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The Evolution of Semantic Networks into Frames

The idea of semantic networks started out as a natural way to represent labelled connections between entities. But, as the representations were expected to support increasingly large ranges of problem solving tasks, the representation scheme necessarily became increasingly complex.

In particular, it became necessary to assign more structure to nodes, as well as to links. For example, in many cases we need node labels that can be computed, rather than being fixed in advance. It was natural to use database ideas to keep track of everything, and the nodes and their relations began to look like frames.

In the literature, the distinction between frames and semantic networks is rather blurred. However, the more structure a system has, the more likely it is to be termed a frame system rather than a semantic network.

For our purposes, we shall use the practical distinction that semantic networks look like networks, and frames look like frames.
Frame Based Systems – The Basic Idea

A *frame* consists of a selection of slots which can be filled by values, or procedures for calculating values, or pointers to other frames. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hotel room</th>
<th>hotel chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>is-a:</em> room</td>
<td><em>is-a:</em> chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>location:</em> hotel</td>
<td><em>location:</em> hotel room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>contains:</em> {hotel chair, hotel bed, hotel phone, ...}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A complete frame based representation will consist of a whole hierarchy of frames connected together by a network of links/pointers.
Frames as a Knowledge Representation

The simplest type of frame is just a data structure with similar properties and possibilities for knowledge representation as a semantic network, with the same ideas of inheritance and default values.

Frames become much more powerful when their slots can also contain instructions (procedures) for computing things from information in other slots or in other frames.

The original idea of frames was due to Minsky (1975) who defined them as “data-structures for representing stereotyped situations”, such as going into a hotel room.

This type of frames are now generally referred to as scripts. Attached to each frame will then be several kinds of information. Some information can be about how to use the frame. Some can be about what one can expect to happen next, or what one should do next. Some can be about what to do if our expectations are not confirmed. Then, when one encounters a new situation, one can select from memory an appropriate frame and this can be adapted to fit reality by changing particular details as necessary.
It is easy to construct frames for each node of a semantic net by reading off the links, e.g.

- Baseball Player
  - is-a: Adult Male
  - batting average: .252
  - bats: equal to handed
  - team:

- Fielder
  - is-a: Baseball player
  - batting average: .262

- Pee-Wee-Reese
  - instance: Baseball player
  - team: Brooklyn Dodgers
Set Theory as a Basis For Frame Systems

The relationship between real world instances, the representation of instances, and the representation of sets/classes of instances, is already quite familiar, e.g.

Clearly *is-a* corresponds to subset $\subseteq$, and *instance* corresponds to element $\in$. Then set theory concepts such as *transitivity, intersection*, etc. apply automatically to our frames.
Problems with Sets That Are Also Instances

Consider the frame that we might create for the Brooklyn Dodgers baseball team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brooklyn Dodgers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>instance</em>: baseball team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>team size</em>: 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>manager</em>: Leo-Durocher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>players</em>: {Pee-Wee-Reese, …}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseball team

Brooklyn Dodgers

Pee-Wee Reese

This is obviously an *instance* of a baseball team, but it is also a *set/class* of players of which Pee-Wee-Reese is an instance.

We need to be very careful about how we set up the hierarchy because we clearly don’t want Pee-Wee-Reese to inherit the general properties of baseball teams (e.g. size 24), but we do want Brooklyn Dodgers to inherit the properties that baseball teams have.
Our Brooklyn Dodgers problem is quite general. From a set of instances we want to use inheritance to infer the instance properties from the general knowledge (default properties) of the set. But the class is also an entity in its own right, and may possess properties that belong to the class as a whole rather than to the individual instances.

