Published in final edited form as:

Psychon Bull Rev. 2010 October ; 17(5): 673–679. doi:10.3758/17.5.673.

Quantity not quality: The relationship between fluid intelligence and working memory capacity

Keisuke Fukuda, Edward Vogel, Ulrich Mayr, and Edward Awh

Abstract

A key motivation for understanding capacity in working memory (WM) is its relationship with fluid intelligence. Recent evidence has suggested a 2-factor model that distinguishes between the *number* of representations that can be maintained in WM and the *resolution* of those representations. To determine how these factors relate to fluid intelligence, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis on multiple number-limited and resolution-limited measures of WM ability. The results strongly supported the 2-factor model, with fully orthogonal factors accounting for performance in the number-limited and resolution-limited conditions. Furthermore, the reliable relationship between WM capacity and fluid intelligence was exclusively supported by the number factor ($r = .66$), while the resolution factor made no reliable contribution ($r = -.05$). Thus, the relationship between WM capacity and standard measures of fluid intelligence is mediated by the number of representations that can be simultaneously maintained in WM rather than by the precision of those representations.

Working memory (WM) enables the active maintenance of information in a readily accessible state. In addition to its core role in most large-scale models of cognition (e.g., ACT-R, Anderson, 1993; EPIC, Kieras & Meyer, 1997), a central motivation for research on working memory is that it exhibits robust correlations with broader measures of intellectual ability such as scholastic aptitude and fluid intelligence (Cowan et al., 2005; Cowan et al., 2006; Engle, 2002; Engle et al., 1999). The link between WM capacity and fluid intelligence has been observed across a broad range of experimental paradigms. One prominent approach has demonstrated correlations between fluid intelligence and WM capacity estimated using “complex span measures” (e.g., Daneman & Carpenter, 1980; Turner & Engle, 1989) that were designed to tap into both storage capacity and processing aspects of WM ability (e.g., Daneman & Carpenter, 1980; Engle et al., 1999; Kyllonen & Christal, 1990; Turner & Engle, 1989). Moreover, although several studies have emphasized the importance of the processing component in complex span tasks for the link with fluid intelligence, subsequent research has shown that even tasks that measure pure storage -- in the absence of secondary processing loads -- exhibit clear correlations with fluid intelligence (Colom et al., 2005; Cowan et al., 2005). Specifically, such correlations are revealed when the task design prevents rehearsal and grouping processes that may skew a “pure” measure of storage capacity (e.g., Cowan, 2001; Cowan, Chen, & Rouder, 2004; Unsworth & Engle, 2007a)¹. For example, Cowan et al. (2005) examined the relationship between fluid intelligence and WM capacity measured in a simple change detection task introduced by Luck and Vogel (1997). Here, observers saw an array of multiple colored squares and then after a brief delay

Correspondence: Edward Awh, 1227 University, Eugene, Oregon 97405, awh@uoregon.edu, 541 346 4983.

Production Number:R631B

¹The core argument is that some types of grouping or rehearsal strategies (e.g., subvocal rehearsal; or the elaboration of memoranda into meaningful “chunks”) may artificially inflate capacity estimates. Because these strategies are more effective for some subjects than others, allowing such strategies to determine variance in the capacity measure may obscure real relationships between storage capacity and other measures.

indicated whether or not any of the items in a subsequent test array had changed or not. Although this task did not impose any other attention-demanding tasks or interfering stimuli, the resulting estimates of WM capacity were reliably correlated with fluid intelligence. Thus, pure storage capacity alone is linked with the broader construct of fluid intelligence.

