**Zeigarnik Effect**

**Abstract:**

The experiment was performed to examine the zeigarnik effect. A subject was selected who did not know about the experiment. The experimenter gave the question paper to the subject and asked the subject to solve the question paper in 20 minutes, and after solving, the experimenter asked to rewrite the questions. The nature of experiment is practical. According to the experiment performed, incomplete tasks can better recalled than complete tasks.

**Introduction:**

The Zeigarnik effect was named after its founder, Russian psychiatrist and psychologist “**Bluma Wulfovna Zeigarnik**”. While dining at a restaurant in 1920s, Zeigarnik noticed waiters were able to keep track of complex orders and unpaid meals, but once the orders were filled and paid for, the waiters were unable to recall detailed information about the orders. Intrigued, she decided to study the phenomenon via a series of experiments in her lab.

In one of her experiments, Zeigarnik asked a group of 138 children to complete a series of simple tasks, puzzles, and arithmetic problems. She allowed the children to complete half of the tasks and interrupted them during the remaining tasks. Zeigarnik investigated their recall after an hour’s delay and discovered 110 of the 138 children had better recall for the interrupted tasks than the completed tasks. In a related experiment involving adults, the participants were able to recall unfinished tasks 90% better than completed tasks.

The Zeigarnik effect has since been studied by many other researchers, with some able to replicate Zeigarnik’s findings and others unable to do so. Several models have been proposed to explain the effect.

**Method:**

* **Type of Practical:** Experimental.
* **Design of Practical:** Repeated Measures.

**Independent variable:** Questionnaire.

**Dependent variable:** The recall ratio.

**Experimental Hypothesis:**

According to “Zeigarnik Effect” we can better recall incomplete tasks as compared to completed tasks.

**Null Hypothesis:**

We can better recall completed tasks as compared to incomplete tasks.

**Subject:**

* **Name:** S.F.
* **Age:** 20.
* **Gender:** Female.
* **Education:** BA.

**Apparatus:**

* Questionnaire.
* Pencil.
* Stopwatch.
* Blank Paper.

**Procedure:**

1. First, we asked the subject S.F. to sit comfortably.
2. The experimenter gave a questionnaire sheet to the subject to answer the questions.
3. The experimenter gave 20 minutes to the subject to fill in the questionnaire.
4. After the subject had filled the question sheet, she was asked to recall the questions asked in questionnaire and write them.
5. After writing the questions, we noticed that she could better recall the questions which remained incomplete rather than complete ones.
6. Hence, the experimental hypothesis is proved.

**Result:**

Completed tasks are not better recalled as compared to incomplete tasks. Thus, the experimental hypothesis is proved.

**Discussion:**

In the experiment, we noticed that complete task is not better as compared to incomplete task. In this experiment, the experimental hypothesis is proved and null hypothesis is rejected. Many scientists and researchers are able to replicate replicate zeigarnik’s effect and others unable to do so. Several models and features of this effect have been proposed and many are coming in this way. The Zeigarnik effect impacts your life and can be observed every day. The stress of daily hassles and frustrations often stem from incomplete tasks. Ambivalence and procrastination can often be traced to the same source: the lawns bugging you to get mowed; the dishes screaming to be washed; the bills pushing you to get paid. How burdensome is the mental and emotional energy they consume, and how they rob us of the present.

The Zeigarnik Effect remains so long as the subject is self-involved with the uncompleted tasks, that is, feels connected in regard to what it tells that person about himself or herself. 3 Other research studies on interruption of test subjects doing simple tasks like jigsaw puzzles by Russian scientist Bluma Zeigarnik found that the test subjects least likely to complete the task were those who had been disrupted at the start. Apparently participants hadn't had the time to become cognitively invested in the task, so they experienced trouble recovering from the distraction. Those who were interrupted closer to the end of the task were more likely to persist with the task to completion.
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