Published in final edited form as:

J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn. 2008 July ; 34(4): 809–822.

Do Young and Older Adults Rely on Different Processes in Source Memory Tasks? A Neuropsychological Study

Elizabeth L. Glisky and Lauren L. Kong

University of Arizona

Abstract

Source memory has consistently been associated with prefrontal function both in normal and clinical populations. Nevertheless, the exact contribution of prefrontal cortex to source memory remains uncertain, and evidence suggests that processes engaged by young and older adults may differ. We explored the extent to which composite measures of frontal and medial temporal function differentially predicted the performance of young and older adults on source memory tasks. Results indicated that the frontal composite, which has consistently been associated with source memory performance in older adults, was unrelated to source memory in young adults, although it was sensitive to a demanding working memory task. The memory composite, however, predicted performance in the young group. In addition, item and source memory were correlated in young people but not in older people. Findings are discussed in terms of age-related differences in working memory and executive functions, and differential binding processes necessary for item and source memory. The requirement to integrate item and source information at encoding appears to place greater demands on executive or working memory processes in older adults than in younger.

Keywords

source memory; neuropsychology; frontal function; young adults; older adults

Although source memory was initially defined narrowly as memory for the origin of information, more recently the construct has been used broadly to include any aspects of context associated with an event, including spatiotemporal, perceptual or affective attributes (Johnson, Hashtroudi, & Lindsay, 1993). Distinctions between content and context, however, are not straightforward, often depending on situational factors or an individual's goals. For these reasons, source has often been defined operationally in terms of the mapping between items and sources and experimenter instructions. In most experimental studies of source memory, there is a many-to-few mapping of items to sources: many sentences spoken in two voices, many concepts perceived or imagined, many objects in two locations or colors, or many words in one of two lists (e.g., Davidson & Glisky, 2002; Dodson & Shimamura, 2000; Glisky, Polster & Routhieaux, 1995; Henkel, Johnson, & DeLeonardis, 1998; Kuo & Van Petten, 2006). The many different stimuli (e.g., sentences) are defined as content, whereas the repeating aspects (e.g., two different voices) are defined as source or context. In addition, instructions or orienting tasks usually focus people's attention on the central content or item (cf., Chalfonte & Johnson, 1996). Notably, the type of materials need not define item and source; rather the nature of the task and instructions conveys such information. Thus, for example, if people hear many voices

Send correspondence to: Elizabeth L. Glisky, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, 1503 E. University Blvd., University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, Phone: 520-621-9289, FAX: 520-621-9306, Email: glisky@u.arizona.edu.

Elizabeth L. Glisky, Department of Psychology, Evelyn F. McKnight Brain Institute, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ and Lauren L. Kong, Department of Psychology, University of Arizona.

speaking one of two sentences and are oriented to the voices, voices are treated as focal content and the two sentences represent peripheral context (see Glisky, Rubin, & Davidson, 2001). Source memory is usually more difficult than item memory because it requires retrieval not just of the item, but of the conjunction of item and source. The encoding and retrieval of source information may thus require integrative processes to link item and source, which may not be necessary for item memory.

Source memory has been found to depend on processes associated with prefrontal function, and the initial evidence supporting this assertion came largely from studies of impaired populations and normally-aging older individuals. For example, early studies of individuals with amnesia (Schacter, Harbluk, & McLachlan, 1984; Shimamura & Squire, 1987) found greater deficits in source memory than item memory only in those people who showed neuropsychological evidence of prefrontal damage. In a related vein, patients with frontal damage were found to be unimpaired on memory for facts but showed deficits when asked where or when the facts had been learned (Janowsky, Shimamura, & Squire, 1989; Johnson, O'Connor, & Cantor, 1997). Later studies in older adults reported greater age-related impairments in source than item memory, deficits that in several cases were associated with poor performance on frontally-dependent, executive function tests (e.g., Craik, Morris, Morris, & Loewen, 1990; Glisky et al., 1995; Parkin, Walter, & Hunkin, 1995). Although several studies (Gold, Smith, Bayley et al., 2006; Henkel et al., 1998; Schwerdt & Dopkins, 2001; Thaiss & Petrides, 2003) have also implicated the medial temporal lobes (MTL) in source memory, the bulk of the literature has consistently identified frontal lobe (FL) function as a key contributor to source memory performance.

An increasing number of studies have begun to examine the neural correlates of source memory in normal young adults and these too have suggested prefrontal involvement. For example, in a fMRI study, Nolde, Johnson, and D'Esposito (1998) reported increased activation in left prefrontal cortex (PFC) for source judgments (picture or word) relative to item recognition, and Slotnick and colleagues (Slotnick, Moo, Segal, & Hart Jr., 2003) found greater left PFC activation during retrieval of the location of visual shapes compared to memory for the shapes themselves (see also Dobbins, Foley, Schacter, & Wagner, 2002; Kahn, Davachi, & Wagner, 2004; Rugg, Fletcher, Chua, & Dolan, 1999). Mitchell and colleagues (Mitchell, Johnson, Raye, & Greene, 2004) have also identified regions of left PFC that are activated to a greater degree during source than item memory in a working memory paradigm. Across these studies, the regions that have most often been associated with source memory compared to item memory tasks are areas of left ventrolateral PFC, including Brodmann's areas (BA) 10, 44, 45 and 47, as well as left dorsolateral regions, namely BA 9 and 46. Studies of source memory using event-related potentials (ERPs) have also reported PFC effects. For example, Senkfor and Van Petten (1998) found a late frontal positivity that was associated with attempts to retrieve source information but not item information (see also Johnson, Kounios, & Nolde, 1997; Trott, Friedman, Ritter, & Fabiani, 1997; Wilding & Rugg, 1996). The majority of the brain imaging studies, however, have examined brain activations only at retrieval, speculating that prefrontal brain regions are involved in systematic and controlled memory search and monitoring processes that are necessary for retrieval and/or evaluation of source-specifying information.

However, the precise contribution of PFC to source memory retrieval remains unclear. Furthermore, most studies have not been very informative with respect to frontally-based encoding processes that might be particularly important for source memory and how such processes might be affected by age. Two fMRI studies of working memory provide suggestive information, however. Mitchell and colleagues (Mitchell, Johnson, Raye, & D'Esposito, 2000a) in a task requiring short-term memory (8s) for objects, locations, and objects in locations, found that young adults showed significantly greater activation in left anterior hippocampus and right PFC (BA10) when memory for the object in location was tested

compared to memory for either object or location alone. Older adults, on the other hand, failed to show differential activation for the combination of attributes, and were impaired only when required to remember the conjunction (see also Mitchell, Johnson, Raye, Mather, & D'Esposito, 2000b). These findings implicate left hippocampus and right medial PFC in the binding of item and source and suggest that older adults are deficient in these binding processes. Further evidence of the involvement of right PFC in the integration of information in working memory was provided by Prabhakaran, Narayanan, Zhao, & Gabrieli (2000), who found increased activation in right BA 9, 10, and 46 when integrated verbal and spatial information was held in working memory compared to maintenance of the two kinds of information separately.

Consistent with these fMRI studies, behavioral studies have suggested that integration of item and source during encoding may be impaired particularly in older adults with reduced FL function. In a series of experiments in our laboratory (Glisky, Rubin, & Davidson, 2001), we demonstrated that older adults with below average scores on a composite measure of frontal function (low FL) were impaired on tests of source memory when attention was focused on the item at encoding. When given an orienting task that required them to integrate item and source at encoding, however, the deficits were completely eliminated. Interestingly, in these studies the integrative orienting task did not benefit young adults or older adults with above-average frontal function (high FL), suggesting that these individuals may have integrated item and source spontaneously. These findings suggest that our composite measure of FL function might reflect the kinds of encoding processes that enable integration of multiple aspects of an experience. If such processes are initiated and implemented at encoding, a well-elaborated and readily retrievable memory trace may be laid down, reducing or eliminating the need for frontal control processes at retrieval.

Further evidence consistent with this view was recently reported by Kuo and Van Petten (2006), who found that when an integrative orienting task focused attention on the item/source conjunction (drawings in colors), the late prefrontal brain electrical activity typically associated with source retrieval attempts was eliminated, and performance improved. Kuo and Van Petten also reported that following the integrative orienting task, performance on item and source memory tasks was correlated whereas after an item-alone orienting task, there was no correlation. Glisky et al. (2001) noted a similar correlation between the two tasks following integrative encoding in young adults. These findings suggest that young adults, particularly after integrative encoding, may perform item and source memory tasks similarly, perhaps accessing the same well-integrated memory trace, whereas older adults, despite achieving a similar level of performance to young, may use different processes for the two tasks.

