction with humans.

In a qualitative study with autism experts [Brännström et al., 2021], in relation to an ongoing project earlier presented in this paper, we found that the choice of motivation in a moment depends on an individual's current motivational beliefs. By assuming that the current mental state of an individual can be sufficiently recognized, i.e., the attitude (A), subjective norm (SN), and perceived behavioral control (PBC), and valued in the scale negative (inhibiting behavior), medium (indifferent to behavior) and positive (promoting behavior), the experts were asked which source of motivation that is most influential in a moment depending on the person's current mental state. E.g., if the person currently has a mental state where A is negative, SN is negative and PBC is negative, then which aspect should be prioritised to increase? If so, what about a similar case where A is medium? By following this approach, 27 states are specified, each state consisting of the variables A, SN, or PBC, in which each variable has a value of negative (N), medium (M), or positive (P). Following the experts' suggestions, we can specify a state space with transition relations between states that represents a prioritised change of A, SN or PBC depending on the recognized mental state of the hu-

man. We can model these relations in terms of an argumentation graph in a rational agent's decision process for changing human mental states (see Figure 2 [Brännström et al., 2021]).




Figure 2: Motivation decision-system. This graph represents a system with states corresponding to human mental states in terms of TPB, i.e., the variables A, SN, and PBC, where each variable has the value of negative (N), medium (M) or positive (P). Transitions correspond to the most influential changes of motivation in a moment. The bold arrow (also in red) is the most prioritized path according to the experts.

In formal argumentation, a TPB model can be created as follows. We (roughly) have a value-based argumentation framework [Bench-Capon, 2003]  $VAF = (AR, AT, V, val, P)$ , where  $AR$  is a set of arguments,  $AT \subseteq AR \times AR$  denotes the attack relation<sup>1</sup> on  $AR$ ,  $V$  is a set of values,  $val$  is a function that maps elements of  $AR$  to elements of  $V$ , and  $P$  is a set of binary relations on  $V$ . For an argumentation-based TPB model, we then have  $P = \langle Pref_A, Pref_{SN}, Pref_{PBC} \rangle$ , where  $Pref_A$  models attitude preferences,  $Pref_{SN}$  models social norm preferences, and  $Pref_{PBC}$  models behavioral control preferences<sup>2</sup>. To model a dialogue, we then generate a sequence of expansions

<sup>1</sup>Note that  $AT$  is irreflexive.

<sup>2</sup> $Pref_A, Pref_{SN}, Pref_{PBC}$  are transitive, irreflexive, and asymmetric.

of our argumentation-based TPB model, and resolve these expansions considering relational consistency principles like reference independence or cautious monotony [Kampik and Nieves, 2021] to ensure the conclusions inferred at different dialogue stages are, roughly speaking, aligned with each other.

### 3 Discussion

A fundamental issue in the process of a dialog-based interaction is to recognize the cause of an agreement or a disagreement in an ongoing dialogue. We can approach this by exploring theories regarding how human beliefs and attitudes are affected by alternative past and future choices and events, in psychology referred to as counterfactual thinking (CT) [Epstude and Roese, 2008]. A theory related to CT regards the occurrence of *cognitive dissonance* [Cooper, 2011] in a decision-maker. Cognitive dissonance refers to a situation involving conflicting attitudes, beliefs or behaviors. This produces a feeling of mental discomfort leading to an alteration in one of the attitudes, beliefs or behaviors to reduce the discomfort and restore balance. Cognitive dissonance makes an individual sensitive to: (a) changing their existing beliefs, (b) adding new beliefs, or (c) reducing importance of beliefs. When it comes to making decisions, we are usually not presented with one perfect option, which means we have to weigh one imperfect option against another. This creates dissonance. The dissonance may come up before or after a decision has been made, and in the latter case lead the person to rationalize why the choice was made; Making a choice does not automatically make the positive attributes of the other choice go away. Thus, the person is in this state sensitive to new beliefs to be convinced that the right decision was made. We hypothesize that a dissonance theoretical framework can be formalized by formal argumentation.

Reasoning about causality in a dialogue is close to the area of story understanding where humans form a comprehension model while reading a story and revise it as new information comes in. A related work proposes a system for automated narrative comprehension [Diakidoy et al., 2015], interest-

ing for the present study where we hypothesize that a narrative comprehension and generation dialogue-framework can be formalized by formal argumentation and formal dialogue games [Prakken, 2005].

