

**Citation for published version:**

Frank Broz, et al, 'The ITALK Project: A Developmental Robotics Approach to the Study of Individual, Social, and Linguistic Learning', *Topics in Cognitive Science*, Vol. 6 (3): 534-544, July 2014.

**DOI:**

<https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12099>

**Document Version:**

This is the Accepted Manuscript version.

The version in the University of Hertfordshire Research Archive may differ from the final published version.

**Copyright and Reuse:**

© 2014 Cognitive Science Society, Inc.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving](#).

**Enquiries**

If you believe this document infringes copyright, please contact Research & Scholarly Communications at [rsc@herts.ac.uk](mailto:rsc@herts.ac.uk)

# Topics in Cognitive Science

## The ITALK Project: A developmental robotics approach to the study of individual, social, and linguistic learning --Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	12-327R3
<b>Full Title:</b>	The ITALK Project: A developmental robotics approach to the study of individual, social, and linguistic learning
<b>Article Type:</b>	Article
<b>Keywords:</b>	robotics, development, language, action, social interaction, learning
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Frank Broz University of Plymouth Plymouth, Devon UNITED KINGDOM
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	University of Plymouth
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>	
<b>First Author:</b>	Frank Broz
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Frank Broz Chrystopher L. Nehaniv Tony Belpaeme Ambra Bisio Kerstin Dautenhahn Luciano Fadiga Tomassino Ferrauto Kerstin Fischer Frank Foerster Onofrio Gigliotta Sascha Griffiths Hagen Lehmann Katrin S. Lohan Caroline Lyon Davide Marocco Gianluca Massera Giorgio Metta Vishwanathan Mohan Anthony Morse Stefano Nolfi Francesco Nori Martin Peniak

	Karola Pitsch
	Katharina J. Rohlfing
	Gerhard Sagerer
	Yo Sato
	Joe Saunders
	Lars Schillingmann
	Alessandra Sciutti
	Vadim Tikhanoff
	Britta Wrede
	Arne Zeschel
	Angelo Cangelosi
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>This article presents results from a multidisciplinary research project on the integration and transfer of language knowledge into robots as an empirical paradigm for the study of language development in both humans and humanoid robots. Within the framework of human linguistic and cognitive development, we focus on how three central types of learning interact and co-develop: individual learning about one's own embodiment and the environment, social learning (learning from others), and learning of linguistic capability. Our primary concern is how these capabilities can scaffold each other's development in a continuous feedback cycle as their interactions yield increasingly sophisticated competencies in the agent's capacity to interact with others and manipulate its world. Experimental results are summarized in relation to milestones in human linguistic and cognitive development and show that the mutual scaffolding of social learning, individual learning, and linguistic capabilities creates the context, conditions and requisites for learning in each domain. Challenges and insights identified as a result of this research program are discussed with regard to possible and actual contributions to cognitive science and language ontogeny. In conclusion, directions for future work are suggested that continue to develop this approach toward an integrated framework for understanding these mutually scaffolding processes as a basis for language development in humans and robots.</p>
<b>Response to Reviewers:</b>	<p>This is the final version of this manuscript, accepted without further revision by the editors.</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Running head: THE ITALK PROJECT

The ITALK Project: A developmental robotics approach to the study of individual, social,  
and linguistic learning

Frank Broz, Chrystopher L. Nehaniv, Tony Belpaeme, Ambra Bisio, Kerstin Dautenhahn,  
Luciano Fadiga, Tomassino Ferrauto, Kerstin Fischer, Frank Förster, Onofrio Gigliotta,  
Sascha Griffiths, Hagen Lehmann, Katrin S. Lohan, Caroline Lyon, Davide Marocco,  
Gianluca Massera, Giorgio Metta, Vishwanathan Mohan, Anthony Morse, Stefano Nolfi,  
Francesco Nori, Martin Peniak, Karola Pitsch, Katharina J. Rohlfing, Gerhard Sagerer,  
Yo Sato, Joe Saunders, Lars Schillingmann, Alessandra Sciutti, Vadim Tikhanoff, Britta  
Wrede, Arne Zeschel and Angelo Cangelosi

ITALK Project

**Abstract**

This article presents results from a multidisciplinary research project on the integration and transfer of language knowledge into robots as an empirical paradigm for the study of language development in both humans and humanoid robots. Within the framework of human linguistic and cognitive development, we focus on how three central types of learning interact and co-develop: individual learning about one's own embodiment and the environment, social learning (learning from others), and learning of linguistic capability. Our primary concern is how these capabilities can scaffold each other's development in a continuous feedback cycle as their interactions yield increasingly sophisticated competencies in the agent's capacity to interact with others and manipulate its world. Experimental results are summarized in relation to milestones in human linguistic and cognitive development and show that the mutual scaffolding of social learning, individual learning, and linguistic capabilities creates the context, conditions and requisites for learning in each domain. Challenges and insights identified as a result of this research program are discussed with regard to possible and actual contributions to cognitive science and language ontogeny. In conclusion, directions for future work are suggested that continue to develop this approach toward an integrated framework for understanding these mutually scaffolding processes as a basis for language development in humans and robots.

## The ITALK Project: A developmental robotics approach to the study of individual, social, and linguistic learning

### Introduction

This article presents and discusses research on learning and language development conducted as part of the ITALK (Integration and Transfer of Action and Language Knowledge in Robots) project, an interdisciplinary research project focussed on the acquisition of complex behavioral, cognitive and linguistic skills by artificial embodied agents through individual and social learning. The primary goal of the project is to produce new theoretical insights, explanations, and models of the integration of action, social, and linguistic skills that bootstrap cognitive development. Research methodologies are employed from human-robot interaction, computational modelling, artificial intelligence, neuroscience, psychology, and developmental linguistics in a constructive manner where situated interaction is always treated as the catalyst for cognitive and linguistic development.

The work conducted investigates the application of minimal autonomous constructivist approaches to learning in realistic scenarios. Cross-disciplinary research methodologies identify and investigate conditions in which mutual scaffolding can improve the development of linguistic and cognitive capabilities. Given the importance of embodied interaction in development, models are tested through interaction between humans and physical robots whenever possible (experiments performed in simulation will be identified as such). The robot used as the primary testbed for the project's experiments was the iCub, a high degree-of-freedom toddler-sized humanoid robot designed as a platform for research in cognitive systems and developmental robotics (Tsakarakis et al., 2007) (see Figure 1).

