

Socially-Minded Intelligence: How Individuals, Groups, and AI Systems Can Make Each-Other Smarter (or Not)

William J. Bingley, S. Alexander Haslam, Janet Wiles

Abstract—A core part of human intelligence is the ability to work flexibly with others to achieve both individual and collective goals. The incorporation of artificial agents into human spaces is making increasing demands on artificial intelligence (AI) to demonstrate and facilitate this ability. However, this kind of flexibility is not well understood because existing approaches to intelligence typically focus either on the individual or the collective level of analysis. At the individual level, intelligence is seen as an individual-difference trait that exists independently of the social environment. At the collective level intelligence is conceptualized as a property of groups, but not in a way that can be used to understand how groups can make group members smarter or how group members acting as individuals might make the group itself more intelligent. In the present paper we argue that by focusing either on individual or collective intelligence without considering their interaction, existing conceptualizations of intelligence limit the potential of people and machines. To address this impasse, we identify and explore a new kind of intelligence — *socially-minded intelligence* — that can be applied to both individuals (in a social context) and collectives (of individual minds). From a socially-minded intelligence perspective, the potential intelligence of individuals is unlocked in groups, while the potential intelligence of groups is maximized by the flexible, context-sensitive commitment of individual group members. We propose ways in which socially-minded intelligence might be measured and cultivated within people, as well as how it might be modelled in AI systems. Finally, we discuss ways in which socially-minded intelligence might be used to improve human-AI teaming.

Index Terms—Artificial intelligence, collective intelligence, human-AI teaming, human intelligence, social identity, socially-minded intelligence

I. INTRODUCTION

Imagine the following scenario: You are stranded with a small group of strangers on a deserted island after your intercontinental flight was forced to make an emergency crash landing. Furthermore, imagine that your primary goal — what you want more than anything else — is to get home alive.

Manuscript submitted to Psychological Review on 12/9/2024. This research was funded by the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language (CE140100041), a University of Queensland strategic grant on Human-Centered AI and a UQ Cyber grant on Cyber Security for Digital Identities.

W. J. Bingley is with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, The University of Queensland, Australia (email: w.bingley@uq.edu.au)

How might each of the following features of this scenario help you achieve this goal? (A) you have a high intelligence quotient (IQ); (B) you and the other survivors of the crash immediately form a cohesive, yet intellectually diverse group; or (C) you and the other survivors are able to act as individuals, subgroups, or as a single unit depending on the demands of the situation.

Individual perspectives on intelligence would say that Feature A (IQ) will be important, but that Features B and C are irrelevant to understanding your intelligence because they are contingent on other people rather than being individual traits or capabilities. Collective perspectives on intelligence would say that Feature B (group cohesion combined with cognitive diversity) is important for the group’s ability to achieve its goals — but these may not overlap with *your* goals as an individual. In the present paper we focus on Feature C, which relies on an individual capability (being able to act as an individual or a group member in a context-sensitive way), but also on other individuals and the social context. Regarding your personal goal of getting home alive, Feature C allows you either to work with the group if they share your goal, or to split off on your own if the group decides they want to stay on the island forever. Moreover, Feature C also contributes something unique beyond Feature B to the group’s collective intelligence, as it allows the group to do such things as split into different foraging and exploration subgroups, or for subgroups to challenge the group’s consensus in decision-making. In short, Feature C — the ability of agents to switch between acting as individuals or as group members depending on the demands of the situation — is a basis for both you and your group to have *socially-minded intelligence*.

We propose that socially-minded intelligence is a key feature of human intelligence, but that this concept has been neglected in both social science and artificial intelligence (AI) research because researchers have tended to focus *either* on individual intelligence *or* on collective intelligence without considering their dynamic interaction. In the present paper we

S. A. Haslam is with the School of Psychology, The University of Queensland, Australia (email: a.haslam@uq.edu.au)

J. Wiles is with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, The University of Queensland, Australia (email: j.wiles@uq.edu.au)

address this lacuna by first identifying an appropriate definition of intelligence that can encompass humans, machines, individuals, and groups. We then review literature on the intelligence of humans (individuals and groups) and artificial systems (single- and multi-agent) before outlining and defining the concept of socially-minded intelligence and deriving relevant metrics. We conclude by exploring applications of this concept.

II. DEFINING INTELLIGENCE

There are many ways to define intelligence, with this concept having been applied to a diverse range of systems [1]. In the present paper we seek to understand the intelligence of individuals, groups, humans, machines, and human-AI teams. With this scope in mind, we take a perspective on intelligence that is *agent-based* — where an agent is “anything that can be viewed as perceiving its environment through sensors and acting upon that environment through actuators” [2, p. 51]. Agent-based approaches have been used successfully to create both single-agent [3] and multi-agent [4] artificial systems. They have also been applied to understand the behavior of both individual people [5] and human groups [6].

Agent-based ‘universal’ intelligence is defined by Legg and Hutter [7, p. 402] as “an agent’s ability to achieve goals in a wide range of environments”. This definition of intelligence is intended to represent “the essence of intelligence in its most general form” [7, p. 402], and can therefore be used to understand the intelligence of both people and machines. In the present paper we base our definition of intelligence on that of Legg and Hutter but adjust the framing of this in two key ways. First, we broaden the term ‘agent’ to include multi-agent systems, not just individual agents. Specifically, we propose that because multi-agent systems are capable of having higher-level goals [8], [9] and have the potential to act in a coordinated manner in their environment [10], Legg and Hutter’s definition can be applied to a *group* of agents to the extent that they (a) have shared higher-level goals and (b) act in their environment as a collective. This conceptualization of groups as agents is similar to that proposed by a number of other researchers (e.g., [11], [12]).

Second, for our present purpose we assume that relevant measures of the intelligence of agents and multi-agent systems will capture their performance in relation to specific goals (whether these are desired states of the world, or more open-ended drives to maximize or minimize a particular state). In other words, we exclude the process of *choosing* high-level goals. However, we include selection of new subgoals as a valid way of achieving existing higher-level goals, so long as the latter still exist to measure the current state of goal attainment. This restriction somewhat limits our definition of intelligence as it applies to humans as goal-setting and goal adaptation are considered to be part of human intelligence [13]. We make this simplification in order to be able to apply a similar standard to measuring the intelligence of both humans and agent-based AI systems (which have specified high-level goals in the form of desired states, utility functions, or performance standards; [2]). Indeed, without this exclusion, no existing AI system would be considered intelligent [14], [15]. An implication of this approach is that the measurement of

intelligence requires us to specify the goals that it corresponds to [12].

Taking all the above considerations into account, for the purposes of the present paper, our working definition of intelligence extends that of Legg and Hutter [7] to suggest that *intelligence is the ability of an agent or multi-agent system to achieve specific goals in a wide range of environments*. Following this definition, a person or group is considered intelligent to the extent that they can achieve specific goals across different environments. This conceptualization aligns with the way that intelligence is understood across the various literatures we are discussing. For example, commonly-used individual difference measures such as IQ scores are intended to predict goal attainment in a variety of domains [16], [17], [18]. Similarly, collective intelligence metrics are used to predict group goal attainment across different kinds of tasks [19]. With regards to artificial intelligence, an artificial agent or multi-agent system can be said to be intelligent to the extent that it can achieve specified goals (e.g., with reference to performance benchmarks) in a wide variety of environments. Accordingly, this definition can be used to discuss intelligence in all of the different kinds of systems in which we are interested.

III. EXISTING APPROACHES TO INTELLIGENCE

A. Psychological Approaches to Intelligence

Researchers in psychology and AI have tended to focus either on individual or collective intelligence, but not on the interaction between these levels of analysis. For example, with regards to psychology, there are many theories that conceptualize intelligence in terms of differences between individuals. Some of these theories, such as the Cattell-Horn-Carroll theory (CHC; [20]) focus on a single factor of intelligence (‘g’ in the CHC theory) within a hierarchy of lower-level factors. Others theories focus on specific kinds of intelligence, such as practical intelligence [21], emotional intelligence [22], social intelligence [23], or cultural intelligence [24], or on combinations of intelligences [25]. A common feature of these approaches is that they treat intelligence as an individual-difference trait or capability — that is, as something that an individual person ‘has an amount of’ and that remains fairly stable across contexts. This perspective is epitomized by IQ tests, which ostensibly identify an individual’s level of g, primarily for the purposes of comparing individuals to each other [26], [27].

In contrast to these individualistic accounts of intelligence, other researchers have focused on collective intelligence. This is generally conceptualized as a group-level variable and has been defined as “groups of individuals acting collectively in ways that seem intelligent” ([28, p. 3]. For example, Woolley and colleagues [29] have identified a general factor called ‘c’, which is analogous to g in the CHC theory of individual human intelligence. Several variables that impact on collective intelligence have been identified, including the abilities of group members [29], [30], the specific configuration of group members’ traits [31], [32], collective attention [31], [33], [34], group structure [12], [35], [36], [37], and intragroup processes [38], [39], [40]. However, while collective intelligence research points to ways in which a group might be more or

less intelligent, it does not specify how acting collectively impacts on the intelligence of group members (in terms of their own individual goals). At the same time, as things stand, it is not clear how the group-level factors that contribute to collective intelligence, such as group structures and intergroup processes, are mediated through individual-level psychological variables such as trust [41], [42] and social identity [43], [44].

B. AI Approaches to Intelligence

Artificial intelligence has been defined as “the science and engineering of making intelligent machines” [45, p. 2]. While there are many subfields and approaches within the field of AI, we propose that there is, broadly speaking, a gap between research into single- and multi-agent AI that mirrors the gap between individual and collective intelligence research in psychology. For example, many tests of the intelligence of AI systems focus on performance against individual human benchmarks [46], [47]. These approaches are examples of ‘psychological AI’, which focuses on designing systems that think like (individual) humans [48]. More broadly, though, even researchers in AI who do not measure system performance by comparison to individual humans have generally conceptualized artificial intelligence as an individual-differences variable — that is, as something a given system has an amount of by itself, which is relatively stable and can be compared against other systems across contexts (e.g., [49], [50], [51]). Moreover, many AI systems have been inspired by ideas from individualistic paradigms within psychology such as associative learning and cognitive psychology [48], [52], [53], [54], [55], propagating an implicitly individual model of human intelligence in AI. Accordingly, there is a perspective within AI which implies that the best way to improve a system’s intelligence is to change its internal processes or components in some way (e.g., by improving processing speed, cognitive architecture, neural network size and depth, reinforcement learning, algorithm optimization, and training datasets; [2], [56], [57]). In other words, this perspective implies that the way to make machines more intelligent (as with people) is to make them smarter *as individuals*.

A system of cooperating artificial agents (a ‘multi-agent system’ or MAS) is comparable to a human group comprised of cooperating group members [58], and the ability of a MAS to achieve its goals can be thought of as its collective intelligence. One approach to designing MAS, inspired by game theory, is to coordinate agents by utilizing utility calculations. For example, this can involve aligning agents’ individual utility calculations to achieve equilibria [59], [60], optimizing group-level utility [4], [61], [62], [63], or combining different types of equilibria-seeking behaviors [64], [65].

Another approach to designing MAS, ‘swarm AI’, is to construct systems that take inspiration from animals and other non-human biological systems (particularly ants and bees; [66]) to produce emergent collective behavior [67], [68], [69], [70], [71], [72]. Game theoretic and swarm approaches can be combined in a single MAS [73]. Agents in MAS are generally designed as components, with the aim of making the overall system more intelligent [2]. This aim is reflected in the

assessment of collective artificial intelligence, which tends to focus on the goals of the system as a whole (e.g., [74], [75]). Accordingly, MAS agents are often designed to be *less* intelligent than they would be if they were independent agents. As Altshuler [76, p. 4] puts it “while designing intelligent swarm systems we must assume (and often even aspire for) having ... available individual agents that are myopic, mute, senile and rather stupid”. Indeed, the kind of individualized thinking that typifies much human intelligence in groups is seen by some MAS researchers as a threat to coordination [77]. In contrast to the uniform, simple agents in the majority of approaches to MAS intelligence, some studies have looked to investigate individuality, subgroups, and intragroup dynamics within collective systems [9], [78], [79]. However, such approaches have focused more or less exclusively on the impact of these dynamics on *collective* (not individual) outcomes.

In summary, approaches to understanding human intelligence in psychology have tended to conceptualize intelligence either as an individual-difference variable, or as a quality of groups. Similarly, AI researchers have generally built and tested AI systems either as individual agents or as MAS. In the following section we discuss some of the limitations of this exclusive focus on either the individual or the collective level of analysis.

C. Limitations of Existing Approaches to Intelligence

Many high-level constructs within human intelligence research (such as *g* and *c*), as well as more specific factors (such as processing speed and emotional intelligence), predict variance in performance outcomes [29], [80], [81], [82]. For example, *c* was found by Woolley and colleagues [29] to account for 43% of performance on a variety of group tasks. Similarly, basic cognitive processes such as processing speed have been found to be positively correlated with scholastic performance [80]. However, regardless of the construct or chosen outcome, there is substantial variance in performance left unexplained by existing conceptualizations of human intelligence [29], [83], [84]. We propose that additional variance might be accounted for by the ability of a person to solve problems by thinking and acting together with other people. Specifically, we suggest that being able to work with others (and having others to work with) will predict variance in an individual person’s intelligence beyond that based on their individual difference traits and capabilities. Moreover, we propose that the ability of people to work with others *when appropriate and/or necessary* will predict variance in collective intelligence when accounting for existing variables that predict this outcome.

