

Intelligent Agents and Their Applications

Alexa Heucke

Munita E.V., Germany

Georg Peters

Munich University of Applied Sciences, Germany

Roger Tagg

University of South Australia, Australia

INTRODUCTION

An agent, in the traditional use of the word, is a person that acts on behalf of another person or group of persons. In information technology, the term *agent* is broadly used to describe software that carries out a special range of tasks on behalf of either a human user or other pieces of software. Such a concept is not new in computing. Similar things have been said about subroutines, reusable objects, components, and Web services. So what makes agents more than just another computer technology buzzword and research fashion?

BACKGROUND

The idea of intelligent agents in computing goes back several decades. Foner (1993, p. 1) dates the first research on software agents to the late 1950s and early 1960s. However, with the breakthrough of the Internet, intelligent agents have become more intensively researched since the early 1990s. In spite of this long heritage, the uptake of these ideas in practice has been patchy, although the perceived situation may be partly clouded by commercial secrecy considerations. Even today, the many different notions of the term *software agent* suggest that the computing profession has not yet reached a generally accepted understanding of exactly what an agent is.

DEFINITIONS AND CLASSIFICATIONS

According to Jennings, Sycara, and Wooldridge (1998, p. 8), “An agent is a computer system, situated in some environment that is capable of flexible autonomous action in order to meet its design objectives.” Thus, the determining characteristics of an software agent are:

- **Reactivity:** An agent has profound knowledge of its environment and has the ability to interact directly with it. It can receive input from the outside and can perform reactions with external effects.
 - **Autonomy:** An agent is in charge of its own internal status and actions. It can perform independently without the explicit interference of any user or other agents.
 - **Proactivity:** An agent has the ability to interpret even minor changes in its environment and can take the initiative to act upon them. It can communicate and interact with entities and can delegate tasks to other agents.
 - **Intelligence:** An agent’s degree of intelligence is determined by its capability to apply methods of AI in order to optimize its action (Meier, 2006, pp. 20-320).
- The research literature discusses many different types of agents, carrying out all sorts of functions with what can be termed primary and secondary characteristics. Primary characteristics include autonomy, cooperation, and learning, while secondary characteristics include aspects like multi-functionality, goodwill, or trustworthiness.
- A typology of software agents was proposed by Nwana (1996, pp. 7-38):
- **Collaborative agents** feature a high degree of cooperation and autonomy. They are determined by the idea of distributed artificial intelligence and by the concept of task sharing, cooperation, and negotiation between agents.
 - **Interface agents** focus on the characteristics of learning and autonomy. By collaborating with the user and by sharing knowledge with other agents, they learn a user’s behavior and are trained to take the initiative to act appropriately.
 - **Mobile agents** are not static but have the ability to travel. This entails non-functional benefits such as freeing local resources, showing more flexibility, and enabling an asynchronous work scenario.
 - **Information or Internet agents** emphasize managing enormous amounts of information. Their main task is to know where to search for information, how to retrieve it, and how to aggregate it.
 - **Reactive agents** show a stimulus-response manner as opposed to acting deliberately. Since they are

based in the physical world and only react to present changes, their behavior is not predetermined.

- **Hybrid agents** comprise more than one agent philosophy and benefit from the combination of different architectures.

Wooldridge and Jennings (1995, pp. 24-30) offer a two-way classification, based on contrasting approaches to building agents. They distinguish the following representative architectures:

- **Deliberative agent architecture:** This classical agent architecture consists of one definite, symbolic world model with all decisions being made on the basis of logical reasoning. Challenges of this approach are the translation of the real world into an accurate model and the establishment of an efficient reasoning.
- **Reactive agent architecture:** In contrast to the deliberative agent architecture, this alternative approach is lacking an explicit and symbolic model of the world as well as extensive reasoning.

Wooldridge and Jennings (1995) also allow for hybrid agent architectures that are built as a hierarchy of deliberative and reactive agent architecture layers.

DISCUSSION

Four aspects are of particular interest when trying to understand how agents work and could be successfully employed in applications and environments: agent knowledge, agent applications, agent standards, and multi-agent systems.

