

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in Psychonomic Bulletin & Review. The final authenticated version is available online at: 10.3758/s13423-020-01833-5

Music is Similar to Language in terms of Working Memory Interference

Anna Marie Fennell,¹ Jennifer A. Bugos,² Brennan R. Payne,³ & Elizabeth R. Schotter⁴

1. Department of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, Teachers College, Columbia

University, New York, NY

2. School of Music, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

3. Department of Psychology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

4. Department of Psychology, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

Correspondence to:

amf2286@tc.columbia.edu

Department of Counseling and Clinical Psychology

Teachers College, Columbia University

525 W 120th St. New York, NY 10027

Running Head: Music Interferes with Verbal Memory

Word Count: 3,672

Abstract

Some researchers theorize that musicians' greater language ability is mediated by greater working memory because music and language share the same processing resources. Prior work using working memory sentence processing dual-task paradigms have shown that holding verbal information (e.g., words) in working memory interferes with sentence processing. In contrast, visuospatial stimuli are processed in a different working memory store and should not interfere with sentence processing. We tested whether music showed similar interference to sentence processing as opposed to non-interference like visuospatial stimuli. We also compared musicians to non-musicians to investigate whether musical training improves verbal working memory. Findings revealed that musical stimuli produced similar working memory interference as linguistic stimuli, but visuospatial stimuli did not – suggesting that music and language rely on similar working memory resources (i.e., verbal skills) that are distinct from visuospatial skills. Musicians performed more accurately on the working memory tasks, particularly for the verbal and musical working memory stimuli, supporting an association between musicianship and greater verbal working memory capacity. Future research is necessary to evaluate the role of music training as a cognitive intervention or educational strategy to enhance reading fluency.

Introduction

Music and language are cognitively intertwined in many ways (e.g., shared syntactic, Patel, 2003, 2013 and auditory working memory systems, Salame' & Baddeley, 1989). Although musical training is linked with advantages in language skills in correlational (Thompson, Schellenberg, & Husain, 2004; Deguchi, Boureux, Sarlo, Besson, Grassi, Schön, & Colombo, 2012; Piro, & Ortiz, 2009; Corrigan, & Trainor, 2011; Tierney & Kraus, 2013) and interventional research (Benz, Sellaro, Hommel, & Colzato, 2016; Bugos & Mostafa, 2011; Bhide, Power, & Goswami, 2013), it is unclear which underlying cognitive mechanisms mediate these relationships. Some researchers believe working memory mediates the benefits of musicianship on reading ability (Suárez et al, 2016; George & Coch, 2011; Slevc & Okada, 2015), especially since working memory is linked to improvements in language outcomes (Caplan, 2016; Hussey, Harbison, Teubner-Rhodes, Mishler, Velnoskey, & Novick, 2017; Payne & Stine-Morrow, 2017).

We suggest that, if working memory is the link between musical training and language skills, then tasks that require working memory to process music must interfere with tasks that require working memory for language. A key paradigm that is used to demonstrate the role of working memory in language processing is a dual-task working memory and sentence reading paradigm (Fedorenko, Gibson, & Rohde, 2006). When readers had to maintain verbal items in memory while reading sentences, comprehension and working memory performance both suffered, especially when both domains consumed more working memory resources (i.e., the sentences were syntactically complex and the working memory stimuli were similar to words in the sentence).

We adapt this dual-task paradigm to investigate whether music interferes with working memory for language processing in a similar way as linguistic stimuli do. Working memory is traditionally described as having three components: the central executive, which is responsible for maintaining and switching attention, and two systems that are responsible for storing, rehearsing, and manipulating perceptual representations: the phonological loop (e.g., verbal information, speech sounds, and tonal stimuli; Salame' & Baddeley, 1989), and the visuospatial sketchpad (e.g., visual images; Baddeley, 1992). The distinction between these two working memory resources is supported through previous research (Shah & Miyake, 1996), which established that spatial skill is distinct from language skill because the two are not correlated with one another. Therefore, while we would expect verbal information to cause working memory interference with sentence processing, we would not expect visuo-spatial information to produce the same kind of interference.

Shared Syntactic Resources in Music & Language

A primary hypothesis as to why music and language share cognitive resources is that music and language are initially perceived independently, but share limited neural resources for syntactic integration and processing (Patel, 2003, 2013). This resource between language and music is demonstrated by a different dual-task paradigm in which participants performed a self-paced reading task and a musical chord coincided with the presentation of each word or short phrase in the sentence (Slevc, Rosenberg, & Patel, 2009). Readers took longer to read syntactically complex sentences than syntactically simple sentences and this slowdown was amplified when it was paired with musical sequences that violated harmonic structures (i.e., when an out-of-key chord is presented, C major to B major), compared to reading with music that followed harmonic structure. The increase in processing difficulty when linguistic violations

and musical structure violations are combined supports the idea that linguistic and musical information are processed using the same limited neural resources for syntax.

While music influences processing speed in a concurrent dual-task, it is unclear if it is drawing on working memory. If music and language share this limited resource for parsing syntax, then we should be able to find a similar interference for music as we do in linguistic dual-task scenarios (Fedorenko et al., 2006). We tested this by extending the working memory and sentence processing dual-task paradigm to include a variety of different kinds of working memory stimuli (e.g., language, music, and visuospatial dots).

Working Memory for Language, Visuo-spatial Information, and Music

It makes sense that music would be related to verbal skills because they are both sound-based. If so, we theorize that music should interfere with verbal working memory, but not with visual stimuli. In this case, perhaps interference functions through more abstract processes rather than perceptual similarity. Verbal working memory could be this commonality since it encompasses auditory speech, tonal stimuli, and written language.

While the Baddeley model predicts that musical skill is not related to visuospatial skill, it is possible that musicians develop improved visuospatial skill by learning to read complex scores at high speeds. Still, there are mixed results in terms of musicians' advantage on visuospatial tasks: some find an advantage (e.g., Sluming, Brooks, Howard, Downes, & Roberts, 2007; Sluming, Barrick, Howard, Cezayirli, Mayes, & Roberts, 2002; Jakobson, Lewycky, Kilgour, & Stoesz, 2008) and some do not (e.g., Talamini, Carretti, & Grassi, 2016; Talamini et al., 2017; Hansen, Wallentin, & Vuust, 2013; Cohen, Evans, Horowitz, & Wolfe, 2011; Ho, Cheung, & Chan, 2003). Therefore, it is an open question in terms of musical training and improved visuospatial skill.

