

Analyzing the Contextual Shortcomings of Artificial General Intelligence

Nick DiSanto

California Baptist University, nicolasc.disanto@calbaptist.edu

Abstract - Even in the most cutting-edge Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) endeavors, the disparity between humans and artificial systems is extremely apparent. Although this difference fundamentally divides the capabilities of each, human-level intelligence (HLI) has remained the aim of AGI for decades. This paper opposes the binarity of the Turing Test, the foundation of this intention and original establishment of a potentially intelligent machine. It discusses how AI experts misinterpreted the Imitation Game as a means to anthropomorphize computer systems and asserts that HLI is a red herring that distracts current research from relevant problems. Despite the extensive research on the potential design of an AGI application, there has been little consideration of how such a system will access and ingest data at a human-like level. Although current machines may emulate specific human attributes, AGI is developed under the pretense that this can be easily scaled up to a general intelligence level. This paper establishes contextual and rational attributes that perpetuate the variation between human and AI data collection abilities and explores the characteristics that current AGI lacks. After asserting that AGI should not be seeking HLI, its current state is analyzed, the Turing Test is reevaluated, and the future of AGI development is discussed within this framework.

Keywords – Artificial General Intelligence (AGI), context, data collection, human-level intelligence (HLI), intelligent systems, Turing Test (TT)

1 INTRODUCTION

Although machine learning and Artificial Intelligent systems have proven to be undoubtedly beneficial, their roles still differ from those of humans. AI, while heuristically impressive, is currently bound to task-based applications. While many of these products are proficient at simple, low-level tasks [1, 2], humans excel at abstract thought and metacognition [3, 4]. "Weak AI," which focuses on one narrow task and will hereafter be referred to as Artificial Narrow Intelligence (ANI), demonstrates a notable contrast to human capability. Though Artificial General Intelligence (AGI)—the complete abstraction of knowledge—is the goal for truly "intelligent" solutions, characteristics of ANI are seen in all current AI products.

Noguerol [5] demonstrates the potential weaknesses of ANI in the context of subjective associations in radiology.

While AI development has gone through "summers" and "winters," the prevailing definition, criteria, and goal of AGI remain unchanged: developing a system that rivals or exceeds human-level intelligence (HLI). Before continuing, it is essential to distinguish intelligence from *general* intelligence in the context of AI development. Well-regarded definitions of intelligence in the AI community include "the ability to solve hard problems" [6] and "achieving goals in a wide variety of environments" [7]. For the scope of this paper, intelligence will simply be considered the ability to learn from data and, most importantly, apply it to solve specific tasks. General intelligence, on the other hand, is less correlated to task-solving ability. Voss [8] describes it as "the essential, domain-independent skills necessary for acquiring a wide range of domain-specific knowledge (data and skills) – i.e., the ability to learn anything (in principle)." Pennachin [9] describes it as "the ability to reason and think in a variety of domains, not just in a single area." For the sake of simplicity, this paper will consider general intelligence to be congruent with HLI: the ability to generalize and learn from *any* data and apply it in abstract environments.

As recent research has attempted to establish criteria for AI to approach HLI, it does not acknowledge abilities that are likely unachievable in current implementations. While AGI is a very broad (not to mention abstruse) idea, its shortcomings are inherent and unavoidable in both theory and practice when compared to human general intelligence.

2 BACKGROUND – TURING TEST

While HLI is undoubtedly a natural benchmark for AGI, the most notable work to formally establish it is likely the Turing Test (TT). Introduced by Turing [10], the "Imitation Game" consists of a human communicating with a hidden entity. For a machine to pass the test, the human test subject must not be able to distinguish human users from AI imposters. Turing's goal in establishing this as a target was simply to create a tangible, task-based benchmark for AGI, considering "thought" has been arbitrarily defined in the philosophical community since Descartes [11].

The TT is generally considered the first quantifiable definition of a conscious entity and the origin of Artificial Intelligence. As one of the original attempts to define a human-like artificial system, it paved the way for deep

learning, developing machine learning models after the human brain's neural networks. Importantly, these demonstrations established the goal of AI development as "rivaling human ability," a dangerous rhetoric that would stay rigid for decades to come.

