Notes on teaching ACT-R modeling

Bill Kennedy George Mason University September 2011

Why Model?



From Marvin L. Bittinger(2004) Calculus and Its Applications, 8th Ed.

Why Model?

- 1. Explain (very distinct from predict)
- 2. Guide data collection
- 3. Illuminate core dynamics
- 4. Suggest dynamical analogies
- 5. Discover new questions
- 6. Promote a scientific habit of mind
- 7. Bound outcomes to plausible ranges
- 8. Illuminate core uncertainties
- 9. Offer crisis options in near-real time

- 10. Demonstrate tradeoffs / suggest efficiencies
- Challenge the robustness of prevailing theory through perturbations
- 12. Expose prevailing wisdom as incompatible with available data
- 13. Train practitioners
- 14. Discipline the policy dialogue
- 15. Educate the general public
- 16. Reveal the apparently simple (complex) to be complex (simple)

Cognitive Science

 An interdisciplinary field including parts of Anthropology, Artificial Intelligence, Education, Linguistics, Neuroscience, Philosophy, and Psychology

 Goal: understanding the nature of the human mind

Goals of AI & Cog Sci

Artificial Intelligence: "scientific understanding of the mechanisms underlying thought and intelligent behavior and their embodiment in machines" (from AAAI website): *demonstrated by functionality*

Cognitive Science: understanding the nature of the human mind as demonstrated by models that match human behavior: i.e., <u>matching human</u> <u>behavior</u>

What is it?



What is it?





What is it?



Components

- An architecture is the fixed* part of a system that implements the mind functions
- Associated with an architecture, a model is the variable* part of a the mind's processing
- System's knowledge representation is on the edge between architectures and models

* with respect to a time scale (from Newell's 1990 UTC)

ACT-R Architecture



ACT-R Architecture Overview

- Procedure core
- Buffers
- Modules
- 2 types of knowledge representation:

- declarative (facts, "chunks")

- procedural (deductions, "productions")

Productions

- Procedural knowledge as if-then statements
- Basic process is: match, select, fire
- Many may match current status
- Only 1 selected to fire

Productions

• Productions use buffers in IF & THEN parts

• IF part checks buffer contents or status

• THEN part, changes buffer values or requests buffer/module action

Productions

• Useful to translate English to ACT-R

eg: IF the goal is to count to y AND currently at x, AND x<>y, THEN remember what comes after x.

Production Design

- eg 1: IF the goal is to count to y AND currently at x, AND x<>y, THEN remember what comes after x.
- but:
 - this production will always match and fire...
 - another production will deal with the remembered fact
 - it can work with addition of a "state" variable

Production Design

• IF the goal is to count to y AND currently at x, AND x<>y, THEN remember what comes after y.

(p rule-getnext	
=goal>	
isa	count
to	У
current	х
- current	У
- state	recalling-next
==>	
+retrieval>	
isa	next-fact
current	х
=goal>	
state	recalling-next
)	

count chunk type: to <n> current <m> state <w>

Production Design 2

- eg 1: IF the goal is to count to y AND currently at x, AND x<>y, THEN recall what comes after y.
- eg 2: IF the goal is to count with current = x AND "to" is not x, THEN recall what comes after x
- eg 3: IF the goal is to count with current is x AND "to" is not x, and we remembered y comes after x, THEN update current to y and recall what comes after y

Production Design (core)

(P increme	nt	
=goal>		
ISA	count-from	
count	=num1	
- end	=num1	
=retrieval	>	
ISA	count-order	
first	=num1	
second	=num2	
==>		
=goal>		
count	=num2	
+retrieval	>	
ISA	count-order	
first	=num2	
!output!	(=num1)	
)		

count-from chunk type: end <n> count <m>

count-order chunk type: first <n> second <m>

Production Design (start)

(P start	
=goal>	
ISA	count-from
start	=num1
count	nil
==>	
=goal>	
count	=num1
+retrieva	>
ISA	count-order
first	=num1
)	

Production Design (stop)

(P stop		
=goal>		
ISA	count-from	
count	=num	
end	=num	
==>		
-goal>		
!output!	(=num)	
)		

ACT-R & Lisp...

