| | Laying | the tr |
|-------|--------|--------|
| EMORY | | |

Introduction

- Memory integration is a critical process in accumulating knowledge (Spalding et al., 2018)
- Individual variability in self-derivation through memory integration is ulletpronounced (Figure 1) and relates to cognitive and academic skills (Esposito & Bauer, 2017; Varga et al., 2019)
- Neural effects at encoding have previously been examined in participants who perform at approx. 50% correct in a self-derivation task (Varga & Bauer, 2017a)

Given the relevance of self-derivation to academic achievement, it is important to investigate neural underpinnings and cognitive correlates of low versus high performers



Figure 1. Individual participants' performance (adapted from Varga & Bauer, 2017b).

Participants:

Methods

21 low performers and 16 high performers excluded from original analyses (N = 37; 20 female); M age = 19.72(.98)

Procedure:

60 novel, related facts ("stem" facts) to be integrated Presented one word at a time; ERPs time-locked to onset of last word



racks for memory integration: Processing of the first premise

Julia T. Wilson, Nicole L. Varga, & Patricia J. Bauer

Department of Psychology, Emory University College of Arts and Sciences

Methods cont'd.

Preprocessing:

Preprocessing performed using the MATLAB toolbox EEGLAB. Artifact rejection visual analysis and independent components analysis (ICA)

Analysis:

Only incorrect trials included for low performers and correct trials for high performers

Time windows: used full latency multichannel cluster windows of stem 1 and stem 2 effects identified in Varga & Bauer, 2017a; two encoding phase time windows were analyzed: 1122-1349 ms and 1424-1706 ms (from Varga & Bauer, 2017a)

Channel inclusion: 75% rule Fp1, F7, F3, Fz, Cz, FP2, F4, FC6, FC5, FC2, FC1, C4, C3, T7, T8, CP6 CP2



Figure 2. from Varga & Bauer, 2017a; Grand average event-related potential (ERP) waveform at encoding for frontal, frontocentral, and centroparietal electrode sites

Results – Current Analysis



Figure 3. Grand average ERP waveform at encoding. Black circle demarcates time window 1 (1122-1349 ms) and red circle demarcates time window 2 (1424-1706 ms)

- Time window 1: Main effect of stem (F(1,35) = 24.92, p < .001, $\eta_p^2 = .42$) and performance (F(1,35) = 5.78, p = .022, $\eta_p^2 = .14$)
- Time window 2: Main effect of stem (F(1,35) = 6.13, p = .018, $\eta_p^2 = .15$)

Time (msec)

Results cont'd. – Cognitive Correlates





Preliminary Conclusions and Future Research

- performance?

Journal of Neuroscience, 38(15), 3767-3775. 148(4), 739–762.

This work was conducted with support from NIH grant NIHHD67359 to Patricia J. Bauer & a James T. Laney Graduate School Dean's Teaching Fellowship to Nicole L. Varga. Special thanks to Dr. Nicole Varga for endless analysis help and original data collection **Correspondence can be addressed to jtwils6@emory.edu**

Figure 4. Relation between stem 1 amplitude and verbal comprehension summed score at time window 1 (1122-1349 ms)

For low performers, verbal comprehension score significantly predicts stem 1 at time window 1 ($R^2 = .20$, p = .046) and time window 2 ($R^2 = .41$, p = .002)

For high performers, verbal comprehension score does not relate to stem 1 at either time window ($R^2 = .04$ and .003, p =.472 and .847, respectively)

• Low performers and high performers may process the first premise in an integration task differently

• This differential processing may be related to encoding of semantic meaning, as indexed by the relation between incorrect trials for low performers and verbal comprehension scores

• Future directions: Potential baseline effects? Do high performers look the same as low on incorrect trials? Correlation with task

References

Esposito, A. G., & Bauer, P. J. (2017). Going beyond the lesson: Self-generating new factual knowledge in the classroom. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 153, 110–125. Spalding, K.N., Schlichting, M.L., Zeithamova, D., Preston, A.R., Tranel, D., Duff, M.C., & Warren, D.E.

Ventromedial prefrontal cortex is necessary for normal associative inference and memory integration.

Varga, N. L., & Bauer, P. J. (2017a). Using event-related potentials to inform the neurocognitive processes underlying knowledge extension through memory integration. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 29(11), 1932–1949. Varga, N. L., & Bauer, P. J. (2017b). Young adults self-derive and retain new factual knowledge through memory integration. Memory & Cognition, 45(6), 1014-1027.

Varga, N. L., Esposito, A. G., & Bauer, P. J. (2019). Cognitive correlates of memory integration across development: Explaining variability in an educationally relevant phenomenon. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General,