

Introduction

Incidental category learning

- Incidental tasks are neither passive, nor entirely unsupervised or feedback free (Gabay et al., 2015; Lim & Holt, 2011; Seitz & Watanabe, 2009; Vlahou et al., 2012)
- Sound categories are learned by virtue of their relationship to success in performing a task defined along other, largely visuomotor, dimensions
 - Does not involve overt category decisions or explicit feedback about categorization
- Incidental tasks capture some of the incidental nature of category learning in more natural environments


An example: the SMART task

- Systematic Multimodal Association Reaction Time (SMART) task (Gabay, Dick, Zevin, & Holt, 2015)
- Simple task in which participants rapidly detect a visual target and report its location with a keypress.
- A brief sequence of sounds precedes the visual target.
- Unknown to participants, the sounds are drawn from one of four distinct sound categories
- Multimodal correspondence from auditory-category to visual-location relates variable sound category exemplars to a consistent visual location

What drives incidental auditory category learning?

- In the current study, we explored two possible drivers of incidental learning
 - Sound category-to-location correspondence (Experiment 1)
 - Association of the sound categories with distinct response alternatives (Experiment 2)


Auditory Categories



Auditory Categories. Each higher-frequency (colored) component is paired with the lower-frequency (grey) component to create 6 category exemplars for training. The 5 generalization exemplars are not pictured (from Wade & Holt, 2005).

Training Paradigms


Experiment 1



Overview of SMART Paradigm

- (A) Four auditory categories are defined by multiple exemplars.
- (B) As in Gabay et al. (2015), each category is **associated with a particular visual target location**.
- (C) In Gabay et al. (2015), participants indicated the target location with a key press. In Experiment 1, participants indicate **target color** with a keypress. Target color does not predict category membership.
- (D) Blocks include a Test Block in which the category-to-location association is destroyed, and an overt labeling post-test follows SMART training.


Experiment 2



Paradigm, Experiment 2

- (A) Four auditory categories as in Gabay et al. (2015).
- (B) Here, each category is **associated with a particular visual target color** (blue, yellow, red, green) appearing equally often at each location.
- (C) In Experiment 2, participants **indicate target color**.
- (D) Training and testing as in Experiment 1.

Results



Target Detection RT in SMART


Incidental sound category learning is evident in online learning as RT Cost.

$$RT \text{ Cost} = RT_{\text{Block 4}} - RT_{\text{Block 3}}$$

- (A) Experiment 1, no RT Cost ($t(23) = 0.13, p = .90, M = 0.7 \text{ ms}$)
- (B) Experiment 2, RT Cost ($t(20) = 2.66, p = .015, M = 58.1 \text{ ms}$)

Mean accuracy in the overt labeling post-test

- (A) Experiment 1 performance was no different from chance ($t(23) = .53, p = .60$)
- (B) Experiment 2 performance was above chance ($t(20) = 4.42, p = .00026$)



Error bars are standard error of the mean.

Conclusions

- Participants can *incidentally* learn perceptual categories as they undertake seemingly unrelated tasks, if the task demands of the primary task align with the structure of the categories
- When behavioral responses were decoupled from category-to-location association experienced in the primary visual detection task (Experiment 1), there was no learning. Reinstating this coupling by introducing category-to-color association and requiring color responses (Experiment 2) led to learning.

References & Acknowledgments

References

- Gabay, Y., Dick, F. K., Zevin, J. D., & Holt, L. L. (2015). Incidental auditory category learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 41, 1124–1138.
- Lim, S.-J., & Holt, L. L. (2011). Learning foreign sounds in an alien world: Videogame training improves non-native speech categorization. *Cognitive Science*, 35, 1390–1405.
- Seitz, A. R., & Watanabe, T. (2009). The phenomenon of task-irrelevant perceptual learning. *Vision Research*, 49, 2604–2610.
- Vlahou, E. L., Protopapas, A., & Seitz, A. R. (2012). Implicit training of nonnative speech stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 141, 363–381.
- Wade, T. & Holt, L. L. (2005). Incidental categorization of spectrally complex non-invariant auditory stimuli in a computer game task. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 118, 2618–2633.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a grant from the National Institutes of Health to Lori L. Holt (R01DC004674).