

A hypothetical model of spontaneous creativity in improvisation

Geraint A. Wiggins Centre for Digital Music Queen Mary, University of London





- What I mean by "spontaneous creativity"
- A hypothetical model of cognitive selection that accounts for inspiration
 - Statistical models of cognitive process
 - Information theory
- Extending the model to interactive creativity
- Evaluation a difficult problem
- Motivation
 - (overall) WHERE DO (MUSICAL) IDEAS COME FROM?
 - (today) HOW DOES (MUSICAL) INTERACTION HAPPEN?

Two kinds of creativity



• One aspect of creativity is **SPONTANEOUS CREATIVITY**

- ideas appear, spontaneously, in consciousness
- cf. Mozart (Holmes, 2009, p. 317)

When I am, as it were, completely myself, entirely alone, and of good cheer – say traveling in a carriage, or walking after a good meal, or during the night when I cannot sleep; it is on such occasions that my ideas flow best and most abundantly.

- Compare with the composer working to build (e.g.) a new version of a TV theme, on schedule, and with constraints on "acceptable style"
 - this is a different kind of activity: CREATIVE REASONING
- Most creative acts of any size are a **mixture of both**
- Here, I focus on **spontaneous creativity** only

A unifying principle



EXPECTATION





EXPECTATION

- Expectation allows us to deal with the world
 - there is too much data out there to process in real time
 - we need to manage it by predicting what comes next, so we have a chance to get ahead
- Expectation works in lots of domains
 - vision
 - movement understanding
 - speech understanding

Why should it be so?



- Key evolutionary points
 - organisms survive better if they can learn
 - organisms survive better if they can anticipate
 - organisms survive better if they can anticipate from what they learn
 - organisms cannot be merely reactive
 - ${\ensuremath{\, ullethed O}}$ anticipation must be proactive
 - organisms must regulate cognitive resource attention is expensive

A uniform account of cognition



- Cognition as information processing
 - To promote survival
 - To manage the world around an organism
- To promote cognition/information processing
 - need memory
 - need compression/optimisation
 - to represent memories as efficiently as possible (reduce cognitive load)
 - to take advantage of any structure/pattern that may be in the perceptual data and avoid repetition
 - need to compare what is perceived with what is remembered, to **predict**
- A system (biological or computational) that can do these things has a big advantage



A uniform account of cognition



- Cognition as information processing
 - To promote survival
 - To manage the world around an organism
- To promote cognition/information processing
 - need memory
 - need compression/optimisation
 - to represent memories as efficiently as possible (reduce cognitive load)
 - to take advantage of any structure/pattern that may be in the perceptual data and avoid repetition
 - need to compare what is perceived with what is remembered, to **predict**
- A system (biological or computational) that can do these things has a big advantage



Framework: Global Workspace Theory



- agents, generating cognitive structures, communicating via a shared workspace
- agnostic as to nature of agent-generators
- information in workspace is available to all agents and to consciousness
- agents gain access to blackboard by "recruiting" support from others
- Problem: how to gain access
- Avoid Chalmers' "hard problem": what is conscious?
 - ask instead: what is it conscious of?



Queen Marv

University of London

Component: Statistical cognitive models



- currently using IDyOM model (Pearce, 2005)
 - predicts human melodic expectation (R²=.81; Pearce & Wiggins, 2006)
 - predicts human melodic segmentation (F₁=.61; Pearce, Müllensiefen & Wiggins, 2010)
 - predicts language (phoneme) segmentation (F₁=.67; Wiggins, 2011)
- Statistical nature means we can apply information theory (Shannon, 1948)



Queen Marv

University of London

Unifying concept: Information theory



- Two versions of Shannon's *entropy* measure (MacKay, 2003)
 - It the number of bits required to transmit data between a hearer and a listener given a shared data model
 - information content: estimated number of bits required to transmit a given symbol as it is received:

$$h = -\log_2 p_s$$

• models unexpectedness

entropy: expected value of the number of bits required to transmit a symbol from a given distribution:

$$H = -\sum_i p_i \log_2 p_i$$

- models **uncertainty**
- p_s, p_i are probabilities of symbols; i ranges over all symbols in the distribution

Instantiating the Global Workspace



Agent generators

- statistical samplers predicting next in sequence from shared learned models of perceptual and other domains
- many agents, working in massive parallel
 - at all times, the likelihood of a given prediction is proportional to the number of generators producing it
- receive perceptual input from sensory systems
 - ${ullet}$ continually compare previous predictions with current world state
- continually predict next world state from current matched predictions
 - ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ sensory input does not enter memory directly
 - \odot the expectation that matches best, or a merger of the two, is recorded
- consider state t (current) and state t+l (next)
 - at state t, we can calculate h_t , H_t , and H_{t+1} (but not h_{t+1} , because it hasn't happened yet)

Anticipatory agent





Memory

Time 🐨

Anticipatory agents



Sensory input



Memory

Time 🐨



Time







Time 🐨

Selecting agent outputs



Competitive access to Global Workspace

- Agents produce (musical) structure representations
- Probability of structure (in learned model) increases "volume"
 - likely structures are generated more often
 - multiple identical predictions are "additive"
- Unexpectedness increases "volume"
 - information content predicts unexpectedness
- Uncertainty decreases "volume"
 - entropy reduces "volume"



Selecting agent outputs



Competitive access to Global Workspace

- Agents produce (musical) structure representations
- Probability of structure (in learned model) increases "volume"
 - likely structures are generated more often
 - multiple identical predictions are "additive"
- Unexpectedness increases "volume"
 - information content predicts unexpectedness
- Uncertainty decreases "volume"
 - entropy reduces "volume"





- Mechanism proposed to anticipate and manage events in the world
- Same mechanism can result in creativity in response to sensory input
- Relative lack of sensory input results in "free-wheeling"
 - which in turn allows (apparently) spontaneous creative production
 - cf. Wallas (1926) "aha" moment between incubation and inspiration
 © corresponds with entry of structure into global workspace
- All this is internal to one individual
 - how might cooperative improvisation be included in this framework?





Time 🚱



Time

Player I





Time

Player I





Player |





Player |





Time

Player I Player 2 State State h_{t+1} h_{t+1} Competitive access to Global Workspace record match Competitive access to Global Workspace record match Seuzory input Sensory input Play Play Memory Memory h_{t+1} State H $H_{n,1}$ State Distribution_{2,t} Distribution_{2,t} $H_{t,2}$ $H_{t,2}$ Agent₂ $Agent_2$ Distribution1,t Distribu sample sample at t at t Agenti Agent sample sample at t at t Established entrainment Compatible models of music Shared model of piece









• Given

- perceptual mechanisms given as discrete representations ongoing research
- Iearned enculturation statistical mechanisms
 - musical technique (e.g. ability to hear musically, ability to play)
 - musical knowledge (e.g. chord sequences of particular songs, music "theory")
- mechanism for entrainment open question (Large et al., oscillatory model?)
- reward mechanism (why is it fun?)
 - maybe somatic responses to memory activity (Biederman & Vessel, 1996)
 - maybe emotional responses to interaction itself (cf. intuitive parentese)
- ... improvisatory behaviour naturally arises from a cognitive mechanism for survival in the world





- Creativity is a slippery concept in humans
 - how can we evaluate the model?
- Doing this with music is in a sense easier than with language or other kinds of knowledge
 - no real-world inference necessary
 - but that doesn't make it easier to evaluate

• Build the beast and see what it does!

- does it produce novel and interesting (musical) ideas?
- does its behaviour match human behaviours?
- Use evaluation methods from CC
 - Ritchie's artefact analysis
 - Colton's FACE & IDEA formalisms, etc.



- Full (long) paper on model due on line in next 3 weeks:
 - Wiggins, G. (2012) The Mind's Chorus: Creativity before Consciousness. Cognitive Computation. Special issue on Computational Creativity, Intelligence and Autonomy, June.