

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

DOES THE PROCESSING OF HYPNOTIC ANALGESIA REQUIRE ATTENTION-DEMANDING RESOURCES?

A dual-task analysis of hypnotic-susceptibility-mediated
differences in executive attentional processing
between hypnotic and nonhypnotic analgesia

A thesis presented in part fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology
at Massey University

Louis Smeets

2000

**Department of Psychology
Massey University
Palmerston North**

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of Ernest R. Hilgard, Kenneth S. Bowers and Nicolas P. Spanos, who all sadly passed away in recent years. Their research efforts spanning several decades have contributed immensely to our understanding of clinical hypnosis in general and hypnotic analgesia in particular, and have inspired many others, myself including, to pursue further research in these areas.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Malcolm Johnson, for introducing me to research in pain mechanisms and management, for allowing me considerable freedom to pursue my own interests and directions, and for his valuable editorial comments.

My sincere thanks also go to Dr. Steve Humphries for his helpful comments and encouragement during the early stages of this project. Daniel Hean for developing the software programme for the tracking task. Blair Vernal for assisting with some of the initial screening sessions. Dr. Bill Zika who, despite his busy schedule, made time to record the hypnotic inductions used during the initial screening sessions on tape. Dr. John Spicer for his sound advice on data analysis, and Dr's. Eric Woody and Auke Tellegen for their clarification on queries about the Waterloo-Stanford Group C Scale of hypnotic ability and the Tellegen Absorption Scale.

I am also grateful for the support received from Barry Andrews who was always helpful and patient during the many requests for available classroom or lecture- theatre space to hold the hypnotic-susceptibility screening sessions. And finally, but most importantly, all the participants who freely gave, what became for many, very substantial amounts of their valuable time.

This research project was approved by the Human Ethics Committee at Massey University (HEC96/45) and was funded by a combined grant from the Psychology Department and the Graduate Research Fund.

CONTENTS

	Page
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Contents	iv
List of figures	xiii
List of tables	xvii
Preface	xix
 <i>Abstract</i>	 1
 <i>Introduction</i>	
Chapter One Pain mechanisms and management	
1.1. Development of pain theories and treatments	3
1.2. Advances in the understanding of nociceptive transmission	4
1.3. The Gate-Control theory of pain	8
1.4. Current understanding of pain	14
1.4.1. Phasic and tonic pain systems – first and second pain	14
1.4.2. The affective-emotional component of pain experience	16
1.4.3. Plasticity in the CNS and the development of acute and chronic pain.	21
1.4.3.1. Different pain states, changes in response patterns, and underlying neurophysiological mechanisms	21
1.4.3.2. Changes in neurotransmitter systems	27
1.4.3.3. Functional plasticity in the CNS	29
1.4.3.4. Plasticity at the gene-expression level	31
1.4.4. The diathesis-stress model of chronic pain	38
1.4.5. Pain in absence of sensory input – the neurosignature	40
1.4.6. The neurophysiology of pain – pain and the brain	44
1.5. Influence on pain management	55

	Page
Chapter Two Psychological strategies for coping with pain	62
2.1. Behavioural and cognitive-behavioural approaches	62
2.1.1. Behavioural strategies	62
2.1.2. Cognitive strategies	63
2.1.2.1. Focusing	63
2.1.1.2. Distraction	63
2.1.3. Factors affecting the efficacy of cognitive-behavioural pain-coping strategies	65
2.1.4. Evidence for effectiveness	66
2.1.5. Anxiety	67
2.1.6. The cognitive costs of attention diversion and thought suppression	69
2.1.7. Distraction versus sensation monitoring	70
2.2. Hypnotic analgesia	73
2.2.1. Characteristics	73
2.2.2. Evidence for effectiveness	74
2.2.3. Mechanisms	76
Chapter Three Attention, multiple-task performance, and interference	
3.1. Attention processing	85
3.1.1. Control of stimulus selection: bottom-up biases and top-down control	86
3.1.2. Models of attention	88
3.2. Multiple-task performance	92
3.3. Task interference	94
3.4. Pain and attentional interference	96
3.4.1. Direct access to awareness	96
3.4.2. The interruptive quality of pain	97
3.4.2.1. Alternative research methodologies: The task paradigm	99
3.4.2.2. Factors that may modulate the interruptive quality of pain	99

