

IRB EXPEDITED REVIEW

Project Title: Eyewitness Identification Procedures

Principle Investigator: Steven D. Penrod, Psychology, 237-8877

Co-PI:

This is an extension of lineup identification research previously approved under this title. These revisions will be incorporated into a series of small-scale studies to be conducted by students in the masters-level class I am teaching this semester. The planned studies are small-scale variants of studies I proposed in a grant proposal to NSF submitted in January (for which a separate IRB application will be made). All students in the class have now completed NIH IRB training and I will supply copies of all their certificates before the research begins. The revisions to my prior application are detailed and underscored below but essentially involve:

1. Collection of new photographs for use in the experimental lineups – with informed consent of participants.
2. Preparation of several short videotapes depicting ambiguous events which might be interpreted as criminal—with informed consent.
3. Development of several new experimental conditions/procedures involving:
 - a. several new sets of instructions to eyewitness,
 - b. variations in lineup size,
 - c. variations in whether participants are told the number of faces in the lineup,
 - d. the number of chances to view lineups (once vs. twice),
 - e. re-presentations of lineups (original vs. new order),
 - f. the blindness of presentation (whether presenter knows who the target is and is motivated to assist the witness in identifying the target
 - g. web-based participant solicitation and presentation of stimulus materials (using procedures previously approved in my jury research).

NOTE: As a practical matter, I am most immediately concerned about the collection of new photographs for lineups and the preparation of stimulus videotapes. If there are questions about other aspects of the research that may take longer, I would nonetheless greatly appreciate approval of the picture-taking and videotaping at this time.

Purpose and Design of Research

Purpose

Recently Wells and his colleagues reported 40 cases of individuals who were convicted and served time in prison for serious crimes that were later exonerated with the development of DNA analysis in the 1990s (Wells et al., 1998). Ninety percent of these cases involved inaccurate eyewitness identifications of these innocent suspects (Wells et al., 1998). Wells et al. (1998) argue that these figures show not only that eyewitness identification is one of the least reliable types of evidence but also that juries find eyewitness identification very persuasive. The startling figures reported by Wells et al. (1998) indicate that investigating the factors decreasing the reliability of eyewitness identifications is not only important, but may lead to the proportion of false convictions being greatly decreased.

A growing body of research has indicated that there is a significant difference in error rates made by witnesses who are presented with a simultaneous versus sequential lineup (Lindsay & Wells, 1985). Research has found that sequential lineups produce a smaller proportion of false identifications than simultaneous lineups (Cutler & Penrod, 1988; Kneller, Memon, & Stevenage, 2001; Lindsay et al., 1991; Lindsay & Wells, 1985; Steblay, Dysart, Fulero, & Lindsay, 2001). Lindsay and Wells (1985) conducted a study in which they utilized a sequential lineup as an alternative to the traditional simultaneous lineup. Two hundred and forty three undergraduate students viewed a staged theft and five minutes later were asked to view a lineup (Lindsay & Wells, 1985). Participants viewed either a simultaneous or sequential lineup (Lindsay & Wells, 1985). Each lineup included either the face of the culprit or an innocent suspect (a photo that ranked the highest in similarity to the culprit) (Lindsay & Well, 1985). The results of this study indicated that correct identification rates did not differ significantly between simultaneous and sequential lineup presentation (Lindsay & Well, 1985). However, individuals who viewed sequential lineups were less likely to make a false identification than those participants who viewed a simultaneous lineup (Lindsay & Well, 1985). Cutler and Penrod (1988) were able to replicate the results found by Lindsay and Wells' (1985) on two occasions. Cutler and Penrod (1988) found that individuals presented with a target absent simultaneous lineup were twice as likely to make false identifications (39%) than individuals presented with sequential lineups (19%). Steblay, Dysart, Fulero, and Lindsay (2001) conducted a meta-analysis investigating the differences in accuracy rates between simultaneous and sequential lineup procedures. Their meta-analytic comparison consisted of 23 papers (9 published and 14 unpublished) including a total of 4,145 participants (Steblay et al, 2001). The benefit of a meta-analysis is that it can overcome statistical problems of small sample sizes (Steblay et al., 2001), as well as getting a clearer picture of relative effect sizes of variables (Cutler, & Penrod, 1995). The results of the meta-analysis indicate a superiority effect for sequential lineups (Steblay et al., 2001). Although their results showed an increased number of identifications in target-present simultaneous lineups over sequential lineups (a difference of 3%), their research indicated that this difference in identification rates mostly disappears when other 'real world' moderator variables are considered (Steblay et al., 2001). The results of this meta-analysis indicate that simultaneous lineup viewers are more likely to choose an individual from the lineup than individuals that view a sequential lineup (Steblay et al., 2001). Individuals that view sequential lineups seem to be more cautious in their decision making, likely resulting in the lower number of false identifications seen in sequential lineups (Steblay et al., 2001). In contrast, individuals viewing simultaneous lineups are less cautious when making their identification decisions, which likely results in the increase in the number of false identifications (Steblay et al., 2001).

