The International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis
1984, Vol. XXXII, No. 4, 338-347

RELATION OF PREDICTED TO ACTUAL HYPNOTIC RESPONSIVENESS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO POSTHYPNOTIC AMNESIA[1]

RONALD E. SHOR[2], DONNA D. PISTOLE,

University of New Hampshire, Durham

RANDOLPH D. EASTON, AND

Boston College

JOHN F. KIHLSTROM[3, 4]

University of Wisconsin, Madison

Abstract: Prior to receiving the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility, Form A (HGSHS:A) of Shor & E. Orne (1962), 423 naive volunteer *Ss* were asked to predict their behavioral response to each of the 12 constituent HGSHS:A suggestions. Another 418 *Ss* made no prior predictions. The relationships between predicted and actual hypnotic responsiveness were significant for HGSHS:A as a whole ($r = .34$) and for many of the individual items (though all $r < .22$). *Ss* who received prior information concerning the contents of HGSHS:A scored significantly lower than those *Ss* who were uninformed. This difference was apparent for 9 of the 12 individual HGSHS:A items (all $p < .01$), although it was most apparent for the posthypnotic amnesia suggestion. Although *Ss*' expectations are significant determinants of hypnotic responsiveness, there is also considerable surprise and disappointment on their part. Implications of the results for the distinction between aptitude and attitude contributions to hypnotic responsiveness, and between suggested amnesia and ordinary forgetting, are discussed.

Any adequate theoretical account of hypnosis must specify the mechanisms underlying individual differences in hypnotizability as well as those underlying specific phenomena such as amnesia and analgesia. An impor-

Manuscript submitted June 21, 1982; final revision received April 13, 1983.

[1]Conduct of this research was supported in part by Grant #MH-35656 from the National Institute of Mental Health, United States Public Health Service.

[2]Ronald E. Shor died January 29, 1982.

[3]The authors would like to thank Lance K. Canon for assistance in scoring *Ss*, Richard H. Bashner for help in the conduct of the experiment, and Patricia A. Register and Leanne Wilson for comments during the preparation of this paper.

[4]Reprint requests should be addressed to John F. Kihlstrom, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin, W. J. Brogden Psychology Building, 1202 West Johnson Street, Madison, WI 53706.

tant aspect of such a theory is to draw a distinction between *aptitudinal* and *attitudinal* components in hypnotic responsiveness. For example, Shor (1959, 1962, 1970, 1979; Shor, M. T. Orne, & O'Connell, 1962, 1966) proposed that individuals differ in their ability to suspend their normal generalized reality orientation, so as to have experiences where external stimulation is not the principal determinant of subjective experience. This isolation of ongoing experience from external reality and critical self-appraisal was called *trance*, and the underlying cognitive skill *trancenbility*. In addition, Shor argued that other situational and interpersonal considerations would determine whether a tranceable person would enter trance on a particular occasion, as when a hypnotist offered suggestions for distortions in perception and memory. Similarly, the Hilgards (E. R. Hilgard, 1965, 1977; J. R. Hilgard, 1979a, 1979b; J. R. Hilgard & E. R. Hilgard, 1962) proposed that during their developmental history, individuals acquire abilities for imaginative involvement and dissociation which they may employ as desired when responding to hypnotic suggestions. From both points of view, some capacity of the individual sets an upper limit on responsiveness to hypnosis; but there is no responsiveness without appropriate motivation, either.

A more detailed analysis of the attitudinal component is to be found in a group of social-psychological theories of hypnosis. For example, Barber (1969, 1979) and his colleagues (Barber, Spanos, & Chaves, 1974) discussed the importance of S's attitudes, motivations, expectations, and willingness to think about and vividly imagine the state of affairs suggested by the hypnotist. Individuals are held to be responsive to hypnosis to the extent that these mediating factors are favorable. Sarbin and Coe (1972, 1979; Coe & Sarbin, 1977) also discuss those contextual variables which determine whether the individual will in fact enter the hypnotic role, and how he or she will enact it. Neither of these approaches ignores the importance of cognitive skills. Sarbin and Coe, especially, underscore the importance of the individual's possession of a repertoire of general and specific cognitive and motoric skills which allow him or her to enact the role of a hypnotized person. Spanos has drawn attention to the hypnotizable S's "willingness and ability to sustain a nonanalytic mode of attending [Spanos, Rivers, & Gottlieb, 1978, p. 568]." Nevertheless, the role of attitudinal variables appears to be a major feature distinguishing the social-psychological approaches from their alternatives (e.g., Barber & Wilson, 1977, p. 34).

