¹ The effect of stimulus duration on directed forgetting for pictures

² Patrick Ihejirika[1]

³ [1] Brooklyn College of CUNY

⁴ Author Note

⁸   Abstract

⁹   Write your abstract here.

¹⁰   *Keywords:* Directed Forgetting, Picture Memory

¹¹   Word count: X

12   The effect of stimulus duration on directed forgetting for pictures

What is memory?

14   What is memory and how is it altered? Memory is often inaccurately defined as the

15   ability to encode, store and retrieve information. A more accurate definition separates

16   memory into two separate processes. Process one is characterized by remembering

17   information and is defined as successfully encoding, storing and retrieving information.

18   Process two is characterized by forgetting information. This definition allows for the

19   conceptual introduction of intentionally controlling ones memory by selectively forgetting

20   information details. The process by which information is forgotten can be explored using a

21   directed forgetting procedure.

What is Directed Forgetting?

23   The directed forgetting procedure instructs participants to selectively remember or

24   forget specific events and measures the accuracy with which participants are able to do so

25   (for reviews see, X, X, X). The design of a directed forgetting procedure consists of an

26   encoding phase and a testing phase. The encoding phase presents participants with a series

27   which is then followed by the presentation of instructional cues, directing participants to

28   either remember or forget the previously presented stimulus. After the participants have

29   been presented with all available stimuli, the testing phase begins. This testing phase then

30   presents the same stimuli of the encoding phase against previously unseen stimuli, and tasks

31   participants to accurately identify the stimulus presented in the encoding phase.

32   Significantly lower accuracy in the recognition of forget-cued encoding stimuli is an

33   indication of the presence of a phenomenon known as the directed forgetting effect.

A classic demonstration of directed forgetting

35   Bjork (1972) provides a description of traditional directed forgetting procedures.

36   Generally, these procedures present participants with a series of items and cues. There are a

number of ways to cue various item sets, including intraserial cuing, postinput cuing and pre-input cuing. The most common method of cuing item sets throughout traditional directed forgetting procedures is intraserial cuing. Intra-serial cuing sequentially presents participants with a set of items and directs them to either forget or remember said item using the cue's instruction. Though the item presented during such experiments may vary, traditional directed-forgetting procedures discussed throughout this paper use word stimuli as the presented items. Traditional directed forgetting procedures also determine the presence and magnitude of a directed forgetting effect using either recognition or recall based testing conditions. Testing conditions which operationalize the directed forgetting effect as the accurate recall of "Forget-cued" stimuli do so by having participants recall as many wordage items as possible, without regard to the cue instructions. Previous research employing this recall-based directed forgetting procedure has identified a directed forgetting effect of 10-15% for F- cued wordage stimuli, compared to the R- cued wordage stimuli (Weiner & Reed, 1969). Testing conditions which operationalize the directed forgetting effect as the accurate recognition of "Forget-cued" stimuli do so by having participants identify as many previously seen wordage items as possible, without regard to the cue instructions.

What do we empirically know about directed forgetting?

MacLeod (1998) has identified 38 factors with the potential to influence the directed-forgetting effect. This paper will specifically focus on 4 of these 38 factors. These 4 factors include cue presentation time, stimulus presentation time, stimulus detail and stimulus type.

Wetzel (1977) used a directed forgetting procedure to explore the effects of cue duration on the participant recall accuracy of word stimuli. This exploration required the manipulation of both the stimuli presentation duration and the cue presentation duration during the encoding phase, creating two separate experimental conditions. These experimental conditions are known as the long delay condition and the short delay condition.

63 The long-delay condition presents the word stimuli for a duration of 2, 4 or 8 seconds and

64 the cue for a duration of 1 second, while the short-delay condition presents the word stimuli

65 for a duration of 1 second and the cue for a duration of 2, 4 or 8 seconds. The result of this

66 experiment indicates that short delay conditions, specifically conditions with short stimulus

67 duration and long cue duration lead to an increased directed forgetting effect. These results

68 serve as a motivation for the factorial manipulation of stimuli presentation duration within

69 my experiment.

70   Ahmad, Tan, and Hockley (2019) used a directed forgetting procedure which explored

71 the effects of stimuli details on accuracy of participant recognition of encoding phase stimuli.

72 This was done through the introduction of novel testing conditions and exemplar conditions

73 into the testing phase. Novel conditions present the same stimuli from the encoding phase

74 against previously unseen stimuli, completely different to that of the encoding stimuli.