Evidence for a link between storage capacity in WM and fluid intelligence is an important step in our understanding of the basic determinants of intelligence. In particular, such simple tasks allow for relatively straightforward conclusions regarding the core cognitive operations that play a role in fluid intelligence, thereby complementing the data from complex span procedures that tap into a broader range of cognitive abilities, including dual task coordination, resistance to interference, access to secondary memory, etc. (e.g., Mogle et al., 2008; Unsworth & Engle, 2007b). Nevertheless, recent research has suggested that storage capacity in WM may not be a unitary construct. We refer here to a distinction between the number of items that can be held in working memory and the resolution or precision of those representations. Xu and Chun (2006) provided neural evidence for such a dissociation with an imaging study that revealed distinct neural regions whose activity tracked the number of items that could be stored in working memory on the one hand, and the complexity of the stored items on the other hand. Given that more precise representations are required to support performance in memory tasks with complex stimuli, the results of Xu and Chun (2006) suggest that dissociable neural processes mediate number and resolution in visual working memory. In line with this hypothesis, Awh, Barton and Vogel (2007) examined individual differences in the number and resolution of representations in WM, and found no correlation between these measures (despite having established the internal reliability of each measure). That is, subjects who could maintain the largest number of items in working memory were not necessarily the subjects who had the clearest memories. These data suggest a two-factor model in which number and resolution represent distinct facets of WM ability.

The two-factor hypothesis raises a fundamental question about the relationship between working memory storage capacity and fluid intelligence. If number and resolution are distinct aspect of memory ability, which of these factors mediates the link with fluid intelligence? At first glance, it is reasonable to expect both factors to predict performance in standard measures of fluid intelligence. Consider two nonverbal measures of fluid intelligence that are prevalent in the literature, Raven's Progressive Matrices and Culture Fair. In each case, subjects are required to identify a missing item that completes a larger pattern defined across multiple complex objects.

To illustrate, Figure 1 depicts a problem styled in this fashion. The goal of the task is to identify the patterns presented across the 8 figures and to indicate which item below ("A", "B", or "C") completes the pattern. In this example, the correct answer is "C", consistent with a pattern in which one additional vertical line appears for each rightward shift in the matrix. Here, a compelling intuition is that patterns of this kind will be more efficiently apprehended when more items can be simultaneously kept active in WM. At the same time, determining the nature of the pattern also requires a sufficiently detailed representation of these complex objects to capture variations in the critical feature.

The central goal of the present work, therefore, was to provide a rigorous test of which components of storage capacity in WM mediate the relationship with fluid intelligence. The procedures we used to measure number and resolution in WM were motivated by recent evidence that the primary limiting factors in change detection depend critically on the similarity between the sample items that are encoded into memory, and the test items that are used to assess those memories (Awh, Barton & Vogel, 2007; Barton, Ester & Awh, 2009; Jiang, Shim & Makovski, 2008; Scolari, Vogel & Awh, 2008). When sample-test

similarity is low – such that changes are relatively large – then accurate change detection depends primarily on whether or not the critical item was represented in WM. This is a core assumption of the analytic procedure for estimating capacity developed by Pashler (1988) and refined by Cowan (2001). Thus, the probability of detecting such large changes provides an estimate of how many items were encoded from the sample array. Importantly, this interpretation of change detection performance has received strong converging support from studies of neural activity during the delay period of this task. Both electrophysiological (McCollough, Machizawa, & Vogel, 2007; Vogel & Machizawa, 2004; Vogel, McCollough, & Machizawa, 2005) and functional magnetic resonance imaging studies (Todd & Marois, 2004, 2005; Xu & Chun, 2006) have demonstrated that activity in the parietal cortex rises in a monotonic fashion as the number of items stored in WM increases. Critically, individual differences in neural responses during this task show that parietal activity reaches a plateau at the same set size in which the observer's capacity has been exhausted (McCollough, Machizawa, & Vogel, 2007; Vogel & Machizawa, 2004; Todd & Marois, 2005). This strong link between behavioral measures of (large) change detection and delay-specific neural activity bolsters the face validity of each method for estimating the number of items stored in WM. At the same time, both behavioral performance (Awh, Barton & Vogel, 2007) and neural activity (Xu & Chun, 2006) are qualitatively different when observers are asked to detect small changes between sample and test stimuli. Given that the same number of items are stored in these small change tasks (Awh, Barton & Vogel, 2007; Xu & Chun, 2006), we have argued that errors in detecting these small changes may depend on whether the representations in WM have sufficient resolution for discriminating between psychologically similar sample and test items. Thus, the present work employs a small-change detection task to operationalize resolution in visual WM.

