ISSN: 2583-9888
DOI: doi.org/10.51219/JAIMLD/Jeremiah-Ratican/17

URF PUBLISHERS
connect with research world

Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Data Science

https://urfpublishers.com/journal/artificial-intelligence

Vol: 1 & Iss: 4

Review Article

Synthesizing Sentience: Integrating Large Language Models and Autonomous Agents for Emulating Human Cognitive Complexity

Jeremiah Ratican*, James Hutson, Daniel Plate

Lindenwood University, USA

Citation: Ratican J, Hutson J, & Plate D. Synthesizing Sentience: Integrating Large Language Models and Autonomous Agents for Emulating Human Cognitive Complexity. *J Artif Intell Mach Learn & Data Sci*, 1(4), 135-141. DOI: doi.org/10.51219/JAIMLD/Jeremiah-Ratican/17

Received: 02 October, 2023; **Accepted:** 10 October, 2023; **Published:** 23 October, 2023

***Corresponding author:** Jeremiah Ratican, Lindenwood University, USA. Email: jratican@lindenwood.edu

ABSTRACT

The paper aims to present a novel methodology for emulating the intricacies of human cognitive complexity by ingeniously integrating large language models with autonomous agents. Grounded in the theoretical framework of the modular mind theory-originally espoused by Fodor and later refined by scholars such as Joanna Bryson—the study seeks to venture into the untapped potential of large language models and autonomous agents in mirroring human cognition. Recent advancements in artificial intelligence, exemplified by the inception of autonomous agents like Age in GPT, auto GPT, and baby AGI, underscore the transformative capacities of these technologies in diverse applications. Moreover, empirical studies have substantiated that persona-driven autonomous agents manifest enhanced efficacy and nuanced performance, mimicking the intricate dynamics of human interactions. The paper postulates a theoretical framework incorporating persona-driven modules that emulate psychological functions integral to general cognitive processes. This framework advocates for the deployment of a plurality of autonomous agents, each informed by specific large language models, to act as surrogates for different cognitive functionalities. Neurological evidence is invoked to bolster the theoretical architecture, delineating how autonomous agents can serve as efficacious proxies for modular cognitive centers within the human brain. Given this foundation, a theory of mind predicated upon modular constructs offers a fertile landscape for further empirical investigations and technological innovations.

Keywords: Autonomous Agents, Large Language Models, Cognitive Complexity, Modular Mind Theory, Theory of Mind

1 Introduction

The rapid maturation of generative artificial intelligence (AI) technologies and large language models (LLMs) has ushered the academic community into a new era of possibilities and challenges. Recent advancements, such as OpenAI's ChatGPT 3.5 and 4, have demonstrated unparalleled aptitude in generating linguistically rich and contextually coherent text, provoking intricate dialogues that closely resemble human-to-human interaction (Gill & Kaur, 2023). Concurrently, these evolutions have imbued the intellectual discourse with pressing questions about the future trajectory of AI, particularly within a myriad of application domains such as healthcare, education, and assisted living (Albahri et al., 2023; Lee, 2023; Liu et al., 2023; Shahriar Hayawi, 2023).

In light of these developments, the endeavor to understand and replicate human cognitive complexity has gained significant traction within the academic landscape. Such pursuits inevitably broach the compelling research frontiers of integrating human emotional dimensions into AI paradigms (Latif et al., 2023). Previous studies have documented that the machine learning algorithms underpinning LLMs are capable of simulating and adopting a diverse set of "personalities," thereby laying the groundwork for the exploration of artificial emotional dimensions (Garon, 2023). These technological strides bring to the fore the tantalizing possibility of constructing emotionally intelligent AI systems, which hold the promise of fostering enhanced user experiences through more meaningful interactions (Ray, 2023).

Central to the arguments presented herein is the integration of large language models with autonomous agents. The impetus for this amalgamation is derived from modular mind theory a foundational concept which posits that cognitive processes are compartmentalized within the brain into distinct modules

(Fodor, 1983). This theoretical underpinning has been further refined by scholars, most notably Joanna Bryson, who contend that modularity exists not only in natural cognitive systems but can also be synthesized within artificial constructs (Bryson, 2010).

Building upon this rich theoretical heritage, as well as a burgeoning body of empirical research such as the work of Park et al. (2023), which highlighted the potential of autonomous agents to mimic human behavior when equipped with personal motivations and preferences this paper endeavors to present a novel strategy. Specifically, it posits an innovative approach for emulating human cognitive complexity through the integration of large language models and autonomous agents. By doing so, the study aims to make a substantive contribution to the extant literature, while also laying a fertile groundwork for future empirical investigations and technological innovations.

The amalgamation of large language models with autonomous agents, structured upon the theoretical scaffolding of modular mind theory, signifies a seminal contribution to interdisciplinary research within the realms of artificial intelligence, psychology, and neuroscience. Leveraging cutting-edge advancements in machine learning architectures and autonomous system designs, the proposed model endeavors to construct a synthetic analog of human cognition, partitioned into specialized modules corresponding to identified facets of mental processing. Grounded in robust empirical observations and theoretical perspectives from the partitioning of the human mind as per modular theories to the discernible efficacy of persona-driven autonomous agents the model introduces an innovative methodological approach for simulating human cognitive complexity. In doing so, it not only pushes the boundaries of what artificial systems can achieve in terms of mimetic cognitive functions, but also lays the groundwork for further research that might elucidate the enigmatic intricacies of human cognition. Thus, the model holds considerable promise both as a heuristic tool for cognitive science inquiries and as a technological harbinger for increasingly sophisticated artificial intelligence systems.