Existing individual tests of human intelligence inherently reflect the influence of the social environment [85]. These tests measure intelligence within existing human social structures, such as organizations, schools, and cultures. However, they either ignore the input of these social structures (as in IQ tests; [27]), or use them to fine-tune the testing context (as in the case of successful intelligence as conceptualized by Sternberg, [86]; or in social intelligence as conceptualized by Kihlstrom and Cantor, [23]). In either case, these tests fail to account for the contribution of the social environment *itself* to a person’s intelligence. For example,

with regards to the first approach, asking two people from different cultures or socio-demographic backgrounds to complete an IQ test and then comparing their scores fails to account for the variance in their performance that arises from the fact that IQ tests have been designed to predict outcomes within a specific (i.e., Western, white collar) social context [27], [87], and hence the test is likely to undervalue the intelligence of people from other backgrounds [88]. Practical intelligence methods address this problem by testing more context-specific outcomes (e.g., assessing domain-relevant tacit knowledge; [13]). However, if a person tends to solve problems with others (regardless of their socio-cultural background), requiring them to perform an intelligence test without those others will also undervalue their intelligence — defined as their ability to achieve their goals in a wide range of environments. In contrast, another person who tends to solve problems by themselves may have their intelligence *overestimated* since the range of environments evaluated does not include ones where working with others would be advantageous. We propose that the social context should be accounted for in theories and tests of intelligence, and indeed that its influence should be measured as part of intelligence itself. We explore this idea further in section IV.A.

The current lack of integration between individual and collective human intelligence has two problematic implications when it comes to understanding the intelligence of groups and group members. The first is that current conceptualizations of collective human intelligence cannot be used to understand how intelligent a given person is in the practical contexts of everyday life. In particular, while collective intelligence research has identified features of individual group members that can help a group achieve its goals (e.g., task-relevant abilities; [89]), this perspective provides no insight into how working with a group might improve the intelligence of a group member in terms of their own individual goals. For example, factors that contribute to collective intelligence may not predict whether a researcher’s personal goal to write highly-cited first-author papers will be better achieved by working with one lab group versus another — as this depends on more than just how effective those lab groups are as collectives. In particular, if one lab group is cohesive but distributes authorship evenly amongst group members, while another is fragmented but allows the researcher to claim first-authorship for more papers, then joining the ‘less effective’ group may be a better way to achieve the researcher’s individual goal. In other words, we agree with Malone and Woolley’s [89, pp. 793–4] claim that “studying collective intelligence provides a link between cognitive psychology and high-level social, organizational, and economic processes” but observe that this link has tended to be one-way — that is, it focuses on the ways in which individual cognitive psychology impacts on collective processes. The inverse link from social processes to individual psychology is neither imagined nor explored.

The second problem that arises from the focus on the group level of analysis concerns the lack of clarity around how intragroup dynamics shape collective intelligence [90]. In particular, while independent yet integrated decision-making has been highlighted as important for collective intelligence outcomes [34], [91], [92], and different kinds of intragroup

decision-making structure have been identified [12], the *dynamics* of these processes in terms of changes over time have not been clearly articulated. For example, the intermediate level of analysis between individuals and groups consists of subgroups that can (and often will) have their own subgoals that may contribute to or hamper the achievement of the overall goals of the group [93]. Accordingly, the extent to which group members see themselves and act as subgroup rather than group members in different contexts needs to be analyzed to determine the ability of the group to function as a whole [94], [95], [96]. In some contexts group members may benefit the group best by acting more as differentiated individuals rather than as undifferentiated group members [97], [98]. For example, an individual group member going against the group’s consensus (when this consensus is incorrect) may help to avoid problems such as groupthink; and having group members who retain some degree of individuality may allow them to contribute differing viewpoints, potentially increasing the group’s intelligence [99]. Finally, because different decision-making structures are optimal in different circumstances [12], being able to change between these structures may help groups be more flexibly intelligent [100], [101]. Existing accounts of collective intelligence do not have an effective way of conceptualizing and predicting these kinds of dynamics.

Just as the individualistic approach to intelligence poses problems for psychology, it also causes issues for artificial intelligence. For example, one of the most apparent differences between biological and artificial intelligence is that the former tends to be general and the latter tends to be narrow [102]. This means that while AI systems are often very powerful, they are at the same time fragile and rely on humans to construct and maintain their performance environment, in ways that limit their intelligence in the sense that we have defined it in this paper [103]. This is most apparent in contexts of use in which AI systems act with a high degree of autonomy in unconstrained settings (e.g., self-driving cars and other social robots).

Progress in such fields, and towards solving the broader problem of ‘common sense’ in AI, has been slow compared with other areas where humans use narrow AI systems as tools [103], [104], [105]. An individualistic approach to improving general AI (e.g., [106, p. 99]; [56], [107]) assumes that the way to increase the intelligence of an agent is to improve something about that agent itself (e.g., its architecture, model size, reward function, data set). This approach is epitomized in the design of artificial agents, in that other agents are typically considered as part of the problem to solve, rather than a way to solve the problem — unless the agent is explicitly designed to be part of a multi-agent system (e.g., [4]). In contrast, most humans have the capacity to form part of a multi-agent team when this is appropriate or required to solve a given problem, and indeed this allows them to do so across varied environments [12], [108], [109]. In other words, a human who can work with others around them does not necessarily need to change anything about themselves to be better able to achieve their goals. More generally, many other naturally-occurring intelligent systems, including animals, bacteria, and even cancers, rely on higher-level cooperation to increase the ability of agents to reach their goals [110], [111], [112], [113], [114].

Along these lines, we propose that individual artificial agents might perform better on benchmarks of goal attainment across different environments if they were able to work with other agents to achieve their goals when appropriate and/or necessary.

Existing conceptualizations of intelligence also limit the potential of MAS in two more important ways. The first results from the fact that treating collective intelligence as a coordination problem is computationally demanding [2]. In particular, approaches which aim to coordinate the ‘selfish’ motivations of individual agents by establishing equilibria become intractable as the number of agents expands [115], [116], [117]. This scalability problem also affects multi-agent reinforcement learning [4], [118]. In contrast, human cooperation can be scaled up to allow cooperation on a scale of hundreds, thousands, or millions of agents [119]. The second limitation is that, as with models of collective human intelligence, multi-agent system designs tend to be static rather than dynamic, in the sense that the relationships between agents and the groups they belong to do not change in response to circumstances. For example, MAS typically have fixed organizational structures, such as hierarchical (“agents have tree-like relations”) or holonic (“agents are organized in multiple groups which are known as holons based on particular features, e.g., heterogeneity”), each of which is better suited to particular kinds of tasks [9, p. 28585]. By comparison, human cooperation is fluid and context-sensitive [120]. This means that while a group may have a particular structure at a given time, this is subject to change depending on the context and the task at hand [121], [122]. These two features of human cooperation — scalability and flexibility — help people to solve problems in changing environments in ways that artificial MAS currently cannot.

In sum, failing to account for the interaction between individuals and groups leads to both overestimation and underestimation of the intelligence of people and human groups. The lack of such abilities in artificial systems also reduces the design space and hence potential intelligence of artificial agents and multi-agent systems. These, we suggest, are problems that a model of socially-minded intelligence can help us address and resolve.

IV. SOCIALLY-MINDED INTELLIGENCE

Thus far, our review of the literature on intelligence in individuals and groups (human and artificial) has revealed factors that contribute to individual intelligence (i.e., the ability of individuals to achieve goals) and collective intelligence (the ability of collectives to achieve goals) but it has also identified limitations that result from failing to account for interactions between these levels of analysis. In this section we propose a new kind of intelligence to capture these interactions. We call this *socially-minded intelligence*. This intelligence only exists in contexts containing more than one agent.

We define socially-minded intelligence as *the extent to which agents can move between acting as individuals and acting as group members – and the extent to which this flexibility is context-sensitive and directed towards specific goals*. In contexts with more than one agent, individual agents

with socially-minded intelligence abilities have the potential (but not the requirement) to form an intersubjective ‘social mind’ with others [123]. Such a social mind is a dynamic assembly of individual agents, each with their own individual goals, who can, when appropriate and/or necessary, define themselves, and act, as group members and work towards group goals. At the individual level, agents that can participate in a social mind with others have an increased potential to achieve their goals relative to agents that can only operate either as individuals or group members. Similarly, at the collective level, groups made up of such agents have an increased potential to achieve their goals relative to groups made up of agents that work only as individuals or only as group members. We therefore propose that there is variance in the performance of individuals and groups that is explained by the concept of socially-minded intelligence, beyond the variance captured by either individual or collective intelligence alone (see Fig. 1).




Fig. 1. Individual, collective, and socially-minded intelligence. This figure represents the unique contribution to the intelligence of individuals and groups represented by the abilities of individuals (individual intelligence), groups (collective intelligence), and the ‘social mind’ formed by individuals who can act as group members or subgroup members when required (socially-minded intelligence).

Given our working definition of intelligence as the ability to achieve goals in different environments, socially-minded intelligence is formulated differently when viewed from an individual versus a collective perspective, since the goals of these entities may differ. The socially-minded intelligence of an individual agent is directed towards solving the individual’s goals and is defined as follows:

An agent’s individual socially-minded intelligence is the extent to which it can flexibly perceive, think, and act with other agents towards its own individual goals.

An agent with a high level of socially-minded intelligence must (A) be able to flexibly perceive, think, and act with other agents using their own social abilities; (B) have other agents in their social environment to perceive, think, and act with; and

(C) be able to act towards its own individual goals together with those other agents. In contrast, an agent that lacks socially-minded intelligence might (A) be unable to flexibly perceive, think, and act with other agents due to a lack of social capability; (B) not have other agents in their social environment to perceive, think, and act with; or (C) be unable to act towards its own individual goals with those other agents. In other words, the social-minded intelligence of a given agent is a function of the agent itself, other agents, their relationship, and the alignment between agents' individual and shared goals.

The socially-minded intelligence of a multi-agent system acting as a group is directed towards solving the group's goals and is defined as follows:

A multi-agent system's group socially-minded intelligence is the extent to which each agent in the system can perceive, think, and act as a group member, subgroup member, or individual — depending on the demands of the context — and can act accordingly to work towards the system's superordinate goals.

A multi-agent system or group with a high degree of socially-minded intelligence must be comprised of agents (A) that can perceive, think, and act as individuals or group members; (B) that can change between these states dynamically in response to the situation; and (C) that in doing so can act towards the system's superordinate goals. A multi-agent system or group that lacks socially-minded intelligence might be comprised of agents (A) that can perceive, think, and act either as individual or group members, but not both; (B) that can perceive, think, and act either as individuals or group members but are not able to move between these states in a dynamic, contextually-sensitive way; or (C) that in acting as individuals or group members fail to act towards the system's overall goals or act in ways that work against these goals. Accordingly, the socially-minded intelligence of a multi-agent system or group is determined by the perceptual, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral flexibility of agents; the extent to which this flexibility is sensitive to the situation; and the extent to which this flexibility leads to actions which align the agents with the goals of the system or group.

Socially-minded intelligence is distinct from the other kinds of intelligence that we reviewed earlier in this paper in that it is not just an individual-difference variable. It shares similarities with social intelligence [23], [124] to the extent that it allows one agent to connect with others, but social intelligence is missing the other two components of socially-minded intelligence: Other people, and the dynamics between people. A person could have a great deal of social intelligence but not have any socially-minded intelligence because they lack others to perceive, think, and act with – or because acting with those others goes against their personal goals. Another similar individual-difference intelligence is Sternberg's [125, p. 141] concept of successful intelligence — “the ability to achieve success in life in terms of one's personal standards, within one's sociocultural context”. Socially-minded intelligence goes further by including sociocultural context within the concept of intelligence itself, not just in the testing context.

Socially-minded intelligence also differs from existing conceptualizations of collective intelligence in that it is

defined by intragroup dynamics. In contrast, collective intelligence exists whenever a group can be considered to act intelligently [28], [89], regardless of whether this involves group dynamics. Indeed, while group dynamics have been identified as a factor that *impacts on* collective intelligence [126], [127], [128], they do not define it. To clarify the difference, imagine a group of people who always act together as a group, even when the group's goals would be best achieved by subgroup or individual action. This group might still have a degree of collective intelligence (in that it might achieve group goals that require purely collective action), but it would not have socially-minded intelligence (in that it cannot achieve group goals that require group members to flexibly switch between individual and group behaviors). Another key difference between these concepts is that socially-minded intelligence requires not only that group members can act as group members, but also that they can perceive and think as group members. In contrast, collective intelligence can be defined purely in terms of the behavior of group members [28], [89].

The agent-environment framework commonly used to design artificial agents ([2], [7]; see Fig. 2) can be used to demonstrate how socially-minded intelligence could differ from the usual conceptualization of intelligence within artificial agents. In this framework, processes such as perception and cognition occur within the individual agent. Other agents are treated as objects in the environment, unless the agent being modelled is part of a multi-agent system, in which case other agents are treated as agents in the environment [2]. In both cases, though, other agents are treated as existing in the environment, not as co-existing with the agent to constitute a broader sense of collective agency.




Fig. 2. The agent-environment framework (redrawn from [2, p. 55])

This difference is analogous to the way that individual tests of human intelligence treat other people as something to be either included or excluded from the testing environment, rather than as something that *contributes to* a person’s intelligence. Expressed differently, the socially-minded intelligence of artificial agents goes one step further than treating other agents as agents in the environment, in that, where appropriate, a socially-minded agent should be able to include other agents *as part of themselves in a broader sense*. That is, socially-minded agents do not only perceive, think about, and act towards other agents; but also perceive, think, and act *with* other agents. This idea can be conceptualized by using an extended version of the agent-environment framework, as represented schematically in Fig. 3.




Fig. 3. A socially-extended agent-environment framework. This figure represents in a simplified manner what it means for an agent to perceive, think, and act with other agents as part of themselves (in a broader sense), not just as part of the environment. To the extent that Agent A sees itself as a part of Group I (i.e., as a group member rather than as an individual agent), it can treat information coming from Agent B as part of its own perception; share its cognition with Agent B by allowing Agent B to influence its own decision-making; and act with Agent B in the environment together as a part of Group I. However, because Agent A is not part of Group II, it will treat Agent C and D as out in the environment — that is, as things to perceive, think about, act *on* rather than as fellow group members to perceive with, think with, and act *with*. Indeed, when Agent A sees itself as an individual rather than a group member, this is also how it will treat Agent B. Finally, when relations between Group I and Group II are competitive, Agent A will act *against* Agents C and D.

