EFT Eyesight Experiment

Designed and conducted by Carol Look

Data Analysis and editorial support by Jayne Morgan-Kidd
Final Data Questionnaire by Rick Wilkes (www.thrivingnow.com)
Editorial support by Dr. Patricia Carrington (www.eftupdate.com)

Preliminary Report by Carol Look

RESEARCH QUESTION: Is it possible for a person with a vision problem to improve their eyesight by using **Emotional Freedom Techniques** (**EFT)**?

Based on the results recorded below, the answer appears to be a resounding yes!!

DESCRIPTION OF EMOTIONAL FREEDOM TECHNIQUES (EFT)

EFT is a form of meridian therapy based on the ancient Chinese technique of acupuncture. The **EFT** practitioner taps on designated acupressure points while inviting the client to tune in to the emotion or problem that has been chosen for treatment.

THE PARTICIPANTS

Participants were volunteers recruited through announcements in Carol Look's newsletter and at energy psychology conferences. At the beginning of this experiment, over 400 people expressed interest in this study and chose to participate. All of them already knew **EFT**. During the course of the 8 weeks, all but 120 dropped out. Many thanks to these 120 who diligently tapped on the **EFT** setups and suggestions provided.

Most of the participants (82%) were women. Most participants (nearly 70%) had not had their eyesight tested during the 3 months prior to the beginning of the study.

Over 80% indicated that they wear glasses for vision correction. Twenty percent wear contact lenses**.**

Participants ranged in age from 30-80. The average age was 52, with just over half the participants in their 50's.

To read the Table below see section "How To Read The Tables"

AGE GROUPS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	30's	10	8.3	8.5	8.5
	40's	27	22.5	22.9	31.4
	50's	62	51.7	**52.5**	83.9
	60's	16	13.3	13.6	97.5
	70's	2	1.7	1.7	99.2
	80's	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	118	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.7		
Total		120	100.0		

Statistical tests were used to determine differences between various groups, such as gender and age. The following were found to be statistically significant ($p<.05$):

1) **There was a significant difference between men and women in terms of overall eyesight improvement** ($p=.022$) in that **women improved their eyesight more than men did.** (The test accounts for the difference in group size.)

2) Over 28% of the final respondents reported that they sought additional EFT help. **There was no significant difference between those who sought additional EFT help during the course of the experiment and those that did not** in terms of their overall eyesight improvement.

3) There were **no** statistically significant differences in age groups in terms of overall improvement in eyesight. **This is a curious finding, considering that the popular belief that eyesight deterioration coincides with the aging process.**

STUDY DESIGN:

Each study participant was sent weekly emails with a topic for tapping. (Fear, anger, guilt, hurt, etc) Three full sets of **EFT** set-up statements were written out for the participants, with each set followed by one **EFT** tapping round focusing on the problem, followed by a second round that focused on the possibility of a solution.

This eyesight experiment was made available primarily to people who were already familiar with **EFT**. Announcements were made at **EFT** conferences and through newsletters.

ANALYSIS

Data was analyzed using SPSS, a statistical software designed for the social sciences. T-tests and ANOVA's were used to detect significant differences in groups.

HOW TO READ THE TABLES

Example:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Slight improvement (15-25%)	**25**	20.8	**20.8**	71.7
Missing	No response				

'Frequency' refers to how many participants chose this response. In this case, 25 people indicated a 'slight improvement'.

'Percent' is the percentage of total number of participants.

'Valid percent' excludes those who:

1) did not answer the question or
2) did not have the symptom addressed in that question.

'Valid percent' gives the clearest picture of the overall result.

'Cumulative percent' simply adds the percentages in each row cumulatively.

'Missing' or 'System missing' shows the number of people who did not answer that question.

RESULTS:

OVERALL EYESIGHT IMPROVEMENT:

As the table below indicates, nearly 75% of participants in this study indicated that an improvement occurred in their vision during and by the end of the study.

