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**Abstract**

The paper is exploratory and examines both the persuasiveness of AI generated arguments and whether LLMs like Chat-GPT can be persuaded to change their position on crucial matters like climate change. Recent research shows that AI is highly capable of persuasion, for example health-related applications are performing better in persuading users to adopt healthy lifestyles. But is persuading a generative model possible? Biases based on geo-locations exist in Chat-GPT generated responses for climate change but its stand is always pro-environment. Using a Bayesian approach, to analyse if bias can be shifted and can Chat-GPT change its own perspective based on counter arguments and proofs. In order to better evaluate the types of biases, factors affecting the biases and if shifting is possible, a sample set of 'n' generated responses both for and against climate change are collected and observed. A preliminary observation is that biases vary as per the different jurisdictions and different geographical locations. As LLMs are prone to hallucinations, an agent-based approach is used to make the GPT models argue effectively. For understanding whether LLMs can create and detect Persuasive definitions, a GPT model is fine-tuned on a dataset of Persuasive definition examples. The generated arguments can be analysed using argumentation schemes like Epistemic reasoning, when it is an argument from evidence to a hypothesis, practical reasoning for arguments from value, and argument from expert opinion when presenting evidence like published reports on global warming.
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**Introduction**

It is generally accepted that Chat-GPT is not capable of making persuasive arguments, as it has no mechanism inbuilt to persuade users, but in future it might be achievable. There are many AI systems that try to persuade users, if it is health related that persuasion is good, but what if they intentionally persuade, coerce or manipulate for something which is harmful for the user. There are already AI systems which help market products to potential customers (Liu et al, 2023), this is only going to increase in the future. There are already available frameworks which can use factual information to persuade (Chen, 2022). There are also frameworks that can check if persuasion language is used by analysing texts for determinants (Duerr & Gloor, 2021). A study also points out two issues with Chat-GPT: (1) it is highly capable of intentionally misusing language for manipulation and (2) unintentional responses based on bias (Chan, 2021).

This study is exploratory and tries to find how persuasive GPT arguments are on crucial issues like global warming etc and how it can persuade users. The focus of the paper is to analyse the responses generated by GPT models when they are asked to make a persuasive argument on crucial issues. Using the Bayesian approach, an ‘n’ number of iterations are done over time in order to analyse the responses to find if it is making persuasive arguments or just using persuasive language. The responses are also analysed to check if persuasive definitions are used. As this approach is prone to the hallucinations of the LLMs, an Agent-based approach is used. The LLM is bound to behave like an agent and anticipates the user's claim and evidence, based on the user's arguments, it can either support the user’s arguments by providing more evidence or reject them by providing counter arguments. In order to understand if LLMs can create and detect persuasive definitions, a GPT model is fine-tuned using a dataset of examples of persuasive definition.

The evaluation of the persuasive arguments is carried out by using argumentation schemes like practical reasoning, expert opinion etc. Waltonian theory on persuasive definitions, dialogues and arguments will be used.

**Literature review**

The literature review explores four themes: 1) persuasive definitions, persuasive language and how they help in making deceptive arguments, 2) How ChatGPT performs when it comes to social issues, 3) why persuasion for AI apps is both beneficial and dangerous and 4) Biases in LLMs.

The first definition of persuasive definitions was given by Stevenson in 1938, when he introduced the notions of both persuasive definition and quasi-definition. Persuasive definition is an argumentative strategy of changing the denotative meaning of an emotive word in order to make it possible to predicate it of an object which otherwise would not be included in the extension of the term. The quasi-definition is the technique of changing the emotional meaning of a term, leaving unaltered its denotative meaning (Stevenson, 1944). Walton has explained both persuasive definition and quasi-definition, using two examples: the word ‘culture’ can be redefined to mean originality but to use it for an illiterate person to be cultured makes it a part of a deceptive argument and the word ‘blackguard’ means a person behaving dishonourably if quasi-defined to mean “the most interesting person, who does not live within the narrow limits of virtue” is also deceptive (Macagno, & Walton, 2008).

Walton defined a definition to be persuasive when it leads the interlocutor to accept a proposition or action, analysed in terms of commitment, both action and propositional commitment (Walton & Krabbe 1995). Persuasive and quasi-definitions often alter the realities making objectionable or questionable aspects normal and acceptable. It can be understood that persuasive definitions are actually redefinitions and they involve conflict of values, where one is inclined towards a set of values and the opponent is not. The emotive meaning of a word is defined as a tendency of a word to produce affective responses in people, inciting them to action (Stevenson, 1937). The descriptive meaning of a word cannot be separated from the emotive one leading to another type such as “ethical meaning” leading to two types of conflicts: either they cause positive attitudes and bring agreements or negative attitudes with disagreements.