2. Literature Review

2.1 AI Agents: Emotions and Personas

Scholarly inquiries into emotionally intelligent artificial intelligence (AI) have proliferated over recent years, revealing multifaceted dimensions that encompass not only the technological underpinnings but also the psychosocial and ethical implications. The collective body of research underscores the pivotal role of emotional faculties in intelligent behavior and decision-making processes (Duan et al., 2019; Mahmud et al., 2022; Strich et al., 2021). Mahmud et al. (2022), for instance, argue that emotions serve as a complex signaling system that affects intelligent decision-making, thereby accentuating the integral nature of emotions in cognitive functions. The importation of these emotional aspects into artificial cognitive systems constitutes a seminal shift in the landscape of AI development (Zall & Kangavari, 2022).

Frameworks for AI systems imbued with social and emotional capabilities have been proposed as necessary advancements to facilitate nuanced human-machine interactions (Samsonovich, 2020; Picard et al., 2004). Samsonovich (2020) astutely observes that empathy in artificial agents contributes to more authentic social interactions, thereby substantiating the claim that emotional intelligence in AI can augment the quality of social exchanges. These proposals intersect with ongoing efforts to construct AI-driven communication systems that employ affective computing techniques to decipher and simulate emotional states (Li et al., 2019; Khachane, 2017). Such research culminates in practical applications that range from emotionally intelligent chatbots to interfaces designed for specialized sectors.

On the frontiers of ethics and practicality, scholars have broached the challenges and conundrums that accompany the incorporation of artificial emotions into AI systems (Pusztahelyi, 2020; Cominelli et al., 2021). Pusztahelyi (2020) raises a pertinent question: What ethical considerations arise when machines simulate human emotions? The query points to a nascent but critical discourse on the moral boundaries and responsibilities involved in deploying emotionally intelligent AI. Concurrently, the realm of affective computing has commenced a transitional phase towards more robust cognitive models of emotional intelligence (Li et al., 2022; Wortman & Wang, 2022), thereby indicating a persistent interest in enhancing the efficacy and reliability of these technologies.

Healthcare, among other sectors, is posited as a fertile ground for the deployment of emotionally intelligent AI systems, particularly in the context of emotion recognition tools that could assist medical professionals (Marcos et al., 2021). The discussion extends to the ethical landscape, probing the extent to which such AI systems should be vested with autonomous decision-making capacities (Huh & Seo, 2019). Additionally, Andersson (2022) foregrounds the necessity of contemplating the potential infringement on fundamental human rights, such as freedom of thought, when deploying emotionally intelligent AI.

Thus, the existing literature serves as an intellectual tapestry woven with diverse threads of academic interest: from the rudimentary mechanics of emotional intelligence to its practical applications and ethical ramifications. Research has delved into the role of emotions in intelligent behavior, articulated the benefits of integrating emotional aspects into artificial cognitive systems, and offered frameworks to realize socially and emotionally intelligent AI. Concurrently, inquiries into AI-enabled communication mechanisms, advancements in synthetic emotional intelligence, and the ethical contours of artificial emotions have enriched the academic discourse. Finally, considerations of healthcare applications and legal challenges offer a holistic view of the state and prospects of emotionally intelligent AI.

2.2 Generative AI Agents

The incorporation of generative AI agents into the domains of video gaming and decision-making processes manifests as a burgeoning area of scholarly inquiry. Early studies, such as those conducted by Naddaf (2010) and Liu et al. (2017), have explored the implementation of reinforcement learning-based methods to tutor AI agents in gameplay. Naddaf's work provides foundational understanding of how AI agents can be trained through reinforcement learning to adapt to specific game environments. Liu et al. (2017) further evolved these concepts, employing agents like the Random Mutation Hill-Climber to bring about game versions with substantial skill depth. These studies are complemented by the work of Holmgård et al. (2014) and Barthet et al. (2022), which postulate that artificial agents can function as abstract simulations of human players' internal decision-making processes. Barthet et al. note that generative personas manifest behaviors and responses that closely emulate human personas, affirming the potential for AI agents to accurately model human behavior and decision-making.

A related vein of research has delved into the evaluation and testing of video games via AI agents. For instance, Ariyurek, Betin-Can, & Surer (2019) found that synthetic agents demonstrate a capacity comparable to human testers in identifying software glitches. However, Fathi & Palhang (2018) delineate a notable limitation, pointing out the paucity of diversity in agent behavior, leading to predictability. The work of Nareyek (2000), Tan and Nareyek (2009), and Miikkulainen et al. (2006) subsequently elucidates the wide-ranging potential of AI techniques in modern video gaming, while Fernández et al. (2006) dissect the complexities involved in designing the behavior of automated player characters.