Musical Training & Experience

If music and language share working memory resources, a corollary prediction would be that musicians would exhibit less working memory interference than non-musicians because their musical training would provide benefits to the verbal working memory system. Because past work by Slevc et al. (2009), among others, has tested only non-musicians, there is scant research on this hypothesis. Research supports that musical training is associated with increased working memory (Suárez et al, 2016; George & Coch, 2011), but it is unclear whether that increased capacity affects the sharing of working memory resources across domains. In other words, would musicians perform better than non-musicians on a dual-task working memory and sentence comprehension paradigm, and would they show different patterns of interference than non-musicians?

MacDonald and Christiansen (2002) theorized that individual differences in sentence comprehension stem from an interaction between biological factors and language experience. Musicians tend to outperform non-musicians on several general cognitive abilities such as long-term memory (Talamini, Altoè, Carretti, & Grassi, 2017), auditory working memory (Suárez, Elangovan, & Au, 2016; Talamini et al., 2017), and mathematics (Vaughn, 2000; Cheek, & Smith, 1999), as well as reading and linguistic skills such as detecting prosody within a sentence (Thompson et al., 2004; Deguchi et al., 2012), vocabulary (Piro & Ortiz, 2009), reading comprehension (Corrigan & Trainor, 2011), and word decoding (Tierney & Kraus, 2013). Such findings have led to the suggestion that music practice is linked with processes for language (Slevc & Okada, 2015) and music-based interventions may have generalizable effects that transfer over to other domains (Benz et al., 2016; Bugos & Mostafa, 2011).

If musical training is generalizable to other abilities such as language (i.e., far transfer), then we should expect improved performance among musicians across both music and verbal working memory tasks. Such findings would suggest that extensive experience using the cognitive resources required for musical training can transfer to performance in a completely different domain such as language. More specifically, we hypothesize that musicians will use similar processes to accommodate challenging language and music (i.e., complex syntax and musical phrases with non-harmonic intervals) due to shared processing networks between language and music. But, if musical training only affects skills specific to music (i.e., near transfer), then we hypothesize improvements restricted to music-based tasks.

The Current Study

Following the dual-task logic laid out by Fedorenko et al., (2006), we manipulated the difficulty of the language task through the syntactic complexity of the sentences. We then compared performance to working memory stimuli that should not be processed by the same working memory system (e.g., visuospatial layouts; Wechsler, 1997b). The key comparison is our test of whether musical stimuli pattern with linguistic stimuli or visuospatial stimuli. So, by using a language-only dual-task to demonstrate interference and a language-visuospatial task to demonstrate non-interference, we will have two boundary conditions to compare against a language-music task and observe if music interferes with language tasks because it is processed in the verbal working memory system. We also manipulated the working memory load and whether the information was structured for the musical and visuo-spatial stimuli. To assess the relationship between musical training and working memory resources, we compared musicians to non-musicians.

We hypothesized that (1) working memory accuracy would decrease for challenging stimuli (e.g., sentences with complex syntax, working memory stimuli with high load and/or unstructured harmony or geometry). We also hypothesized that (2) musicians would perform more accurately than non-musicians because of an increased working memory capacity. However, (3) there may be different patterns for musicians in terms of interference depending on whether musical training provides an across-the-board increase to working memory capacity – in this case (3a) the increase should be equivalent across types of working memory stimuli. Or alternatively, if it is specific to the verbal system of working memory (i.e., the phonological loop), (3b) the increase in accuracy should be more pronounced for nouns and musical phrases relative to visuospatial layouts. Furthermore, if the processing of harmonic structure is analogous to the processing of syntactic structure, then (4a) structured musical phrases should lead to better working memory accuracy than non-structured phrases, but (4b) possibly only for musicians because those with musical training have more experience processing harmony and musical syntax.

Method

Participants

We conducted an a priori power analysis for a linear mixed effects regression using the PANGEA program (Westfall, 2016) to determine our needed sample size with 10 items per condition, which is more than prior work (Fedorenko et al., 2006; Slevc et al., 2009). This analysis indicated that, in all blocks, we would be able to detect a standardized effect size of $d = .25$ or larger for the critical within-participants interaction between musical and linguistic variables (i.e., the 2 (Harmonic Structure) x 2 (Syntactic Complexity) interaction in Block 2) with power equal to .89 with 64 participants (32 musicians and 32 non-musicians). Due to the

Coronavirus, we were not able to collect our full sample, but when we re-ran this power analysis with our smallest group-level sample size (22 non-musicians) we found that our power decreased only to .77.

Sixty participants were recruited from the University of South Florida and the surrounding community, either through the psychology department's subject pool and compensated with course credit, or through flyers and word-of-mouth and compensated with financial incentives (\$20/hour for musicians; \$10/hour for non-musicians). We followed all APA guidelines with respect to the treatment of human subjects. We excluded participants due to technical errors in the experimental script ($n = 7$) or misunderstanding instructions ($n = 1$). The analyses reported below include 22 non-musicians and 30 musicians.

All participants were native English speakers, had normal or corrected-to-normal vision, no significant hearing loss, and no history of learning, reading, or musical disabilities. Criteria for musician status included: a minimum of five years of music training, currently practicing an instrument (min. 5 hours per week), ability to read music, and experience performing music¹. Musicians were instrumentalists (i.e., non-vocalists) and did not have perfect pitch. Criteria for non-musicians included: no experience performing music, less than five years of musical training, and currently not practicing an instrument.

