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THE EFFECT OF QUESTION FORMAT ON RESISTANCE TO MISLEADING POSTEVENT INFORMATION AND SELF-REPORTS OF EVENTS OCCURRING DURING HYPNOSIS

MITCHELL L. EISEN, MAKA OUSTINOVSKAYA, ROSE KISTORIAN, DANIELLE Y. MORGAN, AND LAURA MICKES¹,²

California State University, Los Angeles, California, USA

Abstract: Participants were administered a standard tape-recorded version of the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility, Form A (HGSHS:A) and then a modified version of the HGSHS:A response booklet that asked each participant to report which suggested behaviors they performed during the procedures. These response booklets were altered to include 3 additional suggestions not offered during the hypnotic procedures. Half the participants were administered the questions in the response booklet in the standard format (“I performed the suggested behavior” versus “I did not perform the suggested behavior”). The remaining participants were offered a third alternative to each question (“I do not remember this occurring”). As predicted, participants offered the 3rd alternative were significantly less likely to report performing actions that were never suggested during the procedures. Further, these participants reported performing fewer suggested behaviors (i.e., reported passing fewer of the true Harvard items) than participants in the standard 2-alternative condition.

Group measures of hypnotic responsivity are commonly used as research tools, and the reliability of the self-reports yielded with these instruments is rarely questioned. The utility of any group measure must be founded on the notion that self-reports of hypnotic responding are indeed accurate, or at least not significantly different from ratings that would be gathered through direct observation. The question
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arises, however, whether the conditions surrounding the administration of the measure (e.g., observation versus no observation) and the way in which the self-reports of hypnotic performance are gathered (the way the questions are posed) could to some degree compromise the test’s ability to render fully accurate appraisals of hypnotizability (i.e., the test’s construct validity).

To explore these issues, we must first consider the basic methods involved in assessing hypnotic performance in a group format. Group measures of hypnotizability typically involve a scripted induction (often tape-recorded), followed by a series of directions for the participants to either experience sensory events or to perform various behaviors, and to involuntarily experience these thoughts or actions. From a source-monitoring perspective, the instructions to vividly imagine the hypnotic items should create a sense of familiarity so that if pressed, one might say they performed a behavior when in fact they did not (Johnson, Hastrudi, & Lindsay, 1993). This is of particular concern, because scores on these group-administered scales of hypnotizability are generally based solely on self-reports, and there is usually no actual verification that the actions were indeed performed. Essentially, we are relying on the participants’ memory without corroboration for the events that took place during the hypnotic procedures. Further problems arise when instructions are given for participants to simply guess if they do not remember whether they passed an item or not. Not surprisingly, the relationship between observer ratings and self-reports of actions performed on group administered hypnotizability scales varies greatly across studies with correlations reported as low as .53 for a sample of males (Levitt, Arnoff, & Morgan, 1974) to as high as .83 for all subjects across gender.

Eisen (1996) directly examined the effects of observation on hypnotic performance and found that obtrusively observed subjects scored significantly lower on the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility, Form A (HGSHS:A; Shor & Orne, 1962) compared to nonobserved subjects. Eisen proposed that observed subjects were more conservative in their self-reports of actions performed while under hypnosis due to the clear verifiability of the events. In contrast, nonobserved subjects should be more liberal in their self-reports, since there is no apparent way to verify their actions. Based on Eisen’s findings, it seems that even high correlations between observer and self-reports might be artificially inflated due to more conservative reporting by subjects evidenced in observation conditions.

**The Effect of Question Format on Self-Reports of Hypnotic Behavior: How You Ask the Question Counts**

In one of the most commonly used group measures of hypnotic suggestibility, the HGSHS:A, the assessment of hypnotic responding is
measured by asking the participants a series of two-alternative forced-choice questions designed to assess whether they responded to the suggestions offered during the procedure. Specifically, each participant is asked to indicate which of the behaviors they performed or events they experienced in response to the directed suggestions offered during the procedures. This involves asking each person for a self-report of their memory for the events that took place during the hypnotic procedures. When using the HGSHS:A, the participants are asked a series of two-alternative forced-choice questions (*I did the suggested behavior versus I did not do the suggested behavior*). Even if the participant has no memory for what occurred, they must answer the question, *yes* or *no*, because no other alternative is offered (such as *I do not remember*).

