



HAL
open science

Psychometric Properties of the French Version of the Multifactorial Memory Questionnaire for Adults and the Elderly

Isabelle Fort, Linda Adoul, Delphine Holl, Joël Kaddour, Kamel Gana

► To cite this version:

Isabelle Fort, Linda Adoul, Delphine Holl, Joël Kaddour, Kamel Gana. Psychometric Properties of the French Version of the Multifactorial Memory Questionnaire for Adults and the Elderly. *Canadian Journal on Aging / Revue canadienne du vieillissement*, 2004, 23, pp.347 - 357. hal-01789129

HAL Id: hal-01789129

<https://hal-amu.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01789129>

Submitted on 14 May 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Psychometric Properties of the French Version of the Multifactorial Memory Questionnaire for Adults and the Elderly

Isabelle Fort, Linda Aouf, Delphine Hall, Just Kadane, and Samuel Claverie
University Nancy 2, France

Abstract

Il s'agit de tester à une population de sujets professionnels et de non-professionnels de 20 à 75 ans le questionnaire multifactoriel de mémoire (MMQ) (Fort et al., 2007). Le MMQ est divisé en deux parties : la partie I a pour but de mesurer les propriétés de validité et de fiabilité de l'ensemble de l'échelle à l'aide d'un échantillon composé de sujets professionnels et de non-professionnels ; la partie II a pour but de tester les propriétés de validité et de fiabilité de l'échelle à l'aide d'un échantillon composé de sujets professionnels et de non-professionnels. Les résultats de l'étude ont permis de conclure que le MMQ est un instrument valide et fiable pour mesurer la mémoire à court terme et la mémoire à long terme. Les résultats de l'étude ont également permis de conclure que le MMQ est un instrument valide et fiable pour mesurer la mémoire à court terme et la mémoire à long terme chez les sujets professionnels et les non-professionnels. Les résultats de l'étude ont également permis de conclure que le MMQ est un instrument valide et fiable pour mesurer la mémoire à court terme et la mémoire à long terme chez les sujets professionnels et les non-professionnels. Les résultats de l'étude ont également permis de conclure que le MMQ est un instrument valide et fiable pour mesurer la mémoire à court terme et la mémoire à long terme chez les sujets professionnels et les non-professionnels.

Keywords

The aim of the study was to examine the psychometric properties of French version of the Multifactorial Memory Questionnaire (MMQ) (Fort et al., 2007). The MMQ was divided into two sections: memory span, verbal, abstract, concrete memory functioning (i.e., short-term memory, verbal, abstract, concrete memory functioning), and memory span, verbal, abstract, concrete memory functioning (i.e., long-term memory). The results showed that the French version of the MMQ is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring memory span, verbal, abstract, concrete memory functioning in both professional and non-professional subjects. The results also showed that the MMQ is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring memory span, verbal, abstract, concrete memory functioning in both professional and non-professional subjects. The results also showed that the MMQ is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring memory span, verbal, abstract, concrete memory functioning in both professional and non-professional subjects. The results also showed that the MMQ is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring memory span, verbal, abstract, concrete memory functioning in both professional and non-professional subjects.

Manuscript received / manuscrit reçu: 05/11/10

Manuscript accepted / manuscrit accepté: 07/02/11

Mots-clés: vieillissement, questionnaire, professionnels, non-professionnels, validité, fiabilité, mémoire à court terme

Keywords: aging, Multifactorial Memory Questionnaire, non-professional, professional, properties, reliability, French version, questionnaire, validity, reliability, and so on / Mots-clés: de l'âge, questionnaire, professionnels, non-professionnels, validité, fiabilité, mémoire à court terme

First Author's Note

Correspondence should be addressed to
Isabelle Fort, Nancy 2 University,
54500 Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy, France.
E-mail: fort@univ-nancy2.fr

Metamemory is commonly defined as the knowledge one has of general memory functioning, along with the monitoring and control processes that allow subjects to regulate their memory activity and control (Bjorklund, 1995). This definition includes two domains that refer to knowledge of memory functioning and to monitoring and control processes that are used to perform memory tasks. According to Flavell, Hartwig, Fisher, and Uhl (1986), the knowledge domain itself has two levels of content: (a) factual knowledge about memory processes and memory strategies and (b) the subject's beliefs about her/his own memory abilities. These authors also include another dimension pertaining to memory-related affect.

