

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.

Running head: EYE MOVEMENTS AND THE MISINFORMATION EFFECT

The Effect of Eye Movements on Traumatic Memories and the Susceptibility to
Misinformation: A Partial Replication

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

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

at Massey University, Manawatū, New Zealand

Olivia Sievwright

2018

Copyright is owned by the Author of this 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.

Abstract

The issue of whether certain techniques used in psychotherapy might increase false memories is a major source of contention between cognitive and practising psychologists. Recently, a study by Houben, Otgaar, Merckelbach, and Roelofs (2018) found that bilateral eye movements used in Eye Movement Desensitisation and Reprocessing (EMDR) therapy increase susceptibility to misleading information. EMDR is a popular treatment for posttraumatic stress disorder and is primarily thought to reduce the vividness and emotional intensity of traumatic memories. Individuals who undergo EMDR therapy may be more susceptible to misinformation that is inadvertently introduced by the therapist due to reductions in memory vividness. Despite strong theoretical links between eye movements and false memories, few studies have investigated this effect. The current study addressed this issue by attempting to replicate the study by Houben et al. (2018). This study also investigated the working memory account underlying EMDR by comparing eye movements to an alternative dual-task. An initial pilot study comprising a reaction time task established that attentional breathing taxed working memory most comparably to bilateral eye movements. The main study predicted that eye movements would increase susceptibility to misinformation and that eye movements and attentional breathing would lead to comparable reductions in memory vividness and emotionality. 94 students ($M_{\text{age}} = 25.74$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 9.68$) were recruited to participate in the study at Massey University, Manawātū, New Zealand. Participants viewed a five-minute video depicting a serious car accident. Afterwards, they were randomly assigned to perform either eye movements, attentional breathing, or a control task while simultaneously recalling the car accident. Participants rated the vividness and emotionality of their memory before and after performing the tasks. All participants then received misinformation about the video before completing a

recognition test. Results indicated that the misinformation effect was not replicated, with no effect of eye movements on susceptibility to false memories. Findings also suggested that eye movements and attentional breathing were ineffective in reducing the vividness and emotional intensity of the trauma memory. The present study raises questions about the validity of materials and procedures used to instil the misinformation effect. Limitations of the study and key areas for improvement are considered for further investigation.

Acknowledgements

Behind the scenes of this research has been the unwavering support, encouragement, and guidance from many people. This page is dedicated to those who have contributed to my academic endeavours this year. First and foremost, I am incredibly honoured to have been supervised by Dr Michael Philipp. Your expertise, support, and enthusiasm has motivated me to continue developing my abilities as a researcher, writer, and psychologist-to-be. I am especially grateful for all of the opportunities that have been afforded to me while under your guidance— completing my own research is something I never dreamed of until becoming involved with the Social Cognition Lab. A huge thank you goes to my co-supervisor, Katie Knapp— your knowledge, advice, and reassurance has been invaluable for me this year. I would like to acknowledge Professor Maryanne Garry from the University of Waikato for providing the inspiration for this research and sharing her expertise.

A very special mention goes to my mum, Leanne, my dad, Andrew, and my brother, Jacob. I am tremendously fortunate to have a family that is so understanding of the stresses that postgraduate study can bring. You have always supported me in whatever I do, and I cannot express how grateful I am for this. I know you admire my work ethic and determination— these are qualities I have learned from you all in your own successful careers. Without your love, support, guidance, and great sense of humour I know I wouldn't be the person I am today. Thank you also to my friends, especially Rebe, Cassie, Ross, and Api for your reassurance and the much-needed banter and humour in amongst the stress. Cassie, you have gone beyond the call of duty as my friend this year— from proof-reading my work to the many coffee runs— I am appreciative of all of your support. Lastly, thank you to each of my participants, I (quite literally) could not have done this without you.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	xiii
List of Figures	xiv
CHAPTER 1.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Conceptualisation of False Memories.....	2
Key Characteristics of False Memories	4
Phenomenological quality of memory.....	5
Working memory capacity and false memories.....	7
Overview of False Memory Theory.....	8
Associative activation theory.....	8
Source monitoring framework.....	10
Fuzzy trace theory.....	13
False Memories in Therapy.....	15
Eye Movement Desensitisation and Reprocessing Therapy	17
Effectiveness of EMDR Therapy.....	18
Impact on memory vividness and emotionality.....	18

