# EXPLORING THE EFFECTS OF LINGUISTIC VERSUS NON-LINGUISTIC MENTATION IN A REMOTE VIEWING PROTOCOL, WITH COINCIDENT MICROPSYCHOKINESIS DETECTION USING A NOVEL MATRIX REG

Dr. Paul Stevens & Dr Ben Roberts

University of Derby, UK

**Grant 180/18**

**Background:** This project explores psi-related processes — mode of mentation and possible microPK coincident effects — within a remote-viewing (RV) protocol.

Exploring the mentation mode, two conditions were used in which participants (Ps) expressed their mentation non-linguistically (drawing their impressions) versus linguistically (typing their impresssions). As language structures any experience, verbal description of inner states can only convey an approximation of what occurs within the body. It was hypothesised that verbally describing psi experiences (which appear to occur within such inner worlds rather then being mediated via a specific organ or site) may therefore be less successful in terms of 'hits' than if language is avoided.

The idea of coincident effects is based on previous research on psi as a unitary phenomenon[1], and uses a novel random event generator (REG) based on a CMOS imaging sensor under dark conditions. This design was intended to expand on previous research which gave limited/ inconsistent evidence of patterning from commonly used filtered-output REGs. While the original rationale for filtering was to ensure that REGs were unresponsive to 'non-paranomal' events, this explicitly assumed that microPK is not a direct influence — where underlying processes of generation are important — but instead depends only on final output, despite evidence to the contrary (Ibison, 1998)[2]. Our REG more directly relates to the underlying physical process and provides more information for analysis.

**Aims:** To explore differences in the way the mode of communication (linguistic vs. non-linguistic) might affect access to psi-mediated information, and whether ESP processes might be accompanied by coincident microPK effects. Based on a remote viewing protocol, with a novel REG as the coincident detector.

**Method:** 60[3] participants (Ps) were recruited — 33 Ps in the online condition, taking part from anywhere in the world, and 27 in-person, on the Derby University campus. All sessions were carried out using a website interface that gave standardised instructions, handled randomisation, and securely recorded data. Target sites were visited in real-time by the RV agent. Each session consisted of 20 minutes RV, during which Ps either typed their mentation or uploaded a drawing, depending on assigned condition. Concurrently, the REG recorded session and control data (both pre- and post-session) at the target site. Ps then ranked 4 360° video-clips (target site and 3 decoys), with later independent ranking for comparison.

---

[1]    Roe, C.A., Davey, R. & Stevens, P. (2003). Are ESP and PK aspects of a unitary phenomenon? A   preliminary test of the relationship between ESP and PK. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 67.

[2]    Ibison, M. (1998). Evidence that anomalous statistical influence depends on the details of the        random process. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 12, 407-423

[3]    80 Ps were originally planned but recruitment became difficult due to the pandemic.  A decision was therefore taken to stop the study once 60 sessions had been completed. No analysis, including calculation of hit rate, was performed prior to these studies being completed, to avoid 'optional stopping' concerns.

**Results:** There were 57 fully completed sessions with useable data, with 18 direct hits, giving a $\Pi$ = 0.58 ($p$ = 0.12), slightly less than mean value for $\Pi$ = 0.62 given by Bem and Honorton (1994) in their ganzfeld meta-analysis and not statistically significant ($p$ = 0.21). There was a marked difference in hit rate when comparing in-person (6 hits out of 27, $\Pi$ = 0.46, $p$ = 0.31) versus online Ps (12 hits out of 30, $\Pi$ = 0.67, $p$ = 0.02), possibly due to in-person Ps being primarily course-credit students with lower motivation. Non-linguistic (drawing) mode Ps achieved 9 hits out of 28 sessions ($\Pi$ = 0.59, $p$ = 0.10) and linguistic (typed) mode Ps had 9 hits out of 29 sessions ($\Pi$ = 0.57, $p$ = 0.14). Given the only evidence of remote viewing was in the online group, that group was analysed on its own, but still showed no significant difference between non-linguistic and linguistic modes ($p$ = 0.75). Independent judge rankings did not match participant rankings. The REG did show significantly greater deviation from baseline (based on per participant Stouffer Zs) for remote-viewing hits versus misses ($p$ = 0.03). Hits versus misses for control periods showed no significant difference ($p$ = 0.24). RV periods overall (hits and misses combined) were not significantly different from the control periods overall ($p$ = 0.23), nor were there any significant differences between RV and Control data for hits ($p$ = 0.88) or misses ($p$ = 0.18). Complexity measures, based on fractal dimension of the REG activity as a continuous stream and as a set of surfaces, did not show any significant differences between conditions. No correlation was found between local magnetic field activity and REG activity, confirming that this type of device is relatively robust against external influences (other than temperature, though this is a consistent trend easily compensated for).

**Conclusions:** RV can successfully be performed with a minimal setup, using a standardised webpage interface. There was evidence of successful remote viewing only with online Ps, probably due to probable differing levels of motivation of Ps and possibly non-naive subjects in the online condition. No differences were seen based on the mode of mentation (linguistic or non-linguistic). The novel REG did show significant differences in activity for hits versus misses, suggesting its usefulness as a co-incident detector, but there are doubts as to whether the more complicated design is needed, as opposed to the simpler REG used in microPK studies.

**Keywords:** Remote viewing; Coincident detection; Non-linguistic mentation

**E-mail contact:** Stevens.Paul@gmail.com