There have been a number of related projects involving the use of robots to study language and/or development. For example, the JST ERATO Asada Project has a similar orientation in that it focuses on developmental robotics and treats learning as arising from embodied interaction. In an overview article on developmental robotics, Asada posits language learning as arising out of two-way patterns of imitation between infant and caregiver, though language is not the primary focus of that project (Asada et al., 2009). Yiannis and Meltzoff have proposed a developmental robotics model of social imitation learning that doesn't directly address the emergence of language (Demiris & Meltzoff, 2008). ITALK differentiates itself from the previously mentioned projects by focussing on language learning based on the mutual scaffolding of learning with other cognitive domains, specifically action and social interaction.

### Mutual Scaffolding in Development

A primary source of inspiration and guidance for this research program is the study of infant development. Following this focus, the article will be organized based on the developmental progress of a human infant, with research results relevant to particular capabilities presented and discussed in the order in which they typically occur. The ITALK project addresses development up to roughly two years in age, when the ability to communicate in short sentences emerges (Boysson-Bardies & DeBevoise, 2001). During this time period, an infant makes similarly important gains in its motor abilities and capability to function as a social agent (Vernon, von Hofsten, & Fadiga, 2011). Throughout this timeline, the interrelationship between individual action learning, social learning, and linguistic development is emphasized, with studies investigating the emergence of these capabilities in conjunction with one another rather than in isolation.

While it is unclear whether mutual scaffolding is a necessary prerequisite for linguistic development, there is evidence from child development that it plays a major role

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 in typical development and that impairment of one or more of the component cognitive  
9 abilities may be associated with developmental delays in another. Language and motor  
10 impairments often co-occur in children, suggesting that links exist between the  
11 development of these capabilities (Hill, 2001). Children with autism (a disorder that  
12 results in a lack of social attention) often experience language impairment as well, and the  
13 level of impairment can be predicted from the child's ability to perform joint attention  
14 and other social behaviors (Dawson et al., 2004). While children with impairments in  
15 these areas often do acquire full language use, the prevalence of co-occurring delays or  
16 impairments highlights the coupled nature of these capabilities and provides a motivation  
17 for modeling language acquisition as a process that is embedded in a physical embodiment  
18 and social context.  
19

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 The purpose of this article is to highlight the accomplishments of this project and  
32 present them in relation to one another. Therefore, rather than exploring individual  
33 results in depth, an overview will be provided with references to relevant papers . While  
34 the results arising from this research effort are numerous, there are a few major results  
35 that serve to exemplify the approach of the project. Given the constructive nature of this  
36 work, one of the major outcomes was the production of integrated systems that combined  
37 the work of multiple research endeavors. Most notably, the final project demonstration  
38 involved the integration of multiple systems to enable action and language learning on by  
39 iCub. Details of the demonstration system are presented after the separate systems and  
40 research results that contribute to it have been introduced. The final section addresses the  
41 important role that studies involving human-robot interaction play in this work and  
42 identifies insights gained as well as areas for further research.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*One to Six Months*

In the first six months of life, infants listen to language and imitate actions. Through their close relationships with adult humans, they begin to recognise the structure of intentional behavior.

Infants become capable of recognizing syllables in utterances between the age of one to five months and able to pick out words from continuous speech between five to seven months (Boysson-Bardies & DeBevoise, 2001). Computational modelling was used to explore possible mechanisms which may govern this process, investigating the feasibility of speech segmentation based on only the audio modality (Sato, Ze, & van Dijk, 2013). Another alternative model of infant speech segmentation makes more holistic use of information, relying on both acoustic and visual cues. Hirsh-Pasek and Golinkoff's concept of "acoustic packaging" proposes that language serves to give structure to the stream of actions that an infant perceives (Hirsh-Pasek & Golinkoff, 1999). The acoustic packaging system, a computational implementation of this concept, was used to analyse adult-child and adult-adult interaction data and identified differences between these groups that indicate a more structured presentation of action in adult-child interaction (Schillingmann, Wrede, & Rohlfing, 2009). This result demonstrates how adults modify their action and language in order to facilitate learning by infants, a topic which will be returned to in later sections.

From around six months of age, infants begin to imitate goal-directed acts on objects more often than gestures (Uzgiris, 1999). The ability to act towards goals is an important step in the expansion of an infant's motor repertoire and overall development. The Passive Motion Paradigm (PMP) framework was developed to investigate how goal-oriented action can be produced for robots without explicit prior representation (Mohan, Morasso, Metta, & Sandini, 2009) . Actions emerge due to implicit interactions between the acquired internal body schema of a robot and its intended goal, through a

learning process that combines imitation learning from demonstration by a human teacher, practice and motor imagery (Mohan, Morasso, Zenzeri, & Metta, 2010).

### *Seven to Twelve Months*

Within the first year of life, infants begin producing their first words. They also acquire word meanings through social interaction and physical interactions with their environment.

Infants begin to babble around the age of seven months, imitating and practicing sound production that leads to the ability to pronounce words (Vihman, DePaolis, & Keren-Portnoy, 2009). In a series of human-robot interaction experiments, a computational model of the transition from babbling to word form acquisition was evaluated through proto-conversations between the iCub and a human (Lyon, Nehaniv, & Saunders, 2012). In this system, chance occurrences of words in random syllabic babble spoken by the robot are reinforced by positive feedback from the interaction partner, biasing the robot towards repetition.

From the age of seven to ten months, infants start recognizing words in context, learning word meanings by between ten and twelve months and speaking their first words around twelve months (Boysson-Bardies & DeBevoise, 2001). The ROSSUM architecture empirically models the learning of word meanings through social interaction. Heuristics based on the characteristics of motherese allow a robot to make associations between words and features of its environment or its own embodiment through interaction with a human teacher (Saunders, Nehaniv, & Lyon, 2011). Motherese is a term for a style of speaking typically employed by caregivers when talking with a child (Fernald & Kuhl, 1987). Participants' use of mothers became more pronounced in successive interaction sessions with the robot as they became more aware of its limited abilities. This result provides another example of how adults socially scaffold language learning by modifying

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 their behavior based on the perceived needs of their listener. The ROSSUM architecture  
9  
10 has also been used to model the acquisition of linguistic negation (Förster, 2013). Infants  
11  
12 learn the pragmatics of words from their caretakers, and rejective “no”s are typically the  
13  
14 among the group of first words uttered by toddlers (Pea, 1980). ERA (Epigenetic Robot  
15  
16 Architecture) is another approach to modeling the learning of word meanings, a neural  
17  
18 cognitive architecture that focuses on the influence of embodiment and spatial information  
19  
20 on learning (A. F. Morse, DeGreeff, Belpaeme, & Cangelosi, 2010). In a series of  
21  
22 experiments on the iCub, results from children’s word learning experiments were  
23  
24 replicated, demonstrating the impact of spatial information, embodiment and  
25  
26 proprioceptive information (P. Morse A.and Baxter, Belpaeme, Smith, & Cangelosi, 2011;  
27  
28 A. F. Morse, Belpaeme, Cangelosi, & Smith, 2010).