75 Exemplar conditions present the same stimuli from the encoding phase against previously

76 unseen stimuli similar to that of the encoding stimuli. Both conditions task participants to

77 accurately identify the stimulus presented in the encoding phase. The results of this

78 experiment indicate the existence of a significantly lower directed forgetting effect for novel

79 testing conditions. This indication of significantly higher accuracy in participant recognition

80 for novel testing conditions than exemplar testing conditions serves as a motivation for my

81 experiment.

82   Traditional directed forgetting experiments employed both recall-based testing

83 procedures and verbage stimuli to determine the existence of a directed forgetting effect

84 amongst participants. Epstein (1972) defines the directed forgetting effect from the more

85 traditional perspective as a significant decrease in participant ability to accurately recall the

86 verbage stimuli presented during the encoding phase from memory. The issue with

87 recall-based directed forgetting procedures, is that they fail to consider inherently more

88 memorable stimuli. Standing (1973) shows that people possess the ability to remember

thousands of pictures, along with the object details within said pictures (MacLeod, 1998). Ahmad, Moscovitch, and Hockley (2017) considers this in his experiment through the use of a recognition-based directed forgetting procedure and pictorial stimuli throughout the encoding phase. The results of this experiment indicate that although directed forgetting for pictures and their objects, its effects are extremely small. These results and the memorable ability of images as opposed to word stimuli serves as the motivation for the use of image stimuli throughout my experiment.

Experiment 1

Experiment 1 quite similarly resembles the traditional directed forgetting procedural technique used by Bjork, Laberge, and Legrand (1968) to explore participant recognition of previously seen encoding stimuli when randomly presented with distractors throughout the testing phase. Deviations from Bjork's experimental procedure include (1) the factorial manipulation of stimuli presentation duration by 500 milliseconds, 1 second and 2 seconds (2) the randomized presentation of novel and exemplar distractors throughout the testing phase (3) the use of inherently more memorable stimuli -images- throughout both the encoding and testing phase, instead of word stimuli.

Method

Participants.   All participants in this experiment were undergraduate students in the City University of New York (CUNY) Brooklyn College. In total, XXXX subjects participated in experiment 1. Subjects received course credit for participation in this experiment. All procedures issued by the Brooklyn College Institutional Review Board were followed and consent was received from all subjects throughout each phase of this experiment.

Stimuli and Apparatus.   There were 120 images from a total of 16 categorical scenes presented throughout the encoding phase of this experiment. These sixteen categorical scenes were further classified as being either outdoor scenes or indoor scenes. The eight of sixteen outdoor visual scenes consisted of settings which included bedrooms,

churches, classrooms, offices, dining rooms, conference rooms, hair salons & empty rooms.
The eight of sixteen indoor visual scenes consisted of settings such as airports, bridges,
beaches, castles, cemeteries, houses, tents and playgrounds. These 120 images were of the
same database of 320 total images of 24 different categorical scenes created by Isola, Xiao,
Torralba, and Oliva (2011). Brady, Konkle, Alvarez, and Oliva (2008) and Ahmad et al.
(2019) made similar use of this image dataset in earlier experiments.

Alongside the initial 120 images presented during the encoding phase, another 120
images were selected as distractors throughout the testing phase. Sixty of these images were
of the same visual scene categories as the images presented during the encoding phase.
These images were presented as exemplar distractor testing conditions. The other half of the
120 distractor images were of completely new visual scene categories as the images presented
throughout the encoding phase. These distractor images were presented as novel distractor
testing conditions. This experiment was programmed in JavaScript using Jspsych and was
served onto the web using Jatos. The results of this experiment were analyzed using Rcode.

We used R (Version 4.0.2; R Core Team, 2021) and the R-packages *dplyr* (Version
1.0.7; Wickham et al., 2021), *forcats* (Version 0.5.0; Wickham, 2021a), *ggplot2* (Version 3.3.5;
Wickham, 2016), *jsonlite* (Version 1.7.2; Ooms, 2014), *pacman* (Version 0.5.1; Rinker &
Kurkiewicz, 2018), *papaja* (Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust & Barth, 2020), *purrr* (Version 0.3.4;
Henry & Wickham, 2020), *readr* (Version 2.1.1; Wickham & Hester, 2021), *stringr* (Version
1.4.0; Wickham, 2019), *tibble* (Version 3.1.6; Müller & Wickham, 2021), *tidyr* (Version 1.1.4;
Wickham, 2021b), *tidyverse* (Version 1.3.0; Wickham, Averick, et al., 2019), and *tinylabels*
(Version 0.2.1; Barth, 2021) for all our analyses. We collected five subjects worth of pilot
data. For each subject we computed mean recognition accuracy in each condition of the
design. Figure 1 shows mean recognition accuracy in each condition, collapsed across each
subject.