**Guessing and confabulation.** There is good reason to believe that this type of dichotomous forced-choice question format might lead to overreporting the behaviors performed and even some degree of confabulation. In articulating his theory of interrogative suggestibility, Gudjonsson proposes that forced-choice yes/no type questions can lead to an acquiescent response bias and increased guessing behavior (Gudjonsson, 1986; Gudjonsson & Clark, 1986). Gudjonsson asserts that when a person is uncertain about the memory in question and is pressed to choose, suggestibility will be increased and acquiescence is potentiated. Hastie, Landsman, and Loftus (1978) demonstrated this effect in a study where they asked participants to recall unanswerable questions about an event (elements of an event that never happened). The investigators found that when participants were given a forced-choice recognition test and asked to guess if they were unsure, they were more likely to falsely say that they remembered objects that were never actually seen, than if they were not pressed to guess. The HGSHS:A uses this very type of two-alternative forced-choice question format to assess self-reports of hypnotic suggestibility. In fact, the HGSHS:A instructions specifically ask participants to answer all questions even if they are unsure. Embedded in the instructions is an implied direction to guess even if one is not confident in one’s memory for the event in question.

Eisen (1996) demonstrated how self-reports of hypnotic performance on the HGSHS:A can be manipulated rather easily by asking subjects whether they performed suggestions that were never actually made during the hypnotic procedures. Eisen modified the response booklets of the HGSHS:A to include questions related to three actions that were never suggested during the hypnotic procedures. These three items asked the participants if they clenched their fist, elevated their arm or were unable to move their leg when suggestions to perform these actions were allegedly made during the hypnotic
Eisen found that a surprisingly large percentage of participants reported engaging in at least one of these suggested nonevents (57%).

Eisen proposed that erroneous reports of participating in the suggested nonevents were the result of an affirmative response bias, caused by the overly restrictive nature of the two-alternative forced-choice question format. This interpretation of the data would indicate that when the participants were not clear about exactly what they did and were pressed to choose between the two alternatives, they often acquiesced, resulting in inflated self-reports of hypnotic responding.

The current study was designed to extend Eisen’s (1996) work by examining the effects of question format on college students’ resistance to misleading information. This was accomplished by replicating Eisen’s procedures, while varying the format of the questions posed in the response booklet. Two main hypotheses were set forth. It was predicted that participants who were offered the standard two-alternative forced-choice format would be significantly more likely to report engaging in behaviors that they were never directed to perform than participants who were explicitly offered a third alternative to say that they do not remember the suggestions being made during the hypnotic procedures. Second, we predicted that participants who were explicitly offered the opportunity to say that they do not remember suggestions being made during the hypnotic procedures would also be less likely to report performing suggestions that were actually made (i.e., they would report passing fewer true Harvard items), than participants who were offered the standard two-alternative forced-choice options.

**METHOD**

**Participants**

Participants were 166 undergraduate students from a community college in the Chicago area (52 males, 114 females) ranging in age from 18 to 76 ($M = 26.44$, $SD = 4.67$). The students were all recruited from undergraduate psychology classes and received extra credit for their participation.

**Procedures**

All participants were administered a tape-recorded version of the HGSHS:A. These students were run in groups ranging in number from 4 to 40. Immediately following the tape-recorded procedures, all participants were provided with a modified version of the HGSHS:A response booklet that asked each participant to report which suggested behaviors they performed. For the purposes of this study, these response booklets were modified to include three additional
suggested behaviors that were never offered during the hypnotic procedures (the suggested nonevents). The three items asked the participants if they clenched their fist, elevated their arm, or were unable to move their leg when these behaviors were supposedly suggested during the hypnotic procedures (see Appendix). The three items were inserted into the Harvard response booklet as Questions 8, 11, and 13, raising the number of total items in the booklet from 11 to 14 (not including the amnesia item).

Participants were administered the response booklet under one of two conditions. The control group \((n = 80)\) was administered the response booklet in standard format that offers two alternatives to each item (I performed the suggested behavior versus I did not perform the suggested behavior). The experimental group \((n = 86)\) was offered three alternatives to each item (I performed the suggested behavior, I did not perform the suggested behavior, and I do not remember this occurring). After the administration of the response booklet, each subject was given a checklist that listed all of the items in the response booklet (including the suggested nonevents) and was asked to circle any items that they do not remember occurring during the procedures. Finally, the participants were asked to return the following week for a different experiment (Eisen & Carlson, 1998). As part of those procedures, all subjects were told that they reported performing at least one action that was never suggested during the procedures. The participants were asked to indicate if they were aware that some of the items were fakes and if they realized this at the time they were responding. They were then asked to write down why they thought they made this error.

**RESULTS**

Overall, more than half of the participants \((57.5\%)\) reported engaging in at least one of the three suggested nonevents. Participants in the two-alternative forced-choice conditions were far more likely to report engaging in at least one of the suggested nonevents \((90.3\%)\) than those in the third-alternative condition \((32.4\%)\), where they were explicitly given the opportunity to say that they do not remember the suggestion being made as a response option. Table 1 presents the percentage of participants who report performing 0, 1, 2, or 3 of the suggested nonevents for each of the groups (two-alternative controls versus third-alternative experimental group). Table 2 shows the percentage of participants in each group who reported passing, not passing, or not remembering each item.

To examine errors on the misleading suggestions, the questions with three alternatives (yes, no, I do not remember) were recoded to form a dichotomous variable. This was accomplished by combining the no and don’t remember responses, because they both represented correct
rejections of the misleading presuppositions embedded in the items asking about participation in the suggested nonevents (performed the suggested behavior, versus did not perform the behavior or do not remember). The no and don’t remember responses were also grouped together for the 11 standard Harvard items and scored as indications that the behaviors were not performed.

**Table 1**

*Frequency of Suggested Nonevents Reportedly Performed by Question Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 Errors</th>
<th>1 Error</th>
<th>2 Errors</th>
<th>3 Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-alternative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(9.7%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-alternative</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(66.7%)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(26.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Effects of Hypnotizability and Question Format on Self-Reports of Engaging in the Suggested Nonevents

A 2 (question format: two vs. three alternatives) × 3 (hypnotizability: high, medium, low) factorial ANOVA was performed to examine the relative contributions of question type and hypnotizability on participants’ self-reports of engaging in the suggested nonevents. As predicted, a main effect for question format was revealed, as participants who were offered the third I do not remember alternative reported that they engaged in significantly fewer of the three suggested nonevents on average, M = 0.43, SD = 0.71, compared to participants who were only offered the standard two forced-choice alternatives, M = 1.80, SD = 0.92, F(1, 140) = 76.22, p < .0001 (eta squared = .36).

A main effect for hypnotizability was also revealed, F(2, 140) = 7.27, p = .001 (eta squared = .10). Paired comparisons revealed significant differences between each of the three hypnotizability-level groups, as the high scorers on HGS/A reported engaging in significantly more of the three nonevents, M = 1.53, SD = 1.17, compared to those who scored in the medium range, M = 1.11, SD = 0.99, or low range, M = 0.54, SD = 0.85, and low scorers reported performing fewer of the suggested nonevents than either the medium or high groups. No interaction between hypnotizability and question format was revealed. Table 3 shows the mean rates of self-reports for performing the three suggested nonevents in each of the six conditions.

