

Methods and design assignment 2 - literature review



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Concordia Introduction Literature Review Hypnosis is a mental during which individuals relax their objective area of mind so that the subjective one becomes more active (Manmillar, Kumar & Pekala, 2005, p. 9).

Hypnotisability is the score obtained after hypnotic induction, on a standardized hypnosis scale. “ It is a cognitive trait allowing subjects to modulate perception, emotion and behaviour according to specific suggestions” (Carli, Cavallaro & Santarcangelo, 2007, p. 64).

Individual differences exist in the level of susceptibility to hypnosis. High hypnotisable's, generally, are at ease of relaxing minds as compared to others (Manmillar, Kumar & Pekala, 2005, p. 9). Brynt & Idey (2001) mentioned that they display more fantasy proneness and greater absorption (as cited in Wilson & Barber, 1981; Barber & Glass, 1962). They also experience greater imaginary involvement (as cited in Hilgard, 1979) and a strong attention focus (as cited in Kumar, Pekala & Cummings, 1996). For measuring individual differences, Braffman & Kirsch (2001), discovered two detriments i. e. “ simple and go/no go reaction times”. Hypnotisability was positively related with simple reaction time and negatively with go/no go reaction time, when non hypnotic suggestibility was statistically controlled. Specific, noteworthy characteristics make some individuals more susceptible to hypnosis than others. For many years, hypnotisability scales are in practise, in both clinical and research settings. A set of standardized suggestions are used to check individuals' responses, following standardized induction, to know the measure of hypnotic ability they possess. As hypnotisability is a stable construct, identifying its predictors would help to comprehend the individual differences observed in suggestibility (Paulson & Matthews, 2003, p. 198). Barber, Spanos and Chaves (1974) proposed that <https://assignbuster.com/methods-and-design-assignment-2-literature-review/>

individual differences in ability to respond to hypnosis could be described with the aid of imagination and absorption constructs (Paulson & Matthews, 2003, p. 198-199).

Absorption is termed as an individual's characteristic, which encompasses openness, to experience changes in cognitive and emotional, state over a range of circumstances (Milling, Kirsch & Burgess, 2000, p. 32). It is the capacity for self altering attention that is considered to be a significant component of hypnotisability (Green & Lynn, 2008, p. 156). Highly susceptible individuals, on measures of absorption, are believed to get involved in a variety of imaginative practices (Milling, Kirsh & Burgess, 2000, p. 32). Another study carried out, to consider absorption as a predictor of hypnotisability, (as cited in Council, Kirsch & Grant, 1996) used scales that are made to specifically measure absorption, when tests are administered in the same experimental setting (Green & Lynn, 2008, p. 156).

Szlyk (2003) has described the account of various researchers speculating the particular trait empathy and its relationship with hypnotisability.

Empathy is the ability to understand another person's feelings and motives.

J. R. Hilgard (1970) retrieved, that an individual's capability to empathetically recognise characters in drama and literature makes empathy a notable predictor of hypnotisability.

In his ' High Risk Model of Threat Perception', Wickramasekera I. (1998) derived that, the development of psychosomatic symptoms is more susceptible in high hypnotisable's partly due to the increased empathetic characteristic they possess. Same clinical observations were confirmed by Spiegel and Spiegel (1978) that individuals with high hypnotic ability tend to relate to new events and begin to develop symptoms that resemble the ones
<https://assignbuster.com/methods-and-design-assignment-2-literature-review/>

they have observed in others.

Imagery is the ability of a person to revive an experience or emotional state in one's mind. Relationships among imagery and hypnotisability are complex. While studying the degree of association, one needs to be aware that findings differ with respect to their usage in or outside the hypnotic context. Vivid imagery is frequently used in hypnosis, Kogon, Jasiukaitis, Berardi, Gupta, Kosslyn, & Speigal (1998) decided to co-relate computer generated and self report measure of imagery with hypnotisability to find out the degree of relationship between them, believing that computer generated imagery measures would be better predictors of hypnotisability. But the results were not satisfactory as the measures were administered mostly outside of the hypnotic setting. Moreover, the imagery modality used to measure the co-relation between imagery and hypnotisability must be valid e. g. Carli, Cavallaro & Santacangelo (2007) used "instructions of globally reduced perceptions" instead of suggestions based on particular sensory modalities and got positive results pertaining to their study, that Highs and Lows vary in their preferred imaginative modalities.

