

Socially Cognizant Robotics for a Technology Enhanced Society

Kristin J. Dana*, Clinton Andrews†, Kostas Bekris‡, Jacob Feldman§, Matthew Stone‡,
Pernille Hemmer§, Aaron Mazzeo¶, Hal Salzman†, Jingang Yi¶
Rutgers University

Emerging applications of robotics, and concerns about their impact, require the research community to put human-centric objectives front-and-center. To meet this challenge, we advocate an interdisciplinary approach, *socially cognizant robotics*, which synthesizes technical and social science methods. We argue that this approach follows from the need to empower stakeholder participation (from synchronous human feedback to asynchronous societal assessment) in shaping AI-driven robot behavior at all levels, and leads to a range of novel research perspectives and problems both for improving robots' interactions with individuals and impacts on society. Drawing on these arguments, we develop best practices for *socially cognizant robot design* that balance traditional technology-based metrics (e.g. efficiency, precision and accuracy) with critically important, albeit challenging to measure, human and society-based metrics.

*Electrical and Computer Engineering Dept.

†Bloustein School of Planning and Policy

‡Computer Science Dept.

§Psychology Dept.

¶Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

1 Introduction

Applications of robotics (such as telepresence, transportation, elder-care, remote health care, cleaning, warehouse logistics, and delivery) are bringing significant changes in individuals' lives and are having profound social impact. Despite the envisioned potential of robotics, the goal of ubiquitous robot assistants augmenting quality of life (and quality of work life) has not yet been realized. Key challenges lie in the complexities of **four overarching human-centric objectives** that such systems must aim for: 1) improving quality of life of people, especially marginalized communities; 2) anticipating and mitigating unintended negative consequences of technological development; 3) enabling robots to adapt to the desires and needs of human counterparts; 4) respecting the need for human autonomy and agency.

Pursuing these objectives requires an integrated cohort of technologists, behavioral scientists and social scientists with a shared vision to pursue a deep, multidisciplinary understanding of how robots interact with individuals and society. We introduce a new term, **socially cognizant robotics**, to describe this multi-faceted interdisciplinary branch of technology. The emerging practitioner, the socially cognizant roboticist, represents the convergence of *socially aware technologists*, who can develop intelligent devices that adapt to human and social behavior; and *technology-aware social scientists and policymakers*, who can translate studies of robotics' social effects into actionable and technically-viable principles and policies.

A primary element of *socially cognizant robotics* is a deliberate “invitation to the table” for social scientists, who bring analytical perspectives and methods that are not typically present in robotics. These perspectives cover two levels of human-technology interaction that we view as essential: the **human-robot dyad** (*Section 2*) and the **robot-society dyad** (*Section 3*). Figure 1 illustrates how these levels might operate in the context of the workplace and everyday life. These considerations lead to formulating **best practices in socially cognizant robot design**




Figure 1: Considerations of the human-robot dyad and the robot-society dyad within this nascent interdisciplinary field of socially cognizant robotics lead to a design framework based on human-centric objectives. Empowering AI stakeholder participation (ranging from individual feedback to societal assessment) ensures that people can *affect* and tune robot behavior. This participation can be synchronous (real-time) or asynchronous as described in Figure 2.

(Section 4) that emphasizes the role of feedback (from individual and societal stakeholders) so that humans can affect and tune robot behavior.

2 Human-Robot Dyad

How can robots effectively interact with human partners? Technologists are making great strides in supporting intelligent interaction in fields such as **robot embodiment, control and planning** (9, 87, 101), **visual learning** (23, 29, 62, 75), and **language processing** (10, 51, 100). But excitement due to the technological progress is tempered by an appreciation of the limitations and dangers of current methods (5, 31, 77, 96), especially for data-driven approaches that control action in the physical world in the presence of people without accompanying safety guarantees.

Findings and methods from **psychology and cognitive science** suggest how some of these limitations may be addressed. For example, the ability to understand and anticipate human needs and desires is often referred to in psychology as “theory of mind” (ToM) (60); ToM provides a psychologically-informed framework for designing robotic behavior that mirrors human–human interaction. Such ideas might be realized through developing and employing human-in-the-loop approaches to construct human informed training sets, as well as to guide robot activity in real time. Additionally, cognitive models may identify and meet the needs of the individual under real-world circumstances that are out-of-distribution during lab testing.

2.1 From Vision and Language to Robot Action

Progress in computer vision (CV) and natural language processing (NLP) has made it possible for robots to perceive and represent their environment, including the humans within it. Both CV and NLP are faced with the challenge of extracting meaningful inferences and communication from raw environmental stimuli—the same challenge solved by the human brain. Computationally, raw signals must be converted to suitable intermediate representations in order to extract




Figure 2: Learning from feedback: A socially cognizant robot should interact with and adapt to humans both synchronously and asynchronously within the human-robot dyad or a society-robot dyad.

knowledge. For example, simple image distance metrics are not usually useful, but can be the basis of more structured and meaningful measurements of similarity (27). This challenge of representation learning is fundamental in both CV and NLP research. In CV, CNNs have become a popular architecture due to their robust performance (54, 58). More recently the transformer architecture in NLP has greatly improved language translation and generation (28, 100). The transformer architecture has been repurposed for visual recognition and now largely outperforms CNNs. Recent demonstrations of transformer-based models generating text (e.g., ChatGPT (10, 75, 76)) and images (e.g., Dall-E) (78)) have led to a surge of interest in these frameworks. Current CV and NLP frameworks have uncovered computational representations, useful for understanding and generating both images and language, in a manner that is reminiscent of human ability (although with significant limitations), and the implications for robotics is significant. These frameworks from CV and NLP are inspiring recent similar models for robot action or control (9, 79, 101, 112) including new approaches of reinforcement learning (13, 45). The promise of these methods are tempered by inherent dangers: (7, 30): mistakes in actions models can do more immediate harm, making a socially cognizant approach to robotics particularly timely and urgent.