Emerging research has also scrutinized the capabilities of generative AI models such as ChatGPT in reshaping practices across diverse scientific and medical fields. Morris (2023) reveals through interviews with twenty scientists that generative AI holds the potential to accelerate the pace of scientific discovery. Furthermore, Megahed et al. (2023) indicate that these models could enhance statistical process control practices. They do, however, caution against potential misuse and misunderstanding, given the nascent stage of these technologies. Contributions from Murphy & Thomas (2023) explore the deployment of generative AI in spinal cord injury research, illuminating its utility in creating virtual models and optimizing medical protocols.

Recent advancements demonstrate a unique capability of generative AI agents to simulate diverse personas in controlled environments. Research conducted by Park et al. (2023) manifests this through the creation of an RPG-style virtual world populated by AI agents with distinct personalities and social dynamics. The investigators employed the ChatGPT API for social interactions, developing an intricate architecture that simulated agents with both memories and experiences. When evaluated for the believability of behavior, the generative agent architecture surpassed even human role-play responses in terms of authenticity. However, the researchers also sounded notes of caution, warning of ethical considerations including the formation of inappropriate parasocial relationships and an overreliance on generative agents.

Taken together, scholarship illuminates a trajectory wherein generative AI agents are increasingly implicated in an array of contexts ranging from video gaming to scientific research and medical applications. While the capabilities of these agents to mimic human behavior and decision-making have been affirmed, caveats regarding their responsible deployment remain. Ethical considerations, particularly in the context of believability and human-AI interaction, require further scholarly exploration to safeguard against unintended consequences. Therefore, the research corpus underscores the transformative potential of generative AI agents, even as it calls for a nuanced understanding of their limitations and ethical implications.

2.3 The Modular Mind Theory and Its Application

The Modular Mind Theory postulates that the human brain operates not as a monolithic entity, but as an intricate network of specialized modules or centers dedicated to specific cognitive functions. This perspective gains empirical substantiation through biological evidence, most compellingly through cases of traumatic brain injuries. Observations of individuals who have incurred such injuries often reveal precise deficits corresponding to the localized areas of damage. For instance, damage to Broca's area has been found to result in specific language impairments without affecting other cognitive faculties (Damasio & Damasio, 1992). Fodor (1983) advanced theories around modularity of mind, arguing for specialized and autonomous subsystems that operate on distinct types of information. Furthermore, Fodor posited that such modules are domain-specific, operate autonomously, and are evolutionarily hardwired.

The construct of the modular mind gains additional validation through groundbreaking split-brain experiments. Gazzaniga (1970) pioneered work that involved severing the corpus callosum, the band of nerve fibers that connects the two hemispheres of the brain. The resultant observations illuminated how each hemisphere functions as a distinct module capable of independent cognitive processes. Psychoanalysts, including Fodor, have drawn on these findings to further elaborate the modularity theory, contributing to a deeper understanding of cognitive architecture.

Extending the theory of the modular mind into the realm of AI, Bryson (2000) offers the seminal treatment "Modular Representations of Cognitive Phenomena in AI, Psychology, and Neuroscience." This work builds upon the notion that the architecture underlying cognitive processes whether biological or artificial is fundamentally modular in nature. Bryson delineates a comprehensive framework that distinguishes between horizontal and vertical modules. According to Bryson, horizontal modules pertain to general cognitive processes like attention and memory, whereas vertical modules are domain-specific and tailored for particular tasks. Moreover while the modular perspective affords a parsimonious representation of complex cognitive phenomena, Bryson emphasizes the manifold challenges in constructing modular representations that capture the nuanced interplay between various cognitive components. The task becomes even more daunting when one considers the need to integrate findings across multiple disciplines psychology, neuroscience, and AI to form a cohesive and comprehensive model.

The intricate nature of these systems whether a neural network in a biological entity or a machine learning model in AI reveals a complex tapestry of interwoven modules. The challenge for contemporary research lies in mapping these modular structures accurately and comprehensively, a task made more complicated by the labyrinthine interdependencies that exist within and across modules. Therefore, as Bryson (2000) points out, while modularity offers a framework for simplifying the complexity inherent in cognitive systems, it simultaneously highlights the intricate and multi-faceted nature of these systems.

Thus, the modular mind theory offers an explanatory framework that enjoys empirical support from multiple disciplines. From the selective impairments observed in traumatic brain injuries to the domain-specific architectures posited in artificial intelligence, the modular perspective offers compelling insights. Yet, as research progresses, it becomes evident that capturing the complexity of these modular systems, whether in the human brain or artificial entities, remains a formidable intellectual challenge.

3. Recommendations

3.1 The Proposed Synthesis of Sentience

Contemporary large language models, such as ChatGPT and its more advanced counterpart GPT-4, represent an architecture underpinned by sophisticated neural networks trained on copious amounts of textual data. These architectures demonstrate remarkable flexibility and adaptability, particularly when guided by precise prompts or augmented by additional computational components (Elshentenawy et al., 2023). The capabilities range from rudimentary conversational tasks to solving complex analytical problems, thereby embodying traits suggestive of multiple cognitive modules within a unified framework.