However, the TT exhibits several limitations. Most importantly, it suggests that humans are the only reasonable benchmark for an intelligent system (a fallacy that will be further discussed later). Other important issues with the TT are its reliance on the aptitude of its participants [12] and its assumption that linguistics is the best measure of intelligent thought. The latter is best argued by Dreyfus [13], which contented that human learning is mainly tacit and unquantifiable, and Gunderson [14], which was skeptical that language could adequately encapsulate intelligence.

The TT also sets the expectation that high performance in a performative task, such as conversation, is a surefire demonstration of rational thought. However, as established in the definition of AGI, general intelligence should not be contingent on its abilities in a task-based environment. The "Chinese Room" argument [15] famously demonstrates that giving a "correct" response can be very different from giving a thoughtful one. The strict binarity of the TT further emphasizes the problem with such a black-box environment. The TT concludes with a simple "yes" or "no" answer as to whether the computer is "intelligent" enough to imitate humans. However, it does not indicate the system's thought process, the method it takes to approximate human-level reasoning, or how close it gets to success. This yields no insight into its intellectual proficiency. The difference between the thought process of someone with square roots memorized and someone who can calculate them in their head illustrates this point. Merely acknowledging a correct answer provides no transparency into the person's problem-solving capability.

3 THE GOAL OF AGI

When claiming that the TT is not a viable measure of general intelligence, it becomes necessary to establish what the goal of AGI should instead be. Instead of following popular sentiment, this goal should rely on machine learning architectures' capabilities. Unfortunately, even as AI has continued to improve, its target has hardly changed. Whether spurred by trendy developments in the field, portrayals of the media [16], or Turing himself, the AI community has pressed on in the quest of rivaling human thought. However, while ANI has far surpassed the expectations of even Turing, AGI is struggling to match the general understanding of even a young child. Watching cutting-edge products struggle to fill the human-size shoes of general intelligence begs whether the prevailing approaches are practical.

This paper seeks to establish criteria that demonstrate why the comparison of AI to HLI is a red herring. Instead of framing AGI models to challenge human thought, AI developers should seek to build efficient models that can automate specific tasks with minimal supervision. Russell &

Norvig [17] analogize AI development to the aeronautical engineering research that led to successful "artificial flight." As seen in the construction of airplanes, the most viable solutions did not come by modeling the source – pigeons. Instead, the general principles that govern birds were used as inspiration to build a machine with a different application. Similarly, success in AI ventures does not need to come by perfectly imitating human thought but by reaching effective solutions to relevant issues.

To contradict popular thought, this paper will combat the notion of human-level AGI by presenting foundational distinctions between the efficiency and nature in which humans and AI can collect, process, and learn from data.

4 COMPARISON TO HUMAN LEARNING ARCHITECTURE

Since the discrepancy between the current applications of HLI and AI has been demonstrated, it is essential to understand the factors that determine it. Once these are found, it becomes possible to decide whether or not they may be eliminated to bridge the gap. The areas in which the architectures are alike will be recognized and rejected to illuminate these attributes.

While their effectiveness may vary, all living creatures share remarkably similar low-level data collection and learning processes. Illeris [18] explains human learning as a two-step procedure: "an external interaction process between the learner and his or her social, cultural, or material environment, and an internal psychological process of elaboration and acquisition." It is purely biological to absorb data and make future decisions based on it. While this is a simple summary of the human learning process, it can be argued for all human encounters. Humans are simply unmindful of ideology shifts because their unfathomably extensive data collection (daily life experiences) yields incredibly slow changes.

As alluded to previously, artificial learning systems are hardly different. They are designed to mimic the learning ability of the human brain, breaking data down to its simplest form and training through abstraction. Grossberg [19] provides a particularly famous example, developing specific neural network models after particular brain regions. Similarly, de Garis [20] used simplified cellular automata-based neural networks to simulate the distribution of growth instructions through a 3D space.

