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## Human learning <br> Machine learning

Categorization
Causal learning
Function learning

Density estimation
Graphical models
Regression
Nonparametric Bayes

## Language

Experiment design

Probabilistic grammars
Inference algorithms

## How much structure exists?

- How many categories of objects?
- How many features does an object have?
- How many words (or rules) are in a language?

Learning the things people learn requires using rich, unbounded hypothesis spaces

## Nonparametric Bayesian statistics

- Assume the world contains infinite complexity, of which we only observe a part
- Use stochastic processes to define priors on infinite hypothesis spaces
- Dirichlet process/Chinese restaurant process
(Ferguson, 1973; Pitman, 1996)
- Beta process/Indian buffet process
(Griffiths \& Ghahramani, 2006; Thibaux \& Jordan, 2007)


## Categorization



## cat

## How do people represent categories?

## Prototypes


(Posner \& Keele, 1968; Reed, 1972)

## Exemplars
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## cat

QuickTime ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor are needed to see this picture.
(Medin \& Schaffer, 1978; Nosofsky, 1986)

## Something in between


(Love et al., 2004; Vanpaemel et al., 2005)

## A computational problem

- Categorization is a classic inductive problem
- data: stimulus $X$
- hypotheses: category $c$
- We can apply Bayes’ rule:

$$
P(c \mid x)=\frac{p(x \mid c) P(c)}{\sum_{c} p(x \mid c) P(c)}
$$

and choose $c$ such that $P(c \mid x)$ is maximized

## Density estimation

- We need to estimate some probability distributions
- what is $P(c)$ ?
- what is $p(x \mid c)$ ?
- Two approaches:
- parametric
- nonparametric
- These approaches correspond to prototype and exemplar models respectively
(Ashby \& Alfonso-Reese, 1995)


## Parametric density estimation

Assume that $p(x \mid c)$ has a simple form, characterized by parameters $\theta$ (indicating the prototype)
Probability density

## Nonparametric density estimation

Approximate a probability distribution as a sum of many "kernels" (one per data point)


## Something in between

Use a "mixture" distribution, with more than one component per data point

(Rosseel, 2002)

## Anderson's rational model

 (Anderson, 1990, 1991)- Treat category labels like any other feature
- Define a joint distribution $p(x, c)$ on features using a mixture model, breaking objects into clusters
- Allow the number of clusters to vary...

$$
P(\text { cluster } j) \propto\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
n_{j} & j \text { is old } \\
\alpha & j \text { is new }
\end{array}\right.
$$

a Dirichlet process mixture model
(Neal, 1998; Sanborn et al., 2006)

## The Chinese restaurant process

- $n$ customers walk into a restaurant, choose tables $z_{i}$ with probability
$P\left(z_{i}=j \mid z_{1}, \ldots, z_{i-1}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}\frac{n_{j}}{i-1+\alpha} & \text { existing table } j \\ \frac{\alpha}{i-1+\alpha} & \text { next unoccupiedtable }\end{array}\right.$
- Defines an exchangeable distribution over seating arrangements (inc. counts on tables)
(Aldous, 1985; Pitman, 1996)


## Dirichlet process mixture model

1. Sample parameters for each component

2. Assign datapoints to components via CRP


## A unifying rational model

- Density estimation is a unifying framework - a way of viewing models of categorization
- We can go beyond this to define a unifying model - one model, of which all others are special cases
- Learners can adopt different representations by adaptively selecting between these cases
- Basic tool: two interacting levels of clusters - results from the hierarchical Dirichlet process (Teh, Jordan, Beal, \& Blei, 2004)


## The hierarchical Dirichlet process

## A unifying rational model

- 

cluster exemplar category

|  | $\gamma \in(0, \infty)$ | $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ <br> prototype |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ |  |  |
| $\alpha \in(0, \infty)$ |  |  |
| $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ |  |  |

## $\mathrm{HDP}_{+, \infty}$ and Smith \& Minda (1998)

- $\mathrm{HDP}_{+, \infty}$ will automatically infer a representation using exemplars, prototypes, or something in between (with $\alpha$ being learned from the data)
- Test on Smith \& Minda (1998, Experiment 2)

| Category A: | 000000 |  | 111111 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 100000 |  | 011111 |
|  | 010000 |  | 101111 |
|  | 001000 | Category B: | 110111 |
|  | 000010 |  | 111011 |
|  | 000001 |  | 111110 |
|  | 111101 | exceptions | 000100 |

## $\mathrm{HDP}_{+, \infty}$ and Smith \& Minda (1998)

Probability of A

## The promise of $\mathrm{HDP}_{+,+}$

- In $\mathrm{HDP}_{+,+}$, clusters are shared between categories - a property of hierarchical Bayesian models
- Learning one category has a direct effect on the prior on probability densities for the next category



## Other uses of Dirichlet processes

- Nonparametric Block Model from causality lecture - extends DPMM to relations
- Models of language, where number of words, syntactic classes, or grammar rules is unknown
- Any multinomial can be replaced by a CRP...
- Extensions:
- hierarchical, nested, dependent, two-parameter, distance-dependent, ...


