



Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

The own-race bias in child and adolescent witnesses: Evidence from video line-ups

Journal Item

How to cite:

Havard, Catriona; Memon, Amina and Humphries, Joyce E. (2017). The own-race bias in child and adolescent witnesses: Evidence from video line-ups. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 19(4) pp. 261–272.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2017 The Authors

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1177/1461355717731579>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Final author draft only. The copyedited article may differ from this manuscript version.

The details of the article are as follows: Havard, C., Humphries, J. E., & Memon, A. (2017). The own race bias in child and adolescent witnesses: Evidence from video lineups. International Journal of Police Science and Management.

The own race bias in child and adolescent witnesses: Evidence from video lineups.

Catriona Havard¹, Joyce E. Humphries², and Amina Memon³

1 School of Psychology
Open University
Milton Keynes
United Kingdom

² Department of Psychology
Edge Hill University
Ormskirk
United Kingdom

³ Department of Psychology
Royal Holloway University
Surrey
United Kingdom

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

Abstract

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 The present study investigated the own-race bias in British school children using an eyewitness paradigm. 319
9 participants viewed films of two similar staged thefts, one that depicted a Caucasian culprit and the other an
10 Asian culprit and then after a delay of 2-3 days, viewed a lineup for each culprit. 176 of the participants were
11 Caucasian and 143 were Asian. There were also two age groups, 164 were aged 7-9 years and 152 were 12-14
12 years. There was a significant own race bias for the Caucasian participants from both age groups, that resulted
13 in more correct identifications for the own race culprit from target present lineups and more false
14 identifications for the target absent lineups. The Asian participants from both age groups showed no own race
15 bias and performed equally accurately for culprits of both races. The measures of interracial contact were
16 associated with correct responses for other race targets and also revealed that the majority of Caucasian
17 participants in the current sample had very little contact with Asians, whereas the majority of Asian
18 participants had high levels of contact with Caucasians.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

Introduction

In 1983 Habib Wahir Abdal, then known as Vincent Jenkins, was convicted of raping a young white woman in nature reserve in Buffalo, New York. The woman's initial description of the assailant was a black man with a hooded jacket, even though she had been blindfolded. The victim had been informed by police that Abdal was the suspect, however, she failed to identify him initially as her assailant. After viewing a photo that was 4 years old, the victim eventually identified Abdal from a showup. Abdal served 16 years in prison until he was exonerated through DNA evidence (www.theinnocentproject.org). This is a typical example of a number of cases of mistaken identity where it has later been found that the suspect has been wrongfully convicted and in many of these cases the suspect is from a different racial group from the victim.

A fairly robust effect in the literature is the finding that people are generally better at recognising faces from their own race, as compared to other races. This bias has been referred to as the other-race effect, own-race bias (ORB), own-group bias and cross race effect. The own race bias (the term we will use here) appears to be greater in Caucasian Europeans as compared to other racial groups (Hancock & Rhodes, 2008; Jackiw, Arbuthnott, Pfeifer, Marcon, & Meissner, 2008; Walker & Hewstone, 2006). One meta-analysis by Bothwell, Brighman and Malpass (1989) examined the data from 11 face recognition studies (with 14 samples) all using Afro Caribbean and Caucasian participants. They found that both Afro Caribbean and Caucasians recognized own race faces, more accurately than other race faces. A subsequent meta-analysis by Meissner and Brighman (2001) analysed the data from 39 studies (with 91 samples). In this paper, 56 % of the sample were Caucasian, 32 % were Afro Caribbean and 12 % were Arab/Turkish, Asian and Hispanic (other ethnicities). The majority of studies included were face recognition paradigms (91%) although some studies also used simultaneous target present lineup tasks (9%). The results from the analyses revealed that participants were less likely to correctly recognise previously seen other race faces (hits), and more likely to falsely recognise other race faces that had not been seen previously (misses). The ORB was found to be not significantly different for the Caucasian and

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3 Afro Caribbean participants, however Caucasian participants showed a larger ORB as compared to the other
4
5
6 ethnicities (Arab/Turkish, Asian and Hispanic).
7
8

9
10 Although there have been numerous studies with adult participants (for a review see, Bothwell et al., 1989;
11
12 Brigham, Bennet, Meissner & Mitchell, 2007; Shapiro & Penrod, 1986; Sporer, 2001), the development of the
13
14 ORB and its prevalence in children's face recognition has not been subject to extensive research. Some studies
15
16 have found that younger children (6-12 years) either show no ORB (Goldstein & Chance, 1980) or a reduced
17
18 ORB (Chance, Turner & Goldstein, 1982) as compared to older children (13-14) or adults. Goodman et al. (2007)
19
20 carried out a multination study with Caucasian children and adults in the USA, Norway and South Africa, where
21
22 they were tasked with recognising Caucasian, Asian and Afro-Caribbean faces. They found that Caucasian
23
24 children aged 8-10 years, 12-14 years and adults showed a significant ORB, and recognised own race faces
25
26 more accurately than other race faces, however those aged 5-7 years recognised all the faces equally well.
27
28 Goodman et al. (2007) suggest *"that cross-race face processing is not rigidly 'fixed' during childhood"* (p. 241)
29
30 and may be more plastic for children, as compared to adults. However, her conclusions are based on research
31
32 that has almost exclusively focused on Caucasian samples.
33
34
35