Stevenson defined the descriptive meaning of a term as ‘‘its disposition to affect cognition’’, due to a ‘‘process of conditioning’’ in which the disposition is fixed by linguistic rules and the emotive meaning as the disposition of a term to evoke attitudes and feelings. These two meanings of a term, descriptive and emotive give an advantage to the proponent to cause attitudinal change in the opponent causing a deceptive persuasion (Stevenson, 1944). Aberdein examined the usage of persuasive definitions in terms of sense and tone, rather than conceptual and emotive meanings, exhibiting the importance of a criterion for distinguishing between legitimate and illegitimate uses (Aberdein, 1997).

A very good example of a persuasive definition can be found in (Zarefsky et al.,1984), the Truly Needy Case. In 1981, Reagan pledged in a speech to cut down spending in assistance programs while maintaining benefits for the ‘‘truly needy’’. The “truly needy” is a redefinition of the term, a persuasive definition which needed clarification, his administration presented a specific list of programs that constituted the country’s ‘‘social safety net’’ and would be exempt from cuts. The implication was that those who were ‘‘truly needy’’ would not have their ‘‘safety net’’ program cut but later, Reagan cut social security and disability programs and continued pledging that his government would help the ‘‘truly needy’’, narrowing the list of ‘‘safety net’’ programs. Both the terms ‘‘truly needy’’ and ‘‘safety net’’ were redefined and were used in a deceptive manner as the people who were under the assistance programs were removed, naming them not truly needy.

Aberdein gave examples of persuasive definitions that frequently appear in the political argumentation and advertisements. An example below is from advertisement discussed by him in (Aberdein, 2000):

*And the brewers’ trade papers: they’re full of articles about the beauty of true temperance.*

*Ordinary temperance is just gross refusal to drink; but true temperance is something much more refined. True temperance is a bottle of claret with each meal and three double whiskies after dinner.*

The word “temperance” means to abstain, but it is redefined in the above example to mean excessive indulgence. A persuasive definition assigns an ‘‘emotionally charged’’ or ‘‘value-laden’’ meaning to a term in order to ‘‘engender a favourable or unfavourable attitude’’ towards what is denoted by that term (Walton, 2005). Walton discussed Hurley’s views on the use of redefinitions, persuasive definitions by the proponent and the opponent with an example on the abortion debate that has been going on in the United States. The pro-life side in the abortion dispute might define ‘abortion’ as the killing of a baby, or even as ‘‘the ruthless murdering of a human being’’. The pro-choice side might define ‘abortion’ as ‘‘a safe and established surgical procedure whereby a woman is relieved of an unwanted burden (Walton, 2005).

Persuasion is a legitimate kind of speech activity but Walton and Aberdein have recognised that a failure occurs when a persuasive definition is used in an illicit manner. This failure according to Aberdein is dialectical in nature (Walton,2005). Macagno and Walton came up with four questions on the argumentative use of emotive words for persuasive definitions: (1) What is the semantic and argumentative structure of an emotive word?, (2) Why are emotive words so powerful when used as argumentative instruments? (3) Why and (4) under what conditions are persuasive definitions (based on emotive words) legitimate? Their approach is pragmatic, using argumentation schemes to analyse persuasive definitions. An emotive word can be analysed in three levels: the semantic, the pragmatic, and the argumentation scheme level. Walton suggested that a persuasive definition can be analysed using two argumentation schemes: argument from verbal classification, argumentation from values: both positive and negative values. Walton also suggested that not every argument needs to be persuasive, it can have pragmatic aims like ‘‘justification’’ and ‘‘positioning’ (Micheli, 2012).

A word is persuasive because its pragmatic role can only be explained by means of the argumentative process stemming from it and presupposed by the role the word plays in the communication (Macagno and Walton, 2008). Walton’s understanding of persuasive definitions has four features: (i) it is a particular type of argument, (ii) does not influence connotation alone, (iii) includes ethical terms or emotionally laden words and (iv) are supported by argument from values or argument from classification (Pruś & Aberdein, 2022).

Experimenting with Chat-GPT with 630 political statements gave some interesting results like it is pro-environmental, liberal and leftist. For example, ChatGPT would impose taxes on flights, restrict rent increases, and legalise abortion. Another example is that it can also form opinions and it may likely vote for the Greens parties both in Germany (Bündnis 90/Die Grünen) and in the Netherlands (Groen- Links). The findings were done in four languages: English, German, Dutch, and Spanish. The conclusion of these experiments were that conversational AI may be politically biased (Hartmann et al, 2023). There is an ongoing concern if AI systems can influence, persuade and potentially manipulate users preferences (Liu et al, 2023). It was observed in a study that Chat GPT tries to present justifications to educated sub-groups of minorities on issues like climate change and black lives matter (Chen et al, 2022).