The architectural accuracy of these models shows that the imitation of human brain functionality is not only possible but is underway. Thus, the distinction between humans and AI cannot lie in the implementation of the machines' data processing mechanisms. This solicits an important question: why is the difference between AGI and HLI so substantial if the underlying activity is the same? Simply put, modeling the human brain only goes so far; the actual task is creating a system that can imitate the human mind. Contrary to natural intuition, the problem with creating an artificial mind is not with its "intelligence;" computers are as capable as could be expected of them.

Instead, the issue is with sensory and information collection abilities.

5 THE DISCREPANCY – DATA INGESTION

At a low level, both human and AI systems are deceptively simple in the way they process information. However, the notion of AGI relies on the premature assumption that the external environments in which each function are analogous. State-of-the-art AGI presentations frame their research assuming that the deep, rich data required for HLI is available to machines. This is plainly false; the learnable data presented to each system is completely incomparable.

The most important distinction between human and AI data ingestion is the nature in which it is provided. Humans are presented with tens of thousands of conscious decisions daily (which hardly accounts for unconscious thought). Regardless of the individual's awareness of these interactions, each one influences the individual's intuition. This is why humans naturally avoid pain and seek pleasure without much thought [21]. Awake or asleep, aware or unaware – the body and mind are constantly interacting with their internal and external environments [22]. The human experience can therefore be modeled as a continuous, dynamic dataset with infinite potential values to consider.

Modern AI products, on the other hand, are quite primitive in their data collection techniques. Accumulating data for a supervised model requires incredibly deliberate work, including collecting, labeling, organizing, and preprocessing each value. Additionally, the model will only be provided with values that a human labeler has deemed "valuable." Its training data is entirely contingent on human understanding, which eliminates the freedom for it to reach subconscious conclusions. This is a crucial area of research that is left uninvestigated. Since computers cannot "experience the world," they will never be able to comprehend it in the same way as humans. Attempting to use human-modeled learning architectures on artificial datasets is comparing apples and oranges regarding data availability.

The difference in how these systems can perceive the world is spelled out clearly by Hoyes [23], which argues that the critical component computers are missing is the inability to instantiate 3D perceptions from 2D sense modalities. AGI is not inherently flawed in its learning methodologies; rather, it lacks the ability to absorb data about the world around it in the same way humans can. After all, since it has no real-world context, ANI needs curated data in an incredibly specific domain to perform a task at a human-like level. Instead of being considered geniuses, humans should be regarded as highly efficient data processing machines.

As argued by Huang [24], distinguishing the *method of imitation* is just as important as the tasks for AGI systems. While ANI can certainly surpass human "intelligence" in specific specializations, that goal is quite outlandish for AGI. Generalizing a machine to infinite knowledge over an infinitely vast domain is clearly

ridiculous. Instead of attempting to imitate human intelligence, modeling the human brain mitigates this objective and instead relies on abstract learning abilities. This establishes a learning architecture that emphasizes breadth instead of depth, making "general" intelligence the focus. The model demonstrated by Vinyals [25] is an important example of the pitfalls of HLI imitation. Despite training on hundreds of millions of sentences and tokens with the goal of general language understanding, the model struggles to hold up conversations of depth. How have high-budget language understanding models not mastered human language due to their brute-force learning methods? Rather than architecturally, the performance difference lies in the context of the data they collect.

6 COMPARING CONTEXTUAL COMPREHENSION

Every human experience, of which there are billions every day, elicits reactions from nerves in the body that send an exceptionally complex signal to the brain. The brain can then quickly determine these senses' origin, implications, and contextual applicability. This gives HLI an incredible amount of depth. Not only is there a tremendous amount of data collected, but it is all processed harmoniously. Conversely, AI is difficult to optimize because it cannot contextually understand and apply its data. This is due both to the narrow scope of its applications and its inability to perceive and apply contextual implications to its learning process.