## Learning the features of objects

- Most models of human cognition assume objects are represented in terms of abstract features
- What are the features of this object?
- What determines what features we identify?
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## Binary matrix factorization

$$
P\left(x_{i, t}=1 \mid \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}\right)=1-(1-\lambda)^{\left.<\mathbf{z}_{i, j}, \mathbf{Y} ;, t\right\rangle}(1-\epsilon)
$$





## Binary matrix factorization

$$
P\left(x_{i, t}=1 \mid \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}\right)=1-(1-\lambda)^{\left.<z_{i, j}, \mathbf{y} ;, t\right\rangle}(1-\epsilon)
$$



How should we infer the number of features?

## The nonparametric approach

Assume that the total number of features is
unbounded, but only a finite number will be expressed in any finite dataset



Use the Indian buffet process as a prior on $\mathbf{Z}$ (Griffiths \& Ghahramani, 2006)

## The Indian buffet process

- First customer walks into Indian restaurant, and tastes Poisson ( $\alpha$ ) dishes from the buffet
- The ith customer tastes previously-tasted dish $k$ with probability $m_{k} / i$, where $m_{k}$ is the number of previous tasters, and Poisson ( $\alpha / i$ ) new dishes
- Customers are exchangeable, as in the CRP


## The Indian buffet process

## Dishes


(Griffiths \& Ghahramani, 2006)
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## An experiment...

Training


Testing

(Austerweil \& Griffiths, 2009)

## Results


(Austerweil \& Griffiths, 2009)

## Other uses of the IBP

- Prior on sparse binary matrices, used for number of dimensions in any sparse latent feature model
- PCA, ICA, collaborative filtering, ...
- Prior on adjacency matrix for bipartite graph with one class of nodes having unknown size - e.g., inferring hidden causes
- Interesting link to Beta processes (like CRP to DP)
- Extensions:
- two parameters, three parameters, phylogenetic, ...


## Nonparametric Bayes and the mind

- Nonparametric Bayesian models provide a way to answer questions of how much structure to infer
- For questions like "how many clusters?" we can use the Chinese restaurant/Dirichlet process
- For questions like "how many features?" we can use the Indian buffet/Beta process
- Lots of room to develop new models...


## Learning language

## Discriminative

P(Grammatical|S)
$S^{1} S^{2} S^{3} S^{4} S^{5} S^{6}$


Labels of grammatical or ungrammatical

## VS.

Generative
$\mathrm{P}($ S $\mid$ Grammatical $)$


## An artificial language:

S1) Verb Subject Object
S2) Subject Verb Object
S3) Subject Object Verb

|  | S1 | S2 | S3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| V1 | $+(9)$ | $+(9)$ | $-(6)$ |
| V2 | $-(3)$ | $+(18)$ | $-(3)$ |
| V3 | $+(18)$ | $-(3)$ | $-(3)$ |
| V4* | $+(18)$ | $+(0)$ | $-(6)$ |

## Discriminative Logistic regression

Grammatical


Ungrammatical

## Generative Hierarchical Bayesian model



## Model Predictions



## Condition 1: Generative learning



Always grammatically correct adult

Always grammatically
incorrect child





## blergen norg nagid


blergen

tombat







## nagid blergen semz


blergen
nagid

tombat


## Condition 2: Discriminative learning

scene $1 / 84$

## tombat blergen flern

Was that sentence grammatical?
Gramatical Ungramatical


## Condition 2: Discriminative learning

## scene $1 / 84$

## tombat blergen flern

Was that sentence grammatical?
-Grammatical
Ungramatical


Grammatical

You are correct!


## Condition 2: Discriminative learning

## blergen semz tombat

## scene 4/84



Ungrammatical


Sorry you were wrong.


## Human language learning






| $\square$ | Probabilities |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | Rules |

${ }^{*} \mathrm{x} 2(1)=7.28, \mathrm{p}=0.007$

