

AD-A224 385

# Adaptive Search Through Constraint Violations

Stellan Ohlsson and Ernest Rees

*The Learning Research and Development Center,  
University of Pittsburgh,  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260*

Technical Report No. KUL-90-01  
January, 1990

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government. Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

DTIC  
SELECTED  
JUL 31 1990  
S B D

Copyright © 1990 Stellan Ohlsson

Preparation of this manuscript was supported by ONR grant N00014-89-J-1681, and by the Xerox University Grant to the University of Pittsburgh. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the positions of the sponsoring agencies, and no endorsement should be inferred.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No 0704-0188	
1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION <b>Unclassified</b>		1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS			
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3 DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT			
2b DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		Approved for public release; distribution unlimited			
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) UPITT/LRDC/ONR/KUL-90-01		5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Learning Research & Development Center, University of Pittsburgh		6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Cognitive Science Program Office of Naval Research (Code 1142CS)		
6c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 3939 O'Hara Street Pittsburgh, PA 15260		7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5000			
8a NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Xerox University Grant		8b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER N00014-89-J-1681		
8c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO 61153N	PROJECT NO RR04206	TASK NO RR04206-01	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO NR442a-523
11 TITLE (Include Security Classification) <b>Adaptive Search Through Constraint Violations</b>					
12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) <b>Stellan Ohlsson and Ernest Rees</b>					
13a TYPE OF REPORT <b>Technical</b>		13b TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month Day) <b>January 1990</b>		15 PAGE COUNT
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17 COSATI CODES			18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP			
05	02				
19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)					
<p>Restructuring consists of a change in the representation of the current search state, a process which breaks an impasse during problem solving by opening up new search paths. A corpus of 52 think-aloud protocols from the domain of geometry was scanned for evidence of restructuring. The data suggest that restructuring is accomplished by re-parsing the geometric diagram.</p>					
20 DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION <b>Unclassified</b>		
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL <b>Susan M. Chipman</b>		22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) <b>(202) 696-4318</b>		22c OFFICE SYMBOL <b>ONR 1142CS</b>	

### Knowledge and Understanding in Human Learning

Knowledge and Understanding in Human Learning (KUL) is an umbrella term for a loosely connected set of activities lead by Stellan Ohlsson at the Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh. The aim of KUL is to clarify the role of *world knowledge* in human thinking, reasoning, and problem solving. World knowledge consists of general principles, and contrasts with facts (episodic knowledge) and with cognitive skills (procedural knowledge). The long-term goal is to answer six questions: How can the conceptual content of a particular knowledge domain be identified? How can a particular person's knowledge of a given domain be diagnosed? How is principled knowledge utilized in insightful performance? How does principled knowledge influence procedure acquisition? How is principled knowledge acquired? How can instruction facilitate the acquisition of principled (as opposed to episodic or procedural) knowledge? Different methodologies are used to investigate these questions: Psychological experiments, computer simulations, historical studies, semantic, logical, and mathematical analyses, instructional intervention studies, etc. A list of KUL reports appear at the back of this report.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Knowledge as Constraints on Possible Situations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Learning from Constraint Violations</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Revising a Blocks World Rule</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Discussion and Related Work</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>List of KUL Reports</b>	<b>14</b>

### Abstract

We describe HS, a production system that learns control knowledge through adaptive search. Unlike most other psychological models of skill acquisition, HS is a model of analytical, or knowledge-based, learning. HS encodes general domain knowledge in *state constraints*, patterns that describe those search states that are consistent with the principles of the problem domain. When HS encounters a search state that violates a state constraint, it revises the production rule that generated that state. The appropriate revisions are computed by regressing the constraint through the action of the production rule. HS can learn to solve problems that it cannot solve without learning. We present a *Blocks World* example of a rule revision, empirical results from both initial learning experiments and transfer experiments in the domain of counting, and an informal analysis of the conditions under which this learning technique is likely to be useful.

## Introduction

The acquisition of control knowledge is a central problem in machine learning research. In one formulation of the control knowledge problem, a weak but general problem solver searches for the solution to a problem with an initial set of incomplete or faulty problem solving rules. Learning mechanisms such as discrimination (Langley, 1985), subgoaling (Ohlsson, 1987a), or version spaces (Mitchell, 1982) can be applied to the information in the search tree to identify conditions that will enable the rules to solve the problem, or the relevant class of problems, with less search. Psychologists are interested in this learning scenario because it offers a possible model of how humans learn cognitive skills through practice (see, e. g., Anderson, 1989; Holland, Holyoak, Nisbett, & Thagard, 1986; Laird, Rosenbloom, & Newell, 1986; VanLehn, in press).

Psychological models of skill acquisition employ different problem solving mechanisms (forward search, backward chaining, means-ends analysis, planning, universal weak method) and different learning mechanisms (analogy, chunking, composition, discrimination, grammar induction, subgoaling), but with only a few exceptions (Anderson, 1989; Ohlsson, 1987b; Ohlsson & Rees, 1988) they have focussed on *empirical* learning methods. They identify rule conditions by performing some form of induction (in a broad sense) on the examples of correct and incorrect operator applications embedded in the search tree. Empirical learning methods contrast with *analytical* methods such as explanation-based learning (EBL) which identify rule conditions by applying knowledge about the relevant problem domain (Minton, 1988). But analytical learning methods are particularly interesting from a psychological point of view, because they offer a possible explanation of the facilitating effect of domain knowledge on procedure acquisition. Psychological experiments have shown that knowledge of the principles of a domain enables people to learn procedures faster and apply them more flexibly (see, e. g., Kieras & Bovair, 1984) as compared to conditions in which such knowledge is absent.

We describe a technique for knowledge-based procedure acquisition which is based on the idea that the main function of knowledge is to constrain the possible states of affairs. Incomplete control knowledge will frequently lead to the generation of search states that violate such constraints. The information contained in constraint violations can be used to identify new rule conditions adaptively, before a correct solution path has been found (Mostow & Bhatnager, 1986). The technique is implemented in a running simulation model called HS. We present data from both initial learning experiments and transfer experiments, and an informal analysis of the conditions under which our learning technique is likely to be useful. Our system is related to the FAILSAFE system described by Mostow and Bhatnager (1986), to the proceduralization hypothesis proposed by Anderson (1989), and to the planning net model of counting competence put forward by Smith, Greeno, and Vitolo (in press). A comparison with these systems will be postponed until the discussion section.

## Knowledge as Constraints on Possible Situations

We are interested in the cognitive function of general knowledge. Many discussions of knowledge implicitly assume that the function of general knowledge is either to summarize particular facts or to enable explanations and predictions. There is no doubt that knowledge has those functions. However, we want to suggest that knowledge *also* can have the function of constraining the set of situations that one can reasonably expect to happen. The laws of conservation of mass and energy and the laws of commutativity and associativity of addition are examples of general principles that constrain the possible states of affairs. Faulty control knowledge, e. g., an incorrect laboratory procedure or a buggy addition algorithm, is likely to lead to violations of such constraints.