Humans are more sophisticated learning creatures because their information contains three necessary contextual components: **generalized experiences, emotion and moral responsibility, and significance cognition.**

6.1 – Generalized Experiences

The single most important contextual tool humans have is the ability to generalize previous experiences to new situations. This feature is crucial because the rest of the features presented in this paper, along with the rationality of intelligent life, revolve around it. Without powerful generalization abilities, machines cannot learn altogether. In fact, in many respects, it is the best way to define "intelligence" in the first place. Chollet [26] explains intelligence as a system's "skill-acquisition efficiency." This definition can be another way to view generalization, as deducing unwritten instances is a relatively effective way to collect input [27].

While AI can generalize to a certain extent, the goal is to abstract it to the human level. A seemingly intuitive yet significant way AI struggles with this is in simple, common-sense reasoning. A demonstrative example is given by Davis [28]: when given the sentence "I stuck a pin in a carrot; when I pulled the pin out, it had a hole," humans do not need to hesitate to infer that the carrot is the object with a hole. However, NLP products often struggle with questions. AI systems (especially those trained exclusively in linguistics) have no real-world context to help them

associate their training with human experiences, making simple conclusions incredibly complex.

The following are descriptions of two unique ways humans can generalize previous experiences, along with their contrasts in AI.

6.1.1 – Previous events allow the prediction of future results

Gilbert [29] makes the case that humans can subconsciously predict not only the hedonic consequences of events they have previously experienced but also events that have not yet taken place. Using formerly extrapolated data or rules (the laws of physics, for example), humans can deduce what they expect to happen, making the subsequent result seemingly straightforward. This is sometimes referred to as "metacognition," a skill that equips humans to cope with everyday life's uncertainties. AI, contrastingly, starts from scratch every time. This severely limits its capabilities because most of its brainpower will go to affirm what humans can piece together intuitively simply.

6.1.2 – Drawing connections over different domains

Humans are remarkably adept at drawing deep connections between seemingly unrelated things. A juror in court, for example, will likely be able to consider a suspect's testimony, eyewitness testimony, and evidence, weighing each of these attributes to reach a reasonable conclusion. He is flexible and adaptable because he has processes and structures that can interact cooperatively with each other. A machine, on the contrary, would make quite a lousy juror. It cannot apply its understanding to test data that differs in *fundamental structure* from its training, even if it requires just a simple logical jump. It may be able to learn specific patterns from its training data, but its application lacks the generalization of more loosely related instances.

This is seen in machine learning applications that are used to analyze suspects. Specific neural networks meant to, for example, classify suspects based on a forensic sketch may function with a moderate rate of accuracy [30]. However, this neural network would be completely clueless in analyzing other aspects of the suspect, such as their court testimony or alibi. Although three separate models could achieve high accuracy in each of these smaller tasks, relating them to one another to reach a larger and contextually meaningful solution is impossible.

6.2 – Emotion and Moral Responsibility

The inability to perceive and handle emotions is a key component of AI's limited data collection abilities (and, notably, its exclusion from consideration as a "conscious" entity [31]). Emotion and subjective experiences are essential influencers to humans and weigh into every decision a person makes. First, it is important to note that emotional response is not necessary for improving a system's accuracy, precision, or predictability. In fact, it may often skew the objectivity of the subject. After all, cold, hard data is much less volatile than human emotion. Even so, it is a fundamental part of the human experience. AGI

attempting to exhibit human-like tendencies must also demonstrate the ability to connect with the world around it emotionally.

Regardless of the problem, AI will always seek the most logical and straightforward answer. This may seem like an appropriate ideology at face value, but it only goes so far. Many situations that humans decipher are guided by their opinions and ideologies. After all, many complex problems, such as those in politics or religion, are rooted in the individual's subjectivity. Humans are relational creatures, so emotions must be considered in meaningful interactions. AI may be adept at solving elementary tasks but equating it with humans assumes that it can understand the relational context in which human experience often lies. Since computers cannot interpret personal experiences and emotions, they have no personal philosophy to help them navigate complex real-world situations.

