International Transactions on Artificial Intelligence (ITALIC)
Vol. 1 No. 1, November 2022, pp. 28~42
P-ISSN: xxxx-xxxx, E-ISSN: xxxx-xxxx, DOI: 10.34306

Artificial Intelligence that Exists in the Human Mind

Muhammad Rehan Anwar[1], Fitra Putri Oganda[2], Nuke Puji Lestari Santoso[3], Muhamad Fabio[4]
[1]University of Agriculture Faisalabad (UAF), Faisalabad, Pakistan
[2,3,4]University of Raharja, Tangerang, Indonesia
e-mail: rehan749@gmail.com, fitra.putri@raharja.info, nuke@raharja.info, fabio@raharja.info

Article Info

Article history:

Received May 11, 2022
Revised September 30, 2022
Accepted November 24, 2022

Keywords:

Anthropocentric constraint
Brain/computer distinction
Computation
Mechanical psychology
Processing levels

ABSTRACT

This article asserts that some general AIs are incomprehensible to humans and that computers are innately incapable of performing certain human cognitive activities, including 1) Misconceptions of Godel's theorem and related statistics and mathematical results are at the root of objections to using AI; 2) Reductionism and objections to monistic reductionism, as well as a minimal appreciation of responses to different levels of discussion; 3) Concerns raised by a thorough understanding of computers or computing Developing a model in which "cognitive" functions can be created independently and referred to as "wetware" is pragmatic, according to a psychologist. The cognitive and essential assumptions for individuals involved in the usefulness of AI are pragmatic. From this point of view, AI is heavily invested in the future of cognitive psychology, if only because of their similar fate.

Corresponding Author:

Muhamad Fabio
University of Raharja, Tangerang, Indonesia
Email: fabio@raharja.info

1. INTRODUCTION

Several authors involved (including Rychlak, Penrose, and Searle) recently stated artificial intelligence (AI) is a foolish or futile endeavor [1]. The assertion that individuals might be productively interpreted as machines (and therefore constrained) is sometimes considered as offensive or humiliating, or as a sign of some sort of political unrest, mistake or philosophical stupidity [2].

Artificial Intelligence and Human Reason (AIHR), by Joseph Rychlak, was published in 1991a pair of papers The International Journal of Personal Construct Psychology published an article on this, launched one of the more ardent of these assaults (1990, 1991b) [3]. He is adamant that computers are inherently incapable of performing a particularly human type of cognitive activity known as prediction [4]. He was a former George Kelly pupil, contends Kelly's personal construct theory (Kelly 1955) is correct inherently all computational models of human cognition are incompatible with this [5].

This is characteristic of one of the types of muddled argument that we encounter in this literature: Al is incompatible with some popular human cognitive model. Other examples include:

- Opposition (often raised Philosophers and social scientists are two types of people who are among those who have contributed to this work). Misunderstanding Theorem of Godel, physics, quantum mechanics, and other topics related to Mathematics and science related to AI.
- Objections based on personal experience are said to be possible by humans But the machine probably can't do that.
- Dissents resulting from monistic reductionism and lack of gratitude Presenting different discourse levels (eg Implementation vs. cognitive);
- Dissents resulting from a lack of computer knowledge and calculations.

Fortunately, Rychlak's specific statements contain evident expressions of all of the aforementioned confusions (among others), and so offer illuminating, if extreme, illustrations of the kind of misperception that we have sought to debunk in this debate [6]. In summary, He has made something new a perfect chance in order for us to participate in the discussion and reply to such anti-Al rhetoric, which we believe is inspired mostly by Fear of the unknown, which is unreasonable [7].

Rychlak is a sensitive individual invested in his situation [8]. For example, he informs us that reading about construct framing in He shudders at AI fiction; a a coworker's casual usage of a computer metaphor to represent her own recollection surprised and outraged him, as well as mechanical psychological hypotheses abound... deprived the human not just a sense of agency, but also a sense of personality [9]. These statements reflect a sensation of profundity that we assume underlies a large portion of the bad in response to artificial intelligence concept as a state of consciousness computing, that is deemed disconcerting to many people who are perfectly content with the thought of the body as a whole biological system [10]. This last stance vitalism is nearly trendy, and it is supported Under the authority of some renowned philosophers, such as Searle, John (whom Rychlak approvingly mentions) [11].

It's a unique situation shame that there are so many people consider it this way, because a superficial characterisation Rychlak refers to as "mechanical psychology" conceals the basic distinctions between current AI and (say)the science of cybernetics brain modeling, which some of these are objections may be used [12]. Unlike many other contemporary scientific perspectives, ManyAI, on the other hand, does not advocate for a demeaning vision of people in a passive manner, machinery unable to take moral responsibility [13]. Artificial intelligence (AI) does not portray us as prisoners to 'Selfish genes,' our own victims reinforcing 'histories,' or something similar other type of generic switchboard [14]. AI, on the other hand, is a positive force provides a structure that is adaptable, fast expanding scope and deployability our efforts to come to an agreement on something merely a biological picture of humans with conceptions of first-hand knowledge, conviction, meaning, purpose, anticipation, and, at some point, accountability [15].

2. Dissensions over the nature of computations and Gudel's theorem stemming from misconceptions

Many AI commentators obviously know very little about computer science [16]. Rychlak, in his introduction to AIHR, honestly says that his idea of math came not from technical training on the subject, but from playing with children's punch card porters and plastic models [17]. Regrettably, he does not see this as a restriction on his power to dictate what computers we should use can and cannot do [18]. This book, for example, is littered with sweeping generalizations about what machines cannot achieve. In fact, in the first they only used two paragraphs of the introduction and are unable to find out what they are supposed to learn [19]. They can't predict, they can't guess; all they can do is speculate [20]. They lack a feeling of 'oppositional potential' and are unable to connect figures to one another [21]. that they'd never get it that two automobiles parked next to each other were In reality, the reverse is true [22]. Rychlak fails to present any reasoning or factual evidence to support his claims [23]. substantiate any of these statements, the majority of which appear to be logically flawed or This is demonstrably untrue.