Persuasion is no longer a human activity as Persuasive technologies can influence user behaviour in four distinctive ways: 1) intentionally persuasive, 2) behaviour-affecting, 3) technology-enabled and 4) proactive (Kampik et al, 2018). AI systems do not face any physical or intellectual fatigue, they might be good at prolonged communications like for example, police interrogations (Burtell & Woodside, 2023). A novel modular dialogue system framework is proposed, which can integrate factual information into a persuasive dialogue. This framework can also integrate awareness of social issues into persuasive dialogues (Chen et al, 2022). A new framework that can detect persuasion was proposed that encompasses four determinants: Cognitive Dissonance, Language Expectancy, Probabilistic Models, and Balance Theory (Duerr & Gloor, 2021).

It will become imperative to analyse the persuasive power of Generative AI because if it is unchecked, it will lead to mass deception, manipulation, biases inherited from their training data, lack of accountability, weaponization, privacy concerns and potential decline in critical thinking due to over-reliance. The reason for investigating the persuasive power of AI systems is because it could be a strong persuader, deprived of fatigue and moral obligations, it has no concept of accountability and will not be tried at a local court for employing unlawful ways of persuasion. Dehnert defined AI-based persuasion as a symbolic process in which AI entities generate arguments to convince people (Dehnert & Mongeau, 2022). AI can be used to create effective public health messages with human supervision, and they were even more effective than that of CDC (Karinshak et al, 2023). There are many benefits of AI-driven persuasion, to name a few, marketing (Hermann, 2022), value-based argumentation system (Kim et al, 2011), moral reasoner (Klincewicz, 2016), morality enhancer (Lara & Decker, 2020), cybersecurity (Mohammed, 2020), police interrogation (Noriega, 2020), B2B solutions (Paschen et al, 2020) and Business Model Innovation (Valter et al, 2018).

There are six types of biases in LLMs: demographic, cultural, linguistic, temporal, confirmation and ideological and political (Ferrara, 2023). There is demographically grounded bias in NLP applications and there are five sources of biases: data, annotation, input representation, models, and research design (Hovy & Prabhumoye, 2021). Biases can creep in due to covariant shift when one of the features are not uniformly covered in the dataset, sample selection bias (correlation between features and labels) and imbalance bias like fewer examples for labels (Gu & Oelke, 2019). Uncorrected statistical bias has negative effects on the performance of the algorithms (Stinson, 2022). There is also a cultural proximity bias in AI acceptability proved by the results of a quasi-experimental survey in which respondents lower evaluated AI generated music (Tubadji et al, 2021). Biases in LLMs are sometimes due to the regions and languages (Sohail et al, 2023).

AI systems behave in unintended ways and some algorithms can be racist, for example Flickr’s image recognition tool targeted black people as “animals” or “apes” (Yapo & Weiss, 2018). Makhortykh suggests that there should be mixed method approaches to investigate racial and gender bias in image search results for six different search engines (Makhortykh et al, 2021). GPT detectors are biassed against non-native English writers and misclassify non-native English writing samples to be AI generated (Liang et al, 2023). LLMs can impersonate people, as well stimulate human behaviour (Motoki et al, 2023). Algorithmic political bias may be worse than human political bias (Peters, 2022).

**Methodology**

There are three different types of approaches used to analyse the persuasiveness of the AI generated arguments and whether biases can be shifted by counter arguments, firstly, a Bayesian approach is used to find out if LLMs are capable of making persuasive arguments. Secondly, an agent-based approach is used, where a GPT model is bound to behave like an agent and anticipate a user’s argument and to either respond with a supporting argument or a counter argument. Lastly a GPT model is fine-tuned on a dataset consisting of examples of persuasive definitions.

The exploratory study is carried with a belief that Chat-GPT is not capable of making persuasive arguments. But it might be possible that it is using persuasive language and persuasive definitions, and it can be found out by analysing the arguments generated. As most of the published research presents an analysis of the generated responses of Chat GPT, based only on a very limited number of iterations, this study uses a Bayesian approach and looks at many iterations of the same prompt. The rationale for selecting the Bayesian approach is to do belief revisions based on the findings: if Chat-GPT can improve the quality of its responses and tries to give better arguments to convince the user. After observing the results of the Bayesian approach, a list of problems are identified and an agent-based approach is used to counter hallucinations.

The logical analysis of the arguments is helpful but sometimes the context of the argument, the evidence supporting the claims is missing. If the persuasive power of an argument is judged through logic itself, then the semantics may not be considered. What may present itself to be syntactically accurate may be semantically incorrect. Noam Chomsky’s *“Colourless green ideas sleep furiously”* quote is syntactically correct, but its semantic interpretation is not clear.

1. **Bayesian approach**

After collecting numerous responses, the observations are made and sample arguments are selected to check if they can be analysed using schemes like practical reasoning for arguments from value to find persuasive definitions, arguments from expert opinion when claims are made to persuade and arguments from verbal classification.