30  
31 Gaze plays an important role in organizing episodes of learning. Infants prefer to  
32  
33 look at faces that engage them in mutual gaze, and by the age of ten to twelve months,  
34  
35 they become adept at gaze following (Vernon et al., 2011). Studying mutual gaze during  
36  
37 conversation can identify factors that influence this behaviour and aid in the design of  
38  
39 socially appropriate robot gaze controllers (Broz, Lehmann, Nehaniv, & Dautenhahn,  
40  
41 2012a, 2012b). Gaze makes information about a caregiver’s attention available to an  
42  
43 infant, and the caregiver monitors the infant’s attention in turn. Analyses of  
44  
45 human-human interactions reveal that parents monitor their child’s attention more closely  
46  
47 in younger than in older infants (Pitsch et al., 2009). In tutoring situations with  
48  
49 pre-lexical infants, feedback consists primarily of gazing behavior (Vollmer, Lohan,  
50  
51 Fritsch, Wrede, & Rohlfing, 2010). Changes in the type of feedback given by children at  
52  
53 more advanced stages of development will be discussed in subsequent sections.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*Twelve to Twenty Months*

In the second year of life, children learn about the compositionality of language, beginning to recognize grammatical constructs and produce their own multi-word utterances. They simultaneously become more skilled at composing actions into goal-directed behaviors. As their motor and linguistic skills improve, so does their level of agency during interaction.

Between the ages of twelve and sixteen months, infants begin to understand simple sentences (Boysson-Bardies & DeBevoise, 2001). Motor capabilities also increase, and by the age of about thirteen months, infants are able to smoothly compose general compound actions such as a reaching and grasping (Vernon et al., 2011). A series of simulation experiments investigated the development of language comprehension including compositional semantics grounded in an agent's physical capabilities and environment. Neural controllers were trained for a task that involved the simultaneous learning of a set of physical skills and the ability to respond to imperative utterances to perform those skills (Tuci, Ferrauto, Zeschel, Massera, & Nolfi, 2011). The acquired controllers generalize in both language comprehension and behaviour generation, able to respond to new, never-experienced utterances with never-produced behaviours without further training. The previously mentioned PMP framework also addresses action compositionality through its learning architecture that reuses existing motion knowledge while learning novel motor skills (Mohan et al., 2011).

Sometime between sixteen to twenty months, children begin expressing two-word utterances and are able to distinguish word categories (Boysson-Bardies & DeBevoise, 2001). The ROSSUM architecture was extended to model the two-word stage through the learning of meaningful adjective-noun combinations (Lehmann, Förster, & Nehaniv, 2012). Words were grouped using heuristics based on typical English word order. The perceptual associations learned for these categories were related to the words' grammatical

functions.

Children of this age in tutoring situations use more modalities to give feedback and begin to anticipate next actions with their gaze direction(Vollmer et al., 2010). Infants begin to exhibit gaze that anticipates the goal of another’s action once they have learned to perform that action themselves(Falck-Ytter, Gredebaeck, & von Hofsten, 2006). Experiments found that observing actions of a humanoid robot also evokes gaze proactivity, suggesting there is a mapping between the observed action and the observer’s motor repertoire based in the mirror neuron system (Sciutti et al., 2013). Experiments on motor resonance have found that biologically plausible motion by humanoid robots can produce the same type of motor resonance effects as human motion (Sciutti et al., 2012). These results suggest that people do process robot action similarly to human action when it is human-like, so robots should be able to elicit similar responses during interaction.

#### *Twenty to Twenty-four Months*

By twenty-four months of age, children are able to construct two and three word sentences (Boysson-Bardies & DeBevoise, 2001). They have integrated the skills of acting on objects in their environment and talking to interaction partners about those actions. In children two and up, the type of feedback they give to caretakers changes to reflect their greater action and language comprehension of action. They take an increasingly active role in learning, structuring their feedback by timing their verbal and bodily action in relation to the adult’s presentation (Vollmer et al., 2010). Parents, in turn, use more speech (instead of or in addition to motion) to attract older children’s attention (Vollmer et al., 2009). From these analyses of tutoring in parent-child dyads, a tutor spotter, a continuous measurement scale based on interaction features, was created. It was used to analyze human tutoring behavior towards a simulated robot and the iCub robot. Simple saliency-based robot gaze behavior was not found to produce a contingent interaction and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 did not induce tutoring behavior in the human (Lohan, Rohlfing, Pitsch, et al., 2012).

9  
10 In response, contingent robot gazing and reaching behavior was implemented.  
11  
12 Conversation analysis applied to interactions between a human and a robot exhibiting  
13  
14 these behaviors demonstrate how the robot's behavior influences the human's tutoring  
15  
16 style (Pitsch et al., 2012). These behaviours may improve the learning ability of  
17  
18 interactive systems because the information presented is more likely to be at a more  
19  
20 appropriate level of complexity. Humans are especially sensitive to the robot's behavior  
21  
22 during the first moments of interaction, which creates their expectations of the robot's  
23  
24 abilities. Additional results on the influence of human expectations on language use  
25  
26 towards robots will be discussed in Section .  
27  
28

### 29 **Integrated Language Learning Systems**

30  
31  
32 One of the significant outcomes of this construction-oriented research program was  
33  
34 the production of several working systems that were a result of collaboration between  
35  
36 partners. For example, the tutor spotter system and the ROSSUM learning architecture  
37  
38 were integrated on an iCub robot for an experiment on socially directed robot learning  
39  
40 (Lohan, Rohlfing, Saunders, Nehaniv, & Wrede, 2012). In this study, it was investigated  
41  
42 how different robot feedback might induce tutoring behaviour in a human that could help  
43  
44 support robot language acquisition. These type of integrated systems allowed partners to  
45  
46 conduct research on the interrelationship between motor, social, and language learning  
47  
48 through interaction with physical robots rather than modelling individual aspects in  
49  
50 simulation.  
51  
52

53 The major integration effort for the ITALK project was the production of a robot  
54  
55 learning demonstration that merged multiple systems designed over the course of the  
56  
57 project in order to enable grounded robot language and action learning up to the point of  
58  
59 multi-word utterances. This was achieved through the integration of the PMP motion  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

control framework, ERA learning architecture, acoustic packaging system, and compositional grammar learning. In the demonstration, the robot displays language and action capabilities during interaction with a human tutor at three stages of development that are analogous to a human infant's developmental trajectory and learns new competencies at each stage. At the first stage, the robot performs simple actions on objects and learns word-object associations from the human. During the second stage, the robot learns word-action and word-attribute associations from the tutor's verbal descriptions of actions it performs on objects. And during the third stage, the robot demonstrates simple grammar learning based on the speech it has been exposed to and learns to compose complex actions from simple ones. Video documentation of the system in action can be found at <http://youtu.be/514LHD21YJk>.