It is useful to make a distinction between regular classes whose instances are individual entities, and meta-classes which are classes whose instances are other classes, e.g.
Representing Meta-Classes in Frames

We can see that each frame that corresponds to a set/class needs to contain attributes about the set itself, as well as attributes to be inherited by each element of the set. We distinguish them by prefixing the latter with an asterisk (*). For our previous example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Baseball Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instance: Class</td>
<td>instance: Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isa: Class</td>
<td>isa: Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cardinality: 4563</td>
<td>cardinality: 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*team-size:</td>
<td>*team-size: 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brooklyn Dodgers</th>
<th>Pee-Wee-Reese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instance: Baseball Team</td>
<td>instance: Brooklyn Dodgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isa: Baseball Player</td>
<td>instance: Fielder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manager: Leo-Durocher</td>
<td>handed: left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uniform-colour: blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*manager:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So Brooklyn Dodgers inherits team size 24, but Pee-Wee Reese doesn’t.
**Slots as Full-Fledged Objects**

We have seen that frame based representations can be made much more powerful by allowing the slot fillers to become more than simple values. This includes being frames in their own right, with a full range of hierarchical arrangements, inheritance, etc. The main filler properties we generally want to represent are:

1. Details about whether the slot is single or multi-valued.
2. Constraints on the ranges of values or type of values.
3. Simple default values for the attribute.
4. Rules for inheriting values for the attribute.
5. Rules for computing values separately from inheritance.
6. The classes/frames to which it can be attached.
7. Inverse attributes.

Naturally, the frame system interpreter must know how to process such frames.
**Scripts**

*Scripts* are Minsky’s original idea of a frame based structure that describes stereotyped sequences of events in a particular context.

The slots in such frames will contain several different kinds of information, some of which may be rather complex. Typically they will contain:

1. Information about how to use the frame.
2. A specification for the language/notation used in the frame.
3. Details about the ‘props’ and ‘roles’ that may be encountered.
4. Instructions about what one can expect to happen next, or what one should do next.
5. Indications about what to do if our expectations are not confirmed.
6. Any other information/instructions that might be appropriate.

The idea is that, when someone or something (e.g. our AI agent) encounters a new situation, they can select from memory an appropriate frame, and this can be adapted to fit reality by filling in the details as necessary.
**Primitive Acts**

In formulating scripts it is sensible to build them within a framework of *agents* manipulating *props* using a well defined set of *primitive acts*, such as:

- **MOVE** Movement of a body part by its owner (e.g. kick)
- **PROPEL** Application of physical force to an object (e.g. push)
- **GRASP** Grasping of an object by an agent (e.g. clutch)
- **INGEST** Ingestion of an object by an animal (e.g. eat)
- **ATTEND** Focussing of a sensor towards a stimulus (e.g. listen)
- **MTRANS** Transfer of mental information (e.g. tell)
- **SPEAK** Production of sounds (e.g. say)
- **PTRANS** Transfer of the physical location of an object (e.g. go)
- **ATRANS** Transfer of an abstract relationship (e.g. give)
- **MBUILD** Building of new information out of old (e.g. decide)

From these we can construct arbitrarily complex scripts.
Components of a Script

Looking at some typical scripts we can identify six important components:

**Entry conditions**  Conditions that must be satisfied before the events described in the script can occur.

**Roles**  Agents involved in the events described in the script (which may be explicitly or implicitly declared).

**Props**  Objects involved in the events described in the script (which may be explicitly or implicitly declared).

**Scenes**  All the actual sequences of events that are represented in the script.

**Track**  The specific route through the possible sequences of events that arises when the script is processed.

**Results**  Conditions that will be true after the events described in the script have occurred.

It is clear that scripts provide an extremely powerful representational structure.
Overview and Reading

1. We started by looking at the evolution of semantic networks into frames, and how we can convert from one to the other.
2. We then considered the basic components of frame based representations, and noted how set theory provides a convenient basis for their processing.
3. We saw how problems can arise when sets are also instances, and how these problems can be avoided with the concept of meta-classes.
4. We considered how slots can be promoted to fully-fledged objects with extremely general filler properties.
5. We ended with a discussion of frame based scripts.

Reading

1. Rich & Knight: Chapters 9, 10
2. Winston: Chapter 10
3. Jackson: Chapter 6