Eavesdropping on Autobiographical Memory: A Naturalistic Observation Study of Older Adults’ Memory Sharing in Daily Conversations
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The retrieval of autobiographical memories is an integral part of everyday social interactions. Prior laboratory research has revealed that older age is associated with a reduction in the retrieval of autobiographical episodic memories, and the ability to elaborate these memories with episodic details. However, how age-related reductions in episodic specificity unfold in everyday social contexts remains largely unknown. Also, constraints of the laboratory-based approach have limited our understanding of how autobiographical semantic memory is linked to older age. To address these gaps in knowledge, we used a smartphone application known as the Electronically Activated Recorder, or “EAR,” to unobtrusively capture real-world conversations over 4 days. In a sample of 102 cognitively normal older adults, we extracted instances where memories and future thoughts were shared by the participants, and we scored the shared episodic memories and future thoughts for their make-up of episodic and semantic detail. We found that older age was associated with a reduction in real-world sharing of autobiographical episodic and semantic memories. We also found that older age was linked to less episodically and semantically detailed descriptions of autobiographical episodic memories. Frequency and level of detail of shared future thoughts yielded weaker relationships with age, which may be related to the low frequency of future thoughts in general. Similar to laboratory research, there was no correlation between autobiographical episodic detail sharing and a standard episodic memory test. However, in contrast to laboratory studies, episodic detail production while sharing autobiographical episodic memories was weakly related to episodic detail.
INTRODUCTION

Remembering experiences from our personal history, or autobiographical memories, is thought to aid in the development and maintenance of the self, facilitate social communication, and guide behavior (Pillemer, 1992; Bluck and Alea, 2002; Pasupathi et al., 2002; Bluck, 2003; Bluck et al., 2005). Importantly, the act of recalling and sharing autobiographical memories allows us to communicate a wealth of information with others, from general knowledge to details of a one-time event (Conway and Pleydell-Pearce, 2000), with each form serving distinct purposes (Waters et al., 2014). Such disclosures of personal information in conversation are thought to increase intimacy and empathy within relationships, provide opportunities to teach others, and aid decision making (Alea and Bluck, 2003, 2007). In this sense, autobiographical memory sharing helps us navigate our social interactions.

In prior research, much attention has been given to understanding the relationship between older age and the way autobiographical memories are shared. One reliable finding is that normal cognitive aging is linked to a reduction in the episodic specificity, or the frequency of episodic retrieval and/or the vivid elaboration, of autobiographical memories. For instance, prior research has found that, when asked to reflect on the past, older adults retrieve fewer unique life events in comparison to young adults, and in counterbalance recall more events that are extended over time or are repeated events (Piolino et al., 2006; Ros et al., 2009, 2017; Ford et al., 2014). When asked to elaborate these episodic memories, older adults also tend to incorporate fewer episodic details relative to young adults, replacing them with semantic details, or factual knowledge about one's life story and the broader context of the event (Levine et al., 2002; Addis et al., 2008; Gaesser et al., 2011; Devitt et al., 2017). Critically, some work has further shown that reductions in episodic specificity are evident when comparing young-old to old-old adults (e.g., ages 65–75 vs. +75 or ages 60–69 vs. 70–79), indicating that this effect continues in advanced normal cognitive aging (Piolino et al., 2002; De Beni et al., 2013). The age-related reduction in episodic specificity, broadly reflecting a move away from episodic retrieval, has been interpreted in a few ways. One explanation is that older age is associated with a compensatory shift towards conceptual retrieval that is due to reduced executive resources (Piolino et al., 2010) and stronger coupling of two large-scale brain networks (Turner and Spreng, 2015; Spreng et al., 2018), resulting in a tendency to view things in a semantic light. Alternatively, a natural alteration in narrative style, perhaps related to new perspectives on a lifetime of experiences or changes in language use, could contribute to reduced episodic specificity with age (James et al., 1998; Trunk and Abrams, 2009; Gaesser et al., 2011). Both of these explanations can account for why prior work has commonly found that reduced episodic retrieval is accompanied by increased semantic retrieval. Regardless of the reason(s), these findings and theories suggest that in everyday life, increased age may be linked to less sharing of one's episodic past.

