



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Mondragon, E. ORCID: 0000-0003-4180-1261, Alonso, E., Fernandez, A. and Gray, J. (2013). An extension of the Rescorla and Wagner Simulator for context conditioning. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 110(2), pp. 226-230. doi: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2013.01.016

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/5185/>

Link to published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2013.01.016>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

1
2
3 **An extension of the Rescorla and Wagner Simulator for context**
4 **conditioning**
5
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Esther Mondragón (corresponding author)

13 Centre for Computational and Animal Learning Research

14
15
16
17 St Albans AL1 1RQ, UK

18
19
20 e.mondragon@cal-r.org
21
22
23
24

25 Eduardo Alonso (corresponding author)

26
27 Department of Computer Science, City University London

28
29 London EC1V 0HB, UK

30
31 E.Alonso@city.ac.uk
32
33
34
35
36

37 Alberto Fernández

38
39 Escuela Técnica Superior de Ingeniería Informática, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos

40
41 Madrid 28933, Spain
42
43
44
45
46

47 Jonathan Gray

48
49 Department of Computer Science, City University London

50
51 London EC1V 0HB, UK
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

1
2
3
4
5 This paper introduces R&W Simulator version 4, which extends previous work by
6
7 incorporating context simulation within standard Pavlovian designs. This addition
8
9 allows the assessment of: 1) context-stimulus competition, by treating contextual cues
10
11 as ordinary background stimuli present throughout the whole experimental session; 2)
12
13 summation, by computing compound stimuli with contextual cues as an integrating
14
15 feature, with and without the addition of specific configural cues; and 3) contingency
16
17 effects in causal learning. These new functionalities broaden the range of
18
19 experimental designs that the simulator is able to replicate, such as some recovery
20
21 from extinction phenomena (e.g., renewal effects). In addition, the new version
22
23 permits specifying probe trials among standard trials and extracting their values.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Keywords:** Rescorla and Wagner model; error prediction learning; context
35
36 conditioning; compound stimuli; configural cues; open-source simulator.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

In [1] we introduced a simulator of the Rescorla and Wagner model [2] that incorporated algorithms to work with stimulus compounds and configural cues [3]. A new version of the R&W Simulator, version 4, has been released, which includes an additional functionality to simulate contexts.

The study of context effects has become one of the major research topics in learning. Theoretically, the role of the context [4][5][6][7] and its neurological correlate [8][9][10][11] are still subject to debate. In practice, contextual cues have proved to be critical in the treatment of several clinical conditions, such as drug and alcohol addiction [12], and anticipatory nausea following chemotherapy in cancer patients [13], to name just a few.

Rescorla and Wagner's predictions and well-known limitations [14], are critical when assessing associative principles and are commonly used as test-beds for associative properties. Thus, an accurate, user friendly and wide-ranging simulator of the model, able to represent as realistically as possible experimental conditions, including discrete stimuli as well as contexts, will provide a valuable tool to the community.

R&W Simulator 4 runs in any platform, does not require installation and can be downloaded free from <http://www.cal-r.org/index.php?id=R-Wsim>.

2. The R&W Simulator and contexts

The Rescorla and Wagner model is a formalization of associative learning that describes the progressive increase in the weight of a stimulus association when the

1 stimuli are experienced paired repeatedly. Applied to classical conditioning, the
2 amount of increase in the associative strength (V) of a conditioned stimulus (CS) that
3 signals the occurrence of an unconditioned stimulus (US) is proportional to the degree
4 to which the US is unexpected at that point. With each CS-US pairing (reinforced
5 trials) the discrepancy between the predicted and the current outcome (the predicted
6 error, ΔV) is reduced. Thus, early pairings result in large prediction errors that
7 decrease in size as learning progresses. As a consequence, learning, denoted as the
8 accumulative increase in associative strength, results in a negatively accelerated curve
9 that reach asymptotic level at the point in which the CS fully predicts the US.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Formally, the predicted error and associative strength of a stimulus X at the
22 trial n is described as follows
23
24

$$25 \Delta V_X^n = \alpha\beta(\lambda - V_{\sum x_i}^{n-1}) \quad (1)$$

$$26 V_X^n = V_X^{n-1} + \Delta V_X^n \quad (2)$$

27 where α and β are constants representing the salience of the CS X and of the
28 US respectively, λ is the maximum amount of learning that can occur for that given
29 US, and $V_{\sum x_i}^{n-1}$ the cumulative amount of learning for all present stimuli up to trial
30 $n-1$.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In R&W Simulator 4 the context has been implemented as an additional cue,
52 an ordinary background stimulus, which is always present throughout the
53 experimental session. Contextual cues, often assumed to have a low salience, acquire
54 associative strength during reinforced trials and lose it during non-reinforced. In
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 addition, unlike a standard stimulus, contextual cues lose associative strength during
2 the inter-trial interval (ITI), a loss that is proportional to the interval relative length.
3

