# Dynamic Associative Memory: Connecting Short-term and Long-term Memory

Joseph Glavan Wright State University July 25, 2020

## The Time-Based Resource-Sharing (TBRS) Model of Working Memory



#### Working Memory Capacity is Constrained by Concurrent Processing



(Proportion of total task time devoted to extraneous processing)

## **ICCM 2018**

Glavan & Houpt (2018) An Integrated Working Memory Model for Time-Based Resource-Sharing



Barrouillet et al. (2011)

### TBRS and ACT-R are Compatible

TBRS	ACT-R
Maintenance and processing require the same resource (attention)	Limited capacity buffers
Central bottleneck	Only one production may fire at a time
Attended items gain activation; all others undergo temporal decay	Power law learning and forgetting (base- level learning)
Rapid switching between maintenance and processing	Utility and production rule conditions to establish relative priority



The Time-Based Resource-Sharing model architecture (Figure 6.1 in Barrouillet and Camos, 2015, p. 118).

Why are some things quickly forgotten, and how do we retain other things seemingly indefinitely?

- Separate memory systems?
  - Working memory (WM)  $\rightarrow$  shorter retention (seconds to minutes), under load
  - Short-term memory (STM)  $\rightarrow$  shorter retention, generally without load
  - Long-term memory (LTM) → longer retentions (minutes to indefinitely)
- Studies traditionally focus on only one system (with exceptions)
  - Ignores the relevant factor of time
- Let's focus on the accessibility of knowledge as function of time and circumstance
  - What approaches have been taken to explain each system?
  - Which approaches can be integrated to improve our understanding of memory as a whole?

### Evidence WM Maintenance Improves LTM

- Hartshorne and Makovski (2019) conducted a meta-analysis of 61 experiments in the literature
  - Increased time for maintenance improves accuracy in a subsequent LTM test
- Replicated this effect in 13 large-N studies of their own





#### Mechanisms Implicated in WM/LTM

#### Attentional refreshing

Elaboration



#### Representations Implicated in STM/LTM



(Polyn, Norman & Kahana, 2009)

Caplan (2015), Jonker & MacLeod (2017), Davachi and DuBrow (2015)



FIG. 2. A network representation of the chunk structure encoding the 9-element list "329 714 856".

(Anderson, Bothell, Lebiere & Matessa, 1998)

### Proposed STM/LTM Transfer Theory

- Over the short-term, the strength of items' association with the current context temporarily elevates their accessibility. Refreshing may keep the activation of these items above threshold so long as attention can be devoted to them.
- With time, the shared temporal-context of the items becomes weaker, naturally reducing their accessibility. The cognitive system must learn contextually-invariant associations between the items while they are still available in the short-term.
- Items that have survived to long-term have superior connectivity in declarative memory, allowing them to be cued/accessed more efficiently.

### Proposed Modifications to the Architecture

- Adopt attentional refreshing as standard
- Modify spreading activation and partial matching calculations
  - Direct Associations symbolic, similar to the existing fan mechanism
  - Indirect Associations subsymbolic, based on relative similarity

 $A_i = B_i + .5 \cdot I_i + .5 \cdot D_i) \cdot D_i$ 

- Allow chunks in declarative memory to serve as sources of spreading activation in addition to buffers
  - Treat the retrieval request as spreading activation
- Associative learning process to create new *relation* chunks that link associates



#### The Dynamic Associative Memory Module

- Implements automatic attentional refreshing
- Overrides default activation calculations
  - For tractability, only new chunks created by the imaginal module get to participate in activation spreading
- Tracks association strengths and merges a new relation chunk when above threshold

821 053	PROCEDURAL	CONELICT_RESOLUTION
821.053	DAM	start_attentional_refreshing
821.053	PROCEDURAL	
821.299	DAM	REFRESHED_CHINK RELATION2211
821.299	PROCEDURAL	
821.299	DAM	start_attentional_refreshing
821.299	PROCEDURAL	
821.299	DAM	REERESHED_CHINK_CHINK26_0
821.299	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.299	DAM	start-attentional-refreshina
821.299	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.526	DAM	REFRESHED-CHUNK CHUNK32-0
821.526	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.526	DAM	start-attentional-refreshing
821.526	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.536	DAM	REFRESHED-CHUNK CHUNK20-0
821.536	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.536	DAM	start-attentional-refreshing
821.536	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.548	DAM	REFRESHED-CHUNK CHUNK14-0
821.548	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.548	DAM	start-attentional-refreshing
821.548	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.560		Stopped because time limit reached
821.560	VISION	SET-BUFFER-CHUNK VISUAL-LOCATION VISUAL-LOCATION163 NIL
821.560	VISION	visicon-update
821.560	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.610	PROCEDURAL	PRODUCTION-FIRED ATTEND
821.610	PROCEDURAL	CLEAR-BUFFER VISUAL-LOCATION
821.610	PROCEDURAL	CLEAR-BUFFER VISUAL
821.610	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.610	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.626	DAM	REFRESHED-CHUNK CHUNK26-0
821.626	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.626	DAM	start-attentional-refreshing
821.626	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.668	VISION	Encoding-complete VISUAL-LOCATION163-0 NIL
821.668	VISION	SET-BUFFER-CHUNK VISUAL TEXT163
821.668	PROCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESOLUTION
821.718	PROCEDURAL	PRODUCTION-FIRED ENCODE-CENTER
821.718	PROCEDURAL	CLEAR-BUFFER VISUAL
821.718	PROCEDURAL	CLEAR-BUFFER RETRIEVAL
821.718	DECLARATIVE	start-retrieval
821.718	PRUCEDURAL	
821.718	PRUCEDURAL	CONFLICT-RESULUTION
821.795	DECLARATIVE	RETRIEVED-CHUNK RECALL
821.795	DECLARATIVE	SET-BUFFER-UMUNK RETRIEVAL RECALL
821.795	PRUCEDURAL	CUNFLICT-RESULUTION
821.845	PROCEDURAL	PRODUCTION-FIRED BEGIN-RECALL

