

Defining Hypnosis: Process, Product, and the Value of Tolerating Ambiguity

Commentary: On the Centrality of the Concept of an Altered State to Definitions of Hypnosis.

Vince Polito, PhD^{*} †; Amanda J. Barnier PhD †; Kevin M. McConkey, PhD ‡

March, 2014

Wagstaff (this issue) points to differences among and within general definitions of hypnosis, such as those in dictionaries, and technical definitions of hypnosis, such as those by professional and scientific groups. Wagstaff argues that definitions of hypnosis should be consistent across lay and scientific contexts and should be based on the etymological origins of the terms in question. He considers that defining hypnosis as an ‘altered state of consciousness’ would resolve issues that have prevented an accepted understanding of the phenomenon. Although we are comfortable with the definitional centrality of an altered state of consciousness, we consider that definitions should be built in large part on data and we are reasonably relaxed about ambiguities and inconsistencies.

Theoretical and conceptual disagreements have characterised the field and definition of hypnosis since its beginning (McConkey, 2005, 2008). These differences, however, have not prevented significant advances in understanding and using the phenomenon. Generations of researchers have progressed from characterising the properties of hypnotic phenomena, to using hypnosis as a tool for investigating other aspects of human behaviour and experience, and to developing validated adjunct treatments for a range of clinical conditions (Nash & Barnier, 2008).

Although we are generally comfortable with Wagstaff’s definition of hypnosis, we believe that, rather than focusing on ideological or etymological reasoning, a more productive

approach to establishing definitions is by ‘pushing up’ from available empirical evidence; although researchers need to know where they are pushing towards, that does not need to be overly specified. When considering most current definitions of hypnosis, we have progressed beyond earlier ones because we can draw on a large corpus of data from many years of rigorous empirical work, often from multiple theoretical perspectives. The current task then is to refine and advance by linking ideas to empirical evidence.

Wagstaff argues that an altered state of consciousness, characterised by “changes in sensations, perceptions, thoughts, or behaviour” (p. 92) should be a central feature of a definition of hypnosis; notably, however, he refers to an “alleged” altered state of consciousness (p. 102). This definition focuses on participants’ phenomenal experiences and recognises that although specific stimuli or social interactions (e.g., a hypnotic induction; the presence of a hypnotist) may facilitate hypnosis, the most important factor that allows one to say that hypnosis has occurred is that individuals’ subjective experiences of themselves and the world are altered in ways that they ordinarily would not be altered. We are agnostic about whether the term ‘altered state of consciousness’ is the best descriptor of the changes that participants undergo in hypnosis, especially since this phrase itself is poorly defined and has been used to represent a variety of different positions (Kihlstrom, 2005; Kirsch, 2011). That aside, we agree with the importance of highlighting alterations in

* Department of Psychology, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia
e-mail: vince.polito@mq.edu.au

† ARC Centre of Excellence in Cognition and its Disorders and Department of Cognitive Science, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia

‡ School of Psychology, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia

participants' phenomenal experience in any definition of hypnosis (see also McConkey, 2005; Nash, 2005)

Some of the confusion that exists among and between definitions is because of different emphases on what the hypnotist does versus what the individual experiences. This distinction between hypnosis-as-procedure (what leads an individual to alterations in experience and behaviour) and hypnosis-as-product (those subjective effects) is a useful one to make. Wagstaff's definition contains both these elements with the emphasis on hypnosis-as-product. In many lay definitions and in some theoretical positions the emphasis is on hypnosis-as-process. In our view the emphasis should be on hypnosis-as-product. We are not saying that the process, primarily the hypnotic induction, is not important; rather, we are saying the induction is only one element that together with the hypnotic ability of the individual may or may not lead to alterations in experience.

As Wagstaff indicates, an induction is "a procedure designed to induce or bring about hypnosis" (p. 102). Importantly, Wagstaff does not claim that the induction is a necessary requirement for hypnosis to occur. Below we review data that shows that in some cases the induction has a profound effect on hypnotizable participants' experiences whereas in others it has little facilitative effect. An analogy may help to illustrate how an induction may relate to hypnosis-as-product. Drawing on the work of Shor (1970), we note that for many individuals the experience of hypnosis is akin to becoming absorbed in a book or watching a movie. Individuals differ in their capacity to have such experiences and there are situational factors that can influence the chances of this happening. We liken a movie theatre to the laboratory or clinic in which a hypnotic induction is administered; that is, an environment that is specifically associated with a particular type of experience (watching a movie / being hypnotised). The procedure of the lights dimming just before a movie starts is similar to a hypnotic induction and the events of the film are similar to hypnotic suggestions. As the film begins, people quieten and focus their attention, leading to a greater likelihood

