

Episodic Memory Across the Lifespan: General Trajectories and Modifiers

Yana Fandakova, Ulman Lindenberger, Yee Lee Shing

Center for Lifespan Psychology, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany

Book chapter to appear in:

The Wiley Handbook on The Cognitive Neuroscience of Memory (2015)

Publisher: Wiley-Blackwell, Editors: Donna Rose Addis, Morgan Barense, Audrey Duarte,

pp.309-325

Abstract

We present an overview of episodic memory development from childhood to old age that integrates behavioral and neural evidence. The overview is informed by the two-component framework (Shing et al. 2010), which conceives of lifespan changes in episodic memory as the interplay of two separable but interacting components, one associative and the other strategic. We note that normative age gradients in associative and strategic components co-exist with stable individual differences, and with individual differences in change. We illustrate these claims by reviewing factors that have been shown to affect memory functioning and development in childhood –parental style and physical fitness– and in adulthood and old age –vascular risk and physical fitness. To highlight age-graded differences in memory plasticity, we also review the literature on memory training. The various strands of research demonstrate the utility of the two-component framework not only for examining mean differences among age groups, but also for generating predictions about mechanisms that drive individual differences in episodic memory.

Keywords: long-term memory, development, aging, parental style, physical fitness, vascular risk

Introduction

Episodic memory (EM) refers to memory about events that are bound to specific times and places in the past (Tulving 2002). It allows humans to re-experience multiple aspects of events that happened from minutes to years ago. The remembering of previously experienced episodes increases during childhood (Schneider & Pressley 1997) and declines in old and very old age (Kausler 1994). At first sight, then, it might appear that changes in adulthood are a reversal or mirror image of changes during childhood. However, development of EM is driven by a constellation of factors, including changes in neural brain mechanisms, accumulation of experience and learning, and genetic influences (Lindenberger, Li, and Bäckman 2006; Werkle-Bergner et al. 2006). Importantly, the influences of these factors do not remain constant across the lifespan, such that the lower performance levels in children and older adults relative to younger adults may differ in etiology (Baltes, Lindenberger, and Staudinger 2006).

In the present chapter we provide an overview of the general trajectories of memory development across the lifespan, integrating both behavioral and neural evidence. We adopt the two-component framework (Shing et al. 2010) that conceptualizes change in EM across the lifespan as the interplay of two largely independent but interacting components, one associative and the other strategic (cf. Simons and Spiers 2003). The associative component refers to mechanisms that bind different features of an event into a coherent representation, and is mediated by areas of the medial temporal lobe (MTL) at the neural level (Zimmer, Mecklinger, and Lindenberger 2006). The strategic component, on the other hand, refers to control processes that aid and regulate memory functions at encoding and retrieval. Neurally, the strategic component is supported by regions of the prefrontal cortex (PFC; Miller and Cohen 2001) and the parietal lobes (Cabeza et al. 2008). A series of behavioral experiments (Brehmer et al., 2007;

Shing et al. 2008) provided initial evidence for a dissociation in the lifespan developmental trajectories of the two components, such that the associative component is relatively functional by middle childhood (ages 10-12), but exhibits age-related decline in older adults. In contrast, the strategic component is functioning below the levels of younger adults in both children and older adults, in line with the protracted maturation and early age-related decline in PFC regions. Normative age gradients in associative and strategic components co-exist with individual differences in change (de Frias et al. 2007; Ghisletta et al., 2012) and plasticity (Fandakova, Shing, and Lindenberger, 2012). In the second part of the present chapter we address several factors that have been shown to affect individual differences in EM mechanisms at different life periods. We attempt to interpret these findings from the perspectives of the two-component framework of EM.

EM Across the Lifespan: General trajectories

Evidence for Memory Improvement in Children

EM undergoes substantial changes from infancy to adolescence. With some tasks, performance in source memory tasks is already above chance by preschool years (Lindsay, Johnson, and Kwon 1991), but with more difficult tasks, such as distinguishing between internally-generated stimuli or making distinctions after substantial delays, developmental improvements are observed into the school years (Kovacs and Newcombe 2006). Preschoolers have difficulties in binding together an item and its context into a coherent representation (Sluzenski et al. 2004). In contrast, there seems to be little change in binding abilities after the age of six (Sluzenski, Newcombe, & Kovacs, 2006). Recollection of specific details associated with past events also improves gradually during childhood, with little or no developmental change observed in familiarity-based processing (Ghetti and Angelini 2008). Developmental differences are also observed when memory for specific details of past events (i.e. verbatim

traces) is compared to the ability to extract the general semantic meaning of past events (i.e. gist traces). While increases in verbatim traces are observed during preschool and early elementary school years, gist traces continue to develop up to adolescence (Brainerd and Reyna 2005).

With increasing age, the use of elaborative strategies to support the formation of new memories becomes an increasingly important part of children's learning behavior, especially between late childhood and late adolescence (Schneider and Pressley 1997). Age-related improvements in metamemory also contribute to the rise of memory accuracy during childhood (Ghetti, Castelli, and Lyons 2010). Metamemory refers to a set of constructs, including beliefs, awareness and knowledge about one's memory, as well as about different memory strategies and their effectiveness in a particular task setting (Nelson and Narens 1990). While children's ability to utilize memory strategies to facilitate EM depends on a number of developmental factors such as metamemory and processing resources, temperament and motivation may also play important roles (Bjorklund et al. 1997; Miller and Seier 1994).

Evidence for Memory Decline in Older Adults

At the other end of the lifespan, aging is associated with a pronounced decline in EM functioning (Ghisletta et al., 2012; Rönnlund et al. 2005). Different aspects of memory performance are disproportionately affected by aging, with memory for content showing smaller age-related decrease than memory for context (Chalfonte and Johnson 1996; Spencer and Raz 1995). Older adults exhibit difficulties creating and retrieving intra- and inter-item associations (Old and Naveh-Benjamin 2008). During retrieval, recollection of particular contextual details is more strongly affected by senescent changes than familiarity-based processing (Light et al. 2000).

Age-related differences in EM are magnified under conditions that require self-initiated strategic processing (Cohn, Emrich, and Moscovitch 2008). Older adults are less likely than

younger adults to spontaneously use effective strategies to mediate memory performance (Dunlosky and Hertzog 1998). Metamemory abilities also decline during senescence (Dodson and Krueger 2006). A number of studies have examined cognitive decline in relation to proximity to death in older individuals (i.e. terminal decline). Increased decline in EM has been identified as early as 8.4 years prior to death (Sliwinski et al. 2006), with a rate twice that observed as a function of chronological age (MacDonald, Hultsch, and Dixon 2011). However, the paths associated with aging and terminal decline vary greatly across individuals (Ghisletta et al. 2012; Lindenberger and Ghisletta 2009) as a function of various factors, including lifestyle (e.g., Schaie 2012), vascular risk (e.g., Raz et al. 2005), and genetic influences (e.g., Deary et al., 2012).

Taken together, both children and older adults perform below the level of younger adults under conditions that require the detailed recollection of specific contextual details from previous experiences. Furthermore, strategic and metacognitive abilities of both age groups seem to be less efficient compared to younger adults. However, while associative binding is relatively function by middle childhood, older adults show difficulties in forming and retrieving associations of episodic details.

Neural Evidence from Child Development

Functional differences at encoding. Few studies have examined age differences in neural activation during EM tasks in childhood and adolescence. In general, developmental differences in memory functioning are paralleled by differences in the functional and structural integrity of the underlying brain circuitry during development. For example, Ofen and colleagues (2007) found that during the encoding of subsequently remembered scenes, PFC, but not MTL, activation increased with age in children and adults between 8 and 24 years. This finding is in contrast with a study by Ghetti and colleagues (2010), who found that for both adolescents and younger adults, higher activations in the hippocampus and the posterior parahippocampus during

incidental encoding of items that were later on recollected with specific detail compared to those that were later on forgotten. However, younger children (8 and 10-11 years old) did not show such discrimination, suggesting an increasing specialization of MTL regions to support recollection even in middle childhood.

