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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated by this study is the possibility that circumstances which precede and surround a recaller's efforts to access both recent and early childhood memories may influence their availability, content, and affective tone.

Need for the Study

Although there may currently appear to be a general decline in clinical reliance on data collection, most professionals still find the articulation of a case history, a lifestyle analysis, and/or a multigenerational family genogram useful. All of these techniques require a great deal of historical information, typically supplied by the client, and the use of these techniques implies confidence in the client as a recaller of his own experiential past.

Most who use these techniques do concede that their client's current perceptions of historical facts are more important than the literal accuracy of the remembered incidents. However, most who collect and work with client recollections also assume that the memories themselves are more representative of the client's overall pool of memories and the
general affective tone of his experiential history than of transient circumstances which surround their recollection.

Whatever form the data ultimately takes, the information gathering process entails collection of a great deal of information the client supplies about himself and the circumstances of his recent and distant past. This information may be collected by means of a highly structured questionnaire, designed to be filled out by a client working independently in the counselor's office, or, given to him to be filled out at the time and place of his own choosing and returned to the counselor. Collection may occur by means of an interview conducted by the counselor who is working or who plans to work with the client, or an intake counselor, or, in some settings, a member of the clerical/support staff. (In private practice, the information is usually collected by the person doing the counseling, however, in settings such as clinics and agencies, collection is often begun by others or by questionnaire.) Many questions may refer to relatively factual information presumably immune to situational influence, such as date of birth and marriage. Other questions may refer to more interpretive information concerning early childhood recollections and impressions. While it is probably reasonable to assume that access to factual information is not significantly biased by collection circumstances, it may be inappropriate to assume that interpretive data and things as fragile and illusive as childhood memories are unaffected.
Concern about the collection and use of historical information has tended to focus on the threat of its misinterpretation or misuse and the risk that the collection procedure itself may create a counterproductive shift in the therapeutic locus of control (Corey, 1982; Brammer and Shostrom, 1982; Corsini, 1973). There has been very little empirical investigation of collection procedures and circumstances which may systematically bias a client’s access to his own recollections or their content or affective tone.

Even though skillful counselors can often identify bias in their clients' reports of past events, it seems important to acknowledge that it is dangerous to rely entirely upon either the counselor’s intuition or the clients in this matter. Logically, it seems improbable that a client recaller will recognize when he does not have equal access to all types of memories. Similarly, the counselor/interviewer, although an astute member of the interactive dyad, cannot be expected to recognize a client's recall bias when it may be a consequence of his own relationship with that client.

Once the client's memories have been recalled and shared, the counselor automatically experiences them in the context of his own relationship with that client. At that point, a qualitative similarity between the content and affective tone of the client's recollections and his current behavior may be misconstrued as indicative of the representativeness of his recollections; i.e., the recollections may be wrongly assumed
to reflect the client's stable perceptual frame of reference, in the Adlerian sense.

Although many therapists collect historical information because they value the process as much, or perhaps more, than the product, most do hope that information they collect will shed light upon their client's present circumstance and facilitate his diagnosis and treatment. Most, therefore, do record the content and plan to work with it.

While much has been written about the clinical significance of memories, little has been done to explore the implications of different strategies for their collection. In particular, there have been very few studies concerning the impact circumstances which immediately precede and surround a recaller's effort to access memories may have on them. These circumstances may influence a recaller's ability to recall material, the content and/or affective tone of his recollections and his willingness to discuss them once recalled.

This failure to explore the significance of contextual factors seems inconsistent with an impressive body of evidence concerning the significance of affective state to the availability of memories. Cognitive psychologists have demonstrated an apparent relationship between a recaller's affect at the time he attempts to recall different types of material and the targeted information's affective significance and availability to him (Bower, 1981). Failure to closely examine the significance of recall circumstances is also
inconsistent with the contemporary clinical movement to replace linear thought with an enhanced appreciation of the therapist-client dyad as an interactive system of dynamic significance to each participant.

Efforts to increase the confidence level associated with the clinical use of recollections mandates work in this area. Continuing efforts to understand the clinical relevance of all cognitive and social factors which appear capable of systematically influencing the material clients recall and share in counseling situations seem important.

This study did not address itself to the many important questions which surround the use and significance of diagnosis, a process considered to be the core of therapy by some and its antithesis by others. Nor did this study investigate the diagnostic value of early childhood recollections (ECRs), a topic which has been frequently explored (Olson, 1979). Instead, this study endeavored to focus more narrowly on circumstances which surround the recollection process in an attempt to test their capacity to influence the client's access to his own memories and bias their content and tone.

**Theoretical Rationale**

Although Alfred Adler has long been recognized as a creative thinker and a prolific writer, many practitioners and researchers have been frustrated by the breadth, complexity, and lack of organization and readability of his thought (Ford
and Urban, 1961). With the death of those who learned "Individual Psychology" directly from him, the number of those who understood his thought well enough to interpret his work and expand on it diminished dramatically. Consequently, many of his ideas became overlooked or attributed to others.

Although he was a pioneer field theorist, an ardent proponent of phenomenology and an influential spokesman for the intrapsychic significance (within an interpersonal context) of early childhood social experience, he became wrongly minimized as little more than a dissident student of Freud's. His name came to be simplistically associated with phrases like "inferiority complex" and "will to power" (Allen, 1971). While these phrases do accurately convey some information about Adler's views and the precepts of "Individual Psychology", they ignore much of his genius and tend to trivialize the significance of his clinical work.

"Individual Psychology" is currently enjoying a resurgence in popularity largely because it is inherently appealing to systems thinkers and because very capable disciples have successfully edited, organized, and presented Adler's thoughts and writings (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1964). Indeed, it is becoming hard to ignore Alfred Adler's ideas since his work has so obviously influenced so many broadly accepted popular theorists. For example, we see a recognizable emphasis on issues previously articulated by Adler when we study the work of his former students Rollo May (May, 1969) and Victor Frankl (Frankl, 1969), as well as other popular theorists like Albert
Ellis (Ellis, 1957), Erik Berne (Berne, 1964), Abraham Maslow (Maslow, 1970), and Karen Horney (Horney, 1937). In fact, Adler's influence has been so pervasive that Ellenberger once commented "... it would be hard to find another author from which so much has been borrowed from all sides without acknowledgment than Alfred Adler" (Ellenberger, 1970, p. 645).

Adlerian therapists stress the importance of the humanistic model of knowing their clients. They emphasize the importance of viewing all clients in a holistic and phenomenological way; striving to know their perceptions about themselves, their lives, the world around them and their own view of their prospects for the future (Kopp and Der, 1979).

A client's behavior is seen by Adlerians as reflective of his life style, something which is itself both a consequence and a reflection of his biological and experiential uniqueness (Eckstein, Baruth, and Mahrer, 1978). Although similarities are seen between the life styles of different people, and many useful generalizations can be made (Mosak, 1971), Adlerians view each person's life style as discernibly different from all others and suitable for analysis.

A psychological life-style analysis, used by Individual Psychologists since the early twenties corresponds to a psychological or psychiatric interview or simply an attempt to understand the whole person; body, soul, and mind, in his social and ecological environment.

Ackerknecht, 1979, p. 84
To complete a client's life style analysis, clinicians must rely upon the client's memory as a source of information about his early childhood family constellation and early social experience (Dreikurs, 1954; Mosak, 1958; Shulman, 1962). Life style practitioners assume that the information client recallers provide about their family of origin and their early social interactions sketches a brief portrait of their early social world. They believe that this portrait can be used to discern, with facilitative help from the practitioner, the interpersonal role(s) the client played and strove to perfect within his earliest social milieu, his family.

Each of the client's early recollections is assumed to have clinical relevance since each is seen as a vignette which he has selected from his life for retention and retelling. It is assumed that he selected each from among many competing incidents experienced during his childhood. Adlerians assume that each of the incidents which he has chosen for preservation and recollection has been preserved in his memory and is now shared because it is special to him or his circumstances. Very importantly, the recalled incident is seen as useful to him in the here and now; providing psychic underpinnings to the recaller's present outlook. It is presumed to fortify his convictions about himself and his world or function as a reminder of what he hopes to become or needs to accomplish (Mosak, 1958; Adler, 1958).

In 1958 Alfred Adler said:
... there are no chance memories: out of the incalculable number of impressions which meet an individual he chooses to remember only those which he feels, however darkly, to have bearing on his situation.

Adler, 1958, p. 73

While it may be argued that nothing is ever totally lost from the experience of an individual, it is also clear that some things are dropped from consciousness, often seeming entirely forgotten until they suddenly reappear as abruptly as they left. The appearance and disappearance of childhood memories is usually seen by Adlerians as evidence that memories are stories available for recall when they are indeed useful; i.e., when new present orientation or reference points are needed.

Adler identified the clinical significance of early recollections when he wrote:

... they help us to see the kind of world which a particular person feels he is living in and the ways he is really fond of meeting that world. The basic attitudes which have guided him throughout his life and which prevail, likewise, in his present situation, are reflected in these fragments which he has selected to epitomize his feelings about life, and to cherish in his memory as reminders. He has preserved these as his early recollections.

Adler, 1937, p. 287

Clinicians utilizing life style analysis in their clinical work continue to appreciate Adler's teachings about the
connectedness of their client's lives. They subscribe to his view that certain particular events have impressed themselves upon recallers and have been preserved by them because they are personally meaningful. Most of them also recognize the great influence these recollections have upon their client's lives, believing that they may often function in a self-fulfilling manner, actually guiding the client's perceptions of reality and his behavior.

Though mindful that early childhood recollections (ECRs) are often more a matter of construction than reproduction, advocates assert that memories which clients have dimly-consciously modified or synthesized are as reflective of their contemporary life style as factually accurate memories would be. This idea reflects a basic belief that childhood memories, actual or imagined, are indices of contemporary attitudes and desires (Adler, 1937; Ansbacher, 1967, 1973) and, as such, can never run counter to the recaller's overall style of life (Adler, 1927). All ECRs, those which have been non-consciously modified and/or synthesized as well as those which are "factual", are seen as windows which life style practitioners believe enable them to view the world their clients feel they live in and identify the ways these clients have learned to meet that world.

Disagreement about the significance of easily recalled early childhood memories was one of the major weakening factors between Freud and Adler. While both men agreed that the literal accuracy of early recollections is unimportant, they
disagreed over the real significance of these recollections and the context in which they could be useful to clinicians.