- ACT-R written in Lisp
- ACT-R uses Lisp syntax
- Parts of a model
 - Lisp code (~)
 - Parameters
 - Initialization of memory (declarative & proc)
 - Running a model

ACT-R & Lisp...syntax

- ; comments
- "(" <function-name> <arguments> ")"
 eg: (clear-all)

 (sgp) <= lists all parameters & settings
 (p ...) <= p function creates productions

ACT-R & Lisp....warnings/errors

• Lisp warnings

#|Warning: Creating chunk BUZZ of default type chunk |#
Undefined term, usually insignificant

#|Warning: Invalid chunk definition: (RED ISA CHUNK) names a chunk which already exists. |#
Some terms defined within ACT-R as chunks (~reserved words)

ACT-R & Lisp...warnings/errors

• Lisp /ACT-R error example 1:

- > (help)
- UNDEFINED-FUNCTION

```
Error executing command: "(help)":
```

```
Error:attempt to call `HELP' which is an undefined function..
```

Non-existent function call

ACT-R & Lisp....warnings/errors

• Lisp /ACT-R error example 2:

```
Error Reloading:
; loading
; c:\documents and settings\bill
kennedy\desktop\psyc-768-s09\demo2.txt
error reloading model
error:eof encountered on stream
#<file-simple-stream
   #p"c:\\documents and settings\\bill
kennedy\\desktop\\psyc-768-s09\\demo2.txt" closed
   @ #x20b2159a>
```

Unbalanced parentheses.

ACT-R Model (outline)

```
; header info
(clear-all)
(define-model <model name>
   (sgp :<parm name> <value> <parm name> <value> ... )
   (chunk-type <isa name> <att1> <att2> ...)
   (add-dm
    (<name> isa <chunk-type> <attn> <value>
                      <attm> <value> ...)
    (<name> isa <chunk-type> <attn> <value>
                      <attm> <value> ...)
     ...
    ); end of add-dm
   (p...)
   (goal-focus <chunk-name>)
); end of model definition
```

ACT-R Model

(p < =	<production name=""> goal> ISA <chunk-type> <att> <value></value></att></chunk-type></production>
	 =retrieval>
	<pre>retrieval></pre>
==>	
	<pre>=goal> <att><value> +retrieval></value></att></pre>
)	-goal>

Homework: Data Fitting

- From now on the assignments will be compared to human performance
 - Mostly Response time
 - Correlation and Mean deviation
- Provides a way to compare and judge the models
- Not the only way!
 - Plausibility
 - Generality
 - Simplicity
- Make sure the model does the right thing before trying to tune it with parameters!

Subitizing

- Task: A bunch of objects appear on the display, report the number by speaking it
- Model starts with the counting facts from 0-11
- Will need to manage visual attention
 - Make sure the model gets to every item
 - Needs to know when its done
 - Given 10 finsts with a long duration to start
 - Do not have to use that if you do not want to
- Should not need to adjust parameters to get a reasonable fit to the data

Solution Model





Mechanism

- Find, attend, count, repeat
- Linear in the number of items
- Any other solutions?

Memory's Subsymbolic Representation

Memory's Subsymbolic Representation

At symbolic level

 chunks in DM
 retrieval process

(p add-ones =goal> add-pair isa one-ans busy one1 =num1 one2 =num2 =retrieval> addition-fact isa addend1 = num1 addend2 = num2 sum =sum ==> =goal> one-ans =sum busy carry +retrieval> addition-fact isa addend110 sum =sum)

• When turned on, :esc t,

- retrieval based on chunk's "activation"

Memory's Subsymbolic Representation: Activation

- Activation drives both latency and probability of retrieval
- Activation for chunk i:

 $A_i = B_i + \varepsilon_i$

- Retrieved *if* activation above a threshold (retrieval threshold :rt default 0, often -1)
- Latency calculated from activation

Memory's Subsymbolic Representation: Activation

Activation for chunk i:

$$A_i = B_i + \varepsilon_i$$

- B_i = "Base-level activation"
- ε_i = noise contribution
- Base-level activation
 - Depends on two factors of the history of usage of the chunk: recency & frequency
 - represented as the log of odds of need (Anderson & Schooler, 1991)
 - due to math representation, can be negative
 - includes every previous use
 - affected most by most recent use







- Chunk events affecting activation ("event presentations")
 - chunk creation
 - cleared from a buffer and entered into DM
 - cleared from a buffer and already in DM
 - retrieved from DM (credited when cleared)

 Base-level activation calculation called "Base-Level Learning"

- Key parameter, :bll
 - the exponent in the formula
 - normal value: a half, i.e., 0.5

- Full representation requires keeping data on every previous use...
- Alternate: "Optimized" Learning
- If previous chunk events are evenly spaced, a simpler formula is possible
- Keeping even 1 previous event is effective



Memory's Subsymbolic Representation: Activation

Activation for chunk i:

$$A_i = B_i + \varepsilon_i$$

- B_i = "Base-level activation"
- $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i}$ = noise contribution

Memory's Subsymbolic Representation: Activation Noise

- ε_i = noise contribution
- 2 parts: permanent & instantaneous
- both ACT-R parameters :pas & :ans
- usually only adjust :ans
- :ans setting varies, from 0.1 to 0.7
- noise in model sometimes nec'y to match noise of human subjects...

