ABSTRACT

Researchers have proposed models of curiosity as a means to drive robots to learn and adapt to their environments. While these models balance goal- and exploration-oriented actions in a mathematically principled manner, it is not understood how users perceive a robot that pursues off-task actions. Motivated by a model of curiosity based on intrinsic rewards, we conducted three online video-surveys with a total of 264 participants, evaluating a variety of curious behaviors. Our results indicate that a robot’s off-task actions are perceived as expressions of curiosity, but that these actions lead to a negative impact on perceptions of the robot’s competence. When the robot explains or acknowledges its deviation from the primary task, this can partially mitigate the negative effects of off-task actions.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Curiosity is the intrinsic drive for new information [24, 26]. Psychologists distinguish curiosity from the general desire for information for its underlying motivation being completely intrinsic, i.e., having no immediate external benefit [4, 22, 24, 26, 41]. Essentially, humans seek knowledge and have a desire to know things just “out of curiosity,” with no expectation of direct and immediate utility. As such, curiosity can have short-term costs (e.g., time or effort spent exploring and learning) without necessarily having long-term benefit (e.g., gaining useful new information). Curiosity is nonetheless considered a desirable trait [14], and is believed to be at the core of human development, learning, and even scientific discovery [38, 40, 42, 45]. Curiosity has even been found to be an antecedent for academic success, on par with—and distinct from—intelligence [51].

Researchers are interested in computationally modeling curiosity as a mechanism to drive learning and knowledge acquisition in robots and artificial agents [34]. These effort are usually framed in the context of reinforcement learning and provide the agent with a reward for actions that produce new, novel, or surprising information and effects. For instance, Oudeyer [32] highlights a demonstration of operationalized curiosity in the form of a robot arm exploring its immediate environment with a curiosity based policy that rewards new and novel experience. The curious robot arm will eventually discover a controller joystick, unlocking a litany of novel experience, and it will stop free roaming and focus solely on “mastering” what the joystick is capable of [13, 32]. When implemented as an augmentation to machine learning agents, these behaviors can guide the agent’s learning through a high dimensional state space, but the actions they generate may or may not
relate to accomplishing the current task. Although these curious, exploratory behaviors have demonstrated utility in simulated or limited domains, it is conceivable that the off-task actions that they generate may be perceived negatively, especially when the task is in service of humans, since the long-term benefits are not clear.

In this paper, we explore how a robot’s curiosity-driven off-task actions are perceived by humans and what factors might mitigate potential negative perceptions. First, we identify qualitatively different behaviors of a curious robot using a computational model of intrinsic motivation. Second, we design and validate a questionnaire to measure people’s perception of a robot’s curiosity and competence. Finally, we perform three empirical studies, comparing a range of robot off-task actions. In contrast to past work on interactions with robot curiosity, which have been unconcerned with human perceptions, the current study gauges human perceptions of a robot running a program modeled on curiosity and examines how an autonomous robot’s behaviors influence those perceptions.

2 RELATED WORK

Modeling Curiosity in AI and Robotics. A large body of work on robotics and artificial agents has explored the computational modeling of curiosity as intrinsic motivation [6, 12, 17, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 52]. Oudeyer & Kaplan offer a typology of these models, contrasting approaches that reward different types of novelty [34]. Reflecting the ambiguity of psychological definitions and representations of curiosity, there is considerable variation in what mechanisms computational researchers call curiosity. While some produce off-task actions, which are the primary interest in this paper, others, like active learning, have been equated with curiosity [49], though they optimize for expected learning gains that directly benefit ongoing tasks [2, 9, 46]. Similarly, some work refers to strategies for guiding exploration for information gathering as curiosity, outside the context of learning and intrinsic rewards [15, 31]. Other work equates off-policy learning with curiosity [28, 53].