	Page
3.5. Processing of emotion-arousing information and efficacy of emotion-arousing distractors	103
3.6. Neurophysiology of attentional processes	105
3.6.1. Posterior and anterior (fronto-limbic) attentional systems	105
3.6.2. Major functions of attention and their anatomical substrates	106
3.6.2.1. Orienting	106
3.6.2.2. Selection	107
3.6.2.3. Vigilance	107
3.6.3. Controlled and automatic processing: Event-related brain potentials studies of the different phases of attentional control with evidence for brain structures and neurotransmitter systems involved	108
3.6.3.1. Arousal and familiarisation to novel input: the habituation of the orienting reaction	109
3.6.3.2. Activation and readiness: the maintenance of targeted orienting	112
3.6.3.3. Comfort and effort: innovative attention	113
3.6.3.4. Summary	116
 Chapter Four Consciousness	
4.1. The search for a model of consciousness	118
4.2. Global Workspace theory	121
4.2.1. Why need for competition for access to the Global Workspace?	125
4.2.2. States of absorption	125
4.2.3. Hypnosis	126
4.2.4. Dissociation	127
4.2.5. Compliance and involuntariness	128
4.3. Neurobiological interpretation of Global Workspace theory	129
4.3.1. Support for access competition	129
4.3.2. Evidence of widespread dissimination of conscious information	130

Chapter Five Hypnosis

5.1.	The nature and characteristics of hypnotic phenomena	132
5.2.	Hypnotic susceptibility and its assessment	136
5.2.1.	The development and stability of hypnotic susceptibility	136
5.2.2.	Evidence for a genetic contribution	137
5.2.3.	Relationship to main personality dimensions	138
5.2.4.	Assessment and factor-analytic structure of hypnotic susceptibility	139
5.3.	Absorption	143
5.3.1.	Correlates of absorption	143
5.3.2.	Absorption and altered states of consciousness	144
5.3.3.	Possible moderators of the correlation between absorption and hypnotic susceptibility	145
5.3.4.	The spectral analysis of hypnotic performance with respect to absorption	146
5.3.5.	Dealing with the inherent conflict between suggested behaviour and actual experience	152
5.4.	Dissociation	154
5.5.	Unconscious influences in hypnosis	157
5.5.1.	Conscious and unconscious influences	157
5.5.2.	Efficacy of direct versus indirect suggestions	159
5.5.3.	Conclusions from experimental studies using the “real-simulator” control design	162
5.6.	Models of hypnotic responding	164
5.6.1.	Neodissociation theory	165
5.6.1.1.	Hilgard’s neodissociation model of hypnosis	165
5.6.1.2.	The dissociated-experience model	168
5.6.1.3.	The dissociated-control model	172
5.6.2.	The social psychological model	179
5.6.2.1.	Effortful goal directed actions and misattribution of experience	179