46

Memory's Subsymbolic Representation: Latency(s)

- Activation also affects latency (two ways)
- Latency = $F * e^{-A}$

A is activation

F is "latency factor" (ACT-R parameter : If ~0.5)

 Threshold setting affects latency of retrieval failure

(must wait until latency of threshold passes!)

Memory's Subsymbolic Representation

- Activation = base-level and noise
- Base-level dependent of recency & frequency of previous chunk "presentations"
- Retrieval only when activation above "retrieval threshold"
- Activation <u>and</u> threshold affect latency
- Many parameters :esc, :rt, :bll, :ol, :ans

Memory II: Other Sources of Activation

• Previously, chunk's activation over time

• Now, add the effect of context (two types)

Other Sources: Spreading Activation & Partial Matching

- Activation (previous): $A_i = Base Level Activation + noise$ $= B_i + \varepsilon_i$
- the effect of context (new):

 $A_i = B_i + \varepsilon_i + SA + PM$

• Learn multiple similar facts, e.g.,

A hippie is in the park A lawyer is in the cave A debutante is in the bank A hippie is in the cave A lawyer is in the church

• Tests (seen before Y/N?)

A lawyer is in the park

A hippie is in the cave

 Reponses time increases linearly as number of persons and locations increase, i.e., "fanning out" of activation

• Foils take longer than targets to decide

• The <u>context</u> affects retrievals

 Contents of other buffers contribute to retrieval activation calculation for chunks in DM

• Affects response time

- Consider: several matching chunks in memory
- How decide which?
- Activation based on base (recency & frequency) PLUS small context effect
- Retrieval based on parts of chunk separates exact matches from non-matches

• Activation (previous):

$$A_i = Base Level Activation + noise$$

= $B_i + \varepsilon_i$

• add context: effect of other buffers' chunks

$$A_{i} = B_{i} + \varepsilon_{i} + \sum_{\text{buffers}(k) \text{ slots}(j)} \sum (W_{kj} S_{ji})$$

add context: effect of other buffers' chunks

$$A_{i} = B_{i} + \varepsilon_{i} + \sum \sum (W_{kj} S_{ji})$$

buffers(k) slots(j)

 W_{kj} is weighting of slot j in buffer k (normalized)

 \boldsymbol{S}_{ji} is the strength of the association between slot j and chunk i

add context: effect of other buffers' chunks

$$A_{i} = B_{i} + \varepsilon_{i} + \sum_{k,j} \sum_{(W_{kj} S_{ji})}$$

buffers(k) slots(j)

W_{kj} is weighting of slot j in buffer k (normalized) (default is 1 for goal, 0 for others)

 S_{ji} is the strength of the association between slot j and chunk i $(S_{ji}=0 \text{ or } S-ln(fan_j))$

Fan Effect (Anderson 1974)

 Fan effect: number of associations "fanning out" from a chunk

- Other buffers hold chunks
- Chunk has slots with other chunks
- How many uses of a chunk affects its A_i

Spreading Activation: Fan Effect



Spreading Activation: Fan Effect

- Retrievals based on matching & activation
- Now, other buffers affect retrieval
- But, activation diluted by similar chunks

• Effect:

Similar but non-matches slow retrievals

Other Sources: Partial Matching

Other Sources: Partial Matching

 Provides ACT-R a mechanism to explain errors of commission, retrieving wrong chunk

 (previous activation mechanism explained errors of omission, A_i < :RT)

Partial Matching

• add context: effect of similar chunks

$$A_{i} = B_{i} + \varepsilon_{i} + \sum_{\text{buffers(k) slots(j)}} \sum_{\text{(W}_{kj} S_{ji)}} + \sum_{\text{retrieval slots}} PM_{i}$$

P is weighting of slot

 M_{li} is the similarity between values in slot $_{\rm l}$ of retrieval and slot $_{\rm i}$ of chunk

Partial Matching

• add context: effect of similar chunks

$$A_{i} = B_{i} + \varepsilon_{i} + \sum_{\text{buffers(k) slots(j)}} \sum_{\text{(W}_{kj} S_{ji)}} + \sum_{\text{retrieval slots}} PM_{i}$$

P is weighting of slots (all equal)

 $M_{\rm li}$ is the similarity between values in slot $_{\rm l}$ of retrieval and slot $_{\rm i}$ of chunk

Partial Matching

- Effect is can retrieve a wrong but similar chunk (... IF chunk hierarchy supports it)
- Retrieval of wrong chunk supports errors of commission, taking wrong action vice no action

ACT-R Modeling

• ACT-R Model Development

• ACT-R Model Debugging

ACT-R Model Development

- 1. Plan overall model to work in stages.
- 2. Start simple then add details to your model.
- 3. Write simple productions using simple chunks.
- 4. Run the model (with own trace) frequently to test progress (eg. with every new or changed production).

