

RUNNING HEAD: Outsourcing of Cognitive Control

**Outsourcing Cognitive Control to the Environment:  
Adult-Age Differences in the Use of Task Cues**

Daniel H. Spieler, Ulrich Mayr, & Susan LaGrone

Word count: 4101 (text plus references)

Please send correspondence to:

Daniel H. Spieler  
School of Psychology, 654 Cherry Street  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Atlanta, GA 30332-0170  
[spieler@donders.psych.gatech.edu](mailto:spieler@donders.psych.gatech.edu)  
404-759-4547

### Abstract

When an initial phase of cued task switching is followed by a phase of single-task trials, older adults show difficulties changing to the more efficient single-task mode of processing (Mayr & Liebscher, 2001). In Experiment 1 we show that these costs follow older adults' continued tendency to inspect task cues even though these provide no new information. In Experiment 2 we included a condition in which task cues were eliminated from the display after the task-switching phase. In this condition, old adults behaved as young adults, suggesting that the presence the task cue is critical for observing age differences while switching from a "high-control" to a "low-control" mode of processing. Results are discussed in terms of a life-span shift in terms of the reliance on internal versus external sources of information under conditions of high control demands.

133 words

### **Outsourcing Cognitive Control to the Environment: Massive Adult-Age Differences in the Use of Task Cues**

Assume you are about to prepare a meal for friends coming over for dinner. Initially, you will spend some time thinking about necessary ingredients and the exact sequence of steps. This phase requires deliberation and active processing of external information (e.g., from cook books). Once the plan is laid out, and assuming everything goes as planned, you should be able to execute the remaining routine activities in a relatively ballistic manner, freeing up mental capacity for other activities, such as a chat with your arriving friends. Many day-to-day situations require such a back and forth between high-control and low-control phases.

Ideally, we should enter a low-control mode whenever possible and use the costly high-control mode only when necessary. Are we able to rapidly switch from high-control phases requiring intense, deliberate information processing, to phases in which information intake is geared towards the demands of routine activities?

Normal young adults appear to have little difficulty in shifting control modes. Using a variant of the task-switching paradigm, Mayr and Liebscher (2001) required younger and older participants to switch between responding to the color or form of a stimulus on the basis of task cues ("color" and "shape") presented above the stimulus. On the first 40 trials, individuals switched randomly from one task to another, prompted by the cue. This situation requires significant top-down control and active use of the cue to select the relevant task set on each trial. However, from trial 41 onwards, one of the two tasks dropped out and only one task was relevant for the remaining 80 trials. Individuals were informed which task would drop out at the start of the block, and the no-longer relevant task indicator was "marked out" to emphasize that this task was now irrelevant. Obviously, during this so-called fadeout phase, top-down task selection and task cue use is no longer necessary and individuals should switch into a low-control mode.

Indeed, after only 10 trials into the fadeout phase, young adults' performance was identical to their performance in a single-task control situation in which only one task was relevant throughout the block. In contrast, older adults showed a large, 300 *ms* "fadeout" cost (fadeout-phase RT minus corresponding single task RT) after one of the two tasks dropped out and there remained a 100 *ms* cost at the end of the block. In other words, older adults continued to experience a significant influence of the initial task-selection phase long after younger adults had ceased to show any such influence. These results suggest that the selection of control modes is age-sensitive and a better understanding of the general problem of control mode selection should result from a closer examination of how older and younger adults transition between control modes.

One potential reason for older adults' failure to fully transition to single task performance levels is suggested by studies of visual perception (e.g., Ballard, Hayhoe, Pook, & Rao, 1997) that indicate that people encode limited information about the environment, preferring to use the environment as an external memory. The degree to which people rely on internal versus external information sources varies with task demands (e.g., Ballard et al, 1997) and may also vary with either objective or subjective quality of internal representations. Task-selection situations appear particularly difficult for older adults (e.g., Kray & Lindenberger, 2000) because of problems maintaining reliable representations of competing task sets (Braver, Barch, Keys, Cater, Cohen et al., 2001; Mayr, 2001). This difficulty may increase older adults' reliance on cue processing to update continually degrading task representations. We hypothesize that the reliance on external information to compensate for noisy internal representations overgeneralizes beyond the phases where it is necessary. During the initial task-switching phase, older adults may establish a strong visual routine (Ballard et al., 1997) of inspecting the task cue and this routine persists into

the fade-out phase, accounting for the age difference in performance.