What do computers actually are? So, what exactly is computation? All of those are complex problems that computer scientists are still attempting to answer. This feeling of The new multidisciplinary project known as cognitive is based on discovery. Science has a lot of enthusiasm and energy. However, no serious critic should draw definite judgments about what computers cannot achieve based on simplistic layman's primers to computer science. Everyone understands that a personal computer is a piece of hardware that is binary and does calculations just complies with a set of software instructions that fit essentially formal symbol patterns. All of this is false. Computers are not like that fundamentally; programs that are binary and do not follow instructions are not executed solely by matching formal symbols; and there is no separation between processor and program; between interpreter and interpreted language always correspond to how to tell the difference between hardware and software.

In his depiction of computers, Rychlak makes a number of trivial mistakes. First, let me clear up a common mistake with relation to Godel's well-known incompleteness theorem. Rychlak cites Godel (1991a, pp. 120-123), on the other hand, misunderstands his concept in a usual fashion. Godel illustrates how to design a formula that is true but not provable inside any appropriately expressive axiomatic system's syntax. Rychlak, on the other hand, attributes a significantly more powerful finding to Godel, namely, that a human reasoner must inevitably acknowledge the validity of this formula. Godel makes no mention of the intellect of humans, and thus further steps follow only if one considers that a rational human being can accept all facts as true, which is a significant assumption to make.

Similarly, in his multifaceted a new book The Emperor's New Thoughts (1989), Godel's theorem is discussed by Roger Penrose explicitly assumes that every mathematical truth may be seen by a human being to be true, leading to the seemingly Humans must come to an unavoidable conclusion infinitely capable of surpassing computers. He utilizes quantum theory's indeterminacy to explain how this is possible. However, one does not have to become fascinated in the bizarre ways of modern physics. Even in this situation, a closer look indicates that the conclusion is not entirely justified. Godel's conclusion is restricted to a single, axiomatically fixed framework. Axiomatic systems are not all that computers are.; nonetheless, Godel's far more likely conclusion is that everyone possesses some truths, possibly delicate, nuanced facts about themselves that they are virtually impossible to completely grasp without becoming a new person. Then there would be other new facts with the same impact. One could keep exposing a person to fresh peculiarities and they would continue to be amazed, but It's significantly more probable that their attention will be drawn to you swiftly. In actuality, we feel Penrose's hypothesis is implausible: there are undoubtedly certain truths that claims are so complex that no human could possibly understand them completely grasp them, and the Godel sentences would I'm quite sure I'm in that group. Even if a person accepts it, this different conclusion looks to be rather logical and does not appear to violate the notion of intelligence as computing in any way.

This is not to suggest that which is encoded in bits patterns is not meaningful. We do not mean to suggest a five-gallon bucket barrel can never store real gasoline when we talk about container capacity in gallons. Shannon's concept of the quantity of information is a good comparison. The fact that a computer's memory contains information does not equal knowledge indicating that the data contained in it is false or manufactured. Information theory terminology is commonly used to explain biological systems.

Rychlak commits an odd mistake by asserting the fact that computers are constrained to what he refers to as He uses Boolean logic defined using exclusive incompatibility Even if the specific The logic of the computer's hardware has the following shape: unimportant (as we shall demonstrate later), it is typically Disjunction that is inclusive rather than exclusive. This is a unique opportunity, a really basic statement, but let us make it as clear as possible. Electrical circuits in digital computers can be in one of two states, which are often represented as well as voltages These are often encountered referred to as The computer's circuitry are made out of bits may perform a number of operations on bit patterns, the most essential of which is As a result of the Boolean disjunction, named because, if the bits are conceived of This procedure would encode the logical connective or as truth-values link between them. If any of its parameters is true, this operation returns true: it may be defined either as A or B are the options. (Or, alternatively, both A and B). Rychlak places a high value on what he wrongly says. This surgery is either A or B, but not both, according to him.

Because a large number of Boolean operations may be stated as a mixture of others, choosing one collection over another is mainly for technical reasons. Negation and disjunction, for example, are enough to define anything else. In this perspective, attaching philosophical significance to the choice of one or more types of logical connectives appears to be quite irrational. A metaphor might be beneficial in this situation. Consider the possibility that humans are not able to totally comprehend since we are formed of inorganic chemistry made up of organic components, or that we can never truly grasp Our blood corpuscles are crimson, thus, they are green. These are the ones the arguments organized in the same way that Rychlak are. Whatever the hardware logic is, It has no place in the world constraints based on the logic framework of the program that is going on.

This assertion is true and exemplifies Rychlak's core mistake. In reality, the polar opposite is true: The program runs on the equipment. The computer's brain is the act of executing a program microprocessor, the machine adopts the personality of and, in some ways, becomes the software for it. A fundamental machine statement is duplicated into a computer's processor by carefully reconfiguring its circuitry to produce changes in the condition of the machine that reflect the statement's meaning. Despite the fact that it is commonly referred to as "reading" and "obedience to an order," this is a deceptive metaphor since, as Rychlak points out, The hardware is unable to disobey since it is not reading in the same way that the mechanism of defense cannot. Rather, the hardware is at blame and has developed, in addition to the curriculum stored in its memory, into a brand-one new machine that behavior is determined more than by software bare circuitry.

The skillset of a computer-plus-behavioral software may differ in comparison to the core hidden processor inside it. A wide range of applications with highly distinct computational, logical, and behavioral designs can coexist on the same machine. As a result, inferring the machine's nature from the nature of the situation machine-plus-program system is fairly dangerous.