The Effect of Question Format on Self-Reports of Passing the Standard Harvard Items

A t test was conducted to examine the effect of question format on the number of standard Harvard items passed. As predicted, participants who were offered the third alternative reported performing...
significantly fewer directed behaviors during the hypnotic procedures, \(M = 5.24, SD = 2.86\), compared to participants who were only offered two forced-choice alternatives, \(M = 6.43, SD = 2.93, t(148) = 2.51, p = .01\).

Finally, Pearson correlations were calculated to examine the relationship between hypnotizability scores (using all the standard Harvard items) and self-reports of performing the suggested
nonevents. Separate correlations were calculated for participants in the two- and three-alternative conditions. These analyses revealed that when participants were questioned about which behaviors they performed during the procedures using the standard two-alternative format, Harvard scores were significantly related to reports of performing the three behaviors that were never suggested during the hypnotic procedures, \( r(68) = .39, p < .01 \). When participants were provided with the three-alternative response format, the correlation was reduced but remained statistically significant, \( r(82) = .28 \). An independent groups Z test was performed to see if the magnitude of these two correlations was significantly different. The results of these analyses revealed no difference between the two correlations.

Figure 1 shows how the change in question format resulted in a change in the distribution of hypnotizability scores. In the standard
two-alternative condition, hypnotizability scores were normally distributed, with 25.7% scoring in the low range (0–4), 48.6% scoring in the mid range (5–8), and 25.7% scoring in the high range (9–12). However, when the third alternative was added to give participants the chance to say that they do not remember a suggestion being made, the distribution became negatively skewed, with 38.8% scoring in the low range, 43.8% scoring in the mid range, and only 17.5% scoring in the high range (see Figure 1). Figure 2 shows the distribution of hypnosis scores for all subjects, as well as a more detailed look at the distribution of hypnosis scores by group.

**DISCUSSION**

This study was designed to investigate the effect of question format on participants’ resistance to misleading information and self-reports of events occurring during hypnosis. The results indicate that participants’ memory reports were clearly influenced by the way the questions were asked, as subtle changes in the response format resulted in significant differences in the reports of what behaviors people said they performed during the procedures. As predicted, participants who were offered a third-response option to indicate that they do not remember suggestions being made during the hypnotic procedures were significantly less likely to erroneously report engaging in behaviors that were never actually suggested. This replicates Eisen’s (1996)
findings that the majority of participants reported performing at least one of the suggested nonevents when questions were posed in the standard two-alternative response format. The current findings also extend Eisen’s (1996) work by demonstrating that question format was responsible for a sizable portion of the variance of why so many people erroneously reported engaging in the suggested nonevents. This apparent response bias was reduced significantly by merely altering the question format to include an opportunity for the participants to note that they do not remember the suggestions being made. This change in the response format appeared to lessen the implicit assumption that definitive suggestions were made during the procedures.

It is possible that participants who reported engaging in the suggested nonevents were merely going along with our suggestions in an effort to be good subjects. The format of the questions in the response booklet presupposed that the suggestions were actually made during the procedures. It is reasonable to believe that many participants assumed these suggestions must have been made and then seriously considered the possibility that they engaged in the suggested behaviors. A participant who was trying to be a good subject would be more likely to accept the existence of these suggested nonevents and seriously consider the possibility that they performed the suggested actions when they were supposedly directed to do so.

On the face, it could also be argued that the suggested nonevents were so similar to the true Harvard items that the participants simply confused them with actual suggestions made during the procedures. However, there is evidence against this interpretation, as several participants refused to answer these questions altogether. In fact, a few participants actually wrote in the margin that the suggested nonevents never occurred, providing evidence that these items were distinct enough to stand out. It is important to note that no participants expressed similar doubts about the occurrence of the actual Harvard items (see Table 2).