We collected multiple measures of number and resolution in visual WM, enabling a latent variable analysis that attempted to identify the underlying “pure constructs” that determined memory performance. This allowed a rigorous evaluation of whether these two aspects of performance do indeed reflect distinct aspects of memory ability, as proposed by the two-factor model. In addition, this approach provided a clear test of how these two aspects of WM capacity relate to fluid intelligence.

Methods

Subjects

79 undergraduate students from University of Oregon participated in for monetary compensation (\$8/hour). Each subject performed the two intelligence tests (Culture Fair test and RAPM) first and then performed the working memory task.

Fluid intelligence Measures

The Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices Test (RAPM) and the Cattell Culture Fair Test (CFT) were used to estimate individuals' fluid intelligence. The CFT consists of four subsets of tasks each of which takes about 2.5 to 4 minutes. The score on each subtest was summed to create a single metric for the CFT score. We also administered the Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices (RAPM), using Set I as practice and Set 2 for measurement. First, participants completed four questions on Set I for instruction, and were asked to complete as many questions in Set II correctly possible in 30 mins. The Raven's score was calculated as the sum of correct answers in Set II.

Obtaining Separate Measures of Number and Resolution in Visual WM

To assess number and resolution in visual working memory, we adapted a change detection procedure employed by Awh, Barton and Vogel (2007). The possible stimuli consisted of

four geometric shapes that were modeled after the line drawings used in the two non-verbal measures we used to assess fluid intelligence, Raven's Progressive Matrices and Culture Fair. The four shapes included two ovals and two rectangles. Thus, as Figure 2 illustrates, changes between the possible shapes varied systematically between large changes (e.g., when an oval shape changed to a rectangular shape, or vice versa) and small changes (e.g., changes from one oval to another, or from one rectangle to the other). As the data will show, our assumptions regarding which types of changes were "large" and "small" were confirmed by large and reliable differences in change detection performance; accuracy in the big change condition was more than twice as high as in the small change condition. Next, we outline why performance in the large and small change conditions may be determined, respectively, by the number and the resolution of the representations stored in working memory.

The rationale was that the detection of large changes would be limited primarily by whether or not the critical item was stored in working memory, because the changes were large enough to minimize errors in the process of comparing an item in memory and the corresponding test item. By contrast, during small change trials we reasoned that even when the critical item was stored, the subjects' ability to detect the changes would be primarily determined by whether the critical item was stored with sufficient resolution to discriminate the difference between the sample and test items (see Awh, Barton & Vogel, 2007 for further discussion)². Finally, we also included change detection trials with highly discriminable colored squares so that performance in this well-characterized variant of the change detection procedure could be compared with performance with the geometric shapes.

Stimuli

The stimuli in the change detection procedure were displayed on a centrally positioned light grey region (19.5×19.5 degrees) that appeared over a dark grey background. Sample arrays contained either 4 or 8 items, evenly divided between the four quadrants of the screen, with a minimum center-to-center distance of 4 degrees between items. Colored squares (1.5 degrees on each side) were used to generate sample displays during color trials. The possible colors were red, blue, green, yellow, black and white; these colors were randomly selected with the constraint that no color appeared more than twice in a single sample array. During shape trials, sample arrays were created by randomly selecting from the four possible shapes (1.3 degrees on the short side and 2.5 degrees on the long side) with the constraint that at least one rectangle and one oval were included in each array.

Procedure

1092 ms after the onset of a central fixation point, a sample array of either four or eight objects was presented for 500 ms. A 1s retention interval started upon the offset of the sample array, followed by the presentation of a single test item that remained visible until a response key was pressed. Subjects reported whether the object was the same object as the one presented at the same location in the memory array. The change detection procedure included 9 blocks of 48 trials each. Within each block, 16 trials employed color stimuli (8 "same" and 8 "change" trials, divided equally over set sizes 4 and 8). Set size 4 trials were included for two reasons. First, there has been some indication in the literature that performance with smaller set sizes may have a weaker link with fluid intelligence, perhaps because subjects differ in their ability to handle supra-span displays (Cusack et al, 2009);