Among the attitudinal variables considered relevant to hypnosis, the role of expectations is still somewhat unclear. Melei and E. R. Hilgard (1964) asked naive volunteers to predict their own hypnotizability on a 3-point categorical rating scale, before receiving two standardized hypnotic susceptibility scales. The correlations between self-predictions and actual performance averaged .23. Similar results were obtained by Barber and Calverley (1966), correlating self-predictions and outcome for the first of

a series of hypnotic susceptibility tests, as well as in other investigations (Barber & Calverley, 1969; Derman & London, 1965). The average correlation with actual performance in these studies, weighted by sample size and using Spearman's z transformation, is .40. Such correlations, while frequently statistically significant because of the sample sizes involved, are disappointingly small.

In a review of this literature, Barber (1969) attributed the small magnitude of the correlations to the ambiguous nature of the self-prediction task set for Ss. He argued that where Ss were given more specific information about the criterion task, the accuracy of the self-predictions would increase. Shor (1971), however, did not find this to be the case. His prediction task described the induction procedure and test suggestions in considerable detail, and it asked Ss to predict their responses using precisely the same behavioral criteria employed in the objective scoring of the hypnotizability scale itself. The correlation between predicted and actual total scale score was only .25, with individual phi correlations for the 12 constituent items ranging from −.04 to .28.[3] In a similar vein, Barber et al. (1974) criticized the use of naive Ss in such experiments, on the grounds that these Ss lack precisely those experiences that would enable them to make accurate predictions. Data on this point, however, is at present ambiguous, with one study finding better predictions for experienced Ss (Melei & E. R. Hilgard, 1964), one finding worse predictions (Derman & London, 1965), and two relevant studies failing to make the critical comparison (Barber & Calverley, 1966; Gregory & Diamond, 1973). The reported predictability coefficients range from .30 to .42, which are well within the range of those gathered from naive Ss, and considerably less than what might be expected given the high test-retest reliability of hypnotic susceptibility (E. R. Hilgard, 1965).

The present study was intended to be a replication and extension of Shor's (1971) earlier study, in order to confirm or qualify the previous findings. The original design was extended to include a group of Ss who received the same assessment of hypnotizability but did not make any prior predictions, so as to evaluate the effects of the pre-information supplied by the prediction task on subsequent performance. Particular interest was attached to Ss' memory for the events of the experimental session, in light of the prior information given to them about what they would experience during hypnosis.

Method

The procedure for the present experiment paralleled that of Shor (1971), with the addition of a group of Ss who were not informed before-

[3] In an earlier study employing a similar procedure, Shor (1964) had shown that naive Ss are moderately good at estimating the difficulty levels of a group of representative hypnotic suggestions, with the rank orders of "general estimates" correlating .48-.87 with those derived from the actual performance of various independent samples.

hand about the contents of the hypnotic susceptibility scale, and who were not asked to make predictions concerning their response to hypnotic suggestions. This control group of *Ss* permitted a direct test of the effects of pre-information on hypnotic responsiveness.

Subjects

A total of 841 male and female college students volunteered for an experiment on the measurement of hypnotic susceptibility. The *Ss* were enrolled in the introductory psychology course at the University of New Hampshire and received credit for their services toward their research participation requirement. All participants completed the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility, Form A (HGSHS:A) of Shor and E. C. Orne (1962) and one of two sets of questionnaires. A group of 423 *Ss* were asked to predict, prior to HGSHS:A, how they would respond behaviorally to each of its constituent test suggestions (*Informed* Group). The remaining 418 *Ss* completed instead a short battery of personality questionnaires, not further discussed in this report (*Uninformed* Group). No *Ss* had participated in previous hypnosis research. Assignment to conditions was random, and data were collected over a period of 2 semesters.

Procedure

The HGSHS:A is a standardized procedure consisting of an induction of hypnosis accompanied by suggestions for 12 discrete representative hypnotic experiences. All *Ss* received the identical series of suggestions, including one for posthypnotic amnesia, administered by tape recording. After completing the amnesia test, *Ss* were asked to rate retrospectively their response to each of the 12 HGSHS:A suggestions according to specific behavioral criteria. These objective item ratings were summed to yield a total behavioral score ranging from 0-12. Before completing the objective item ratings, all *Ss* were asked to rate each HGSHS:A item as to whether it had been subjectively successful, following the procedure of Kihlstrom and E. C. Orne[5]. These subjective item ratings were summed to yield a total subjective score ranging from 0-12.