Despite the vast evidence for age-related reductions in episodic specificity and its potential importance to how memories are shared in everyday social life, this quality of memory retrieval has been largely studied in an analog of the real-world, namely through laboratory interviews (Williams and Broadbent, 1986; Levine et al., 2002; St. Jacques and Levine, 2007; Addis et al., 2008; Barnabe et al., 2012). In one approach, participants generate memories in response to positive and negative cue words, and they are subsequently scored as “episodic” or as more general memories of the past (Williams and Broadbent, 1986). Other laboratory interviews instruct individuals to retrieve episodic memories from a particular time or period and to focus on describing episodic details (Levine et al., 2002). Often, participants are provided cues, such as neutral words (e.g., “tree”), and once a natural ending point is reached, the experimenter may probe for additional information. These reports are then parsed into individual details, with each one scored according to whether it is episodic or “internal” to an event or more generic or “external,” providing a fine-grained, objective picture of recollection (Levine et al., 2002).

Although, there are practical and psychometric benefits to this structured approach, the laboratory interview departs from the contexts encountered naturally in everyday life in several ways, including how autobiographical memories are likely cued and with whom they are commonly shared. Diary studies and other naturalistic thought sampling methods, which require individuals to record events or report on them, have revealed commonalities between laboratory-derived and real-world memories (Levine et al., 2002; Berntsen and Hall, 2004; Schlagman and Kvavilashvili, 2008; D’Argembeau et al., 2011). Yet, by their nature, these methods do not capture in-the-moment, naturalistic outward sharing of autobiographical memories with others, and these studies have not focused on assessing episodic specificity at the level of detail commonly done in the laboratory. Therefore, it remains unclear how age-related alterations in episodic specificity unfold in real-world social contexts.

One way to address this gap in knowledge is to utilize ambulatory assessment technologies that allow for the unobtrusive recording of everyday conversation as it happens (Mehl, 2017). The Electronically Activated Recorder or EAR
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(Mehl et al., 2001; Mehl, 2017) is one method for such an approach (see Robbins, 2017). The EAR is a mobile smartphone application that periodically samples blocks of ambient sounds, including conversation, from one’s moment-to-moment environment, providing what amounts to an acoustic log of one’s day. Recently, the EAR has been applied to assess autobiographical sharing in natural, everyday social life, revealing outcomes that replicate and go beyond findings from the laboratory. For instance, prior work using the EAR has shown that in everyday social interactions, older adults tend to be past-oriented (Demiray et al., 2018) and share fewer future thoughts than young adults (Brianza and Demiray, 2019). Older adults also appear to share autobiographical memories in their natural social relationships for specific motives (Demiray et al., 2019). The EAR, therefore, presents a unique opportunity to ask whether, in everyday conversation, older age is associated with a reduction in sharing episodic memories and/or episodic detail.

New technologies that unobtrusively capture many memories over time can also be used to further investigate the influence of older age on autobiographical semantic memory. The relationship between older age and autobiographical semantic memory has been difficult to fully appreciate based on laboratory studies for a few reasons, chiefly that participants are typically required to recall a certain number of memories, and the amount of time given to memory sharing is controlled. As such, it remains unclear if older adults, under less constrained conditions, would retrieve autobiographical semantic memories or details at the rates commonly reported in laboratory-based studies. Concerning the real-world, according to both executive coupling (Turner and Spreng, 2015; Spreng et al., 2018) and narrative style accounts (James et al., 1998, 2018a; Trunk and Abrams, 2009; Gaesser et al., 2011) of autobiographical memory and normal cognitive aging, increased age among older adults may be positively associated with the generation of semantic memories and semantic details while describing episodic memories. However, according to the integrity hypothesis of default network functioning (Andrews-Hanna et al., 2014, 2019) increased age among older adults may be associated with a general reduction in autobiographical memory retrieval in social contexts, including semantic memories, which may be revealed through both frequency and semantic elaborateness (i.e., detail generation). Finally, in light of evidence that age-related cognitive differences in autobiographical memory are also reflected in future thinking (Addis et al., 2008; Madore et al., 2014; De Brigard et al., 2016), we expected that findings in the memory domain (e.g., older age linked to reduced episodic memory retrieval) would also be reflected in future thought sharing (e.g., older age associated with less sharing of future episodic thoughts).