Similarly, every human decision is rooted in that person's inherent values and moral responsibilities. To make an informed decision, humans have a lifetime of opportunities to learn what they consider "right" and "wrong." This allows for complete abstraction from problems, even if they have never explicitly been encountered. To illustrate, a fiscal conservative unfamiliar with the specifics of a new market regulation can deduct from his principles that he will likely disagree with it. On the other hand, a machine cannot do more than memorize what it "believes" is right and wrong. After all, the patterns among the data in these cases are not easily quantifiable.

While humans can make reasonable decisions by relying on their fixed morals, AI systems lack inherent rationality behind their reasoning. This aspect of decision-making is also a large reason why the AI community is hesitant to trust it to make significant decisions for groups of people. The "gut feeling" humans feel towards making decisions allows them to sidestep ethical issues. On the other hand, machine learning demonstrates imprecision with some of these intangible issues [32].

6.3 – Significance Cognition

The propensity for humans to assign meaning to incoming sensory data is a pivotal way they can understand a situation [33]. While a brute force data collection technique may yield strong results on tasks of limited scope, it does not inform the system of the significance of different events. Narrow tasks can avoid complications since the application of the data is one-dimensional. However, human experiences are wrapped in emotional, personal, social, and societal implications that alter their impact.

To illustrate, picture two men: Tom is watching a silly movie while Jim is attending his father's funeral. Both activities may take an hour, but Jim will undoubtedly extract more meaning from his event than Tom. The human brain has an acute ability to decipher what events should stick in long-term memory and have significant ramifications for future decisions. This is because humans can assign different values to different situations in their everyday lives

and determine which ones should play a role in decision-making. Voss [34] explains this concept fittingly, stating, "Reality presents massively more features and details than is (contextually) relevant or can be usefully processed. This is why the system needs to have some control over what input data is selected for analysis and learning – both in terms of which data, and also the degree of detail."

On the other hand, AI has no way of understanding the real-world implications of its interactions contextually. It will assume equal importance between both the television show and the funeral. Although both events may have a role in the AI learning process, they will be in inaccurate and improperly weighed manners. AI cannot analyze and highlight notable encounters from the trillions of experiences encapsulating human experience. As long as it cannot understand the more profound implications that different situations insinuate, it will not be able to distinguish which aspects to focus on and consider with greater importance. Shortcomings are unavoidable in practice when compared to human general intelligence.

7 IMPLICATIONS

Typical research consensus is that general intelligence is the ability to improve without having much knowledge. However, this argument differs: an incredible amount of knowledge *certainly is* required to improve the general intelligence of a system. The distinction is that AI simply does not have the means to collect such data in the same way humans can. A reasonable argument for the consciousness of AI can certainly be made if the issue of data accumulation is resolved. Assuming it can eventually experience the world in the same way humans are, there is no reason to believe that its learning capability would be affected in any way.

In addition, the inherently differing learning capabilities between humans and AI should significantly influence their applications. This leads to the unavoidable conclusion that AGI supporters have had the wrong goal for decades. Because AI is missing the data acquisition methods necessary to reach HLI, trying to get it to emulate human activity is pointless. These findings have dramatic implications for the current application and scope of AI. Acknowledging the fundamental contextual differences between both systems necessitates distinguishing tasks for each. Humans and AI should focus on the tasks for which they are best equipped: abstract problems and focused individual tasks, respectively.

This consideration will also play a prominent role in how AGI is approached in the future. Much of American society is frightened by the rise of AI, whether in the form of automation, robotics, or AGI [35]. While certainly perpetuated by the media, these fears are largely understandable due to the field's rapid expansion. However, the strength of current AI solutions is being hindered by these hesitations, which can be rejected through a proper understanding of the functions this paper presents. Recognizing and implementing these systems in the roles

where they are best suited would eliminate this concern and boost their potential.

Finally, the Turing Test should be revisited once more. While many may seek to simply throw it out, this paper is not attempting to undermine it entirely. Instead, it asserts that the TT should be viewed merely as a display of AGI's ability instead of its intelligence criterion. It seems safe to claim that modern AGI enthusiasts are far too passionate about the specifics of Turing's original prediction, seeking to create a perfect "Turing Test environment." However, this misses the big picture. The thought behind the test can be extracted from the Imitation Game itself. The goal for AGI, while lofty (and, quite frankly, fanciful), can be abstracted to perceiving, absorbing, and contextually understanding the world in a human-like manner.