Other evidence consistent with this notion was reported by Naveh-Benjamin and Craik (1996), who found that a deep level of processing produced similar benefits in item and source memory in young adults, but not in older adults, for whom only an item memory benefit was observed. In an ERP study, Swick, Senkfor, and Van Petten (2006) recently found that older adults displayed a prominent left frontal negativity in the 600-1200 ms post-stimulus interval during retrieval of source information that was not observed in young adults. They suggested that this reflected the use of alternate, perhaps compensatory, strategies in older adults that were not needed by young adults.

Taken together, these findings suggest that older adults may engage different processes or strategies for source than item memory tasks and that these strategies may require greater reliance on frontally-based control processes. Younger adults, on the other hand, may engage similar processes for the two kinds of tasks. Alternatively, older adults may attempt to use the same strategies as young adults but use them less efficiently. They may thus have to draw on

additional frontal control processes at encoding, retrieval or both to maintain performance on more demanding tasks such as source memory.

It has been suggested that source memory tasks may require more recruitment of prefrontal brain regions simply because they are more difficult than item memory tasks. To test this hypothesis, Glisky et al. (2001) created a difficult item memory task requiring memory for novel voices and compared that to memory for the sentence that the voice spoke—arguably a relatively easy source memory task—in a many-voices-to-two-sentences paradigm. Although performance on the voice memory “item” task was relatively low, reflecting its difficulty, there was no hint that frontal function played a role. Performance on the source memory task, however, was again dependent on frontal function in the older adults, suggesting that frontal processes were not just recruited for all difficult tasks but played a more specific role in source memory.

As noted earlier, most of the behavioral evidence supporting the involvement of the FLs in source memory comes from studies of neurological patients and older adults—populations that exhibit impaired or low levels of performance on tests of executive function. To our knowledge, none of these studies has examined whether the source memory performance of normal young adults is related to or supported by the same executive function processes as those employed by older adults. Both behavioral and neuroimaging studies of source memory, however, suggest that the processes engaged in source memory tasks by young and older adults may be different.

In the present study, we compared the performance of groups of younger and older adults, both of which were characterized according to their performance on tests of FL and MTL function, in a source memory paradigm in which the item and source memory tasks were equated for difficulty. We expected that the performance of older adults in the source memory task would depend on FL function, as previously found, and that performance on item and source memory tasks would not be correlated in the older group. The extent to which neuropsychological function might affect the performance of young adults was an empirical question.

Before exploring the effects of neuropsychological function in younger adults, we first wanted to demonstrate a) that the group of neuropsychological tests used in previous studies with older adults produced a similar factor structure in young adults, and b) that there was sufficient variability in the two neurocognitive domains of interest—FL/executive function and MTL/memory function—among normal young people so that their effects could be observed. Experiment 1 reports the results of the neuropsychological findings in two groups of young people and compares them to the data from older adults, which have been updated from those previously reported in the literature. Experiments 2 and 3 then explore the relation of neuropsychological function in young people to their performance on two source memory tasks.

Experiment 1

Method

Participants—Ninety-six younger adults ranging in age from 18-23 years old ($M = 18.99$, $SD = 1.21$) with a mean education level of 12.72 ($SD = 0.99$) were drawn from a pool of undergraduates taking an introductory psychology course at the University of Arizona and received course credit for their participation.

Two-hundred and twenty-seven older adults between the ages of 65 and 90 ($M = 73.39$, $SD = 5.39$) with a mean education level of 15.58 ($SD = 2.44$), who had previously completed neuropsychological testing as part of an ongoing aging study, contributed test data for this study. All older adults were currently in good health, living independently in the community,

and reported no depression, dementia, or previous neurological problems that might impair cognitive function. Their mean score on the Mini-Mental Status Examination (MMSE; Folstein, Folstein, & McHugh, 1975) was 28.9. The older adult participants received monetary compensation for their participation.

A second, somewhat older group of 25 young adults (“older-young adults”), ranging in age from 21 to 34 ($M = 25.72$, $SD = 3.08$) and matched to the older adult group on education ($M = 16.28$, $SD = 1.94$) was recruited from the University community and was paid for their participation.

Materials and procedure—Participants were given a battery of ten neuropsychological tests that have traditionally been associated with either FL/executive function or MTL/memory function. The neuropsychological tests had previously been submitted to an exploratory principal components analysis based on data from a group of 48 older adults, and had generated a two-factor solution, consistent with the FL/MTL distinction (see Glisky et al, 1995). This factor structure was later replicated with a separate group of 100 older adults (see Glisky et al., 2001). Because more recent versions of the neuropsychological tests have since been substituted for some of the original tests, we decided to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis using the updated tests and a new, larger group of 227 older adults. In addition, given that college students typically constitute the comparison group for older adults, we wanted to explore whether a similar factor structure existed in the group of 96 young participants. The 25 older-young participants were included in this experiment both as an education-matched comparison group for the older adults, and also as a comparison to the young participants whose neural and cognitive functions may not have fully developed (Clark, Paul, Williams et al., 2006). The older-young adults, however, were not included as an independent group in the factor analysis, because of the small sample size. The five tests included in the factor analysis that were expected to measure FL function were, total number of words produced to the cues F, A, and S in a verbal fluency task (Spreen & Benton, 1977), the number of categories achieved on the modified Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (Hart, Kwentus, Wade, & Taylor, 1988), Backwards Digit Span and Mental Control from the Wechsler Memory Scale-III (WMS-III; Wechsler, 1997), and Mental Arithmetic from the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R; Wechsler, 1981). The five tests hypothesized to measure MTL function were Logical Memory I, Verbal Paired Associates I, and Faces I (all from the WMS-III), Visual Paired Associates II from the Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised (WMS-R; Wechsler, 1987), and the Long-Delay Cued Recall measure from the California Verbal Learning Test (Delis, Kramer, Kaplan, & Ober, 1987). The memory tests were selected to tap basic retention or consolidation processes traditionally thought to depend on the MTLs and to be minimally influenced by strategic factors that might be contributed by the FLs. The FL tests, on the other hand, were clearly not tests of long-term memory, but were thought to tap executive control processes, perhaps those associated with working memory. In a paper presented recently at the Cognitive Aging Conference in Atlanta (McCabe et al., 2006), our frontal factor was found to share 98% of its variance with complex span tasks, consistent with the view that our FL factor represents executive functions associated with higher level working memory tasks. In hemodynamic studies, most of these tasks have been found to activate inferior and dorsolateral prefrontal regions, although superior frontal gyri have also been implicated.

A multiple-sample confirmatory factor analysis using EQS (Bentler, 1995) was conducted on the neuropsychological data from the young and older adult groups. We tested two models, with and without cross-sample constraints. The unconstrained model tested whether the two groups had the same factor structure; the constrained model tested whether the factor loadings were the same across the two groups. After the factor solutions were obtained, factor scores were computed for all groups based on the sample of 323 by averaging z-scores for those tests loading on each factor, using unit-weighting.

Results

The mean level of performance on each of the individual neuropsychological tests for each age group is shown in Table 1. Note that on two of the tests of FL function—verbal fluency and mental arithmetic—older adults actually performed significantly better than the young. On the majority of the tests, however, the older-young group produced the highest scores, followed by the young group, and then the oldest group, although not all of these differences reached significance.

The results of the multiple sample confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the unconstrained model fit the data extremely well confirming the two factor structure in both old and young samples, $X^2(68) = 81.68, p = .12, CFI = .971, RMSEA = .035$. Factor loadings for the two age groups are shown in Table 2. All loadings were significant with the exception of Mental Arithmetic in young adults and the two factors were correlated in both groups, $r = .55$ in old and $.54$ in young ($ps < .05$). The constrained model was a very poor fit by all criteria, $X^2(79) = 322.71, p < .01, CFI = .484, RMSEA = .139$, indicating that the loadings in the two groups were different. An examination of the factor loadings in Table 2 suggested that the most notable difference between the two groups lay in the test of mental arithmetic, which did not load significantly on the FL factor in the young group but did in the older group. However, removing the cross-sample equality constraint for the mental arithmetic variable still did not provide an acceptable fit of the constrained model, $\chi^2(78) = 299.74, p = .00, CFI = .531, RMSEA = .133$. Thus the two-factor structure held up across age groups but the strength of the loadings of the individual tests varied.

