Cognitive Psychology (EXP 4680)

Christine L. Ruva, Ph.D.

LONG TERM MEMORY CHAPTER 5

INFORMATION PROCESSING MODEL

	IN OKWINION TROCESSING MODEL
	Computer Analogy
	Structure:
	Processes:
	□ Encoding:
	 transduction process
	□ <u>Storage:</u>
	• <u>Retrieval</u> :
	INFORMATION PROCESSING MODEL
•	CHARACTERISTICS OF LTM
	THEORIES OF THE RELATION BETWEEN STM AND LTM
•	ATKINSON-SHIFFRIN MODEL (1968):

■ EXTREMES ON A SINGLE CONTINUUM:

THEORIES OF THE RELATION BETWEEN STM AND LTM: RESEARCH SUPPORTING SEPARATE STORES MODEL

• Rundus' Research:

0

0

■ <u>Kintsch & Buschk (1969)</u> : proposed that STM is coded and LTM is coded
The Experiment:
 Participants were given 2 lists of words
■ 1st list: <u>synonyms</u>
• 2nd list: <u>homonyms</u>
 Ps Given 2 lists of words: 1st list: synonyms
■ If model is correct we would expect more <u>semantic confusion</u> at the
of the list than at the because
■ 2nd list: <u>homonyms</u>
 If model is correct we would expect more <u>acoustic confusion</u> at the of
the list than at the because
Neuroscience Research: dissociations between LTM tasks and STM.
THEORIES OF THE RELATION BETWEEN STM AND LTM: EVIDENCE AGAINST THE SEPARATE STORE MODEL
Evidence that STM is also coded
Evidence that LTM is also coded
Long-term recency effect

2 HYPOTHESES FOR FORGETTING

- <u>Trace Theories</u>
 - □ **Proactive:**

■ Interference Theories

□ **Retroactive**:

CRITICISM OF MULTI-STORE MODELS

DETERMINANTS OF ACCURACY

- Depth of Processing/Level of Processing
- **■** Context Effects:
 - Encoding Specificity
 - State-Dependent Memory
 - □ Mood:
 - pollyanna principle
 - mood congruence
 - mood state dependence
- **■** Self Reference Effect:

ENCODING PROCESSES IN LTM

 DEPTH OF PROCESSING

- □ Incidental Learning Procedure (Hyde & Jenkins, 1969, 1973)
 - Intent to learn not crucial importance.
 - **■** What was crucial?

CRAIK AND LOCKHART'S LEVELS OF PROCESSING MODEL (1972)

- Deeper processing
- □ Processing ranges from *shallow* to *deep*.
- □ The modality in which the information is handled is determined by the
- Craik & Tulving (1975)

WHY DOES THE SEMANTIC LEVEL RESULT IN BETTER RECOGNITION OR RECALL?

• Craik & Lockhart (1986): 2 factors responsible for depth of processing effects

WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF REHEARSAL ON FUTURE RECALL?

- □ Maintenance Rehearsal
- □ Elaborative Rehearsal

ENCODING AND RETRIEVAL INTERACTIONS

•	Encoding Specificity Effect:
	• Memory =
	□ Context =
	□ Steven Smith (1979, 1986):
	Geiselman & Glenny (1977)
	WHY ISE RESEARCH ON ENCODING SPECIFICITY EFFECT IS CONTROVERSIAL?
•	<u>Inconsistency of results</u> :
•	Why this inconsistency?
	□ Different types of tasks:
	 Outshining Hypothesis:
	Physical versus Mental Context:
	State Dependent Learning: A Type of Encoding Specificity
	State-Dependent Memory:
	Context & Memory
	 2 Types Of Cues: External cues Internal cues

□ Godden & Baddeley (1975):

EMOTIONS, MOOD, AND MEMORY

- Pollyanna principle:
- Positivity Effect
- Socioemotional Selectivity Theory (Mather & Carstensen, 2005)
- Negativity Bias (Kisley, Wood, & Burrows, 2007; Vaish, Grossmann, & Woodward, 2008)
- Memory for Items Differing in Emotion
 - Over time, unpleasant memories fade faster
 - Walker and coauthors (1997)
 - personal events recorded and rated for pleasantness and intensity
 - people tend to rate past events more positively with the passage of time

CONTEXT EFFECTS AND MOOD

- **■** Mood congruence:
 - o Murray and colleagues (1999)—
- Mood state dependence:
 - o Gordon Bower 1970's series of studies
 - Both induced and naturally occurring moods for learning lists and for tests
 - Inconsistent findings: problem w/ methods
 - How can we measure mood more accurately?

ORGANIZATION OF LTM: TULVING'S MODEL

- Procedural memory
- Semantic/Declaritive memory:
- **Episodic memory**
 - Flashbulb Memory
- Talorico, J.M. & Rubin, D. C. (2003). Confidence, not Consistency, Characterizes flashbulb memories. Psychological Science, 5, pp. 455-461.

RESEARCH IN SUPPORT OF TULVINGS MODEL

- □ Neuroscience:
 - □ <u>Brain areas</u> that are <u>active</u> during semantic and episodic tasks are different.
 - <u>Dissociations</u> in <u>brain damaged persons</u> good semantic memory, but poor episodic memory.
- □ **Small correlation** between performance on semantic and episodic memory tasks.
- □ Variables that effect semantic memory performance don't effect episodic memory performance and vice versa.

ORGANIZATION OF LTM: IMPLICIT & EXPLICIT MEMORY

Explicit Memory

•	Implicit Memory
	MEASURES OF IMPLICIT MEMORY
	Mere Exposure Effect
	<u>degraded word</u> - (col) and <u>degraded picture</u>
	perceptual memory test
	physiological response measures:
	implicit recognition task:
	EVIDENCE OF 2 SEPARATE MEMORY SYSTEMS
-	<u>Dissociations</u> :
	 <u>Divided attention:</u> effects performance on explicit tests, but does not affect performance on implicit tests.

□ Older Ss usually perform more poorly on explicit tests than younger Ss, but no

□ <u>Amnesiacs</u>: impoverished performance on explicit tasks, but performance similar to

difference is found on implicit memory tests.

normal on implicit tasks.