²Of course, even in small change trials, the number of items stored determines the upper bound for performance. The experimental rationale, therefore, rests on the assumption that when the changes are small, the primary source of behavioral variance shifts from how many items are stored in memory, to whether the stored representations are clear enough to enable the detection of a relatively subtle change.

thus including both set sizes allowed us to replicate previous findings that set size may mediate the strength of the relationship with fluid intelligence. Second, the set size 8 trials are very difficult (given that they contain approximately twice the number of items that an average subject can store), and the set size 4 trials may help to keep subjects from deciding the task is intractable. The remaining 32 trials employed the geometric shapes (16 “same” and 16 “change” trials, divided equally over set sizes 4 and 8). Shape memory arrays were created by randomly selecting from the four possible shapes. When one of the shapes changed (with probability .5), it was replaced by a shape randomly selected from the remaining three shapes, such that approximately two thirds of change trials involved big changes (i.e., from oval to rectangle or rectangle to oval) and the remaining one third of change trials were small changes (i.e., from oval to oval or rectangle to rectangle). To derive capacity estimates (k), we used the formula first invented by Pashler (1988) and refined by Cowan (2001): $k = \text{set size} * (\text{hit rate} - \text{false alarm rate})$, where k represents the number of objects stored, set size is the number of items in the sample array, hit rate is the proportion of “change” trials correctly detected, and false alarm rate is the proportion of “same” trials that elicited a “change” response. The k formula is a standard metric in the visual working memory literature, because it corrects for response bias and enables a common metric of performance across different set sizes³. In the primary SEM analysis, we used the average k from set size 4 and 8 trials. When the raw correlations between WM capacity and intelligence were examined separately for each set size, a qualitatively similar pattern of correlations was observed (see Footnote 5)

Results

First, we employed an exploratory factor analysis to test the hypothesis that two separate factors account for the number and the resolution of the representations that could be maintained in visual working memory (see Tables 1. a and b for descriptive statistics and full correlation matrix).

This analysis included five separate measures of change detection performance defined by the type of item probed and the size of the change between the sample and test stimulus: (1) color k (color changes were always big); (2) big oval k (changes from ovals to rectangles); (3) small oval k (changes from one oval to the other); (4) big rect k (changes from rectangles to ovals); and (5) small rect k (changes from one rectangle to the other). The two-factor hypothesis predicted that capacity estimates from the three big change conditions (i.e., color k , big oval k and big rect k) should load on a single factor related to the number of items that could be held in working memory, while the two small change conditions (small oval k and small rect k) should load on a distinct factor related to the resolution or precision of the representations stored in working memory. The exploratory factor analysis confirmed that performance in the big and small change trials was best accounted for by a two-factor model. The three “big change” conditions (color k (.84), big oval k (.88), and big rect k (.90)) all loaded strongly on a single factor, hereafter referred to as the “number” factor. By contrast, the “small change” conditions (small oval k (.87), small rect k (.88)) loaded on an orthogonal factor, hereafter referred to as the “resolution” factor (see Table 2).

There were no significant cross loadings ($p = .15$). These data therefore conform precisely to the predictions of the two-factor model, suggesting that number and resolution are distinct aspects of working memory ability.

³Also, note that a shared pool of “same” trials contributed to “ k ” estimates in the big and small change conditions. Here again, the motivation was to provide a common metric for these two types of trials while correcting for the influence of response bias.

Having found strong support for a two-factor model of storage capacity, we examined which of these two aspects of storage capacity mediated the relationship with fluid intelligence. We carried out a confirmatory factor analysis of a model that included two independent factors for number and resolution and a third factor for fluid intelligence. The two measures of fluid intelligence loaded strongly on a common factor for fluid intelligence, or “g” (RAPM (.83) and CFT (.70)). The fit between the overall model and the observed data was excellent (χ^2 (13, $n = 79$) = 10.845, $p = .6238$, RMSEA = .00, CFI = 1.0, see Figure 3).