	Page
5.6.2.2. Further results from real-simulator control studies and conclusions reached	182
5.6.2.3. Critique of the social-psychological view of hypnosis	190
5.6.3. Predictions regarding attentional involvement	191
5.6.4. Signs of rapprochement: sociocognitive and dissociation explanations may apply to different ends of the continuum of hypnotic responding	193
5.7. The neuropsychophysiology of hypnosis	198
5.7.1. Evidence of neuropsychological changes during hypnosis	198
5.7.2. Evidence of neurophysiological changes during hypnosis	202
5.7.2.1. Do people with high and low hypnotic susceptibility differ in brain activity during the nonhypnotic state?	203
5.7.2.2. Are there changes in brain activity that distinguish hypnosis from the nonhypnotic state?	205
5.7.2.3. Do people with high and low hypnotic susceptibility show fundamental differences in the patterns of brain activity during hypnosis?	206
5.7.3. A neuropsychophysiological model of hypnosis	210
5.7.3.1. Summary of main findings leading to its development	210
5.7.3.2. Crawford et al's neuropsychophysiological model of hypnosis	212
Chapter Six The current study	
6.1. Miller and Bowers (1986, 1993)	214
6.2. Design of the current study	216
6.2.1. Methodological issues	216
6.2.1.1. Secondary attention-demanding task	217
6.2.1.2. Method of experimental pain stimulation	217
6.2.1.3. Experimental design	218
6.2.2. Comments on the rationale for the hypothesised interference effects	220
6.3. Hypotheses	223

*Method***Chapter Seven Screening for Hypnotic Ability**

7.1. Introduction	225
7.2. Initial Assessment	226
7.2.1. Subjects	226
7.2.2. Measures	227
7.2.2.1. Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility: Form A	227
7.2.2.2. Tellegen Absorption Scale	228
7.2.2.3. Toronto Alexithymia Scale	230
7.2.2. Procedure	230
7.3. Follow-up Assessment	231
7.3.1. Subjects	232
7.3.2. Measure - Waterloo-Stanford Group C Scale	232
7.3.3. Materials	234
7.3.4. Procedure	234

Chapter Eight Experimental Stage

8.1. Experimental design	237
8.2. Subjects	238
8.3. Apparatus	239
8.3.1. Pain stimulus delivery	239
8.3.2. Tracking task and control of pain stimulus delivery	241
8.4. Measures	243
8.4.1. Pain ratings (intensity and unpleasantness)	244
8.4.1.1. Pain intensity	244
8.4.1.2. Pain unpleasantness	245
8.4.2. Absorption in tracking task	245
8.4.3. Strategy use	245
8.4.4. Hypnotic depth	246

	Page
8.5. Procedure	248
8.5.1. Familiarisation	248
8.5.2. Assessment of individual pain levels - the pain-threshold and pain-tolerance trials	249
8.5.3. Main experiment	251
8.5.3.1. Nonhypnotic analgesia condition	251
8.5.3.2. Hypnotic analgesia condition	252

Results

Chapter Nine Tracking-Performance Data

9.1. Introduction	254
9.2. Tracking-performance data	255
9.2.1. Accuracy of input and missing data	255
9.2.2. Violations of assumptions	255
9.2.2.1. Normality	256
9.2.2.2. Homogeneity of variance	256
9.2.2.3. Transformation of variables	257
9.2.2.4. Random sample and independence of scores	259
9.2.3. Analysis	260
9.2.3.1. Data from full tracking wave for all three trials combined	260
9.2.3.2. Exploration of tracking-wave differences	266
9.2.3.2. Data from middle parts of tracking wave for all three trials combined	268
9.2.3.4. Data for middle parts of tracking wave for trial one only	272
9.3. Summary of main findings	278

12.2.4. Evidence arguing against the notion that the process of hypnosis does not require executive attentional effort 327