Freud asserted that easily accessed childhood memories are only "screen memories" that protect adult recallers from a conscious encounter with traumatic childhood experiences which cannot and should not be faced outside the framework of a long term psychoanalytic relationship (Freud, 1935, 1950). Thus, Freud emphasized the significance of omissions from remembered material while Adler chose to minimize their significance in favor of an effort to understand the importance of what was recalled, not forgotten. Predictably, these two great men also differed over the ease of interpretation of ECRs. While Adler believed that childhood memories could be interpreted outside the context of complete psychoanalysis, Freud adamantly disagreed, insisting upon the need for a psychoanalytic probe of what he considered to be the more 'important' repressed material obscured by the trivial and easily accessed "screen memories" Adler chose to work with.

Many practicing clinicians agree with Adler, considering the collection and interpretation of ECRs to be at least as diagnostically and therapeutically fruitful as a more penetrating analytic search for clues about possible childhood repression of infantile sexual impulses. Others, especially those with a more behavioral bent, value lifestyle techniques because they foster a deep and productive sense of connectedness with clients, born of an expressed interest in them, their families, and their earliest social experiences.
Clearly, it is easy to discuss ECRs with clients since they generally consider the information they are providing interesting, factual, and innocuous, and share it with enthusiasm and a minimum of self-consciousness and defensive speculation.

On the other hand, clinicians who value ECRs for their content maintain that the early recollections of clients represent a focal image of their perceptual field, describing the way they perceive others and relate to them. This belief that ECRs which clients describe are of special and enduring importance implies an assumption that client recallers are free to recall central, especially stable and important memories independent of and presumably even discrepant with their immediate social circumstances and their transient affective state at the time of recall. In other words, this assumes that ECRs have an immunity to affective and social factors which are known to influence many other products of memory.

Although this assumption about the robust nature of easily recalled ECRs is central to clinical assumptions concerning their usefulness, there has been very little systematic exploration of its validity. This seems especially naive since therapists of such diverse interpersonal and professional styles collect ECRs so differently in different settings.
Sample and Data Gathering Procedures

Subjects for this study included 108 male and female undergraduate students enrolled at Randolph-Macon College during the period from September, 1985 to February, 1986. They were solicited from undergraduate psychology, sociology, and education classes (Appendix A). Volunteers were also recruited by approaching students on the campus. No subject was a friend or family member of the examiner.

Participants were told that they were assisting the psychology department faculty in their effort to determine norms for their collective research of memory. All subjects were debriefed before leaving the experimental setting.

Each subject was tested individually after randomized assignment to one of eight experimental and four control conditions. Recent adult recollections (RARs) and early childhood recollections (ECRs) were collected in either an interview situation or by use of questionnaires to be filled out by Ss working independently at the test site.

Subjects from all groups experienced the situational context appropriate to their group, behaviorally communicated by manipulated feedback concerning their performance on an anagram task and an attempted recall task. They were asked to generate descriptions of six early childhood or six recent adult recollections according to the procedure for their group (Fig. 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Group 1</th>
<th>Collection 1st 3 RARs (questionnaire)</th>
<th>Anagram task (success)</th>
<th>Recog. task (success)</th>
<th>Collection 2nd 3 RARs (questionnaire)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group 2</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 RARs (interview)</td>
<td>Anagram task (success)</td>
<td>Recog. task (success)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 RARs (interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group 3</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 ECRs (questionnaire)</td>
<td>Anagram task (success)</td>
<td>Recog. task (success)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 ECRs (questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group 4</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 ECRs (interview)</td>
<td>Anagram task (success)</td>
<td>Recog. task (success)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 ECRs (interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group 5</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 RARs (questionnaire)</td>
<td>Anagram task (failure)</td>
<td>Recog. task (failure)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 RARs (questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group 6</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 RARs (interview)</td>
<td>Anagram task (failure)</td>
<td>Recog. task (failure)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 RARs (interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group 7</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 ECRs (questionnaire)</td>
<td>Anagram task (failure)</td>
<td>Recog. task (failure)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 ECRs (questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group 8</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 ECRs (interview)</td>
<td>Anagram task (failure)</td>
<td>Recog. task (failure)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 ECRs (interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group 9</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 RARs (questionnaire)</td>
<td>Anagram task (no feedback)</td>
<td>Recog. task (no feedback)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 RARs (questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group 10</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 RARs (interview)</td>
<td>Anagram task (no feedback)</td>
<td>Recog. task (no feedback)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 RARs (interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group 11</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 ECRs (questionnaire)</td>
<td>Anagram task (no feedback)</td>
<td>Recog. task (no feedback)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 ECRs (questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group 12</td>
<td>Collection 1st 3 ECRs (interview)</td>
<td>Anagram task (no feedback)</td>
<td>Recog. task (no feedback)</td>
<td>Collection 2nd 3 ECRs (interview)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1 Diagram of the experimental design, with order of tasks from left to right.
Following the description of each recollection, subjects were asked to evaluate their own feelings at the time the incident they described occurred, and how they feel as they think back over the incident now. All subjects were then debriefed, thanked, and instructed not to discuss the experiment with anyone because of the need for secrecy. Suitable arrangements were made with subjects who wished to be informed of the results of the study.

**Definition of Terms**

**Individual Psychology:** The term which designates the totality of Adler's clinical views.

**Life style:** The coherence of the personality and the consistent unity of the individual. Expressed another way it is a cognitive map which accounts for the consistency of his life movement, comprising his opinions of himself, the world, and others.

**Life style analysis:** An effort to discern the "life-others-self" themes and overriding goals which govern an individual's unique way of meeting situations.

**Life style practitioner:** A helper who utilizes the life style analysis for diagnostic and/or therapeutic purposes.

**Early childhood recollections (ECRs):** Specific incidents, events, occurrences, or happenings the recaller can remember and identify as having happened before the age of eight.
Recent adult recollections (RARs): Specific incidents, events, occurrences, or happenings the recaller can remember and identify as having happened within the previous year.

Family constellation: Ordinal arrangements and familial alignments which might logically be assumed to influence personality development; including sibling style, interactive patterns within the family and parental messages.

Diagnosis: Determination of a particular disorder through analysis of symptoms, problems and/or information presented by a client or others familiar with his circumstances.

Systems theory: Body of thought that regards systems as defined by the interrelationship of their parts, each of which may be a system in itself while each system may be part of a larger system.

Affect: The experience of emotion or feeling.

Episodic memory: Memory for temporally dated autobiographical events in an individual's own life.

Limitations of the Study

This study only analyzed the impact of two interpersonal, situational contexts on student subject who were asked to recall incidents from their early childhood or from their recent past. One context was designed to provoke feelings of success and well being while the other was designed to provoke feelings of failure and inadequacy. Control group Ss were not given feedback.
This study only analyzed the impact of these conditions with respect to their implications for report of early and recent recollections. The study only assessed the impact of one other collection variable, interviewer participation during information gathering, and it only explored the possibility of an interaction between recallers presumed feelings, interviewer presence, and type of memory.

This study only included 108 student subjects enrolled at Randolph-Macon College between the months of September, 1985 and February, 1986. It only included adult subjects, eighteen years of age or older, and it did not control for the effects of age, race, socioeconomic class, academic standing at Randolph-Macon College, major area of academic interest, or number of years at the College.

This study was limited by the fact that subjects were self-selected volunteers whose attraction to the project most probably reflected their desire to earn academic credit or the appreciation of their faculty. Because of the aforementioned limitations and problems of internal validity inherent in the instrumentation and statistical treatments, this study has limited generalizability to clinical populations encountered in therapeutic settings.

**General Hypothesis**

The general hypothesis is that there will be no significant quantitative or qualitative difference ($\alpha = .05$)
between the recollections or recall latencies of groups of subjects where circumstances which precede and surround their collection have been systematically varied.

Presentation Plan

Information pertinent to the investigation has been organized and is presented in the context of five chapters. The first chapter introduces the subject, discusses its relevance and theoretical importance, defines important terms, and states the general working hypothesis. The second chapter presents a review of related research and a summary of its relationship to the problem. Chapter three describes methodology, experimental design, ethical safeguards, and the null hypotheses which guided the project. Chapters four and five summarize results and analyses of results and state conclusions and recommendations which derive from the study.
The following review of research is divided into four sections. The first is related to the empirical manipulation of the study itself, describing studies concerning mood dependent recall. The second and third sections introduce evidence about the asymmetrical cognitive consequences of positive and negative affect and about interpersonal dynamics which may influence a client's willingness to describe material he has recalled. The final section highlights the clinical importance of acknowledging the interactive nature of the counseling relationship and its possible impact upon a recaller's sense of himself as a success or failure.

**Mood Dependent Recall**

Iaen et al., (1978) asked subjects to play a computer game which was programmed to allow manipulation of their win/loss ratio. Subjects who engaged in the game were allowed to win or lose, and then presented with a word list to learn. After a delay they replayed the game immediately before attempting to recall items from the list they had formerly learned. Four conditions were possible: win-learn followed by win-recall; win-learn followed by lose-recall; lose-learn followed by lose-recall or lose-learn followed by win-recall. Assuming a
mood congruent effect for the win-win and lose-lose circumstances, the observed superiority of these conditions over the incongruent lose-win and win-lose combinations supported their assumption that mood congruence between time of learning and time of attempted recall facilitates recall performance.

In a subsequent, somewhat similar effort to explore the mood congruent recall phenomenon, Bower (1981) asked volunteer subjects to keep a diary for a week, recording emotional incidents of both positive and negative valence in considerable detail. The diaries were then collected and held for one week before the subjects returned to the lab for hypnotic induction of pleasant or unpleasant mood. Although the diaries contained approximately twice as many descriptions of pleasant as unpleasant events, subjects who were manipulated into an unpleasant mood recalled and described a higher percentage of recorded unpleasant memories than pleasant ones. Subjects who were hypnotically manipulated into a pleasant mood recalled a greater percentage of recorded pleasant experiences.

In previous work, Teasdale and Fogarty (1979) had used the same Velton hypnotic procedure (1968) to induce mood change and examine retrieval time for mood congruent and mood incongruent memories. Hypnotically elated subjects were observed to access happy memories prompted by a neutral word stimulus faster than sad memories and saddened subjects were observed to access sad memories faster than happy ones.
In a somewhat similar study which spanned several months, Henry et al., (Henry, Weingartner, and Murphy, 1973) observed psychotic patients who were subject to the affective mood swings of bipolar disorders. They were asked to produce twenty free associations to each of two stimulus words while in one affective state, and when their affect changed, they were asked to reproduce as many of the original forty associations as they could. The quantity of forgotten or inaccessible material was positively correlated with the magnitude of the patient's change in affective state.