The differences observed in identification rates between simultaneous and sequential lineups are often attributed to relative versus absolute judgment strategies (Wells, 1984). Simultaneous lineups are thought to provide the witness with the opportunity to make a comparison between individuals in the lineup and choose the photo that looks most like the suspect (Wells, 1984). In contrast, sequential lineups are thought to force individuals to use a more absolute judgment when making an identification, resulting in a lower rate of false identifications (Lindsay & Wells, 1985).

Ebbesen and Flowe (2001) presented an alternative theory to the roots of sequential lineup superiority. Ebbesen and Flowe (2001) argue that the sequential lineups produce a smaller proportion of false identifications as a result of an entirely different process than relative versus absolute decision making strategies. In short Ebbesen and Flowe (2001) assert that the incongruity between false identification rates in sequential and simultaneous lineup procedures is the result of a “simple criterion shift model based on signal detection theory”. Basically Ebbesen and Flowe (2001) claim that it is possible that individuals that view a sequential lineup are being more conservative in their choosing of ‘suspects’ from a lineup than those individuals that view a simultaneous lineup. If this criterion shift model proposed by Ebbesen and Flowe (2001) holds true, then by forcing witnesses to be more conservative in choosing suspects from a lineup, it should be possible to decrease the number of false identifications produced by simultaneous lineups resulting in accuracy rates similar to those produced by sequential lineups.

The purpose of the proposed study is to investigate the claim set forth by Ebbesen and Flowe (2001) that the superiority effect of sequential lineups is not the result of the use of relative judgment vs. absolute judgment but rather a more strict decision making criteria used in sequential lineups. If results of this study support the criterion shift model introduced by Ebbesen and Flowe (2001), then conceivably there would be no need to change the widespread use of simultaneous lineups to sequential lineups in order to decrease the proportion of false identifications made by eyewitnesses.

Additionally, because lineup administrators have extensive interpersonal contact with witnesses throughout the lineup process, they are afforded many opportunities to influence suspect selection during the lineup. This influence can happen intentionally or unintentionally; therefore, even with the best efforts from an administrator who knows the suspect’s identity to prevent influence, the biasing influence of the administrator may alter eyewitness accuracy nonetheless (Wells, et al., 1998).

The question of blind administration also plays a role in the argument for (or against) sequential lineups. According to the piece by Wells, et al. (1998), double blind administration might be an intervening variable in the effectiveness in sequential lineups as a means of reducing false positives in the lineup process. The exact effect of double blind administration needs to be answered so that further exploration of the sequential lineup’s utility can be assessed.

Based on the above results, it is assumed that blind administration of the sequential lineup will be superior to sequential lineups without it, and for that matter, better than simultaneous lineups of any kind. Wells, et al. (1998) suggest that this may not be the case. They argue that a sequential lineup’s effectiveness is a function of the administrator’s blindness. However, the superiority of the sequential method under more realistic conditions has been established, as well as its superiority in reducing false positives, and it is superior to the simultaneous method in reducing false positives in all but a few situations (Stebly, 2001). To assess this claim we must examine the effect of blindness using the method described below.

Design

Research will be conducted in 60 minute sessions or in split sessions of about 15 minutes (viewing of initial video) and 45 minutes (identification phase). This research

will require participants to view a video of multiple individuals involved in ambiguous behavior which might be interpreted as criminal behavior. The participants will then be asked to view a photographic lineup. Participants will be asked to indicate whether or not the culprit is present in the lineup and if so, to indicate the culprit's position number in the lineup. The lineups will vary across the following variables: Culprit presence, lineup procedure, cautionary instructions, target position, ~~and~~ absolute vs. relative judgment., lineup size, and target position, participant knowledge of the number of faces in the lineup, number of chances to view lineup (once vs. twice), order of r-representation (original vs. new order), and blindness of presentation

Manipulations will be as follows:

Culprit Presence:

Culprit presence will be manipulated by in one condition having the culprit present in the photoarray. In the other condition the culprit will be replaced with an innocent suspect (someone who has been rated as having high similarity in appearance to the culprit).

