

We developed a laboratory analogue of the "forgot-it-all-along" effect that Schooler, Bendiksen, and Ambadar (1997) proposed for cases of "recovered memories" in which individuals had forgotten episodes of talking about the abuse when they were supposedly amnesic for it. In Experiment 1, participants studied homographs with disambiguating context words; in Test 1 they received studied- or other-context words as cues, and in Test 2 they received studied-context cues and judged whether they had recalled each item during Test 1. Experiment 2 manipulated retrieval cues on both tests. In Experiment 3, both the studied- and other-context cues corresponded to the same meaning of each homograph. In Experiment 4, Test 1 was free recall and studied- versus other-context cues were presented in Test 2. Participants more often forgot that they had previously recalled an item if they were cued to think of it differently on the two tests. The controversy regarding reported "recovered memories" of childhood sexual abuse has highlighted a number of questions of interest to memory researchers (see Lindsay & Read, in press, for a recent enumeration of some of these). Participants were instructed to say "Yes" only if they remembered recalling and saying the target word on Test 1. Results and Discussion Recall performance. The proportion correctly recalled for each condition of Test 1 and Test 2 is shown in Table 2. Proportion correctly recalled on Test 1 was higher for items cued with the studied-context words ($M = .88$) than with other-context words ($M = .77$), $F(1, 23) = 57.76$, $MSE = .003$, $p = .0001$. The proportions of items correctly recalled on Test 2 were analyzed in a 3 (Test 1: studied-context, other-context, and not-tested) $\times 2$ (Test 2: studied-context vs. other-context) within-subjects ANOVA. Correct recall on Test 2 was higher for items cued with the studied-context words ($M = .90$) than with the other-context words ($M = .80$), $F(1, 23) = 26.29$, $MSE = .01$, $p = .0001$. Correct recall on Test 2 was also influenced by context on Test 1, $F(2, 46) = 3.34$, $MSE = .01$, $p = .04$: Test 2 recall performance was slightly poorer for items not-tested on Test 1 ($M = .83$) than for items tested in the studied-context condition ($M = .87$), $t(23) = 2.19$, $p = .04$, or other-context condition ($M = .86$), $t(23) = 2.53$, $p = .02$. There was no interaction between context on Test 1 and Test 2, $F(1) = 1.73$, $ps = .20$. Judgment of previous recollection. The proportions of items on Test 2 correctly judged as recalled on Test 1 are shown in Table 3. The subsequent analyses were performed on the judgment data for items correctly recalled on both Test 1 and Test 2 (shown in bold in Table 3), although the same pattern of results was found when analyses were contingent only on correct recall on Test 1. No reliable effect of the test list counterbalancing factor for the judgment task was found in an initial omnibus ANOVA (all F s 1.73 , $ps = .20$), and therefore analyses collapsed across this manipulation. The proportions of correct "Yes" judgments were analyzed in a 2 (Test 1: studied-context vs. other-context) $\times 2$ (Test 2: studied-context vs. other-context) $\times 2$ (Study list: study list 1 vs. study list 2) mixed factorial ANOVA. Schooler and his coworkers (Schooler, 1999, in press; Schooler, Ambadar, & Bendiksen, 1997; Schooler, Bendiksen, & Ambadar, 1997) described two fascinating cases in which women reported full-blown recovered-memory experiences. Materials