Functional differences in retrieval. Only a few studies examined age differences in neural activation during EM retrieval. Paz-Alonso and colleagues (2008) investigated retrieval activations for true and false memories among 8-year-olds, 12-year-olds, and adults. Anterior MTL was engaged in item-specific recollection for 12-year-olds and adults, but not in the younger children. Children of both age groups engaged ventrolateral and anterior PFC to a lesser degree than adults, suggesting continued maturation of semantic and monitoring processes during childhood. These findings were only partially supported by a recent neuroimaging study that examined retrieval of previously studied complex scenes in 8 to 21-year-olds (Ofen et al. 2012). In this study, activation in ventrolateral PFC increased with age for successfully retrieved scenes, confirming the late maturation of PFC regions. However, in contrast to Paz-Alonso and colleagues (2008), no age differences in MTL activations were found. Notably, age related increases in parietal activations across middle childhood and adolescence were consistently reported in both studies. More research is needed to understand the neural mechanisms by which age differences in parietal regions contribute to age-related increases in the ability to recollect past episodes that are rich in contextual details.

Taken together, the majority of studies reported developmental trends in PFC regions that support control aspects of EM. On the structural level, gray matter volume in the frontal lobes initially increases up to middle childhood and subsequently declines during adolescence, with the most dorsal aspects of the frontal regions showing the latest maturation (Sowell et al. 2003). White matter volume increases linearly in both anterior-posterior and inferior-superior directions

during childhood and adolescence (Colby, Van Horn, and Sowell 2011), probably reflecting increments in the speed and efficiency of communication among brain regions as a consequence of axon myelination.

In contrast, the findings with regard to age differences in MTL activation are mixed. One possible reason for this discrepancy might be the heterogeneity of maturational changes across subregions of the hippocampus. For instance, Gogtay and collaborators (2006) did not find changes in total hippocampal volume between 4 and 25 years, but reported that the volume of the posterior hippocampus gradually increased with age, whereas the volume of the hippocampal head decreased with age. With regard to the functional significance of these structural changes, successful retrieval of item-color associations was shown to engage distinct regions along the hippocampal axis in children (8-11-year-olds) and adults (DeMaster and Ghetti 2012). While children engaged the posterior hippocampus when correctly remembering the color with which line drawings were previously studied, correct source memory was associated with anterior hippocampus activation in younger adults.

Neural Evidence from Aging

Structural and functional changes in MTL. At the other end of the lifespan, age-related changes in the functional and structural integrity of the cortical network supporting EM, particularly the PFC and MTL, are frequently observed in neuroimaging studies. Gray matter changes are especially pronounced in the hippocampus, and less so in the surrounding cortex (Raz et al. 2005). Findings regarding MTL functional alterations during episodic encoding and retrieval in old age are contradictory, with some studies reporting age-related decreases (Daselaar et al. 2006; Grady, McIntosh, and Craik 2003), and others not (Dulas and Duarte 2011; Persson et al. 2010). One potential factor that may explain differences across studies is that differences in brain activation are often confounded by differences in memory performance, which compromise

the interpretation of results at the neural level (Rugg and Morcom 2005). In addition, age-related decreases in hippocampal activations are relatively minor before age 70 (Salami et al. 2012), suggesting that differences across studies may at least partly be related to age range differences of the study samples.

Longitudinally, Persson and colleagues (2012) reported that for some older adults (55 to 79 years) examined in the context of the BETULA study memory performance decreased across a period of 10 years, whereas for others it remained stable or even increased. Importantly, decrease in hippocampal activation and gray matter volume was observed only in the older adults who showed a pronounced decline in memory performance, but not in the older adults who remained stable in their performance. This study is important because it directly related longitudinal decline in memory performance in old age to functional and structural changes in relevant brain areas. At the same time, it underscores the need to delineate the physiological correlates that help to maintain memory performance in old age (Nyberg et al. 2012).

Structural and functional changes in PFC. Prefrontal brain regions are among the areas that undergo the strongest atrophy in old age (Raz et al. 2005). Changes in the microstructure of white matter integrity accompany these gray matter losses (Burzynska et al. 2009). Older adults often show lower PFC activation during both encoding (Dennis et al. 2008; Dulas and Duarte 2011), and retrieval of past episodes (Duarte, Henson, and Graham 2008; Fandakova, Lindenberger, and Shing 2013). In contrast, some studies have reported additional PFC activation in older adults than in younger adults (Cabeza et al. 2002), which has been interpreted as compensatory activity for age-related decline in posterior brain regions. Alternatively, additional PFC activations might reflect decrease of neural efficiency or less differentiated processing with advancing adult age (Baltes and Lindenberger 1997).

It is worth noting that most analyses suggesting “overrecruitment” of task-relevant brain

regions with advancing adult age rely on cross-sectional evidence. Again, findings from the BETULA study provide a notable exception. Nyberg and colleagues (2010) investigated longitudinal change in brain structure and function over a period of 6 years. While the cross-sectional analysis suggested *increased* activation of dorsal PFC in older adults, longitudinally activity in this region *decreased*, indicating that aging is associated with under- rather than overrecruitment of PFC regions. These findings are corroborated by recent evidence showing that older adults who deviate less from younger adults in the brain networks engaged during incidental picture encoding have higher recognition performance (Düzel et al. 2010), suggesting that the extent of preservation in functional networks in old age is an important determinant of individual differences in memory performance. Based on this pattern of findings, Nyberg et al. (2012) suggested that brain maintenance (or relative lack of brain pathology) constitutes the primary determinant of successful memory aging (see also Lindenberger, Burzynska, and Nagel 2012)

EM Across the Lifespan: Modifiers

As reviewed above, a wide range of evidence points to substantial heterogeneity in EM performance during all age periods, and to reliable and substantial individual differences in developmental change. To understand these individual differences in level and change, researchers need to delineate the mechanisms that influence the memory development of individuals. These mechanisms are likely to unfold as epigenetic interactions between genetic makeup and environmental factors, and appear as lifestyle choices such as physical exercise, cognitive stimulation, nutrition, social participation, and other dimensions of daily life that influence memory performance. In the following sections, we selectively review three key factors that have been identified to influence individual differences in level and change of memory performance in childhood –parental style and physical fitness– and adulthood –vascular risk and

physical fitness. We also provide an overview of key findings from the cognitive training literature, focusing on individual differences in training, as a demonstration of memory plasticity across the lifespan. These factors are discussed in the context of the two-component framework. We aim to demonstrate the framework's utility for classifying them according to their effect on associative and strategic aspects of EM. Doing so may foster our understanding of their common and distinctive effects and may help generate questions and models to be tested in future research.

Parental Style

Animal models suggest that environmental enrichment in early life has long-lasting beneficial effects on brain development (Greenough, Black, and Wallace 1987). However, the specific mechanisms by which experience shapes the brain in human are not well understood. Enriched environment entails complexity in the sensory input and social stimulation from an individual's surroundings. In early childhood, a major share of social stimulation is related to the parents and/or primary caregivers. Of particular relevance to human memory development is retrospective data suggesting a link between lack of early nurturance due to maltreatment and later impaired brain development, including hippocampal volumes. Animal model of stress provides hypotheses of how hippocampus is particularly vulnerable to the effects of adverse early environment (see review in Tottenham, Nim, and Sheridan 2009).