Metamemory has been studied mostly within two fields: educational psychology and the psychology of aging. In the latter field, it is considered to offer a possible explanation for the aging of memory abilities according to Hartwig, Fisher, and Flavell (1986): "Metamemory is not, by itself, a contributing factor to deficient strategy utilization by older persons in two ways: (a) failure to construct and/or identify the strategy behavior necessary to optimize task performance, and (b) inadequate ability to characterize the nature of memory" (p. 105). They add that older people may have accurate knowledge about memory functioning. Hartwig and Uhl (1989) study older age differences in metamemory against this hypothesis, demonstrating that older people's judgments of self-estimated ability than younger subjects, report more memory problems and use external aids more often (Hays, 1981; Chaffin & Berman, 1981; Craighero & Pass, 1981; Elder, Searles, & Boffing, 1981; Lewis, Stone, & Cook, 1981; Mace, Stone, & Bognard, 1981).

In the field of aging psychology today, we are witnessing an evolution in the place given to metamemory studies as the relationship between metamemory and concepts from social cognition are now being considered. Craighero (1988) and Craighero, Bellandi, and Hartwig (1991) feel it is useful to integrate other concepts into models of these relationships—order to qualify the nature of monitoring and beliefs about memory. For instance, according to Craighero, attentively monitoring memory involves one of the characteristics of cognitive structures, which is the distinctive sense of the representational categories associated with memory aging. "Metamemory shows up in the elderly as an instance of memory problems that those of young people continue to be cognitive self-ratings among older subjects. The relationship between general beliefs about memory aging and beliefs about one's abilities has been empirically supported by Craighero and Hartwig (1991), Stone,

and colleagues concerning memory aging, will influence the way subjects answer questions dealing with the utilization of abilities.

Another specificity of the concept of metamemory is that it is considered an aging stability, so that it encompasses the concept of stability's complexity. Memory complexity refers to an impression that one's memory abilities have improved with age (Bjorklund, 1985). While ability self-ratings usually a dimension of metamemory, it also seems to include memory complexity. However, Bjorklund (1985) and Craighero (1988) and Craighero, Bellandi, and Hartwig (1991) believe that memory complexity is distinct from memory complexity and depression. Analyzing the link between depression and self-evaluation of ability could help us gain a partial understanding of how self-ratings are influenced.

Metamemory Subjects: Memory Functioning

A person's awareness and knowledge of her/his own memory functioning are usually measured by self-reports from questionnaires that rely on self-ratings of memory in various situations or with the frequency of forgetting in everyday life. Older adults with a more diverse range of topics, such as changes in a subject's ability during the day for the execution of memory tasks, or the influence of affective factors (Bjorklund, 1981; Craighero, Bellandi, & Uhl, 1981).

The most widely used questionnaire dealing solely with frequency of forgetting and ability self-ratings is the Inventory of Memory Experiences (IME). Developed by Craighero and Bognard (1981), a short version of this questionnaire (the Short Inventory of Memory Experiences (SIME)) is described by Craighero (1981). Like the original version, it has two components. The first contains 16 items related to forgetting and assesses the following areas: memories people cannot, geographical information, conversations, things learned by rote, abstract conclusions, and beliefs to witness something one knows. The second part contains two sections: recall of early childhood (free names) and recall of various specific events (free names). This version has been used in several studies pertaining to age differences in the relationships between metamemory and memory (Chaffin & Berman, 1981; Craighero & Pass, 1981; Elder et al., 1981; Hays, 1981). However, neither the factor structure nor the internal consistency of this short version has been studied.

The most frequently used questionnaire dealing with diverse topics on the Memory Functioning Questionnaire and the Inventory of Subjective Questionnaire (Hays, 1981; Searles, 1981; Craighero & Pass, 1981; Craighero, Bellandi, & Uhl, 1981). Lee,

van et al., 1997; McClelland, Shiffrin, Gault, & Rydqvist, 1997; Lee & Zelazo, 1997). The Memory Functioning Questionnaire was designed as a self-report measure of ability-memory functioning to reflect it was derived from Zelazo (1996) and Thompson's (1995) Memory Questionnaire and was shortened by factor analysis using the principal component (Cohen et al., 1996). The authors obtained a final questionnaire consisting of 16 items. The factor analysis revealed four factors that accounted for 74.3 per cent of the variance. Factor 1 was interpreted as general memory ability (i.e., recalled items related to items of everyday life). It was designed as a composite functioning factor and hence it included items about strategy use and was named memory use. This factor structure was chosen to be similar to those of the α -coefficients of the different forms created from 1987 to 1994, indicating good internal consistency within each form. The MFMQ has been translated into French (Gault & Weintraub, 1994), but the psychometric properties of this version have not been investigated.