To complement these age-related analyses and provide a clearer picture of the degree to which real-world memory sharing mirrors that of laboratory-based findings in older adults, we also examined a few additional features. First, we investigated whether, as shown in laboratory research, episodic specificity of one’s memories is related to how detailed individuals are when they describe future episodic thoughts (Addis et al., 2008; Hill and Emery, 2013). Second, we examined whether two laboratory-based cognitive testing findings are found while sharing memories in the real-world, namely whether greater episodic specificity is associated with better working memory (Addis et al., 2008; Ros et al., 2009, 2017; Piolino et al., 2010), but weakly related to impersonal, laboratory-based measures of episodic learning and memory (Palombo et al., 2015; Grilli et al., 2018a). Third, similar to laboratory findings, we assessed whether episodic specificity is higher in women relative to men when memory sharing is assessed in real-world social contexts (Davis, 1999; MacDonald et al., 2000; Niedźwińska, 2003; Pillemer et al.,...
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants
The present study utilized data from a previously conducted study on cognitive aging using the EAR technology (Polsinelli et al., 2020). Participants (46 males/56 females) were between the ages of 65 and 90 (M = 76.12, SD = 6.00) and had, on average, 16.60 years of education (SD = 2.32, range = 12–22). All participants scored ≥ 25 on the Mini-Mental Status Examination, which indicated that their cognition was within normal limits.

Participants provided written informed consent following the Institutional Review Board of the University of Arizona.

Materials and Procedure
As mentioned, the present study was a secondary data analysis of the study conducted by Polsinelli et al. (2020). Polsinelli and colleagues adhered to the standard EAR protocol (Mehl, 2017), under which the participants are trained on how to use the EAR device before the study period (e.g., how to charge the EAR at night, how to wear the EAR to maximize recording quality). Participants wear the EAR while going about their days, unaware when exactly the device is recording. Through its sampling, the EAR protects privacy (i.e., takes snippets out of their larger conversational context) and enables at-scale empirical studies. Wearing the EAR is minimally bothersome and it has been successfully used, with good acceptance and compliance, in age groups ranging from childhood to old age (3 years to 93 years) and with both healthy and clinical populations. In the present study, compliance with the EAR procedures was high, with only 10 participants experiencing any notable technical difficulties at any point in the study period (i.e., failing to recharge overnight properly). When participants returned their EAR device, they completed a standard EAR evaluation measure (Mehl and Holleran, 2007). On average, participants reported low obtrusiveness for themselves (e.g., “To what extent did the EAR impede your daily activities?”; M = 1.87, SD = 0.64; 1 = “not at all” through 5 = “a great deal”) and bystanders (e.g., “To what extent did the EAR influence the behavior of people around you?”; M = 1.94, SD = 0.83). Participants wore the EAR for approximately 4 days (a weekend and two weekdays) and gathered, on average, 310 30-s sound file samples (SD = 62, range = 91–405). The total number of sound files included only those during which participants were awake and deemed (i.e., coded as) wearing the EAR. The recorded sound files were transcribed as part of the original data analysis plan. For our secondary data analysis, we first determined whether each sound file contained speech by the participant and then whether the files captured any form of autobiographical memories or future thoughts being verbally shared with another person. We then separated this set into four categories, namely autobiographical episodic memories, semantic memories, future episodic thoughts, and future semantic thoughts. Consistent with prior descriptions, we scored autobiographical memories and future thoughts as episodic if they pertained to a specific event occurring at a particular time and place. Memories and future thoughts that lacked such specificity were scored as semantic.

We used the AI scoring protocol (Levine et al., 2002) to analyze the content of a subset of these autobiographical sound files. We selected the AI protocol because of its well-validated status as a measure of episodic specificity (Levine et al., 2002; St. Jacques and Levine, 2007; Devitt et al., 2017; Grilli et al., 2018a), its adaptability for scoring future event episodic specificity (Addis et al., 2008; Madore et al., 2014), and neural evidence linking episodic and semantic details to distinct regions/pathways of the default network (Hodgetts et al., 2017; Palombo et al., 2018; Memel et al., 2020). Consistent with the standard AI scoring, all sound files we tagged as containing episodic memories and future episodic thoughts were segmented into individual details and each detail was scored as episodic or semantic. Details were scored as episodic if they described the event content or sequencing, timing, location, perceptual quality, or thoughts or emotions of an event. Details that described facts about the self or world knowledge and details that were personal, non-specific events (e.g., extended or repeated events) were scored as semantic. Each detail was further scored as past or future-oriented based on the temporal nature of the event to which the detail was attached. The original AI protocol includes three additional detail types, namely repetitions, meta-comments, and descriptions of events external to the main event being described in the autobiographical interview. In our application of the AI protocol to EAR sound files, we did not attempt to score these categories. For repetitions and meta-comments, in the absence of insight into the social context, it was often difficult to reliably determine whether someone was absentmindedly thinking aloud, repeating oneself, or sharing information with someone who may not have heard or been present for the initial sharing of that detail. Notably, we did not repeatedly score the same information (e.g., we did not “double score” the re-sharing of the same episodic detail), but we also did not count these details as repetitions. We did not use the external detail category, because we did not assume that a single sound file must capture no more than one episodic memory. Relatedly, although future episodic thoughts might be scored as external details in the laboratory-based application of the AI, we simply scored them as episodic details if attached to episodic memory. To be consistent, we also included future-oriented semantic details attached to episodic memories as semantic details. We want to emphasize that while we slightly departed from the original AI scoring protocol, studies of healthy populations, both young and older, commonly find that semantic details capture the vast majority of “external” contents (Levine et al., 2002; Murphy et al., 2008; Bastin et al., 2013). Figure 1 shows examples of scored sound files.

