Carnegie Mellon University Research Showcase @ CMU

Department of Psychology

Dietrich College of Humanities and Social Sciences

November 2008

Using Cognitive Modeling to Understand the Roles of Prefrontal and Posterior Parietal Cortex in Algebra Problem Solving

Jared F. Danker Carnegie Mellon University

John R. Anderson *Carnegie Mellon University*

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.cmu.edu/psychology

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Dietrich College of Humanities and Social Sciences at Research Showcase @ CMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Psychology by an authorized administrator of Research Showcase @ CMU. For more information, please contact research-showcase@andrew.cmu.edu.



Using Cognitive Modeling to Understand the Roles of Prefrontal and Posterior Parietal Cortex in Algebra Problem Solving

Jared F. Danker & John R. Anderson

Department of Psychology and Center for the Neural Basis of Cognition, Carnegie Mellon University

Introduction



- The current instantiation of the ACT-R theory (Anderson, 2005) associates retrieval and transformation with activity in prefrontal and posterior parietal cortex, respectively
- \bullet Activity in these regions are likewise correlated during naturalistic problem solving (Anderson et al., 2003)
- Can we isolate the processes of transformation and retrieval in algebra problem solving and manipulate them independently?
- If so, can we also isolate activity in their neural correlates?

Method

- 20 participants run in a BOLD fMRI study
- Algebra equations were created that needed to be solved in 2 phases:
- Transformation phase: isolate x from a and b
 - •Retrievals are delayed until numerical values of a and b are given
- Retrieval phase: calculate the value of x given the numerical values of a and b





• Why did our manipulations fail to isolate the activity in these regions?

- Explanation 1: These regions are not functionally distinct as characterized by ACT-R
- Explanation 2: Our task manipulations failed to properly isolate retrieval and transformation
- We designed two ACT-R models to determine the plausibility of Explanation 2
- \bullet Pure Model: Encompassed our initial assumptions about the design but failed to fit the RT data (R² = .50)
- Mixed Model: Assumed that both manipulations had retrieval and transformation components and fit the RT data well ($R^2 = .94$)



Pure Model

| Low Transformation | | High Transformation | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Low Retrieval | High Retrieval | Low Retrieval | High Retrieval |
| Encode x + a = b | Encode x + a = b | Encode x - b = a | Encode x + a = b |
| Retrieve | Retrieve | Transform | Transform |
| key for + | key for + | Retrieve key for + | Retrieve key for + |
| Respond + | Respond + | Respond + | Respond + |
| Encode | Encode | | |
| a = 4 - 0 | a = 7 - 3 | a = 4 - 0 | a = 7 - 3 |
| b = 8 - 0 | Retrieve 7 - 3 = 4 | Encode b = 8 - 0 | Retrieve |
| Retrieve 4 + 8 = 12 | Encode b = 9 = 1 | Retrieve | Encode |
| Retrieve key for 2 | Retrieve 9 - 1 = 8 | Retrieve | b = 9 - 1 Retrieve |
| Respond 2 | Retrieve | Regrand 2 | 9 - 1 = 8 |
| | 4 + 8 = 12 | Respond z | Retrieve 4 + 8 = 12 |
| | Retrieve key for 2 | | Retrieve key for 2 |
| | Respond 2 | | Respond 2 |

| Mixed Model | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| Low Transformation | | High Transformation | | |
| Low Retrieval | High Retrieval | Low Retrieval | High Retrieval | |
| Encode x + a = b | Encode x + a = b | Encode x - b = a | Encode x + a = b | |
| Retrieve key for + | Retrieve key for + | Retrieve Operator | Retrieve Operator | |
| Respond + | Respond + | Transform | Transform | |
| Encode a = 4 - 0 | Encode a = 7 - 3 | Retrieve key for + | Retrieve key for + | |
| Encode b = 8 | Retrieve 7 - 3 = 4 | Respond + | Respond + | |
| Retrieve 4 + 8 = 12 | | Encode a = 4 - 0 | Encode a = 7 - 3 | |
| Retrieve | b = 9 - 1 Retrieve 9 - 1 = 8 | Encode b = 8 | Retrieve 7 - 3 = 4 | |
| key for 2 | | Retrieve | | |
| Respond 2 | | 4 + 8 = 12 | Encode | |
| | Retrieve 4 + 8 = 12 Retrieve key for 2 | key for 2 | Retrieve 9 - 1 = 8 | |
| | | Respond 2 | | |
| | | | Retrieve 4 + 8 = 12 | |
| | Acapoliti 2 | l | Retrieve key for 2 | |
| | | | Respond 2 | |

Center for the Neural Basis of Cognition

Conclusions

- There is a lot of difficulty isolating the basic cognitive processes characterized by ACT-R
- The difference between the roles of prefrontal and posterior parietal cortices in algebra problem solving remains unclear
- \bullet Using cognitive modeling can help in the interpretation of behavioral and neuroimaging data

References

Anderson, J.R., Qin, Y., Sohn, M.-H., Stenger, V.A., Carter, C.S. (2003). An information-processing model of the BOLD response in symbol manipulation tasks. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 10, 241–261.

Anderson, J.R. (2005). Human symbol manipulation within an integrated cognitive architecture. Cognitive Science, 29, 313–341.

 Danker, J. F., Anderson, J. R. (2007). The roles of prefrontal and posterior parietal cortex in algebra problem solving: A case of using cognitive modeling to inform neuroimaging data. *NeuroImage*, 35, 1365-1377.