**Problems with the Harvard**

As predicted, participants who were explicitly offered the third alternative to indicate that they do not remember suggestions being made during the hypnotic procedures reported passing fewer of the true Harvard items. In other words, this subtle change in response format resulted in significantly lower hypnotizability scores. As noted earlier, the two-alternative forced-choice questions offered in the standard version of the Harvard response booklet (I did the suggested behavior versus I did not do the suggested behavior) forces the participants to answer each question yes or no, even when they are not sure. According to Gudjonsson’s theory of interrogative suggestibility (Gudjonsson & Clark, 1986), posing a question in this manner should lead to increased guessing behavior and acquiescent responding. In
this instance, when participants were asked about nonevents in the standard dichotomous forced-choice format for the Harvard, an acquiescent response bias was quite notable, as evidenced by relatively frequent endorsement of the nonevents. Whereas, when participants were permitted a third choice (I don’t remember), the response set appeared to be minimized (i.e., less frequent endorsement of the nonevents). By extension then, it appears that the conventional dichotomous forced-choice format of the Harvard might contribute to compliance or acquiescent response sets in determining the final score, arguably compromising the construct validity of the scale.

Further, as noted earlier, detailed instructions to imagine events occurring during the hypnotic procedures should result in increased confidence that the events were actually experienced, even if the action was not performed. That is to say, directions to imagine performing various behaviors should create a sense of familiarity, so that if pressed one might recall the mental act of going through the behavior step by step as it was described to them during the hypnotic procedures.

It is important to note that adding the third alternative did not automatically result in decreased reports of passing each item. In fact, differences in the percentage of passed, not remembered, or not passed responses varied across the two experimental conditions greatly depending on the item in question. Table 2 shows that the pass rates for 9 of the 11 standard Harvard items were lower in the third-alternative group, with decreases in reports of passing items ranging from as minor as 2.5% to as great as 22%. Participants in the third-alternative condition actually showed slightly higher pass rates for the eye-closure item (increasing 3.2% across conditions) and the posthypnotic suggestion to touch your left ankle (increasing 4.8% across conditions). Interestingly, these two items share little in common, as one is considered to be among the easiest items (eye closure) and the other one of the hardest (the posthypnotic suggestion). Also noteworthy, the percentage of participants who reported not passing these two items was higher in the two-alternative condition. In fact, reports of not passing items were lower in the third-alternative condition for 6 of the 11 standard Harvard items (decreases ranging from 5% to 16%). Reports of not passing each of the three nonevents also decreased across the two conditions (decreases ranging from 8.1% to 23.5%). This pattern of data shows that adding the third alternative does not merely result in fewer people saying they passed suggestions. Rather, the change in scores seems to cut both ways, with some participants shifting from reports of passing items to not remembering, while others move away from not passed to not remembered.

Changes in the distribution of Harvard scores. Changing the response format to offer a third alternative did not just result in decreased hypnotizability scores overall but also resulted in a change in the
distribution of hypnotizability scores. In the standard two-alternative response condition, hypnosis scores were normally distributed. However, when the third alternative was added, we found a 13% increase in scores in the low range and a nearly 10% decrease in scores in the high range. A closer look at the data (see Figure 2) shows that the most obvious shift in scores took place at the extreme ends of the scale. At the extreme high end of the distribution, 8.6% of the respondents in the two-alternative condition scored 11 or 12 on the Harvard, whereas only 2.5% of participants in the third-alternative condition scored in this very high range. On the other extreme end of the scale, only 7.1% of the respondents in the standard two-alternative group scored in the 0–2 range on the scale, compared to 20% of the participants in the third-alternative group. Overall, this change in response format resulted in scores that would reveal far fewer hypnotic virtuosos and almost three times as many people appearing to be hypnotically nonresponsive.

Relations Between Hypnotizability and Reports of Engaging in the Suggested Nonevents

The importance of expanding the response alternatives when asking for self-reports of hypnotic responsivity is clear: Allowing subjects an “I don’t remember” option decreased reports of engaging in nonevents and revealed that at least some reports of passing items in the conventional two-choice condition must be based on an acquiescence bias and not actual memory of passing the item. This seems to be the most plausible explanation for why scoring on the 11 actual Harvard items decreased when the response options were expanded. One simple way to deal with this issue would be to amend the Harvard instructions in the response booklet to delete the direction for participants to “guess” when they are not sure whether they passed an item or not. Instead, participants could be told that they should only say they passed an item if they clearly remember the event in question occurring.