8 FUTURE WORK

Time will be the most significant indicator of how future AGI attempts may look. Assuming the prevailing architecture of an HLI-based standard stays the same, the question is at what point the products will begin to stagnate. Once the most cutting-edge modern implementations reach their peak, the variance compared to humans can be analyzed. At that point, it will be evident that raw computational power is simply too shallow to explore complex ideas. When this time comes, several important questions will determine the future of these applications.

The most important question in the wake of declining AGI performance is whether it is a worthy goal to continue to pursue. While this paper asserts that it is not, the developers themselves must decide whether to continue chasing HLI. Even if developers decide to change their scope, additional elements must be considered. One such question that presents interesting applications is whether current AGI attempts can be modified to perform well in more narrow contexts. If this is possible, AGI attempts may offer informative insight to optimize the learning ability of ANI applications.

The main problem that the field currently faces is that every innovation is viewed as the new "intelligent system" that enthusiasts have been waiting for. However, once the hype wears off, it becomes clear that it is simply another advanced computer program. Unfortunately, in the current AI summer, the excitement for and promotion of ongoing developments makes this analysis of its culmination seem impractical.

9 CONCLUSION

This paper certainly is not meant to undermine current AI implementations' strength, intelligence, and usefulness. AI and machine learning applications undeniably change how humans approach tasks in varying industries. This paper merely highlights the features that AI excels at and redirects attention off of HLI while the current architecture cannot support it. As many sources and implementations demonstrate, AGI is (in theory) possible. That is, the computing power necessary to train an intelligent model is

not unreasonable. However, computing power is independent of the contextual and experiential data required to train such a model.

It is also important to note that the issues in AGI do not necessarily lie in the potential intelligence of the systems themselves. There is no reason to believe that the underlying learning capabilities are compromised. Instead, the issue lies in the inability to ingest and learn from large amounts of data efficiently. To illustrate, someone who never went to second grade and does not know their times tables is not necessarily incapable of learning them. They simply have not been presented with it so that it can be properly understood. AGI can have a profound impact in a variety of fields but finding a way for it to emulate the human experience is a necessary first step. Only when AI is examined in a context where it can thrive can it be judged for its true potential.

