Memory for Oral Communications

Much of what witnesses testify to is not an action they saw but a statement they heard — a threat, a promise, an admission, a warning, an order. Remembered conversation pervades litigation: oral contracts, fraud, conspiracy, notice, consent, defamation, harassment, and the countless ordinary exchanges that bear on what people knew, intended, or agreed. Yet memory for what was said obeys some rules that differ sharply from memory for what was done, and it is unusually vulnerable to a particular failure that has no close parallel for actions: the witness can remember only what was understood, and conversation invites misunderstanding at every turn. This paper explains how memory for oral communications is formed and how it fails — at understanding, at storage, and at retrieval — and why these issues, though present in nearly every case, are rarely examined with the care given to memory for faces and events. It assumes no background in psychology.

Why Conversations Are Different

Memory for speech, like memory in general, is mainly memory for gist — the perceived meaning of an utterance — rather than for its exact words. That makes the interpretation a listener places on a statement, at the moment of hearing it, the foundation of everything later remembered. And here conversation differs from other events in degree that amounts to a difference in kind. Actions can be misperceived, but statements can be misunderstood in a vast number of ways, as attested by the entire industry devoted to preventing miscommunication (communication training, drafting conventions) and to repairing it (mediation, marital therapy). The potential for misunderstanding is, in the words of the leading review, an order of magnitude greater for conversation than for action (Davis & Friedman, 2007).

This matters legally because a remembered statement can be offered for many purposes — to prove the matter it asserts, to prove that a contract was formed, to show a speaker's state of mind, or to show what a listener was put on notice of — and the accuracy of the memory bears on all of them. A witness who sincerely reports the gist of a conversation may nonetheless be reporting a meaning the speaker never intended, words the speaker never used, or an exchange that happened in some other conversation entirely.

The Classic Studies: Leveling, Sharpening, and Assimilation

The systematic study of conversational memory began with research on how accounts degrade as they are recalled and retold. Building on Bartlett's (1932) demonstration that remembering reshapes a story toward the rememberer's expectations, Allport and Postman (1947) studied the serial transmission of a message through a chain of people and described three recurring distortions. In leveling, details drop out so the account grows shorter and easier to handle. In sharpening, a few remaining elements become the focus and are emphasized. In assimilation, the account is bent to fit the hearer's own expectations and schemas — often because the listener lacked the vocabulary or cultural background to grasp what was actually said and filled the gap with a plausible guess.

These early studies, foundational to the field, established that memory for the gist of a message can be reasonably good while the verbatim content is poorly preserved, and that each retelling can carry the account further from the original. Modern research has gone well beyond the question of how much is remembered to ask who said what to whom, with what tone, in what context, and with what response — but the core insight remains: a remembered conversation is a reconstruction shaped by the listener's understanding, not a recording of the words.

Failures at Encoding: You Cannot Remember What You Did Not Understand

The most distinctive vulnerability of conversational memory arises before storage even begins, at the moment of understanding. Accurate communication depends on what linguists call common ground — the shared knowledge and context that lets a listener grasp what a speaker means, especially what the speaker is referring to (Clark, 1996; Grice, 1975). When common ground fails, understanding fails, and the basis for an accurate memory is gone. Allport and Postman observed that listeners with normal hearing routinely mishear or misinterpret words for which they have no supporting mental context, and that these misunderstandings seed the distortions in later reports (Davis & Friedman, 2007).

Such failures arise from both sides of a conversation. Listeners may lack the vocabulary or fail to attend to the context they would need. But speakers are frequently the source: they are often disorganized and egocentric, leaving out referents, commenting abruptly on something only they have been thinking about, and shifting topics without warning — all of which strand the listener without the context needed to track the meaning. Listeners also expect remarks to be relevant to the ongoing exchange, and statements that do not obviously connect are often confusing and poorly remembered. Davis and Holtgraves (1984) found that memory was clearly impaired for replies that were only tangentially relevant to a question, compared with fully responsive ones — so much so that, asked to recall a tangential reply verbatim, subjects often simply wrote "didn't answer the question."

Motivated Interpretation

Understanding is shaped not only by context but by what the listener wants or fears to hear. Motivation pervasively guides interpretation, and the same forces that distort perception of the social world distort the understanding and memory of conversation (Davis & Friedman, 2007). A person highly motivated to believe a romantic interest reciprocates may read affection into neutral remarks; a person high in anxiety about relationships may detect slights or hidden meanings that were never intended, while someone avoidant may tune such implications out entirely. People also remember conversations in self-flattering, ego-protective ways, particularly when their self-image is threatened.

These are not exotic phenomena confined to the laboratory. Motivated distortions in how conversational behavior is interpreted and remembered lie at the heart of many litigated disputes — medical malpractice, sexual harassment, allegations of assault, wrongful termination, and discrimination among them — where the central question is often what was said and meant, and where the parties' competing motivations make divergent honest memories of the same exchange entirely predictable.

Distortions During Storage

Once a conversation is understood and stored, it remains subject to the same reshaping that affects memory for any event, and to some distortions peculiar to language. Schematic effects are well documented even for verbatim memory. Brewer and Hay (1984) showed that memory for the wording of remarks drifts toward the general style of the surrounding context — remarks heard in an academic setting are misremembered as more academic in phrasing, and so on. Speaker status has a similar effect: statements tend to be remembered as more assertive when the speaker is described as high status rather than low (Holtgraves, Srull, & Socall, 1989). Notably, that effect appears only when the status is known as the remarks are heard, not when it is learned afterward — indicating that the distortion is built in at understanding (a constructive effect) rather than imposed later at recall.

Failures at Retrieval: Source Monitoring

Even an accurately understood and well-stored conversation can be misremembered at retrieval through a failure of source monitoring — the set of mental processes by which we attribute a memory to its origin (Johnson, Hashtroudi, & Lindsay, 1993). Source attributions are most accurate when the original memory is rich, distinctive, and well differentiated from similar memories; they fail when encoding was shallow and when the memory blends with others like it. Conversations are especially exposed on both counts: many occur with divided attention, and many are highly similar to one another — think of a professional's near-identical exchanges with a stream of clients or patients. The opportunities for confusing one conversation with another are, accordingly, abundant.

Davis, Kemmelmeier, and Follette (2005) catalogued ten common categories of conversational source error, most of which recur in litigation: who said a given thing; to whom it was said; whether it was actually said or only considered, imagined, or planned; in which of several conversations an exchange occurred; when or where it occurred; the order in which things were said; who else was present; what surrounding context would change an utterance's meaning; and whether information came from a conversation at all or from some other source such as a document or news report. Each of these is a way a sincere witness can misremember a conversation while feeling certain of the account.

Reality Monitoring: Said, or Only Thought?

A particularly consequential source error is reality monitoring — distinguishing what actually happened from what was only imagined, intended, or planned. In conversation this becomes the question of whether one truly said (or was told) something, or merely thought of saying it. The risk is real and grows over time. Research has shown that people can be led to falsely remember having made statements when their sense of familiarity with the topic is artificially raised, becoming more prone to the error as time passes and certainty fades (Buehler & Ross, as discussed in Davis & Friedman, 2007). In a striking series of studies on "saying the unsaid," Parks (1997) had people plan to utter particular phrases or answers but prevented them from actually doing so; participants frequently and confidently reported having said things they had only thought. Older adults appear especially prone to confusing what was thought with what was spoken.

For litigation the implication is direct. A witness may sincerely testify that he told someone of a danger, gave a warning, disclosed a fact, or obtained consent, when in truth the statement was only intended or contemplated. Because such memories can be held with full confidence, the error is not detectable from the witness's demeanor; it can be assessed only by examining the surrounding circumstances and any independent record.

Memory for Oral Communications and the Law

Testimony about statements is nearly universal in litigation — asked at a continuing-legal-education seminar whether anyone had ever handled a case involving no testimony about conversations, not a single experienced litigator raised a hand (Davis & Friedman, 2007). The law channels such testimony chiefly through the rules of evidence rather than a distinct body of identification law. A witness may testify only to matters within personal knowledge (Fed. R. Evid. 602), and remembered statements offered to prove what they assert are governed by the hearsay rules (Fed. R. Evid. 801–803), including the exception for a declarant's then-existing state of mind (Fed. R. Evid. 803(3)). These rules regulate which remembered statements may be heard and for what purpose, but they do not themselves test the accuracy of the underlying memory; that task falls to cross-examination, corroborating evidence, and, where appropriate, expert testimony.

Here the science lags the need. Although remembered conversation is among the most common forms of evidence, basic research on conversational memory remains comparatively thin, and memory experts have rarely been asked to address the determinants of accuracy in memory for what was said (Davis & Friedman, 2007). Whether such testimony is admitted 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). The established principles drawn on here — gist over verbatim, the primacy of understanding, schematic and status-driven distortion, and source and reality monitoring — rest on well-accepted memory science, even as their specific application to conversation continues to be developed.

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, remembered statements are often central — admissions, threats, statements in furtherance of a conspiracy, or a witness's account of what a defendant said. The issue most likely to surface is the accuracy of a witness's memory for the words and meaning of such a statement, particularly where the conversation was brief, divided in attention, or one of many similar exchanges. The error best guarded against is treating a confident recollection of what someone said as equivalent to a verbatim record, when the research shows memory for speech is largely for gist and is subject to source confusion about who said what, to whom, and in which conversation. Documenting how and when the witness's account was first obtained, and seeking independent corroboration such as recordings, writings, or contemporaneous notes, allows the State to present conversational evidence whose reliability can be assessed rather than assumed.

Understood this way, attention to the science strengthens the State's proof. A reported statement that is corroborated and whose context is well documented is far more durable than one resting solely on a single witness's reconstructed memory, and care in distinguishing what was actually said from what may have been inferred or assumed protects the integrity of the case.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the recurring task is to test a remembered statement against the ways conversational memory is known to fail. The issue most likely to surface is reliance on a witness's account of what was said where misunderstanding, gist-based reconstruction, or source confusion is plausible — for instance, an account drawn from one of many similar conversations, or a claim that the accused said something the witness may have inferred from context rather than heard. The error best guarded against is allowing the witness's confidence or the coherence of the recalled exchange to stand in for accuracy, given that sincere witnesses can misattribute who said what, can remember meaning the speaker never intended, and can even recall as spoken something that was only imagined or planned. Examining the conditions of the conversation, its similarity to others, and any independent record is central to that task.

The corresponding safeguard is to ensure the trier of fact understands the documented limits of memory for speech: that it captures gist rather than exact words; that understanding — and therefore memory — can fail through missing common ground, motivated interpretation, or distraction; and that source and reality monitoring errors are especially common for conversation. Where admissible, expert explanation of these principles can help the factfinder weigh testimony about what was said with appropriate care.

References

Allport, G. W., & Postman, L. (1947). The psychology of rumor. Henry Holt.

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

Brewer, W. F., & Hay, A. E. (1984). Reconstructive recall of linguistic style. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 23(2), 237–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(84)90159-2

Clark, H. H. (1996). Using language. Cambridge University Press.

Davis, D., & Friedman, R. D. (2007). Memory for conversation: The orphan child of witness memory researchers. 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. 3–52). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Davis, D., & Holtgraves, T. (1984). Perceptions of unresponsive others: Attributions, attraction, understandability, and memory of their utterances. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 20(4), 383–408. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(84)90033-3

Davis, D., Kemmelmeier, M., & Follette, W. C. (2005). Conversational memory on trial. In Y. I. Noy & W. Karwowski (Eds.), Handbook of human factors in litigation (pp. 12-1–12-29). CRC Press.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Holtgraves, T., Srull, T. K., & Socall, D. (1989). Conversation memory: The effects of speaker status on memory for the assertiveness of conversation remarks. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56(2), 149–160. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.149

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

Parks, T. E. (1997). False memories of having said the unsaid: Some new demonstrations. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 11(6), 485–494. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0720(199712)11:6<485::AID-ACP479>3.0.CO;2-Y

Legal Authorities

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

Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

Federal Rule of Evidence 801.

Federal Rule of Evidence 803(3).

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

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

Related topic papers: Source-Monitoring Errors · Reconstruction and Recall · Earwitness Memory · Misinformation Effect · Co-Witness Contamination · Why Accounts Change Over Time