To collect quantitative measures of musical background, we also collected a measure of aural music aptitude (Advanced Measures of Music Audiation, AMMA; Gordon, 1989), and a self-report measure of musical training, experience, and musical engagement (Musical USE (MUSE) questionnaire; Chin, & Rickard, 2012). The AMMA is an aural music aptitude test

¹ Our criteria are slightly more inclusive than other researchers in terms of years of musical training, (i.e., 5 as opposed to 6 as suggested by Zhang, Susino, McPherson, & Schubert, 2020) but are more stringent in terms of practice schedule (i.e., we required 5 hours per week opposed to the proposed 1 hour per week).

yielding a tonal, rhythm, and composite score (i.e., sum of the two sub-scores) that takes approximately 20 minutes to complete. The participant hears two short phrases of music and then selects an answer in a multiple-choice online form for whether they were the same, had a change in pitch, a change in rhythm, or if they didn't know (there are never any phrases that differ in both pitch and rhythm). The participant gets a point for every question they answer correctly, lose a point for every question they answer incorrectly, and neither lose or gain a point if they answer that they do not know. The MUSE questionnaire is an index of quality and quantity of music production and music reception that takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. It includes a music engagement profile with indices of music training, music instrument playing, and music listening and five styles of music engagement (Cognitive & Emotional Regulation, Engaged Production, Social Connection, Physical Exercise, and Dance). Welch's t-test for unequal independent groups revealed that, on average, the group of musicians reported practicing music for more hours per day ($t(45.26) = 11.06, p < .001$) and for more years ($t(39.16) = 14.81, p < .001$) and scored higher on the AMMA test composite score ($t(49.55) = 4.91, p < .001$) than the group of non-musicians (see Table 1).

Participant Group	N	Age	Gender (% female)	MUSE: Hours of Practice per Day	MUSE: Years of Musical Experience	AMMA Score
Musician	30	20.6 (2.8)	0.47	4.53 (1.8)	11.6 (3.7)	34.2 (6.2)
Non-Musician	22	19.7 (1.6)	0.59	0.36 (0.9)	0.8 (1.4)	26.5 (5.0)

Table 1. Descriptive statistics (means with standard deviations in parentheses) of participants in the musician and non-musician groups.

Materials and Design

Each participant experienced 186 dual-task working memory-sentence processing trials in which they remembered a working memory stimulus and read a sentence. There were three blocks, one where the working memory stimuli were nouns ($n = 20$ trials), another where the working memory stimuli were musical phrases ($n = 80$ trials), and another where the working memory stimuli were visuospatial layouts of dots ($n = 80$ trials). The nouns block only manipulated sentence structure (simple vs. complex) in a single-factor, two-condition within-subjects design. The music and dots blocks were both 2 (sentence structure: simple vs. complex) $\times 2$ (memory load: low vs. high) $\times 2$ (memory item type: structured vs. unstructured) full factorial within-subjects design. Therefore, each block contained 10 trials per condition, and started with 2 practice trials.

The sentences were taken from a variety of different studies manipulating syntactic complexity by either comparing subject versus object extraction (Fedorenko et al., 2006; e.g., “The violinist [who flattered the cellist/who the cellist flattered] played a piece from the symphony.”), garden-paths (Schotter, Tran, & Rayner, 2014; additional stimuli that were written for this study), reduced relative clauses (Rayner, Carlson, & Frazier, 1983), or whether the critical participial verb had the same surface form as the verb’s simple-past form (Levy, Bicknell, Slattery, & Rayner, 2009). Of the 360 sentences used in the experiment, only 84 were not taken from published sources. Sentences from different sources were presented evenly across conditions and blocks and the order of trials was fully randomized within blocks. Sentences were fully counterbalanced across conditions so that no participant saw the same item more than once, and sentences from each source were evenly distributed across conditions and blocks. There was a question after each sentence that probed for syntactic understanding ($n = 138$; e.g., “Did the

violinist flatter the cellist?” YES/NO) or for semantic understanding ($n = 42$; e.g., “While Sam cried the bread in the toaster caught on fire.” “Was the bread okay?” YES/NO). Our counterbalancing scheme consisted of 16 lists in which 8 lists saw a nouns block, then a music block, then a dots block, and the other 8 lists saw a nouns block, then a dots block, then a music block.

The memory stimuli in the nouns block were similar to the semantic information of the sentence (e.g., occupations: Teacher - Lawyer - Doctor). After the sentence, the words could be in the same or a different order (e.g., Lawyer - Doctor - Teacher). The memory stimuli in the music block were musical phrases, which were either structured or unstructured, and had either few or many notes (Figure 1). The melodies were composed in MuseScore with a piano timbre and were modeled from Halpern and Bower (1982). The structured musical phrases originated from American Folk Songs for Children (Seeger, 1948). The few notes condition had 5 notes (avg duration = 2.74 sec), while the many note conditions had 10 notes (avg duration = 5 sec). The unstructured phrases were edited from the structured phrases to sound similar, but violate harmony, resulting in dissonant intervals, lack of internal structure, and/or a hard-to-locate tonic. In order to adjust the phrases for the unstructured and different conditions, 1-5 notes within each phrase were altered. This was done by adjusting the original notes up or down by one half or whole step. For these adjustments, the few conditions were altered by 1-2 notes, and the many conditions were altered by 3-5 notes. The different variations did not change the structuredness, but lowered or raised select notes of the phrases. The first and last notes of each phrase remained unchanged.



Figure 1. Example stimuli from the music block (presented auditorily), manipulated for number of notes (few/many) and harmonic structure (structured/unstructured).

The memory stimuli in the dots block were a layout of dots within a 5x5 grid (Figure 2). The matrix was 166p x 166p presented in the center of the screen, allowing for four degrees of visual angle from the center of the matrix to the perimeter. Structured dot matrices were based on regular (i.e., equiangular/equilateral) geometric shapes (e.g., squares or triangles) or straight lines, either in the center or the corner of the matrix, whereas the unstructured dot matrices were not vertically symmetrical and did not have any distinct regular geometric shape. The few conditions had 3-4 dots, and the many conditions had 8-9 dots. Every dot layout for the many conditions was built from its few condition counterparts. The variation for each different condition was consistent within each pair (e.g., shifting the figure up one unit, rotating the figure 90 degrees).




Figure 2. Example stimuli from the dots block, manipulated for number of dots (few/many) and visual structure (structured/unstructured).