36
37
38 The research that has examined developmental differences in processing other race faces is inconclusive. Some
39
40 studies report that infants can show a preference to look at own race faces from as early as 3 months of age
41
42 (Bar-Haim, Ziv, Lamy & Hodes, 2006; Kelly et al., 2007; Sangrigoli & de Schonen, 2004). Furthermore,
43
44 Corenblum and Meissner (2006) found that Euro-Canadian children (aged 6-14 years) were more accurate
45
46 when recognising Caucasian faces, as compared to Afro-Caribbean faces and there were no differences in
47
48 performance as a function of participant age.
49
50
51

52
53
54 Although there have been a number of face recognition studies investigating the cross-race effect, fewer have
55
56 been conducted using the eyewitness paradigm. In their meta-analysis Meissner & Brigham (2001) found less
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

3 than 10 percent had used lineups. Another finding from the meta-analysis was that individuals were not only
4
5 worse at recognising faces from another race, but were more likely to falsely identify other race faces. (For
6
7 review of the literature see Brigham, et al., 2007). Although this area has received little research from the
8
9 eyewitness field, the Innocent Project found that of 70 % of mistaken identification cases involved cross-race
10
11 identification (www.theinnocentproject.org), therefore making it a noteworthy area of research.
12
13

14
15
16 The majority of studies that have used lineups to investigate the own race bias, have used adult witnesses. One
17
18 study by Smith, Stinson and Prosser (2004) asked Caucasian participants to identify either a Caucasian or Afro-
19
20 Caribbean target they had previously seen, from either a target present (TP) lineup where the culprit was
21
22 present, or a target absent (TA) lineup, where the culprit was not present. They found that participants made
23
24 more correct identifications for own race targets, as compared to other-race targets, and made more false
25
26 identifications for other race foils, as compared to own race foils. In another study by Jackiw, et al. (2008),
27
28 Caucasians and First Nation (indigenous people of Canada) participants were presented with a series of First
29
30 Nation and Caucasian faces and then 12 lineups (6 TP and 6 TA). They found that all participants were
31
32 significantly more accurate with their own-race, however all participants were also more likely to choose from
33
34 the First Nation lineup, as compared to the Caucasian lineups, especially the Caucasian participants.
35
36
37

38
39
40 In one of the few studies using child witnesses, Kask & Bull (2009) investigated identification of multiple
41
42 suspects of different ethnicities. They presented Caucasian children (aged 8-10 years) and young adults (aged 16-
43
44 19 years) in the UK with four target faces of different ethnicities (Caucasian, Afro-Caribbean, Latino, and
45
46 Turkish). After a delay, they either saw a sequential lineup for each ethnicity (2 TP and 2 TA), or 24 faces shown
47
48 sequentially and the participants either made a decision to each face, or once all the faces had been shown.
49
50
51 Kask and Bull found that adults made more false identifications for other race faces as compared to own race
52
53 faces, but there were no differences in responses for the child witnesses. In the United States, Pezek, Blandon-
54
55 Gitlin and Moore (2003), presented Caucasian and Afro-Caribbean children (aged 5-6 and 8-9 years) and young
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