To capture the idea of general knowledge as constraints on possible situations, we encode a principle  $C$  as a *state constraint*, i. e., as an ordered pair of patterns  $\langle C_r, C_s \rangle$  in which  $C_r$  is the *relevance pattern* and  $C_s$  is the *satisfaction pattern*. For example, the law of commutativity of addition expressed as a state constraint becomes *if  $x + y = p$  and  $y + x = q$ , then it should be the case that  $p = q$* . The principle of one-to-one mapping becomes *if object  $A$  has been assigned to object  $B$ , then there should not be some other object  $X$  which also has been assigned to  $B$* . The law of conservation of mass becomes *if  $M_1$  is the mass of the ingredients in a chemical experiment, and  $M_2$  is the mass of the products, then it should be the case that  $M_1 = M_2$* . A constraint consists of a pair of patterns because all constraints are not relevant for all problem types. The relevance pattern of a state constraint specifies those search states (situations) in which the corresponding principle applies. The purpose of expressing domain knowledge in state constraints is to enable the HS system to efficiently identify search states that violate principles of the domain. This requires a  $\text{MATCH}(C, S)$  predicate that can decide whether a given pattern matches a given search state. We have used a RETE pattern matcher (Forgy, 1982) as our MATCH predicate.

HS is a relatively standard production system architecture that has been augmented with the state constraint representation. The system is given a problem space (an initial state, a set of operators, and a goal criterion), and a set of (minimally constrained) production rules. The initial state is a fully instantiated description of the problem, an operator consists of an addition list and a deletion list, and the goal criterion is a pattern. The system solves problems by forward breadth-first search through the problem space. Forward search is a very weak method, but since HS searches adaptively (Mostow & Bhatnager, 1987), improving its rules before it has found a complete solution path, it need not search the problem space exhaustively. HS searches until it encounters a constraint violation, learns from that violation, backs up to the initial state, and tries anew to solve the problem. If a state violates more than one constraint, HS selects one at random to learn from.

The identification of constraint violations proceeds as follows. When a production rule  $P: R \rightarrow O$  with condition  $R$  and action  $O$  is applied to a search state  $S_1$ , thereby generating a descendent state  $S_2$ , the relevance patterns of all constraints are matched against the new state  $S_2$ . If the relevance pattern  $C_r$  of constraint  $C$  does not match  $S_2$ , then  $C$  is irrelevant for that state and no further action is taken with respect to that constraint; if  $C_r$  does match, then  $C$  is relevant and the satisfaction pattern  $C_s$  is also

matched against  $S_2$ . If  $C_s$  matches, no further action is taken. But if  $C_s$  does not match, then a constraint violation is recorded. State constraints do not generate conclusions or fire operators; nothing is added to the problem description when a state constraint is applied. A state constraint functions as a classification device that sorts search states into those that are consistent with the principles of the domain and those that are not.

## Learning from Constraint Violations

There are two types of constraint violations in the HS system. Suppose that production rule  $P: R \rightarrow O$  was evoked in state  $S_1$ , leading to the generation of a new state  $S_2$ . In a *Type A* violation the constraint  $C$  is irrelevant in  $S_1$ , and it is relevant but not satisfied in  $S_2$ . In a *Type B* violation the constraint  $C$  is both relevant and satisfied in  $S_1$ , and it is relevant but not satisfied in  $S_2$ . Each type violation requires two different revisions of the rule  $P$ . The new rules are computed by regressing the constraint through the operator, but we will explain the technique with a set-theoretic notation which shows clearly why each type of violation gives rise to *two* new rules.

Rule revisions for Type A violations. If the relevance pattern  $C_r$  does not match state  $S_1$ , but does match its immediate descendent  $S_2$ , then the effect of operator  $O$  is to create expressions that enable  $C_r$  to match. But since, *ex hypothesi*, the constraint  $C$  is violated in  $S_2$ ,  $O$  does not create the expressions needed to complete the match for the satisfaction pattern  $C_s$ . This situation warrants two different revisions of the rule  $P$  that fired  $O$ . First, the condition of  $P$  should be revised so that the revised rule—call it  $P'$ —only matches in situations in which  $O$  does not complete the relevance pattern for  $C$ , thus ensuring that the constraint remains irrelevant. Second, the condition of  $P$  should be revised so that the revised rule—call it  $P''$ —only fires in those situations in which *both* the relevance *and* the satisfaction patterns of  $C$  are completed, thus ensuring that the constraint becomes satisfied.

*Revision 1. Ensuring that the constraint remains irrelevant.*  $O$  will complete  $C_r$  when the parts of  $C_r$  that are not added by  $O$  are already present in  $S_1$ . Those parts are given by  $(C_r - O_a)$ , where the symbol "-" signifies set difference. To limit the application of rule  $P$  to situations in which operator  $O$  will not complete  $C_r$ , we augment the condition of  $P$  with the negated expression *not*  $(C_r - O_a)$ . The new rule is

$$P': R \ \& \ \text{not} \ (C_r - O_a) \ \rightarrow \ O$$

where "&" signifies conjunction.

*Revision 2. Ensuring that the constraint becomes satisfied.* To guarantee that  $C_r$  will become complete, we augment the condition  $R$  with  $(C_r - O_a)$ . To guarantee that  $C_s$  will also become complete we augment  $R$  with those parts of  $C_s$  that are not added by  $O$ . They are given by  $(C_s - O_a)$ , so the desired effect is achieved by adding the entire expression  $(C_r - O_a) \cup (C_s - O_a)$  to  $R'$ , where the symbol " $\cup$ " signifies set union. The new rule is

$$P'': R \cup (C_r - O_a) \cup (C_s - O_a) \rightarrow O$$

Rule revisions for Type B violations. If the constraint C is both relevant and satisfied in state  $S_1$ , and relevant but not satisfied in  $S_2$ , the effect of operator O is to destroy the match for the satisfaction pattern  $C_s$ , but not for the relevance pattern  $C_r$ . This situation also warrants two revisions of rule P.

*Revision 1. Ensuring that the constraint is irrelevant.* Rule P is revised so that it will only fire in situations in which constraint C is not relevant and in which C will not become relevant. This is accomplished by adding the negation of the relevance pattern  $C_r$  to the condition R of the rule. The new rule is

$$P': R \& \text{not } C_r \rightarrow O$$

*Revision 2. Ensuring that the constraint remains satisfied.* Rule P is replaced by a rule P'' which only fires in situations in which the constraint remains satisfied. This is done in two steps. The first step is to constrain the rule to fire only in situations in which the constraint is relevant. This is accomplished by adding the relevance pattern  $C_r$  to the rule condition. The second step is to constrain the rule to situations in which the match of the satisfaction pattern is unaffected by the action of operator O. This is accomplished by adding the negation of the intersection between the satisfaction pattern and the deletion list,  $\text{not}(C_s \cap O_d)$ , to the rule condition. The desired effect is attained by adding the entire expression  $C_r \cup \text{not}(C_s \cap O_d)$ , so the new rule is

$$P'': R \cup C_r \cup \text{not}(C_s \cap O_d) \rightarrow O.$$

The above description of the learning algorithm is simplified in the following respects: (a) Rules are not replaced by their descendents. The old rules are retained, but their descendents are preferred during conflict resolution. (b) In order to add parts of a constraint to a rule condition correspondances must be computed between the variables in the constraint and the variables in the rule. In the implementation those correspondances are computed by the regression algorithm. (c) A negated condition can cease to match as the result of the addition of expressions to a search state. Our revision algorithm handles those cases as well. (d) There are cases in which one of the two revisions results in the empty list of new conditions. In those cases only one new rule is created.