Moreover, the analysis demonstrated that the number and resolution factors had very different relationships with fluid intelligence. The number factor showed a strong positive correlation with fluid intelligence ($r = .66$, S.E. = 0.1), but the resolution factor showed no evidence of a reliable link with fluid intelligence ($r = -.05$, S.E. = 0.13). Moreover, constraining the path from mnemonic resolution to fluid intelligence to be 0 did not change the fit of the model ($\chi^2_{\text{Difference}}$ (1, $n = 79$) = .286, $p = .59$) (Table 3), strengthening the conclusion that mnemonic resolution was unrelated to fluid intelligence.

These results suggest that the relationship between WM capacity and fluid intelligence is driven solely by the ability to hold multiple discrete representations in WM, and not by the clarity of those representations⁴. Finally, although 79 participants is lower than the number employed in many analyses of this kind, we note that the standard errors around the correlations between fluid intelligence and slots (0.1) and resolution (0.13) are small. Thus, given the very strong contrast between the links observed between fluid intelligence and the two aspects of capacity (i.e., number and resolution), even a relatively large increase in the number of observations would be unlikely to change the core conclusions of this study.

Conclusions

The present work provides a new insight into the relationship between WM capacity and fluid intelligence. Using a simple change detection procedure, we obtained strong support for a two-factor model of WM capacity, in which the number and resolution of the representations in WM are determined by distinct aspects of memory ability. This two-factor model enabled a straightforward test of which aspects of WM capacity mediate its link with fluid intelligence. The data were very clear. The number of representations that could be held in WM showed a robust correlation with fluid intelligence ($r = .66$), while mnemonic resolution showed no trace of a reliable link with fluid intelligence ($r = -.05$). Thus, the relationship between storage capacity in WM and fluid intelligence appears to be mediated solely by the maximum number of items that can be simultaneously stored in WM, rather than by the resolution or precision of those representations.

One important consequence of these results is that in designing and selecting working memory tasks researchers need to be mindful of the aspects they want to have reflected in the performance scores. Only tasks that assess sensitivity to large visual changes seem to relate to complex reasoning abilities as assessed in fluid intelligence tasks. Although the resolution aspect can be assessed reliably, future research is required to assess its external validity and its generality. One interesting possibility goes back to Spearman's distinction

⁴One alternative explanation of the correlation between big change performance and fluid intelligence deserves comment. Given that big change trials were twice as frequent as small change trials, it is possible that the correlation between big change performance and intelligence resulted intelligent subject being more likely to detect this contingency. Note, however, that the strength of the correlations between fluid intelligence and number was very similar across the color and shape change detection trials, even though all changes in the color condition were big (thereby obviating the need to “notice” this contingency). Moreover, even if big change performance was affected by whether subjects noticed the greater frequency of those trials, this would not explain why there was no apparent link between mnemonic resolution and fluid intelligence (despite high internal loadings that demonstrate the reliability of the resolution measure). Thus, the core conclusion that number and resolution in working memory have different relationships with fluid intelligence may hold even if sensitivity to trial proportions had an influence on big change performance.

between general ability (g) and specific abilities (s): Possibly g is reflected in the number of slots, whereas the resolution aspect reflects domain-specific, and possibly experience-dependent characteristics of mnemonic processing.

Our findings fall in line with a recent observation that similar “chunk limits” have been observed in studies of capacity limits during abstract reasoning tasks and storage in WM (Halford, Cowan, & Andrews, 2007). Halford and colleagues (2007) suggested that a common attentional resource might be recruited to maintain individuated items in WM on the one hand, and to apprehend the interrelationships between relevant elements during reasoning on the other hand. In each case, average capacity estimates hover in the range of 3–4 items or interrelationships. The present data corroborate this finding by demonstrating that the abilities tracked by these memory and intelligence tasks strongly covary across individuals. Thus, the number of items that can be held in this online memory system may be a key limiting factor in our ability to apprehend abstract relationships between novel items.

Number of Slots or Control over Slots?