3 adults ($M = 25$ years) a video depicting a Caucasian and an Afro-Caribbean man carrying out a cookery
4 demonstration. After a 24 hour delay the participants were presented with a TP lineup for each target.
5
6 Caucasian participants were more accurate at identifying the Caucasian target and Afro-Caribbean participants
7
8 were more accurate at identifying the Afro-Caribbean target. Furthermore, identification accuracy increased
9
10 with age.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17 There are a number of social and cognitive theories as to why people are better at recognising a face from their
18
19 own race or group (see Sporer, 2001). One theory, the contact hypothesis, argues that through the high level of
20
21 contact that individuals have with own race faces, they become experts at recognising such faces (Brigham &
22
23 Malpass, 1985; Slone, Brigham & Meissner, 2000). On the other hand the comparatively lower amount of
24
25 contact with other-race faces, leads them to be relatively inexpert at differentiating between other race faces
26
27 (Hugenberg, Miller, & Claypool, 2007). According to the contact hypothesis, the more experience that one has
28
29 with a different racial group the more accurate they should be at identifying members of that particular group
30
31 (Brigham, et al., 2007). The expertise gained from contact with own race faces or other race faces may result in
32
33 different processing strategies being used. It has been well established that faces are usually processed
34
35 holistically or configurally (Farah, Tanaka, & Drain, 1995; Farah, Wilson, Drain, & Tanaka, 1995; Farah, Wilson,
36
37 Drain, & Tanaka, 1998; Tanaka & Farah, 1993, 2003), and it has been suggested that other race faces may
38
39 receive less holistic processing (Michel, Caldara & Rossion, 2006; Michel, Rossion, Han, Chung, & Caldara,
40
41 2006; Rhodes, Brake, Taylor & Tan, 1989; Tanaka, Kiefer & Bukach, 2004) and poorer configural encoding
42
43 (Hayward, Rhodes & Schwaninger, 2008; Rhodes, Hayward & Winkler, 2006) as compared to own race faces. In
44
45 a recent study Hancock & Rhodes (2008) reported that not only did higher levels of self reported contact with
46
47 other race faces reduce the own race bias, but it also reduced cross-race differences in configural coding.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3 The small number of studies using children tend to support the contact hypothesis and suggest that the
4
5 majority race (e.g. Caucasian) shows an own race bias as a result of reduced contact with minority races,
6
7 whereas the minority race shows no bias, due to contact with the majority race. One study found that
8
9 Caucasian (majority race) participants (aged 7, 12 and 17 years of age) were poorer at recognising Afro-
10
11 Caribbean faces than Caucasian faces, whereas Afro-Caribbean (participants showed no bias and were equally
12
13 good with both race faces (Cross, Cross, & Daly, 1971). This pattern was also replicated by Feinman and
14
15 Entwisel (1976) who found that African American children were better at recognising Caucasian faces, than
16
17 Caucasian children were at recognising African American faces, however children who lived in a mixed race
18
19 environment showed less ORB than those from segregated schools.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 None of the early studies investigating own race bias with children used a specific measure of interracial
29
30 contact and the studies that have used contact measures have predominantly used only participants from one
31
32 race. One further study by Corenblum and Meissner (2006) used a measure of interracial contact with child
33
34 participants (aged 7-10 years) and a face recognition paradigm. Caucasian children (Euro Canadian) were asked
35
36 to recognise African American, Native Canadian, and Euro-Canadian child faces and were also asked how much
37
38 contact they had with other Native Canadian children. The results from Corenblum and Meissner's study
39
40 revealed that children with lower levels of contact with Native Canadians were less likely to correctly recognise
41
42 Native Canadian faces. Another study by Sporer, Trinkl and Guberova (2007) with German (majority race) and
43
44 Turkish (minority race) children (aged 10-15 years) used a specific measure of interracial contact by asking the
45
46 participants about levels of contact they had with people of a different race. The participants in Sporer et al
47
48 (2007) study were tasked with matching faces to a 10 face array and they used response times rather than
49
50 accuracy for the dependent variable. The findings reported that total amount of contact could predict the own
51
52 race bias and that overall German children had quicker response times for matching German faces than Turkish
53
54 faces, however Turkish children had equal response times for German and Turkish faces.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

3
4
5
6 There is also evidence that interracial contact can influence the own race bias from real life situations. Studies
7
8 have reported that Asian children who have been adopted by Caucasian families in Western Europe, show no
9
10 own race bias (de Herring Liedekerke, Deboni & Rossion, 2010) and in some circumstances the own race bias
11
12 was even reversed (Sangrigoli, Pallier, Argenti, Ventureyra & de Schonen, 2005).

13
14
15
16
17 An alternative explanation for the own-race bias is Levin's feature selection hypothesis (1996, 2000). The
18
19 feature selection model proposes that it is not differences in expertise that account for the ORB, but
20
21 differences in processing styles for in-group versus out-group members. When processing in-group faces,
22
23 observers typically look for features that differentiate one person from another, but when processing out-
24
25 group faces, category specific features are encoded (e.g. skin tone) rather than individuating features. Similarly
26
27
28
29 Sporer's (2001) in-group/out-group model (IOM) assumes that when an individual encounters another race
30
31 face, an automatic process occurs which includes deeper processing of the face during encoding. According to
32
33 IOM, when another race face is encountered, less effort is allocated during encoding which could lead to
34
35
36 shallow (or feature based) encoding of the other-race face and, individuating information is ignored (Meissner,
37
38 Brigham, & Butz, 2005). It has been suggested that the in-group/out-group model can account not only for the
39
40 own race bias, but other effects such as the own-age bias and effects of gender (Meissner et al., 2005).