A close examination of Figure 2 shows that a subset of high scorers on the Harvard were also quite likely to say they performed two or more of the suggested nonevents. These individuals appear to have a more liberal memory heuristic, resulting in higher rates of reporting behaviors they did and did not actually engage in. However, it is important to note that reports of performing two or three of the suggested nonevents were not restricted to participants who scored high on the Harvard. A substantial subset of participants with hypnotizability scores in the low and medium range also reported engaging in two or three of the suggested nonevents. Further, several participants in the third-alternative group scored in the high range of hypnotizability and did not report performing any of the nonevents. These individuals reported that they responded to many Harvard suggestions but were still clear enough in
their memory reports to resist explicit suggestions that the nonevents occurred and to deny that they engaged in these behaviors during hypnosis. These participants appeared to have a more strict memory heuristic and were quite careful in their reporting of what behaviors they did and did not engage in during the hypnotic procedures. These data underscore the point that the trait of high hypnotizability (as measured by the Harvard) is not a good indicator of one’s resistance to misleading information. Although some highly hypnotizable individuals are quite accepting of misinformation, others are far less susceptible to misinformation effects. These data provide further evidence supporting the notion that the acceptance of misinformation is a distinct form of suggestibility that is clearly distinguished from hypnotic suggestibility.

Limitations

Several limitations to this study should be noted. First, we report a decrease in self-reports of hypnotic responsivity in the three-alternative condition (as measured by the number of true Harvard items passed), but we provide no external support for this finding in the form of observer ratings. In the future, it would be useful to obtain covert observations of performance on the items to verify the self-reports provided across both response-format conditions. Further, the Harvard should be administered under both response-format conditions without the inclusion of the three modified items to see if the decrease in scores in the three-alternative condition is still evidenced during a standard administration of the measure. In addition, the size of the groups used in this experiment varied greatly (from 4 to 40). It is possible that people may respond differently when they are one of only 4 participants, compared to the large groups of 40.

It is also important to point out that we used a rather conservative dichotomous coding scheme in this study (passed and remembered versus forgotten or failed). Relatedly, when participants do not remember a suggestion being made, it does not mean they did not pass the item in question. It could be that as many of these forgotten items were passed as were failed. Or it could be that most of these forgotten items were failed and would be reported as passed given a two-choice format. The point is, it is impossible to know precisely what is going on based on the current data. Perhaps future studies could investigate this issue. But for current purposes, it suffices to say that the standard two-alternative format results in some error variance that had not been previously identified.

Summary

In this experiment, participants’ memory reports were influenced by subtle changes in the response format of the questions asked, resulting in important differences in reports of what behaviors people say they
performed during hypnotic procedures. Offering a third-response option to indicate that they do not remember suggestions being made during the hypnotic procedures significantly reduced erroneous reports of engaging in behaviors that were never actually suggested. Importantly, this change in response format also resulted in significantly lower hypnotizability scores and significant changes in the distribution of scores on the Harvard. These findings contribute to our developing understanding of various factors that can influence hypnotizability effects of all kinds. Also, in light of these findings, and those of Eisen (1996), careful consideration should be given to some level of revision in the response format of group-administered self-report measures of hypnotizability.
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APPENDIX

THE THREE ADDITIONAL ITEMS ADDED TO THE HGSHS: A RESPONSE BOOKLET

VIII. ARM ELEVATION (RIGHT ARM)

You were then told that your right arm was being pulled up and that it would float up effortlessly and feel as if it were not attached to your body at all. Would you estimate that an onlooker would have observed that you lifted your arm more than six inches (before you were told to stop trying)?
XI. CLENCHED FIST (RIGHT HAND)

You were next told to extend your right arm and to make a clenched fist with your right hand, told how tightly your fingers had clenched to make this fist and then told to try to open your hand and to extend your fingers. Would you estimate that an onlooker would have observed that your fist was completely unclenched (before you were told to stop trying)?