Socially-minded intelligence is similar to approaches in MAS that utilize subgroups [9], [78], [79], but as noted above, it differs in that these approaches are targeting collective outcomes. In contrast, we are proposing that agents might be better able to achieve their *individual* goals when they can perceive, think, and act with other agents.

The socially-minded intelligence approach to agent cooperation also differs from prevalent game-theoretic approaches in that it does not require either negotiation between agents (e.g., [59], [60]) or group-level optimality (e.g., [61], [62], [63]). Rather, socially-minded agents are expected to cooperate when, intersubjectively, they see each other as part of the same higher-level ‘self’. In Fig. 3, cooperation between Agent A and Agent B results from a shared sense of self as part of Group I, which changes what ‘self-interest’ means for these agents. Critically, unlike swarm agents, socially-minded agents do not have to act as group members to be intelligent.

We propose that the concept of socially-minded intelligence is both a useful way to conceptualize human psychology in social situ, and at the same time a blueprint for designing new kinds of intelligent artificial systems. In the next section we discuss ways in which this concept might be applied in different contexts.

A. Applications to Understanding, Measuring, and Improving Human Intelligence

A socially-minded approach enables a reevaluation of biases in which people tend to conform or agree with others (e.g., [129], [130], [131]). For example, people tend to trust ingroup members more than outgroup members, even when this trust is based on arbitrary groups and even when it can lead to risk-taking behavior [132], [133]. In experiments to extract the influence of social environment from cognition, such tendencies appear to reduce individual intelligence [134], [135], [136]. However, variables such as ingroup trust, cohesion, and the ability of group members to be influenced by leaders are vital for group dynamics, not least because they enable people to achieve goals collectively [43], [137], [138] and are thus an inherent component of their socially-minded intelligence. Accordingly, the socially-minded perspective predicts that the experimental context of psychology studies and intelligence tests can lead to a misinterpretation of the extent to which people who follow others are ‘biased’, rather than optimized for their social world. This prediction is consistent with research showing that heuristics (cognitive shortcuts) that lead to errors in experimental contexts can lead to successful performance in ecologically valid contexts [139], [140]. Just as human rationality is less effective when deployed by individuals without the input of other people [141], human intelligence more broadly appears impoverished when it is removed from its social context. New approaches are needed to reinterpret the impact of such social-cognitive biases on intelligence to account for the ways in which people work with others to achieve goals.

Adopting a socially-minded intelligence perspective may help individuals and groups to improve in a range of domains required for intelligence [12]: learning, remembering, sensing, creating possibilities, and deciding on action. For example, individuals can learn more effectively with the help of others [142], [143]; other people can act as aids to memory [37], [144], [145]; creativity is unlocked in particular social contexts [146]; and decision-making can be improved through interaction with others [139], [141]. Collective intelligence might also be improved by focusing on the ability of group members to act flexibly as individuals or in subgroups. For example, having group members who can operate with some degree of independence can improve the ability of a group to generate ideas [147], [148] and to decide on an effective course of action [92], [149], [150]. Moreover, pro-social dissent within groups (whether by individuals or subgroups) can improve collective intelligence by challenging and changing harmful social norms [98] and improving creativity [151].

Socially-minded intelligence itself might be increased in several ways for both individuals and groups. A person’s socially-minded intelligence can be improved *without changing anything about the person* if they join a group that

can provide them with resources to achieve their goals. Similar improvements regarding individual health outcomes have been demonstrated in the ‘social cure’ that flows from new group memberships and increased social identification [152], [153], [154]. Along related lines, socially-minded intelligence may also be increased by increasing an individual’s ability to build and harness social resources. This might be achieved by increasing social [155], emotional [156], or cultural [157] intelligence; or by developing relevant cognitive skills such as theory of mind [158] and social self-categorization [159].

Enhancing the socially-minded intelligence of a given group might be achieved by improving the relationship between group members and the group. One way to do this would be to focus on group members’ social identification with the group [43], [44], [137]. Groups with a strong sense of shared social identity are likely to be more effective in dynamic situations that require action as individuals or subgroups, in particular because such groups are better able to maintain continuity across these different social structures [160], [161], and also because shared social identity can be used to foster psychological safety [162], meaning that such groups have greater potential to harness the power of intragroup disagreement to benefit decision-making [12], [141], [163], [164]. At the same time it will be important for the group’s socially-minded intelligence to avoid structural factors which entrench a particular identity structure within the group, such as a climate of excessive individualism or collectivism [165], [166], or deep faultiness (overlapping differences between group members) that make subgroup identities chronically salient [167]. If group members always see themselves as either individuals, subgroup members, or parts of a collective whole, this will reduce the extent to which they can flexibly see themselves and act according to a different group structure when the situation changes – because they are in a sense ‘tied’ to a single level of self-construal [168].

Measuring a person’s socially-minded intelligence requires new methods that capture not only their abilities as an individual, but also their social environment. As a starting point, a target person’s ability to perceive, think, and act with others can be operationalized using existing constructs such as emotional intelligence [169], agreeableness [138], and self-categorization ability [159]. These abilities could be combined to form a composite measure of socially-minded ability, representing the target person’s individual-difference traits and skills that are important for socially-minded intelligence.

The social environment has two key variables that measure the extent to which social resources are available: The first variable reflects the extent to which each person present shares a sense of social identity with the target person (*shared social identity*, *SSI*; e.g., [170]). Because people are more trusting of

[132], [133], have better communication with [171], [172], and are more well-intentioned towards those they share a sense of social identity with [173], [174], [175], a target person with a greater sense of shared identity with those around them has a greater potential to draw upon those people to work with them. Moreover, through this, they will have greater ‘social power’ [176].

The second variable relevant to the social context is the extent to which the target person’s personal goals align with those they might potentially work with in the current context. One way to quantify this variable is to measure the *goal alignment*, *GA*, between the target person and each other person in the context.

The *social resource*, *SR*, of the target person combines their shared social identity and goal alignment with each other person in the current context. This term represents how much the potential social power represented by shared social identity is enabled by alignment.

A person’s socially-minded intelligence (the extent to which they can perceive, think, and act with other agents towards their own individual goals) is therefore a function of their *individual-difference socially-minded ability* and *social resources*, which in turn combines *shared social identity* and *goal alignment* in that context. Box 1 provides an example of how this measure might be calculated more specifically.

For groups, it is possible to calculate a similar measure of socially-minded intelligence (the extent to which each person in the group can perceive, think, and act as a group member, subgroup member, or individual – depending on the demands of the situation – and act accordingly towards the system’s superordinate goals). This requires calculating (a) the individual-difference abilities of group members that are relevant to socially-minded intelligence; (b) the degree to which the group is self-defining for group members (i.e., ‘group identification’; [177]); and (c) the extent to which the goals of the identity that is currently most salient to group members (e.g., individual, subgroup, superordinate group; [178]) align with the group’s goals. In other words, a group’s socially-minded intelligence is a function of *group members’ individual-difference socially-minded ability*, *SMA*; their *group identification*, *GI*; and their *salient identity goal alignment*, *SIGA*. Box 2 provides an example of how this measure might be calculated more specifically in a given context.

The definitions for ISMI and GSMI derived in Boxes 1 and 2 show a deep mathematical similarity between their formulations. The general concepts of aligned abilities, self-overlap, and goal overlap may also be useful for defining other ways to use the concepts of ISMI and GSMI (see Box 3).

Box 1. Individual socially-minded intelligence in a given context

Definition. A person's ISMI is the extent to which they can flexibly perceive, think, and act with other people in the present context towards their own individual goals. (From p. 5)

In what follows we derive a measure of individual socially-minded intelligence (*ISMI*) from its natural language definition and desired computational properties.

A positive socially-minded intelligence value for an individual represents the extent to which the target person will be perceiving, thinking, and acting with other agents *towards* its own individual goals by working with others in the context; while a negative socially-minded intelligence value represents the extent to which the target person will be perceiving, thinking, and acting with other agents *away* from its own individual goals by working with others in the context. Note that ISMI operates differently to measures of individual intelligence such as IQ – which is a stable indicator of a person's intelligence – because it is always a function of a given social context.

To define the ISMI metric for a given context, properties P1 – P3 define the relevant variables, and P4 – P6 provide the criteria for how they are combined:

P1. *SMA and SR*: Each individual has a *socially-minded ability (SMA)*, which is assumed to be relatively stable across contexts. This ability contributes to achieving a person's goals when they interact with others, who constitute their *social resources (SR)*. SMA ranges from 0 (totally unable to perceive, think, and act with available others) to 1 (fully capable of perceiving, thinking, and acting with available others). ISMI is the product of SMA and SR. If there are no other people around, regardless of how much individual intelligence the target person has, their SR would be 0 and hence their ISMI would be 0.

P2. *SSI*: In a given context, the social identities of two people can vary, and we define their degree of *shared social identity (SSI)* ranging from 0 (no shared social identity) to 1 (fully shared social identity). Note that SSI can change in different contexts, even between the same two people, since contexts can make different social identities more or less salient.

P3. *GA*: In a given context, the goals of two people can vary from fully aligned to fully opposed, which we define as their degree of *goal alignment (GA)*. It is defined to range from -1 (goals are fully opposed), through 0 (goals are unrelated), to 1 (goals are fully aligned).

P4. A person who has a high SSI with the target person in the context should increase their ISMI if their GA is positive (their goals are aligned) and decrease their ISMI if their GA is negative (their goals are opposed). Note that this means that a target person's ISMI can be negative in contexts where others they identify with strongly have opposing goals.

P5. A person who has a low SSI with the target person in the context should have minimal or no effect on their ISMI.

P6. To realize properties P4 – P5, the contribution of a person in the context (a *contributor*) to a target person's SR is calculated as the product, $SSI \times GA$. Each additional person contributes independently to this measure.

We can now formally define the *ISMI* metric, for a target person, p , and a given context, c , as follows:

$$ISMI_{pc} = SMA_p \times SR_{pc} \quad \text{Equation (1)}$$

where SMA_p is the target person's socially-minded ability; and SR_{pc} is the target person's social resources in the given context. SMA_p is a non-negative real number, ranging from 0 – 1 (see p1 above). SR_{pc} is calculated as the sum of shared social identity with all others, indexed by q , in the context, c , as follows:

$$SR_{pc} = \sum_q (SSI_{pqc} \times GA_{pqc}) \quad \text{Equation (2)}$$

where SSI_{pqc} is shared social identity between the target individual p , and each other person, q (where $q \neq p$) in context c . SSI_{pqc} is defined as a non-negative value from 0 – 1 (see P2 above). GA_{pqc} is the goal alignment between the target person, p , and each other person, q , in context, c , and is a real value from -1 to +1 (see P3 above).

Worked Example 1. Calculating the contribution of one other person to *ISMI*

If a target person, p , has an *SMA* of .7, and is in a context in which one other person, q , who shares average levels of *SSI* = .5 and moderately positive *GA* = .5 with the target person, then the target person's *ISMI* would be calculated using Equation (1) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned}
 ISMI_{pc} &= 0.7 \times SR_{pc} \\
 &= 0.7 \times \sum_q (SSI_{pqc} \times GA_{pqc}) \\
 &= 0.7 \times (0.5 \times 0.5) \\
 &= 0.7 \times 0.25 \\
 &= 0.18
 \end{aligned}$$

With the contribution of one other person, *ISMI* can vary from -1 to +1. Even the moderate levels of *SSI* and *GA* in this example contribute positively to the *ISMI* of the target person, albeit not by a large amount.

Example Notes: Each additional person in the context who has *SSI* > 0 adds to the social resources for the target person (see Appendix A, Examples A1, and A2 for worked examples for 2 – 5 other people). *ISMI* has additional interesting properties: Someone with a low *SMA* in a context with several people with average *SSI* and *GA* can have a greater *ISMI* than someone with a higher *SMA* but just one other person as their social resource (see Appendix A, Examples A3 and A4). *ISMI* can also be reduced by the presence of others, as shown in the following example:

Worked Example 2. Calculating the contribution to *ISMI* from others with positive and negative *GA*

If a target person, p , has an *SMA* of .7, and is in a context with five other people who have varying levels of *SSI* (.5, .3, .4, .7, 0) and a range of positive and negative levels of *GA* (.5, .7, -.8, -.3, -.9), then the target person's *SR* and *ISMI* are affected by the presence of others with positive or negative *GA* to the extent that they have *SSI* with each other person, as shown in the following (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned}
 ISMI_{pc} &= 0.7 \times SR_{pc} \\
 &= 0.7 \times \sum_q (SSI_{pqc} \times GA_{pqc}) \\
 &= 0.7 \times ((0.5 \times 0.5) + (0.3 \times 0.7) + (0.4 \times -0.8) + (0.7 \times -0.3) + (0 \times -0.9)) \\
 &= 0.7 \times (0.25 + 0.21 - 0.32 - 0.21 + 0) \\
 &= -0.049
 \end{aligned}$$

With the contribution of five other people, *ISMI* can vary from -5 to +5. This example shows how negative and positive social resources can counteract each other. Note that in this second Worked Example it is important to calculate the social resources for the target person from each person first before summing them (e.g. negative goal alignments are only detrimental if there is also a positive social identity with the target individual). In relatively homogeneous groups, the product of total *SSI* and average *GA* would be a reasonable approximation to a target person's social resources, but these approximations are less valid in heterogeneous groups.

Box 2. Calculating a group's socially-minded intelligence in a given context.

Definition. *GSMI is the extent to which group members can flexibly perceive, think, and act as group members, subgroup members, or individuals – and the extent to which the level of self-definition of each group member in the present context aligns with the goals of the group. (From p. 6)*

The derivation of a measure of group socially-minded intelligence (*GSMI*) follows a similar structure to Box 1. However, instead of evaluating others as social resources for a target individual (as in Box 1), the group measure here requires estimating the contribution of the *aligned abilities* of members towards the group as a whole. A positive socially-minded intelligence value for a group thus represents the extent to which group members' flexibility in terms of self-definition contributes *towards* the group's goals in the present context; while a negative socially-minded intelligence value represents the extent to which group members' flexibility in terms of self-definition works *against* the group's goals.