### **How Humans Talk to Robots (And Why)**

An important goal of the ITALK project is to explore computational models which bootstrap language learning through interaction, both sensorimotor interaction with the environment and social interaction with humans. It is essential to know how people use language with robots, because these interactions constitute the input robots bootstrap their language knowledge from. Caretakers have been found to produce adaptations that potentially facilitate language acquisition for child language learners. Will people interact with robots in similar ways as with young children, making these facilitative cues available to robot language learners?

Extrapolating from previous work in human-computer interaction suggests that people may involuntarily and automatically interact with robots like they interact with humans (Reeves & Nass, 1996) Instead, comparisons between child-directed and robot-directed speech in this project revealed interaction to be mainly based on participants' perceptions of the robot's affordances (Fischer, 2011a). Users' preconceptions

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 also influence their interactions with robots considerably, guiding them to a particular  
9 understanding of the situation (Fischer, 2011b). A robot's appearance influences the way  
10 people talk to it, but while humanoid appearance may suggest human-like capabilities,  
11 people do not necessarily talk to a robot as they do to a child (Fischer, Foth, Rohlfling, &  
12 Wrede, 2011b, 2011a). Instead, they behave based on what they understand the  
13 functionality of the robot to be, informed by a more global partner model (Fischer,  
14 2011c). Infant-like robot behaviour is a far stronger influence on human interaction  
15 behaviour than appearance alone. Therefore, feedback plays a considerable role in the  
16 input the robot receives for language learning.

17  
18 Designing appropriate behaviour thus constitutes an important challenge for future  
19 work on the acquisition of language by robots. The study of human interaction helps to  
20 identify what behaviours among the complex patterns that characterise embodied verbal  
21 interactions a robot should perform to encourage humans to conceive of it as a potential  
22 language learner. The human-human and human-robot interaction experiments conducted  
23 during the ITALK project examined human behaviours that facilitate face-to-face  
24 communication and language learning, investigated under what conditions humans will  
25 engage in such facilitative behaviours with a robot, and suggested further directions for the  
26 design of robot behaviour to facilitate language learning through interaction with humans.

## 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 **Conclusion**

47  
48  
49 This article provides an overview of the products of a research program focussed on  
50 investigating the mutual scaffolding of individual, social, and language learning in the  
51 development of human children by employing a constructive approach to modelling and  
52 studying linguistic development using a humanoid robot platform. This  
53 embodiment-oriented and ecologically situated methodology is quite different from  
54 focusing on specific aspects of development in isolation, where they are artificially treated

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 as disconnected phenomena. We use language to enact our relationships with the world  
9  
10 around us, both in humans and in robots. Results from human experiments conducted  
11  
12 during this project informed further experimentation using computational models. The  
13  
14 extensive use of human-robot interaction experiments to study language acquisition has  
15  
16 led to new discoveries about the role of robot behavior in eliciting human behavior that  
17  
18 can scaffold learning. The results of the ITALK project provide a basis for further work  
19  
20 on more advanced language development expanding on this paradigm, including work that  
21  
22 uses robots to test theories from child development and uses computational models to  
23  
24 make predictions about human language learning.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

- Asada, M., Hosoda, K., Kuniyoshi, Y., Ishiguro, H., Inui, T., Yoshikawa, Y., . . . Yoshida, C. (2009). Cognitive developmental robotics: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development*, 1(1), 12-34.
- Boysson-Bardies, B., & DeBevoise, M. (2001). *How language comes to children: From birth to two years*. MIT Press.
- Broz, F., Lehmann, H., Nehaniv, C. L., & Dautenhahn, K. (2012a). Automated analysis of mutual gaze in human conversational pairs. In Y. Nakano, C. Conati, & T. Bader (Eds.), *Eye gaze in intelligent human computer interaction*. Springer.
- Broz, F., Lehmann, H., Nehaniv, C. L., & Dautenhahn, K. (2012b). Mutual gaze, personality, and familiarity: Dual eye-tracking during conversation. In *Proceedings of IEEE international symposium on robot and human interactive communication (Ro-Man)*.
- Dawson, G., Toth, K., Abbott, R., Osterling, J., Munson, J., Estes, A., & Liaw, J. (2004). Early social attention impairments in autism: Social orienting, joint attention, and attention to distress. *Developmental Psychology*, 40(2), 271-283.
- Demiris, Y., & Meltzoff, A. (2008). The robot in the crib: a developmental analysis of imitation skills in infants and robots. *Infant and Child Development*, 17(1), 43-53.
- Falck-Ytter, T., Gredebaeck, G., & von Hofsten, C. (2006, Jul). Infants predict other people's action goals. *Nat Neurosci*, 9(7), 878-879.
- Fernald, A., & Kuhl, P. (1987). Acoustic determinants of infant preference for motherese speech. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 10(3), 279 - 293.
- Fischer, K. (2011a). How people talk with robots - dialog as uncertainty reduction. *AI Magazine*, 32(4), 31-38.
- Fischer, K. (2011b). Interpersonal variation in understanding robots as social actors. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM/IEEE international conference on human-robot*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*interaction (HRI)* (pp. 53–60).

Fischer, K. (2011c). *Recipient design, alignment, interaction: The role of the addressee in so-called 'simplified registers'* (Habilitation Thesis). University of Bremen.

Fischer, K., Foth, K., Rohlfing, K., & Wrede, B. (2011a). Is speaking to a simulated robot like speaking to a child? In *Proceedings of 1st joint IEEE international conference on development and learning and on epigenetic robotics ICDL-EPIROB*.

Fischer, K., Foth, K., Rohlfing, K., & Wrede, B. (2011b). Mindful tutors - linguistic choice and action demonstration in speech to infants and to a simulated robot. *Interaction Studies*, 12(1), 134–161.

Förster, F. (2013). *Robots that say 'no': Acquisition of linguistic behaviour in interaction games with humans* (Tech. Rep.). Hatfield, UK: University of Hertfordshire.

Hill, E. L. (2001). Non-specific nature of specific language impairment: a review of the literature with regard to concomitant motor impairments. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 36(2), 149–171.

Hirsh-Pasek, K., & Golinkoff, R. (1999). *The origins of grammar: Evidence from early language comprehension*. MIT Press.