XIII. LEG IMMOBILIZATION (LEFT FOOT)

You were next told how heavy your left foot felt and then told to try to lift your foot. Would you estimate that an onlooker would have observed that you did not lift your foot at least one inch (before you were told to stop trying)?

Die Auswirkung des Frageformats auf Widerstand gegenüber irreführenden Folgeinformationen und Selbstberichten während Hypnose

Mitchell L. Eisen, Maka Oustinovskaya, Rose Kistorian, Danielle Y. Morgan und Laura Mickes


Ralf Schmaelzle
University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany

L’effet du libellé d’un questionnaire sur la résistance à de l’information trompeuse post-événement et sur l’autocotation des événements ayant eu lieu durant l’hypnose
Mitchell L. Eisen, Maka Oustinovskaya, Rose Kistorian, Danielle Y. Morgan et Laura Mickes

Résumé: On a administré aux sujets une version enregistrée sur cassette du questionnaire de l’échelle de susceptibilité hypnotique du Groupe de Harvard, formulaire A (HGSHS:A), puis une version modifiée du questionnaire de cette échelle, ce questionnaire demandant aux sujets d’indiquer quels étaient les comportements suggérés qu’ils avaient adoptés sous hypnose. Ces questionnaires avaient été modifiés pour y inclure trois suggestions supplémentaires non offertes durant l’hypnose. On a administré à la moitié des sujets le questionnaire comprenant le choix de réponses standard («J’ai produit le phénomène suggéré» / «Je n’ai pas produit le phénomène suggéré»), et on a offert aux autres sujets un troisième choix de réponse à chaque question («Je ne m’en souviens pas»). Comme nous l’avions prédit, les sujets à qui l’on avait offert un troisième choix avaient beaucoup moins tendance à confirmer des phénomènes qui n’avaient jamais été suggérés durant l’hypnose. De plus, ces sujets ont indiqué avoir produit moins de phénomènes suggérés (c.-à-d. qu’ils ont répondu de façon positive à un nombre moindre de suggestions du test original de Harvard), que les sujets ayant répondu au questionnaire standard offrant deux choix de réponses.

Johanne Reynault
C. Tr. (STIBC)

El efecto del formato de preguntas en la resistencia a la información post-evento capciosa y el auto-informe de sucesos durante la hypnosis

Mitchell L. Eisen, Maka Oustinovskaya, Rose Kistorian, Danielle Y. Morgan, y Laura Mickes

Resumen: Administramos a los participantes una versión grabada de la Escala Grupal de Susceptibilidad Hipnótica de Harvard, Forma A (HGSHS:A) y una versión modificada del cuadernillo de respuestas para el HGSHS:A que pide a los participantes que mencionen qué conductas sugeridas realizaron. Alteramos estos cuadernillos para incluir tres sugestiones adicionales no ofrecidas durante los procedimientos hipnóticos. La mitad de los participantes recibieron las preguntas en el cuadernillo de respuesta en el formato estándar (Realicé el comportamiento sugerido versus No realicé el comportamiento sugerido). A los participantes restantes se les ofreció una tercera alternativa a cada pregunta (No recuerdo que esto ocurriera). Como predijimos, los participantes a quienes se ofreció la tercera alternativa mencionaron significativamente menos que realizaron conductas no sugeridas durante los procedimientos. Asimismo, estos participantes mencionaron haber realizado menos de las conductas sugeridas (i.e., dijeron haber pasado menos de los verdaderos reactivos del HGSHS:A) que los participantes en las dos otras condiciones.

Etzel Cardeña
Lund University, Lund, Sweden