

Thinking About Human Memory

Thinking About Human Memory provides a novel analytical approach to understanding memory that considers the goals of the memory task, the cues and information available, the opportunity to learn, and interference from irrelevant information (noise). Each of five chapters describing this approach introduces historical ideas and demonstrates how current thinking both differs from and is derived from them. These chapters also contain analyses of current problems designed to demonstrate the power of the approach. In a subsequent chapter, the authors discuss how memory is controlled by the environment, by others, and by ourselves, and then apply their insights to the problem solving of children, our hominin ancestors, and scrub jays. Finally, the questions of how to define episodic memory and how to investigate phylogenetic and developmental changes in memory are addressed. This book will appeal to memory researchers, including applied researchers, and advanced students.

MICHAEL S. HUMPHREYS is Professor Emeritus in the School of Psychology at the University of Queensland, Australia.

KERRY A. CHALMERS is Senior Lecturer in the School of Psychology at the University of Newcastle, Australia.





Thinking About Human Memory

Michael S. Humphreys

School of Psychology, The University of Queensland, Australia

Kerry A. Chalmers

School of Psychology, University of Newcastle, Australia





CAMBRIDGEUNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107087149

© Michael S. Humphreys and Kerry A. Chalmers 2016

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2016

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Humphreys, Michael S., author. | Chalmers, Kerry A., author.

Thinking about human memory / Michael S. Humphreys, Kerry A. Chalmers. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2016. | Includes bibliographical references.

LCCN 2015039030 | ISBN 9781107087149

LCSH: Memory.

LCC BF371 .H777 2016 | DDC 153.1/2-dc23

LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2015039030

ISBN 978-1-107-08714-9 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate



Contents

| List of figures, tables, and box | | page vi |
|----------------------------------|--|---------|
| 1 | Overview of how to analyze memory tasks | 1 |
| 2 | Analyzing the goals of a task | 10 |
| 3 | The importance of thinking about cues and targets | 14 |
| 4 | Theoretical analyses involving the use of information and its complexity | 47 |
| 5 | Opportunity for learning | 79 |
| 6 | The discrimination problems posed by different memory tasks | 119 |
| 7 | Controlling human memory | 143 |
| 8 | Episodic memory | 164 |
| 9 | Conclusions | 195 |
| References | | 200 |
| Index | | 224 |

v



List of Figures, Tables, and Box

Figures

Response times to nontarget trials (task interference) as a function of memory instructions (Remember vs. Forget) and test instructions (Respond All vs. Respond List 2) in Experiment 1. Error bars represent standard errors. From "Control of access to memory: The use of task interference as a behavioral probe" by S. Loft, M. S. Humphreys, and S. J. Whitney, 2008, Journal of Memory and Language, 58, 465-479. Copyright 2008 by Elsevier. page 31 4.1 Mean probability of a "certainly yes" response to 4-proposition test items as a function of sentence complexity at study. From "Ask me again': Differential effects of repeated questioning on the recognition and endorsement of autobiographical childhood events" by L. C. Spark, 2007, unpublished honors thesis, University of Queensland, Australia. 77 5.1 Perceptual stimuli that incorporate two stimuli as a unitized shape (left-hand side) versus as two separate features (righthand side). From "A reformulation of the problems of associations" by S. E. Asch, 1969, American Psychologist, 24, 92-102. Copyright 1969 by American Psychological Association. 89 5.2 Mean correct recall and Block 1 intrusions as a function of presentation modality in the verbal distractor conditions. From "Determinants of short-term forgetting: Decay, retroactive interference, or proactive interference?" by G. A. Tolan and G. Tehan, 1999, International Journal of Psychology, 34, 285–292. Copyright 1999 by Wiley. 103 6.1 The distribution of evidence assumed by signal detection theory. 123 8.1 Schematic map of the normal route home (dashed lines) and the alternate route taken during the roadwork construction period (dotted lines). 166