ACT-R Model Development

- 5. Start with productions doing one thing at a time (i.e., reference goal + one buffer) and use multiple productions. Combine later.
- 6. Use state variables to rigorously control sequencing until model works, then remove as many as possible.

ACT-R Model Development

7. With each buffer request, consider a production for handling the failure.

8. In using loops, consider preps to start and how to leave loop.

ACT-R Debugging Process

- Run ACT-R up to problem...
 - set time limit
 - change production to stop at problem step
- Check "why not" of expected production
- Check buffers & buffer status
- Check visicon
- Causes ...

ACT-R Code Debugging

Stops unexpectedly/expected production not firing:

- Conditions not met (use "Why not" to identify which)
- Conditions over-specified with unnec'y variable tests which don't match
- Logic mismatch among conditions
- nil will not match =variable
Stops unexpectedly/expected production not firing (continued):

- Typo on variable name, i.e., not same ref.
- Wrong slot referenced in LHS
- Time ran out
- Production not in memory
- Error on loading (production ignored)
- Production overwritten by duplicate naming (warning)

Wrong production firing:

- Firing production <u>also</u> meets current conditions
- Conditions do not meet expected production LHS

Production firing repeatedly:

- LHS not changed by firing, i.e., still valid

Buffer unexpectedly empty:

- Not filled
- Implicit clearing (on LHS but not RHS)

Buffer with unexpected chunk:

- Previous production to fill it didn't fire
- Sensor handling not as expected
- Buffer not updated/cleared as expected

Retrieval unsuccessful:

- Expected chunk not in memory
- Retrieval specification unintended
 - overly specific (too many slots specified)
 - unintended chunk type
- Expected chunk's activation too low
- Wrong chunk retrieved
 - under specified (too few slots specified)
 - partial matching effect (intended)

Timing too slow:

- Combine productions
- Driven by retrieval failures and :RT too low

Timing too fast:

Driven by retrieval failures and :RT too high

Unit 4: Zbrodoff's Experiment

- alpha arithmetic, eg: A + 2 = C: correct?
- possible addends: 2, 3, or 4
- learning over:
 - stimuli set (24)
 - repetition (5)
 - blocks (2) = 192 trials

Model Design

- Given model that counts to answer
- Process: read problem, count, answer
- Already creates saves chunks of answers
- Strategy?

Model Design - start

- Basic strategy: learn to retrieve answer
- How: attempt retrieval
 if successful, answer based on it
 if fails, resort to counting
 (another basic process...)
- After model runs, adjust :RT

Model Design – basic process

Instance-based action/declarative learning process:



Model Coding

Ziegler homework: ~80% given



Parameter Tweaking

 After model runs, adjust retrieval threshold to control when learning occurs vs. problem solving

Unit 5: Siegler Experiment

- Experiment is 4 yr olds answering addition problems: 1+1 up to 3+3 (answers from 0-8 & "other")
- Environment starts with problem stuffed into imaginal buffer as "text"
- Goal: beat 0.976 / 0.058
- Strategy?

Model Development Process

- 1. get working for one case
- 2. expand for all cases
- 3. adjust parameters

Model / Coding Issue

- Note: one <> "one" <> "1" <> 1, (symbol, strings, and a constant)
- Facts stored using different representations
 Number fact: (one ISA number value 1 name "one")
 Addition fact: (f11 ISA plus-fact addend1 one addend2 one sum two)
- problem input & response as strings, eg., "one"

Model / Coding Issue

 Now possible to access to chunk names eg., =retrieval like previous =visual-location

• <u>Or</u>, ("old school") add slot with value, eg: (four ISA number value 4 name "four" ref four)

Model Design - basics

Given chunk types and functions to set base activation and set similarities

• Basic process: encode, retrieve, respond

Parameter Tweaking

- Set base level activations for successful retrievals throughout a run
- Adjust :ans to get "other" responses
- Set similarities to generate error distribution to match human subjects

Siegler Experiment Data



	zero	one	two	three	four	five	six	seven	eight	other
1+1	0	0.05	0.86	0	0.02	0	0.02	0	0	0.06
1+2	0	0.04	0.07	0.75	0.04	0	0.02	0	0	0.09
1+3	0	0.02	0	0.1	0.75	0.05	0.01	0.03	0	0.06
2+2	0.02	0	0.04	0.05	0.8	0.04	0	0.05	0	0
2+3	0	0	0.07	0.09	0.25	0.45	0.08	0.01	0.01	0.06
3+3	0.04	0	0	0.05	0.21	0.09	0.48	0	0.02	0.11

Siegler Data & Models

Experimental Data

Perfect Behavior (0.942 / 0.125)

My Model (0.960 / 0.059)



 A reward value is propagated backwards through rule firings <u>and</u> depreciated by time





• Eg: (spp Rule-b :reward 10)

(spp Rule-w :reward 15)



• Eg: (spp Rule-b :reward 10)

(spp Rule-w :reward 15)



Why?

