

## **Working Memory**

Working memory is the mind's small, short-lived workspace — the system that holds a handful of items in conscious awareness for a matter of seconds while we use them. It is what keeps a phone number in mind between hearing it and dialing, or holds the first half of a sentence while we read the second. Working memory is distinct from long-term memory, the durable store from which a witness recalls an event days or years later, and the two depend on partly different brain systems. This distinction matters in court for a simple reason: the fact that a witness can repeat something back moments after seeing or hearing it says little about whether a lasting, accurate memory was formed, and the narrow capacity of working memory limits how much of a fast, crowded scene a witness could have taken in at all. This paper explains what working memory is, what is known about its basis in the brain, and why these foundations bear on the evaluation of testimony. It assumes no background in psychology.

### **What Working Memory Is**

Working memory refers to actively holding information in mind over a brief interval, typically a few seconds (Slotnick, 2017). Researchers study it with a simple structure: a study phase in which information is presented, a delay period during which the person holds it in mind, and a test phase in which memory is probed. The delay period is the heart of the matter — it is the interval during which the information must be actively maintained, and it is what distinguishes working memory from a fleeting perception. Working memory is an explicit, conscious process: its contents are, by definition, what one is currently aware of holding in mind.

The influential model of Baddeley and Hitch (1974) describes working memory not as a single store but as a set of components — a limited-capacity "central executive" that directs attention, coordinating two specialized buffers, a "phonological loop" for verbal and acoustic information and a "visuospatial sketchpad" for visual and spatial information; a later addition, the "episodic buffer," was proposed to integrate information across these systems and link it to long-term memory (Baddeley, 2000). For legal purposes the key point is functional rather than anatomical: working memory is the temporary stage on which incoming information is briefly held and manipulated before some of it — but only some — is encoded into lasting memory.

### **Capacity: How Little We Hold at Once**

Working memory is sharply limited in how much it can hold. In one of the most cited papers in psychology, Miller (1956) estimated that immediate memory spans about seven items, plus or minus two, while noting that the limit could be stretched by "chunking" — grouping elements into larger meaningful units, as when a string of digits is remembered as a few familiar groups. Later work that controlled for chunking and rehearsal revised the estimate downward: Cowan (2001) concluded that the focus of attention holds closer to about four chunks in adults. Either way, the capacity is small.

This limit has a direct bearing on what a witness could have perceived. A complex event — a robbery, a collision, a crowded encounter — presents far more information than working memory can hold at once. A witness necessarily takes in only a fraction of the available detail, and what is not held in working memory cannot be transferred into durable long-term memory. The capacity limit is therefore not a sign of inattention or untruthfulness; it is a fixed property of normal cognition that bounds how much of any scene anyone could absorb.

### **Working Memory in the Brain**

Neuroscience has traditionally localized working memory to the front of the brain. Sustained neural activity during the delay period has long been observed in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, and was thought to embody the contents being held in mind; the parietal cortex is also reliably

engaged (Slotnick, 2017). More recent work using multi-voxel pattern analysis — a technique that reads information from the pattern of activity across many small regions — has shown that the specific contents of working memory can also be decoded from early sensory areas, including the primary visual cortex (V1). On this view, holding an image in mind partly re-engages the same sensory regions that processed it in the first place, rather than storing it solely in a separate prefrontal buffer. Working memory is further associated with rhythmic brain activity in particular frequency bands, notably alpha and gamma oscillations.

### **Working Memory Versus Long-Term Memory: The Hippocampus Question**

One of the most important facts about working memory is what it does not require: the hippocampus, the medial temporal lobe structure essential to forming new long-term memories. The classic demonstration is the patient known as H. M., whose medial temporal lobes — including the hippocampus — were surgically removed: he was left with a severe inability to form new long-term memories yet retained normal working memory, able to hold information in mind across short delays (Scoville & Milner, 1957; Slotnick, 2017). Working memory and long-term memory are, in this respect, dissociable systems.

Recent studies have claimed that the hippocampus contributes to working memory after all, but a careful look at the methods shows why the claim remains unproven, and the analysis is itself instructive about how memory research must be read. One fMRI study reported hippocampal activity in a working-memory task (Hannula & Ranganath, 2008), but the activity appeared during the study and test phases — not during the delay period, the only phase that purely reflects working memory — and those phases involved novel, spatially demanding stimuli that are known to engage the hippocampus for reasons unrelated to working memory, including ordinary long-term encoding (Slotnick, 2017). A later study designed specifically to separate the two processes found that working-memory encoding did not engage the hippocampus while long-term encoding did, suggesting the earlier result reflected long-term memory (Bergmann, Rijpkema, Fernández, & Kessels, 2012), and a reanalysis of the original data using pattern analysis again found no hippocampal involvement during the delay period (Libby, Hannula, & Ranganath, 2014). A lesion study reported impaired working memory for color–location associations, but only at the longer of two delays — the pattern expected if long-term memory, not working memory, were responsible — and the lesions extended beyond the hippocampus to several neighboring structures (Finke et al., 2008; Slotnick, 2017). To date there is no compelling evidence that the hippocampus is necessary for working memory, and the distinction between the brief workspace and the durable store remains well founded.

### **Training and Plasticity**

Working memory is not entirely fixed. Extensive training on working-memory tasks — sessions repeated over many weeks — can change activity in the dorsolateral prefrontal and parietal cortices, reflecting both genuine training-related plasticity and the more mundane efficiency that comes from practicing the same task (Slotnick, 2017). There is some evidence that such training can improve performance on untrained tasks and perhaps even raise measured intelligence, but these broader transfer claims remain contested and should be treated as tentative. For present purposes the relevant point is modest: working-memory capacity is a stable individual characteristic that can be shifted somewhat by sustained practice, not a fixed quantity and not one easily changed by ordinary experience.

### **Why Working Memory Matters in the Courtroom**

Although working memory is rarely litigated by name, it underlies several issues that are. The first is the encoding bottleneck. Nothing reaches durable long-term memory without first passing

through the narrow channel of attention and working memory; what a witness never held in mind cannot later be recalled, however confidently. Because working memory holds only a few items at a time, a witness to a fast, information-rich event can have encoded only a portion of it, and gaps in a later account may reflect this normal limit rather than evasion or poor character.

The second is the difference between immediate and durable memory. That a witness can repeat a license plate, a phrase, or a sequence of events moments after the fact demonstrates working memory, not the existence of a lasting, accurate long-term memory; the two rely on different systems, and strong immediate recall does not guarantee strong recall days or weeks later. Conditions that tax working memory — divided attention, time pressure, stress, intoxication, or simply too much happening at once — reduce how much is encoded in the first place, with consequences that surface only later when the durable memory is tested. These foundations inform, and are presupposed by, expert testimony about memory generally; whether such testimony is admitted is governed by the usual standards for expert evidence — *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals* (1993), as extended by *Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael* (1999), or the *Frye* general-acceptance test still used in some jurisdictions (*Frye v. United States*, 1923) — and a witness may in any event testify only to what lies within personal knowledge (Fed. R. Evid. 602). The working-memory and long-term-memory distinction rests on decades of convergent behavioral, lesion, and neuroimaging evidence and is among the most firmly established findings in memory science.

### **Special Issues in Legal Practice**

The principles described above apply with equal force to every party in a legal proceeding. Memory operates the same way regardless of who is asking the questions, and the science summarized here favors no side. What differs between the parties is not the science but the vantage point — the particular places where memory issues tend to surface, and the particular errors each party is best positioned to guard against. The two summaries below identify those recurring issues. They are offered for orientation, not as litigation strategy; in every case the controlling question is what the evidence in that case will, and will not, support, and the expert's role is to inform the trier of fact rather than to advocate for either side.

#### **Special Issues for Prosecutors**

For the State, working-memory principles bear most on how immediate recall and the completeness of an account are characterized. The issue most likely to surface is the inference from a witness's prompt, confident report to the durability of the underlying memory: working memory makes brief, accurate immediate recall of a small amount of information unremarkable, but it does not by itself establish that a lasting long-term memory was formed. The error best guarded against is overstating what strong immediate recall proves about later accuracy, or treating a witness's failure to report every detail as a credibility problem, when capacity limits make incomplete encoding of a busy scene the normal case. Documenting when each account was given, and securing the earliest recollection, lets the State present memory evidence whose strength is tied to how and when it was obtained.

Understood this way, the science is not adverse to the State. Working memory is robust for small amounts of information held briefly, and a witness who reliably retained and reported a limited, central set of facts is doing exactly what the system is built to do. Recognizing the boundary between what was briefly held and what was durably stored helps the State present such evidence accurately and defend it against overreaching challenges.

#### **Special Issues for Defense**

For the defense, working-memory principles bear on both how much a witness could have taken in and how much an immediate report guarantees. The issue most likely to surface is reliance on a

detailed account of a fast or crowded event, or on the assumption that a confident immediate identification or recollection ensures durable accuracy. The error best guarded against is letting either the apparent completeness of an account or the strength of immediate recall stand in for reliable long-term memory, given that capacity limits cap how much was encoded and that immediate and durable memory rest on different systems. Examining the conditions at the scene — how much was happening, how divided the witness's attention was, and whether stress, time pressure, or intoxication taxed working memory — is central to that task.

The corresponding safeguard is to ensure the trier of fact understands the foundations: that working memory holds only a few items at a time, so a witness necessarily absorbed a fraction of a complex event; that what was not held could not be stored; and that strong immediate recall does not guarantee accurate memory later. Where admissible, expert explanation of the working-memory and long-term-memory distinction can help the factfinder weigh an account in light of what cognition makes possible.

### References

- Baddeley, A. (2000). The episodic buffer: A new component of working memory? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4(11), 417–423. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(00\)01538-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01538-2)
- Baddeley, A. D., & Hitch, G. (1974). Working memory. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 8, pp. 47–89). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421\(08\)60452-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421(08)60452-1)
- Bergmann, H. C., Rijpkema, M., Fernández, G., & Kessels, R. P. C. (2012). Distinct neural correlates of associative working memory and long-term memory encoding in the medial temporal lobe. *NeuroImage*, 63(2), 989–997. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.03.047>
- Cowan, N. (2001). The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 24(1), 87–114. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X01003922>
- Finke, C., Braun, M., Ostendorf, F., Lehmann, T.-N., Hoffmann, K.-T., Kopp, U., & Ploner, C. J. (2008). The human hippocampal formation mediates short-term memory of colour–location associations. *Neuropsychologia*, 46(2), 614–623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.10.004>
- Hannula, D. E., & Ranganath, C. (2008). Medial temporal lobe activity predicts successful relational memory binding. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 28(1), 116–124. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3086-07.2008>
- Libby, L. A., Hannula, D. E., & Ranganath, C. (2014). Medial temporal lobe coding of item and spatial information during relational binding in working memory. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 34(43), 14233–14242. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0655-14.2014>
- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63(2), 81–97. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043158>
- Scoville, W. B., & Milner, B. (1957). Loss of recent memory after bilateral hippocampal lesions. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, 20(1), 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.20.1.11>
- Slotnick, S. D. (2017). *Cognitive neuroscience of memory*. Cambridge University Press.

### Legal Authorities

- Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993).  
Federal Rule of Evidence 602.  
*Frye v. United States*, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).  
*Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael*, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).

**Related topic papers:** [The Hippocampus](#) · [Episodic Memory](#) · [Forgetting](#) · [Memory for Persons](#) · [Intoxication and Memory](#) · [Stress and Memory](#)