Context Effects

Memory does not float free of the circumstances in which it is formed. What a person encodes is bound up with the setting — the place, the sounds and smells, the person's mood and physical state, the surrounding events — and that context becomes part of the cue structure by which the memory is later retrieved. As a result, a memory is generally easier to retrieve in a setting that resembles the one in which it was formed and harder to retrieve in a different setting. These context effects have two faces of direct interest to the law. On one hand, deliberately reinstating the original context can improve a witness's accurate recall, a principle built into modern investigative interviewing. On the other hand, contextual information can bias judgment — including the judgments of forensic examiners — in ways that have nothing to do with the underlying memory or evidence. This paper explains how context shapes encoding and retrieval, and how both faces of the effect bear on legal proceedings. It assumes no background in psychology, and the science here favors no party.

Memory Is Cue-Dependent

Much of what looks like forgetting is not the loss of a memory but a failure to retrieve it — a failure that the right cue can cure. Tulving and Pearlstone (1966) showed this directly: people who could not freely recall words they had studied recalled many more of the same words when given category cues, demonstrating that the information was still stored (available) but could not be reached (accessible) without the proper prompt. The governing principle, known as encoding specificity, is that a cue aids retrieval to the extent that it matches what was encoded at the time of the original experience (Tulving & Thomson, 1973). A memory is reached not by searching for it directly but by activating something associated with it; the more the retrieval situation overlaps with the encoding situation, the more such associations are available to do the work.

Cues come in several kinds. Semantic cues are meaning-based associations — recalling one detail of a trip because a related detail was mentioned. State cues are aspects of the rememberer's internal condition at encoding — mood, or whether the person was sober, intoxicated, calm, or frightened. Context cues are features of the external environment — the place, weather, ambient sounds or odors, who else was present. Each can serve as a hook by which a memory is pulled back into awareness, and each can be missing when a person tries to remember in different surroundings.

Environmental Context-Dependent Memory

The classic demonstration of environmental context effects is striking in its design. Godden and Baddeley (1975) had deep-sea divers learn lists of words either on land or fifteen feet underwater, and then tested recall in each setting. Words learned underwater were recalled best underwater, and words learned on land were recalled best on land; recall dropped substantially when the learning and testing environments did not match. The setting itself had become part of the memory's retrieval scaffold. A meta-analysis confirmed that environmental context-dependent memory is a reliable effect, while also showing that it is moderated — it shrinks when strong non-contextual cues are available, and can be partly restored by mentally reinstating the original context at retrieval (Smith & Vela, 2001).

Space appears to play an especially central organizing role. Because events almost always occur somewhere, spatial context acts as a scaffold for episodic memory: people remember events set in a place more vividly and in more detail, spontaneously supply a spatial setting even when none was given, and use location as a particularly effective retrieval cue (Robin, Wynn, & Moscovitch, 2016). Familiarity with the environment can further support memory; familiar surroundings have been found to bolster object and spatial memory in both younger and older adults (Merriman et al., 2016).

State-Dependent and Mood-Dependent Memory

Context need not be external. The rememberer's internal state at encoding can itself become a retrieval cue, so that material learned in a particular state is better recalled when that state is reinstated — a phenomenon called state-dependent memory. The effect has been studied for drug and alcohol intoxication and for mood: information encoded in a given emotional state can be easier to retrieve when the person is again in that state (Eich, 1995). Mood can also affect memory performance more generally; a positive real-life event such as winning a competition has been found to alter subsequent memory performance, an effect tied to the resulting emotional state rather than to arousal alone (Lagner et al., 2015). For legal purposes, state-dependence connects to the papers on intoxication and on emotion: a witness's physical or emotional condition at the time of an event is part of the conditions under which the memory was formed.

Emotional Context

The emotional tone of the surrounding context also shapes what is remembered, and does so selectively. Neutral information encoded within an emotionally charged context tends to be remembered better than the same information encoded in a neutral context, and the binding between a neutral item and an emotional background can be durable (Ventura-Bort et al., 2015). This binding is of particular interest for trauma: it helps explain how an otherwise neutral cue — a sound, an object, a place — can later trigger a strong memory because of the emotional context with which it was originally associated. The valence of the context matters as well; some research finds positive contexts to be especially strong predictors of later memory for neutral faces encountered within them (Martínez-Galindo & Cansino, 2015). Emotional context is thus another channel by which the circumstances of encoding become embedded in the memory.