 Multiple rules' LHS meet current conditions and appropriate strategy is a balance between the them.

• Rule selection balance can be learned

• To turn on utility learning: (sgp :ul t)

Learning Utility

• Difference Learning Equation:

 $U_i(n) = U_i(n-1) + \alpha [R_i(n) - U_i(n-1)]$

 $U_i(n)$ is utility of rule i at nth firing $R_i(n)$ is reward for rule i at nth firing α is "learning rate" (sgp :alpha 0.2)

Learning Utility

• Difference Learning Equation effect:



- Match a given length by a combination of 3 other given lengths
- Two strategies: building up or subtracting ("undershoot"/"overshoot" based on first move)

7/ Building Sticks Task	
<u>A</u> –	
<u>B</u>	
<u> </u>	
Reset	



- Searching for combination of A,B, & C that equals target length (green)
- If current is too long, length is subtracted 100

Demo

Goal: 103

Demo

Goal: 103 = B – 2C – A

Human performance data:

available lengths Goal %Overshoot b а С 15 250 55 125 20 10 155 22 101 67 14 200 37 112 20 22 200 32 114 47 10 243 37 159 87

• BST model has 27 productions



• BST model has 27 productions



- BST model has 27 productions
- Key productions decide which length to use based on whether current length is too long ("over") or too short ("under")

decide-over decide-under force-over force-under

```
(p decide-under
                                           (p force-under
    =goal>
                                               =goal>
      isa
               try-strategy
                                                          try-strategy
                                                 isa
      state
               choose-strategy
                                                          choose-strategy
                                                 state
      strategy nil
                                               - strategy under
    =imaginal>
      isa
               encoding
               =over
      over
      under =under
    !eval! (< =under (- =over 25))</pre>
==>
    =imaginal>
                                           ==>
    =goal>
      state
               prepare-mouse
                                               =goal>
      strategy under
                                                 state
                                                          prepare-mouse
    +visual-location>
                                                 strategy under
               visual-location
      isa
                                               +visual-location>
      kind oval
                                                          visual-location
      screen-y 85)
                                                 isa
                                                 kind
                                                          oval
                                                 screen-y 85)
```

• (collect-data 100) → corr: 0.803

• Utilities start \rightarrow end decide-over $13 \rightarrow 13.15$ decide-under $13 \rightarrow 11.15$ force-over $10 \rightarrow 12.15$ force-under $10 \rightarrow 6.59$
Model design:

productions

- start by detecting "choose" in window
- generate key-press (heads <u>and</u> tails)
- read actual result
- note matches and non-matches
 settings :ult (to turn on utility learning)
 :egs noise parameter
 set initial utilities

AND establish rewards for specific productions

Model results (collect-data 100): Corr: / Mean Dev. official answer: 0.991 / 0.012

Model results (collect-data 100): Corr: / Mean Dev. official answer: 0.991 / 0.012 my best: 0.998 / 0.010

Model results (collect-data 100): Corr: / Mean Dev. official answer: 0.991 / 0.012 my best: 0.998 / 0.010 another run: 0.990 / 0.030 run 200: 0.990 / 0.024

- Anderson (1982) suggested a 3 stage learning process:
 - "Cognitive" (problem solving, chunking)
 - "Associative" (retrieval of solutions)
 - "Autonomous" (new procedural knowledge)



• How? compiling rules that fire sequentially

Abstract: Rule $A \rightarrow B$ followed by rule $B \rightarrow C$

. . .

• How? compiling rules that fire sequentially

Abstract:

Rule $A \rightarrow B$ followed by rule $B \rightarrow C$ combined into a new rule: $A \rightarrow B\&C$

```
(p rule1
  =goal>
    isa
          goal
    state nil
==>
  =goal>
    state start
)
(p rule2
  =goal>
          goal
    isa
    state start
==>
  =goal>
    add1 zero
)
```





state nil

state start

add1 zero

```
(p rule1
  =goal>
          goal
    isa
    state nil
==>
                                  (p rule1+2
  =goal>
                                      =goal>
    state start
)
                                   ==>
(p rule2
                                      =goal>
  =goal>
          goal
    isa
    state start
==>
  =goal>
    add1 zero
)
```

• Is that all?

