

External Sources of Memory Distortion

A memory is not a sealed recording. Between an event and the moment a witness recounts it in court, the recollection is exposed to a stream of outside information — news coverage, conversations with other witnesses, the questions of investigators, photographs and props, and the witness's own repeated retellings — any of which can quietly enter the memory and change it. The result is that even a scrupulously honest, sincere witness cannot be presumed entirely accurate, because much of what they confidently report may have come from somewhere other than the event itself. This paper surveys the principal external sources through which misinformation contaminates witness memory, and the related self-generated sources that arise from retelling and reconstruction. Several of these sources are treated at greater length in dedicated papers, noted along the way. The aim is to map the landscape of contamination in plain language and without favoring any party; it assumes no background in psychology.

How Outside Information Enters Memory

Once a memory is formed, incorrect information encountered afterward can be absorbed into it. The added information may simply insert a detail that was never there, replace a true detail with a false one, or alter an existing detail — changing a car into a truck, or a stop sign into a yield. The foundational demonstrations are the misinformation studies of Elizabeth Loftus and colleagues, which showed that exposure to misleading post-event information can lead witnesses to remember a yield sign they never saw, broken glass that was never present, or a barn in a scene that contained no buildings (Loftus, 1979). Even the wording of a question matters: asking whether a witness saw "the" broken headlight, presupposing one existed, produces more false reports than asking about "a" broken headlight (Loftus & Zanni, 1975).

Misinformation does not take hold uniformly. Its effect is governed by the principle of discrepancy detection: a witness is more likely to absorb false information when they fail to notice the conflict between it and their original memory (Tousignant, Hall, & Loftus, 1986). Accordingly, distortion is greater when the misinformation arrives after a delay rather than immediately, when it concerns peripheral rather than central detail, when the original memory is weak, and when the source seems credible or unbiased. Susceptibility also varies between people: children and older adults are, on average, more vulnerable to misleading information than young adults, and several personality factors are associated with greater suggestibility.

Media Coverage and Pretrial Publicity

Coverage of crimes and accidents is among the most common sources of contamination, because it reaches witnesses early, repeatedly, and with apparent authority. A controlled demonstration came from the 1992 crash of a cargo plane into an Amsterdam apartment block: although no footage of the impact itself ever existed, in surveys conducted months later a majority of Dutch residents reported having seen film of the plane striking the building, and answered detailed questions about it (Crombag, Wagenaar, & van Koppen, 1996). Media accounts can also seed theories that then shape what witnesses report — as documented in the witness memories surrounding a widely publicized airline crash, where a circulating explanation colored subsequent accounts (Davis & Loftus, 2007). Because news reports are repeated and elaborated as a case approaches trial, a witness's memory may be steadily reshaped toward the version the coverage tells.

Co-Witness Contamination and Memory Conformity

When witnesses to the same event talk with one another — as they very often do — their memories tend to converge, a phenomenon called memory conformity. Controlled studies show the effect directly: told that a co-witness reported a particular (incorrect) detail, witnesses become significantly more likely to report that same detail themselves, an influence that persists on later

testing (Shaw, Garven, & Wood, 1997; Gabbert, Memon, & Allan, 2003). Conformity is greatest when a witness's own memory is weak, when more co-witnesses agree, and when the others seem credible; it is reduced by a dissenter who breaks the others' unanimity or by doubt about the others' reliability — the same pattern seen in classic conformity research (Asch, 1955). The influence can flow through both routes: witnesses adopt others' information because they believe it, and because they wish to agree with or support fellow witnesses.

Co-witness contact does more than align the content of memories; it inflates confidence. Witnesses told that a co-witness made the same identification grew more confident in their own, while those told of a differing identification grew less confident (Luus & Wells, 1994). Because jurors treat confidence as a sign of accuracy, this socially inflated confidence in turn made witnesses appear more credible to mock jurors — so co-witness contamination can raise both the assurance and the persuasiveness of an identification without improving its accuracy. These dynamics are developed further in the companion papers on co-witness contamination and on post-identification feedback.

Suggestive Interviews and Implanted Memories

The way witnesses are questioned can create as well as distort memory. Beyond leading questions, sustained suggestion can implant memories of whole events that never occurred. In the widely used family-informant procedure, researchers — with a relative's confirmation that the event never happened — tell a person that they experienced some childhood event, such as being lost in a shopping mall, and ask them to try to remember it; over repeated attempts a substantial minority come to "remember" the fabricated event in detail. A related technique is imagination inflation: merely imagining an event that did not occur increases a person's confidence that it really happened (Garry, Manning, Loftus, & Sherman, 1996). Such techniques appear to work through a sequence in which a person first comes to regard an event as plausible, then to believe it occurred, and finally to reinterpret their imagery of it as a genuine memory (Mazzoni, Loftus, & Kirsch, 2001).