A straightforward prediction follows from this account: If older adults fail to shift to a low-control mode due to continued reliance on task cues, they should continue to inspect the task cue during the fade-out phase even though it contains no new information. In Experiment 1, we use the basic paradigm introduced by Mayr and Liebscher, but used eye-movement analyses to examine how old and young adults used the task cues during the fadeout phase.

## **Experiment 1**

### **Method**

#### *Participants*

Twenty-four healthy older adults with no history of neurological disorders ( $M$  Age = 71.9,  $SD$  = 4.5) and 24 younger adults ( $M$  Age = 19.3,  $SD$  = 1.9) adults recruited from the undergraduate student population at the Georgia Institute of Technology participated. Older adults received \$10 per hour for participation, younger adults received course credit. Younger adults scored an average 73.1 (5.2) on the digit-symbol subtest of the WAIS compared to 47.1 (10) for older adults.

#### *Apparatus*

Eye movements were monitored using an ISCAN ETL400 remote video-based pupil/corneal reflection system sampling at 120 Hz. A ViewSonic P815 21-inch monitor displayed stimuli. Participants used a chin/forehead rest to control head movements and maintain viewing distance of 81 cm.

#### *Materials*

An example stimulus is shown in Figure 1. The color and form task cues were separated by 20.6 degrees and both were 14.9 degrees from the 2.7 by 1.1 degree vertically or horizontally

oriented bars that required either color or form (orientation) judgments from the participants

### *Procedure*

Sessions took 60 to 90 minutes. Instructions specific to each block of trials (single task, mixed task, and fade out blocks) were provided at the start of each block of trials. The actual experiment began only when participant's eye position calibration error was below 1 degree. Participants then completed 50 practice trials consisting of 5 mini-blocks mirroring those of the experimental session: single task trials in color and form judgments, switching trials, and fadeout style trials ending in either color or form tasks, followed by 6 experimental blocks of 60 trials each. There were 2 single task blocks, 2 switching blocks, and two fadeout blocks.

On each trial: a) a validation point appeared and required a stable fixation within one degree for 800 ms before the start of the trial, b) upon meeting the validation criteria, the display appeared, eye position recording began, and the display remained until response, c) upon a response validation for the next trial appeared.

Tasks required discriminations based on the color (red versus blue) or form (vertical versus horizontal) of the stimuli. Participants made their responses using the z and / keys on the keyboard. Saccades were defined as eye movements exceeding 90 degrees/second and traveling at least 1 degree from beginning to end, while all other samples were assumed to be fixations. Fixation location was defined as the mean X and Y coordinate from the end of one saccade to the start of the next. If velocity criteria identified fixations lasting less than 50 ms, these data points were reassigned to the preceding saccade.

## **Results**

Incorrect responses, correct response times less than 200 ms or greater than 3000 ms were eliminated from all analyses. Analyses focus on performance during the single task phase of the

fadeout block (i.e., trials 32-60, henceforth the fade-out phase) compared with the corresponding trials from the single-task blocks. Error rates on the critical fadeout block were below 5% for both groups so we do not pursue further analyses of error rates<sup>1</sup>. Trials in the fade-out phase were analyzed in terms of six five-trial segments (except for the first, four-trial segment). Unless otherwise noted, all effects were significant at the .01 level.

As shown in Figure 2a, during the mixed phase of the fadeout block, both young and older adults exhibited large switch costs (i.e., difference between switch and nonswitch RTs) and mixing costs (i.e., difference between nonswitch RT and single task RT). Both the switching and mixing costs were qualitatively identical to those in the full mixed task blocks. Turning to the fadeout phase, older adults had much larger fade-out costs than young adults (i.e., fade-out RTs compared to corresponding single-task RTs),  $F(1, 46) = 30.68$ ; there was a significant linear decrease in fade-out costs across trial segments,  $F(1, 46) = 88.08$ , and this decrease was larger for older than for younger adults  $F(1, 46) = 12.19$ . However, for the final segment, younger adults' performance was indistinguishable from single task performance,  $t(23) = .52, p > .61$  (19 ms), while older adults performance was still slower than single task performance,  $t(23) = 6.30$  (299 ms).

As shown in Figure 2b, older adults were much more likely to fixate cues than young adults,  $F(1, 46) = 61.67$  (analyses were based on arc-sine transformed probabilities; Winer, Brown & Michels, 1991). At the end of the block, young adults were no more likely to fixate the cue than in single task performance,  $t(23) < 1$ , while for older adults the critical difference remained highly reliable,  $t(23) = 8.21$ .

As shown, in Figure 2c the average gaze time on the cue per trial was much larger for old than for young adults. For the first two fade-out segments, this time was considerably shorter

than the corresponding RT fade-out cost (*525 ms* and *399 ms* versus *760 ms* and *588 ms* for gaze time and RT respectively) suggesting that cue processing cannot entirely explain fade-out costs early in the fadeout phase. However, during the remaining four segments, cue-inspection costs were only slightly shorter than RT fadeout costs (*349 ms*, *340 ms*, *313 ms*, and *310 ms* versus *411 ms*, *382 ms*, *398 ms*, and *299 ms* respectively).

We computed the correlation between each individual's RT fadeout cost and the mean time per trial each individual spent on the task indicators. Across age groups, this correlation was *.81*. Within old adults it was *.74*, whereas within young adults it was only *.39* reflecting the restriction of range arising from the much lower level of cue checks in this group. If the RT cost is directly associated with processing of these task cues, then we should expect a similar relationship to hold within individuals. We regressed the RT for each trial onto time on the task indicators for that trial in the fadeout blocks. We found an average unstandardized slope of *1.4* (Young: *1.82* Old: *0.99*) and an average  $R^2$  of *.34* (Young: *.31* Old: *.37*), which is a substantial amount of variance explained given many factors that drive trial-to-trial RTs fluctuations. The slope measure for younger adults should be interpreted with caution due to the very small number of cue fixations in this group. Combined, these results suggest that cue processing is almost entirely responsible for age differences in performance during the fadeout phase of the experiment.

We hypothesized that older adults use the cue during the fadeout phase in the same way as during initial task-selection trials, namely to ensure the adequate task set prior to stimulus processing. Alternatively, older adults may be less confident about their performance and therefore engage a post selection checking stage. This predicts cue inspections late in the trial. In fact, on average, cue inspections occurred after only 22% of the total time within the trial for

older and after 33% for young adults. Thus, particularly for older adults, this pattern is consistent with reliance on cue information prior to processing of the stimulus.

## **Experiment 2**

Experiment 1 demonstrates that older adults rely on external information to a far greater extent than younger adults and the RT fadeout cost was strongly related to the time spent on the task cues. Furthermore, cue fixations occurred early in the trial suggesting that these fixations were reinforcing the current task set rather than associated with a checking stage just prior to response. These results suggest older adults maintain a high level of reliance on external information and this reliance is responsible for the observed age differences in fadeout costs.

An alternative account for these results is that older adults have difficulty in maintaining a consistent task set over time (Braver et al., 2001) and the reliance on cue information, far from causing these fadeout effects, actually attenuates otherwise larger age differences that would arise in the absence of this cue information.

These two accounts make opposite predictions about the role that task cues play in fadeout-cost age differences. In the former account, it is the presence of the cues during the fade-out phase that continues to prompt cue-checking behavior on old adults. Thus, removal of the task cues during the fade-out should *improve* older adults' performance. In the latter account, the cues are critical in supporting older adults performance and cue removal should exacerbate fadeout costs. We tested these contrasting predictions by manipulating the presence of task cues during the fadeout phase of the experiment. We included both the fade-out condition with the cues present as in Experiment 1 and one in which the cues disappear during the fade-out phase.

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants were 24 older ( $M = 77.8$ ,  $SD = 6.7$ ) and 24 younger ( $M = 22.0$ ,  $SD = 4.3$ ) adults with no history of neurological disorders. Younger adults were recruited from the undergraduate student population at the University of Oregon and participated for course credit. Older adults were recruited from the Eugene OR community and they were paid \$10 per hour for participation. All participants were in good health and had normal or corrected to normal vision. On Digit-symbol substitution older adults scored an average of 45.6 (11.1) and younger adults scored 64.9 (9.9).

### *Materials*

Stimuli were displayed against a black background within a white, 14 x 11.3 degree frame. As task cues the verbal label "Color" was shown in the upper left corner, the label "Shape" was shown in the lower right corner. Each word was about 1.1 degrees wide and 0.5 degrees in height. A thin white frame (1 pixel) surrounded each task label that thickened (8 pixels) for the label corresponding to the currently relevant task. The task stimulus was presented centrally, 2.9 degrees from the bottom of the frame. The direct distance between task labels and stimulus was 9 degrees. The stimulus was either a red or green rectangle with a side length of about 1.2 degrees.

### *Design and Procedure*

To keep the experimental session of a manageable length, we included only single task and fadeout blocks. Throughout all blocks, task cues were present for the first 40 trials. For two single task and two fadeout blocks, one block for each task, task cues disappeared from trial 44 onwards. For the other two single task and fadeout blocks, the task cues remained as in

Experiment 1. On no-cue fade-out blocks, trials 41 to 43 served as a "transition phase" during which subjects had an opportunity to adapt to the changed task demands signaled by the crossed out task cue that was no longer relevant for the remainder of the block. Each individual test block was not only preceded by detailed instructions, but also by a 14-trial practice block that resembled the structure of the following test block in a compressed manner (initial phase: 5 trials, transition phase: 3 trials, fade-out phase: 6 trials). The sequence of the eight test blocks was counterbalanced according to a Latin square.

Each trial began with a 500 ms period during which only the stimulus frame was present. Then the task cue was presented for 100 ms followed by the stimulus. Cue and stimulus remained on the screen until the correct response was entered. The two tasks required subjects to respond to either the color (red or blue) or the form (vertical or horizontal) of the stimulus and participants made their responses using the / and z key of the keyboard.

## Results

RTs were filtered as in Experiment 1. Error rates for the critical fadeout block were again below 5% for both groups<sup>2</sup>. We looked at correct responses from trial 44 onwards, breaking down the block into five 10-trial segments. Figure 3 shows the relevant results. Older adults, but not younger adults, again showed large fade-out costs when task cues remained present during the entire fade-out phase. Fade-out costs were substantial but lower than in Experiment 1. We attribute this difference to the fact that overall, participants had received considerably more practice in Experiment 2 than in Experiment 1. Consistent with the visual-routine hypothesis, Figure 3 shows that older adults' cost almost disappeared when no cue was present during the fade-out phase. Older adults' performance was clearly more influenced by the presence/absence of the cue than that of younger adults, age by task type (fadeout versus single

task) by cue presence,  $F(1,46)=18.02$ . Separate analyses showed older adults were considerably better without than with task cues,  $F(1,46) = 15.11$  while younger adults, showed if anything, the opposite trend,  $F(1,46) = 2.94, p = .10$ . The critical Fadeout by Cue interaction was reliable for the final segment in old adults,  $F(1,23) = 6.86, p < .05$ , but young adults showed the opposite trend,  $F(1,23) = 3.30, p = .08$ .

### Conclusions

Switching flexibly from a high- to a low-control mode of processing is easy for a young-adult cognitive system, but poses considerable difficulties as we grow older (Mayr & Liebscher, 2001). Studies of eye-movement patterns during complex visual-motor tasks have suggested that people will often minimize the use of internal representations to guide action selection (Ballard, Hayhoe, & Pelz, 1995). Rather, they rely on task-specific visual routines that extract the relevant information from the visual scene as needed, treating the environment as an external memory (e.g., Ballard et al., 1997). These studies also suggest that the relative reliance on internal versus external information is a delicate optimization problem. Here, we show that older adults solve this optimization problem differently from young adults.

In our paradigm, the critical information was very simple, namely which of two tasks remained relevant after an initial task-switching phase. As indicated by small cue-fixation times and fadeout costs, young adults seemed to rely almost exclusively on the internal task set representation. In contrast, older adults continued to inspect the cue even though the cue information was completely redundant with a possible internal representation. Cue inspection almost entirely responsible for the large RT fadeout costs. Of course external and internal information is redundant for older adults only if they are capable of establishing an adequate internal representation of the current task demands. Thus, it was revealing that old adults'

fadeout costs were almost eliminated when individuals were forced to rely on internal representations by taking away the task cues in the fadeout phase. It is not the faulty internal representation that causes persistent use of the task cues but rather the presence of task cues triggers cue inspection, and in turn, is responsible for the behavioral costs during the fadeout phase. Similar tendencies to rely on external versus internal information in older adults have also been reported from studies using a more complex paired-associate learning task (Rogers, Hertzog, & Fisk, 2001). The critical difference here is that old adults' specific information-use strategy has profound effects in a simple executive-control situation where the amount of information to be represented internally is extremely limited (essentially 1 bit).

The fact that both young and older adults can perform the task in the absence of external cues suggests that less reliable internal representations are not the immediate cause of old adults' persistent use of these cues. However, generally noisier internal context representations (e.g., Braver et al., 2001) could be an indirect factor behind older adults' increased tendency to use external information. One way of adapting to noisier internal representations is to buttress these representations via external information sources. Indeed, there may even be an nonspecific increased tendency to consult the environment in older adults: in the single-task control blocks there was also a higher rate of inspecting the cue (24% of trials compared to 6% for younger adults, see Figure 2b).<sup>3</sup> However, the more striking result was that old adults' tendency to rely on the task cues was dramatically increased in the immediate aftermath of a phase in which task cues were critical for performance.

There are two ways in which a bias towards external information sources may have produced such a pattern of results. Older adults may have a generally reduced threshold for using external sources of information. An external signal that, in the immediate past, was critical for

performance (i.e., the task cues during the task switching phase) may possess greater saliency and thus, with greater probability surpass old adults' lower threshold needed to draw attention compared to a signal that was less recently critical for performance (e.g., the cues in the single-task blocks). Alternatively, older adults' cue inspection behavior during the fadeout phase may be an aftereffect of their greater reliance on cue processing during the initial task-switching phase. For example, Logan's instance theory (1988; see also Mayr & Bryck, 2005) suggests that the constellation of processes applied in a particular stimulus situation are encoded as memory instances and that the quality of these instances is dependent on how much attention was applied during the selection situation. If older adults allocate more attentional resources to the initial task-switching phase than young adults they may sample more persistent memory records that then continue to be retrieved automatically when similar stimulus situations reoccur within that fadeout phase.

Whatever may turn out to be the precise mechanism underlying older adults' increased cue utilization, the present results are important as they establish a significant shift of information processing in demanding situations across the life span. When external sources of information are present, older adults are much more likely than young adults to use them, even if the information demands are very limited and can be represented reliably, and even if the use of the external sources incurs a behavioral cost. Note we have shown that these age differences are directly associated with age differences in the use of environmental information. Often general theories of cognitive aging attempt to account for age differences in performance across a wide range of tasks by positing a fundamental change such as a general slowing of processing (e.g., Cerella, 1990). Such theories typically predict increased effects of experimental manipulations in older adults compared to younger adults. The present set of results are inconsistent with such

generalized slowing accounts precisely because we have shown that the presence of age effects (e.g., fadeout costs) are controlled by the availability of environmental cues. Thus, the causal factor that determines the presence of an age difference is the availability of environmental information. Because general slowing accounts eschew specific process accounts for age differences, these theories are ill-suited to explaining such context specific age effects.

At this point we withhold judgment about the degree to which older adults reliance on environmental information should be interpreted in terms of a deviation from optimal performance when viewed from the eyes of a young adults' cognitive system. What presents itself as a cost under some circumstances may actually indicate a beneficial adaptation that compensates for the pitfalls of an overall less reliable system (e.g., Baltes, 1997).

## References

- Ballard, D. H., Hayhoe, M. M., & Pelz, J. B. (1995). Memory representations in natural tasks. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 7, 66-80.
- Ballard, D. H., Hayhoe, M. M., Pook, P. K., & Rao, R. P. N. (1997). Deictic codes for the embodiment of cognition. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 20, 723-767.
- Baltes, P.B. (1997). On the incomplete architecture of human ontogeny. Selection, optimization, and compensation as foundation of developmental theory. *American Psychologist*, 52, 366-380.
- Braver, T.S., Barch, D.M., Keys, B.A., Cater, C.S., Cohen, J.D., Kaye, J.A., Janowsky, J.S., Taylor, S.F., Yesavage, J.A., Mumenthaler, M.S., Jagust, W.J., & Reed, B.R. (2001). Context processing in older adults: Evidence for a theory relating cognitive control to neurobiology in healthy aging. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 130, 746-763.
- Cerella, J. (1990). Aging and information-processing rate. In J. E. Birren & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of aging* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Kray, J. ,& Lindenberger, U. (2000). Adult age differences in task switching. *Psychology & Aging*, 15, 126–147.
- Logan, G.D. (1988). Toward an instance theory of automatization. *Psychological Review*, 95, 492-527.
- Mayr, U., & Bryck (2005). Sticky rules: Integration between abstract rules and specific actions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 31, 337-350.
- Mayr, U., & Liebscher, T. (2001). Is there an age deficit in the selection of mental sets? *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 13, 47-69.
- Rogers, W.A., Hertzog, C., & Fisk, A.D. (2001). An individual differences analysis of

ability and strategy influences: Age-related differences in associative learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition*, 26, 359-394.

Winer, B.J., Brown, D.R., Michels, K.M. (1991). Statistical principles in experimental design. McGraw-Hill, Inc.

#### Author Note

Ulrich Mayr and Daniel Spieler contributed equally to this paper and author sequence was determined via coin toss. This work was supported through NIA grants R01 AG19296-01A1, R01 AG17024-01A1 and NIH Institutional Training Grant T32 AG00175.

### Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> Error rates across the switch, no-switch and single task conditions were 4.0%, 3.2%, and 1.6% respectively for young adults and 3.8%, 2.5%, and 2.8% respectively for older adults. For the single task phase of the fadeout block, error rates were 1.1% and 1.9% for young and older adults respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Error rates across the switch, no-switch and single task conditions were 8.4%, 5.7%, and 3.8% for younger adults and 19.6%, 5.4%, and 2.1% for older adults. For the single task phase of the fadeout block, younger adults had error rates of 4.4% and 4.8% for cue and no-cue conditions respectively compared to older adults 2.4% and 2.2% respectively.

<sup>3</sup> This result is somewhat ambiguous because single-task blocks occurred in the larger context of blocks that did involve task switching. Thus, older adults' increased cue-inspection tendency in single-task blocks may either constitute an unconditional over-reliance on external information or a manifestation of the same, albeit reduced, cost observed in fadeout blocks.

### Figure Captions

Figure 1. Sample stimulus screen for Experiment 1.

Figure 2. Old and young adults' mean RTs (top panel), cue fixation probabilities (middle panel), and average time on cue (bottom panel) for the mixed task phase and for the five segments of the fadeout phase with corresponding segments of the single-task conditions. Error bars represent the 95% within-subject confidence interval for the contrast between fadeout and single-task conditions computed separately for each segment.

Figure 3. Old and young adults' average RTs for six 10-trial segments of fadeout phase separately for the conditions with and without cue and for the corresponding segments of the single-task conditions. Error bars represent the 95% within-subject confidence interval for the interaction between the Fadeout and the Cue factor, computed separately for each segment.

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3