4
5 Figure 1 illustrates (a) the distribution of associative strength gained by a
6 context and a CS during excitatory Pavlovian training with an ITI/CS ratio equal to 4,
7 (b) the course of CS conditioning when no context is included in the simulation, and
8 (c) the progress of context conditioning when the context is the only simulated cue
9 (context conditioning). Following each conditioning trial, the associative strength of
10 both the CS and the context increases regardless of whether they are conditioned
11 together or independently. During the ITI, however, unlike the CS that terminates
12 after each trial presentation, the context remains present, an experimental condition
13 that is formally equivalent to extinction and that results in a loss of associative
14 strength. As any other stimulus, the context competes with other cues to win
15 associative strength, that is, the context comes to form part of the summed error term,
16 subtracting some of the available strength that the CS could otherwise acquire;
17 likewise, the CS also reduces some of the strength that the context could obtain.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1 about here.

Whenever a cue is tested, the associative strength gained by the context in which it appears also contributes to the behavior observed. The algorithms implemented in the simulator allow representing and computing this cumulative value by considering stimulus compounds as units composed by discrete cues and the context in which they occur. Context-stimulus compounds can be formed when there is an overlap, and their associative strength is determined by the sum of the stimulus' and the context's respective associative values. Moreover, as with standard cues, the

1 simulator encodes the possibility of generating context and stimulus configural cues,
2 that is, additional stimuli that represent a unique feature of their combination.
3
4
5
6

7 In the simulator, the user can choose to work with contexts by selecting
8 “Context Simulation” in the “Setting” menu. Six distinct contexts are available to be
9 assigned and their salience configured per phase, with a maximum of one context in
10 each phase. To stipulate the context loss of associative strength during the ITI, the
11 user must enter a “ITI/CS ratio”. By default the context salience and the ITI/CS ratio
12 are set to 0.15 and 5 respectively.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **3. Test results**

27 We have chosen two well-known phenomena in the associative learning literature to
28 exemplify the simulator’s new functionality: context blocking of a discrete cue, and
29 renewal.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **3.1. Context Blocking**

41 When an unconditioned stimulus (US) is presented in the experimental apparatus
42 before being used as a reinforcer in a Pavlovian CS-US training, conditioning is often
43 weaker than when no US has been pre-exposed [15][16]. Considerable research has
44 been conducted around this phenomenon, predominantly in fear conditioning
45 preparations [17]. Standard associative models assume that during the US pre-
46 exposure phase, contextual cues become associated. Thus the associative strength
47 gained by the context will block conditioning to the CS when later introduced due to
48 cue competition. We simulated this paradigm by giving 12 US presentations in Phase
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 before conditioning a target stimulus (X) with the same US in Group Blocking;
2 Group Control received the same treatment but no US was programmed to occur
3 during Phase 1. Figure 2 shows the results of this simulation. The associative strength
4 of X during conditioning in Group Blocking is correctly predicted to be lower than in
5 Group Control.
6
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 **Figure 2 about here.**
15
16
17
18

19 3.2. Renewal

20
21 Renewal refers to a set of conditioning results that show a recovery of the
22 conditioned response following an extinction treatment when the CS is tested in a
23 context other than the one in which extinction occurred [18][19]. The renewal effect
24 is particularly noticeable when the test context and the conditioning context are the
25 same.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34
35
36 The renewal paradigm has been extensively investigated in drug addiction
37 studies, including cocaine [20], heroine [21], nicotine [22], and alcohol [23], as well
38 as in anxiety disorders [24] and post-traumatic stress disorders [25].
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 We simulated a set of different renewal instances to test the Context-CS
47 compound functionality. Four groups were considered, in all of which a target
48 stimulus T was conditioned for 10 trials (Phase 1), then extinguished during another
49 10 trials (Phase 2), and, finally, tested in 3 further trials (Phase 3). The groups differed
50 depending on the context in which each learning phase was given: Group AAA
51 received all phases in the same context (Context Φ); in Group AAB conditioning and
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 extinction took place in Context ψ whereas test was administered in a different
2 context (Context Φ). Group ABA received conditioning and test trials in Context Φ
3 but extinction was delivered in Context ψ ; lastly, in Group ABC each phase was
4 programmed to occur in a different context, Context Φ , Context ψ and Context Ω ,
5 respectively.
6
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 **Figure 3 about here.**
15
16

