Mood-Congruent and State-Dependent Memory

Memory is sensitive not only to what happened but to the conditions under which it was encoded and is later retrieved, including a person's internal state and mood. Three related phenomena capture this. State-dependent memory is the finding that material learned in a particular physiological state, such as intoxication, is recalled better when that state is reinstated. Mood-dependent memory is the same idea for emotional states: recall is best when the mood at retrieval matches the mood at encoding. Mood-congruent memory is distinct: we more readily recall material whose emotional tone matches our current mood, so a distressed person more easily summons distressing memories. Each has a bearing on how, and how well, a witness recalls what they observed.

This paper distinguishes these effects, summarizes the evidence, explains the underlying principle, and identifies their relevance to interviewing and to witnesses whose state at encoding or retrieval is in question.

State, Mood, and Congruence

Bower's (1981) influential work established that mood can act as a context for memory: people recalled more of the material that matched their mood at retrieval, and recall was aided when the retrieval mood matched the encoding mood. The mood-dependent version of the effect is real but elusive, emerging most clearly when retrieval relies on a person's own internal cues rather than strong external prompts (Eich, 1995). Mood-congruence, by contrast, is more readily observed: a current emotional state tends to prime memories of similar tone. These are related expressions of a single principle, that the state present during an experience becomes part of the memory and can serve as a cue to it.

The External Analog and the Role of Alcohol

The same logic applies to external context. Godden and Baddeley (1975) found that divers who learned word lists underwater recalled them better underwater, and those who learned on land recalled them better on land, a classic demonstration of context-dependent memory. Internal states can work similarly. Material encoded under the influence of alcohol may be somewhat better retrieved in a comparable state, a state-dependent pattern documented in early work (Goodwin, Powell, Bremer, Hoine, & Stern, 1969). This must be kept distinct from alcohol's larger and more important effect of impairing encoding in the first place, which is addressed in the companion papers on alcohol and intoxication.

Why It Happens

The unifying explanation is encoding specificity: retrieval is most effective when the cues available at recall overlap with those present at encoding. The mood, physiological state, and physical surroundings that accompany an event are encoded alongside it and can later serve as retrieval cues, so reinstating them aids access while a mismatch hinders it. Mood-congruence reflects the related tendency for an active emotional state to spread activation to similarly toned material, biasing what comes to mind.

Relevance for Testimony

Three implications follow. First, the principle that reinstating context aids retrieval is the rationale behind the mental context reinstatement used in the Cognitive Interview, in which a witness is guided to recreate the setting and feelings of the event to improve recall, without physically returning to the scene. Second, a witness's current emotional state can color retrieval, so a distressed witness may more readily recall negative material, a mood-congruent bias to bear in mind when an account is taken under strong emotion. Third, where a witness encoded an event in an unusual state, notably intoxication, both the state-dependence of what was encoded and the separate problem of impaired encoding bear on the resulting memory. These are reasons to attend to the conditions of encoding and retrieval, not grounds for categorical conclusions about reliability.

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, these effects bear on how a witness's account is best elicited and on witnesses whose state is in question. The prosecution is well positioned to use mental context reinstatement, a research-based interviewing technique, to help a witness retrieve more of what they observed (Bower, 1981), and to recognize that a witness recalling an event under strong emotion may show a mood-congruent tilt. The error to guard against is overlooking that memory encoded in an unusual state, such as intoxication, may be both state-dependent and impaired at encoding. The safeguard is to interview in ways that reinstate context without suggestion and to weigh the conditions of encoding when assessing what the memory can support.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the research is relevant where a witness encoded the events in an altered state or gave an account under strong emotion. The defense is well positioned to show that intoxication at encoding can leave a memory that is both state-dependent and degraded, and that a witness's mood at retrieval can bias which memories surface (Eich, 1995; Goodwin et al., 1969). The corresponding error to guard against is overclaiming. State- and mood-dependent effects are real but often modest and condition-specific, and context reinstatement generally aids accurate recall rather than distorting it. Responsible cross-examination and expert testimony should tie the point to the specific conditions of encoding and retrieval, not assert that emotion or intoxication renders a witness's memory categorically unreliable.

References

Bower, G. H. (1981). Mood and memory. American Psychologist, 36(2), 129–148. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.36.2.129

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

Goodwin, D. W., Powell, B., Bremer, D., Hoine, H., & Stern, J. (1969). Alcohol and recall: State-dependent effects in man. Science, 163(3873), 1358–1360. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.163.3873.1358

Legal Authorities

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).

Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).

Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).

Related topic papers: Intoxication and Memory · Alcohol and Memory · Context Effects · Emotion and Memory · Improving Eyewitness Memory