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Our latest Research

- How do children and young people fare with video parades (moving images) as compared to still photo lineups?
- How do variations in the standard VIPER procedure influence performance?
- Are correct identifications related to how long a witness sees a culprit?
Viper vs Still lineups (TP & TA)


• Valentine, Darling & Memon (2007)
  Fewer false IDs for TA VIPER

• Darling, Valentine & Memon (2007)
  No difference for VIPER or still lineups
Experiment 1

Phase 1
Live event
Shoe survey man

Phase 2
9-person sequential lineup
TP or TA
Video or Still

3-4 days

Sample N=215
114 aged 7-9 years (59 ♀ & 55 ♂)
101 aged 13-15 years (63 ♀ & 38 ♂).

Lord Advocates Guidelines
“the person may or may not be there”
Lineup viewed twice
Moving vs Still images: target present lineups

(ns)

7-8 year olds
Correct ID- 58%

13-15 year olds
Correct ID- 69%
Moving vs Still images: target absent lineups

\( (\chi^2 (1) = 3.76, p = .053) \)

7-8 year olds

Correct rejection – 32 %

Correct rejection – 62 %
VIPER procedure

Lord Advocate’s guidelines

“the witness should normally view the whole set of images at least twice before confirming that he or she wants to view the images or any part of them again. Only where the identification is unequivocal at the first viewing, and further viewing is likely to cause distress to the witness, should this practise be departed from” (Appendix C).
Viewing once vs. twice

- Pike, Rowlands, Towell & Kemp (1999)
  TP benefit from twice viewing, not TA.

- Valentine et al., (2007)
  Strict sequential reduced correct ID.

- Lindsay, Lea & Fulford (1991)
  Twice viewing increased false ID rate for TA.

*Photo lineup*
Target Exposure

• Memon, Hope & Bull (2006)
  Longer exposure more correct IDs

• Shapiro and Penrod (1986)
  Positive correlation for exposure and correct ID, but also false ID from TA lineups.

• Read (1995)
  Longer duration increased tendency to choose, and confidence. Higher correct IDs & false IDs
Experiment 2

Phase 1

View a staged crime:
2 targets
1 long exposure 3 mins.
1 short exposure 1 min.

Phase 2

VIPER viewed once or twice
Long or short target
TP or TA
Confidence rating

5 min filler task

“the person may or may not be there”

Satrosphere Science Centre volunteers
Sample 223 aged 6-54 years (107 ♀ & 116 ♂).
186 aged between 6 & 11 years of age
Hypotheses

• Seeing a lineup twice will increase choosing for TP and TA lineups

• Seeing a target for longer should increase correct ID and confidence
TP lineups: Long vs Short Exposure: lineup viewed once or twice

\( \chi^2 (2) = 14.51, p = .001 \)

Correct ID – 41.4 % for Long exposure (3 min)

Correct ID – 73 % for Short exposure (1 min)

\begin{align*}
\text{Long exposure (3 min)} & \\
\text{Short exposure (1 min)} & \\
\end{align*}
## TA lineups: Long vs Short exposure: lineup viewed once or twice

(ns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>ONCE</th>
<th>TWICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correct rejection – 51%

#### Long exposure (3 min)

#### Short exposure (1 min)

### Frequency

- **Correct rejection**: 51%
- **False ID**: 33.5%
TA Lineup viewed once vs. twice

\( \chi^2 (2) = 4.38, p = .036 \)
Choosers vs Non choosers (TP & TA)

- Lineup viewing ($\chi^2 (1) = 4.92, p < 0.05$)
  Once = 63.7%, twice = 77.3%
  *Second viewing increases choosing*

- Exposure ($\chi^2 (1) = 4.92, p < 0.05$)
  Long = 61.4%, short = 79.8%
Confidence ratings

• TP: higher confidence-higher accuracy
  \((\rho (108) = .42, p < .001)\)

• TA: no relationship between confidence and accuracy \((p > .1)\)

• Higher confidence for short target vs. long target \((5.1 \text{ vs } 4.8; F (1, 221) = 4.14, p < 0.05)\).
Why are Ss more accurate, confident and more likely to choose the shorter target exposure?

Short exposure target rated by independent judges as being significantly more distinctive than long exposure target.
Conclusions

• No differences in correct identifications for VIPER vs. Static parades. VIPER can reduce false IDs for adolescents.

• Viewing a VIPER parade twice increases choosing which can increase false IDs.

• Effects of exposure on face recognition will vary with distinctiveness of the face.

*Threshold for exposure?*
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