Lehmann, J. S. H., Förster, F., & Nehaniv, C. L. (2012). Robot acquisition of lexical meaning - moving towards the two-word stage. In *Proceedings of 2nd joint IEEE conference on development and learning and epigenetic robotics (ICDL-EpiRob)*.

Lohan, K. S., Rohlfing, K. J., Pitsch, K., Saunders, J., Lehmann, H., Nehaniv, C. L., ... Wrede, B. (2012). Tutor spotter: Proposing a feature set and evaluating it in a robotic system. *International Journal of Social Robotics, Special Issue on Expectations, Intentions, and Actions*, 4(2), 131–146.

Lohan, K. S., Rohlfing, K. J., Saunders, J., Nehaniv, C. L., & Wrede, B. (2012). Contingency scaffolds language learning. In *Proceedings of 2nd joint IEEE international conference on development and learning and on epigenetic robotics*

(*ICDL-EpiRob*) (p. 1-6).

- Lyon, C., Nehaniv, C. L., & Saunders, J. (2012, 06). Interactive language learning by robots: The transition from babbling to word forms. *PLoS ONE*, 7(6), e38236.
- Mohan, V., Morasso, P., Metta, G., & Sandini, G. (2009). A biomimetic, force-field based computational model for motion planning and bimanual coordination in humanoid robots. *Autonomous Robots*, 27(3), 291-301.
- Mohan, V., Morasso, P., Zenzeri, J., & Metta, G. (2010). Teaching humanoids to imitate 'shapes' of movements. In K. Diamantaras, W. Duch, & L. S. Iliadis (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on artificial neural networks: Part II (ICANN)* (p. 234-244). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Mohan, V., Morasso, P., Zenzeri, J., Metta, G., Chakravarthy, V., & Sandini, G. (2011). Teaching a humanoid robot to draw 'shapes'. *Autonomous Robots*, 31(1), 21-53.
- Morse, A. F., Belpaeme, T., Cangelosi, A., & Smith, L. B. (2010). Thinking with your body: Modelling spatial biases in categorization using a real humanoid robot. In *Proceedings of the 2010 annual meeting of the cognitive science society* (pp. 1362-1368).
- Morse, A. F., DeGreeff, J., Belpaeme, T., & Cangelosi, A. (2010). Epigenetic robotics architecture (ERA). *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development*, 2(4), 325-339.
- Morse, P., A. and Baxter, Belpaeme, T., Smith, L. B., & Cangelosi, A. (2011). The power of words (and space). In *Proceedings of the 1st joint international conference on developmental learning and on epigenetic robotics (ICDL-EpiRob)*.
- Pea, R. (1980). The Development Of Negation In Early Child Language. In D. Olson (Ed.), *The Social Foundations of Language & Thought: Essays in Honor of Jerome S. Bruner* (p. 156-186). W.W. Norton.
- Pitsch, K., A.L.Vollmer, Fritsch, J., Wrede, B., Rohlfing, K., & Sagerer, G. (2009). On

the loop of action modification and the recipient's gaze in adult-child interaction. In *Proceedings of Gesture and Speech in Interaction (GESPIN)*.

Pitsch, K., Lohan, K. S., Rohlfing, K., Saunders, J., Nehaniv, C. L., & Wrede, B. (2012).

Better be reactive at the beginning. implications of the first seconds of an encounter for the tutoring style in human-robot-interaction. In *Proceedings of IEEE international symposium on robot and human interactive communication (Ro-Man)*.

Reeves, B., & Nass, C. (1996). *The media equation: how people treat computers, television, and new media like real people and places*. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Sato, Y., Ze, J., & van Dijk, S. (2013). Recurrence-based learning of word-like units: learning by 'echoing' in human-robot interaction. In L. Gogate (Ed.), *Theoretical and computational models of word learning: Implications for psychology and artificial intelligence* (pp. 327–349). IGI Global.

Saunders, J., Nehaniv, C. L., & Lyon, C. (2011). The acquisition of word semantics by a humanoid robot via interaction with a human tutor. In K. Dautenhahn & J. Saunders (Eds.), *New frontiers in human-robot interaction* (pp. 211–234). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Schillingmann, L., Wrede, B., & Rohlfing, K. J. (2009). A computational model of acoustic packaging. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development*, 1(4), 226 -237.

Sciutti, A., Bisio, A., Nori, F., Metta, G., Fadiga, L., , & Sandini, G. (2013). Robots can be perceived as goal-oriented agents. *Interaction Studies, Special Issue on Gaze in Human-Robot Communication*, 14(3), 329-350.

Sciutti, A., Bisio, A., Nori, F., Metta, G., Fadiga, L., Pozzo, T., & Sandini, G. (2012). Measuring human-robot interaction through motor resonance. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 4(3), 223-234.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Tsakarakis, N., Metta, G., Sandini, G., Vernon, D., Beira, R., Becchi, F., . . . Caldwell, D.  
9  
10 (2007). iCub - The Design and Realization of an Open Humanoid Platform for  
11  
12 Cognitive and Neuroscience Research. *Journal of Advanced Robotics, Special Issue*  
13  
14 *on Robotic platforms for Research in Neuroscience*, 21(10), 1151–1175.
- 15  
16 Tuci, E., Ferrauto, T., Zeschel, A., Massera, G., & Nolfi, S. (2011). An experiment on  
17  
18 behaviour generalisation and the emergence of linguistic compositionality in evolving  
19  
20 robots. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development*, 3(2), 176–189.
- 21  
22 Uzgiris, I. (1999). Imitation as activity: its developmental aspects. In J. Nadel &  
23  
24 G. Butterworth (Eds.), *Imitation in infancy* (p. 186-206). Cambridge University  
25  
26 Press.
- 27  
28 Vernon, D., von Hofsten, C., & Fadiga, L. (2011). *A roadmap for cognitive development in*  
29  
30 *humanoid robots* (1st ed., Vol. 11). Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- 31  
32  
33 Vihman, M., DePaolis, R., & Keren-Portnoy, T. (2009). A dynamic systems approach to  
34  
35 babbling and words. In E. Bavin (Ed.), *Handbook of child language* (pp. 163–182).  
36  
37 Cambridge University Press.
- 38  
39 Vollmer, A. L., Lohan, K. S., Fischer, K., Nagai, Y., Pitsch, K., Rohlfing, K. J., & Wrede,  
40  
41 B. (2009). People modify their tutoring behavior in robot-directed interaction for  
42  
43 action learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 8th international conference on*  
44  
45 *development and learning (ICDL)* (p. 1-6).
- 46  
47 Vollmer, A. L., Lohan, K. S., Fritsch, J., Wrede, B., & Rohlfing, K. J. (2010). Developing  
48  
49 feedback: How children of different age contribute to a tutoring interaction with  
50  
51 adults. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 9th International Conference on Development*  
52  
53 *and Learning (IEEE)* (pp. 76–81).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Author Note**

The work described in this paper was conducted within the EU Integrated Project ITalk funded by the European Commission under contract number FP7-214668.

**Figure Captions**

*Figure 1.* An experiment participant interacts with the iCub robot.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



Running head: THE ITALK PROJECT

The ITALK Project: A developmental robotics approach to the study of individual, social,  
and linguistic learning

Frank Broz, Chrystopher L. Nehaniv, Tony Belpaeme, Ambra Bisio, Kerstin Dautenhahn,  
Luciano Fadiga, Tomassino Ferrauto, Kerstin Fischer, Frank Förster, Onofrio Gigliotta,  
Sascha Griffiths, Hagen Lehmann, Katrin S. Lohan, Caroline Lyon, Davide Marocco,  
Gianluca Massera, Giorgio Metta, Vishwanathan Mohan, Anthony Morse, Stefano Nolfi,  
Francesco Nori, Martin Peniak, Karola Pitsch, Katharina J. Rohlfing, Gerhard Sagerer,  
Yo Sato, Joe Saunders, Lars Schillingmann, Alessandra Sciutti, Vadim Tikhanoff, Britta  
Wrede, Arne Zeschel and Angelo Cangelosi

ITALK Project

### **Abstract**

This article presents results from a multidisciplinary research project on the integration and transfer of language knowledge into robots as an empirical paradigm for the study of language development in both humans and humanoid robots. Within the framework of human linguistic and cognitive development, we focus on how three central types of learning interact and co-develop: individual learning about one's own embodiment and the environment, social learning (learning from others), and learning of linguistic capability. Our primary concern is how these capabilities can scaffold each other's development in a continuous feedback cycle as their interactions yield increasingly sophisticated competencies in the agent's capacity to interact with others and manipulate its world. Experimental results are summarized in relation to milestones in human linguistic and cognitive development and show that the mutual scaffolding of social learning, individual learning, and linguistic capabilities creates the context, conditions and requisites for learning in each domain. Challenges and insights identified as a result of this research program are discussed with regard to possible and actual contributions to cognitive science and language ontogeny. In conclusion, directions for future work are suggested that continue to develop this approach toward an integrated framework for understanding these mutually scaffolding processes as a basis for language development in humans and robots.

## **The ITALK Project: A developmental robotics approach to the study of individual, social, and linguistic learning**

### **Introduction**

This article presents and discusses research on learning and language development conducted as part of the ITALK (Integration and Transfer of Action and Language Knowledge in Robots) project, an interdisciplinary research project focussed on the acquisition of complex behavioral, cognitive and linguistic skills by artificial embodied agents through individual and social learning. The primary goal of the project is to produce new theoretical insights, explanations, and models of the integration of action, social, and linguistic skills that bootstrap cognitive development. Research methodologies are employed from human-robot interaction, computational modelling, artificial intelligence, neuroscience, psychology, and developmental linguistics in a constructive manner where situated interaction is always treated as the catalyst for cognitive and linguistic development.

The work conducted investigates the application of minimal autonomous constructivist approaches to learning in realistic scenarios. Cross-disciplinary research methodologies identify and investigate conditions in which mutual scaffolding can improve the development of linguistic and cognitive capabilities. Given the importance of embodied interaction in development, models are tested through interaction between humans and physical robots whenever possible (experiments performed in simulation will be identified as such). The robot used as the primary testbed for the project's experiments was the iCub, a high degree-of-freedom toddler-sized humanoid robot designed as a platform for research in cognitive systems and developmental robotics (Cicchi, ?) (see Figure 1).

There have been a number of related projects involving the use of robots to study

language and/or development. For example, the JST ERATO Asada Project has a similar orientation in that it focuses on developmental robotics and treats learning as arising from embodied interaction. In an overview article on developmental robotics, Asada posits language learning as arising out of two-way patterns of imitation between infant and caregiver, though language is not the primary focus of that project (?). Yiannis and Meltzoff have proposed a developmental robotics model of social imitation learning that doesn't directly address the emergence of language (?). ITALK differentiates itself from the previously mentioned projects by focussing on language learning based on the mutual scaffolding of learning with other cognitive domains, specifically action and social interaction.

### **Mutual Scaffolding in Development**

A primary source of inspiration and guidance for this research program is the study of infant development. Following this focus, the article will be organized based on the developmental progress of a human infant, with research results relevant to particular capabilities presented and discussed in the order in which they typically occur. The ITALK project addresses development up to roughly two years in age, when the ability to communicate in short sentences emerges (?). During this time period, an infant makes similarly important gains in its motor abilities and capability to function as a social agent (?). Throughout this timeline, the interrelationship between individual action learning, social learning, and linguistic development is emphasized, with studies investigating the emergence of these capabilities in conjunction with one another rather than in isolation.

While it is unclear whether mutual scaffolding is a necessary prerequisite for linguistic development, there is evidence from child development that it plays a major role in typical development and that impairment of one or more of the component cognitive abilities may be associated with developmental delays in another. Language and motor

impairments often co-occur in children, suggesting that links exist between the development of these capabilities (?, ?). Children with autism (a disorder that results in a lack of social attention) often experience language impairment as well, and the level of impairment can be predicted from the child's ability to perform joint attention and other social behaviors (?, ?). While children with impairments in these areas often do acquire full language use, the prevalence of co-occurring delays or impairments highlights the coupled nature of these capabilities and provides a motivation for modeling language acquisition as a process that is embedded in a physical embodiment and social context.

The purpose of this article is to highlight the accomplishments of this project and present them in relation to one another. Therefore, rather than exploring individual results in depth, an overview will be provided with references to relevant papers . While the results arising from this research effort are numerous, there are a few major results that serve to exemplify the approach of the project. Given the constructive nature of this work, one of the major outcomes was the production of integrated systems that combined the work of multiple research endeavors. Most notably, the final project demonstration involved the integration of multiple systems to enable action and language learning on by iCub. Details of the demonstration system are presented after the separate systems and research results that contribute to it have been introduced. The final section addresses the important role that studies involving human-robot interaction play in this work and identifies insights gained as well as areas for further research.

### *One to Six Months*

In the first six months of life, infants listen to language and imitate actions. Through their close relationships with adult humans, they begin to recognise the structure of intentional behavior.