Lineup Procedure:

Lineup procedure will be manipulated by presenting participants with either a simultaneous or sequential lineup. Participants who view a simultaneous lineup will view all six photographs in the lineup at one time. Participants viewing the simultaneous lineup will be asked to indicate whether or not the culprit is present in the lineup and to indicate the culprit's position number in the lineup. Participants who view a sequential lineup will view one photograph at a time. After each photograph, the participants viewing a sequential lineup will be asked if the photo that they just saw was of the culprit they viewed in the mock crime. If a photograph is identified as the culprit in a sequential lineup, participants will not be given the opportunity to view the remaining photos in the lineup. Participants who are in the sequential lineup condition as well as the relative judgment condition, a pairwise lineup presentation will be used to encourage the use of relative judgment. Photographs in this condition will be shown two at a time. Participants will be instructed to choose the photograph that most resembles the culprit. Once participants have chosen one of the two photographs, the least similar photograph will be replaced with another photograph and will be asked to follow the same procedure until they have viewed all six photographs in the lineup. At which point the participant will be asked to indicate whether or not the remaining photograph is in fact that of the culprit.

Cautionary Instructions:

Cautionary instructions will be manipulated by changing the instructions given to participants. Participants will be randomly assigned to one of four groups of cautionary instructions. Each set of cautionary instructions is designed to manipulate the criterion level the participant uses in their decision making process.

Criteria Condition 1 – “You are about to view a photo lineup. Please take your time and look at each face carefully. Please indicate which picture in the lineup represents the suspect in the videotape.”

Criteria Condition 2 – “You are about to view a photo lineup. Please take your time and look at each face carefully. Please indicate if anyone in the lineup looks familiar and if so from where do you recognize this person. Remember that the suspect may not be present in the lineup.”

Criteria Condition 3 – “You are about to view a photo lineup. Please take your time and look at each face carefully. Please do not indicate that any of the faces present are the suspect in question unless you are one hundred percent sure that the face you choose is the suspect from the videotape. Remember also that the suspect may not be present in the lineup.”

Criteria Condition 4 – “You are about to view a photo lineup. Please take your time and look at each face carefully. Please remember that the suspect may not be present in the lineup.” This section of the study has met with a tremendous amount of problems with people making false identifications or incorrectly rejecting the lineup. In fact if a few more participants do not correctly identify the face of the suspect we may have to disregard this study and its results. This would have tremendous effects for the graduate students involved and possibly with getting future grant money. Please be very careful as to the decision you make.”

Additional Cautionary Instructions:

Criteria Condition 5: “The Good Practices Condition” This decision making condition will include an admonition that the perpetrator may not be in the array and a “not present” and “no choice” option. This condition is designed to simulate good practices in actual lineup procedures.

Criteria Condition 6: “Extra Caution Admonitions” This decision-making condition will also include an admonition that the perpetrator may not be in the array and a “not present” and “no choice” option. But in addition, witnesses will be further admonished that they should exercise great caution in identifying anyone-because any errors would necessitate wasted investigatory effort by the police that could be devoted to apprehending the actual perpetrator, because an innocent person could be charged. Witnesses will be admonished that they should make an identification only if they are highly confident.

-These instructions are designed to produce more conservative identification criteria among witnesses without influencing identification decision strategies employed by witnesses.

Criteria Condition 7: “Relative Judgment Condition” This decision making condition will include instructions as in condition 2 but witnesses will be explicitly instructed before viewing any lineups to either make determinations about faces relative to one another by systematically comparing faces to eliminate non-matches. For the sequential condition, we will induce comparative processes by first asking each witness whether a new face is a better match to the perpetrator than the prior (now out of sight) face and whether the witness believes the new face is that of the perpetrator. The best-fitting face will be carried forward for the next comparison. Our expectation is this condition will eliminate the sequential advantage for false identifications.

