



**Predicting Independent Functioning in an Elderly Population:  
The Evaluation of Working Memory Capacity as a Biomarker  
of Ageing.**

**Sara. L. Howard, B. Health Sc. (First Class Honours Psychology)**

**School of Psychology**

**The University of Adelaide,**

**South Australia.**

**This thesis is submitted to the Graduate Centre in fulfilment for the award of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Medicine.**

**Submitted: 16 March 2007**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables .....	xii
List of Figures .....	xix
Abstract .....	xxi
Declaration .....	xxiii
Acknowledgments .....	xxiv

---

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION (PART I)

AGEING AND THE ABILITY TO FUNCTION INDEPENDENTLY .....	1
1.1 Dissertation overview: Independent functioning, chronological age, working memory and biomarkers .....	1
1.2 Independent functioning .....	2
1.3 Physical and cognitive declines associated with increasing age .....	4
1.3.1 Physical decline .....	4
1.3.2 Cognitive decline .....	4
1.4 Chronological age is not a good indicator of individual variation in ageing .....	5
1.5 Established factors that influence functional dependence in the elderly .....	10
1.5.1 Previous studies involving cognitive predictors of independent functioning: Limitations .....	12
1.6 Working memory .....	13
1.6.1 Age-related decline in working memory .....	14
1.6.2 Mediating role of working memory .....	15

1.6.3 Ecological validity of working memory in independent functioning .....	16
1.7 Relationship of independent functioning to the concept of ‘biomarkers’ ...	17
1.7.1 Limitations of biomarker research .....	18
1.8 Summary and contribution of this dissertation .....	19

---

## CHAPTER 2: INTRODUCTION (PART II)

WORKING MEMORY IN THEORY AND PRACTICE .....	21
2.1 Overview: Importance of clarifying working memory theory and tasks ....	21
2.2 What is working memory? .....	21
2.2.1 Memory structures .....	22
2.2.2 Memory processes .....	23
2.3 The development of working memory .....	24
2.4 Working memory models .....	25
2.5 Baddeley and Hitch’s (1974) tripartite model of working memory .....	26
2.5.1 The phonological loop .....	27
2.5.2 The visuo-spatial sketchpad .....	29
2.5.3 The central executive .....	30
2.6 Operationalisation of working memory in the current study .....	33
2.6.1 Reading Span: An overview .....	34
2.6.1.1 The original Reading Span Test .....	35
2.6.1.2 Reading sentences aloud .....	35
2.6.1.3 Reading sentences silently .....	37
2.6.1.4 Listening (‘Listening Span’) .....	37
2.6.2 Adaptations to the Reading Span Test .....	37

2.6.3 Analyses of how different versions of the Reading Span	
Test can vary .....	39
2.6.4 What do reading span-type tasks measure? .....	46
2.6.5 Performance on reading span tests by age group .....	47
2.7 Dot Matrix: An overview .....	49
2.7.1 Development of the Dot Matrix Task .....	49
2.7.2 Performance on visuo-spatial tasks by age group .....	51
2.8 Digit Ordering: An overview .....	52
2.8.1 Development of the Digit Ordering Task .....	53
2.8.2 Performance on digit ordering tasks by age group .....	56
2.9 Summary of working memory test selection .....	57

---

## CHAPTER 3: STUDY DESIGN AND METHOD

### INITIAL, INTERMEDIATE AND FINAL MEASUREMENT

BATTERIES .....	59
3.1 Chapter overview .....	59
3.2 Study design .....	59
3.2.1 General qualities of longitudinal studies .....	60
3.3. Participants .....	61
3.3.1 Selection and exclusion criteria .....	63
3.3.2 Demographic information across test sessions .....	64
3.4 Apparatus and measures .....	64
3.4.1 Selection criterion assessment: Screening for the presence of dementia .....	65
3.4.2 Outcome measures .....	67

3.4.2.1	Activities of daily living .....	67
3.4.2.2	Reasoning ability .....	70
3.4.2.3	Life satisfaction .....	73
3.4.2.4	Crystallised ability .....	74
3.4.2.5	Memory-based activities of daily living .....	77
3.4.3	Covariates .....	78
3.4.3.1	Demographic variables .....	79
3.4.3.2	Depression .....	79
3.4.3.3	Health .....	82
3.4.3.4	Lifestyle measures .....	85
3.4.4	Biomarkers .....	92
3.4.4.1	Blood pressure .....	92
3.4.4.2	Grip strength .....	97
3.4.4.3	Body mass index .....	99
3.4.4.4	Visual acuity .....	101
3.4.4.5	Working memory .....	103
3.5	Procedure .....	111

---

## CHAPTER 4: WORKING MEMORY TASKS

FACTOR STRUCTURE AND AGE DIFFERENCES .....	113
4.1 Overview: Analysis of working memory tasks .....	113
4.2 Working memory: Construct validity .....	113
4.3 Working memory: Age differences .....	117
4.3.1 Storage or processing: Which element of working memory is more sensitive to the ageing process? .....	120

4.3.1.1 Meguro et al. (2000) .....	123
4.3.1.2 Application of Meguro et al.'s (2000) study here .....	124
4.3.1.3 Discussion of results about age differences in Digit Ordering .....	128
4.4 Summary .....	131
<hr/>	
CHAPTER 5: CROSS-SECTIONAL RESULTS (INITIAL ASSESSMENT) .....	133
5.1 Overview .....	133
5.2 Descriptive statistics .....	133
5.2.1 Selection criteria – Dementia screening .....	134
5.2.2 Outcome variables .....	134
5.2.2.1 Activities of daily living .....	134
5.2.2.2 Reasoning ability .....	135
5.2.2.3 Life satisfaction .....	136
5.2.3 Covariates .....	136
5.2.3.1 Depression .....	136
5.2.3.2 Health .....	137
5.2.3.3 Lifestyle .....	138
5.2.4 Biomarkers .....	141
5.2.4.1 Blood pressure .....	141
5.2.4.2 Grip strength .....	141
5.2.4.3 Body mass index .....	141
5.2.4.4 Visual acuity .....	142
5.2.4.5 Reading Span .....	143
5.3 Relationships among variables .....	143

5.4 Regression analyses: Predicting independent functioning outcome variables .....	146
5.4.1 Activities of daily living .....	146
5.4.2 Reasoning ability .....	148
5.4.3 Life satisfaction .....	151
5.5 Result summary and discussion .....	151

---

## CHAPTER 6: LONGITUDINAL RESULTS

THE CALCULATION AND USE OF CHANGE SCORES .....	157
6.1 Overview .....	157
6.2 Confounds to longitudinal analyses .....	157
6.2.1 Measurement error/Regression-to-the-mean .....	158
6.2.2 Initial test performance .....	159
6.2.3 Test-retest reliability .....	159
6.2.4 Practice effects .....	160
6.2.5 Demographic measures .....	160
6.3 Measuring change: Different types of change scores .....	161
6.3.1 The simple difference score .....	161
6.3.1.1 Mean difference score .....	162
6.3.2 Regression-based/Residualised change scores .....	162
6.3.2.1 Reliable Change Index .....	163
6.4 Summary: Selection of a change score method .....	164
6.5 Change scores: Reliability assessment and descriptive statistics .....	164
6.5.1 Presence of true change confounds .....	165

6.5.2 Developing standardised regression-based regression equations .....	169
6.5.3 Clinically relevant change scores .....	172
6.6 Regression analyses: Predicting independent functioning outcome measures over time .....	177
6.6.1 Activities of daily living .....	179
6.6.1.1 Basic activities of daily living .....	180
6.6.1.2 Instrumental activities of daily living .....	182
6.6.2 Reasoning ability .....	187
6.6.3 Crystallised ability .....	189
6.6.4 Memory-based activities of daily living .....	191
6.7 Assessment of selective attrition .....	193
6.8 Results summary and discussion .....	195

---

## CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

GENERAL DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS .....	201
7.1 Dissertation objectives, achievements and limitations .....	201
7.2 Criteria for biomarkers and future research .....	202

