Reconstruction and Recall

Common intuition treats memory as a kind of recording — an event is captured, stored, and later played back more or less intact. A century of research points to a different picture. Remembering is an active process of reconstruction: the mind builds a memory at the moment of recall out of fragments of the original experience, general knowledge and expectations, information encountered since the event, and the rememberer's present beliefs and goals. This paper explains what it means to say that memory is constructive and reconstructive, summarizes the research establishing the point, and describes how reconstruction can quietly change an account over time without the witness being aware that anything has changed. Because honest, confident testimony can nonetheless be a reconstruction rather than a replay, these principles bear directly on how recall should be understood in court. This overview is offered to inform the trier of fact and assumes no background in psychology.

Memory Is Reconstructed, Not Replayed

The idea that memory rebuilds rather than retrieves has deep roots. In a foundational series of studies, Bartlett (1932) had people read an unfamiliar folk tale and retell it after delays. Their reproductions were not faithful copies; instead, witnesses unconsciously reshaped the story to fit their own cultural expectations, dropping details that did not make sense to them and adding or altering others so the account cohered. Bartlett concluded that remembering is governed by "schemas" — organized frameworks of prior knowledge — and that recall is an act of construction guided by those frameworks rather than a literal readout of a stored trace.

Modern memory science has confirmed and extended this view. Most contemporary theorists hold that memory is constructive at the time of encoding, when experience is interpreted through existing expectations, and reconstructive at the time of retrieval, when the rememberer integrates information acquired since the event and brings present beliefs to bear (Schacter, 1996; Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). A memory researcher captured the everyday version of the point with a wry observation: "It is all too common for caterpillars to become butterflies and then to maintain that in their youth they had been little butterflies. Maturation makes liars of us all" (Vaillant, 1977, p. 197). The liar in that sentence is not dishonest; the past has simply been rebuilt to fit the present.

Construction at Encoding, Reconstruction at Retrieval

It is useful to separate the two moments at which the mind shapes a memory. The first is encoding. We never record a scene like a camera; we interpret it, and what we notice and store is filtered through expectations about what such scenes usually contain. Brewer and Treyens (1981) showed this vividly: participants who briefly waited in an office later "remembered" seeing books that were never there, because books fit their schema of an academic office, while genuinely present but schema-inconsistent objects were forgotten. What is encoded is thus already a blend of the actual event and the perceiver's expectations.

The second moment is retrieval. Recall is not the reactivation of a complete record but the assembly of a plausible account from partial traces, filled out with general knowledge and with whatever the rememberer has learned, thought, or been told in the interim. Because the gaps are filled at the time of remembering, two influences that were absent at the event — later information and present belief — can become woven into the memory itself. The witness experiences the result as a single, seamless recollection and cannot ordinarily tell which parts came from the event and which were supplied by reconstruction (Schacter, 1996; Read & Connolly, 2007).

The Present Shapes the Past

One of the most striking features of reconstruction is that a person's current state and beliefs can reshape memory of the past. Ross (1989) demonstrated that people hold implicit theories about whether their

attitudes, traits, and behaviors tend to stay the same or change, and that they use those theories to construct their personal histories — recalling a past that is consistent with how they believe they should have changed or stayed constant. Where the implicit theory is wrong, the recalled past is systematically distorted to match it. People who believe an attitude is stable, for instance, will misremember their past attitudes as closer to their present ones than they actually were.

Conway and Pleydell-Pearce (2000) placed this within a broader model in which "the self, and especially the current goals of the self, function as control processes that modulate the construction of memories" (p. 264). On this account, autobiographical memories are assembled in service of a present sense of identity, and information that fits current goals and self-understanding is favored in the rebuilding. The same tendency has been documented across domains as varied as memory for family structure, exposure to combat stress, emotional reactions to political events, and the witnessing of violence. The unsettling implication for testimony is that a change in the witness's circumstances, beliefs, or understanding between the event and the trial can change the remembered event without any deliberate fabrication.

Change Over Time: Evidence From Witnessed Events

Reconstruction is not confined to the laboratory or to memory for one's own attitudes; it has been observed directly in memory for witnessed events, and it grows more pronounced as time passes. Poole and White (1993) re-interviewed children roughly two years after they had observed a staged interaction between two people. Some of the changes in their later descriptions were not random errors but shifts in interpretation — the event was recast in terms that were more socially appropriate and that fit the children's more mature understanding of social interactions. The memory had been updated to match the person the child had become.

Later knowledge can also rewrite the content of what was witnessed. In work reviewed by Read and Connolly (2007), Davis and colleagues found that memory for the specific comments made by actors in a staged event could change over the retention interval once participants learned that the interaction had ended in violence — the outcome retroactively colored the recollection of what was said beforehand. Findings like these are part of a larger body of work showing that delay does not merely fade memory but actively opens it to reshaping, as intervening experiences, conversations, and learned facts are absorbed into the account (Read & Connolly, 2007). The longer the interval between an event and the testimony about it, the more opportunity reconstruction has had to operate.

How Reconstruction Produces Error

Because recall fills gaps with outside information, the words and assumptions surrounding a question can become part of the remembered event. In a classic demonstration, Loftus and Palmer (1974) showed participants a film of a car crash and varied a single verb in a later question — how fast were the cars going when they "smashed" versus "hit" each other. Those asked with "smashed" estimated higher speeds, and a week later were more likely to remember broken glass that had never appeared in the film. A subtle change in language had been reconstructed into a false visual detail.

Reconstruction can even manufacture memories of things that never occurred. Roediger and McDermott (1995), refining an earlier paradigm, had participants study lists of related words (bed, rest, awake, tired) and found that they later recalled and confidently recognized a related word that was never presented (sleep) at rates rivaling their memory for words actually shown. The false memories were not hesitant guesses but vivid, confident recollections. The lesson that runs through this literature is that confidence and detail are products of the reconstructive process and are not, by themselves, guarantees that a memory corresponds to what happened.

Reconstruction and the Law

The reconstructive nature of memory cuts to the heart of how courts evaluate testimony. Two intuitive markers of reliability — confidence and consistency — are weaker indicators than they appear. A

witness can sincerely and confidently report a reconstructed detail, and an account that has shifted between an early statement and trial testimony may reflect ordinary reconstruction over time rather than dishonesty. Conversely, a smoothly consistent account is not proof of accuracy, since reconstruction tends to produce coherent, plausible narratives. The law already provides tools that intersect with these facts: a witness must testify from personal knowledge (Fed. R. Evid. 602), and prior inconsistent statements may be used to examine a witness (Fed. R. Evid. 613) — a procedure whose force depends on understanding that some inconsistency is the normal signature of a reconstructive memory rather than necessarily a sign of fabrication.

Courts have increasingly recognized that memory is malleable and reconstructive. In State v. Henderson (2011), the New Jersey Supreme Court reviewed the scientific literature at length and overhauled the framework and jury instructions for evaluating eyewitness evidence, acknowledging that memory can be altered by post-event information and the passage of time. Perry v. New Hampshire (2012) held that judicial pre-screening of identification reliability is constitutionally required only where police used improper suggestion, leaving most concerns about memory's malleability to be addressed through cross-examination, argument, and expert testimony. Whether an expert may explain reconstruction to a jury is governed by the general standards for expert evidence — Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals (1993), as extended to specialized knowledge by Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael (1999), or the Frye general-acceptance test still followed in some jurisdictions (Frye v. United States, 1923). The constructive-reconstructive account of memory is among the most firmly established and widely accepted findings in psychology, tracing an unbroken line from Bartlett (1932) to the present.

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 reconstructive nature of memory bears most directly on how the strength of recall is characterized to the jury. The issue most likely to surface is the temptation to treat a witness's confidence or the consistency of a polished trial account as proof of accuracy, when both can be products of reconstruction. The error best guarded against is allowing later, firmer testimony to displace the witness's earliest account: because memory is updated by intervening information and conversation, a witness's first statement — taken before reconstruction has had time to work — is often the most probative, and preserving it verbatim protects the integrity of the evidence. Documenting when and how each account was obtained, and resisting interview practices that supply details the witness can later reabsorb as memory, help ensure that what reaches the jury reflects the event rather than the process of remembering it.

Understood this way, the science is not an obstacle to the State but a guide to building durable evidence. An account whose origins and timing are well documented, and that has been protected from contamination, can be presented with its reliability intact, and honest changes over time can be explained to the jury as the ordinary workings of memory rather than treated as fatal inconsistencies.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the recurring task is to trace how an account may have been rebuilt between the event and the courtroom. The issue most likely to surface is testimony that has grown more detailed, more certain, or better organized over time, or that has shifted to fit information the witness learned afterward — from investigators, media, or other witnesses. The error best guarded against is letting the apparent

confidence and coherence of a reconstructed account stand in for accuracy. Comparing the witness's earliest statements with later ones, and identifying what the witness may have learned in the interim, can reveal where reconstruction has been at work.

The corresponding safeguard is to ensure the jury understands that memory is reconstructed rather than replayed: that confident, consistent testimony can still incorporate post-event information and present belief; that some change over time is the normal signature of memory rather than proof of lying; and that detail and certainty are not guarantees of correspondence to the event. Where admissible, expert explanation of reconstruction can help the trier of fact weigh recall realistically — neither dismissing honest testimony nor accepting it as an unmediated recording of the past.

References

Bartlett, F. C. (1932). Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology. Cambridge University Press.

Brewer, W. F., & Treyens, J. C. (1981). Role of schemata in memory for places. Cognitive Psychology, 13(2), 207–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(81)90008-6

Conway, M. A., & Pleydell-Pearce, C. W. (2000). The construction of autobiographical memories in the self-memory system. Psychological Review, 107(2), 261–288. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.107.2.261

Hyman, I. E., Jr., & Loftus, E. F. (1998). Errors in autobiographical memory. Clinical Psychology Review, 18(8), 933–947. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(98)00041-5

Loftus, E. F., & Palmer, J. C. (1974). Reconstruction of automobile destruction: An example of the interaction between language and memory. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 13(5), 585–589. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(74)80011-3

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

Poole, D. A., & White, L. T. (1993). Two years later: Effect of question repetition and retention interval on the eyewitness testimony of children and adults. Developmental Psychology, 29(5), 844–853. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.29.5.844

Read, J. D., & Connolly, D. A. (2007). The effects of delay on long-term memory for witnessed events. 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. 117–155). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Roediger, H. L., III, & McDermott, K. B. (1995). Creating false memories: Remembering words not presented in lists. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 21(4), 803–814. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.21.4.803

Ross, M. (1989). Relation of implicit theories to the construction of personal histories. Psychological Review, 96(2), 341–357. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.96.2.341

Schacter, D. L. (1996). Searching for memory: The brain, the mind, and the past. Basic Books.

Vaillant, G. E. (1977). Adaptation to life. Little, Brown.

Legal Authorities

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

Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

Federal Rule of Evidence 613.

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: Autobiographical Memory · Misinformation Effect · Why Accounts Change Over Time · Source-Monitoring Errors · False and Implanted Memory · Forgetting