17
18
19 Figure 3 shows the simulated combined associative strength of the context and the
20 cue, represented as a context-stimulus compound obtained during the test phase. An
21 inspection of these values reveals that recovery after extinction was greater in Group
22 ABA that received extinction in a different context from conditioning than in all other
23 groups. Groups AAB and ABC showed an intermediate level of recovery in
24 comparison to the levels predicted for Group AAA, in which all phases occurred in
25 the same context. The simulator correctly reproduces the pattern of empirical results.
26 We are aware that evidence supports that contextual associative strength is neither
27 necessary nor sufficient for explaining renewal [26][27], and it is not our intention to
28 claim so. Nevertheless, these are clear predictions of the Rescorla and Wagner model
29 and as such have been incorporated as an example of the simulator capabilities.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **4. Other improvements and Conclusions**

52
53
54

55 The R&W Simulator 4 offers an algorithm to specify probe trials by adding a hat
56 symbol (^) immediately after the cue (e.g., 10AB^+). The calculated associative
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 strength of the marked stimulus during these trials will be copied to the output and to
2 the figures as a snapshot of the chosen cue.
3
4
5

6 In summary, the simulator provides a user-friendly, fast and free tool to
7 simulate the Rescorla and Wagner model. It allows both discrete cues and context
8 simulation, and it computes compound stimuli formed by different stimuli and
9 stimulus-context compounds. It also permits defining configural cues to add to the
10 compounds. The addition of context simulation is an important extension since the
11 role of the background in learning is theoretically controversial and of practical
12 relevance in the treatment of several clinical conditions.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **References**

- 27
28
29
30
31 [1] E. Alonso, E. Mondragón and A. Fernández, A Java simulator of Rescorla and
32 Wagner's prediction error model and configural cue extensions. *Computer Methods
33 and Programs in Biomedicine* 108(2012) 346-355.
34
35
36
37
38
39 [2] R.A. Rescorla and A.R. Wagner, A theory of Pavlovian conditioning: The
40 effectiveness of reinforcement and non-reinforcement, in *Classical Conditioning
41 II: Current Research and Theory*, eds. A.H. Black and W.F. Prokasy, pp. 64-99
42 (Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York NY, 1972).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 [3] A.R. Wagner and R.A. Rescorla, Inhibition in Pavlovian conditioning: Application
50 of a theory, in *Inhibition and Learning*, eds. R.A. Boakes and M.S. Halliday, pp.
51 301-336 (Academic Press, New York NY, 1972).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 [4] M. E. Bouton, Context and behavioral processes in extinction, *Learning &*
11 *Memory* 11 (2004) 485-494.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 [5] M. E. Bouton, and D. Swartzentruber, Analysis of the associative and occasion-
19 setting properties of contexts participating in a Pavlovian discrimination, *Journal*
20 *of experimental psychology. Animal behavior processes* 12 (1986) 333-350.
21
22
23 [6] G. Hall and E. Mondragón, Contextual control as occasion setting, in *Occasion*
24 *setting: Associative learning and cognition in animals*, eds. N. A. Schmajuk & P.
25 C. Holland, pp. 199-222 (American Psychological Association, Washington DC,
26 1998).
27
28
29 [7] A. R. Wagner, SOP: a model of automatic memory processing in animal
30 behavior, in *Information Processing in Animals: Memory Mechanisms*, eds. N.E.
31 Spear, R. R. Miller, pp. 95–128 (Erlbaum, Hillsdale, 1981).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 [8] S. G. Anagnostaras, G.D. Gale, and M. S. Fanselow, *Hippocampus and*
39 *Contextual Fear Conditioning: Recent Controversies and Advances*, *Hippocampus*
40 11 (2001) 8–17.
41
42
43
44
45 [9] J. E. LeDoux, Emotion Circuits in the Brain, *Annual Review of Neuroscience* 23
46 (2000) 155–184.
47
48
49
50 [10] R. G. Phillips and J. E. LeDoux, Differential Contribution of Amygdala and
51 *Hippocampus to Cued and Contextual Fear Conditioning*, *Behavioral*
52 *Neuroscience* 106 (1992) 274-285.
53
54
55
56
57 [11] J. W. Rudy. Context representations, context functions, and the
58 parahippocampal-hippocampal system, *Learning & Memory* 16 (2009) 573 –585.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [12] D. E. McCarthy, T. B. Baker, H. M. Minami and V. M. Yeh, Applications of Contemporary Learning Theory in the Treatment of Drug Abuse, in *Associative Learning and Conditioning Theory: Human and Non-Human applications*, eds. T. R. Schachtman and S. Reilly, pp. 235-269 (Oxford University Press, New York, 2011).
- [13] M. Symonds and G. Hall, Avoidance, anxiety, and aversion in the clinical setting: the role of classical conditioning, in *Clinical Applications of Learning Theory*, eds. M. Haselgrove and L. Hogarth, pp. 27-47 (Psychology Press, Hove and New York, 2012)
- [14] R.R. Miller, R.C. Barnet and N.J. Grahame, Assessment of the Rescorla-Wagner Model, *Psychological Bulletin* 117 (1995) 363–386.
- [15] J. B. Ayres, J. C. Bombace, D. Shurtleff and M. Vigorito, Conditioned suppression tests of the context-blocking hypothesis: Testing in the absence of the preconditioned context. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes* 11 (1985) 1-14.
- [16] A. Randich, R. T. Ross, Mechanisms of blocking by contextual stimuli, *Learning and Motivation* 1 (1984) 106-117.
- [17] G. P. McNally, M. Pigg, and G. Weidemann, Blocking, Unblocking, and Overexpectation of Fear: A Role for Opioid Receptors in the Regulation of Pavlovian Association Formation, *Behavioral Neuroscience* 118 (2004) 111-120.
- [18] M.E. Bouton and R.C. Bolles, Contextual control of the extinction of conditioned fear, *Learning and Motivation* 10 (1979) 445-466.
- [19] M.E. Bouton and C.A. Peck, Context effects on conditioning, extinction and reinstatement in an appetitive conditioning preparation, *Animal Learning & Behavior* 7 (1989) 88-98.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [20] D.N. Kearns and S.J. Weiss, Contextual renewal of cocaine seeking in rats and its attenuation by the conditioned effects of an alternative reinforce, *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 90 (2007) 193-202.
- [21] J.M. Bossert, S.Y. Liu, L. Lu and Y. Shaham, A role of ventral tegmental area glutamate in contextual cue-induced relapse in heroin seeking, *Journal of Neuroscience* 24 (2004) 10726-30.
- [22] L. Diergaarde, W. de Vries, H. Raasø, A.N.M. Schoffelmeer and T.J. De Vries, Contextual renewal of nicotine seeking in rats and its suppression by the cannabinoid-1 receptor antagonist Rimonabant (SR141716A), *Neuropharmacology* 55 (2008) 712-6.
- [23] N. Chaudhri, L.L. Sahuque, and P.H. Janak, Context-induced relapse of conditioned behavioral responding to ethanol cues in rats, *Biological Psychiatry* 64 (2008) 203-10.
- [24] M.E. Bouton, S. Mineka and D. Barlow, A modern learning theory perspective on the etiology of panic disorder, *Psychological Review* 108 (2001) 4-32.
- [25] C. Grillon, C.A. Morgan, M. Davis and S.M. Southwick, Effects of experimental context and explicit threat cues on acoustic startle in Vietnam veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder, *Biological Psychiatry* 44 (1998) 1027–1036.
- [26] M.E. Bouton and D.A. King, Contextual control of the extinction of conditioned fear: Tests for the associative value of the context, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes* 9 (1983) 248-265.