Procedure

All participants provided informed consent after study procedures were explained to them and the voluntary nature of participation was emphasized. No identifying information (e.g., names) was obtained and the only information connected to their data files was an arbitrary code. After providing informed consent, participants took the AMMA assessment, and then proceeded to the main experiment. On each trial, participants were presented with a memory element (three nouns, a melody, or a dot matrix) followed by a sentence and then a comprehension question. After they answered the comprehension question, they had to judge whether a second memory element was the same as the first one (see Figures 3-5). The nouns block was always presented first, and the order of the music block and the dots block were counterbalanced across participants for which block was presented before the other. Between the music and the dots blocks, the participants completed the music background questionnaire (MUSE). Data collection took approximately 2 hours total per participant and occurred one participant at a time.




Figure 3. Procedure for the nouns block. The participant saw a list of three nouns (occupations that were similar to the entities in the sentence), then the participant read a sentence (manipulated for complexity: simple/complex), answered a comprehension question about the sentence, then the nouns were presented again (either in the same or different order) and the participant responded whether they were the same or different. Each participant was specifically instructed that the Same/Different question referred to the *order* of the nouns.




Figure 4. Procedure for the music block. The participant heard a musical phrase auditorily (manipulated for structure: harmonic vs. non-harmonic and memory load: few vs. many notes), then the participant read a sentence (manipulated for complexity: simple/complex), answered a comprehension question about the sentence, then a melody is played again (either the same melody or a different melody) and the participant responded whether it was the same or different.




Figure 5. Procedure for the dots block. The participant saw a dot matrix (manipulated for structure: geometric/non-geometric and working memory load: few vs. many dots), then the participant read a sentence (manipulated for complexity: simple/complex), answered a comprehension question about the sentence, then a second matrix was presented (either the same matrix or a different matrix) and the participant responded whether it was the same or different.

The experiment was programmed in SR Research Experiment Builder (SR Research Ltd., 2011). Participants were seated approximately 60 cm away from an HP p1230 CRT monitor (1024 x 768 resolution, 150 Hz refresh rate), connected to sound-canceling headphones, and responses to comprehension questions and memory questions were recorded by buttons on a response pad. The memory stimulus in the nouns block and the dots block was presented in the center of the screen for 1800 ms. While the memory stimulus in the music block was being played, a treble clef image was presented on the screen. After the initial working memory stimulus was presented (e.g., nouns, music, or dots), and then they had the option of taking time to rehearse the stimuli by looking at a crosshair in the center of the screen (i.e., “crosshair” time).

Then the participant triggered a sentence to appear by looking at a black box on the left side of the screen; they read the sentence as many times as needed, and pressed a button to indicate that they were finished reading. Afterward, they answered a yes/no comprehension question about the sentence. Finally, a working memory test array was presented, where participants responded whether the initial WM stimulus and test array matched. The participant responded whether it was the same or different on a response pad.

Results

Data were analyzed with (generalized) linear mixed-effects models (G)LMMs using the `glmer()` function from the `lme4` package (version 1.1- 12; Bates, Maechler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015) within the R Environment for Statistical Computing (version 3.3.2; R Development Core Team, 2016). Model structures are specified in each section, below.

General Memory Accuracy

We conducted a logistic regression with memory accuracy as the dependent measure (see Table 2, Figure 6). The model included three factors: (1) block, which consisted of two contrasts: one that compared between the music and noun blocks, and the second that compared between the music and dot blocks, (2) sentence complexity, which compared simple to complex sentences with a sum-to-zero contrast, and (3) musicianship status, which compared non-musicians to musicians with a sum-to-zero contrast. The model also included the two-way and three-way interactions between each of these factors. Therefore, the model produced eleven contrasts: one comparing dots to music, one comparing music to nouns, one for the effect of sentence complexity, one for the effect of musicianship status, two for the interaction between block and complexity, two for the interaction between musicianship status and complexity, and two for the three-way interaction of block, status, and complexity. We included crossed random effects of

items and participants (intercepts only because some participants and items exhibited ceiling effects in some conditions the model could not estimate variances around random slopes).

There was significantly higher accuracy in the dots block than the music block ($p < .001$), but no difference between the music and nouns blocks ($p = .35$). Musicians significantly outperformed non-musicians ($p < .001$). There was no main effect of sentence complexity ($p = .67$), nor were there any two-way interaction between complexity and either of the contrasts between blocks (both $ps > .69$), nor any three-way interactions (all $ps > .7$). This is consistent with previous studies (see Fedorenko et al., 2006) in which we only see complexity effects for sentence comprehension, not working memory accuracy (see below).

There was a significant interaction between sentence complexity and musicianship status ($p < .01$). Follow-up analyses performed separately for each of the participant groups revealed that while the musicians have higher accuracy in the simple conditions (Estimate = -0.90, SE = 0.14, z value = -6.48, $p < .001$), the non-musicians have higher accuracy in the complex conditions (Estimate = -0.62, SE = 0.13, z value = -4.85, $p < .001$). There was no three-way interaction between sentence complexity, musicianship status, and the contrast between the music and noun blocks ($p = .07$). There was no two-way interaction between musicianship status and the contrast between the noun and music blocks ($p = .8$), but there was a significant two-way interaction between musicianship status and the contrast between the music and dot blocks ($p < .001$) with a larger advantage for musicians over non-musicians in the music block compared to the dot block. Follow-up analyses run for the difference in memory accuracy as a function of musicianship status separately in each block revealed that musicians were more accurate than non-musicians for all types of working memory stimuli (all $ps < .001$), although the effect sizes did vary between blocks (see below).

<i>Predictors</i>	Memory Accuracy			
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	4.02 ***	3.42 – 4.74	16.72	<0.001
Music-Dots	0.51 ***	0.41 – 0.63	-6.23	<0.001
Nouns-Music	1.17	0.84 – 1.62	0.93	0.351
Complexity	1.05	0.83 – 1.34	0.43	0.665
Musicianship Status	2.21 ***	1.72 – 2.85	6.16	<0.001
Music-Dots*Complexity	0.94	0.62 – 1.44	-0.27	0.787
Nouns-Music*Complexity	1.04	0.54 – 2.00	0.11	0.912
Music-Dots*Status	1.61 ***	1.28 – 2.02	4.13	<0.001
Nouns-Music*Status	1.02	0.72 – 1.44	0.11	0.916
Complexity*Status	1.47 **	1.14 – 1.90	2.93	0.003
Music-Dots*Complexity*Status	0.92	0.58 – 1.44	-0.38	0.708
Nouns-Music*Complexity*Status	1.92	0.96 – 3.83	1.84	0.065
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
τ_{00} item	0.63			
τ_{00} subject	0.15			
ICC	0.19			
N_{subject}	51			
N_{item}	360			
Observations	9179			
Marginal R^2 / Conditional R^2	0.057 / 0.238			

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 2. Results of the lmer model for memory accuracy ~ block*complexity*status.