OVERALL Eyesight Improvement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	31	25.8	25.8	25.8
	very little change (up to 15%)	30	25.0	**25.0**	50.8
	Slight improvement (15-25%)	25	20.8	**20.8**	71.7
	noticeable improvement (25-50%)	18	15.0	**15.0**	86.7
	definite improvement (50-75%)	8	6.7	**6.7**	93.3
	significant improvement (over 75%)	8	6.7	**6.7**	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	100.0	

Only 25% indicated no change.

TEMPTED TO DROP OUT:

At the beginning of this study, over 400 people expressed interest and chose to participate. During the course of the 8 weeks, all but 120 dropped out. I received numerous emails informing me that participants could no longer continue as “life” was getting in the way. Reasons included ailing elderly parents, daily stress, the upcoming holiday season, being called out of town, and no longer being interested in the experiment. (I suspect that some people, if they did not notice significant improvement immediately, were no longer “held” by the experiment.)

In addition, I was unable to offer individualized coaching or counseling, and it is possible that ***secondary gains*** (advantages of maintaining poor eyesight) were more likely to retain a foothold without outside help. ***Comfort zones*** about what is possible with improving one's vision were definitely challenged by this experiment.

Slightly under half of the **participants (44%) that stayed in the study were 'tempted to drop out'** at some point, for example, one participant wrote in:

> *I had a hard time with week 4 – anger. I do not seem to have a problem with anger. When something negative happens around me I will go to feeling sorry for somebody or feeling hurt about a situation, but not anger. As a life coach and self improvement junkie, I do not think that I am stuffing the anger. I really think I simply don't have a lot of anger. Thus, week 4 was difficult to tap on things like "this blinding rage needs to be released", etc. It seemed negative to be tapping on something that was not there. This was the week I was tempted to drop out of the experiment.*

Q5 tempted to drop out

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	66	55.0	55.9	55.9
	Yes	52	43.3	**44.1**	100.0
	Total	118	98.3	100.0	
Missing	No response	2	1.7		
Total		120	100.0		

I asked the participants of the study to name their known diagnoses with regard to vision, even though we didn't target any particular medical diagnoses in the study. The most common diagnosis reported was Astigmatism, and over half of the participants did not report a diagnoses**.**

Diagnosis	**Number of those reporting a diagnosis (% of those reporting a diagnosis)**
Astigmatism	16 (29%)
Farsightedness	3 (5%)
Nearsightedness (short sightedness, myopia)	5 (9%)
Floaters	7 (13%)
Glaucoma	3 (5%)
Cataracts	5 (9%)
All others reported	16 (29%)
None reported	65 (not included in %)

TAPPING COMPLIANCE:

Participants were asked to use the **EFT** assignments once a day. Eighty-six percent of participants reported that they tapped 7 or more times at the end of week one of this experiment. At the end of the second week, the number of people tapping 7 or more times dropped slightly to about 82%. For the next 3 weeks, this trend held fairly well. During the last 3 weeks, the number of people who reported tapping 7 or more time dropped again to mid to lower 70% range. Most people in this study complied well with the instructions.

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE:

In the final questionnaire, participants were asked to answer certain questions about their emotions and responses to the experiment in addition to tabulating their numeric results. Some of the questions and answers are as follows:

Q1: Which emotion you tapped on caused the most dramatic changes in your eyesight?

Anger was mentioned 42 times, far more often than any other emotion. Also of interest was the fact that 3 people indicated that their most dramatic response was during the tapping sessions on beliefs about aging. (If this question had included this limiting belief as one of the choices, there may well have been more response in this area.)

Emotion	Number of times mentioned
Anger	**42**
Anxiety	24
Fear	20
Guilt	21
Hurt	19
All	3
None	14

Q2: What was the biggest reason you might have been reluctant to improve your eyesight?