Agent Knowledge

To operate autonomously, any software agent must build up a collection of knowledge, typically data and rules that enable it to serve the principal it is acting for. According to Maes (1994, pp. 2f), an agent's knowledge base should be built up gradually by learning from users and other agents. The key issues are competence and trust. To be competent, the agent must have a knowledge base that is comprehensive and flexible enough to adapt to the user's profile. For an agent to be trusted, a human user must feel comfortable when accepting help from the agent or when delegating tasks to it. Generally, an agent can only learn from its user and other agents if their actions show an iterative pattern. Maes (1994) suggests four different ways of training an agent to build up competence: observation and imitation of the user's habits, user feedback, training by example, and training by other agents.

However, Nwana and Ndumu (1999, p. 10) have criticized Maes' approach, claiming that an agent would not only need

to know all peculiarities of the deployed operating system, but also must understand all tasks its user is engaged in. Furthermore, the agent would need to be capable of gathering the user's intent at any time, thus continuously modeling its user. Nwana and Ndumu (1999) identify four main competences for an agent: domain knowledge about the application, a model of its user, strategies for assistance, and a catalog of typical problems that users face in the environment.

Agent Applications

Software agents can be employed in many fields of information technology. One role for agents is to act as an assistant or helper to an individual user who is working with a complex computer system or physical equipment. Examples are:

- **Information agents** (Davies, Weeks, & Revett, 1996, pp. 105-108) that help a human researcher in finding the most relevant material — for example by additionally taking browsing information into consideration (Sharon, Lieberman, & Selker, 2002).
- **Decision support agents** that help a user assess alternative courses of action; functions include filtering and summarization of data, optimizing algorithms, heuristics, and so forth.
- **E-mail agents** (Maes, 1994, p. 5f), which filter spam, allocate incoming mail to folders, and work out addresses to which outgoing mail should be sent.
- **Buying and selling agents**, which assist a user in finding good deals in Internet marketplaces, or *bidding agents* (Morris, Ree, & Maes, 2000), which assist participants in auctions (He, Jennings, & Prügel-Bennett, 2006). These agents have characteristics of information agents as well as of decision support agents.

A second group of applications is where the agent acts as a coordinator of activities, or "virtual manager." Any workflow management system could qualify for this category. Other examples include meeting scheduling agents (Kozierok & Maes, 1993, p. 5), and dynamic scheduling agents that are able to reallocate resources to meet the goals of a business process (Lander, Corkill, & Rubinstein, 1999, p. 1ff). Delegation agents are another example in this category, although they could also be regarded as individual support.

A third group of applications is where the agent continually monitors data and rules in an organization, and on that organization's behalf alerts or sends messages to human recipients. Examples are advertising agents, notification agents, recommendation agents, and selling agents. Such agents are at work when you receive an e-mail from an Internet bookstore about a book that might interest you.

Other agents act as a third party between two humans or pieces of software that need to cooperate. Examples include brokering agents, negotiation agents, mediation

3 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/intelligent-agents-their-applications/13873

Related Content

Organizational Urbanism: A Value Proposal for the Generation of Organizational Intelligence to Healthcare Institutions – The Case of a Portuguese Hospital Center

Pedro Fernandes Anunciação and Sónia Nunes (2016). *Handbook of Research on Information Architecture and Management in Modern Organizations* (pp. 458-486).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/organizational-urbanism/135781

Factors for the Management of Scarce Human Resources and Highly Skilled Employees in IT-Departments: A Systematic Review

Olaf Radant, Ricardo Colomo-Palacios and Vladimir Stantchev (2016). *Journal of Information Technology Research* (pp. 65-82).

www.irma-international.org/article/factors-for-the-management-of-scarce-human-resources-and-highly-skilled-employees-in-it-departments/149677

EMD-Based Semantic User Similarity Using Past Travel Histories

Sunita Tiwari and Saroj Kaushik (2022). *Journal of Cases on Information Technology* (pp. 1-17).

www.irma-international.org/article/emd-based-semantic-user-similarity-using-past-travel-histories/281223

An Update on Health Information Technology

Juan A. Juanes, Pablo Ruisoto, Francisco J. Cabrero and Alberto Prats-Galino (2014). *Journal of Information Technology Research* (pp. 63-74).

www.irma-international.org/article/an-update-on-health-information-technology/111298

The Influences of the Degree of Interactivity on User-Outcomes in a Multimedia Environment: An Empirical Investigation

William D. Haseman, Vichuda Nui Polatoglu and K. Ramamurthy (2003). *Advanced Topics in Information Resources Management, Volume 2* (pp. 258-300).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/influences-degree-interactivity-user-outcomes/4607