Realistic example:

- Rule 1 initiates retrieval of a chunk
- Rule 2 harvests the retrieved chunk
- New Rule 1+2 built with chunk information "built in" i.e., no retrieval involved

Realistic example (specifics):

- Recall the two column addition exercise
- Add by counting from first number, the second number of times
- Consider a specific case: start with 3 and need to count 2 steps to get sum

(P initialize-add-count =qoal> ISA add addend1 =arg1 addend2 =arg2 nil sum ==> +retrieval> ISA order first =arg1 =qoal> =arq1 sum count zero

(P increment-sum =goal> ISA add sum =sum count =count =retrieval> ISA order first =sum second =new ==> =goal> sum =new +retrieval> ISA order first =count

(P	initializ	ze-add-cou	nt	(P	incre
	=goal>				=goal
	ISA	add			ISA
	addend1	=arg1			sum
	addend2	=arg2			count
	sum	nil			=retr
==>	>				ISA
	+retrieva	al>			firs
	ISA o	rder			seco
	first	=arg1		==)	>
	=goal>				=goal
	sum =	argl			sum
	count	zero			+retr:
					ISA
					firs
			Retrieve	d chunk:	
			ISA	order	
			first	throp	
			l secon	d tour	

ment-sum > add =sum =count t ieval> order t =sum nd =new > =new ieval> order =count t

(P	initial	lize-add-co	ount	(P	increme	ent-s	sum
	=goal>				=goal>		
	ISA	add			ISA		add
	addend	1 =arg1			sum		=sum
	addend	2 =arg2	-		count		=count
	sum	nil			=retrie	eval>	
==;	>		١		ISA	ord	er
	+retrie	val>	-		first		=sum
	ISA	order			second	1	=new
	first	=arg1	١	==>	•		
	=goal>		1		=goal>		
	sum	=arg1			sum	=nev	W
	count	zero	\		+retrie	eval>	
					ISA	ord	er
				•	first		=count
			Retrieve	<u>d chunk</u> :			
			ISA	arder			
			first	three			
			second	d four			



126



127

add

three

=count

three four

=count

(P	initial	ize	-add-cou	int	(P	'in	creme	ent-s	um
	=goal>					=g	oal>		
	ISA		add			I	SA		ado
	addend	1	three			S	um		th
	addend	2	=arg2			С	ount		=co
	sum		nil			=r	etrie	val>	•
==>	>					I	SA	ord	er
	+retrie	val	>			f	irst		th
	ISA	ord	ler			S	econd		fo
	first		three		==	>			
	=goal>					=g	oal>		
	sum	thr	ee			S	um	fou	r
	count		zero			+r	etrie	val>	•
						I	SA	ord	er
						f	irst		=c
				Retrieve	ed chunk:				
					ordor				
				IJA	UIUEI				
				tirst	three				
				l secon	d four				

(P	initialize-add-count		
	=goal>		
	ISA	add	
	addend	1 three	
	addend	2 =arg2	
	sum	nil	
==>	>		
	+retrie	val>	
	ISA	order	
	first	three	
	=goal>		
	sum	three	
	count	zero	

(P increment-sum =goal> ISA add three sum count =count =retrieval> ISA order first three second **four** ==> =goal> four sum +retrieval> ISA order first =count

(P	initial	ize-add-coun	it	(P	increme	nt-sum
	=goal>				=goal>	
	ISA	add			ISA	add
	addend	1 three			sum	three
	addend	2 =arg2			count	=count
	sum	nil			=retrie	val>
==>	>			_	ISA	order
	+retrie	val>			first	three
	ISA	order			second	four
	first	three		==>	>	
	=goal>				=goal>	
	sum	three			sum	four
	count	zero			+retrie	val>
					ISA	order
					first	=count



(P initialize-add-count =goal> ISA add

addend1threeaddend2=arg2sumnil

==>

+retrieval>			
ISA	order		
first	three		
=goal>			
sum	three		

count zero

(P	increme	nt-sum
	=goal>	
	ISA	add
	sum	three
	count	=count
	=retrie	val>
	ISA	order
	first	three
	second	four

==>

=goal> sum four +retrieval> ISA order first =count

(P initia) =goal>	lize-add-count		(P increme =goal>	ent-sum
ISA	add		ISA	add
addend	l1 three		sum	three
addend	l2 =arg2		Count	=count
sum	nil		=retrie	val>
==>			ISA	order
+retrie	eval>		first	three
ISA	order	1	second	four
first	three		==>	
=goal>			=goal>	
sum	three		sum	four
count	zero		+retrie	val>
			ISA	order
			first	=count





