

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 Warning Participants Attenuate the Retrieval-Enhanced
Suggestibility Effect? Exploring a Retrieval Fluency
Explanation**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

**Master of Science
in
Psychology**

at Massey University, Manawatū,
New Zealand.

Amanda Naus

2014

Abstract

The purpose of the current research was to explore a retrieval fluency explanation for the retrieval-enhanced suggestibility (RES) effect and to investigate whether the RES effect can be reduced with a warning. Participants were a volunteer sample of 91 people between 18 and 45 from across New Zealand, recruited via social media and word of mouth. A 3 x 2 x 2 factorial design was used, with participants being assigned to either the single testing or repeated testing condition, and either the warning or no warning condition. Item type (misinformation, consistent, or control) was manipulated within-subjects. Participants watched a video, then either took a 15 question forced-choice test or played the video game Tetris. All participants then read a summary of the video event, which contained some misleading information. Participants in the warning conditions were then warned the information may not be accurate. After watching a distractor video, all participants completed the same 15 question forced-choice test that has been used earlier. Average hit rates, confidence ratings, and response latencies were measured. It was hypothesised that participants in the repeated testing condition would report more of the misinformation and consistent items on the final test, compared to participants in the single testing condition, but only for participants who were not warned. It was also hypothesised that participants in the repeated testing condition would have higher confidence, and faster response latencies, for misinformation and consistent items, than participants in the single testing condition, but only for participants who were not warned. Results showed there was limited evidence for the RES effect, and some evidence for a response

fluency-based explanation for the RES effect. The mixed support for the various hypotheses was discussed along with the limitations of the current research, and recommendations for future research.

Acknowledgements

I am using this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to everyone who supported me throughout this research project. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Stephen Hill. Without his assistance and dedicated involvement throughout every step of the process, this project would not have been possible. Thank you for your guidance, encouragement and expert advice.

I would also like to thank Malcolm Loudon for his expertise in developing the technical applications necessary for this project to proceed.

I would like to thank my husband, Phillip, for his endless support and encouragement. Finally, I would like to thank all of the family and friends who supported me, and who were kind enough to lend their time to take part in this study, thereby contributing to this important field of psychology.

The materials and procedures used in this project were evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, this project was not reviewed by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee.

Table of Contents

Abstract	I
Acknowledgement	III
Table of Contents	IV
List of Tables	VII
CHAPTER ONE	1
Introduction	1
CHAPTER TWO	4
Literature Review	4
Introduction.....	4
Misinformation Effect.....	5
Testing effect.....	7
Retrieval-Enhanced Suggestibility Effect.....	8
Theoretical Explanations and Cognitive Mechanisms Underlying RES	14
Warning Participants about Possible Inaccuracies	19
Retrieval Fluency	25
Summary and Hypotheses	29
CHAPTER THREE	32
Method	32
Participants.....	32
Materials and Procedure	33
CHAPTER FOUR	36
Results	36

Introduction.....	36
Initial analyses.....	36
Normality.	36
<i>Average hit rate</i>	37
<i>Average false recognition of misinformation</i>	37
<i>Average confidence ratings</i>	38
<i>Average confidence ratings for misleading questions</i>	39
<i>Average reaction time scores</i>	39
<i>Average reaction time scores for misleading trials</i>	40
Homogeneity of variance.....	41
Homogeneity of intercorrelations.	41
Main Findings.....	42
Recognition accuracy.	42
False recognition associated with misleading questions.....	45
Confidence ratings.	46
Confidence on misleading trials.....	50
Response latency.	52
Response latency for misleading trials.	54
Summary.....	56
CHAPTER FIVE.....	58
Discussion.....	58
Discussion of Main Findings.	59
Recognition accuracy/RES effect findings.....	59

Confidence findings.	68
Response latency findings.....	71
Limitations to the current study and recommendations for future research.....	74
Summary and Conclusions	77
References	79
List of Appendices	95

List of Tables

Table 4.1	Average hit rates on the final test as a function of test condition, warning, and item type.....	42
Table 4.2	Average false recognition of misinformation associated with misleading questions	45
Table 4.3	Mean confidence (0-100) associated with the final test as a function of warning, test condition and response type.	46
Table 4.4	Mean confidence scores (0-100) associated with recognition decisions for misleading responses	50
Table 4.5	Mean response latencies (in ms) associated with the final test as a function of warning, test condition and response type.....	52
Table 4.6	Mean response latencies (in ms) associated with recognition decisions on misleading questions.	54