The present data reveal a sharp contrast in how fluid intelligence relates to number and resolution in visual working memory; while a robust correlation was found between the number and g constructs, no similar link was observed between resolution and g. Nevertheless, important questions remain regarding the core sources of variability in the number construct. One intuitive account of this measure is that it reflects variability across individuals in “how many” slots are available; from this perspective, low capacity individuals are those that have less space in working memory. An alternative view, however, is that apparent variations in the number of items stored may instead reflect individual differences in “filtering efficiency” such that individuals with low capacity have difficulty excluding irrelevant information from reaching WM (McNab & Klingberg, 2007; Vogel, McCollough, & Machizawa, 2005). In this case, even if the number of slots available was relatively constant across observers, large variations in WM performance could emerge based on individual differences in filtering efficiency. Both the “space” and “filtering” accounts can account for individual differences in the number of relevant items represented in WM, but they posit distinct reasons for these differences.

In favor of the “filtering” account, a broad range of work has revealed tight correlations between WM capacity and filtering efficiency (Engle, 2002; Fukuda & Vogel, 2009; McNab & Klingberg, 2007; Vogel, McCollough, & Machizawa, 2005). Indeed, a recent study (Cusack et al, 2009) suggested that the link between visual WM and intelligence may be best explained by selection efficacy during these memory tasks, rather than by the total amount of “space” in WM⁵. At the same time, other studies have highlighted cases in which group differences in memory performance seem better accounted for by variations in “space” rather than “filtering” (e.g., Cowan et al, 2010; Gold et al., 2006); these results suggest that it may be useful to maintain a distinction between “space” and “filtering” effects on WM capacity. So far, it is not clear whether only one of these accounts can explain all the variation across individuals in the storage of relevant items, or if these abilities are separate but strongly covarying aspects of memory function. Thus, an important goal for future work will be to determine whether “space” and “filtering” abilities account for unique variance in broad measures of intellectual function.

⁵This argument was based on the observation that correlations between WM capacity and IQ were observed only for arrays larger than four items. This motivated the hypothesis that those correlations are driven more by the nature of the response to supra-span arrays rather than capacity *per se*. In the current data set, the raw correlations with fluid intelligence were similar (and statistically reliable) between set size 4 (mean r-value = .34) and set size 8 (mean r-value = .38).

Acknowledgments

Portions of this work were supported by NIH-R01MH087214-01 to E.A. and E.K.V. We thank Nash Unsworth for valuable discussion of these findings.

References

- Anderson, JR. Rules of the Mind. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1993.
- Awh E, Barton B, Vogel EK. Visual working memory represents a fixed number of items, regardless of complexity. *Psychological Science* 2007;18(7):622–628. [PubMed: 17614871]
- Barton B, Ester EF, Awh E. Discrete resource allocation in visual working memory. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform* 2009;35(5):1359–1367. [PubMed: 19803642]
- Colom R, Flores-Mendoza C, Quiroga MaA, Privado J. Working Memory and General Intelligence: The Role of Short-Term Storage. *Personality and Individual Differences* 2005;39:1005–1014.
- Cowan N. The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 2001;24:87–185. [PubMed: 11515286]
- Cowan N, Chen Z, Rouders JN. Constant capacity in an immediate serial-recall task: A logical sequel to Miller (1956). *Psychological Science* 2004;15:634–640. [PubMed: 15327636]
- Cowan N, Elliott EM, Saults JS, Morey CC, Mattox SM, Hismjatullina A, Conway ARA. On the Capacity of Attention: Its Estimation and Its Role in Working Memory and Cognitive Aptitudes. *Cognitive Psychology*. 2005
- Cowan N, Fristoe NM, Elliott EM, Brunner RP, Saults JS. Scope of attention, control of attention, and intelligence in children and *adults*. *Memory & Cognition* 2006;34(8):1754–1768.
- Cowan N, Morey CC, AuBuchon AM, Zwilling CE, Gilchrist AL. Seven-year-olds allocate attention like adults unless working memory is overloaded. *Developmental Science* 2010;13:120–133. [PubMed: 20121868]
- Cusack R, Lehmann M, Veldsman M, Mitchell DJ. Encoding strategy and not visual working memory capacity correlates with intelligence. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 2009;16(4):641–647. [PubMed: 19648446]
- Daneman M, Carpenter PA. Individual differences in working memory and reading. *Journal of Verbal Learning & Verbal Behavior* 1980;19:450–466.
- Engle RW. Working memory capacity as executive attention. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 2002;11:19–23.
- Engle RW, Tuholski SW, Laughlin J, Conway ARA. Working memory, short-term memory and general fluid intelligence: A latent variable model approach. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 1999;128:309–331. [PubMed: 10513398]
- Fukuda K, Vogel EK. Human variation in overriding attentional capture. *Journal of Neuroscience* 2009;29(27):8726–8733. [PubMed: 19587279]
- Gold JM, Fuller RL, Robinson BM, McMahon RP, Braun EL, Luck SJ. Intact attentional control of working memory encoding in schizophrenia. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 2006;115:658–673. [PubMed: 17100524]
- Halford GS, Cowan N, Andrews G. Separating cognitive capacity from knowledge: a new hypothesis. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 2007;11:237–242.
- Jiang YV, Shim WM, Makovski T. Visual working memory for line orientations and face identities. *Percept Psychophys* 2008;70(8):1581–1591. [PubMed: 19064500]
- Kieras D, Meyer DE. An overview of the EPIC architecture for cognition and performance with application to human-computer interaction. *Human-Computer Interaction* 1997;12:391–438.
- Kyllonen PC, Christal RE. Reasoning ability is (little more than) working-memory capacity?! *Intelligence* 1990;14:389–433.
- Luck SJ, Vogel EK. The capacity of visual working memory for features and conjunctions. *Nature* 1997 November 20;390:279–281. [PubMed: 9384378]
- McCollough AW, Machizawa MG, Vogel EK. Electrophysiological measures of maintaining representations in visual working memory. *Cortex* 2007;43(1):77–94. [PubMed: 17334209]

- McNab F, Klingberg T. Prefrontal cortex and basal ganglia control access to working memory. *Nature Neuroscience* 2007;11:103–107.
- Mogle JA, Lovett BJ, Stawski Rs, Sliwinski MJ. What's so special about working memory? An Examination of the relationships among working memory, secondary memory, and fluid intelligence. *Psychological Science* 2008;19(11):1071–77. [PubMed: 19076475]
- Pashler H. Familiarity and visual change detection. *Percept Psychophys* 1988;44(4):369–378. [PubMed: 3226885]
- Scolari M, Vogel EK, Awh E. Perceptual expertise enhances the resolution but not the number of representations in working memory. *Psychon Bull Rev* 2008;15(1):215–222. [PubMed: 18605506]
- Todd JJ, Marois R. Capacity limit of visual short-term memory in human posterior parietal cortex. *Nature* 2004;428(6984):751–754. [PubMed: 15085133]
- Todd JJ, Marois R. Posterior parietal cortex activity predicts individual differences in visual short-term memory capacity. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci* 2005;5(2):144–155. [PubMed: 16180621]
- Turner ML, Engle RW. Is working memory capacity task dependent? *Journal of Memory & Language* 1989;28:127–154.
- Unsworth N, Engle RW. On the division of short-term and working memory: An examination of simple and complex spans and their relation to higher order abilities. *Psychological Bulletin* 2007a;133:1038–1066. [PubMed: 17967093]
- Unsworth N, Engle RW. The nature of individual differences in working memory capacity: Active maintenance in primary memory and controlled search from secondary memory. *Psychological Review* 2007b;114:104–132. [PubMed: 17227183]
- Vogel EK, Machizawa MG. Neural activity predicts individual differences in visual working memory capacity. *Nature* 2004;428(6984):748–751. [PubMed: 15085132]
- Vogel EK, McCollough AW, Machizawa MG. Neural measures reveal individual differences in controlling access to working memory. *Nature* 2005;438(7067):500–503. [PubMed: 16306992]
- Xu Y, Chun MM. Dissociable neural mechanisms supporting visual short-term memory for objects. *Nature* 2006;440:91–95. [PubMed: 16382240]

Figure 1.
A typical example of a fluid intelligence task
Note: The correct answer is C.

