

Butler University
Digital Commons @ Butler University

Scholarship and Professional Work - LAS

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

10-2009

When Being Sad Improves Memory Accuracy: The Role of Affective State in Inadvertent Plagiarism

Amanda C. Gingerich Butler University, mgingeri@butler.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers

Part of the Educational Psychology Commons, and the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Gettysburg College Psychology Department Homecoming Symposium, October 2009

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarship and Professional Work - LAS by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.



When Being Sad Improves Memory Accuracy: The Role of Affective State in Inadvertent Plagiarism

Amanda C. Gingerich Hege



Gettysburg College Homecoming Psychology Symposium 16 October 2009

Affect-as-Information Hypothesis¹

• Affective state provides information about the current situation and how it should be interpreted.



¹ Clore, Schwarz, & Conway (1994); Gasper & Clore (2002); Schwarz & Clore (1983)







 Negative affective state (i.e., sad mood) has been shown to reduce false memory errors ²



² Storbeck & Clore (2005)

Does Affective State Influence Source Memory?



What is Inadvertent Plagiarism?

- Memory error that occurs when one
 - (a) claims a previously-encountered idea to be a new idea or
 - (b) claims an idea generated by someone else to be one's own idea.



<u>Also known as</u>: Cryptomnesia Unintentional Plagiarism Unconscious Plagiarism

What is Inadvertent Plagiarism?

George Harrison vs. Bright Tunes Music Corp.





Three-Phase Procedure³



³ Brown & Murphy (1989, Exp. 1)

Initial Generation



Initial Generation

=



Recall-Own Phase



Generate-New Phase



****Significant Inadvertent Plagiarism in every Phase****



Experiment 1

Can mood influence inadvertent plagiarism?

Overview of Procedure



Overview of Procedure



Boggle Paradigm⁴



⁴Marsh & Bower (1993)

 $\overline{\mathbf{r}}$

Boggle Paradigm⁴ Initial-Generation **Trial 1** Y sat, yes, soil C S G N gate N A

⁴Marsh & Bower (1993)

Boggle Paradigm⁴ Initial-Generation **Trial 2** S Τ Y E tail, ate, son C S A () G L N Ι cat N L A

⁺Marsh & Bower (1993)

Initial Generation Computer's Turn



The computer's word is: GREEN

When you have located this word, click the button below.

l'∨e found it

Initial Generation <u>Participant's Turn</u>





Technical problems? Please <u>contact us</u> and let us know.



Materials

Four trials for each of 6 puzzles

Total Generations: Computer: 72 Participant: 24



Overview of Procedure



 $\overline{=}$

Overview of Procedure



Recall-Own Task



Please enter the four words that you generated in the previous phase below in any order.

Your word:	Confidence:	(Choose One)	۷
Your word:	Confidence:	(Choose One)	*
Your word:	Confidence:	(Choose One)	*
Your word:	Confidence:	(Choose One)	*

Submit

Overview of Procedure



Generate-New Task



Please fill in four *new* words that have not been presented in the previous phases.

Your word:	Confidence:	(Choose One)	*
Your word:	Confidence:	(Choose One)	*
Your word:	Confidence:	(Choose One)	*
Your word:	Confidence:	(Choose One)	*

Submit

Overview of Procedure







Please describe how you were feeling <u>while you were</u> <u>writing your story</u>.

Please describe how you are feeling <u>right now, at this</u> <u>moment</u>.

Overview of Procedure

 $\overline{=}$



Data Scoring



Decision Processes Required in Recall-Own Phase⁵

<u>Computer-Generated</u>:

Trial 1: sat, yes, soil

Trial 2: tail, ate, son

Participant-Generated:

Trial 1: gate Trial 2: cat

Recall-Own New Error Correct Partner-Plagiarism sat, gate, ex, yes, cat

⁵ Landau & Marsh (1997)

Data Scoring



Decision Processes Required in Generate-New Phase⁵

<u>Computer-Generated</u>:

Trial 1: sat, yes, soil

Trial 2: tail, ate, son

Participant-Generated:

Trial 1: gate
Trial 2: cat



⁵ Landau & Marsh (1997)



Different Decision Processes in Different Tasks⁵



⁵ Landau & Marsh (1997)

Experiment 1: Predictions

Ţ

Task	Inadvertent Plagiarism
------	------------------------

Experiment 1: Predictions



Experiment 1: Predictions



Experiment 1:

*

Recall-Own Task Results



Experiment 1:

*

Generate-New Task Results



Experiment 1: Results

- Mood affects source memory processes
 - Source Memory Errors (Who-Generated-What?)



