

Working Memory and Language Aptitude

Ahmad Hamed 

Lecturer, Maaref University of Applied Sciences, Syria

Corresponding Author: e-mail: ahmad.hamed@mas.edu.syAvailable online at: <https://doi.org/10.66422/RJMU.ID.67>

Received: 13 May 2026

Revised: 27 June 2026

Accepted: 30 July 2026

Abstract— Working memory is increasingly recognized as a central cognitive factor in second language acquisition and a major component of language aptitude. This paper examines the relationship between working memory and language learning through Baddeley's multicomponent model, focusing on the central executive, phonological loop, visuospatial sketchpad, and episodic buffer. It reviews how these components contribute to vocabulary learning, grammatical processing, pronunciation, reading comprehension, and the integration of linguistic information. Empirical research indicates that learners with greater working memory capacity often demonstrate stronger second language proficiency, particularly in tasks requiring simultaneous processing and storage. The paper also considers the proposition that verbal working memory constitutes the core of language aptitude and discusses its relationship with traditional aptitude constructs. Pedagogical implications include reducing cognitive load, increasing repetition, using multimodal support, and teaching memory strategies. Finally, the paper highlights ongoing theoretical debates and identifies directions for neurological, longitudinal, computational, and intervention-based research in SLA.

Keywords— Working Memory, Language Aptitude, Second Language Acquisition, Phonological Loop, Central Executive, Episodic Buffer, L2 Learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

Individual differences in second language (L2) acquisition have long resisted simple explanation. Learners may receive broadly comparable instruction, study the same materials, encounter similar amounts of input, and yet progress at strikingly different rates. Some seem to notice patterns almost intuitively, retain unfamiliar words after only limited exposure, or reproduce novel sound sequences with surprising ease, whereas others require repeated encounters before the same material becomes stable. Such variation is not an incidental feature of language learning; it is one of its defining realities. Research has repeatedly documented that certain learners appear to possess a comparatively strong natural facility for acquiring additional languages (Grigorenko et al., 2000). This capacity, generally conceptualized as language aptitude, has consequently occupied a central position in second language acquisition (SLA) research, particularly in attempts to explain why instructional outcomes remain uneven even when external learning conditions are relatively similar.

Language aptitude, however, is not necessarily a single, indivisible ability. It is better understood as a constellation of cognitive capacities that support different aspects of language learning, from detecting grammatical regularities to retaining unfamiliar phonological sequences. Over recent decades, working memory (WM) has become especially prominent in this discussion. Its role is compelling because second language learning places extraordinary demands on the learner's ability to hold information temporarily while simultaneously doing something with it: interpreting, comparing, rehearsing, predicting, restructuring, or linking it with earlier knowledge. In other words, the learner rarely has the luxury of processing linguistic information one element at a time. Listening to even an ordinary sentence may require retaining the beginning of the utterance while interpreting its ending, recognizing grammatical relationships, retrieving vocabulary from long-term memory, and suppressing irrelevant interpretations, all within seconds. It is hardly surprising, then, that some accounts have gone so far as to treat working memory as effectively synonymous with language aptitude, or

at least as one of its central cognitive foundations (Yalçın, 2016).

Working memory can broadly be described as a limited-capacity cognitive system that enables the temporary maintenance and active manipulation of information needed for complex mental activity. Language comprehension, reasoning, problem solving, and learning all depend upon this ability to keep information mentally available while processing it at the same time (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974; Daneman & Carpenter, 1980). This distinction between merely storing information and actively working with it is important. Short-term retention alone would not adequately explain how learners understand a syntactically complex sentence, compare alternative grammatical interpretations, or remember the beginning of a phrase while deciding how the final clause alters its meaning. Working memory is dynamic rather than simply archival; it is closer to a temporary cognitive workspace in which information remains accessible long enough to be reorganized and integrated.

Baddeley and Hitch (1974) initially conceptualized this system through a tripartite model consisting of a central executive together with two subsidiary components, the phonological loop and the visuospatial sketchpad. The model was influential partly because it rejected the idea of short-term memory as a single undifferentiated storage mechanism. Instead, it proposed a coordinated architecture in which different types of information could be maintained and processed through partly specialized systems. For language learning, this distinction is particularly useful because acquiring an L2 is rarely dependent upon one cognitive operation alone. A learner may need to retain the sound shape of an unfamiliar word, direct attention toward a grammatical ending, visualize a referent, retrieve background knowledge, and suppress interference from the first language, sometimes almost simultaneously.