Two standard cognitive tests that were administered to a subgroup of participants in the original studies were included.
Scoring Examples

**Past Sound File:** “...upstate [state] and [city 1] (not scored). Real nice guy (semantic).

Wonderful gentleman (semantic). He was um more senior than me at the time (semantic). He was like the dean of our hospital association group (semantic). I look down (episodic) and I see [name] his name (episodic). I see his name plate there, but he is not at his seat (episodic). And um I didn't think much of it (episodic). I figured he is in the bathroom or something (episodic). And um time goes by (episodic) and then all of a sudden someone taps me on the shoulder (episodic). It is the guy from the [city 2] Hospital Association (episodic). He said (not scored)…”

**Future Sound File:** “We got to get to the post office (episodic). We have to get to the post office (not scored). We have to get to [name of first person]’s (episodic). We have to get to [name of second person]’s (episodic).”

in this secondary data analysis. One was a test of working memory, measured using the Digit Span Backward subtest raw score from the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Third Edition (WAIS-III DSB; Wechsler, 1997), and the other was a test of episodic memory, measured with the California Verbal Learning Test, First or Second Edition long delay cued recall raw score (CVLT LDC; Delis et al., 1987, 2000). We selected these two cognitive tests because they have been used in laboratory-based studies that have found relationships between episodic detail generation and working memory (Addis et al., 2008) or have suggested no relationship between episodic detail generation and verbal episodic memory (Grilli et al., 2018a). Only a subset of participants received these tests because, in the original study (Polsinelli et al., 2020), the cognitive battery evolved across two dissertation projects (Polsinelli, 2017; Moseley, 2018), and therefore the entire study sample did not receive the same cognitive tests. Approximately two-thirds of the sample received WAIS-III DSB ($n = 72$, $M = 7.47$, $SD = 2.26$). Twenty-three participants received the first edition of the CVLT LDC, recalling 12.78 words on average ($SD = 2.56$), and 46 received the second edition ($M = 10.28$, $SD = 2.99$). In total, 69 participants had CVLT LDC data from either the first or second edition ($M = 11.12$, $SD = 3.07$).3

### Statistical Procedures

Consistent with established procedures to determine interrater reliability, one primary rater scored all participants and a secondary rater independently scored approximately 20%, or 21 participants (Verfaellie et al., 2014; Grilli et al., 2018b). Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to determine how reliably we could identify the sound files that contained autobiographical memories or future thoughts and the episodic and semantic scoring of the details within the episodic memories and future episodic thoughts.

Two sets of analyses examined the relationship between age and autobiographical memory and future thought.

3Because 23 participants only had long delay cued recall scores from the first edition of the CVLT, we ran the correlation with EAR episodic specificity separately for those with first edition CVLT scores and those with second edition CVLT scores. In both cases, we obtained the same results (i.e., no correlation between episodic memory and past episodic specificity).
sharing. First, to investigate whether age was related to a reduction in the sharing of episodic or semantic memories, we conducted non-parametric (Spearman) partial correlations to examine the relationship between age and sound files that contained autobiographical memories—overall, and both episodic and semantic memories separately (Kim, 2015). Non-parametric analyses were selected given that some data were not normally distributed. The number of sound files that contained any speech from the participant was used as the covariate in these analyses to control for the wide variation of speech production across participants. These analyses were repeated to examine the correlation between age and future thought sharing. Second, to investigate whether age was associated with lower detail generation while describing episodic memories, we conducted Spearman correlations between age and the average number of total details, as well as episodic and semantic details separately, captured per autobiographical episodic memory. A test of correlations from dependent samples with overlapping variables was used to compare the magnitudes of statistically significant partial correlations when appropriate (Steiger, 1980; Diedenhofen and Musch, 2015). This second set of analyses also were conducted on details generated during future episodic thought sharing.