- Item Memory Errors (Familiar vs. Novel?)



Experiment 1: Mood Data

Mood During Story Writing

Нарру	Sad
5.26	2.88

Mood at End

Нарру	Sad
4.22	4.31



What if null effect in Generate-New phase was because induced mood had "worn off?"



Experiment 2: Procedure





Experiment 2: Predictions

Mood Affects Source Memory:

Task	Inadvertent Plagiarism
Recall-Own	
Generate-New	

Mood Affects Item and Source Memory:

Task	Inadvertent Plagiarism
Recall-Own	
Generate-New	<u> </u>

Experiment 2:

*

Recall-Own Task Results



Experiment 2:

*

Generate-New Task Results



Experiment 2:

*

Generate-New Task Results



Experiment 2: Mood Data

Recall-Own

Generate-New

Mood During Story Writing

Нарру	Sad	Нарру	Sad
4.75	3.20	4.75	3.15

Experiment 2: Mood Data

Recall-Own

Generate-New

Mood During Story Writing

Нарру	Sad	Нарру	Sad
4.75	3.20	4.75	3.15

Mood at End

Нарру	Sad	Нарру	Sad
4.60	4.05	4.15	3.60

Experiment 2: Conclusions

• Mood affects source memory and *may* affect item memory processes



Experiment 3

Does effect of mood on inadvertent plagiarism occur at encoding or retrieval?

Experiment 3: Procedure





Experiment 3: Predictions

If	Predicted Effect on Inadvertent Plagiarism
Encoding	Encoding: \bigcirc > \bigcirc Retrieval: \bigcirc = \bigcirc
Retrieval	Encoding: 😃 = 😕 Retrieval: 😃 > 😕
Encoding & Retrieval	Encoding: 😃 > 😕 Retrieval: 😃 > 😕

Experiment 3:

Recall-Own Task Results



 $\overline{\mathbf{F}}$

Experiment 3: Mood Data



Recall-Own Task



 $\overline{=}$

Recall-Own Task Results

If	Predicted Effect on Inadvertent Plagiarism
Encoding	Encoding: \bigcirc > \bigcirc Retrieval: \bigcirc = \bigcirc
Retrieval	Encoding: 🙂 = 😕 Retrieval: 🙂 > 😕
Encoding & Retrieval	Encoding: 😃 > 😕 Retrieval: 😃 > 😕

Experiment 3:

Generate-New Task Results

Before Encoding
□ Happy Mood (n = 20)
□ Sad Mood (n = 20)

Before Retrieval
□ Happy Mood (n = 20)
□ Sad Mood (n = 20)



Experiment 3: Mood Data



Experiment 3: Conclusions

Sad mood decreased source memory errors at encoding.

Mood had no effect on type of item memory errors made.

Summary of Experiments

Experiment 1

- Question: Does mood affect source memory in inadvertent plagiarism paradigm?
- Answer: Yes.

Experiment 2

- Question: Is the effect of mood in Recall-Own but not Generate-New due to "wearing off" of mood?
- **Answer**: Probably Not.

Summary of Experiments

Experiment 3

- Question: Does mood effect in Recall-Own occur at encoding or retrieval (or both)?
- **Answer**: Encoding.
- **Question**: What's going on with Generate-New?
- Answers: Sad mood enhances item memory accuracy.
 No effect of mood on inadvertent

plagiarism.

Ongoing & Future Research

Subjective Experience Resolve Inconsistency Reality Monitoring

Many Thanks To...

Faculty Collaborators:

- Dr. Chad Dodson
- Dr. Jerry Clore
- Dr. Brian Nosek

Computer Programming:

- Jonathan Emmons
- Debby Kermer

Undergraduate Collaborators:

- Kelsey Carlson
- Cari Day
- ✤ Laura Higginbotham
- ✤ Julie Kenney
- ✤ Amanda Miller
- Michael Patrizio
- Caitlin Santucci
- Erin Sullivan

When Being Sad Improves Memory Accuracy: The Role of Affective State in Inadvertent Plagiarism

Amanda C. Gingerich Hege



Gettysburg College Homecoming Psychology Symposium 16 October 2009