Curiosity in HRI. In the field of human–robot interaction (HRI), research on robot curiosity is sparse and has mostly focused on sparking or promoting curiosity in human counterparts, particularly children. For instance, robots have been used in classroom settings to leverage interest for a novel artifact (i.e., a robot) in order to encourage curiosity-related behaviors like question asking in students [43]. Robots have similarly been positioned as interactive peers aimed at increasing curiosity in children by displaying curious behaviors (e.g., wondering out-loud, asking questions, expressing desire to learn) for participants to mirror or to teach themselves [16, 48]. In many instances, the conception of robot curiosity has largely been inconsequential and behavioral representations of curiosity (i.e., whether the robot truly acts “curious”) are only measured by the success of impacting behavioral outcomes in human participants (e.g., does the human behave with more curiosity).

Perceptions of Robots. Understanding how people perceive robots is critical to their long-term adoption because a robot—even a very capable or intelligent one—is subject to the whims of human perceptions. Indeed, a fundamental understanding of HRI is that humans will place exceptional meaning into any agent in motion [20] and that people will ascribe complex social and mental traits to any object of significant complexity [37]. However, careful behavioral designs can help control these subjective judgements by providing humans with a conceptual framework that they can implicitly understand [1, 20, 44, 47]. For instance, past work has found robots which employ targeted implicit communication techniques like facial expressions or gestures can increase performance in collaborative tasks [5], be more persuasive [10], and seem more approachable [19]. Similarly, well designed and domain sensitive communication techniques can help robots seem competent and likeable when recovering from errors [25].

More recently, research on robotic curiosity has begun to build upon this by attempting to assess how external expressions of curiosity translate to understanding internal states of robots by human counterparts. In an experimental study with adults, Ceha et al., [8] used external expressions of curiosity (e.g., showing interest in new information, saying “I am curious about...”) to imply an internal state of curiosity during an educational game and found that participants who engaged with a robot designed to seem curious were more likely to rate the robot as curious than those in a neutral condition. This is particularly important because observable curious behaviors have been difficult to define and capture [18]. Moreover, this demonstrates that the success and outcome of a robot performing a task or expressing complex internal states can be fundamentally altered by how it is seen to do it [39, 47]. As such, implementations of an internal construct, such as curiosity, are likely incomplete without also capturing their correct external representations.

3 DOMAIN

We studied perceptions of robot off-task actions in the context of information gathering. Mobile robots with sensors are well suited for assisting people in gathering physically distributed information and have been used for this purpose across different settings, from underwater environments [21] to human-populated buildings [11]. In our domain, the robot assists the user by inventorying boxes, as it might in a retail store, warehouse, or data center. This domain’s action space consists solely of information gathering actions, rather than other behaviors like physical manipulation of objects, allowing us to focus on curiosity, which is principally about gathering information.

We studied the instance of this domain shown in Figure 1, consisting of 8 boxes spread across a room. The simplicity of the scenario makes it obvious what the robot should do to accomplish its tasking while still providing opportunities for off-task actions.

3.1 Markov Decision Process

Our domain can be formalized as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), enabling us to apply a common model of intrinsic motivation by adjusting the reward function. The MDP is defined by the tuple $M = (S, A, T, R)$ where:

- $S$ is the set of possible configurations that the world can be in. The state variables in our domain include (1) a binary representation of whether it knows the contents of each box (unknown before the box has been checked), (2) the index of the box corresponding to the person’s latest information
The MDP from Section 3.1 can be solved using value iteration to
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Different values of rint, rtask, and rstep in the reward function Eq. 1
result in policies that chose different actions in the same state.
Rolling out these policies produce qualitatively distinct behaviors
in terms of tendencies towards off-task actions, examples of which
are shown in Figure 2.

When rtask > rint ≫ rstep the robot collects and delivers the
requested information as soon as the episode starts to get maximal
reward as soon as possible (Figure 2a). In contrast, when rtask < rint
the robot first collects all possible information before it delivers the
requested one, going completely off task (Figure 2d).
The number of off-task actions can be modulated by modifying
Rstep(s, a) to depend on the action a, for instance, to reflect how long
it takes to execute the action. While large task rewards (rtask ≫ rint)
will still result in immediately delivering the information, intrinsic
rewards that are almost as high as the task reward (rtask ≈ rint)
push the robot towards actions with minimal cost, (i.e. take the
least time to perform) rather than trying to deliver the requested
information right away. Depending on how the difference between
intrinsic and task rewards compares to the cost of actions, the
robot might perform more (Figure 2c) or fewer (Figure 2b) off-task
actions, before completing the task. Lastly, modifying the intrinsic
reward to consider factors other than novelty of information, such
as how challenging it is to obtain the information, we see that the
robot’s off-task actions can be directed towards different parts of
the environment (Figure 1).