References

- Barber, T. X. & Glass. L. (1962). Significant factors in hypnotic behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 64: 222-8.
- Barber, T. X., Spanos, N. P., & Chaves, J. F. (1974). *Hypnosis, Imagination and Human Potentialities*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Braffman, W., & Kirsch I. (2001). Reaction time as a predictor of imaginative suggestibility and hypnotisability. *Contemporary Hypnosis*, 18(3): 107-119.
- Brynt, R. A., & Idey, A. (2001). Intrusive thoughts and hypnotisability. *Contemporary Hypnosis*, 18(1): 14-20.
- <https://assignbuster.com/methods-and-design-assignment-2-literature-review/>

Carli, G., Cavallaro, F. I., Santarcangelo E. L. (2007). Hypnotisability and imagery modality preference: Do highs and lows live in the same world? *Contemporary Hypnosis*, 24(2): 64-75.

Council, J. R., Kirsch, I., & Grant, D. L. (1996). Imagination, expectancy and hypnotic responding. In: R. G. Kunzendorf, N. P. Spanos, B. Wallace (eds) *Hypnosis and Imagination*. Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing Co, 41-66.

Green, J. P., & Lynn, S. J. (2008). Fantasy Proneness and hypnotisability: Another look. *Contemporary Hypnosis*, 25(3-4): 156-164.

Hilgard, J. R. (1970). *Personality and hypnosis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hilgard, J. R. (1979). Imaginative and sensory-affective involvements in everyday life and in hypnosis. In: E Fromm, RE Shor (eds) *Hypnosis: Developments in research and new perspectives*. New York: Aldine; 483-517.

Kirsch, I. & Braffman, W. (2001). Imaginative suggestibility and hypnotisability. *American Psychological Society*, 10(2): 57-61

Kogon, M. N., Jasiukaitis, P., Berardi, A., Gupta, M., Kosslyn, S. M., & Speigal, D. (1998). Imagery and Hypnotisability Revisited. *The International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, XLVI (4): 363-370.

Kumar, V. K., Pekala, R. J., Cummings, J. (1996). Trait factors, state effects and hypnotisability. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 44: 232-49.

Manmiller, J. L., Kumar, V. K., & Pekala, R. J. (2005). Hypnotisability, creative capacity, creative styles, absorption and phenomenological experience, during hypnosis. *Creativity Research Journal*, 17(1): 9-24.

<https://assignbuster.com/methods-and-design-assignment-2-literature-review/>

Milling, L. S., Kirsch, I., & Burgess, C. (2000). Hypnotic suggestibility and absorption: Revisiting the context effect. *Contemporary Hypnosis*, 17: 32-41.

Poulsen, B. C., & Matthews, W. J. (2003). Correlates of imaginative and hypnotic suggestibility in children. *Contemporary Hypnosis*, 20(4): 198-208.

Spiegel, H., & Spiegel, D. (1978). *Trance and treatment*. New York: Basic Books.

Wickramasekera, II, I. E. (1998). Secrets kept from the mind but not the body or behavior:

The unsolved problems of identifying and treating somatization and psychophysiological

disease. *Advances in Mind-Body Medicine*, 14, 81-132.

Wickramasekera II, I. E & Szlyk, J. P. (2003). Could empathy be a predictor of hypnotic ability? *The International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 51: 390-399.

Wilson, S. C., & Barber, T. X. (1981). Vivid fantasy and hallucinatory abilities in the life histories of excellent hypnotic subjects (' somnambules'): preliminary report with female subjects. In: E. Klinger (ed) *Imagery*. Volume 2: Concepts, Results and Applications. New York: Plenum Press; 133-49.