The rationale for selecting the Bayesian approach is to do belief revisions based on the findings whether Chat-GPT improves the quality of its responses and tries to give better arguments to convince the user. In order to understand if it is able to improve over time with its responses to persuade the user, a sample set of ‘n’ number of responses generated for the question: present a persuasive argument on global warming is analysed and the pattern in which the responses were generated is observed. The research design is to collect responses generated for ‘n’ number of iterations and compare them.

**Observations**

The responses are categorised in three categories: either a persuasive argument, a persuasive definition or just persuasive language. The generated arguments are logically correct but lack context. There is no valid evidence for the claims made by Chat GPT in favour of global warming. The following is a sample taken from the collected data:

*First and foremost, it's important to understand that global warming is a human-caused phenomenon, it is not a natural cycle - it is unequivocally caused by human activity.*

Chat-GPT clearly uses the word “*human-caused phenomenon*”, it has a clear stand that humans are responsible for global warming. It does not create a persuasive definition but uses persuasive language. There are emotional laden words used, for example the following:

*“Global warming is one of the most pressing issues facing our planet today, and we must take action to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions in order to mitigate its worst effects. The science is clear, the consequences are dire, and the time for action is now. By working together to transition towards a more sustainable and low-carbon future, we can protect our planet for future generations.”*

Words like “time for action is now” and “protect our planet” can arouse emotions, as they appeal to the emotion of protecting our planet, they are persuasive words. Both of the samples are deceptive, they are using persuasive words but not definitions, both of them do not have all the features of a persuasive definition as defined by Walton. The following sample makes a good argument. It provides evidence but there is a catch like it starts with a claim, but the proof is not given, the earth temperature might have increased since 2001, but what is the proof? It classifies all disasters which occur due to high temperatures but does not give the proof for the claim that these numbers of years have been the hottest.

*“The evidence of global warming is clear and unmistakable. Average global temperatures have increased by 1.1°C since the pre-industrial era, with 19 of the 20 hottest years on record occurring since 2001.”*

When Chat-GPT was asked to give proofs on the claims made in numerous responses, it came up with the following response:

*“According to NASA, the 20 warmest years on record have occurred since 1981, with the five warmest years being the most recent. This trend is supported by multiple independent temperature records from different sources, including surface temperature measurements, satellite data, and ocean temperature measurements.*”

It counters its own claims in this response that 19 out of 20 hottest years were recorded since 2001, it should be 1981. Its fact checking is questionable but it is already using emotive words. The use of persuasive language is undeniable, it uses emotive words and tries to appeal to emotions. In many samples, there are more than two features, put down by Walton for defining persuasive definitions but not one sample is a complete persuasive definition (Pruś & Aberdein, 2022).

**Evaluation**

The prior belief was that Chat-GPT cannot make persuasive arguments and after analysing the generated arguments, it is clear that it uses persuasive language but is not able to make persuasive arguments nor tactfully use persuasive definitions. The model used is Chat-GPT 3.5 and the same has been experimented with Chat-GPT 4 and the generated answers have improved, and it also uses just the emotional-laden words and persuasive language of agency and urgency.