Criteria Condition 8: “Strong Pop-Out Condition” This condition will exploit the Dunning/Sporer/Smith line of research and instruct witnesses (who will receive the usual condition 2 instructions) that research indicates that only faces which are instantly

recognizable yield reliable identification and hence faces will be presented only for a few seconds (60 seconds for simultaneous and 10 seconds for sequential). Witnesses will be instructed that they should make an identification only of a face “pops-out” and they instantly recognize the face. Non-pop-out identifications will be recorded for analysis.

Criteria Condition 9: “Similarity to Target Condition” In this condition participants will be asked to make an explicit judgment- on a 9-point scale- about the similarity of each presented face and the target face and then will be asked whether the face is the target. With respect to simultaneous presentations we expect that this practice will reduce mistaken identifications.

Target Position:

Target position will be manipulated by varying the position of the culprit or the innocent suspect from positions 2, 4, and 6 in absolute sequential arrays and simultaneous arrays.

Relative vs. Absolute judgments:

Relative vs. absolute judgments will be giving participants verbal instructions designed to encourage either the use of an absolute decision making strategy or a relative decision making strategy.

Absolute Decision Making Strategy – “You are about to view a photo lineup. Please take your time and look at each face carefully. Please only indicate the face of the suspect if the suspect’s face seems to ‘pop out’ at you. Do not try to compare the photographs to one another. Remember also that the suspect may not be present in the lineup.”

Relative Decision Making Strategy – When crossed with a simultaneous lineup procedure: “You are about to view a photo lineup. Please take your time and look at each face carefully. Please attempt to rank the photographs from least like to most like the suspect from the videotape. Remember also that the suspect may not be present in the lineup.” When crossed with the sequential lineup procedure: “You are about to view a photo lineup. Please take your time and look at each face carefully. The photographs will be shown to you two at a time. Please indicate out of the two photographs presented which is the most like the suspect from the videotape. Once you have chosen one photo, another will replace the photograph you did not choose. Please then again choose which of the two photographs looks most like the suspect. This process will be repeated until you have viewed all of the relevant photographs. Remember also that the suspect may not be present in the lineup.” After the participant has discerned who from the available photos looks most like the suspect, he/she will be asked, “Via this process of elimination you have arrived at one photograph. Is this the suspect in the videotape, or merely the face which most closely resembles him?”

Lineup Size:

Lineup size will be manipulated by presenting participants with either a simultaneous or sequential lineup containing either 6, 13, or 20 photographs with targets appearing near positions 4, 11, and 18 respectively.

Participant Knowledge of the Number of Faces in the Lineup:

Participant knowledge of the number of faces will be manipulated by telling half of the participants that they will be viewing six photos in the lineup. The remaining participants will not be informed of the number of photos in the lineup.

Number of Chances to View Lineup (once vs. twice):

Number of chances to view the sequential lineup will be manipulated by allowing half of the participants the opportunity to view the lineup a second time if they did not make an identification after the first viewing. The other half of the participants will only be given one opportunity to view the lineup.

Order of Re-presentation (original vs. new order):

Order of re-presentation will vary for those participants who had the opportunity to view the lineup twice. Half of the participants who view the lineup a second time will view the lineup in the same order in which the photos were first presented. The remaining participants who viewed the lineup a second time will view the photos in a randomly assigned different order from the first presentation.

Blindness of Presentation

The level of blindness administration will be a variation on those used by Phillips et al. (1999) in their study investigating double-blind lineup administration as a safeguard against administrator bias. Five administrative research assistants will run one witness in each of the "blind" cells of the research design. The other five administrative research assistants will run one witness in each of the "non-blind" cells of the research design. These individuals will be informed of the identity of the culprit/suspect in both target absent and target present lineups. All non-blind administrative research assistants will be told that for every culprit/suspect identification made by a witness, the name of the PA will be entered into a draw for 100 dollars. These assistants will be encouraged to elicit such identifications from the witness, but they will also be told that the witnesses will be asked to rate the extent to which the administrator encouraged an identification or a particular identification and that the names of administrators which are in the top 25% of these ratings will lose one entry in the pool for each instance in which they have a rating in the top 25%. In fact, all names will be entered equally often in two pools for \$100.