Because the Mental Arithmetic measure did not load significantly in the young group, that test was not included in the calculation of the factor scores for the young adults. Their FL factor scores were thus computed by averaging the z-scores of the four other tests in factor 1, which were equally weighted. In addition, the mental arithmetic test was omitted from calculations of factor scores in older and older-young adults in this study in order to make direct comparisons of factor scores among age groups.

Figure 1 displays the box plots showing the median, overall range, and interquartile range of the FL scores for the three groups of participants. Visual inspection of this plot indicates that medians and interquartile ranges are roughly comparable across groups, but the total range of scores is largest in the older adult group, smallest in the older-young group, with the young group falling in between. Means and standard deviations for the factor scores of the three groups are shown in Table 3. A one-way ANOVA comparing the means for the FL factor indicated no significant differences across groups, $F < 1$. Variances were also not significantly different, Levene's $F = 1.12, p = .33$.

Figure 2 displays the boxplots showing the median, overall range, and interquartile range of the MTL scores for the three groups of participants. Visual inspection of this plot shows a rather different pattern, with the older-young showing a higher median, a smaller overall range, and a smaller interquartile range than the older adult group, with the young group again falling in-between. A one-way ANOVA indicated that the means were significantly different across groups, $F(2, 345) = 4.97, p = .007$, as were the variances, Levene's $F = 4.29, p = .01$ (see Table 3). Post-hoc tests indicated that the older-young group, who were matched to the older group on education, had a higher mean MTL factor score, $t(39) = 4.14, p < .01$, and less variance, $F = 6.16, p = .01$, than the older adult group. The young adults also had a lower mean MTL factor score than the older-young group, $t(119) = 2.08, p = .04$, although variances did not differ significantly, $F = 1.88, p = .17$. Finally, the young and older adults were not significantly different in mean MTL scores, $t(201) = 1.72, p = .09$, although the old were significantly more variable than the young group, $F = 3.627, p = .058$.

Discussion

The results of this study confirm the two-factor structure in both young and older adults, although there were quantitative differences in the loadings on individual tests across age groups. All loadings in both age groups were significant except mental arithmetic in young people. Mental arithmetic is a task on which young adults perform significantly more poorly than older adults (see Table 1), perhaps reflecting greater reliance on calculators and less dependence on working memory. This may be the reason why this task did not share significant variance with the other executive function tasks.

Somewhat surprisingly, even with mental arithmetic removed from the factor, young adults did not outperform older adults on the composite measure of FL/executive function, nor were they less variable. Table 1 reveals that young adults were superior to older adults on the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test, whereas older adults were superior to younger adults on Verbal Fluency (the FAS task). The older-young group appeared to be higher performing and less variable than the other two groups on all component tasks, but the smaller sample size may have precluded finding significant differences. Nevertheless, differences on the composite measure of FL function across the three groups were relatively small and non-significant, suggesting relative stability across the lifespan of the executive processes captured by our FL factor. We should point out that the use of a composite measure provides a more reliable and stable measure of FL function than any single measure (cf., Salthouse, Atkinson, & Berish, 2003). Many studies in the literature have reported age-related impairments on single measures of executive function, including the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test, the Stroop Test, the Tower of London, and the Self-Ordered Pointing Task (Bryan & Luszcz, 2000), but other studies have failed to find any age effects on other frontal tasks, including Letter Fluency, Backward Digit Span, and Mental Control (e.g., Lamar & Resnick, 2004), all three of which are part of our FL composite, although some studies have reported age differences. The literature is thus relatively inconsistent concerning what aspects of executive function are impaired in normal aging and which remain intact. Our FL factor likely represents only a subset of all possible executive functions, perhaps reflecting processes involved in working memory (see McCabe et al., 2006) or a more general non-mnemonic control process. We will return to this issue in the General Discussion.

On the MTL factor, however, there were significant group differences, but these differences reflected primarily a higher mean level of performance in the older-young group relative to both the young and the older adults. In addition, both young groups were less variable than the older adults. This pattern may reflect continuing development of memory processes into the mid-20s or with continuing education, and a decline in the upper age ranges.

Experiment 2

The findings of Experiment 1 indicated that the two-factor structure previously found in older adults was maintained in young adults and that there was substantial variability in both factors among young individuals. The two factors thus might reasonably be used to explore the kinds of memory and executive processes used by young adults in tests of item and source memory. As noted earlier, a number of studies have suggested that the cognitive processes and brain regions engaged by younger adults in source memory tasks may be different than those recruited by older adults. In the present experiment, we attempted to replicate an earlier study conducted in young and older adults (Glisky et al., 2001, Experiment 1) in which there was a clear effect of FL function on source memory in the older group. (Neuropsychological function was not assessed in the young group.) In the 2001 study, we used the multiple voices/two sentences paradigm, in which participants were oriented to each of 12 voices speaking one of two sentences. Memory for each voice was subsequently tested in an item memory task, whereas memory for the conjunction of item and source (i.e., Which of the two sentences did

each voice speak?) comprised the source memory task. Findings indicated that the FL factor was related to performance on the source memory task but not on the item task. Because the item memory task—memory for novel voices—was a quite difficult one, the findings suggested that the executive processes comprising the FL factor were not recruited just for any difficult or nonroutine memory tasks, as some theories might suggest (e.g., Shallice, 1982), but instead appeared specific to source memory. We chose this same paradigm for the present study in order to equate the difficulty of the item and source memory tasks.

Method

Participants—Sixty-six young adults ranging in age from 18 to 23 ($M = 19.05$, $SD = 1.26$) with a mean education of 12.74 ($SD = 0.88$) participated in this experiment. These participants were a subset of the young group in Experiment 1, and they completed the present experiment in the same sessions as the neuropsychological testing reported in Experiment 1. All were assigned z-scores representing their relative performance on the two neuropsychological factors as outlined in Experiment 1. Those with factor scores above 0 were assigned to a “high” group and those with scores below 0 constituted a “low” group on that function. FL factor scores ranged from -1.78 to 1.39 ($M = -.08$, $SD = .60$) and MTL factor scores ranged from -1.90 to 1.19 ($M = -.01$, $SD = .60$). All the young adults were undergraduates at the University of Arizona and received course credit for their participation. A comparison group of 24 older adults, also characterized on the basis of neuropsychological function, were selected from a larger pool of healthy, community-dwelling individuals over the age of 65 ($M = 72.4$, $SD = 2.06$) and received monetary compensation for their participation. Although the older group had significantly more years of education ($M = 16.3$, $SD = 2.4$) than the young group, $t(88) = 10.3$, $p < .01$, they did not differ from the young on the two factor scores (both $ts < 1$). Their FL factor scores ranged from -1.59 to 1.02 ($M = -.05$, $SD = .68$) and MTL scores ranged from -1.39 to 1.49 ($M = .02$, $SD = .69$). Characteristics of the groups are summarized in Table 4.

Materials and procedure—The source and item memory tasks were identical to those described in Experiment 1 of Glisky et al. (2001) in which the item memory test involved memory for novel voices and source memory required remembering which of two studied sentences each voice spoke. Multiple male and female voices were recorded speaking two sentences that were equated for speaking time: “Stock prices fell sharply in heavy trading today, reflecting the uncertainty of the trade negotiations” and “Clouds are expected to move in from the west later this afternoon, increasing the likelihood of rain overnight.” The voices and sentences were combined to form three 12-item lists composed of 12 voices (half male and half female) speaking one of the two sentences. Three additional 12-item lists were created in which each voice spoke the other of the two sentences. Each of the six lists occurred equally often across participants as targets for the item and source tasks, and as distractors for the item test.

The source and item tests were matched for difficulty in younger adults. This matching was based on previous findings by Glisky et al. (2001) and also additional pilot data indicating that in a sample of 32 younger adults, item and source memory performance did not differ significantly (74% and 75% respectively). All study and test materials were presented on a Macintosh computer using SuperLab.

Two study-test sessions were conducted, with a brief digit cancellation distractor task between sessions. The item session always preceded the source session because pilot data indicated that under these presentation conditions, performance on the item and source tests was equated in young adults. In both sessions, participants were oriented to the voice (i.e., the item information) but no mention was made of a subsequent memory test or of its nature. For the item study, participants heard one 12-item list of voices each speaking one of the two sentences

and were asked to rate on a 5-point scale how likely it would be to hear each voice on the radio. Study lists were presented three times to each participant in a different random order. A two-alternative forced choice (2AFC) recognition test was then immediately given, where participants were presented with two voices - a target voice from the study session and a novel distractor voice of a different gender. Target voices were never tested speaking the same sentence as at study, but always spoke the other of the two studied sentences. Thus item memory depended solely on memory for the voice, not on the conjunction of voice and sentence. The distractor voice always spoke the other of the two studied sentences. Both sentences had thus been heard repeatedly during study, whereas one voice of the pair had been studied and the other was novel. Participants were asked to decide which voice was heard during the study session and to respond by pressing the appropriate key (1 or 2) to indicate whether they had heard the first or second voice at study.