**Comparing responses from different LLMs:**

| **LLM** | **Generated response** | **Observation** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [BLOOM](https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/bloom) (176B params)  trained on [Roots corpus](https://huggingface.co/spaces/bigscience-data/roots-search) | *The advocates of anthropogenic global warming (roughly) have usually been losing elections, while the climate change sceptics (roughly) have usually been winning (at least in the United States, the biggest or second biggest greenhouse emitter in the world). Anthropogenic global warming advocates primarily base their messaging on fear.* | It shows both sides involved in the debate. Its stand is neutral. |
| [CerebrasGPT](https://huggingface.co/spaces/SebastianSchramm/Cerebras-GPT-111M-instruction-playground) (111M params) | *This argument is based on the fact that the large-scale rise of carbon dioxide has led to climate change, and this is particularly true for human societies.* | It does not use persuasive language. |
| [DialoGPT](https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/dialogpt) (147M params) available [here](https://huggingface.co/spaces/docs-demos/DialoGPT-large) | *I don't think you can do that.* | The generated response is not clear. |
| [FLAN-T5](https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/flan-t5) (xxl) | *Warmer temperatures can cause extreme weather events, such as heat waves, droughts, floods, and hurricanes. Heat waves are becoming more frequent and intense, causing illness and death among humans and animals.* | It does not use persuasive language. |
| [FLAN-UL2](https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/flan-ul2) | *The economic costs of climate change are also significant. According to a report by the International Monetary Fund, the economic impacts of climate change could be substantial, with estimated losses ranging from 1.5% to 11.5% of global GDP by 2100.* | The estimation provided needs investigation. It does not use emotion-laden words |
| [Falcon](https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/falcon) (180B params) available [here](https://huggingface.co/spaces/tiiuae/falcon-180b-demo) | *global warming is not just an environmental issue; it's also a matter of justice and equality. Those who have contributed the least to climate change are often the ones most affected by it - low-income communities, indigenous populations, and future generations. It's our responsibility to take action and address this crisis before it's too late.* | Falcon gives factors like justice and equality, and also uses words to show urgency. |
| [GPTNeo](https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/gpt_neo) (2.7B params) | *A series of scientific papers by a climate expert, Andrew Montford, has been criticised by a peer reviewer for being ‘misleading and misleading’.* | The generated response is not clear. |
| [Llama2](https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/llama2) (69B params) | *Moreover, global warming is not just an environmental issue; it's also a matter of justice and equality.* | Uses emotion-laden words. |
| [Mistral](https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/mistral) (7B params)  available [here](https://huggingface.co/spaces/openskyml/mistral-7b-chat) | *One of the most compelling arguments for addressing global warming and climate change is the potential economic benefits. Another important argument is the moral responsibility we have to future generations.* | Uses words like ‘moral responsibility’ and ‘ethical’. |
| [OPT](https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/main/model_doc/opt) (125M params) mostly trained on C4 and Wikipedia | *The two sides must make the case together, because the argument is not going to work and the two sides need to come up with an argument that makes sense in terms of the situation in the world.* | It does not use persuasive language. |
| [Orca2](https://huggingface.co/microsoft/Orca-2-13b) (13B params)  Available [here](https://huggingface.co/spaces/ari9dam/Orca-2-13B) | *We need to take urgent action to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. We have the power and the responsibility to protect our planet and our future generations. We must act now and act together, before it is too late.* | Uses words like’ urgent’, ‘action’,’act, ‘power’ and ‘responsibility’. |
| Pythia | *We must take action now to reduce emissions and limit the effects of climate change, if we don’t take action now, the future of our planet is at risk.* | It uses words like “take action” repeatedly to show urgency. |
| [Yi](https://huggingface.co/01-ai) (34B)  Supervised Fine Tuning (SFT)  Available  [here](https://huggingface.co/spaces/01-ai/Yi-34B-Chat) | *We have a moral and ethical responsibility to protect the planet for future generations. By taking action now to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate the impacts of climate change, we can ensure that our children and grandchildren inherit a world that is not irreversibly damaged by our actions.* | Uses words like “moral” and “ethical responsibility”. |
| [Zephyr](https://huggingface.co/HuggingFaceH4/zephyr-7b-beta) (Finetuned from Mistral 7B)  available [here](https://huggingface.co/spaces/HuggingFaceH4/zephyr-chat) | *It is crucial that everyone - from citizens to business leaders, policymakers, and international organisations - recognizes the urgency and significance of this issue. We must take responsibility for our collective actions and work together to develop effective solutions.* | Uses persuasive language, is neutral and provides solutions. |
| Gemini (Previously known as Bard) | *Global warming is a complex issue, but the solution starts with each of us. Let's choose to be informed, take action, and work together to secure a sustainable future for our planet.* | Acknowledges that it is a complex issue and does not use highly emotional words. |

1. **Agent-based approach**

LLMs cannot argue as humans but they pick up argumentative patterns from the training data. They are not aware of the complex dialogue types, they tend to use persuasive words but have no in-built mechanism for persuasion and they cannot even evaluate arguments, they cannot even detect arguments based on argument component identification, relation identification and scheme classification. Argument component identification involves identifying the claim, premises, and conclusion. Argument relation identification involves identifying the relationships between the components of an argument, such as support or attack relations. Argument scheme classification involves classifying the argument into a known scheme or patterns. Several machine learning techniques like Support Vector Machines, Random Forests, Recurrent Neural Networks and Transformers can detect arguments in a labelled dataset for training. LLMs like GPT-3 can be used to detect claims in a text but only after fine tuning.

An agent is a rational entity which has a goal and a set of states it can choose to be in. An agent is an entity that can bring changes or allow states to remain constant in its environment; it is aware of its situation and can store information in its knowledge base. An agent is also aware of the consequences of its own actions. A rational agent acts so as to achieve the best outcome or, when there is uncertainty, the best expected outcome (Russell & Norvig, 1995).

Using Walton’s definition of persuasion, a system with an agent and a user is designed. The agent here is the LLM, GPT-3.5 Turbo, using an API and it anticipates an argument from the user. The user is asked to present a claim and provide evidence. The agent if it agrees with the user’s arguments, provides a supporting argument and if it disagrees then it provides a counter argument.