vi



| | List of figures, tables, and box | vii |
|-----|---|-----|
| 8.2 | Results from Experiment 1 in "Recent study, but not retrieval, of knowledge protects against learning errors" by H. G. Mullet, S. Umanath, and E. J. Marsh, 2014, <i>Memory & Cognition</i> , 42, 1239–1249. Copyright 2014 by Psychonomic Society. | 169 |
| 8.3 | Results from Experiment 2 in "Recent study, but not retrieval, of knowledge protects against learning errors" by H. G. Mullet, S. Umanath, and E. J. Marsh, 2014, <i>Memory & Cognition</i> , 42, 1239–1249. Copyright 2014 by Psychonomic Society. | 169 |
| Tab | les | |
| 3.1 | Mean rating for words presented in synonym and passage tasks, synonym task alone, passage task alone, and in neither the synonym nor the passage task. The three between-subject conditions were whether participants were asked to recognize the words from the passage task, recognize the words from the synonym task, or to rate the words for their frequency in the | |
| | language. | 28 |
| 3.2 | Example stimuli used in Humphreys, Murray, and Koh (2014, Experiment 2) along with examples of switch and | |
| 2.2 | no-switch trials. | 35 |
| 3.3 | Results from Roediger, Weldon, Stagler, and Riegler (1992, Experiment 1). Participants studied words or pictures and were either cued with word fragments (generally a single completion possible) or with word stems (multiple completions possible). In addition, half of the participants were given implicit recall instructions and half were given | 40 |
| 3.4 | explicit recall instructions. Results from Humphreys, Tehan, O'Shea, and Bolland (2000). The observed and predicted probabilities of cued recall and free association as a function of whether the two targets subsumed | 40 |
| 4.1 | under the cue are similar or less similar. Sample size (<i>n</i>), hit rates for the individual words within intact and rearranged pairs, and the double miss rates for intact and rearranged pairs. In all experiments participants are instructed to | 42 |
| | indicate for each word whether it is old or new. | 53 |
| 4.2 | Average number of errors made on pairs with an A term and pairs with an E term (not including pair AE). | 62 |
| 4.3 | Hit rate (HR) and false alarm rate (FAR) in rearranged and mixed pairs, and double miss rate for the pair-bias and item-bias | 02 |