(P initial =goal>	ize-add-count	(P	increme =goal>	ent-sum
ISA	add		ISA	add
addend?	l three		sum	three
addend	2 =arg2		count	zero
sum	nil		=retrie	eval>
==>			ISA	order
+retriev	val>		first	three
ISA	order		second	l four
first	three	==	>	
=goal>			=goal>	
sum	three		sum	four
count	zero		+retrie	eval>
			ISA	order
			first	zero



(P initial:	P initialize-add-count			
=goal>				
ISA	add			
addend1	three			
addend2	2 =arg2			
sum	nil			
==>				
+retriev	val>			
ISA	order			
first	three			
=goal>				

sum	three
count	zero

(P	increme	nt-sum
	=goal>	
	ISA	add
	sum	three
	count	zero
	=retrie	val>
	ISA	order
	first	three
	second	four

==>

=goal> sum four +retrieval> ISA order first zero

(P initiali	.ze-add-cour	it (1	P in
=goal>			=g
ISA	add		I
addend1	three		SI
addend2	=arg2		C
sum	nil		=re
==>			IS
+retriev	al>		f
ISA	order		Se
first	three	=	=>
=goal>			=go
sum	three		SI
count	zero		+r
			~

increment-sum		
=goal>		
ISA	add	
sum	three	
count	zero	
=retrieval>		
ISA	order	
first	three	
second	four	
•		



(P	initial	ize-add-count	(P	increm	ent-s
	=goal>			=goal>	
	ISA	add		ISA	i
	addend	1 three		sum	
	addend	2 =arg2		count	1
	sum	nil		=retrie	eval>
==>	>			ISA	orde
	+retrie	val>		first	
	ISA	order		secon	d
	first	three	==>	>	
	=goal>			=goal>	
	sum	three		sum	foui
	count	zero		+retrie	eval>
				ISA	orde
				first	

increment-sum		
=goal>		
ISA	add	
sum	three	
count	zero	
=retrie	val>	
ISA	order	
first	three	
second	four	

four

order

zero

(P	initialize-add-count		
	=goal>		
	ISA	add	
	addend1	three	
	addend2	=arg2	
	sum	nil	
==>	>		

+retrieval> ISA order first three =goal>

sum three

count zero

(P increme	nt-sum
=goal>	
ISA	add
sum	three
count	zero
=retrie	val>
ISA	order
first	three
second	four

==>

=goal> sum four +retrieval> ISA order first zero





NOTICE:

1.New rule is very specific due to adding the retrieved chunk's information to the two parent rules
NOTICE:

2.Very simply written rules can become more sophisticated with production compilation (i.e., write simple rules that get the desired behavior and let the system learn to be fast enough to match data...)

- Utility of new rule?
- Intent: gradual rule use (contrary to Soar philosophy)

- Previous utility rule $U_i(n) = U_i(n-1) + a [(R_i(n) - U_i(n-1))]$
- Utility for new rule $U_i(n) = U_i(n-1) + a [(U_{1st parent}(n) - U_i(n-1))]$
- Starts at 0 (default) and is increased with re-creation until with noise gets selected. Then gets reward more directly and can surpass parent.



- Rule compilation conditions:
 - no conflicts
 - no "externalities", i.e., reliance on outside world
 - must be turned on: (sgp :epl t)

(default is nil)

Review

- Learning new procedural knowledge:
 - 2 sequentially-firing rules combine into a new rule
 - production learning turned on with (sgp :epl t)
 - utility set like reward
- Use: learned new rules eventually take over and can be much faster than parents

• Model design?



• Given:



• Given:

















30,000 trials

10,000 trials 500 increment

Issues in Cognitive Modeling

Issues in Cognitive Modeling

- Philosophical issues
- Foundational issues
- Architectural issues
- Modeling issues
- Validation issues
- Scope issues

- Cognitive Science (& modeling) vs. Artificial Intelligence
- Sources of knowledge
- Mind-Body problem
- Computational Theory of Mind

- Cognitive Science (& modeling) vs Artificial Intelligence
 - similar search for understanding:
 - what is intelligence
 - how the brain produces behavior
 - different purposes
 - understanding mind for science's sake
 - applying that understanding to problems

- Source of knowledge
 - from experience (Locke, Hume, Mill)
 - innate, instinct, built-in (Decartes, Kant, & Pinker's "Language Instinct")

- Mind-body problem
 - mind distinct from body (Dualism)
 - mind an extension of the body (Materialism)
 - reality is in the mind (Idealism)

- Computational hypothesis
 - computation as a theory of mind
 - < 50 years old</p>
 - John Searle's Chinese Room

- Symbol hypothesis
 - symbols vs. Gestalt's holistic, parallel, analog perception of whole different as from parts
 - related to neural network approach to the Cognitive Science