The Central Executive and Attentional Control

Within this framework, the central executive (CE) functions as an attentional control system. It regulates the allocation of cognitive resources, coordinates the activities of other working-memory components, shifts attention when task demands change, and helps retrieve relevant information from long-term memory (Henry, 2012). Its significance in SLA becomes especially apparent when one considers how demanding even apparently simple language use can be. A learner listening to rapid L2 speech, for instance,

must decide which elements deserve attention, maintain recently heard information, anticipate possible continuations, and resist distraction from unfamiliar vocabulary or misleading first-language associations. The central executive helps manage these competing demands rather than merely storing their contents.

Its role becomes even more pronounced when learners process structurally difficult or ambiguous language. Parsing a complex sentence may require holding one interpretation provisionally while waiting for later information to confirm or overturn it. The learner may need to redirect attention from lexical meaning to morphology, from morphology to syntax, and then back to the broader discourse context. This kind of mental coordination is cognitively expensive. In SLA, the central executive is therefore particularly important for coping with unfamiliar linguistic input, directing attention toward relevant features, managing syntactic complexity, and temporarily sustaining competing interpretations during comprehension (Wen, 2022). A learner with more efficient executive control may be better able to maintain linguistic information without becoming overwhelmed by simultaneous processing demands, whereas limited executive resources may contribute to breakdowns even when the individual components of the sentence are technically familiar.

The central executive is also relevant to an issue that often receives less attention: selective attention. Language learners encounter far more information than they can consciously process at once. Not every phonetic distinction, grammatical ending, discourse marker, or lexical nuance can receive equal attention. Some must be prioritized while others remain peripheral. The ability to allocate attention strategically may influence what learners actually notice in the input, and noticing, in turn, can shape what becomes available for subsequent learning. From this perspective, working memory is not simply a mechanism operating after linguistic information has entered cognition; it may also influence which pieces of that information are processed deeply enough to matter.

The Phonological Loop and Verbal Learning

The phonological loop (PL), by contrast, is specialized for the temporary maintenance and processing of verbal and auditory material. It consists of a phonological store, which briefly holds sound-based information, and an articulatory rehearsal mechanism that refreshes this information through subvocal repetition before it fades. Its relevance to language acquisition is particularly intuitive. When

encountering an unfamiliar L2 word, a learner must first preserve some representation of its sound sequence long enough to repeat it, compare it with existing forms, connect it with meaning, and eventually encode it into longer-term memory. If the sound pattern disappears too quickly or is represented imprecisely, learning becomes considerably more difficult.

For this reason, the phonological loop has been strongly associated with vocabulary learning and the acquisition of unfamiliar lexical forms in both first and second languages (Baddeley, 2000; “Baddeley’s Model of Working Memory,” n.d.). An efficient phonological loop appears to support success in acquiring new L2 vocabulary because it provides a temporary platform on which unfamiliar verbal material can be rehearsed and stabilized before a durable representation is established (Martin & Ellis, 2012). This helps explain a familiar classroom phenomenon: some learners can hear a novel word once or twice and reproduce it accurately, while others retain only a vague approximation of its sound structure. The difference is not necessarily one of motivation or effort. It may partly reflect the efficiency with which phonological information is temporarily encoded and maintained.

The importance of the phonological loop, however, extends beyond vocabulary. Second-language pronunciation requires learners to perceive sound contrasts that may not exist in their first language, preserve those auditory patterns long enough to compare them, and gradually refine their articulatory representations. Similar demands arise when learners acquire grammatical morphology, particularly forms that are phonologically subtle, unstressed, or easily masked in connected speech. Through repeated rehearsal, the phonological loop can help preserve these fragile representations until they become increasingly familiar. It therefore contributes not only to lexical acquisition but also to L2 pronunciation, phonological awareness, and the learning of unfamiliar sound sequences and morphological forms (Martin & Ellis, 2012; Verhagen & Leseman, 2016).

