

Learning and Teaching

(Based on Shoham and Leyton-Brown (2008). *Multiagent Systems: Algorithmic, Game-Theoretic, and Logical Foundations*, Cambridge.)

Leen-Kiat Soh

Why Teaching? Is Learning Not Sufficient?

Learning is to meet the needs of the learner agent

What about the needs of the teacher agent?



Learning is akin to "search" for the best solutions, or best solution paths, from among many solutions and non-solutions. **Approaching this search from both ends allows the process to be more timely, more targeted!**

Introduction

- The capacity to learn is a key facet of **intelligent** behavior
- Learning is **complex**
 - the **interaction** between learning and teaching
 - the **settings** in which learning takes place and what constitutes learning in those settings
 - the **learning of the other agents will be impacted by the learning performed by individual agents**
 - the **yardsticks by which to measure this or that theory of learning** in multiagent systems

Recall the handout on Learning and Communication



Introduction 2

- The **simultaneous** learning of the agents means that every learning rule leads to a **dynamical** system, and sometimes even **very simple learning rules can lead to complex global behaviors of the system**
- Moreover, in MAS, one **cannot separate learning from teaching**
 - when choosing a course of action, an agent must take into account not only what it has learned from other agents' past behavior, but also how **it wishes to influence their future behavior**

Adversarial: A learns about B, B learns about A accordingly, how should each learn?



Non-Adversarial: A wants to teach B about X, B wants to learn from A about Y, what if X and Y are not the same thing?



Example | Stackelberg Game

	Player 2 plays L	Player 2 plays R
Player 1 plays T	1,0	3,2
Player 1 plays B	2,1	4,0

Player 1 has a dominant strategy: Play B

Nash equilibrium

- **Player 1 must teach player 2**
- **Why can't player 2 teach player 1?**
 - Who has a **dominant strategy**?
 - Is there a unique **Nash equilibrium**?

Implications? What's the motivation of player 1? Why does player 1 believe that player 2 will learn to do what player 1 teaches?



Example | Pure Coordination Game

	Driver 2 Left	Driver 2 Right
Driver 1 Left	1,1	0,0
Driver 1 Right	0,0	1,1

- Which driver should be the teacher?
 - Either driver could be with equal success
 - **However**, if both decide to play teacher and happen to select **uncoordinated** actions (Left, Right) or (Right, Left) then the players will receive a payoff of zero forever
- *Is there a learning rule that will enable them to coordinate without an external designation of a teacher?*
 - Learning involves **choosing actions** and **updating beliefs**
 - In the abstract, **accumulating knowledge** never hurts, since one can always ignore **what has been learned**

Example | Game of Chicken

	Player 2 Yield	Player 2 Dare
Player 1 Yield	2,2	1,3
Player 1 Dare	3,1	0,0

- The principle of the game is that while each player prefers not to yield to the other, the **worst** possible outcome occurs when **both players do not yield**
- *How to teach?* Does a player have any incentive for learning?
- *Note:* The “**Watch out: I’m crazy**” policy
 - less knowledge is more, in terms of teaching the other player?



Connection to MAS?

For an agent to consider teaching, it needs to be able to understand that the learner agent will learn and will carry out what is taught once learned; Implications?



For an agent to consider teaching, since it is “effortful”, it has to be worth it: the expected outcome to the agent is better than not teaching



Silly Question: Social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc., is popular. What if Facebook had a new rule: If the average number of likes of a user’s posts is below a certain threshold, then the user’s monthly limit on number of posts is decreased. What would happen?

