EYEWITNESS MEMORY

LINEUP DECISION

- You will now be shown a lineup. You will see it only once before being asked to make an identification.
- Please <u>circle</u> the number of the person who you believe committed the crime you just witnessed.

1 2 3 4 5 6

Please indicate how confident you are in your lineup choice by <u>circling</u> the number that best represents how confident you are in your lineup decision. That is, how confident are you that you accurately identified the culprit from the lineup?

| Not at all | Slightly | | J | Very | Extre | mely |
|------------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|
| confident confident | confident | (| confident | | confident | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | <u>5</u> | |
| | | Line | eup | | | |

EVENT VS. IDENTIFICATION MEMORY

- Identification memory (recognition):
- Event memory (recall):

FACTORS AFFECTING EYEWITNESS MEMORY

- Estimator Variables:
 - <u>cross-race bias</u> (Meissner & Brigham, 2001)
 - age & IQ:
 - gender of the witness:

FACTORS AFFECTING EYEWITNESS MEMORY

| - 6 | Estimator | Variables (| (continued) |): |
|-----|------------------|-------------|-------------|----|
|-----|------------------|-------------|-------------|----|

| lighting conditions: |
|--|
| ■ <u>Dark Adaptation</u> |
| ■ <u>Light Adaptation</u> |
| ■ <u>stress</u> (Yerkes-Dodson Law): |
| ■ <u>emotional events</u> |
| ■ weapon focus effect (Loftus et. al., 1987 & Steblay, 1994) |
| ■ speed of identification |
| ■ Amount of time face in view |

• expectations (schemas and stereotypes):

FACTORS AFFECTING EYEWITNESS MEMORY

- System Variables:
 - Composition of the Lineup
 - Functional size
 - Select fillers
 - Place suspects in different positions
 - Instructions Prior to Viewing the Lineup
 - Steblay's (1997) meta-analysis
 - <u>Sequential Versus Simultaneous Presentation Variable</u>
 - Standard police lineup
 - Sequential procedure
 - Perpetrator-Absent Lineups
 - Perpetrator-Present Lineups

FACTORS AFFECTING EYEWITNESS MEMORY

| | • | Systen | n Variables (| (continued): |
|--|---|--------|---------------|--------------|
|--|---|--------|---------------|--------------|

| | • | Confidence | Malleability |
|--|---|------------|--------------|
|--|---|------------|--------------|

- Possibility of <u>dissociation</u> between confidence & accuracy
- Eyewitness <u>accuracy</u> is a function of ______.
- Confidence
- Confidence inflation

Behavioral Influences

- Experimenter Expectancies
 - Clever Hans Effect (Pfungst, 1911)
 - Rosenthal & Jacobson (1966)
 - Double-Blind Procedure
- Confirmation Bias
- Source Memory Errors
 - Confusions over why the face seems familiar.
 - Problems associated with multiple exposures
 - Transference:

MISINFORMATION EFFECT

- <u>Definition</u>:
- Loftus and Palmer's (1974) paradigm:

POSTEVENT INFORMATION & SUGGESTIBILITY

- Alteration Position:
- Coexistence Position:
- Gap Filling Strategy:
- Retrieval difficulties as a result of source monitoring:

FACTORS LEADING TO THE GUIDE

- http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/178240.pdf
- Expert Testimony
 - Defense attorneys
- Media Pressure
- DNA Exoneration Cases
 - Forensic DNA was not used in U.S. courts until 1989.
 - In 1995, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ)
 - The resulting report, released in 1996, showed that

| • | Eyewitness researchers | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| • | The | of these cases is unclear (e.g., most are |
| |), rel | evant, |
| | | and the number of DNA |
| | exoneration cases is not large | |
| • | It is important to note that | |
| • | The media and the justice sy | stem |
| ■ <u>U.S</u> | 6. Attorney General Janet Rer | <u>10</u> |
| ■ <u>W</u> | orking Group: | |
| | THE PRO | DUCT: THE GUIDE |
| ■ Fe | atures Establishing Rapport | |
| ■ En | couraging the Witness to Vol | unteer information without Prompting |
| ■ As | king Open-ended Questions: | Avoiding Leading Questions |
| ■ Ca | utioning Against Guessing | |
| ■ On | e Suspect Per Identification I | Procedure |

THE PRODUCT: THE GUIDE (Continued)

| ■ <u>The Selection of Lineup Fillers</u> | |
|--|--|
| ■ <u>Prelineup Instructions</u> : | |
| Avoiding Postidentification Suggestion: | |
| SHORTCOMINGS | |
| Double-Blind Testing | |
| Police fought against double-blind testing because: | |
| | |
| Technological developments | |
| Not Naming The Sequential Procedure As The Preferred Lineup Procedure: | |
| ■ Valid Concerns of Police: | |
| | |
| | |

LINEUP AS AN EXPERIMENT

- Lineup should be viewed as an experiment:
- The same factors that can make the results of an experiment uninterpretable can make results of a lineup uninterpretable.

IS THE EXPERT EYEWITNESS MORE ACCURATE THAN THE AVERAGE WITNESS OFF THE STREET?

Are Police More Accurate Than Lay People When Making Eyewitness IDs?

DEFINITIONS OF SUGGESTIBILITY

Ceci, S. J. & Bruck, M. (1993). Suggestibility of the child witness: A historical review and synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 403 - 439.

Suggestibility concerns the degree to which children's encoding, storage, retrieval, and/or reporting of an event can be influenced by a range of internal and external factors. This definition implies that:

CHILDREN AS EYEWITNESSES

VARIABLES THAT EFFECT THE SUGGESTIBILITY OF YOUNG CHILDREN

| - | Form Of Question | |
|---|--|--|
| | ■ Impoverished memory reports when free recall is used | |

| Less accurate than older children & adults when answering |
|---|
| |
| |
| |

- Why are young children more suggestible . . .?
- Repeated Questioning
- Status Of The Source Of The Misinformation
 - Pettit, Fegan, and Howie (1990)
 - Results
 - Confirmation bias

HOW CAN AN INTERVIEWER OBTAIN VERIDICAL/TRUTHFUL ACCOUNTS FROM CHILDREN?

| 1. | |
|----|---|
| 2. | |
| 3. | |
| 4. | |
| 5. | |
| | |
| | FAULTY INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES ARE HARMFUL IN MANY WAYS |
| 1. | FAULTY INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES ARE HARMFUL IN MANY WAYS |
| | FAULTY INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES ARE HARMFUL IN MANY WAYS |
| 1. | FAULTY INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES ARE HARMFUL IN MANY WAYS |