

Know your body through intrinsic goals

Francesco Mannella^{1*}, Vieri Santucci¹, Eszter Somogyi², Lisa Jacquey²,
Kevin J. O'Regan², Gianluca Baldassarre¹

¹*Institute of cognitive sciences and technologies,
National Research Council - CNR, Rome, Italy*

²*Laboratoire Psychologie de la Perception (UMR 8158),
Paris Descartes - CPSC, Paris, France*

Correspondence*:

Francesco Mannella

Institute of cognitive sciences and technologies

Via San Martino della Battaglia, 44

00185 Roma, Italia

francesco.mannella@gmail.com

2 ABSTRACT

3 The first 'object' that newborn children start to play with is their own body. This activity allows
4 them to autonomously form a sensorimotor map and a repertoire of actions that constitutes the
5 core of future cognitive and motor development. In this work we propose a computational model
6 incorporating the hypothesis that this acquisition of early knowledge is not guided by random
7 motor-babbling, but rather by goals autonomously generated and set on the basis of intrinsic
8 motivations. During the initial motor-babbling, the system forms representations of sensory events.
9 When the agent realises the possibility to re-activate those representations through its motor
10 behaviour, it will be intrinsically motivated to improve its competence in obtaining those specific
11 events. More precisely, the discovered events become intrinsic goals that guide both the learning
12 and the selection of motor actions. The model is based on five components: (1) a competitive
13 neural network, supporting the acquisition of abstract representations based on experienced
14 changes in the sensory input; (2) a selector that on the basis on competence-based intrinsic
15 motivations (CB-IMs) determines the pursued goal and which motor resources will be trained
16 to obtain that goal; (3) an echo-state neural network that controls the movements of the robot
17 and supports the acquisition of the motor skills; (4) a predictor of the accomplishment of the
18 pursued goal, used to measure the improvement of the system competence; (5) the generator of
19 the CB-IM signal that biases the activity of the selector. The model is tested as the controller of a
20 simulated simple planar robot composed of two kinematic 3DoF arms exploring own body in a 2D
21 environment. Sensory information from self-touching is used by the system to form goals and
22 guide skill learning. Results are presented, together with their possible implications for ongoing
23 empirical experiments with human babies. Moreover, the model will be discussed in relation
24 to possible applications to design new open-ended learning robotic architectures able to act in
25 unstructured environments.

26 **Keywords:** developmental robotics, developmental psychology, intrinsic motivations, goals, body schema

1 INTRODUCTION

The first “object” that newborn children start to play with is their own body. This activity, that starts even in the fetus and continues for many years after birth (?), determines the formation of a “body schema” (cit.), a sensorimotor map and a repertoire of actions that constitute the core of future cognitive and motor development. [TODO, Kevin]

If we observe children in their first months, they seem to alternate phases of rest to phases of random activity of the limbs that gradually became more controlled and targeted during their development. Differently from this empirical evidence, in this work we propose a computational model incorporating the hypothesis that early knowledge in children is not acquired through random motor-babbling, but guided by self-generated goals, autonomously set on the basis of intrinsic motivations (IMs).

The concept of IMs was introduced in animal psychology during the 1950s and then extended in human psychology (????) to describe a set of motivations that were incompatible with the Hullian theory of drives (?) where motivations were strictly connected to the satiation of primary needs. Different experiments (e.g. ????) showed how exploration, novel or surprising neutral stimuli and even the possibility to affect the environment are able to modify the behaviour of the agents driving the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the absence of tasks directly established by biological fitness. Further neurophysiological research (e.g. ???) showed how IMs can be linked to neuromodulators activity, and in particular to dopamine. These results highlighted the role of IMs in enhancing neural plasticity and driving the learning of new skills. Following biological inspiration, IMs has been also introduced in machine learning (e.g. ??) and developmental robotics (e.g. ??) to foster the autonomous development of artificial agents and the open-ended learning of repertoires of skills. Depending on their functions and mechanisms, different typologies of IMs have been identified (???) and broadly into two main groups (?): (1) knowledge-based IMs (KB-IMs), divided in (1a) novelty based IMs related to novel non-experienced stimuli, and (1b) prediction-based IMs, related to the violation of the agent’s predictions; and (2) competence-based IMs (CB-IMs) related to action, i.e. to the agent’s competence to change the world and accomplish self-defined *goals*. In their first implementations in computational research, IMs have been used to generate the learning signal for autonomous skills acquisition (????). Recent research has started to use IMs for the autonomous generation and/or selection of *goals* which can then drive the acquisition of skills (???) and the optimisation of learning processes in high-dimensional action spaces with redundant robot controllers (??).