### Revising a Blocks World Rule

The HS system has mainly been applied to arithmetic tasks such as counting a collection of objects, and subtracting multi-digit integers (Ohlsson & Rees, 1988). We nevertheless illustrate the rule revision algorithm with an example from the Blocks World, because of the widespread familiarity with this domain. Successful performance in the Blocks World requires knowledge of where blocks can be put down. Putting a block on the table or on top of a stack generally results in a stable situation, but trying to put a block on another block that already has other blocks stacked on top of it is likely to lead to the collapse of the stack. The following Blocks World rule says that *if the hand is holding a block, and the goal is to put*

*the block down, and the hand is in the up position, and there is a possible support, then lower the hand:*

```
(GOAL PUTDOWN <Block>)(ISA BLOCK <Block>)(HOLDING HAND <Block>)
(POSITION HAND UP)(ISA SUPPORT <Support>)
-->
LowerHand(<Block>, <Support>)
```

The operator LowerHand lowers the block onto the support, but does not let go of the block. It is defined by the deletion list

$$O_d = \{(POSITION\ HAND\ UP)\}$$

and the addition list

$$O_a = \{(POSITION\ HAND\ DOWN)(ON\ <Block>\ <Support>)\}.$$

Since blocks are members of the category *supports*, this rule will attempt to lower the block onto any other block in the world. If the supporting block is in the middle of a stack, this operation violates the principle that *only one block can be on top of another block*, which can be expressed as a state constraint with relevance pattern

$$C_r = \{(ON\ <Block>\ <Support>)(ISA\ BLOCK\ <Support>)\}$$

and satisfaction pattern

$$C_s = \{(not\ (ON\ <OtherBlock>\ <Support>)\ (not\ (EQUAL\ <OtherBlock>\ <Block>)))\}$$

Lowering a block until it rests on a block that is not a top block, i. e., a block which has other blocks resting on it, leads to a violation of this constraint. Since the constraint cannot be relevant before the hand is lowered, this is a Type A violation.

*Revision 1. Ensuring that the constraint remains irrelevant.* The difference between the relevance pattern  $C_r$  and the addition list  $O_a$  is

$$C_r - O_a = \{(ISA\ BLOCK\ <Block>)\}.$$

The negation of this expression is added to the rule condition, so the new rule becomes:

```
(Goal: PUTDOWN <Block>)(ISA BLOCK <Block>)(HOLDING HAND <Block>)
(POSITION HAND UP)(ISA SUPPORT <Support>)
(not (ISA BLOCK <Support>))
-->
LowerHand(<Block>)
```

where the new condition is in boldfaced typefont. This rule says that it is possible to put a block down on any support that is not a block. In the standard version of the Blocks World, the only support that is not a block is the table.

*Revision 2. Ensuring that the constraint becomes satisfied.* As noted above the difference ( $C_r - O_a$ ) is in this case

$$C_r - O_a = \{(ISA\ BLOCK\ <Support>)\}.$$

Subtracting the addition list  $O_a$  from the satisfaction pattern  $C_s$  returns the satisfaction pattern itself,

because they do not have any expressions in common in this case. Adding  $\{(C_r - O_a) \cup (C_s - O_a)\}$  to the rule therefore generates the new rule

```
(Goal: PUTDOWN <Block>)(ISA BLOCK <Block>)(HOLDING HAND <Blocks>)  
(POSITION HAND UP)(ISA SUPPORT <Support>)  
(ISA BLOCK <Support>)  
(not [(ON <OtherBlock> <Support>)(not (EQUAL <OtherBlock> <Block>))])
```

-->

```
LowerHand(<Block>, <Support>)
```

where the new conditions are in boldfaced typefont. This rule says a block can be lowered onto another block, if that other block is a top block, i. e., if it does not have any blocks resting on it.

In summary, the revision algorithm takes as input a violation of the constraint *only one block can be on top of another block* and sorts out the two action possibilities that are consistent with it--either put a block down on the table, or put it down on a top block--encoding each possibility in a separate production rule. The two new rules are not perfect, of course, and they will be revised further when they violate other constraints. Repeated revision of rules is a central feature of learning in the HS system.

## Evaluation

The task of quantifying a collection of objects by counting them is interesting from the point of view of the cognitive function of principled knowledge, because observations of children show that they understand the principles that underly counting (Gelman & Gallistel, 1978; Gelman & Meck, 1986). Modifying slightly the analysis by Gelman and Gallistel (1978), we identify three counting principles: (a) *The Regular Traversal Principle* which says that correct counting begins with unity and generates the natural numbers in numerical order. (b) *The One-One Mapping Principle* which says that each object should be assigned exactly one number during counting. (c) *The Cardinality Principle* which says that the last number to be assigned to an object during counting represents the numerosity of the counted collection. These three principles form the conceptual basis of the procedure for *standard counting*, in which the objects are counted in any order. In order to probe children's understanding of counting, Gelman and Gallistel (1978) invented two non-standard counting tasks, *ordered counting*, in which the objects are counted in some pre-defined order (e.g., from left to right), and *constrained counting*, in which the objects are counted in such a way that a designated object is assigned a designated number. These three counting tasks require different procedures (control knowledge), but all three procedures are based on the above principles.

HS can learn the correct procedure for either of the three counting tasks. The input to the system consists of a problem space for counting, state constraint representations of the counting principles, and an initial rule set. Our representation for the counting task is very fine-grained, and the operations of setting and retracting goals are treated as search steps, so counting three objects requires 48 steps through the problem space. Since the initial rules are minimal, the branching factor before learning is between two and four, giving a search space of more than  $60 \cdot 10^9$  states. This search problem is too large

Table 1: Initial Learning Effort for Three Counting Tasks.

Counting task	Effort measure		
	Rule revisions	Production system cycles	Search states
Standard	12	854	979
Ordered	11	262	294
Constrained	12	451	507

to be solved by brute force, but since HS searches adaptively, the system is nevertheless successful. Table 1 show three measures of the amount of work required to learn each counting procedure. The number of rule revisions required is approximately the same (either 11 or 12) for each procedure. The number of states visited during learning is less than  $10^3$ , so the system only needs to visit a very small portion of the total search space in order to find those rule revisions. In terms of either the number of production system cycles or the number of search states visited, standard counting is harder to learn than constrained counting, which in turn is harder to learn than ordered counting, a prediction which in principle is empirically testable.

Observations of children show that they can easily switch from standard counting to either of the two non-standard counting tasks (Gelman & Gallistel, 1978; Gelman & Meck, 1986). The most plausible explanation for this flexibility is that children can derive the control knowledge for the non-standard counting tasks from their knowledge of the counting principles. To simulate this flexibility we performed transfer experiments with HS. Once the system had learned a correct counting procedure, we gave it counting problems of a different type than the type on which it had practiced. For example, having practiced on standard counting, the system might be given constrained counting problems, and vice versa. To solve these problems the system had to adapt the already learned control knowledge to the new task. Since there are three different counting tasks, there are six possible transfers, all of which HS carried out successfully. Table 2 shows three measures of the amount of work required for each of the six transfers.

Three conclusions emerge from Table 2. First, the number of rule revisions is between one order of magnitude lower than the number of production system cycles or the number of search states visited, so HS predicts that the density of learning events during practice is low. Second, there is substantial transfer between the three counting tasks. The number of rule revisions required to learn any one of the three counting tasks from scratch is either 11 or 12; the number of revisions required to transfer to a different task is between 0 and 3 in five cases, a saving of approximately 75 %. Third, transfer is asymmetric. Ordered counting does not transfer to constrained counting, but constrained counting transfers very well

Table 2: Learning Effort for Six Transfer Tasks in the Counting Domain.

Training task	Transfer task		
	Standard counting	Ordered counting	Constrained counting
<b>Standard</b>			
Revisions	-	2	2
Cycles	-	110	127
States	-	119	141
<b>Ordered</b>			
Revisions	1	-	11
Cycles	184	-	297
States	209	-	334
<b>Constrained</b>			
Revisions	0	3	-
Cycles	162	154	-
States	180	190	-

to ordered counting. Although we do not yet possess the relevant observations, these predictions are in principle empirically testable.