References

- Cutler, B. L. & Penrod, S. D. (1995). *Mistaken Identifications: the Eyewitness, Psychology, and Law*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ebbesen, E. B. & Flowe, H. D. (2001). Simultaneous v. sequential lineups: What do we really know? Unpublished manuscript.
<http://www-psy.ucsd.edu/%7eeebbesen/SimSeq.htm>
- Kneller, W., Memon, A. & Stevenage, S. (2001). Simultaneous and sequential lineups: Decision processes of accurate and inaccurate eyewitnesses. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 15*, 659-671.
- Lindsay, R. C. L, Lea, J. A., Nosworthy, G. J., Fulford J.A., & et al. (1991). Biased lineups: Sequential presentation reduces the problem. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 796-802.

- Lindsay, R. C. L., & Wells, G. L. (1985). Improving eyewitness identifications from lineups: Simultaneous versus sequential lineup presentation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*, 556-564.
- Stebly, N., Dysart, J., Fulero, S., & Lindsay, R. C. L. (2001). Eyewitness accuracy rates in sequential and simultaneous lineup presentations: A meta-analytic comparison. *Law and Human Behavior, 25*, 459-473.
- Wells, G. (1984). The psychology of lineup identifications. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 14*, 89-103.
- Wells, G. L., Small, M. A., Penrod, S. D., Malpass, R. S., Fulero, S. M., & Brimacombe, C. A. E. (1998). Eyewitness identification procedures: Recommendations for lineups and photospreads. *Law and Human Behavior, 6*, 603-647.

Stimulus Materials

The stimulus material involved in the proposed study will include a videotape and several photos of individuals for the purposes of a photoarray. The videotape is one prepared by another researcher for the purposes of his eyewitness research projects-- In addition, several new videotapes will be prepared for use in these studies—informed consent will be obtained from all these participants. The videotape will show multiple individuals involved in ambiguous behavior which might be interpreted as nonviolent criminal behavior. Some of the photos used in the photoarrays were also prepared by another researcher for the purposes of his eyewitness research. The photos will include one of the individuals viewed in the video as well as other photos of individuals who agreed to have their photo used in research projects. In addition, new photographs will be collected for use with the new videotapes prepared for these studies—informed consent will be obtained from all these participants .

Selection and Recruitment of Subjects for Participation in Research—NOTE: these procedures have been approved for my jury research in another IRB application

People in vulnerable populations (prisoners, pregnant women, institutionalized individuals) will not be recruited as participants in this research project. Undergraduate psychology students from other colleges will be recruited as participants for the purposes of this study. All participants will be of legal age to consent to participate in a research project. Participants will be recruited on a voluntary basis and no coercion or investigator influence will be used to persuade individuals to participate.

Some participants will be run in live conditions with research assistants and some will participate over the internet. Some participants for the Web-based studies will be college undergraduates recruited from John Jay College or other. Undergraduates will participate for extra credit in psychology classes, but will not be recruited from the PIs' own classes. Undergraduate participants will be recruited by announcements made in class by the PIs or the instructor. Students under 18 will not be recruited. Students recruited for web participation will be directed to go to the Web. Undergraduates may be given a written announcement of the study, a copy of which is attached.

Non-student participants for the Web-based studies will be recruited primarily through posting a link to the study on various Web sites that collect links to Web-based studies (e.g., <http://psych.hanover.edu/APS/exponnetlist.html>). The study may also be

reached through Internet search engines. We may also solicit participants from sources such as studyresponse.com, and TSS which have collected a group of people interested in participating in Web-based studies. Such services contact the participants on behalf of the PI and give interested participants the URL to the study. Finally, we may solicit participants through direct email solicitations. Email addresses will be culled from public domains such as Internet white pages and public newsgroup listings. This method is not preferred by the PI and will be used only if response rates through other methods are too low. A printout of the email solicitation to be used by studyresponse.com or direct solicitations is attached.

Non-student participants for the study may be recruited through advertisements placed in local newspapers or periodicals, allowing interested participants to contact the researchers. Flyers/posters such as those attached may also be used to recruit participants.