of becoming absorbed in the film. For some audience members, this procedure may have little effect and they may 'watch', but not become absorbed in the movie. Others may become quickly absorbed, even if they have missed the dimming of the lights, because of their ability to focus and suspend disbelief. Similarly, an induction may increase the chances of some individuals becoming hypnotised, but it is not crucial for hypnosis-as-product to occur for those who have a high level of hypnotic ability. Finally, although the movie theatre is a strong cue for absorption, an individual may get caught up in a movie in any number of contexts—watching at home, in an airplane, or even on a mobile device. Similarly, although a laboratory or clinic may strongly cue the experience of hypnosis, it is not a necessary requirement for hypnosis-as-product to occur for some individuals if they choose to have the experience. The key point is that although an induction procedure is an important cue that can increase hypnotic responding, it is not a sufficient criterion by which to define the occurrence of hypnosis. In fact, the relationship between process and product can be complex, and that can be seen across various studies; we will give three examples.

Connors et al. (2012) administered a suggestion based on clinical face processing impairments to participants with and without a hypnotic induction. Participants who received an induction were more likely to misidentify their own face following the suggestion compared to those who did not receive an induction. In this case, the induction strongly influenced participants' behaviour and subjective experiences.

McConkey, Szeps, and Barnier (2001) gave individuals a suggestion to experience themselves as the opposite sex following either an induction or an imagination instruction given in the hypnotic setting. Participants were equally likely to respond to the suggestion regardless of whether they received a formal induction or an imagination instruction. However, their subjective experiences did vary. Those who received an induction experienced a faster onset of the suggested effects than those in the imagination condition. This

is consistent with the notion that although an induction may facilitate hypnotic experience, their own hypnotic ability and other contextual cues may be sufficient for some individuals to experience subjective alterations.

Polito, Barnier, Woody and Connors (2014) investigated participants' responses with and without an induction across ideomotor, challenge, and cognitive suggestions. Participants who received an induction were more likely to pass suggestions, although some passed without an induction. Notably, however, for those who passed each suggestion, alterations to experience in terms of reductions in feeling of control, were similar whether or not they had received a hypnotic induction. In this case, an induction influenced participants' behaviour but not the phenomenal experience of those who responded to the suggestions.

Overall, these data show that participants' experiences of hypnosis are not simple responses 'switched on' at the beginning of a session by an induction. Most participants in these studies experienced hypnosis-as-product because they had the ability to do so, and the relevance of an induction procedure was dependent on the specific context. In some cases, an induction had an effect on behaviour and experience; in other cases the

effect was minimal or subtle. These data underscore that whereas hypnosis-as-product is central to the definition of hypnosis, the place of hypnosis-as-procedure in any definition is less straightforward.

The roles of a hypnotic induction, of hypnotic ability, and of specific hypnotic suggestions in producing alterations in experience and behaviour will be part of the continued debate, and we are comfortable with definitional and theoretical plurality (McConkey, 2005). The domain of hypnosis as a research area is broad and different researchers have been working to explain different parts of the phenomenon. Although we may have been operating with a variety of theoretical and definitional frameworks, we all have discovered some part of the truth. The significant progress of the field, despite these differences, demonstrates that science can tolerate ambiguity; in fact, the tolerance of ambiguity may be essential in advancing science (McConkey, 2005). In defining hypnosis, an understanding of process and product, and a tolerance of ambiguity will move us toward a definition that is consistent with the data, useful for generating new insights, and reasonably articulates what the phenomenon is and what it is not.

REFERENCES

- Connors, M. H., Barnier, A. J., Coltheart, M., Cox, R. E., & Langdon, R. (2012). Mirrored-self misidentification in the hypnosis laboratory: Recreating the delusion from its component factors. *Cognitive Neuropsychiatry*, *17*(2), 151–176. doi:10.1080/13546805.2011.582287
- Kihlstrom, J. F. (2005). Is hypnosis an altered state of consciousness or what? *Contemporary Hypnosis*, *22*(1), 34–38. doi:10.1002/ch.20
- Kirsch, I. (2011). The altered state issue: Dead or alive? *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, *59*(3), 350. doi:10.1080/00207144.2011.570681
- McConkey, K. M. (2008). Generations and landscape of hypnosis: Questions we've asked, questions we should ask. In M. R. Nash & A. J. Barnier (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of hypnosis: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 53–77). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- McConkey, K. M. (2005). On finding the balanced path of hypnosis definition. *American Journal of Clinical Hypnosis*, *48*(2–3), 137–139.
- McConkey, K. M., Szeps, A., & Barnier, A. J. (2001). Indexing the experience of sex change in hypnosis and imagination. *The International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, *49*(2), 123–138.
- Nash, M. R. (2005). The importance of being earnest when crafting definitions: Science and scientism are not the same thing. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, *53*(3), 265–280. doi:10.1080/00207140590961934
- Nash, M. R., & Barnier, A. J. (2008). Introduction: A roadmap for explanation, a working definition. In M. R. Nash & A. J. Barnier (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of hypnosis: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 1–18). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Polito, V., Barnier, A. J., Woody, E. Z., & Connors, M. H. (2014). Measuring Agency Change Across the Domain of Hypnosis. *Psychology of Consciousness: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *1*(1), 3–19. doi:10.1037/cns0000010
- Shor, R. E. (1970). The three-factor theory of hypnosis as applied to the book-reading fantasy and to the concept of suggestion. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, *18*(2), 89–98. doi:10.1080/00207147008415907
- Wagstaff, G. F. (2014). On the Centrality of the Concept of an Altered State to Definitions of Hypnosis. *Journal of Mind–Body Regulation*, *2*(2), 90–108.

THE JOURNAL OF MIND- BODY REGULATION

HOME ABOUT LOG IN REGISTER SEARCH CURRENT
ARCHIVES ANNOUNCEMENTS THESIS ABSTRACTS

Home > About the Journal > Submissions

SUBMISSIONS

- » [Online Submissions](#)
- » [Author Guidelines](#)
- » [Copyright Notice](#)
- » [Privacy Statement](#)
- » [Author Fees](#)

ONLINE SUBMISSIONS

Already have a Username/Password for The Journal of Mind-Body Regulation?
[GO TO LOGIN](#)

Need a Username/Password?
[GO TO REGISTRATION](#)

Registration and login are required to submit items online and to check the status of current submissions.

AUTHOR GUIDELINES

SUBMITTING TO THE JOURNAL OF MIND-BODY REGULATION

Before submitting an article to The Journal of Mind-Body Regulation (MBR), authors must become acquainted with the scope and guidelines of the journal and refer to the document entitled "[About the Journal](#)".

What MBR is looking for:

To be accepted for publication in MBR, articles must present the results of primary scientific research or constitute integrative review articles that appeal to a broad readership and are of interdisciplinary scope. As in most scientific journals, results must not have been published or be considered for publication elsewhere before or during the submission process to MBR.

Authors must perform and report on experiments and describe them in sufficient detail; including statistics, and other analyses, according to high technical standards. The conclusions must be supported by the data, and the discussion should be accessible to both experts and non-experts. The article should follow an intelligible sequence (e.g., Introduction; Methods; Results; Discussion; Conclusions) and the usage of English must be sound, clear and unambiguous. The research must meet recognized institutional ethical standards (e.g., IRB approval) and respect

OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS

[Journal Help](#)

USER

Username
Password

Remember me

LANGUAGE

English ▼

JOURNAL CONTENT

Search

All ▼

Browse

[By Issue](#)
[By Author](#)
[By Title](#)

INFORMATION

[For Readers](#)
[For Authors](#)
[For Librarians](#)

KEYWORDS

Color Dying on the 4th day of the month Earth years
Expectancy Expectation Form
Historical variation Conclusions
Hypnosis Hypnosis, hypnotism, trance, altered state, suggestion, hypnotizability
Intention Lung diseases MBCT
MBSR National cultural differences Number
Suggestion Variability in meaning response antidepressant medication
depression **hypnosis**
placebo effects

NOTIFICATIONS

[View](#)
[Subscribe / Unsubscribe](#)

participants' integrity and anonymity. To be considered for publication in MBR, all data, including computer codes involved in the creation or analysis of data, must be available to any reader upon request. The manuscript must adhere to appropriate reporting guidelines and authors must preserve transparency in reporting their results. Specific guidelines about reporting data are accessible at the **EQUATOR** website.

MBR is an open access journal; authors therefore preserve the copyright of their paper but agree to publicly and freely disclose their results to any interested reader or institution.