The source study was identical to the item study, except with a new list of 12 voices. The 2AFC source recognition test immediately followed. Participants heard each studied voice speaking each of the two sentences that had been presented during the study session. Participants were asked to decide which of the two sentences was originally spoken by that voice and to respond by pressing the appropriate key (1 or 2). Note that in this case, the components of both the target and distractor stimuli had occurred during the study, but only one of the voice-sentence combinations had been heard. In both the item and source tests, the target voice or sentence was presented first for half of the test items and second for the other half.

Results

Results for the young participants on the item and source memory tasks are presented in Table 5. The first thing to note is that, as expected on the basis of pilot data, performance on the item and source memory tasks was equivalent (.73 on source, .72 on item), confirming that the two tasks were of equal difficulty for young people. Second, performance on the two tasks was correlated in young adults, $r = .27$, $p = .03$, suggesting that young people may engage similar processes for item and source memory.

Of primary interest was the extent to which the FL factor scores predicted performance in source memory in young adults. A 2×2 between-groups ANOVA indicated that there was no effect of the FL factor scores on source memory, $F(1, 62) < 1$; high and low FL groups performed equivalently. There was, however, a significant effect of the MTL factor, $F(1, 62) = 4.26$, $MSE = .026$, $p = .04$. Those with above-average scores on the memory composite measure performed significantly better than those with below average scores (.77 compared to .68). There was no interaction between the two factors. On the item memory task, there was no effect associated with the FL factor, $F < 1$. Overall the high MTL group out-performed the low MTL group, but that difference was not significant, $F(1, 62) = 1.63$, $MSE = .037$, $p = .21$, nor was there a significant interaction.

Results for the older group are shown in Table 6. A 2×2 between-groups ANOVA on the source memory data revealed a significant effect of FL factor scores, $F(1, 20) = 4.97$, $MSE = .023$, $p = .04$, indicating that the high FL group (.69) performed at a higher level than the low FL group (.56), replicating our earlier finding with a group of 32 older adults (High FL = .66; Low FL = .54; Glisky et al., 2001). There was a non-significant effect of the MTL factor, $F(1, 20) = 2.45$, $p = .13$ and no interaction. There were no effects on the item memory task. In addition, item and source memory were not correlated in older adults, $r = -.007$, n.s. Performance on the item memory task (.73) was significantly better than performance on the source memory task (.63), $t(23) = 2.29$, $p = .03$, suggesting that for some older adults the source memory task was more challenging. A direct comparison between the two age groups confirmed a main effect of age in source memory, $F(1, 88) = 7.21$, $p = .01$, but no effect in item memory, $F < 1$.

Discussion

There was no hint that FL function as measured by our factor score played any role in the performance of young adults on the source memory task. This finding is in contrast to previous and present findings in older adults in which individuals with high FL scores have consistently outperformed those with low scores, indicating robust frontal involvement in source memory in older adults (Glisky et al., 1995; 2001). The finding also appears inconsistent with evidence from a number of neuroimaging studies that have implicated the frontal lobes in source memory in young adults. There may be several reasons for these inconsistencies, given that the FLs are large, complex brain regions that likely support a myriad of control functions, only a small subset of which may be captured by our FL factor. One possibility, consistent with previous findings, is that the processes represented by our FL factor are involved in the initiation and/or execution of integrative processing during encoding. Such processes ensure that various, disparate aspects of an experience are linked together at encoding and co-registered in the memory system so that they can later be simultaneously retrieved. Previous research (Glisky et al., 2001) has suggested that these kinds of integrative processes may be engaged automatically by young adults, without placing additional demands on frontal control processes. Older adults, on the other hand, may need to recruit control processes to ensure adequate integration of item and source information during encoding. Those older individuals who have above average FL function may successfully recruit these processes, or may, like young adults, be able to initiate and execute the integration processes spontaneously. Older adults with low FL function, however, may fail to initiate the processes necessary to achieve a well-integrated memory trace.

If integrative encoding processes are carried out rather automatically in young adults, individual differences among young people in source memory may reflect fundamental differences in less strategic aspects of memory processing such as consolidation or binding, which depend more on the MTLs. Poor MTL function could result in deficits in both item and source recognition, although source memory would place greater demands on the binding process. The fact that item and source memory performance were correlated in young adults in Experiment 2 is consistent with shared processes across the two tasks. Note, however, that in older adults, item and source memory performance were not correlated, suggesting that the processes that older adults engage for the two tasks may be different.

There were also no significant benefits in item memory for those with high MTL function compared to those with low MTL function in either the young or old groups. Although we have previously obtained an effect of the MTL factor on item memory in older adults with sentence materials (Glisky et al., 1995), in an earlier study of memory for voices (Glisky et al., 2001), we failed to observe an advantage for the high MTL group. Although the MTL factor score includes two non-verbal measures including shapes and faces, it is possible that memory for novel voices relies on different processes than those required by most standard neuropsychological tests of memory (cf., Winograd, Kerr, & Spence, 1984).

Because the young adults appeared not to engage the frontal processes represented by our FL factor in this source memory task, we considered the possibility that the task was not difficult enough to require frontal input in young people. To test the difficulty hypothesis, we chose a more challenging source task in Experiment 3.

Experiment 3

In Experiment 2, the FL factor did not predict source memory performance in young adults. It has been suggested that the frontal lobes may be important only in difficult tasks. The source memory performance of younger adults in the previous experiment was .73, raising the possibility that this source task was not of sufficient difficulty to engage the FLs in young

people. In order to rule out this possibility, a more challenging source task was chosen that required the participants to remember the spatial location in which each stimulus was presented (see Cook, 2007). In addition, an attentionally-demanding neuropsychological test known to measure working memory was included in this experiment in order to ensure that the FL factor was sensitive to executive function differences in young adults.

Method

Participants—Forty-eight young adults, ranging in age from 18 to 22 ($M = 18.73$, $SD = .96$) with a mean education level of 12.7 ($SD = 1.1$) participated in this experiment. Thirty of these individuals were part of the larger group reported in Experiment 1 and did not participate in Experiment 2. One of these participants was excluded for failing to follow instructions. An additional 19 young people, who were not part of either Experiment 1 or 2, were recruited from the same pool of psychology undergraduates, all of whom received course credit for their participation. All participants completed the present experiment during the same sessions in which their neuropsychological testing was conducted, and all were assigned z-scores representing their performance on the two neuropsychological factors. FL factor scores ranged from -2.17 to 1.39 ($M = -.001$, $SD = .67$) and MTL scores ranged from -.94 to 1.29 ($M = .29$, $SD = .54$). Characteristics of this group are summarized in Table 7.

Materials and procedure—In this experiment, sentences served as the stimuli for the item test and spatial location provided the source information. A male voice was recorded speaking 100 neutral sentences (e.g. “Yesterday she wrote an email to me”). Five lists of 20 sentences were formed, with two lists serving as item study lists, two lists as distractors for the item test, and one list as the source study list, resulting in five counterbalancing conditions. Two study-test sessions were conducted. The item session preceded the source session as in Experiment 2 for 29 of the participants. To ensure that order of tests did not influence the outcome, the additional group of 19 individuals completed the source session prior to the item session. Sentences were presented auditorily, half from a speaker placed to the right of the individual and half from a speaker located to the left, and location varied randomly. For the item study task, participants heard 40 sentences presented once, and were asked to rate on a 5-point scale how likely it would be to hear each sentence on the radio. Immediately following the item study, a 2AFC recognition test was given in which participants heard two sentences, one that they had heard during study and one that was new, and were asked to decide which sentence they had heard previously and to respond by pressing the appropriate key (1 or 2). For the source study session, 20 sentences were presented and participants were asked to make the same likelihood judgment as in the item study session. The 20 sentences were presented twice in a different random order, but from the same speaker as in the first presentation. For the source test, participants heard each target sentence played once from each speaker and were asked to choose from which speaker the sentence was originally presented and to respond by pressing the appropriate key (L or R). In both the item and source tests, the target sentence or location occurred first for half of the test items and second for the other half, and participants were not told ahead of time about the nature of the impending memory test.

