DISCUSSION

From the data gathered by the experimenters, the study supports the acceptance of the null hypothesis. The study conveyed that there was no increase on the accuracy of recall of the participants at the different treatment

conditions. There was no significant difference among their mean scores in the recall test.

The study therefore supports the findings which states that the rate of forgetting would be the same whether or not a formal mnemonic were used in learning (Britannica, p.893 and Roedigger, 1980). This also contradicted the conviction of other researchers (Mendler, 1967; Raugh,1975; Belleza Cheesman & Reddy, 1977; Lawson, 1977) whose studies employed different systems of mnemonic device whose results upheld its helpfulness in recall. However, the results of this study do not intend to debunk these opposing studies since the nature and design of the mentioned experiment were not the same and this experiment is not a mere replication of the related studies mentioned.

Also, the researchers do not want to limit the interpretation of the data from the result of the statistical tool alone. The trends of the data which were gathered should also be considered. It is worth noting that all the participants who belong to the third group with the mnemonic device got a perfect score of 10 in the written test. This tends to prove that mnemonics do aid us in our recall although based on this experiment, its use does not guarantee us of a superior performance when compared to those who did not use any mnemonics.

Such result may be due to the unexpected high performance of some participants who belonged to the control group. Two participants scored a perfect 10 while one got 9 correct answers. This is an effect of two organismic variables which might have confounded the study: apprehension and sophistication of the participants. Majority of them expressed the feeling of self-consciousness upon learning that the experiment was about short-term memory. Some even wanted to know their scores right after they finished answering the written test. Because of being apprehensive and likely to exhibit the best in them, the participants' use of their own mnemonics for their own convenience occurred. From an informal interview with some of the subjects in the control condition, the experimenters gathered that a common mnemonic device employed was the one mentioned by McConnell (1982): ". . . taking the initial letter of each term and memorizing the letter themselves. Recalling the letters at a later time would then give you a clue as to the terms themselves"(p.374).

Further observation of the test scores will reveal that the participants of the mnemonic condition performed better than those who belonged to the mnemonic and picture condition. This may be attributed to the difference in the mental picture to which the participant associated the mnemonics with to the pictures the experimenters made

(Pezdek, 1977). Example was bird in a tree - the bird may be an eagle standing on a branch while the mnemonic with picture shown in the experiment was a small bird nestled at the top of a tree.

Departing from trends and using the result gathered from the use of ANOVA as a statistical tool, we can see that such difference is not significant. This imply that recall whether aided or not with mnemonics will function on the same performance level.

In conclusion, considering both the trend of the data and the result of the ANOVA, the experimenters believe that recall can be aided by mnemonics but this does not entail superior or better performance of tasks concerning the use of short-term memory.

The researchers recommend that this study upon replications should involve a larger number of participants. It is also suggested that participants be drawn out from different college levels and courses for a better representation of the population.