This process also reveals why first-language knowledge can be both useful and troublesome. Learners naturally interpret unfamiliar sounds through categories already established in the first language. When the L2 contains phonological distinctions that do not map neatly onto those categories, temporary retention becomes especially important because the learner must hold and examine a sound pattern that initially feels unstable or even difficult to perceive. Rehearsal offers an opportunity, albeit a brief one, to resist immediate assimilation into familiar L1 patterns

and gradually construct more precise representations. In this sense, phonological working memory may serve as a kind of cognitive holding space in which unfamiliar linguistic forms remain available long enough to become learnable.

The Visuospatial Sketchpad and Multimodal Learning

The visuospatial sketchpad (VSS) performs a different function, supporting the temporary storage and manipulation of visual and spatial information. Its relationship with language acquisition is less direct than that of the phonological loop, yet describing it as peripheral would underestimate the multimodal nature of real language learning. Learners rarely encounter words in a purely abstract verbal vacuum. Meaning is often supported by images, gestures, diagrams, written forms, spatial layouts, facial expressions, and other visual cues. The visuospatial sketchpad allows such information to remain temporarily accessible while the learner integrates it with linguistic material.

This can become particularly important when language expresses spatial relationships. Prepositions such as above, beneath, through, across, or between, for example, are more easily understood when learners can map them onto visual or spatial representations. Similar processes may occur when learners mentally reconstruct the setting described in a narrative, follow instructions involving movement, interpret charts or diagrams alongside L2 text, or use gesture to clarify meaning. The visuospatial sketchpad may thus support comprehension by enabling linguistic information to interact with visual contextual representations (“Working Memory and Language,” n.d.).

Its relevance may be especially pronounced in contemporary language-learning environments, where multimedia materials are now routine rather than exceptional. Learners encounter subtitles, animations, diagrams, interactive interfaces, video, digital flashcards, and visually rich instructional platforms. These resources can reduce comprehension difficulty when designed well, but they can also create cognitive competition if the learner must divide attention between too many channels at once. The visuospatial component of working memory consequently becomes part of a broader question about cognitive load: when does visual support genuinely assist language processing, and when does it become another demand competing for limited mental resources? The answer is unlikely to be identical for every learner or every task.

The Episodic Buffer and the Integration of Meaning

Baddeley's model was subsequently expanded in 2000 through the addition of the episodic buffer (Baddeley, 2000). This fourth component was introduced partly to account for phenomena that could not be fully explained by the original architecture. The episodic buffer functions as a temporary integrative system, combining information from the phonological loop, the visuospatial sketchpad, and long-term memory into coherent multidimensional representations (Baddeley, 2000; McLeod, n.d.). It can therefore be understood as a meeting point at which different sources of information are bound together rather than processed in isolation.

For SLA, this integrative function is particularly consequential. Understanding an utterance requires far more than recognizing its individual words. Learners must combine lexical meanings with syntactic relationships, semantic expectations, contextual knowledge, discourse information, speaker intention, and, in spoken interaction, often prosodic or visual cues as well. Consider a sentence containing an unfamiliar idiomatic expression. The literal meanings of the individual words may point in one direction, while the surrounding context strongly suggests another. Successful comprehension depends on bringing these competing sources together into a unified interpretation. The episodic buffer may help support this process by temporarily binding linguistic and contextual information into a coherent representation.

Sentence comprehension offers another clear example. A learner may know all of the vocabulary in a sentence yet still misunderstand it because the relations among the words are complex. To construct meaning, lexical, syntactic, semantic, and contextual information must be integrated rather than simply recognized independently. The episodic buffer can contribute to this integration, helping the learner assemble a temporary representation of what the sentence as a whole means. Its role is consequently not reducible to storage; it supports the organization of information into episodes that are cognitively meaningful.

The episodic buffer may also participate in the transition from temporary processing to long-term learning. New linguistic information rarely enters memory completely disconnected from what the learner already knows. A new word may resemble a familiar word, occur within a recognizable semantic field, evoke an image, or connect with a previously learned grammatical structure. By linking newly encountered information with existing knowledge, the

episodic buffer may facilitate the construction of new long-term representations (Churchill Jr., n.d.). This connection between working memory and long-term memory is essential because successful language acquisition ultimately depends on information ceasing to be merely temporary. What begins as a fragile representation held for a few seconds must, through repetition, meaningful association, retrieval, and use, become accessible knowledge.