There is a subtle distinction in the concept of aligned abilities which is critical to the definition of *GSMI*: *GSMI* represents members' self-definitional flexibility, group identification, and salient identity goal alignment, *not* the group's goal-directed ability more generally (which would be collective intelligence).

To define the *GSMI* metric for a given context, properties P7 – P9 define the relevant variables, and P10 – P12 provide the criteria for how they are combined:

P7. *SMA and AA*: Each group member has a *socially-minded ability (SMA)*, which is equivalent to their SMA as described in property P1. This ability contributes to achieving a group's goals to the extent that their identities and goals are aligned with the group, which we call their *aligned abilities (AA)*, and which can vary from -1 to +1. Note that AA from each contributor towards the group may differ from their AA with other members individually (this distinction is indicated by subscripts in the equations below). *GSMI* averages the aligned abilities of all the members in the group.

P8. *GI and SO*: In a given context, each group member will identify more or less with the group (i.e., the group will be more or less self-defining), and we define their degree of *group identification (GI)* ranging from 0 (no group identification) to 1 (identity fusion; Swann Jr. et al., 2009). Note that GI shares similarities with SSI from Box 1 in that both are measures of *self-overlap (SO)* between a contributor and a target unit and can change in different contexts. They differ in the scale of their targets from individuals for ISMI and groups for *GSMI* and also in that self-overlap is intersubjective ('two-way') in the case of SSI, and unidirectional ('one-way', from the perspective of each group member) for GI.

P9. *SIGA and GO*: In a given context, the goals of the most salient identity for each group member (e.g., 'individual', 'subgroup', 'group') and the group can vary from fully aligned to fully opposed, which we define as their degree of *social identity goal alignment (SIGA)*. This is defined to range from -1 (goals are fully opposed), through 0 (goals are unrelated), to 1 (goals are fully aligned). Note that *SIGA* shares similarities with GA from Box 1 in that both are measures of *goal-overlap (GO)* between a contributor and a target unit (individual vs group) and can change in different contexts. In the case of GA the overlap is between the goals of the target person and each contributing person, while for *SIGA* the overlap is between the goals of the group and the goals of the identity that is most salient to each contributing person. In both cases the overlap is two-way, because groups and individuals can both have goals. Like GA, *SIGA* can change in different contexts as identities become more or less salient to each group member.

P10. Each person joining a group has the potential to increase, maintain or reduce the group's social resources: If everyone in a group has the same level of self-definitional flexibility (*SMA*), group identification, and goal alignment with the group, the number of people in the group does not impact on the group's average aligned abilities. As the group grows larger, the relative impact of each individual group member on the group's *GSMI* is reduced.

P11. If a person joins the group with below average aligned abilities (which could be due to low goal alignment *or* below average group identification), the group's *GSMI* is reduced.

P12. To realize properties P10-P11, the aligned abilities of a person in the context towards the group as the target unit is calculated as the product, $SMA \times GI \times SIGA$, which can be written more generally in terms of self- and goal overlaps as $SMA \times SO \times GO$.

The formal definition for GSMI can now be given as follows:

GSMI, is defined for a target group, g , in a given context, c , as the average across all group members of their aligned abilities, which is calculated as the product of three context-dependent factors: (1) each group member's individual-difference abilities relevant to the group's socially-minded intelligence, SMA_m , (2) their group identification, GI_m , and (3) their salient identity goal alignment, $SIGA_m$:

$$GSMI_{gc} = (\sum_m(SMA_m \times GI_m \times SIGA_m))/N_m \quad \text{Equation (3)}$$

where SMA_m is each group member's individual-difference socially-minded abilities as defined in Equation 1, with the subscript m indexed over all group members in the context, and N_m is the number of group members.

Worked Example 3. Calculating a group's *GSMI* in a context with 2 group members.

In a context where a target group, g , has 2 group members present with varying *SMA*s (.7, .8), *GI*s (.3, .8) and alignment between each group member's current salient identity and the group's goals (.5, .3), the group's *GSMI* would be calculated using Equation (3) as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned} GSMI_{gc} &= (\sum_m(SMA_m \times GI_m \times SIGA_m))/N_m \\ &= ((0.7 \times 0.3 \times 0.5) + (0.8 \times 0.8 \times 0.3))/2 \\ &= (0.11 + 0.19)/2 \\ &= 0.15 \end{aligned}$$

Regardless of the number of members in the group, *GSMI* can vary from -1 to +1. This example shows a relatively small positive value, reflecting the low alignments of the individuals with the group.

Notes. A group could in principle have a single member, which may occur if people are continually joining and leaving the group. In this case, the *GSMI* is the product of the single group member's individual *SMA*, their group identification, and their salient goal alignment with the group goals (see Appendix B Example B1). Example 3 extends naturally to averaging the contributions of additional group members (see Appendix 2 examples B2-B5).

Worked Example 4. Calculating the contribution to *GSMI* from a group with positive and negative group goal alignment

In a context where a target group, g , has 5 group members present with varying *SMA*s (.7, .8, .6, .9, .5), varying *GI*s, (.3, .8, .2, .7, .3) and both positive and negative alignment between each group member's current salient identity and the group's goals (.5, .3, -.8, .4, -.1), the group's *GSMI* would be calculated using Equation (3) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned} GSMI_{gc} &= (\sum_m(SMA_m \times GI_m \times SIGA_m))/N_m \\ &= ((0.7 \times 0.3 \times 0.5) + (0.8 \times 0.8 \times 0.3) + (0.6 \times 0.2 \times -0.8) + (0.9 \times 0.7 \times 0.4) \\ &\quad + (0.5 \times 0.3 \times -0.1))/5 \\ &= (0.11 + 0.19 - 0.096 + 0.25 - 0.015)/5 \\ &= 0.088 \end{aligned}$$

As in Example 3, *GSMI* can vary from -1 to +1. However, when more individuals with low alignment and/or a mixture of positive and negative goal alignment are part of the group, *GSMI* tends towards zero for the group as a whole in that context.

Box 3. Towards a general formula for socially-minded intelligence in a given context

Based on the derivations in of ISMI and GSMI in Boxes 1 and 2, we can now use the concepts of *aligned abilities* AA , *self-overlap* (SO), and *goal overlap* (GO) to define similar forms of the equations for ISMI and GSMI.

The aligned abilities AA_{xqc} , to a target unit x ($x = p$ for an individual; $x = g$ for a group), from a contributor, q , in a context c , can be expressed as:

$$AA_{xqc} = SMA_x \times SO_{xqc} \times GO_{xqc} \quad \text{Equation (4)}$$

Combining Equations 1 – 2 from Box 1, the formulation for $ISMI_{pc}$ can be rewritten as the sum of the *aligned abilities* (AA_{pqc}) of the target person, p , from the contributors, q , in context c as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} ISMI_{pc} &= SMA_p \times \sum_q (SSI_{pqc} \times GA_{pqc}) \\ &= \sum_q (SMA_p \times SSI_{pqc} \times GA_{pqc}) \\ &= \sum_q (SMA_p \times SO_{pqc} \times GO_{pqc}) \\ &= \sum_q (AA_{pqc}) \end{aligned} \quad \text{Equation (5)}$$

Equation (5) has a parallel derivation in the formulation for the $GSMI_{gc}$ as the sum of the *aligned abilities* (AA_{gqc}) of the contributors, q , to the group g , in context, c :

$$\begin{aligned} GSMI_{gc} &= (\sum_q (SMA_q \times GI_{gqc} \times SIGA_{gqc})) / N_m \\ &= (\sum_q (SMA_q \times SO_{gqc} \times GO_{gqc})) / N_m \\ &= \sum_q (AA_{gqc}) / N_m \end{aligned} \quad \text{Equation (6)}$$

The similarities between the forms of Equations (5) and (6) shows that the measurement of socially-minded intelligence is not tied to a single level of analysis (individual or group) but can be applied across the different scales of target units. A similar formula could be derived for the intermediate sub-units of a group.

In this section we have discussed how the concept of socially-minded intelligence can be used to understand and enhance human intelligence, as well as proposing ways of measuring this construct for individuals and groups. In the following section we discuss how socially-minded intelligence might be implemented in artificial systems in order to improve their ability to achieve their goals across different contexts.

B. Applications to Developing Socially-Minded Abilities for Artificial Intelligence

As suggested in Fig. 3, a socially-minded agent should be able to perceive, think, and act with other agents. Currently, artificial agents are unable to do this in a flexible, context-sensitive manner. Taking inspiration from social psychology, in particular the social identity perspective [168], [175], we propose three key capabilities that, when added together and integrated into the architectures of existing agents, may allow them to be socially-minded in this way:

Capability 1. Social landscape modelling. The target agent can model its current social landscape by identifying a parsimonious set of higher-order agentic structures (i.e., collectives of agents that can act together) that provide candidate explanations of the current social context. The model includes information about where agents are located within these higher-order structures, such that the target agent can identify which higher-order agentic structures a given agent belongs to, as well as which agents belong to each higher-order agentic structure. The questions this

capability answers for the target agent are: ‘What are the groups?’, ‘Who are the group members?’, and ‘Which groups do I belong to?’. This model is updated in response to changes in the social landscape.

Capability 2. Self-relevance calculation. The target agent can calculate the self-relevance of agentic structures (both higher-order structures that include the target agent, as well as an ‘individual’ structure that *only* includes the target agent) to determine which is most self-defining in the current situation. The individual self-structure represents the possibility that the target agent is defined best as an individual in this context. The question this capability answers for the target agent is whether it is best defined as an individual or as a member of a particular higher-order agentic structure in the current situation. Moreover, although the target agent might belong to multiple agentic structures, only one is treated as self-defining in a given context. In other words, while the target agent might identify through social landscape modelling that it belongs to both Group I and Group II (assuming these groups overlap), its self-relevance calculation needs to inform it whether it is best defined as a member of Group I, Group II, or as an individual agent in the present context.

Capability 3. Social influence algorithm. The target agent can identify which agents it should be influenced by, and incorporate those other agents into its perception, cognition, and action. Specifically, if the most self-relevant agentic structure in the present context is a higher-order collective structure:

3a) Information coming from agents belonging to the same self-defining higher-order agentic structure is treated as more relevant (i.e., more as part of the target agent’s own perception of the environment) as a function of the strength of the self-relevance of that higher-order agentic structure.

3b) Other agents belonging to the same self-defining higher-order agentic structure have greater influence over the target agent’s decision-making as a function of the strength of the self-relevance of that higher-order agentic structure.

3c) Actions that benefit other agents belonging to the same self-defining higher-order agentic structure – as well as actions that benefit the structure itself – are treated as having greater utility as a function of the strength of the self-relevance of that higher-order agentic structure.

However, if the target agent is best defined as an individual in the present context, the agent is not influenced by others in its perception, decision-making, or action in the manner we have described above.

Capability 1 (social landscape modelling) and Capability 2 (self-relevance calculation) allow an agent to have a sense of self as an individual, subgroup member, or superordinate group member which changes in response to their environment. Capability 3 (social influence algorithm) applies this sense of self-in-social-context to perception, cognition, and action. Together, these capabilities can be integrated with existing agent architectures that are based on the agent-environment framework to allow inputs, processes, and outputs to be shaped by elements of the social environment. Agents with these capabilities should be able to perceive, think, and act with other agents in a context-sensitive way, so as to optimize their socially-minded intelligence.

While social identity processes have been modelled in artificial agents [180], [181], these processes have not been integrated in a way that allows an agent to be socially-minded. Moreover, self-categorization theory (a cognitive extension of social identity theory; [168]) has not previously been used to create artificial agents, and it is this theory that provides possible ways to achieve the key capabilities we have identified. For example, the self-relevance of agentic structures to the target agent in a given context (Capability 2) could be calculated through a mechanism inspired by the principles of fit and perceiver readiness [168]. Applied to human psychology, these principles are that a person will self-categorize as a member of a group rather than an individual based on the ratio of within-to between-group differences (comparative fit); the extent to which a given grouping fits observed patterns of behavior (normative fit); and the extent to which the person is predisposed to identify in terms of this group (perceiver readiness). Similar principles might be employed for an artificial agent to calculate the self-relevance of higher-order agentic structures in a given context. Self-categorization theory has also been applied to create theories of social influence [182], leadership [183], and group dynamics [43] which are relevant to Capability 3. With regards to Capability 1, the principles of comparative and normative fit might be combined with factors identified by research into group perception [184], attention [185], [186], and agency [187] to inspire approaches to modelling an agent’s social landscape.

Designing artificial agents to be more socially-minded has the potential to make individual agents and multi-agent systems more intelligent in the sense that we have defined it in this paper. For an individual agent, being able to selectively utilize information from other agents in perception and decision-making, as well as being able to act together with other agents towards shared goals when necessary, has the potential to amplify its intelligence. Depending on how many other socially-minded agents are present in the situation, this increase in potential intelligence may be manifold (in the same way that human intelligence is potentially multiplied by social cognition and action).

Designing artificial agents within a MAS to be more socially-minded may also expand the applications for existing approaches. For example, different MAS structures are more or less effective in different problem-solving environments [9]. However, a group of socially-minded agents need not have a pre-specified structure as they are able to act as individuals, subgroup members, or as a single collective depending on the situation. For socially-minded agents, the situation *defines the structure of the group*, allowing a MAS incorporating such agents to be flexible in responding to changing environments. For example, rather than needing to operate as a single swarm, a socially-minded MAS could split into subgroups or even work as individuals depending on the demands of the situation. Moreover, in contrast to the design of some swarm agents, socially-minded agents need not be less individually intelligent in order to operate collectively [76], [77]. At the same time, in contrast to game theoretic approaches, socially-minded agents can cooperate without needing to calculate equilibria. In this sense, socially-minded agents may represent a middle ground between approaches to MAS which focus on coordinating ‘smart but selfish’ individual agents and those that make individual agents less intelligent for the sake of collective coordination.

