

1. garrison—*garrison, lieutenant, dignitary*
2. dignitary—*crown queen, oh . . . dignitary*
3. vulture—*vulture . . . bird, there was a bird present . . . vulture, bird . . . garrison*
4. disk—*disk . . . disk, record, disk, can't remember statue*
5. crown—*crown queen, the dignitary visits the crown queen, the lieutenant is in the garrison*
6. bowl—*bowl . . . bowl of flowers . . . the dignitary visits the crown queen, and gives her a bowl of flowers*
7. present—I am *present*, I also am a *student*, I think . . . *student*
8. student—*student*, I am *present*, I also am a *student* . . . the *dignitary* is also a *student* philosopher
9. dragon—oh, I forgot all the fairy tales . . . *goose, dragon, mother goose* fairy tales
10. kitchen—*kitchen, still the mother, the widowed mother* [p. 374]

This subject was given no special instructions; she was just asked to say out loud what she was thinking about during study. She is not an atypical subject. Moreover, we believe that the protocols just reflect the tip of the elaborative iceberg. From our introspections, it became apparent to us that the ideas and elaborations that occur during a memory experiment are generated at a rate that is too rapid to report verbally.

There is probably a purpose for the large amount of elaboration that is generated. We speculate that the rich elaboration affects memory performance. That is, we take the depth-of-processing results as an indication of a function and a consequence of the elaborative process—improved memory for material elaborated.

There are two critical questions that need to be addressed in making this theoretical proposal concrete. First, why should amount of elaboration affect memory performance? Second, why should amount of elaboration vary with depth of processing?

To answer these questions, it is necessary to articulate our view of the nature of the representation of information in a memory task. We assume that long-term memory is a network of interconnected propositions and that when a subject goes through an experiment, the subject adds propositions to this memory network. At a minimum, the subject adds propositions encoding the memory items. So, given the paired-associate "dog—chair" the subject would encode the proposition: "In the context of the experiment, I learned that *chair* was the response for the stimulus *dog*." Typically, of course, the subject encodes much more than this minimum. Frequently, this additional elaboration will be about the meaning of the words rather than the words per se.

Any particular encoded proposition is fragile. There is a significant chance that the subject will not be able to activate that proposition at test. So, if a person's memory for the item rested on the minimum proposition, poor memory