These mechanisms are most dangerous where suggestion is intense and repeated — in some recovered-memory therapies that use hypnosis, guided imagery, and age regression, and in interrogations that press a suspect to imagine committing the crime, a practice implicated in documented false confessions. The suggestibility of children, the recovered-memory debate, and imagination inflation are each treated in their own papers; the point here is that an interview is never a neutral readout of memory, and a suggestive one can generate confident recollections of things that never happened.

Props, Drawings, and Photographs

Investigators sometimes show witnesses props, drawings, or photographs, or return them to the scene, to jog memory. Such reinstatement of context can genuinely aid recall, but the same aids can distort it. A retrieval cue can suppress memory for material it does not cue, and any prop or image that carries misinformation can implant it. Photographs are particularly potent: in one study, giving people their genuine school class photographs from childhood significantly increased their rate of false memories for a fabricated school event, because the real photo lent plausibility and detail to the invented memory (Lindsay, Hagen, Read, Wade, & Garry, 2004). An image, in other words, can supply the raw material from which a false recollection is built.

Self-Generated Distortion: Retelling and Fabrication

Not all contamination comes from outside; some is generated by the witness's own mental activity, especially the act of retelling. Each recounting is shaped to its audience and purpose, and the reshaped version then biases later memory — a "saying-is-believing" effect in which the account a person gives comes to replace what they originally encoded (Pasupathi, 2001). Merely repeating a statement increases belief in its truth, and describing an event for one listener can impair memory

for aspects not emphasized in the telling. Because witnesses typically discuss events many times — with family, friends, and investigators — before any formal statement, these informal retellings can powerfully shape the eventual testimony. This conversational dimension is developed in the companion paper on memory for oral communications.

Deliberate falsehood also leaves a mark on memory. Research on lying and on feigned amnesia finds that intentionally providing a false account, or pretending not to remember, can impair a person's genuine memory for the event afterward (Christianson & Bylin, 1999; Polage, 2004). The effect is of practical significance given how often suspects lie or claim not to remember, and it means that a fabricated or withheld account at one stage can degrade the accuracy of what the same person is able to report later.

External Sources of Distortion and the Law

Two features of contamination make it especially consequential in litigation. First, it tends to cascade: a single witness's early statement can shape the investigation, influence how lineups and questions are constructed, and reach other witnesses through the media or conversation before they are interviewed — so that several apparently independent accounts may in fact share a common, contaminated source. Second, the witness is usually unaware of it; contaminated details are reported with the same sincerity and confidence as genuine ones. For both reasons, the witness's earliest, least-contaminated statement is generally the most valuable, and safeguards aim at prevention: interviewing witnesses separately and promptly, recording first accounts verbatim, avoiding leading and suggestive questioning, and documenting any exposure to media, co-witnesses, or images.

Courts address these issues largely through the ordinary tools of the adversary system and, where appropriate, expert testimony. Where suggestive police procedures produced an identification, its reliability may be screened by the court; otherwise it is for the jury to weigh (*Perry v. New Hampshire*, 2012), and some courts have revised their frameworks to account for the system and estimator variables — including co-witness influence and feedback — that the research identifies (*State v. Henderson*, 2011). Expert testimony on contamination can be valuable precisely because jurors tend not to appreciate how readily memory absorbs outside information, and how that absorption inflates confidence without improving accuracy; its admissibility 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) — and a witness may testify only from personal knowledge (Fed. R. Evid. 602). Such testimony informs the trier of fact about how memory becomes contaminated; it does not establish that a particular memory is false.

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, the integrity of witness memory depends on how early and how cleanly it was captured. The issue most likely to surface is whether a witness's account was shaped after the fact

— by media coverage, conversations with other witnesses, suggestive questioning, or repeated retelling — so that confident testimony reflects contamination rather than observation. The error best guarded against is presenting several witness accounts as independent corroboration when they may share a contaminated source, or relying on confidence that co-witness contact has socially inflated. The State is well positioned to protect its evidence by interviewing witnesses separately and promptly, recording first statements verbatim, using non-leading questions, and documenting any exposure to outside information. Evidence gathered this way is far more robust, and genuine, independent convergence among witnesses can be shown rather than assumed.

Understood this way, attention to contamination strengthens the prosecution. An account preserved close to the event and shielded from suggestion withstands scrutiny that a later, contaminated account invites, and careful documentation lets the State demonstrate that apparent corroboration is real.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the recurring task is to trace whether a witness's account originated in observation or in the many channels through which memory is contaminated. The issue most likely to surface is testimony that grew more detailed or confident after exposure to media, co-witnesses, suggestive interviews, photographs, or repeated retelling — or a set of witness accounts that converge because they influenced one another rather than because they independently agree. The error best guarded against is overclaiming — treating contamination as proof that a particular memory is false, when it describes a risk and a mechanism rather than a finding about a given witness, and many memories are accurate. Obtaining the sequence of statements, the conditions of each interview, and the witness's exposure to outside information is central to the task.

The corresponding safeguard is to ensure the trier of fact understands the science: that memory readily absorbs information from media, conversation, questioning, and images; that contamination is sincere and invisible to the witness; that co-witness contact inflates confidence without improving accuracy; and that confidently held details may have come from sources other than the event. Where admissible, expert explanation of these external sources of distortion can help the factfinder weigh witness accounts in light of everything the witness was exposed to between the event and the testimony.

References

- Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American*, 193(5), 31–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican1155-31>
- Christianson, S.-Å., & Bylin, S. (1999). Does simulating amnesia mediate genuine forgetting for a crime event? *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 13(6), 495–511. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0720\(199912\)13:6<495::AID-ACP615>3.0.CO;2-0](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0720(199912)13:6<495::AID-ACP615>3.0.CO;2-0)
- Crombag, H. F. M., Wagenaar, W. A., & van Koppen, P. J. (1996). Crashing memories and the problem of “source monitoring.” *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 10(2), 95–104.
[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0720\(199604\)10:2<95::AID-ACP366>3.0.CO;2-%23](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0720(199604)10:2<95::AID-ACP366>3.0.CO;2-%23)
- Davis, D., & Loftus, E. F. (2007). Internal and external sources of misinformation in adult witness memory. In M. P. Toglia, J. D. Read, D. F. Ross, & R. C. L. Lindsay (Eds.), *The handbook of eyewitness psychology: Vol. 1. Memory for events* (pp. 195–237). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gabbert, F., Memon, A., & Allan, K. (2003). Memory conformity: Can eyewitnesses influence each other's memories for an event? *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 17(5), 533–543.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.885>
- Garry, M., Manning, C. G., Loftus, E. F., & Sherman, S. J. (1996). Imagination inflation: Imagining a childhood event inflates confidence that it occurred. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 3(2), 208–214.
<https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03212420>

- Lindsay, D. S., Hagen, L., Read, J. D., Wade, K. A., & Garry, M. (2004). True photographs and false memories. *Psychological Science*, 15(3), 149–154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.01503002.x>
- Loftus, E. F. (1979). *Eyewitness testimony*. Harvard University Press.
- Loftus, E. F., & Zanni, G. (1975). Eyewitness testimony: The influence of the wording of a question. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 5(1), 86–88. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03336715>
- Luus, C. A. E., & Wells, G. L. (1994). The malleability of eyewitness confidence: Co-witness and perseverance effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 714–723. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.714>
- Mazzoni, G. A. L., Loftus, E. F., & Kirsch, I. (2001). Changing beliefs about implausible autobiographical events: A little plausibility goes a long way. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 7(1), 51–59. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-898X.7.1.51>
- Pasupathi, M. (2001). The social construction of the personal past and its implications for adult development. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(5), 651–672. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.5.651>
- Polage, D. C. (2004). Fabrication deflation? The mixed effects of lying on memory. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 18(4), 455–465. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.995>
- Shaw, J. S., III, Garven, S., & Wood, J. M. (1997). Co-witness information can have immediate effects on eyewitness memory reports. *Law and Human Behavior*, 21(5), 503–523. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024875723399>
- Tousignant, J. P., Hall, D., & Loftus, E. F. (1986). Discrepancy detection and vulnerability to misleading postevent information. *Memory & Cognition*, 14(4), 329–338. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03202511>

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).
Perry v. New Hampshire, 565 U.S. 228 (2012).
State v. Henderson, 208 N.J. 208, 27 A.3d 872 (2011).

Related topic papers: [Misinformation Effect](#) · [Co-Witness Contamination](#) · [Memory for Oral Communications](#) · [Post-Identification Feedback](#) · [Suggestibility of Children's Memory](#) · [Recovered and Repressed Memory](#)