

Source Monitoring

Remembering a fact is only half of memory. The other half is knowing where the memory came from, whether you saw an event or were told about it, experienced something or imagined it, witnessed a detail at the scene or picked it up later from another witness, an officer, or the news. Source monitoring is the name for the mental processes that make these attributions. It is a quiet, usually accurate background operation, but when it fails the result is a memory whose content is real while its origin is wrong. Source monitoring is worth a paper of its own because it is the common mechanism beneath many of the specific distortions treated elsewhere in this series.

This paper explains how people judge the source of a memory, why those judgments sometimes go wrong, the conditions that make errors more likely, and why this matters for the reliability of testimony.

How the Mind Judges Source

According to the source-monitoring framework (Johnson, Hashtroudi, & Lindsay, 1993), the mind does not store a tidy label recording where each memory came from. Instead it infers the source from the qualities of the memory itself. Memories of genuinely perceived events tend to carry rich perceptual detail, spatial and temporal context, and meaning, whereas memories of imagined or internally generated events tend to carry traces of the mental effort that produced them. We judge source rapidly and heuristically by weighing these features. The judgment is usually right, but because it is an inference rather than a readout, it can be fooled.

The Engine of Many Distortions

A great deal of memory error is, at bottom, source error. In the misinformation effect, a witness exposed to misleading post-event information later attributes that information to the original event, a source confusion between what was seen and what was suggested (Lindsay & Johnson, 1989; Zaragoza & Lane, 1994). Imagination inflation occurs when a vividly imagined event is later misremembered as having happened. Unconscious transference occurs when a familiar face is correctly recognized but its source is misattributed to the crime. In each case the content of the memory may be accurate while its origin is not, which is why confident, detailed testimony can nonetheless be wrong about the one thing that matters: whether the witness actually perceived it at the scene.

What Makes Errors More Likely

Source monitoring is more fragile than memory for content, and certain conditions strain it. Errors increase when the possible sources are similar to one another (two interviews, two similar faces), when attention was divided at encoding so that contextual detail was poorly bound to the event, when time has passed and contextual markers have faded, and when questioning invites the witness to imagine or speculate, which lends internally generated content the perceptual richness that ordinarily signals a real perception. Aging and high emotional arousal can also reduce source accuracy even where memory for the central content is preserved (Mitchell & Johnson, 2009).

Why It Matters for Testimony

The practical lesson is that a sincere, confident, detailed memory can still be attached to the wrong source, and that the question a court most needs answered, did the witness perceive this at the event, or acquire it afterward, is precisely the question source monitoring can get wrong. The corrective is procedural and evidentiary: conduct early, open-ended, non-suggestive interviews that do not ask witnesses to imagine or guess; document what information each witness was exposed to, from co-witnesses, officers, or the media, and when; and treat the origin of a contested detail as something to be established against the record rather than assumed from the witness's confidence.

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, source monitoring explains why a truthful witness may correctly remember a detail yet be mistaken about whether they saw it at the scene or learned it afterward. The prosecution is well positioned to protect against contamination by interviewing early and without suggestion, by keeping witnesses from discussing the event with one another, and by documenting each witness's exposure to outside information so the source of key details can be traced (Johnson et al., 1993). The error to guard against is treating a confident, detailed account as proof that its contents were perceived firsthand, when the detail may have entered through a later source. The safeguard is to corroborate that contested details originated in the witness's own observation rather than in post-event information.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, source monitoring bears on whether the details a witness attributes to the crime were in fact perceived there or were absorbed from suggestion, co-witnesses, media, or imagination encouraged during questioning (Lindsay & Johnson, 1989; Zaragoza & Lane, 1994). The defense is well positioned to develop the witness's exposure history and the manner of questioning. The corresponding error to guard against is overclaiming. Source-monitoring errors are possible, not inevitable; people usually attribute source correctly, and the framework identifies risk conditions rather than condemning all detailed memory. Responsible cross-examination and expert testimony should show where the conditions for source confusion were present and bear on the weight of the account, without asserting that every confident detail must have come from the wrong source.

References

- Johnson, M. K., Hashtroudi, S., & Lindsay, D. S. (1993). Source monitoring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(1), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.114.1.3>
- Lindsay, D. S., & Johnson, M. K. (1989). The eyewitness suggestibility effect and memory for source. *Memory & Cognition*, 17(3), 349–358. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03198473>
- Mitchell, K. J., & Johnson, M. K. (2009). Source monitoring 15 years later: What have we learned from fMRI about the neural mechanisms of source memory? *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(4), 638–677. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015849>
- Zaragoza, M. S., & Lane, S. M. (1994). Source misattributions and the suggestibility of eyewitness memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 20(4), 934–945. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.20.4.934>

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: [External Sources of Memory Distortion](#) · [Imagination Inflation](#) · [Unconscious Transference](#) · [False Memory](#) · [Reconstruction and Recall](#)