The *Ss* in the Informed group made their predictions concerning their own response to hypnosis on the Estimates of Personal Hypnotic Susceptibility questionnaire devised by Shor (1971). This instrument provides an extensive description of HGSHS:A, including details of the wording of the 12 suggestions and an explicit account of the behavioral criteria by which response to the suggestion is scored. The *Ss* were asked to guess how they personally would respond to each suggestion, under the assumption that they were cooperating with the procedure in the context of a scientific experiment. These predictions were summed to yield a total predicted score ranging from 0-12. Predictions were made before

[5]Kihlstrom, J. F., & Orne, E. C. Retrospective appraisals of hypnotic depth: Correlates with response to suggestions. Manuscript in preparation, 1953.

HGSHS:A was administered. Immediately after completing the pre-experimental questionnaires, *Ss* in both groups received 15 minutes of anticipatory socialization to hypnosis and HGSHS:A, following the procedure advocated by Shor and E. C. Orne (1962).

Results

The mean HGSHS:A score was 5.61 (*S.D.* = 2.65) for the 423 *Ss* in the Informed group, and 6.75 (*S.D.* = 2.60) for the 418 *Ss* in the Uninformed group, ($F = 39.34$, $df = 1,839$; $p < .001$). The sample parameters for *Ss* in the Uninformed group are representative of those obtained in similar United States college samples recently run under similar conditions. Likewise, the mean for the Informed group is similar to that obtained by Shor (1971). On the basis of HGSHS:A behavioral scores, *Ss* were classified as low (0-4), medium (5-7), and high (8-12) in hypnotic susceptibility.

Relation between Personal Predictions and Actual Performance

The *Ss* in the Informed group predicted that they would pass 43.1% of HGSHS:A items on average ($\bar{X}$ predicted score = 5.19, *S.D.* = 3.07); as noted earlier, they actually passed an average of 46.7% ($\bar{X}$ = 5.61, *S.D.* = 2.65) items according to the behavioral criterion. Their subjective criteria for success were somewhat more liberal than the behavioral criteria set for the items by the standardized scoring procedure (53.2% pass; $\bar{X}$ = 6.39, *S.D.* = 2.60). The Informed *Ss* responded to hypnosis significantly more positively than they predicted they would (predicted versus actual behavior: $t = 2.61$, $df = 422$, $p < .01$; predicted behavior versus subjective success: $t = 7.36$, $df = 422$, $p < .001$).

The correlation between predicted and actual behavior was $r = .34$, which is statistically significant ($p < .001$) but rather low in magnitude; the comparable figure reported by Shor (1971) was $r = .25$. Similarly, there was a low but significant correlation between predicted behavior and subjective success ($r = .31$, $p < .001$). There was a high correlation between actual behavior and subjective success ($r = .83$, $p < .001$), paralleling the findings of other studies (e.g., Kihlstrom & E. C. Orne[7]). The significant but weak relationship between predicted and actual behavior, and between predicted behavior and subjective success, obtained for HGSHS:A as a whole, was also observed in subscales of ideomotor, challenge, and cognitive items derived from factor analyses of HGSHS:A (for a review see McConkey, Sheehan, & Law, 1980).

Table 1 shows the relations between predicted and actual behavioral performance on each of the 12 individual HGSHS:A items. The two variables are cast in the form of a 2 × 2 frequency table for each item scored dichotomously (pass/fail), plus the resulting phi correlations and the corresponding results obtained by Shor (1971). While many of the correlations are statistically significant because of the large *N* involved,

[7] See footnote 6.

