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Serial Behaviour:
Evidence for an Intermediate Level

- Action slips and lapses in normal, over-learned, behaviour (Reason, 1979, 1984; Norman, 1981):
  - Errors of capture, anticipation, omission, perseveration, object substitution
- Neuropsychological disturbances of action:
  - Action Disorganisation Syndrome: Sequential and object substitution errors in object-related goal-directed sequential action
  - Ideational Apraxia: Conceptual and sequential errors in over-learned object-related action sequences
  - Amphetamine psychosis: Increased rate of responding with reduced number of response categories
  - Bradykinesia: Slowed initiation of an action sequence
Hierarchical Control: Supporting Evidence

- What makes serial behaviour hierarchical?
  - The occurrence of subsequences in different contexts, or
  - The goal/subgoal structure of behaviour

- Anecdotal behavioural evidence for hierarchy:
  - Goal-directedness but note flexible subsequence concatenation
  - Chunking, transfer, canonicity, but note interleaving

- Phenomenology:
  - Willed control of action at multiple levels

- Experimental work:
  - Botvinick & Bylsma (2005)
  - Ruh, Cooper & Mareschal (2006; in preparation)

---

Cooper & Shallice Model: I
Hierarchical Structuring of Schemas
Cooper & Shallice Model: II
Temporal Nesting of Subschemas

Cooper & Shallice Model: III
Schema/Object Interactions
Cooper & Shallice Model: IV

- **Strengths**
  - Plausible account of routine slips and lapses
  - Good account of Action Disorganisation Syndrome (noise in schema network, object networks or both)
  - Good account of Ideational Apraxia (disconnection between schemas and objects)
  - Qualitative simulations of disorders of rate

- **Limitations**
  - No quantitative simulations of disorders or rate or RT effects
  - Primitive account of visual attention
  - No learning!

Ruh et al: Experiment 1

**Method**

- 40 subjects learned a set of hierarchically structured tasks (beverage preparation) from feedback on task completion
- Tasks were presented on screen, and required ordered drag and drop operations to make tea/coffee
- Two hour-long training sessions; 112 trials in total
- On 50% of trials participants also completed a secondary task (auditory monitoring)
- Primary dependent measure:
  - Latency between mouse clicks either when “picking up” the spoon (nBP) or “picking up” the first ingredient (BP)
Ruh et al: Experiment 1

Results

Between-action latency at branch points depends upon task experience and presence of a secondary task

Ruh et al: Experiment 2

Aims and Method

- Aim: Explore effects of task frequency, environmental cues
- 19 subjects; 200 trials over 3 sessions
- 6 task variants, learned through instruction and feedback:
Ruh et al: Experiment 2
Selected Results

Selection of invariant actions is unaffected by secondary task, but selection at branch points is

Selection of C is speeded when the pot is transparent, but all other actions are unaffected

Conclusion

- **Empirical:**
  - Selection difficulties occur when low frequency responses must be chosen, environmental cues are absent, temporal dependencies are involved, or attentional processes are diverted

- **Modelling:**
  - Cooper & Shallice capture the patient data, but not learning data

- **Ultimate goal:**
  - A network that learns to settle while remaining instructable at multiple levels and sensitive to both higher goals and environmental contingencies
  - This may combine IAN and SRN concepts