There are relatively few human studies that prospectively track the effect of parental care on subsequent brain and cognitive development. In a longitudinal study of depressed and healthy children, maternal support (as measured with a parent-child interaction paradigm) in early childhood was positively associated with hippocampal volume measured at school age (Luby et al. 2012). Such association between maternal support and hippocampal volumes was stronger in the sample of nondepressed children than in the sample of depressed children. In another

longitudinal study by Rao and colleagues (2010), parental nurturance (as measured by warmth and availability of parental care) and environmental stimulation (as measured by the availability of cognitively stimulating toys and activities) were measured at age 4 and 8 years. During adolescence, the participants underwent structural brain imaging. Parental nurturance at age 4 (but not at age 8) was associated with the volume of the left hippocampus in adolescence, but in the unexpected direction of better nurturance associated with smaller hippocampal volume. Environment stimulation, on the other hand, showed no effect on hippocampal volume. These findings point out the possibility of sensitive periods in which parental factors show heightened influence on subsequent brain development. Furthermore, the directionality of parental influence on subsequent hippocampal volume may be nonlinear, and needs to be interpreted taking into account that the hippocampus volume undergoes an inverted U-shape trajectory across development (Gogtay et al. 2006).

Taken together, adverse early experiences shape brain development, including a negative stress-related effect on the hippocampus. However, the mechanisms underlying such environment-brain relation cannot be readily generalized to the effects of less extreme environments. While the existing evidence suggests normal range variation in parental factors is associated with subsequent brain development (particularly the hippocampus, part of the associative component), many questions are left open. First, the two longitudinal studies reviewed above (Luby et al. 2012; Rao et al. 2010) did not measure hippocampal volume in early childhood, or in the parents. Therefore, one cannot be certain the reported results merely reflect common sources of variance, notably genetic differences. This is a common critical issue in studies that examine effects of parenting practices, which calls for innovative use of methodologies, including animal models (e.g., Freund et al. 2013), to probe environmental influences on epigenetic effects. Second, studies that simultaneously measure parental factors,

brain development, and memory development are scarce. The empirical links across neural, behavioral, and cognitive levels of analysis are yet to be demonstrated. Third, while parents and primary caregivers play an important role in the life of developing children, schooling context becomes increasingly salient in older children. Given behavioral evidence that suggest teachers' memory-relevant language is related to the development of children's memory skills (Coffman et al. 2008), there is a need to better understand the influence of schooling context on neural development underlying memory functioning.

Vascular Health

Vascular changes are among the most important modifiers of normal aging. A growing body of evidence links vascular factors to age-associated changes in cognition during adulthood and old age. Indicators of vascular risk such as higher blood pressure, body mass index, cholesterol level, blood sugar level, and others have been associated lower cognitive performance in old age, including an increased risk to be diagnosed with dementia. A number of behavioral measures are associated with lower vascular risk and maintenance of good health in old age, including exercise and refraining from smoking (see review in Warsch and Wright 2010).

Structural, functional, and behavioral evidence indicates that vascular health protects against accelerated forms of cognitive aging. For example, Raz et al. (2005) reported that hypertension is associated with shrinkage of the hippocampus in a sample of healthy older adults. In this study, age-related acceleration of shrinkage in the hippocampus was limited to hypertensive participants (treated with medication). Furthermore, Shing et al. (2011) reported smaller CA1 subfields of hippocampus in older adults with hypertensive status, whereas normotensive subjects showed CA1 volumes within the range of younger adults. This finding demonstrates regional differences in vulnerability to vascular disease within the hippocampus (Wu et al. 2008).

The extent to which vascular factors are a potential risk for cognitive decline may interact with common genetic variation. Bender and Raz (2012) found that normotensive carriers of the Apolipoprotein (ApoE) e4 allele with elevated systolic blood pressure showed lower verbal recognition than e4 carriers with lower blood pressure. Of note, blood pressure had a negative effect on prefrontal volumes, but not hippocampal volumes, of ApoE e4 carriers. Similar interactions between genetic and vascular risk in association with cognitive deficits have been reported previously. For instance, Raz et al. (2008) reported that elevated blood glucose predicted lower memory scores only in carriers of the 66Met allele of the BDNF gene, which is assumed to be associated with lower levels of the brain-derived neurotrophic factor in the central nervous system relative to Val homozygotes. Taken together, these results suggest that the combination of a relatively mild elevation in physiological indicators of vascular risk with a genetic risk factor may lead to poorer functioning of brain and cognition.

Taken together, vascular risk has a negative effect on both the associative and strategic components in old age. Interacting with genetic burden, vascular risk seems to affect PFC volumes in particular, resulting in lower associative memory. Future studies should address the effect of interventions that try to reduce blood pressure, especially in individuals with a genetic risk factor. Based on the two-component framework, it would be expected that such interventions would have a positive effect on both strategic and associative aspects of memory.

Physical Fitness

Physical fitness has profound effects on brain and cognitive function, both during child development and aging. In school-aged children, physical activity is positively associated with measures of learning and general cognitive ability (Sibley and Etnier 2003). Recent studies have attempted to link the positive effects of physical fitness on memory to underlying brain mechanisms. For instance, Chaddock and colleagues (2010) investigated the effects of physical

fitness on relational memory and hippocampal volume among higher- and lower-fit 9 and 10-year-olds. Both groups did not differ in item memory, but higher-fit children performed better than lower-fit children in an associative memory task. Higher-fit children also had greater hippocampal volumes than lower-fit children, and individual differences in hippocampal volumes were positively related to relational (but not item) memory performance across all children in the study. The effect of physical fitness on relational memory was directly tested in a subsequent study (Monti, Hillman, and Cohen 2012), in which a group of preschoolers underwent a 9-month after-school aerobic exercise intervention and was compared to a waiting-list control group on measures of item and relational memory for faces and scenes. The groups did not differ in memory performance for item or relational information. However, the intervention group allocated a greater proportion of time on viewing the correctly recognized faces, perhaps reflecting more efficient hippocampal involvement in relational memory following increase in aerobic fitness.

The beneficial effects of physical fitness have also been documented in old age. Older adults who underwent an aerobic training intervention for six months showed reliable increases in brain gray and white matter volume (Colcombe et al. 2006), and altered patterns of task-related functional activation (Colcombe et al. 2004). Paralleling the results from child development, Erickson and colleagues (2009) found that the positive relationship between aerobic fitness and spatial memory performance was predicted by individual differences in hippocampal volume. The neural mechanisms driving the positive effects of aerobic fitness on brain status and cognitive performance in humans are yet not well understood. Evidence from animal studies suggests that these effects are, at least to some degree, associated with neurogenesis in the hippocampus, and the dentate gyrus in particular, due to changes in neurotransmitter and growth factor release (Kempermann, 2008; van Praag, 2009).

Taken together, the existing evidence suggests that aerobic fitness has positive effects on the associative component of EM. However, studies in both children and older adults indicate that the positive effects of aerobic fitness training on brain functioning are not restricted to the hippocampus but may also affect brain networks engaged during tasks of attention and cognitive control (Chaddock et al. 2012; Colcombe et al. 2004). Thus, the beneficial effects of aerobic fitness may not be restricted to the associative, but also directly affect the strategic component of EM at both ends of the lifespan. Alternatively, the effects of aerobic fitness on the strategic component may not be direct, but may result from associative-strategic interactions such that a more functional associative component decreases the demand on memory control processes.