Working Memory as a Source of Individual Variation in SLA

The relationship between working memory and language aptitude is consequently more intricate than the claim that “better memory produces better language learning.” Working memory appears to influence several distinct processes: retaining novel phonological material, controlling attention, coordinating simultaneous linguistic operations, integrating multimodal information, linking new input with existing knowledge, and managing the sheer cognitive congestion that often accompanies L2 comprehension. Different components may become more or less important depending on the task. Vocabulary learning may place particularly heavy demands on the phonological loop, complex sentence processing may rely more strongly on executive control, and multimodal comprehension may draw substantially on visuospatial and integrative resources.

This also helps explain why language aptitude should not be treated as destiny. Working-memory advantages may make certain forms of language learning easier, but cognitive capacity operates alongside motivation, prior linguistic knowledge, quality of instruction, exposure, learning strategies, age, affective factors, and opportunities for meaningful communication. A learner with relatively modest working-memory capacity may still become highly proficient through effective strategies and sustained engagement, while strong cognitive aptitude alone does not guarantee success. Human learning is rarely that tidy.

What working-memory research does offer is a more refined explanation of why learners experience the same L2 task so differently. A classroom activity that feels manageable to one student may impose an intense processing burden on another, not because one is more serious or intelligent, but because the task consumes different proportions of their available cognitive resources. This perspective has important pedagogical implications. It suggests that effective instruction should not merely present linguistic content; it should also consider the cognitive conditions under which that content must be processed. Breaking complex input into meaningful segments, providing rehearsal

opportunities, combining verbal explanation with carefully selected visual support, revisiting new forms across different contexts, and reducing unnecessary processing demands may all help learners use their limited working-memory resources more efficiently.

Seen from this perspective, working memory is less a background psychological variable than an active participant in L2 development. It shapes what learners can hold onto, what they can notice, what they can combine, and ultimately what they may be able to learn from a fleeting moment of exposure. That fleeting quality matters. Language arrives quickly and disappears just as quickly, especially in spoken communication. Working memory gives the learner a brief cognitive window in which transient linguistic input can be examined, rehearsed, connected, and transformed into something more enduring. The window is small, but much of second language learning happens there.

II. Working Memory in Second Language Acquisition

Research consistently demonstrates the instrumental role of working memory in L2 acquisition, particularly in vocabulary development and grammatical learning. Reading span tests, for example, require learners to process the meanings of sentences while simultaneously recalling particular words. Such tasks provide an effective means of examining working memory capacity because they combine processing and storage demands (Juffs & Harrington, 2011). Research indicates that learners with greater working memory capacity frequently demonstrate faster L2 vocabulary acquisition and stronger subsequent recall (Juffs & Harrington, 2011).

Working memory is equally important for L2 grammar acquisition. Learning and applying grammatical rules require the learner to hold several pieces of information simultaneously, including word order, inflectional forms, morphological markers, and syntactic relationships. These elements must often be processed while the learner is comprehending or producing language in real time. Individual differences in working memory capacity have consequently been associated with grammatical development among both child and adult language learners (Flores-Salgado, 2024; Verhagen & Leseman, 2016). Learners with greater working memory capacity may be better equipped to detect, retain, and internalize complex grammatical patterns, ultimately contributing to more accurate L2 production (Shi, 2025).

Empirical research provides considerable support for the role of working memory across different dimensions of L2 development. In a major meta-analysis, Linck et al. (2014) identified a significant

relationship between working memory and second language proficiency, demonstrating that higher working memory capacity tends to be associated with stronger L2 performance. Complex span tasks, which place greater demands on the central executive than simple storage tasks, often demonstrate particularly strong relationships with L2 outcomes. This pattern is especially apparent in activities involving substantial cognitive processing, including reading comprehension, language production, and grammatical judgment (Juffs & Harrington, 2011; Shi, 2025).

The proposition that working memory represents a central, and perhaps even defining, component of language aptitude has consequently gained significant attention. Traditional language aptitude frameworks included factors such as phonetic coding ability, grammatical sensitivity, associative memory, and inductive language learning ability (Carroll, 1965). Several of these capacities correspond closely with the functions now attributed to different components of working memory. Phonetic coding, for example, relies considerably on phonological storage and rehearsal, while grammatical sensitivity requires attentional control and the integration of several sources of linguistic information.

Researchers have therefore increasingly argued that verbal working memory, in particular, may constitute a core dimension of language aptitude (“A New Perspective,” n.d.; “Individual Differences,” n.d.). From this perspective, a robust working memory system supplies much of the cognitive infrastructure needed for efficiently processing, temporarily storing, manipulating, and retrieving linguistic information. Working memory consequently helps learners manage the substantial cognitive load inherent in acquiring another language.

