Does the Temporal Contiguity Effect Require Intentional Retrieval?

Abigail Mundorf





Temporal Contiguity Effect (TCE)

- Recall of one event tends to trigger recall of other events originally experienced nearby in time
- Encoding intentionality
 - Intentional
 - Incidental (Mundorf et al., 2021)
- Retrieval intentionality?
 - Explicit memory (free recall, recognition, etc.)



Temporal Contiguity Effect (TCE)

- Recall of one event tends to trigger recall of other events originally experienced nearby in time
- Encoding intentionality
 - Intentional
 - Incidental (Mundorf et al., 2021)
- Retrieval intentionality?
 - Explicit memory (free recall, recognition, etc.)
 - Implicit memory?
 - Repetition priming: words are processed more quickly on their second presentation

Does the temporal contiguity effect require intentional retrieval?

- Subjects (N = 602) read 505 words aloud
 - 385 words presented once, 60 words presented twice



Does the temporal contiguity effect require intentional retrieval?

- Subjects (N = 602) read 505 words aloud
 - 385 words presented once, 60 words presented twice
 - Vocal responses recorded
- First presentation: varied lag between the two repeated words
 - Ilag = 1, 2, or 5















- Subjects (N = 602) read 505 words aloud
 - 445 words presented once, 60 words presented twice
 - Vocal responses recorded
- First presentation: varied lag between the two repeated words
 - ||ag| = 1, 2, or 5
- Second presentation: Cue presented first, followed by Target
 - lag = +10 between first and second presentation of Target
- Surprise final free recall
- Reading onset

- Subjects (N = 602) read 505 words aloud
 - 445 words presented once, 60 words presented twice
 - Vocal responses recorded
- First presentation: varied lag between the two repeated words
 - Ilag = 1, 2, or 5
- Second presentation: Cue presented first, followed by Target
 - lag = +10 between first and second presentation of Target
- Surprise final free recall
- Reading onset

- Subjects (N = 602) read 505 words aloud
 - 445 words presented once, 60 words presented twice
 - Vocal responses recorded
- First presentation: varied lag between the two repeated words
 - ||ag| = 1, 2, or 5
- Second presentation: Cue presented first, followed by Target
 - lag = +10 between first and second presentation of Target
- Surprise final free recall
- Reading onset











Conclusion

- Temporal proximity of Cue and Target during first exposure affects both explicit and implicit memory
 - Implicit: less repetition priming when Cue and Target were studied nearby in time



All Lag_{Cue}, Lag_{Target} = +10

Lag_{Cue} = +10, Lag_{Target} = +10









Results – Probability of Making at Least One Recall from Each Trial





Background

Prediction	TCE in explicit memory?	TCE in implicit memory?
If temporal associations <i>are not</i> automatically encoded	×	X
If temporal associations are automatically encoded, but not automatically retrieved		×
If temporal associations are automatically encoded <i>and</i> automatically retrieved		