REFERENCES

- [1] Russakovsky, O., Deng, J., Su, H., et al. (2014). ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.1409.057
- [2] Chen, S.-Y., Su, W., Gao, L., et al. (2020). Deep Generation of Face Images from Sketches. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2006.01047
- [3] Shah, K. P. (2021). Abstract Thought: Production of New Knowledge for the Development of Human Civilization. *Journal of Fine Arts Campus*, 3(2), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jfac.v3i2.48232>
- [4] Rouault, M., McWilliams, A., Allen, M., et al. (2018). Human Metacognition Across Domains: Insights from Individual Differences and Neuroimaging. *Personality Neuroscience*, 1, E17. doi:10.1017/pen.2018.16
- [5] Noguerol, T. M., Paulano-Godino, F., Martín-Valdivia, M. T., et al. (2019). Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats Analysis of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Applications in Radiology. *Journal of the American College of Radiology: JACR*, 16 9 Pt B, 1239–1247.
- [6] Minsky, M. (1986). *The Society of Mind*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- [7] Legg, S., & Hutter, M. (2006). A Collection of Definitions of Intelligence. *AGI*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0706.3639>
- [8] Voss, P. (2007). Essentials of General Intelligence: The Direct Path to Artificial General Intelligence. In: Goertzel, B., Pennachin, C. (eds) *Artificial General Intelligence. Cognitive Technologies*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68677-4_4
- [9] Pennachin, C., Goertzel, B. (2007). Contemporary Approaches to Artificial General Intelligence. In: Goertzel, B., Pennachin, C. (eds) *Artificial General Intelligence. Cognitive Technologies*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68677-4_1
- [10] Turing, A. M. (1950). Computing Machinery and Intelligence. *Mind*, 59, 433–460. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/LIX.236.433>
- [11] Radner, D. (1988). Thought and Consciousness in Descartes. *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 26(3), 439–452. doi:10.1353/hph.1988.0064
- [12] Shieber, S. M. (1994). Lessons from a Restricted Turing Test. *Commun. ACM*, 37(6), 70–78. doi:10.1145/175208.175217
- [13] Dreyfus, H. (1992). *What Computers Can't Do*. MIT Press.
- [14] Gunderson, K. (1964). The imitation game. *Mind* 73 (April):234–45.
- [15] Searle, J. (1980). Minds, brains, and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(3), 417–424. doi:10.1017/S0140525X00005756
- [16] Ouchchy, L., Coin, A. & Dubljević, V. AI in the headlines: the portrayal of the ethical issues of artificial intelligence in the media. *AI & Soc* 35, 927–936 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00965-5>
- [17] Russell, S. J., & Norvig, P. (1995). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall.
- [18] Illeris, K. (2010). Towards a Contemporary and Comprehensive Theory of Learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*. July–August 2003. 396–406. 10.1080/026013703004837
- [19] Grossberg, S. (1988). *Neural Networks and Natural Intelligence*. MIT Press.
- [20] de Garis, H. (2007). Artificial Brains. *Artificial General Intelligence*, 159–174. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68677-4_5
- [21] Kováč, L. (2012). The biology of happiness: chasing pleasure and human destiny. *EMBO reports*, 13(4), 297–302.
- [22] Chalmers, D. J. (1997). The conscious mind: In search of a fundamental theory. *Oxford Paperbacks*.
- [23] Hoyes, K.A. (2007). 3D Simulation: the Key to A.I.. In: Goertzel, B., Pennachin, C. (eds) *Artificial General Intelligence. Cognitive Technologies*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68677-4_11
- [24] Huang, T.J. (2017). Imitating the brain with neurocomputer a "new" way towards artificial general intelligence. *Int. J. Autom. Comput.* 14, 520–531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11633-017-1082-y>
- [25] Vinyals, O., & Le, Q.V. (2015). A Neural Conversational Model. ArXiv, abs/1506.05869
- [26] Chollet, F. (2019). On the Measure of Intelligence. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.1911.01547
- [27] Baker, B., Akkaya, I., Zhokhov, P., et al. (2022). Video PreTraining (VPT): Learning to Act by Watching Unlabeled Online Videos. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2206.11795
- [28] Davis, E., & Marcus, G. (2015). Common-sense Reasoning and Commonsense Knowledge in Artificial Intelligence. *Commun. ACM*, 58(9), 92–103. doi:10.1145/2701413
- [29] Gilbert, D. T., & Wilson, T. D. (2007). Prospection: Experiencing the Future. *Science*, 317(5843), 1351–1354. doi:10.1126/science.1144161
- [30] Tang, X., & Wang, X. (2002). Face photo recognition using sketch. Proceedings. *International Conference on Image Processing*, 1, 1–I. doi:10.1109/ICIP.2002.1038008
- [31] Haladjian H.H., Montemayor C. Artificial consciousness and the consciousness-attention dissociation. *Conscious Cogn.* 2016 Oct;45:210-225. doi: 10.1016/j.concog.2016.08.011. Epub 2016 Sep 19. PMID: 27656787
- [32] Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., et al. (2021). A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine Learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 54(6). doi:10.1145/3457607
- [33] Franklin, S. (2007). A Foundational Architecture for Artificial General Intelligence. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*. 157, 36–54.
- [34] Voss, P. (2007). Essentials of General Intelligence: The Direct Path to Artificial General Intelligence. In: Goertzel, B., Pennachin, C. (eds) *Artificial General Intelligence. Cognitive Technologies*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68677-4_4
- [35] Liang, Y., Lee, S.A. Fear of Autonomous Robots and Artificial Intelligence: Evidence from National Representative Data with Probability Sampling. *Int J of Soc Robotics* 9, 379–384 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-017-0401-3>