Lloyd and Lishman (1975) observed that clinically depressed patients who were instructed to recall both happy and sad personal experiences cued by neutral words had great difficulty retrieving mood-incongruent happy memories. They also noted a positive correlation between severity of the depression (as measured by Beck's Depression Inventory) and access time. The sadder the patient the quicker his recall of sad experiences and the longer (relative to less depressed patients) the latency of his recall for pleasant material.

In 1981, Bower asked subjects who had been hypnotically saddened or elated to generate many memories, hopping from one to another describing each very briefly. When these same subjects returned to the lab the next day, in their presumably neutral mood, they were asked to rate the memories they had generated while hypnotized the day before. Based upon each subject's own evaluation of the affective tone of his own memories, it was evident that hypnotically elated subjects had
generated many more pleasant than unpleasant memories (a 92% bias) and saddened subjects had generated more unpleasant than pleasant ones (a 55% bias).

Since recall can be so clearly influenced by straightforward laboratory manipulations which only alter affect, it is understandable that two states as physiologically discrepant as sleep and wakefulness would limit memory retrieval across their boundary. Although most people dream for significant portions of every night and their dreams contain material which is bizarre and strongly memorable, most are unable to recall many details of their dream experiences upon waking (Cohen, 1979).

While it may be presumptuous to infer that a given memory can only be retrieved by returning to the affective or physiological state in which the event was first stored, or a state which nearly matches it, it does seem that events experienced and stored in one state are best recalled when one returns to that state. The state dependent recall effect of centrally active drugs appears to support this conclusion (Ho, Richards, and Chute, 1978).

It is interesting to note that most of the drugs which are known to alter the central nervous system physiologically and produce state dependent recall effects are also known for their mood altering properties (e.g., alcohol, amphetamine, the barbiturates, the hallucinogens, etc.) (Weingartner, 1978). While psychopharmacologists generally avoid reference to mood as the mediating variable, it would seem appropriate for those
with clinical interests to assume its relevance to this phenomenon.

A different body of literature reminds us that mood is probably as relevant to the storage of information as it is to its retrieval. Bower (1981) proposed an associative network theory which suggests that events are stored in memory in clusters of descriptive propositions with associative connections among instances of the concepts used in describing the stored events. Bower sees the proposition as the basic unit of thought and he believes that thinking involves activation of propositions and their concepts. Activation is seen by him as spreading from one concept to another or from one proposition to another by associative linkages. He proposes that when the activation level of particular sensations, concepts and/or propositions exceeds some threshold they enter consciousness. Accordingly, this network theory suggests that mood activates and primes mood congruent categories for both the input categorization and the retrieval of information.

Evidence that experimental subjects are much better able to recall words from learned lists when they are prompted with the name of word categories (i.e., furniture, Presidents, states, etc.) constitutes support for the notion of a distinction between the availability of information (its presence in memory) and its accessibility under differential recall conditions (Tulving and Pearlstone, 1966).
While individuals may vary in the extent to which they use affect to categorize and hence access information, this information processing hypothesis suggests that mood can serve as a retrieval cue in situations where other cues or motivational factors do not obviate the need for it. Although the search cue provided by mood may be unnecessary under many conditions of recall, such as times when there are high levels of motivation and/or an abundance of alternate cues, emotional state has been clearly demonstrated to help recallers distinguish targeted from competing material in instances when this is not true.

The wisdom of a systematic investigation of circumstances which surround the harvest of recollections is further supported by awareness of the difficulty of thinking about material which is not compatible with existing cognitions and mood. If mood does exert a powerful influence over cognitive processes then its relevance to the recollection of material which therapists may use to construct a clinical case history, a lifestyle analysis or a multigenerational relationship genogram should not be ignored. In fact, to the contrary, mood induction for the specific intent of collecting recollections of a particular affective tone may be demonstrated to have some clinical value.

Summary:

Material which is selectively remembered and forgotten in clinical interviews is often considered expressive of fairly enduring traits of the recaller (Olson, 1979). However, it
seems imperative that clinicians acknowledge and explore recent evidence concerning the relationship between the affective milieu at the time a memory is stored and the time it is recalled and the relevance of this to its accessibility.

It has been demonstrated that mood actually influences recall for stimuli as diverse as recently learned word lists (Isen, et al., 1978) and as personal as material from one's own log of recent experiences (Bower, 1981). Although it is unlikely that evidence developed in experimental situations will clarify all of the issues related to the many variables which operate in a clinical setting, the possibility that affect at the time of recollection might influence recall of recent events and of material as well established as early childhood recollections must be thoroughly explored.

Evidence of a mood dependent recall pattern is consistent with a frame-of-reference hypothesis which predicts that experiences which are affectively congruent with a recaller's affective frame-of-reference at the time of recall will be recalled before or instead of those which are discrepant with it. A mood matching effect of this sort strongly suggests that what is recalled may be more dependent upon a match between mood at the time of storage and the time of retrieval than upon more enduring factors such as the personality trait(s) of the recaller or his repertoire of memorable experiences.
The tendency for people in a good mood to be more likely than those in a bad mood to offer help to others when it is requested is often seen as a direct consequence of a mood induced recall bias (Isen, Clarke, and Schwartz, 1976; Isen, et al., 1978). Social psychologists who advocate this view assume that helping behavior flows from a decision which an individual makes by recalling and evaluating the pros and cons of offering assistance. They argue that mood influences willingness to help by influencing the content of recalled material such that the advantages and disadvantages of helping are not equally available to recallers in different mood states.

Furthermore, social psychologists have demonstrated that positive and negative mood states are not symmetrical in their effect on recall and helping behavior (Mischel, Ebbesen, and Zeiss, 1976). While success increases one's tendency toward positive cognitions and subsequent helping behavior, failure does not appear to tip the balance as far in the direction of negative cognitions and subsequent reluctance to help. In a well controlled study of this asymmetry Isen, et al., (1978) observed that subjects who won a computer game demonstrated enhanced recall for positive material while those who lost and presumably entered a more negative mood state did not manifest an equivalent shift toward enhanced recall of negative material. It was suggested that mood maintenance motives were significant to the asymmetry. Negative mood was seen as more complex and
less comfortable than positive mood and it was assumed that its perpetuation through its own influence on cognition would be maladaptive and therefore less probable than the cognitive self-perpetuation of positive mood. In summary, the mood maintenance model appears to be a better predictor of behavior when applied to happy persons than sad ones.

The asymmetrical response to mood shifts reported by I森, et al., (1978) may be the best explanation for Bower's observation that the hypnotic induction of sadness only yielded a 55% recall bias while hypnotic induction of happiness yielded a 92% recall bias (Bower, 1981). If it is true that happy people attempt to maintain their good mood by recalling mood congruent pleasant things, then it seems reasonable to suppose that unhappy people attempt to terminate their negative mood by choosing to think about or report thinking about mood incongruent happy material, although mood congruent sad material may be more accessible to them (Masters and Furman, 1975).

Paradoxically, neutral mood subjects seem more likely to think about unpleasant material than subjects in whom either a negative or positive mood has been induced. Apparently subjects in a neutral mood have no need to maintain or change their mood so they are more free to make cognitive choices according to criteria other than their own mood maintenance needs.
Summary:

Cognitive processes are complex and factors which influence what we think of, dwell on, and choose to discuss are usually diverse and subtle. Social psychologists exploring helping behavior have developed credible evidence that our choice of thoughts and behaviors is often as much motivated by our desire to manipulate our own mood (Masters and Furman, 1975) as by the accessibility of our recollections.

Subjects who feel good apparently prefer to think about pleasant things, both because they are more accessible and because pleasant thoughts help them maintain their good mood. Subjects who are unhappy frequently think about happy material in an attempt to terminate their own unhappiness even though this mood incongruent material may be less accessible to them (Cialdini, Darby, and Vincent, 1973). Somewhat surprisingly, subjects who are in a neutral mood appear more free to think about negative things than either happy or sad subjects, apparently because they are less invested in either the maintenance or alteration of their mood and mood is not a salient recall cue for them.

Any exploration of the vulnerability of recollections to influence from situational variables operating at the time of recall must acknowledge and attempt to discern the possible role of mood maintenance as a motivational factor of potential significance. It is important to remain aware that predictions made on the basis of theories which only describe mood dependent recall may, in the instance of depressed or
discouraged subjects, be different from those based on an acknowledgment of both mood dependent recall and mood maintenance theory.

Image Maintenance

Some types of information are more willingly shared than others and some people share information more easily than others. Attitudes and opinions are more easily shared than information about personalities and bodies, women appear to disclose more easily than men, and whites more easily than blacks (Jourard, 1971). Apparently a liking for the listener is much more important to females than males when each contemplates self-disclosure (Jourard and Landsman, 1960; Ehrlich and Graeven, 1971; Rubin and Shenker, 1973) but both sexes disclose more to intimates and former intimates than to strangers (Jourard, 1971).

All subjects become increasingly able to self-disclose when they are provided with social approval for doing so. In an experiment where some confederates were trained to provide subjects with continuous positive reward for self-disclosure during conversations and others were trained to provide negative or mixed feedback, it became obvious that subjects self-disclosed more frequently to those who positively reinforced it (Taylor, Altman, and Sorrentino, 1969).

Some individuals are especially sensitive to cues which help them monitor the impression their disclosures are having
on others. They are extremely sensitive to subtle differences in social settings and they use social feedback so effectively that all of their self-presentations are exquisitely accurate reflections of their own interpersonal needs.

When subjects who were selected because of extreme scores on the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974) were asked to speak with peer groups, those who had scored high on the scale were noted to conform when the group favored particular positions while low scorers were generally unaffected by group preferences (Snyder and Monson, 1975). Apparently, individuals who score high on the self-monitoring scale are very sensitive to the self-presentations of others in social situations and they use these as guidelines in their effort to develop their presentation of themselves. They are such intuitively excellent actors that they even exploit their self-presentational skills to practice deceit in face-to-face interview situations which normally constrain others.

High self-monitoring individuals are extremely skilled at impression management and quite likely to practice it. One even suspects that their aptitude for impression management may become an impediment to their own occasional efforts to openly self-disclose and one fears that this aptitude might be a source of unconscious bias in their social or clinical efforts to freely and honestly report recalled personal experiences. It is disquieting to note that even experimental subjects who have been instructed to present themselves to an audience as accurately as possible manage to present themselves as being
more similar to the audience than they really are unless that audience is made up of thoroughly obnoxious and unlikeable persons (Newton and Czerlinsky, 1974; Moore, 1975; Cooper and Jones, 1969).

Human beings appear to have an exquisite capacity for self-deception as well as the deception of others. Even in situations where subjects have obviously biased their self-descriptions to receive social approval, most do not perceive themselves as having deviated from honesty. In a study of this phenomenon, Jones, et al. (Jones, Gergen, and Davis, 1962) motivated some college women to say whatever was necessary to secure the favorable approval of an interviewer while others were motivated to be very candid, honest, and accurate with the same person. Post-experimental inquiry revealed that the two groups did not differ in their personal perception of how honest they had been during the interview. Apparently people are quite likely to continue to view themselves as honest even while varying the selves they choose to present under different circumstances.

Goffman (1963, 1967) described a person whose interpersonal image elicits approval as one who is "in face" and one whose image does not as one who is "out of face." He proposed that interpersonal challenges to the face of participants in a social interaction would reliably elicit corrective "face work" on their part.

Schneider's (1960) observation that social approval becomes more necessary when one has experienced failure is
entirely consistent with Goffman's prediction. In an experiment where he arranged to have some subjects fail and others succeed at the same task just before they all described themselves to another person, Schneider observed that those who failed described themselves in more positive terms than those who succeeded. Subjects in the failure group apparently acted on their enhanced need for social approval.

However, in a related study which highlighted the importance of viewing all interpersonal situations from an interactive perspective, Schneider (1969) reported evidence that "face work" is only undertaken when a subject's listener is capable of providing social approval. When the listener cannot do so, subjects who fail tend to describe themselves in more negative terms than subjects who succeed.

Summary:

This study rests on the assumption that it is important to learn as much as possible about those cognitive and motivational factors which might reasonably be assumed to affect the availability of recollections and the willingness to share them. It is easy to imagine that there are times when a client's inclination toward impression management and his conscious awareness of the need to honestly self-disclose collide and he yields, perhaps unconsciously, to the former.

Impression management appears to stem from a fairly universal desire for social approval. While maintaining face is not the goal of all social interactions it is a significant component of most and as such must be recognized as a potential
impediment to honest self-disclosure in experimental and clinical situations which provoke subjects to recall and share personal memories. The effort to rise above the inclination toward image maintenance is very difficult for many persons and it may be made especially difficult by some circumstances. In fact, the effort to present an unvarnished image of oneself may require considerable personal work on the part of both the recaller and his listener.

The Interactive Nature of Counseling

Every therapist shares a unique and special relationship with each client. The relationship develops within the framework of the approach the therapist has selected to guide his work with the client or to characterize his work in general.

As the relationship between the client and the therapist develops the client struggles to define himself. Both participants become living features of the interactive field which emerges, inseparable from it and constrained by its characteristics and demands.

All clinical methods impose some consequences upon the client-therapist relationship. The therapist may be allowed, even required, to be warm, accepting and nonjudgmental by one frame while he may be required to be distant, analytic, and interpretive by another.
Classical analysis is a depth approach committed to the opinion that both the origin and solution of human problems lie deep within the personality, cut off from the client's consciousness. Analysts seek to help their clients by making that which has become unavailable to them (unconscious) available (conscious) (Corey, 1982). Always suspecting that unconscious sexual conflicts lie at the root of psychological problems (Nye, 1981) classic psychoanalytic therapists seek to unravel their client's inner secrets through the projective process and analysis of free associations (the fundamental rule) and dreams.

Analysts who work within this model attempt to end the repression of deeply unconscious material by provoking a reliving rather than a simple retelling of their client's past lives. They believe that this is best accomplished when clients reexperience their old emotions by projecting the characteristics of significant people from their past onto therapists. If projection is to occur analysts feel they must facilitate it by remaining a "blank screen" personally unknown to and detached from clients. The need to maintain emotional distance is believed so important to the projection process that it must be pursued even when the client experiences it as a rejection.

Analysts recognize that clients have a strong emotional resistance to developing awareness of their own problems and most regret that their model creates conditions which often frustrate, hurt, disappoint, and anger clients. However, as
analysts, they must proceed carefully, in a dispassionate way, to create the climate which will support the projective process because they believe it is essential to therapeutic movement (Kovel, 1976).

Often these same analysts must even struggle with irrational and conflicted feelings very similar to those of their clients. Sometimes they even come to resent their clients and doubt themselves as much as their clients have come to resent and doubt them.

This transference and counter-transference process is of such instrumental significance to the analytic frame that it is deliberately cultivated although it often causes both therapist and client pain as it distorts the natural dynamics of their relationship (Corsini, 1973). While the need for emotional distance and the need to resolve transference and counter-transference issues may be central to the effectiveness of this technique, they are often the source of abrupt and upsetting negative shifts in the client's evaluation of himself.

In contrast to the therapist who chooses the analytic approach, the therapist who chooses a client-centered approach presents himself very differently. He wishes to be and to be perceived as a warm, caring, deeply sensitive, nonjudgmental person who prizes his client and his relationship with him.

The client-centered therapist works to create the sort of close personal relationship with his client which will trigger the "releasing of an already existing capacity in a potentially competent individual" (Rogers, 1959, p. 221). Rejecting the
role of expert employed to diagnose and treat his patient, he favors the role of honest, transparent advocate who values his client's special personhood and his relationship with him. He challenges the very notion that he is more knowledgeable than his client, resisting any inclination to give him advice, direction or interpretation (Corey, 1982).

Client-centered therapists believe that individuals who perceive genuine, accurate, empathic understanding and unconditional positive regard in their relationship with their therapist will be strengthened by it. These therapists argue that clients who experience this will access a self-actualizing capacity within themselves which will allow them to accept previously unacceptable parts of themselves and express formerly denied feelings (Corsini, 1973).

It is the client-centered therapist's trust in the inner resources of the client and his willingness to substitute warmth, unconditional positive regard and support for distance, interpretation, and judgment which distinguishes his style from that of the analyst. The client-centered therapist accepts his function as one of being immediately present in his relationship with the client and accessible to him as a whole person. He believes that the emotional quality of their relationship is the most significant therapeutic tool he has at his disposal (Brammer and Shostrom, 1982). Believing the quality of their relationship to be the remedy itself, he strives to be fully present for his clients, studiously avoiding any overt or covert expression of disapproval or
distance. He works very hard to nurture every client's feelings of positive self-regard, relying upon the capacity of this positive self-perception to bring about therapeutic movement (Corsini, 1973).

If, as Purcell (1956) supposed, memory is related to the dynamics of the moment, then Bauserman's (1984) investigation of the impact of interactional effects posited in the counter transference literature was an important first step in the investigation of the effect an interviewer's style might have on the recall and report of ECRs. He observed that Ss who are interviewed by "warm" examiners provide significantly more solitary and significantly less vivid memories than Ss who are interviewed by "cold" examiners. He interpreted this as indicating that Ss make their memories more positive as a defense designed to balance the effect of the cold examiner. Whether his interpretation is correct or not, his observation that examiner style influences recall content supports the wisdom of further investigation of the matter.

Summary:

Therapists who choose the analytic approach inevitably elicit strong affect in their clients. Although these analysts never use necessary reserve as an excuse to be unfeeling, withdrawn or cruel, they often exacerbate their clients' feelings of failure and inadequacy when they withhold responses and assurances their clients want (Kovel, 1976).

Conversely, therapists who operate within the client centered model exhibit high levels of empathy, support, caring
and genuineness when they are with their clients, believing that people who experience themselves as adequate, secure, and worthy will be more free to explore areas of their experience (past and present) that are normally inaccessible to them. For these therapists, the quality of therapy is seen as synonymous with the quality of their personal relationship with the client and the extent to which they can help him experience himself as a capable successful person.

Since different therapists adopt different styles, different clients have different experiences in therapy. While some experience their therapists as coolly distant authority figures who temporarily cause them to devalue themselves, others perceive their therapists as warm, personable, supportive friends who enhance their feelings of competence. Clinicians in each group are equally adept at defending the therapeutic validity of their approach but there has been very little independent exploration of the effect the client's experience during the therapeutic encounter may have upon the accessibility and tone of his recollections and his willingness to share them.

Summary of Research and its Relationship to the Problem

A review of the literature strongly suggests that mood is significant to recall. Recall is made easier by congruence between mood at the time of learning and the time of attempted recollection. While the proportion of congruent memories
freely recalled greatly exceeds the proportion of incongruent ones, it is possible for recallers to access mood incongruent recollections since mood congruence appears to be only one factor among many which influence recall.

Recallers who have been hypnotically saddened or elated tend to generate memories which are congruent with their induced affective state, but the effect is more prominent for elated than saddened ones. This asymmetry suggests that a volitional factor operates in conjunction with the congruence factor to help recallers choose recollections which will enable them to maintain affective states they enjoy and terminate those they find unpleasant.

Evidence that many individuals are extremely sensitive to the impact of their self-presentations supports concern that a recaller's effort to self-disclose honestly may be compromised by his need to do "face work" when he perceives himself as being "out of face". When "face work" is the consequence of a recaller's need for social approval, the client's motivation for impression management may override his conscious effort to self-disclose honestly and bias the content of his reported recollections.

Since a recaller's recollections may be significantly affected by intra and interpersonal factors such as his actual mood, the mood he desires to achieve or maintain, the impression he wishes to make on his listener and/or the dynamics of his relationship with that listener, it seems prudent to explore the effects events which immediately precede
and surround recall circumstances may have on the recall and report of both ECRs and RARs. Therapists who wish to solicit and use their client's memories have an understandable need to learn as much as possible about their susceptibility to the influences of transient circumstances which surround their collection. This is especially important since therapists of such diverse professional and interpersonal styles approach the collection situation in such different ways.

While the results of this study will have limited generalizability to clinical populations, it is anticipated that they will contribute to a further awareness of the interactive nature of the recall task and its capacity to influence the counseling process.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Population and Selection of the Sample

The population was male and female undergraduate students above the age of 18 and enrolled at Randolph-Macon College in Ashland, Virginia, during the period from September, 1985 to February, 1986. The sample consisted of 108 volunteers, each randomly assigned to one of eight experimental or four control groups, using order of appearance and a table of random numbers. Each group included nine subjects.

Subjects were solicited from undergraduate psychology, sociology, and education classes. Volunteers were also recruited by approaching students on the campus. No subject was a friend or family member of the examiner.

Subjects were accepted for participation on a first-come, first-accepted basis until all 108 subjects and some reserves had been recruited. Participants were randomly assigned to treatment and control groups and all were told that they were assisting the Psychology Department faculty in their effort to determine norms for the investigation of memory.