Following the memory testing, the Paced Auditory Serial Addition Test (PASAT; Gronwall, 1977), a demanding working memory test, was administered to the initial group of 30 participants. A pseudorandom series of 61 numbers from 1 to 9 were presented auditorily via audiocassette with one digit presented every two seconds. Participants were required to add every two consecutive numbers, and report each sum out loud.

Results and Discussion

There were no significant differences in performance on either the item or source memory tasks as a function of the order of testing, nor did this variable interact with either of the

neuropsychological variables. Results were therefore collapsed across test order. Performance on the item memory test averaged 0.95 ($SD = .07$) and was on the ceiling in all groups, and so no further analyses were conducted with reference to the item memory data. Source memory performance, however, was quite poor ($M = .54$, $SD = 0.11$), attesting to the difficulty of the source memory task. Nevertheless, the distribution of scores on the source memory test ranged from .35 to .85 providing sufficient variability to assess the possible effects of our neuropsychological variables. Because the distribution of participants was unequal across cells of the design, however, the results were analyzed using both ANOVA and correlational measures.

The source memory data are presented in Table 8. A 2×2 between-groups ANOVA indicated that the only significant effect was for the MTL factor, $F(1, 44) = 8.76$, $MSE = .011$, $p = .005$ with the high MTL group performing at a higher level than the low MTL group. This significant effect is unlikely to be attributable to the below-chance level of performance of some participants, since the high MTL group performed significantly above the chance level of .50, $t(31) = 3.88$, $p = .001$. A correlational analysis also showed that source memory was significantly correlated with the MTL factor, $r = .45$, $p = .002$, but not with the FL factor, $r = .10$, n.s.

The mean number correct on the PASAT was .56 ($SD = .14$), which is within the normal range for this age group (Strauss, Sherman, & Spreen, 2006), and PASAT scores were significantly correlated with the FL factor ($r = .47$, $p = .009$), indicating that our FL factor was sensitive to executive function differences in young adults when the working memory demands were high. Nevertheless, the executive processes tapped by the FL factor seemed not to be involved in the very difficult source memory task, again suggesting that our FL factor is not tracking difficulty.

General Discussion

Several interesting findings emerged from these experiments. First, the two-factor structure previously found in an exploratory principal components analysis in older adults was supported in a confirmatory factor analysis in a large sample of older adults and a large group of young college students. The analysis confirmed two factors, one composed of executive control and working memory tests thought to tap FL functions and one composed of memory tests associated with MTL functions. Somewhat unexpectedly, we found that neither college freshmen nor a group of more educated young adults differed significantly from older adults on our FL factor, either in mean level of performance or in variability. Although the young and older groups showed different relative strengths on the tests within the factor, the distributions of the composite FL scores were remarkably similar. These data thus indicate that although there are age-related declines in performance on individual FL tests, some aspects of executive function may hold up rather well with age, at least in a sub-group of older adults. The tests comprising the FL factor were selected on the basis of neuropsychological data suggesting that they tapped executive function. However, there are almost certainly numerous different executive processes associated with the FLs (see Miyake, Friedman, Emerson et al., 2000; Stuss, Alexander, Floden et al., 2002), and the literature is inconsistent with respect to the specific executive processes that decline with age. This inconsistency may be partly attributable to the variety of "frontal" tests used across studies and the unreliability of many tests of executive function (see Salthouse et al., 2003). In addition, most tests of executive function are not process-pure, and may require non-executive processes in addition to one or more executive processes (Crawford & Henry, 2005). Thus, it is difficult to attribute an impairment on any single frontal test to any particular executive function. The advantage of a composite measure derived from factor analysis is an increase in reliability because the factor represents the systematic variance shared by its constituent tests without measurement error. Scores on the composite measure thus reflect only the process(es) captured by that common variance.

That variance in the present case is almost certainly traceable to the FLs given the evidence that each of the individual tests are associated with that brain region (e.g., Gerton, Brown, Meyer-Lindenberg et al., 2004; Gruber, Indefrey, Steinmetz, & Kleinschmidt, 2001; Konishi, Kawazu, Uchida et al., 1999; Phelps, Hyder, Blamire, & Shulman, 1997). The factor analysis, however, cannot tell us what the common processes are or what specific neural correlates are shared. The data provided by the present study tell us only that the distribution of the processes associated with the FL factor score is similar across the age groups tested. However, experimental studies in which the factor is shown to be predictive of performance on other cognitive tasks may begin to provide suggestive evidence of the processes represented in the FL factor score.

The memory factor, however, did reveal lower performance in the older group both in mean score and variability. Examination of the individual tests indicated that although the young adults scored significantly higher than the older adults only on the delayed test of visual paired-associates, every test within the MTL factor showed a small numeric advantage for the young group. Nevertheless, the overall mean composite MTL score was not significantly different between the young and the older group, although the young group was less variable. The memory factor score for the older-young group, however, was significantly higher than for both the young and the older groups, suggesting that memory function may continue to develop into the mid- to late-20s or with continuing education, and then decline in the upper years. There was also suggestive evidence of a similar pattern for the FL factor. Although differences between the older-young group and the other groups on the FL composite were not significant (probably because of the smaller sample of older-young people), performance on all 5 executive frontal tasks was numerically higher in the older-young group than in the other two groups, suggesting that performance on these tests may also increase with age or education. We should note here that our older adult sample is highly educated ($M = 15.6$ years), although representative of many older adult samples reported in the literature, and so cognitive function may hold up particularly well in an educated group. Nevertheless, memory function was significantly lower in the older group relative to the education-matched older-young group, suggesting that declines do occur in memory even in well-educated older adults.

The second finding of interest concerns the age-related differences in the involvement of the two neuropsychological composite measures in the source memory task. Previous research has made a strong case for the importance of FL function in source memory, although its exact role remains elusive. A few studies have also suggested that older adults use different processes to perform source memory tasks than young adults, but how and why these processes might differ is unclear. The present studies provide further evidence relevant to this issue. Our previous work (Glisky et al., 2001) indicated that older adults with below average scores on the FL factor failed to integrate item and source during encoding, although when given an integrative encoding task, they were able to do so and benefit from that integration. More recent studies from our lab (Cook, 2007) have shown that low FL older adults do not integrate information from two different sources, although young and high FL older adults are quite able to do so. These findings have led us to propose that the FL factor may reflect a component of working memory that enables the integration of information across different cognitive or perceptual domains. These processes may decline in a subgroup of older adults but remain intact in others. Neuroimaging evidence consistent with this view comes from a study by Mitchell and colleagues (2000a), who reported that young adults showed greater activation in right anterior PFC (BA 10) and left anterior hippocampus in a working memory task when encoding combinations of objects in locations, compared to either objects or locations alone. Older adults, however, failed to activate these regions, and showed a selective memory deficit for the conjunction of object and location. These investigators attributed this failure to an age-related binding deficit in older adults that reduced the ability to integrate multiple features of

an experience. Our findings suggest that this integrative process may be particularly affected in older adults with below average scores on our composite measure of FL function.

Alternatively, the deficit in source memory in our low FL older group could be attributable to a failure to initiate the encoding and/or retrieval processes necessary for good performance in source memory tasks (cf., Craik, 1986) rather than a deficit in integrative processing per se. Craik (Craik & Byrd, 1982) has suggested that a general decline in processing resources with age could underlie a number of age-related declines in memory. Older adults with good executive function may have more of these resources or be more likely to recruit them in a compensatory fashion for difficult memory tasks, whereas those with poorer executive function may be less able to do so. Our previous findings, showing that our FL factor scores were not predictive of performance in a difficult and demanding item memory task, however, suggest that our FL factor score is not just a measure of a general processing capacity, but may reflect processes, such as integration, that are more specific to source memory. Related work by Naveh-Benjamin and colleagues (e.g., Naveh-Benjamin, 2000) also suggests a differential deficit in associative memory in older adults, compared to memory for the individual items forming the association. These investigators (Naveh-Benjamin, Guez, & Shulman, 2004; Naveh-Benjamin, Hussain, Guez & Bar-On, 2003) have provided additional evidence that the associative deficit is not attributable simply to declining processing resources in the older group: Young adults with reduced processing resources (i.e., under divided attention conditions) did not show a differential deficit in associative memory. These findings are consistent with our proposal that the deficit in source memory observed in our low FL group reflects a specific problem with integrating item and source information in working memory. Our view is also similar to one proposed and modeled by Kimberg & Farah (1993; also Kimberg, D'Esposito, & Farah, 1997), who suggested that prefrontal damage in patients weakens the strength of associations among elements in working memory, causing failures on multiple "executive" tasks, including WCST for example, one of the tasks in our frontal composite (see also Spencer & Raz, 1995).