### 4 Conclusion

Collaborative intelligence between humans and intelligent systems, e.g., persuasive systems for facilitating behavior-change, relies on the system’s ability of modelling the human’s reasoning, changing beliefs and dynamic goals, in order to form agreements. Approaching these challenges, the present project aims to formalize cognitive theories in order to capture human reasoning in formal computational models using non-monotonic reasoning techniques. Formal argumentation is applied as a process of decision-making for changing mental states of human agents in a strategic interaction.

Future work involves evaluating strategic reasoning processes in interactions between intelligent systems and humans. Computational soundness, theory of mind, as well as ethical implications and usefulness, of an agent’s strategic argumentation will be evaluated to further advance the models. We implement proof-of-concept prototypes of the systems aiming to validate and verify our approach in real use-cases, by considering functional and human requirements in line with ethics guidelines for responsible artificial intelligence [Dignum, 2019]. Evaluations are conducted in mixed-reality settings, i.e., virtual reality or augmented reality. Mixed-reality opens up new inspiring opportunities for human-system interaction which will be explored throughout this project.

### Acknowledgements

The author thanks Juan Carlos Nieves, Virginia Dignum and Timotheus Kampik for guidance and valuable insights in this project. This work was partially funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

## References

- [Ajzen et al., 1991] Ajzen, I. et al. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2):179–211.
- [Amgoud and Prade, 2004] Amgoud, L. and Prade, H. (2004). Reaching agreement through argumentation: A possibilistic approach. *KR*, 2004:175–182.
- [Bench-Capon, 2003] Bench-Capon, T. J. (2003). Persuasion in practical argument using value-based argumentation frameworks. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 13(3):429–448.
- [Brännström et al., 2020] Brännström, A., Kampik, T., and Nieves, J. C. (2020). Towards human-aware epistemic planning for promoting behavior-change. In *Workshop on Epistemic Planning (EpiP)@ ICAPS, Online, October 26-30, 2020*.
- [Brännström et al., 2021] Brännström, A., Nieves, J. C., Kampik, T., Domellöf, E., Gu, L., and Liljeström, M. (2021). Human-aware planning in virtual reality for facilitating social behavior in autism. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- [Chakraborti, 2018] Chakraborti, T. (2018). *Foundations of Human-Aware Planning-A Tale of Three Models*. PhD thesis, Arizona State University.
- [Cooper, 2011] Cooper, J. (2011). Cognitive dissonance theory. *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, 1:377–398.
- [Diakidoy et al., 2015] Diakidoy, I.-A., Kakas, A., Michael, L., and Miller, R. (2015). Star: A system of argumentation for story comprehension and beyond. In *2015 AAAI Spring Symposium Series*.
- [Dignum, 2019] Dignum, V. (2019). *Responsible artificial intelligence: How to develop and use AI in a responsible way*. Springer Nature.
- [Dung, 1995] Dung, P. M. (1995). On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *Artificial intelligence*, 77(2):321–357.
- [Epstude and Roese, 2008] Epstude, K. and Roese, N. J. (2008). The functional theory of counterfactual thinking. *Personality and social psychology review*, 12(2):168–192.
- [Gelfond and Kahl, 2014] Gelfond, M. and Kahl, Y. (2014). *Knowledge representation, reasoning, and the design of intelligent agents: The answer-set programming approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- [Georgeff and Rao, 1991] Georgeff, M. and Rao, A. (1991). Modeling rational agents within a bdi-architecture. In *Proc. 2nd Int. Conf. on Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR’91)*. Morgan Kaufmann, pages 473–484. of.
- [Governatori et al., 2014] Governatori, G., Olivieri, F., Rotolo, A., Scannapieco, S., and Sartor, G. (2014). Two faces of strategic argumentation in the law. In *JURIX*, pages 81–90.
- [Kampik and Nieves, 2021] Kampik, T. and Nieves, J. C. (2021). Abstract argumentation and the rational man. *Journal of Logic and Computation*. exab003.
- [Kowalski and Toni, 1996] Kowalski, R. A. and Toni, F. (1996). Abstract argumentation. In *Logical Models of Legal Argumentation*, pages 119–140. Springer.
- [Paglieri, 2007] Paglieri, F. (2007). Changing minds: the role of beliefs in cognitive dynamics. *Synthese*, pages 163–166.
- [Prakken, 2005] Prakken, H. (2005). Coherence and flexibility in dialogue games for argumentation. *Journal of logic and computation*, 15(6):1009–1040.
- [Sbaraini et al., 2011] Sbaraini, A., Carter, S. M., Evans, R. W., and Blinkhorn, A. (2011). How to do a grounded theory study: a worked example of a study of dental practices. *BMC medical research methodology*, 11(1):128.