Reinstating Context: The Investigative Interview

Because retrieval improves when the encoding context is reinstated, investigators can use this principle deliberately to help witnesses remember more. The best-known application is the Cognitive Interview, a structured interviewing method whose central component, the mental reinstatement of context, asks the witness to recreate in their mind the physical surroundings, sounds, and feelings present at the time of the event before recounting it. Grounded in encoding specificity, this technique has been shown across many studies to elicit substantially more accurate detail than standard interviewing, without a corresponding flood of errors (Memon, Meissner, & Fraser, 2010). Mental reinstatement is generally preferred to physically returning a witness to the scene, which is logistically harder and risks introducing new, post-event information that can contaminate the memory. Used properly, context reinstatement is a means of recovering accurate memory, not of creating it.

Context as a Source of Bias: Forensic Comparison

The same sensitivity to context that aids witness recall can distort expert judgment. In the forensic comparison disciplines — fingerprints, handwriting, and the like — the surrounding case information is a form of context, and it can sway conclusions. Using a signal-detection framework that separates a genuine change in accuracy from a mere shift in the willingness to declare a "match," Searston, Tangen, and Eva (2016) found that case information about a serious crime led people to say "match" more often without improving their ability to tell matching from non-matching fingerprint pairs — a change in response bias rather than accuracy. But context did affect accuracy when the case information was familiar, and even subtle similarity to a previously seen case could sway judgments. Context, in other words, can move a forensic examiner's decisions through more than one route, and not always in the direction of truth.

This connects context effects to the broader problem of forensic confirmation bias treated in the companion paper: contextual information that is irrelevant to the comparison task can nonetheless shape its outcome, which is why bias-management procedures seek to shield examiners from such context. The lesson is that context is double-edged — a legitimate aid to a witness's own recall, and a potential contaminant of a third party's evaluation of evidence.

Context Effects and the Law

Two practical implications follow for legal proceedings. The first is constructive: because memory is cue-dependent and improves when the encoding context is reinstated, structured interviewing that mentally reinstates context can help a cooperative witness recover more accurate detail, and the absence of such methods may leave usable memory unretrieved. By the same token, a witness's failure to recall something in the unfamiliar setting of an interview room or courtroom does not establish that the memory is absent; the retrieval environment may simply lack the cues that would unlock it. The second implication is cautionary: contextual information can bias judgments about evidence, including the conclusions of forensic examiners, independently of the underlying memory or physical trace — which supports shielding examiners from case context irrelevant to their task.

These matters reach the trier of fact through the ordinary tools of the adversary system and, where appropriate, expert testimony, the admissibility of which is governed by the general standards for expert evidence — Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals (1993), as extended by Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael (1999), or the Frye general-acceptance test still followed in some jurisdictions (Frye v. United States, 1923). A witness may testify only to matters within personal knowledge (Fed. R. Evid. 602). As with all such findings, context effects describe general tendencies that inform the evaluation of memory and of evidence, rather than resolving whether a particular recollection or comparison is correct.

Special Issues in Legal Practice

The principles described above apply with equal force to every party in a legal proceeding. Memory operates the same way regardless of who is asking the questions, and the science summarized here favors no side. What differs between the parties is not the science but the vantage point — the particular places where memory issues tend to surface, and the particular errors each party is best positioned to guard against. The two summaries below identify those recurring issues. They are offered for orientation, not as litigation strategy; in every case the controlling question is what the evidence in that case will, and will not, support, and the expert's role is to inform the trier of fact rather than to advocate for either side.

Special Issues for Prosecutors

For the State, context effects bear on both the gathering of witness memory and the integrity of forensic evidence. On the gathering side, structured interviewing that reinstates the encoding context can legitimately help a witness recover accurate detail, and a witness's inability to recall something in a sterile interview setting should not be read as proof the memory is false. The error best guarded against on the evidence side is allowing irrelevant case context to reach forensic examiners, where it can shift conclusions toward a "match" without improving accuracy; shielding examiners from extraneous case information and documenting what they were told protect the value of the forensic evidence the State offers. Used with discipline, context reinstatement strengthens witness evidence while context management strengthens forensic evidence.

Understood this way, the science is a practical asset. Proper interviewing recovers more of what a cooperative witness genuinely remembers, and disciplined handling of case context keeps forensic conclusions defensible — both of which produce a sturdier record than ad hoc methods would.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, context effects cut in two directions worth examining. First, a forensic examiner who knew case context — a confession, a suspect's identity, the perceived severity of the crime — may have been influenced by it, and the research shows such context can shift both the tendency to declare a match and, when familiar, accuracy itself. Second, the conditions under which a witness was interviewed matter: whether context-reinstatement methods were used or instead leading, contaminating techniques that import post-event information. The error best guarded against is overclaiming — treating context effects as proof that a given identification or comparison was wrong, when they describe a risk and a mechanism rather than a finding about the particular case. Probing what context each actor was exposed to, and under what interviewing conditions, is the sounder course.

The corresponding safeguard is to ensure the trier of fact understands the science: that memory is cue-dependent, so retrieval conditions affect what is recalled; that reinstating the original context can aid accurate recall while contaminating context can distort it; and that irrelevant case information can bias even expert forensic judgments. Where admissible, expert explanation of context effects can help the factfinder weigh both witness memory and forensic evidence in light of the conditions under which each was produced.

References

Eich, E. (1995). Searching for mood dependent memory. Psychological Science, 6(2), 67–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1995.tb00309.x

Godden, D. R., & Baddeley, A. D. (1975). Context-dependent memory in two natural environments: On land and underwater. British Journal of Psychology, 66(3), 325–331. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1975.tb01468.x

Lagner, P., Kliegel, M., Phillips, L. H., Ihle, A., Hering, A., Ballhausen, N., & Schnitzspahn, K. M. (2015). Mood effects on memory and executive control in a real-life situation. Cognition and Emotion, 29(6), 1107–1116. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2014.957643

Martínez-Galindo, J. G., & Cansino, S. (2015). Positive and negative emotional contexts unevenly predict episodic memory. Behavioural Brain Research, 291, 89–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2015.05.017

Memon, A., Meissner, C. A., & Fraser, J. (2010). The Cognitive Interview: A meta-analytic review and study space analysis of the past 25 years. Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 16(4), 340–372. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020518

Merriman, N. A., Ondřej, J., Roudaia, E., O'Sullivan, C., & Newell, F. N. (2016). Familiar environments enhance object and spatial memory in both younger and older adults. Experimental Brain Research, 234(6), 1555–1574. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-016-4557-0

Robin, J., Wynn, J., & Moscovitch, M. (2016). The spatial scaffold: The effects of spatial context on memory for events. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 42(2), 308–315. https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000167

Searston, R. A., Tangen, J. M., & Eva, K. W. (2016). Putting bias into context: The role of familiarity in identification. Law and Human Behavior, 40(1), 50–64. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000154

Smith, S. M., & Vela, E. (2001). Environmental context-dependent memory: A review and meta-analysis. Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 8(2), 203–220. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03196157

Tulving, E., & Pearlstone, Z. (1966). Availability versus accessibility of information in memory for words. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 5(4), 381–391. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(66)80048-8

Tulving, E., & Thomson, D. M. (1973). Encoding specificity and retrieval processes in episodic memory. Psychological Review, 80(5), 352–373. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0020071

Ventura-Bort, C., Löw, A., Wendt, J., Moltó, J., Poy, R., Dolcos, F., Hamm, A. O., & Weymar, M. (2016). Binding neutral information to emotional contexts: Brain dynamics of long-term recognition memory. Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience, 16(2), 234–247. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-015-0385-0

Legal Authorities

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).
Federal Rule of Evidence 602.
Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).
Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).

Related topic papers: Confirmation Bias · Delayed Recall · Forensic Interviewing Protocols · Intoxication and Memory · Emotion and Memory · Reconstruction and Recall