41
42
43
44
45 **The age of the witness can also influence identification accuracy. Children often make more false**
46
47 **identifications from TA lineups as compared to adults and in some cases fewer correct identifications in TP**
48
49 **lineups as compared to adults (for a review of the literature please see Havard, 2014 and for a meta-analysis**
50
51 **see Fitzgerald & Price, 2015). Children's poorer performance for TA lineups may relate to the social and task**
52
53 **demands (Pozzulo & Lindsay, 1997), including the assumption that the perpetrator must be within the lineup**
54
55 **(Gross & Haynes, 1996). This exerts an implicit pressure to select someone, but adults appear to have a**

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3 greater capacity to resist this pressure than children (Beal, Schmitt, & Dekle, 1995; Ceci, Ross, & Toglia,
4
5
6 1987). It has also been suggested that children view giving a positive response as being more favourable than
7
8 giving a negative response (Zajac & Karageorge, 2009), and that giving an answer is preferable to not giving
9
10 any answer (Waterman, Blades, & Spencer, 2000). Children may feel, therefore, that they should choose
11
12 someone from the lineup instead of saying 'the person isn't there' or 'I don't know'. A few studies have
13
14 reported that older children, aged 12 to 14 years, can perform like adults on target-absent lineups (Pozzulo &
15
16 Lindsay, 1997; Pozzulo & Warren, 2003, Experiment 2), or more accurately than younger children (Havard,
17
18 Memon, Clifford & Gabbert, 2010). However the age of which children behave like adults, especially on
19
20 target absent lineups still remains an empirical question (Havard, 2017).
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Of the research that has been described thus far, no studies have investigated the own race bias with children
28
29 using an eyewitness paradigm and also measures of interracial contact. Moreover, few studies have used more
30
31 than one racial group as participants. In the current experiment the aim is to investigate the own-race bias with
32
33 Caucasian and Asian child witnesses in the UK and ascertain whether measures of interracial contact can
34
35 predict other race identification from a video lineup. Our first hypothesis is that the Caucasian participants (the
36
37 majority race) will exhibit an own-race bias and make more correct identifications for their own race target for
38
39 the target present (TP) lineups. Additionally, the ORB may be present in the TA lineups and Caucasian
40
41 participants will make more false identifications for other race target as compared to the own race target. Our
42
43 second hypothesis is that Asian participants (who are the minority race) should be equally accurate at
44
45 identifying the Asian and Caucasian targets from the target present lineups, and also show no own-race bias on
46
47 the target absent lineups. Thirdly, if interracial contact influences the own race bias then a measure of
48
49 interracial contact should be predictive of the own race bias, and participants with higher levels of interracial
50
51 contact should be more accurate with other race targets. As a subsidiary hypothesis we predict that
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

adolescents may make fewer false identifications for TA lineups as compared to our younger age group, as reported by previous research with video lineups (Havard, et al., 2010.)

Method*Participants*

A total of 319 children were recruited from state run primary and secondary schools. 176 Caucasian pupils were from the Aberdeenshire area and the 143 Asian pupils were from the East Midlands, UK. These locations were chosen as Aberdeenshire has a predominantly Caucasian population, whereas the East Midlands has a more ethnically diverse population. According the Aberdeenshire Council school roll 2009 (P. Argo, personal communication, August, 2010) 94.7 percent of pupils were Caucasian and 0.51 % were Asian; 0.11 % Indian, 0.1 % Pakistani, 0.06 % Bangladeshi and 0.24% other Asian. According to Leicester City Council estimates, approximately 60% of the population is Caucasian, 31 % is Asian; 28% Indian, 2% Pakistani, 1% Bangladeshi (Roberts-Thomson, 2009).

There were two age groups 7-9 years ($M = 8.1$ years, 100 females and 64 males) and 12-14 years ($M = 13.01$ years, 107 females and 48 males). These age groups were selected because previous research found the older age group were more accurate in performance on the video target absent lineups, as compared to the younger age group (Havard et al., 2010). Additionally we wanted to test whether the own race bias was greater for the older age group, as compared to the younger age group as has been previously reported (Goodman et al., 2007). Consent to carry out the research was obtained from both the head teachers and legal guardians.

Materials

Two short films were created, one starred a male Caucasian (Target) actor (26 years of age) and the other was a male Pakistani (Asian target) actor (24 years of age). The films were identical except for the targets. Each film

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3 began with the target walking along a corridor towards the camera and trying several handles on the doors,
4
5
6 until one opened. The next scene is of the target entering the door of an office and looking around picking up a
7
8 wallet from the table, then a lap top from another desk. The target then looks through several drawers and
9
10 also picks up a mobile phone. The target takes one final look around the room before leaving. The last scene is
11
12 of the target walking back up the corridor with the lap top bag over his shoulder¹. The total time for each film
13
14 was 1 minute and 30 seconds. Both targets were seen in full face frontal and profile views throughout the film.
15
16
17