[27] M.E. Bouton and D. Swartzentruber, Analysis of the associative and occasion-setting properties of contexts participating in a Pavlovian discrimination, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes* 12 (1986) 333-350.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figures Captions

Figure 1. (a) Simulated acquisition of associative strength during Pavlovian training of a discrete CS (filled circles) and the experimental Context (open circles) in which conditioning takes place; (b) simulated CS acquisition of associative strength when no context assumed in the simulation –CS alone (filled squares); (c) and context associative strength acquisition assuming isolated context-US presentations –Context alone (open squares). Simulation parameters: $\lambda = 1$; $\beta_+ = 0.5$; $\beta_- = 0.45$; $\alpha(\text{CS}) = 0.3$; $\alpha(\text{Context}) = 0.25$; number of trials = 10; ITI/CS ratio = 4.

Figure 2. Screenshot of the simulation results showing acquisition of associative strength during a conditioning test phase of a target stimulus X following US pre-exposure (Group Blocking) or following non-reinforced pre-exposure to the context (Group Control). Simulation parameters: $\lambda = 1$; $\beta_+ = 0.6$; $\beta_- = 0.5$; $\alpha(\text{X}) = 0.4$; $\alpha(\Phi) = 0.25$; number of pre-exposure trials = 12; number of conditioning trials = 5; ITI/CS ratio = 2. Checked boxes below the figure legend indicate the selected group and corresponding cues.

Figure 3. Screenshot of the simulation results showing context (Φ , Ψ , Ω)–CS (T) combined associative strength during the 3 test trials of a renewal design in Groups AAA, AAB, ABA, and ABC. Simulation parameters: $\lambda = 1$; $\beta_+ = 0.5$; $\beta_- = 0.45$; $\alpha(\text{T}) = 0.4$; $\alpha(\Phi) = 0.25$; $\alpha(\Psi) = 0.25$; $\alpha(\Omega) = 0.25$; number of conditioning trials = 10;

number of extinction trials = 10; number of test trials = 3; ITI/CS ratio = 3. Checked

boxes below the figure legend indicate the selected group and corresponding cues.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure2

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 3

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Dear Editor,

There are no conflicts of interest.

Dr Esther Mondragón and Dr Eduardo Alonso