

























such way it reasons by selecting arguments with the higher emotional stimuli, and being emotionally influenced by the use of the arguments. We state the necessary conditions under which an argument can be selected for passing from an argumentation stage (an step on the reasoning process) to another. We think it is an interesting approach to make the reasoning process of an agent more focused, each time avoiding arguments that are not emotionally-relevant for the agent, simplifying the amount of information that an agent uses in reasoning.

For future work, we propose to define an emotion-based semantic that determines what to believe from the set of conclusions supported by the arguments considered in a given emotional argumentation stage.

We also propose to integrate this formalism with the DeLP argumentation system [3]. In such integration, the emotions could be related to logical rules instead of arguments (i.e., a rule should reach some emotional interest to be used, and it would trigger some emotional changes as a result of its use). Thus, an activated argument could be formed by the chaining of activated rules, and a contextually preferred argument could be formed by the chaining of most emotionally-relevant rules.

## References

1. Dias, J., Paiva, A.: Feeling and reasoning: A computational model for emotional characters. In: Progress in Artificial Intelligence, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3808, pp. 127–140. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg (2005)
2. Dung, P.M.: On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in non-monotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *Artificial Intelligence* 77, 321–357 (1995)
3. García, A.J., Simari, G.R.: Defeasible logic programming an argumentative approach. *TPLP* pp. 95–138 (2004)
4. Gratch, J., Marsella, S.: A domain-independent framework for modeling emotion. *Journal of Cognitive Systems Research* 5, 269–306 (2004)
5. Lloyd-Kelly, M., Atkinson, K., Bench-Capon, T.J.M.: Emotion as an enabler of co-operation. In: *ICAART* (2). pp. 164–169 (2012)
6. Marsella, S.: Modeling coping behavior in virtual humans: Dont worry, be happy. In: *AAMAS 2003*. pp. 313–320. ACM Press (2003)
7. Marsella, S.C., Gratch, J.: Ema: A process model of appraisal dynamics. *Cognitive Systems Research* 10(1), 70–90 (2009)
8. Ortony, A., Clore, G.L., Collins, A.: The cognitive structure of emotions. *books-googlecom* 54(1-2), 229–240 (1988)
9. Scherer, K.R.: *Appraisal Theory*, pp. 637–663. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd (2005)
10. Simon, H.A.: *Reason in human affairs* / Herbert A. Simon. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif. : (1983)
11. Steunebrink, B.R., Dastani, M., Meyer, J.J.C.: A formal model of emotions: Integrating qualitative and quantitative aspects. In: *ECAI*. pp. 256–260 (2008)
12. Steunebrink, B.R., Dastani, M., Meyer, J.J.C.: A formal model of emotion-based action tendency for intelligent agents. In: *EPIA*. pp. 174–186 (2009)
13. Vreeswijk, G.A.W.: Abstract argumentation systems. *Artificial Intelligence* 90(1–2), 225–279 (1997)