## Discussion and Related Work

In which task domains is constraint violation likely to be effective? The technique allows a system to identify, out of all possible paths in a search space, those paths which are consistent with the principles of the task domain. Let us call those *correct* paths. A correct path is not necessarily a *useful* path, i. e., a path that leads to a desired problem solution. Constraint violation is likely to be effective when (a) the ratio of correct to possible paths is small, i. e., when correct paths are rare, and (b) the ratio of useful to correct paths is high, i. e., when many correct paths are useful. In the counting domain every step is regulated by the counting principles, so every correct path is also a useful path. Another domain in which constraint violation might be useful is predicting the outcomes of chemical experiments, where all reaction paths that are consistent with the laws of chemistry need to be considered. But in proof spaces in algebra and geometry, where there are many mathematically correct paths which do not lead to a desired theorem, constraint violation is likely to be ineffective.

Our system is similar in basic conception to the FAILSAFE system described by Mostow and Bhatnager (1987) that operates in a floor planning domain. Both systems learn control knowledge during forward

search by using the information in failed solution paths to revise the rules that lead to those paths. Both systems encode domain knowledge as constraints on correct solutions, and both systems use regression to identify the new rule conditions. However, there are also differences. First, Mostow and Bhatnager (1987) argue that one of the advantages of adaptive search is that it becomes possible to make progress on problems for which the completion of a correct solution path through unconstrained search is infeasible. However, this advantage does not seem to be realized in the FAILSAFE system, since the system in fact completes an entire floorplan before testing whether it satisfies the constraints. The HS system applies its constraints after each problem solving step, and it learns before it has completed a correct solution. Second, the FAILSAFE system relies on the fact that the length of a floor plan solution is known *a priori* to identify failures. In contrast, the state constraint representation provides HS with a general method for identifying failures. Third, the FAILSAFE system learns one new rule for each failure, while HS learns two new rules in response to each constraint violation. The cause of this difference deserves to be analyzed in more detail than we can do here. Fourth, like other EBL systems, FAILSAFE uses its domain theory to construct explanations, a potentially complicated process which might require search, and which might fail if the domain theory is incorrect or incomplete. HS replaces the construction of explanations with pattern matching. Fifth, the FAILSAFE system can assign blame to rules which are several steps removed from the point of failure detection. This is an advance upon the HS system, in which blame is always assigned to the last rule to fire before failure detection.

Psychological models of learning do not usually address the problem of the cognitive function of general knowledge in procedure acquisition. One exception is the ACT\* theory proposed by Anderson (1989), which claims that declarative knowledge structures are *proceduralized* during problem solving. The main difference between proceduralization and constraint violation is that in proceduralization declarative knowledge only participates in the creation of *initial* rules; further improvement of those rules is handled by empirical learning mechanisms such as composition and strengthening. In constraint violation declarative knowledge continues to influence rule revisions during the entire life time of the rule. The planning net model of counting competence proposed by Smith, Greeno, and Vitolo (in press) addresses the same phenomenon as the HS system--children's flexibility in moving between different counting tasks--and their model also assumes that the source of this flexibility is a declarative encoding of the counting principles. However, Smith, Geeno, and Vitolo (in press) characterize their model as a competence model rather than as a process model, disclaiming any psychological reality for the processes they describe. It is therefore unclear how to conduct a comparison between their system and ours.

#### Acknowledgements

Preparation of this manuscript was supported by ONR grant N00014-89-J-1681, and by the Xerox University Grant to the University of Pittsburgh. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of the sponsoring agencies, and no endorsement should be inferred.

## References

- Anderson, J. R. (1989). A theory of the origins of human knowledge. *Artificial Intelligence*, 40, 313-351.
- Forgy, C. L. (1982). Rete: A fast algorithm for the many pattern/many object pattern match problem. *Artificial Intelligence*, 19, 17-37.
- Gelman, R. & Gallistel, C. R. (1978). *The child's understanding of number*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gelman, R., & Meck, E. (1986). The notion of principle: The case of counting. In J. H. Hiebert (Ed.), *Conceptual and procedural knowledge: The case of mathematics* (pp. 29-57). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Holland, J. H., Holyoak, K. J., Nisbett, R. E., & Thagard, P. R. (1986). *Induction: Processes of inference, learning, and discovery*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Kieras, D. E., & Bovair, S. (1984). The role of a mental model in learning to operate a device. *Cognitive Science*, 8, 255-273.
- Laird, J. E., Rosenbloom, P. S., & Newell, A. (1986). Chunking in Soar: The anatomy of a general learning mechanism. *Machine Learning*, 1, 11-46.
- Langley, P. (1985). Learning to search: From weak methods to domain-specific heuristics. *Cognitive Science*, 9, 217-260.
- Minton, S. (1988). *Learning search control knowledge. An explanation-based approach*. Boston, Mass.: Kluwer.
- Mitchell, T. M. (1982). Generalization as search. *Artificial Intelligence*, 18, 203-226.
- Mostow, J., & Bhatnager, N. (1987). Failsafe -- A floor planner that uses EBG to learn from its failures. *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Milan, Italy, August 1987, pp. 249-255.
- Ohlsson, S. (1987a). Transfer of training in procedural learning: A matter of conjectures and refutations? In L. Bolc (Ed.), *Computational models of learning* (pp. 55-88). Berlin, Federal Republic of Germany: Springer-Verlag.
- Ohlsson, S. (1987b). Truth versus appropriateness: Relating declarative to procedural knowledge. In D. Klahr, P. Langley, & R. Neches (Eds.), *Production system models of learning and development* (pp. 287-327). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Ohlsson, S., & Rees, E. (1988). An information processing theory of the cognitive function of conceptual understanding in the learning of arithmetic procedures (Technical Report No. KUL-88-03). Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh, PA.
- Smith, D. A., Greeno, J. G., & Vitolo, T. M., (in press). A model of competence for counting. *Cognitive Science*.
- VanLehn, K. (in press). *Mind bugs: The origin of procedural misconceptions*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

## KUL Reports

### 1985

Ohlsson, S., & Langley, P. (April, 1985). *Psychological evaluation of path hypotheses in cognitive diagnosis* (Technical Report No. 1985/2). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

### 1986

Ohlsson, S. (January, 1986). *Some principles of intelligent tutoring* (Technical Report No. 1986/2). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S. (June, 1986). *Computer simulation and its impact on educational research and practice* (Technical Report No. 1986/14). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S. (October, 1986). *Sense and reference in the design of interactive illustrations for rational numbers* (Technical Report No. 1986/18). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

### 1987

Ohlsson, S. (April, 1987). *A semantics for fraction concepts* (Technical Report No. KUL-87-01). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S. (September, 1987). *Trace analysis and spatial reasoning: An example of intensive cognitive diagnosis and its implications for testing* (Technical Report No. KUL-87-02). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S., Nickolas, S., & Bee, N. V. (December, 1987). *Interactive illustrations for fractions: A progress report* (Technical Report No. KUL-87-03). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S., & Rees, E. (December, 1987). *Rational learning: Deriving arithmetic procedures from state constraints* (Technical Report No. KUL-87-04). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

### 1988

Ohlsson, S. (February, 1988). *Mathematical meaning and applicational meaning in the semantics for fractions and related concepts* (Technical Report No. KUL-88-01). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S. (March, 1988). *The conceptual basis of subtraction with regrouping: A mathematical analysis* (Technical Report No. KUL-88-02). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S., & Rees, E. (August, 1988). *An information processing analysis of the function of conceptual understanding in the learning of arithmetic procedures* (Technical Report No. KUL-88-03). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S. (December, 1988). *Towards intelligent tutoring systems that teach knowledge rather than skills: Five research questions* (Technical Report No. KUL-88-04). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

### 1989

Ohlsson, S. (January, 1989). *Knowledge requirements for teaching: The case of fractions* (Technical Report No. KUL-89-01). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S. (April, 1989). *Cognitive science and instruction: Why the revolution is not here yet* (Technical Report No. KUL-89-02). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Robin, N., & Ohlsson, S. (August, 1989). *Impetus then and now: A detailed comparison between Jean Buridan and a single contemporary subject* (Technical Report No. KUL-89-03). Pittsburgh:

Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S., (Ed.), (September, 1989). *Aspects of cognitive conflict and cognitive change* (Technical Report No. KUL-89-04). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Leinhardt, G., & Ohlsson, S. (November, 1989). *Tutorials on the structure of tutoring from teachers* (Technical Report No. KUL-89-05). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ernst, A. M., & Ohlsson, S. (December, 1989). *The cognitive complexity of the regrouping and augmenting procedures for subtraction: A theoretical analysis* (Technical Report No. KUL-89-06). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Bee, N., Ohlsson, S., & Zeller, P. (December, 1989). *Empirical evaluation of a computer-based learning environment for fractions* (Technical Report No. KUL-89-07). Pittsburgh: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

#### 1990

Ohlsson, R., & Rees, E. (January, 1990). *Adaptive search through constraint violations* (Technical Report No. KUL-90-01). Pittsburgh, PA: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Ohlsson, S., & Hall, N. (February, 1990). *The cognitive function of embodiments in mathematics instruction* (Technical Report No. KUL-90-02). Pittsburgh, PA: Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Distribution List

Ms. Lisa B. Acibille  
Code 5538  
Naval Research Lab  
Overlook Drive  
Washington, DC 20375-5008

Dr. Edith Acibromoni  
Media Laboratory  
E15-311  
28 Ames Street  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Beth Adelson  
Department of Computer Science  
Tufts University  
Medford, MA 02155

Technical Document Center  
AFHRL/RS-TDC  
Wright-Patterson AFB  
OH 45433-6583

Dr. Robert Ahlers  
Code N711  
Human Factors Laboratory  
Naval Training Systems Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Robert M. Aikun  
Computer Science Department  
038-24  
Temple University  
Philadelphia, PA 19222

Mr. Tejwanti S. Anand  
Philips Laboratories  
345 Scarborough Road  
Briarcliff Manor  
New York, NY 10520

Dr. James Anderson  
Brown University  
Department of Psychology  
Providence, RI 02912

Dr. John R. Anderson  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Schenley Park  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Thomas H. Anderson  
Center for the Study of Reading  
174 Children's Research Center  
51 Garry Drive  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Stephen J. Anzole, Chairman  
Department of Information Systems  
and Systems Engineering  
George Mason University  
4400 University Drive  
Fairfax, VA 22030

Prof. John Annett  
University of Warwick  
Department of Psychology  
Coventry CV4 7AL  
ENGLAND

Edward Atkins  
Code 61Z1218  
Naval Sea Systems Command  
Washington, DC 20362-5101

Dr. Francis Beckett  
School of Education  
618 E. University, Rm 1302D  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

Dr. James D. Baker  
Director of Automation and Research  
Allen Corporation - America  
309 Madison Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Maryl S. Baker  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-4808

prof. dott. Bruno G. Bara  
Unità di ricerca di  
intelligenza artificiale  
Università di Milano  
20122 Milano - via F. Sforza 23  
ITALY

Dr. Jonathan Baron  
88 Gleason Avenue  
Barry, PA 19312

Dr. Gautam Biswas  
Department of Computer Science  
Box 1688, Station B  
Vanderbilt University  
Nashville, TN 37235

Dr. John Black  
Teachers College, Box 8  
Columbia University  
325 West 120th Street  
New York, NY 10027

Dr. Michael Blackburn  
Code 943  
Naval Ocean Systems Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-5008

Dr. Arthur S. Blaisius  
Code N712  
Naval Training Systems Center  
Orlando, FL 32813-7100

Dr. Deborah A. Bobbin-Davis  
Department of Psychology  
George Mason University  
4408 University Drive  
Fairfax, VA 22030

Dr. Sug Boggar  
Army Research Institute  
ATTN: PERJ-SF  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Dr. Jeff Bonar  
Guidance Technology, Inc.  
808 Vinini Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

Dr. J. C. Boudreau  
Center for Manufacturing  
Engineering  
National Bureau of Standards  
Gaithersburg, MD 20899

Dr. Lyle E. Bourne, Jr.  
Department of Psychology  
Box 345  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Hugh Burns  
Department of English  
University of Texas  
Austin, TX 78703

Dr. Robert Calfee  
School of Education  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Joseph C. Campione  
Center for the Study of Reading  
University of Illinois  
51 Garry Drive  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Joanne Capper, Director  
Center for Research into Practice  
3545 Albemarle Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20008

Dr. James G. Carbonell  
Computer Science Department  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Schenley Park  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Gail Carpenter  
Center for Adaptive Systems  
111 Cummings St., Room 244  
Boston University  
Boston, MA 02215

Dr. John M. Carroll  
IBM Watson Research Center  
User Interface Institute  
P.O. Box 704  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Dr. Ruth W. Chabay  
CDEEC, Hamburg Hall  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Fred Chang  
Pacific Bell  
2600 Camino Ramon  
Room JS-450  
San Ramon, CA 94583

Dr. David Charney  
English Department  
Penn State University  
University Park, PA 16802

Mrs. Ole Clarke  
818 South George Mason Drive  
Arlington, VA 22204

Dr. Norman Cliff  
Department of Psychology  
Univ. of So. California  
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1061

Dr. Stanley Collier  
Office of Naval Technology  
Code 222  
808 N. Quincey Street  
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. Jere Conrady  
Cornell University  
Dept. of Education  
Room 490 Roberts  
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Lynn A. Cooper  
Department of Psychology  
Columbia University  
New York, NY 10027

Dr. Meredith P. Crawford  
3543 Hamlet Place  
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Dr. Hans F. Crossing  
Faculty of Law  
University of Limburg  
P.O. Box 616  
Maastricht  
The NETHERLANDS 6200 MD

Dr. Kenneth B. Cross  
Amnagon Sciences, Inc.  
P.O. Drawer Q  
Santa Barbara, CA 93102

Dr. Cary Czibon  
Intelligent Instructional Systems  
Texas Instruments AI Lab  
P.O. Box 640246  
Dallas, TX 75246

Brian Dailman  
Training Technology Branch  
3400 TCHTW/TTGXC  
Lowry AFB, CO 80230-5000

## University of Pittsburgh/Oberlin

Mr. John F. Dolphin  
Chair, Computer Science Dept.  
Towson State University  
Baltimore, MD 21284

Margaret Day, Librarian  
Applied Sciences Associates  
P.O. Box 1072  
Butler, PA 16003

Gosny Delacose  
Directeur de L'Informatique  
Scientifique et Technique  
CNRS  
15, Quai Anacleto France  
75700 Paris, FRANCE

Dr. Deane Delleiros  
Psychology Department  
Box 8A, Yale Station  
Yale University  
New Haven, CT 06520-7447

Dr. Sharon Derry  
Florida State University  
Department of Psychology  
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Dr. Thomas E. DeZure  
Project Engineer, AI  
General Dynamics  
PO Box 748/Mail Zone 2646  
Fort Worth, TX 76101

Dr. Roma Dillon  
Department of Guidance and  
Educational Psychology  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, IL 62901

Dr. J. Stuart Doms  
Faculty of Education  
University of British Columbia  
2125 Main Mall  
Vancouver, BC CANADA V6T 1Z5

