



Human and Machine Learning

Tom Mitchell
Machine Learning Department
Carnegie Mellon University

April 23, 2008



How can studies of
machine (human) learning inform
studies of
human (machine) learning?

Outline

1. Machine Learning and Human Learning
2. Aligning specific results from ML and HL
 - Learning to predict and achieve rewards
 - TD learning \leftrightarrow Dopamine system in the brain
 - Value of redundancy in data inputs
 - Cotraining \leftrightarrow Intersensory redundancy hypothesis
3. Core questions and conjectures

Machine Learning - Practice

Data:

Patient103 time=1	Patient103 time=2	Patient103 time=n
Age: 23	Age: 23	Age: 23
FirstPregnancy: no	FirstPregnancy: no	FirstPregnancy: no
Anemia: no	Anemia: no	Anemia: no
Diabetes: no	Diabetes: YES	Diabetes: no
PreviousPrematureBirth: no	PreviousPrematureBirth: no	PreviousPrematureBirth: no
Ultrasound: ?	Ultrasound: abnormal	Ultrasound: ?
Elective C-Section: ?	Elective C-Section: no	Elective C-Section: no
Emergency C-Section: ?	Emergency C-Section: ?	Emergency C-Section: Yes
...

One of 18 learned rules:

If No previous vaginal delivery, and
Abnormal 2nd Trimester Ultrasound, and
Malpresentation at admission
Then Probability of Emergency C-Section is 0.6

Over training data: 26/41 = .63,
Over test data: 12/20 = .60


Mining Databases

Text analysis

Peter H. van Oppen, Chairman of the Board & Chief Executive Officer
Mr. van Oppen has served as chairman of the board and chief executive officer of ADIC since its acquisition by Interpoint in 1994 and a director of ADIC since 1986. Until its acquisition by Crane Co. in October 1996, Mr. van Oppen served as chairman of the board of directors, president and chief executive officer of Interpoint. Prior to 1985, Mr. van Oppen worked as a consulting manager at Price Waterhouse LLP and at Bain & Company in Boston and London. He has additional experience in medical electronics and venture capital. Mr. van Oppen also serves as a director of Seattle FilmWorks Inc. and Spacelabs Medical, Inc.. He holds a B.A. from Whitman College and an M.B.A. from Harvard Business School, where he was a Baker Scholar.

MACHINE LEARNING
DEPARTMENT

0.3s 0.4s
/shape/squared/compute.wav Duration: 1.14 seconds



Speech Recognition



Control learning



Object recognition

- Reinforcement learning
- Supervised learning
- Bayesian networks
- Hidden Markov models
- Unsupervised clustering
- Explanation-based learning
-

Machine Learning - Theory

PAC Learning Theory

(for supervised concept learning)

examples (m)

representational complexity (H)

error rate (ϵ)

failure probability (δ)

$$m \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon} (\ln |H| + \ln(1/\delta))$$

Other theories for

- Reinforcement skill learning
- Unsupervised learning
- Active student querying
- ...

... also relating:

- # of mistakes during learning
- learner's query strategy
- convergence rate
- asymptotic performance
- ...

ML Has Little to Say About

- Learning cumulatively over time
- Learning from instruction, lectures, discussions
- Role of motivation, forgetting, curiosity, fear, boredom, ...
- Implicit (unconscious) versus explicit (deliberate) learning

What We Know About Human Learning*

Neural level:

- Hebbian learning: connection between the pre-synaptic and post-synaptic neuron increases if pre-synaptic neuron is repeatedly involved in activating post-synaptic
 - Biochemistry: NMDA channels, Ca^{2+} , AMPA receptors, ...
- Timing matters: strongest effect if pre-synaptic action potential occurs within 0 - 50msec before postsynaptic firing.
- Time constants for synaptic changes are a few minutes.
 - Can be disrupted by protein inhibitors injected after the training experience

What We Know About HL*

System level:

- In addition to single synapse changes, memory formation involves longer term 'consolidation' involving multiple parts of the brain
- Time constant for consolidation is hours or days: memory of new experiences can be disrupted by events occurring after the experience (e.g., drug interventions, trauma).
 - E.g., injections in amygdala 24 hours after training can impact recall experience, with no impact on recall within a few hours
- Consolidation thought to involve regions such as amygdala, hippocampus, frontal cortex. Hippocampus might orchestrate consolidation without itself being home of memories
- Dopamine seems to play a role in reward-based learning (and addictions)

What We Know About HL*

Behavioral level:

- Power law of practice: competence vs. training on log-log plot is a straight line, across many skill types
- Role of reasoning and knowledge compilation in learning
 - chunking, ACT-R, Soar
- Timing: Expanded spacing of stimuli aids memory, ...
- Theories about role of sleep in learning/consolidation
- Implicit and explicit learning. (unaware vs. aware).
- Developmental psychology: knows much about sequence of acquired expertise during childhood
 - Intersensory redundancy hypothesis

Models of Learning Processes



Machine Learning:

- # of examples
- Error rate
- Reinforcement learning
- Explanations

- Learning from examples
- Complexity of learner's representation
- Probability of success
- Exploitation / exploration
- Prior probabilities
- Loss functions

Human Learning:

- # of examples
- Error rate
- Reinforcement learning
- Explanations

- Human supervision
 - Lectures
 - Question answering
- Attention, motivation
- Skills vs. Principles
- Implicit vs. Explicit learning
- Memory, retention, forgetting



1. Learning to predict and achieve rewards



Reinforcement learning in ML



Dopamine in the brain


Reinforcement Learning

[Sutton and Barto 1981; Samuel 1957]



$$V^*(s) = E[r_t + \gamma r_{t+1} + \gamma^2 r_{t+2} + \dots]$$

Reinforcement Learning in ML



$$V(s_t) = E[r_t + \gamma r_{t+1} + \gamma^2 r_{t+2} + \dots]$$

$$V(s_t) = E[r_t] + \gamma V(s_{t+1})$$


To learn V , use each transition to generate a training signal:

$$training_error_t = r_t + \gamma \hat{V}(s_{t+1}) - \hat{V}(s_t)$$

Dopamine As Reward Signal


[Schultz et al.,
Science, 1997]

No prediction
Reward occurs



Dopamine As Reward Signal

[Schultz et al.,
Science, 1997]




Dopamine As Reward Signal


[Schultz et al.,
Science, 1997]

$$\text{error} = r_t + \gamma V(s_{t+1}) - V(s_t)$$


No prediction
Reward occurs



Reward predicted
Reward occurs



Reward predicted
No reward occurs



RL Models for Human Learning

[Seymore et al., Nature 2004]





Figure 1 Experimental design and temporal difference model. **a**, The experimental design expressed as a Markov chain, giving four separate trial types. **b**, Temporal difference value. As learning proceeds, earlier cues learn to make accurate value predictions (that is, weighted averages of the final expected pain). **c**, Temporal difference prediction error;


during learning the prediction error is transferred to earlier cues as they acquire the ability to make predictions. In trial types 3 and 4, the substantial change in prediction elicits a large positive or negative prediction error. (For clarity, before and mid-learning are shown only for trial type 1.)

a Experimental design




- Trial type 1 (41%) Cue A → Cue B → High pain
- Trial type 2 (41%) Cue C → Cue D → Low pain
- Trial type 3 (9%) Cue C → Cue B → High pain
- Trial type 4 (9%) Cue A → Cue D → Low pain

b Temporal difference value



c Temporal difference prediction error



[Seymore et al., Nature 2004]




Figure 2 Temporal difference prediction error (statistical parametric maps). Areas coloured yellow/orange show significant correlation with the temporal difference

Human EEG responses to Pos/Neg Reward

from [Nieuwenhuis et al.]




Fig. 1. Typical example of event-related brain potentials associated with negative and positive feedback (adapted from Ref. [25]). Negative is

Response due to feedback on timing task (press button exactly 1 sec after sound).


Neural source appears to be in anterior cingulate cortex (ACC)

Response is abnormal in some subjects with OCD

One Theory of RL in the Brain

from [Nieuwenhuis et al.]

- Basal ganglia monitors events, predict future rewards
- When prediction revised upward (downward), causes increase (decrease) in activity of midbrain dopaminergic neurons, influencing ACC
- This dopamine-based activation somehow results in revising the reward prediction function. Possibly through direct influence on Basal ganglia, and via prefrontal cortex



Summary: Temporal Difference ML Model Predicts Dopaminergic Neuron Activity during Learning

- Evidence now of neural reward signals from
 - Direct neural recordings in monkeys
 - fMRI in humans (1 mm spatial resolution)
 - EEG in humans (1-10 msec temporal resolution)
- Dopaminergic responses track temporal difference error in RL
- Some differences, and efforts to refine HL model
 - Better information processing model
 - Better localization to different brain regions
 - Study timing (e.g., basal ganglia learns faster than PFC ?)



2. The value of unlabeled multi-sensory data
for learning classifiers

Cotraining \leftrightarrow Intersensory redundancy
hypothesis

Redundantly Sufficient Features

Professor Faloutsos

my advisor



U.S. mail address:

Department of Computer Science
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

(97-99: [on leave at CMU](#))

Office: 3227 A. V. Williams Bldg.

Phone: (301) 405-2695

Fax: (301) 405-6707

Email: christos@cs.umd.edu

Christos Faloutsos

Current Position: Assoc. Professor of [Computer Science](#). (97-98: [on leave at CMU](#))

Join Appointment: [Institute for Systems Research](#) (ISR).

Academic Degrees: Ph.D. and M.Sc. ([University of Toronto](#).); B.Sc. ([Nat. Tech. U. Ath](#))


Research Interests:

- Query by content in multimedia databases;
- Fractals for clustering and spatial access methods;
- Data mining;

Redundantly Sufficient Features

Professor Faloutsos

my advisor



Redundantly Sufficient Features



U.S. mail address:

Department of Computer Science
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

(97-99: [on leave at CMU](#))

Office: 3227 A. V. Williams Bldg.

Phone: (301) 405-2695

Fax: (301) 405-6707

Email: christos@cs.umd.edu

Christos Faloutsos

Current Position: Assoc. Professor of [Computer Science](#). (97-98: [on leave at CMU](#))

Join Appointment: [Institute for Systems Research](#) (ISR).

Academic Degrees: Ph.D. and M.Sc. ([University of Toronto](#).); B.Sc. ([Nat. Tech. U. Ath](#))

Research Interests:

- Query by content in multimedia databases;
- Fractals for clustering and spatial access methods;
- Data mining;

Redundantly Sufficient Features

Professor Faloutsos

my advisor



U.S. mail address:

Department of Computer Science
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

(97-99: [on leave at CMU](#))

Office: 3227 A. V. Williams Bldg.

Phone: (301) 405-2695

Fax: (301) 405-6707

Email: christos@cs.umd.edu

Christos Faloutsos

Current Position: Assoc. Professor of [Computer Science](#). ([97-98: on leave at CMU](#))

Join Appointment: [Institute for Systems Research](#) (ISR).

Academic Degrees: Ph.D. and M.Sc. ([University of Toronto.](#)); B.Sc. ([Nat. Tech. U. Ath](#))


Research Interests:

- Query by content in multimedia databases;
- Fractals for clustering and spatial access methods;
- Data mining;

Co-Training

Idea: Train **Classifier₁** and **Classifier₂** to:

1. Correctly classify labeled examples
2. Agree on classification of unlabeled



Co-Training Theory

[Blum&Mitchell 98; Dasgupta 04, ...]


CoTraining setting:

learn $f : X \rightarrow Y$

where $X = X_1 \times X_2$

where x drawn from unknown distribution

and $\exists g_1, g_2 \ (\forall x) g_1(x_1) = g_2(x_2) = f(x)$



→ want inputs less dependent, increased number of redundant inputs, ...

Theoretical Predictions of CoTraining



- Possible to learn from unlabeled examples
- Value of unlabeled data depends on
 - How (conditionally) independent are X_1 and X_2
 - The more the better
 - How many redundant sensory inputs X_i there are
 - Expected error decreases exponentially with this number
- Disagreement on unlabeled data predicts true error

Do these predictions hold for human learners?

Co-Training

[joint work with Liu, Perfetti, Zi]

Can it work for humans learning chinese as a second language?



Examples

- Training fonts and speakers for “nail”

- Testing fonts and speakers for “nail”

釘 釘

釘 釘

釘 釘

釘

釘

Familiar

Unfamiliar

Experiment: Cotraining in Human Learning

[with Liu, Perfetti, 2006]

- 44 human subjects learning Chinese as second language
- Target function to be learned:
 - chinese word (spoken / written) → english word
 - 16 distinct words, 6 speakers, 6 writers = 16x6x6 stimulus pairs
- Training conditions:

1. Labeled pairs: 48 labeled pairs
_____→


2. Labeled pairs plus
unlabeled singles: 32 labeled pairs 192 unlabeled singles 16 labeled pairs
_____→

3. Labeled pairs plus
unlabeled, conditionally
indep. pairs: 32 labeled pairs 192 unlabeled pairs 16 labeled pairs
_____→


- Test: 16 test words (single chinese stimulus), require english label

Results

Does it matter whether X_1 , X_2 are conditionally independent?