The Memory in Addition (MIA) scale was developed by Hinton and Hinton (1998). The authors aimed to derive a multidimensional psychometric instrument to represent a multidimensional construct of memory in addition. After an examination of questionnaires and interviews about semantic memory, episodic memory, memory metamemory, and self-perception, its initial goal is to be able to be generated a content analysis of this part but the authors decided to create 180 items, covering the following dimensions: strategy (memory strategy use) and knowledge about memory processes and taking explicit knowledge about one's own abilities, change (pattern of evolution of one's memory), ability (judging the functioning memory ability), strategy and ability strategy activation (importance of activating in a task), and level (level of control in memory ability). Alpha coefficients indicated relatively high estimates of internal consistency (from .88 to .97), except in the case of the strategy dimension (8). The results of a factor analysis showed that level of the eight dimensions were clearly distinct, but the strategy dimension was combined with the change dimension. Moreover, within the strategy dimension, one could distinguish between use of internal strategies and use of external strategies (Hinton & Hinton, 1998). Although the stability and validity of the MIA have been objectively proven recently, its dimensional structure has not been demonstrated (Hinton, Hinton, & Gross, 1999). Moreover, the MIA has been validated in French (Gauthier, 1999). Gauthier (1999) conducted a principal component analysis of the MIA. With the exception of writing, all of the dimensions

were identified. The also found satisfactory estimates of the internal consistency of the dimensions ($\alpha > .85$ to .97), with the exception of motivation ($\alpha = .70$).

Hinton and Hinton (1998) examined the existing questionnaires to have proved themselves that made their internal use difficult. The drawbacks were related to the content of the items, the fact that some items are not relevant for all subjects, the length of the questionnaires, and the diversity of the questionnaires. Therefore, Hinton and Hinton (1998) designed the Multidimensional Memory Questionnaire (MFMQ). The MFMQ consists of 16 items, seven of which are more hypothetical dimensions: structure memory judgments, memory activation, memory ability self-appraisal, and strategy use (memory). The authors aimed to create short items and to include only items dealing with situations where action is possible, along with some situations relevant to memory use (memory use, memory activation, look with the technology). Participants about their current memory ability (past, done, satisfaction, endorsement, intention) and with the self-evaluation abilities. It includes 16 items in 5-point Likert format, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, with higher scores indicating higher satisfaction with one's memory. Memory ability addresses frequency of forgetting in different situations. It contains 16 items that ask the subject to rate the frequency of events that do the best experiment in the last 2 weeks as a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from never to always, with higher scores indicating more positive patterns. The strategy dimension deals with strategy use in everyday life. It includes 16 items. Participants answer on 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from never to always, in accordance with how often they used the strategies in the last 2 weeks. Higher scores indicate greater propensity to use memorization strategies. The MFMQ was used by Hinton (1999) in a study about the effects of an intervention program for older adults.

Hinton and Hinton (1998) examined the internal consistency test-retest reliability and construct validity of scores on the MFMQ scale among 16 middle-aged and elderly subjects (50% were female) aged from 40 to 60 years ($M = 54$, $SD = 8$). The mean level of education was 12.6 years (ranging from 8 to 16, $SD = 2.8$). Construct validity was tested for MFMQ content, with the MFMQ ability and internal MFMQ (memory use) correlation after a month interval were strong (ranging from .63 to .89) ($p < .05$). The convergent validity of the MFMQ scales was demonstrated by their correlation with the Memory Functioning Questionnaire (MFMQ) and Memory in Addition Questionnaire (MIA) and objective memory tasks. Construct validity was demonstrated by the lack of correlation between the MFMQ scale and

translation team. A principal component analysis with a varimax criterion identified three factors corresponding to the hypothesized questionnaire scales. The BMMQ scores were psychometrically sound and ready for translation.

The aim of the present study was to develop a French version of the BMMQ and to examine its psychometric properties in order to provide a tool for research and clinical purposes. In order to our knowledge, the psychometric properties of a French version of a questionnaire questionnaire have been investigated only for the BMMQ. Therefore, this study will provide researchers and practitioners with the opportunity to select among our self-report questionnaires to assess vulnerability.

Method

Translating and Adapting the BMMQ

The BMMQ was translated in three steps: firstly, three translations were produced by four English-speaking persons, one of whom was a professional translator (senior); for each item, each translator was asked to select which of the four translations best represented the meaning of the original item. Finally, an experimental version generated from the consensus given by the translators (the shortened, original) and approved by a committee of psychologists working in the field of psychological measurement. The final version is presented in the Appendix.

Participants and Procedures

The study participants were 196 French adults (198 women and 98 men) their average age was 61.9 years (ranging from 41 to 94, $M = 61.9$, $SD = 10.6$) and lived in their own homes. All participants lived in retirement homes, and 110 percent had 10 or more years of education. They were contacted by the authors' relatives or through independent clubs and associations. Participants were informed of the voluntary and anonymous nature of the study.

Measures

The participants filled out the BMMQ individually in the format originally proposed by Inoué and Ishii (2001). The other measures described below were used to evaluate the construct validity of the scale.