C. Applications to Human-AI Teaming

Another research area that may benefit from a socially-minded intelligence perspective is human-AI teaming, where humans and machines work together in order to be more intelligent than either could be alone [12, p. 241]. This kind of teaming has tremendous potential but is complex and fraught, with the introduction of artificial agents potentially impairing existing team functioning [188], [189], [190]. The AI teaming challenge has been characterized as having a fundamentally *cognitive* basis, such that AI teammates need to be better able to process and respond to social information in a dynamic way [191]. As machine intelligence increases, people expect AI teammates to be more socially responsive [192] and studies have found that enabling AI agents to adjust dynamically to their human teammates can improve teaming outcomes [193], [194]. This kind of ‘teaming intelligence’ in AI agents has been conceptualized more concretely as “knowledge, skills, and strategies with respect to managing interdependence” [195, p. 18], which allows a human-AI team to establish common ground, to be flexible with regards to team structure, to coordinate action, and to make decisions collectively. However, currently AI systems have only rudimentary teaming intelligence [195].

Socially-minded intelligence can be applied to potentially improve human-AI teaming. Specifically, the capabilities we have outlined may be useful for designing AI agents that can better respond to changes in the social situation that might lead a human teammate to act more as an individual or as a group member. For example, socially-minded agents could estimate when they should work with a human teammate or work autonomously (as a function of information from their social environment). Such AI agents may also address criticisms of static behavior from AI teammates and social identity-based divides in human-AI teaming [194], [196]. It may also enable people to treat AI systems as teammates, which is a significant barrier to establishing team cognition in human-AI teams [197]. Accordingly, socially-minded AI-human teams may be more effective in situations where it is not possible to specify roles beforehand, or where roles or team structures need to change in response to circumstances [198], [199].

V. TOWARDS TESTS OF THE CONSTRUCT OF SOCIALLY-MINDED INTELLIGENCE

The foregoing analysis argues that the construct of socially-minded intelligence differs from existing conceptualizations of intelligence that focus on capabilities that are either individual or collective (but never both). This claim, and its merits as a more complete model of intelligence could be tested in the following ways for individual people, groups, artificial agents, and multi-agent systems.

For individual people, one approach would be to identify people's personal goals and then compare performance on these goals across a variety of environments with and without social resources (i.e., other people they can work with). If people can better achieve their goals with social resources, socially-minded intelligence explains variance above that of individual-difference measures of intelligence. Another way to test this hypothesis would be to compare goal-directed performance across social versus non-social contexts for people with higher or lower socially-minded intelligence (as an individual-difference variable). If there is a positive relationship between socially-minded intelligence ability and performance, with this being more pronounced in social contexts, this would support the idea that socially-minded intelligence is a function of both the ability to harness social resources and the presence of those resources in the situation. Socially-minded intelligence ability could also be directly manipulated rather than measured by making individual identity salient or suppressing group identity by preventing 'switching' from one identity to another [200], [201]. The third component of socially-minded intelligence, goal alignment, might also be included as an additional moderator (manipulated or measured).

The construct of socially-minded intelligence might be tested for human groups by identifying groups' goals, measuring group members' individual socially-minded abilities as well as other factors that have been identified in the literature as relevant for group performance (e.g., [202], [203], [204]), and then constructing scenarios where group goals are best achieved by group members acting as individuals, subgroup members, or group members. If group members'

socially-minded intelligence predicts improved group performance above the contribution of other individual and group-level factors, this would support the validity of the construct. Moreover, manipulating socially-minded intelligence by making a particular identity chronically salient would also help to establish its validity. In particular, influencing group members to see themselves solely as individuals, subgroup members, or superordinate group members in contexts that require flexibility between these identities would be predicted to undermine socially-minded intelligence, and hence group performance. As with individual socially-minded intelligence, goal alignment between group members, subgroups, and the overall group may be either manipulated or measured to test whether greater alignment predicts better performance.

For artificial agents, the construct of socially-minded intelligence could be tested by comparing the performance of existing agents against ones augmented with socially-minded intelligence (i.e., by utilizing the capabilities we have outlined) in relation to a variety of goals in different social contexts. In addition to overall system performance, each capability can also be tested individually. That is, one could establish (a) whether agents that can integrate information from other socially-minded agents into their perception as a function of shared higher-order agentic self-relevance are able to more accurately perceive their environment, (b) whether agents that are more influenced by other socially-minded agents in their decision-making as a function of shared higher-order agentic self-relevance make better decisions, and (c) whether agents that include actions benefiting other socially-minded agents and higher-order agentic structures in their utility functions as a function of shared higher-order agentic self-relevance are better able to act with those agents. By varying the number of agents in these tests, it would also be possible to evaluate the prediction that performance improvements are a function of the number of other socially-minded agents present in the situation. For multi-agent systems, similar tests to the single agent systems could be conducted to evaluate whether socially-minded agents are able to perform better on collective tasks (via improved perception, decision-making, and action) than agents which are not socially-minded.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the present paper we have argued that, as things stand, our appreciation of the jigsaw of human and artificial intelligence is missing an important piece. This relates to the fact that approaches to intelligence which treat people either as isolated individuals or as mere component pieces of collectives fail to capture the dynamic relationships between individuals and groups that allow human intelligence to be both powerful and flexible across contexts. To address this lacuna, we introduced and fleshed out the concept of socially-minded intelligence. This, we argue, has the capacity to unify existing approaches but also to open up new vistas of understanding and application.

As artificial agents become more prevalent and increasingly require interaction with humans, we would suggest that facilitating this kind of interactive intelligence in these agents

is likely to be vital for efforts to ensure both the efficacy and integrity of AI systems. Informed by this framework, teams comprised of humans and socially-minded AI agents have the potential to elevate their mutual intelligence still further. However, the potential of this brave new world is unlikely to be realized without sensitivity to the various issues that our analysis has raised. Indeed, it may be profoundly compromised.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. J. Sternberg, Ed., *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [2] S. Russell and P. Norvig, *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach*, Fourth edition. Pearson, 2021.
- [3] B. Singh, R. Kumar, and V. P. Singh, "Reinforcement learning in robotic applications: a comprehensive survey," *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 945–990, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10462-021-09997-9.
- [4] S. Gronauer and K. Diepold, "Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning: a survey," *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 895–943, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10462-021-09996-w.
- [5] A. Scalco, J. I. Macdiarmid, T. Craig, S. Whybrow, and G. W. Horgan, "An agent-based model to simulate meat consumption behaviour of consumers in Britain," *J. Artif. Soc. Soc. Simul.*, vol. 22, no. 4, p. 8, 2019, doi: 10.18564/jasss.4124.
- [6] R. L. Goldstone and M. A. Janssen, "Computational models of collective behavior," *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 9, pp. 424–430, Sep. 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2005.07.009.
- [7] S. Legg and M. Hutter, "Universal intelligence: A definition of machine intelligence," *Minds Mach.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 391–444, Dec. 2007, doi: 10.1007/s11023-007-9079-x.
- [8] L. Braubach, A. Pokahr, D. Moldt, and W. Lamersdorf, "Goal representation for BDI agent systems," in *Programming multi-agent systems*, R. H. Bordini, M. Dastani, J. Dix, and A. El Fallah Seghrouchni, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2005, pp. 44–65. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-32260-3_3.
- [9] A. Dorri, S. S. Kanhere, and R. Jurdak, "Multi-agent systems: A survey," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 28573–28593, 2018, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2831228.
- [10] Y. Cao, W. Yu, W. Ren, and G. Chen, "An overview of recent progress in the study of distributed multi-agent coordination," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Inform.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 427–438, Feb. 2013, doi: 10.1109/TII.2012.2219061.
- [11] M. E. Bratman, *Shared agency*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [12] T. W. Malone, *Superminds: How hyperconnectivity is changing the way we solve problems*. Simon and Schuster, 2018.
- [13] R. J. Sternberg, "The augmented theory of successful intelligence," in *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence*, 2nd ed., R. J. Sternberg, Ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, pp. 679–708. doi: 10.1017/9781108770422.029.
- [14] R. Fjelland, "Why general artificial intelligence will not be realized," *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–9, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1057/s41599-020-0494-4.
- [15] B. Goertzel, "Artificial general intelligence: Concept, state of the art, and future prospects," *J. Artif. Gen. Intell.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–48, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.2478/jagi-2014-0001.
- [16] K. H. Kim, "Meta-analyses of the relationship of creative achievement to both IQ and divergent thinking test scores," *J. Creat. Behav.*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 106–130, 2008, doi: 10.1002/j.2162-6057.2008.tb01290.x.
- [17] K. Kriegbaum, N. Becker, and B. Spinath, "The relative importance of intelligence and motivation as predictors of school achievement: A meta-analysis," *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 25, pp. 120–148, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2018.10.001.
- [18] T. Strenze, "Intelligence and socioeconomic success: A meta-analytic review of longitudinal research," *Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 401–426, Sep. 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.intell.2006.09.004.
- [19] C. Riedl, Y. J. Kim, P. Gupta, T. W. Malone, and A. W. Woolley, "Quantifying collective intelligence in human groups," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 118, no. 21, p. e2005737118, May 2021, doi: 10.1073/pnas.2005737118.
- [20] K. S. McGrew, "CHC theory and the human cognitive abilities project: Standing on the shoulders of the giants of psychometric intelligence research," *Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 1–10, Jan. 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.intell.2008.08.004.
- [21] R. J. Sternberg, *Practical intelligence in everyday life*. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [22] P. Salovey and J. D. Mayer, "Emotional intelligence," *Imagin. Cogn. Personal.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 185–211, 1990, doi: 10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG.
- [23] J. F. Kihlstrom and N. Cantor, "Social intelligence," in *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence*, 2nd ed., R. J. Sternberg, Ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, pp. 756–779. doi: 10.1017/9781108770422.032.
- [24] P. C. Earley and S. Ang, *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford University Press, 2003.
- [25] H. Gardner, *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*, 3rd ed. New York: Basic Books, 2011.
- [26] E. Byington and W. Felps, "Why do IQ scores predict job performance?: An alternative, sociological explanation," *Res. Organ. Behav.*, vol. 30, pp. 175–202, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.riob.2010.08.003.
- [27] K. Richardson, "What IQ tests test," *Theory Psychol.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 283–314, Jun. 2002, doi: 10.1177/0959354302012003012.
- [28] T. W. Malone and M. S. Bernstein, *Handbook of collective intelligence*. Cambridge, Massachusetts ; London, England: The MIT Press, 2015.
- [29] A. W. Woolley, C. F. Chabris, A. Pentland, N. Hashmi, and T. W. Malone, "Evidence for a collective

- intelligence factor in the performance of human groups,” *Science*, vol. 330, no. 6004, pp. 686–688, 2010, doi: 10.1126/science.1193147.
- [30] W. L. Adair, I. Hideg, and J. R. Spence, “The culturally intelligent team: The impact of team cultural intelligence and cultural heterogeneity on team shared values,” *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 941–962, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.1177/0022022113492894.
- [31] I. Aggarwal and A. W. Woolley, “Do you see what I see? The effect of members’ cognitive styles on team processes and errors in task execution,” *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.*, vol. 122, no. 1, pp. 92–99, Sep. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.04.003.
- [32] A. Williams Woolley, J. Richard Hackman, T. E. Jerde, C. F. Chabris, S. L. Bennett, and S. M. Kosslyn, “Using brain-based measures to compose teams: How individual capabilities and team collaboration strategies jointly shape performance,” *Soc. Neurosci.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 96–105, Jun. 2007, doi: 10.1080/17470910701363041.
- [33] A. W. Woolley, “Means vs. ends: Implications of process and outcome focus for team adaptation and performance,” *Organ. Sci.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 500–515, Jun. 2009, doi: 10.1287/orsc.1080.0382.
- [34] A. W. Woolley, “Putting first things first: Outcome and process focus in knowledge work teams,” *J. Organ. Behav.*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 427–452, 2009, doi: 10.1002/job.578.
- [35] K. Girotra, C. Terwiesch, and K. T. Ulrich, “Idea generation and the quality of the best idea,” *Manag. Sci.*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 591–605, Apr. 2010, doi: 10.1287/mnsc.1090.1144.
- [36] J. R. Larson and Jr, *In search of synergy in small group performance*. New York: Psychology Press, 2009. doi: 10.4324/9780203848784.
- [37] I. Momennejad, “Collective minds: social network topology shapes collective cognition,” *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, vol. 377, no. 1843, p. 20200315, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2020.0315.
- [38] S. Faraj and Y. Xiao, “Coordination in fast-response organizations,” *Manag. Sci.*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 1155–1169, Aug. 2006, doi: 10.1287/mnsc.1060.0526.
- [39] T. W. Malone, R. Laubacher, and C. Dellarocas, “The collective intelligence genome,” *MIT Sloan Manag. Rev.*, 2010.
- [40] G. A. Okhuysen and B. A. Bechky, “Coordination in organizations: An integrative perspective,” *Acad. Manag. Ann.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 463–502, 2009, doi: 10.5465/19416520903047533.
- [41] A. C. Costa, R. A. Roe, and T. Taillieu, “Trust within teams: The relation with performance effectiveness,” *Eur. J. Work Organ. Psychol.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 225–244, Sep. 2001, doi: 10.1080/13594320143000654.
- [42] B. A. De Jong, K. T. Dirks, and N. Gillespie, “Trust and team performance: A meta-analysis of main effects, moderators, and covariates,” *J. Appl. Psychol.*, vol. 101, no. 8, pp. 1134–1150, 2016, doi: 10.1037/apl0000110.
- [43] N. Ellemers, D. De Gilder, and S. A. Haslam, “Motivating individuals and groups at work: A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance,” *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 459–478, Jul. 2004, doi: 10.5465/amr.2004.13670967.
- [44] S. A. Haslam, *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE, 2004.
- [45] J. McCarthy, “What is artificial intelligence?” 2004. [Online]. Available: <http://jmc.stanford.edu/articles/whatisai.html>
- [46] S. Bringsjord and B. Schimanski, “What is artificial intelligence? psychometric AI as an answer,” in *Proceedings of the Proceedings of the 18th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, in IJCAI’03. San Francisco, CA, USA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., Aug. 2003, pp. 887–893.
- [47] M. V. Mahoney, “Text compression as a test for artificial intelligence,” in *Proceedings of the Sixteenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence and the Eleventh Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, in AAAI ’99/IAAI ’99. USA: American Association for Artificial Intelligence, Jul. 1999, p. 970.
- [48] A. K. Goel and J. Davies, “Artificial intelligence,” in *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence*, 2nd ed., R. J. Sternberg, Ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, pp. 602–625.
- [49] D. Chauhan, C. Singh, R. Rawat, and M. Dhawan, “Evaluating the performance of conversational AI tools,” in *Conversational artificial intelligence*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2024, pp. 385–409. doi: 10.1002/9781394200801.ch24.
- [50] M. Desnoyer and D. Wettergreen, “Aesthetic image classification for autonomous agents,” in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, Aug. 2010, pp. 3452–3455. doi: 10.1109/ICPR.2010.843.
- [51] J. Hernández-Orallo, “Evaluation in artificial intelligence: from task-oriented to ability-oriented measurement,” *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 397–447, Oct. 2017, doi: 10.1007/s10462-016-9505-7.
- [52] J. R. Anderson, *The adaptive character of thought*. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, 1990.
- [53] G. E. Hinton and R. R. Salakhutdinov, “Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks,” *Science*, vol. 313, no. 5786, pp. 504–507, 2006, doi: 10.1126/science.1127647.
- [54] J. E. Laird, *The Soar cognitive architecture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012.
- [55] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, “Toward a modern theory of adaptive networks: Expectation and prediction,” *Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 88, no. 2, pp. 135–170, 1981, doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.88.2.135.
- [56] N. Bostrom, *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford: University Press, 2014.
- [57] S. Cong and Y. Zhou, “A review of convolutional neural network architectures and their optimizations,” *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 1905–1969, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10462-022-10213-5.