Although there was a variety of responses, **three repetitive themes emerged** throughout this section:

1) Fear of memories that could surface or **fear of *'seeing'*** (understanding) an event more clearly (one-third of respondents)

2) Resistance to life changes or **secondary gains** (such as losing disability money, avoid responsibility for doing more with one's life) (20%)

3) Limiting belief in one's ability to improve eyesight because of the 'natural aging process' or **disbelief that EFT could improve eyesight.** (nearly 18% of respondents)

Sample responses to the question *"what is the downside of improving your eyesight"* were as follows:

> *...if I can make this change - nothing is too impossible. Am I ready to accept that nothing is impossible?*

> *…Owning my power: if I could improve my eyesight with some simple tapping, then I would have to own my power - accept how powerful I really am.*

Q2. (The Biggest Reason…)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no reason/no reluctance	18	15.0	16.7	16.7
	Fear	36	30.0	**33.3**	50.0
	Resistance or secondary gain	22	18.3	**20.4**	70.4
	limiting belief	19	15.8	**17.6**	88.0
	Other reason	13	10.8	12.0	100.0
	Total	108	90.0	100.0	
Missing	No response	12	10.0		
Total		120	100.0		

Q3. Were you surprised about feelings and incidents from childhood that surfaced?

Those answering "yes" or "no" were equally distributed. One woman who answered yes stated, *"Yes, I was surprised that they had that kind of impact on my eyesight and health."*

Q3. (Surprised about feelings…)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	49	40.8	**44.5**	44.5
	Yes	48	40.0	**43.6**	88.2
	Somewhat	7	5.8	6.4	94.5
	Nothing surfaced	6	5.0	5.5	100.0
	Total	110	91.7	100.0	
Missing	No response	10	8.3		
Total		120	100.0		

Many of those answering 'no' indicated that they actually had expected the tapping to unearth memories that would be related to their problems with their eyesight.

RESULTS FOR EACH INDICATOR OF CHANGE

Below you will find a chart for each indicator of change.

TOTAL represents the number of people who indicated a need for improvement in each particular area.

VALID PERCENT indicates the percentage of people who made an improvement anywhere between 15—100%. The participants were able to indicate levels of improvement through the following rating system:

0 = No change or improvement
1 = Very little improvement (up to 15%)
2 = Slight improvement (between 15-25%)
3 = Noticeable improvement (between 25-50%)
4 = Definite improvement (between 50-75%)
5 = Significant improvement (75% or more)

ABILITY TO SEE BRIGHTNESS:

In the following table, 60 people indicated that they had a problem seeing "brightness." At the end of the experiment, after taking out the answers indicating "very little change" (up to 15%), **over 41% identified a change between a slight and significant improvement (anywhere from 15% to over 75%).**

Brightness

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	23	19.2	38.3	38.3
	Very little	12	10.0	20.0	58.3
	Slight	6	5.0	**10.0**	68.3
	Noticeable	10	8.3	**16.7**	85.0
	Definite	6	5.0	**10.0**	95.0
	Significant	3	2.5	**5.0**	100.0
	Total	**60**	50.0	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	60	50.0		
Total		120	100.0		

CLARITY OF NEAR VISION:

In the category for clarity, I asked participants to identify issues with clarity in their distance vision as well as in near vision, such as when they were reading. Sixty-eight (68) participants, or 56 per cent of the final group, indicated that they had trouble with their vision when reading or viewing up close. Of this group, **41% of them reported between 15-75% improvement in their near vision.** (Again, I did not include those that indicated less than a 15% improvement.)

Clarity (near)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	27	22.5	39.7	39.7
	Very little	13	10.8	19.1	58.8
	Slight	11	9.2	**16.2**	75.0
	Noticeable	9	7.5	**13.2**	88.2
	Definite	5	4.2	**7.4**	95.6
	Significant	3	2.5	**4.4**	100.0
	Total	**68**	56.7	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	52	43.3		
Total		120	100.0		

CLARITY OF FAR VISION:

In the chart below reporting on distance vision, **43% of the participants reported an improvement between 15-75%. And of this group, *7.5% of them reported more than 75% improvement in their far sighted vision.***

Clarity (far)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	29	24.2	43.3	43.3
	Very little	9	7.5	13.4	56.7
	Slight	13	10.8	**19.4**	76.1
	Noticeable	6	5.0	**9.0**	85.1
	Definite	5	4.2	**7.5**	92.5
	Significant	5	4.2	**7.5**	100.0
	Total	**67**	55.8	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	53	44.2		
Total		120	100.0		

EYE FATIGUE:

In the next chart, you will notice that 33 people initially reported they had problems with eye fatigue. After the experiment, **nearly three-quarters of them reported that their eye fatigue had improved between 15 –75%.**

FATIGUE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very little	9	7.5	27.3	27.3
	Slight	6	5.0	**18.2**	45.5
	Noticeable	10	8.3	**30.3**	75.8
	Definite	6	5.0	**18.2**	93.9
	Significant	2	1.7	**6.1**	100.0
	Total	**33**	27.5	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	87	72.5		
Total		120	100.0		

COLOR PERCEPTION:

In the results for “color perception” below, 50 people identified this as a problem, **and 38% of them reported an improvement somewhere between 15-75%.**

Color Perception

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	21	17.5	42.0	42.0
	Very little	10	8.3	20.0	62.0
	Slight	6	5.0	**12.0**	74.0
	Noticeable	5	4.2	**10.0**	84.0
	Definite	5	4.2	**10.0**	94.0
	Significant	3	2.5	**6.0**	100.0
	Total	**50**	41.7	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	70	58.3		
Total		120	100.0		

COLOR CONTRAST:

Forty-nine participants indicated that noticing color contrast was an issue for them; **just under one-third of these people noticed a change from between 15% --over 75%.**

Color Contrast

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	24	20.0	49.0	49.0
	Very little	10	8.3	20.4	69.4
	Slight	4	3.3	**8.2**	77.6
	Noticeable	3	2.5	**6.1**	83.7
	Definite	7	5.8	**14.3**	98.0
	Significant	1	.8	**2.0**	100.0
	Total	**49**	40.8	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	71	59.2		
Total		120	100.0		

DRYNESS

Forty seven respondents indicated that dry eyes were a problem for them. Of these, nearly 47% indicated improvement of 15-over 75% by the end of the study.

DRYNESS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	19	15.8	40.4	40.4
	Very little	6	5.0	12.8	53.2
	Slight	12	10.0	**25.5**	78.7
	Noticeable	7	5.8	**14.9**	93.6
	Definite	3	2.5	**6.4**	100.0
	Total	**47**	39.2	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	73	60.8		
Total		120	100.0		

EYE BURNING/ ITCHING:

Of the 37 people who said that they were bothered by eye burning or itching, nearly one-third of those showed an improvement of between 15-75%.

EYE BURNING/ ITCHING

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	18	15.0	48.6	48.6
	Very little	7	5.8	18.9	67.6
	Slight	3	2.5	**8.1**	75.7
	Noticeable	5	4.2	**13.5**	89.2
	Definite	4	3.3	**10.8**	100.0
	Total	**37**	30.8	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	83	69.2		
Total		120	100.0		

EYE STRAIN:

Of the 47 people who said they were bothered by eye strain, **nearly half of them indicated that they found improvement by the end of the experiment in the range of 15-over 75%.**

EYE STRAIN

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	18	15.0	38.3	38.3
	Very little	7	5.8	14.9	53.2
	Slight	9	7.5	**19.1**	72.3
	Noticeable	9	7.5	**19.1**	91.5
	Definite	3	2.5	**6.4**	97.9
	Significant	1	.8	**2.1**	100.0
	Total	**47**	39.2	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	73	60.8		
Total		120	100.0		

FLOATERS:

While 34 people reported that they experienced “floaters” in their eyes, **29% of those that tracked this problem reported between a slight (15-25%) and significant (75% and above) improvement.**

FLOATERS (DECREASED)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	22	18.3	64.7	64.7
	Very little	2	1.7	5.9	70.6
	Slight	4	3.3	**11.8**	82.4
	Noticeable	3	2.5	**8.8**	91.2
	Definite	3	2.5	**8.8**	100.0
	Total	**34**	28.3	100.0	
Missing	Non-applicable	86	71.7		
Total		120	100.0		

- **Over 28% of the participants sought additional support from an EFT practitioner during the course of the experiment.**
- **For 30% of participants, the most significant change *reported* was in their vision.**
- **For another 46%, the most significant change *reported* was in the area of emotional release.**

Changes in the problems of Nearsightedness and Farsightedness are listed below.

Nearsightedness Change

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no change	52	43.3	44.4	44.4
	Better	59	49.2	**50.4**	94.9
	Worse	6	5.0	5.1	100.0
	Total	**117**	97.5	100.0	
Missing	Not reported	3	2.5		
Total		120	100.0		

Over one-half of the participants indicated that their nearsightedness improved.

Farsightedness Change

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No change	57	47.5	52.8	52.8
	Better	46	38.3	**42.6**	95.4
	Worse	5	4.2	4.6	100.0
	Total	**108**	90.0	100.0	
Missing	Not reported	12	10.0		
Total		120	100.0		

Over 42% of the participants who reported being farsighted, indicated an improvement.

LIMITATIONS of the EXPERIMENT / EXPERIMENTER:

While I am extremely satisfied with the results of the **EFT Eyesight Experiment**, I want to list some obvious limitations of this experiment and of me, Carol Look, the one conducting the experiment. As Gary would say, this experiment is a "good start."

(1) **There was no way to monitor participants' tapping.** Some may have been doing it in a quiet, peaceful place (as recommended with each week's assignments) while others may have had family, television or other distractions during their tapping sessions.

(2) **If "STUCK" or needing to go further on a particular issue**, I was unable to help the participants individually.

(3) **If any of the participants bumped into huge limiting beliefs not included in what I asked them to tap for**, there would be no chance of "collapsing" these beliefs if they were outside of conscious awareness. As we know now, limiting beliefs cause psychological reversal, and play a huge part in determining whether someone succeeds or not in making gains with **EFT**.

(4) **Some participants had problems with what I asked *or failed to ask* them to do.** Some responses were as follows:

a. **I (Carol) did not account for the mid range of vision**, i.e. viewing a computer screen. (Many participants included computer viewing in "near" vision.)

b. Someone complained that **I did not give them "permission" to tap more than once a day.** I was looking for compliance, knowing if I asked for more than once a day, the compliance rate might have decreased.

c. **There was no allowance for some of these eyesight problems GETTING WORSE**, which we know can happen with symptoms when we tap on serious emotional conflict. As Gary tells us, when symptoms get worse, this is a good indicator that we are in the right "zone" and more emotional tapping should be done.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY:

The present experiment constitutes a preliminary pilot investigation. It would be very desirable to follow it up with some formal studies investigating, among other things, the following unanswered questions:

1. **To be a controlled experiment the study would need to include a comparison group** consisting of people with similar vision problems who do *not* receive any **EFT** treatment for 8 weeks. The responses of these people would be studied before and after this 8 week period in order to find out if any improvement occurred spontaneously over time (or any symptom worsening).

2. It would also be valuable to obtain some **objective evidence** of the changes reported in the experiment by having formal eye examinations administered before the participants learn **EFT** and again 8 weeks after learning it, with the results formally compared by a vision specialist. (see attached case study)

3. In addition, **"expectation effects" could be at least partially ruled out** by providing a third group of participants who did not know **EFT** and had absolutely no positive expectations concerning it. This would help to rule out the effects of positive suggestion.

4. **The high dropout rate in this experiment should also be investigated.** This might be done by comparing the dropout rate in the present experiment with the dropout rate of a group people practicing **EFT** for reasons quite unrelated to vision (who also used written instructions to make the conditions comparable). It would also be desirable to include questionnaires concerning the reasons for the dropout rate in more detail in order to study the correlations between the tendency to drop out of the study and such factors as negative reactions to the **EFT** process itself or to emotional material being unearthed that the participant found difficult to deal with, etc.

(All of these factors could be formally studied, producing a publishable study, if sufficient funding were available.)