All subjects signed a student consent form (Appendix B). There was no control for race, socioeconomic status, religious preference, handedness, birth order, sex, academic class or academic standing.
Data Collection

Each subject (S) was asked to share six specific recollections from his early childhood (gps. 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, and 12) or his recent past (gps. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10). Each recollection was cued by a neutral word (Appendix C) presented by the experimenter (E) in direct conversation with S (gps. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12) (Appendices D and E) or presented as a part of a written questionnaire (gps. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11) (Appendices F and G) read by S while working alone in the examining room.

In the instance of direct conversation, E recorded the recollection S described, carefully noting the amount of time which passed between the moment when S heard the cue word and he began his description. In the instance where S responded in writing, E observed S through a one-way mirror, carefully noting the amount of time which passed from the moment S read the cue word at the top of the questionnaire page to the time he indicated that he had recalled the incident it provoked him to describe.

After each subject described a recollection, he was asked (by E or by questionnaire) to rate the recollection on a nine-point scale, ranging from one point for "very unpleasant" to nine points for "very pleasant." Each memory was rated for pleasure twice; first, "as you feel about the incident recalling it today" and then, "as you recall feeling about the
incident you have described when it was happening". Additionally, each subject was interviewed to determine his perceived instrumentality (activity) score (1-9) and the importance of other's score (1-9).

After collection of the first three recollections, E proceeded to create the situational context appropriate to S's treatment group. In all cases, the first phase of the procedure was repeated after S completed the tachistoscopic memory task (Appendix H) and the anagram task (Appendix I). During this repetition, three new recollections were cued by three new neutral words and collected in the exact manner described above. All recollections were rated as before.

All subjects were seen and instructed individually during all phases of their participation. Proper testing procedures were adhered to by the interviewer. Each subject was read standardized instructions and each was given ample opportunity to seek clarification of instructions at each step in the procedure.

**Treatments**

This study involved eight experimental and four control groups. There were two experimental contexts (failure and success) and one control context (no feedback). Before and after introduction of the experimental context, subjects were asked to generate one of two classes of recollections (ECRs or
RAs) under one of two different recall circumstances (interview vs. questionnaire).

A situational context of success or failure for Ss in the success and failure groups was established by providing false feedback regarding performance on an anagram task and utilizing the level-of-aspiration method described by Postman and Brown (1952) for use with a tachistoscopic task. This procedure allowed for some Ss to experience themselves as attaining or exceeding their stated goals in an experimental task while others experienced themselves as generally falling short of their goals.

The task originally described by Postman and Brown (1952) utilizes a series of fifteen slides, each bearing twelve randomly arranged symbols: capital letters, lower case letters, and numbers. The symbols are arranged quite differently on each slide and each slide bears different symbols. Each slide is exposed tachistoscopically for just six seconds. The subject's task is to report as many of the symbols as he/she recognizes. (Subjects seldom accurately report more than six symbols.)

There were eight experimental groups (four Failure Groups and four Success Groups) and four Control Groups (no feedback). Members of the Control Groups received the following instructions at the beginning of the experiment:

I am interested in measuring the visual span of apprehension for a representative sample of college students. In order to do
this, I shall expose on the screen in front of you a group of letters and numbers and I want you to tell me after each exposure which of the symbols you were able to see. Now I shall show you a few sample slides to give you an idea of the task. (E exposes three slides.)

Postman and Brown, 1952, p. 214-215

Members of the Failure and Success Groups received the following additional instructions:

Since you now know how well you were able to do on the practice slides, let us make the task a little more interesting by having you state before each exposure how well you feel you will be able to do. Of course, how well you do on this kind of task depends on a number of things. The most important of these are how well you can concentrate, how efficiently you can respond to changing symbols in the environment and your speed of reaction. Eyesight, with fairly normal correction, doesn't seem to make a difference. In other words, the things that make for success in this task are the same things that are involved in good driving, accurate shooting, and other perceptual-motor tasks. Make your estimate by using percentage ranks which are based on a curve similar to a course-grade curve which you are no doubt acquainted with. In other words, before each exposure you tell me what percentage of our previous subjects will fall below your score. For example, if you say 70,
that means that 70 percent of our Ss were below you, while 30 percent were above you. Or if you say 45, that means that 45 percent were below and 55 percent were above your score. I shall expose the slide and you tell me as in the practice trials what you were able to see. Then I shall check your actual score for that slide in our tables which have been standardized on a large population of students and tell you how close you came in your estimate. For your convenience, I am giving you a piece of paper to record your scores, estimates, and the values I give you from the table under the proper headings. This will enable you to keep track of how well you are doing. I might add that these slides vary in difficulty, and I shall begin by exposing some of the easier slides and go on to more difficult ones.

Postman and Brown, 1952, p. 215

In further accordance with the procedure described by Postman and Brown, the series of 15 slides were exposed immediately after the instructions. As described, subjects in both groups stated their estimates of expected performance scores, expressed as percentile ranks, prior to each exposure and each was given a score (feedback) after each exposure. The E performed mathematical calculations before stating the score in an effort to convince Ss that the reported score represented a calculated percentile derived from comparison with a table of norms. The use of percentile rank rather than raw score had the advantage of allowing that feedback conveying success and
Failure could proceed in a prearranged sequence independent of Ss actual performance. Additionally, it was hoped that comparison to norms which the subject believed were established on a population of his peers would intensify his experience of himself as a success or a failure.

Percentile ranks reported to Ss in the Success Groups indicated that they had exceeded their own estimate in 11 of 15 trials. Their performance on trials (exposures) #3, 6, 8, and 11 was reported as having barely reached or fallen only slightly short of their estimates.

Percentile ranks reported to Ss in the Failure Groups indicated that they failed to achieve their own estimated performance level in eleven of fifteen trials. Their performance on trials (exposures) #1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15 was reported as having fallen short of their estimates.

Control group Ss were not asked to make estimates about their performance and they were not given feedback concerning it. However, their experience with the slides was exactly like that of Ss in the other groups.

Ethical Safeguards and Considerations

The investigators doctoral advisor and two other members of her dissertation committee reviewed this study before it was undertaken. Data collection did not proceed without their approval.
All Ss were advised that their test performance and interview data would be handled in a manner which would protect their anonymity. Although they were misled initially, all Ss were thoroughly debriefed when the project was completed. The usual request for cooperation was accompanied by an offer to communicate the investigators findings when the study was completed.

All Ss were advised that they could withdraw from the study at any time.

Instrumentation

Experimental materials included one difficult and one easy version of an anagram list. Other materials included a bell, stop watch, carousel projector, eighteen slides and one phony 'norm' sheet, to be consulted by E before providing feedback to S.

The experiment was conducted in a testing room furnished with a table and two chairs. There was a one-way mirror through which E observed and timed those Ss who were using the written questionnaire.

Research Design

This study was intended to evaluate possible effects which experimentally imposed changes in the interpersonal and intrapersonal collection climates might have on the availa-
bility, content, and affective tone of recollections. A Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design was employed (Campbell & Stanley, 1963.)

**Expt. Gps.**
1: RO1 Xa1 0a1
2: RO2 Xa2 0a2
3: RO3 Xb1 0b1
4: RO4 Xb2 0b2
5: RO5 Xa1 0a1
6: RO6 Xa2 0a2
7: RO7 Xb1 0b1
8: RO8 Xb2 0b2

**Control Gps.**
9: RO9 a1 0a1
10: RO10 a2 0a2
11: RO11 b1 0b1
12: RO12 b2 0b2

**Key:** The "R" indicates that subjects will be randomly assigned to the treatments, the "X" indicates exposure to a combination of 3 independent variables specifically denoted by its subscript. The "0" refers to the posttests used to evaluate consequences of the manipulations.

**Experimental Groups 1 and 2:** Members of these groups succeeded at the anagram task. They received success feedback about their performance on the span of apprehension task. The interviewer's style was designed to enhance their feeling of well being. Information concerning their RARs was gathered by questionnaire (gp. 1) or interview (gp. 2).
Experimental Groups 3 and 4: Members of these groups succeeded at the anagram task and received success feedback about their performance on the span of apprehension task. The interviewer's style was designed to enhance their feeling of well-being. Information about their ECRs was gathered by questionnaire (gp. 3) or interview (gp. 4).

Experimental Groups 5 and 6: Members of these groups failed the anagram task and received failure feedback about their performance on the span of apprehension task. Interviewer style was designed to intensify their discomfort. Descriptions of their RARs were gathered by questionnaire (gp. 5) or interview (gp. 6).

Experimental Groups 7 and 8: Members of these groups failed the anagram task and received failure feedback about their performance on the span of apprehension task. Interviewer style was designed to intensify their discomfort. Descriptions of their ECRs were gathered by questionnaire (gp. 7) or interview (gp. 8).

Control Groups 9 and 10: Members of these groups were not asked to predict their performance and they were not given feedback concerning their performance on the tachistoscopic task or the anagram task. Their interviewer's style was as neutral as possible. Descriptions of their RARs were gathered by questionnaire (gp. 9) or interview (gp. 10).

Control Groups 11 and 12: Members of these groups did not predict their performance on the span of apprehension task.
and they were not given feedback concerning their performance on it or the anagram task. The interviewer's style was as neutral as possible and information concerning their ECRs was gathered by questionnaire (gp. 11) or interview (gp. 12).

Statistical Analysis

Anovas and t tests were used to evaluate the vulnerability of ECRs and RARs to influence from transient collection circumstances (Wood, 1974).

Specific Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

H₀₁: Collection format (interview vs. questionnaire) will not significantly (α = .05) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memory, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

H₀₂: Type of memory collected (ECR vs. RAR) will not significantly (α = .05) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's
memory, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

$H^0_3$: Collection format (questionnaire vs. interview) and type of memory collected (ECR vs. RAR) will not interact to significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memory, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

$H^0_4$: Feedback context (success, failure, or no feedback) will not significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memories, (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories, or (d) Ss latency (sec's) to recall of memories.

$H^0_5$: Feedback context (success, failure, or no feedback) will not interact with type of memory (ECR vs. RAR) to significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memories, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

$H^0_6$: Feedback context (success, failure and no feedback) will not interact with type of memory (ECR vs. RAR) and collection format (questionnaire vs. interview) to significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of
pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their recollections - then and
today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the
recaller's memories, or (c) the perceived instrumentality
(activity) of recallers in their memories.

H07: There will not be a significantly (α = .05) greater
latency associated with recall of memories which are
affectively incongruent with the recaller's recall context
(success vs. failure experience).

H08: There will be no significant (α = .05) difference in
recall latency among the four groups: situation positive
and recollection positive, situation negative and
recollection negative, situation positive and recollection
negative, and situation negative and recollection
positive.

Summary of Methodology

One hundred and eight young adults currently enrolled at
Randolph-Macon College were volunteer subjects in this study.
All of the subjects were randomly assigned to one of eight
experimental and four control groups representing three
treatment variables.

Subjects from each group were individually exposed to the
feedback context of their group (success, failure or no
knowledge of results) and their memories (ECRs or RARs) were
collected by interview or questionnaire immediately before and
after that experience. Each recollection was evaluated by the
recaller for its affective significance to him, and rated for
perceived importance of others to the recaller's memory and perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

Analyses of variance and t tests were used to evaluate the relative impact of collection circumstances which immediately preceded and surrounded the recall of early childhood recollections (ECRs) and recent adult recollections (RARs). Interactions between type of recollection, recaller's experience immediately before and during recollection, and recall format were also tested for possible significance.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Hypotheses

Because this study sought to evaluate possible effects which experimentally imposed changes in the interpersonal and intrapersonal collection climate might have on the availability, content and affective tone of recollections, a Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design was employed. However, pretest-posttest scores were collapsed for analysis of the significance of collection format (questionnaire vs. interview) and type of memory recalled (early childhood vs. recent recollection). Although analyses of variance were used to determine significance in most cases, a t test was used to evaluate the significance of differences in recall latency for those posttest memories which were congruent and those which were incongruent with the presumed affect of the recaller. Eight null hypotheses were proposed to test the influence feedback context, collection format, and memory type had on the accessibility, content, and affective tone of recollections.

The first null hypothesis was:

Collection format (interview vs. questionnaire) will not significantly (α = .05) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and
today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memory, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

The second null hypothesis was:

Type of memory collected (ECR vs. RAR) will not significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memory, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

The third null hypothesis was:

Collection format (questionnaire vs. interview) and type of memory collected (ECR vs. RAR) will not interact to significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memory, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

Data, summarized in Table 1, reveals a significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference between the degree of pleasure subjects assign to their memories today when those memories have been
collected as responses to a questionnaire and when they have been collected by an interviewer, (F/1,104 = 5.40, p < .05). The remainder of data pertinent to the first null hypothesis, and the second and third null hypotheses, are summarized in Tables 1 through 4. Failure to achieve traditional levels of significance (α = .05) resulted in failure to reject these hypotheses.

The fourth null hypothesis was:

Feedback context (success, failure, or no feedback) will not significantly (α = .05) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memories, (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories, or (d) Ss' latency (sec's) to recall of memories.

The fifth null hypothesis was:

Feedback context (success, failure, or no feedback) will not interact with type of memory (ECR vs. RAR) to significantly (α = .05) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memories, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.
# Table 1

## Total Scores Indicating the Degree of Pleasure Subjects Assign to Their Memories Today Grouped by Recall Format and Memory Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Type of Memory</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>869.0</td>
<td>29,627.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>950.5</td>
<td>34,524.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>965.0</td>
<td>36,002.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>1,026.0</td>
<td>40,000.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format (Q vs. I)</td>
<td>272.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>272.34</td>
<td>5.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Type (RAR vs. ECR)</td>
<td>188.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188.02</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X type</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within gp.</td>
<td>5,245.89</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,710.14</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F (1, 104) = 5.40, p < .05
TABLE 2
TOTAL SCORES INDICATING THE DEGREE OF PLEASURE
SUBJECTS RETROSPECTIVELY ASSIGN TO THEIR MEMORIES
GROUPED BY RECALL FORMAT AND MEMORY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Type of Memory</th>
<th>( EX )</th>
<th>( EX^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>849.0</td>
<td>28,683.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>798.0</td>
<td>24,193.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>879.5</td>
<td>30,371.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>816.5</td>
<td>26,535.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format (Q vs. L)</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Type (RAR vs. ECR)</td>
<td>120.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120.33</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X type</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within gp.</td>
<td>6,161.12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>59.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 6,305.02 107

* Non-significant at .05 level
## Table 3

TOTAL SCORES INDICATING PERCEIVED INSTRUMENTALITY (ACTIVITY LEVEL) OF RECALLERS IN THEIR MEMORY GROUPED BY RECALL FORMAT AND MEMORY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Type of Memory</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>769.0</td>
<td>24,227.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>822.5</td>
<td>26,691.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>782.0</td>
<td>23,461.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>782.0</td>
<td>24,445.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format (Q vs. I)</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Type (RAR vs. ECR)</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X type</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within gp.</td>
<td>6,569.63</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>63.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,629.64</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-significant at .05 level
TABLE 4

TOTAL SCORES INDICATING PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF OTHERS TO RECALLER'S MEMORY GROUPED BY RECALL FORMAT AND MEMORY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Type of Memory</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>745.0</td>
<td>22,293.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>809.5</td>
<td>27,111.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>731.5</td>
<td>21,398.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>798.0</td>
<td>25,333.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format (Q vs. I)</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Type (RAR vs. ECR)</td>
<td>158.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>158.90</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X type</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within gp.</td>
<td>7,906.19</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>76.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,070.92</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-significant at .05 level
The sixth null hypothesis was:

Feedback context (success, failure, or no feedback) will not interact with type of memory (ECR vs. RAR) and collection format (questionnaire vs. interview) to significantly (α = .05) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their recollections—then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memories, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

Analysis of data summarized in Table 8, reveals a significant (F/2,96/ = 1.52, p < .05) difference between the pretest-posttest score differences in perceived instrumentality which subjects report having felt during recalled incidents when they are reported as recent rather than early childhood recollections. All other effects were below traditional levels of significance (α = .05). The remainder of data pertinent to the fourth null hypothesis and hypotheses five and six, are summarized in Tables 5 through 9. Failure to achieve traditional levels of significance resulted in failure to reject these hypotheses.

The seventh null hypothesis was:

There will not be a significantly (α = .05) greater latency associated with recall of memories which are affectively incongruent
### TABLE 5

**GROUP TOTALS INDICATING PRETEST-POSTTEST DIFFERENCES IN THE DEGREE OF PLEASURE SUBJECTS ASSIGN TO THEIR MEMORIES TODAY CLASSIFIED BY RECALL FORMAT, FEEDBACK CONTEXT, AND MEMORY TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Memory Type</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>112.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>324.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>311.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>54.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>+19.0</td>
<td>244.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>351.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>316.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>-20.0</td>
<td>260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>355.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>280.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory Type (ECR/RAR)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format (Q/I)</td>
<td>29.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.55</td>
<td>1.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (+/-/Φ)</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X Format</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X Feedback</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X Feedback</td>
<td>117.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X Format X Feedback</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2,708.33</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,932.41</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-significant at .05 level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Memory Type</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>452.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>502.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>521.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>262.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>1,024.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>321.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>323.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>872.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>378.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format (Q/I)</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Type (ECR/RAR)</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>0.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (+/-/Ø)</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X Format</td>
<td>107.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107.00</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X Feedback</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X Feedback</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X Type X Feedback</td>
<td>79.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>0.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4,926.06</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,256.47</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-significant at .05 level
TABLE 7
TOTAL SCORES INDICATING PRETEST-POSTTEST DIFFERENCES IN PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF OTHERS TO RECALLER'S MEMORY GROUPED BY RECALL FORMAT, FEEDBACK CONTEXT, AND MEMORY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Memory Type</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>495.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>824.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>416.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>379.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>240.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>973.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>562.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>609.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>429.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>158.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>581.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>494.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format (Q/I)</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Type (ECR/RAR)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (+/-/Ø)</td>
<td>134.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.07</td>
<td>1.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X Format</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X Feedback</td>
<td>68.91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.46</td>
<td>0.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X Feedback</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X Type X Feedback</td>
<td>44.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3,997.94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                           | 4,286.08 | 107 |

* Non-significant at .05 level
### Table 8

**Pretest-Posttest Differences in Perceived Instrumentality (Activity) of Recallers in Their Memories Grouped by Recall Format, Feedback Context, and Memory Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Memory Type</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>229.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>333.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>402.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>339.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>171.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>382.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>189.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>348.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>388.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>278.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format (Q/I)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type (ECR/RAR)</td>
<td>193.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>193.34</td>
<td>6.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (+/-#)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X Format</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X Feedback</td>
<td>89.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.96</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X Feedback</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format X Type X Feedback</td>
<td>42.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3,022.33</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>31.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,385.53</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F (1,96) = 6.14, p < .05
### TABLE 9

**Pretest-Posttest Differences in Recall Latency (Sec's) Grouped by Type of Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Feedback</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback (gpa. 1-4)</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>-391.18</td>
<td>16,592.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative feedback (gpa. 5-8)</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>-5.03</td>
<td>28,808.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feedback</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>-233.54</td>
<td>50,841.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2,094.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,047.13</td>
<td>1.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>90,476.02</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>861.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92,570.27</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-significant at .05 level
with the recaller's recall context (success vs. failure experience).

Analyses (t tests) of latency differences summarized in Tables 10 and 11, revealed no significant (α = .05) differences between congruent and incongruent groups. The investigator failed to reject this hypothesis.

The eighth null hypothesis was:

There will be no significant (α = .05) difference in recall latency among the four groups: situation positive and recollection positive, situation negative and recollection negative, situation positive and recollection negative, and situation negative and recollection positive.

Analyses of data summarized in Tables 12 and 13, revealed no significant (α = .05) difference in recall latency among the four groups. The investigator failed to reject this hypothesis.
TABLE 10

POSTTEST RECALL LATENCY (SEC'S) FOR MEMORIES CURRENTLY ASSIGNED PLEASURE RATINGS WHICH ARE AFFECTIVELY CONGRUENT AND THOSE WHICH ARE AFFECTIVELY INCONGRUENT WITH THE CONTEXT PRESUMABLY INTRODUCED BY MANIPULATED FEEDBACK AT THE TIME OF RECALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent Recollections</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>966.77</td>
<td>18,837.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent Recollections</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>1,079.24</td>
<td>31,421.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t (189) = 0.49, p > .05$
### TABLE II

POSTTEST RECALL LATENCY (SEC'S) FOR MEMORIES RETROSPECTIVELY RATED AS AFFECTIVELY CONGRUENT AND THOSE RETROSPECTIVELY RATED AS AFFECTIVELY INCONGRUENT WITH THE CONTEXT PRESUMABLY CREATED BY MANIPULATED FEEDBACK AT THE TIME OF RECALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>EX^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent Recollections</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>1,026.22</td>
<td>33,014.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent Recollections</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>1,151.32</td>
<td>26,015.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t (197) = 0.21, p > 0.05 \]
TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF POSTTEST RECALL LATENCY TOTALS (SEC'S) FOR MEMORIES RATED AS CURRENTLY CONGRUENT OR INCONGRUENT WITH POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE FEEDBACK CONTEXT AT THE TIME OF THEIR RECALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Memory Pleasure Rating</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Corrected n</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>Corrected EX</th>
<th>EX²</th>
<th>Corrected EX²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>628.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,926.26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>307.24</td>
<td>596.41</td>
<td>4,159.36</td>
<td>7,256.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>338.07</td>
<td>680.79</td>
<td>6,911.66</td>
<td>10,582.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>772.00</td>
<td>793.42</td>
<td>27,262.31</td>
<td>27,491.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>355.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118.40</td>
<td>1.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>27,987.10</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>112.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total      | 28,342.29 | 251 |

* Non-significant at .05 level
### TABLE 13

**TABLE OF POSTTEST RECALL LATENCY TOTALS (SEC's) FOR MEMORIES RETROSPECTIVELY RATED AS CONGUENT OR INCONGRUENT WITH POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE FEEDBACK CONTEXT AT THE TIME OF RECALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Memory Pleasure Rating</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Corrected n</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>Corrected EX</th>
<th>EX^2</th>
<th>Corrected EX^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>445.57</td>
<td>533.09</td>
<td>7,078.55</td>
<td>8,035.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>495.36</td>
<td>528.18</td>
<td>9,079.81</td>
<td>9,438.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>580.65</td>
<td>690.05</td>
<td>25,936.07</td>
<td>27,132.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>655.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,936.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>379.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126.43</td>
<td>0.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>32,043.84</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>148.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32,423.14</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-significant at .05 level
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the significance of some contextual factors suspected of having the capacity to influence the availability, content, and affective tone of recollections. One hundred and eight young adult volunteer subjects were each asked to recall six cued recent or early childhood memories. Recall latencies were noted as well as scores indicating the degree of pleasure Ss attributed to their recollections at the time of their recall and the degree of pleasure they recall having attributed to the incidents at the time they occurred. Recollections were also evaluated for the importance of others to the remembered incidents and the perceived instrumentality (activity) of the recaller in the recalled incidents.

The research design used in this study was the Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. Statistical procedures included analyses of variance and a t test. Eight null hypotheses provided the basis for testing the significance of two different collection formats (Q/I), three different collection contexts (+,-,Ø), and two different types of recollections (ECRs/RARs).

The following null hypotheses were tested:
\textbf{H^0_1}: Collection format (interview vs. questionnaire) will not significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memory, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

\textbf{H^0_2}: Type of memory collected (ECR vs. RAR) will not significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memory, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

\textbf{H^0_3}: Collection format (questionnaire vs. interview) and type of memory collected (ECR vs. RAR) will not interact to significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memory, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

\textbf{H^0_4}: Feedback context (success, failure, or no feedback) will not significantly ($\alpha = .05$) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller's memories, (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories, or (d) Ss latency (sec's) to recall of memories.
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H°5: Feedback context (success, failure, or no feedback) will not interact with type of memory (ECR vs. RAR) to significantly \(^{(\alpha = .05)}\) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their memories - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller’s memories, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

H°6: Feedback context (success, failure and no feedback) will not interact with type of memory (ECR vs. RAR) and collection format (questionnaire vs. interview) to significantly \(^{(\alpha = .05)}\) influence, (a) the degree of pleasure Ss assign(ed) to their recollections - then and today, (b) the perceived importance of others to the recaller’s memories, or (c) the perceived instrumentality (activity) of recallers in their memories.

H°7: There will not be a significantly \(^{(\alpha = .05)}\) greater latency associated with recall of memories which are affectively incongruent with the recaller’s recall context (success vs. failure experience).

H°8: There will be no significant \(^{(\alpha = .05)}\) difference in recall latency among the four groups: situation positive and recollection positive, situation negative and recollection negative, situation positive and recollection negative, and situation negative and recollection positive.
Analyses of test data revealed a significant difference between the degree of pleasure subjects assigned to their memories at the time of collection when those memories were collected by questionnaire and by interview. Subjects whose recollections were solicited directly by an interview either recalled incidents which were significantly more pleasant to them, or, when asked how they felt about the recalled incidents as they reflected on them at the time of recall, reported significantly more pleasant feelings about them than Ss asked to report the same information by questionnaire. Notably, when subjects who were interviewed were asked to report how they now believe they would have rated the degree of pleasure associated with the recalled incidents at the time they occurred, they reported ratings which were not significantly different from those reported by Ss asked for the same information by questionnaire.

Although pilot data indicated that Ss could independently assign values (1-9) to their own instrumentality in recalled incidents, experience with most of the 108 subjects in this study indicated that they had difficulty understanding this task and responding according to a uniform criteria. Therefore, it was necessary to assist Ss by asking facilitating questions which made the request meaningful to them. Unfortunately, the wide variety of incidents reported as recollections precluded standardization of these questions. It was a disappointment that most Ss could not use the scale independently.
The above concern weakens the significance of analyses relevant to this variable. However, obtained results are reported because they are in the expected direction and they achieved traditional levels of statistical significance.

Data summarized in Table 8 describes pretest-posttest differences in perceived instrumentality with group scores presented by recall format (Q/I), feedback context, (+,−,0), and type of recollection (ECR, RAR). An analysis of variance indicated a significant difference between pretest-posttest instrumentality ratings for ECR and RAR groups.

Subjects who were asked to evaluate their instrumentality in ECRs registered an average 8 percent posttest decline in rating (irrespective of collection format and nature of feedback) while Ss who were asked to evaluate their recent recollections registered an average 22 percent posttest increase in rating. This result would be more interpretable if data summarized in Table 3 had revealed a significant main effect for memory type. However, when subject's scores were collapsed across pretest and posttest collection circumstances, statistical analyses revealed non-significant differences between ECR (average score = 4.79) and RAR (average score = 4.95) groups.

It is probable that the failure to detect a difference for instrumentality ratings in the situation where collapsed scores were analyzed for each group was due to a lack of sensitivity in the measurement approach. Whereas the approach which evaluated pretest-posttest score differences, in a comparison
of ECR and RAR conditions, controlled for initial values, the comparison of collapsed scores for each of these conditions did not.

Evaluation of pretest–posttest score differences in instrumentality reported by Ss differed significantly for ECR and RAR groups. Subjects in the ECR group reflected a posttest decline in their instrumentality score and RAR Ss reflected an increase. Speculation about the relevance of this pattern should await more definitive findings provided by a replication which matches subjects by their pretest scores.

Conclusions

Indications that Ss assign significantly different contemporary pleasure values to recollections which are collected by questionnaire and interview seems very relevant to the clinician's desire to determine which contextual factors, if any, influence recollections and/or their significance to recallers. Furthermore, the results of this study are entirely consistent with the likely assumption that the therapist–client dyad is an interactive system of dynamic significance to each participant.

It is worth noting that recall format (Q/I) did not significantly alter pleasure scores retrospectively assigned to recalled incidents when Ss were asked to think back to the value those incidents held for them at the time they occurred. Absence of this effect seems to suggest that memories have a
historic quality which is less subject to contextual influence, and which clients can distinguish from their less well-anchored contemporary quality, if asked to do so. In the light of this observation, it seems important to be certain that a recaller who is asked to evaluate a recalled incident understands whether the requested evaluation is to be indicative of his current feelings about the incident or his recollection of the feelings he had about the incident when it occurred.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on results of this research:

1. It is recommended that this study be replicated.
2. It is recommended that future efforts to explore the significance of contextual factors control for individual differences by using a design which matches subjects according to their pretest instrumentality scores.
3. It is recommended that future efforts to explore the stability of a recaller's perception about his own instrumentality in a recalled incident utilize a scale which is demonstrably meaningful to the recaller.
4. It is recommended that clinicians who seek to collect recollections become more aware of the relevance of the recall format (Q/I) they select.

5. It is recommended that clinicians who ask clients to assign a degree of pleasure/displeasure to their recollections carefully stipulate their intention that the score represent a contemporary or retrospective evaluation.
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APPENDIX A

Recruiting Statement Read to Students in Psychology, Sociology, and Education Classes and to Individuals Approached on the Randolph-Macon College Campus.

The faculty of the psychology department has become interested in pursuing a joint research project and we are calling for student participation. Some students are in classes where participation in a research project is expected as part of their semester's work and part of the experience of being in the course and some students will be participating just to help us out. Whichever is your situation, we would appreciate your help.

I'd like to pass a sign-up sheet and ask you to indicate several days of the week and times of the day or evening when you can come to the lab for about an hour and fifteen minutes.

I can't tell you anything about the hour now except to say that I think the task will be interesting to you and I can assure you that you won't be doing anything that is difficult or painful or anything like that and your individual results will be held in strict confidence although all Ss will be informed of the results of the study when it has been completed.

You'll find out all about it when everyone has had their appointment. Until then, one of the important things about an experiment is that people not discuss it. It is important for everyone to start out equal if the results are to be meaningful.

Please know that Dr. Wessels, Mrs. Hughes, and Dr. Trahan greatly appreciate your help.
APPENDIX H

Subject Consent Form

I agree to participate in this research as explained to me as follows:

We are interested in various forms of memory and how well people perform in a variety of memory tasks. You will be asked to remember and report a wide variety of events, some very recent and some more distant, and you will be observed and timed as you attempt to do so.

I have read the above statement and am consenting to participate in this research of my own volition. I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation at any time. I understand that, if I am dissatisfied with any aspect of the program at any time, I may report grievances anonymously to the chairman of the Psychology Department.

Signed: ______________________________ Date: __________
APPENDIX C

Single Words Used to Stimulate Subjects to Recall Both Early and Recent Recollections:

1st 3 memories:  furniture
city
clothes

2nd 3 memories: family
food
friend(s)
APPENDIX D

Instructions Given to Ss in the Interview Format - ECR gps. (gps. 4, 8, and 12)

In the following few minutes I will be asking you to describe three of the earliest childhood memories which the words I say bring to mind. Please keep the following points in mind:

* The early memory you describe must be a specific incident, event, occurrence, or happening that you remember. Early memories which describe incidents that occurred over and over again (ex., "we used to have parties whenever ...") are not true early recollections and should not be described.

* Describe any early recollection that the word I say brings to your mind, even if you are not absolutely sure that the incident actually occurred.

* Report any specific recollection that you think of regardless of how insignificant it may seem to you.

* Describe the first recollection that you remember and associate with the word that I say to you.

* Describe only those recollections which you think occurred approximately before the age of eight (8).

Now, let me tell you about the bell. I'm using it because I am interested in timing you so I want you to ring the bell when you first think of the incident you will describe to me.

So, let me summarize:

- I will say a word.

- You will try to think of an incident from your early childhood which the word I said prompts you to recall.

- You will ring the bell as soon as you've thought of it and then describe the incident to me and I will write it down and we will talk about it a little.

Do you have any questions?
APPENDIX E

Instructions Given to Subjects in the Interview Format - RAR gps. (gps. 2, 6, and 10)

In the following few minutes, I will be asking you to describe three recollections from the events of the last year which words I say bring to mind. Please keep the following points in mind:

* The memories you describe must be of specific incidents, events, occurrences, or happenings that you remember. Memories which describe incidents that occurred over and again (ex. "we used to have parties whenever...") are not true recollections and should not be described.

* Describe any recollection that the word I say brings to your mind, even if you are not absolutely sure that the incident occurred the way you remember it.

* Report any specific recollection that you think of regardless of how insignificant it may seem to you.

* Describe only those recollections which you think occurred between last Christmas and last week.

Now, let me tell you about the bell. I'm using it because I am interested in timing you so I want you to ring the bell when you first think of the incident you will describe to me.

So, let me summarize:

- I will say a word.

- You will try to think of an incident from the last year which the word I said prompts you to recall.

- You will ring the bell as soon as you've thought of it and then describe the incident to me and I will write it down and we will talk about it a little.

Do you have any questions?
APPENDIX F

Instructions Given to Subjects in the Questionnaire Format
ECR gps. (gps. 3, 7, and 11)

This is a brief questionnaire. Please read the directions on this page and ask me any questions you may have now since I won't be able to answer your questions once you have begun—in fact, I'll be out of the room while you work.

On the following three pages, you are asked to describe three of your early childhood memories, each associated with a word which is listed at the top of the page.

* The early memory you describe must be of a specific incident, event, occurrence, or happening that you remember. Early memories which describe incidents that occurred over and over again (ex., "we used to have a party whenever ...") are not true early recollections and consequently should not be written down.

* Write down any early recollection that comes to your mind, even if you are not absolutely sure that the incident actually occurred.

* Report any specific recollection that you think of when you see the word, regardless of how insignificant it may seem to you.

* Write down the first recollection that you remember and associate with the word at the top of the page.

* Write only those recollections which you think occurred approximately before age eight (8).

Do you have any questions?

So, let me summarize:

After I have left the room, please wait a few seconds and then turn to the first page of the questionnaire. At the top of that page, you will see a single word. Please ring the bell so I will know when you have seen that word. Next, try to recall a specific incident it triggers from your memory of events which occurred before you were eight years old. Ring the bell again, as soon as you have thought of one.
Let me tell you about the bell. I'm using it because I am interested in timing you but I don't want to sit here where I'm liable to make it harder for you to concentrate and remember specific events. So, let me say again, I want you to turn the page after I've left the room and ring the bell when you see the word and ring it again when you first think of the incident you will write down.

- Turn the page.
- See the word and ring the bell immediately.
- Ring the bell again when you've thought of an incident it reminds you of, and then,
- Write a description of the incident on the page below the word.
APPENDIX G

Instructions Given to Subjects in the Questionnaire Format
RAR gps. (gps. 1, 5, and 9)

This is a brief questionnaire. Please read the directions on this page and ask me any questions you may have now since I won't be able to answer your questions once you have begun; in fact, I'll be out of the room while you work.

On the following three pages, you are asked to describe three memories from the year 1985 — each associated with a word which is listed at the top of the page.

* The memory you describe must be of a specific incident, event, occurrence, or happening that you remember. Memories which describe incidents that occurred over and over again (ex., "we used to have a party whenever . . .") are not true recollections and consequently should not be written down.

* Write down any recollection that comes to your mind, even if you are not absolutely sure that the incident actually occurred.

* Report any specific recollection that you think of when you see the word, regardless of how insignificant it may seem to you.

* Write down the first recollection that you remember and associate with the word at the top of the page.

* Write only those recollections which you think occurred between last Christmas and last week.

Do you have any questions?

So, let me summarize:

After I have left the room, please wait a few seconds and then turn to the first page of this questionnaire. At the top of the next page, you will see a single word. Please ring the bell so I will know when you have seen that word. Next, try to recall a specific incident it triggers from your memory of events which occurred during the last year. Ring the bell again, as soon as you have thought of one.
Let me tell you about the bell. I'm using it because I am interested in timing you but I don't want to sit here where I'm liable to make it harder for you to concentrate and remember specific events. So, let me say it again, I want you to turn the page after I've left the room and ring the bell when you see the word and ring it again when you first think of the incident you will write down.

- Turn the page.
- See the word and ring the bell immediately.
- Ring the bell again when you've thought of an incident it reminds you of, and then,
- Write a description of the incident on the page below the word.
APPENDIX H

Instructions for Visual Apperception Task:

Instructions for members of the Control Groups:

I am interested in measuring the visual span of apprehension for a representative sample of college students. In order to do this, I shall expose a group of letters and numbers on the screen in front of you and I want you to tell me after each exposure which of the symbols you were able to see and remember. Now I shall show you a few sample slides to give you an idea of the task.

Additional instructions for members of Failure and Success Groups:

Since you now know how well you were able to do on the practice slides, let us make the task a little more interesting by having you state before each exposure how well you feel you will be able to do. Of course, how well you do on this kind of task depends on a number of things. The most important of these are how well you can concentrate, how efficiently you can respond to changing symbols in the environment and your speed or reaction. Eyesight, with fairly normal correction, doesn't seem to make a difference. In other words, the things that make for success in this task are the same things that are involved in good driving, accurate shooting, and other perceptual-motor tasks. Make your estimate by using percentage ranks which are based on a curve similar to a course-grade curve which you are no doubt acquainted with. In other words, before each exposure you tell me what percentage of our previous subjects will fall below your score. For example, if you say 70, that means that 70% of our Ss were below you, while 30% were above you. Or, if you say 45, that means that 45% were below and 55% were above your score. I shall expose the slide and you tell me as in the practice trials what you were able to see. Then I shall check your actual score for that slide in our tables which have been standardized on a large population of students and tell you how close you came in your estimate. For your convenience, I am giving you a piece of paper to record your estimates and the values I give you from the table under the proper headings. This will enable you to keep track of how well you are doing. I might add that these slides vary in difficulty, and I shall begin by exposing some of the easier slides and go on to more difficult ones.
APPENDIX I

Anagram Instructions

The first thing I am going to ask you to do is an anagram task. You are to solve a list of five-letter anagrams that I will present to you. Please work on them carefully in the allotted time. A five-letter anagram is simply five scrambled letters. Each set of letters will make a common English word if properly arranged. Rearrange each set of letters so that they make a word. Do not use foreign words or proper names. You will have 15 minutes in which to work. Go ahead.

After 15 minutes, E will say, "Count the number of anagrams you have correctly solved, and place this figure in a circle at the top of your paper. (Pause). The solution will be shown on this screen for two minutes. Please study the solutions carefully."

You have actually done (very well or rather poorly) on the task.
## Easy Anagram List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ANAGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. eugen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. esloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. tuudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. owers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. dichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. irpmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. orthe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. aetch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. hiaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. iwhtc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. ylear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. occlk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. relpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. ortut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. hchief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. eegrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. lafat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. hiwle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. eashor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. shref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. oolfad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. haemp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. ovser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. atmch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. ellga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. owtel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. ysea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. rofat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. rapty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. tseer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. elaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. lifed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. lapce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. nacoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. calen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36. psaeek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37. velel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. raeng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39. inren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40. veery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Difficult Anagram List

Name ________________________________

ANAGRAMS

1. nuqee
2. soeol
3. dtyus
4. rewo
5. lhdic
6. epmi
7. ehtro
8. aceht
9. spis
10. hiwct
11. lraye
12. okclc
13. lrpee
14. ttoru
15. fhcei
16. engre
17. taelf
18. lheiw
19. rehos
20. hfsre
21. dfolc
22. cmahp
23. esrev
24. hmcta
25. agell
26. weolt
27. yseas
28. stfor
29. yptrar
30. eetra
31. elsap
32. lidef
33. aepc
34. onaec
35. ncael
36. mapks
37. eelvl
38. aegon
39. rienn
40. revye
Form for Recording Anagram Solutions
Anagram Solutions

1. queen
2. loose
3. study
4. worse
5. child
6. prime
7. other
8. teach
9. ships
10. witch
11. early
12. clock
13. repel
14. tutor
15. chief
16. green
17. fatal
18. while
19. shore
20. fresh
21. flood
22. champ
23. serve
24. match
25. legal
26. towel
27. essay
28. frost
29. party
30. trees
31. leaps
32. field
33. place
34. ocean
35. clean
36. speak
37. level
38. anger
39. inner
40. every
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ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATION OF SELECTED EFFECTS OF CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH PRECEDE AND SURROUND RECALL OF EARLY CHILDHOOD AND RECENT ADULT EXPERIENCES

Carol Caswell Hughes

The College of William and Mary in Virginia, April 1986

Chairman: Professor Fred L. Adair

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the significance of some contextual factors suspected of having the capacity to influence the availability, content, and affective tone of recollections. One hundred and eight young adult volunteer subjects were each asked to recall six cued recent or early childhood memories. Recall latencies were noted as well as scores indicating the degree of pleasure Ss attributed to their recollections at the time of their recall and the degree of pleasure they recall having attributed to the incidents at the time they occurred. Recollections were also evaluated for the importance of others to the remembered incidents and the perceived instrumentality (activity) of the recaller in the recalled incidents.

The research design used in this study was the Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. Statistical procedures included analyses of variance and a t test. Eight null hypotheses provided the basis for testing the significance of the impact of two different collection formats (questionnaire vs. interview), three different collection contexts (created by provision of manipulated positive, neutral of non-responsive feedback regarding performance on an anagram task, and a span of apprehension task), and type of memory requested (recent vs. early childhood recollections).

Analyses of the data revealed a significant difference between the degree of pleasure subjects in interview and questionnaire groups assigned to their memories when they were being assessed for their contemporary significance to the recaller (F/1,104/=5.40,p .05).