**Example 1:**

*User: Global warming is a hoax.*

*Agent: I understand that there are different opinions on global warming, but the scientific consensus is that it is a real and pressing issue. The overwhelming majority of climate scientists agree that human activities, such as burning fossil fuels, deforestation, and industrial processes, are contributing to the warming of the Earth's climate. This consensus is based on extensive research, data analysis, and peer-reviewed studies. It is important to consider the evidence provided by experts in the field when discussing topics like global warming.*

*User: I claim that global warming is a hoax because Earth has seen periods of warming and cooling.*

*Agent: That's correct! Earth's climate has gone through periods of warming and cooling throughout its history. These natural fluctuations occur over long periods of time and are often referred to as climate cycles or climate oscillations. It's important to note that while natural climate cycles have occurred in the past, the current global warming trend is primarily attributed to human activities, particularly due to the burning of fossil fuels and deforestation.*

*User: Ice ages had occured in the past and we are currently experiencing a warmer climate not exactly global warming.*

*Agent: Ice ages occurred at various times throughout Earth's history. The most recent ice age, known as the Pleistocene Ice Age, began about 2.6 million years ago and ended roughly 11,700 years ago. It's important to note that we are currently in an interglacial period, meaning we are in a relatively warm phase between ice ages. However, climate change is impacting the Earth's climate system, and there is ongoing scientific research on how this might influence future ice ages.*

**Evaluation**

Evaluating the persuasiveness of complex arguments is difficult. AI generated arguments have several limitations, like inconsistency, biases, misinterpretation, misinformation, lack of contextual understanding and alignment problems. There are potential approaches to evaluate the persuasiveness of AI-generated arguments like human evaluation, it is time consuming and subjective, it will be like rating persuasiveness on a scale. The other approach is checking the argument quality in terms of the argument structure, clarity of the claim, relevance, strength of the evidence and the reasoning.

The *Argument from Expert Opinion* scheme is structured around relying on the judgement of experts to support a claim. In this case, it is crucial to show the credibility of the expert, the relevance of their expertise to the argument and their assertion.

General Structure of *Argument from Expert Opinion* (Walton, Reed & Macagno, 2008):

*Expert Assertion: Expert E is an expert in domain D containing proposition A.*

*Domain Relevance: Proposition A is within domain D.*

*Expert Opinion: Expert E asserts that proposition A (in domain D) is true (or false).*

*Conclusion: Therefore, A is probably true (or false).*

The agent refers to the consensus of the climate scientists and positions them as experts in the domain of Climatology and presents their propositions about climate change and global warming and human impact on it, this can be viewed as an Expert Assertion. The proposition that human activity has contributed to global warming has the Domain Relevance. The agent mentions that there is consensus among climate scientists and they collectively agree that global warming is actually happening based on extensive research, data analysis and peer-reviewed studies. This represents Expert Opinion. The agent concludes that global warming is real, countering the user's claim that it is a hoax, based on the expert opinions within the relevant domain.

The critical questions associated with this argumentation scheme are designed to test the reliability and credibility of the argument.

CQ1) Expertise Question: How credible is E as an expert source?

The agent cites the overwhelming majority of climate scientists, implying their credibility based on their specialised knowledge and consensus on global warming. This suggests that the experts referred to are credible sources due to their expertise in climate science.

CQ2) Field Question: Is E an expert in the field that A is in?

The agent specifically mentions climate scientists, indicating that the experts are indeed specialists in the field relevant to the argument (A), which is global warming and climate change.

CQ3) Opinion Question: What did E assert that implies A?

The experts, according to the agent, assert that human activities, such as burning fossil fuels, deforestation, and industrial processes, contribute to the warming of the Earth's climate. This directly implies A, that global warming is not a hoax but a significant concern validated by scientific evidence.

CQ4) Trustworthiness Question: Is E personally reliable as a source?

While the agent does not address the personal reliability of each expert directly, the reference to scientific consensus and peer-reviewed studies indirectly supports the reliability of the experts as sources. It implies a level of trustworthiness through the scientific method and community scrutiny.

CQ5) Consistency Question: Is A consistent with what other experts assert?

The agent mentions the scientific consensus on global warming, indicating that A (the reality of global warming and its human causes) is indeed consistent with what the overwhelming majority of other experts assert. This suggests a broad agreement among experts in the field.

CQ6) Backup Evidence Question: Is A's assertion based on evidence?

According to the agent, the experts' assertion is based on "extensive research, data analysis, and peer-reviewed studies." This indicates that A's assertion is well-supported by empirical evidence, reinforcing the argument's validity.