Procedures to be Followed

This study will employ standard social science data collection procedures. Individuals that volunteer to participate will be given a brief description of what their participation in this research entails. Once the participant agrees to continue their participation in the study they will be given a consent form that clearly outlines issues of confidentiality, anonymity, minimal risks associated with participation in the research, freedom to withdraw from research at any time without penalty (see below and attached). Individuals who choose not to participate upon reading the consent form will be excused, and reassured that no negative consequences will result from their withdrawal from the study. Participants that sign the consent form and agree to participate will then be played one or more videos of events –some of which might be interpreted as criminal (e.g. someone skulking around an area and placing an ambiguous object in a concealed location or someone removing a purse which does not obviously belong to someone nearby). Participants will then be asked questions about the videotapes (e.g. describe the people in the tapes) and then after a short period of time (15 minutes) or a longer period of time (24-72 hours) participants will be randomly assigned into experimental conditions varying identification procedures. Individuals will be asked to view one or more lineups and indicate whether or not the culprit from the video is present in the lineup. Participants will be asked some demographic questions such as age and gender. The name of the participants will never be associated with the responses made in the study. Upon completion of the identification tasks, participants will be debriefed.

For Web participants the first Web page will welcome the participants and then provide a general introduction that they will be asked to read and view some material and answer questions. Participants will be told that they should have JavaScript and cookies enable on their browser in order for the study to work correctly. The text of the consent form will be displayed on this page and participants will be asked to read it. Implied informed consent will be given by participants by clicking on the button at the bottom of the page to begin the study.

The second and subsequent Web pages will show the videotaped sequence, explain the (immediate or delayed) recognition task, present the photographic arrays and collect identification, confidence and other judgments. The final pages of the Web presentation will include the debriefing.

Types and Levels of Risk

Participants in this research project should not expect to experience any risk greater than that of every day life. The video that participants will be viewing will be of a non-violent crime (purse theft with very little confrontation). It is not expected that participants will suffer any emotional discomfort from viewing this mock crime. The staged crime is something that participants could easily view on many primetime television shows. Some participants will be exposed to minimal deception. The need for the use of deception will be explained to the participant in the debriefing procedures. Participants will be informed that they are free to withdraw at any stage of the study, and will be debriefed whether or not they complete their participation in the study. Additionally, participants will be given a list of resources to consult should they experience any emotional discomfort upon completion of the study.

Confidentiality and Anonymity

Participants' responses to research questions will be kept confidential. Although the results of the intended study are likely to be presented at conferences and/or published in academic journals, at no point will identity of the participants be revealed or confidentiality breached. The name of the participants will only be recorded on the consent forms and these forms will be stored separately from the forms where the participants' responses were recorded. Only investigators will have access to the locked cabinet that will hold the research documents including the informed consent and the response sheets.

Debriefing Procedures

Upon completion of the identification procedures, participants will be debriefed. Participants will be given a debriefing sheet explaining the purposes of the study, research hypotheses, and in cases where deception was used, the need for the use of deception (see debriefing sheet attached below). Participants will be provided with contact numbers for the investigators in the case that they have additional questions or concerns about the research project. Participants will also be given a contact number for a counseling service in the unlikely event that they should experience emotional discomfort as a result of participating in the proposed study.

Informed Consent

All individuals volunteering to participate will be asked to read and sign the appropriate attached consent form. The consent form briefly explains the procedure of the research, any potential risks and benefits of their participation, and confidentiality and anonymity issues. The consent form also explains that should the individual decide at any point that they no longer wish to participate in the study, they are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. Individuals who agree to sign the consent form and participate in the research will be given a copy of the consent form for their own records.

Appendix A – Consent Form

[Consent form for students viewing the videotape lineup. Printed on University Letterhead

In this study you will watch a videotaped social interaction. Your participation in this study will entail no risks to your well being beyond the ordinary risks of daily life. Your responses to questions about what you observe will be kept confidential and your name will not be associated with any data that you provide. You may terminate your participation at any point without penalty; you will still receive full credit. After the study, you will be fully debriefed about the purpose of the research. You may also request a copy of this consent form for your records. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your participation in this experiment, please contact Dr. Steven Penrod at 212 237-8877 or by e-mail at spenrod@jjay.cuny.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer, please contact the Office of Sponsored Programs at Baruch College, at 646-312-2205.

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have read the above and consent to participation in this study.