TABLE 1

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PREDICTED AND ACTUAL BEHAVIOR: INDIVIDUAL HGSHS:A ITEMS, ALL *S*s

Item	Actual Performance				Phi Correlation		Item-to-Total Correlation		t^a
	Predicted Fail		Predicted Pass		Present Study	Shor (1971)	With Behavior	With Predictions	
	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass					
1. Postural Alteration	94	120	48	161	.22***	.28**	.35***	.27***	1.46
2. Eye Closure	29	49	60	294	.11*	.18*	.31**	.12**	3.60***
3. Hand Lowering	42	160	21	200	.16**	.16*	.30***	.19***	2.01*
4. Arm Immobilization	227	95	91	47	.15**	.10	.41***	.15**	5.01***
5. Finger Lock	169	100	66	89	.20***	.21*	.54***	.24***	6.27***
6. Arm Rigidity	159	86	74	74	.18***	.19*	.42***	.15**	5.28**
7. Hands Moving	69	129	47	178	.16**	.18*	.31***	.16***	2.86***
8. Communication Inhibition	205	86	71	61	.16**	.06	.43***	.16***	5.36***
9. Fly Hallucination	207	25	143	41	.15**	.18*	.23***	.10***	2.10*
10. Eye Catalepsy	154	102	76	91	.14*	−.02	.32***	.13**	3.06***
11. Posthypnotic Suggestion	166	16	200	41	.12*	.13	.32***	.15**	3.21***
12. Posthypnotic Amnesia	260	105	41	17	.00	−.01	.11*	.01	1.18

$^a df = 421$

$^*p < .05$; $^{**}p < .01$; $^{***}p < .001$.

they are small at best and in some cases nonexistent (mean $r = .15$, *S.D.* = .06). The rank-order correlation between predicted and actual pass percents was *rho* = .44 (n.s.). In particular, there was no relationship between predicted and actual behavioral response to the suggestion for posthypnotic amnesia. These findings generally replicate the effects obtained by Shor (1971).

In order to assess the differential contributions of general hypnotizability and general expectations concerning hypnosis to response to each test suggestion, item-to-total correlations were calculated between the behavioral response to each item and both the total behavioral and total predicted scores. These total scores were corrected by eliminating *S*'s response or prediction on the particular item in question, yielding 11-point scales. Table 1 shows that in each case the item-to-total correlation was higher with the corrected total behavioral score than with the corrected total predicted score, significantly so in 10 of the 12 cases (all $p < .05$). Averaging across the items, the item-to-total behavioral correlations were significantly higher than the item-to-total prediction correlations ($\bar{X} = .38$, *S.D.* = .13 versus $\bar{X} = .16$, *S.D.* = .06, respectively; $t = 6.38$, $df = 11$, $p < .001$, 2-tailed).

TABLE 3

EFFECT OF PRE-INFORMATION ON BEHAVIORAL PERFORMANCE AND SUBJECTIVE SUCCESS: HGSHS:A SUBSCALES AND TOTAL SCORE

Subscale	Behavior		t	Success		t
	Informed	Uninformed		Informed	Uninformed	
N	423	418		423	418	
Ideomotor						
$\bar{X}$	3.05	3.18	1.84	3.32	3.50	3.08**
$S.D.$	1.09	.99		0.93	0.75	
Challenge						
$\bar{X}$	1.96	2.63	5.69***	2.40	3.02	5.25***
$S.D.$	1.68	1.69		1.71	1.71	
Cognitive						
$\bar{X}$	0.69	0.94	6.36***	.67	.84	3.22**
$S.D.$	0.74	0.82		0.71	0.85	
Total						
$\bar{X}$	5.61	6.75	6.27***	6.39	7.37	5.65***
$S.D.$	2.65	2.60		2.60	2.60	

**$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$.

Effects of Pre-Information on Subsequent Response

As noted earlier, *Ss* who completed the self-prediction task scored significantly lower on HGSHS:A than those *Ss* who did not. Table 2 shows the group differences on the three factorially derived subscales of HGSHS:A. Behaviorally, the Informed *Ss* scored significantly lower than the Uninformed *Ss* on the challenge and cognitive items (all $p < .001$), with a similar trend for the ideomotor items. Significant group differences (all $p < .01$) were found on 9 of the 12 individual HGSHS:A items, with proportionately more Uninformed *Ss* passing the criterion in each case. Similar findings were obtained for the ratings of subjective success, with Informed *Ss* showing lower total scores ($F = 29.70$, $df = 1,839$; $p < .001$) and subscale scores (all $p < .001$); at the level of individual items, this group difference was observed on 10 of the 12 HGSHS:A items (all $p < .05$).