Recent scholarship posits the integration of LLMs with autonomous agents as a pathway toward emulating the complexity inherent in human cognition. In essence, autonomous agents would represent specific psychological modules, thus functioning as surrogates for distinct components of human mental activity (Hong et al., 2023; Xi et al., 2023). A compelling aspect of this synthesis is the incorporation of personas, delineated behavioral and cognitive profiles, to guide the activities of these agents (Ratican & Hutson, 2023). The overarching objective centers on mimicking the variegated complexity of human thought, achieved through orchestrating the interactions among these autonomous modules.

Essential to this synthetic model of sentience is the postulation of an executive module, responsible for the preservation of a cohesive sense of self. An executive module would function analogously to the role played by the prefrontal cortex in human cognition, overseeing the activity of specialized modules such as "emotion," "social cognition," "executive control," and "cognitive processing" (Williams et al., 2023). This structure aims to replicate the nuanced interplay observed in human cognitive systems, where specialized regions of the brain handle specific tasks yet work in concert to produce unified thought and behavior.

In fact, the empirical basis for such a synthesis is not without precedent. Cases of traumatic brain injury have demonstrated how specific cognitive functions are impaired in direct correlation to the location of damage, thereby reinforcing the modular view of the mind (Damasio & Damasio, 1992). Furthermore, research into split-brain patients highlights the semi-autonomous nature of brain hemispheres (Gazzaniga, 1970). Theories of modularity from cognitive science and psychoanalysis further lend credence to this approach (Fodor, 1983). However, the complexity of replicating the architecture of human cognition should not be underestimated. Efficacy depends on precise calibration of each autonomous agent's functional parameters and effective integration into an overarching system. Furthermore, the algorithmic architecture must continually adapt to account for the emergent properties of the integrated system, an area necessitating further investigation.

The proposed synthesis offers a theoretical yet empirically grounded framework for advancing the capabilities of large language models. By integrating these models with specialized autonomous agents, each embodying a distinct cognitive or psychological module, this architecture aims to approximate the complexity and functionality of human cognition. Although these are early days for such interdisciplinary ventures, the approach stands as an exemplar of converging insights from psychology, neuroscience, and artificial intelligence, holding promise for both theoretical advancement and practical application.

3.2 The Proposed Model: Autonomous Agents as Proxies for Mental Modules

The conceptual bedrock of the present study builds upon extant literature that delineates the human mind as a modular entity a concept espoused by theorists like Fodor (1983) and empirical researchers alike (Bryson, 2005). Specifically, Bryson's seminal paper serves as a lynchpin, situating this study at the crossroads of neuroscience, psychology, and AI. Bryson delineates the mind as comprising both horizontal and vertical modules, where the former correspond to generalized cognitive processes and the latter to domain-specific skills. This dual-module model offers a comprehensive approach to cognitive phenomena, thus laying the groundwork for the current research initiative.

Current AI models such as GPT-4 consist of neural networks trained on vast datasets, demonstrating adaptability and functional versatility (Brown et al., 2020). Such versatility lends credence to the feasibility of employing these models as proxies for psychological and neurological modules, as delineated by modular mind theory and related psychological theories. For instance, Brown et al. (2020) point out the ability of these language models to adapt to various task requirements, a trait that could serve well in emulating the flexibility of human cognition. Central to the proposed model is the idea of employing autonomous agents as representatives for specific mental modules. Each agent, powered by large language models potentially of varying capacities is accorded a specialized role reflective of specific mental functions. These agents then process information and relay it to an 'executive module,' thereby preserving an overarching sense of self. Herein, the model takes inspiration from the biological observations that trauma to specific brain regions often results in correlated cognitive impairments (Norman et al., 2023).

The issue of computational efficiency is pivotal; thus, the model postulates the potential utility of smaller, specialized models for specific modules. For example, less computationally demanding pre-trained models, such as BERT-Tiny and BERT-Small, if fine-tuned appropriately, could outperform a larger, general-purpose model like GPT-4 in specialized tasks (Rana et al., 2023). The crux of the model resides in the executive function module, a computational entity that ensures mental cohesion and preserves a unified sense of self. Biologically speaking, the human brain appears to possess an analogous function, particularly within its hemispheres (Gazzaniga, 1983). Gazzaniga's work on split-brain patients (and more recently Zhu (2023)) reveals that the two hemispheres can hold divergent beliefs yet maintain a unified self, suggesting an executive function at play. Challenges notwithstanding, this theoretical framework offers a robust scaffold for future research. The proposition of using autonomous agents as proxies for mental modules melds advances in AI with nuanced psychological theories. The ultimate aim achieving a coherent, unified agent mirrors the intricate interplay of modular functions within the human mind, thereby extending the frontiers of both AI and cognitive science.

4. Conclusion

The endeavor to integrate autonomous agents as representative elements of distinct psychological and neural functions presents a research frontier characterized by both conceptual promise and empirical challenges. A noteworthy aspect demanding scholarly attention is the identification of optimal architectures for these agents, with the imperative of ensuring compatibility with established theories of mental modules. Experiments are requisite to ascertain the computational frameworks best suited for the emulation of specific cognitive, affective, and sensorimotor functions, thereby fostering an alignment between psychological understanding and computational realization.

Efficiency remains a paramount consideration in the allocation of roles among different artificial intelligence agents. The diversity among available large language models, ranging from those tailored for general purposes like GPT-4 to specialized variants like TinyBERT, provides researchers with a broad spectrum of options. Indeed, the application of smaller, specialized models like TinyBERT could enhance the system's efficiency without substantially compromising functionality. TinyBERT, for instance, has been observed to perform effectively in specific tasks while requiring less computational power, rendering it an attractive candidate for specialized roles within the synthetic mental framework (He et al., 2023).

Central to the success of this synthetic cognitive model is the maintenance of a cohesive and unified mental state, simulated through an executive function module. This feature not only parallels the integrative operations within human cognition but is also essential for the functional stability of the model. It ensures that the individual components coalesce into an entity approximating human-like cognition, sidestepping the potential for conflicting outputs that might compromise the system's integrity. The interdisciplinary orientation of this research engaging computational science, neuroscience, and psychology is instrumental in providing a multifaceted understanding of cognition. By employing modular representations, this work navigates the complexities of mental functions and creates a scaffold upon which advancements in individual disciplines can be collectively integrated.

Finally, the potential implications of this research are manifold, notably in the domain of emulating intricate facets of human cognition. Although the endeavor remains exploratory, the plausible outcomes could significantly expand the scope of what artificial intelligence systems can achieve. Nevertheless, the synthetic cognition model presented herein accentuates the parallels as well as the distinctions between biological and artificial cognitive architectures. While the modular approach has gained traction in the understanding of both natural and artificial cognitive systems, it is pivotal to remember that the latter still lacks the biological nuances that characterize the human mind, such as neuroplasticity and emotional complexity. In all, the quest for a synthetic model that approximates the multifaceted nature of human cognition posits not only scientific challenges but also opportunities for revolutionary advancements in both artificial intelligence and neuroscience.

5. Data Availability

Data available upon request.

6. Conflicts of Interest

The author(s) declare(s) that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

7. Funding Statement

NA

8. Authors' Contributions

Conceptualization, J. Ratican; Methodology, J. Ratican; Validation, J. Hutson; Investigation, J. Hutson – Original Draft Preparation, J. Hutson; Writing – Review & Editing, J. Hutson.; Visualization, J. Hutson.

9. About The Authors

James Hutson: Department Head of Art History and Visual Culture, College of Arts and Humanities, Lindenwood University, Saint Charles, MO, USA.

10. References

1. Albahri AS, Duhaim AM, Fadhel MA, Alnoor A, Baqer NS, Alzubaidi L, & Deveci M, et al., A Systematic Review of Trustworthy and Explainable Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Assessment of Quality, Bias Risk, and Data Fusion. Information Fusion 2023;96:156-191.
2. Al-Kurdi OF, El-Haddadeh R, & Eldabi T. The Role of Organisational Climate in Managing Knowledge Sharing Among Academics in Higher Education. International Journal of Information Management 2020;50:217-227.
3. Andersson R. The Bioeconomy and the Birth of a "New Anthropology". Cultural Anthropology 2022;37(1):37-44.
4. Ariyurek S, Betin-Can A, & Surer E. Automated Video Game Testing Using Synthetic and Humanlike Agents. IEEE Transactions on Games 2019;13(1):50-67.
5. Barthet M, Khalifa A, Liapis A, & Yannakakis G. Generative Personas that Behave and Experience Like Humans. In Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games September 2022;34:(pp. 1-10).
6. Biggs JB, Tang C, & Kennedy G. Ebook: Teaching for Quality Learning at University 5e. McGraw-Hill education (UK) 2022.
7. Brew A, & Boud D. Teaching and Research: Establishing the Vital Link with Learning. Higher Education 1995;29(3):261-273.
8. Bryson JJ. Modular Representations of Cognitive Phenomena in AI, Psychology and Neuroscience. In Visions of Mind: Architectures for Cognition and Affect (pp. 66-89). IGI Global 2005.
9. Budhwar P, Malik A, De Silva MT, & Thevisuthan P. Artificial Intelligence–Challenges and Opportunities for International HRM: A Review and Research Agenda. The International Journal of Human Resource Management 2022;33(6):1065-1097.
10. Buffington A, Lange C, Bakker C, Nanney M, Roberts W. Berge J, & Lot K. The Collaborative Scholarship Intensive: A Research-Intensive Course to Improve Faculty Scholarship. Family Medicine 2021;53(5):355-358.
11. Centra JA. Research Productivity and Teaching Effectiveness. Research in Higher Education 1983;18: 379-389.
12. Coate K, Barnett R, & Williams G. Relationships Between Teaching and Research in Higher Education in England. Higher Education Quarterly 2001;55(2):158-174.
13. Cominelli L, Hoegen G, & De Rossi D. Abel: Integrating Humanoid Body, Emotions, and Time Perception to Investigate Social Interaction and Human Cognition. Applied Sciences 2021;11(3):1070.
14. de Carvalho PAC. Emojar: Collecting and Reliving Memorable and Emotionally Impactful Digital Content (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal)), 2019.
15. Damasio AR, & Damasio H. Brain and language. Scientific American 1992;267(3):88-109.
16. Duan Y, Edwards JS, & Dwivedi YK. Artificial Intelligence for Decision Making in the Era of Big Data–Evolution, Challenges and Research Agenda. International Journal of Information Management 2019;48:63-71.
17. Elshentenawy M, Ahmed M, Elalfy M, Bakr A, Heidar M, & Amer E. Intellibot: A Personalized Behavioral Analysis Chatbot Framework Powered by GPT-3. In 2023 Intelligent Methods, Systems, and Applications (IMSA) (pp. 136-141). IEEE July 2023.
18. Fathi K, & Palhang M. Evaluation of Using Neural Networks on Variety of Agents and Playability of Games. In 2018 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Data Processing (IDAP) (pp. 1-8). IEEE September 2018.

19. Fernández, S., Adarve, R., Pérez, M., Rybarczyk, M., & Borrajo, D. Planning for an AI Based Virtual Agents Game. In Proceedings of the Workshop AI Planning for Computer Games and Synthetic Characters in the ICAPS 2006.
20. Finnegan, D. E., & Gamson, Z. F. Disciplinary Adaptations to Research Culture in Comprehensive Institutions. The Review of Higher Education 1996;19(2):141-177.
21. Fodor JA. (1983). The Modularity of Mind. MIT Press.
22. Foster NF, & Gibbons S. Understanding Faculty to Improve Content Recruitment for Institutional Repositories. Online Submission 2005;11(1).
23. Gazzaniga MS. Right Hemisphere Language Following Brain Bisection: A 20-year Perspective. American Psychologist 1983;38(5):525.
24. Garon J. A Practical Introduction to Generative AI, Synthetic Media, and the Messages Found in the Latest Medium. Synthetic Media, and the Messages Found in the Latest Medium March 14, 2023.
25. Gill SS, & Kaur R. ChatGPT: Vision and challenges. Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems 2023;3:262-271.
26. He D, Lv X, Zhu S, Chan S, & Choo KKR. A Method for Detecting Phishing Websites Based on Tiny-Bert Stacking. IEEE Internet of Things Journal 2023.
27. Hill Y, Lomas L, & MacGregor J. Students' Perceptions of Quality in Higher Education. Quality Assurance in Education 2003;11(1):15-20.
28. Holmgard C, Liapis A, Togelius J, & Yannakakis GN. Generative Agents for Player Decision Modeling in Games. 9th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games, Fort Lauderdale 2014;1-8.
29. Hong S, Zheng X, Chen J, Cheng Y, Zhang C, Wang Z, et al., Metagpt: Meta programming for multi-agent collaborative framework. arXiv preprint 2023;arXiv:2308.00352.
30. Huh JH, & Seo YS. Understanding Edge Computing: Engineering Evolution with Artificial Intelligence. IEEE Access 2019;7:164229-164245.
31. Jacelon CS, Zucker DM, Staccarini JM, & Henneman EA. Peer Mentoring for Tenure-Track Faculty. Journal of Professional Nursing 2003;19(6):335-338.
32. Jamali A, Bhutto A, Khaskhely M, & Sethar W. Impact of Leadership Styles on Faculty Performance: Moderating Role of Organizational Culture in Higher Education. Management Science Letters 2022;12(1):1-20.
33. Jayman M, Glazzard J, & Rose A. Tipping Point: The Staff Wellbeing Crisis in Higher Education. In Frontiers in Education. Frontiers August 2022;7:929335.
34. Jeste DV, Graham SA, Nguyen TT, Depp CA, Lee EE, & Kim HC. Beyond Artificial Intelligence: Exploring Artificial Wisdom. International Psychogeriatrics 2020;32(8):993-1001.
35. Khachane MY. Organ-Based Medical Image Classification Using Support Vector Machine. International Journal of Synthetic Emotions (IJSE) 2017;8(1):18-30.
36. Khezr P, & Mohan V. The Vexing but Persistent Problem of Authorship Misconduct in Research. Research Policy 2022;51(3):104466.
37. Koch A, Nafziger J, & Nielsen HS. Behavioral Economics of Education. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization 2015;115:3-17.
38. Kulage KM, Larson EL, & Begg MD. Sharing Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Cost Recovery to Facilitate Interdisciplinary Research. Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges 2011;86(3):394-401.
39. Latif E, Mai G, Nyaaba M, Wu X, Liu N, Lu G, et al., Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) for Education. arXiv preprint 2023;arXiv:2304.12479.
40. Lee H. The Rise of ChatGPT: Exploring Its Potential in Medical Education. Anatomical Sciences Education 2023.
41. Li Y, Jiang Y, Tian D, Hu L, Lu H, & Yuan Z. AI-Enabled Emotion Communication. IEEE Network 2019;33(6):15-21.
42. Liu J, Togelius J, Pérez-Liébana D, & Lucas SM. Evolving Game Skill-Depth Using General Video Game AI Agents. In 2017 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC). IEEE June 2017;pp.2299-2307.
43. Liu Y, Han T, Ma S, Zhang J, Yang Y, Tian J, et al., Summary of ChatGPT/GPT-4 Research and Perspective Towards the Future of Large Language Models. arXiv preprint 2023;arXiv:2304.01852.
44. Liu-Thompkins Y, Okazaki S, & Li H. Artificial Empathy in Marketing Interactions: Bridging the Human-AI Gap in Affective and Social Customer Experience. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science 2022;50(6):1198-1218.
45. Mahmud H, Islam AN, Ahmed SI, & Smolander K. What Influences Algorithmic Decision-Making? A Systematic Literature Review on Algorithm Aversion. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 2022;175:121390.
46. Marcos S, García Peñalvo FJ, & Vázquez Ingelmo A. Emotional AI in Healthcare: A pilot architecture proposal to merge emotion recognition tools. In Ninth International Conference on Technological Ecosystems for Enhancing Multiculturality (TEEM'21) October 2021;342-349.
47. Matos JF, Piedade J, Freitas A, Pedro N, Dorotea N, Pedro A, & Galego C. Teaching and Learning Research Methodologies in Education: A Systematic Literature Review. Education Sciences 2023;13(2):173.
48. Maxwell LD, & Ball AL. What is Scholarship? Faculty Knowledge and Perceptions of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Journal of Agricultural Education 2010;51(2):127.
49. McKeown JS, Bista K, & Chan RY. Global Higher Education During COVID-19: Policy, Society, and Technology. STAR Scholars 2022.
50. McNair TB, Albertine S, McDonald N, Major Jr T, & Cooper MA. Becoming a Student-Ready College: A New Culture of Leadership for Student Success. John Wiley & Sons 2022.
51. Megahed FM, Chen YJ, Ferris JA, Knoth S, & Jones-Farmer LA. How Generative AI Models such as ChatGPT can be (Mis)Used in Practice, Education, and Research? An Exploratory Study. Quality Engineering 2023:1-29.
52. Meilani YFCP, Tan JD, Murwani FD, Bernarto I, & Sudibjo N. Motivating and Retaining Generation Z Faculty Members in Private Universities. Journal of Educational and Social Research 2021;11(1):245-255.
53. Miikkulainen R, Bryant BD, Cornelius R, Karpov IV, Stanley KO, & Yong CH. Computational Intelligence in Games. Computational Intelligence: Principles and Practice 2006:155-191.
54. Mokiy V, & Lukyanova T. Development of Interdisciplinarity and Transdisciplinarity in Modern Russian Science and Higher Education. In Institutionalizing Interdisciplinarity and Transdisciplinarity. Routledge 2022;pp.124-138.
55. Moody J. Faculty Diversity: Removing the Barriers. Routledge 2013.
56. Morris MR. Scientists' Perspectives on the Potential for Generative AI in their Fields. arXiv preprint 2023;arXiv:2304.01420.
57. Murphy C, & Thomas FP. Generative AI in Spinal Cord Injury Research and Care: Opportunities and Challenges Ahead. The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine 2023;46(3):341-342.

58. Naddaf Y. Game-Independent AI Agents for Playing Atari 2600 Console Games. University of Alberta, Canada.

59. Nareyek A. Intelligent Agents for Computer Games. In International Conference on Computers and Games (pp. 414-422). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg October 2000.

60. Norman R, Flaugher T, Chang S, & Power E. Self-Perception of Cognitive-Communication Functions after Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology 2023;32(2S):883-906.

61. Norton-Meier L, Hand B, Cavagnetto A, Akkus R, & Gunel M. Pedagogy, Implementation, and Professional Development for Teaching Science Literacy: How Students and Teachers Know and Learn. Quality Research in Literacy and Science Education: International Perspectives and Gold Standards 2009;pp.169-187.

62. Omar MS, Idrus IM, & Jamal NA. The Influence of Job Motivation on Job Satisfaction: A Case Study of Polytechnic Academic Staff. Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH) 2021;6(1):206-213.

63. Park, JS, O'Brien, JC, Cai CJ, Morris MR, Liang P, & Bernstein MS. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. arXiv preprint 2023;arXiv:2304.03442.

64. Picard RW, Papert S, Bender W, Blumberg B, Breazeal C, Cavallo D, et al., Affective Learning A Manifesto. BT Technology Journal 2004;22(4): 253-269.

65. Power MJ. The Structure of Emotion: An Empirical Comparison of Six Models. Cognition & Emotion 2006;20(5):694-713.

66. Prince MJ, Felder RM, & Brent R. (2007). Does Faculty Research Improve Undergraduate Teaching? An Analysis of Existing and Potential Synergies. Journal of Engineering Education 2007;96(4):283-294.

67. Pusztahelyi R. Emotional AI and Its Challenges in the Viewpoint of Online Marketing. Curentul Juridic 2020;81(2):13-31.

68. Rana V, Garg V, Mago Y, & Bhat A. Compact BERT-Based Multi-Models for Efficient Fake News Detection. In 2023 3rd International Conference on Intelligent Technologies (CONIT). IEEE June 2023;pp.1-4.

69. Ratican J, & Hutson J. (2023). The Six Emotional Dimension (6DE) Model: A Multidimensional Approach to Analyzing Human Emotions and Unlocking the Potential of Emotionally Intelligent Artificial Intelligence (AI) via Large Language Models (LLM). Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics 2023;1(1).

70. Ray PP. ChatGPT: A Comprehensive Review on Background, Applications, Key Challenges, Bias, Ethics, Limitations and Future Scope. Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems 2023.

71. Sadiq Sohail M, & Daud S. Knowledge Sharing in Higher Education Institutions: Perspectives from Malaysia. Vine 2009;39(2): 125-142.

72. Samsonovich AV. Socially Emotional Brain-Inspired Cognitive Architecture Framework for Artificial Intelligence. Cognitive Systems Research 2020;60:57-76.

73. Santo SA, Engstrom ME, Reetz L, Schweinle WE, & Reed K. Faculty Productivity Barriers and Supports at a School of Education. Innovative Higher Education 2009;34:117-129.

74. Sato M, & Loewen S. Do Teachers Care About Research? The Research–Pedagogy Dialogue. ELT Journal 2019;73(1):1-10.

75. Selvaraj C, Chandra I, & Singh SK. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Approaches for Drug Design: Challenges and Opportunities for the Pharmaceutical Industries. Molecular Diversity 2021;26:1893-1913.

76. Shahriar S, & Hayawi K. Let's Have a Chat! A Conversation with ChatGPT: Technology, Applications, and Limitations. arXiv preprint 2023;arXiv:2302.13817.

77. Shavit, Y. (Ed.). (2007). Stratification in Higher Education: A Comparative Study. Stanford University Press 2007.

78. Singh A, & Chouhan T. Artificial Intelligence in HRM: Role of Emotional–Social Intelligence and Future Work Skill. In The Adoption and Effect of Artificial Intelligence on Human Resources Management, Part A. Emerald Publishing Limited 2023;pp.175-196.

79. Sohrabi C, Mathew G, Franchi T, Kerwan A, Griffin M, Del Mundo JSC, et al., Impact of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic on Scientific Research and Implications for Clinical Academic Training–A Review. International Journal of Surgery, 2021;86:57-63.

80. Strich F, Mayer AS, & Fiedler M. What Do I Do in a World of Artificial Intelligence? Investigating the Impact of Substitutive Decision-Making AI Systems on Employees' Professional Role Identity. Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 2021;22(2):304-324.

81. Tan SC, & Nareyek A. Integrating Facial, Gesture, and Posture Emotion Expression for a 3D Virtual Agent. In Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Computer Games: AI, Animation, Mobile, Interactive Multimedia, Educational & Serious Games (CGames 2009 USA) 2009;pp. 23-31.

82. Tavares O, Sin C, Sá C, Bugla S, & Amaral A. Inbreeding and Research Collaborations in Portuguese Higher Education. Higher Education Quarterly, 2022;76(1): 102-115.

83. Terenzini PT, & Pascarella ET. Studying College Students in the 21st century: Meeting New Challenges. The Review of Higher Education 1998;21(2):151-165.

84. Trott CD, Sample McMeeking LB, & Weinberg AE. Participatory Action Research Experiences for Undergraduates: Forging Critical Connections Through Community Engagement. Studies in Higher Education 2020;45(11):2260-2273.

85. Väljataga T, Fiedler SH, & Laanpere M. Re-Thinking Digital Textbooks: Students as Co-Authors. In Advances in Web-Based Learning--ICWL 2015: 14th International Conference, Guangzhou, China, November 5-8, 2015, Proceedings 14. Springer International Publishing 2015;143-151.

86. Werth E, & Williams K. Exploring Student Perceptions as Co-Authors of Course Material. Open Praxis 2021;13(1):53-67.

87. Williams R, Andreassi S, Moselli M, Fantini F, Tanzilli A, Lingiardi V, & Laghi F. Relationship between Executive Functions, Social Cognition, and Attachment State of Mind in Adolescence: An Explorative Study. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 2023;20(4):2836.

88. Wortman B, & Wang JZ. HICEM: A High-Coverage Emotion Model for Artificial Emotional Intelligence. arXiv preprint 2022;arXiv:2206.07593.

89. Xi Z, Chen W, Guo X, He W, Ding Y, Hong B, et al., The Rise and Potential of Large Language Model Based Agents: A Survey. arXiv preprint 2023;arXiv:2309.07864.

90. Zall R, & Kangavari MR. Comparative Analytical Survey on Cognitive Agents with Emotional Intelligence. Cognitive Computation 2022;14(4):1223-1246.

91. Zhang L, Carter Jr RA, Qian X, Yang S, Rujimora J, & Wen S. (2022). Academia's Responses to Crisis: A Bibliometric Analysis of Literature on Online Learning in Higher Education During COVID-19. British Journal of Educational Technology, 2022;53(3):620-646.

92. Zhu Y. The Summarization of Split Brain Study of Last Few Decades. Highlights in Science, Engineering and Technology 2023;30:117-122.