12.2.5. Final conclusion and recommendation 330

References 333

Appendices

Hypnotic Susceptibility Screening - Initial Assessment

1. Subject Information Sheet 428

2. Consent Form 430

Hypnotic Susceptibility Screening - Follow-up Assessment

3. Subject Information Sheet 431

4. Consent Form 432

Experimental Session

5. Subject Information Sheet 433

6. Consent Form 434

7. Medical Checklist 435

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
1.	Superficial layers of the dorsal horn receiving postsynaptic facilitation from tactile fibres and inhibition from nociceptive fibres. Deeper layers receiving postsynaptic facilitation from both noxious $A\delta$ and nonnoxious $A\alpha$ and $A\beta$ fibres. Substantia gelatinosa neurons presynaptically inhibit projection neurons. Output of projection neurons crosses to the other side of the spinal cord and ascends up the spinal column.	11
2.	Simplified schematic representation of the gate-control theory of pain transmission	12
3.	Major ascending and descending pathways in the central nervous system relating to nociception.	13
4.	Schematic representation of information processing in the neuromatrix.	42
5.	Relationship between basic constructs of Global Workspace theory with widely used equivalent terms.	122
6.	The spectrum of hypnotic performance.	146
7.	The spectral analysis of hypnotic performance with respect to absorption.	147
8.	Item-characteristic curve for Communication Inhibition suggestion, HGSHS:A.	148
9.	Item-characteristic curve for Music Hallucination suggestion, WSGS.	149
10.	Diagram depicting competition for limited resources between the attention-demanding requirements of pain processing and tracking-task performance.	220

	Page
11. Diagram depicting effective use of hypnotic suggestions by subjects with high hypnotic susceptibility, as hypothesised.	221
12. Diagram depicting the use of nonhypnotic strategies to cope with painful stimulation, while simultaneously performing an attention-demanding tracking task.	222
13. Experimental design showing all treatment combinations.	237
14. Electrode placement for iontophoretic pain stimulation, showing the anode bowl on the volar surface of the subject's arm.	241
15. Full tracking wave and block of three pain-stimulus trials for each condition.	243
16. Visual analogue scale for subjects' rating of pain intensity.	244
17. Difference in mean tracking-deviation scores between pain-off and pain-on situations for all treatment conditions by hypnotic ability. Data representing the full tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	263
18. Difference in mean tracking-deviation scores between treatments, for pain-on situations at both pain levels by hypnotic ability. Data representing the full tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	264
19. Between-treatment comparison of mean tracking-difference values, with 95% confidence intervals, at both pain levels by hypnotic ability. Data representing the full tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	266
20. Section of the tracking wave showing the division between extreme and middle parts of the waveform.	267

	Page
21. Difference in mean tracking-deviation scores between pain-off and pain-on situations for all treatment conditions by hypnotic ability. Data representing the middle parts of the tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	269
22. Difference in the mean tracking-deviation scores between treatments, for pain-on situations at both pain levels by hypnotic ability. Data representing the middle parts of the tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	270
23. Between-treatment comparison of mean tracking-difference values, with 95% confidence intervals, at both pain levels by hypnotic ability. Data representing the middle parts of the tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	272
24. Difference in mean tracking-deviation scores between pain-off and pain-on situations for all treatment conditions by hypnotic ability. Data representing the middle parts of the tracking wave for trial one only.	274
25. Difference in mean tracking-deviation scores, for pain-on situations at both pain levels by hypnotic ability. Data representing the middle parts of the tracking wave for trial one only.	275
26. Between-treatment comparison of mean tracking-difference values, with 95% confidence intervals, at both pain levels by hypnotic ability. Data representing the middle parts of the tracking wave for trial one only.	277
27. Mean pain-intensity ratings for both hypnotic-ability groups in all treatment conditions.	283
28. Mean pain-intensity ratings, with 95% confidence intervals, for both hypnotic-ability groups in treatment conditions with tracking task on.	284

	Page
29. Mean tracking-unpleasantness ratings for both hypnotic-ability groups in all treatment conditions.	287
30. Mean pain-unpleasantness ratings, with 95% confidence intervals, for both hypnotic-ability groups in treatment conditions with tracking task on.	288
31. Mean ratings for absorption in the tracking task, with 95% confidence intervals, for both hypnotic-ability groups in all treatment conditions.	290
32. Mean pain-intensity ratings for all treatment conditions by hypnotic depth.	296
33. Mean pain-unpleasantness ratings for all treatment conditions by hypnotic depth.	298
34. Distribution of item-pass percentages for HGSHS:A.	302
35. Distribution of item-pass percentages for WGSC by hypnotic-ability group.	307