Rychlak and Searle are in a tie for first position, a high priority on a clear contrast between soft and formal is a mental one, programs and hard, causal machines; yet, this distinction is becoming increasingly difficult to make in reality. One form of current processor chip, for example, has a memory that stores program pieces and a tiny processor within that interprets the entire system made in the silicon. Is this true? a software or hardware product? Even in the digital age, the nature of programming has changed, the basic sense that word-processing software is now offered in supermarkets, broadens our conceptual framework for defining them. Is a program a work of literature that should be protected by copyright, or a

gadget that should be patented? None of the following apply: It is a novel entity for which new laws are being drafted. Because of known conceptual weaknesses in the fundamental soft/hard and program/machine divides, The use of technical language has been eliminated and expanded to encompass ideas such as virtual machines and firmware. A computer, a MacintoshTM, for example, contains numerous layers of software between and interpreting a user's behavior and the underlying hardware architecture, many of which are only tangentially linked to one another.

In computer science, the link There is a gap between the hardware of a computer and the instructions in machine code stored in its memory equivalent to the relationship between a translator and the program he or she is interpreting. However, it is a very specific and fundamental example of this interaction, There are a lot of them within a building true machine. These result in layers in which the processor is located one level at the intersection of a computer and a processor software at a lower level. The structure of a system's upper levels is seldom, if ever, isomorphic to the structure of the system's lower levels. Structures interpreted at a higher level do not have to look like a set of instructions They may be Concept networks, databases of complicated claims, and systems of visual arrays, and understanding them could include traversing network links, or sifting through logical conclusions, recognizing perceptually persuasive patterns in images.

The incorrect (and sometimes implied) premise that structural similarity exists among the many tiers of a company's organization creates major trouble. Any complex computational model would contain several layers of such descriptions, each of which is equally valid. In reality, a comprehensive characterization of the machine's behavior will almost definitely require a description at several levels, but no simple reduction to a single level of rule matching will suffice, and certainly the fundamental hardware level will not suffice to explain the machine's complexity. There is no enigma here: same observations could be made about any other piece of equipment or a thing. The human brain's operation is complex, most likely completely influenced by biological processes, However, this is not the case. diminish the relevance in the field of psychology This is the point is essentially a Rychlak's rejection of reductionism is notable is likely to concur.

One common counter-argument is that no matter how complex the computer-coded systems are, they can only be simulations of anything true. Searle contrasts between powerful AI, which holds that a computer that has been designed may truly have cognition, and AI that is not very good, which holds that it can make a mental simulation and even properly copy it. He makes fun of the conflation of these notions by wondering if Using a weather modeling tool allows It is rain inside the computer. This however, ignores a basic feature of computation: a simulated machine simulation is precisely putting one into action. They are indistinguishable from one another in higher-level computations and simulations.

For example, a word-processing simulation system application on a Macintosh computer (which operates on a Macintosh) would include algorithms and data structures that emulated the machine's behavior as follows: a computer's installation of software on another. This type of software is, in fact, commercially available. Is this a simulation or a real-life implementation? The question has no meaning. A computer simulation calculation is referred to as a computation.

3. Appeals to intuition pumps: Rychlak's room

Rychlak's sole argument in favor of computer restrictions is a remake of Searle's renowned Chinese Room from 1980. Searle's story has been addressed far too many times in the decade since its initial publication for a comprehensive Here's where you will find the survey (though In preparation, see Hayes and Ford); nonetheless, We will just state that it is similarly founded on naive and incorrect assumptions concerning computers and software The most essential of them in a computational paradigm, the identification of the agency using the computer's hardware computer performing the schedule.

Searle urges us to submit a list of programs that claim to comprehend Chinese. It might be any AI software that claims to demonstrate cognition when you are in the presence of someone who understands the program language but does not comprehend (or lacking cognitive ability ability that the software is designed to demonstrate). Allowa Chinese-speaking panel to provide this room's inputs, and then allow the man inside to 'control the software by reading it and following its instructions. This might entail matching forms, but the guy does it only based on their finding shape, with no knowledge of what they could represent. Finally, the schedule of events orders Output some Chinese squiggles from him, which look to Chinese spectators outside the room to be a legitimate response. As a result, the room passes. However, as Searle points out, the Chinese Turing test is inconclusive as you would have you believe, no comprehension is taking on.

After all, the schedule listed on the website can not be grasping anything (it is simply a pile of paper); the man, by assumption, does not understand There is nothing else in the room but Chinese. This hypothetical circumstance, according to Searle, is comparable to a computer that is running software. The equipment has no understanding of the software, and the software has no understanding of the hardware. software just establishes a method of formally matching patterns to one another.

Rychlak agrees with Dennett (1984) that there is a Chinese chamber more of an intuition booster rather than a debate (1991a, pp. 3-4). Rychlak introduces a useful distinction between retrospective and introspective perspective sees his own take on Searle's metaphor: That is, we can consider it from a different perspective perspective from the perspective of an outside observer gazing inside the room, or from the perspective of the perspective of the man-in-the-room, examining the person in charge of the program.

Our empathy, in Searle's example, is with the individual who is caught up in the procedure for moving about the Chinese figures. As a result, even when we leave the room to go to the bathroom, reflect on the inputs to outputs exchange, we are underwhelmed by the putative intelligence portrayed in the 'information process.

According to The Pump, Rychlak obtains it's logical power by encouraging our instinctive need to be able to relate to the machine's physical state instead of a system made up of processors software This hardware is operating. Despite this, he is unable to understand that this is simply the result of Searle's ruse redirecting our sympathies. Two lines later, Rychlak expresses his own perplexity:

The key issue is that... the machine—which can only be described retrospectively—creates the appearance that introspection is a process taking place,... When there appears there must be a 'point of view' involved isn't one! Searle's character is never able to convey a perspective since he is mechanically moving symbols from inputs to outputs without knowing what he is doing.