Impact of Conditional Independence in unlabeled pairs



Intersensory Redundancy Guides the Development of Selective Attention, Perception, and Cognition in Infancy

Lorraine E. Bahrick,¹ Robert Lickliter,¹ and Ross Flom²

¹*Infant Development Research Center, Department of Psychology, Florida International University, and*

²*Department of Human Development, Brigham Young University*

ABSTRACT—*That the senses provide overlapping information for objects and events is no extravagance of nature. This overlap facilitates attention to critical aspects of sensory stimulation, those that are redundantly specified, and attenuates attention to nonredundantly specified stimulus properties. This selective attention is most pronounced in infancy and gives initial advantage to the perceptual processing of, learning of, and memory for stimulus properties that are redundant, or amodal (e.g., synchrony, rhythm, and intensity), at the expense of modality-specific properties (e.g., color, pitch, and timbre) that can be perceived through only one sense. We review evidence*

sound of footsteps foretell the approach of a person, and that the breaking glass made the sharp crashing sound. How does the infant, who begins life with no prior knowledge to guide attention, make sense of this flow and focus on stimulation that is meaningful, coherent, and relevant? What guides and constrains perceptual development and provides the foundation for the knowledge of the adult perceiver?


One answer to these questions arises from the fact that the senses pick up overlapping, redundant information for objects and events in the environment. In a radical move from traditional perceptual theory, J.J. Gibson (1966) proposed that different forms of sensory stimulation

Co-Training

Where else might this work?


- learning to recognize phonemes/vowels

[de Sa, 1994; Coen 2006]



Visual features: lip contour data


[Michael Coen, 2006]




Unsupervised clustering for learning vowels

[Michael Coen, 2006]


Formant data



Lip contour data




Viewing Hebbian links



Exploit the spatial structure of Hebbian co-occurrence data


Definition: Hebbian projection



A Hebbian projection corresponds to a conditional probability distribution

Projection from Mode A to Mode B


Definition: Hebbian projection




A Hebbian projection corresponds to a conditional probability distribution

Projection from Mode B to Mode A


Formant data



Lip contour data



[Michael Coen, 2006]



Mutual clustering

CoTraining Summary

- Unlabeled data improves supervised learning when example features are redundantly sufficient and conditionally weakly correlated
- Theoretical results
 - If X_1, X_2 conditionally independent given Y , Then
 - PAC learnable from weak initial classifier plus unlabeled data
 - disagreement between $g_1(x_1)$ and $g_2(x_2)$ bounds final classifier error
 - Disagreement between classifiers over unlabeled examples predicts true classification error
- Aligns with developmental psychology claims about importance of multi-sensory input
- Unlabeled conditionally independent pairs improve second language learning in humans
 - But dependent pairs are also helpful !

Human and Machine Learning

Additional overlaps:

- Learning representations for perception
 - Dimensionality reduction methods, low level percepts
 - Lewicky et al.: optimal sparse codes of natural scenes yield gabor filters found in primate visual cortex
- Learning using prior knowledge
 - Explanation-based learning, graphical models, teaching concepts & skills, chunking
 - VanLehn et al: explanation-based learning accounts for some human learning behaviors
- Learning multiple related outputs
 - MultiTask learning, teach multiple operations on the same input
 - Caruana: patient mortality predictions improve if same predictor must also learn to predict ICU status, WBC, etc.



Some questions and conjectures

One learning mechanism or many?

- Humans:
 - Implicit and explicit learning (unaware/aware)
 - Radically different time constants in synaptic changes (minutes) versus long term memory consolidation (days)
- Machines:
 - Inductive, data-intensive algorithms
 - Analytical compilation, knowledge + data

Conjecture:

In humans two very different learning processes.

Implicit largely inductive, Explicit involves self-explanation

Predicts: if an implicit learning task can be made explicit, it will be learnable from less data

Can Hebbian Learning Explain it All?

- Humans:
 - It is the only synapse-level learning mechanism currently known
 - It is also known that new neurons grow, travel, and die

Conjecture:

Yes, much of human learning will be explainable by Hebbian learning, just as much of computer operation can be explained by modeling transistors. Even two different learning mechanisms.

But much will need to be understood at an architectural level. E.g., what architectures could implement goal supervised learning in terms of Hebbian mechanisms?

What is Learned, What Must be Innate?

We don't know. However, we do know:

- Low level perceptual features can emerge from unsupervised exposure to perceptual stimuli [e.g., M. Lewicky].
 - Natural visual scenes → Gabor filters similar to those in visual cortex
 - Natural sounds → basis functions similar to those in auditory cortex
- Semantic object hierarchies can emerge from observed ground-level facts
 - Neural network model [McClelland et al]
- ML models can help determine what representations can emerge from raw data.