#### **Base-level** Activation

- Implements the refreshing and decay assumptions of TBRS
  - Produces recency and frequency effects
- Includes base-level (temporal) inhibition
  - Temporarily penalizes more recently retrieved items to avoid perseveration
- Free intercept parameter

$$B_{i} = \log\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} t_{ij}^{-\delta}\right) - \log(1 + t_{in}^{-\gamma}) + \beta$$

#### Direct Associative Process (DAP)

- Based on symbolic, all-or-nothing relations
- Two chunks *i* and *j* are *directly associated* if and only if either *i* is in a slot of *j* or *j* is in a slot of *i*

$$\delta_{ji} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \text{ and } i \text{ are directly related} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$



#### Indirect Associative Process (IAP)

- Based on continuous similarity relations
  - Regularized gamma function is a reasonable candidate
- Here, k is a slot-type common to chunks i and j
  - E.g., temporal-context

$$\Psi_k(k_i, k_j; s_k, r_k) = \frac{\Gamma(s_k, r_k |k_i - k_j|)}{\Gamma(s_k)}$$

#### Indirect Associative Process (cont.)

- Activation from retrieval request spreads by normalized geometric mean of its similarity to each item in memory
  - Represents the specificity of the request
- Buffers spread their sourceactivation (W)
- Items in memory spread their base-level activation (B)

$$I_{i} = W_{R} \cdot \frac{\left[\prod_{k_{Ri}} \zeta_{k} \cdot \Psi_{k}(k_{R}, k_{i})\right]^{\frac{1}{K_{Ri}}}}{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\prod_{k_{Rl}} \zeta_{k} \cdot \Psi_{k}(k_{R}, k_{l})\right]^{\frac{1}{K_{Rl}}}}$$

$$+ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \left( W_j \cdot \frac{\sum_{k_{jl}} \Psi_k(k_j, k_l)}{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{k_{jl}} \Psi_k(k_j, k_l)} \right)$$
$$- \sum_{j \in \{\mathcal{M} \setminus i\}} \left( B_j \cdot \frac{\sum_{k_{jl}} \Psi_k(k_j, k_l)}{\sum_{l \in \{\mathcal{M} \setminus i\}} \sum_{k_{jl}} \Psi_k(k_j, k_l)} \right)$$

#### Associative Learning Process (ALP)

- When an item is retrieved, the model updates its estimates of the *causal power* of other items to have caused that retrieval
  - The causal power of x on y is the probability x causes y when x is present
- Once a power estimate exceeds some threshold, a new item representing the direct association between the two items is created
- The new relation chunk may now participate in refreshing and spreading activation processes

#### Associative Learning (cont.)

• Power PC theory of causal induction (Cheng, 1997)

$$\rho_{xy} = \frac{P(y|x) - P(y|\neg x) - \rho_{ay}[P(a|x) - P(a|\neg x)]}{1 - \rho_{ay} \cdot P(a|x)}$$

• If all candidate causes can be assumed to occur independently

$$\rho_{xy} = \frac{P(y|x) - P(y|\neg x)}{1 - P(y|\neg x)}$$

#### Associative Learning (cont.)

When chunk y is retrieved, update the following arrays:

$$P_t(y|x) = \alpha \cdot \mathcal{L}_y(t) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot P_{t-1}(y|x)$$
  
for any chunk *x* currently in the causal set, and

$$P_t(y|\neg x) = \alpha \cdot \mathcal{L}_y(t) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot P_{t-1}(y|\neg x)$$

for any chunk x not currently in the causal set, where

$$\mathcal{L}_{y}(t) = \left[1 + \exp\left(-\frac{A_{y}(t) - \tau}{s_{\varepsilon}}\right)\right]^{-1}$$

#### Associative Learning (cont.)

• Update the following to learn strength of associations

$$S_{xy}(t) = \alpha \cdot \rho_{xy}(t) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot S_{xy}(t - 1)$$

• When S<sub>xy</sub> is computed to be above some threshold (free parameter), create a new chunk representing the association between x and y

### Hypotheses and Predictions

- Model should predict
  - Cognitive load effect
  - Semantic and temporal clustering
    - Greater for delayed than immediate recall
    - Greater with repetition
  - Elaboration instructions give associative learning a "head start"
  - Primacy within-list, primacy and greater recency between-lists
- New module allows to adjudicate some debates in the literature
  - Fixed or variable attentional refreshing rate?
  - Is attentional refreshing covert?
    - Should it be subjected to a retrieval threshold?

#### Discussion

- Dynamic Associative Memory theory
  - A process-level, computational account of
    - how memories are formed and maintained in the short-term
    - how memories reinforced to remain accessible in the long-term
  - Unites pre-existing theories of WM, STM, LTM, learning, and reasoning
- Work in progress (thanks COVID-19!)
  - Module/model fully coded, in testing
  - Simulation study on deck, human study planned
- "A good model is useful."
  - These amendments are computationally costly.
  - We probably don't want to enable them for every model.
  - Current ACT-R may be at a more useful level of abstraction for some tasks.

## Thank you!

- All feedback is appreciated
- Happy to answer any questions