



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Otgaar, H., Wang, J., Dodier, O., Howe, M. L. ORCID: 0000-0002-5747-5571, Lilienfeld, S., Loftus, E., Lynn, S., Merckelbach, H. and Patihis, L. (2020). Skirting the Issue: What Does Believing in Repression Mean?. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*,

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/24805/>

Link to published version:

Copyright and reuse: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

**Skirting the Issue:
What Does Believing in Repression Mean?**

Henry Otgaar^{1,2,3}, Jianqin Wang⁹, Olivier Dodier⁸, Mark L. Howe^{1,2}, Scott O. Lilienfeld⁴,
Elizabeth F. Loftus⁵, Steven Jay Lynn⁶, Harald Merckelbach¹, and Lawrence Patihis⁷

¹Maastricht University, The Netherlands

²City, University of London, UK

³Catholic University of Leuven. Belgium

⁴Emory University; University of Melbourne

⁵University of California, Irvine

⁶Binghamton University

⁷University of Portsmouth

⁸Faculté de Psychologie, Université de Nantes, Nantes, France

⁹Fudan University, China

Correspondence should be sent to: Henry Otgaar, Henry.Otgaar@maastrichtuniversity.nl,
Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, section Forensic Psychology, Maastricht University or
Lawrence Patihis, Lawrence.patihis@port.ac.uk, Department of Psychology, University of
Portsmouth.

IN PRESS: *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*

Accepted August 10, 2020

Skirting the Issue:

What Does Believing in Repression Mean?

In their reply, Brewin et al. (in press) criticized us for relying on a single questionnaire item to measure repression. Brewin and colleagues have, intentionally or not, skirted the core issue animating our critique. Our goal was not to measure repression in multiple ways, but to correct the shortcomings in Brewin et al.'s (2019) study. Although they claimed to examine unconscious repression, they did not include the term “unconscious repression.” Furthermore, although they criticized previous survey research on repression for lacking “sound methodology,” their design did not allow for clear conclusions regarding what people mean when they say they believe in repression. Hence, we improved on their design (Otgaar et al., in press) and, together with an extended replication of our work (Dodier et al., 2020), found that many people indeed believe in unconscious repression, even more so than in deliberate suppression (see Dodier et al., 2020).

We believe that the burden of proof falls on Brewin et al. to demonstrate what people mean when they say that they believe in repression. As a first step in this direction, we conducted a new study that included additional statements assessing what people mean when they endorse the view that traumatic memories can be repressed. We recruited 1015 participants using MTurk (mean age = 42, *SD* = 14; 52% female)¹. We administered a questionnaire on memory beliefs along with follow-up questions. The critical statement was “Traumatic memories are often repressed” (six-point Likert scale 1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). If people agreed

¹ A full description of the study can be found in the online Supplemental Materials (<https://osf.io/puzdy/>)

BELIEFS ABOUT REPRESSED MEMORIES

with this statement, they received follow-up questions regarding whether traumatic memories are (a) accessible during repression and (b) unconscious during repression. We found that 89.5% ($n = 909$) agreed to some extent that traumatic memories can be repressed and of those, 73.7% ($n = 670$) agreed that such memories are inaccessible, and 80.9% ($n = 735$) agreed that such memories are unconscious. Both answers on the follow-up questions are strongly consistent with the concept of unconscious repression.

We have provided the first evidence that, *contra* Brewin et al., when additional items are asked, large proportions of laypersons endorse the concept of unconscious repression. Given the weak scientific evidence supporting unconscious repression of autobiographical memories, the apparent strong belief in unconscious repression among much of the general public, and the potential hazards associated with this belief (e.g., uncritical acceptance of suggestive therapeutic techniques to exhume otherwise inaccessible memories of trauma), our findings provide further grounds for warning researchers, legal professionals, and clinicians against referring to the concept of unconscious repression in their work.

References

- Brewin, C.R., Li, H., Ntarantana, V., Unsworth, C., & McNeilis, J. (in press). On repression, and avoiding red herrings. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.
- Brewin, C.R., Li, H., Ntarantana, V., Unsworth, C., & McNeilis, J. (2019). Is the public understanding of memory prone to widespread “myths”? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *148*, 2245-2257.
- Dodier, O., Gilet, A., & Colombel, F. (2020, July 24). What do people really think of when they claim to believe in repressed memory? Methodological middle ground and applied issues. Preprint available at <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/4qrny>
- Otgaar, H., Wang, J., Howe, M. L., Lilienfeld, S. O., Loftus, E. F., Lynn, S. J., . . . Patihis, L. (in press). Belief in unconscious repressed memory is widespread: A comment on Brewin, Li, Ntarantana, Unsworth, and McNeilis (2019). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.