Foundational Issues

Foundational Issues

- Symbol hypothesis (on boarder)
- Levels/bands what are we studying?
- Where is foundation
- Cognitive plausibility

Newell's Levels & Bands

Architectural term	t (sec)	Units	System	Band
	10 ¹¹⁻¹³	10 ⁴ -10 ⁶ years		Evolutionary
	10 ¹⁰	Millennia		Historical
Lifetime	10 ⁹	~50 years		Historical
	10 ⁸	Years	(Expertise)	Historical
	10 ⁷	Months	(Expertise)	Social
Development	10 ⁶	Weeks		Social
	10 ⁵	Days		Social
	10 ⁴	Hours	Task	Rational
Knowledge acq	10 ³	10 min	Task	Rational
	10 ²	Minutes	Task	Rational
	10 ¹	10 sec	Unit task	Cognitive
Performance	10 ⁰	1 sec	Operations	Cognitive
Temp storage	10 ⁻¹	100 ms	Deliberate act	Cognitive
Primitive act	10 ⁻²	10 ms	Neural net	Biological
	10-3	1 ms	Neuron	Biological
	10-4	100 μs	Organelle	Biological

172

Foundational Issues

- Where is the foundation?
 - working from neuron up
 - theory of mind down, or
 - middle in both directions

Foundational Issues

- Cognitive plausibility
 - common usage
 - formal matching of clever experimental data
 - multi-level justification

- Goal of architecture
- Perception-cognition boundary
- Movement-movement boundary
- Symbolic memory representation Subsymbolic representation
- Strong assumptions

- Goal of architecture
 - Al or Cognitive Science
 - Narrow behavioral focus or broad

• Perception-cognition boundary

• Perception-cognition boundary



- Perception-cognition boundary
 - where's the edge?
 - how much does one affect the other?
 - being studied
- Movement-movement boundary
 - presumed well defined: thought vs. action
 - "Mirror neurons" challenging definition
 - not focus of study
 - (robotics not the same subject)

- Symbolic memory representation
 - LTM & STM accepted as different
 - Procedural generally accepted as different
 - Episodic different?
 - Images different?
 - Spatial different?
 - (Feelings different?)

- Subsymbolic representation
 - Generally accepted as necessary
 - Architectural design impact not settled
 - Neural representation?
 - Functional mathematical representation?
 - Stochastic representation?

- Strong assumptions
 - disprovable theoretic claims to advance science
 - Newell's UTC stake in the ground
 - Icarus' variation
 - Clarion (& ACT-R) neural representation dependency
 - Modularity and physiological comparisons

- Standard methodologies
- Bottom-up vs. top-down
- Chunk size
- Production size
- Parameter standardization
- Other: modeling or architecture issues

- Standard methodologies
 - Some:
 - rule based behavior
 - some patterns of rules
 - problem solving techniques
 - find, attend, harvest
 - prepare, execute
 - Lack of standard methodologies an indicator of the youth of the field or something else...

- Bottom-up vs. top-down
 - Goal driven or environmentally driven?
 - Goal: procedural process retrieval
 - Env: perception, reactive behavior
 - Mixed? How?

- Chunk size
 - How many slots?
 - Smaller is better
 - When is larger, too large, 7+/- 2? (!)
 - How complicated is a slot
 - indirect references?
 - variable slot names?
 - un-named slots?

- Production size
 - How many conditions?
 - How complicated is the logic?
 - and
 - not
 - or?
 - evaluation function?
 - How many actions on RHS?
 - How complicated are the actions?

- Parameter standardization (ACT-R)
 - Production firing: 50ms
 - Retrieval threshold: varies
 - Move attention: 85ms
 - Imaginal vs. goal buffer: ?
 - others...
 - Other architectures?

- Other: modeling or architecture issues
 - Memory for goals (are goals different?)
 - Multi-tasking (interleaved by model or architecture)
 - Emotion affecting cognition
 - different rules
 - different parameters (eg. RT)
 - Motivation(?)

- Validation criteria
- Validity vs. reliability
- Acceptable evidence

- Validation criteria
 - Statistical hypothesis testing
 - Goodness of fit
 - Verbal protocols

- Validity vs. reliability
 - Well defined phenomenon
 - Clearly demonstrated
 - Explanation rational
 - Explanation/model cognitively plausible

- How demonstrated?
 - match single human on single experiment
 - match multiple subjects on single experiment
 - match data on a wide range of behaviors
 - replicated

Scope Issues

- Natural Language
- "Numerosity" (sense of quantity, size, etc.)
- Judgment
- Realistic vs. rational behavior
- Social behavior
- Abnormal behavior
- Creativity, art, music

```
•
```