# The Role of Variability in Learning Transfer: A Similarity-Based Computational Approach

Thomas E. Gorman

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Psychology and Brain Sciences and the Cognitive Science Program, Indiana University Indiana University

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Inc. the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.	liana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements t
	Robert L. Goldstone, PhD
	Robert Nosofsky, PhD
	Peter Todd, PhD
	Mike Jones, PhD

@2023

Thomas E. Gorman

# ${\bf Acknowledgements}$

## **Abstract**

This dissertation seeks to explore the cognitive underpinnings that govern the generalization of learning, focusing specifically on the role of variability during training in shaping subsequent transfer performance. A comprehensive review of the existing literature is presented, emphasizing the methodological complications associated with disentangling the confounding effects of similarity. Through a series of experiments involving several novel visuomotor tasks, this work investigates whether and how variability in training conditions affects performance in novel tasks. To theoretically account for the empirical outcomes, I employ both instance-based and connectionist computational models, both of which incorporate similarity-based mechanisms. These models serve to account for the extent to which variability influences the learners' generalization gradient, and also explain how training variation can produce both beneficial and deleterious outcomes.

# **Table of contents**

Abstract
Main body
Appendix
Appendix - Project 2 - Experiment 1
E1 Appendix
Posterior Predictive Distributions
Empirical vs. Predicted
Different Aggregations

## References

# List of Figures

# **List of Tables**

### Main body

Following the procedure used by Mcdaniel et al. (2009), we will assess the ability of both ALM and EXAM to account for the empirical data when fitting the models to 1) only the training data, and 2) both training and testing data. Models will be fit directly to the trial by trial data of each individual participants, both by minimizing the root-mean squared deviation (RMSE), and by maximizing log likelihood. Because ALM has been shown to do poorly at accounting for human patterns extrapolation (DeLosh et al., 1997), we will also fit the extended EXAM version of the model, which operates identically to ALM during training, but includes a linear extrapolation mechanism for generating novel responses during testing.

```
quarto pandoc -citeproc -pdf-engine xelatex -t pdf
-bibliography=../Assets/Bib/Dissertation.bib
-standalone
-f markdown igas_e1.pdf.md
-o refer-test.pdf

quarto render igas_e1.qmd -citeproc -pdf-engine xelatex -t pdf
-bibliography=../Assets/Bib/Dissertation.bib
-standalone
-o refer-test.pdf
```

## **Appendix**

Appendix - Project 2 - Experiment 1

E1 Appendix

**Posterior Predictive Distributions** 

**Empirical vs. Predicted** 

**Different Aggregations** 

#### References

DeLosh, E. L., McDaniel, M. A., & Busemeyer, J. R. (1997). Extrapolation: The Sine Qua Non for Abstraction in Function Learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23(4), 19. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.23.4.968

Mcdaniel, M. A., Dimperio, E., Griego, J. A., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2009). Predicting transfer performance: A comparison of competing function learning models. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 35, 173–195. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013982

DeLosh, E. L., McDaniel, M. A., & Busemeyer, J. R. (1997). Extrapolation: The Sine Qua Non for Abstraction in Function Learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23(4), 19. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.23.4.968

Mcdaniel, M. A., Dimperio, E., Griego, J. A., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2009). Predicting transfer performance: A comparison of competing function learning models. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 35, 173–195. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013982