An adapted French version of the BMMQ scale (Inoué & Ishii, 2001) validated by Bourgeois (2005) was administered. This is a 14-item questionnaire on a 4-point Likert format assessing five dimensions of vulnerability: eating (1 item, *middle* "I do not eat because when I am put on the spot to remember one thing"); change of time, *middle* "The clock gets the better of me to remember things"; *middle* "I forget the things, such as "I am good at remembering names"; and strategy (4 items, *middle* "Do you ever appear

stupid on a schedule to help you remember them?"), alpha coefficient estimates of reliability for the items on each dimension were 0.85, 0.79, 0.83, and 0.82, respectively.

A French version of the short version of the Cognitive Function Scale (CFS) (Folstein & Folstein, 1990; Folstein, Folstein, & McHugh, 1975) validated by Bourgeois et al. (2005) was used to measure short status. This is a 10-item, dichotomously scored scale in which respondents are asked to respond *yes* or *no* to each item. A sample item from this scale is, "Can you do good games such as the *jeu de l'oie*?" Item that the scale was designed especially for the ability, but it is also suitable for younger participants. Bourgeois's estimate of reliability for scores on the CFS was 0.76. Bourgeois research has demonstrated that mood affects not only cognitive functioning, but also self-evaluation, so hypothesized that scores on the BMMQ would be positively correlated with scores on the CFS (Jok, McLaughlin, & Inoué, 2009; McLaughlin, 2009).

Fort's (2001) Memory Aging Questionnaire (MAQ) was administered to assess how participants perceived of memory change with advancing age. The MAQ is a 14-item scale (1 = *great* 4 = *little*), with lower scores indicating stronger beliefs that aging is associated with declining memory performance. This scale includes items such as "With advancing age, memory decreases" and "With advancing age, people are better at remembering things to do". The reliability of the scores on this scale was satisfactory ($\alpha = 0.81$). We hypothesized that negative beliefs about age-related memory performance would be negatively associated with vulnerability judgments.

Self-perceived health was measured by a single item, "How do you judge your health right now?" Answers were given on a 4-point scale ranging from *excellent* to *poor*, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with one's health (strong self-perceived health).

Results

Comparisons with the English-speaking sample

The BMMQ scores are presented in Table 1, along with scores from an English-speaking sample (Inoué & Ishii, 2001). To compare the two samples, *t* tests were performed. The results showed that our sample had higher scores than the English-speaking sample on the commitment and ability dimensions of vulnerability (intercorrelation on the strategy dimension: *Yes*, though, that our sample was younger than the English-speaking sample) (2010: 65% of our study and 61.7% in the original study, $p < 0.001$).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the dimensions of the BMAQ

	Countdown		Ability		Strategy		Age	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Countdown	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)
Ability	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)
Strategy	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)
Age	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)	10.1 (1.0)

Factorial structure

A maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to evaluate the three-dimensional model proposed by Torgue and Bork (2004). This model did not adequately fit the data ($\chi^2(128.5) = 171.1$, $p < 0.001$, $RMSEA = 0.071$) and principal component analysis, followed by varimax rotation, was then performed. The solution for use of a factor analysis was evaluated by applying Bartlett's dimension test and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test. The χ^2 value on Bartlett's test was $\chi^2(127.5) = 171.1$, $p < 0.001$ and the value on the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test was 0.80, both indicating adequate factorability. The number of factors extracted was based on the eigenvalues greater than 1 criterion plus another interpretability of the solution. The initial analysis revealed without specifying the number of factors to be extracted. This procedure resulted in six factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. However, after many trials, the two-factor solution provided the best interpretable factor pattern. This solution accounted for 64.3 per cent of the total variance in the questionnaire responses. Items with structure coefficients greater than 0.400 were found to be meaningful for the questionnaire.

Factor 1 (eigenvalue = 18.0) accounted for 28.1 per cent of the variance variance and included all items on the ability dimension of the BMAQ. Factor 2 (eigenvalue = 1.0) accounted for 1.6 per cent of the total variance and included all four test items of the countdown dimension. Factor 3 (eigenvalue = 0.8) accounted for 1.3 per cent of the variance variance and included nine items from the strategy dimension. It was labelled the overall strategy factor. Factor 4 (eigenvalue = 0.4) accounted for 0.6 per cent of the variance variance and included nine other items from the BMAQ strategy dimension. This factor was named the overall strategy factor. Only two items (C7 and C10) did not have high coefficients (> 0.4) on either an

overall dimension of items or the Factor 1 items of the BMAQ.

The internal consistencies of the items on the three questionnaire subs (BMAQ) dimensions were examined using Cronbach's α coefficients. For the countdown dimension, $\alpha = 0.828$ (α for the original version) for ability, $\alpha = 0.8$ (α for the original version) for strategy, $\alpha = 0.7$ (α for the original version).

We also conducted an item analysis in order to provide evidence of internal consistency and identify items that failed to contribute optimally to the respective total dimension scores. All but two items, total correlation coefficients for the countdown dimension exceeded 0.50, all but one item, total correlation coefficient for the ability dimension exceeded 0.50, and all but three items, total correlation coefficients for the strategy dimension exceeded 0.50. One dropping these items did not improve α coefficient estimates.

Construct validity

Like Torgue and Bork (2004), we studied convergent validity between the BMAQ and the BMA by comparing correlation coefficients. Table 1 summarizes the results. The countdown dimension of the BMAQ was significantly correlated with both strategy and age ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$, $p < 0.001$, respectively), which is similar to the results reported by Torgue and Bork (2004) ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$, and $r = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$). These results indicate that a high degree of strategy utilization was associated with a low level of accuracy and a finding of ability concern. In our's children, strong, significant correlations ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$) were found between the BMAQ ability dimension and the BMA ability dimension, as reported by Torgue and Bork (2004) ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$). The correlation indicates that an optimal rating of one's abilities was associated with low reports of difficulty. The strategy dimension of the BMAQ was strongly and significantly correlated with the strategy dimension of the BMA ($r = 0.70$, $p < 0.001$).

Table 6. Multivariate ordered structural models for the 2000 (N = 1,938)

Model year ^a	Structure coefficients ^b				R-squared
	Forma I	Forma II	Forma III	Forma IV	
0.1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
0.2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
0.3	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
0.4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
0.5	0.000*	0.000	0.000*	0.000	0.000
0.6	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
0.7	0.000	0.000*	0.000	0.000	0.000
0.8	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
0.9	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.3	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.6	0.000	0.000*	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.7	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.8	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.9	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.3	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.6	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.7	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.8	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.9	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.3	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.6	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.7	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.8	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.9	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.3	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.6	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.7	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.8	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.9	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
5.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
5.1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
5.2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

a. 0.1: Baseline model; 4.0: adding 10% of strategies.

b. Structure coefficients for relationships with a factor.

Table 1 (continued)

1998 Item ^a	Structure coefficient ^b				Communality
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	
133	0.520	0.175	0.152	0.001	0.331
134	0.580	0.077	0.001	0.001	0.340
137	0.670	0.101	0.001	0.001	0.451
138	0.580	0.112	0.012	0.001	0.350
139	0.580	0.122	0.001	0.001	0.352
140	0.581	0.119	0.001	0.001	0.350
151	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.400	0.161
152	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.351	0.121
153	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.120
154	0.001	0.100	0.670	0.001	0.447
155	0.001	0.001	0.100	0.400	0.201
156	0.100	0.075	0.600	0.001	0.361
157	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.400	0.167
158	0.100	0.101	0.600	0.001	0.362
159	0.001	0.100	0.001	0.400	0.162
170	0.101	0.001	0.111	0.400	0.171
171	0.072	0.001	0.600	0.001	0.301
172	0.001	0.101	0.001	0.400	0.161
173	0.100	0.001	0.600	0.001	0.301
174	0.100	0.101	0.600	0.001	0.301
175	0.001	0.100	0.001	0.400	0.162
176	0.001	0.001	0.600	0.001	0.301
177	0.001	0.101	0.600	0.075	0.361
178	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.400	0.170
179	0.001	0.001	0.670	0.001	0.407

a. N = 1,000; Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.91$; SPSS 10.0 for Windows.

b. Structure coefficient coefficients for each item within factor.

This correlation is higher than the reportedly 'large' and 'high-stimulus' ($r = 0.44$) and equates that 'importance of the strategies assessed by the WMI' and 'importance with highest use of the strategies assessed by the WMI'.

As expected, a significant correlation was found between depressed mood and monetary judgments. Table 1 shows that the three dimensions of the WMI were significantly correlated with the CDS scores. Clearly, a depressed mood was negatively correlated with confidence with one's money abilities ($r = -0.16$, $p < 0.01$) and frequency of budgeting ($r = -$

0.21 , $p < 0.01$) and positively correlated with the use of monetary strategies, especially interest rates ($r = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$).

Also as expected, a significant correlation was found between monetary judgments and beliefs about aging-related money performance. Table 1 shows that the three WMI dimensions were significantly correlated with stereotypes about aging money. These results mean that beliefs in negative stereotypes about money aging were associated with a low degree of confidence with one's abilities ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$), enhanced reporting of money problems

Table 2. Correlations between the MMQ dimensions, the MMQ dimensions, dependent level strategies about memory aging and demographic variables

	MMQ- Substratum	MMQ-Ability	MMQ-Strategy	MMQ-Strat1 Strategies	MMQ-Strat2 Strategies
MMQ-Strategy		0.27**			
MMQ-Change	0.20**				
MMQ-Strategy	0.28**				
MMQ-Strategy			0.75+	0.87**	0.75+
Dependent level	0.28**	0.28**	0.32**	0.32**	0.31
Demographic about Aging	0.07+	0.03+	-0.03+	-0.02	-0.02+
Age	-0.11	-0.12*	0.00	0.00	0.12*
Education	-0.01	-0.01	0.15+	0.00	0.01+
Subjective health	0.26**	0.28**	0.17*	0.00	0.17**

**Significance at $p < 0.01$; *Significance at $p < 0.05$.

($r = 0.18$, $p < 0.05$), and frequent use of mnemonic strategies especially external ones ($r = 0.09$, $p < 0.005$).

Finally, correlations between metamemory judgments, on the one hand, and age, education, and self-perceived health, on the other, were computed. As shown in Table 3, only ability and external strategy-related ones, but statistically significant ones, ($r = 0.14$, $p < 0.01$) and ($r = 0.15$, $p < 0.01$, MMQ-Strategy) were found to relate more memory problems and more external mnemonic strategies more frequently than the frequent and high ability did not appear any significant correlation between age and the MMQ dimensions in their high-ability sample. Level of education was significantly correlated with the MMQ-Strategy dimension only more positively for external strategies, ($r = 0.13$, $p < 0.01$). Self-perceived health was positively correlated with metamemory ($r = 0.13$, $p < 0.01$) and ability ($r = 0.13$, $p < 0.01$), and negatively correlated with strategy ($r = -0.16$, $p < 0.01$). Positive self-perceived health was related to a lower propensity to use more mnemonic strategies, fewer externalizing problems, and greater satisfaction with one's abilities.

Discussion

This article focuses on the three constructs, memory reliability and ability estimates of scores on the French version of the MMQ. The results allow us to conclude that our French version of this index is psychometrically sound (highly trustworthy on the French MMQ) proved highly reliable and correlated to the expected dimensions with other constructs. Evidence for the convergent validity of the MMQ scores was provided by three statistically significant positive cor-

relations with the MMQ. Correlations between the MMQ abilities and the MMQ subscores were strong, ranging from 0.76 to 0.79, and similar to those obtained by Lopez and Holt (2011) in their original study. Validity was established by examining the relationships between subscores across self-reported variables. We found that metamemory judgments were associated to the expected direction with dependent level use in previous studies (see Planes et al., 1995; Balle et al., 1991; Johnson et al., 1997) and to negative beliefs about aging-related memory performance (as hypothesized by Fleming and, 1996). Instead we noted that beliefs in negative stereotypes about memory aging were associated with the frequent use of external mnemonic strategies, which could be considered as a way of compensating for one's need or imaginary memory impairment. Also, we found that perceived good health was related to a lower propensity to use mnemonic strategies, less frequent awareness of memory problems, and more satisfaction with one's abilities. Our results revealed that, with advancing age, subjects tend not only to report more problems concerning but also to use greater mnemonic strategies more often. These results are in line with those obtained by other authors who have examined the relationship between metamemory and age (Lopez, 1991; Charlton & Harrison, 1991; Comstock & Pass, 1989; Balle et al., 1991; Larson et al., 1985). Finally, we found that the higher the subjects' level of education, the more they relied on mnemonic strategies. These results are close to studies that examined the validity of the MMQ scores.

Regarding the factor structure, the results of the confirmatory factor analysis did not support the a priori three-factor model of the MMQ; no explanatory factor

analysis revealed that a few items reliably reflect the most recognizable patterns of factor scores, accounting for 1.4 per cent of the common variance in the data set. Three of the dimensions proposed by Deane and East (2000) were replicated: *task ability* and *strategy* (with 'I find that reflecting on my strengths and...') appears to reflecting strategy ability (like those in the statement *strategy*) and to frequency of *reflecting* items (like those in the problem *reflecting*) are determined by *strategy* self-efficacy defined as 'a set of beliefs about one's capability to use strategy effectively to solve situations' (Lawrence *et al.*, 1999, p. 50). Also, the *statement* and *ability* dimensions of the *MSAQ* can be seen as different measures of strategy self-efficacy. The third *strategy* category was divided into two factors: *internal* strategies and *external* strategies. *Internal* strategies are strategies that rely on students' using internal elaboration to solve problems that usually (e.g., by creating a visual image regarding information to learn, or reflecting what they've come up with) while *external* strategies require modifications of the subject's environment and therefore are external class to cognitive performance (e.g., writing down things to do, or writing an class study). This distinction was established in an earlier study that validated the *MSAQ* (Deane & Webb, 1995). Moreover, this measure allows us to gain further information about a possible preference of subjects for one type of strategy and to give specific class advice on that with the subject's preferences.