Figure 6. Memory item accuracy across blocks (nouns/music/dots) as a function of sentence complexity (simple/complex) and musicianship status. Error bars represent 1 +/- SEM.

We visualized the model estimates of effect size and variability for the effects of complexity, musicianship status, and their interaction from the separate models for the nouns block, music block, and dots block using the sjplot() package in R (Figure 7). The model effect estimates are represented as odds ratios, the exponent of the log-odds coefficients from the GLMM models. An odds ratio of 1 indicates a null effect of the fixed effect of interest (i.e., conditions in which the participant is equally likely to be accurate as to be inaccurate) and odds ratios further away from 1 represent effect sizes that are larger, with those below 1 representing that accuracy decreases and those above 1 representing that accuracy increases for complex sentences or musicians. As reported above, there is an effect of musicianship status (i.e., musicians perform better than non-musicians on memory tasks), which is larger for the nouns and music blocks compared to the dots block, indicated by the estimates being further above 1.




Figure 7. Estimates of effect size and variability for the effects of complexity, musicianship status, and their interaction on memory accuracy within the noun, music, and dots block.

Sentence Accuracy

To ensure that the effects in the working memory task were not due to different strategies for prioritizing the two tasks², we analyze the sentence accuracy with the same model structure as the model for general memory accuracy (see Table 3, Figure 8). There was significantly

² We also tested whether the time spent on the screen before revealing the sentence (i.e., crosshair time) or time spent processing the sentence influenced memory accuracy. There was no main effect of crosshair time, nor any interactions with block. There was an interaction with musicianship, but this cannot explain the group differences in accuracy; non-musicians who spent longer were more accurate in the memory task, while musicians always outperformed non-musicians and showed no relationship between crosshair time and memory accuracy. There was no main effect of sentence processing time. Although there was an interaction between sentence processing time and block, this cannot explain the working memory accuracy patterns either. There was no relationship between sentence processing time and memory accuracy in the nouns block (all p s > .09). These data are available on OSF.

higher accuracy in the simple conditions compared to the complex conditions ($p < .001$), replicating past research (Fedorenko et al., 2006; Gordon, Hendrick, & Levine, 2002), and musicians significantly outperformed non-musicians ($p < .01$). However, there were no main effects of block (both $ps > .08$), nor were there any two-way or three-way interactions between any of the factors (all $ps > .10$). These patterns suggest that all participants were sensitive to the manipulation in the sentence processing task equally across the different blocks. Furthermore, these data suggest that the musicians' better performance in the memory accuracy task could not have been due to a decrease in effort allocated to the sentence processing task relative to the non-musicians.




Figure 8. Sentence comprehension accuracy across blocks (nouns/music/dots) as a function of sentence complexity (simple/complex), and musicianship status. Error bars represent 1 +/- SEM.

<i>Predictors</i>	Sentence Accuracy			
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	5.50 ***	3.97 – 7.60	10.28	<0.001
Music-Dots	1.14	0.78 – 1.67	0.69	0.489
Nouns-Music	0.59	0.33 – 1.07	-1.74	0.082
Complexity	6.06 ***	3.92 – 9.36	8.11	<0.001
Musicianship Status	2.20 **	1.33 – 3.63	3.08	0.002
Music-Dots*Complexity	1.65	0.78 – 3.52	1.31	0.192
Nouns-Music*Complexity	0.72	0.22 – 2.35	-0.55	0.585
Music-Dots*Status	1.16	0.89 – 1.51	1.13	0.260
Nouns-Music*Status	0.83	0.56 – 1.24	-0.90	0.366
Complexity*Status	1.05	0.79 – 1.42	0.35	0.723
Music-Dots*Complexity*Status	1.31	0.77 – 2.21	0.99	0.321
Nouns-Music*Complexity*Status	1.95	0.87 – 4.37	1.63	0.103
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
τ_{00} item	2.47			
τ_{00} subject	0.74			
ICC	0.49			
N_{subject}	51			
N_{item}	360			
Observations	9179			
Marginal R^2 / Conditional R^2	0.137 / 0.563			
* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$				

Table 3. These are the results of the lmer model for sentence accuracy ~ block*complexity*status.

Effects of Memory Structure and Load

We constructed two linear mixed effects models: one for memory accuracy in the music block (see Figure 9), and another for memory accuracy in the dots block (see Figure 10; Table 4). Both models included four factors: (1) sentence complexity, which compared simple to complex sentences with a sum-to-zero contrast, (2) structure, which compared unstructured to structured working memory items with a sum-to-zero contrast, (3) load, which compared many to few working memory items with a sum-to-zero contrast, and (4) musicianship status, which compared non-musicians to musicians with a sum-to-zero contrast, as well as the interactions between these factors. Therefore, the models produced seven contrasts: one for the effect of structure, one for the effect of load, one for the effect of musicianship status, one for the interaction between structure and load, one for the interaction between structure and musicianship status, one for the interaction between load and musicianship status, and one for the three-way interaction between structure, load, and musicianship status. The models also contained crossed random effects of items and participants (intercepts only).

Working Memory Accuracy in the Music Block. There was no significant main effect of structure ($p = .21$). There was a significant effect of load ($p < .01$) in which accuracy was higher when there were fewer notes. There was a significant effect of musicianship status ($p < .001$), in which musicians outperformed non-musicians. There was a significant interaction between structure and musicianship status ($p < .05$), in which musicians have higher memory accuracy for structured musical phrases whereas non-musicians show no difference between structured and unstructured musical phrases (see Figure 9). There were no significant interactions between structure and load, or load and status, nor was there a significant three-way interaction of structure, load, and status (all $ps > .1$).




Figure 9. Memory item accuracy in the music block as a function of sentence complexity (simple/complex), harmonic structure (structured/unstructured), load (few/many), and musicianship status. Error bars represent 1 +/- SEM.

Working Memory Accuracy in the Dots Block. There was a significant effect of structure ($p < .001$), in which accuracy was higher in the structured conditions. There was a significant effect of musicianship status ($p < .05$), in which musicians outperformed non-musicians. There was no effect of load, nor any two-way interactions between structure, load, or status (all $ps > .4$). There was not a significant three-way interaction between structure, load, and musicianship status ($p = .09$).




Figure 10. Memory item accuracy in the dots block as a function of sentence complexity (simple/complex), visual structure (structured/unstructured), load (few/many), and musicianship status. Error bars represent 1 +/- SEM.

<i>Predictors</i>	Music Memory Accuracy				Dots Memory Accuracy			
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	3.02 ***	2.54 – 3.60	12.55	<0.001	7.21 ***	5.57 – 9.33	15.03	<0.001
Structure	0.89	0.77 – 1.03	-1.52	0.128	0.39 ***	0.33 – 0.47	-9.88	<0.001
Load	0.81 **	0.70 – 0.94	-2.75	0.006	0.93	0.78 – 1.12	-0.77	0.443
Musicianship Status	2.57 ***	1.91 – 3.47	6.21	<0.001	1.67 **	1.16 – 2.41	2.73	0.006
Structure*Load	0.83	0.61 – 1.11	-1.26	0.206	0.99	0.68 – 1.42	-0.08	0.938
Structure*Status	0.74 *	0.55 – 1.00	-1.99	0.047	0.95	0.66 – 1.37	-0.27	0.786
Load*Status	0.97	0.72 – 1.30	-0.23	0.815	1.14	0.79 – 1.64	0.68	0.494
Structure*Load*Status	0.73	0.40 – 1.32	-1.05	0.296	0.54	0.26 – 1.11	-1.67	0.095
Random Effects								
σ^2	3.29				3.29			
τ_{00}	0.30 _{item}				1.19 _{item}			
	0.21 _{subject}				0.33 _{subject}			
ICC	0.14				0.32			
N	51 _{subject}				51 _{subject}			
	160 _{item}				160 _{item}			
Observations	4079				4080			
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.060 / 0.188				0.057 / 0.355			

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 4. These are the results of the lmer models for memory accuracy ~ structure*load*status within the music block, and memory accuracy ~ structure*load*status within the dots block.

Discussion

The primary goals of this study were to investigate if music relied on similar working memory systems compared to language or visuospatial stimuli. We found that music interfered with sentence processing similarly to language, indicated by higher memory accuracy in the dots block and the greater effect sizes for the nouns and music blocks. We also found that musical training was associated with greater performance. Musicians had a greater verbal, musical, and visuospatial memory than non-musicians, and took advantage of the harmonic structure within musical melodies. These findings suggest that musical training could provide a benefit to

working memory, specifically through verbal working memory by organizing information through syntactic structure (i.e., chunking) and utilizing the language system.

Our data support the theory that music taxes the working memory system in a similar way to language, whereas visuospatial stimuli do not show the same pattern – which is consistent with prior work showing that verbal and visuospatial WM are distinct systems (Miyake & Shah, 1996; Baddeley, 1992). This finding is particularly interesting considering how the working memory tasks in previous studies were founded on similarity-based interference (e.g., Fedorenko et al., 2006); the fact that we see interference for music on verbal memory even though they have very little surface similarity challenges this phenomenon. It could be that since music taxes language, which is a different domain, similarity-based interference is more abstract, and not necessarily based on perceptual relatedness alone.

Our data support the theory that musical training is associated with a generalizable improvement in working memory because musicians were better than non-musicians across not only linguistic and musical items (representing verbal working memory), but also dots (representing the visuospatial working memory). However, the difference in performance between musicians and non-musicians was larger in the verbal and musical tasks, compared to visuospatial tasks. The presence of any advantage in the visuospatial task is somewhat surprising given the past literature not showing such advantages (see Talamini et al., 2016; Talamini et al., 2017; Hansen et al., 2013; Cohen et al., 2011; Ho et al., 2003). While musical training seems to benefit the working memory system as a whole, it seems to provide a benefit more dramatically to verbal skill (i.e., language and music) rather than visuospatial skill. This is consistent with experimental findings that demonstrate benefits of music training on verbal memory performance (Bugos, 2010; Ferreri et al., 2013; Franklin et al., 2008; Ho et al., 2003).

We anticipated a general pattern that musical and visuospatial stimuli would be more challenging (i.e., lower accuracy) when it was unstructured. And, we predicted that musicians would have more experience to adapt to the lack of structure (i.e., the potential deficit would be smaller in the musician group compared to the non-musician group). While non-musicians were more accurate when the musical phrases had fewer notes, regardless of harmonic structure, they were more accurate when the visuospatial layouts were geometrically structured, regardless of how many dots there were. Of interest was whether the musicians would show similar patterns of working memory interference, structure, and load. For tonal memory, musicians were able to remember melodies more when they were harmonically structured, and this structure helped them compensate for when there were many notes in the musical phrase. This supports the theory that musical training may be associated with an increased sensitivity to syntactic structure, particularly within music (e.g., harmony; Patel, 2003, 2013), and the observed advantage may be due to chunking strategies rather than a general increase in capacity. For visuospatial memory, in contrast, the musicians showed the same pattern as the non-musicians in that they were sensitive to the geometric structure, regardless of the number of dots. This suggests that the benefit of musicianship to working memory is specific to verbal processes and does not change processes associated with visuospatial working memory.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although we aimed to make the memory tasks as analogous as possible, it could be argued that the difference in performance across blocks is due to the variance in task difficulty rather than the differences in how the stimuli are processed (i.e., in the verbal versus visuospatial working memory system). We believe this alternative explanation is unlikely because there were similar effects of the working memory tasks on sentence comprehension accuracy and

because musicians did not show differences in working memory accuracy across tasks. However, this is an important avenue for future research; to test this, future studies should test this by norming each task for difficulty by running a single-task version of the working memory blocks without an intervening sentence processing task and ensure they are equated on accuracy level.

Conclusion

Our study provides evidence from a dual-task interference paradigm that music taxes the verbal working memory system in a similar way to language, and that those with musical experience are less affected by this interference, perhaps due to greater verbal working memory. Musicians displayed less interference for linguistic and musical stimuli compared to visuospatial stimuli, which supports the distinction between these component parts of the working memory system. Musicians benefitted from harmonic structure, suggesting that musical training affords the ability to chunk musical information based on harmony. Because musical phrases produced similar patterns of interference as written text, this suggests that verbal working memory is based on abstract mental representations rather than perceptual representations. Furthermore, this suggests that musical training could confer benefits to cognitive systems in a domain-general way that extend beyond processing music, such as reading and processing language.

Open Practices Statement

The experiment reported in this article was not formally preregistered. De-identified data for both experiments and the data analysis script are posted at <https://osf.io/cqkhu/>.

Acknowledgements

This project was funded through a Psi Chi 2018-19 Spring Undergraduate Research Grant under Anna M. Fennell. Portions of these data were presented at the Virtual Working Memory Symposium (2020), the University of South Florida Undergraduate Research Conference (2020), and the University of South Florida Annual Psychology Expo (2019).

Elizabeth R. Schotter and Brennan R. Payne developed the study concept. All authors contributed to the study design. Testing and data collection were performed by Anna M. Fennell who performed the data analysis and interpretation under the supervision of Elizabeth R. Schotter and Brennan R. Payne. Anna M. Fennell and Elizabeth R. Schotter drafted the manuscript, and Brennan R. Payne and Jennifer A. Bugos provided critical revision.

We thank Dr. Amanda Huensch and Dr. Jennifer Bosson for their helpful feedback throughout the project's development.

References

- Baddeley, A. (1992). Working memory. *Science*, 255(5044), 556-559.
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67, 1– 48.
- Benz, S., Sellaro, R., Hommel, B., & Colzato, L. S. (2016). Music makes the world go round: The impact of musical training on non-musical cognitive functions—A review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 2023.
- Bhide, A., Power, A., & Goswami, U. (2013). A rhythmic musical intervention for poor readers: A comparison of efficacy with a letter-based intervention. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 7(2), 113-123.
- Bopp, K. L., & Verhaeghen, P. (2005). Aging and verbal memory span: A meta-analysis. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 60(5), P223-P233.
- Brandler, S., & Rammsayer, T. H. (2003). Differences in mental abilities between musicians and non-musicians. *Psychology of music*, 31(2), 123-138.
- Bugos, J.A. (2010). The benefits of music instruction on processing speed, verbal fluency, and cognitive control in aging. *Music Education Research International*, 4, 1-9.
- Bugos, J. A., & Mostafa, W. (2011). Musical training enhances information processing speed. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 7-18.
- Caplan, D. (2016). Working memory and sentence comprehension. *Neurobiology of Language*, 633-645. Academic Press.
- Cheek, J. M., & Smith, L. R. (1999). Music training and mathematics achievement. *Adolescence*, 34(136), 759.

- Chin, T., & Rickard, N. S. (2012). The music USE (MUSE) questionnaire: An instrument to measure engagement in music. *Music Perception: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 29(4), 429-446.
- Cohen, M. A., Evans, K. K., Horowitz, T. S., & Wolfe, J. M. (2011). Auditory and visual memory in musicians and nonmusicians. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 18(3), 586-591.
- Corrigall, K. A., & Trainor, L. J. (2011). Associations between length of music training and reading skills in children. *Music perception*, 29(2), 147-155.
- Deguchi, C., Boureux, M., Sarlo, M., Besson, M., Grassi, M., Schön, D., & Colombo, L. (2012). Sentence pitch change detection in the native and unfamiliar language in musicians and non-musicians: Behavioral, electrophysiological and psychoacoustic study. *Brain research*, 1455, 75-89.
- Fedorenko, E., Gibson, E., & Rohde, D. (2006). The nature of working memory capacity in sentence comprehension: Evidence against domain-specific working memory resources. *Journal of memory and language*, 54(4), 541-553.
- Ferreri, L., Aucouturier, J. J., Muthalib, M., Bigand, E., & Bugaiska, A. (2013). Music improves verbal memory encoding while decreasing prefrontal cortex activity: an fNIRS study. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 7, 779. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00779>
- Franklin, M. S., Sledge Moore, K., Yip, C. Y., Jonides, J., Rattray, K., & Moher, J. (2008). The effects of musical training on verbal memory. *Psychology of Music*, 36(3), 353-365.
- George, E. M., & Coch, D. (2011). Music training and working memory: an ERP study. *Neuropsychologia*, 49(5), 1083-1094.
- Gordon, E. (1989). *Advanced measures of music audiation*. Gia Publications.

- Gordon, P. C., Hendrick, R., & Levine, W. H. (2002). Memory-load interference in syntactic processing. *Psychological Science, 13*(5), 425-430.
- Halpern, A. R., & Bower, G. H. (1982). Musical expertise and melodic structure in memory for musical notation. *The American Journal of Psychology, 31*-50.
- Hansen, M., Wallentin, M., & Vuust, P. (2013). Working memory and musical competence of musicians and non-musicians. *Psychology of Music, 41*(6), 779-793.
- Hussey, E. K., Harbison, J., Teubner-Rhodes, S. E., Mishler, A., Velnoskey, K., & Novick, J. M. (2017). Memory and language improvements following cognitive control training. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 43*(1), 23.
- Ho, Y. C., Cheung M. C., and Chan, A. A. (2003). Music training improves verbal but not visual memory: cross-sectional and longitudinal explorations in children. *Neuropsychology 17*, 439–450. doi: 10.1037/0894-4105.17.3.439
- Jakobson, L. S., Lewycky, S. T., Kilgour, A. R., & Stoesz, B. M. (2008). Memory for verbal and visual material in highly trained musicians. *Music Perception: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 26*(1), 41-55.
- Kim, D., Mishra, S., Wang, Z., & Singh, S. N. (2016). Insidious Effects of Syntactic Complexity: Are Ads Targeting Older Adults Too Complex to Remember?. *Journal of Advertising, 45*(4), 509-518.
- Kraus, N., & Chandrasekaran, B. (2010). Music training for the development of auditory skills. *Nature reviews neuroscience, 11*(8), 599-605.
- Levy, R., Bicknell, K., Slattery, T., & Rayner, K. (2009). Eye movement evidence that readers maintain and act on uncertainty about past linguistic input. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106*(50), 21086-21090.

- MacDonald, M. C., & Christiansen, M. H. (2002). Reassessing working memory: Comment on Just and Carpenter (1992) and Waters and Caplan (1996). *Psychological Review*, 109(1), 35–54.
- Payne, B. R., & Stine-Morrow, E. A. (2017). The effects of home-based cognitive training on verbal working memory and language comprehension in older adulthood. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, 9, 256.
- Patel, A. D. (2003). Language, music, syntax and the brain. *Nature neuroscience*, 6(7), 674-681.
- Patel, A. D. (2013). *Sharing and nonsharing of brain resources for language and music*.
- Piro, J. M., & Ortiz, C. (2009). The effect of piano lessons on the vocabulary and verbal sequencing skills of primary grade students. *Psychology of Music*, 37(3), 325-347.
- R Core Team (2016). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Rayner, K., Carlson, M., & Frazier, L. (1983). The interaction of syntax and semantics during sentence processing: Eye movements in the analysis of semantically biased sentences. *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior*, 22(3), 358-374.
- Salamé, P., & Baddeley, A. (1989). Effects of background music on phonological short-term memory. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A*, 41(1), 107-122.
- Särkämö, T. (2018). Music for the ageing brain: Cognitive, emotional, social, and neural benefits of musical leisure activities in stroke and dementia. *Dementia*, 17(6), 670-685.
- Schotter, E. R., Tran, R., & Rayner, K. (2014). Don't Believe What You Read (Only Once): Comprehension Is Supported by Regressions During Reading. *Psychological Science*, 25(6), 1218–1226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614531148>

- Seeger, R. C. (1948). *American Folk Songs for Children*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Slevc, L.R., & Okada, B.M., (2015). Processing structure in language and music: a case for shared reliance on cognitive control. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 22(3), 637-652.
- Slevc, L. R., Reitman, J., & Okada, B. (2013). Syntax in music and language: The role of cognitive control. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, 35(35).
- Slevc, L. R., Rosenberg, J. C., & Patel, A. D. (2009). Making psycholinguistics musical: Self-paced reading time evidence for shared processing of linguistic and musical syntax. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 16(2), 374-381.
- Sluming, V., Barrick, T., Howard, M., Cezayirli, E., Mayes, A., & Roberts, N. (2002). Voxel-based morphometry reveals increased gray matter density in Broca's area in male symphony orchestra musicians. *Neuroimage*, 17(3), 1613-1622.
- Sluming, V., Brooks, J., Howard, M., Downes, J. J., & Roberts, N. (2007). Broca's area supports enhanced visuospatial cognition in orchestral musicians. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 27(14), 3799-3806.
- SR Research Experiment Builder 1.10.165 [Computer software]. (2011). Mississauga, Ontario, Canada: SR Research Ltd.
- Suárez, L., Elangovan, S., & Au, A. (2016). Cross-sectional study on the relationship between music training and working memory in adults. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 68(1), 38-46.
- Talamini, F., Carretti, B., & Grassi, M. (2016). The working memory of musicians and nonmusicians. *Music Perception: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 34(2), 183-191.

- Talamini, F., Altoè, G., Carretti, B., & Grassi, M. (2017). Musicians have better memory than nonmusicians: A meta-analysis. *PloS one*, 12(10), e0186773.
- Thompson, W. F., Schellenberg, E. G., & Husain, G. (2004). Decoding speech prosody: Do music lessons help?. *Emotion*, 4(1), 46.
- Tierney, A., & Kraus, N. (2013). Music training for the development of reading skills. *Progress in brain research*, 207, 209-241. Elsevier.
- Tierney, A., Rosen, S., & Dick, F. (2019). Speech-in-speech perception, non-verbal selective attention, and musical training. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*.
- Van de Cavey, J., & Hartsuiker, R. J. (2016). Is there a domain-general cognitive structuring system? Evidence from structural priming across music, math, action descriptions, and language. *Cognition*, 146, 172-184.
- Vaughn, K. (2000). Music and mathematics: Modest support for the oft-claimed relationship. *Journal of aesthetic education*, 34(3/4), 149-166.
- Wechsler, D. (1997). *WAIS-III, Wechsler adult intelligence scale: Administration and scoring manual*. Psychological Corporation.
- Westfall, J. (2016). PANGEA: Power ANalysis for GEneral Anova designs (working paper).
- Williamson, V. J., Baddeley, A. D., & Hitch, G. J. (2010). Musicians' and nonmusicians' short-term memory for verbal and musical sequences: Comparing phonological similarity and pitch proximity. *Memory & Cognition*, 38(2), 163-175.
- Zhang, J. D., Susino, M., McPherson, G. E., & Schubert, E. (2020). The definition of a musician in music psychology: A literature review and the six-year rule. *Psychology of Music*, 48(3), 389-409.

Zhu, Z., Hou, X., & Yang, Y. (2018). Reduced syntactic processing efficiency in older adults during sentence comprehension. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 243.

Filename: M&MPBRpreprint.docx
Directory: /Users/amfennell/Library/Containers/com.microsoft.Word/Data/Documents
Template: /Users/amfennell/Library/Group Containers/UBF8T346G9.Office/User Content.localized/Templates.localized/Normal.dotm
Title:
Subject:
Author: Fennell, Anna
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 10/20/20 4:25:00 PM
Change Number: 2
Last Saved On: 10/20/20 4:25:00 PM
Last Saved By: Fennell, Anna
Total Editing Time: 0 Minutes
Last Printed On: 10/20/20 4:25:00 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 39
Number of Words: 8,010
Number of Characters: 46,018 (approx.)