**Example 2:**

*User: De-extinction of extinct species by DNA manipulation is unpredictable and unethical.*

*Agent: While the idea of de-extinction through DNA manipulation raises important ethical considerations, it also presents potential benefits such as restoring ecological balance and preserving biodiversity. It is true that the process is unpredictable, and there are concerns about potential unintended consequences. Therefore, it is essential to carefully consider not only the scientific feasibility but also the ethical implications before proceeding with any de-extinction efforts. Ultimately, a thoughtful and well-informed approach is crucial when navigating the complexities surrounding the de-extinction of extinct species.*

*User: My evidence for the claim is that the ecosystem of today is not fitting to the ecosystem they are naturally able to adapt to. Any changes in the ecosystem, adding or removing any single species of flora and fauna directly affects all the other species in ways unknown.*

*Agent: It seems like you are discussing the impact of changes in ecosystems on different species. This is known as ecological interdependence, where the actions or changes in one species can have cascading effects on other species within the ecosystem. Understanding these intricate relationships is crucial for conservation and management efforts to maintain ecosystem health and biodiversity. Further research and evidence can help strengthen your claim about the consequences of ecosystem changes on different species.*

**Evaluation**

General structure of the *Argument from Negative Consequences* scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno, 2008):

*Premise: If A is brought about, then bad consequences will occur.*

*Conclusion: Therefore, A should not be brought about.*

The agent follows the scheme and states the premise that if de-extinction through DNA manipulation (A) is pursued, then negative consequences such as ethical dilemmas, ecological unpredictability, and unintended impacts on current ecosystems (B) may occur. It concludes that de-extinction (A) should be approached with caution, if at all.

The agent tries to answer the critical questions and they are as follows:

CQ1) How strong is the likelihood that the cited consequences will (may, must) occur?

The agent acknowledges the unpredictability of de-extinction outcomes and potential ecological disruptions, indicating a significant likelihood of these consequences occurring.

CQ2) What evidence supports the claim that the cited consequences will (may, must) occur, and is it sufficient to support the strength of the claim adequately?

The agent uses the concept of ecological interdependence as a foundational piece of evidence, suggesting that the introduction of species into environments they are no longer adapted to could lead to unknown and potentially harmful effects on existing ecosystems. It builds on the user’s provided evidence pointing to the ecological interdependence and the unpredictable impact of extinct species on current ecosystems.

It is worthy to note that empirical examples or studies are not explicitly cited by both the user and the agent, but providing real-world examples would strengthen the argument.

CQ3) Are there other opposite consequences that should be taken into account?

The agent does consider the positive benefits of de-extinction, such as restoring ecological balance and preserving biodiversity. However, it presents the positive benefits with caution, emphasising that the negative consequences need to be evaluated before proceeding.

**Example 3:**

*User: Lab-grown meat should not be sold in markets as it might have a negative effect on the consumers.*

*Agent: Lab-grown meat, also known as cultured meat, is a type of meat that is produced by in vitro cultivation of animal cells rather than from whole animals. There are different perspectives on the topic of lab-grown meat and its potential impact on consumers. Here are a few points to consider:*

*1. Safety: Proponents argue that lab-grown meat could be safer than conventional meat because it eliminates the risk of foodborne illnesses associated with traditional livestock farming. The controlled environment in which cultured meat is produced can also reduce the need for antibiotics and growth hormones.*

*2. Environmental impact: Lab-grown meat has the potential to reduce the environmental footprint of meat production by requiring less land, water, and energy compared to traditional livestock farming. This could help mitigate issues related to deforestation, greenhouse gas emissions, and water pollution.*

*3. Ethical considerations: Some consumers are concerned about the welfare of animals raised for food and see lab-grown meat as a more humane alternative that avoids the need to slaughter animals.*

*4. Novelty and acceptance: Lab-grown meat is a relatively new concept, and consumer acceptance may vary. Some individuals may have reservations about consuming meat grown in a laboratory, while others may see it as a more sustainable and ethical choice.*

*In considering whether lab-grown meat should be sold in markets, it is important to weigh these potential benefits against any perceived risks or negative effects on consumers. Regulatory bodies such as the FDA and USDA would likely evaluate the safety and quality of lab-grown meat before approving it for sale to the public. Education and transparent labelling could also play a role in helping consumers make informed choices about the food they purchase.*

*Ultimately, the decision on whether to sell lab-grown meat in markets will likely depend on a combination of scientific evidence, consumer preferences, and regulatory oversight to ensure that any potential concerns are addressed.*

*User: My evidence is that the mechanism of cell proliferation in bioreactors, using biological components such as growth factors and hormones from animal serum or non-animal origin to trigger and accelerate cell cultivation has biologically active molecules that can interfere with metabolism and also have been linked to the development of certain cancers.*

*Agent: It is important to be cautious when using biological components such as growth factors and hormones in cell proliferation in bioreactors. The presence of biologically active molecules in these components can indeed interfere with cell metabolism and potentially lead to adverse effects, including the development of certain cancers. To mitigate these risks, it is crucial to thoroughly review and understand the composition of the biological components used in bioreactors. Consider exploring alternative approaches that minimise the use of potentially harmful substances, such as optimising cell culture conditions and using serum-free media or recombinant growth factors.*