4 METHOD

Informed by the types of behaviors that emerged from the model,
we endeavored to evaluate human impressions of a range of off-task
actions. We captured videos of interactions, giving us a high degree
of control over extraneous variables like timing and motion that
may impact perceptions of the robot. The use of videos also facilita-
ted a large online survey experimental design, enabling inference
about many conditions.

4.1 Robot Platform
The Mayfield Kuri robot is a mobile social robot equipped with
a pan-tilt head, one degree-of-freedom actuated “eye-lids”, and a
holonomic wheeled base. The robot interacts using a microphone
array, a speaker, and a chest LED array. For our experiments, we
used nodding and blinking animations as well as beep sounds that
were created by the robot’s designers. The robot does not provide
a default text-to-speech implementation, so we used the SLT voice
from the Festival Speech System HTS 2007 engine1 with its pitch
raised by 165 cents. We used the default autonomous navigation
implementation, wherein the robot localizes itself against a prebuilt
map using a short range LIDAR sensor.

4.2 Videos
We constructed a physical version of our domain and recorded
videos of a robot fulfilling a user’s request, frames from which can
be seen in Figure 3.
Recording was conducted in a classroom with a camera statically
positioned to capture the user and eight boxes that were placed in
the same arrangement as our domain model. The videos depict the
boxes labeled with numbers 1-8, however, because the assignment
of the numbers is randomized in different conditions, we refer to
boxes by their names from Figure 1 for consistency. We included a
backpack and a trashcan in the scene as additional targets for the
robot’s checking behavior.
The common elements across all videos are that

• the user asks the robot to “check box [N].” The requested
number always corresponds to box E.

1http://www.cstr.ed.ac.uk/projects/festival/
the robot plays a nodding animation and emits an affirmative beep. It turns to begin the task.
- the user sits at a table in front of a laptop and does not look at the robot as it works.
- the user updates a label placed on a nearby whiteboard, removing the number corresponding to the current request and placing the number of the next request.
- the robot fulfills the user’s request. The box check action is denoted by the robot navigating to the edge of a box, tilting its head down and making a beep sound.
- the robot returns to verbally report that “box [N] contains [X]”. We randomly selected a common household good, like mugs or books, and a number as the contents to be reported.

All of our manipulations introduce off-task checks of a box or other object. Off-task checks play the same animation but emit an alternative beep sound, connecting that the robot distinguishes between the actions. Some manipulations append an explanation or additional information to the robot’s final report.

The videos were recorded with blank labels, enabling us to emphasize that each clip depicts a wholly distinct interaction by using compositing software to randomize the assignment of the numbers across conditions in an experiment. To further reinforce this, we color tinted the robot so that each conditions’ robot had a different visual appearance. During editing, we also slightly accelerated the robot’s motion, and controlled the timing of check events and the overall length of comparable clips.

### 4.3 Participants
All participants were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk and compensated between $1 and $1.5. Participation was limited to workers with a submission acceptance rate above 95% from predominantly English-speaking countries. All procedures were approved by the University of Washington’s Institutional Review Board.

### 4.4 Procedure
In each experiment, participants were told that they would be rating their impressions of different robots that were designed to help a user inventory boxes in an office. After providing consent, participants watched an example video which showed a near-complete interaction, designed to familiarize them with the robot and scenario. The instructional video included annotations for the user, the robot, the boxes, the “next task” placed on the whiteboard by the user, and a textual label “box check” that displayed as the robot tilted its head down towards the target box. The example video was intentionally cut between the target box check and contents report to avoid priming the user to expect the robot to return directly.

Participants were shown either 4 or 5 different videos, depending on the experiment. The order of the videos was randomized and fully counterbalanced in all experiments. For each video, participants filled out a short questionnaire gathering their impression of the robot. Participants’ were not allowed to advance past a video until they watched it completely and responded to the required items. The video player allowed participants to freely scrub through and restart the video, however no numeric representation of the duration of the clip was displayed. After viewing all conditions, participants completed additional questions. Finally, we asked participants to provide demographic information, any overall comments, and thanked them for their participation. The interface and videos used are provided in the auxiliary materials.

### 4.5 Measures

#### 4.5.1 Questionnaire Items
To our knowledge, there are no validated instruments for perceptions of curiosity. The closest is the Five-dimensional Curiosity Scale developed by psychologists to assess curiosity in people [23]; however, this instrument is meant for self-assessment and does not translate well to evaluation of a non-human agent.

Because we are primarily interested in the relationship between perceptions of the robot’s competence and curiosity, we adopted items from the Godspeed Questionnaire’s “Intelligence” scale [3] and created additional items that we thought would reflect these attributes. To maintain compatibility with Godspeed items, we used 5-point semantic differential format.

We conducted a pilot study in which 48 participants, aged between 19 and 62 (M = 36.0, SD = 10.95, 31 male, 17 female), rated their impression of the robot on each of 4 videos. Participants were split evenly between seeing draft versions of the videos used in Experiments I and II, described in Sections 5 and 6 respectively.

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis with promax rotation and used parallel analysis to determine cutoffs for the eigenvalues of the factors, yielding two factors, shown in Table 1. The first factor, which we call “competence” for its similarity with the RoSAS factor of the same name [7], includes all of the Godspeed Intelligence items we adopted, as well as three of our new items.

#### 4.5.2 Open-ended Questions
For each video, we asked users to:
1. “In a few words, describe what the robot did.”
2. (Optionally) “Please explain any significant factors in your responses.”

We hoped these questions would capture how participants conceived of the robot’s actions. In piloting, we observed that most participants provided only factual narration (e.g. “the robot checked box 4”) when prompted to describe a video, however we kept the question because we found that inaccurate or garbled responses were a reliable indicator of spam submissions.

After participants finished rating all videos, we asked them consider all of the videos they had seen and to answer two open-ended questions:
1. “What aspects of the robot’s behaviors stood out to you?”

---

2To further facilitate replication and extension, the source footage and compositing resources are also archived: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3600600
The first study aims to uncover the impact of the presence of off-task actions. We also investigate variations of off-task actions in terms of the distance travelled to check the extra box and order in which the requested and extra boxes are checked. We expected that off-task actions would be recognized as expressions of curiosity, and that the a longer distance traveled off-task may be perceived as a stronger expression of curiosity. Similarly, we thought that a robot that gave precedence to an off-task action by pursuing it before attending to the user’s request may similarly be viewed as more strongly curious.

5 EXPERIMENT I: DISTANCE AND ORDER

The first study aims to uncover the impact of the presence of off-task actions. We also investigate variations of off-task actions in terms of the distance travelled to check the extra box and order in which the requested and extra boxes are checked. We expected that off-task actions would be recognized as expressions of curiosity, and that the a longer distance traveled off-task may be perceived as a stronger expression of curiosity. Similarly, we thought that a robot that gave precedence to an off-task action by pursuing it before attending to the user’s request may similarly be viewed as more strongly curious.

Hypothesis 1: A robot that takes an off-task action is perceived as more curious than one that does not.
Hypothesis 2: The further a robot travels off-task, the more curious it will be perceived to be.
Hypothesis 3: A robot that takes an off-task action first will be liked less than a robot that takes an off-task action after an on-task action.

Conditions. We leveraged the procedure described in Section 4.4 to conduct a within-subjects comparison of 4 conditions:

Control (CON): The robot checks box E and reports its contents.
Distance 1 (DS1): The robot checks box E, then checks box B and reports the contents of box E.
Distance 2 (DS2): The robot checks box E, then checks box H and reports the contents of box E.
Distance 1 Before (D1B): The robot checks box B, then checks box E and reports its contents.

Participants. 72 participants, aged 20-70 (M = 35.2, SD = 11.3, 39 male, 32 female, 1 non-binary) completed the study.

Results. Curiosity showed acceptable reliability (α = .70) and competence showed excellent reliability (α = .91). We conducted pairwise dependent t tests comparing conditions for each measure, applying the Holm-Bonferroni adjustment to the resulting p values. The results of these tests for the competence and curiosity scales are given in Table 2 and summarized in Figure 4.

H1 was supported: Each manipulated condition resulted in the robot being perceived as significantly more curious when compared to the control.
H2 was not supported: DS1 and DS2 were not perceived as distinguishable levels of curiosity.
H3 was not supported: DS1 and D1B showed no significant difference in curiosity.

Open-ended comments by participants explaining their ratings included attributions of curiosity and inquisitiveness to the robots

---

Table 1: Loading matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient-Efficient</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective-Effective</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfocused-Focused</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irresponsible-Responsible</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent-Competent</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent-Intelligent</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent-Investigative</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninquisitive-Inquisitive</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incurious-Curious</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike-Like</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintrusive-Intrusive</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinelike-Humanlike</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) “In your own words, describe what the robot was doing when it did things besides what the user asked it to do.”

These questions were phrased to avoid biasing participants towards specific language and thereby collect the widest possible range of responses. In contrast with the per-video description question, a large majority of participants responded to the concluding description request with character attributions or free ranging speculation about the robot’s intent, as desired.

Figure 3: Frames from the videos used in the experiments with the captions included above each frame. The first column indicates the conditions and experiments (I-III) in which the video was used. For conditions EXC and EXU, the explanation offered by the robot (shown in the blue box) was different.
that performed off-task actions, some seeing it as a positive attribute, e.g., “The robot investigated an extra box, but it was on the way to the target box. While not as efficient as the direct route it still took advantage of pathway to get additional information.” (D1B) or “The extra stop which was outside of the primary mission makes the robot seem more inquisitive about the surrounding environment.” (DS1). Another participant supported this view with a comment about the robot that does not perform any off-task actions “It can be nice to have a task performed exactly as requested, but feels like a missed opportunity to quickly take note of the contents in other boxes along the way.” (CON).

While increasing the perception of curiosity, performing off-task actions negatively impacted perception of competence. All manipulations resulted in significantly lower competence ratings compared to the control (Table 2). Participants commented on the off-task actions negatively, e.g., “robot seemed somewhat incompetent because it checked a box it was not instructed to check”, or “not so good because it made unnecessary stop at another box” (DS1). They attributed the off-task actions to a number of different reasons. Some participants thought the off-task action was due to an error, complaining that they could not trust the robot’s report, e.g., “I’m not sure if it’s correctly reporting the contents of box 6 or incorrectly reporting the contents of the last box it looked in” (DS1). Others attributed agency to the robot, e.g., “it was distracted”, “he appears to have Robot ADHD,” “acted out of order”, “decided on its own to check another box” (DS1). In some cases participants did not understand why the off-task actions were happening, e.g., “checked a box it wasn’t told to for unknown reasons” (DS1). Other comments supported the higher perceived competence of the control condition, e.g., “did exactly as instructed”, “performed the task perfectly”, “it was fast and effective”.

Some participants complained about the robot’s lack of an explanation or report regarding the off-task actions: “This robot checked more boxes than asked, but did not give a reason for it” (DS1) or “It should have at least reported its findings” (DS1). This inspired some strategies the robot could use to mitigate the perception of lower competence due to off-task actions, which we explore in Experiment III (Section 7).

While there was no difference between DS2 and other off-task conditions, some participants called out the difference in distance in their comments: “I still appreciate the apparent curiosity, and it comes off as less annoying when the additional box being checked was one along the path” (D1B). Similarly, the order did not have a statistically significant effect on competence or curiosity, but was mentioned in comments: “it check what it wanted to before checking what it was told to check I felt it was inefficient” (D1B).

All manipulations were seen as more human-like, more intrusive, and were liked less than the control. However, there were no significant differences between the different manipulations (DS1, DS2, D1B).

### 6 EXPERIMENT II: PAYOFF AND RELEVANCE

The negative impact of off-task actions on the perceived competence of the robot prompted us to consider whether participants would be sensitive to whether an off-task action showed a clear utility.

**Hypothesis 4:** Off-task behaviors that show utility are perceived as more competent than those that do not.

**Hypothesis 5:** The less relevant an off-task action is to the current task, the more curious the robot is perceived to be.

**Conditions.** We leveraged the procedure described in Section 4.4 to conduct a within-subjects comparison of 4 conditions. We used the Control and Distance 1 conditions from Experiment I as a basis and compared them against two new manipulations:

- **Distance 1 Payoff (PAY):** The robot checks the user-requested box, then checks box B, and reports the contents of the user-requested box. In contrast to DS1, the next-task that the user posts to the board is box B.
- **Distance 1 Non-box (NON):** The robot checks the user-requested box, then checks a trashcan, and reports the contents of the user-requested box. The trashcan is placed at comparable relative distance as box B.

**Participants.** 72 participants, aged 19-73 ($M = 36.0, SD = 11.53, 44$ male, 27 female) completed the study.

**Results.** Curiosity showed acceptable reliability ($\alpha = .76$) and competence showed excellent reliability ($\alpha = .93$). We conducted pairwise dependent $t$ tests comparing conditions for each measure, applying the Holm-Bonferroni adjustment to the resulting $p$ values. The results of these tests for the competence and curiosity scales are given in Table 3 and summarized in Figure 5.
Table 3: Pairwise tests for Experiment II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>M_A</th>
<th>S_A</th>
<th>M_B</th>
<th>S_B</th>
<th>t(71)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>DS1</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-6.05</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAY</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS1</td>
<td>PAY</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-2.72</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAY</td>
<td>NON</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H4 was supported. An off-task action that displayed potential to benefit the user resulted in higher competence ratings.

H5 was not supported. Making a trashcan the target of the off-task behavior resulted in lower ratings of curiosity.

Participant comments indicated that they noticed the payoff of the off-task action in the PAY condition. Some perceived it positively, e.g., “It looked like the robot was checking box 5 ahead of time” (PAY), while others were unsure about giving the robot credit “The robot went to the next box. Might have been a coincidence, perhaps not.” (PAY).

The NON condition being perceived as less curious was surprising, but might have been due to participants not perceiving the robot’s action towards the trash can as checking or not even noticing the trashcan because it blended into the scene (e.g., it was not labeled like the boxes), despite the robot making a “beep” to indicate its checking action. Only 13 out of the 72 participants mentioned the trashcan in their open-ended description of the video, some expressing uncertainty about the off-task action “I’m not sure if it was (incorrectly) checking the trash can or not” (NON). This misunderstanding about the off-task action might also be the reason for the NON condition being perceived as significantly more competent than DS1, consistent with the CON, which has no off-task actions.

DS1 was perceived as less likeable than the control, but differences between other conditions where not significant. As in Experiment I, robots that took off-task actions were perceived as more intrusive, though this impact was not significant in the NON condition. There were no significant differences in humanlikeness.

7 EXPERIMENT III: EXPLANATIONS

Experiment II indicated that users are sensitive to the apparent utility of a robot’s off-task actions, however this impact is largely outside of the robot’s control. This, and participant feedback, motivated us to consider ways in which the robot could more directly control perceptions of its actions and mitigate negative attributions by providing explanations.

Hypothesis 6: A robot that acknowledges its off-task behavior is perceived as more competent than one that does not.

Hypothesis 7: A robot that explains an off-task action is perceived as more competent than one that merely acknowledges the action.