The largest group difference in response to individual HGSHS:A items occurred on the suggestion for posthypnotic amnesia, where the percentage of *Ss* passing the item was cut almost in half, from 53.1% to 28.8%. This by itself was not enough to create the group difference in overall HGSHS:A score, however, as the difference remained even after HGSHS:A scores were corrected by eliminating the amnesia item, yielding an 11-point scale (Informed: $\bar{X} = 5.32$, $S.D. = 2.56$; Uninformed: $\bar{X} = 6.22$, $S.D. = 2.48$ ($t = 5.17$, $df = 839$, $p < .001$).

Table 3 shows the average number of items recalled on HGSHS:A tests of initial amnesia and subsequent reversibility, for *Ss* classified by level of hypnotizability according to the corrected scores (low, 0-4; medium, 5-7; high, 8-11). A total recall score was also calculated by summing the

TABLE 3

POSTHYPNOTIC RECALL FOR *Ss* CLASSIFIED BY PRE-INFORMATION AND HYPNOTIZABILITY

Variable	Informed			Uninformed		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Initial Amnesia						
$\bar{X}$	4.56	4.27	3.83	3.40	3.30	2.47
S.D.	2.28	2.16	2.09	2.35	2.09	2.20
Reversibility						
$\bar{X}$	.82	1.23	1.95	.80	1.44	2.09
S.D.	1.10	1.28	1.74	1.27	1.48	1.76
Total Recall						
$\bar{X}$	5.37	5.50	5.78	4.21	4.74	4.56
S.D.	2.25	2.06	1.93	2.31	2.20	1.95

results of the amnesia and reversibility tests. A 2 × 3 analysis of variance with two between-*Ss* variables (pre-information and level of hypnotizability) showed significant main effects on amnesia scores of both pre-information ($F = 54.49$, $df = 1,835$; $p < .001$) and hypnotizability ($F = 10.01$, $df = 2,835$; $p < .001$), but no interaction ($F < 1$). A similar analysis was not performed on reversibility scores, insofar as the effects of hypnotizability are confounded by ceiling effects imposed by the level of initial amnesia. Analysis of the total recall scores showed a significant main effect of pre-information ($F = 46.83$, $df = 1,835$; $p < .001$) but no effect of hypnotizability ($F = 2.16$, $df = 2,835$; n.s.) and no interaction ($F = df = 2,835$; n.s.).

DISCUSSION

The present study revealed small, though often statistically significant, relations between predicted and actual response to the items of HGSHS:A. While on the whole *Ss* were able to indicate whether they would respond to hypnosis in a generally positive manner, when the predictions for individual HGSHS:A were analyzed, it was clear that whether responsiveness was measured in terms of overt behavioral responsiveness or subjective feelings of success, there was considerable room for disappointment on the part of those *Ss* who predict passing, and surprise on the part of those *Ss* who predict failing. In fact, the balance was tipped in favor of surprise: overall, *Ss* were significantly more responsive to hypnosis than they predicted they would be. Expectations do have some effect on response to hypnosis, then, but they are far from self-fulfilling prophecies.

The precise mechanism of the expectational effect, such as it is, is unknown at present. Perhaps positive expectations affect *Ss'* willingness to become involved in the experience, so that their behavior more adequately reflects their capacity to experience the alterations in perception

and memory that define the domain of hypnosis. Nor is much known about the process by which Ss make their self-predictions. Most likely, Ss engage in a prototype-matching procedure, comparing the features of their self-concepts with their intuitive concepts of hypnotizable and insusceptible individuals (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1982; Kihlstrom & Cantor, 1984). Alternatively, they may compare features of their past personal experience to their intuitive concepts of hypnosis. In either case, a high degree of feature overlap would result in a positive prediction. The (limited) accuracy of Ss' self-predictions suggests that at least some of their intuitions concerning the skills and prior experiences required for hypnosis are correct. In the final analysis, the effect of expectations on hypnosis is likely to be mediated by the individual's beliefs about both hypnosis and him/herself.

Somewhat paradoxically, while positive expectations are positively related to subsequent hypnotic behavior, the *assessment* of these expectations seems to impair it. In some respects, the effect may be analogous to the inoculation and forewarning effects familiar in the literature on attitude change, whereby S's knowledge that she/he is about to receive a persuasive communication makes him/her more resistant to attitude change (Allyn & Festinger, 1961; McGuire, 1964). In this case, the hypnotic procedure is the persuasive communication (McGuire, 1969), and the assessment of expectations provides the forewarning. The analogy, however, is by no means perfect. In the first place, hypnotizability is not correlated with susceptibility to social influence, at least as measured by a variety of tests familiar in the social psychology laboratory (Moore, 1964). Moreover, in the attitude-change paradigm, S is confronted with an attitude that is discrepant from his or her own. Most laboratory Ss, as volunteers, most likely are positive toward hypnosis, so that the content of the procedure is not discrepant with their initial attitude.[5]

While the suggestion for posthypnotic amnesia is not immune from inoculation and forewarning effects—if that is what they are—still other factors may contribute to the diminished response to this particular suggestion among informed Ss. Perhaps the expectations questionnaire provided extra opportunity for Ss to rehearse HGSHS:A items; or, foreknowledge that posthypnotic memory was of interest may have shifted Ss' task orientation from incidental to intentional learning. In either case, memory for HGSHS:A items seems to have received extra protection from the effects of ordinary forgetting, as indicated by the group difference averaging approximately one item on both initial amnesia and total recall. The fact that the two groups showed equivalent amounts of reversibility, however, indicates that the amnesic process, superimposed on

[5]For example, in research by Pistole (1979), 86% of 367 Ss about to receive HGSHS:A predicted that hypnosis would be a pleasurable experience, while 88% of Ss indicated that they wanted to be hypnotized. By contrast, only 48% of Ss expected to find it easy to be hypnotized, and only 58% thought that they would be "good" hypnotic Ss.

ordinary forgetting, was equally strong in the two groups. While the pre-information raised the overall amount of memory accessible to Ss both during and after amnesia, it did not prevent amnesia from occurring.

In general, the findings of the present study appear inconsistent with theoretical accounts of hypnosis which emphasize the willingness of the motivated S to comply with the hypnotist's suggestions, and de-emphasize the characteristics of S who enters hypnosis as a result of suggestion. Apparently hypnosis, while entered via suggestion, is not the same as suggestion; and while it requires positive attitudes, motivations, and expectancies on the part of S, it also requires specific cognitive skills that allow the individual to become absorbed in imaginative involvement and to set aside his or her generalized reality orientation.

References

Allyn, J., & Festinger, L. The effectiveness of unanticipated persuasive communications. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1961, 62, 35–40.

Barber, T. X. *Hypnosis: A scientific approach*. New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold, 1969.

Barber, T. X. Suggested ("hypnotic") behavior: The trance paradigm versus an alternative paradigm. In E. Fromm & R. E. Shor (Eds.), *Hypnosis: Developments in research and new perspectives*. (2nd rev. ed.) New York: Aldine, 1979. Pp. 217–271.

Barber, T. X., & Calverley, D. S. Toward a theory of hypnotic behavior: Experimental evaluation of Hull's postulate that hypnotic susceptibility is a habit phenomenon. *J. Personality*, 1966, 34, 416–433.

Barber, T. X., & Calverley, D. S. Multidimensional analysis of "hypnotic" behavior. *J. abnorm. Psychol.*, 1969, 74, 209–220.

Barber, T. X., Spanos, N. P., & Chaves, J. F. *Hypnotism, imagination, and human potentialities*. New York: Pergamon, 1974.

Barber, T. X., & Wilson, S. C. Hypnosis, suggestions, and altered states of consciousness: Experimental evaluation of the new cognitive-behavioral theory and the traditional trance-state theory of "hypnosis." In W. E. Edmonston (Ed.), *Conceptual and investigative approaches to hypnosis and hypnotic phenomena*. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.*, 1977, 296, 34–47.

Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J. F. Cognitive and social processes in personality. In G. T. Wilson & C. M. Franks (Eds.), *Contemporary behavior therapy: Conceptual and empirical foundations*. New York: Guilford, 1982. Pp. 142–201.

Coe, W. C., & Sarbin, T. R. Hypnosis from the standpoint of a contextualist. In W. E. Edmonston (Ed.), *Conceptual and Investigative Approaches to Hypnosis and hypnotic phenomena*. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.*, 1977, 296, 2–13.

Deiman, D., & London, P. Correlates of hypnotic susceptibility. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1963, 29, 537–545.

Gregory, J., & Diamond, M. J. Increasing hypnotic susceptibility by means of positive expectancies and written instructions. *J. abnorm. Psychol.*, 1973, 82, 363–367.

Hilgard, E. R. *Hypnotic susceptibility*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1968.

Hilgard, E. R. *Divided consciousness: Multiple controls in human thought and action*. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1977.

