



Australian  
National  
University

---

THESES SIS/LIBRARY  
R.G. MENZIES LIBRARY BUILDING NO:2  
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY  
CANBERRA ACT 0200 AUSTRALIA

TELEPHONE: +61 2 6125 4631  
FACSIMILE: +61 2 6125 4063  
EMAIL: [library.theses@anu.edu.au](mailto:library.theses@anu.edu.au)

## USE OF THESES

This copy is supplied for purposes  
of private study and research only.  
Passages from the thesis may not be  
copied or closely paraphrased without the  
written consent of the author.

THE PROCESS OF REMEMBERING PICTURES

Jean Elizabeth Bird

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
*Doctor of Philosophy*  
of the Australian National University

May, 1976

*This thesis describes original research  
carried out by the author during the tenure  
of a Commonwealth Postgraduate Research Award  
in the Department of Psychology of the  
Australian National University from February,  
1973, to May, 1976.*

  
J.E. BIRD

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to the many people who have contributed their time and efforts to this research. My supervisor for the project, Dr. Michael L. Cook, has been invaluable in providing new ideas and thoughtful criticisms of the work as it has progressed. His constant interest, and the painstaking care with which he helped me to produce a finished version of the manuscript, are very much appreciated.

I also wish to thank the other postgraduate students and members of the technical and academic staff in the Department of Psychology who have given valuable suggestions and technical assistance in designing experimental apparatus, typing response sheets and proof-reading the manuscript. The constructive suggestions made by Ms Norma Chin for the presentation and typing of the thesis deserve special commendation.

Finally, I am indebted to the undergraduate students in the Department of Psychology at the Australian National University who volunteered for my experiments, since without their participation this research could not have been possible.

## C O N T E N T S

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
ABSTRACT	xiii
 CHAPTER ONE. PROBLEMS IN STUDYING MEMORY FOR PICTURES	 1
1.1 The Narrow Scope of Present Conceptualizations of Memory	1
1.2 Models of Memory Based on Data from Nonverbal Studies: Their Problems	2
1.3 The Choice of Stimuli	5
1.4 Past and Present Directions in the Study of Memory for Pictures	9
1.4.1 The Verbal Loop Hypothesis	11
1.4.2 The Effects of Verbal Encoding on Memory for Pictures	14
 CHAPTER TWO. MEASURING MEMORY FOR PICTURES	 29
2.1 Reproduction of Pictures by Drawing	30
2.1.1 Early Studies	30
2.1.2 A Further Examination of the Reproduction Method	35
2.1.3 Later Uses of the Method of Reproduction	43
2.2 Other Methods of Reproducing Pictures	46
2.3 The Use of Words to Recall Pictures	47
2.4 Recognizing Pictures	50
2.4.1 Studies Demonstrating High Recognition Capacity	51
2.4.2 The Influence of the Distractor Set on Recognition of Pictures	56
2.4.3 Conclusion	71
2.5 The Choice of a Method for Measuring Memory for Pictures	73

2.5.1	Recognition versus Recall	73
2.5.2	The Exclusion Set Method	76
CHAPTER THREE. LONG-TERM CHANGES IN MEMORY FOR PICTURES		81
3.1	Introduction	81
3.2	Experiment 1: Effects of Delay on Recognition	83
3.2.1	Method	83
3.2.2	Results	90
3.2.3	Discussion	97
3.3	Conclusion	103
CHAPTER FOUR. INTENTIONAL AND INCIDENTAL INSTRUCTION IN RECOGNITION MEMORY FOR PICTURES		105
4.1	Effect of Instructions on Recognition and Recall	106
4.1.1	Studies of Intentional and Incidental Memory	106
4.1.2	The Orienting Task	107
4.1.3	Instructional Effects on Memory for Pictures	110
4.1.4	The Present Approach	111
4.2	Experiment 2: The Manipulation of Instructions	112
4.2.1	Method	112
4.2.2	Results	115
4.2.3	Discussion	123
CHAPTER FIVE. A COMPARISON OF ORIENTING TASK INSTRUCTIONS WITH STANDARD MEMORY INSTRUCTIONS IN RECOGNITION OF PICTURES		129
5.1	Introduction	129
5.2	Experiment 3: Effect of Instructions to Remember on Recognition of Pictures	132
5.2.1	Method	132
5.2.2	Results	138
5.3	General Discussion of Experiments 2 and 3	150
5.3.1	Effects of Instructions on Memory for Pictures	150
5.3.2	The Orienting Task: A Useful Independent Variable?	153
5.3.3	The Exclusion Set Paradigm: Experiment 3	155
5.3.4	Conclusion	157

CHAPTER SIX. THE INFLUENCE OF TEMPORAL PARAMETERS ON MEMORY FOR PARTS OF PICTURES AND THEIR COMBINATIONS	159
6.1 The Fragmented Memory Effect	159
6.1.1 A Preliminary Study of Confusions in Recognition of Pictures	160
6.1.2 Theoretical Implications	165
6.2 Temporal Parameters in Recognition Memory for Pictures	168
6.3 Hypotheses	176
CHAPTER SEVEN. INVESTIGATION OF TEMPORAL PARAMETERS IN RECOGNITION OF PICTURES	178
7.1 The Method for Testing Recognition of Parts and Wholes	178
7.2 Overview of the Experiments	182
7.3 Experiment 4: A Study of Effects of Rapid Presentation Times and ISI's on Recognition Memory	183
7.3.1 Method	183
7.3.2 Results	188
7.3.3 Discussion	192
7.4 Experiment 5: The Effect of Lengthening Presentation Time on Recognition of Shapes	195
7.4.1 Method	196
7.4.2 Results	199
7.4.3 Discussion	202
7.5 Experiment 6: The Effect of Lengthening ISI on Recognition of Shapes	205
7.5.1 Method	205
7.5.2 Results	206
7.5.3 Discussion	211
7.6 Experiment 7: A Replication of Experiment 4	214
7.6.1 Method	216
7.6.2 Results	217
7.6.3 Discussion	224
7.7 General Discussion	225
7.7.1 Memory for Whole Pictures	225
7.7.2 Partial Memory	229
7.7.3 Conclusion	232

CHAPTER EIGHT. EFFECTS OF PERCEPTUAL STRATEGY ON RECOGNITION OF SHAPES	233
8.1 A Change in Stimuli to Examine the Fragmented Memory Effect and the Generality of Findings of Chapter Seven	233
8.2 Experiment 8: Effects of Perceptual Strategy on Recognition of Parts and Wholes of Shapes	235
8.2.1 Method	235
8.2.2 Results	239
8.2.3 Discussion	244
CHAPTER NINE. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	251
9.1 Summary of Findings	251
9.1.1 Experiment 1: The Capacity of Memory for Pictures	252
9.1.2 Experiments 2 and 3: Effects of Intentional and Incidental Instructions on Memory for Pictures	253
9.1.3 Experiments 4 to 7: Effects of Temporal Parameters on Memory for Shapes	255
9.1.4 Experiment 8: Effects of Perceptual Strategy on Recognition Memory	257
9.2 Concluding Remarks	269
9.2.1 Implications for a Theory of Memory	259
9.2.2 Recognition Methodology: Future Directions	261
REFERENCES	264
APPENDIX 1	276
APPENDIX 2	281
APPENDIX 3	283
APPENDIX 4	297
APPENDIX 5	300
APPENDIX 6	303



## LIST OF TABLES

1. Estimates of the capacity of memory for pictures in the recognition studies reviewed.	63
2. Means and standard deviations of exclusion set scores for each delay condition and each picture: Experiment 1.	91
3. Summary of the analysis of variance: Experiment 1.	94
4. The frequencies of incorrect rejections of the prototype for each delay group in Phase One and Phase Two testing.	94
5. Frequencies of responses to questions asked in the post-recognition interview: Experiment 1.	96
6. Means and standard deviations of exclusion set scores for each group: Experiment 2.	116
7. Means and standard deviations of the frequencies of correct and incorrect responses for particular confidence ratings: Experiment 2.	117
8. Means and standard deviations of hit rates for each picture in each instructional condition: Experiment 2.	118
9. Summary of analysis of variance: Experiment 2.	118
10. Means and standard deviations of arcsin P(A) and bias scores for all groups: Experiment 2.	121
11. Frequencies of responses to questions about intention to remember and rehearsal: Experiment 2.	122
12. Means and standard deviations of exclusion set scores for each instructional group: Experiment 3.	139
13. Summary of the analysis of variance of exclusion set scores: Experiment 3.	140
14. Means and standard deviations of hit rate scores for each instructional group: Experiment 3.	141
15. Summary of the analysis of variance of hit rate scores: Experiment 3.	142
16. Frequencies of responses to the post-recognition questionnaire: Experiment 3.	144

17. Possible contents of memory implied by a choice of each recognition item.	181
18. Means and standard deviations of proportions of responses to all items in the test sets, TP and CCP scores for each experimental group in Experiment 4.	189
19. Summary of the analysis of variance for hit rate data: Experiment 4.	190
20. Summary of the analysis of variance for CCP scores: Experiment 4.	191
21. Means and standard deviations of confidence ratings of insides (I), outsides (O) and wholes (W) for each item type in each experimental group in Experiment 4.	193
22. Means and standard deviations of recognition scores in each experimental group in Experiment 5.	200
23. Means and standard deviations of confidence ratings for insides (I), outsides (O) and wholes (W) of all response types in each experimental group in Experiment 5.	203
24. Means and standard deviations of all recognition scores in each experimental group in Experiment 6.	207
25. Means and standard deviations of <i>oo</i> scores for each group on the first and second distractor set: Experiment 6.	209
26. Means and standard deviations of confidence ratings for insides (I), outsides (O) and wholes (W) of each test item for each condition in Experiment 6.	210
27. Means and standard deviations of all response scores for each experimental group in Experiment 7.	218
28. Summary of the analysis of variance for hit rates: Experiment 7.	218
29. Summary of the analysis of variance for CCP scores: Experiment 7.	219
30. Means and standard deviations of proportions of <i>oo</i> and <i>oo'</i> scores for first and second test sets in each experimental group in Experiment 7.	221
31. Means, frequencies and standard deviations of confidence ratings for insides (I), outsides (O) and wholes (W) of each response type for each experimental group in Experiment 7.	223
32. Means and standard deviations of proportions of responses to each item in the test sets, TP scores and CCP scores in each experimental group in Experiment 8.	240

33. Means, frequencies and standard deviations of confidence ratings for test items in each condition in Experiment 8.	243
A1. Means and standard deviations of exclusion set scores for each picture, in each instructional group in Experiment 3.	287
A2. Means and standard deviations of correct rejection scores for all pictures in each instructional group in Experiment 3.	288
A3. Summary of the analysis of variance of correct rejection scores in Experiment 3.	289
A4. Means and standard deviations of hit rate scores for all pictures in each instructional group in Experiment 3.	290
A5. Means and standard deviations of circles counted in each orienting task group, for each picture, in Experiment 3.	291
A6. Means (and standard deviations) of confidence ratings for each prototype and its five variations in each instructional group in Experiment 3.	292
A7. Means, standard deviations and frequencies of confidence ratings for each item in the test set averaged over all pictures, for each position in the list and each instructional group in Experiment 3.	294

## LIST OF FIGURES

1. Examples of stimuli used in the preliminary study of reproduction with subjects' drawings from memory.	38
2. An example of a prototype picture (Picture 2, Experiment 1) and its first (V1), second (V2) and fifteenth (V15) distractor variations.	78
3. Recognition accuracy (exclusion set size) as a function of delay in Experiment 1.	92
4. Mean exclusion set scores at each delay period tested for each of the four stimulus pictures (Experiment 1).	93
5. The confusion matrix.	119
6. Noise-signal distributions for left items (A) and right items (B).	120
7. The test set for Picture 3 in Experiment 3.	134
8. Confidence ratings for each item in the test sets, for all items regardless of their position in the list and for the first item in each list, for each group in Experiment 3.	147
9. Confidence ratings for each item in the test sets for each position in the list, for each group in Experiment 3.	149
10. Three test pictures used in the preliminary study of confusions between pictures.	162
11. A stimulus set of three shapes and the two recognition sets which were used to test memory for the first two stimuli (Experiment 5).	180
12. Percentages of: (A) both <i>oo</i> and <i>oo'</i> (including <i>o'o</i> ) responses, and (B) both <i>on</i> (including <i>o'n</i> ) and <i>no</i> (including <i>no'</i> ) responses, for all experimental groups in Experiments 5, 6 and 7.	226
13. A stimulus set of three shapes, and the two recognition sets which were used to test memory for the first two stimuli, from Experiment 8.	237