| conditions of Bain and Humphreys (1988). The results have been collapsed over Experiments 3a, 3b, and 3c. 4.4 Hit rate (HR) for once-presented items and false alarm rate (FAR) for new items as a function of the presentation frequency of the paired item (5, 1, or 0) from Experiments 1 and 2 of Buchler, Light, and Reder (2008). 4.5 An example of an event set (Grandparents' House) including elements, components, connectives, and possible event component combinations. 4.6 Event components presented at study for each experimental condition. 5.1 Hit and false alarm rates as a function of type of item (pronounced, unpronounced, or new) and type of design (mixed list, blocked, or between-subjects) from Bodner, Taikh, and Fawcett (2014). 5.2 Examples of the relationships between items presented for the priming task and the test items on the recognition test. The names for the priming conditions refer to the relationship between the prime and the target and the names for the recognition conditions refer to the word that was tested for recognition. The prime-associate-foil triples used to construct these examples are doctor-nurse-purse, soil-dirt-dart, length-width-witch, office-work-word, and chair-table-fable. 5.3 Hit rate (HR), false alarm rate (FAR), and d' as a function of Experiment (5A or 5B) and test context (Same old, Different old, and New) from Hockley (2008). 5.4 Probability of recognizing an item studied as a single as a function of whether it was tested as a single or in a pair (adapted from Thomson, 1972). 5.5 A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition and at Time 2 in the competitive retrieval practice condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is | viii | List of figures, tables, and box | |
|--|------|--|----------|
| (FAR) for new items as a function of the presentation frequency of the paired item (5, 1, or 0) from Experiments 1 and 2 of Buchler, Light, and Reder (2008). 4.5 An example of an event set (Grandparents' House) including elements, components, connectives, and possible event component combinations. 4.6 Event components presented at study for each experimental condition. 5.1 Hit and false alarm rates as a function of type of item (pronounced, unpronounced, or new) and type of design (mixed list, blocked, or between-subjects) from Bodner, Taikh, and Fawcett (2014). 5.2 Examples of the relationships between items presented for the priming task and the test items on the recognition test. The names for the priming conditions refer to the relationship between the prime and the target and the names for the recognition conditions refer to the word that was tested for recognition. The prime-associate-foil triples used to construct these examples are doctor-nurse-purse, soil-dirt-dart, length-width-witch, office-work-word, and chair-table-fable. 5.3 Hit rate (HR), false alarm rate (FAR), and d' as a function of Experiment (5A or 5B) and test context (Same old, Different old, and New) from Hockley (2008). 5.4 Probability of recognizing an item studied as a single as a function of whether it was tested as a single or in a pair (adapted from Thomson, 1972). 5.5 A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is related to the cue that starts with those initial letters. Note also that instead of studying the cue-target pair at Time 2, Anderson, Bjork, and Bjork (2000) had part | 4.4 | been collapsed over Experiments 3a, 3b, and 3c. | 70 |
| 4.5 An example of an event set (Grandparents' House) including elements, components, connectives, and possible event component combinations. 4.6 Event components presented at study for each experimental condition. 5.1 Hit and false alarm rates as a function of type of item (pronounced, unpronounced, or new) and type of design (mixed list, blocked, or between-subjects) from Bodner, Taikh, and Fawcett (2014). 5.2 Examples of the relationships between items presented for the priming task and the test items on the recognition test. The names for the priming conditions refer to the relationship between the prime and the target and the names for the recognition conditions refer to the word that was tested for recognition. The prime-associate-foil triples used to construct these examples are doctor-nurse-purse, soil-dirt-dart, length-width-witch, office-work-word, and chair-table-fable. 5.3 Hit rate (HR), false alarm rate (FAR), and d' as a function of Experiment (5A or 5B) and test context (Same old, Different old, and New) from Hockley (2008). 5.4 Probability of recognizing an item studied as a single as a function of whether it was tested as a single or in a pair (adapted from Thomson, 1972). 5.5 A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is related to the cue that starts with those initial letters. Note also that instead of studying the cue-target pair at Time 2, Anderson, Bjork, and Bjork (2000) had participants generate the cue to the target and | | (FAR) for new items as a function of the presentation frequency of the paired item (5, 1, or 0) from Experiments 1 and 2 of | 71 |
| condition. 5.1 Hit and false alarm rates as a function of type of item (pronounced, unpronounced, or new) and type of design (mixed list, blocked, or between-subjects) from Bodner, Taikh, and Fawcett (2014). 5.2 Examples of the relationships between items presented for the priming task and the test items on the recognition test. The names for the priming conditions refer to the relationship between the prime and the target and the names for the recognition conditions refer to the word that was tested for recognition. The prime-associate-foil triples used to construct these examples are doctor-nurse-purse, soil-dirt-dart, length-width-witch, office-work-word, and chair-table-fable. 5.3 Hit rate (HR), false alarm rate (FAR), and d' as a function of Experiment (5A or 5B) and test context (Same old, Different old, and New) from Hockley (2008). 5.4 Probability of recognizing an item studied as a single as a function of whether it was tested as a single or in a pair (adapted from Thomson, 1972). 5.5 A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition and at Time 2 in the competitive retrieval practice condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is related to the cue that starts with those initial letters. Note also that instead of studying the cue—target pair at Time 2, Anderson, Bjork, and Bjork (2000) had participants generate the cue to the target and | 4.5 | An example of an event set (Grandparents' House) including elements, components, connectives, and possible event | 75 |
| (pronounced, unpronounced, or new) and type of design (mixed list, blocked, or between-subjects) from Bodner, Taikh, and Fawcett (2014). 5.2 Examples of the relationships between items presented for the priming task and the test items on the recognition test. The names for the priming conditions refer to the relationship between the prime and the target and the names for the recognition conditions refer to the word that was tested for recognition. The prime-associate-foil triples used to construct these examples are doctor-nurse-purse, soil-dirt-dart, length-width-witch, office-work-word, and chair-table-fable. 5.3 Hit rate (HR), false alarm rate (FAR), and d' as a function of Experiment (5A or 5B) and test context (Same old, Different old, and New) from Hockley (2008). 5.4 Probability of recognizing an item studied as a single as a function of whether it was tested as a single or in a pair (adapted from Thomson, 1972). 5.5 A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition and at Time 2 in the competitive retrieval practice condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is related to the cue that starts with those initial letters. Note also that instead of studying the cue—target pair at Time 2, Anderson, Bjork, and Bjork (2000) had participants generate the cue to the target and | 4.6 | Event components presented at study for each experimental | 76 |
| 5.2 Examples of the relationships between items presented for the priming task and the test items on the recognition test. The names for the priming conditions refer to the relationship between the prime and the target and the names for the recognition conditions refer to the word that was tested for recognition. The prime-associate-foil triples used to construct these examples are doctor-nurse-purse, soil-dirt-dart, length-width-witch, office-work-word, and chair-table-fable. 5.3 Hit rate (HR), false alarm rate (FAR), and d' as a function of Experiment (5A or 5B) and test context (Same old, Different old, and New) from Hockley (2008). 5.4 Probability of recognizing an item studied as a single as a function of whether it was tested as a single or in a pair (adapted from Thomson, 1972). 5.5 A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition and at Time 2 in the competitive retrieval practice condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is related to the cue that starts with those initial letters. Note also that instead of studying the cue—target pair at Time 2, Anderson, Bjork, and Bjork (2000) had participants generate the cue to the target and | 5.1 | (pronounced, unpronounced, or new) and type of design (mixed list, blocked, or between-subjects) from Bodner, Taikh, and | 92 |
| chair-table-fable. 5.3 Hit rate (HR), false alarm rate (FAR), and d' as a function of Experiment (5A or 5B) and test context (Same old, Different old, and New) from Hockley (2008). 5.4 Probability of recognizing an item studied as a single as a function of whether it was tested as a single or in a pair (adapted from Thomson, 1972). 5.5 A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition and at Time 2 in the competitive retrieval practice condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is related to the cue that starts with those initial letters. Note also that instead of studying the cue—target pair at Time 2, Anderson, Bjork, and Bjork (2000) had participants generate the cue to the target and | 5.2 | Examples of the relationships between items presented for the priming task and the test items on the recognition test. The names for the priming conditions refer to the relationship between the prime and the target and the names for the recognition conditions refer to the word that was tested for recognition. The prime-associate-foil triples used to construct these examples are doctor-nurse-purse, | |
| 5.4 Probability of recognizing an item studied as a single as a function of whether it was tested as a single or in a pair (adapted from Thomson, 1972). 5.5 A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition and at Time 2 in the competitive retrieval practice condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is related to the cue that starts with those initial letters. Note also that instead of studying the cue—target pair at Time 2, Anderson, Bjork, and Bjork (2000) had participants generate the cue to the target and | 5.3 | chair-table-fable. Hit rate (HR), false alarm rate (FAR), and d' as a function of Experiment (5A or 5B) and test context (Same old, Different | 94 |
| 5.5 A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition and at Time 2 in the competitive retrieval practice condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is related to the cue that starts with those initial letters. Note also that instead of studying the cue—target pair at Time 2, Anderson, Bjork, and Bjork (2000) had participants generate the cue to the target and | 5.4 | Probability of recognizing an item studied as a single as a function of whether it was tested as a single or in a pair (adapted | 96 97 |
| the initial letters of the cue. | 5.5 | A comparison of the sequence of study and test events that occurred in a study of retrieval practice and a study of retrieval-induced forgetting. The materials used to illustrate the conditions come from Grimaldi and Karpicke (2012). Note that at Time 1 in the constrained retrieval condition and at Time 2 in the competitive retrieval practice condition, the participants are supplied with a related word as a cue plus the initial letters of the target. They are expected to produce a word that is related to the cue that starts with those initial letters. Note also that instead of studying the cue—target pair at Time 2, Anderson, Bjork, and | 110 |



| List of figures, ta | bles, and box | ix |
|-------------------------|--|-----|
| 6.1 Proportion of items | s judged old in Experiments 1 and 2 from | |
| Dodson and Schac | ter (2001). | 141 |
| 7.1 Single item recogn | ition for right pair member $(N = 29)$. | 147 |
| | | |
| Box | | |
| - | lus materials used in Humphreys, Cornwell, | |
| McAlister, Kelly, (| Quinn, and Murray (2010). | 44 |