To investigate additional features regarding the quality of social sharing of autobiographical memory, Spearman correlations were conducted to determine if the average frequency of episodic details per future episodic thought description correlated with autobiographical episodic memory description. We also used Spearman correlations to examine the association of the average number of episodic details produced in sound files that contained autobiographical episodic memories with working memory (i.e., WAIS-III DSB) and with a standardized cognitive test of verbal episodic memory (i.e., CVLT LDC). To contextualize our autobiographical memory findings more broadly, we also examined the relationship between age and our laboratory-based measures of working memory and verbal episodic memory. Finally, we conducted an independent samples t-test, to investigate gender effects on average episodic detail production (Fox and Weisberg, 2019). All analyses were two-tailed. We did not conduct an a priori power analysis and none of the analyses were pre-registered. All analyses and graphs were conducted in or created with RStudio (Wickham, 2007, 2016; Kim, 2015; Auguie, 2017; Fox and Weisberg, 2019; R Core Team, 2019).

**RESULTS**

**Interrater Reliability**
Good to excellent reliability was achieved for the total number of sound files that contained either an autobiographical memory or future thought, and for episodic and semantic subtypes separately (Cronbach’s alpha range 0.86–0.99). Excellent reliability was also achieved for the total number of details produced across sound files that contained an autobiographical episodic memory or future thought, whether analyzed together or separately (Cronbach’s alpha range 0.91–0.995).

**Sample Included in Autobiographical Memory Analyses**
To ensure that individual scores were reliable, we identified four participants who provided fewer than five sound files with an autobiographical memory or autobiographical future thought and an average of 7.50 (SD = 3.11) total details. In comparison, the remaining 98 participants produced an average of 27.16 (SD = 18.43) sound files with autobiographical memories or autobiographical future thoughts and approximately 84.98 (SD = 70.36) total details. Thus, these four participants were excluded based on having too few memories/thoughts and details to likely be reliable. Notably, they were removed before any further analyses of the data. In the remaining sample, the average age was 76.07 (SD = 5.94), with 44 men (age: M = 75.98, SD = 6.49) and 54 women (age: M = 76.15, SD = 5.51). There was an average of 81.84 sound files (SD = 44.04) that captured speech and 23.65 sound files (SD = 15.77) that included past autobiographical sharing. Of these sound files, an average of 11.17 (SD = 8.95) contained an autobiographical episodic memory, and participants generated an average of 44.24 (SD = 42.85) total details for these memories. Also, on average, 2.93 (SD = 2.99) focused on future episodic thoughts, with participants generating an average of 6.07 (SD = 6.88) total details for these thoughts.

**Relationships Between Age and Autobiographical Sharing**

**Age and the Frequency of Autobiographical Memory and Future Thought Sharing**
When controlling for the amount of conversation captured by the EAR, age was negatively correlated with overall autobiographical memory sharing, \( r_{(95)} = -0.32, p = 0.001 \) (**Figure 2**). Age was significantly and negatively related to sharing episodic memories, \( r_{(95)} = -0.24, p = 0.02 \), and to sharing semantic memories, \( r_{(95)} = -0.29, p = 0.004 \) (both including amount of conversation as a covariate). A comparison of the magnitude of these two effects revealed that they were not significantly different, \( z = 0.45, p = 0.65 \).

Alternately, age and autobiographical future thought sharing, covaried for amount of conversation, were not significantly correlated, \( r_{(95)} = -0.09, p = 0.38 \) (**Figure 3**). However, whereas the correlation between production of future episodic thoughts and age was not significant, \( r_{(95)} = -0.03, p = 0.80 \), the correlation between future semantic thoughts and age was significant and negative, \( r_{(95)} = -0.21, p = 0.04 \) (both including amount of conversation as a covariate).

**Age and Autobiographical Memory and Future Thought Detail Sharing**
In regard to past memory detail generation, age was negatively related to the average number of total details produced while describing autobiographical episodic memories, \( r_{(94)} = -0.30, p = 0.003 \) (**Figure 4**). Age was significantly and negatively related to average episodic, \( r_{(94)} = -0.23, p = 0.02 \), and semantic details, \( r_{(94)} = -0.30, p = 0.003 \), separately. The magnitude of these two relationships did not significantly differ, \( z = 0.57, p = 0.57 \).
For future episodic thought sharing, age and the average total details produced was not significant, $r_{(80)} = 0.01, p = 0.90$. Similarly, there was no significant correlation between age and average episodic details, $r_{(80)} = -0.02, p = 0.88$, or age and average semantic details, $r_{(80)} = 0.04, p = 0.72$. Figure 5 depicts these three relationships.