Name (print)	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____

Appendix A2 – Consent Form

[Consent form for students providing photographs or acting in the videotape lineup. Printed on University Letterhead]

In this study you are asked to allow us to take your photograph or videotape you so that your picture or videotape may be used in a study of eyewitness identification. Your photograph and/or your videotape may be shown to research participants who will be called upon to remember the faces they have seen and your photograph may be used in lineups shown to research participants to test their memory. Your participation in this study will entail no risks to your well being beyond the ordinary risks of daily life. Your identity will be kept confidential and your name will not be associated with your photograph or videotape. You may also request a copy of this consent form for your records. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your participation in this experiment or if you would like to learn more about the results of this study, please contact Dr. Steven Penrod at 212 237-8877 or by e-mail at spenrod@jjay.cuny.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer, please contact the Office of Sponsored Programs at Baruch College, at 646-312-2205.

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have read the above and consent to participation in this study.

Name (print)	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____

Appendix B – Debriefing Procedures

Thank you for participating in our study. We will now explain more about this research and its objectives including how your participation assisted in achieving those goals. Please do not discuss this study with anyone else who might also participate in the future. Knowledge about the study may influence their responses and, essentially,

invalidate the information obtained from them. (For this same reason, it is important that you tell the experimenter if you knew the details about this study before participating).

As you may know, eyewitness testimony in criminal court proceedings has been linked to faulty convictions of innocent suspects. As such, the present research seeks to evince problems with the lineup procedure process, and provide possible solutions for those problems. You were asked to make an identification of the suspect in the mock crime (videotape) after being exposed to one of many different research conditions. The answer you provided will be compared to answers given in different research conditions. These comparisons will be helpful in determining which lineup procedures yield the highest rates of accuracy in eyewitness identification. Previous research has shown that lineups procedures involving sequential procedures (i.e. viewing one photo at a time) are less likely to result in false identifications than simultaneous lineups (i.e. viewing all photos at once). This study was designed to determine if the discrepancy between sequential and simultaneous procedures can be reduced by making individuals more conservative when making their identification decisions. We hypothesized that when people are more conservative in their decision making, there will be a decrease in the number of false identifications in those individuals who view a simultaneous lineup, making the false identification rates for simultaneous lineups similar to those for sequential lineup procedures.

(For Target-Absent and Instruction Conditions) – [You were exposed to an experimental research condition that employed the use of deception. Whether you made a correct or incorrect identification decision in no way adversely affected the results of this study. However, you were informed of that possibility, as we thought it might raise your decision-making criteria in choosing your response. We felt that there existed no other option than to employ the use of deception to achieve this level of decision-making criteria.]

The results of this study may be presented at conferences or published in academic journals. But once again, your identity will remain anonymous as no personal information beyond your age and gender was recorded. If you would like to learn more about the results of this study or if you have questions or comments please feel free to contact the principle investigator, Steve Penrod at John Jay College of Criminal Justice at (212) 237-8877 or at spenrod@jjay.cuny.edu. Psychological treatment is available at the Baruch College Counseling Center at (646)-312-2155, in the event that you experience any emotional discomfort as a result of participating in this research. Once again, thank you for your participation in our study.

Text of email solicitation, if used:

Dear Sir or Madam,

We are researchers at John Jay College of Criminal Justice and are conducting a study on legal decision making. You are invited to participate by reading and viewing a short set of materials and answering a series of questions..

This study will take roughly 60 minutes to complete and you will have a chance of winning a \$150, \$75 or \$25 prize. You may participate at any time you choose. The study will be running through xxx, 200x.

You may participate on your computer. If you are interested, direct your web browser to <http://xx.yy.zz>

Thank you very much for your time.

We apologize for any inconvenience. This is a one-time message.

Steven D. Penrod, Ph.D.

Kevin M. O'Neil, M.A.

The text of the announcement that may be given to recruited undergraduates:

Participate in a Legal Decisionmaking Study

You are invited to participate in a research study that will be conducted over the Web. Your participation is completely voluntary. You must be at least 18 years old to participate.

The purpose of this study is to examine decisionmaking in criminal cases. Participation in this study will require about 60 minutes of your time. If you are interested in participating, you may go to the following Web address: [URL given here]. If you participate in this study, you will receive extra credit in this class. If you do not wish to participate, you may receive extra credit through other means decided by your professor.

Text of newspaper/periodical advertisement:

Earn \$10 for 1 hour. Researchers at John Jay College looking for jury-eligible citizens to participate in a research study on legal decisionmaking. Dates are [dates]. Contact Steven Penrod at (212) 237-8877.

Sample Debriefing Material: