

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindsor

CRRAR Publications

Centre for Research in Reasoning,
Argumentation and Rhetoric (CRRAR)

2013

Distinctive features of persuasion and deliberation dialogues

Katie Atkinson

Trevor Bench-Capon

Douglas Walton
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/crrarpub>



Part of the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#), and the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Atkinson, Katie; Bench-Capon, Trevor; and Walton, Douglas. (2013). Distinctive features of persuasion and deliberation dialogues. *Argument & Computation*, 4 (2), 105-127.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/crrarpub/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Centre for Research in Reasoning, Argumentation and Rhetoric (CRRAR) at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in CRRAR Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact scholarship@uwindsor.ca.

RESEARCH ARTICLE: ARGUMENT & COMPUTATION 2012 to appear
Distinctive Features of Persuasion and Deliberation Dialogues

Katie Atkinson, Department of Computer Science, University of Liverpool, L69 3BX, UK

Trevor Bench-Capon, Department of Computer Science, University of Liverpool, L69 3BX, UK

Douglas Walton, CRRAR, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3Y1, Canada.

Abstract

The distinction between action persuasion dialogues and deliberation dialogues is not always obvious at first sight. In this paper we provide a characterization of both types of dialogue that draws out the distinctive features of each. It is important to recognize the distinctions since participants in both types of dialogue will have different aims, which in turn affects whether a successful outcome can be reached. Such dialogues are typically conducted by exchanging arguments for and against certain options. The moves of the dialogue are designed to facilitate such exchanges. In particular, we show how the conditions for the use of particular moves in the dialogues, as well as their illocutionary and perlocutionary effects, are very different depending upon whether they are used as part of a persuasion over action or a deliberation dialogue. We draw out the distinctions with reference to a running example that we also present as a logic program in order to give a clear characterization of the two types of dialogue which is intended to enable them to be used more effectively within systems requiring automated communication.