**Episodic Detail Sharing in Daily Conversation**

**Episodic Detail Generation During Past Episodic Event and Future Episodic Thought Sharing**

The correlation between the average number of episodic details produced during autobiographical episodic memory sharing and future episodic thought sharing, while positive, was not significant, $r_{(80)} = 0.18, p = 0.10$ (Figure 6).

**Laboratory-Based Cognitive Tests of Working Memory and Episodic Memory**

Contrary to laboratory-based findings, our measure of working memory, DSB, was not significantly correlated with the average number of episodic details produced when participants shared autobiographical episodic memories in daily conversation, $r_{(68)} = -0.01, p = 0.96$. However, consistent with laboratory-based findings, the association between a laboratory measure of episodic memory (i.e., CVLT LDC) and episodic detail provided while sharing autobiographical episodic memories was also not significant, $r_{(65)} = 0.05, p = 0.66$. See Figure 7 for both correlations. Interestingly, age was not significantly correlated with our laboratory-based cognitive measure of working memory, $r_{(68)} = -0.08, p = 0.49$, or verbal episodic memory, $r_{(65)} = -0.12, p = 0.32$.

**Gender Comparison of Episodic Detail Generation**

Contrary to some laboratory-based findings, men ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.00$) and women ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 0.85$) produced
DISCUSSION

Individuals share autobiographical memories to juggle a wide range of everyday social situations, including navigating social bonds, teaching others, and solving problems (Pillemer, 1992; Bluck and Alea, 2002; Pasupathi et al., 2002; Bluck, 2003; Bluck et al., 2005). Prior laboratory-based research has extensively studied how the sharing of autobiographical memories appears to change with older age, with one key finding being that there is a robust age-related reduction in episodic memories that is evident in both the frequency at which such memories are retrieved (Piolino et al., 2006; Ros et al., 2009, 2017; Ford et al., 2014) and how much episodic detail is shared to describe unique life events (Levine et al., 2002; Addis et al., 2008; Gaesser et al., 2011; Devitt et al., 2017). The present study utilized the EAR, a method that has recently been applied to capture memories being shared in everyday conversations as they happen (Demiray et al., 2018, 2019; Brianza and Demiray, 2019), to extend the assessment of episodic specificity out of the laboratory and shed light on how older age and episodic specificity are related in the real-world.

By tracking the frequency with which autobiographical memories were generated in social conversations over 4 days, we found that, in an older adult sample, older participants shared fewer autobiographical episodic memories than younger participants. Interestingly, older age also was associated with reduced autobiographical semantic memory sharing in daily conversation. Notably, the magnitude of the effects of age on episodic memory and semantic memory sharing were similar, and not significantly different when directly compared. Together, these findings suggest that older age was linked to a global reduction in the social sharing of autobiographical memories, independent of how often individuals conversed. These results extend our knowledge of the relationship between age and episodic memory by showing that a reduction in the retrieval of episodic memories is not only evident

comparable averages of the number of episodic details when describing episodic memories, $t_{(94)} = 0.73$, $p = 0.47$, 95% CI ($-0.24, 0.51$; Figure 8). Co-varying for age did not alter these outcomes, $p = 0.50$. 

FIGURE 4 | Bivariate Spearman correlations between average (avg) (A) total, (B) episodic, and (C) semantic details produced in sound files containing autobiographical episodic memories (EM) and age.

FIGURE 5 | Bivariate Spearman correlations between average (avg) (A) total, (B) episodic, and (C) semantic details produced in sound files containing future episodic thoughts (FET) and age.
in the laboratory (Piolino et al., 2006; Ros et al., 2009, 2017; Ford et al., 2014), but also during memory sharing in daily conversations. Our findings further suggest that age-related reductions in memory retrieval may not be specific to episodic reflections, at least when autobiographical memory is assessed in daily conversations in the context of increased age among older adults. We interpret these findings as consistent with the integrity hypothesis of default network functioning (Andrews-Hanna et al., 2014, 2019), which predicts that age-related decline in the functionality of the default network should result in a broad reduction in the frequency at which one’s thoughts drift towards the personal past.

Regarding details attached to autobiographical episodic memories, we found a significant negative relationship between age and overall detail generation. Interestingly, older age was not exclusively linked to less episodic detail production, as there was a significant negative relationship between age and semantic detail as well, consistent with the integrity hypothesis of default network functioning (Andrews-Hanna et al., 2014, 2019). The relationship between age and episodic detail did not differ statistically from the magnitude of the age and semantic detail relationship. Thus, similar to our analyses of overall memory sharing, our findings likely suggest that older age has a global, negative effect on memory detail generation while sharing episodic memories. While prior work indicates that reductions in episodic detail may be relevant to social cognitive behavior, including social problem-solving (Vandermorris et al., 2013; Madore and Schacter, 2014) and empathy or intentions to help others (Gaesser, 2013; Gaesser and Schacter, 2014), future research can investigate the broader implications of less semantic detail retrieval in social recollection.