Nevertheless, working memory should not necessarily be understood as a single undifferentiated ability. Executive functions themselves consist of related yet distinguishable cognitive processes, and individual variation across these processes may affect learning in different ways (Miyake & Friedman, 2012). Consequently, different components of working memory may contribute differently to various aspects of L2 learning, rather than a single overall working memory capacity uniformly determining language aptitude.

III. Pedagogical Implications, Theoretical Debates, and Future Research

The substantial role of working memory in L2 acquisition offers important implications for language pedagogy. Recognizing that learners differ considerably in their working memory capacities can

help educators design instructional practices that reduce unnecessary cognitive demands while creating stronger opportunities for meaningful processing and consolidation.

One useful strategy is to reduce cognitive load by presenting new linguistic information in smaller and more manageable units rather than introducing numerous unfamiliar elements simultaneously. Repetition and recycling are equally important because repeated encounters with vocabulary, grammatical structures, and phonological forms can support their gradual transfer from temporary storage into long-term memory.

Visual and multimodal support can also enhance learning by engaging different components of the working memory system. Images, gestures, diagrams, realia, and other forms of contextual support can engage the visuospatial sketchpad while reinforcing verbally presented material (“Working Memory and Language,” n.d.). Presenting information through complementary modalities may therefore provide learners with multiple pathways for encoding and retrieving linguistic information.

Active engagement and interaction can similarly strengthen memory traces and facilitate language learning (“Working Memory’s Role in Language Comprehension and Learning,” n.d.). Rather than relying exclusively on passive exposure, learners can benefit from opportunities to retrieve, manipulate, negotiate, and produce linguistic information. Educators may also explicitly teach strategies such as note-taking, chunking, categorization, rehearsal, and mnemonic techniques to help learners make more efficient use of their limited working memory resources.

Creating rich and contextualized learning experiences that connect new linguistic material with learners’ existing knowledge is also important. Such approaches correspond with the integrative function attributed to the episodic buffer. Activities encouraging deeper processing, contextual interpretation, and meaning-making are therefore likely to support long-term retention more effectively than decontextualized memorization alone.

Despite growing evidence regarding the importance of working memory, the relationship between WM and language aptitude remains complex. One central debate concerns whether working memory capacity facilitates language learning or whether extensive language learning itself contributes to changes in working memory processes. The relationship may, in fact, be bidirectional (Paradis, 2009).

Distinguishing between domain-general working memory and language-specific working memory is another important theoretical issue. Different components of working memory may provide more reliable indicators of language aptitude depending on the linguistic task under consideration (Martin & Ellis, 2012; Verhagen & Leseman, 2016). The relationship becomes still more complex when working memory interacts with other individual-difference variables. Motivation, anxiety, learning experience, personality, and strategic behavior can influence learners’ ability to utilize their cognitive resources effectively (Dörnyei, 2009).

Future research should consequently examine the neurological mechanisms underlying working memory during L2 processing through neuroimaging and related methods (Indefrey, 2006). Research is also required to determine whether targeted working memory training can produce meaningful and transferable improvements in second language learning. Existing evidence concerning the general effectiveness and transferability of working memory training remains contested, emphasizing the need for carefully controlled investigations involving L2 learners (Melby-Lervåg & Hulme, 2013).

Longitudinal research could further clarify how working memory capacities and L2 proficiency develop over extended periods and whether their relationship changes according to proficiency level, age, or learning context. Comparative studies involving typologically different language pairs may also reveal whether particular working memory components become more important when learners encounter linguistic systems that differ substantially from their first language.

Finally, integrating computational models of working memory with contemporary theories of language acquisition could provide deeper explanations of the processes through which linguistic representations are encoded, maintained, selected, and retrieved. Computational accounts of working memory and learning may offer particularly useful frameworks for investigating the interaction between executive control, memory systems, and language development (O’Reilly & Frank, 2006).

