Unravelling the intersections between consolidation, refreshing, and removal

Souza, Alessandra S ; Vergauwe, Evie

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.13943

This commentary has been accepted for publication in Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. It has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination, and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as: https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.13943 .

Unravelling the Intersections between Consolidation, Refreshing, and Removal – Introduction to the special issue on Attention in Working Memory

Alessandra S. Souza [1] & Evie Vergauwe [2]

[1] University of Zurich, Switzerland
[2] University of Geneva, Switzerland

Working memory (WM) is the cognitive system whose limited capacity is responsible for temporarily holding, processing, and manipulating information in mind. WM capacity limits the complexity of the tasks we can perform, and how well we can reason. In recent years, researchers have been interested in uncovering how attention can serve the efficient allocation of WM capacity. At least three attentional processes have been put forward as crucial in attaining this goal: *consolidation, refreshing, and removal*. **Consolidation** is assumed to consist of the (short-term) stabilization of a recently formed memory trace by directing attention to it even after the perceptual stimulus is no longer available [1,2]. **Refreshing**, in contrast, has been defined as an attentional based-process that cycles over all working memory contents (not only the most recently acquired ones), thereby augmenting their accessibility in memory and preventing forgetting [3–6]. Lastly, **Removal** has been conceptualized as the active, controlled discarding of irrelevant or outdated information [7–9], thereby freeing capacity and preventing that relevant and irrelevant information interfere with each other in WM [10].

The research domain concerned with these three processes has become increasingly popular and new data is accumulating quickly. Studies have started to consider how these processes may contribute not only to WM

performance in general, but also to individual differences in cognitive abilities [11–13], to age-related WM decline [14–17], and how they might be implemented in computational models [9,18,19]. These are exciting days for researchers interested in the interplay of attention in WM. Nonetheless, the three aforementioned attentional processes are still relatively ill-defined and not well understood, nor is the relationship between them. Furthermore, although each of these processes is assumed to fulfill a different role, they can yield similar behavioral predictions [e.g., 1,20], which make it difficult to tease apart these attentional processes. Accordingly, whether an effect is ascribed to one or the other process can be more dependent on the theoretical orientation of the researchers conducting the study than on the data that the process is assumed to explain. This is an undesirable state of affairs for the scientific progress in the field. On the one hand, cognitive psychologists should strive to assume as few cognitive processes as possible to describe a given phenomenon. If any of the processes defined above is redundant, then we should remove it from the list of potential mechanisms affecting WM performance. On the other hand, if these processes are not redundant, then we need to better understand their exact contribution, and potential interaction, in different cognitive tasks.

Given this state of affairs, we felt the time was right to bring some more perspective into these topics. Our ultimate wish was to bring researchers to refine their theoretical concepts of consolidation, refreshing, and removal, to agree on the descriptions of their exact mechanisms in WM thereby facilitating the future implementation of these processes in computational models, and, ultimately, to derive testable predictions to disentangle their contributions to the efficient allocation of WM capacity. With these aims in mind, we organized a workshop in June, 2017 that brought together over 30 researchers from different countries (US, Australia, UK, Israel, Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Switzerland). All of these researchers shared a common interest in the role of attentional processes in WM. Inspired by a seminal book [21] that compared WM theories in light of the same set of questions, we challenged researchers

with a new set of seven questions to be answered for each of the attentional processes: (1) What is its basic definition? (2) How and upon which representations does it operate? (3) Which type of attention does it engage? (4) What is its time-course? (5) What limits the occurrence of this process? (6) Does it rely on long-term memory knowledge? and (7) What counts as evidence for and against its existence? The fruits of these discussions feature in this special issue across three review papers, one per process, which are directed at describing what we know (or think we know) at this point in time about consolidation [22], refreshing [23], and removal [24]. Another review paper brings some additional perspective on the difficulties of theoretically separating and empirically examining these processes [25]. We hope these review papers will help in understanding the current points of agreement and disagreement in the field, and that they will constitute a stepping stone for further theoretical and empirical refinements of the concepts at hand.

The workshop was not only an opportunity for theoretical exchanges, but also to discuss new empirical findings. Accordingly, this special issue also presents a large set of empirical articles (17 in total) which link attention to WM through the lens of the concepts of consolidation, refreshing, and removal. The research articles present a myriad of approaches to examine how these processes affect WM performance. We hope this will encourage discussions about which sort of paradigms and evidence we embrace in building up our theoretical (and, possibly, computational) models of WM.

To conclude, we would like to make some remarks on what we, ourselves, perceive as challenges and opportunities emerging from this endeavor. Regarding challenges, we note that, during the discussion held at the workshop, it was difficult to achieve agreement on seemingly basic properties of the three attentional processes of interest here. Furthermore, in trying to answer the seven questions stated above, we realized that not all questions have been addressed empirically. On the upside, this means that are many opportunities to contribute to the advancement of research in this field. We

briefly mention here some of the issues that we perceive as being more pressing. First, we need to gather more evidence that speak to the seven questions stated above. Second, we should contemplate whether we actually need three attentional processes in WM, and whether any of these processes is redundant. Third, we need to understand how the different processes relate to each other, what they have in common, how they are different, and how they interact to support WM performance. Fourth, we need more detailed, preferentially computational, implementations of these processes in models of WM. Progress will be enormously accelerated if we consider these attentional processes in light of clear operational definitions that are buttressed by computational models, which in turn can provide unambiguous empirical predictions to be tested.

We are looking forward to see and contribute to these future developments. We hope this special issue inspires readers to join us in this endeavor.

Acknowledgements

This special issue follows the work presented at the workshop entitled *"The crossroads of attention in working memory: Consolidation, refreshing, and removal"* that took place in Ovronnaz, Switzerland, from 29. June to 02. July 2017. The workshop was organized by Evie Vergauwe and Alessandra S. Souza, and was supported by a grant from the Swiss National Science Foundation to A. S. Souza (N° IZ32Z0_173389). As this special issue shows, the workshop was a great success, and we would like to thank all participants for contributing to both.

References

1. Bayliss D.M., J. Bogdanovs & C. Jarrold. 2015. Consolidating working memory: Distinguishing the effects of consolidation, rehearsal and attentional refreshing in a working memory span task. *J. Mem. Lang.* **81**: 34–50.
2. Ricker T.J. 2015. The role of short-term consolidation in memory persistence. *AIMS Neurosci.* **2**: 259–279.
3. Barrouillet P. & V. Camos. 2012. As time goes by temporal constraints in working memory. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* **21**: 413–419.
4. Johnson M.K. 1992. MEM: Mechanisms of recollection. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **4**: 268–280.
5. Souza A.S., L. Rerko & K. Oberauer. 2015. Refreshing memory traces: thinking of an item improves retrieval from visual working memory. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **1339**: 20–31.
6. Vergauwe E. & N. Cowan. 2014. A common short-term memory retrieval rate may describe many cognitive procedures. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **8**:.
7. Ecker U.K.H., S. Lewandowsky & K. Oberauer. 2014. Removal of information from working memory: A specific updating process. *J. Mem. Lang.* **74**: 77–90.
8. Oberauer K. 2001. Removing irrelevant information from working memory: A cognitive aging study with the modified Sternberg task. *J. Exp. Psychol. Learn. Mem. Cogn.* **27**: 948–957.
9. Oberauer K. & S. Lewandowsky. 2011. Modeling working memory: a computational implementation of the time-based resource-sharing theory. *Psychon. Bull. Rev.* **18**: 10–45.
10. Souza A.S., L. Rerko & K. Oberauer. 2014. Unloading and reloading working memory: Attending to one item frees capacity. *J. Exp. Psychol. Hum. Percept. Perform.* **40**: 1237–1256.
11. Ecker U.K.H., S. Lewandowsky, K. Oberauer, *et al.* 2010. The components of working memory updating: An experimental decomposition and individual differences. *J. Exp. Psychol. Learn. Mem. Cogn.* **36**: 170–189.
12. Singh K.A., G.E. Gignac, C.R. Brydges, *et al.* 2018. Working memory capacity mediates the relationship between removal and fluid intelligence. *J. Mem. Lang.* **101**: 18–36.
13. Lucidi A., V. Loaiza, V. Camos, *et al.* 2014. Assessing Working Memory Capacity Through Time-Constrained Elementary Activities. *J. Gen. Psychol.* **141**: 98–112.
14. Souza A.S. 2016. No age deficits in the ability to use attention to improve visual working memory. *Psychol. Aging* **31**: 456–470.
15. Loaiza V.M. & D.P. McCabe. 2012. The influence of aging on attentional refreshing and articulatory rehearsal during working memory on later episodic memory performance. *Aging Neuropsychol. Cogn.* **20**: 471–493.
16. Hoareau V., B. Lemaire, S. Portrat, *et al.* 2016. Reconciling Two Computational Models of Working Memory in Aging. *Top. Cogn. Sci.* **8**: 264–278.

17. Plancher G., H. Boyer, B. Lemaire, *et al.* 2017. Under Which Conditions Can Older Participants Maintain Information In Working Memory? *Exp. Aging Res.* **43**: 409–429.
18. Lewandowsky S. & K. Oberauer. 2015. Rehearsal in serial recall: An unworkable solution to the nonexistent problem of decay. *Psychol. Rev.* **122**: 674–699.
19. Lemaire B., A. Pageot, G. Plancher, *et al.* 2017. What is the time course of working memory attentional refreshing? *Psychon. Bull. Rev.* 1–16.
20. Souza A.S. & K. Oberauer. 2016. In search of the focus of attention in working memory: 13 years of the retro-cue effect. *Atten. Percept. Psychophys.* 1–22.
21. Miyake A. & P. Shah. 1999. "*Models of Working Memory: Mechanisms of Active Maintenance and Executive Control.*" Cambridge University Press.
22. Ricker T.J., M.R. Nieuwenstein, D.M. Bayliss, *et al.* 2018. Working memory consolidation: insights from studies on attention and working memory. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **0**:
23. Camos V., M.R. Johnson, V.M. Loaiza, *et al.* 2018. What is attentional refreshing in working memory? *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **0**:
24. Lewis-Peacock J.A., Y. Kessler & K. Oberauer. 2018. The removal of information from working memory. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **0**:
25. Morey C.C. & N. Cowan. in press. Can we distinguish three maintenance processes in working memory? *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.*