Figure 2. Illustration of a sample display (set size varied between 4 and 8), and the single-item probe display that appeared after a 1 s retention period.

Figure 3.

Results of the factor analysis. Based on the initial exploratory factor analysis, we generated three latent factors for g, working memory slots, and working memory resolution. The g factor was estimated from RAPM and CFT measures. The slots factor was generated from Color k, Big Oval k, and Big Rect k. Lastly, the resolution factor was generated from Small Oval k and Small Rect k. The resulting model above was simultaneously tested.

Note: RAPM = Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices, CFT = Cattell Culture Fair, Color k = K estimate from color Conditions, Small Oval k = K estimate from within-categorical oval conditions, Small Rect k = K estimate from within-categorical rectangle conditions, Big Oval k = K estimate from big-change oval conditions, Big Rect k = K estimate from big-change rectangle conditions.

Table 1.a

Descriptive statistics for WM tasks and intelligence tasks

	RAPM	CFT	Color	Small oval k	Small rect k	Big oval k	Big rect k
Mean	22.00	26.19	3.36	1.40	1.16	3.36	3.52
SD	4.61	4.53	0.92	1.13	1.05	1.17	1.13
Range	11.00, 32.00	37.00, 14.00	5.38, 1.06	5.50, -0.49	4.66, -1.17	5.85, 1.11	5.77, 0.81
Skewness	-0.27	-0.52	-0.06	0.83	0.57	-0.03	0.00
Kurtosis	-0.20	0.46	0.18	1.13	0.80	-0.72	-0.42

Note: RAPM = Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices, CFT = Cattell Culture Fair, Color k = K estimate from color Conditions, Small oval k = K estimate from within-categorical oval conditions, Small rect k = K estimate from within-categorical rectangle conditions, Big oval k = K estimate from cross-categorical oval conditions, Big rect k = K estimate from cross-categorical rectangle conditions.

Table 1.b

A correlation table for intelligence and WM capacity measures

	RAPM	CFT	Color	Small oval k	Small rect k	Big oval k	Big rect k
RAPM	1						
CFT	.58***	1					
Color	.46***	.41***	1				
Small Oval k	.06	.00	.22	1			
Small Rect k	.04	.00	.13	.55***	1		
Big Oval k	.44***	.34**	.63***	.22	.13	1	
Big Rect k	.42***	.36**	.62***	.06	-.01	.70***	1

Note: RAPM = Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices, CFT = Cattell Culture Fair, Color k = K estimate from within-categorical oval conditions, Small rect k = K estimate from within-categorical rectangle conditions, Big oval k = K estimate from cross-categorical oval conditions, Big rect k = K estimate from cross-categorical rectangle conditions.

** = p < .01,
*** = p < .001

Table 2

Factor loadings of 5 WM capacity measures

	Number	Resolution
Color k	.841	
Big oval k	.877	
Big rect k	.897	
Small oval k		.869
Small rect k		.883

Note: Color k = K estimate from color Conditions, Small oval k = K estimate from within-categorical oval conditions, Small rect k = K estimate from within-categorical rectangle conditions, Big oval k = K estimate from cross-categorical oval conditions, Big rect k = K estimate from cross-categorical rectangle conditions. Loadings for missing cells were all less than .15.

Table 3

Statistics for CFA analysis

Model	df_M	$\chi^2(p\text{-value})$	χ^2 Difference with Model 1 ($p\text{-value}$)	RMSEA (90 % CI)	CFI
Model 1 (Figure 2)	13	10.845 (.6238)	-	.00 (.00, .09)	1.0
Model 2	14	11.131 (.6757)	.286 (.5928)	.00 (.00, .09)	1.0

Note: Chi-squares not significant at the .05 level indicate good fits to the data. Non-significant Chi-square difference with Model 1 indicates the model has equivalent fit with the data. Lower values of root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) indicate better fit. A RMSEA value lower than .1 indicates a good fit to the data. Values above .95 for Bentler's comparative fit index (CFI) indicate excellent fit.