# **ARTICLE IN PR**

### NeuroImage xxx (2015) xxx-xxx

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# NeuroImage

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ynimg

## Thinking about thinking: Neural mechanisms and effects on memory

Corinna Bonhage <sup>a,b,\*,1</sup>, Friederike Weber <sup>c,1</sup>, Cornelia Exner <sup>c</sup>, Philipp Kanske <sup>d</sup> Q2

<sup>a</sup> Neurolinguistics Department, Institute of Cognitive Science, University of Osnabruck, Germany 3

<sup>b</sup> Department of Neuropsychology, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig, Germany

<sup>c</sup> Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, University of Leipzig, Germany 5

6 <sup>d</sup> Department of Social Neuroscience, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig, Germany

#### ARTICLE INFO 8

Article history: 10 Received 7 September 2015 11 Accepted 28 November 2015 Available online xxxx 1213 29 Keywords: 30 Attention Cognitive self-consciousness 31 32 Default mode network 33 Proactive interference/ memory 34 Salience network 35 fMRI

## ABSTRACT

It is a well-established finding that memory encoding is impaired if an external secondary task (e.g. tone discrim- 14 ination) is performed simultaneously. Yet, while studying we are also often engaged in internal secondary tasks 15 such as planning, ruminating, or daydreaming. It remains unclear whether such a secondary internal task has 16 similar effects on memory and what the neural mechanisms underlying such an influence are. We therefore 17 measured participants' blood oxygenation level dependent responses while they learned word-pairs and simul- 18 taneously performed different types of secondary tasks (i.e., internal, external, and control). Memory perfor- 19 mance decreased in both internal and external secondary tasks compared to the easy control condition. 20 However, while the external task reduced activity in memory-encoding related regions (hippocampus), the in- 21 ternal task increased neural activity in brain regions associated with self-reflection (anterior medial prefrontal 22 cortex), as well as in regions associated with performance monitoring and the perception of salience (anterior 23 insula, dorsal anterior cingulate cortex). Resting-state functional connectivity analyses confirmed that anterior 24 medial prefrontal cortex and anterior insula/dorsal anterior cingulate cortex are part of the default mode network 25 and salience network, respectively. In sum, a secondary internal task impairs memory performance just as a sec- 26 ondary external task, but operates through different neural mechanisms. 27

© 2015 Published by Elsevier Inc. 28

#### Introduction 40

30 38

Numerous studies have shown that memory performance suffers 41 if an external secondary task (e.g. listening tasks) is performed during 42 encoding (e.g. Murdock, 1965; Baddeley et al., 1984; Naveh-Benjamin 43 et al., 2003). However, we also engage in *internal* secondary tasks, 44 45 such as planning, ruminating, or daydreaming (Kane et al., 2007; Killingsworth and Gilbert, 2010). The effects that such a preoccupation 46with one's own thoughts has on memory performance are poorly 47 understood despite the high prevalence of an internal attentional 4849 focus of about one-third of the waking time (Killingsworth and Gilbert, 2010). The incidence rate is even further increased in some clin-50ical groups, such as obsessive-compulsive or major depressive disorder 5152(Wells and Matthews, 1996; Wells, 2000; Huffziger et al., 2009), which also show memory impairments (Kuelz et al., 2004; Trivedi and Greer, 04 2013). This raises the hypothesis that the preoccupation with internal 5455processes directly impairs memory encoding (Exner et al., 2009; 56Smallwood et al., 2007). We therefore aim at studying the consequences

E-mail address: corinna.bonhage@uos.de (C. Bonhage).

<sup>1</sup> Shared first authorship.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.11.067 1053-8119/© 2015 Published by Elsevier Inc.

of a preoccupation with one's own thoughts by asking (1) whether or 57 not an internal secondary task impairs memory encoding in a similar 58 fashion as an external secondary task, and (2) what the neural mecha- 59 nisms underlying the impairments due to internal versus external sec- 60 ondary task performance are.

So far, several neuroimaging studies investigating the processes 62 underlying memory impairment due to divided attention asked partic- 63 ipants to memorize items and simultaneously perform an external 64 secondary task, such as auditory tone discrimination. Such external 65 secondary tasks impaired memory performance by interfering with se- 66 mantic processing of the items (i.e. attenuated activation in inferior 67 frontal gyrus) (Shallice et al., 1994; Fletcher et al., 1995; Iidaka et al., 68 2000; Anderson et al., 2000), disrupting effective encoding processes 69 (i.e. attenuation of subsequent memory effects in the hippocampus) 70 (Kensinger et al., 2003; Uncapher and Rugg, 2008), or by competing 71 with the primary memory task for general processing resources (i.e. ex-72 ecutive processes, dorsolateral PFC) (Fletcher et al., 1998; Uncapher and 73 Rugg, 2005). 74

So far, memory research has largely neglected internal secondary 75 tasks, most likely because it is difficult to experimentally manipulate 76 internal processes. A recent approach has been to assess whether or 77 not task-unrelated thoughts surface during episodic memory encoding 78 (Maillet and Rajah, 2014b), providing first tentative evidence that 79 memory performance drops in trials where participants experience 80

NeuroImage



<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author at: University of Osnabruck, Institute of Cognitive Science, Albrechtstr. 28, 49076 Osnabrück, Germany.

2

task-unrelated thoughts (i.e., mind wandering, task-relevant interfer-81 82 ences, or internal/external distractions) compared to trials where they were focused on the task. However, although this approach is ecologi-83 84 cally valid, it (a) subsumes internally and externally focused cognitive processes under the term "task-unrelated thoughts" and (b) does not 85 experimentally manipulate or control the internal processes. In order 86 to compare the effects of internal versus external secondary tasks on 87 memory encoding, it was necessary to identify a solely internally-88 89 focused secondary process that can be experimentally varied: height-90 ened cognitive self-consciousness.

Heightened cognitive self-consciousness is defined as the tendency 9192to monitor and be preoccupied with one's own thoughts (Cartwright-Hatton and Wells, 1997) - it refers to an ongoing process, a "state of 93 94mind" in which the subjects find themselves. More specifically, heightened cognitive self-consciousness can be understood as a state of 95 96 heightened awareness of thinking (Janeck et al., 2003) (e.g. "Am I thinking about work, while reading a book and actually trying not to 97 98 worry about work?"). In terms of brain effort, it can be considered an ongoing, parallel cognitive process, which, in contrast to mind wander-99 ing (cf.Mrazek et al., 2012), is not suppressed during external cognitive 05 challenges such as working memory tasks and thus qualifies as an inter-101 nal secondary task for the present experiment. The definition of height-102 103 ened cognitive self-consciousness is clearly more restricted than the 104 conglomerate of concepts under the term "task-unrelated thought", which comprises mind wandering, task-related interfering thoughts, 105as well as external distraction (e.g. due to scanner noise) in the study 106 by Maillet and colleagues. 107

108 Most importantly, in contrast to other mental activities classified as preoccupation with one's own thoughts such as for example mind wan-109dering (Smallwood, 2013), heightened cognitive self-consciousness 110 can be induced reliably through experimental manipulation (Weber 111 112et al., 2014). In a behavioral study, we recently probed a thought-113monitoring task as an internal secondary task that induced heightened cognitive self-consciousness and yielded first evidence that internal 114 secondary tasks might indeed impair encoding similarly to external sec-115ondary tasks (Weber et al., 2014). Therefore, using heightened cognitive 116 self-consciousness enabled us to directly compare the neurophysiolog-117 118 ical effects of external versus internal secondary tasks during memory encoding. 119

#### Hypotheses 120

The present study aimed to characterize the neural correlates of 121 memory impairment caused by heightened cognitive self-consciousness 122 123 and investigating whether or not these mechanisms differ from processes underlying memory impairment caused by an external secondary task. 124125To this end we used a multiple associate learning paradigm (adapted from Weber et al., 2014): While learning word-pair associations, partic-126ipants were challenged with three different secondary tasks (i.e., an in-127ternal, an external, and a control task). The internal secondary task 128(internal condition) asked participants to monitor their thought during 129130the encoding of word pairs. The external secondary task (external condi-131 tion) engaged participants in judging the similarity of subsequent auditory simple tones. In the high-level perceptual control condition, 132participants simply pressed a button for every occurrence of a tone 133(see Fig. 1). Memory performance was assessed with a covert cued-134135recall test.