Consider the following: for a moment. If a machine can do it, merely to be explained, it is not a machine in extraordinary terms, we should treat the machine that is executing the software, i.e. the entire room, as the agent with When you have Searle's intuition is a point of view kicks in. The comparison is based on the interrogators in China speaking with the application's computer rather than its core CPU. Rychlak merely asserts that the system as a whole lacks a vantage point.

Indeed, like a Von Neumann computer's bare hardware, Searle's person in his chamber is incapable of expressing an opinion. However, such a claim is not required by the AI viewpoint. Computational cognition models do not make any assumptions about the cognitive capacity silicon-based (or carbon). They must, according to Rychlak, demonstrate his lack of knowledge of the interplay between software and hardware.

Using Rychlak's phrasing, we can arrive at a different result. Assume tWhen a computer software passes some information form of the Turing Examination (maybe Conversation in Chinese), and so It has to be given some consideration type of cognitive standing for the purpose of empirical evidence objectivity If Searle's

theory is correct reasoning is correct, is correct, relying on the introspective viewpoint on the main computer processor, despite its intuitive appeal, would be a major error. A computer that is up and running software must be more than that simply a physical processor in order to be important in terms of thought.

If we accept The processor, according to Searle's intuition cannot know on its own, we must come to the conclusion that the machine executing the software is a separate machine from the raw hardware. That is correct. precisely the gut feeling provided by the field of computer science, providing credibility to the study of AI effort. Despite the fact that Searle's reasoning is sound, fundamentally (Hayes and Ford in Ford and Hayes in the works), it may to be accepted the form of Rather of modus ponens, modus tollens is used, and completely in line with artificial intelligence It isn't true agree with Rychlak's anti-computer stance. stance, as evidenced by his rigid belief that a machine can only be a machine characterized in a retrospective in style (our emphasis). He just refuses to grant But he can't give his selfhood to a machine makes no case for Why should we, or any other machine, agree with him?

4. Incompatibility with a popular psychological paradigm of human cognition, according to some

As previously Attacks on AI have been recorded typically It might take on the appearance of being seen to be in conflict with another neurological or psychological hypothesis that is considered authoritative. Rychlak, for example, has a central thesis that the mind's computational models created by Kelly's (1955) personal construct theory is essentially incompatible with AI and cognitive science, and Kelly's (1955) personal construct theory is fundamentally incompatible with AI and cognitive science. was approximately accurate. This post will spend some time researching this claim.

4.1 *The Nickel tour as a personal construct theory*

Adams-Webber (1979) and Kelly (1955, 1970) created personal construct theory, which is a constructivist model of human representational processes that focuses on different assumptions regarding the evolution of cognitive functions, as well as their structure. The essential in this case, units of analysis method dimensions that are bipolar known as Kelly's own personal conceptions (1955, p. 8) characterized as a template that an individual forms and then seeks to compensate for the reality from which the world is formed.

His theory asserts that, to the extent that the principle of human cognition is located in the brain rather thanIt comprises our reactions to external circumstances. goal to increase the connection between some mental representations and certain mental representations what we may experience in the future Adams-Webber (1989) is a good example of this. As a result, anticipating is a core component of our mental representations (Adams-Webber and Mancuso 1983). To describe perceived similarities and contrasts, we employ bipolar notions between subsequently arranging into these representations logical patterns or settings in which we find ourselves may work to identify specific recurring motifs that have emerged inside our lives as time passes, and finally forwarding various representations, which are in the form of future event expectations. The way new occurrences are perceived is a constant validation process that supports or refutes many of our assumptions. As a result, as they change as a consequence of experience, Our constructions may evolve over time. Specific alterations in the form or substance of Personal constructions emerge most frequently as a result of anticipated "Surprise" or "failure" (Adams-Webber 1989).

Every structure is unique though to possess its own spectrum for the sake of convenience, which comprises everything whereby the user would discover its utility advantageous. As a result, each construct's range of utility determines its enlargement in terms of a certain property of a bounded domain of occurrences. However, in our experience, a single construct seldom, if ever, stands alone, since it

is typically used in concert with one or more more constructions that are linked to generate a specific framework for comprehending as well as forecasting events. Structured cognition requires there is some overlap across ideas in terms of their relative convenience ranges This intersection, or overlap, of existing structural expansions allows us to construct hypotheses. To put it another way, when we interpret one occasion, we basically classify it according to one or more constructs, and then we may use our initial categorisation, generate predictive inference by examining our interconnected constructions. Personal constructs' predictive role provides logical support for Kelly's sake (1955, p. 46) argument "A person's life" is a phrase that means "a person's life activities are psychologically influenced by manner whereby he expects occurrences." Ford claims that (1989, p. 190):

We humans routinely project observed uniformities into the future to predict the presence or nonoccurrence of future events. As a result, we continue with our time machine, you may travel from the past to the future prior experience lighting and structuring the way future occurrences will show themselves to us.

4.2 *Does Rychlak get Kant and Kelly right?*

Because Rychlak commonly mistakes these two epistemological approaches, it is crucial that we distinguish Kantian constructivism and Kelly's constructive alternativism in opposition to each other. here. For instance, he maintains:

Today, the term "construction" causes consternation since it might have a Lockean or a Kantian interpretation. The term was used in the Kantian meaning by George Kelly (Rychlak 1991a, p. 85).

Similarly, Slife et al. (1991, p. 334) claim that the 'Kantian focus There can not be a personal construct theory in personal construct theory rejected.

All human representational mechanisms, according to Rychlak defined by Kelly, reflect prediction: Constructing is foretelling (p. 248, Rychlak 1991b). Indeed, he repeatedly reminds us that Kelly's prediction is merely his new word for her building approach. He also supplies his own precise definition: the process of affirming, rejecting, or defining wider meaning patterns in connection to make it smaller or more specific Meaningful patterns, more restricted Meaningful patterns. As a result, Rychlak sees, based on a top-down shift from the general to the local specific, a transfer of significance from one thing to another broader range of usefulness to a narrower range of convenience. As a result, it must always begin at a somewhat high level of abstraction and work its way down. It follows logically that even the most fundamental impressions must be created by applying classifications that are abstract sensory inputs. This is essentially a neo-Kantian frame of view.

"Kant argued predicationally that ideas are conceptualizing or "constructive" processes that lend meaning to the unstructured sensory cacophony that comes from experience," writes Rychlak (1991a, pp. 28—29).” The Kantian categorical framework, in other words, while presumption shared by all sorts of prediction, is, in a number of ways, dissimilar to actual realities (Husain 1983), As a result, The most fundamental concepts are found at the greatest levels of abstraction meaning Space, time, and unity are examples of a priori (i.e., prior to experience) concepts' role must be purely epistemological (in the sense that they impose structure and shape on everything) objects of human experience). In the words of Rychlak:

Human beings, Kant claims, are born with a priori categories of knowledge that predicate experience from the start. The preceding (a priori) categories, rather than the a posteriori forms of the world, would 'create' the mental representations in Kant's concept (Rychlak 1991b, p. 63).

These Kantian classifications are only applicable to entirely unstructured and unformed sensory overload information Husain (1983) is a good example of this. Miles is a character in the film Miles (1986, p. 172) asserts that There is one latent in terms of empirical inquiry a predetermined structure that gives a frame of reference without which scientific findings would be meaningless study "It is not feasible" (d. Ewing 1939).

Raw senses (perceptions, etc.) were not seen by Kant as packed meaningful units (ideas). The influence of external experience is received

through sensory 'inputs,' but without the person's act of perception prediction via the categories of comprehension—which organizes or categorizes patterns there would be no awareness of the contribution provided by the external environment in bringing the parts of feeling together to give them significance. (Rychlak 1991a, p.84).

Husain (1983, p. 12) observes that when directly comparing Kelly and Kant:

Kant travels to considerable efforts to demonstrate that our presumption creations are universal and so in no way personal. They're both essential and ubiquitous. Kelly's focus on the subjective character of conceptions distinguishes him as a distinctively non-Kantian figure.

In addition, unlike Kant, Kelly advocated that all personal information be made public creations are of a similar kind nature. According to Kelly, every aspect of human cognition is empirical, and ideas may be a word that may be used to describe anything specific to an individual. Prior to the application of any constructions, it follows that occurrences have their own forms and patterns. According to "The most significant of these (forms) is time," writes Husain (1983, p. 14), "which for Kelly, unlike Kant, is not a priori but belongs to the present." facts "On their own" (i.e. "input"). Because the facts have structure, our basic concepts will be a posteriori, thus it will be consistent with previous empirical findings assumptions. It It also follows from Kelly's core notion of "constructive alternativism" because:

Something must be diverse with polarities in order to provide them with ontological basis and something to which they may attach themselves. As a result, events are presupposed by constructions in the same way as subject words are presupposed by predicate words, and event is significantly more general than any construct as the bearer of all constructions (Husain 1983, p. 20).

Let us begin to consider the phrase "forecast." If we understand Rychlak correctly, his argument is that any construct's meaning must be clarified provided inside a bigger picture, and that it must also have resistance. As a result, the definition of good must contain its relationship to bad, as well as the position of this opposing pair within a larger system of structures to which it is linked in some way. He contends that the positive and negative meanings "integrate profoundly into each other's meaning" (Rychlak 1991a, p. 11). They define each other in some ways, and it is rare that one of these bipolar couples can be understood without the other. There are two concepts at work here: inherent oppositionality and contextual meaning definition (the One construct can only have one meaning supplied by examining a wider in which it is used connected in comparison to other constructs).

Rychlak believes that computers cannot not just in this case, invoke context manners, but also with logic opponents (due to their Boolean nature, as mentioned above). Because Computers have inherently incorrect Boolean logic can only act as mediators rather than predictors. Rychlak describes mediation as a process in which anything taking in, often known as "input," begins to play an indirect part in a procedure that wasn't supposed to happen previously a component of this method.

Based on this premise, Rychlak argues that computers will never be able to understand bipolar opposition, i.e. prediction, and that we will never discover suitable Kellyanne psychology models in artificial intelligence or information-processing literature.

4.3 *Construct relations: intensional vs extensional*

Obviously, Rychlak is correct in stating Kelly has (1955, p. 137) saw construct bipolarity as a contrast rather than an inconsistency, stating, The connection between a construct's two poles is a contrasted one (i.e., we view the opposing end of a construct to be both significant and required to the construct's meaning). As a result, a construct's opposing poles are both positive in and of themselves (see Benjafield 1983). Husain is a Muslim who lives in Pakistan (1983, pp. 16-18) continues:

The notion of bipolarity as a significant contrast, or contrast required to understand a It is a construction that is intense... When a construct is created, it is called a construct intentionally, it includes three terms: its general nature (for example, gender) and the diametrically opposed states in which it exists is divided (for example, male/female).... [As a result, interactions between constructions binary logic can not deal with it because] using a binary logic is a logic that is divided into two halves. equivalent to dropping the third one (generic) word. removing the foundation general character taken into account, and treating as though it were bipolar contrast might arise and to be relevant in solitude.

Nonetheless, Kelly did just that: he used the binary logic issue of functionally characterizing construct relationships, this prompted him to the conclusion that these linkages are structured in a hierarchical manner. Husain emphasizes This is explained in the footnote that follows (1983, p. 18):

Kelly (1955) is not one of them necessarily subscribe to the heightened intensity notion of constructions. He frequently employs an elongated definition in the intention of making binary logic relevant to constructions. His elongated concept is based on similarities and differences... Kelly can use binary logic to consider similarity and dissimilarity without regard to one another. by, for the time being, disregarding the third term

Kelly's method is extensional of operationally establishing interactions between entities, which served as the logical foundation Hinkle's (1965) implication grid, and for Hinkle's (1965) implication grid, and Hinkle's is (1965) subsequently, The bipolar implication grid of Fransella (1972), intensionality is simply ignored. That is to say, it ignores the fact that constructions are discontinuous in respect of their intensional meanings with one another, making subsuming one construct beneath another logically and It is nearly impossible. Again, Husain is a Muslim who lives in Pakistan (1983, p. 20) succinctly states the issue:

Bipolarity in nature, which each exemplifies the apex of difference capable of a qualitative general character, do not exist in a hierarchical system... since none is intrinsically of larger or smaller extent compared to the other.

This fundamental logical difficulty of Rychlak's claim that "Kelly is the problem" is refuted (1955a) successfully when he made a specific prediction stating, "The superordinate systems influence the subordinate systems. under whose authority they have been positioned" (p. 78). Rychlak, Rychlak (243 in 1991b). Husain (1983) is one example of this, pointing out, Kelly could not show a single instance of one construct encompassing another (in fact, He could not since it is impossible logically).

Technically, we may avoid By creating constructs, we can solve this logical difficulty purely in terms of particular sets of components that are, by definition, of greater or lesser extension. Of course, this is what Kelly (1955) assumes when he believes that each construct comes with a set of benefits that may different from one another person to the next, or even over time for the exact same person This strategy is effective. May be used to provide interim personal construct operational definitions information usage for the purpose of discovering constellations based on patterns of correlation use of several constructed by the same people, such as data from the repertory grid. Rather than a logical strategy, this is essentially a statistical approach to detecting correlations between the two constructions.

Adams-Webber (1979) established, nevertheless, that in theory, we may logically specify the operational relationship between any two construction Extensions, often known as "convenient ranges," are a type of extension," in terms Boolean algebra is a kind of Boolean algebra. As an example, construct A's a variety of benefits is a subset constructing 8's range of convenience, or A and 8's ranges of convenience are mutually exclusive incompatible. Simple Venn diagrams may be used to illustrate such correlations, or they can be turned into logical order assertions of the style If p is true, q', then (see Ford and Adams-Webber 1992). This technique for discovering entailment linkages Computers have been used to implement the relationship between personal constructs and part knowledge that is

interactive learning technologies (See, for example, Nicod in ICONKAT in Ford and colleagues (1991a and 1991b).

5. Discussion: AI and psychology

We shall now move on from Rychlak and extend our horizon's investigation to look into the entire AI and psychology have a symbiotic connection. Why does (or should) Al do what he does? worry about psychological theory What if Rychlak is incompatible with you? What if Rychlak is not a good match for you? face what Glymour is saying (1987) refers to as a Is there an anthropocentric constraint? To put it another way, must our intellect objects function mentally or physiologically in the same way that we do? In contrast, what, if any, contribution Is AI research possible? bring in terms of psychology? What advantages may scholars in these two very complicated and scattered fields of study receive from exchanging ideas and techniques?

5.1 *Why is Al in the same boat as cognitive psychology?*

There appears to be a reoccurring intuition which AI and psychology have in common a lot on the whole, and that there is a major (and growing) reciprocal cross-fertilization and facilitation relationship between them. Recent escapes from non-representational pasts, in particular, have linked AI and psychology: cybernetics and behaviorism, respectively. For most of the first half of the twentieth century, the recognized language for psychological theory was behavioral, with no mention of beliefs, desires, or intentions. Nonetheless, psychology is concerned not just with overt conduct, but also with experience, which includes our everyday conscious acts of interpreting and forecasting events, and by the mid-1960s, cognitive psychology and the computational metaphor had established as the dominant paradigm. The core premise of computational psychology is that what brains do may be thought of as a sort of computing at some level.

The practical utility of building models that include cognitive functions described regardless Any characterization of their neural substrate (i.e. wetware) should be avoided. is a fundamental premise shared by the vast majority of cognitive psychologists, as well as a critical assumption shared by those active in AI. All forms of representationalism believe in the worth of mental states or devices They reflect the world's states (Fodor and Pylyshyn 1988). Both cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence will benefit humanity in the long term by relying on the suggested Lower implementation (biological) and cognitive or psychological levels of description are functionally causally decoupled (akin to the relationship between genetics and the chemistry that underpins it). Artificial Intelligence (AI) is strongly implicated in cognitive psychology's future from this vantage point, if only because they share a fate. If it is discovered that intelligence cannot be studied apart from its application, cognitive psychology will become a rather uninteresting endeavor, focusing solely on those aspects of human cognition that are still open to biological speculation, and even then only until biology determines what is truly going on.

Let us do an appropriate thinking experiment. Consider a universe in which the objective of biology (particularly neurology) has been around for a while and all of the mechanics are parts of the human brain thoroughly known (much like (hardware for computers). Furthermore, imagine (as improbable as it may appear) that this corpus of a body of knowledge adequately explains all actions currently recognized as reflecting 'cognition' without resorting to psychological explanations. The aforementioned decoupling would not exist in such a society, and cognitive psychology as we know it now may have become outdated. Others, however, suggest that this process has already begun, noting the comeback of AI techniques that are naturally motivated, as well as an The number of cognitive psychologists is growing wagering on predicted advancements in the fast-paced burgeoning area "Cognitive neuroscience" is the term for this type of research.