Relative to the autobiographical memory findings, our naturalistic observation of autobiographical future thought-sharing produced weaker relationships with older age. These outcomes are surprising, considering the theoretical and empirical link between remembering and imagining (Schacter and Addis, 2007; Addis et al., 2008; Madore et al., 2014; Addis, 2018). Interestingly, whereas the negative correlation between older age and episodic future thought sharing was not significant, there was a significant, negative association between older age and future semantic thought sharing. Therefore, for both remembering and imagining in daily conversation, older age was linked to less outward retrieval of semantic information. On the one hand, these findings are difficult to reconcile with an executive coupling framework (Piolino et al., 2010; Turner and Spreng, 2015; Spreng et al., 2018) or narrative style differences...
There were also two notable differences between laboratory-based work and our study of naturalistic autobiographical memory sharing. In our study, working memory was not associated with episodic specificity, a correlation that laboratory research has found in older adults. It is possible that our naturalistic sampling of autobiographical episodic memory sharing was not related to working memory because the memories captured were often shorter than what is reported in laboratory studies. We noticed that in their natural conversations, individuals often completed their description of a memory in less than the 30-s window of the EAR recording. Thus, it may be that working memory, perhaps in particular feature binding (i.e., episodic buffer; Baddeley, 2000; Piolino et al., 2010), is less important for the telling of shorter memories, and instead crucial for integrating and maintaining content over extended sharing. Another possibility is that our ability to capture a relationship was obscured given that only memory fragments were often captured. Future research using the EAR for this purpose could increase the recording time to better capture verbalized autobiographical memory sharing and examine different aspects of working memory more fully.

In addition to working memory, in contrast to laboratory-based work, we did not reveal gender differences in autobiographical memory sharing, as men and women were equally specific in their daily lives while conversing with others about past episodes. Although the current study did not directly address an underlying mechanism for the discrepancy between the findings of our naturalistic assessment and those of laboratory-based studies, one possibility is that social and contextual interactions may modulate episodic specificity. In other words, men and women may express various degrees of autobiographical memory specificity depending on context (e.g., other individuals involved in the conversation; Aukett et al., 1988; Gryzman and Hudson, 2013) and on the purpose that sharing serves (e.g., social bonding, teaching; Bluck, 2003). These factors may be critical to whether gender differences emerge. An alternative, and not mutually exclusive, explanation could be related to differences in available cues provided in naturalistic and laboratory environments. There is evidence that men may be more sensitive to visual/spatial cuing than women such that particular brain regions associated with greater detail, reliving, and richness showed greater activation to visuospatial compared to verbal cues in an autobiographical memory task (St. Jacques et al., 2011). These results might mean that the level of episodic specificity in men and women depends on the environmental cues of the experiment (i.e., visual/spatial cues in naturalistic studies and verbal cues in laboratory studies). Finally, many of the studies examining gender differences in autobiographical memory specificity were conducted in younger individuals (Wang et al., 2011; Fuentes and Desrocher, 2013; Wang, 2013). These findings have been extended to older individuals (Pillemer et al., 2003), but more research should be done to fully investigate possible gender differences in the specificity of socially shared personal episodes in older individuals.