#### Behavioral hypotheses 136

For our hypothesis, we focused on impaired memory performance 137 for both internal and external secondary task conditions compared to 138 139the control condition. In line with previous research, we hypothesized that the external condition would impair memory performance by 140 (i) competing for general processing resources (such as attention and 141 working memory capacity) with the primary word-pair learning 142 143 (Uncapher and Rugg, 2005), and by (ii) disrupting encoding processes (Kensinger et al., 2003; Uncapher and Rugg, 2008). Regarding the inter- 144 nal secondary task, we assumed that it affects executive resources and 145 memory encoding similarly, albeit due to an inward focus of attention. 146 This difference, although not necessarily evident in behavioral memory 147 performance, should be visible in different underlying brain mecha- 148 nisms supporting internal and external secondary task performance. 149

### Neurophysiological hypotheses

For both the internal and external condition compared to the con- 151 trol condition, we expected activity decreases in brain regions involved 152 in memory encoding (e.g. the hippocampus, cf. Kensinger et al., 2003; 153 Uncapher and Rugg, 2008) and semantic processing of the to-be- 154 remembered items (inferior frontal gyrus; cf. Shallice et al., 1994; 155 Fletcher et al., 1995; lidaka et al., 2000; Anderson et al., 2000). More- 156 over, as the internal secondary task requires shifting attention between 157 internal thoughts and external stimulation, we expected additional 158 brain systems to be involved compared to the external condition; candi- 159 date brain regions are detailed in the following paragraphs. 160

As described above, the internal secondary task triggers heightened 161 cognitive self-consciousness, an inwardly-focused cognitive process 162 that has not been investigated via brain imaging techniques so far. 163 Therefore, in order to generate hypotheses concerning the underlying 164 neural mechanisms, we refer to related constructs whose neural corre- 165 lates are already better understood. Three concepts that share features 166 with heightened cognitive self-consciousness are task-relevant interfer- 167 ences (Stawarczyk et al., 2011a; Stawarczyk et al., 2011b), perfor- 168 mance monitoring (Ridderinkhof et al., 2004), and mind wandering 169 (Gusnard and Raichle, 2001; Mason et al., 2007; Christoff et al., 2009). 170 Starting with the latter, mind wandering has been defined as self- 171 generated mental activity that is unrelated to external perceptual 172 input (Smallwood, 2013) and, thus, shares the feature of inwardly 173 focused attention with cognitive self-consciousness. From a neuro- 174 physiological perspective, mind wandering has been associated with 175 activity in the default mode network, including the anterior medial pre- 176 frontal cortex (PFC), posterior cingulate cortex and precuneus, as well 177 as the temporoparietal junction; activity in this network is typically ob- 178 served in resting state (Gusnard and Raichle, 2001; Mason et al., 2007; 179 Christoff et al., 2009). However, while mind wandering is commonly 180 understood as being unconstrained and task-irrelevant (Smallwood, 181 2013), we argue that in healthy populations, heightened cognitive 182 self-consciousness relates closer to the actual primary task: for ex- 183 ample, sitting in a lecture and having difficulty staying attentive, you 184 put effort to closely monitor your focus of attention. Following this 185 line of argumentation, heightened cognitive self-consciousness is an 186 inherently secondary task, as it is always concerned with an ongoing 187 primary thinking process. In consequence, heightened cognitive 188 self-consciousness comprises aspects of performance monitoring (i.e. 189 the continuous monitoring of actions and the outcome of actions) 190 (Ridderinkhof et al., 2004) and so-called task-relevant interferences 191 (i.e., cognitive appraisals of the current task, such as e.g. task length or 192 mistakes made earlier) (Stawarczyk et al., 2011b). The following para- 193 graph will detail the neurophysiological hypotheses emerging from the 194 conceptual relations between heightened cognitive self-consciousness, 195 performance monitoring, and task-relevant interferences. 196

Heightened cognitive self-consciousness and performance monitor- 197 ing share a scrutinizing focus on ongoing activity. To some extent, they 198 both compare these actions to inner standards, even though heightened 199 cognitive self-consciousness is not focused on overt behavior, but rather 200 on the thinking process. Conditions requiring intensified performance 201 monitoring, such as response conflict, response uncertainty, and re- 202 sponse errors, result in increased activity in the anterior cingulate cortex 203 (ACC) (Ridderinkhof et al., 2004; Kanske and Kotz, 2011) and in the an- 204 terior insula (Klein et al., 2007, 2013; Ullsperger et al., 2010). Both 205 regions are discussed as core nodes of the salience (Menon and Uddin, 206 2010) or task control network (Dosenbach et al., 2007) and thus, also 207 qualify as potential support regions for heightened cognitive self- 208

Please cite this article as: Bonhage, C., et al., Thinking about thinking: Neural mechanisms and effects on memory, NeuroImage (2015), http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.11.067

150

Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6024560

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6024560

Daneshyari.com