Hilgard, J. R. Imaginative and sensory-affective involvements in everyday life and in hypnosis. In E. Fromm & R. E. Shor (Eds.), *Hypnosis: Developments in research and new perspectives*. (2nd rev. ed.) New York: Aldine, 1979. Pp. 483–517. (a)

Hilgard, J. R. *Personality and hypnosis: A study of imaginative involvement*. (2nd ed.) Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1979. (b)

Hilgard, J. R., & Hilgard, E. R. Developmental-interactive aspects of hypnosis: Some illustrative cases. *Genet. Psychol. Monogr.*, 1962, 66, 143–178.

KIHLSTROM, J. F., & CANTOR, N. Mental representations of the self. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 16. New York: Academic Press, 1984.

MC CONKEY, K. M., SHEEHAN, P. W., & LAW, H. G. Structural analysis of the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility, Form A. *Int. J. clin. exp. Hypnosis*, 1980, *28*, 164–175.

MCGUIRE, W. J. Inducing resistance to persuasion: Some contemporary approaches. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 1. New York: Academic Press, 1964. Pp. 191–229.

MCGUIRE, W. J. The nature of attitude and attitude change. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*. (2nd ed.) Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969. Pp. 136–314.

MELEI, J. P., & HILGARD, E. R. Attitudes towards hypnosis, self-predictions, and hypnotic susceptibility. *Int. J. clin. exp. Hypnosis*, 1964, *12*, 99–108.

MOORE, R. K. Susceptibility to hypnosis and susceptibility to social influence. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1964, *68*, 282–294.

PISTOLE, D. D. A multivariate study of hypnotic susceptibility as a function of locus of control, method of induction, and sex of subject. (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Hampshire, 1978.) *Diss. Abst. Int.*, 1979, *40*, 1403B. (University Microfilms No. 79-21026.)

SARBIN, T. R., & COE, W. C. *Hypnosis: A social-psychological analysis of influence communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1972.

SARBIN, T. R., & COE, W. C. Hypnosis and psychopathology: Replacing old myths with fresh metaphors. *J. abnorm. Psychol.*, 1979, *88*, 506–526.

SHOR, R. E. Hypnosis and the concept of the generalized reality-orientation. *Amer. J. Psychother.*, 1959, *13*, 582–602.

SHOR, R. E. Three dimensions of hypnotic depth. *Int. J. clin. exp. Hypnosis*, 1962, *10*, 23–38.

SHOR, R. E. The accuracy of estimating the relative difficulty of hypnotic phenomena. *Int. J. clin. exp. Hypnosis*, 1964, *12*, 191–201.

SHOR, R. E. The three-factor theory of hypnosis as applied to the book-reading fantasy and to the concept of suggestion. *Int. J. clin. exp. Hypnosis*, 1970, *18*, 89–98.

SHOR, R. E. Expectancies of being influenced and hypnotic performance. *Int. J. clin. exp. Hypnosis*, 1971, *19*, 154–168.

SHOR, R. E. A phenomenological method for the measurement of variables important to an understanding of the nature of hypnosis. In E. Fromm & R. E. Shor (Eds.), *Hypnosis: Developments in research and new perspectives*. (2nd rev. ed.) New York: Aldine, 1979. Pp. 105–135.

SHOR, R. E., & ORNE, E. C. Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility, Form A. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1962.

SHOR, R. E., ORNE, M. T., & O'CONNELL, D. N. Validation and cross-validation of a scale of self-reported personal experiences which predicts hypnotizability. *J. Psychology*, 1962, *53*, 55–75.

SHOR, R. E., ORNE, M. T., & O'CONNELL, D. N. Psychological correlates of plateau hypnotizability in a special volunteer sample. *J. pers. soc. Psychol.*, 1966, *3*, 80–95.

SPANOS, N. P., RIVERS, S. M., & GOTTLIEB, J. Hypnotic responsivity, meditation, and nonanalytic attending. *J. abnorm. Psychol.*, 1978, *87*, 566–569.