The FL effect, however, was not observed in young people. This suggests that the source memory task in young people does not require the control processes tapped by our FL factor. Young people may not need to engage FL support to integrate disparate components of an experience during encoding; such integration may occur spontaneously and without demands on attentional resources (cf., Naveh-Benjamin et al., 2003;2004). Thus, although the FL factor may reflect a capacity-limited function of working memory, this capacity may not be taxed by source memory tasks in young people. The FL factor appears to be sensitive to working memory differences in young adults, however: When presented with an attentionally-demanding working memory task such as the PASAT, young people with lower FL factor scores exhibited lower levels of performance.

An alternative explanation for the lack of a FL effect in young adults may be that the 2AFC recognition test does not require executive control processes, whereas a cued recall test might. I think this is unlikely to be the case. The high degree of familiarity of the lures in the 2 AFC source task suggests that this task requires recollective processes to retrieve the particular conjunction of item and source, and such processes would likely overlap those required in cued recall. In addition, although different test formats also have different processing requirements (e.g., cued recall has a search component that may be absent in recognition), it is not obvious that these two test formats would make different demands on the kinds of working memory processes that seem to characterize our FL factor. Other executive function tasks may provide better indicators of retrieval processes. Nevertheless, it is possible that different test formats could be differentially sensitive to our factor scores, and we are currently investigating this possibility.

Whether high FL older people perform the integrative functions automatically as young adults appear to do or whether they initiate compensatory strategies to integrate the multiple aspects of an event cannot be determined from the present experiment. Future neuroimaging studies, however, could serve to clarify whether the processes in the high FL group are similar to those in young or whether they involve the recruitment of additional brain regions. Such a study is currently underway in our laboratory.

The finding of a significant MTL effect in young adults was an unexpected result. We speculate that, although different aspects of an experience may be coded and integrated automatically during encoding in young people, these components still have to be bound together by structures in the MTLs. For item recognition, relatively little binding is required and so effects of low MTL function may be minimal. The retrieval of source information, however, places greater demands on binding and so MTL function is likely to be more important for source memory. Consistent with this notion, the findings of Mitchell and colleagues (2000a) indicated that, in young adults, the hippocampus showed greater activations during the encoding and maintenance of object/location conjunctions than for either one alone. Similarly, Davachi, Mitchell, and Wagner (2003) found that MTL activations were involved in the encoding of both item and source, with the hippocampus and parahippocampal cortex associated with subsequent source recollection and perirhinal cortex with item recognition. These findings suggest that low scores on our MTL factor may thus reflect poorer binding at the level of the hippocampus. If this is the case, one might also expect to see an effect of MTL function on source memory in older adults. Although we have generally not found such an effect, there was a non-significant advantage for the high MTL older group in the present study, and such a finding has been previously reported in the literature by other investigators (e.g., Henkel, et al., 1998).

One other finding is of particular note: Performance on the item and source memory tasks in Experiment 2 was correlated ($r = .27$) in young adults but not in older adults. At first blush, this finding seems to suggest that young adults may use similar processes when performing the two tasks, whereas older adults do not. This conclusion, however, seems contrary to the neuroimaging data, which shows that younger adults activate right PFC for item recognition, but recruit left PFC when recollection of additional details is necessary (e.g., Dobbins et al., 2002; Mitchell et al., 2004; Nolde et al., 1998). It may be that young people, although engaging different regions of PFC in the two tasks, nevertheless access the same integrated memory representation when making either item or source memory judgments, thereby accounting for the correlation. Results of fMRI studies by Gold et al. (2006), showing similar activations in MTL regions during both item and source memory tests, are consistent with this view.

Older adults, on the other hand, may not access the memory trace when faced with the resource-demanding source memory task, but instead may attempt to base their source judgments on familiarity. This failure to engage in recollective processing may be particularly likely to occur in low FL older adults, thereby contributing to their poor performance in source memory. Alternatively, they may access an impoverished memory trace, which is sufficient to support item memory but lacks the details to support source memory. Another possibility is that older adults recruit the same processes as young adults for source memory tasks, but they are less efficient. Findings consistent with this view were obtained in a neuroimaging study of source memory (Cabeza, Anderson, Locantore, & McIntosh, 2002), in which it was reported that some older adults activated the same right unilateral prefrontal regions as young adults, but nevertheless performed more poorly. Other older adults activated prefrontal brain regions bilaterally and showed levels of performance comparable to the young. These results suggest that the processes employed by the poor performers, although apparently similar to those used by young, were ineffective. The high performers, on the other hand, appeared to recruit additional processes in order to maintain a high level of performance.

From the present study, it is unclear exactly how to interpret the lack of correlation among the two tasks in older adults. On the one hand, it might represent the recruitment of additional resources or alternate processes required to maintain high levels of performance on the more demanding source memory task. On the other hand, it might represent a failure of recollective search and monitoring processes needed to retrieve source-specifying information or the lack of source information in the memory trace. Answers to this question will thus require further neuroimaging studies in young and older adults to help identify the specific processes required by source memory tasks at both encoding and retrieval and the differences that exist both between young and old and between different subgroups within the older cohort.

Finally, there is an apparent discrepancy between the neuropsychological and neuroimaging findings. Neuroimaging data have frequently shown PFC activations in young adults in source memory tasks, but in the present studies FL function seemed not to be implicated in young people. Most of the neuroimaging studies, however, have focused on retrieval, whereas we propose that the FL effect that we have observed occurs at encoding. The neuroimaging study by Mitchell et al. (2000a), however, showed right PFC activation during integrative encoding of item and source in young adults but not in older adults, a result that seems contrary to the current findings. However, activation in BA 10 may reflect integration processes per se or may track maintenance of integrated information (see Prabhakaran et al., 2000), and may be present whether the integration occurred spontaneously or effortfully. As we have argued previously, integration processes are initiated spontaneously by younger adults, and do not require input from the executive control processes reflected in our FL factor. Older adults with low FL function may fail to initiate the integrative processes entirely. We would therefore hypothesize that older adults who are low performers on our FL composite will not show activation of this PFC region during source encoding, whereas high FL older adults and young people will. Again, whether high FL older adults do this spontaneously or recruit additional resources, cannot be determined from the present data.

In summary, the present studies have added to our knowledge of the processes involved in source memory in young and older adults. Findings are consistent with a specific deficit in integrative encoding processes among older individuals who have below-average FL function based on our composite measure. Although we hypothesize that the FL composite reflects attentional or executive processes associated with working memory in both young and older adults, the integrative processes required by the source memory tasks in these studies do not appear to tax working memory in young people. Instead, deficits in source memory occur in young adults with low MTL function, and may be attributable to less effective binding mechanisms in the hippocampus. Older adults may also have a more general problem with the initiation of relevant encoding and retrieval processes and their strategies may be less efficient. Recruitment of additional executive functions thus may be needed when encoding or retrieval processes are poorly supported by the task environment.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by National Institute on Aging Grant AG14792. We thank Aurelio J. Figueredo for statistical assistance for Experiment 1, and Casey Catlin, Carolyn Langlois, Kerry Ward, Brittany Pace, Shari Robbins, Lilian Patron and Alex German for help in data collection and neuropsychological testing.