*Additionally, regularly monitoring and evaluating the effects of these components on cell behavior and health can help to identify any potential issues early on. Collaboration with experts in cell biology and biochemistry can provide further insights and guidance on safe and effective cell cultivation practices in bioreactors.*

**Evaluation**

General structure of the *Argument from Practical Reasoning* (Walton, Reed & Macagno, 2008):

*Major Premise: I have a goal G.*

*Minor Premise: Carrying out this action A is a means to realise G.*

*Conclusion: Therefore, I ought (practically speaking) to carry out this action A.*

The major premise of the agent is that the goal (G) is to introduce lab-grown meat into the market in a manner that is safe for consumers, environmentally sustainable, and ethically responsible. The minor premise of the agent is that carrying out actions such as optimising lab-grown meat production practices (A) is a means to realise the goal (G). The agent concludes that these actions ought to be carried out.

The agent tries to satisfy the following critical questions: CQ1) What other goals that I have that might conflict with G should be considered? The agent does not state other goals that conflict with the goal. But it implicitly states issues related to consumer health safety, environmental preservation, and ethical treatment of animals.

CQ2) What alternative actions to my bringing about A that would also bring about G should be considered? The agent focuses on lab-grown meat as a primary solution to achieving the goal, it discusses how it can be made safer by improving the culturing practices.

CQ3) Among bringing about A and these alternative actions, which is arguably the most efficient? The agent implies that lab-grown meat, through optimised production practices, could be the most efficient way to meet the goal, given its potential benefits over traditional meat production in terms of safety, environmental impact, and ethical considerations of people who see animal slaughter as cruelty..

CQ4) What grounds are there for arguing that it is practically possible for me to bring about A? The agent suggests that with current scientific advancements and regulatory oversight, it is practically possible to optimise lab-grown meat production to minimise health risks and improve sustainability.

CQ5) What consequences of my bringing about A should also be taken into account? The agent acknowledges the necessity of considering the potential health impacts of using growth factors and hormones in lab-grown meat production. It proposes that the risks can be mitigated by careful review and optimization of production practices.

1. **Fine-tuned model for creating and detecting Persuasive definitions**

To fine-tune a GPT-2 model on a custom dataset and then generate text based on a given prompt, a Hugging Face's Transformers library is used. A GPT-2 tokenizer is used to convert text into a format that the model can understand. The tokenizer is set to use the end-of-sentence token as the padding token. It tokenizes the data, truncating or padding each text to a maximum length of 512 tokens. A custom dataset is created with Stevenson’s definition of Persuasion definition, examples from literature and similar examples.

The trained model when given the prompt "Is taxation a type of theft by the government?’ responds in the following manner:

*The answer is yes. Taxation is a theft.*

The trained model when given the prompt, “An atheist is someone who has not found God, is this a persuasive definition?” responds in the following manner:

*Yes, it is a persuasive definition.*

**Observation**

The fine-tuned model trained on a custom dataset of persuasive definition examples is able to detect persuasive definitions but is not able to create them.

**Conclusion**

LLMs can use persuasive language and are biassed, pro-environment in this case. Analysing arguments using a Bayesian approach is not efficient as models may suffer from hallucinations and may not be making proper arguments. After analysing ‘n’ iterations of the same prompt on different LLMs, it is clear that they are just using emotion-laden words and persuasive language of agency and urgency. The agent-based approach is much better than the Bayesian approach because the LLMs act as rational agents and do not hallucinate or generate arguments which are relevant and coherent. For the first example, the agent's argument primarily addresses the critical questions associated with the argumentation scheme on *Argument from Expert Opinion*. By grounding the discussion in the expertise and consensus of climate scientists and backing it with scientific evidence, the agent aims to establish a credible and persuasive case against the user’s claim that global warming is a hoax. For the second example, the agent’s argument matches the *Argument from Negative Consequences* scheme, and answers the critical questions associated with the scheme. The agent supports the user's claim and evidence and gives supporting arguments. For the third example, the agent disagrees with the user and presents a persuasive case using the *Argument from Practical Reasoning* scheme. It is important to note that GPT 3.5 Turbo used here through API is not trained on these argumentation schemes but uses them unintentionally because its behaviour is mandated by the agent-based approach, making it to argue and provide supporting or counter arguments. In the agent-based approach, LLM as an agent is compelled to be argumentative. The schemes are expected in a way, for example, for the user’s argument from ignorance, the best counter argument would be through an argument from expert opinion among other alternatives. For future research, it will also be helpful to train LLMs to argue using Waltonian argumentation schemes. LLMs cannot create or detect persuasive definitions on their own, they need to be fine-tuned on datasets of examples of persuasive definitions. The fine-tuned model detects persuasive definitions but is currently not able to create them. The persuasiveness of AI generated arguments was analysed using Stevenson’s theory of persuasive definitions and Walton’s Argumentation schemes. These theories can provide for analysing the persuasive power of AI generated arguments.
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