- [58] N. Chmait, D. L. Dowe, Y.-F. Li, D. G. Green, and J. Insa-Cabrera, “Factors of collective intelligence: How smart are agent collectives?,” in *ECAI 2016*, IOS Press, 2016, pp. 542–550. doi: 10.3233/978-1-61499-672-9-542.
- [59] M. S. Stankovic, K. H. Johansson, and D. M. Stipanovic, “Distributed seeking of Nash equilibria with applications to mobile sensor networks,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 904–919, Apr. 2012, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2011.2174678.
- [60] Y. Tang and P. Yi, “Nash equilibrium seeking for high-order multiagent systems with unknown dynamics,” *IEEE Trans. Control Netw. Syst.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 321–332, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1109/TCNS.2022.3203362.
- [61] P. Caillou, S. Aknine, and S. Pinson, “Searching pareto optimal solutions for the problem of forming and restructuring coalitions in multi-agent systems,” *Group Decis. Negot.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 7–37, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1007/s10726-009-9183-9.
- [62] R. Cui, B. Gao, and J. Guo, “Pareto-optimal coordination of multiple robots with safety guarantees,” *Auton. Robots*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 189–205, Apr. 2012, doi: 10.1007/s10514-011-9265-9.
- [63] R. Rădulescu, P. Mannion, D. M. Roijers, and A. Nowé, “Multi-objective multi-agent decision making: a utility-based analysis and survey,” *Auton. Agents Multi-Agent Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 1, p. 10, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10458-019-09433-x.
- [64] E. Semsar-Kazerooni and K. Khorasani, “Multi-agent team cooperation: A game theory approach,” *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp. 2205–2213, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.automatica.2009.06.006.
- [65] K. Verbeeck, A. Nowé, T. Lenaerts, and J. Parent, “Learning to reach the Pareto optimal Nash equilibrium as a team,” in *AI 2002: Advances in artificial intelligence*, B. McKay and J. Slaney, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2002, pp. 407–418. doi: 10.1007/3-540-36187-1_36.
- [66] A. Chakraborty and A. K. Kar, “Swarm intelligence: A review of algorithms,” in *Nature-Inspired computing and optimization: Theory and applications*, S. Patnaik, X.-S. Yang, and K. Nakamatsu, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 475–494. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-50920-4_19.
- [67] D. Askay, L. Metcalf, L. Rosenberg, G. Willcox, and D. Baltaxe, “Amplifying the collective intelligence of teams with swarm AI,” *ACM Collect. Intell.*, 2019, [Online]. Available: https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/it_fac/101
- [68] E. Bonabeau, M. Dorigo, and G. Theraulaz, *Swarm intelligence: from natural to artificial systems*. in Santa Fe Institute studies in the sciences of complexity. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- [69] R. Gray, A. Franci, V. Srivastava, and N. E. Leonard, “Multiagent decision-making dynamics inspired by honeybees,” *IEEE Trans. Control Netw. Syst.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 793–806, 2018, doi: 10.1109/TCNS.2018.2796301.
- [70] M. S. Innocente and P. Grasso, “Self-organising swarms of firefighting drones: Harnessing the power of collective intelligence in decentralised multi-robot systems,” *J. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 34, pp. 80–101, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jocs.2019.04.009.
- [71] X.-B. Meng, X. Z. Gao, L. Lu, Y. Liu, and H. Zhang, “A new bio-inspired optimisation algorithm: Bird Swarm Algorithm,” *J. Exp. Theor. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 673–687, 2016, doi: 10.1080/0952813X.2015.1042530.
- [72] M. Neshat, G. Sepidnam, M. Sargolzaei, and A. N. Toosi, “Artificial fish swarm algorithm: A survey of the state-of-the-art, hybridization, combinatorial and indicative applications,” *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 965–997, 2014, doi: 10.1007/s10462-012-9342-2.
- [73] C. Hahn *et al.*, “Nash equilibria in multi-agent swarms,” *Icaart Proc. 12Th Int. Conf. Agents Artif. Intell. Vol 1*, pp. 234–241, 2020, doi: 10.5220/0008990802340241.
- [74] B. S. Sami, “Intelligent energy management for off-grid renewable hybrid system using multi-agent approach,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 8681–8696, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2963584.
- [75] R. Sathiyaraj and A. Bharathi, “An efficient intelligent traffic light control and deviation system for traffic congestion avoidance using multi-agent system,” *Transport*, vol. 35, no. 3, Art. no. 3, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.3846/transport.2019.11115.
- [76] Y. Altshuler, “Recent developments in the theory and applicability of swarm search,” *Entropy*, vol. 25, no. 5, Art. no. 5, May 2023, doi: 10.3390/e25050710.
- [77] L. Rosenberg and G. Willcox, “Artificial swarm intelligence,” in *Intelligent systems and applications*, Y. Bi, R. Bhatia, and S. Kapoor, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 1054–1070. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-29516-5_79.
- [78] M. E. Aydin, “Coordinating metaheuristic agents with swarm intelligence,” *J. Intell. Manuf.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 991–999, Aug. 2012, doi: 10.1007/s10845-010-0435-y.
- [79] C. List, C. Elsholtz, and T. D. Seeley, “Independence and interdependence in collective decision making: an agent-based model of nest-site choice by honeybee swarms,” *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, vol. 364, no. 1518, pp. 755–762, Dec. 2008, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2008.0277.
- [80] D. Luo, L. A. Thompson, and D. K. Detterman, “The criterion validity of tasks of basic cognitive processes,” *Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 79–120, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.intell.2004.12.003.
- [81] E. H. O’Boyle Jr., R. H. Humphrey, J. M. Pollack, T. H. Hawver, and P. A. Story, “The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis,” *J. Organ. Behav.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 788–818, 2011, doi: 10.1002/job.714.
- [82] F. L. Schmidt and J. Hunter, “General mental ability in the world of work: Occupational attainment and job performance,” *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 162–173, 2004, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.1.162.
- [83] S. Fox and P. E. Spector, “Relations of emotional intelligence, practical intelligence, general intelligence, and trait affectivity with interview outcomes: it’s not all

- just ‘G,’” *J. Organ. Behav.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 203–220, 2000, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200003)21:2<203::AID-JOB38>3.0.CO;2-Z.
- [84] D. Luo, L. A. Thompson, and D. K. Detterman, “The causal factor underlying the correlation between psychometric g and scholastic performance,” *Intelligence*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 67–83, Jan. 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0160-2896(02)00113-7.
- [85] R. J. Sternberg and E. L. Grigorenko, “Intelligence and culture: how culture shapes what intelligence means, and the implications for a science of well-being,” *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.*, vol. 359, no. 1449, pp. 1427–1434, Sep. 2004, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2004.1514.
- [86] R. J. Sternberg, “The theory of successful intelligence,” *Rev. Gen. Psychol.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 292–316, Dec. 1999, doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.3.4.292.
- [87] S. J. Gould, *The mismeasure of man*, 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1981.
- [88] P. M. Greenfield, “You can’t take it with you: Why ability assessments don’t cross cultures,” *Am. Psychol.*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 1115–1124, 1997, doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.52.10.1115.
- [89] T. W. Malone and A. W. Woolley, “Collective intelligence,” in *Cambridge handbook of intelligence*, 2nd ed., R. J. Sternberg, Ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, pp. 780–801.
- [90] M. Janssens, N. Meslec, and R. T. A. J. Leenders, “Collective intelligence in teams: Contextualizing collective intelligent behavior over time,” *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 13, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.989572.
- [91] H. M. Caruso and W. A. Williams, “Harnessing the power of emergent interdependence to promote diverse team collaboration,” in *Diversity and groups*, vol. 11, K. W. Phillips, Ed., in *Research on managing groups and teams*, vol. 11, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2008, pp. 245–266. doi: 10.1016/S1534-0856(08)11011-8.
- [92] J. Surowiecki, *The wisdom of crowds: Why the many are smarter than the few and how collective wisdom shapes business, economies, societies, and nations*. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
- [93] M. A. Cronin, K. Bezrukova, L. R. Weingart, and C. H. Tinsley, “Subgroups within a team: The role of cognitive and affective integration,” *J. Organ. Behav.*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 831–849, 2011, doi: 10.1002/job.707.
- [94] K. Bezrukova, K. A. Jehn, E. L. Zanutto, and S. M. B. Thatcher, “Do workgroup faultlines help or hurt? A moderated model of faultlines, team identification, and group performance,” *Organ. Sci.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 35–50, Feb. 2009, doi: 10.1287/orsc.1080.0379.
- [95] D. Cooper, P. C. Patel, and S. M. B. Thatcher, “It depends: Environmental context and the effects of faultlines on top management team performance,” *Organ. Sci.*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 633–652, Apr. 2014, doi: 10.1287/orsc.2013.0855.
- [96] J. F. Dovidio, T. Saguy, and N. Shnabel, “Cooperation and conflict within groups: Bridging intragroup and intergroup processes,” *J. Soc. Issues*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 429–449, 2009, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01607.x.
- [97] L. Adelman and N. Dasgupta, “Effect of threat and social identity on reactions to ingroup criticism: Defensiveness, openness, and a remedy,” *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 740–753, May 2019, doi: 10.1177/0146167218796785.
- [98] D. J. Packer, “On being both with us and against us: A normative conflict model of dissent in social groups,” *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 50–72, 2008, doi: 10.1177/1088868307309606.
- [99] C. Nemeth, K. Brown, and J. Rogers, “Devil’s advocate versus authentic dissent: stimulating quantity and quality,” *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 707–720, 2001, doi: 10.1002/ejsp.58.
- [100] Z. Lei, M. J. Waller, J. Hagen, and S. Kaplan, “Team adaptiveness in dynamic contexts: Contextualizing the roles of interaction patterns and in-process planning,” *Group Organ. Manag.*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 491–525, Aug. 2016, doi: 10.1177/1059601115615246.
- [101] J. Siegel Christian, M. J. Pearsall, M. S. Christian, and A. P. J. Ellis, “Exploring the benefits and boundaries of transactive memory systems in adapting to team member loss,” *Group Dyn. Theory Res. Pract.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 69–86, 2014, doi: 10.1037/a0035161.
- [102] E. O. Neftci and B. B. Averbeck, “Reinforcement learning in artificial and biological systems,” *Nat. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 133–143, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s42256-019-0025-4.
- [103] R. J. Brachman and H. J. Levesque, “Toward a new science of common sense,” *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 36, no. 11, Art. no. 11, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21485.
- [104] M. Shanahan, M. Crosby, B. Beyret, and L. Cheke, “Artificial intelligence and the common sense of animals,” *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 862–872, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2020.09.002.
- [105] Y. Zhu *et al.*, “Dark, beyond deep: A paradigm shift to cognitive AI with humanlike common sense,” *Engineering*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 310–345, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.eng.2020.01.011.
- [106] R. V. Yampolskiy, “AI-complete, AI-hard, or AI-easy – Classification of problems in AI,” in *Proceedings of the 23rd Midwest Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Science Conference*, S. Visa, A. Inoue, and A. Ralescu, Eds., Cincinnati, OH, Apr. 2012, pp. 94–102.
- [107] A. Sandberg and N. Bostrom, “Whole brain emulation: A roadmap,” Oxford University, Oxford, Technical report 2008-3, 2008. [Online]. Available: <http://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/Reports/2008-3.pdf>.
- [108] E. A. Smith, “Communication and collective action: language and the evolution of human cooperation,” *Evol. Hum. Behav.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 231–245, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.03.001.
- [109] W. von Hippel, *The social leap: How and why humans connect*. Melbourne: Scribe Publications, 2018.
- [110] J.-P. Capp *et al.*, “The paradox of cooperation among selfish cancer cells,” *Evol. Appl.*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 1239–1256, 2023, doi: 10.1111/eva.13571.