References

- Bentler, PM. Multivariate Software; Encino, CA: 1995. EQS Structural Equations Program Manual.
- Bryan J, Luszcz MA. Measurement of executive function: Considerations for detecting adult age differences. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology* 2000;22:40–55. [PubMed: 10649544]

- Cabeza R, Anderson ND, Locantore JK, McIntosh AR. Aging gracefully: Compensatory brain activity in high-performing older adults. *NeuroImage* 2002;17:1394–1402. [PubMed: 12414279]
- Chalfonte BL, Johnson MK. Feature memory and binding in young and older adults. *Memory & Cognition* 1996;24:403–416.
- Clark CR, Paul RH, Williams LM, Arns M, Fallahpour K, Handmer C, et al. Standardized assessment of cognitive functioning during development and aging using an automated touchscreen battery. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology* 2006;21:449–467. [PubMed: 16904862]
- Cook SP. Are all sources equal? The roles of aging and the frontal lobes in multiple types of source memory using a repeated-measures design. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering* 2007;67:5433.
- Craik, FIM. A functional account of age differences in memory. In: Klix, F.; Hagendorf, H., editors. *Human memory and cognitive capabilities, mechanisms and performances*. Elsevier; Amsterdam: 1986. p. 409-422.
- Craik, FIM.; Byrd, M. Aging and cognitive deficits: The role of attentional resources. In: Craik, FIM.; Trehub, S., editors. *Aging and cognitive processes*. Plenum; New York: 1982. p. 191-211.
- Craik FIM, Morris LW, Morris RG, Loewen ER. Relations between source amnesia and frontal lobe functioning in older adults. *Psychology and Aging* 1990;5:148–151. [PubMed: 2317296]
- Crawford, JR.; Henry, JD. Assessment of executive dysfunction. In: Halligan, PW.; Wade, DT., editors. *The effectiveness of rehabilitation for cognitive deficits*. Oxford University Press; Oxford: 2005. p. 233-245.
- Davachi L, Mitchell JP, Wagner AD. Multiple routes to memory: Distinct medial temporal lobe processes build item and source memories. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2003;100:2157–2162.
- Davidson PSR, Glisky EL. Neuropsychological correlates of recollection and familiarity in normal aging. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience* 2002;2:174–186.
- Delis, DC.; Kramer, J.; Kaplan, E.; Ober, BA. *The California Verbal Learning Test*. Psychological Corporation; San Antonio, TX: 1987.
- Dobbins IG, Foley H, Schacter DL, Wagner AD. Executive control during episodic retrieval: Multiple prefrontal processes subserve source memory. *Neuron* 2002;35:989–996. [PubMed: 12372291]
- Dodson CS, Shimamura AP. Differential effects of cue dependency on item and source memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 2000;26:1023–1044.
- Folstein MF, Folstein SF, McHugh PR. Mini-Mental State: A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* 1975;12:189–198. [PubMed: 1202204]
- Gerton BK, Brown TT, Meyer-Lindenberg A, Kohn P, Holt JL, Olsen RK, Berman K,F. Shared and distinct neurophysiological components of the digits forward and backward tasks as revealed by functional neuroimaging. *Neuropsychologia* 2004;42:1781–1787. [PubMed: 15351627]
- Glisky EL, Polster MR, Routhieaux BC. Double dissociation between item and source memory. *Neuropsychology* 1995;9:229–235.
- Glisky EL, Rubin SR, Davidson PSR. Source memory in older adults: An encoding or retrieval problem? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 2001;27:1131–1146.
- Gold JJ, Smith CN, Bayley PJ, Shrager Y, Brewer JB, Stark CEL, et al. Item memory, source memory, and the medial temporal lobe: Concordant findings from fMRI and memory-impaired patients. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2006;103:9351–9356.
- Gronwall DMA. Paced Auditory Serial-Addition Task: A measure of recovery from concussion. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 1977;44:367–373. [PubMed: 866038]
- Gruber O, Indefrey P, Steinmetz H, Kleinschmidt A. Dissociating neural correlates of cognitive components of mental calculation. *Cerebral Cortex* 2001;11:350–359. [PubMed: 11278198]
- Hart RP, Kwentus JA, Wade JB, Taylor JR. Modified Wisconsin Card Sorting Test in elderly normal, depressed and demented patients. *Clinical Neuropsychologist* 1988;2:49–56.
- Henkel LA, Johnson MK, DeLeonardis DM. Aging and source monitoring: Cognitive processes and neuropsychological correlates. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 1998;127:251–268. [PubMed: 9742716]

- Janowsky JS, Shimamura AP, Squire LR. Source memory impairment in patients with frontal lobe lesions. *Neuropsychologia* 1989;27:1043–1056. [PubMed: 2797412]
- Johnson MK, Hashtroudi S, Lindsay DS. Source monitoring. *Psychological Bulletin* 1993;114:3–28. [PubMed: 8346328]
- Johnson MK, Kounios J, Nölde SF. Electrophysiological brain activity and memory source monitoring. *NeuroReport* 1997;8:1317–1320. [PubMed: 9175136]
- Johnson MK, O'Connor M, Cantor J. Confabulation, memory deficits, and frontal dysfunction. *Brain and Cognition* 1997;34:189–206. [PubMed: 9220085]
- Kahn I, Davachi L, Wagner AD. Functional-neuroanatomical correlates of recollection: Implications for models of recognition memory. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 2004;24:4172–4180. [PubMed: 15115812]
- Kimberg DY, Farah MJ. A unified account of cognitive impairments following frontal lobe damage: The role of working memory in complex, organized behavior. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 1993;122:411–428. [PubMed: 8263463]
- Kimberg DY, D'Esposito M, Farah MJ. Cognitive functions in the prefrontal cortex—working memory and executive control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 1997;6:185–192.
- Konishi S, Kawazu M, Uchida I, Kikyo H, Asakura I, Miyashita Y. Contribution of working memory to transient activation in human inferior prefrontal cortex during performance of the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test. *Cerebral Cortex* 1999;9:745–753. [PubMed: 10554997]
- Kuo TY, Van Petten C. Prefrontal engagement during source memory retrieval depends on the prior encoding task. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 2006;18:1133–1146. [PubMed: 16839287]
- Lamar M, Resnick SM. Aging and prefrontal functions: dissociating orbitofrontal and dorsolateral abilities. *Neurobiology of Aging* 2004;25:553–558. [PubMed: 15013577]
- McCabe, DP.; Roediger, HL.; McDaniel, MA.; Balota, DA.; Hambrick, DZ. The relationship between working memory capacity and frontal lobe functioning; Paper presented at the Cognitive Aging Conference; Atlanta, GA. April 2006;
- Mitchell KJ, Johnson MK, Raye CL, D'Esposito M. fMRI evidence of age-related hippocampal dysfunction in feature binding in working memory. *Cognitive Brain Research* 2000a;10:197–206. [PubMed: 10978709]
- Mitchell KJ, Johnson MK, Raye CL, Greene EJ. Prefrontal cortex activity associated with source monitoring in a working memory task. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 2004;16:921–934. [PubMed: 15298780]
- Mitchell KJ, Johnson MK, Raye CL, Mather M, D'Esposito M. Aging and reflective processes of working memory: Binding and test load deficits. *Psychology and Aging* 2000;15:527–541. [PubMed: 11014715]
- Mitchell KJ, Raye CL, Johnson MK, Greene EJ. An fMRI investigation of short-term source memory in young and older adults. *NeuroImage* 2006;30:627–633. [PubMed: 16256377]
- Miyake A, Friedman NP, Emerson MJ, Witzki AH, Howerter A. The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to complex “frontal lobe” tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology* 2000;41:49–100. [PubMed: 10945922]
- Naveh-Benjamin M. Adult age differences in memory performance: Tests of an associative deficit hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 2001;26:1170–1187.
- Naveh-Benjamin M, Guez J, Shulman S. Older adults' associative deficit in episodic memory: Assessing the role of decline in attentional resources. *Psychonomic Bulletin, & Review* 2004;11:1067–1073. [PubMed: 15875977]
- Naveh-Benjamin M, Hussain Z, Guez J, Bar-On M. Adult age differences in episodic memory: Further support for an associative-deficit hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 2003;29:826–837.
- Naveh-Benjamin M, Craik FIM. Effects of perceptual and conceptual processing on memory for words and voice: Different patterns for young and old. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 1996;49A:780–796. [PubMed: 8828404]
- Nölde SF, Johnson MK, D'Esposito M. Left prefrontal activation during episodic remembering: An event-related fMRI study. *NeuroReport* 1998;9:3509–3514. [PubMed: 9855308]

- Parkin AJ, Walter BM, Hunkin NM. Relationships between normal aging, frontal lobe function, and memory for temporal and spatial information. *Neuropsychology* 1995;9:304–312.
- Phelps EA, Hyder F, Blamire AM, Shulman RG. fMRI of the prefrontal cortex during overt verbal fluency. *Neuroreport* 1997;8:561–565. [PubMed: 9080448]
- Prabhakaran V, Narayanan K, Zhao Z, Gabrieli JDE. Integration of diverse information in working memory within the frontal lobe. *Nature Neuroscience* 2000;3:85–90.
- Rugg MD, Fletcher PC, Chua PM-L, Dolan RJ. The role of the prefrontal cortex in recognition memory and memory for source: An fMRI study. *NeuroImage* 1999;10:520–529. [PubMed: 10547329]
- Salthouse TA, Atkinson TM, Berish DE. Executive functioning as a potential mediator of age-related cognitive decline in normal adults. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 2003;132:566–594. [PubMed: 14640849]
- Schacter DL, Harbluk JL, McLachlan DR. Retrieval without recollection: An experimental analysis of source amnesia. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 1984;23:593–611.
- Schwerdt PR, Dopkins S. Memory for content and source in temporal lobe patients. *Neuropsychology* 2001;15:48–57. [PubMed: 11216889]
- Senkfor AJ, Van Petten C. Who said what? An event-related potential investigation of source and item memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 1998;24:1005–1025.
- Shallice T. Specific impairments of planning. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, B* 1982;298:199–209.
- Shimamura AP, Squire LR. A neuropsychological study of fact memory and source amnesia. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 1987;13:464–473.
- Slotnick SD, Moo LR, Segal JB, Hart J Jr. Distinct prefrontal cortex activity associated with item memory and source memory for visual shapes. *Cognitive Brain Research* 2003;17:75–82. [PubMed: 12763194]
- Spencer WD, Raz N. Differential effects of aging on memory for content and context: A meta-analysis. *Psychology and Aging* 1995;10:527–539. [PubMed: 8749580]
- Spreen, O.; Benton, AL. *Neurosensory Center Comprehensive Examination for Aphasia*. University of Victoria Neuropsychology Laboratory; Victoria, BC: 1977. Revised ed.
- Strauss, E.; Sherman, E.; Spreen, O. *A compendium of neuropsychological tests: Administration, norms and commentary*. 3rd ed.. Oxford University Press; New York: 2006.
- Stuss, DT.; Alexander, MP.; Floden, D.; Binns, MA.; Levine, B.; McIntosh, AR.; Rajah, N.; Hevenor, SJ. Fractionation and localization of distinct frontal lobe processes: Evidence from focal lesions in humans. In: Stuss, DT.; Knight, RT., editors. *Principles of frontal lobe function*. Oxford University Press; Oxford: 2002. p. 392-407.
- Swick D, Senkfor AJ, Van Petten C. Source memory retrieval is affected by aging and prefrontal lesions: Behavioral and ERP evidence. *Brain Research* 2006;1107:161–176. [PubMed: 16828722]
- Thaïss L, Petrides M. Source versus content memory in patients with a unilateral frontal cortex or a temporal lobe excision. *Brain* 2003;126:1112–1126. [PubMed: 12690051]
- Trott CT, Friedman D, Ritter W, Fabiani M. Item and source memory: Differential age effects revealed by event-related potentials. *NeuroReport* 1997;8:3373–3378. [PubMed: 9351675]
- Wechsler, D. *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale--Revised*. Psychological Corporation; New York: 1981.
- Wechsler, D. *Wechsler Memory Scale - III*. Psychological Corporation; San Antonio, TX: 1997.
- Wechsler, D. *Wechsler Memory Scale--Revised*. Psychological Corporation; New York: 1987.
- Wilding EL, Rugg MD. An event-related potential study of recognition memory with and without retrieval of source. *Brain* 1996;119:889–906. [PubMed: 8673500]
- Winograd E, Kerr NH, Spence MJ. Voice recognition: Effects of orienting task, and a test of blind versus sighted listeners. *American Journal of Psychology* 1984;97:57–70. [PubMed: 6721008]

Figure 1.
Comparison of FL factor scores for young, older-young, and older adults, showing median, range, and interquartile range

Figure 2. Comparison of MTL factor scores for young, older-young, and older adults, showing median, range, and interquartile range

Table 1

Mean (SD) Neuropsychological Test Performance for the Three Age Groups in Experiment 1

	Young Adults	Older-Young Adults	Older Adults
Test (Maximum Score)			
Wisconsin Card Sort Test (6)	5.09 (1.60) *	5.12 (1.74)	4.50 (1.75) *
Backward Digit Span (12)	7.14 (2.03)	7.84 (1.99)	7.58 (2.24)
Verbal Fluency	38.10 (10.6) *	41.92 (8.14)	41.86 (11.6) *
Mental Arithmetic (19)	10.78 (3.28) *	12.08 (3.20)	13.15 (3.26) *
Mental Control (40)	26.96 (4.42)	27.16 (3.88)	26.21 (5.52)
Logical Memory I (50)	25.57 (6.38)	26.80 (4.05)	25.16 (6.60)
Visual Paired Associates II (6)	5.64 (.85) *†	6.00 (.00) †	5.40 (1.08) *
Verbal Paired Associates I (32)	23.32 (5.64) †	25.00 (4.97) †	22.16 (7.67)
Faces I (48)	36.42 (4.13)	37.20 (3.19)	36.16 (4.50)
CVLT Long-Delay Cued Recall (16)	11.44 (2.62) †	12.52 (2.52) †	11.04 (3.03)

Note. CVLT = California Verbal Learning Test

* = significant group differences

† = significant group differences

Table 2

Factor Loadings for 227 Older Adults and 96 Young Adults

Test	Young Adults Factor		Older Adults Factor	
	1	2	1	2
Wisconsin Card Sorting Test	.335		.425	
Backwards Digit Span	.454		.564	
Verbal Fluency (FAS)	.650		.560	
Mental Arithmetic	.188		.594	
Mental Control	.644		.630	
Logical Memory I		.710		.536
Visual Paired Associates II		.442		.493
Verbal Paired Associates I		.637		.732
Faces I		.337		.291
CVLT Long-Delay Cued Recall		.691		.624

Note. CVLT = California Verbal Learning Test

Table 3

Mean and (SDs) of FL and MTL factor scores in young, old-young, and older adults

Group	FL Factor	MTL Factor
Young	.02 (.62)	.09 (.60)
Old-Young	.15 (.58)	.36 (.42)
Older	.01 (.70)	-.04 (.68)

Note. FL = frontal lobe; MTL = medial temporal lobe

Table 4
 Characteristics of Young and Older Adult Groups in Experiment 2

Younger Adults	FL Function		MTL Function	
	High	Low	High	Low
N	33	33	37	29
Age	19.0	19.1	19.0	19.1
Education	12.8	12.6	12.8	12.7
FL score	.39	-.55	.07	-.26
MTL score	.09	-.12	.40	-.54
Older Adults	FL Function		MTL Function	
	High	Low	High	Low
N	12	12	12	12
Age	72.4	72.4	72.3	72.5
Education	15.9	16.7	16.5	16.1
FL score	.48	-.58	-.008	-.10
MTL score	.13	-.09	.56	-.52

Note. FL = frontal lobe; MTL = medial temporal lobe

Table 5
Mean Proportion Correct (SD) on Source and Item Memory Tasks in Young Adults in Experiment 2

MTL Function	Source Memory FL Function		Mean	High	Item Memory FL Function		Mean
	Low	High			Low	High	
High	.78 (.20)	.76 (.14)	.77 (.16)	.77 (.16)	.71 (.17)	.75 (.17)	.75 (.17)
Low	.69 (.16)	.68 (.14)	.68 (.15)	.61 (.21)	.74 (.24)	.69 (.23)	.69 (.23)
Mean	.73 (.18)	.73 (.15)	.73 (.16)	.72 (.19)	.73 (.21)	.72 (.20)	.72 (.20)

Note. FL = frontal lobe; MTL= medial temporal lobe

Table 6
Mean Proportion Correct (SD) on Source and Item Memory Tasks in Older Adults in Experiment 2

MTL Function	Source Memory FL Function		Mean	Item Memory FL Function		Mean
	High	Low		High	Low	
High	.72 (.13)	.63 (.12)	.67 (.13)	.72 (.13)	.74 (.16)	.73 (.14)
Low	.67 (.14)	.49 (.21)	.58 (.19)	.72 (.09)	.72 (.19)	.72 (.14)
Mean	.69 (.13)	.56 (.18)	.63 (.17)	.72 (.10)	.73 (.17)	.73 (.14)

Note. FL = frontal lobe; MTL= medial temporal lobe

Table 7

Characteristics of Young Adults in Experiment 3

	FL Function		MTL Function	
	High	Low	High	Low
N	24	24	32	16
Age	18.9	18.6	18.7	18.8
Education	12.9	12.5	12.7	12.8
FL score	.53	-.54	.15	-.32
MTL score	.46	.13	.61	-.33

Note. FL = frontal lobe; MTL= medial temporal lobe

Table 8

Mean Proportion Correct (SD) on Source Memory Task in Young Adults in Experiment 3

MTL Function	High	FL Function Low	Mean
High	.57 (.11)	.58 (.10)	.57 (.11)
Low	.48 (.08)	.47 (.09)	.48 (.09)
Mean	.55 (.11)	.53 (.11)	.54 (.11)

Note. FL = frontal lobe; MTL= medial temporal lobe