Defense Technical  
Information Center  
Cameron Station, Bldg 5  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(2 Copies)

Dr. Pierre Dugast  
Organization for Economic  
Cooperation and Development  
2, rue Andre-Pascal  
75016 PARIS  
FRANCE

Dr. Ralph Dunst  
V-P Human Factors  
JIL Systems  
1225 Jefferson Davis Hwy.  
Suite 1209  
Arlington, VA 22201

Dr. John Ellis  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 51  
San Diego, CA 92252

Dr. Susan Epstein  
144 S. Mountain Avenue  
Morristown, NJ 07042

ERIC Facility Acquisitions  
2440 Research Blvd, Suite 550  
Rockville, MD 20850-3238

Dr. K. Anders Ericsson  
University of Colorado  
Department of Psychology  
Campus Box 345  
Boulder, CO 80309-0345

Dr. Debra Evans  
Applied Science Associates, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1072  
Butler, PA 16003

Dr. Lorraine D. Eyles  
Office of Personnel Management  
Office of Examination Development  
1900 E St., NW  
Washington, DC 20415

Dr. Jean-Claude Falmagne  
Irvine Research Unit in  
Mathematical & Behavioral Sciences  
University of California  
Irvine, CA 92717

Dr. Beatrice J. Farr  
Army Research Institute  
PERI-IC  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Marshall J. Farr, Consultant  
Cognitive & Instructional Sciences  
2520 North Vernon Street  
Arlington, VA 22207

Dr. P.-A. Federico  
Code 51  
NPRDC  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Jerome A. Feldman  
University of Rochester  
Computer Science Department  
Rochester, NY 14627

Dr. Paul Feltsovich  
Southern Illinois University  
School of Medicine  
Medical Education Department  
P.O. Box 3926  
Springfield, IL 62708

Dr. Elizabeth Fenwick  
Curriculum and Instruction  
University of Wisconsin  
225 North Mills Street  
Madison, WI 53706

CAPT J. Finelli  
Commandant (G-PTE)  
U.S. Coast Guard  
2100 Second St., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20593

Prof. Donald Fitzgerald  
University of New England  
Department of Psychology  
Armidale, New South Wales 2351  
AUSTRALIA

Dr. Michael Flamingan  
Code 52  
NPRDC  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. J. D. Fletcher  
Institute for Defense Analysis  
1808 N. Beauregard St.  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. Kenneth D. Forbes  
University of Illinois  
Department of Computer Science  
1304 West Springfield Avenue  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Barbara A. Fox  
University of Colorado  
Department of Linguistics  
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Carl H. Frederiksen  
Dept. of Educational Psychology  
McGill University  
3700 McTavish Street  
Montreal, Quebec  
CANADA H3A 1Y2

Dr. John R. Frederiksen  
BBN Laboratories  
10 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02238

Dr. Norman Frederiksen  
Educational Testing Service  
(05-R)  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Department of Humanities and  
Social Sciences  
Harvey Mudd College  
Claremont, CA 91711

Dr. Alfred R. Freely  
AFOSR/NL, Bldg. 410  
Bolling AFB, DC 20332-6448

Dr. Alinda Friedman  
Department of Psychology  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  
CANADA T6G 2E9

Dr. Michael Friendly  
Psychology Department  
York University  
Toronto ONT  
CANADA M3J 1P3

Col. Dr. Ernst Frise  
Heerespsychologischer Dienst  
Maria Theresien-Kaserne  
1130 Wien  
AUSTRIA

Dr. Robert M. Gagne  
1456 Mitchell Avenue  
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Dr. C. Lee Giles  
AFOSR/NE, Bldg. 410  
Bolling AFB  
Washington, DC 20332

Dr. Philip Gillis  
ARI-Fort Gordon  
ATTN: PERI-ICD  
Fort Gordon, GA 30905

Mr. Lee Gladwin  
305 Dove Avenue  
Lynchburg, VA 22075

Dr. Robert Glaser  
Learning Research  
& Development Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Marvin D. Glock  
101 Homestead Terrace  
Ithaca, NY 14854

Dr. Dwight J. Goehring  
ARI Field Unit  
P.O. Box 5787  
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5011

Dr. Joseph Goguen  
Computer Science Laboratory  
SRI International  
333 Ravenswood Avenue  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

## University of Pittsburgh/Oleson

Mr. Richard Golden  
Psychology Department  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

Mr. Harold Goldstein  
University of DC  
Department Civil Engineering  
Bldg. 42, Room 12  
4208 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20008

Dr. Sherris Gost  
AFHRL/MOMJ  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5401

Dr. T. Govindaraj  
Georgia Institute of  
Technology  
School of Industrial  
and Systems Engineering  
Atlanta, GA 30332-0285

Dr. Wayne Gray  
Artificial Intelligence Laboratory  
NYNEX  
500 Westchester Avenue  
White Plains, NY 10604

H. William Greenup  
Dep Asst CS, Instructional  
Management (E03A)  
Education Center, MCCDC  
Quantico, VA 22134-5050

Dr. Dirk Gregory  
Admiralty Research  
Establishment/AXB  
Queens Road  
Teddington  
Middlesex, ENGLAND TW110LN

Dr. Stephen Greenberg  
Center for Adaptive Systems  
Room 244  
111 Cummington Street  
Boston University  
Boston, MA 02215

Michael Habon  
DORNIER GMBH  
P.O. Box 1420  
D-7990 Friedrichshafen 1  
WEST GERMANY

Dr. Henry M. Hallé  
Hallé Resources, Inc.  
4916 13rd Road, North  
Arlington, VA 22207

Mr. H. Hamburger  
Department of Computer Science  
George Mason University  
Fairfax, VA 22030

Dr. Bruce W. Hatell  
Research Center  
The Johns Hopkins University  
Applied Physics Laboratory  
Johns Hopkins Road  
Laurel, MD 20787

Dr. Patrick R. Harrison  
Computer Science Department  
U.S. Naval Academy  
Annapolis, MD 21402-5002

Janice Hart  
Office of the Chief  
of Naval Operations  
OP-1112  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, D.C. 20350-2000

Dr. Wayne Harvey  
Center for Learning Technology  
Education Development Center  
55 Chapel Street  
Newton, MA 02460

Dr. Barbara Hayes-Roth  
Knowledge Systems Laboratory  
Stanford University  
701 Welch Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dr. Frederick Hayes-Roth  
Telcnowledge  
P.O. Box 10119  
1850 Embarcadero Rd.  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Dr. James Hendler  
Dept. of Computer Science  
University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. James Hibart  
Department of Educational  
Development  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19716

Dr. Geoffrey Hinton  
Computer Science Department  
University of Toronto  
Sandford Fleming Building  
10 King's College Road  
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A4 CANADA

Dr. James E. Hoffman  
Department of Psychology  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19711

Dr. Keith Holyoak  
Department of Psychology  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Ms. Julia S. Hough  
Cambridge University Press  
40 West 20th Street  
New York, NY 10011

Dr. William Howell  
Chief Scientist  
AFHRL/CA  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5401

Dr. Steven Hunts  
3-104 Educ. N.  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  
CANADA T6G 2G5

Dr. Jack Hunter  
2122 Coolidge Street  
Lansing, MI 48906

Dr. Bonnie E. John  
West Hall 8124  
Department of Computer Science  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Daniel B. Jones  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
NRR/TLRB  
Washington, DC 20555

Mr. Paul L. Jones  
Research Division  
Chief of Naval Technical Training  
Building East-1  
Naval Air Station Memphis  
Millington, TN 38054-5056

Mr. Roland Jones  
Mitre Corp., K-203  
Burlington Road  
Bedford, MA 01730

Dr. Marek Just  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Department of Psychology  
Scholarly Park  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Ruth Kanfer  
University of Minnesota  
Department of Psychology  
Elliot Hall  
75 E. River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Michael Kaplan  
Office of Basic Research  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333-5400

Dr. A. Karmiloff-Smith  
MRC-CDU  
17 Gordon Street  
London  
ENGLAND WC1H 0AH

Dr. Milton S. Katz  
European Science Coordination  
Office  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
Box 65  
FPO New York 09510-1500

Dr. Frank Keil  
Department of Psychology  
228 Uris Hall  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14850

Dr. Wendy Kellogg  
IBM T. J. Watson Research Ctr.  
P.O. Box 704  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Dr. Douglas Kelly  
University of North Carolina  
Department of Statistics  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Dr. David Kieras  
Technical Communication Program  
TIDAL Bldg., 2360 Bonistead Blvd.  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2108

Dr. Thomas Kilian  
AFHRL/OT  
Williams AFB, AZ 85240-4457

Dr. Jeremy Kilpatrick  
Department of  
Mathematics Education  
105 Aderhold Hall  
University of Georgia  
Athens, GA 30602

Dr. J. Peter Kincaid  
Army Research Institute  
Orlando Field Unit  
c/o PM TRADE-8  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Walter Kintsch  
Department of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80309-0345

Dr. Alex Kirlik  
Georgia Institute of  
Technology  
Center for Human-Machine  
Systems Research  
Atlanta, GA 30332-0205

## University of Pittsburgh/Ohleson

Dr. Janet L. Kolodner  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
School of Information  
& Computer Sciences  
Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. Stephen Koshye  
Harvard University  
1236 William James Hall  
33 Kirkland St.  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Kenneth Kotovity  
Community College of  
Allegheny County  
808 Ridge Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

Dr. Keith Kraemer  
HCI Lab, Code 5530  
Naval Research Laboratory  
4445 Overlook Avenue  
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. Gary Kross  
628 Spitzer Avenue  
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Dr. Lois-Anne Kuntz  
3010 S.W. 23rd Terrace  
Apt. No. 105  
Gainesville, FL 32608

Dr. David R. Lambert  
Naval Ocean Systems Center  
Code 772  
271 Catalina Boulevard  
San Diego, CA 92152-5000

Dr. Pat Langley  
NASA Ames Research Ctr.  
Moffett Field, CA 94035

Dr. Robert W. Lawler  
Matthews 118  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Dr. Eugene Lee  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93943-5026

Dr. Yuh-Jeng Lee  
Department of Computer Science  
Code 52L  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93943

Dr. Jill F. Lehman  
School of Computer Science  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3090

Dr. Jim Lewis  
Department of  
Educational Psychology  
210 Education Building  
1310 South Sixth Street  
Champaign, IL 61820-6990

Dr. John Lewis  
Learning R&D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Mark Lewis  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Davis K. Lidzke  
Software Productivity Consortium  
1800 Campus Commons Drive, North  
Reston, VA 22091

Dr. Marcia C. Linn  
Graduate School  
of Education, EMST  
Tolman Hall  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. Robert Lloyd  
Dept. of Geography  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Jack Lockhead  
University of  
Massachusetts  
Physics Department  
Amherst, MA 01003

Vern M. Maier  
NPRDC, Code 52  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. William L. Maloy  
Code 04  
NETPMSA  
Pensacola, FL 32509-5000

Dr. Mary Marino  
Director, Educational Technology  
HQ USAFA/DFTB  
USAF Academy, CO 80840-5000

Dr. Sandra P. Marshall  
Dept. of Psychology  
San Diego State University  
San Diego, CA 92182

Dr. John H. Mason  
Centre for Maths Education  
Mathematics Faculty  
Open University  
Milton Keynes MK7 6AA  
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. Manton M. Matthews  
Department of Computer Science  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Richard E. Mayer  
Department of Psychology  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. David J. McGuinness  
Gallaudet University  
800 Florida Avenue, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20002

Dr. Joseph C. McLachlan  
Code 52  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Douglas L. Medin  
Department of Psychology  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Mr. Steig Meincke  
Forevers Center for Leadership  
Christianshavns Voldgade 8  
1424 Kobenhavn K  
DENMARK

Dr. Arthur Melamed  
Computer Arts and  
Education Laboratory  
New York University  
719 Broadway, 12th floor  
New York, NY 10003

Dr. Jose Mestre  
Department of Physics  
Habrocock Laboratory  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. D. Michie  
The Turing Institute  
George House  
36 North Hanover Street  
Glasgow G1 2AD  
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. Vittorio Midoro  
CNR-Istituto Tecnologie Didattiche  
Via All'Opera Pia 11  
GENOVA-ITALIA 16145

Dr. James R. Miller  
MCC  
1500 W. Balcones Center Dr.  
Austin, TX 78759

Dr. James Millman  
Department of Education  
Roberts Hall  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Christie M. Mitchell  
School of Indus. and Sys. Eng.  
Center for Man-Machine  
Systems Research  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Atlanta, GA 30532-0205

Dr. Andrew R. Molnar  
Appl. of Advanced Technology  
Science and Engr. Education  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. William Montague  
NPRDC Code 13  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Melvin D. Montemario  
NASA Headquarters  
Code RC  
Washington, DC 20546

Prof. John Morton  
MRC Cognitive  
Development Unit  
17 Gordon Street  
London WC1H 0AH  
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. Allen Munro  
Behavioral Technology  
Laboratories - USC  
250 N. Harbor Dr., Suite 309  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dr. William R. Murray  
PMC Corporation  
Central Engineering Lab  
1205 Columbia Avenue  
Box 580  
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Chair, Department of Weapons and  
Systems Engineering  
U.S. Naval Academy  
Annapolis, MD 21402

Dr. T. Niblett  
The Turing Institute  
George House  
36 North Hanover Street  
Glasgow G1 2AD  
UNITED KINGDOM

Library, NPRDC  
Code P201L  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Librarian  
Naval Center for Applied Research  
in Artificial Intelligence  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 5510  
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr.  
School of Education - WPH 801  
Department of Educational  
Psychology & Technology  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0031

Dr. Paul O'Rourke  
Information & Computer Sciences  
University of California, Irvine  
Irvine, CA 92717

Dr. Shellen Oblason  
Learning R. & D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. James B. Olson  
WICAT Systems  
1875 South State Street  
Orem, UT 84058

Dr. Gary M. Olson  
Cognitive Sciences and  
Machine Intelligence Lab.  
University of Michigan  
701 Tappan Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1234

Dr. Judith Reisman Olson  
Graduate School of Business  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1234

Office of Naval Research,  
Code 1142CS  
800 N. Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217-5000  
(6 Copies)

Dr. Judith Oranow  
Basic Research Office  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Jesse Orfanos  
Institute for Defense Analysis  
1801 N. Beauregard St.  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. Everett Palmer  
Mail Stop 239-3  
NASA-Ames Research Center  
Moffett Field, CA 94035

Dr. Otoboon Park  
Army Research Institute  
PERL-2  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Roy Pen  
Institute for Research  
on Learning  
2550 Hamover Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dr. David N. Perkins  
Project Zero  
Harvard Graduate School  
of Education  
7 Appian Way  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. C. Perrino, Chair  
Dept. of Psychology  
Morgan State University  
Cold Spring La.-Hillan Rd.  
Baltimore, MD 21299

Dr. Nancy M. Perry  
Naval Education and Training  
Program Support Activity  
Code-047  
Building 2435  
Pensacola, FL 32509-5000