- [111] D. L. Cheney, “Extent and limits of cooperation in animals,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 108, no. supplement_2, pp. 10902–10909, Jun. 2011, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1100291108.
- [112] I. P. A. Lee, O. T. Eldakar, J. P. Gogarten, and C. P. Andam, “Bacterial cooperation through horizontal gene transfer,” *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 223–232, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2021.11.006.
- [113] J. L. Sachs, U. G. Mueller, T. P. Wilcox, and J. J. Bull, “The evolution of cooperation,” *Q. Rev. Biol.*, vol. 79, no. 2, pp. 135–160, Jun. 2004, doi: 10.1086/383541.
- [114] A. Whiten, D. Biro, N. Bredeche, E. C. Garland, and S. Kirby, “The emergence of collective knowledge and cumulative culture in animals, humans and machines,” *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, vol. 377, no. 1843, p. 20200306, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2020.0306.
- [115] J. Han and R. Hu, “Deep fictitious play for finding Markovian Nash equilibrium in multi-agent games,” in *Proceedings of the first Mathematical and Scientific Machine Learning Conference*, PMLR, Aug. 2020, pp. 221–245. Accessed: Jun. 25, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v107/han20a.html>
- [116] C. Papadimitriou, “The complexity of computing equilibria,” in *Handbook of game theory with economic applications*, vol. 4, H. P. Young and S. Zamir, Eds., Elsevier, 2015, pp. 779–810. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-444-53766-9.00014-8.
- [117] M. Wooldridge, *An introduction to multiagent systems*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- [118] D. Mguni, J. Jennings, and E. M. de Cote, “Decentralised learning in systems with many, many strategic agents,” *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 32, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1609/aaai.v32i1.11586.
- [119] C. L. Apicella and J. B. Silk, “The evolution of human cooperation,” *Curr. Biol.*, vol. 29, no. 11, pp. R447–R450, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2019.03.036.
- [120] D. G. Rand, S. Arbesman, and N. A. Christakis, “Dynamic social networks promote cooperation in experiments with humans,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 108, no. 48, pp. 19193–19198, Nov. 2011, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1108243108.
- [121] V. Hagemann, A. Kluge, and S. Ritzmann, “Flexibility under complexity: Work contexts, task profiles and team processes of high responsibility teams,” *Empl. Relat.*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 322–338, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.1108/01425451211217734.
- [122] A. A. Stachowski, S. A. Kaplan, and M. J. Waller, “The benefits of flexible team interaction during crises,” *J. Appl. Psychol.*, vol. 94, no. 6, pp. 1536–1543, 2009, doi: 10.1037/a0016903.
- [123] J. C. Turner and P. J. Oakes, “The socially structured mind,” in *The message of social psychology: Perspectives on mind in society*, C. McGarty and A. Haslam S., Eds., Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 1997, pp. 355–373.
- [124] K. Conzelmann, S. Weis, and H.-M. Süß, “New findings about social intelligence,” *J. Individ. Differ.*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 119–137, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.1027/1614-0001/a000106.
- [125] R. J. Sternberg, “A broad view of intelligence: The theory of successful intelligence,” *Consult. Psychol. J. Pract. Res.*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 139–154, 2003, doi: 10.1037/1061-4087.55.3.139.
- [126] J. R. Galbraith, “Organizing to deliver solutions,” *Organ. Dyn.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 194–207, Sep. 2002, doi: 10.1016/S0090-2616(02)00101-8.
- [127] G. F. Massari, I. Giannoccaro, and G. Carbone, “Are distrust relationships beneficial for group performance? The influence of the scope of distrust on the emergence of collective intelligence,” *Int. J. Prod. Econ.*, vol. 208, pp. 343–355, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2018.12.005.
- [128] S. M. Reia, A. C. Amado, and J. F. Fontanari, “Agent-based models of collective intelligence,” *Phys. Life Rev.*, vol. 31, pp. 320–331, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.plrev.2018.10.004.
- [129] R. B. Cialdini and N. J. Goldstein, “Social influence: Compliance and conformity,” *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, vol. 55, no. 2004, pp. 591–621, Feb. 2004, doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015.
- [130] H. G. Hoffman, P. A. Granhag, S. T. Kwong See, and E. F. Loftus, “Social influences on reality-monitoring decisions,” *Mem. Cognit.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 394–404, Apr. 2001, doi: 10.3758/BF03196390.
- [131] W. Wood, “Attitude change: Persuasion and social influence,” *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, vol. 51, no. Volume 51, 2000, pp. 539–570, Feb. 2000, doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.539.
- [132] T. Cruwys *et al.*, “When trust goes wrong: A social identity model of risk taking,” *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 120, no. 1, pp. 57–83, 2021, doi: 10.1037/pspi0000243.
- [133] A. Voci, “The link between identification and in-group favouritism: Effects of threat to social identity and trust-related emotions,” *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 265–284, 2006, doi: 10.1348/014466605X52245.
- [134] J. M. Clegg, Nicole. J. Wen, and C. H. Legare, “Is non-conformity WEIRD? Cultural variation in adults’ beliefs about children’s competency and conformity,” *J. Exp. Psychol. Gen.*, vol. 146, no. 3, pp. 428–441, 2017, doi: 10.1037/xge0000275.
- [135] N. Rhodes and W. Wood, “Self-esteem and intelligence affect influenceability: The mediating role of message reception,” *Psychol. Bull.*, vol. 111, no. 1, pp. 156–171, 1992, doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.156.
- [136] M. Zuckerman, J. Silberman, and J. A. Hall, “The relation between intelligence and religiosity: A meta-analysis and some proposed explanations,” *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 325–354, Nov. 2013, doi: 10.1177/1088868313497266.
- [137] M. van Vugt and C. M. Hart, “Social identity as social glue: The origins of group loyalty,” *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 86, no. 4, pp. 585–598, 2004, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.4.585.
- [138] M. P. Wilmot and D. S. Ones, “Agreeableness and its consequences: A quantitative review of meta-analytic findings,” *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 242–280, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1177/10888683211073007.

- [139] G. Gigerenzer, "Intelligence and decision-making," in *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence*, 2nd ed., R. J. Sternberg, Ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, pp. 580–601. doi: 10.1017/9781108770422.025.
- [140] P. J. Oakes, S. A. Haslam, and J. C. Turner, *Stereotyping and social reality*. Oxford, England; Cambridge: Blackwell, 1994.
- [141] H. Mercier and D. Sperber, *The enigma of reason: A new theory of human understanding*. London: Penguin Press, 2018.
- [142] S. V. Bentley, "Learning from a social identity perspective," 2019, doi: 10.14264/uql.2019.560.
- [143] L. S. Vygotsky, *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- [144] A. Lanzi, V. Burshnic, and M. S. Bourgeois, "Person-centered memory and communication strategies for adults with dementia," *Top. Lang. Disord.*, vol. 37, no. 4, p. 361, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1097/TLD.000000000000136.
- [145] J. Sutton, C. B. Harris, P. G. Keil, and A. J. Barnier, "The psychology of memory, extended cognition, and socially distributed remembering," *Phenomenol. Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 521–560, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.1007/s11097-010-9182-y.
- [146] S. A. Haslam, I. Adarves-Yorno, T. Postmes, and L. Jans, "The collective origins of valued originality: A social identity approach to creativity," *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 384–401, 2013, doi: 10.1177/1088868313498001.
- [147] R. Bissola and B. Imperatori, "Organizing individual and collective creativity: Flying in the face of creativity clichés," *Creat. Innov. Manag.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 77–89, 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8691.2011.00597.x.
- [148] M. Rosenberg, G. Gordon, L. Noy, and K. Tuyen, "Social interaction dynamics modulates collective creativity," *Proc. Annu. Meet. Cogn. Sci. Soc.*, vol. 44, no. 44, 2022, Accessed: Jun. 26, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9p3276dt>
- [149] M. Z. Juni and M. P. Eckstein, "Flexible human collective wisdom," *J. Exp. Psychol. Hum. Percept. Perform.*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1588–1611, 2015, doi: 10.1037/xhp0000101.
- [150] T. Kameda, W. Toyokawa, and R. S. Tindale, "Information aggregation and collective intelligence beyond the wisdom of crowds," *Nat. Rev. Psychol.*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 345–357, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.1038/s44159-022-00054-y.
- [151] C. K. De Dreu and M. A. West, "Minority dissent and team innovation: the importance of participation in decision making," *J. Appl. Psychol.*, vol. 86, no. 6, pp. 1191–1201, 2001, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1191.
- [152] C. Haslam, J. Jetten, T. Cruwys, G. A. Dingle, and S. A. Haslam, *The new psychology of health: Unlocking the social cure*. London: Routledge, 2018. doi: 10.4324/9781315648569.
- [153] S. A. Haslam, C. McMahan, T. Cruwys, C. Haslam, J. Jetten, and N. K. Steffens, "Social cure, what social cure? The propensity to underestimate the importance of social factors for health," *Soc. Sci. Med.*, vol. 198, pp. 14–21, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.12.020.
- [154] J. Jetten, C. Haslam, and A. Haslam S., *The social cure: Identity, health and well-being*. Psychology Press, 2012.
- [155] E. K. Zautra, A. J. Zautra, C. E. Gallardo, and L. Velasco, "Can we learn to treat one another better? A test of a social intelligence curriculum," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 10, no. 6, p. e0128638, Jun. 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0128638.
- [156] I. Kotsou, M. Mikolajczak, A. Heeren, J. Grégoire, and C. Leys, "Improving emotional intelligence: A systematic review of existing work and future challenges," *Emot. Rev.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 151–165, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1177/1754073917735902.
- [157] M. T. Rehg, M. J. Gundlach, and R. A. Grigorian, "Examining the influence of cross-cultural training on cultural intelligence and specific self-efficacy," *Cross Cult. Manag. Int. J.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 215–232, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.1108/13527601211219892.
- [158] E. Cavallini, F. Bianco, S. Bottiroli, A. Rosi, T. Vecchi, and S. Lecce, "Training for generalization in Theory of Mind: a study with older adults," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 6, Aug. 2015, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01123.
- [159] D. P. Skorich and S. A. Haslam, "The integrated self-categorization model of autism," *Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 129, no. 6, pp. 1373–1393, 2022, doi: 10.1037/rev0000385.
- [160] M. J. Slater, A. L. Evans, and M. J. Turner, "Implementing a social identity approach for effective change management," *J. Change Manag.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 18–37, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1080/14697017.2015.1103774.
- [161] J. Ullrich, J. Wieseke, and R. V. Dick, "Continuity and change in mergers and acquisitions: A social identity case Study of a German industrial merger," *J. Manag. Stud.*, vol. 42, no. 8, pp. 1549–1569, 2005, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00556.x.
- [162] J. J. Van Bavel and D. J. Packer, *The power of us: Harnessing our shared identities to improve performance, increase cooperation, and promote social harmony*. New York: Little, Brown Spark, 2021.
- [163] K. Fransen, D. McEwan, and M. Sarkar, "The impact of identity leadership on team functioning and well-being in team sport: Is psychological safety the missing link?," *Psychol. Sport Exerc.*, vol. 51, p. 101763, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2020.101763.
- [164] N. Shahinpoor and B. F. Matt, "The power of one: Dissent and organizational life," *J. Bus. Ethics*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 37–48, Aug. 2007, doi: 10.1007/s10551-006-9218-y.
- [165] A. Presbitero and P. Langford, "The relationship between collectivism and climate: A review of the literature," *Pap. Int. Assoc. Cross-Cult. Psychol. Conf.*, Jan. 2013, doi: <https://doi.org/10.4087/VMAY3015>.
- [166] H. C. Triandis, *Individualism & collectivism*. in New directions in social psychology. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995.
- [167] E. L. Zanutto, K. Bezrukova, and K. A. Jehn, "Revisiting faultline conceptualization: measuring