The present study has a few main limitations that are worth considering. First, although episodic specificity differences have been found in laboratory-based studies of older adult cohorts
more often, an older adult group is compared to a young adult group. Thus, it may be that older adults, as a cohort, tend to generate more semantic memories in everyday life and provide more semantic details than young individuals, as would be predicted by executive coupling (Piolino et al., 2010; Turner and Spreng, 2015; Spreng et al., 2018) and narrative style theoretical models (James et al., 1998; Trunk and Abrams, 2009; Gaesser et al., 2011), but there is a relative decline in these features across older adulthood. A future study could address this possibility by evaluating autobiographical memory sharing across the adult age spectrum. A young vs. older adult comparison could further evaluate the degree to which other laboratory-based findings related to aging and autobiographical memory translate to real-world remembering in daily conversations, such as a relationship to working memory. Second, as is the case for studies of real-world behavior, our naturalistic recording approach inherently provides decreased experimental control over study conditions when compared to laboratory-based studies. Future research will need to examine whether real-world contextual features, such as with whom and where one is speaking, influence the relationship between older age and autobiographical memory. Such social and environmental differences could have contributed to the divergence between laboratory and real-world autobiographical memory assessment reported in the present study. In some respects, variability in environmental and social features can be an advantage, revealing contexts that prominently affect performance among older adults. We suggest that by pairing both in- and out-of-laboratory designs, one could strike a balance between the generalizability that naturalistic observation affords and the high level of experimental control of the laboratory. A third limitation is that the EAR can only capture verbalized memories and future thoughts, leaving in the dark memories and simulations that are part of internal cognition. This may be particularly noteworthy for the naturalistic assessment of future thinking, given that we captured fewer instances of sharing future thoughts (thus replicating Demiray et al., 2018). Other everyday assessment methods, such as diary studies or other thought sampling designs of self-reported vividness and content of future thoughts, may be better suited for capturing and assessing the quality of future thoughts. Fourth, with longer EAR snippets, we would be in a better position to examine the dynamic relationship between episodic and semantic detail use (Devitt et al., 2017). Relatedly, collecting EAR data over more than 4 days would likely boost the frequency of captured future thought-sharing in daily conversation, which may improve our ability to reliably evaluate the relationships between real-world autobiographical future thinking and older age. More days of EAR data collection would also presumably boost the frequency of autobiographical memories captured and variety of environmental contexts, which would allow for further investigation of how contextual features of daily conversation (e.g., with whom or where one is engaged in a conversation) relate to autobiographical memory sharing. Finally, while the selection of the two standard cognitive tests used in the present study was based on data from prior studies (Addis et al., 2008; Grilli et al., 2018a), not all participants received them and there was only one test per domain. A future study could administer a larger battery to more participants that includes a greater range of assessments for each cognitive construct.

Despite these limitations, the present study sheds new light on how older individuals share autobiographical memories in real-world contexts, and in the process, lays the foundation for future research using new technologies to further investigate a host of clinical and functional implications of memory sharing. On the clinical side, reduced episodic specificity has been documented in a range of neurologic conditions (e.g., dementia and amnesia, Irish et al., 2011, 2012; Palombo et al., 2018) and psychiatric conditions (e.g., schizophrenia and depression; Potheegadoo et al., 2014; Söderlund et al., 2014; MacDougall et al., 2015). Both in-laboratory and unobtrusive naturalistic acquisition of autobiographical memory could be useful clinical tools for tracking changes in episodic specificity in these populations. For example, evaluating baseline episodic specificity in-clinic or in-laboratory could indicate a need for follow-up assessments of specificity using naturalistic methods such as the EAR. Furthermore, including real-world observation of autobiographical memory could provide increased coherence in clinicians’ understanding of subjective patient complaints with observed deficits. Given that our standard working memory and verbal episodic memory tests were not significantly related to age, real-world memory assessment may be more sensitive to age-related cognitive changes than many laboratory-based cognitive tests, which tend to be socially decontextualized. However, we acknowledge that in future work, other standard cognitive tests will need to be compared to naturalistic assessment. On the functional side, autobiographical memory has been linked to performance on problem-solving tasks (Vandermorris et al., 2013; Madore and Schacter, 2014; McFarland et al., 2017), creative thinking (Madore et al., 2015), and emotion regulation (Jing et al., 2016). Therefore, naturalistic assessment of daily conversation using new technologies such as the EAR has the potential to be another important method for understanding the degree to which autobiographical memories are being adaptively applied to a variety of cognitive processes that are critical for wellbeing (Seifert et al., 2018).

In sum, in the present study, we used a new technology that has been recently applied to study memory sharing in natural social contexts (Demiray et al., 2018, 2019; Brianza and Demiray, 2019) and found that cross-sectionally, older individuals in the sample demonstrated lower frequencies of autobiographical memory sharing in everyday conversations, a relationship that affected both episodic and semantic memories. For episodic memories, older age was also linked to a reduction in the level of detail at which events were described. In terms of future autobiographical thought sharing, age was neither related to sharing of future episodic thoughts nor sharing of all details in future episodic thoughts. Interestingly, age was negatively correlated with future semantic thought sharing. Additional analyses revealed a commonality with findings from laboratory research (i.e., a lack of a relationship between specificity and a cognitive test of episodic memory) and differences (i.e., lack of a relationship between episodic detail in memories and future thoughts, lack of a relationship between episodic specificity and
working memory, and gender differences). Overall, our findings align with recent research showing that the EAR and similar new technologies for unobtrusively capturing cognition “in the wild” can complement laboratory-based approaches and provide new insights into the actual use of autobiographical memory in everyday life.
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