Theories Underpinning EMDR	21
Adaptive information processing model.	22
Investigatory reflex/orienting response hypothesis.....	23
Interhemispheric interaction account.	24
Working memory account.	25
EMDR and working memory capacity.	28
Divided Attention and False Memories	29
Eye Movements and False Memory	32
Methodology for the Current Study.....	35
Overview of the Current Research	36
CHAPTER 2.....	38
Pilot Study: A Preliminary Test of the Working Memory Account... 38	38
Aims.....	38
Hypotheses	39
Hypothesis 1	39
Hypothesis 2.	39
Hypothesis 3.	39
Method.....	39
Pre-registration	39
Design	40

Participants 40

Measures and Materials 41

Random interval repetition task. 41

Horizontal eye movement stimuli. 42

Vertical eye movement stimuli. 43

Attentional breathing task..... 44

Procedure..... 44

Training session. 44

Experiment process. 45

Results..... 46

Data Preparation and Analyses..... 46

Hypothesis Testing 47

Summary of Pilot Results..... 50

CHAPTER 3..... 53

Main Experiment 53

Overview of the Literature 53

Aims of the Study 54

Hypotheses 55

Hypothesis 1: Memory vividness ratings. 55

Hypothesis 2: Memory emotionality ratings. 56

Hypothesis 3: Recognition test scores..... 58

Hypothesis 4: Endorsement of misinformation 59

CHAPTER 4..... 61

Experiment Method 61

Pre-registration 61

Design 62

Participants 62

Measures and Materials 63

 Operation Span task. 63

 Trauma video. 66

 Eye movement stimulus. 66

 Attentional breathing task..... 66

 Recall-only task. 67

 Maze filler-task. 67

 Vividness rating scale..... 68

 Emotionality rating scale..... 68

 Misinformation narrative..... 68

 Recognition test. 69

Procedure 69

 Greeting and introduction..... 69

 Experiment process. 70

Post-experiment debrief..... 73

CHAPTER 5..... 74

Experiment Results 74

Data Preparation 74

Assumption Checks 75

Inference Criteria..... 76

Hypothesis Testing 79

Memory vividness ratings..... 79

 Moderating effect of working memory capacity..... 82

Memory emotionality ratings..... 86

 Moderating effect of working memory capacity..... 89

Recognition test performance..... 91

Endorsement of misinformation..... 94

 Moderating effect of working memory capacity..... 95

Exploratory Data Analyses..... 98

 Assumption checks..... 99

 Recognition test performance..... 99

 Endorsement of misinformation..... 100

Brief Summary of Results 101

CHAPTER 6..... 103

Discussion 103

 Summary of Key Findings 103

 Implications for EMDR Therapy..... 104

 Effects of eye movements on traumatic memories..... 105

 Working memory theory of EMDR..... 108

 Do eye movements increase susceptibility to misinformation? 111

 Implications for False Memory Research 114

 Retention interval for misinformation..... 114

 Recognition test. 116

 Divided attention and false memories..... 117

 Limitations of the Current Study and Future Directions 118

 Concluding Comments..... 122

References 124

Appendices 143

 Appendix A 143

 Instructions for the Attentional Breathing Practice Task 143

 Appendix B 144

 Rating Scales for Memory Emotionality and Vividness..... 144

 Appendix C 145

 Misinformation Manipulation..... 145

 Appendix D 147

Recognition Test 147

Appendix E 149

 Confirmatory Analysis Data 149

Appendix F 155

 Exploratory Analysis Data 155

List of Tables

Table 1.	Gender and Mean Age of Participants in the Attentional Breathing Group, Eye Movement Group, and Recall-Only Control Group.	63
Table 2.	Results from Levene's Test of Equality of Variances for the Dependent Variables.....	76
Table 3.	Unstandardized (B) and Standardized (β) Coefficients for the Moderating Effect of Working Memory Capacity on the Relationship Between Condition and Change in Memory Vividness.	85
Table 4.	Unstandardized (B) and Standardized (β) Coefficients for the Moderating Effect of Working Memory Capacity on the Relationship Between Condition and Change in Memory Emotionality.....	90
Table 5.	Unstandardized (B) and Standardized (β) Coefficients for the Moderating Effect of Working Memory Capacity on the Relationship Between Condition and Endorsement of Misinformation.	97

List of Figures

Figure 1. Structure of nodes within a concept network according to the spreading activation theory of memory..... 10

Figure 2. Opposing processes involved in the investigatory reflex/orienting response hypothesis..... 24

Figure 3. Orders of conditions for each group using Balanced Latin Squares design. 40

Figure 4. Tasks used in the pilot study testing working memory taxation. Each task was performed during the RIR reaction time task. The white arrows signify movement and were not displayed during the experiment. 43

Figure 5. Means and standard deviations (*SD*) of reaction times (ms) in the attentional breathing, horizontal eye movement, reaction-time only, and vertical eye movement tasks..... 48

Figure 6. The hypothesised moderating effect of working memory capacity on memory vividness ratings across experimental conditions. 56

Figure 7. The hypothesised moderating effect of working memory capacity on memory emotionality ratings across experimental conditions. 58

Figure 8. The hypothesised moderating effect of working memory capacity on endorsement of misinformation across experimental conditions. 60

Figure 9. Illustration of the sequence of tasks in the OSPAN. (a) shows the sequence of events during the study phase, (b) shows the test phase, where participants recalled the letters they saw during the study phase.. 64

Figure 10. Sequence of tasks that participants completed in the main experiment for the current study..... 71

Figure 11. Group means for memory vividness ratings at pre- and post- intervention. 80

Figure 12. Mean working memory capacity scores and mean math errors on the OSPAN for each group. OSPAN scores are based on absolute scores. Error bars show 95% confidence intervals..... 83

Figure 13. Group means for memory emotionality at pre- and post- intervention.... 87

Figure 14. Means of correct answers and misinformation answers for the attentional breathing group, eye movement group, and control group. 92

Figure 15. Scatterplot of the relationship between working memory capacity (OSPAN absolute scores) and the number of misinformation answers for each experimental group. 98

Figure 16. Comparisons of mean correct answers and mean misinformation answers between the current study and Houben et al. (2018) study.. 100

Figure E1. Boxplots for the pre- (top) and post- (bottom) intervention memory vividness rating scales in each condition. 149

Figure E2. Boxplots for the pre- (top) and post- (bottom) intervention memory emotionality rating scales in each condition. 150

Figure E3. Boxplots for recognition test accuracy in each condition. 151

Figure E4. Boxplots for misinformation answers in each condition..... 151

Figure E5. Boxplots for working memory capacity absolute scores on the OSPAN in each condition..... 152

Figure E6. Modified Brinley plot showing change in memory vividness ratings from pre-intervention to post-intervention in each experimental group. 153

Figure E7. Modified Brinley plot showing change in memory emotionality ratings from pre-intervention to post-intervention in each experimental group. The diagonal line is the line of no change..... 154

Figure F1. Boxplots for recognition test accuracy in Houben et al.'s (2018) study for the eye movement and control conditions..... 155

Figure F2. Boxplots for total misinformation answers in Houben et al.'s (2018) study for the eye movement and control conditions..... 155