Conditions. We leveraged the procedure described in Section 4.4 to conduct a within-subjects comparison of five conditions. We used the Control and Distance 1 conditions as a basis and compared them against three new manipulations:

Extra Info (INF): The robot checks the user-requested box, then checks box B, and reports the contents of the user-requested box. The robot then says that it “also checked box [B],” and reports its contents.

Explanation Curious (EXC): The robot checks the user-requested box, then checks box B, and reports the contents of the user-requested box. The robot then says that it “also checked box [B], because [it] was curious.”

Explanation Useful (EXU): The robot checks the user-requested box, then checks box B, and reports the contents of the user-requested box. The robot then says that it “also checked box [B], because [it] thought it would be useful to know.”

Participants. 120 participants, aged 18-69 (M = 36.1, SD = 11.3, 70 male, 49 female, 1 non-binary) completed the study.

Results. Curiosity showed acceptable reliability (α = .79) and competence showed excellent reliability (α = .92). We conducted pairwise t tests comparing conditions for each measure, applying the Holm-Bonferroni adjustment to the resulting p values. The results of these tests for the competence and curiosity scales are given in Table 4 and summarized in Figure 6.

H6 was supported. A robot that acknowledged taking an off-task action by reporting the additional information (INFO) was not perceived as more capable than one that did not (DS1).

H7 was partially supported. When compared to a robot that reported the extra information it gathered (INFO), a robot that offered an explanation based on utility (EXU) was perceived as more competent. A robot that attributed the off-task action to curiosity (EXC) was not perceived to be more competent.

Although reporting the information obtained through the off-task action did not improve perceived competence, some participants commented positively about it, e.g., “On the one hand, the extra time lost by checking the unasked box is annoying, the fact that it reported the information helped mitigate my dissatisfaction.”
Despite potential benefits of sharing extra information or explanations, all conditions were still perceived as significantly less competent than the control condition. Negative participant comments about these conditions were similar to the off-task action conditions from Experiments I and II, e.g., “The robot completed the task it was assigned but also did something that was not requested. This could have caused a delay if the task had been urgent.” (INF), “I would prefer the robot to follow instructions exactly as told.” (EXC), and “The robot did not execute its orders efficiently.” (EXU).

As in Experiments I and II, all manipulations were perceived as more intrusive than the control. A robot that provided a utility-based explanation (EXU) was perceived as less intrusive than a robot that provided a curiosity motivation (EXC). All manipulations were perceived as more humanlike than the control. The curiosity-based explanation (EXC) was perceived as more humanlike than the baseline detour (DS1) and the extra information (INF) condition. All manipulations were liked less than the control. Differences between conditions were not significant.

### 8 DISCUSSION

**Implications.** These findings suggest that (1) it is possible to design off-task, exploratory robot behaviors to be perceived as “curious” (not merely distracted or broken), (2) curious robots might be perceived as less competent than non-curious robots, but (3) providing explanations about the robot’s curious behaviors can mitigate some of those negative impacts. Together, these findings inform the design of curious robots that might take off-task actions, like exploring additional boxes while fetching or looking for shortcuts while navigating. If it can be acceptable for robots to engage in curiosity-driven exploration, interrupting assigned tasks, then it might be even more acceptable for robots to explore during the robots’ “downtime.”

**Limitations and Future Work.** As with many HRI studies, these studies represent responses from a particular set of participants to a particular robot in a particular setting. We have done our best to thoroughly describe these participants and methods so that others can reuse this approach to explore broader sets of participants, robots, and settings. In order to test a large set of robot behaviors, we chose to run these studies online, constraining participants to the role of observers, not interactants. Further, we could not control the immersiveness of the experience (e.g., minimize interruptions, control screen sizes). These limitations can be addressed by running in-person lab studies. The current studies provide guidance for determining the variables worth exploring in the future. Building upon this work, it will be important to explore the human-robot perspective, not only a bystanders perspective; longer-term time periods of interaction; and different types of robot roles in relation to the human interactants. Expanding this work to explore more interactive, self-directed robotic agents (as opposed to command-and-control style robots) will enable us to understand the larger design space of curious robot behaviors and interactions with people.
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