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Contrasting capabilities of conscious and unconscious processes.	119
2.	Item difficulty, estimated item reliability, and biserial correlation with absorption for all items of HGSHS:A and WSGC.	148
3.	Correlation of trait and situational variables with hypnotic responsiveness as a function of hypnotisability level. Summary based on Kirsch, Silva, Comey, and Reed (1995), experiment 4.	151
4.	Stimulus delays and ramp rates for pain threshold-tolerance trials.	250
5.	Means and standard deviations of tracking-deviation scores in pain-off and pain-on situations for both hypnotic-ability groups in all treatment conditions. Data representing the full tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	262
6.	Mean tracking-performance scores for the difference between pain-off and pain-on situations. Data representing the full tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	265
7.	Means and standard deviations of tracking-performance scores for both hypnotic ability groups in all treatment conditions. Data representing the middle parts of the tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	269
8.	Mean tracking-performance scores for the difference between pain-off and pain-on situations. Data representing the middle parts of the tracking wave for all three stimulus trials combined.	271
9.	Means and standard deviations of tracking-performance scores for both hypnotic-ability groups in all treatment conditions. Data from the middle parts of the tracking wave for trial one only.	273

	Page
10. Mean tracking-performance scores for the difference between pain-off and pain-on situations. Data representing the middle parts of the tracking wave for trial one only.	276
11. Means and standard deviations of subjects' pain-intensity ratings for all treatment conditions by hypnotic ability.	282
12. Means and standard deviations of subjects' pain-unpleasantness ratings for all treatment conditions by hypnotic ability.	286
13. Means and standard deviations for absorption in tracking-task ratings for all treatment conditions by hypnotic-ability group.	289
14. Number of times subjects in both hypnotic-ability groups used deliberate pain-coping strategies in each treatment condition.	292
15. Means and standard deviations of subjects' pain-intensity ratings for all treatment conditions by hypnotic depth.	294
16. Means and standard deviations of subjects' pain-unpleasantness ratings for all treatment conditions by hypnotic depth.	297
17. Number and percentage of subjects that passed each item on HGSHS:A.	301
18. Item-pass percentages and rank order for current sample of the HGSHS:C, and normative data from Australian, Californian, and Harvard samples.	303
19. Item-pass percentages and rank order of item difficulty for the current sample of WGSC, a normative sample for WGSC, and a comparative sample using the SHSS:C	305

	Page
20. Item-pass data for WGSC by hypnotic-susceptibility group.	306
21. Means and standard deviations of pain reduction scores. From Eastwood, Gaskovski, and Bowers (1998).	325

PREFACE

For most people, myself included, the first contact with hypnosis is through watching a demonstration of hypnosis either on television or as part of a live audience. Such performances can be quite spectacular and are certainly entertaining. However, to me they remained interesting stage phenomena, much like those performed by a skilled magician, and did not arouse any scientific interest into hypnosis. Being interested in pain management thought, one sooner or later comes across accounts of hypnotic analgesia, that is the use of hypnotic suggestions to achieve relief of pain and distress. Whatever ones opinion about hypnosis, it has been thoroughly proven, both in clinical and experimental settings, that some people do achieve significant and clinically important benefits when using hypnotic suggestions over and above those available to the average person using nonhypnotic coping methods. The interesting question, which has been debated by some researchers for decades, is what are the processes whereby hypnotic analgesia is achieved, and are these fundamentally different from those involved in the execution of nonhypnotic coping strategies.

More recently, pain research has increasingly emphasised the role of attention in pain processing and in particular the ability of pain to have priority access to processing resources and dominate conscious processing at the expense of other activity. This interference with other ongoing activity is one of the major pain-related handicaps experienced by people with chronic pain. The concept of attention, and in particular the distinction between controlled and automatic processing, is crucial to an understanding of both pain processing and hypnosis and provides an important and fascinating approach for studying the two.

This thesis was written as part of a study investigating differences in attentional interference effects between hypnotic and nonhypnotic analgesia. The main hypothesis tested is whether: "Hypnotic analgesia, unlike nonhypnotic pain-coping strategies, can be achieved without reliance on high-order (executive) attentional resources and therefore results in no or only minimal interference with other ongoing and attention-demanding activities.

A proper understanding of this topic and the wider context wherein it occurs requires some knowledge of the following key aspects: (1) pain and pain management; (2) pain coping strategies; (3) attention, and in particular access to, and interference with, attentional resources in multiple task environments; (4) consciousness; and (5) hypnosis. The introduction to this thesis follows this outline.

Chapters one to six form the introduction. Some sections of the introduction provide additional and more in-depth information (particularly on the neurophysiology of pain, attention, and hypnosis) that are useful for a fuller appreciation of these topics and can assist the reader in understanding how these main aspects are linked together. However, strictly seen these are not necessary for a direct understanding of the main research question. For the convenience of the reader, these sections are marked with a red asterisk (*) following the section heading. They include sections 1.4, 3.6, 5.2, 5.5, 5.6.2.2., 5.7, and all of chapter 4.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the main aspects of our current understanding of pain processing and the control mechanisms involved. Particular reference is given to inhibitory control processes descending from cortical and subcortical brain structures. As Chapter 6 will show, there is evidence for hypnosis-related differences in the effectiveness of such inhibitory control mechanisms. The final section briefly covers how the advances in pain research have influenced pain management practices.

Section 1.4 * provides more in-depth information on the affective-emotional dimension of pain, on the changes that take place when a pain condition becomes chronic, and on the neurophysiology of cortical and subcortical brain structures involved in pain processing and responding. It is in the management of chronic pain where hypnotic analgesia may have its greatest advantage. The specific question of the current study is part of an underlying research effort to enhance our understanding of pain mechanisms and derive at more effective methods for the control of particularly chronic pain. Developments in the area of neurophysiology are leading to a more specific understanding of the theoretical mechanisms of pain, which in turn contributes to the development of more specific and effective pain management practices. It is for this reason that these areas are given substantial coverage in the introduction of this thesis.

Chapter 2 “Psychological methods of pain control” consists of two main parts. The first part introduces behavioural and cognitive pain coping strategies, highlights factors that may influence their utility, and evaluates evidence for the effectiveness of such strategies. It then describes some of the influences of anxiety on pain responding, outlines the cognitive costs of using attention diversion and pain suppression strategies, and contrasts the effectiveness of attention diversion versus sensation monitoring strategies. The second part describes the main characteristics of hypnotic analgesia, looks at both clinical and experimental evidence for its effectiveness, and outlines proposed mechanisms whereby hypnotic analgesia may reduce pain.

Chapter 3 “Attention, multi-task performance, and task interference.” This chapter briefly describes the main characteristics of information processing: competition for limited capacity processing resources, and the selection of information for further processing. It continues with a description of how this latter process is influenced by both bottom-up stimulus-driven biases and by top-down control. It then highlights the development of models of attention with particular reference to Shiffrin and Schneider’s (1977) distinction between controlled and automatic processing, and outlines the main components of Norman and Shallice’s (1986) hierarchical model of supervisory attentional control. This is followed by a description of how interference and the demands of concurrent task performance are treated by traditional limited-capacity models of attention, and by models based on multiple resource theory. The next section describes the interruptive quality of pain, its specific (hard-wired) capacity to capture attention, and factors that may moderate the interruption of ongoing activity. This is followed by a brief section on biases in the processing of emotion-arousing information and preliminary findings regarding the efficacy of distraction tasks with an emotional theme.

Section 3.6* deals with the neurophysiology of attention. This section reviews the different dimensions of attentional processing and their anatomical correlates, including arousal and targeted readiness which are also important aspects in pain processing, and novelty which is important for attentional capture and effective distraction strategies.

Particular attention is given to the mechanisms involved in the control of attention and findings supporting the existence of anterior and posterior attentional systems. This section provides a summary of the background knowledge that has led to the development of the neuropsychophysiological model of hypnosis described in section 5.7.3.2.

Chapter 4 briefly introduces the topic of consciousness and relates conscious and unconscious processes with respectively controlled and automatic attention. It does so with particular reference to Bernard Baars' Global Workspace theory of consciousness and briefly describes how this conceptualisation can be used to explain such phenomena as hypnosis, absorption, dissociation and involuntariness. Many actions and processes are either well established (learned and familiarised) or may be programmed (hard-wired) as is the case with pain so that they, once activated, can be executed on an automatic and subconscious level. As will be covered in section 5.6, some researchers and theorists argued that hypnosis is one of these processes.

Chapter 5 "Hypnosis" starts with a description of the nature and characteristics of hypnotic phenomena, and the factors that may contribute to the experience of hypnosis. The next three sections deal more in-depth with the three main factors: hypnotic susceptibility, absorption, and dissociation respectively.

Section 5.6 compares and critically evaluates the main models of hypnosis: the dissociated experience and dissociated control models and the social-psychological model of hypnosis, and the predictions they make regarding the involvement of attention. The next part highlights some more recent findings that indicate that the opposing views of social psychological and special process (i.e. dissociation) explanations both appear to apply, but at different ends of the continuum of hypnotic responding.

Section 5.2 ^{*} covers the assessment and measurement of hypnotic susceptibility. Experimental studies of hypnosis phenomena commonly use scores on standard hypnotic susceptibility scales as the criterion for allocating subjects to experimental conditions on the basis of their hypnotic ability. This section explores the argument as to how well such measures capture the important components of hypnotic responding.

This is relevant because there is increasing support for the notion that (1) individual differences in hypnotic responding reflect differences in kind (i.e., underlying mechanisms) rather than in dimension (i.e., position along the continuum of a single trait), and (2) there exist subsamples of highly hypnotisables exhibiting distinct patterns of responding and brain activity that are not differentiated by the standard hypnotic susceptibility tests which treat highly hypnotisables as a homogeneous group.

Section 5.5 * “Unconscious influences in hypnosis” indicates how human behaviour in general, and hypnotic responding in particular, can be influenced by information that is perceived and processed outside of normal conscious awareness. It highlights how the social psychological explanation of hypnosis emphasises the importance of Type I unconscious influences such as demand characteristics, expectancies, and social compliance; but, unlike the dissociation model of hypnosis, denies the influence of Type II unconscious influences involving genuine alterations in the way information is processed such as the down-regulation of nonessential functions and a shift towards increased primary process thinking. This section also reviews experimental research into the relative efficacy of direct and indirect hypnotic suggestions, and highlights how a type of control experiment called the real-simulator design can be used to assess the influence of demand characteristics.

Section 5.7 * It is the area of neurophysiological research that provides important new insights in the, otherwise largely stagnated, debate about the mechanisms underlying hypnotic responding in general and hypnotic analgesia in particular. This section reviews neurophysiological evidence for fundamental changes in brain activity that: (1) can distinguish the hypnotic from the nonhypnotic state, and (2) can distinguish between individuals with low and high hypnotic susceptibility in each of these states. It concludes with a summary of a neuropsychophysiological model of hypnosis that is based on the result of these studies.

Chapter 6 “The current study” starts with a description of the two studies by Miller and Bowers (1986; 1993) that form the basis for the current experiment.

This is followed by a description of the main aim of the current study and the ways in which the methodology was changed in an effort to increase the sensitivity of the design and allow for greater specificity when analysing the effects of the experimental manipulation. The last section outlines the specific hypotheses of the current study.