Given the importance of aerobic fitness for hippocampus and memory in old age, several studies have examined to what extent physical training may have a beneficial effect on ApoE-e4 allele carriers, who are at higher risk for developing Alzheimer's disease in old age. Initial evidence from this research indicates that physical fitness may serve as a protective factor for ApoE-e4 carriers, such that aerobic fitness is positively associated with increased functional activation (Deeny et al. 2008) and better cognitive functioning in individuals with greater genetic risk for Alzheimer's disease (Etnier et al. 2007). However, another study reported higher performance benefit from an aerobic training in ApoE-e4 noncarriers compared to APOE-e4 carriers, indicating that cognitive benefits from physical exercise may be attenuated by genetic risk factors (Lautenschlager et al. 2008). These results suggest that the beneficial effects of physical fitness interventions may not be linear, but may depend on the functional status of the individual at the onset of the training. Finally, a recent study with older adults revealed that executive functioning along with use of self-regulatory strategies and self-efficacy measures at the beginning of a physical exercise program were predictive of adherence to the intervention

(McAuley et al. 2011). The importance of these factors is not restricted to aerobic training programs, and should receive more attention in future developmental training studies.

Individual Differences in Memory Training Gains

EM performance in childhood and old age can be improved through instruction and practice (e.g., Noack et al. 2009). Nevertheless, even after extensive practice, older adults do not reach the levels of performance of younger adults (Baltes and Kliegl 1992). In contrast, when given the possibility to optimize a newly acquired strategy through extensive practice, children can catch up with younger adults (Brehmer et al. 2007, 2008; Shing et al. 2008). Importantly, there is a substantial degree of heterogeneity in training benefits in both children and older adults. Understanding the factors contributing to these age differences is an important task for developmental research, as it will help identify programs and interventions that target specific mechanisms that may differ across individuals.

Instruction of an elaborative imagery strategy was shown to effectively increase memory performance in both children and older adults (Brehmer et al. 2007; Shing et al. 2008). In contrast, following extensive practice of the strategy, children surpassed older adults, presumably reflecting their relatively mature associative binding mechanisms (Brehmer et al. 2007; Shing et al. 2008). In the samples of children and older adults originally reported by Brehmer and colleagues (2007), only children improved performance without further practice across an 11-month period of no testing, probably reflecting a maturational changes in the brain network underlying the strategic component (Brehmer et al., 2008). Furthermore, individual differences in initial performance gains (i.e., immediately following mnemonic strategy instruction) correlated *negatively* with baseline performance (Lövdén et al., 2012). In line with conceptual considerations (Lövdén et al., 2010), this finding suggests that individuals who were already implementing efficient strategies at baseline had less to gain from strategic instruction. In

contrast, the correlation between baseline performance and gains flipped its sign in both groups after extensive practice with the memory strategy, suggesting that the potential for plasticity of the associative component is higher among individuals with higher baseline performance.

In particular, the reanalysis of the Brehmer et al. (2007) by Lövdén et al. (2012) suggests that individual differences in memory-relevant mechanisms and strategies modulate the benefits of training. For example, individuals with lower memory functioning may require a more directed strategy instruction, reflecting their greater need for environmental support (cf. Craik, 1983). In contrast, for individuals with relatively preserved strategic and associative functioning, providing the context for self-initiated strategy use followed by extensive practice may be sufficient (Fandakova et al. 2012; Jones et al. 2006). Accordingly, in a recollection strategy training with older adults, self-initiation of controlled processing predicted individual differences in training efficacy (Bissig and Lustig 2007). These findings receive further support by neuroimaging evidence indicating that older adults who show greater performance gains after instruction in an elaborative memory strategy show patterns of neural activation during word encoding that more closely resemble the activation patterns of younger adults (Jones et al. 2006; Nyberg et al. 2003)

Besides specific factors associated with memory functioning, differences in other aspects of cognition may also contribute to individual differences in the ability to benefit from training interventions. For example, performance on tests of perceptual speed and working memory predicts the degree to which individuals benefit from memory training programs (Kliegl et al. 1990; Verhaeghen and Marcoen 1996), supporting the notion that individual differences are magnified by training (Baltes, 1987; Lövdén et al. 2012). These findings are line with the observation that successful aging is associated with higher performance across different cognitive tasks as well as with higher levels of education (Ghisletta et al. 2012; Habib, Nyberg, and Nilsson 2007), presumably reflecting the ability to make flexible and efficient use of available brain

resources, and to preserve structural and functional aspects of brain integrity up to old age (Lindenberger et al. 2013; Nyberg et al. 2012).

Finally, recent studies suggest that heterogeneity in training benefits are related to genetic variation. For instance, the KIBRA gene has been associated with better EM for T-allele carriers in both younger and older adults (Schaper et al. 2008). In younger adults, the positive memory effect for T-allele KIBRA carriers was additionally enhanced by presence of the CLSTN2 C-allele (Preuschhof et al., 2010), underscoring the need to examine interactions among multiple genes in order to understand their influence on complex cognitive functions (Lindenberger et al. 2008). As both these genes exert their influence primarily on MTL regions, future research should examine the degree to which variation in these genes is associated with benefits from memory intervention in childhood and old age. In working memory, variations in the DAT1 receptor gene were not related to performance prior to an adaptive training across 4 weeks, but DAT1 10-repeat carriers (characterized by less active dopaminergic pathways) demonstrated smaller training-related gains compared to DAT1 9/10-repeat carriers (Brehmer et al. 2009). These findings suggest that genetic effects on cognitive functioning may even be more pronounced in a training context rather than a single assessment.

Variation in dopamine modulation has also been related to individual differences in memory performance. For example, DAT and D2 receptor genes interactively influenced backward serial recall in younger and older adults (Li et al., 2013). In line with the resource modulation hypothesis (Lindenberger et al. 2008), the DAT and D2 genetic effects on recall were magnified in older adults whose structural and neurochemical brain resources are compromised. Hence, genetic influence on training benefits may crucially depend on the available cognitive resources of the individual at the onset of the training program. Future research should determine

whether differences in common genetic variation are related to distinct aspects of a training program depending on the brain networks that they are primarily targeting.

Taken together, individual differences in the benefit from memory training have been more extensively investigated in aging research compared to child development. In general, training benefits seem to be positively associated with general cognitive resources. However, accumulating evidence suggest that genetic factors and factors specific to memory functioning need to be taken into consideration, as they may influence the degree to which different individuals benefit from an intervention.

Conclusion

In this chapter we outlined the main developmental trajectory for EM across the lifespan and noted that it is largely compatible with a two-component model of memory functioning, with strategic and associative memory components following distinct trajectories across the lifespan. We then outlined some of the potential modifiers of these trajectories that may contribute to heterogeneity of memory functioning in childhood and old age. To arrive at a more complete understanding of EM development from childhood to old age, we need to (1) isolate different components of EM, and track their changes across the lifespan, (2) identify factors that may underlie individual differences in memory functioning, and (3) understand how the interactions between general and modifying factors change across the lifespan. The presented evidence demonstrates the utility of the two-component framework not only for examining mean differences among age groups, but also for generating predictions regarding mechanisms that drive individual differences in EM.

References

- Baltes, Paul B. 1987. "Theoretical propositions of life-span developmental psychology: On the dynamics between growth and decline." *Developmental Psychology*, 23: 611–626.
- Baltes, Paul B., and Reinhold Kliegl. 1992. "Further Testing of Limits of Cognitive Plasticity: Negative Age Differences in a Mnemonic skill Are Robust." *Developmental Psychology*, 28: 121-125. DOI:10.1037/0012-1649.28.1.121.
- Baltes, Paul B., and Ulman Lindenberger. 1997. "Emergence of a Powerful Connection between Sensory and Cognitive Functions across the Adult Life Span: A New Window to the Study of Cognitive Aging?" *Psychology and Aging*, 12: 12-21. DOI:10.1037/0882-7974.12.1.12.
- Baltes, Paul B., Ulman Lindenberger, and Ursula M. Staudinger. 2006. "Lifespan Theory in Developmental Psychology." In *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical Models of Human Development*, edited by William Damon and Richard M. Lerner, 1029 - 1143. New York: Wiley.
- Bender, Andrew R., and Naftali Raz. 2012. "Age-Related Differences in Memory and Executive Functions in Healthy APOE Epsilon4 Carriers: The Contribution of Individual Differences in Prefrontal Volumes and Systolic Blood Pressure." *Neuropsychologia*, 50: 704-14. DOI:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.12.025.
- Bissig, David, and Cindy Lustig. 2007. "Who Benefits from Memory Training?" *Psychological Science*, 18: 720-726. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01966.x.
- Bjorklund, David F., Patricia H. Miller, Thomas R. Coyle, and Jennifer L. Slawinski. 1997. "Instructing Children to Use Memory Strategies: Evidence of Utilization Deficiencies in Memory Training Studies." *Developmental Review*, 17: 411-441. DOI:10.1006/drev.1997.0440.

Brainerd, Charles J., and Valerie F. Reyna. 2005. *The Science of False Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brehmer, Yvonne, Shu-Chen Li, Viktor Müller, Timo von Oertzen, and Ulman Lindenberger. 2007. "Memory Plasticity across the Life Span: Uncovering Children's Latent Potential." *Developmental Psychology*, 43: 465-478. DOI:10.1037/0012-1649.43.2.465.

Brehmer, Yvonne, Shu-Chen Li, Benjamin Straube, Gundula Stoll, Timo von Oertzen, Viktor Müller, and Ulman Lindenberger. 2007. "Comparing Memory Skill Maintenance Across the Lifespan: Preservation in Adults, Increases in Children." *Psychology and Aging*, 43: 465-478. DOI:10.1037/0012-1649.43.2.465.

Brehmer, Yvonne, Helena Westerberg, Martin Bellander, Daniel Fürth, Sari Karlsson, Lars Bäckman. 2009. "Working memory plasticity modulated by dopamine transporter genotype." *Neuroscience Letters*, 467:117-120.

Burzynska, Aga Z., Claudia Preuschhof, Lars Backman, Lars Nyberg, Shu-Chen Li, Ulman Lindenberger, and Hauke R. Heekeren. 2009. "Age-Related Differences in White Matter Microstructure: Region-Specific Patterns of Diffusivity." *Neuroimage*. DOI:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.09.041.

Cabeza, Roberto, Nicole D. Anderson, Jill K. Locantore, and Anthony R. McIntosh. 2002. "Aging Gracefully: Compensatory Brain Activity in High-Performing Older Adults." *Neuroimage*, 17: 1394-402. DOI:10.1006/nimg.2002.1280.

Cabeza, Roberto, Elisa Ciaramelli, Ingrid R. Olson, and Morris Moscovitch. 2008. "The Parietal Cortex and Episodic Memory: An Attentional Account." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 9: 613-625. DOI: 10.1038/nrn2459.

Chaddock, Laura, Kirk I. Erickson, Ruchika Shaurya Prakash, Jennifer S. Kim, Michelle W. Voss, Matt VanPatter, Matthew B. Pontifex, Lauren B. Raine, Alex Konkel, Charles H.

- Hillman, Neal J. Cohen, and Arthur F. Kramer. 2010. "A Neuroimaging Investigation of the Association between Aerobic Fitness, Hippocampal Volume, and Memory Performance in Preadolescent Children." *Brain Research*, 1358: 172-183. DOI:10.1016/j.brainres.2010.08.049.
- Chalfonte, Barbara L., and Marcia K. Johnson. 1996. "Feature Memory and Binding in Young and Older Adults." *Memory and Cognition*, 24: 403-416.
- Coffman, Jennifer L., Peter A. Ornstein, Laura E. McCall, and Patrick J. Curran. 2008. "Linking Teachers' Memory-Relevant Language and the Development of Children's Memory Skills." *Developmental Psychology*, 44: 1640-1654. DOI:10.1037/a0013859.
- Cohn, Melanie, Stephen M. Emrich, and Morris Moscovitch. 2008. "Age-Related Deficits in Associative Memory: The Influence of Impaired Strategic Retrieval." *Psychology and Aging*, 23: 93-103. DOI:10.1037/0882-7974.23.1.93.
- Colby, John B., John D. Van Horn, and Elizabeth R. Sowell. 2011. "Quantitative In Vivo Evidence for Broad Regional Gradients in the Timing of White Matter Maturation during Adolescence." *Neuroimage*, 54: 25-31. DOI:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.08.014.
- Colcombe, Stan J., Arthur F. Kramer, Edward McAuley, Kirk I. Erickson, and Paige Scalf. 2004. "Neurocognitive Aging and Cardiovascular Fitness: Recent Findings and Future Directions." *Journal of Molecular Neuroscience*, 24: 9-14. DOI:10.1385/jmn:24:1:009.
- Colcombe, Stanley J., Kirk I. Erickson, Paige E. Scalf, Jenny S. Kim, Ruchika Prakash, Edward McAuley, Steriani Elavsky, David X. Marquez, Liang Hu, and Arthur F. Kramer. 2006. "Aerobic Exercise Training Increases Brain Volume in Aging Humans." *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 61: 1166-1170.

Craik, Fergus I. M. 1983. "On the transfer of information from temporary to permanent memory." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B*, 302: 341–359.

Daselaar, Sander M., Mathias S. Fleck, Ian G. Dobbins, David J. Madden, and Roberto Cabeza. 2006. "Effects of Healthy Aging on Hippocampal and Rhinal Memory Functions: An Event-Related fMRI Study." *Cerebral Cortex*, 16: 1771-1782.
DOI:10.1093/cercor/bhj112.

Deary, Ian J., Jian Yang, Gail Davies, Sarah E. Harris, Albert Tenesa, David Liewald, Michelle Luciano, Lorna M. Lopez, Alan J. Gow, Janie Corley, Paul Redmond, Helen C. Fox, Suzanne J. Rowe, Paul Haggarty, Geraldine McNeill, Michael E. Goddard, David J. Porteous, Lawrence J. Whalley, John M. Starr, and Peter M. Visscher. 2012. "Genetic contributions to stability and change in intelligence from childhood to old age." *Nature*, 482: 212-215. DOI:10.1038/nature10781

de Frias, Cindy M., Martin Lövdén, Ulman Lindenberger, and Lars-Göran Nilsson. 2007. "Revisiting the Dedifferentiation Hypothesis with Longitudinal Multi-Cohort Data." *Intelligence*, 35: 381-392. DOI:10.1016/j.intell.2006.07.011.

Deeny, Sean P., David Poeppel, Jo B. Zimmerman, Stephen M. Roth, Josef Brandauer, Sarah Witkowski, Joseph W. Hearn, Andrew T. Ludlow, José L. Contreras-Vidal, Jason Brandt, and Bradley D. Hatfield. 2008. "Exercise, APOE, and Working Memory: MEG and Behavioral Evidence for Benefit of Exercise in Epsilon4 Carriers." *Biological Psychology*, 78: 179-187. DOI:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2008.02.007.

DeMaster, Dana M., and Simona Ghetti. 2012. "Developmental Differences in Hippocampal and Cortical Contributions to Episodic Retrieval." *Cortex*. DOI:10.1016/j.cortex.2012.08.004.