Dept. of Administrative Sciences  
Code 54  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93943-5026

Dr. Peter Pirolli  
School of Education  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Prof. Tommaso Poggio  
Massachusetts Institute  
of Technology E25-201  
Center for Biological  
Information Processing  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Peter Polson  
University of Colorado  
Department of Psychology  
Boulder, CO 80309-0345

Dr. Steven E. Poltrook  
Boeing Advanced Technology Center  
PO Box 24346 m/s 7L-44  
Seattle, WA 98124

Dr. Joseph Poutka  
ATTN: PERI-IC  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Ave.  
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Mr. Paul S. Rau  
Code U-33  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
White Oak Laboratory  
Silver Spring, MD 20903

Dr. James A. Reggia  
University of Maryland  
School of Medicine  
Department of Neurology  
22 South Greene Street  
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dr. J. Wesley Regian  
AFHRL/IDI  
Brooks AFB, TX 78215

Dr. Fred Reif  
Physics Department  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. Charles M. Reigeluth  
330 Huntington Hall  
Syracuse University  
Syracuse, NY 13244

Dr. Daniel Reinberg  
Reed College  
Department of Psychology  
Portland, OR 97202

Dr. Lauren Resnick  
Learning R. & D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. J. Jeffrey Richardson  
Center for Applied AI  
College of Business  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80309-0419

Dr. Edwin L. Riseland  
Dept. of Computer and  
Information Science  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003

Mr. William A. Rizzo  
Code 71  
Naval Training Systems Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Linda G. Roberts  
Science, Education, and  
Transportation Program  
Office of Technology Assessment  
Congress of the United States  
Washington, DC 20510

Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf  
AT&T Bell Laboratories  
Room 2D-456  
600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974

Dr. Alan H. Schoenfeld  
University of California  
Department of Education  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Lowell Schoer  
Psychological & Quantitative  
Foundations  
College of Education  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Janet W. Schofield  
816 LRDC Building  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Kay Schultz  
Computer Science Dept.  
U.S. Naval Academy  
Annapolis, MD 21402-5018

Dr. Miriam Schustack  
Code 52  
Navy Personnel R. & D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Judith W. Segal  
OERI  
555 New Jersey Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Robert J. Seidel  
US Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Ave.  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Colleen M. Seifert  
Institute for Cognitive Science  
Mail Code C-015  
University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Michael G. Shiffrin  
NASA Ames Research Ctr.  
Mail Stop 239-1  
Moffett Field, CA 94035

Mr. Colin Sheppard  
AXC2 Block 3  
Admiralty Research Establishment  
Ministry of Defence Portsmouth  
Portsmouth Hants PO64AA  
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. Lee S. Shulman  
School of Education  
507 Serra  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305-3084

Dr. Randall Shumaker  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 5510  
4555 Overlook Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. Edward Silver  
LRDC  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Herbert A. Simon  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Schenley Park  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Robert L. Simpson, Jr.  
DARPA/ISTO  
1400 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22209-2308

Dr. Zita M. Simutin  
Chief, Technologies for Skill  
Acquisition and Retention  
ARI  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Derek Stomton  
Computing Science Department  
The University  
Aberdeen AB9 2FX  
Scotland  
UNITED KINGDOM

Ms. Gail K. Stinson  
LOGICON, Inc.  
P.O. Box 85158  
San Diego, CA 92138-5158

Dr. Edward E. Smith  
Department of Psychology  
University of Michigan  
330 Packard Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Dr. Alfred P. Smeets  
Code 7A  
Research and Development Dept.  
Naval Training Systems Center  
Orlando, FL 32813-7100

Dr. Elliot Soloway  
Yale University  
Computer Science Department  
P.O. Box 2158  
New Haven, CT 06520

Linda B. Soriano  
IBM-Los Angeles Scientific Center  
1660 Wilshire Blvd., 4th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

N. S. Sridharan  
FMC Corporation  
Box 580  
1205 Coleman Avenue  
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Dr. Marian Stearns  
SRJ International  
333 Ravenswood Ave.  
Room B-5124  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Dr. Friedrich W. Steege  
Bundesministerium  
des Verteidigung  
Postfach 1328  
D-5300 Bonn 1  
WEST GERMANY

Dr. Frederick Steinhauser  
CIA-ORD  
Amm Building  
Washington, DC 20505

Dr. Saul Sternberg  
University of Pennsylvania  
Department of Psychology  
3815 Walnut Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6196

Dr. Ronald Sternfels  
Oak Ridge Assoc. Univ.  
P.O. Box 117  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0117

Dr. David E. Stone  
Computer Teaching Corporation  
1713 South Neil Street  
Urbana, IL 61820

Dr. Patrick Suppes  
Stanford University  
Institute for Mathematical  
Studies in the Social Sciences  
Stanford, CA 94305-4115

Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke  
FMC Corporation  
Central Engineering Labs  
1205 Coleman Avenue, Box 580  
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Dr. Sharon Thies  
Allen Corporation  
209 Madison Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Douglas Towne  
Behavioral Technology Labs  
University of Southern California  
250 N. Harbor Dr., Suite 309  
Rancho Beach, CA 90277

Major D. D. Tucker  
HQM, Code MA, Room 4023  
Washington, DC 20380

Dr. Paul T. Twohig  
Army Research Institute  
ATTN: PERJ-RL  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Dr. Zita E. Tyer  
Department of Psychology  
George Mason University  
4400 University Drive  
Fairfax, VA 22030

Dr. Harold P. Van Cott  
Committee on Human Factors  
National Academy of Sciences  
2101 Constitution Avenue  
Washington, DC 20418

Dr. Kurt Van Lehn  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Schenley Park  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Frank L. Viano  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-4800

Dr. Jerry Vogt  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 51  
San Diego, CA 92152-4800

Dr. Thomas A. Warr  
FAA Academy AAC934D  
P.O. Box 25082  
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

Dr. Beth Warren  
BBN Laboratories, Inc.  
10 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02238

Dr. Diane Wearne  
Department of Educational  
Development  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19711

Dr. Shih-sung Wen  
Department of Psychology  
Jackson State University  
1400 J. R. Lynch Street  
Jackson, MS 39217

Dr. Keith T. Wescourt  
FMC Corporation  
Central Engineering Labs  
1205 Coleman Ave., Box 580  
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Dr. Douglas Wetzel  
Code 51  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-4800

Dr. Barbara White  
School of Education  
Tolman Hall, EMST  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. David Wilkins  
University of Illinois  
Department of Computer Science  
1304 West Springfield Avenue  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Marsha R. Williams  
Appl. of Advanced Technologies  
National Science Foundation  
SEE/MDRISE  
1800 G Street, N.W., Room 635-A  
Washington, DC 20550

S. H. Wilson  
Code 5505  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. Robert A. Winber  
U.S. Army Institute for the  
Behavioral and Social Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Dr. Martin C. Wittrock  
Graduate School of Education  
UCLA  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Mr. Paul T. Wobig  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Ave.  
ATTN: PERJ-RL  
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Mr. Joseph Wohl  
Alphatech, Inc.  
2 Burlington Executive Center  
111 Middlesex Turnpike  
Burlington, MA 01803

Dr. Wallace Wulfeck, III  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 51  
San Diego, CA 92152-4800

Dr. Masoud Yazdani  
Dept. of Computer Science  
University of Exeter  
Prince of Wales Road  
Exeter EX44PT  
ENGLAND

Dr. Joseph L. Young  
National Science Foundation  
Room 320  
1800 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Uri Zarek  
General Electric  
Research & Development Center  
Artificial Intelligence Program  
PO Box 8  
Schenectady, NY 12301