

SGL: Symbolic Goal Learning in a Hybrid, Modular Framework for Human Instruction Following

Ruinian Xu, Hongyi Chen, Yunzhi Lin, and Patricio A. Vela

Abstract—This paper investigates robot manipulation based on human instruction with ambiguous requests. The intent is to compensate for imperfect natural language via visual observations. Early symbolic methods, based on manually defined symbols, built modular framework consist of semantic parsing and task planning for producing sequences of actions from natural language requests. Modern connectionist methods employ deep neural networks to automatically learn visual and linguistic features and map to a sequence of low-level actions, in an end-to-end fashion. These two approaches are blended to create a hybrid, modular framework: it formulates instruction following as symbolic goal learning via deep neural networks followed by task planning via symbolic planners. Connectionist and symbolic modules are bridged with Planning Domain Definition Language. The vision-and-language learning network predicts its goal representation, which is sent to a planner for producing a task-completing action sequence. For improving the flexibility of natural language, we further incorporate implicit human intents with explicit human instructions. To learn generic features for vision and language, we propose to separately pretrain vision and language encoders on scene graph parsing and semantic textual similarity tasks. Benchmarking evaluates the impacts of different components of, or options for, the vision-and-language learning model and shows the effectiveness of pretraining strategies. Manipulation experiments conducted in the simulator AI2THOR show the robustness of the framework to novel scenarios.

Index Terms—Deep Learning in Grasping and Manipulation; AI-Enabled Robotics; Representation Learning

I. INTRODUCTION

IDEALLY robot agents sharing the same working space with humans and assisting them would be capable of interpreting human instructions and performing their corresponding tasks. Human instruction following is a long-standing topic of interest whose main challenge comes from the diversity of communication and interpretation, which permits incomplete or ambiguous natural language. This paper proposes to disambiguate natural language via visual information with a hybrid, modular framework.

Early symbolic works employ semantic parsing and task planning to first map natural language into certain representations and then generate a sequence of actions. Attempts to address the ambiguity of natural language include incorporating knowledge bases [1], [2], dialogue systems [3], and vision [4]. Semantic parsing, which relies on syntactic structure of natural language, can't well capture its semantic meaning and has the issue with abstract or vague language input such as human intents.

Ruinian Xu, Hongyi Chen, Yunzhi Lin and Patricio A. Vela are with Institute for Robotics and Intelligent Machines, Georgia Institute of Technology, GA, USA. {rxu72, hchen657, yunzhi.lin, pvela}@gatech.edu

* This work was supported in part by NSF Award #2026611.




Fig. 1. Illustration of a hybrid and modular framework for human instruction following. The framework consists of four main components which are perception, goal learning, task planning and execution. Better view in color.

The rise of connectionist approaches provided a means to avoid processing natural language and vision based engineered symbolic representations, by automatically learning visual and linguistic features via deep neural networks. For example, sequence-to-sequence models learn to map raw vision and language input into a sequence of low-level actions [5], [6]. These end-to-end designs suffer from performance drops in testing stage. To avoid all-in-one network designs, researchers have sought to factorize the network into sub-modules or separately consider different types of tasks [7]–[10].

To leverage strengths of symbolic and connectionist approaches to compensate limitation of each other, we propose a hybrid, modular framework as depicted in Figure 1. It consists of perception, goal learning via a deep network, task planning via a task planner and execution. Inspired by previous methods for manipulation task completion via object affordance recognition [11], [12], we formulate goal learning as predicting symbolic goal representation for Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL), which bridges connectionist goal learning and symbolic task planning in the proposed hybrid system. In addition to incomplete human instructions, we further consider implicit human intent, which has not been explored in existing methods. The learning phase of proposed visuo-linguistic network should benefit from pretraining [13]–[15] if task-relevant tasks can be identified. Considering robotic manipulation requires interpreting the interaction between objects, we propose to pretrain the visual encoder on scene graph parsing. Though valid natural language requests can be structured quite differently, such as explicit human instruction versus implicit human intent, they should have similar semantic meaning. Thus, the linguistic encoder is pretrained on a semantic textual similarity task. This paper's main contributions are:

(1) A hybrid, modular framework for human instruction following. The hybrid approach leverages the semantic feature learning properties of deep neural networks and the symbolic

computation of task planners. The modular structure enables easy component-level analysis and upgrades.

(2) Benchmarking evaluates the impacts of different components for vision-and-language learning. The proposed strategy of separately pretraining visual and linguistic encoders, on scene graph parsing and semantic textual similarity tasks, outperforms standard pretraining strategies.

(3) Manipulation experiments conducted in the simulator AI2THOR [16], with five daily activities and unseen scenarios, demonstrate the robustness of the proposed framework to novel objects and environments.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Human Instruction Following

Human instruction following requires robotic agents understanding human instructions and performing corresponding tasks. Common robotic task can be categorized into navigation and manipulation. Navigation and manipulation are tasks with different natures in scene understanding. Navigation focuses on identifying landmarks to understand where it is and where to go. Manipulation requires interpreting interactions between objects and how to manipulate them. Considering that, we will only study instruction following for robotic manipulation in this work. These review papers [17], [18] well describe existing studies about Vision-and-Language Navigation. This section will first review existing symbolic and connectionist methods for human instruction following. For connectionist method, a review is then provided for feature learning in vision-and-language joint learning deep neural networks. Common pretraining tasks are reviewed for learning generic visual and linguistic features.

1) *Symbolic Method*: Human instruction following requires translating human language into robot understandable language. Based on manually defined symbols, early works employ semantic parsing to transform natural language into logical representations which preserves the meaning. With well-structured input language, there are works parse natural language into formal semantic expressions such as a list of templates [19], which is unscalable with the growth of the complexity of the manipulation task. Instead of parsing natural language into formal representation, researchers have explored the direction of intermediate representations such as Spatial Description Clause (SDC) [20] and Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) [21], [22], which will also be the direction of symbolic representation in this work. However, instructions provided by non-expert human users can be vague or incomplete. Realizing the ambiguity of natural language, some researchers attempt to incorporate external information such as knowledge base [1], [2], dialogue system [3], visual information of surrounding environments [4] or multi-source information [23]. Among these auxiliary information, robotic vision, served as the simple and straightforward but rich way to disambiguate natural language, will be studied in this work. Semantic parsing, which relies on syntax of language to perform symbolic computation, can't well capture the semantic meaning of language and has the difficulty of translating abstract sentences such as human intents. Meanwhile, symbolic approaches using rule-based

task planning achieve high accuracy for computing action sequences for manipulation when the symbols are correct.

2) *Connectionist Method*: With the significant evolution of connectionist methods in recent years, deep neural networks show impressive strengths of learning semantic and high-dimensional features, which improves robustness to various types of input data. Packing everything into one network, end-to-end learning models [5], [6] are first proposed to directly map natural language and vision to a sequence of low-level actions. The sequence-to-sequence model suffers from the well-known issue of teacher forcing, which leads to the poor performance under test scenarios. Observing the great performance drop from training to testing stages of end-to-end learning models, researchers start to break the end-to-end network design and modularize the framework into several networks. There are different designs of modular networks focus on different natures of robotic tasks, such as factorizing the model into perception and action policy streams [7], [8], modularizing the model into separate sub-modules for sub-tasks [9], [10], decomposing the problem into sub-goal planning, scene navigation, and object manipulation [24] and constructing the model into observation model, high-level controller and low-level controller [25]. Modular networks significantly outperform end-to-end ones but the overall performance in the testing stage requires further improvement. The potential reason could be deep networks can't well maintain past information during the process of predicting sequential low-level actions. Inspired by advantages and disadvantages of symbolic and connectionist approaches, we propose to address human instruction following via a hybrid system. Additionally, ambiguous natural language for complex manipulation tasks has not been explored in connectionist approaches, which will be another aim in this work.

B. Vision-and-Language Feature Learning

Learning symbolic goal representation via vision-and-language deep networks requires learning generic visual and linguistic features to assist generalization to unseen scenarios. In this section, we provide a brief review of existing methods in visual question answering for encoding visual and linguistic features and corresponding pretraining tasks.

Visual feature learning method used in V&L models can be categorized into Object Detector(OD)-based region, CNN-based grid and Vision Transformer(ViT) patch features. Due to the computational and time cost of pretraining vision transformer, this type of methods will not be explored and benchmarked. Most previous works [14], [15], [26], [27] employ OD-based region features which are extracted via pretrained Faster R-CNN [28] based object detectors. The main concerns of this type of methods are frozen parameters and time cost of object detectors during the training and inference stage, respectively. To address above two issues, there are works [29], [30] have explored the way of extracting grid visual features via CNN such as ResNet [31], which makes the vision-and-language model end-to-end trainable. One-stage design for visual feature learning also reduces inference time but sacrifices a small amount of performance.

For pretraining visual encoders to learn generic features, [32] found out that pretraining CNNs can be served as generic feature representation for many downstream tasks, such as object detection [33], semantic segmentation [34], and instance segmentation [35]. Though existing pretraining tasks help capture object information in imagery, they ignore potential interactions between objects important to robotic tasks.

For linguistic feature learning, early research [36]–[38] works on learning word-level feature embeddings. To learn high-level semantic embedding for sentences, based on Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN), LSTM, Bidirectional LSTM, GRU [39] and other similar designs are proposed. The main concern of RNN-based methods is forgetting past information for modeling long sequence data. With the rise of Transformers [40], a series of approaches are proposed such as GPT [41], BERT [42], RoBERTa [43] and etc. Among them, BERT model and its pretraining strategy of masked language modeling (MLM) is perhaps most widely used due to its simple network design and superior performance. Modeling natural language without clustering sentences with similar semantic meanings, linguistic encoders might have the difficulty of interpreting similarity between explicit human instruction and implicit human intent.

The above literature review of symbolic and connectionist approaches for human instruction following gives us the insight of a hybrid, modular system. To leverage strengths of both methods and compensate each other’s limitation, we propose to address human instruction following via connectionist goal learning and symbolic task planning. Employing Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL) as symbolic representation, we propose to bridge connectionist and symbolic approaches with symbolic goal representation of PDDL. The vision-and-language connectionist framework, which consists of the visual encoder, linguistic encoder, multi-modal fusion and classification, is propose to learn symbolic goal representation. The detected goal representation will be fed into symbolic task planners to generate a sequence of actions. To help learn generic features in vision-and-language framework, we propose to separately pretrain the visual and linguistic encoders on scene graph parsing and semantic textual similarity tasks. Scene graph parsing forces visual encoders to capture relationships between objects, while semantic textual similarity helps linguistic encoders learn similar semantic embeddings between human instructions and intents. The modular design of goal learning and instruction following frameworks enables simple replacement and upgrade for individual components and also analysis for failures.

III. PRELIMINARIES

A. Planning Domain Definition Language

For task planning, we employ the Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL), a widely used symbolic planning language. With a list of pre-defined **objects** and their corresponding **predicates** (such as dirty, graspable, etc.), a **domain** consists of primitive actions and corresponding effects. Here, affordances and attributes serve to define available **predicates** for subsequently specifying object-action-object relationships.

Planning requires establishing a **problem**, which is composed of the initial state and a desired goal state of the world. The initial state is formed with a list of objects with corresponding predicates. The goal state is structured in the form of action, subject and object. From the **domain** and **problem** specification, a PDDL planner produces a sequence of primitive actions leaving the world in the goal state when executed.

B. Problem Statement

Given a RGB image and a sentence of natural language, the objective of this framework is to generate a sequence of manipulation actions that achieve the task indicated by the sentence. Processing of RGB image generates an initial state estimate using an object detector. Completing the problem specification involves the proposed vision-and-language deep learning framework, whose function is to convert the paired image and natural language input into a symbolic goal representation compatible with PDDL. Once the problem specification is built, the symbolic PDDL planner solves it to generate the action sequence. The robot then performs the ordered actions in the environment.

IV. APPROACH

This section first describes the vision-and-language deep learning framework proposed for learning symbolic goal representation for PDDL. The framework is built in modular design. Different approaches will be introduced for each module. Two pretraining tasks are then proposed for learning generic visual and linguistic features. Lastly, a hybrid, modular framework for human instruction following is proposed to take vision and language as input and then output a sequence of actions to interact with environments.

A. Vision-and-Language Task Goal Learning

Given a RGB image I and natural language string L , the vision-and-language deep learning framework outputs a simple PDDL goal consisting of action a , subject s and object o . The proposed PDDL symbolic goal learning framework, depicted in Figure 2, adopts a modular design and consists of a visual encoder, a linguistic encoder, multi-modal fusion and classification modules. The visual and linguistic encoders are responsible for learning visual and linguistic features, respectively. Visual and linguistic features are embedded in different domains, which requires to be fused into joint features. Lastly, joint features are fed to the classification module for predicting the goal representation. The classification module is a 2-layer Multi-Layer Perception (MLP) with 256 hidden dimensions; it will not be covered.

Visual Encoder. The visual encoder produces a set of local features $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, from a RGB image $I \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$. There are two principal types of visual features, grid and region. To generate the grid feature, the 2D image will be fed into a backbone network, such as ResNet [31]. We treat each grid or pixel over the produced feature map $D \in \mathbb{D}^{H_1 \times W_1 \times C_1}$ as a local feature v_i , where H_1 and W_1 are the height and width and C_1 is the dimension of each feature. To better




Fig. 2. Vision and language symbolic goal learning network architecture. From RGB image and natural language inputs, it outputs a PDDL goal state (action, subject and object). Dark blue blocks represent components. Light blue, green and yellow blocks represent visual, linguistic and joint features.

localize the latent region, based on two-stage object detectors such as Faster R-CNN [28], region features $V \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C_1}$ are extracted from regions proposed by region proposal network, where N is the number of regions.

Linguistic Encoder. Given a natural language sentence L composed of K words, the linguistic encoder can either generate the corresponding embedding set $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_k\}$ which represents each word or a single embedding vector q which represents the semantic meaning of the entire sentence. The encoder commonly involves word embedding and feature encoding. For word embedding, each word in the sentence will be mapped to an embedding based on some pretrained embedding tables, such as GloVe [37]. For feature encoding, LSTM, capable of connecting past information to the current task, has become a ubiquitous network model for language modeling. However, due to issues arising from their sequential design and forgetting past information, attention-based transformers are proposed to memorize long sentences and better capture semantic meanings for language.

Multi-modal Fusion. Visual and linguistic features lie in different domains, and require additional operations to fuse into a joint representation. The simplest fusion operations are concatenation, element-wise addition, and multiplication. While linguistic features represent the entire sentence, the set of visual features only implicitly does so. Additional operations on the visual feature set are needed to obtain a single image-wide feature representation. Pooling operations such as max or average pooling, or simple addition achieve this outcome. However, a potential issue is that not all local features evenly contribute to the final prediction. Some visual features are related to irrelevant pixels or regions, which should be ignored or have less influence on the pooled output. Importantly, linguistic features extracted from human instructions can provide the guidance in identifying latent regions whose information should be preserved. Attention [40] in the form of self-attention and cross-attention modules are widely used to build correlations for features in the same domain and across different domains, respectively.

B. Pretraining on Scene Graph Parsing

The vision-and-language task learning framework considers multi-modal information to play different roles. Vision cap-

tures the information of objects and their interactions, which reflects potential robotic tasks in the scene. Language provides context. It helps to narrow down or determine the target task over the task space inferred from vision. We apply this insight and propose to pretrain the visual encoder on scene graph parsing to help learn generic features that encode attributes and relationships for objects. A scene graph G consists of:

- a set of bounding boxes $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}, b_i \in \mathbb{R}^4$;
- a set of corresponding attributes $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ where the tuple a_i include object category c_i , affordance f_i and general attribute t_i ; and
- a set of relationships $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_j\}$ between bounding boxes.

Employing the Stacked Motif Network [44], we factorize the probability of constructing the graph G given the RGB image I as

$$P(G|I) = P(B|I)P(A|B, I)P(R|A, B, I) \quad (1)$$

The bounding box generation model $P(B|I)$ is based on the Faster R-CNN object detection model [28]. It is pre-trained on the proposed dataset as described in Section V-A2 and keeps parameters frozen during the training stage for attribute and relation prediction. The attribute prediction model $P(A|B, I)$ involves encoding contextual representation for each bounding box and decoding corresponding attribute information. Predicted bounding boxes B will be ordered from left to right by the central x-coordinate in the image and fed into an biLSTM for learning contextual representation $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$. Another LSTM is employed to decode object category, affordance and attribute. The relation prediction model $P(R|A, B, I)$ follows a similar design and predicts relationships between each pair of bounding boxes. Implementation details and corresponding code are publicly provided in [45](Scene Graph Parsing).

C. Pretraining on Semantic Textual Similarity

We propose to admit explicit human instructions and implicit human intents, the latter which might require incorporating environmental information for full understanding. Explicit human instructions are divided into complete and incomplete instructions. The complete instruction describes ordered substeps with full actions and objects, while the incomplete

one has partial information. There are four main reasons for missing information: missing object, missing action, high-level verb and anaphoric reference. Though composed with different low-level words, explicit instruction and implicit intent have the same high-dimensional semantic meaning in the robotic task domain. Semantic textual similarity tackles determining how similar two texts’ semantic meanings are. We apply this insight and propose to pretrain the linguistic encoder on semantic textual similarity between explicit human instructions and implicit human intents.

The Siamese network is a network consists of twin networks which take different inputs but are coupled by a common objective function. Following the design of Sentence-BERT [46], we employ BERT followed by a pooling layer as the language modeling network to learn separate embeddings for each sentence in the pair. With two embeddings, we compute cosine similarity between them and use the mean squared error as the objective function:

$$\mathcal{L}_{sts}(s_{ex}, s_{im}; \epsilon) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{s_{ex} \cdot s_{im}}{\max(\|s_{ex}\|_2 \cdot \|s_{im}\|_2, \epsilon)} \right)^2 \quad (2)$$

where s_{ex} and s_{im} are embeddings for explicit instruction and implicit intent, n is the number of sentence pairs and ϵ is set to $1e - 8$. The implementation is open-source [45](Semantic Textual Similarity).

D. Instruction Following Framework

As shown in the Figure 3, the proposed hybrid, modular instruction following framework consists of four components: perception, goal learning, task planning and execution. The hybrid design leverages the strength of semantic feature learning from deep neural networks and the strength of symbolic manipulation from symbolic planners, which compensates limitation of both methods. Modular design benefits include: easy analysis of which part leads to failure; easy component replacement with better methods; and easy augmentation with other components, such as life-long learning; to make the entire framework more complete and powerful. The **Perception** module is responsible for interpreting visual information of surrounding environments. The **Goal Learning** module learns symbolic goal representation for the **Task Planning** module. The **Task Planning** module generates a sequence of low-level actions. The **Execution** module performs generated actions with operational information detected by the **Perception** module.

This work uses Mask R-CNN [47] as the **Perception** module to detect objects and their category segmentation masks. The categorical information is detected and corresponding affordances and attributes are retrieved from knowledge base to build the initial state for PDDL. A vision-and-language learning network is the **Goal Learning** module for goal state prediction. The **Task Planner** module is a PDDL planner that outputs a primitive action sequence from the detected initial and goal states, which is then sent to the robot for execution. Robotic action requires operational information, which is provided via masks detected by **Perception** module.




Fig. 3. Human instruction following framework. This robotic framework is designed for performing manipulation tasks by following instructions from human. It takes vision and language as input and performs a sequence of actions in the real world.

V. VISION-AND-LANGUAGE MODEL BENCHMARK

This section introduces three training datasets with corresponding training policies for learning three tasks. The evaluation metric is then discussed along with benchmarking to evaluate each component in the vision-and-language goal learning framework, and the two proposed pretraining tasks.

A. Datasets

The proposed three datasets are symbolic goal learning, scene graph parsing and semantic textual similarity datasets. The dataset and training code is provided [45] (Dataset).

1) *Symbolic Goal Learning Dataset*: For learning symbolic goal representation from vision and language, we created a dataset containing 32,070 images paired with natural language, which could be either an explicit instruction or implicit intent. It covers five daily activities: picking and placing, object delivery, cutting, cooking, and cleaning. We employ the simulator AI2THOR to generate image and sentence pairs, which is automatically annotated with PDDL goal states. Besides imperfect natural language, we also include imperfect vision where one or both objects involved in the task not exist in the image. With such input, the vision-and-language symbolic goal learning network is expected to predict the missing object to be “unknown” in the goal state output.

2) *Scene Graph Parsing Dataset*: The Scene Graph Parsing dataset was also created using AI2THOR and focuses on common daily objects. Object categories, affordances, attributes and their relationships are recorded. It covers 32 categories, 4 affordances, 5 attributes and 4 relationships. The total dataset includes 32,070 RGB images, automatically annotated with ground-truth bounding box, category, affordance, attribute and relationship, which is labor-free.

3) *Semantic Textual Similarity Dataset*: The created Semantic Textual Similarity dataset is for learning the similar semantic meaning between explicit human instructions and implicit human intents for robotic tasks. There same five daily activities are in the dataset: picking and placing, object delivery, cutting, cleaning, and cooking. It contains 90,000 pairs of explicit instruction and implicit intent, generated from a manually created list of templates. For the purpose of improving the diversity, sentences are automatically paraphrased by Parrot [48] during the generation process. To automatically rank the similarity of two sentences, three different scores are assigned based on the following rules:

- 5.0 if two sentences contain the same subject and object,
- 3.3 if two sentences match either subject or object, and
- 1.7 if two sentences describe the same task.

TABLE I
BENCHMARKING VISION-AND-LANGUAGE SYMBOLIC GOAL LEARNING

Model	RGL Accuracy(%)	Speed (fps)
Grid-LSTM-Concat	77.24	476.19
Grid-LSTM-Add	80.29	476.19
Grid-LSTM-Mul	72.47	476.19
Region-LSTM-Concat	81.35	9.14
Grid-BERT-Concat	89.02	230.95
Grid-BERT-Add	85.69	226.41
Grid-BERT-TDAtt-v1 [26]	92.61	215.98
Grid-BERT-TDAtt-v2 [26]	93.54	210.71
Grid-BERT-CoAtt [27]	92.30	120.70
Grid-BERT-Concat (SGP)	93.55	230.95
Grid-BERT-Concat (STS)	90.96	230.95
Grid-BERT-Concat (SGP&STS)	94.54	230.95

B. Training Policy

All models evaluated in Table I are implemented in Pytorch and trained on a single nVidia Titax-X (Pascal). For training, Adamax and AdamW are the optimizers for the LSTM and BERT models with $1e-8$ and $5e-5$ for initial learning rate. The learning rate scheduler is warmup cosine with a 1 epoch warmup stage. The model is trained for 20 epoches. For model implementations and training details, see [45].

C. Evaluation Metric

Evaluating the prediction accuracy of the vision-and-language models should test for symbolic matching to the PDDL goal state entities, which are action, subject, and object. We propose the Robotic Goal Learning (RGL) accuracy score:

$$\text{RGL} = \delta(\hat{a}, a, \hat{s}, s, \hat{o}, o) \equiv \delta(\hat{a}, a) \cdot \delta(\hat{s}, s) \cdot \delta(\hat{o}, o). \quad (3)$$

where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Kronecker delta function, \hat{a} and a are predicted and ground-truth action label, and the same holds for the subject s and object o labels.

D. Benchmarking Vision-and-Language Goal Learning

The test configurations in Table I permit comparison of different implementation choices regarding the core components, plus the effect of attention models and pre-training. The baseline visual and and language encoders will employ Grid features and LSTM, respectively. For reference, the LSTM-only and BERT-only models perform at 67.07% and 55.91%.

Regarding the fusion component for the baseline model, three simple strategies were tested: concatenation (concat), addition (add) and multiplication (mul). The best of the three tested for the baseline LSTM implementation is addition. Switching from Grid to Region features, with concatenation, leads to a small boost in performance of 4.11% but a 50x drop in processing rate. Grid feature encoders show better trade-off between prediction accuracy and inference speed if real-time is important. Considering a change in the language encoder to BERT, there is a boost in performance to 89.02% and 85.69%, for fusion by concatenation and addition, respectively. The 2x drop in timing is not serious, thus BERT+concat would be the more sensible option to use. It provides a 11.78% boost in performance and still operates beyond frame-rate.

Regarding attention versus pre-training, the attention model implemented were Top-Down Attention (TDAtt) [26] and Co-Attention (CoAtt) [27]. There two top-down attention variants: directly feeding the fused embedding for classification, and concatenating the fused embedding with extracted visual and linguistic features. Pre-training involved Scene Graph Parsing (SGP) and Semantic Textual Similarity (STS) tasks, as noted earlier. Of the two strategies for increasing performance, independent pre-training of the two encoders provided the best boost without affecting processing time. While attention models did improve the outcomes, they are known to require customized training policies to operate well [49].

VI. MANIPULATION EXPERIMENTS

A. Experimental Setup

Manipulation experiments in AI2THOR evaluate the robustness and generalization of the proposed instruction following framework to novel scenarios. Five different daily activities are conducted, which include Picking and Placing, Object Delivery, Cutting, Cleaning and Cooking. There are four different levels of scenarios for each task. Easy scenario only contains involved objects in the scene. Medium scenario incorporates irrelevant objects. The first hard scenario further includes multiple candidates while the second hard scenario misses partial or all objects required to perform the task. Due to missing objects in the scene, task planning is not expected to find valid solutions and execution is also not required for the second hard case. There are 10 scenarios for each level and either novel instruction or intent will be paired with the image. The model, which consists of grid feature encoder, BERT and concatenation and is pretrained on both tasks, are employed.

B. Manipulation Metrics

To evaluate each module in the instruction following framework, each manipulation experiment trial is considered as successful if it satisfies four conditions. For **Perception**, all involved objects are required to be correctly detected, which constructs the initial state for PDDL. For **Goal Learning**, PDDL goal state should be correctly predicted. For **Task Planning**, generated action sequence is composed of correct ordered actions. Given that AI2THOR does not support physical modeling of robot-object interaction, **Execution** evaluation requires the Intersection-of-Union (IoU) of detected and ground-truth masks for objects to be over the 0.5 threshold. Based on [5], Valid Success Rate (VSR) and Invalid Success Rate (ISR) are employed for easy, medium and the first hard, and the second hard scenarios, respectively. VSR evaluates tasks with valid solutions while ISR evaluates ones where there is no valid solution. Success Rate (SR) is used to take the average over all valid and invalid tasks.

C. Outcomes and Analysis for Manipulation Experiments

Results of manipulation experiments are collected in the Table II. Evaluating the performance change between seen and unseen scenarios for the proposed symbolic goal learning network, success rate drops from 94.5% to 80.0%. The

TABLE II
RESULTS OF MANIPULATION EXPERIMENTS IN AI2THOR. P: PERCEPTION; GL: GOAL LEARNING; TP: TASK PLANNING; E: EXECUTION.

	Pick_n_Place				Object Delivery				Cut				Cook				Clean				VSR (%)			
	P	GL	TP	E	P	GL	TP	E	P	GL	TP	E	P	GL	TP	E	P	GL	TP	E	P	GL	TP	E
Easy	9	9	9	9	10	9	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	10	10	10	10	98.0	92.0	92.0	92.0
Medium	10	8	8	8	9	9	8	8	10	8	8	8	10	7	7	7	10	10	10	9	98.0	84.0	82.0	80.0
Hard1	10	7	7	7	10	8	8	8	10	8	8	8	9	7	6	6	9	7	7	6	96.0	74.0	72.0	70.0
VSR (%)	96.7	80.0	80.0	80.0	96.7	86.7	83.3	83.3	100.0	86.7	86.7	86.7	96.7	73.3	70.0	70.0	96.7	90.0	90.0	83.3	97.3	83.3	82.0	80.7
ISR (%)																								
Hard2	9	7	10	10	10	6	10	10	10	8	10	10	9	5	10	10	10	9	10	10	96.0	70.0	100.0	100.0
SR (%)																								
SR (%)	95.0	77.5	85.0	80.0	97.5	80.0	87.5	83.3	100.0	85.0	90.0	86.7	95.0	67.5	77.5	70.0	97.5	90.0	92.5	83.3	97.0	80.0	86.5	85.5

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF MANIPULATION EXPERIMENTS TO EXISTING METHODS

	V2A [5]		ALFRED [6]		Mod. [9]		HiTUT [24]		SGL		
	S	U	S	U	S	U	S	U	S_GL	U_GL	U_E
SR (%)	44.7	40.2	70.3	49.9	71.9	63.0	87.7	80.6	94.5	80.0	85.5
VSR (%)	23.8	6.4	70.3	49.9	71.9	63.0	87.7	80.6	96.7	83.3	80.7
ISR (%)	65.0	79.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	88.8	70.0	100.0

performance drop is mainly caused by two aspects. Firstly, training dataset doesn't include images with multiple candidate objects, which causes the domain shift. The grid-based feature encoder may have trouble localizing the correct regions of interest. Secondly, the main issues is with the *cook* tasks. The potential reason could be the appearance of the microwave and stove burner in the same image leading to a misunderstanding of cookware.

For easy, medium and the first hard scenarios which have valid solutions for tasks, results show that success rate of task planning is roughly equal to the product of perception and goal learning. The observation shows the approximate independence between perception and goal learning modules. The 97.0% success rate for perception and 1% performance drop from task planning to execution show that the existing perception module works pretty well. The goal learning module, which is the primary interest here, is the biggest bottleneck in the current stage. Further study of symbolic goal learning framework could provide the proposed instruction following framework with significant boost.

For the second hard scenario which has no valid solutions or plans, the result shows that success rate of task planning is higher than the product of perception and goal learning. The reason is that even when goal learning module fails to predict a missing object as *unknown*, the perception module does not detect the missing object. With an incomplete initial representation the symbolic task planner correctly outputs *no solution*, which shows the value of the modular system and of symbolic planning. With a symbolic module computing the sequence of primitive actions, the system knows whether it is possible to achieve the task instead of having to predict the sequential actions via connectionist approaches.

D. Outcomes and Analysis for Comparison

Since the proposed method focuses on manipulation tasks which do not include navigation, we collect experimental results of manipulation sub-tasks for existing connectionist approaches in Table III for perform approximate comparative analysis. Seen and Unseen scenarios are denoted as S and U. As shown in the Table III, the proposed framework achieves

average 85.5% task success rate which outperforms all methods, thereby supporting the hypothesized benefits of the proposed hybrid, modular instruction following framework.

For seen to unseen goal learning (GL), the proposed method experiences average 14.5% performance drop, 13.4% performance drop for tasks with valid solution and 18.8% performance drop for task with no valid solutions. The result shows that the proposed symbolic goal learning achieves better performance on valid cases than invalid case. The invalid case requires the model to first interpret visual information and then use it to correct mismatched language, which is challenging. However the task planner fully compensates. SGL achieves a lower performance drop in success rate than ALFRED and a lower performance drop in VSR than V2A. The result shows that symbolic goal learning via deep neural networks experiences a lower performance drop from seen to unseen than predicting sequential actions. The performance drop of Mod. [5] and HiTUT [24] is 5.6% and 7.4% lower than the proposed method, SGL. Mod. segments the entire instruction into several sub-tasks, which helps significantly improve its performance on unseen scenarios and suggests that SGL should pre-process long-length instructions into task-specific segments. HiTUT incorporates self-monitoring and backtracking which allows the robotic agent to perform the action again if it fails the previous attempt. The success of self-monitoring and backtracking indicates that incorporating similar modules within SGL to deal with dynamic environments may improve performance.

VII. CONCLUSION

To address human instruction following with diverse natural language inputs, we propose to compensate for implicit or missing information via vision and present a hybrid, modular framework consisting of symbolic goal learning via deep neural networks and task planning via symbolic planners. We propose a vision-and-language goal learning framework, which consists of the visual encoder, linguistic encoder, multi-modal fusion and classification. Benchmarking compares the impacts of different techniques for the different components. For learning generic features and boosting the performance when fine-tuning on specific tasks, we propose to separately pretrain the visual and linguistic encoder on scene graph parsing and semantic textual similarity tasks. We show the effectiveness of the two pretraining tasks on a model with visual grid features, BERT, and fusion by concatenation, Evaluation of the instruction following framework in the AI2THOR simulator shows robustness to novel scenarios. The hybrid framework

combines the strength of semantic feature learning from deep neural networks and capability of rejecting invalid tasks from symbolic planners. The modular design of the framework enables easy determination and analysis of the cause of failure, simple replacement of each component, and incorporation of more modules. The current proposed framework lacks modules such as a task progress monitor and feedback mechanism to deal with dynamic environments, which will be the aim of future work. Additionally, the proposed symbolic goal learning network is trained on synthetic data; we will work on domain adaptation to bridge the gap between synthetic and real data.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Tenorth and M. Beetz, "Knowrob: A knowledge processing infrastructure for cognition-enabled robots," *IJRR*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 566–590, 2013.
- [2] A. Antunes, L. Jamone, G. Saponaro, A. Bernardino, and R. Ventura, "From human instructions to robot actions: Formulation of goals, affordances and probabilistic planning," in *ICRA*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 5449–5454.
- [3] P. Pramanick, C. Sarkar, and I. Bhattacharya, "Your instruction may be crisp, but not clear to me!" in *IEEE RO-MAN*, 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [4] D. K. Misra, J. Sung, K. Lee, and A. Saxena, "Tell me dave: Context-sensitive grounding of natural language to manipulation instructions," *IJRR*, vol. 35, no. 1-3, pp. 281–300, 2016.
- [5] M. Nazarczuk and K. Mikolajczyk, "V2a-vision to action: Learning robotic arm actions based on vision and language," in *ACCV*, 2020.
- [6] M. Shridhar, J. Thomason, D. Gordon, Y. Bisk, W. Han, R. Mottaghi, L. Zettlemoyer, and D. Fox, "Alfred: A benchmark for interpreting grounded instructions for everyday tasks," in *IEEE CVPR*, 2020, pp. 10740–10749.
- [7] K. M. Dipendra, B. Andrew, B. Valts, N. Eyvind, S. Max, and A. Yoav, "Mapping instructions to actions in 3d environments with visual goal prediction," in *EMNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2018, pp. 2667–2678.
- [8] K. P. Singh, S. Bhambri, B. Kim, R. Mottaghi, and J. Choi, "Factorizing perception and policy for interactive instruction following," in *IEEE ICCV*, 2021, pp. 1888–1897.
- [9] R. Corona, D. Fried, C. Devin, D. Klein, and T. Darrell, "Modular networks for compositional instruction following," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.12764*, 2020.
- [10] S. Zhou, P. Yin, and G. Neubig, "Hierarchical control of situated agents through natural language," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08214*, 2021.
- [11] F.-J. Chu, R. Xu, L. Seguin, and P. A. Vela, "Toward affordance detection and ranking on novel objects for real-world robotic manipulation," *RA-L*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 4070–4077, 2019.
- [12] F.-J. Chu, R. Xu, and P. A. Vela, "Recognizing object affordances to support scene reasoning for manipulation tasks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05770*, 2020.
- [13] C. Sun, A. Myers, C. Vondrick, K. Murphy, and C. Schmid, "Videobert: A joint model for video and language representation learning," in *IEEE ICCV*, 2019, pp. 7464–7473.
- [14] J. Lu, D. Batra, D. Parikh, and S. Lee, "Vilbert: Pretraining task-agnostic visiolinguistic representations for vision-and-language tasks," *NIPS*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [15] L. H. Li, M. Yatskar, D. Yin, C.-J. Hsieh, and K.-W. Chang, "Visualbert: A simple and performant baseline for vision and language," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.03557*, 2019.
- [16] E. Kolve, R. Mottaghi, W. Han, E. VanderBilt, L. Weihs, A. Herrasti, D. Gordon, Y. Zhu, A. Gupta, and A. Farhadi, "AI2-THOR: An Interactive 3D Environment for Visual AI," *arXiv*, 2017.
- [17] A. Mogadala, M. Kalimuthu, and D. Klakow, "Trends in integration of vision and language research: A survey of tasks, datasets, and methods," *JAIR*, vol. 71, pp. 1183–1317, 2021.
- [18] S. Tellex, N. Gopalan, H. Kress-Gazit, and C. Matuszek, "Robots that use language: A survey," 2020.
- [19] S. Guadarrama, L. Riano, D. Golland, D. Go, Y. Jia, D. Klein, P. Abbeel, T. Darrell *et al.*, "Grounding spatial relations for human-robot interaction," in *IROS*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1640–1647.
- [20] S. Tellex, T. Kollar, S. Dickerson, M. Walter, A. Banerjee, S. Teller, and N. Roy, "Understanding natural language commands for robotic navigation and mobile manipulation," in *AAAI*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2011, pp. 1507–1514.
- [21] H. Kress-Gazit, G. E. Fainekos, and G. J. Pappas, "From structured english to robot motion," in *IROS*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 2717–2722.
- [22] C. Finucane, G. Jing, and H. Kress-Gazit, "Ltlmop: Experimenting with language, temporal logic and robot control," in *IROS*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1988–1993.
- [23] P. Lindes, A. Mininger, J. R. Kirk, and J. E. Laird, "Grounding language for interactive task learning," in *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Language Grounding for Robotics*, 2017, pp. 1–9.
- [24] Y. Zhang and J. Chai, "Hierarchical task learning from language instructions with unified transformers and self-monitoring," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.03427*, 2021.
- [25] V. Blukis, C. Paxton, D. Fox, A. Garg, and Y. Artzi, "A persistent spatial semantic representation for high-level natural language instruction execution," in *CoRL*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 706–717.
- [26] P. Anderson, X. He, C. Buehler, D. Teney, M. Johnson, S. Gould, and L. Zhang, "Bottom-up and top-down attention for image captioning and visual question answering," in *IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 6077–6086.
- [27] Z. Yu, J. Yu, Y. Cui, D. Tao, and Q. Tian, "Deep modular co-attention networks for visual question answering," in *IEEE CVPR*, 2019, pp. 6281–6290.
- [28] S. Ren, K. He, R. Girshick, and J. Sun, "Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks," *NIPS*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [29] H. Jiang, I. Misra, M. Rohrbach, E. Learned-Miller, and X. Chen, "In defense of grid features for visual question answering," in *IEEE CVPR*, 2020, pp. 10267–10276.
- [30] Z. Huang, Z. Zeng, B. Liu, D. Fu, and J. Fu, "Pixel-bert: Aligning image pixels with text by deep multi-modal transformers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.00849*, 2020.
- [31] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *IEEE CVPR*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [32] J. Donahue, Y. Jia, O. Vinyals, J. Hoffman, N. Zhang, E. Tzeng, and T. Darrell, "Decaf: A deep convolutional activation feature for generic visual recognition," in *ICML*. PMLR, 2014, pp. 647–655.
- [33] R. Girshick, J. Donahue, T. Darrell, and J. Malik, "Rich feature hierarchies for accurate object detection and semantic segmentation," in *IEEE CVPR*, 2014, pp. 580–587.
- [34] J. Long, E. Shelhamer, and T. Darrell, "Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation," in *IEEE CVPR*, 2015, pp. 3431–3440.
- [35] B. Hariharan, P. Arbeláez, R. Girshick, and J. Malik, "Simultaneous detection and segmentation," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2014, pp. 297–312.
- [36] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, and J. Dean, "Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013.
- [37] J. Pennington, R. Socher, and C. D. Manning, "Glove: Global vectors for word representation," in *EMNLP*, 2014, pp. 1532–1543.
- [38] R. Kiro, Y. Zhu, R. R. Salakhutdinov, R. Zemel, R. Urtasun, A. Torralba, and S. Fidler, "Skip-thought vectors," *NIPS*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [39] K. Cho, B. Van Merriënboer, C. Gulcehre, D. Bahdanau, F. Bougares, H. Schwenk, and Y. Bengio, "Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation," in *EMNLP*. ACL, 2014, pp. 1724–1734.
- [40] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, E. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *NIPS*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [41] A. Radford, K. Narasimhan, T. Salimans, and I. Sutskever, "Improving language understanding by generative pre-training," 2018.
- [42] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [43] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, J. Du, M. Joshi, D. Chen, O. Levy, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, and V. Stoyanov, "Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [44] R. Zellers, M. Yatskar, S. Thomson, and Y. Choi, "Neural motifs: Scene graph parsing with global context," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 5831–5840.
- [45] R. Xu, H. Chen, Y. Lin, and P. A. Vela, "IVALab: Vision and Language Symbolic Goal Learning," <https://github.com/ivalab/mmf>, 2022.
- [46] N. Reimers and I. Gurevych, "Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks," in *EMNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 11 2019.
- [47] K. He, G. Gkioxari, P. Dollár, and R. Girshick, "Mask r-cnn," in *ICCV*, 2017, pp. 2961–2969.
- [48] P. Damodaran, "Parrot: Paraphrase generation for nlu." 2021.
- [49] L. Liu, X. Liu, J. Gao, W. Chen, and J. Han, "Understanding the difficulty of training transformers," in *EMNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020, pp. 5747–5763.