Together with IMs, *goals* are a crucial element for the presented model. Here, in consonance with computational and empirical perspectives (??), goals are intended as agent’s internal representations of a world/body state or event (or of a set of them), with these properties: (a) the agent can keep the representation active even in the absence of the corresponding state or event; (b) the representation has the power to focus the behaviour of the agent towards the accomplishment of the goal and to generate a learning signal when the world state matches the goal (“goal-matching”).

Our hypothesis is that goals and IMs play an important role even in the early phases of knowledge acquisition, i.e. in the first months after birth. In particular, the infant initial motor-babbling results in the formation of sensory events representations. When the baby discovers (through further random activity) the possibility to re-activate the same representations through its behaviour, this will generate a CB-IM signal for obtaining those specific sensory events. More precisely, the discovered events become intrinsic goals that guide both the learning and the selection of motor actions.

Given the important role of IMs in enhancing exploration, a different hypothesis on the development of early knowledge could exclude the involvement of an high-level construct such as goals.

69 TODO] Kevin, you should develop here the hypothesis that we discussed with you in the past (what we
70 initially called the ‘oudeyer hypothesis’).
71 If we remember some key points of it were as follows.
72 The agent is endowed with a repertoire of actions.
73 The agent is able to recognise a certain number of ‘interesting’ outcomes.
74 The problem of its development is to learn a repertoire of action-outcome contingencies on the basis of
75 intrinsic motivations.
76 The acquisition process works as follows.
77 The agent explores the environment with its actions.
78 When an interesting outcome is detected, the agent memorise in its repertoire the action-outcome
79 contingency just experienced.
80 The action and the perceptual experience involved in the contingency now receive a high motivation for
81 exploration, so that the agent tends to produce similar actions and obtain similar contingencies, so learning
82 other action outcome contingencies that are progressively stored in their repertoire.
83 When these action-outcome contingencies become progressively more refined the motivation for them
84 decreases and exploration progressively shifts to other areas of the action-outcome space.

85 In this paper we only investigate our hypothesis, and leave the alternative one for future comparison. In
86 particular, we implement a model (sec. ?? and sec. ?? tested as the controller of a simulated planar robot
87 composed of two kinematic 3DoF arms exploring its own body in a 2D environment (sec. ??). Sensory
88 information from self-touch activity is used by the system to form goals and drive skill learning. Results
89 of the experiment are presented (sec. 3) together with their possible implications for ongoing empirical
90 experiments with human babies (sec 3). The final section of the paper (sec: 4) discusses relevant related
91 literature and possible future development of the presented model.

2 THE MODEL

3 RESULTS

92 sectionPredictions of the model

4 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORKS

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

93 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
94 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

95 The Author Contributions section is mandatory for all articles, including articles by sole authors. If an
96 appropriate statement is not provided on submission, a standard one will be inserted during the production
97 process. The Author Contributions statement must describe the contributions of individual authors referred
98 to by their initials and, in doing so, all authors agree to be accountable for the content of the work. Please
99 see here for full authorship criteria.

FUNDING

100 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation
101 Program under Grant Agreement no. 713010 (GOAL-Robots - Goal-based Open-ended Autonomous
102 Learning Robots).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