Working memory is thus a cornerstone of the cognitive architecture supporting second language acquisition. Baddeley’s multicomponent model—including the central executive, phonological loop, visuospatial sketchpad, and episodic buffer—provides a valuable framework for understanding how learners process, retain, integrate, and retrieve unfamiliar linguistic information. The accumulated evidence suggests that

working memory constitutes a fundamental dimension of language aptitude, although its effects interact with other cognitive, linguistic, emotional, and motivational variables. By drawing on these insights, educators can develop instructional approaches that accommodate individual differences in cognitive capacity and create more accessible and effective L2 learning environments. Continued research will further clarify the dynamic relationship between working memory and language acquisition and determine the potential value of targeted cognitive interventions.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for this book review.

Human Participants

This paper does not involve human participants.

Originality Note

The authors confirm that the manuscript is their original work, and if others' works are used, they are properly cited/quoted.

REFERENCES

1. "A new perspective on foreign language aptitude research: Building and supporting a case for 'working memory as language aptitude.'" (n.d.). Redalyc.
2. Baddeley, A. (2000). The episodic buffer: A new component of working memory? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4(11), 417–423.
3. Baddeley, A., & Hitch, G. J. (1974). Working memory. In G. A. Bower (Ed.), *Recent advances in learning and motivation* (Vol. 8, pp. 47–90). Academic Press.
4. "Baddeley's model of working memory." (n.d.). Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baddeley%27s_model_of_working_memory
5. Carroll, J. B. (1965). *The Modern Language Aptitude Test*. The Psychological Corporation.
6. Churchill Jr., E. F. (n.d.). The role of working memory in SLA.
7. Daneman, M., & Carpenter, P. A. (1980). Individual differences in working memory and reading. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 19, 450–466.
8. Dörnyei, Z. (2009). *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
9. Flores-Salgado, E. (2024). Working memory and cross-linguistic influence on second language acquisition. *PMC*, PMC11352211.
10. Grigorenko, E., Sternberg, R., & Ehrman, M. (2000). A theory-based approach to the measurement of foreign language learning ability: The CANAL-F theory and test. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(3), 390–405.
11. Henry, L. (2012). *The development of working memory in children*. SAGE Publications.
12. Indefrey, P. (2006). A meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies on word production. *Cortex*, 42(6), 743–752.
13. "Individual differences in second language proficiency: Working memory as language aptitude." (n.d.). Taylor & Francis.
14. Juffs, A., & Harrington, M. (2011). *Working memory in second language interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
15. Linck, J. A., Osthus, P., Koeth, J., & Bunting, M. F. (2014). Working memory and second language acquisition: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 64(2), 253–282.
16. Martin, K. I., & Ellis, N. C. (2012). The roles of phonological short-term memory and working memory in L2 grammar and vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
17. McLeod, S. (n.d.). Working memory model. *Simply Psychology*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/working-memory.html>
18. Melby-Lervåg, M., & Hulme, C. (2013). Is working memory training effective? A meta-analytic review. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(2), 270–291.
19. Miyake, A., & Friedman, N. P. (2012). The nature and organization of individual differences in executive functions: Four general conclusions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(1), 8–14.
20. O'Reilly, R. C., & Frank, M. J. (2006). Making working memory work: A computational model of learning in the prefrontal cortex and basal ganglia. *Neural Computation*, 18(2), 283–328.
21. Paradis, M. (2009). *Declarative and procedural determinants of second languages*. John Benjamins Publishing.
22. Shi, D. (2025). The roles of aptitude and working memory in L2 learners' language development. *ScienceDirect*.
23. Verhagen, J., & Leseman, P. (2016). How do verbal short-term memory and working memory relate to the acquisition of vocabulary and grammar? A comparison between first and second language. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 150, 1–16.
24. Wen, Z. E. (2022). Working memory models and measures in language research. *PMC*, PMC9221522.
25. "Working memory and language: An overview." (n.d.). *ScienceDirect*.
26. Yalçın, S. (2016). The relationship between aptitude and working memory: An exploratory study. *ERIC*, EJ1088501.

About the author

Ahmad Hamed is a management and language professional with over a decade of experience spanning humanitarian operations, education, and linguistics. Holding a Master's degree in Applied Linguistics, he combines strong analytical skills with deep experience in translation, communication, and training. Ahmad has led teams and coordinated programmes in complex environments, supporting strategic planning, stakeholder engagement, and capacity-building. His background in language education and translation allows him to bridge technical, institutional, and community perspectives,

while his management roles demonstrate his ability to align operational realities with educational and communication goals across multilingual settings.



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) (CC BY-NC 4.0) which allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format for noncommercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator.