The uniqu	e contributio	ns of the	facilitation	of proce	edural r	memory	and	working
meatingry to	o individual o	difference	s in intellig	gence				

mamory	
memory al memory	
nce elfigence ension	Individual differences in working memory account for a substantial portion of individual differences in TJ-21.4108-1.3357TD[((facilitation)-312.3(in)-298.4(procedural)-305.9(memory,)-304.3(working)-299.8(memory,)-3
al differences	

## 2.2.5. ALTM tasks

To assess facilitation of procedural memory, we modified the task used by Woltz and Was (2006) that was illustrated in Fig. 1. The purpose of the modifications was to enhance the sensitivity of the task to capture individual differences in the facilitation of procedural memory. Three measures of facilitation were used: Category Task, Synonym task, and Attribute Task, with each task having the same structure (see Fig. 2). In each of the three tasks, each of nine trials began with a memory load of five words presented visually at a rate of 2.25 s per word. The fi

## 2.2.7. Measures of comprehension

The three standard tests of comprehension were as follows: (a) the reading comprehension task from the Air Force Officer Qualifying Test (AFOQT; see Kane et al., 2004), (b) the Shipley Vocabulary

the direct effects of the latent factors facilitation of procedural memory and WM on gF and comprehension. The estimated standardized total effects of facilitation of procedural memory on gF were  $\mathcal{L}=.23$  and of facilitation of procedural memory on comprehension were  $\mathcal{L}=.21$ , whereas the estimated standardized total effects of WM on gF were  $\mathcal{L}=.53$  and of WM on comprehension were  $\mathcal{L}=.45$ . WM and facilitation of procedural memory together accounted for 43.2% of the variance in gF



facilitation of procedural memory accounts for unique variance in