What impact would this seeming disintegration of psychologists and victory have? What impact does reductionism have on AI? as we know it today? It appears

reasonable to expect AI to be demoted to the landfill of fun Language games, however, are no longer practical, or to become into a discipline of engineering that connects Various structures like brains As a result, the traditional AI's future prospects, and most likely individuals who work in any other branch of cognitive science (including most of psychology), are predicated on the fact that our reality is not of the sort Above, we proposed a hypothesis, i.eTheir independence as disciplines is predicated on the premise that there is a meaningful level of discourse beyond which explanations of cognitive operations cannot be made. adequately translated into descriptions of observable n functions using reduction sentences.

The fundamental issue is that experiences are neither 'cognitive' or 'neurological' in and of themselves. That is, happenings do not always fit into a single interpretation, and no single explanation of an event is more true than another. Cognitive psychology, neurology, economics, and political science are just a few of the conceptual tools used by humans to predict and influence events. Within its particular spectrum of convenience, each of these disciplines has a certain degree of logical consistency and pragmatic value. None of these are possible totally absorbed. Neither can they be reduced to one or more of the others predicting the "full truth" of a situation specific event. As a result, The same thing might happen again, seen as having distinct neurobiological, Consequences in terms of cognition, economics, and politics.

5.2 *The anthropocentric restriction, AI, and psychology*

We are forced to rely on a since the material underpinning for our machine intelligence is a non-biologically interpretable implementation (i.e. a computer) attempts. Researchers in artificial intelligence (AI) may have not much hope that the engineering profession will create. As a result, we are developing a genuinely brain-like (i.e., an artificial brain that embodies all of the relevant properties of actual brains) computer forced to rely on a non-biologically interpretable alternative implementation (i.e. a computer) as the Whether we like it or not, our endeavors to create true cognitive architectures will be implemented on computer devices distinct from our brains. As a result, the aforesaid causal decoupling is critical for any AI that succeeds deployment (by definition, virtually). Rather than neurobiological We should consider believability. be concerned with cognitive plausibility in practice in AI. From this vantage point, cognitive psychology may one day be proven to be critical to AI.

There is also a problem here. So far, we have assumed, as Rychlak does, that all cognitive scientists' goal is to figure out how "regular" brains work and/or develop artificial brains that do the same. Many AI researchers, on the other hand, are far more pragmatic: their goal is to build mechanical intelligence rather than to understand the normal, adult mind. They are not bound or aided by psychology (or neuroscience) any more than engineers are constrained or aided by the necessity to make calculators do division in the same manner that humans do. Glymour's anthropocentric limitation, in other words, does not have to confine AI.

To be clear, while a pragmatic perspective may be able to liberate AI from its anthropocentric mindset limitations (i.e., computers must be able to communicate with one another and behave like humans), it does not diminish our dependence on the projected The biological and cognitive/psychological levels of description are causally decoupled. Take calculating machine as an Designers, for example, allowed to put division in place whatever way they see suitable, but they are still executing division.There would be no prospect of building dividing robots if division was a procedure that could only be done occur (i.e. no causal decoupling) in a biological brain. Calculators do not truly divide, but just simulate division

Although the preceding argument established the potential usefulness of cognitive models of psychology in What is artificial intelligence (AI)? practical benefit does Artificial intelligence research bring for people who are just interested in the field of cognitive psychology? Several psychologists have sought to comprehend human cognitive abilities processes by borrowing notions and metaphors from AI attempts at genuine machine cogniti. Computational metaphors are now aplenty in cognitive psychology. However, this is not a one-way communication channel.

Various ideas and points of view continue to travel throughout the fields of cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence, constantly borrowing and influencing one another.

Consider the concept of propositional networks, which has psychological foundations. This psychological concept is used by AI researchers to create formalisms (for example, semantic networks), uncover connections with others and logics. To practice and test the theory, computer applications are used. In the light of theoretically significant results, such as a number of most recent computer vision research models, these more rigorous concepts are currently being reintroduced to psychology for empirical confirmation and expansion.

This new method, dubbed cognitive science, is a fundamentally inter/multidisciplinary endeavor that combines many of the intellectual aims of a variety of hard sciences, including philosophy, psychology, and computer science (among others). Traditional psychology, as well as biological and neurological approaches to cognition, are fundamentally different. The core idea is that computational models (machines) may be utilized to solve problems, make at least some cognitive psychology theories more cogent and plain, and that researchers working on intelligent artifacts (AI) can learn about how to improve their systems from psychologists' experiments with human subjects.

6. Conclusion

Psychology and artificial intelligence should be pals. We use a range of disciplinary procedures to deal with the same problem. Each side benefits from a different source: Artificial intelligence (AI) has a subject matter that is largely dictated by psychology, and it gives a new set of tools for thinking about that subject matter, as well as a new intellectual discipline, in exchange. In addition, models must be implementable and have enough internal knowledge and accuracy to suit empirical data to be executed on a computer to achieve the desired behavior. As a result, the models have a level of depth and complexity that is unrivaled in the industry. However, maybe more crucially, technique consistently reveals new and unexpected model properties. Because the behavior of complex systems is not always predictable from code, implementing them is an empirical task in and of itself.

Let us establish a clear distinction between our hypothesis and any potential misconceptions. The meaning of the computational metaphor Isn't it true that all computers have a mental status? Your IBM PC is not thinking about Vienna. It is also untrue that the human brain is arranged similarly to a Von Neumann computer, or that this is the best approach to describe all elements of human behavior. The idea is that there is a degree of explanation that is beneficial for numerous facets of mental health, particularly characteristics of cognition, in which internal resources mental processes are described as a type of computation—the processing of meaningful symbolic patterns in which the rules regulating internal behavior regularities may be expressed in terms of their form.