14. Percentages of: (A) both *oo* and *oo'* (including *o'o*) responses, and (B) both *on* (including *o'n*) and *no* (including *no'*) responses, for both experimental groups given 0.5 seconds of presentation time (PT) and inter-stimulus interval (ISI) in Experiments 4 and 7, and for the Figure-Ground (F-G) and Doughnut (D) groups in Experiment 8.

## ABSTRACT

Eight experiments were carried out to investigate processes involved in remembering pictorial stimuli. Because of difficulties encountered in measuring memory for this kind of material, previous investigations in the area (reviewed in Chapters One and Two) have not successfully estimated the capacity of memory for pictures or specified the nature of its encoding processes. A new recognition paradigm, the exclusion set method, was developed in order to measure the accuracy of the subject's memory for representational drawings. It was used to refute two hypotheses: (1) that memory for pictures has a phenomenally high capacity (Experiment 1), and (2) that encoding of pictures is an automatic process (Experiments 2 and 3). Another method of recognition testing was then devised to examine the constructive nature of the encoding process in more detail, in a study of memory for abstract shapes (Experiments 4 to 8).

Experiment 1 tested subjects' memory for pictures after delays of one, two, seven and 60 days. There was evidence that memory is limited in capacity, since subjects were not accurate on the recognition task. Memory declined after one week's delay and again after two months.

To determine whether the elaboration of subjects' encoding strategies affects memory for pictures, intentional and incidental instructions were manipulated in Experiments 2 and 3. Three instructional groups were tested in each experiment: (1) an Incidental group not told of the memory task and instead given a picture-classification orienting task, (2) a Control group given the orienting task but told about the memory requirement, and (3) an Intentional group allowed to view the pictures freely without an orienting task. In Experiment 2, no differences between any of the groups was found, suggesting that despite subjects' different encoding strategies, all had encoded the same amount of information from the pictures. In Experiment 3, the Intentional group was altered to include a practice trial for this group only.

Intentional subjects given practice recognized more pictures than Incidental or Control subjects. This showed that different encoding activities carried out during presentation of a list of pictures can be variable and under the subject's control, rather than an automatic registration of information into memory.

Since encoding did appear to be a function of the subject's encoding activities, it was hypothesized that recognition would be affected by the amount of time subjects were given to process each picture. In particular, it was predicted that temporal variables would affect subjects' tendency to encode only parts of a stimulus without adequately encoding their combinations. The presence of inter-picture confusions in previous studies suggested that a "fragmented memory effect" is a common outcome of subjects' inadequate encoding activities. Experiment 4 found no effect of longer presentation time or ISI on recognition of shapes, but the fragmented memory effect was demonstrated empirically. The methodology of this experiment was improved and it was found that five seconds of presentation time led to more accurate recognition than two seconds (Experiment 5), though increasing the ISI from 1.5 to seven seconds had no effect (Experiment 6), and that subjects given two seconds of either presentation time or ISI performed more accurately than subjects 0.5 seconds (Experiment 7). Presentation time was found to be more beneficial than ISI, given the same total time. Thus, memory for whole shapes improved with longer presentation times and also with longer ISI's of short duration. A final experiment (Experiment 8) was carried out to see whether the fragmented memory effect could be altered, during fast presentation of pictures, with different perceptual strategies. Strategies altered the attention to different parts of the shapes but did not affect fragmented memory. The encoding process was discussed as a sequence of acts of attention to parts of pictures followed by an integration which is not always successful.