Chapters 7 and 8 make up the method section for respectively the hypnotic susceptibility screening stage and the experimental part of the study.

Chapters 9, 10, and 11 comprise the results section. Chapter 9 covers the results of analysis of tracking performance data relating to the main research question. Chapter 10 lists the results of the assessment of pain intensity and pain unpleasantness ratings as well as data on subjects' level of absorption, strategy use, and hypnotic depth. Chapter 11 briefly summarises the results of hypnotic susceptibility measurements during the screening part of the study. The data in Chapters 10 and 11 does not directly relate to the main research question, but does provide additional information used in interpreting the results and supports the arguments made and conclusions reached in the discussion section.

Chapter 12 starts with a discussion of results relating to the main research question (hypotheses 1 and 2) and evaluates possible reasons for the absence of hypothesised differences in interference effects. The effectiveness of the tracking task is examined with reference to the characteristics of attentional capture of visual motion, and recommendations are made for future research and improvements to the current design. This is followed by a discussion of the analyses of pain ratings (hypotheses 3 and 4). Finally, recent research of attentional processing during hypnosis is evaluated with particular emphasis on neuroimaging studies providing direct measures of localised cortical activation during hypnosis and performance of attention-demanding tasks.

ABSTRACT

There is substantial evidence that hypnotic analgesia can be effective in reducing pain and distress in both experimental and clinical settings in at least a sizeable portion of the population. However, the mechanism whereby hypnosis achieves this are not well-understood and various explanations have been proposed. These offer fundamentally different predictions about the attentional involvement of hypnotic analgesia, which are highly relevant to pain research as the disruption of ongoing activity is one of the more debilitating aspects of pain. While cognitive-behavioural coping strategies may attenuate pain of short duration, their effortful deployment further interferes with ongoing activity, and there are strong indications that their effectiveness rather rapidly decreases as pain perseveres. If, as dissociated-control theory proposes, hypnotic analgesia does not require attentional effort for its execution, it would provide significant advantages for individuals who can effectively achieve it (i.e., those who are highly susceptible to hypnotic suggestions). This hypothesis was further tested in an experimental study using a dual-task scenario and repeated-measures design. One hundred and ninety student volunteers were first screened for hypnotic susceptibility using the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility: Form A, and seventy-eight also completed a more demanding follow-up assessment using the Waterloo-Stanford Group C scale. This resulted in fifty individuals who qualified for participation in the experimental part of the study by scoring as either high or low hypnotisable on both these measures. Of these, 12 lows and 14 highs went on to take part in an experimental study that had high and low hypnotisables performed a cognitively demanding tracking task while using either hypnotic analgesia or cognitive-behavioural strategies to cope with iontophoretically administered pain. Interruption of tracking performance during each coping method was used as a measure of central attentional resources needed to execute that coping strategy. Results did not find evidence for the hypothesised absence of interference effects among high hypnotisables using hypnotic analgesia. Possible reasons are examined and exploration of data indicates that the tracking task was not difficult enough to require significant and continuous attention, and lacked sensitivity to distinguish interference effects between treatment conditions.

Findings do not allow a conclusion of support for either explanation of the mechanisms underlying effective hypnotic analgesia. Highly hypnotisable subjects using hypnotic analgesia did achieve significantly greater reductions in both the intensity and unpleasantness of the pain than low hypnotisables using hypnotic analgesia or high and low hypnotisables using cognitive-behavioural coping strategies. Characteristics of the attentional capture of visual motion are discussed and suggestions made for future research and improvements to the design of the current study. Considerable attention is given to findings of a large body of neurophysiological studies of brain activity and a proposed neuropsychophysiological model of hypnosis. When combined, results of these studies indicate that: the mechanisms of attentional control involved in the process of hypnosis are fundamentally different from those involved in the use of standard cognitive-behavioural strategies, but that both processes do require central attentional effort and resources.