2.2 Human-in-the-Loop Robot Training

In socially cognizant robotics, humans are not merely part of the robot’s environment (e.g. to consider for collision avoidance). Rather, the human-in-the-loop meaningfully participates in shaping robot behavior and robot training. Socially cognizant robotics empowers AI stakeholder participation at multiple levels (such as individuals interacting with robots, expert dataset annotators, user feedback, and group assessment surveys) both synchronously and asynchronously, as shown in Figure 2, with the goal of improving the outcomes of robot interactions.

A common and well-developed method for humans training robots is through supervised machine learning where datasets are annotated by humans (including our research (1, 56, 105, 106, 110)). This asynchronous human interaction takes the form of large labeled datasets where humans have provided the knowledge label (e.g. labeling the contents of an image or the location of an object in the image) for training computer or robot vision perception tasks such as image recognition, semantic segmentation, object detection, instance segmentation and object counting. For robot control, this asynchronous human input includes video observations of task demonstration that can be used to learn human behavior (68, 86). Problems associated with using datasets (5, 25, 31, 53, 77) include the cost and human effort of obtaining new datasets, ethical considerations for human annotators, problematic domain shifts, and a hyperfocus of research on obtaining results on existing datasets. Anticipating and mitigating these negative consequences are an important part of the early design stage as discussed in Section 4.

A trend that is emerging from the need for human feedback is synchronous or online human-in-the-loop robot training. This is a paradigm of humans improving robots by interacting and intervening, i.e. *humans teaching robots*. Recent work in human-in-the-loop reinforcement learning provides examples of this paradigm (15, 44, 52, 59, 102, 111). Human-in-the-Loop RL typically works by modifying the reward function, e.g. by indicating preferences for a particular robot behavior. A related concept is imitation learning and learning by demonstration,

which (57, 89). Recent hybrid methods use both asynchronous demonstration and intervention (44, 83). Because such methods can be adjusted by humans during the operation, humans can affect the design iterations and this paradigm is well aligned with the overarching goal of respecting human agency. Additionally, human-in-the-loop methods may offer efficient performance improvements with less reliance on datasets.

2.3 Robot Theory of Mind

One striking difference between conventional robots and human agents is that only the latter possess *theory of mind*, the ability to understand other agents' mental states (60). People attribute mental attributes—beliefs, intentions, and knowledge—to other agents almost reflexively (6, 37, 98), utilizing a neural pathway apparently specialized for social relations (70). Indeed mental state attributions are essential for normal social interaction, especially when language is involved (22): it is scarcely possible to interpret an instruction, a question, or even a single word without comprehending the speaker's likely state of knowledge. Joint action by multiple humans is similarly facilitated by people's ability to understand each other's mental processes (85). Indeed many of our inferences, actions, and reactions are predicated on an intuitive sense of what other people are thinking, what they want, and how they will likely perceive our own actions (33, 49).

It has long been speculated that making robots engage in human-like social interaction would require endowing them with ToM (e.g. (20)). But progress on this problem has been slowed by our limited understanding of how human “theory of mind” actually works. Current models from our research and others (4, 46, 66) are based on Bayesian estimation of other-agent mental states, allowing the model to guess the goals and desires of another agent in order to fully understand their actions and anticipate their needs. However, these models only work in very limited contexts, based on a small set of predetermined possible goals. In order to interact



Figure 3: Modern robot embodiment includes exoskeletons. Flexible, light-weight, high-torque bilateral knee exoskeletons are shown here in the task of assisting construction workers to reduce fatigue and injuries. Left: Masonry work. Right: Roof worker with kneeling gait (14).

effectively with a person, a robot must be able to decide among hundreds or thousands of potential human desires, corresponding to the myriad goals a human user might have in interacting with an automated device (82). An important example comes from navigation. People navigate around other people in part by using ToM to understand and anticipate the likely movements of others (19, 26, 48). For a robot to navigate among humans in a similar manner would require a similar degree of social awareness (65). Computational models of human ToM have been proposed (4, 66) and introduced into robotics (73). Recent computational models for ToM use deep learning (74) and inverse reinforcement learning (47). we expect computational ToM models to benefit from recent machine learning paradigms and architectures, such as transformers and human-in-the-loop RL. To achieve truly socially cognizant robotics, such models need to include mechanisms for humans to synchronously and/or asynchronously affect and tune computational ToMs in order to affect robot behavior.

2.4 Robot Embodiment for Human Interaction

Robots have thrived in highly structured, accurately known, and safely enclosed industrial settings. Typically, these platforms consist of rigid elements connected by a few degrees of freedom (DoF) that can be controlled directly. This allows strict enforcement of motion for high speed, accuracy, and consistency of repeated tasks. In contrast, modern robotics aspires to more general and ambitious operational goals involving highly unstructured environments, arbitrary terrains, unknown objects, or more importantly in the context of Socially Cognizant Robotics, the company of humans. These altered priorities lead to the key challenge of robots with versatile physical traits, such as deformation and heightened articulation (80), which can be achieved by using soft components or a high number of compliant DoF (71). These features allow for adaptive contact geometry and storage or dissipation of energy for purposes, such as efficient mobility on rough terrain and manipulation of arbitrary objects. Examples include soft (24, 34) and adaptive hands (93), grippers (42, 92), manipulators (32), locomotors [(90)], skin-like sensors (91, 113), and hybrid soft-rigid tensegrity robots (88). Pioneering early work from our research and others in soft robotics (18, 42, 90) seeded exponential growth in the field in recent years (36). Robots with versatile physical traits also include soft robotic exoskeletons to provide strength augmentation for purposes of mobility assistance, rehabilitation and worker protection during repetitive lifting (14, 104, 107–109) as illustrated in Figure 3. Socially cognizant robotics considers how technology, such as soft robotic material, can change the perceived empathy, competence, and safety of robots. This requires integrated treatment of human intent, perception, and behavior in interaction with embodied and intelligent robots.