Infants become capable of recognizing syllables in utterances between the age of one

to five months and able to pick out words from continuous speech between five to seven months (?). Computational modelling was used to explore possible mechanisms which may govern this process, investigating the feasibility of speech segmentation based on only the audio modality (?). Another alternative model of infant speech segmentation makes more holistic use of information, relying on both acoustic and visual cues. Hirsh-Pasek and Golinkoff's concept of "acoustic packaging" proposes that language serves to give structure to the stream of actions that an infant perceives (?). The acoustic packaging system, a computational implementation of this concept, was used to analyse adult-child and adult-adult interaction data and identified differences between these groups that indicate a more structured presentation of action in adult-child interaction (?). This result demonstrates how adults modify their action and language in order to facilitate learning by infants, a topic which will be returned to in later sections.

From around six months of age, infants begin to imitate goal-directed acts on objects more often than gestures (?). The ability to act towards goals is an important step in the expansion of an infant's motor repertoire and overall development. The Passive Motion Paradigm (PMP) framework was developed to investigate how goal-oriented action can be produced for robots without explicit prior representation (?). Actions emerge due to implicit interactions between the acquired internal body schema of a robot and its intended goal, through a learning process that combines imitation learning from demonstration by a human teacher, practice and motor imagery (?).

### *Seven to Twelve Months*

Within the first year of life, infants begin producing their first words. They also acquire word meanings through social interaction and physical interactions with their environment.

Infants begin to babble around the age of seven months, imitating and practicing

sound production that leads to the ability to pronounce words (?). In a series of human-robot interaction experiments, a computational model of the transition from babbling to word form acquisition was evaluated through proto-conversations between the iCub and a human (?). In this system, chance occurrences of words in random syllabic babble spoken by the robot are reinforced by positive feedback from the interaction partner, biasing the robot towards repetition.

From the age of seven to ten months, infants start recognizing words in context, learning word meanings by between ten and twelve months and speaking their first words around twelve months(?). The ROSSUM architecture empirically models the learning of word meanings through social interaction. Heuristics based on the characteristics of motherese allow a robot to make associations between words and features of its environment or its own embodiment through interaction with a human teacher (?). Motherese is a term for a style of speaking typically employed by caregivers when talking with a child (?). Participants' use of mothers became more pronounced in successive interaction sessions with the robot as they became more aware of its limited abilities. This result provides another example of how adults socially scaffold language learning by modifying their behavior based on the perceived needs of their listener. The ROSSUM architecture has also been used to model the acquisition of linguistic negation (?). Infants learn the pragmatics of words from their caretakers, and rejective "no"s are typically the among the group of first words uttered by toddlers (?). ERA (Epigenetic Robot Architecture) is another approach to modeling the learning of word meanings, a neural cognitive architecture that focuses on the influence of embodiment and spatial information on learning (?). In a series of experiments on the iCub, results from children's word learning experiments were replicated, demonstrating the impact of spatial information, embodiment and proprioceptive information (?).

Gaze plays an important role in organizing episodes of learning. Infants prefer to

look at faces that engage them in mutual gaze, and by the age of ten to twelve months, they become adept at gaze following (?). Studying mutual gaze during conversation can identify factors that influence this behaviour and aid in the design of socially appropriate robot gaze controllers (?). Gaze makes information about a caregiver's attention available to an infant, and the caregiver monitors the infant's attention in turn. Analyses of human-human interactions reveal that parents monitor their child's attention more closely in younger than in older infants (?). In tutoring situations with pre-lexical infants, feedback consists primarily of gazing behavior (?). Changes in the type of feedback given by children at more advanced stages of development will be discussed in subsequent sections.

### *Twelve to Twenty Months*

In the second year of life, children learn about the compositionality of language, beginning to recognize grammatical constructs and produce their own multi-word utterances. They simultaneously become more skilled at composing actions into goal-directed behaviors. As their motor and linguistic skills improve, so does their level of agency during interaction.

Between the ages of twelve and sixteen months, infants begin to understand simple sentences (?). Motor capabilities also increase, and by the age of about thirteen months, infants are able to smoothly compose general compound actions such as a reaching and grasping (?). A series of simulation experiments investigated the development of language comprehension including compositional semantics grounded in an agent's physical capabilities and environment. Neural controllers were trained for a task that involved the simultaneous learning of a set of physical skills and the ability to respond to imperative utterances to perform those skills (?). The acquired controllers generalize in both language comprehension and behaviour generation, able to respond to

new, never-experienced utterances with never-produced behaviours without further training. The previously mentioned PMP framework also addresses action compositionality through its learning architecture that reuses existing motion knowledge while learning novel motor skills (? , ?).

Sometime between sixteen to twenty months, children begin expressing two-word utterances and are able to distinguish word categories (? , ?). The ROSSUM architecture was extended to model the two-word stage through the learning of meaningful adjective-noun combinations (? , ?). Words were grouped using heuristics based on typical English word order. The perceptual associations learned for these categories were related to the words' grammatical functions.

Children of this age in tutoring situations use more modalities to give feedback and begin to anticipate next actions with their gaze direction(? , ?). Infants begin to exhibit gaze that anticipates the goal of another's action once they have learned to perform that action themselves(? , ?). Experiments found that observing actions of a humanoid robot also evokes gaze proactivity, suggesting there is a mapping between the observed action and the observer's motor repertoire based in the mirror neuron system (? , ?). Experiments on motor resonance have found that biologically plausible motion by humanoid robots can produce the same type of motor resonance effects as human motion (? , ?). These results suggest that people do process robot action similarly to human action when it is human-like, so robots should be able to elicit similar responses during interaction.

#### *Twenty to Twenty-four Months*

By twenty-four months of age, children are able to construct two and three word sentences (? , ?). They have integrated the skills of acting on objects in their environment and talking to interaction partners about those actions. In children two and up, the type of feedback they give to caretakers changes to reflect their greater action and language

comprehension of action. They take an increasingly active role in learning, structuring their feedback by timing their verbal and bodily action in relation to the adult's presentation (?). Parents, in turn, use more speech (instead of or in addition to motion) to attract older children's attention (?). From these analyses of tutoring in parent-child dyads, a tutor spotter, a continuous measurement scale based on interaction features, was created. It was used to analyze human tutoring behavior towards a simulated robot and the iCub robot. Simple saliency-based robot gaze behavior was not found to produce a contingent interaction and did not induce tutoring behavior in the human (?).

In response, contingent robot gazing and reaching behavior was implemented. Conversation analysis applied to interactions between a human and a robot exhibiting these behaviors demonstrate how the robot's behavior influences the human's tutoring style (?). These behaviours may improve the learning ability of interactive systems because the information presented is more likely to be at a more appropriate level of complexity. Humans are especially sensitive to the robot's behavior during the first moments of interaction, which creates their expectations of the robot's abilities. Additional results on the influence of human expectations on language use towards robots will be discussed in Section .

### **Integrated Language Learning Systems**

One of the significant outcomes of this construction-oriented research program was the production of several working systems that were a result of collaboration between partners. For example, the tutor spotter system and the ROSSUM learning architecture were integrated on an iCub robot for an experiment on socially directed robot learning (?). In this study, it was investigated how different robot feedback might induce tutoring behaviour in a human that could help support robot language acquisition. These type of integrated systems allowed partners to conduct research on the interrelationship between

motor, social, and language learning through interaction with physical robots rather than modelling individual aspects in simulation.

The major integration effort for the ITALK project was the production of a robot learning demonstration that merged multiple systems designed over the course of the project in order to enable grounded robot language and action learning up to the point of multi-word utterances. This was achieved through the integration of the PMP motion control framework, ERA learning architecture, acoustic packaging system, and compositional grammar learning. In the demonstration, the robot displays language and action capabilities during interaction with a human tutor at three stages of development that are analogous to a human infant's developmental trajectory and learns new competencies at each stage. At the first stage, the robot performs simple actions on objects and learns word-object associations from the human. During the second stage, the robot learns word-action and word-attribute associations from the tutor's verbal descriptions of actions it performs on objects. And during the third stage, the robot demonstrates simple grammar learning based on the speech it has been exposed to and learns to compose complex actions from simple ones. Video documentation of the system in action can be found at <http://youtu.be/514LHD21YJk>.

### **How Humans Talk to Robots (And Why)**

An important goal of the ITALK project is to explore computational models which bootstrap language learning through interaction, both sensorimotor interaction with the environment and social interaction with humans. It is essential to know how people use language with robots, because these interactions constitute the input robots bootstrap their language knowledge from. Caretakers have been found to produce adaptations that potentially facilitate language acquisition for child language learners. Will people interact with robots in similar ways as with young children, making these facilitative cues available

to robot language learners?

Extrapolating from previous work in human-computer interaction suggests that people may involuntarily and automatically interact with robots like they interact with humans (? , ?) Instead, comparisons between child-directed and robot-directed speech in this project revealed interaction to be mainly based on participants' perceptions of the robot's affordances (? , ?). Users' preconceptions also influence their interactions with robots considerably, guiding them to a particular understanding of the situation (? , ?). A robot's appearance influences the way people talk to it, but while humanoid appearance may suggest human-like capabilities, people do not necessarily talk to a robot as they do to a child (? , ? , ?). Instead, they behave based on what they understand the functionality of the robot to be, informed by a more global partner model (? , ?). Infant-like robot behaviour is a far stronger influence on human interaction behaviour than appearance alone. Therefore, feedback plays a considerable role in the input the robot receives for language learning.

Designing appropriate behaviour thus constitutes an important challenge for future work on the acquisition of language by robots. The study of human interaction helps to identify what behaviours among the complex patterns that characterise embodied verbal interactions a robot should perform to encourage humans to conceive of it as a potential language learner. The human-human and human-robot interaction experiments conducted during the ITALK project examined human behaviours that facilitate face-to-face communication and language learning, investigated under what conditions humans will engage in such facilitative behaviours with a robot, and suggested further directions for the design of robot behaviour to facilitate language learning through interaction with humans.

## Conclusion

This article provides an overview of the products of a research program focussed on investigating the mutual scaffolding of individual, social, and language learning in the development of human children by employing a constructive approach to modelling and studying linguistic development using a humanoid robot platform. This embodiment-oriented and ecologically situated methodology is quite different from focusing on specific aspects of development in isolation, where they are artificially treated as disconnected phenomena. We use language to enact our relationships with the world around us, both in humans and in robots. Results from human experiments conducted during this project informed further experimentation using computational models. The extensive use of human-robot interaction experiments to study language acquisition has led to new discoveries about the role of robot behavior in eliciting human behavior that can scaffold learning. The results of the ITALK project provide a basis for further work on more advanced language development expanding on this paradigm, including work that uses robots to test theories from child development and uses computational models to make predictions about human language learning.

**Author Note**

The work described in this paper was conducted within the EU Integrated Project ITalk funded by the European Commission under contract number FP7-214668.

**Figure Captions**

*Figure 1.* An experiment participant interacts with the iCub robot.

prohibition-eps-converted-to.pdf

# The Cognitive Science Society, Inc.

## Publication Agreement

The undersigned authors agree that the manuscript entitled The ITALK Project:  
A developmental robotics approach to the study of  
individual, social and linguistic learning  
 having been accepted for publication in the journal *Cognitive Science*, or *topiCS*, is now the property of the Cognitive Science Society, Inc. Specifically, the author(s) transfer(s) to the Society the exclusive rights comprised in the copyright of said manuscript, except that the author(s) retain(s) the following:

- 1) All proprietary rights, other than copyright.
- 2) The right to make oral presentations of the material.
- 3) The right to use, after publication, all or part of the material in any book authored or edited by the author(s).
- 4) Authors are entitled to distribute copies of the article for personal use, either on paper or electronically, through their own personal mailing or website, or through the website of an agency by which they are employed, but permission of the Cognitive Science Society is required to reproduce published papers in other sources, including electronic archives.

It is understood, in relation to Item 4, that the author(s) is/are required to obtain permission in writing from the Cognitive Science Society for all or a substantial part of the article to be reproduced for distribution by a commercial publisher or an agency in which the author(s) is/are not employed.

In the case of works prepared by employees or contractors of the U.S. Government, the U.S. Government will retain a non-exclusive, royalty-free license to use any or all of the material for any government purpose.

The author(s) warrant(s) that the manuscript is the original work of the author(s), contains no libelous or unlawful statements, and does not infringe any legal rights of any other party. In the case of an employee work for hire, both the author and a representative authorized to bind the owner of the work have signed below.

Cognitive Science and *topiCS* prefer all co-authors of jointly authored papers to sign the copyright transfer. In the event where only the principle co-author signs, Cognitive Science and *topiCS* will assume that the signing co-author does so with the authorization of the remaining co-author(s).

Intending to be legally bound, and understanding that the Society will grant specific license for republication of this manuscript without charge when agreed to by the authors and upon written request of the prospective licensee, the author(s) has/have subscribed below.

Frank Broz 25/2/2014      Frank Broz      Plymouth University  
 Author's Signature & Date      Printed Name      Institution or Organization

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Author's Signature & Date      Printed Name      Institution or Organization

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Author's Signature & Date      Printed Name      Institution or Organization

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Author's Signature & Date      Printed Name      Institution or Organization

figure 1 alternate format  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