PREPARING THE MANUSCRIPT FOR SUBMISSION

General Guidelines:

The following guidelines apply all peer-reviewed research and review articles submissions. All article manuscripts submitted to MBR should be within 8500 words. Authors must submit, alongside their manuscript, a short abstract of their paper. The abstract should contain no subtitle and be approximately 170 words in length (with a strict maximum of 350 words).

If accepted by the editorial team, the manuscript will undergo double-blind peer-review; authors must write their manuscript with this blind-review process in mind (e.g., avoid referring to one's work in identifiable terms).

The text is single-spaced; uses a 12-point font; employs italics, rather than underlining (except with URL addresses); and all illustrations, figures, and tables are placed within the text at the appropriate points, rather than at the end.

Authors should include a high quality copy of any illustrations, figures, and tables under a separate file and upload them in the supplementary material of their submission (e.g., illustrations, figures and graphs as image files – preferably .png, but .jpeg, .tif, .pdf and other select format are also acceptable – and tables as editable word documents.). If they wish, authors may present a short appendix or sample material alongside their article manuscript (cf Moerman; de Jong and Raz, MBR Volume 1, Issue 2). Although MBR is an electronic journal and welcomes high quality colour graphs and figures, we encourage authors to verify that their colour choices print in distinguishable greyscale shades.

Statistical Analysis Report:

All statistical analysis results must be reported appropriately following the guidelines of the 6th edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2011; thereafter referred to as APA 6th).

Referencing:

Authors should strictly follow the guidelines of the APA 6th for in-text referencing and the reference list. If authors use reference management software (e.g., EndNote, BibTeX, RefWorks, etc.), they must ensure that they deactivate the field codes before submitting their manuscript. When available, URLs to access references online, including those for open access versions of the reference, should appear in the reference list, after each reference. The URLs should be ready to click.

Supplementary Material:

Only specific types of multimedia files are accepted in MBR. Authors should contact the Journal Manager, Noémie Aubert Bonn (noemie.aubertbonn@mail.mcgill.ca) prior to submission to become acquainted with acceptable formats. Failure to do so may result in the inability to include audiovisual files or other materials.

Specifics:

Authors should capitalize their main title according to the guidelines of the APA 6th. Subtitles and section titles, however, should only contain sentence capitalization (i.e., sole initial letter and any abbreviation or proper noun).

When authors submit their initial manuscript, they should use indentation of the first line of each paragraph. To facilitate the layout process, however, indentation should not be composed of character spaces (e.g., using 5 spaces before the text of a new paragraph in Word), but rather of automatic indentation (e.g., using the «Tab» key before the text of a new paragraph in Word).

Before submitting their manuscript, authors should make sure their Word document contains only one font style (preferably Times, Times New Roman or Helvetica) and that any font type (e.g., italics, bold, etc.) is intentional.

AFTER SUBMITTING

After submitting to MBR, authors should expect 2–3 weeks for the editorial board to decide whether the manuscript corresponds to the scope and quality standards of MBR, in which case the **peer-review process** will be initiated. The editorial board will notify the authors upon this decision. **If the manuscript proceeds to peer-review, three or four reviewers will evaluate its relevance, quality and interest.** This step takes approximately 3 weeks. Following this delay, the editorial board will notify the authors of the decision that it has taken concerning their manuscript (accept submission; accept pending revisions; resubmit for review; resubmit elsewhere; or decline submission). If the decision is to "accept pending revisions", the authors will have a maximum of 10 days to revise their manuscript in line with the reviews obtained. If the authors properly address the suggestions of reviewers, or if the initial decision was «accept submission», authors should expect a few more weeks before the manuscript is published. MBR values timely publication, therefore, authors are expected to respond efficiently and rapidly to emails from the editors during the review, copyediting and layout processes. Once published, authors are welcome to share a link to their publication on their personal webpage or to distribute their article openly. For more information about the publication process, look at **OJS Editorial and Publishing System**.

SUBMISSION PREPARATION CHECKLIST

As part of the submission process, authors are required to check off their submission's compliance with all of the following items, and submissions may be returned to authors that do not adhere to these guidelines.

1. The submission has not been previously published, nor is it before another journal for consideration (or an explanation has been provided in Comments to the Editor).
2. The submission file is in Microsoft Word or RTF document file format.
3. When available, the URLs to access references online are provided, including those for open access versions of the reference. The URLs are ready to click (e.g., <http://pkp.sfu.ca>).