Although the results provide support for the psychometric properties of the French version of the *MSAQ*, additional research is needed to further examine predictive validity among diverse samples, using different languages. *Correlations* between scores obtained by self-report measures about some shared method variance (concomitant factor analysis) may be an issue sample (for instance, young subjects or cognitively impaired subjects) are needed to reflect heterotrait-to-hetero measures of the *MSAQ*. The usefulness of *MSAQ* by construct validation is now well known and well documented. In fact, *metacognitive factor loadings* generated by *MSAQ* can be regarded as 'validity coefficients' (Deane, 1999). Furthermore, a factor loading score as an index of how good the item is at indicating the underlying construct it is intended to measure.

Notes

1. We used the following Springer-Verlag publications:

References

- Bale, B. J., Anderson, B. W., & Swanson, H. J. (2000). *MSAQ*: Metacognitive strategies in middle schools and middle school students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 20-30.
- Bale, B. J. A. (1999). *Metacognitive strategies and learning outcomes*. New York: Wiley.
- Bale, B. J. A. (2002). *Metacognitive strategies: Disaggregating the *MSAQ* into learning strategies*. *OT*, 28, 26.
- Balshazy, J. (1992). *Metacognitive strategies of self-assessment*. *Empirical Music Research*, 18(1), 17-21.
- Barney, P., Mitchell, J., & Moran, J. (1992). *Metacognitive strategies in middle school mathematics: gender, reading achievement, and strategy*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 29(1), 29-39.
- Bale, B. J., Anderson, B. W., & Swanson, H. J. (1999). *Metacognitive strategies in middle schools: A comparison between the US and Canada*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(1), 29-39.
- Broome, J. (1999). *Metacognitive in social cognition*. *Metacognition and Learning: Theory and Research* (Ed. by J. Metcalfe & L. Finn), 179-192. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Broome, J., Anderson, B. W., & Bale, B. J. (1999). *Metacognitive strategies in middle schools: A comparison between the US and Canada*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(1), 29-39.
- Broome, J., & Finn, J. (1992). *Metacognitive strategies of middle school mathematics students and their self-efficacy*. *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 193-202.
- Chen, B., & Morrison, B. J. (1998). *Self-regulation of memory ability: An experimental study*. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 37, 20.
- Chen, B., Morrison, B. J., & Anderson, B. W. (1999). *Metacognitive strategies in middle schools: A comparison between the US and Canada*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(1), 29-39.
- Chen, B., & Webb, B. T. (1995). *Metacognitive strategies of middle school mathematics students and their self-efficacy*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 32, 299-309.
- Chen, B., Morrison, B. J., & Anderson, B. W. (1999). *Metacognitive strategies in middle schools: A comparison between the US and Canada*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(1), 29-39.
- Chen, J. (1999). *Metacognitive strategies in mathematics: A study of middle school students' self-regulation of learning*. *Empirical Music Research*, 25(1), 17-21.
- Chen, B. J., & Morrison, B. J. (1998). *Metacognitive strategies in middle schools: A comparison between the US and Canada*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 35(1), 29-39.
- Chen, B. J., Morrison, B. J., & Anderson, B. W. (1999). *Metacognitive strategies in middle schools: A comparison between the US and Canada*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(1), 29-39.
- Chen, B. J., Morrison, B. J., & Anderson, B. W. (1999). *Metacognitive strategies in middle schools: A comparison between the US and Canada*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(1), 29-39.
- Chen, B. J., Morrison, B. J., & Anderson, B. W. (1999). *Metacognitive strategies in middle schools: A comparison between the US and Canada*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(1), 29-39.

- Wahlstein, D., & Thoresen, C. (1999). An inventory of ways aging adults participate in life-time learning. *P. 100-110*. In J. B. Birren & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), *Handbook of aging and cognition* (2nd ed., pp. 100-110). London: Academic Press.
- Wahlstein, D., Thoresen, C. E., & Schulz, J. (1999). *Measuring self-directed learning: Development of the Self-Directed Learning Scale*. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 11(4), 407-420. doi:10.1177/0898010199111004
- Wahlstein, D., Schulz, J., & Thoresen, C. (1999). *Measuring self-directed learning: Validity of three self-report measures*. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 11(4), 421-433.
- Wahlstein, D., Wahlstein, D., Thoresen, C., & Schulz, J. (1999). *Measuring memory self-efficacy and self-efficacy for life-long learning*. In J. B. Birren & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), *Handbook of aging and cognition* (2nd ed., pp. 45-62). New York: Springer.
- Wahlstein, D., & Schulz, J. (1998). *Questionnaire for learning: Manual for the national study of self-directed learning*. *University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, Center for Lifelong Learning: Department of Educational Psychology*. Available at <http://www.csl.lac.edu/~jwahlstein/questionnaire>. Paper 1998.
- Wahlstein, D., & Schulz, J. (1998). *Measuring confidence among learners: Learning Self-Efficacy*. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 17(4), 387-397.
- Wahlstein, D., Wahlstein, D., & Schulz, J. (1997). *Self-report on memory for learning: A longitudinal study of the educational benefits to memory perspective and self-efficacy performance*. *Journal of Gerontology*, 52(1), 103-110.
- Wahlstein, D., & Schulz, J. (1997). *Age-related differences in the memory self-efficacy questionnaire*. *Adult Development and Aging*, 19, 18-25.
- Wahlstein, D., & Wahlstein, J. (1995). *Adult self-efficacy and social skills: Implications for learning and aging*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 1088-1096.
- Wahlstein, D., Wahl, D. J., & Schulz, J. (1997). *Age-related differences in self-efficacy*. *Department of Educational Psychology*. Available at <http://www.csl.lac.edu/~jwahlstein>.
- Wahlstein, D. (1995). *Memory self-efficacy questionnaire*. *University of Wisconsin-La Crosse*. Available at <http://www.csl.lac.edu/~jwahlstein>.
- Wahlstein, D., Schulz, J., & Thoresen, C. (1999). *Measuring self-directed learning: Development of a global measure*. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 11(4), 407-420. doi:10.1177/0898010199111004
- Wahlstein, D. (1997). *Improving memory knowledge, self-efficacy, and functioning in older adults and their care: An intervention for older adults*. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 9(4), 455-465.
- Wahlstein, D., Schulz, J., & Thoresen, C. (1999). *Psychometric properties of three measures of perceived life-time learning*. *Journal of Gerontology*, 54(1), 25-37.
- Wahlstein, D., Thoresen, C. E., & Schulz, J. (1999). *Measuring performance self-efficacy in learning and performing: Learning Self-Efficacy Scale*. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 11(4), 421-433.
- Wahlstein, D., Schulz, J., Wahl, D. J., & Thoresen, C. E. (1999). *The Memory Self-Efficacy Scale: Development of memory self-efficacy and self-report for the Study of Life-Long Learning*. In *Journal of Aging and Health*, 11(4), 407-420. doi:10.1177/0898010199111004

Appendix French version of the SRRQ

SRRQ – L'Apprentissage

- 1 Je regarde les reports de nouvelles en continu
- 2 Je lis des livres
- 3 Je regarde des émissions importantes je suis intéressé par les nouvelles
- 4 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 5 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 6 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 7 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 8 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 9 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 10 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 11 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 12 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 13 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 14 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 15 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 16 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 17 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu
- 18 Je regarde les nouvelles en continu

SRRQ – Santé

- 1 Vous avez eu des problèmes de santé au cours de votre vie ?
- 2 Vous avez eu des problèmes de santé au cours de votre vie ?
- 3 Vous avez eu des problèmes de santé au cours de votre vie ?

1. How do you think you will use the results of this study personally or your class of students?
2. How do you think students might use the results of your paper in their own work?
3. How do you think students would use it?
4. How do you think students or you will discuss your results, for example, at a conference or journal meeting or other venue?
5. How do you think students will use your results?
6. How do you think students will discuss your results with you?
7. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
8. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?
9. How do you think students will discuss your results with other researchers?
10. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
11. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?
12. How do you think students will discuss your results with other researchers?
13. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
14. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?
15. How do you think students will discuss your results with other researchers?
16. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
17. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?
18. How do you think students will discuss your results with other researchers?
19. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
20. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?

HWQ2 – Strategy

1. How do you think students will use the results of your paper personally or your class of students?
2. How do you think students might use the results of your paper in their own work?
3. How do you think students would use it?

4. How do you think students or you will discuss your results, for example, at a conference or journal meeting or other venue?
5. How do you think students will use your results?
6. How do you think students will discuss your results with you?
7. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
8. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?
9. How do you think students will discuss your results with other researchers?
10. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
11. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?
12. How do you think students will discuss your results with other researchers?
13. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
14. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?
15. How do you think students will discuss your results with other researchers?
16. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
17. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?
18. How do you think students will discuss your results with other researchers?
19. How do you think students will discuss your results with other students?
20. How do you think students will discuss your results with other teachers?

CANADIAN
JOURNAL
ON
AGING

LA REVUE
CANADIENNE
DU
VIEILLISSEMENT