- Dodson, Chad S., and Lacy E. Krueger. 2006. "I Misremember It Well: Why Older Adults Are Unreliable Eyewitnesses." *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 13: 770-5.
- Duarte, Audrey, Richard N. Henson, and Kim S. Graham. 2008. "The Effects of Aging on the Neural Correlates of Subjective and Objective Recollection." *Cerebral Cortex*, 18: 2169-2180. DOI:10.1093/cercor/bhm243.
- Dulas, Michael R., and Audrey Duarte. 2011. "The Effects of Aging on Material-Independent and Material-Dependent Neural Correlates of Contextual Binding." *Neuroimage*, 57: 1192-204. DOI:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.05.036.
- Dunlosky, John, and Christopher Hertzog. 1998. "Aging and Deficits in Associative Memory: What Is the Role of Strategy Production?" *Psychology and Aging*, 13: 597-607. DOI:10.1037/0882-7974.13.4.597.
- Düzel, Emrah, Hartmut Schutze, Andrew P. Yonelinas, and Hans J. Heinze. 2010. "Functional Phenotyping of Successful Aging in Long-Term Memory: Preserved Performance in the Absence of Neural Compensation." *Hippocampus*, 21: 803-14. DOI:10.1002/hipo.20834.
- Erickson, Kirk I., Ruchika S. Prakash, Michelle W. Voss, Laura Chaddock, Liang Hu, Katherine S. Morris, Siobhan M. White, Thomas R. Wójcicki, Edward McAuley, and Arthur F. Kramer. 2009. "Aerobic Fitness Is Associated with Hippocampal Volume in Elderly Humans." *Hippocampus*, 19: 1030-1039. DOI:10.1002/hipo.20547.
- Etnier, Jennifer L., Richard J. Caselli, Eric M. Reiman, Gene E. Alexander, Benjamin A. Sibley, Deron Tessier, and Elisabeth C. McLemore. 2007. "Cognitive Performance in Older Women Relative to ApoE-Epsilon4 Genotype and Aerobic Fitness." *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 39: 199-207.

- Fandakova, Yana, Yee Lee Shing, and Ulman Lindenberger. 2012. "Heterogeneity in Memory Training Improvement among Older Adults: A Latent Class Analysis." *Memory*. DOI:10.1080/09658211.2012.687051.
- Fandakova, Yana, Ulman Lindenberger, and Yee Lee Shing. 2013. "Deficits in process-specific prefrontal and hippocampal activations contribute to adult age differences in episodic memory interference." *Cerebral Cortex*. DOI:10.1093/cercor/bht034
- .Freund, Julia, Andreas M. Brandmaier, Lars Lewejohann, Imke Kirste, Mareike Kritzler, Antonio Krüger, Norbert Sachser, Ulman Lindenberger, Gerd Kempermann. 2013. "Emergence of individuality in genetically identical mice". *Science*, 340: 756-759. DOI: 10.1126/science.1235294
- Fivush, Robyn, and Fayne A. Fromhoff. 1988. "Style and Structure in Mother–Child Conversations about the Past." *Discourse Processes*, 11: 337-355.
- Ghetti, Simona, and Laura Angelini. 2008. "The Development of Recollection and Familiarity in Childhood and Adolescence: Evidence from the Dual-Process Signal Detection Model." *Child Development*, 79: 339-358. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01129.x.
- Ghetti, Simona, Paola Castelli, and Kristen E. Lyons. 2010. "Knowing about Not Remembering: Developmental Dissociations in Lack-of-Memory Monitoring." *Developmental Science*, 13: 611-621. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00908.x.
- Ghetti, Simona, Dana M. DeMaster, Andrew P. Yonelinas, and Silvia A. Bunge. 2010. "Developmental Differences in Medial Temporal Lobe Function during Memory Encoding." *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 30: 9548-9556. DOI:10.1523/jneurosci.3500-09.2010.

- Ghisletta, Paolo, Patrick M. A. Rabbitt, Mary Lunn, and Ulman Lindenberger. 2012. "Two thirds of the agebased changes in fluid and crystallized intelligence, perceptual speed, and memory in adulthood are shared." *Intelligence*, 40: 260-268.
- Gogtay, Nitin, Tom F. Nugent, David H. Herman, Anna Ordonez, Deanna Greenstein, Kiralee M. Hayashi, Liv Clasen, Arthur W. Toga, Jay N. Giedd, Judith L. Rapoport, and Paul M. Thompson. 2006. "Dynamic Mapping of Normal Human Hippocampal Development." *Hippocampus*, 16: 664-672. DOI:10.1002/hipo.20193.
- Grady, Cheryl L., Anthony R. McIntosh, and Fergus I. M. Craik. 2003. "Age-Related Differences in the Functional Connectivity of the Hippocampus during Memory Encoding." *Hippocampus*, 13: 572-586. DOI:10.1002/hipo.10114.
- Greenough, William T., James E. Black, and Christopher S. Wallace. 1987. "Experience and Brain Development." *Child Development*, 58: 539-559. DOI:10.2307/1130197.
- Habib, Reza, Lars Nyberg, and Lars-Göran Nilsson. 2007. "Cognitive and Non-Cognitive Factors Contributing to the Longitudinal Identification of Successful Older Adults in the Betula Study." *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, 14: 257-273. DOI:10.1080/13825580600582412.
- Jones, Sari, Lars Nyberg, Johan Sandblom, Anna Stigsdotter Neely, Martin Ingvar, Karl Magnus Petersson, and Lars Bäckman. 2006. "Cognitive and Neural Plasticity in Aging: General and Task-Specific Limitations." *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 30: 864-871. DOI:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2006.06.012.
- Kausler, Donald H. 1994. *Learning and Memory in Normal Aging*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kempermann, Gerd. 2008. "The neurogenic reserve hypothesis: what is adult hippocampal neurogenesis goodfor?" *Trends in Neuroscience*, 31: 163-9.

- Kliegl, Reinhold, Jacqui Smith, and Paul B. Baltes. 1990. "On the Locus and Process of Magnification of Age Differences during Mnemonic Training." *Developmental Psychology*, 26: 894-904. DOI:10.1037/0012-1649.26.6.894.
- Kovacs, Stacie L., and Nora S. Newcombe. 2006. "Developments in Source Monitoring: The Role of Thinking of Others." *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 93: 25-44. DOI:10.1016/j.jecp.2005.06.006.
- Li, Shu-Chen, Goran Papenberg, Irene E. Nagel, Claudia Preuschhof, Julia Schröder, Wilfried Nietfeld, Lars Bertram, Hauke R. Heekeren, Ulman Lindenberger, and Lars Bäckman. 2013. "Aging magnifies the effects of dopamine transporter and D2 receptor genes on backward serial memory." *Neurobiology of Aging*, 34: 358.e1-358.e10.
- Lautenschlager, Nicola T., Kay L. Cox, Leon Flicker, Jonathan K. Foster, Frank M. van Bockxmeer, Jianguo Xiao, Kathryn R. Greenop, and Osvaldo P. Almeida. 2008. "Effect of Physical Activity on Cognitive Function in Older Adults at Risk for Alzheimer Disease: A Randomized Trial." *JAMA*, 300: 1027-37. DOI:10.1001/jama.300.9.1027.
- Light, Leah L., Matthew W. Prull, Donna La Voie, and Michael R. Healy. 2000. "Dual-Process Theories of Memory in Old Age." In *Models of Cognitive Aging*, edited by Timothy J. Perfect and Elizabeth A. Maylor. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lindenberger, Ulman, and Paolo Ghisletta. 2009. "Cognitive and Sensory Declines in Old Age: Gauging the Evidence for a Common Cause." *Psychology and Aging*, 24: 1-16. DOI:10.1037/a0014986.
- Lindenberger, Ulman, Shu-Chen Li, and Lars Bäckman. 2006. "Delineating Brain-Behavior Mappings across the Lifespan: Substantive and Methodological Advances in Developmental neuroscience." *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 30: 713-717. DOI:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2006.06.006.

Lindenberger, Ulman, Irene E. Nagel, Christian Chicherio, Shu-Chen Li, Hauke R. Heekeren, and Lars Bäckman. 2008. "Age-Related Decline in Brain Resources Modulates Genetic Effects on Cognitive Functioning." *Frontiers of Neuroscience*, 2: 234-44.

DOI:10.3389/neuro.01.039.2008.

Lindenberger, Ulman., Burzynska, Agnieszka Z., and Irene E. Nagel. 2012. "Heterogeneity in frontal lobe aging." In *Principles of frontal lobe functions*, edited by Donald T. Stuss & Robert T. Knight, 609-627. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lindsay, D. Stephen, Marcia K. Johnson, and Paul Kwon. 1991. "Developmental Changes in Memory Source Monitoring." *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 52: 297-318.

DOI:10.1016/0022-0965(91)90065-Z.

Lövdén, Martin, Lars Bäckman, Ulman Lindenberger, Sabine Schaefer, and Florian Schmiedek. 2010. "A Theoretical Framework for the Study of Adult Cognitive Plasticity."

Psychological Bulletin, 136: 659-676. DOI:10.1037/a0020080.

Lövdén, Martin, Yvonne Brehmer, Shu-Chen Li, and Ulman Lindenberger. 2012. "Training-Induced Compensation versus Magnification of Individual Differences in Memory Performance." *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6: 141.

DOI:10.3389/fnhum.2012.00141.

Luby, Joan L., Deanna M. Barch, Andy Belden, Michael S. Gaffrey, Rebecca Tillman, Casey Babb, Tomoyuki Nishino, Hideo Suzuki, and Kelly N. Botteron. 2012. "Maternal Support in Early Childhood Predicts Larger Hippocampal Volumes at School Age." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109: 2854-2859. DOI:10.1073/pnas.1118003109.

MacDonald, Stuart W. S., David F. Hultsch, and Roger A. Dixon. 2011. "Aging and the Shape of Cognitive Change before Death: Terminal Decline or Terminal Drop?" *The Journals of*

Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 66: 292-301.

DOI:10.1093/geronb/gbr001.

- McAuley, Edward, Sean P. Mullen, Amanda N. Szabo, Siobhan M. White, Thomas R. Wójcicki, Emily L. Mailey, Neha P. Gothe, Erin A. Olson, Michelle Voss, Kirk Erickson, Ruchika Prakash, and Arthur F. Kramer. 2011. "Self-Regulatory Processes and Exercise Adherence in Older Adults: Executive Function and Self-Efficacy Effects." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 41: 284-290. DOI:10.1016/j.amepre.2011.04.014.
- Miller, Earl K., and Jonathan D. Cohen. 2001. "An Integrative Theory of Prefrontal Cortex Function." *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 24: 167-202.
- Miller, Patricia H., and Wendy L. Seier. 1994. "Strategy Utilization Deficiencies in Children: When, Where, and Why." *Advances in Child Development and Behaviour*, 25: 107-56.
- Monti, Jim M., Charles H. Hillman, and Neal J. Cohen. 2012. "Aerobic Fitness Enhances Relational Memory in Preadolescent Children: The FITKids Randomized Control Trial." *Hippocampus*, 22: 1876-1882. DOI:10.1002/hipo.22023.
- Nelson, Thomas O., and Louis Narens. 1990. "Metamemory: A Theoretical Framework and New Findings." *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 26: 125-173.
- Noack, Hannes, Martin Lövdén, Florian Schmiedek, and Ulman Lindenberger. 2009. "Cognitive Plasticity in Adulthood and Old Age: Gauging the Generality of Cognitive Intervention Effects." *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience*, 27: 435-453. DOI:10.3233/rnm-2009-0496.
- Nyberg, Lars, Petter Marklund, Jonas Persson, Roberto Cabeza, Christian Forkstam, Karl Magnus Petersson, and Martin Ingvar. 2003. "Common Prefrontal Activations during Working Memory, Episodic Memory, and Semantic Memory." *Neuropsychologia*, 41: 371-377. DOI:10.1016/S0028-3932(02)00168-9.

Nyberg, Lars, Alireza Salami, Mikael Andersson, Johan Eriksson, Grégoria Kalpouzos, Karolina Kauppi, Johanna Lind, Sara Pudas, Jonas Persson, and Lars-Göran Nilsson. 2010.

"Longitudinal Evidence for Diminished Frontal Cortex Function in Aging." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107: 22682-22686. DOI:10.1073/pnas.1012651108.

Nyberg, Lars, Martin Lövdén, Katrine Riklund, Ulman Lindenberger, and Lars Bäckman. 2012.

"Memory aging and brain maintenance." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16: 292-305.

DOI:10.1016/j.tics.2012.04.005

Ofen, Noa, Yun-Ching Kao, Peter Sokol-Hessner, Heesoo Kim, Susan Whitfield-Gabrieli, and John D. E. Gabrieli. 2007. "Development of the Declarative Memory System in the

Human Brain." *Nature Neuroscience*, 10: 1198-1205. DOI:10.1038/nn1950

Ofen, Noa, Xiaoqian J. Chai, Karen D. I. Schuil, Susan Whitfield-Gabrieli, and John D. E.

Gabrieli. 2012. "The Development of Brain Systems Associated with Successful Memory Retrieval of Scenes." *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 32: 10012-10020.

DOI:10.1523/jneurosci.1082-11.2012.

Old, Susan R., and Moshe Naveh-Benjamin. 2008. "Differential Effects of Age on Item and Associative Measures of Memory: A Meta-Analysis." *Psychology and Aging*, 23: 104-118. DOI:10.1037/0882-7974.23.1.104.

Paz-Alonso, Pedro M., Simona Ghetti, Sarah E. Donohue, Gail S. Goodman, and Silvia A.

Bunge. 2008. "Neurodevelopmental Correlates of True and False Recognition." *Cerebral Cortex*, 18: 2208-2216. DOI:10.1093/cercor/bhm246.

Persson, Jonas, Grégoria Kalpouzos, Lars-Göran Nilsson, Mats Ryberg, and Lars Nyberg. 2010.

"Preserved Hippocampus Activation in Normal Aging As Revealed by fMRI."

Hippocampus, 21: 753-66. DOI:10.1002/hipo.20794.

- Persson, Jonas, Sara Pudas, Johanna Lind, Karolina Kauppi, Lars-Göran Nilsson, and Lars Nyberg. 2012. "Longitudinal Structure–Function Correlates in Elderly Reveal MTL Dysfunction with Cognitive Decline." *Cerebral Cortex*, 22: 2297-2304.
DOI:10.1093/cercor/bhr306.
- Preuschhof, Claudia, Hauke R. Heekeren, Shu-Chen Li, Thomas Sander, Ulman Lindenberger, and Lars Bäckman. 2010. "KIBRA and CLSTN2 polymorphisms exert interactive effects on human episodic memory". *Neuropsychologia*, 48: 402-408.
- Rao, Hengyi, Laura Betancourt, Joan M. Giannetta, Nancy L. Brodsky, Marc Korczykowski, Brian B. Avants, James C. Gee, Jiongjiang Wang, Hallam Hurt, John A. Detre, and Martha J. Farah. 2010. "Early Parental Care Is Important for Hippocampal Maturation: Evidence from Brain Morphology in Humans." *Neuroimage*, 49: 1144-1150.
DOI:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.07.003.
- Raz, Naftali, Ulman Lindenberger, Paolo Ghisletta, Karen M. Rodrigue, Kristen M. Kennedy, and James D. Acker. 2008. "Neuroanatomical Correlates of Fluid Intelligence in Healthy Adults and Persons with Vascular Risk Factors." *Cerebral Cortex*, 18: 718-726.
DOI:10.1093/cercor/bhm108.
- Raz, Naftali, Ulman Lindenberger, Karen M. Rodrigue, Kristen M. Kennedy, Denise Head, Adrienne Williamson, Cheryl Dahle, Denis Gerstorf, and James D. Acker. 2005. "Regional Brain Changes in Aging Healthy Adults: General Trends, Individual Differences and Modifiers." *Cerebral Cortex*, 15: 1676-1689.
DOI:10.1093/cercor/bhi044.
- Reese, Elaine, Catherine A. Haden, and Robyn Fivush. 1993. "Mother-Child Conversations about the Past: Relationships of Style and Memory over Time." *Cognitive Development*, 8: 403-430. DOI:10.1016/S0885-2014(05)80002-4.

- Reese, Elaine, and Rhiannon Newcombe. 2007. "Training Mothers in Elaborative Reminiscing Enhances Children's Autobiographical Memory and Narrative." *Child Development*, 78: 1153-1170. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01058.x.
- Rönnlund, Michael, Lars Nyberg, Lars Bäckman, and Lars-Göran Nilsson. 2005. "Stability, Growth, and Decline in Adult Life Span Development of Declarative Memory: Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Data from a Population-Based Study." *Psychology and Aging*, 20: 3-18. DOI:10.1037/0882-7974.20.1.3.
- Rugg, Michael D., and Alexa M. Morcom. 2005. "The Relationship between Brain Activity, Cognitive Performance, and Aging: The Case of Memory." In *Cognitive Neuroscience of Aging*, edited by Roberto Cabeza, Lars Nyberg and Denise C. Park, 132-154. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Salami, Alireza, Johan Eriksson, and Lars Nyberg. 2012. "Opposing Effects of Aging on Large-Scale Brain Systems for Memory Encoding and Cognitive Control." *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 32: 10749-10757. DOI:10.1523/jneurosci.0278-12.2012.
- Schaie, K. Warner. 2012. *Developmental influences on adult intelligence: The Seattle Longitudinal Study*, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schaper, Karsten, Heike Kölsch, Julius Popp, Michael Wagner, and Frank Jessen. 2008. "KIBRA Gene Variants Are Associated with Episodic Memory in Healthy Elderly." *Neurobiology of Aging*, 29: 1123-1125. DOI:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2007.02.001.
- Schneider, Wolfgang, and Michael Pressley. 1997. *Memory Development Between Two and Twenty*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shing, Yee Lee, Karen M. Rodrigue, Kristen M. Kennedy, Yana Fandakova, Nils Bodammer, Markus Werkle-Bergner, Ulman Lindenberger, and Naftali Raz. 2011. "Hippocampal

Subfield Volumes: Age, Vascular Risk, and Correlation with Associative Memory."

Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience, 3: 2. DOI:10.3389/fnagi.2011.00002.

Shing, Yee Lee, Markus Werkle-Bergner, Yvonne Brehmer, Viktor Müller, Shu-Chen Li, and Ulman Lindenberger. 2010. "Episodic Memory across the Lifespan: The Contributions of Associative and Strategic Components." *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 34: 1080-1091. DOI:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.11.002.

Shing, Yee Lee, Markus Werkle-Bergner, Shu-Chen Li, and Ulman Lindenberger. 2008.

"Associative and Strategic Components of Episodic Memory: A Life-Span Dissociation."

Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 137: 495-513. DOI:10.1037/0096-3445.137.3.495.

Sibley, Benjamin A., and Jennifer L. Etnier. 2003. "The Relationship between Physical Activity and Cognition in Children: A Meta-Analysis." *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 15: 243-256.

Simons, Jon S., and Hugo J. Spiers. 2003. "Prefrontal and Medial Temporal Lobe Interactions in Long-Term Memory." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 4: 637-648.

Sliwinski, Martin J., Joshua M. Smyth, Scott M. Hofer, and Robert S. Stawski. 2006.

"Intraindividual coupling of daily stress and cognition." *Psychology and Aging*, 21: 545-557. DOI:10.1037/0882-7974.21.3.545.

Sluzenski, Julia, Nora Newcombe, and Wendy Ottinger. 2004. "Changes in Reality Monitoring and Episodic Memory in Early Childhood." *Developmental Science*, 7: 225-245.

DOI:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2004.00341.x.

Sluzenski, Julia, Nora S. Newcombe, and Stacie L. Kovacs. 2006. "Binding, Relational Memory, and Recall of Naturalistic Events: A Developmental Perspective." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 32: 89-100.

DOI:10.1037/0278-7393.32.1.89.

- Sowell, Elizabeth R., Bradley S. Peterson, Paul M. Thompson, Suzanne E. Welcome, Amy L. Henkenius, and Arthur W. Toga. 2003. "Mapping Cortical Change across the Human Life Span." *Nature Neuroscience*, 6: 309-315. DOI:10.1038/nm1008.
- Spencer, Wesley D., and Naftali Raz. 1995. "Differential Effects of Aging on Memory for Content and Context: A meta-Analysis." *Psychology and Aging*, 10: 527-539. DOI:10.1037/0882-7974.10.4.527.
- Tottenham, Nim, and Margaret A. Sheridan. 2009. "A Review of Adversity, the Amygdala and the Hippocampus: A Consideration of Developmental Timing." *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 3: 68. DOI:10.3389/neuro.09.068.2009.
- Tulving, Endel. 2002. "Episodic Memory: From Mind to Brain." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53: 1-25.
- van Praag, Henriette. 2009. "Exercise and the Brain: Something to Chew on." *Trends in Neurosciences*, 32: 283-290. DOI:10.1016/j.tins.2008.12.007.
- Verhaeghen, Paul, and Alfons Marcoen. 1996. "On the Mechanisms of Plasticity in Young and Older Adults after Instruction in the Method of Loci: Evidence for an Amplification Model." *Psychology and Aging*, 11: 164-178. DOI:10.1037/0882-7974.11.1.164.
- Warsch, Jessica R. L., and Clinton B. Wright. 2010. "The Aging Mind: Vascular Health in Normal Cognitive Aging." *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 58: S319-S324. DOI:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2010.02983.x.
- Werkle-Bergner, Markus, Viktor Müller, Shu-Chen Li, and Ulman Lindenberger. 2006. "Cortical EEG Correlates of Successful Memory Encoding: Implications for Lifespan Comparisons." *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 30: 839-854. DOI:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2006.06.009.

Wu, William, Adam M. Brickman, Jose Luchsinger, Peter Ferrazzano, Paola Pichiule, Mitsuhiro Yoshita, Truman Brown, Charles DeCarli, Carol A. Barnes, Richard Mayeux, Susan J. Vannucci, and Scott A. Small. 2008. "The Brain in the Age of Old: The Hippocampal Formation Is Targeted Differentially by Diseases of Late Life." *Annals of Neurology*, 64: 698-706. DOI:10.1002/ana.21557.

Zimmer, Hubert D., Axel Mecklinger, and Ulman Lindenberger, eds. 2006. *Handbook of Binding and Memory: Perspectives from Cognitive Neuroscience*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Biosketches

Yana Fandakova

Dr. Yana Fandakova is a postdoctoral research fellow at the Center for Lifespan Psychology at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin, Germany. She studied psychology in Berlin and received her doctorate in psychology from the Humboldt Universität zu Berlin in 2012. Her primary research interests are the cognitive and neural mechanisms of developmental change across the lifespan, with a focus on episodic memory and cognitive control development in childhood and aging.

Word count: 74

Ulman Lindenberger

Dr. Ulman Lindenberger directs the Center for Lifespan Psychology at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany. He is a honorary professor at Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, and Saarland University, Saarbrücken, Germany. His primary research interests are behavioral and neural plasticity across the lifespan, brain-behavior relations across the lifespan, multivariate developmental methodology, and formal models of behavioral change. He received the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Prize from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft in 2010.

Word count: 76

Yee Lee Shing

Dr. Yee Lee Shing is a research scientist at the Center for Lifespan Psychology at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin, Germany. She received her doctorate in psychology from the Humboldt University Berlin in 2008. She is primarily interested in the development and plasticity of cognitive mechanics across the lifespan, with a focus on brain-behavior relations of episodic memory components. She received the Heinz Maier-Leibnitz Prize from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft in 2012.

Word count: 75