140   **Design.**   This experiment consisted of a 2x2x3 completely within-subjects

141 experimental design, with the manipulated variables including the Distractor Test, Cue &

142 picture encoding time. The distractor testing condition variable possessed two distinct

143 manipulations, being novel testing conditions and exemplar testing conditions. Novel testing

144 conditions display images with previously unseen or unrelated visual scene categories as

145 distractors during the testing phase. Exemplar testing conditions display images with similar

146 visual scene categories as distractors during the testing phase. The picture presentation time

147 variable possessed three distinct manipulations to the duration of images presented during

148 the encoding phase of the experiment. These three manipulations included durations of 500

149 milliseconds, 1 second and 2 seconds. The cue presentation variable possessed two distinct

150 manipulations. These two manipulations included the "Remember" cue and the "Forget" cue.

151 The Remember cue instructs participants to remember the upcoming image stimuli, while

152 the "Forget" cue instructs participants to selectively forget the upcoming image stimuli.

153 **Procedure.**

154   Participants used the (JAVOS) site to access the experiment. As stated earlier, there

155 are two major phases of the experiment. These phases are the encoding phase and the testing

156 phase. Prior to the encoding phase however, participants were presented with a consent form.

157 Upon completion of the consent form, they were presented with encoding phase instructions.

158   During the encoding phase, participants are presented with the cue instructions

159 followed by the images. The cues instruct participants to either selectively remember or

160 selectively forget the upcoming image stimuli at random. There are a total of 120 cue

161 instructions, which are presented for a duration of (XXXX) seconds. The image stimuli

162 presented during the encoding phase are composed of the 120 images from a total of 16

163 categorical scenes subsetted from the larger database of 320 images with a total of 24

164 categorical scenes. These 120 images are presented at random at durations of either 500

165 milliseconds, 1 second or 2 seconds. The presentation times of the images will also be

displayed at random. Seeing as how the presentation of a single cue instruction followed by a single image consists of a single trial, and there are 120 cue instructions and 120 images to be presented, then there will be 120 trials throughout the encoding phase of this experiment.

Upon completion of the encoding phase, participants were then taken to the testing phase. Similarly to the encoding phase, during the beginning of the testing phase participants were given instructions of completing the testing phase. During the testing phase, participants are given a series of trials where they are shown either an exemplar distractor image or a novel distractor image alongside an image previously seen during the encoding phase and are tasked with selecting the encoding image. There are 60 novel distractor images and 60 exemplar distractor images, each of which were presented at random throughout the testing procedure.

Results

The proportion of accurately recognized encoding stimuli was collected for each of the subjects who participated in the pilot study. The recorded proportions were then averaged according to the conditions present in this 2x2x3 within subjects experimental design. Mean proportion correct for each subject was then submitted to a 2: Cue instruction conditions (R vs F), by 2: Test conditions (Novel vs Exemplar), by 3: Stimulus duration conditions (500ms vs 1000ms vs 2000ms), repeated measures analysis of variance.

The main effect of cue instruction condition was, $F(1,4) = 0.09$, $MSE = 0.02$, $p = .778$, $\hat{\eta}_G^2 = .001$. Mean accuracy in the remember condition was 0.75, and mean accuracy in the forget condition was 0.74.

The main effect of test condition was, $F(1,4) = 10.42$, $MSE = 0.02$, $p = .032$, $\hat{\eta}_G^2 = .120$. Mean accuracy in the novel test condition was 0.81, and mean accuracy in the exemplar test condition was 0.68.

Figure 1. Mean recognition accuracy for each condition in the Pilot experiment

The main effect of stimulus duration was, $F(2,8) = 0.06$, $MSE = 0.02$, $p = .938$, $\hat{\eta}_G^2 = .002$. Mean accuracy in the 500 ms condition was 0.75, mean accuracy in the 1000 ms condition was 0.75, and mean accuracy in the 2000 ms condition was `r 0.74`.

The two-way interaction between encoding instruction and test condition was, $F(1,4) = 0.17$, $MSE = 0.02$, $p = .699$, $\hat{\eta}_G^2 = .002$. The two-way interaction between encoding instruction and stimulus duration was, $F(2,8) = 0.02$, $MSE = 0.03$, $p = .984$, $\hat{\eta}_G^2 = .001$. The two-way interaction between test condition and stimulus duration was, $F(2,8) = 3.57$, $MSE = 0.01$, $p = .078$, $\hat{\eta}_G^2 = .042$. Finally, the three-way interaction was, $F(2,8) = 0.58$, $MSE = 0.02$, $p = .584$, $\hat{\eta}_G^2 = .011$.

Discussion

Statistical analysis of pilot data indicates the presence of a directed forgetting effect for Testing conditions, as participant accuracy in novel conditions is significantly greater compared to participant accuracy in exemplar conditions. A potential explanation of this difference in accuracy lies within the visual scene details information processed by participants during novel conditions versus exemplar conditions. Since novel testing conditions present distractor images from completely different categories than those shown in the encoding phase, less specific or gist information of the visual scenes details suffices. With less visual scene details required for visual scene processing in novel conditions relative to exemplar conditions, more gist information can be processed and stored in long term memory (Ahmad et al., 2017) with greater efficiency. This efficient storage of gist information in long term memory may explain the difference in performance across testing conditions.

A directed forgetting effect fails to exist for both cue instruction and stimulus presentation duration conditions however, as there are no such significant differences in performance between R or F cues and 500ms, 1000ms or 2000ms.

References

Ahmad, F. N., Moscovitch, M., & Hockley, W. E. (2017). Effects of varying presentation time on long-term recognition memory for scenes: Verbatim and gist representations. *Memory & Cognition*, *45*(3), 390–403. https://doi.org/10/gmgg4q

Ahmad, F. N., Tan, P., & Hockley, W. E. (2019). Directed forgetting for categorised pictures: Recognition memory for perceptual details versus gist. *Memory*, *27*(7), 894–903. https://doi.org/10/gmgg3g

Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Prepare reproducible APA journal articles with R Markdown.* Retrieved from https://github.com/crsh/papaja

Barth, M. (2021). *tinylabels: Lightweight variable labels.* Retrieved from https://github.com/mariusbarth/tinylabels

Bjork, R. A. (1972). Theoretical implications of directed forgetting. In A. W. Melton & E. Martin (Eds.), *Coding processes in human memory* (pp. 217–235). Washington, DC: Winston.

Bjork, R. A., Laberge, D., & Legrand, R. (1968). The modification of short-term memory through instructions to forget. *Psychonomic Science*, *10*(2), 55–56. https://doi.org/10/gmt488

Brady, T. F., Konkle, T., Alvarez, G. A., & Oliva, A. (2008). Visual long-term memory has a massive storage capacity for object details. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *105*(38), 14325–14329. https://doi.org/10/c268jz

Epstein, D. W. W., William. Massaro. (1972). Selective search in directed forgetting. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *94*(1), 18–24. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0032791

Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2020). *Purrr: Functional programming tools.* Retrieved from

https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr

Isola, P., Xiao, J., Torralba, A., & Oliva, A. (2011). What makes an image memorable? *IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (cvpr)*, 145–152.

MacLeod, C. M. (1998). Directed forgetting. In J. M. Golding & C. M. MacLeod (Eds.), *Intentional forgetting: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 1–57). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2021). *Tibble: Simple data frames.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble

Ooms, J. (2014). The jsonlite package: A practical and consistent mapping between json data and r objects. *arXiv:1403.2805 [stat.CO]*. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.2805

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/

Rinker, T. W., & Kurkiewicz, D. (2018). *pacman: Package management for R.* Buffalo, New York. Retrieved from http://github.com/trinker/pacman

Standing, L. (1973). Learning 10000 pictures. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 25*(2), 207–222. https://doi.org/10/fnjhs5

Wetzel, R. E., Douglas C. Hunt. (1977). Cue delay and the role of rehearsal in directed forgetting. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, 3*(2), 233–245. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.3.2.233

Wickham, H. (2016). *Ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis.* Springer-Verlag New York. Retrieved from https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

260 Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string operations.*

261 Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr

262 Wickham, H. (2021a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables (factors).*

263 Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats

264 Wickham, H. (2021b). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data.* Retrieved from

265 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr

266 Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., . . . Yutani,

267 H. (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *4*(43), 1686.

268 https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686

269 Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2021). *Dplyr: A grammar of data*

270 *manipulation.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr

271 Wickham, H., & Hester, J. (2021). *Readr: Read rectangular text data.* Retrieved from

272 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr