### Dynamic Field Theory: Memory

Gregor Schöner gregor.schoener@ini.rub.de

### Recall from last lecture ...



[after: Ottes et al., Vis. Res. 25:825 (85)]

[after Kopecz, Schöner: Biol Cybern 73:49 (95)]

#### reaction time (RT) paradigm



### weak preshape in selection



in which specific (imperative) input dominates and drives detection instability



[Wilimzig, Schöner, 2006]

parameter, x

### strong preshape in selection





[Wilimzig, Schöner, 2006]

### Behavioral evidence for the graded and continuous evolution of decision





[Ghez and colleagues, 1988 to 1990's]



theoretical account for Henig et al.

Experimental results of Henig et al

[Erlhagen, Schöner. 2002, Psychological Review 109, 545–572 (2002)]



infer width of preshape peaks in field

[Ghez et al 1997]

### Neural evidence for preshape







[Bastian, Riehle, Schöner: Europ J Neurosci 18: 2047 (2003)]

[after Bastian, Riehle, Schöner, submitted]







[Bastian, Schöner, Riehle 2003]



[Bastian, Schöner, Riehle 2003]

### Pre-shape and memory trace

#### how does pre-structuring of representations arise?

- in some cases, from the perceptual layout, the environment...
- but in other cases, from experience.... memory trace

#### the memory trace

- inhomogeneities from simplest from the memory trace
- habit formation (?) William
  James: habit formation as the simplest form of learning
- habituation: the memory trace for inhibition..



#### mathematics of the memory trace

$$\tau \dot{u}(x,t) = -u(x,t) + h + S(x,t) + u_{mem}(x,t) + \int dx' w(x-x') \sigma(u(x'))$$

$$\tau_{\text{mem}} \dot{u}_{\text{mem}}(x,t) = -u_{\text{mem}}(x,t) + \int dx' w_{\text{mem}}(x-x')\sigma(u(x',t))$$

memory trace only evolves while activation is excited

potentially different growth and decay rates

### memory trace reflects history of decisions formation



### (Working) memory instability



#### Working memory as sustained peaks

WM is marginally stable state: it is not asymptotically stable against drift within the low-dimensional space

=> empirically real..?

# "space ship" task probing spatial working memory



[Schutte, Spencer, JEP:HPP 2009]



 DFT account of repulsion: inhibitory interaction with peak representing landmark



[Simmering, Schutte, Spencer: Brain Research, 2007]

visual working memory

- has limited capacity
  - based on the number of objects...

about 4

probed by change detection, free recall



100 ms

500 ms Cued

12

6

6

6

8

4

[Luck, Vogel, 1997]

### DFT account of WM capacity

fundamentally caused by accumulation of inhibitory interaction across peaks

=> generic to DFT

### WM capacity depends on interaction

capacity increases across development

consistent with "spatial precision hypothesis"... interaction becomes more excitatory/local over development



[Simmering 2010]

### Change detection

### the standard probe of working memory



Same/Different

[Johnson, et al. 2009]

#### separation between perceptual and memory function

### 3 layer model



### 3 layer model

$$\begin{aligned} \tau \dot{u}(x,t) &= -u(x,t) + h_u + S(x,t) + \int dx' \ c_{uu}(x-x') \ \sigma(u(x',t)) \\ &- \int dx' \ c_{uv}(x-x') \ \sigma(v(x',t)) + \int dx' \ c_{uw}(x-x') \ \sigma(w(x',t)) \\ \tau \dot{v}(x,t) &= -v(x,t) + h_v \\ &+ \int dx' \ c_{vu}(x-x') \ \sigma(u(x',t)) + \int dx' \ c_{vw}(x-x') \ \sigma(w(x',t)) \\ \tau \dot{w}(x,t) &= -w(x,t) + h_w + \int dx' \ c_{ww}(x-x') \ \sigma(w(x',t)) \\ &- \int dx' \ c_{wv}(x-x') \ \sigma(v(x',t)) + \int dx' \ c_{wu}(x-x') \ \sigma(u(x',t)) \end{aligned}$$

#### => simulations

=> account for how working memories arise from percepts, how percepts may detect change and update memories...

- generate the categorical "answer" by two competing nodes
- based on the "hidden" go-signal in the task



**Feature Dimension** 



[Johnson, et al. 2009]

2) change detection in "same" trial



**Close Item Tested** Far Item Tested 30 2) change Peak in Perceptual Field No Peak in detection in Drives "Diff" Node **#**Perceptual Field 0 0 "different" trial Peaks in VWM Peaks in VWM Drive "Same" Node Drive "Same" Node 0 0

predict better
 change
 detection
 when items
 are metrically
 closer !





Predict better change detection when items are metrically closer !



[Johnson, et al. 2009]

### Multi-object tracking

Seeing and Visualizing: It's not what you think

Zenon Pylyshyn



t = 1

t = 2

t = 3

t = 4

[Pylyshyn]

### Multi-object tracking



[Spencer et al]

### Multi-object tracking



[Spencer et al]

## Combining working memory and the memory trace

in a case study that invokes all dynamic instabilities of DFT as well...

### Piaget's A not B paradigm: "out-of-sight -- out of mind"





#### Toyless variant of A not B task



[Smith, Thelen et al.: Psychological Review (1999)]

### Toyless variant of A not B task reveals that A not B is essentially a decision task!



[Smith, Thelen et al.: Psychological Review (1999)]



[Thelen, et al., BBS (2001)]

### Instabilities

- detection: forming and initiating a movement goal
- selection: making sensori-motor decisions
- (learning: memory trace)
- boost-driven detection: initiating the action
- memory instability: old infants sustain during the delay, young infants do not



### Instabilities

- detection: forming and initiating a movement goal
- selection: making sensori-motor decisions
- (learning: memory trace)
- boost-driven detection: initiating the action
- memory instability: old infants sustain during the delay, young infants do not



movement parameter

### Instabilities

- detection: forming and initiating a movement goal
- selection: making sensori-motor decisions
- (learning: memory trace)
- boost-driven detection: initiating the action
- memory instability: old infants sustain during the delay, young infants do not









in spontaneous errors, activation arises at B on an A trial

which leads to correct reaching on B trial

because reaches to B on A trials leave memory trace at B



#### => DFT is a neural process model

- that makes the decisions in each individual trial, by amplifying small differences into a macroscopic stable state
- and that's how decisions leave traces, have consequences



#### Decisions have consequences

a spontaneous error doubles probability to make the spontaneous error again



[Dineva, Schöner: Connection Science 2018]

### Conclusions

- action, perception, and embodied cognition takes place in continuous spaces. peaks = units of representation are attractors of the neural dynamics
- neural fields link neural representations to these continua
- stable activation peaks are the units of neural representation
- peaks arise and disappear through instabilities through which elementary cognitive functions (e.g. detection, selection, memory) emerge