103 The authors want to thanks ...

REFERENCES

- 104 Baldassarre, G. and Mirolli, M. (2013). *Intrinsically motivated learning in natural and artificial systems*
105 (Berlin: Springer)
- 106 Baldassarre, G., Stafford, T., Mirolli, M., Redgrave, P., Ryan, R., and Barto, A. (2014). Intrinsic motivations
107 and open-ended development in animals, humans, and robots: an overview. *Frontiers in Psychology –*
108 *Cognitive Science* 5, E1–5
- 109 Baranes, A. and Oudeyer, P.-Y. (2013). Active learning of inverse models with intrinsically motivated goal
110 exploration in robots. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 61, 49 – 73
- 111 Barto, A., Mirolli, M., and Baldassarre, G. (2013). Novelty or surprise? *Frontiers in Psychology –*
112 *Cognitive Science* 4, E1–15
- 113 Barto, A. G., Singh, S., and Chantanez, N. (2004). Intrinsically motivated learning of hierarchical
114 collections of skills. In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Developmental Learning*
115 (ICDL). 112–119
- 116 Berlyne, D. E. (1950). Novelty and curiosity as determinants of exploratory behaviour. *British Journal of*
117 *Psychology. General Section* 41, 68–80. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.1950.tb00262.x
- 118 Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, Arousal and Curiosity* (McGraw Hill, New York)
- 119 Bremner, A. J., Mareschal, D., Lloyd-Fox, S., and Spence, C. (2008). Spatial localization of touch in
120 the first year of life: Early influence of a visual spatial code and the development of remapping across
121 changes in limb position. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 137, 149
- 122 Chiodo, L. A., Antelman, S. M., Caggiula, A. R., and Lineberry, C. G. (1980). Sensory stimuli alter
123 discharge rate of dopamine (da) neurons: evidence for two functional types of da cells in the substantia
124 nigra. *Brain research* 189, 544–549
- 125 Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*
126 (Springer Science & Business Media)
- 127 Glow, P. H. and Wtnefield, A. H. (1978). Response-contingent sensory change in a causally structured
128 environment. *Animal Learning & Behavior* 6, 1–18
- 129 Harlow, H. F. (1950). Learning and satiation of response in intrinsically motivated complex puzzle
130 performance by monkeys. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology* 43, 289–294
- 131 Hart, S. and Grupen, R. (2011). Learning generalizable control programs. *IEEE Transactions on*
132 *Autonomous Mental Development* 3, 216–231
- 133 Horvitz, J. C. (2000). Mesolimbocortical and nigrostriatal dopamine responses to salient non-reward events.
134 *Neuroscience* 96, 651–656
- 135 Hull, C. (1943). *Principles of behavior: An introduction to behavior theory* (New York: Appleton-century-
136 crofts)

- 137 Kish, G. B. (1955). Learning when the onset of illumination is used as reinforcing stimulus. *Journal of*
138 *Comparative and Physiological Psychology* 48, 261–264
- 139 Kompella, V. R., Stollenga, M., Luci, M., and Schmidhuber, J. (2015). Continual curiosity-driven skill
140 acquisition from high-dimensional video inputs for humanoid robots. *Artificial Intelligence*
- 141 Merrick, K. E. (2012). Intrinsic motivation and introspection in reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions*
142 *on Autonomous Mental Development* 4, 315–329
- 143 Mirolli, M., Santucci, V. G., and Baldassarre, G. (2013). Phasic dopamine as a prediction error of intrinsic
144 and extrinsic reinforcements driving both action acquisition and reward maximization: A simulated
145 robotic study. *Neural Networks* 39, 40–51
- 146 Montgomery, K. C. (1954). The role of the exploratory drive in learning. *J Comp Physiol Psychol* 47,
147 60–4
- 148 Oudeyer, P.-Y. and Kaplan, F. (2007). What is intrinsic motivation? a typology of computational approaches.
149 *Front Neurobot* 1, 6. doi:10.3389/neuro.12.006.2007
- 150 Oudeyer, P.-Y., Kaplan, F., and Hafner, V. (2007). Intrinsic motivation system for autonomous mental
151 development. In *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*. 703–713
- 152 Redgrave, P. and Gurney, K. (2006). The short-latency dopamine signal: a role in discovering novel
153 actions? *Nat Rev Neurosci* 7, 967–75. doi:10.1038/nrn2022
- 154 Rolf, M. and Steil, J. J. (2014). Efficient exploratory learning of inverse kinematics on a bionic elephant
155 trunk. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 25, 1147–1160
- 156 Russell, S. J. and Norvig, P. (2003). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* (Upper Saddle River, NJ:
157 Prentice Hall). Second edition
- 158 Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new
159 directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 25, 54–67
- 160 Santucci, V. G., Baldassarre, G., and Mirolli, M. (2013). Which is the best intrinsic motivation signal for
161 learning multiple skills? *Frontiers in Neurobotics* 7
- 162 Santucci, V. G., Baldassarre, G., and Mirolli, M. (2016). GRAIL: a Goal-discovering Robotic Architecture
163 for Intrinsically-motivated Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems* 8,
164 214–231
- 165 Schmidhuber, J. (2010). Formal theory of creativity, fun, and intrinsic motivation (1990–2010). *Autonomous*
166 *Mental Development, IEEE Transactions on* 2, 230–247
- 167 Thill, S., Caligiore, D., Borghi, A. M., Ziemke, T., and Baldassarre, G. (2013). Theories and computational
168 models of affordance and mirror systems: an integrative review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*
169 37, 491–521
- 170 White, R. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. *Psychological Review* 66, 297–333