Finally, we should ponder why the computational metaphor has been targeted so recently. Why are people so adamant about putting this new discipline out of business? There appears to be a prevalent belief that embracing such a paradigm will reduce or devalue our self-image. In response, we feel that the computational metaphor, on the other hand, presents a distinct humanistic perspective image of humanity that is yet compatible with the most rigorous physical standpoint of research truth. It's the only option description we know of: a description of how a physical system works may utilize symbols in such a way that their meaning is inextricably linked to how it functions, and how a mind might constrain a body.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers are grateful to UNIVERSITY of RAHARJA for supporting this work.

REFERENCES

[1] C. Zhang and Y. Lu, "Study on artificial intelligence: The state of the art and future prospects," *J. Ind. Inf. Integr.*, vol. 23, p. 100224, 2021.
[2] A. Holzinger, G. Langs, H. Denk, K. Zatloukal, and H. Müller, "Causability and explainability of artificial intelligence in medicine," *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Data Min. Knowl. Discov.*, vol. 9, no. 4, p. e1312, 2019.
[3] R. Vaishya, M. Javaid, I. H. Khan, and A. Haleem, "Artificial Intelligence (AI) applications for COVID-19 pandemic," *Diabetes Metab. Syndr. Clin. Res. Rev.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 337–339, 2020.
[4] M. Haenlein and A. Kaplan, "A brief history of artificial intelligence: On the past, present, and future of artificial intelligence," *Calif. Manage. Rev.*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 5–14, 2019.
[5] L. Chen, P. Chen, and Z. Lin, "Artificial intelligence in education: A review," *Ieee Access*, vol. 8, pp. 75264–75278, 2020.
[6] B. Shneiderman, "Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy," *Int. J. Human–Computer Interact.*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 495–504, 2020.
[7] K. Jarek and G. Mazurek, "Marketing and Artificial Intelligence.," *Cent. Eur. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2019.
[8] R. B. Parikh, S. Teeple, and A. S. Navathe, "Addressing bias in artificial intelligence in health care," *Jama*, vol. 322, no. 24, pp. 2377–2378, 2019.
[9] B. W. Wirtz, J. C. Weyerer, and C. Geyer, "Artificial intelligence and the public sector—applications and challenges," *Int. J. Public Adm.*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 596–615, 2019.
[10] U. Schmidt-Erfurth, A. Sadeghipour, B. S. Gerendas, S. M. Waldstein, and H. Bogunović, "Artificial intelligence in retina," *Prog. Retin. Eye Res.*, vol. 67, pp. 1–29, 2018.
[11] U. Rahardja and E. P. Harahap, "Implementation of Information Planning and Strategies Industrial Technology 4.0 to Improve Business Intelligence Performance on Official Site APTISI," in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2019, vol. 1179, no. 1, p. 12111.
[12] U. Rahardja, Q. Aini, and A. Khoirunisa, "The Effect of Rinfogroups as a Discussion Media in Student Learning Motivation," *Aptisi Trans. Manag.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 79–88, 2018.
[13] M. J. Iqbal *et al.*, "Clinical applications of artificial intelligence and machine learning in cancer diagnosis: Looking into the future," *Cancer Cell Int.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2021.
[14] K. D. Stephan and G. Klima, "Artificial intelligence and its natural limits," *AI Soc.*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 9–18, 2021.
[15] I. N. Mseer, "Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and the Spirit of Humanity," in *The Fourth Industrial Revolution: Implementation of Artificial Intelligence for Growing Business Success*, Springer, 2021, pp. 327–340.
[16] H. L. J. van der Maas, L. Snoek, and C. E. Stevenson, "How much intelligence is there in artificial intelligence? A 2020 update," *Intelligence*, vol. 87, p. 101548, 2021.
[17] M. Elbadawi *et al.*, "Harnessing artificial intelligence for the next generation of 3D printed medicines," *Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev.*, vol. 175, p. 113805, 2021.
[18] Y. Li and O. Hilliges, *Artificial Intelligence for Human Computer Interaction: A Modern Approach*. Springer, 2021.
[19] H. S. Lee and J. Lee, "Applying artificial intelligence in physical education and future perspectives," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 351, 2021.
[20] U. Rahardja, Q. Aini, H. D. Ariessanti, and A. Khoirunisa, "Pengaruh Gamifikasi pada iDu (iLearning Education) dalam Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Mahasiswa," *NJCA (Nusantara J. Comput. Its Appl.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 120–124, 2018.
[21] H. Kong, Y. Yuan, Y. Baruch, N. Bu, X. Jiang, and K. Wang, "Influences of artificial intelligence (AI) awareness on career competency and job burnout," *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*, 2021.
[22] A. Arslan, C. Cooper, Z. Khan, I. Golgeci, and I. Ali, "Artificial intelligence and human workers interaction at team level: a conceptual assessment of the challenges and potential HRM strategies," *Int. J. Manpow.*, 2021.

[23] J. M. Packard, L. J. Folse, N. D. Stone, M. E. Makela, and R. N. Coulson, "Applications of artificial intelligence to animal behavior," in *Interpretation and explanation in the study of animal behavior*, Routledge, 2021, pp. 147–191.

BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS

	**Muhammad Rehan Anwar, University of Agriculture Faisalabad (UAF), rehan749@gmail.com**
	**Fitra Putri Oganda, University of Raharja, fitra.putri@raharja.info**
	**Nuke Puji Lestari Santoso, University of Raharja, nuke@raharja.info**
	**Muhamad Fabio, University of Raharja, fabio@raharja.info**