- faultline strength and distance,” *Qual. Quant.*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 701–714, Apr. 2011, doi: 10.1007/s11135-009-9299-7.
- [168] J. C. Turner, M. A. Hogg, P. J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher, and M. S. Wetherell, *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Cambridge, MA, US: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- [169] L. M. Bru-Luna, M. Martí-Vilar, C. Merino-Soto, and J. L. Cervera-Santiago, “Emotional intelligence measures: A systematic review,” *Healthcare*, vol. 9, no. 12, Art. no. 12, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.3390/healthcare9121696.
- [170] S. S. Khan, N. Hopkins, S. Reicher, S. Tewari, N. Srinivasan, and C. Stevenson, “Shared identity predicts enhanced health at a mass gathering,” *Group Process. Intergroup Relat.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 504–522, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1177/1368430214556703.
- [171] K. H. Greenaway, R. G. Wright, J. Willingham, K. J. Reynolds, and S. A. Haslam, “Shared identity is key to effective communication,” *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 171–182, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0146167214559709.
- [172] K. H. Greenaway, K. Peters, and S. A. Haslam, “Shared identity and the intergroup dynamics of communication,” in *Advances in intergroup communication*, H. Giles and A. Maas, Eds., New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2016, pp. 19–34.
- [173] J. F. Dovidio, S. L. Gaertner, A. Validzic, K. Matoka, B. Johnson, and S. Frazier, “Extending the benefits of recategorization: Evaluations, self-disclosure, and helping,” *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 401–420, Jul. 1997, doi: 10.1006/jesp.1997.1327.
- [174] M. Levine, A. Prosser, D. Evans, and S. Reicher, “Identity and emergency intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping behavior,” *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 443–453, 2005, doi: 10.1177/0146167204271651.
- [175] H. Tajfel and J. C. Turner, “An integrative theory of intergroup conflict,” in *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, W. G. Austin and S. Worchel, Eds., Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1979, pp. 33–37.
- [176] B. Simon and P. Oakes, “Beyond dependence: An identity approach to social power and domination,” *Hum. Relat.*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 105–139, Jan. 2006, doi: 10.1177/0018726706062760.
- [177] T. Postmes, S. A. Haslam, and L. Jans, “A single-item measure of social identification: Reliability, validity, and utility,” *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 597–617, 2013, doi: 10.1111/bjso.12006.
- [178] M. R. Forehand, R. Deshpandé, and A. Reed II, “Identity salience and the influence of differential activation of the social self-schema on advertising response,” *J. Appl. Psychol.*, vol. 87, no. 6, pp. 1086–1099, 2002, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1086.
- [179] W. B. Swann Jr., Á. Gómez, D. C. Seyle, J. F. Morales, and C. Huici, “Identity fusion: The interplay of personal and social identities in extreme group behavior,” *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 96, no. 5, pp. 995–1011, 2009, doi: 10.1037/a0013668.
- [180] G. Charness and Y. Chen, “Social identity, group behavior, and teams,” *Annu. Rev. Econ.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 691–713, 2020, doi: 10.1146/annurev-economics-091619-032800.
- [181] I. Lobo, J. Dimas, S. Mascarenhas, D. Rato, and R. Prada, “When ‘I’ becomes ‘we’: Modelling dynamic identity on autonomous agents,” *J. Artif. Soc. Soc. Simul.*, vol. 26, no. 3, Art. no. 3, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.18564/jasss.5146.
- [182] J. C. Turner, *Social influence*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1991.
- [183] S. A. Haslam, S. Reicher, and M. Platow, *The new psychology of leadership: Identity, influence and power*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2020.
- [184] B. Lickel, D. L. Hamilton, G. Wierzchowska, A. Lewis, S. J. Sherman, and A. N. Uhles, “Varieties of groups and the perception of group entitativity,” *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 78, no. 2, pp. 223–246, 2000, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.223.
- [185] G. Shteynberg, “A silent emergence of culture: the social tuning effect,” *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 99, no. 4, pp. 683–689, 2010, doi: 10.1037/a0019573.
- [186] D. P. Skorich, T. B. Gash, K. L. Stalker, L. Zheng, and S. A. Haslam, “Exploring the cognitive foundations of the shared attention mechanism: Evidence for a relationship between self-categorization and shared attention across the autism spectrum,” *J. Autism Dev. Disord.*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 1341–1353, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s10803-017-3049-9.
- [187] M. D. Rutherford and V. A. Kuhlmeier, *Social perception: detection and interpretation of animacy, agency, and intention*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013, doi: 10.7551/mitpress/9780262019279.001.0001.
- [188] M. F. Jung, N. Martelaro, and P. J. Hinds, “Using robots to moderate team conflict: The case of repairing violations,” in *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*, in HRI ’15. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Mar. 2015, pp. 229–236. doi: 10.1145/2696454.2696460.
- [189] N. J. McNeese, M. Demir, N. J. Cooke, and C. Myers, “Teaming with a synthetic teammate: Insights into human-autonomy teaming,” *Hum. Factors*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 262–273, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1177/0018720817743223.
- [190] T. O’Neill, N. McNeese, A. Barron, and B. Schelble, “Human-autonomy teaming: A review and analysis of the empirical literature,” *Hum. Factors*, vol. 64, no. 5, pp. 904–938, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1177/0018720820960865.
- [191] T. Chakraborti, S. Kambhampati, M. Scheutz, and Y. Zhang, “AI challenges in human-robot cognitive teaming,” Jul. 15, 2017, *arxiv*. Accessed: Jun. 26, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.04775v2>
- [192] E. Glikson and A. W. Woolley, “Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research,” *Acad. Manag. Ann.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 627–660, 2020, doi: 10.5465/annals.2018.0057.
- [193] A. I. Hauptman, B. G. Schelble, N. J. McNeese, and K. C. Madathil, “Adapt and overcome: Perceptions of

adaptive autonomous agents for human-AI teaming,” *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, vol. 138, p. 107451, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2022.107451.

- [194] R. Zhang, N. J. McNeese, G. Freeman, and G. Musick, “‘An ideal human’: Expectations of AI teammates in human-AI teaming,” *Proc ACM Hum-Comput Interact*, vol. 4, no. CSCW3, p. 246:1-246:25, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1145/3432945.
- [195] M. Johnson and A. Vera, “No AI is an island: The case for teaming intelligence,” *AI Mag.*, vol. 40, no. 1, Art. no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.1609/aimag.v40i1.2842.
- [196] B. G. Schelble, C. Flathmann, N. J. McNeese, G. Freeman, and R. Mallick, “Let’s think together! Assessing shared mental models, performance, and trust in human-agent teams,” *Proc ACM Hum-Comput Interact*, vol. 6, no. GROUP, p. 13:1-13:29, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1145/3492832.
- [197] G. Musick, T. A. O’Neill, B. G. Schelble, N. J. McNeese, and J. B. Henke, “What happens when humans believe their teammate is an AI? An investigation into humans teaming with autonomy,” *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, vol. 122, p. 106852, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2021.106852.
- [198] A. M. Madni and C. C. Madni, “Architectural framework for exploring adaptive human-machine teaming options in simulated dynamic environments,” *Systems*, vol. 6, no. 4, Art. no. 4, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.3390/systems6040044.
- [199] M. Zhao, R. Simmons, and H. Admoni, “The role of adaptation in collective human-AI teaming,” *Top. Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 0, pp. 1–33, 2022, doi: 10.1111/tops.12633.
- [200] K. Kawakami and K. L. Dion, “The impact of salient self-identities on relative deprivation and action intentions,” *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 525–540, 1993, doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420230509.
- [201] A. K. Zinn, A. Lavric, M. Levine, and M. Koschate, “Social identity switching: How effective is it?,” *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 101, p. 104309, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2022.104309.
- [202] S. A. Haslam, *Psychology in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE, 2004.
- [203] T. Postmes, S. A. Haslam, and R. I. Swaab, “Social influence in small groups: An interactive model of social identity formation,” *Eur. Rev. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–42, Jan. 2005, doi: 10.1080/10463280440000062.
- [204] D. van Knippenberg and N. Ellemers, “Social identity and group performance: Identification as the key to group-oriented effort,” in *Social identity at work: Developing theory for organizational practice*, M. J. Platow, N. Ellemers, S. A. Haslam, and D. van Knippenberg, Eds., New York: Psychology Press, 2003, pp. 29–42.

APPENDIX A

WORKED EXAMPLES FOR ISMI

Worked Example A1. Calculating the contribution of two other people to ISMI

If a second person joins the context in Example 1, so that the target person now has $SSI = (0.5, 0.3)$ and $GA = (0.5, 0.7)$, then by Property P6, the second person should add to the social resources of the target person independently of the first person. We can see how this is implemented in the equation for ISMI as the *sum* of the social resources from each person. The two people together would increase the ISMI of the target person as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned} ISMI_{pc} &= 0.7 \times SR_{pc} \\ &= 0.7 \times \sum_q (SSI_{pqc} \times GA_{pqc}) \\ &= 0.7 \times ((0.5 \times 0.5) + (0.3 \times 0.7)) \\ &= 0.7 \times (0.25 + 0.21) \\ &= 0.32 \end{aligned}$$

With the contribution of two other people, *ISMI* can vary from -2 to +2, however the full range is only seen with very high positive or negative alignments. This example shows the increase with the second person of *ISMI* from 0.15 (in Example 1) to 0.32.

Worked Example A2. Calculating the contribution of five other people to ISMI

In a context where a target person, p , has an *SMA* of .7, with five other people present who have varying levels of *SSI* (.5, .3, .4, .7, .5) and *GA* (.5, .7, .3, .3, .9) with the target person, their *ISMI* would be calculated using equation (1) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned} ISMI_{pc} &= 0.7 \times SR_{pc} \\ &= 0.7 \times \sum_q (SSI_{pqc} \times GA_{pqc}) \\ &= 0.7 \times ((0.5 \times 0.5) + (0.3 \times 0.7) \\ &\quad + (0.4 \times 0.3) + (0.7 \times 0.3) \\ &\quad + (0.5 \times 0.9)) \\ &= 0.7 \times (0.25 + 0.21 + 0.12 + 0.21 + 0.45) \\ &= 0.87 \end{aligned}$$

This example shows the steady increase of *ISMI* with the addition of aligned individuals.

Worked Example A3. Calculating the contribution of five other people to ISMI with a low SMA

In a context where a target person, p , has a low *SMA* of .3, with five other people present who have varying levels of *SSI* (.5, .3, .4, .7, .5) and *GA* (.5, .7, .3, .3, .9) with the target person, their *ISMI* would be calculated using equation (1) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned} ISMI_{pc} &= 0.3 \times SR_{pc} \\ &= 0.3 \times \sum_q (SSI_{pqc} \times GA_{pqc}) \\ &= 0.3 \times ((0.5 \times 0.5) + (0.3 \times 0.7) \\ &\quad + (0.4 \times 0.3) + (0.7 \times 0.3) \\ &\quad + (0.5 \times 0.9)) \\ &= 0.3 \times (0.25 + 0.21 + 0.12 + 0.21 + 0.45) \\ &= 0.37 \end{aligned}$$

Worked Example A4. Calculating the contribution of five other people to ISMI with low SSI

In a context where a target person, p , has an SMA of .7, with five other people present who have low levels of SSI (.1, .2, 0, .1, .1) and varying levels of GA (.5, .7, .3, .3, .9) with the target person, their $ISMI$ would be calculated using equation (1) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned}
 ISMI_{pc} &= 0.7 \times SR_{pc} \\
 &= 0.7 \times \sum_q (SSI_{pqc} \times GA_{pqc}) \\
 &= 0.7 \times ((0.1 \times 0.5) + (0.2 \times 0.7) \\
 &\quad + (0 \times 0.3) + (0.1 \times 0.3) \\
 &\quad + (0.1 \times 0.9)) \\
 &= 0.7 \times (0.05 + 0.14 + 0 + 0.03 + 0.09) \\
 &= 0.22
 \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX B

WORKED EXAMPLES FOR GSMI

GSMI in all examples is an average measure, independent of group size and varies from -1 to 1.

Worked Example B1. Calculating a group's GSMI in a context with 1 group member.

Example B1 is an edge case where the group has a single individual and is included for completeness, to show that the metric is well-behaved with different group sizes. In a context where a target group, g , has 1 member present with an SMA of .7, that person's GI is .6, and the alignment between that person's current salient identity and the group's goals is .5, the group's $GSMI$ would be calculated using Equation (3) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned}
 GSMI_{gc} &= (\sum_m (SMA_m \times GI_m \times SIGA_m)) / N_m \\
 &= 0.7 \times 0.6 \times 0.5 \\
 &= 0.11
 \end{aligned}$$

Worked Example B2. Calculating a group's GSMI in a context with 5 group members.

In a context where a target group, g , has 5 group members present with varying SMA s (.7, .8, .3, .9, .2), varying GI s (.6, .8, .2, .7, .5), and alignment between each group member's current salient identity and the group's goals (.5, .3, .8, .4, .2), the group's $GSMI$ would be calculated using equation (3) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned}
 GSMI_{gc} &= (\sum_m (SMA_m \times GI_m \times SIGA_m)) / N_m \\
 &= ((0.7 \times 0.6 \times 0.5) + (0.8 \times 0.8 \times 0.3) \\
 &\quad + (0.3 \times 0.2 \times 0.8) \\
 &\quad + (0.9 \times 0.7 \times 0.4) \\
 &\quad + (0.2 \times 0.5 \times 0.2)) / 5 \\
 &= (0.21 + 0.19 + 0.048 + 0.25 + 0.02) / 5 \\
 &= 0.14
 \end{aligned}$$

Worked Example B3. Calculating a group's GSMI in a context with 5 group members and high SMAs.

In a context where a target group, g , has 5 group members present with high SMA s (.8, .9, 1, .8, .9), with the same GI s (.6, .8, .2, .7, .5) and alignment between each group member's current salient identity and the group's goals (.5, .3, .8, .4, .2), the group's $GSMI$ would be calculated using equation (3) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned}
 GSMI_{gc} &= (\sum_m (SMA_m \times GI_m \times SIGA_m)) / N_m \\
 &= ((0.8 \times 0.6 \times 0.5) + (0.9 \times 0.8 \times 0.3) \\
 &\quad + (1 \times 0.2 \times 0.8) \\
 &\quad + (0.8 \times 0.7 \times 0.4) \\
 &\quad + (0.9 \times 0.5 \times 0.2)) / 5 \\
 &= (0.24 + 0.22 + 0.16 + 0.22 + 0.09) / 5 \\
 &= 0.19
 \end{aligned}$$

Worked Example B4. Calculating a group's GSMI in a context with 5 group members and a high SIGA.

In a context where a target group, g , has 5 group members present with varying SMA s (.7, .8, .3, .9, .2), the same GI s (.6, .8, .2, .7, .5), and a high level of alignment between each group member's current salient identity and the group's goals (.9, .7, .8, .8, .9), the group's $GSMI$ would be calculated using equation (3) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned}
 GSMI_{gc} &= (\sum_m (SMA_m \times GI_m \times SIGA_m)) / N_m \\
 &= ((0.7 \times 0.6 \times 0.9) + (0.8 \times 0.8 \times 0.7) \\
 &\quad + (0.3 \times 0.2 \times 0.8) \\
 &\quad + (0.9 \times 0.7 \times 0.8) \\
 &\quad + (0.2 \times 0.5 \times 0.9)) / 5 \\
 &= (0.38 + 0.45 + 0.048 + 0.50 + 0.09) / 5 \\
 &= 0.29
 \end{aligned}$$

Worked Example B5. Calculating a group's GSMI in a context with 5 group members with high GIs.

In a context where a target group, g , has 5 group members present with varying SMA s (.7, .8, .3, .9, .2), high GI s (.9, .9, .7, .8, .7), and varying levels of alignment between each group member's current salient identity and the group's goals (.5, .3, .8, .4, .2), the group's $GSMI$ would be calculated using equation (3) above as follows (results shown to 2 significant figures):

$$\begin{aligned}
 GSMI_{gc} &= (\sum_m (SMA_m \times GI_m \times SIGA_m)) / N_m \\
 &= ((0.7 \times 0.9 \times 0.5) + (0.8 \times 0.9 \times 0.3) \\
 &\quad + (0.3 \times 0.7 \times 0.8) \\
 &\quad + (0.9 \times 0.8 \times 0.4) \\
 &\quad + (0.2 \times 0.7 \times 0.2)) / 5 \\
 &= (0.32 + 0.22 + 0.17 + 0.29 + 0.028) / 5 \\
 &= 0.20
 \end{aligned}$$