Beziehung zwischen vorhergesagter und wahrer hypnotischer Empfänglichkeit, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der posthypnotischen Amnesie

Ronald E. Shor, Donna D. Pistole, Randolph D. Easton und John F. Kihlstrom

Abstrakt: Bevor das Messen an einer standardisierten Skala für Hypnoseempfänglichkeit, Harvard-Gruppenmaßstab für Hypnoseempfindlichkeit, Form A [HGSHS:A], Shor

& E. Orne (1962), vorgenommen wurde, wurden 423 naive, freiwillige *Vpn.* gebeten, ihre verhaltensmäßige Reaktion auf jede der 12 Testsuggestionen des HGHSH:A vorauszusagen. Andere 418 *Vpn.* machten keine Voraussagen. Die Beziehungen zwischen vorhergesagter und wirklicher hypnotischer Empfänglichkeit waren für den HGHSH:A als Ganzes bedeutlich ($r = .34$) sowie für viele der individuellen Elemente (durchweg $r < .32$). *Vpn.*, die man im voraus über den Inhalt des HGSHS:A informiert hatte, schnitten bedeutlich niedriger als die *Vpn.* ab, die nicht informiert worden waren. Der Unterschied offenbarte sich an 9 der 12 individuellen HGSHS:A-Elemente (alle $p < .01$), obgleich sie am offensichtlichsten für die posthypnotische Amnesiesuggestion waren. Obwohl die Erwartungen der *Vpn.* ein bedeutender, bestimmender Faktor für hypnotische Empfänglichkeit sind, bestehen bei ihnen auch beträchtliche Überraschung und Enttäuschung. Man diskutiert hier die Implikationen der Ergebnisse für die Unterscheidung zwischen Tauglichkeits- und Verhaltensbeiträgen zur hypnotischen Empfänglichkeit und zwischen suggerierter Amnesie und gewöhnlichem Vergessen.

Relation entre l'hypnotisabilité prévue et l'hypnotisabilité réelle avec une note spéciale sur l'amnésie posthypnotique

Ronald E. Shor, Donna D. Pistole, Randolph D. Easton et John F. Kihlstrom

Résumé: Quatre cent vingt trois sujets naifs, volontaires ont eu à prédire leur comportement pour chacun des douze items de l'échelle d'hypnotisabilité de groupe de Harvard (HGSHS:A, Shor et Orne) avant même de subir la passation de l'échelle. Pour 418 autres sujets, aucune prédiction ne leur a été demandée. La relation entre l'hypnotisabilité prévue et l'hypnotisabilité réelle s'est avérée significative pour l'échelle prise globalement ($r = .34$) ainsi que pour plusieurs items pris individuellement ($r = .22$). Les sujets ayant bénéficié d'information avant la passation du HGSHS:A ont obtenu des scores significativement plus élevés que ceux n'ayant pas eu l'information. Même si cette différence est plus marquée pour l'amnésie posthypnotique, elle demeure quand même significative ($p .01$) pour 9 des 12 items du HGSHS:A. Même si les attentes des sujets constituent des prédicteurs valides de l'hypnotisabilité, beaucoup parmi eux furent surpris et parfois déçus des résultats. Les résultats sont discutés selon deux axes: la distinction entre la contribution des aptitudes et celle des attitudes, dans l'hypnotisabilité, et la distinction entre l'amnésie suggérée et l'oubli ordinaire.

Relación de la respuesta hipnótica esperada con la respuesta real, con especial referencia a la amnesia poshipnótica

Ronald E. Shor, Donna D. Pistole, Randolph D. Easton y John F. Kihlstrom

Resumen: Antes de pasar una escala standardizada de susceptibilidad hipnótica (Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptility, Form A de Shor y Orne, 1962), se requirió a 423 voluntarios ingenuos de predecir su respuesta conductual a cada una de las 12 sugestiones que forman parte de la HGSHS:A. No se le pidieron predicciones a otros 418 sujetos. La relación entre la respuesta hipnótica predicha y la real fue significativa para la HGSHS:A en su totalidad ($r = .34$) y para muchos de los ítems individuales (aunque todas las $r < .22$). Los *Ss* que recibieron información previa con respecto a los contenidos de la HGSHS:A tuvieron un puntaje significativamente menor que aquellos *Ss* que no estaban informados. Esta diferencia fue clara para 9 de los 12 ítems individuales de la HGSHS:A (todas las $p < .01$), aunque fué más evidente para la sugestión de amnesia poshipnótica. Aunque las expectativas de los *Ss* eran determinantes significativos de la respuesta hipnótica, mostraron también considerable sorpresa y desengaño. Se discutieron las implicaciones de los resultados para hacer la distinción entre las contribuciones de la aptitud y la actitud en la respuesta hipnótica y entre la amnesia sugerida y el olvido ordinario.