---

REFERENCES .....	207
------------------	-----

APPENDICES .....	266
------------------	-----

Appendix A: Copy of the Alzheimer’s Disease Assessment Scale – Cognitive (ADAS-Cog) .....	266
---	-----

Appendix B (Part A): Full version of the composite activities of daily living questionnaire .....	281
---	-----

Appendix B (Part B): Abridged version of the composite activities of daily living questionnaire .....	287
Appendix C: Performance distribution of Concept Formation on the initial measurement occasion .....	290
Appendix D: Questions from the Information test used in the current study ..	291
Appendix E: Copy of the self-report Health Questionnaire .....	297
Appendix F: General Health Status .....	304
Appendix G (Part A): Body systems represented by symptoms .....	308
Appendix G (Part B): Body systems represented by diseases .....	311
Appendix H: Diet Diary used to assess nutritional intake .....	313
Appendix I: Macronutrients and micronutrients .....	326
Appendix J: Digit Ordering stimuli .....	327
Appendix K: Reasons behind Dot Matrix missing data .....	330
Appendix L: Australian recommended dietary intake levels for various nutrients .....	334
Appendix M: Relationships between depression and biomarker and independent functioning variables (initial assessment occasion) .....	335
Appendix N: Relationships between health and biomarker and independent functioning variables (initial assessment occasion) .....	336
Appendix O: Relationships between lifestyle variables and biomarker and independent functioning variables (initial assessment occasion) .....	338
Appendix P: Bivariate correlations (Pearson's $r$ ) between dependent and independent variables for cross-sectional regression results (Chapter 5) .....	349

Appendix Q: Bivariate correlations (Pearson's $r$ ) between dependent and independent variables for longitudinal regression results (Chapter 6) .....	350
---	-----

## ABSTRACT

The ageing process is characterised by declines in physical and cognitive ability and by a general increase in dependence in carrying out daily tasks. Maintenance of functional *independence* is critical to quality of life in elderly populations (Black & Rush, 2002; Sulander et al., 2005). Therefore, identifying measures that can predict functional ability is of particular interest to societies with an ageing population.

Due to increases in inter-individual and intra-individual variability with age, chronological age has been demonstrated to be a poor predictor of an individual's functional ability (Bauco et al., 1996; Willis et al., 1992). Consequently, other, more successful indicators, referred to as biomarkers, have been established (e.g. grip strength and visual acuity). However, of these more accurate measures, few are cognitive. This is surprising given the reported strong and positive relationship between independent functioning and intact cognition (Atkinson et al., 2005; Bäckman & Hill, 1996). Therefore, the current project investigated whether a task of working memory capacity (Reading Span), could predict a range of independent functioning outcome measures.

Employing a longitudinal study design (three measurement occasions over approximately 18 months), 150 community-dwelling participants, 70 years of age and over (99 females, 51 males), were tested on a range of cognitive and physiological tasks. Cross-sectional results from logistic and linear regressions showed that chronological age was in fact a significant predictor of all three functional outcome measures. In contrast, Reading Span was a significant predictor only of one outcome measure (reasoning ability). Some of the physiological and sensorimotor biomarkers were found to predict two of the three functional outcome measures. Therefore, cross-sectional results showed that all of the biomarkers were limited in their ability to predict

outcomes measured concurrently and, in the current sample, chronological age was the best predictor of some outcome measures. However, over time, Reading Span became a significant predictor of most of the outcome measures and explained a comparable amount of variance to age. Reading Span also often accounted for more variance than physiological and sensorimotor variables.

The current sample was healthy, independent functioning and cognitively intact. Performance variability was low initially and was further reduced by the presence of selective attrition (i.e. individuals with poorer reasoning and crystallised ability and lesser working memory capacity dropped out of the study). Based on this, it is not surprising that biomarkers were able to explain less than 10% of the variance in *any* outcome measure. In summary, the current study shows that working memory capacity, as measured by Reading Span, is a valuable addition to the assessment of functional ability in an elderly population and highlights the importance of cognition in this context. However, further investigations are required before Reading Span can be described as a *biomarker* of ageing.