2.5 Life-Long and Continual Learning with Memory

Robots of the future may be trained by a combination of cognitive models, pre-trained large networks, human interaction, synthetic environments, and self-supervision from videos. Robot

devices, like individuals, are a unique combination of their training experiences, combining data, models and interactions. The goal of life-long learning for intelligent agents (21, 67, 95) necessitates addressing memory, deciding how and what to remember, so that training based on past experience can be efficient. A significant shortcoming of artificial neural networks is that they experience catastrophic forgetting. While they can be efficiently trained on a single task across a wide variety of domains, when trained on a new task they often fail to retain previously learned tasks. This is a fundamental challenge in life-long learning. In contrast, humans, despite the very complex cognitive processes involved, efficiently encode and retrieve memories across the lifespan, without forgetting previously learned experiences. Human episodic memory is a reconstructive process, and one can think of episodic memory as a problem of extracting and storing information from the noisy signals presented to our senses, with the goal of efficiently storing and retrieving relevant information. Because the encoded memory traces are inherently noisy and incomplete reconstruction at recall requires input from at least two memory structures: one based on specific prior episodes, and one that is an abstraction of relevant prior knowledge and expectations (aka semantic memory). In this way, reconstructive memory can exploit environmental regularities to ‘clean up’ the noise in our memory system and improve average recall performance. (Importantly, this also prevents catastrophic forgetting.) If an episodic trace is too noisy or inaccessible, without semantic memory the best the system can do is guess randomly and at worst have catastrophic forgetting. However, the optimal behavior is a trade-off between the strength of the evidence in episodic memory and the likelihood of the event based on prior knowledge and expectations. Using prior knowledge at multiple levels of abstraction is an efficient strategy that allows generalization over experiences and correction of noisy memories (38, 39). A similar type of knowledge transfer has long been argued to be essential in robot learning (e.g., (97)). Lifelong learning for intelligent agents, and the parallel mechanism in humans, is a significant open-issue and the subject of on-going

research (21, 55, 69, 99).

3 Robot-Society Dyad

Scaling robotic solutions at a societal level will fundamentally change the technology used by society including for transportation (smart cars), health care (medical robots), infrastructure (smart buildings), restaurant industry (food prep and food delivery robots), waste management (trash and recycling robots), and warehouse logistics (sorting, picking and packing robots). The paradigm of human feedback affecting robot behavior scales to societal participants affecting robot behavior. Feedback takes on a more formal structure with open issues such as: who can engage with and affect the robot systems? (i.e. what is their organizational role?) and when are they empowered to do so? (i.e. what timeline is appropriate given societal goals and constraints) The framework of stakeholder participation includes both real-time synchronous human-in-the-loop training where robots and humans learn from and adapt to one another, as well as asynchronous engagement, where social, economic and political forces can more easily affect robot design. Asynchronous societal engagement includes discussions with stakeholders, survey research, ethnographic observations, ethical evaluations, market uptake of innovations, development of guidelines/policies by organizations and institutions, legal proceedings, the development of governmental regulations, incentives, and information (2, 84). A key conjecture is that all robot systems will have unintended consequences that may only be fully discovered and quantified after initial deployment. It is critical to build with the expectation of iteration and mechanisms must exist to collect feedback, address issues, and re-deploy.

3.1 Societal Theory of Mind

The concept of Theory of Mind (ToM) where robots and/or humans predict the intent of collaborators and other entities, can be extended to a societal Theory of Interaction with Social Systems

(TISS) to enable robotic systems to anticipate the needs and intentions of human groups, organizations, and institutions. TISS models are different from traditional or machine ToM models because the fundamentals of human-robot interaction change with scale. Robot systems interacting with a community have different properties and necessitate different evaluation than the individual human-robot framework. For example, robot systems impact the culture, economy and infrastructure of a society. Predicting the mental state of humans in TISS encompasses the prediction of human groups, crowds, and assemblies. Similarly robots may act in groups or swarms and agents working with such groups need cues to predict their intent to facilitate appropriate interaction. Computational methods for robot vision, language and action provide can provide such cues by sensing people over space and time drawing conclusions on the needs of groups. To date, both human and machine ToM models are open research issues and the problem of TISS has received sparse attention.

When scaling up from interactions between individual robots and humans to those at the societal level, it becomes important to acknowledge that social, economic, and political systems exert forces on individuals and vice versa. There is a classic debate in the social sciences about whether structure constrains the agency of individuals, or whether agency determines structure. Contrast “class shapes everything about our lives” (Karl Marx), “we are constrained by social norms and values” (Emile Durkheim), and “bureaucracies can confine us” (Max Weber); with “individual behavior as a shaping force” (Norbert Elias), society as “the free-playing, interacting interdependence of individuals” (Georg Simmel), and “individual adaptation, goal attainment, integration and latency form the basic characteristics of social action” (Talcott Parsons). The message for socially cognizant roboticists is that social structures are both persistent and malleable. In the short run, social practices offer resistance to change, and humans will enforce contextualized behavioral norms on robots and one another (e.g. sidewalk delivery robots should stay navigate in a manner similar to that of humans (19)).

3.2 Robots and the Built Environment

Performance improvements in robot technology will likely lead to ubiquitous devices in our streets and homes. As industry and agencies seek to deploy robots for a myriad of tasks including food delivery, landscaping, surveillance, advertisement and entertainment, the question will soon arise: What will our future world look like? How many robots are too many? We can look to the past and see the transition from nature to the built environment and learn mistakes and successes. In particular, though the field of neuroaesthetics (11, 12, 16, 17, 50) primarily focuses on architecture, it is highly relevant to the proliferation of robotics in society. This field examines the intersection of neuroscience and architectural design so that by understanding human response to the built environment (e.g. stress vs. well-being), architects can account for this response in their design. The relevance of neuroaesthetics to socially cognizant robotics is clear; the appearance of robotic systems can foster or inhibit human and societal trust of robotics. The near-term future may bring a proliferation of robots, drones and related infrastructure such as cell towers, charging stations, and storage. Headless dog-robots, snake robots, spider robots and other embodiments may cause stress in humans, much like a heavily industrialized urban environments do when compared to nature (8, 35). Intuitively, the effect may be amplified as the number of robots increases. The relevance of neuroaesthetics to socially cognizant robotics is clear: the appearance of robotic systems can foster or inhibit human and societal trust of robotics.

3.3 Unintended Consequences and Policy Development

Innovations sometimes bring unintended adverse consequences for members of society, such as birth defects in children whose mothers used the sedative Thalidomide, formation of a hole in the stratospheric ozone layer from fugitive emissions of chlorofluorocarbon refrigerants, and political violence encouraged by Facebook's news feed algorithm. Markets can avoid obvious

adverse consequences for buyers because innovations often get adopted slowly, over time, on a voluntary basis, in a bottom-up manner that allows quick feedback and decentralized responses to bad news. Political systems often react more slowly, relying on tort liability to redress harm to individuals and the (often lengthy) development of public policies to remedy wider societal harms.

Unintended consequences have been the object of much social inquiry, for example identification of key sources (64) (ignorance, error, willful ignorance, paradoxical values, and self-defeating predictions); relational thinking about what is known and unknown to us and others (63); and assertions that both outcomes and likelihoods may be problematic (94), thus contrasting risk, uncertainty, ambiguity, and ignorance. Of particular importance in robotics are the unanticipated consequences of deployment at scale, where consequences may be economic (displaced workers), social (lonely seniors), or political (projection of military power).

It would be useful to anticipate unintended consequences of widespread deployment of robotics technologies beforehand instead of waiting for the harms to become evident. Technology assessment efforts attempt to do this by looking forward into an uncertain future using a variety of tools. These include reasoning from historical analogies, modeling socio-economic systems in order to project future impacts, fostering discussion and debate about the wisdom of deploying the innovation, reflecting on professional practices, learning from small experiments, and others (3, 72). Public policies can encourage either risk-taking to spur innovation or precaution to reduce potential harms. The first may yield unintended adverse consequences and the second may stifle innovation. Advocating *humility in design* can encourage the expectation of unintended consequences and the planning of design iterations.

Public policymakers strive to encourage innovation while avoiding harm by iteratively acting and learning, a process known as “muddling through” or mutual incremental adjustment (61). It stands in contrast to a planning or optimization approach in which decision makers

assume that they already have all of the needed knowledge to make correct decisions. The incrementalist, iterative approach works best when lots of small experiments take place and there is a systematic effort to learn from the experiments. There is a strong movement for policy and regulation in AI (especially in generative AI), there are well known problems and cases of unregulated AI leading to unexpected consequences. There has been recent attention to regulating generative AI (40, 41, 103), but less attention to robotics, although robotics can be much more directly dangerous. Self-driving cars are regulated (43), but these regulations are for a narrow application area. Future regulation and policies for robotics can extend to multiple application contexts, global collaborations (81), and can draw from core human-centric objectives as we have done for formulating best practices for socially cognizant robot design.

4 Socially Cognizant Robot Design: Best Practices

Standard technical design optimizes measurable metrics such as accuracy, precision and speed. Socially cognizant design is a more complex process because humanity-based metrics are not easily quantifiable but are critically important. Guided by four core human-centric objectives described in Section 1, we present a list of 10 questions that should be considered during a socially cognizant design. This proposed question set and design framework comprise best practices in socially cognizant design. As robotics advances and the quest for socially cognizant robotics grows, we expect the enumeration of best practices to evolve further.

Ten Questions to Address for Socially Cognizant Robotics Design

1. Does the design improve **quality of life**?
2. Does this technology address a **critical societal need**? The designer should evaluate the significance given competitive technologies and consider that the technology uses limited economic and environmental resources.

Socially Cognizant Design Framework




Figure 4: Standard technical design optimizes measurable metrics such as accuracy, precision and speed. Socially cognizant design is a more complex process because humanity-based metrics are not easily quantifiable but are critically important. We propose a framework that embeds meaningful best practices in the form of addressing 10 questions as described in Section 4. A key element is *AI stakeholder participation* both individual and societal for affecting and tuning robot behavior. Additionally, humility in design drives the need for iterations and evaluation of each iteration.

3. Have **discussions** occurred with a diverse set of stakeholders prior to deployment? Consult and ask stakeholders (e.g., customers, casual users, bystanders, managing organizations, etc.) to predict the impact.
4. What are the potential **unintended consequences**? Predict unintended consequences and enumerate them before iterating over the technology. Discuss with other designers that have previous experience of robot deployment or previous users of related/competing technology.
5. Are there **safety issues** in the application domain and have the appropriate permissions and inspections been completed? Are existing requirements sufficient to ensure human safety?
6. What is the **schedule for iteration**? There is tension between speed of development and the goal of socially cognizant design. Managing this tension is related to the need for iteration.
7. How will the technology **adapt to human desires** and needs of people once deployed?
8. Is there a mechanism for users to provide **feedback** and is there a plan to act on that feedback (asynchronous engagement)?
9. What are the **ethical considerations**? Discuss with ethicists and groups that may be impacted by the technology.
10. Does the design **respect human agency** and autonomy? Complete autonomy may be desirable in some setups but may also be less adaptive to human needs in others. What are the specific mechanisms for synchronous engagement, i.e. for the human to be in the loop, to bypass automated decisions or to improve automated decisions? Is there sufficient recognition of the limitations of automated decisions?

In real-world design, while a socially cognizant solution may be desirable, budget and time constraints lead roboticists to first develop a technology-only solution. A meaningful step toward socially cognizant robotics is to have a deliberate design step of *AI stakeholder participation* to affect AI-driven robot behavior. AI stakeholders in this context are the individuals, groups, businesses, and communities that are involved with and impacted by robotics. This participation may be asynchronous (e.g., stakeholder meetings to understand the value of a design, user surveys to assess impact) or synchronous (e.g., robot training affected by individual or societal interaction). Iterations of building/deploying/evaluating after multiple rounds of stakeholder assessment is crucial for meeting human-centric objectives.

5 Conclusion

Traditionally, robotics (e.g. in the context of manufacturing) has aimed primarily for speed, accuracy, and efficiency. As robots are deployed in a wider variety of domains, it becomes important to consider human-centered objectives such as safety, adaptability, privacy, bias, and ethical considerations. At the same time, traditional social sciences have usually studied the effects of technology on society only after deployment. Given the potential impact of robotics, we cannot afford to evaluate the societal and human impact of this technology a posteriori.

The limited exposure of robotics professionals to behavioral and social sciences makes them less than fully prepared to predict the impact of the technology they develop on society and public discourse. Roboticists should be empowered to identify critical societal needs that robotics technology can realistically address in order to catalyze and guide meaningful convergence research. Societal needs include providing inexpensive and effective public services, efficient transportation, and environmental protection. Meeting these needs with robotic systems can transform our society by augmenting human abilities.

Socially cognizant robotics differs from human-centered robotics by going beyond human-

robot interaction to consider robot-society interactions. Furthermore, socially cognizant robotics emphasizes the importance of empowering humans to affect robot behavior both synchronously and asynchronously, recognizing the need for human agency. It includes the objective of ethical development of robotics with the goal of enhancing life for both the individual and society. As technology increasingly infiltrates daily life, humans have become less trustful of the pervasive applications, cameras, and automation. While convenience and ease of communications has been extolled, critical failures are arising, such as biased algorithms, fatal accidents with automated vehicles, and ambiguous accountability. Socially cognizant roboticists should adhere to and contribute to the evolving ethics guidelines of automation and train scientists who consider this component at the earliest stage of robot design as well as after robot deployment.

6 Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) National Research Traineeship (NRT) entitled "NRT-FW-HTF: Socially Cognizant Robotics for a Technology Enhanced Society (SOCRATES)" Grant No. 2021628.

References

1. Peri Akiva, Benjamin Planche, Aditi Roy, Peter Oudemans, and Kristin Dana. Vision on the bog: Cranberry crop risk evaluation with deep learning. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 203:107444, 2022.
2. CJ Andrews. From professional ethics to technological citizenship. In *Proceedings of the 2006 IEEE International Symposium on Electronics and the Environment, 2006.*, pages 45–47. IEEE, 2006.

3. Clinton J. Andrews. If a colleague asks: “Will my innovation have unintended consequences?”. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 40(2):4–5, 2021.
4. Chris L. Baker, Julian Jara-Ettinger, Rebecca Saxe, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. Rational quantitative attribution of beliefs, desires and percepts in human mentalizing. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 03/2017 2017.
5. Emily M Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 610–623, 2021.
6. Philip W. Blythe, Peter M. Todd, and Geoffrey F. Miller. How motion reveals intention: categorizing social interactions. In *Simple heuristics that make us smart*, pages 257–285. Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.
7. Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
8. Gregory N Bratman, J Paul Hamilton, and Gretchen C Daily. The impacts of nature experience on human cognitive function and mental health. *Annals of the New York academy of sciences*, 1249(1):118–136, 2012.
9. Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Justice Carbajal, Yevgen Chebotar, Joseph Dabis, Chelsea Finn, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Karol Hausman, Alex Herzog, Jasmine Hsu, et al. Rt-1: Robotics transformer for real-world control at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.06817*, 2022.

10. Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
11. Anjan Chatterjee, Alex Coburn, and Adam Weinberger. The neuroaesthetics of architectural spaces. *Cognitive processing*, 22(Suppl 1):115–120, 2021.
12. Anjan Chatterjee and Oshin Vartanian. Neuroaesthetics. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 18(7):370–375, 2014.
13. Lili Chen, Kevin Lu, Aravind Rajeswaran, Kimin Lee, Aditya Grover, Misha Laskin, Pieter Abbeel, Aravind Srinivas, and Igor Mordatch. Decision transformer: Reinforcement learning via sequence modeling. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 15084–15097. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
14. Siyu Chen, Duncan T Stevenson, Shuangyue Yu, Monika Mioskowska, Jingang Yi, Hao Su, and Mitja Trkov. Wearable knee assistive devices for kneeling tasks in construction. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 26(4):1989–1996, 2021.
15. Valerie Chen, Abhinav Gupta, and Kenneth Marino. Ask your humans: Using human instructions to improve generalization in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
16. Alex Coburn, Oshin Vartanian, and Anjan Chatterjee. Buildings, beauty, and the brain: A neuroscience of architectural experience. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 29(9):1521–1531, 2017.

17. Alex Coburn, Adam Weinberger, and Anjan Chatterjee. How architectural design influences emotions, physiology, and behavior. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Neuroaesthetics*, pages 194–217. Routledge, 2022.
18. Mark R Cutkosky and Sangbae Kim. Design and fabrication of multi-material structures for bioinspired robots. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 367(1894):1799–1813, 2009.
19. R. C. Dalton, C. Hölscher, and D. R. Montello. Wayfinding as a Social Activity. *Front Psychol*, 10:142, 2019.
20. Kerstin Dautenhahn. Socially intelligent robots: dimensions of human–robot interaction. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 362:679–705, 2007.
21. Matthias De Lange, Rahaf Aljundi, Marc Masana, Sarah Parisot, Xu Jia, Aleš Leonardis, Gregory Slabaugh, and Tinne Tuytelaars. A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 44(7):3366–3385, 2021.
22. J. G. de Villiers. The interface of language and theory of mind. *Lingua*, 117(11):1858–1878, 2007.
23. Mostafa Dehghani, Josip Djolonga, Basil Mustafa, Piotr Padlewski, Jonathan Heek, Justin Gilmer, Andreas Steiner, Mathilde Caron, Robert Geirhos, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, et al. Scaling vision transformers to 22 billion parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05442*, 2023.
24. Raphael Deimel and Oliver Brock. A novel type of compliant and underactuated robotic hand for dexterous grasping. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 35(1-3):161–185, 2016.

25. Emily Denton, Mark Díaz, Ian Kivlichan, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, and Rachel Rosen. Whose ground truth? accounting for individual and collective identities underlying dataset annotation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04554*, 2021.
26. Serena DeStefani, Davide Schaumann, Xun Zhang, Jacob Feldman, and Mubbasir Kapadia. Spatial and non-spatial factors in wayfinding. *Journal of Vision*, 20(11):1664–1664, 2020.
27. N. Destler, M. Singh, and J. Feldman. Skeleton-based shape similarity. *Psychological Review*, 2023.
28. Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
29. Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
30. Luciano Floridi and Massimo Chiriatti. Gpt-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines*, 30:681–694, 2020.
31. Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé Iii, and Kate Crawford. Datasheets for datasets. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(12):86–92, 2021.
32. Thomas George Thuruthel, Yasmin Ansari, Egidio Falotico, and Cecilia Laschi. Control strategies for soft robotic manipulators: A survey. *Soft robotics*, 5(2):149–163, 2018.

33. György Gergely, Zoltan Nádasdy, Gergely Csibra, and Szilvia Bíró. Taking the intentional stance at 12 months of age. *Cognition*, 56:165–193, 1995.
34. Guoying Gu, Ningbin Zhang, Haipeng Xu, Shaoting Lin, Yang Yu, Guohong Chai, Lisen Ge, Houle Yang, Qiwen Shao, Xinjun Sheng, et al. A soft neuroprosthetic hand providing simultaneous myoelectric control and tactile feedback. *Nature biomedical engineering*, pages 1–10, 2021.
35. Terry Hartig, Richard Mitchell, Sjerp De Vries, and Howard Frumkin. Nature and health. *Annual review of public health*, 35:207–228, 2014.
36. Elliot W Hawkes, Carmel Majidi, and Michael T Tolley. Hard questions for soft robotics. *Science robotics*, 6(53):6049, 2021.
37. Fritz Heider and Marianne Simmel. An experimental study of apparent behavior. *American journal of psychology*, 57:243–259, 1944.
38. Pernille Hemmer and Mark Steyvers. A bayesian account of reconstructive memory. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 1(1):189–202, 2009.
39. Pernille Hemmer and Mark Steyvers. Integrating episodic memories and prior knowledge at multiple levels of abstraction. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 16:80–87, 2009.
40. Emmie Hine and Luciano Floridi. The blueprint for an ai bill of rights: in search of enactment, at risk of inaction. *Minds and Machines*, pages 1–8, 2023.
41. The White House. Blueprint for an ai bill of rights, 2023. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/ai-bill-of-rights/>, Last accessed on 2023-07-17.
42. Filip Ilievski, Aaron D Mazzeo, Robert F Shepherd, Xin Chen, and George M Whitesides. Soft robotics for chemists. *Angewandte Chemie*, 123(8):1930–1935, 2011.

43. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety IIHS. Autonomous vehicle laws, 2023. <https://www.iihs.org/topics/advanced-driver-assistance/autonomous-vehicle-laws>, Last accessed on 2023-06-26.
44. Eric Jang, Alex Irpan, Mohi Khansari, Daniel Kappler, Frederik Ebert, Corey Lynch, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Bc-z: Zero-shot task generalization with robotic imitation learning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 991–1002. PMLR, 2022.
45. Michael Janner, Qiyang Li, and Sergey Levine. Offline reinforcement learning as one big sequence modeling problem. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:1273–1286, 2021.
46. J. Jara-Ettinger, L. E. Schulz, and J. B. Tenenbaum. The Naïve Utility Calculus as a unified, quantitative framework for action understanding. *Cognitive Psychology*, 123:101334, 2020.
47. Julian Jara-Ettinger. Theory of mind as inverse reinforcement learning. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 29:105–110, 2019.
48. Faith Johnson and Kristin Dana. Learning a pedestrian social behavior dictionary. *Proceedings of the British Machine Vision Conference BMVC*, 2023.
49. Susan C. Johnson. The recognition of mentalistic agents in infancy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4(1):22–28, 2000.
50. Tulay Karakas and Dilek Yildiz. Exploring the influence of the built environment on human experience through a neuroscience approach: A systematic review. *Frontiers of Architectural Research*, 9(1):236–247, 2020.

51. Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton and Lee Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*, pages 4171–4186, 2019.
52. Baber Khalid, Malihe Alikhani, and Matthew Stone. Combining cognitive modeling and reinforcement learning for clarification in dialogue. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 4417–4428, 2020.
53. Bernard Koch, Emily Denton, Alex Hanna, and Jacob G Foster. Reduced, reused and recycled: The life of a dataset in machine learning research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.01716*, 2021.
54. Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25, 2012.
55. Dhireesha Kudithipudi, Mario Aguilar-Simon, Jonathan Babb, Maxim Bazhenov, Douglas Blackiston, Josh Bongard, Andrew P Brna, Suraj Chakravarthi Raja, Nick Cheney, Jeff Clune, et al. Biological underpinnings for lifelong learning machines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(3):196–210, 2022.
56. H. M. La, N. Gucunski, K. Dana, and S. Kee. Development of an autonomous bridge deck inspection robotic system. *Journal of Field Robotics*, 34(8):1489–1504, 2017.
57. Miguel Lázaro-Gredilla, Dianhuan Lin, J Swaroop Guntupalli, and Dileep George. Beyond imitation: Zero-shot task transfer on robots by learning concepts as cognitive programs. *Science Robotics*, 4(26):eaav3150, 2019.
58. Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, et al. Convolutional networks for images, speech, and time series. *The handbook of brain theory and neural networks*, 3361(10):1995, 1995.

59. Kimin Lee, Laura M Smith, and Pieter Abbeel. Pebble: Feedback-efficient interactive reinforcement learning via relabeling experience and unsupervised pre-training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6152–6163. PMLR, 2021.
60. A. Leslie. Pretense and representation: the origins of “theory of mind”. *Psychological Review*, 94:412–426, 1987.
61. Charles Lindblom. “the science of muddling through.”. *Public administration review*, 19(2):79–88, 1959.
62. Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 10012–10022, 2021.
63. Joseph Luft and Harry Ingham. The johari window, a graphic model of interpersonal awareness. *Proceedings of the western training laboratory in group development, Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles*, 246, 1955.
64. Robert K Merton. The unanticipated consequences of purposive social action. *American sociological review*, 1(6):894–904, 1936.
65. Ronja Möller, Antonino Furnari, Sebastiano Battiato, Aki Härmä, and Giovanni Maria Farinella. A survey on human-aware robot navigation. *Robotics Auton. Syst.*, 145:103837, 2021.
66. P. C. Pantelis, C. L. Baker, S. A. Cholewiak, K. Sanik, A. Weinstein, C. C. Wu, J. B. Tenenbaum, and J. Feldman. Inferring the intentional states of autonomous virtual agents. *Cognition*, 130(3):360–379, 2014.

67. German I Parisi, Ronald Kemker, Jose L Part, Christopher Kanan, and Stefan Wermter. Continual lifelong learning with neural networks: A review. *Neural networks*, 113:54–71, 2019.
68. Tim Pearce, Tabish Rashid, Anssi Kanervisto, Dave Bignell, Mingfei Sun, Raluca Georgescu, Sergio Valcarcel Macua, Shan Zheng Tan, Ida Momennejad, Katja Hofmann, et al. Imitating human behaviour with diffusion models. *ICLR*, 2023.
69. Sashank Pisupati and Yael Niv. The challenges of lifelong learning in biological and artificial systems. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 2022.
70. D. Pitcher and L. G. Ungerleider. Evidence for a third visual pathway specialized for social perception. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 25(2):100–110, 2021.
71. Panagiotis Polygerinos, Nikolaus Correll, Stephen A Morin, Bobak Mosadegh, Cagdas D Onal, Kirstin Petersen, Matteo Cianchetti, Michael T Tolley, and Robert F Shepherd. Soft robotics: Review of fluid-driven intrinsically soft devices; manufacturing, sensing, control, and applications in human-robot interaction. *Advanced Engineering Materials*, 19(12):1700016, 2017.
72. Ramona Pringle, Katina Michael, and Michael G Michael. Unintended consequences of living with ai: The paradox of technological potential? part ii [guest editorial]. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 35(4):17–21, 2016.
73. Xavier Puig, Tianmin Shu, Shuang Li, Zilin Wang, Yuan-Hong Liao, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, Sanja Fidler, and Antonio Torralba. Watch-and-help: A challenge for social perception and human-ai collaboration. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021.

74. Neil Rabinowitz, Frank Perbet, Francis Song, Chiyuan Zhang, SM Ali Eslami, and Matthew Botvinick. Machine theory of mind. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4218–4227. PMLR, 2018.
75. Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
76. Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
77. Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Emily M Bender, Amandalynne Paullada, Emily Denton, and Alex Hanna. Ai and the everything in the whole wide world benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.15366*, 2021.
78. Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8821–8831. PMLR, 2021.
79. Scott Reed, Konrad Zolna, Emilio Parisotto, Sergio Gomez Colmenarejo, Alexander Novikov, Gabriel Barth-Maron, Mai Gimenez, Yury Sulsky, Jackie Kay, Jost Tobias Springenberg, et al. A generalist agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.06175*, 2022.
80. Daniela Rus and Michael T Tolley. Design, fabrication and control of soft robots. *Nature*, 521(7553):467–475, 2015.
81. Hal Salzman and Leonard Lynn. Collaborative advantage: creating global commons for science, technology, and innovation. *Issues in science and technology*, 2023.

82. Maartje de Graaf Sam Thellman and Tom Ziemke. Mental state attribution to robots: A systematic review of conceptions, methods, and findings. *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction*, 11(4):41:1–41:51, 2022.
83. Karl Schmeckpeper, Oleh Rybkin, Kostas Daniilidis, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Reinforcement learning with videos: Combining offline observations with interaction. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 339–354. PMLR, 2021.
84. W Richard Scott. *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities*. Sage publications, 2014.
85. N. Sebanz, H. Bekkering, and G. Knoblich. Joint action: bodies and minds moving together. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 10(2):70–76, 2006.
86. Nur Muhammad Mahi Shafiullah, Zichen Jeff Cui, Ariuntuya Altanzaya, and Lerrel Pinto. Behavior transformers: Cloning \$k\$ modes with one stone. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
87. Dhruv Shah, Błażej Osipiński, Sergey Levine, et al. Lm-nav: Robotic navigation with large pre-trained models of language, vision, and action. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 492–504. PMLR, 2023.
88. Dylan S Shah, Joran W Booth, Robert L Baines, Kun Wang, Massimo Vespignani, Kostas Bekris, and Rebecca Kramer-Bottiglio. Tensegrity robotics. *Soft robotics*, 9(4):639–656, 2022.
89. Lin Shao, Toki Migimatsu, Qiang Zhang, Karen Yang, and Jeannette Bohg. Concept2robot: Learning manipulation concepts from instructions and human demonstrations. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 40(12-14):1419–1434, 2021.

90. Robert F Shepherd, Filip Ilievski, Wonjae Choi, Stephen A Morin, Adam A Stokes, Aaron D Mazzeo, Xin Chen, Michael Wang, and George M Whitesides. Multigait soft robot. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 108(51):20400–20403, 2011.
91. Benjamin Shih, Dylan Shah, Jinxing Li, Thomas G Thuruthel, Yong-Lae Park, Fumiya Iida, Zhenan Bao, Rebecca Kramer-Bottiglio, and Michael T Tolley. Electronic skins and machine learning for intelligent soft robots. *Science Robotics*, 5(41):eaaz9239, 2020.
92. Nina R Sinatra, Clark B Teeple, Daniel M Vogt, Kevin Kit Parker, David F Gruber, and Robert J Wood. Ultragente manipulation of delicate structures using a soft robotic gripper. *Science Robotics*, 4(33):eaax5425, 2019.
93. Avishai Sintov, Andrew S Morgan, Andrew Kimmel, Aaron M Dollar, Kostas E Bekris, and Abdeslam Boularias. Learning a state transition model of an underactuated adaptive hand. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 4(2):1287–1294, 2019.
94. Andy Stirling. Keep it complex. *Nature*, 468(7327):1029–1031, 2010.
95. Chen Tessler, Shahar Givony, Tom Zahavy, Daniel Mankowitz, and Shie Mannor. A deep hierarchical approach to lifelong learning in minecraft. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 31, 2017.
96. H Holden Thorp. Chatgpt is fun, but not an author, 2023.
97. Sebastian Thrun and Tom M Mitchell. Lifelong robot learning. *Robotics and autonomous systems*, 15(1-2):25–46, 1995.
98. P. D. Tremoulet and J. Feldman. The influence of spatial context and the role of intentionality in the interpretation of animacy from motion. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 68(6):1047–1058, 2006.

99. Gido M Van de Ven, Hava T Siegelmann, and Andreas S Tolias. Brain-inspired replay for continual learning with artificial neural networks. *Nature communications*, 11(1):4069, 2020.
100. Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
101. Sai Vemprala, Rogerio Bonatti, Arthur Bucker, and Ashish Kapoor. Chatgpt for robotics: Design principles and model abilities. *2023*, 2023.
102. Xiaofei Wang, Kimin Lee, Kouros Hakhmaneshi, Pieter Abbeel, and Michael Laskin. Skill preferences: Learning to extract and execute robotic skills from human feedback. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1259–1268. PMLR, 2022.
103. Thomas Wischmeyer and Timo Rademacher. *Regulating artificial intelligence*, volume 1. Springer, 2020.
104. Michele Xiloyannis, Ryan Alicea, Anna-Maria Georgarakis, Florian L Haufe, Peter Wolf, Lorenzo Masia, and Robert Riener. Soft robotic suits: State of the art, core technologies, and open challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 38(3):1343–1362, 2021.
105. J. Xue, H. Zhang, and K. Dana. Deep texture manifold for ground terrain recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 558–567, 2018.
106. J. Xue, H. Zhang, K. Dana, and K. Nishino. Differential angular imaging for material recognition. *IEEE Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017.

107. Hong Kai Yap, Jeong Hoon Lim, Fatima Nasrallah, James CH Goh, and Raye CH Yeow. A soft exoskeleton for hand assistive and rehabilitation application using pneumatic actuators with variable stiffness. In *2015 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*, pages 4967–4972. IEEE, 2015.
108. Hong Kai Yap, Hui Yong Ng, and Chen-Hua Yeow. High-force soft printable pneumatics for soft robotic applications. *Soft Robotics*, 3(3):144–158, 2016.
109. Shuangyue Yu, Tzu-Hao Huang, Xiaolong Yang, Chunhai Jiao, Jianfu Yang, Yue Chen, Jingang Yi, and Hao Su. Quasi-direct drive actuation for a lightweight hip exoskeleton with high backdrivability and high bandwidth. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 25(4):1794–1802, 2020.
110. H. Zhang, K. Dana, J. Shi, Z. Zhang, X. Wang, A. Tyagi, and A. Agrawal. Context encoding for semantic segmentation. In *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, volume 4, page 7, 2018.
111. Ruohan Zhang, Faraz Torabi, Lin Guan, Dana H Ballard, and Peter Stone. Leveraging human guidance for deep reinforcement learning tasks. *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
112. Brady Zhou, Philipp Krähenbühl, and Vladlen Koltun. Does computer vision matter for action? *Science Robotics*, 4(30):eaaw6661, 2019.
113. Xiyue Zou, Chuyang Chen, Tongfen Liang, Jingjin Xie, Eda-Nicole Gillette-Henao, Ji-hoon Oh, Jonathan Tumalle, and Aaron D Mazzeo. Paper-based resistive networks for scalable skin-like sensing. *Advanced Electronic Materials*, 4(8):1800131, 2018.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) National Research Traineeship (NRT) entitled "NRT-FW-HTF: Socially Cognizant Robotics for a Technology Enhanced Society (SOCRATES)" Grant No. 2021628.