18
19 Four 9-person video lineups were created, half target present (TP) and half target absent (TA) according to
20
21 VIPER² specifications for each actor. The targets (actors) were filmed at a VIPER suite at a local police station in
22
23 order that the lineup met the standard specific content. The lineups were created by an experienced VIPER
24
25 operator, in the same manner as a real identification parade would be made and foils were chosen in the same
26
27 manner as Valentine, Darling & Memon (2007). The same foils were used for the TP and TA lineups, except the
28
29 designated target replacement foil that was used in the TA lineups. To control for factors that might affect
30
31 identification accuracy, the images in the lineups including the targets were rated by 28 individuals who did not
32
33 take part in the study. There were two groups of raters; 14 Caucasians aged from 21 to 57 age (mean = 30.7
34
35 years) and 14 Asians aged from 20 to 39 (mean = 28.7 years). Each face was rated on a 1-7 scale for
36
37 distinctiveness, i.e. *"if you had to pick this person out of a crowd at a railway station, how easy would it be?"*. A
38
39 **mixed factor ANOVA 2 (Face ethnicity: Asian vs Caucasian) x 2 (Face type: Target vs Foil) were within subject**
40
41 **factors and 2 (Rater ethnicity Asian vs Caucasian) was the between subject factor conducted on the mean**
42
43 **ratings. The results found no significant main effects or significant interactions (all ps > .05).**
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

3 The positions of both the designated target replacement foil (TA lineup) and target were manipulated so that
4
5 for half the lineups they appeared at position 4, hereafter referred to as Lineup A and for half position 6,
6
7 hereafter referred to as Lineup B. This manipulation was to try and detect any bias to choosing early or late in
8
9 the sequence. Each lineup member appeared as a standard VIPER film. In other words there was a 15 second
10
11 video clip of the person looking straight to the camera and then turning their head to the right and then to the
12
13 left. All the VIPER files contained the head and shoulders and were filmed under the same lighting conditions
14
15 against a grey background. Once the film has been made it was sent to the VIPER headquarters for quality
16
17 control purposes before being approved (for more details about the quality control processes see Havard and
18
19 Memon, 2009).
20
21
22
23
24

Design

25
26
27
28
29
30
31 The study employed a split plot design; 2 (Target: Caucasian vs. Asian) x 2 (Lineup type: TP vs. TA) were within-
32
33 group factors, and 2 (Witness: Caucasian vs. Asian) x 2 (Witness Age: 7-9 yrs vs. 12-14 yrs) were between
34
35 subject factors. Each participants saw one TP and one TA lineup that were counterbalanced so that they could
36
37 appear first or second and could either be the Caucasian or the Asian target. Subsequent analyses found no
38
39 significant effects of order of film or lineup for identification responses.
40
41
42
43
44

45 The dependent variables were the lineup identification decisions. For the TP lineups there were three possible
46
47 responses; a correct identification (hit), a foil identification (false positive), or an incorrect rejection (miss). For
48
49 the TA lineups responses were either a correct rejection, or a false identification. Data for TP and TA lineups
50
51 were analysed separately, additional dependent measures was the sum of responses from the contact
52
53 questionnaire.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

Procedure

Initially, groups of children viewed two videos and again, these were counterbalanced and could therefore see the Caucasian or Asian target first. They were told that the makers of the film wanted to get some feedback and would come back to the school to ask some questions, for example, '*what do you think will happen next in the story?*'.

In the second phase two to three days later, children were tested individually and carried out the identification task. They were shown one lineup first and told that either the White man or the Asian man "*may or may not be present*". Then in accordance to the Police & Criminal Evidence Act (PACE: 1984) in England and Wales and the Lord Advocates Guidelines in Scotland (2007) they were shown the lineup twice and told that they could pause the video at any time and they could go back and see any picture again. After the second viewing the participants were asked if they wanted to view any part of the lineup again. They were then asked if they had seen the White man (or Asian man) from the film. If they identified a person they were shown the lineup member and asked "*is this the person you saw?*" Immediately after making an identification decision, the witness was shown the second lineup following the same procedure. Finally, participants were asked five questions about intergroup contact based on the questionnaire by Corenblum and Meissner (2006). The questions were:

Do you have any Asian (or White) pupils at your school? If yes, how many

Do you have any Asian (or White) people who live near you? If yes, how many

Do you ever work/play with Asian (or White) people in school? If yes, how many

Do you ever work/play with Asian (or White) people outside school? If yes, how many

How many Asian (White) people do you know?

3
4
5
6 Following Corenblum and Meissner (2006), the scores for each question were calculated on a 5-point scale, 1=
7 never to 5 = more than 5. Finally the total score for each participant was calculated by summing all the scores
8 for all questions.
9
10

11 Results

12 Data for the target present and target absent lineups were analysed separately as eyewitness research (e.g.,
13 Wells, 1993) and face recognition (e.g., Megreya & Burton, 2007) showed consistently that performance on TP
14 and TA conditions is unrelated. Furthermore, responses are different for each lineup.
15
16

17 *Target present lineups*

18 Overall for the TP lineups 38.9 % of participants correctly identified a target (correct ID), 36.7 % incorrectly
19 chose a foil from the lineup (foil ID) and 24.4 % incorrectly rejected the lineup saying the target was not
20 present. Table 1 shows the percentage of responses for both Caucasian and Asian witnesses for the Caucasian
21 and Asian targets. A hierarchical loglinear analysis (HILOG) was conducted with witness ethnicity (Caucasian,
22 Asian), witness age (child, adolescent), target ethnicity (Caucasian, Asian) and response (correct ID, foil ID and
23 incorrect rejection) as factors. The likelihood ratio of the model was $\chi^2(12) = 12.24, p = .43$, there was a
24 significant interaction for witness ethnicity, target ethnicity and response ($\chi^2(2, N = 319) = 9.27, p = .01$). The
25 data were split and separate χ^2 tests for target ethnicity and response were carried out for the Caucasian and
26 Asian witnesses. For Caucasian witnesses there was a significant effect of target ethnicity ($\chi^2(2, N = 176) =$
27 29.62, $p < .001, \Phi = .41$), there were more correct identifications for the Caucasian target (59 %) as compared
28 to the Asian target (20.5%), and there were more foil identifications for the Asian target (60.2 %) as compared
29 to the Caucasian target (25 %). For the Asian witnesses there were no significant effects ($\chi^2(2, N = 143) = .65, p$
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3 = .72, $\Phi = .07$), and responses were not significantly different for the Caucasian (41.2%) or Asian (34.6 %)
4
5 targets.

6
7
8
9
10 As an additional measure the responses for lineup A (target position 4) and lineup B (target position 6) were
11
12 also analysed to determine whether there was any influence of the target's position in the lineup on
13
14 identification. This was found to be non-significant ($\chi^2 (2, N = 319) = 3.2, p = .2$)
15
16
17
18
19

20 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE.
21
22
23

24 *Target Absent Lineups*

25 For the TA lineups 44.2 % of participants correctly stated the target was not present (correct rejection) and
26
27 55.8 % chose a member from the lineup (false ID). Table 2 shows the percentage of participants' responses for
28
29 both age groups for the Caucasian and Asian targets. A hierarchical loglinear analysis (HILOG) was conducted
30
31 with witness ethnicity (Caucasian, Asian), witness age (child, adolescent), target ethnicity (Caucasian, Asian)
32
33 and response (correct rejection, false ID) as factors. The likelihood ratio of the model was ($\chi^2 (6, N = 319) =$
34
35 2.66, $p = .85$), there was a significant interaction for witness ethnicity, target ethnicity and response ($\chi^2 (1, N =$
36
37 319) = 4.69, $p = .03$), and also for witness age and response ($\chi^2 (1, N = 319) = 12.28, p < .001$).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 To explore the interaction for witness ethnicity, target ethnicity and response, the data were split and separate
46
47 χ^2 tests for target ethnicity and response were carried out for the Caucasian and Asian witnesses. For Caucasian
48
49 witnesses there was a significant effect of target ethnicity ($\chi^2 (1, N = 176) = 8.53, p = .004, \Phi = .2$), there were
50
51 more correct rejections for the Caucasian target (51 %) as compared to the Asian target (29.5 %), and there
52
53 were more false identifications for the Asian target (70.5 %) as compared to the Caucasian target (48.9 %). For
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

3 the Asian witnesses there were no significant effects ($\chi^2 (1, N = 143) = .06, p = .81, \Phi = .02$), and responses
4
5 were not significantly different for the Caucasian (48.2 %) or Asian target (49.8 %).
6
7

8
9
10 The effect of witness age upon response, was also statistically significant ($\chi^2 (1, N = 319) = 12.21, p < .001, \Phi =$
11
12 .2). Adolescent witnesses made more correct rejections (54.2 %) as compared to the child witnesses (34.8 %)
13
14 and children made more false identifications (65.2 %) as compared to adolescent witnesses (45.8 %).
15
16

17
18
19
20 The responses for TA lineups A and B were also analysed to determine whether there was any in differences in
21
22 identification, according to lineup order. This was found to be non-significant ($\chi^2 (2, N = 319) = .02, p = .89$).
23
24
25
26

27 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE.
28
29
30

31 *Choosers vs. non-choosers*

32
33 The data for the target-present and target-absent line-ups were collapsed to investigate overall choosing
34
35 behaviour, the responses are shown in Table 3. A hierarchical loglinear analysis (HILOG) was conducted with
36
37 witness ethnicity (Caucasian, Asian), witness age (child, adolescent) and choosing response (did not choose,
38
39 chose on one lineup, chose on both lineups) as factors. The likelihood ratio of the model was ($\chi^2 (3, N = 319) =$
40
41 3.57, $p = .31$), there was a significant interaction for witness ethnicity and choosing ($\chi^2 (2, N = 319) = 8.52, p =$
42
43 .014), and also for witness age and choosing ($\chi^2 (2, N = 319) = 17.26, p < .001$). A χ^2 test for witness ethnicity
44
45 and choosing was found to be significant ($\chi^2 (2, N = 319) = 8.46, p = .015, \Phi = .16$), Caucasian witnesses were
46
47 more likely to choose on both lineups (48.9 %) as compared to Asian witnesses (33.6 %) and Asian witnesses
48
49 were more likely to not choose on either lineup (14.7 %) as compared to Caucasian witnesses (8.5 %). An χ^2 test
50
51 for witness age and choosing was found to be significant ($\chi^2 (2, N = 319) = 17.04, p < .001, \Phi = .23$), the
52
53 younger age group were more likely to choose on both lineups (53 %) as compared to the older age group (30.3
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
) , whereas the older age group were more likely to choose on one lineup (56.8 %) as compared to the younger age group (37.2 %).

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

Inter-racial Contact

Following Corenblum and Meissner (2006) a measure of inter-racial contact was calculated for each witness from the sum of the responses from the inter-racial questionnaire, they are shown in table 4. The χ^2 test for total contact and witness ethnicity was found to be significant ($\chi^2 (4, N = 319) = 205.54, p < .001, \Phi = .8$). Caucasian witnesses were significantly more likely to not know any Asians (75 %), whereas very few Asians knew no Caucasians (2 %). The majority of Asian children knew 5 or more Caucasians (90.8 %), whereas very few Caucasian children knew 5 or more Asians (12.5 %). In line with predictions, there was a significant correlation between the sum of the responses from the interracial contact questionnaire and correct identification of other race faces for target present lineups ($r (155) = .21, p = 0.008$). There was also a significant correlation for levels of contact and correct rejections for the target absent lineups ($r (153) = .18, p = 0.031$)

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate the own-race bias using an eyewitness paradigm, with Caucasian and Asian children and adolescents and to examine the effects of contact on own race bias. Our first prediction for the target present lineups was that as Caucasian participants are the majority race in the UK, they would exhibit

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

3 an own race bias and make more correct identifications for their own race, as compared to the other race
4
5
6 target. This was found to be the case, Caucasian participants were significantly more accurate at correctly
7
8 identifying the Caucasian target (59%) as compared to the Asian target (20.5%). For the target absent lineups we
9
10 predicted that the Caucasian participants would be more likely to falsely identify the Asian target as compared
11
12 to the Caucasian target. This prediction was also confirmed, as Caucasian participants were significantly more
13
14 likely to falsely identify a member from the Asian lineup (70 %) as compared to someone from the Caucasian
15
16 lineup (48.2 %).
17

18
19
20
21
22 The own race bias shown here for the Caucasian participants confirms previous face recognition research that
23
24 reports that people are better at recognising their own race, as compared to other races and that this effect is
25
26 greater in Caucasian Europeans as compared to other racial groups (Hancock & Rhodes, 2008; Jackiw et al.,
27
28 2008; Walker & Hewstone, 2006). Our findings also confirm those from previous eyewitness studies that have
29
30 found that participants make more correct identifications for own race targets from target present lineups and
31
32 more false identifications of other race lineup members from target absent lineups (Smith et al., 2004; Jackiw et
33
34 al., 2008).
35
36

37
38
39
40 Our second prediction was that as Asian participants are the minority race, they would exhibit no own race bias
41
42 and be equally good at identifying both races. This hypothesis was supported , Asian participants were equally
43
44 accurate at identifying the Asian target (34.6%) and the Caucasian target (41 %) in target present lineups.
45
46 Furthermore for the target absent lineups, Asian participants also showed no own race bias, and had similar
47
48 false identification rates for the Asian (50.3%) and Caucasian (51.8 %) lineups. The finding that our Asian
49
50 participants showed no own race bias confirms previous research that has found that minority races do not
51
52 show an own race bias and recognise faces from another race equally to own race faces, if the faces are from
53
54 the majority race (Corenblum & Meissner, 2006; Cross et al., 1971, Feinman & Entwisle, 1976; Sporer et al.,
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

2007). According to Sporer et al (2007) the findings that our Asian participants do not exhibit an ORB like our Caucasian participants, is due to asymmetric social interactions. That is, our minority members are likely to have more contact with majority members, than majority members have with persons in the minority group. This was confirmed by our measures of interracial contact.

Our third prediction was that measures of interracial contact might predict responses for identifying other race targets. We found a significant correlation between the level of interracial contact and correct identification of the other race target. Furthermore, the Asians participants had high levels of contact with Caucasians, whereas our Caucasian participants had low levels of contact with Asians. These findings appear to support the contact hypothesis which suggests that that through high levels of contact with one's own race we become experts (Brigham & Malpass, 1985; Slone, Brigham & Meissner, 2000), however having high levels of contact with other races can eradicate the own race bias (de Herring et al., 2010). We additionally found that higher levels of contact could help to reduce false identifications for TA lineups, and this is an area that warrants further research.

However, not all research has found asymmetric patterns for the ORB. One study with children by Pezdek et al., (2003) found an own race bias for both Caucasian and Afro-American participants. This study used similar experimental stimuli to our study using a film of a staged event, although both targets (Caucasian and Afro-American) were presented at the same time and not one at a time as in our study. Pezdek and colleagues lineup also used a 6-person video lineup for their identification phase, however in contrast to our own lineups, each member walked into the room and stood facing the camera, rather than the head and shoulders video used in the present study. The participants in Pezdek et al. study also responded on a scale of 1 (*absolutely sure this was not the target man*) to 5 (*absolutely sure this was the target man*), rather than identifying a number from the lineup. Pezdek and colleagues found an own race bias for both the Caucasian and Afro-American participants,

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

3 with both groups more accurate at identifying their own race face. This could be due to experimental
4
5 differences or due to different rates of interracial contact for the participants. Unfortunately, Pezdek and
6
7 colleagues did not include measures of interracial contact, so we cannot determine whether differences in inter-
8
9 racial contact are driving the effects.
10

11
12
13
14
15 Following previous research we examined whether video lineups may be beneficial at reducing false
16
17 identifications from target absent lineups for the adolescent group. It was found that adolescents (54.2%)
18
19 made significantly more correct rejections as compared to the children (34.8%). This replicates previous
20
21 research that reports video lineups can reduce false identifications for target absent lineups as compared to
22
23 static lineups for adolescent participants, but not for children (Harvard et al., 2010). It maybe that seeing a
24
25 moving image allows a witness to view multiple angles of the face and this information is better utilised by
26
27 adolescents than children. Alternatively, Valentine et al. (2007) suggest that the additional information
28
29 provided in the video may reveal distinctive features of a face that the witness does not remember, and this
30
31 may lead to a decision that the face is not that of the culprit. All of this evidence points to the use of using
32
33 video images for lineup identification, over static images.
34
35

36
37
38
39
40 As an additional measure we examined choosing rates, as these may reflect a tendency or bias to pick from a
41
42 lineup regardless of memory quality. Caucasian participants were more likely to choose on both lineups (48.9 %)
43
44 as compared to Asian participants (33.6%), whilst Asians (14.7%) were more likely to not to choose on either
45
46 lineup as compared to the Caucasians (8.5%). This seems to show that Caucasians were less conservative in their
47
48 responses and more likely to pick a person from the lineup, whereas Asian participants appeared to be more
49
50 cautious and less likely to choose someone from the lineups. Younger participants were also more likely to
51
52 choose from both lineups (53 %) as compared to the older participants (30.3%). This confirms previous research
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3 that has shown that younger children (aged 6-8 years) are more likely to choose from lineups, as compared to
4
5
6 adults (Havard, Memon, Laybourn & Cunningham, 2011).
7
8

9
10 Although our results report some differences in accuracy for target absent lineups and also differences in
11
12 choosing rates as a function of age, there were no differences in own race bias as a function of age. This
13
14 confirms previous research that has found that there were no developmental differences in recognising faces
15
16 from different races (Corenblum & Meissner, 2006; Pezdek et al., 2003), however it also contrasts with research
17
18 that has shown that younger children can sometimes recognise faces of another race equally with own race
19
20 faces (Chance et al., 1982; Goldstein & Chance, 1980; Goodman et al., 2007). The studies that have found no
21
22 own race bias for younger children have employed face recognition paradigms, as opposed to an eyewitness
23
24 paradigm. These studies also do not report any interracial contacts measures that could be influencing the
25
26 accuracy for other race faces.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 There is a limitation of this study that should be considered, that the lineups for both races were constructed by
34
35 a Caucasian policeman and a Caucasian researcher. Although there is research which has shown that video
36
37 lineups show no difference in the fairness as a function of the ethnic origin of the lineup members (Valentine,
38
39 Harris, Colom Piera, & Darling, 2003) some other laboratory studies suggest, the own-race bias can influence the
40
41 construction of the lineup. Brigham and Ready (1985) tasked a group of Afro-Caribbean and Caucasians to select
42
43 5 foils that were similar in appearance to a target photo, a task similar to that when constructing a lineup. They
44
45 found that both groups went through more photos when looking for own-race matches than when looking to
46
47 match the foils to the other-race target. They also used a stricter criterion for similarity for the own race photos.
48
49
50
51 Several other studies have found that race can influence the fairness of lineups (Brigham, Ready & Spier, 1990;
52
53 Lindsay, Ross, Smith & Flanigan, 1999) and Brigham et al. (2007) suggest that lineups should be constructed by
54
55 operators who are the own race as the suspect, to increase fairness and remove any bias. **A further limitation**
56
57
58
59
60

3 is the use of a single target for the Asian and the Caucasian perpetrator, which could limit the generalisability
4
5
6 of findings (Wells & Windschitl, 1999). Additionally, when using only one target and lineup for each group it
7
8 could be argued that one lineup might be easier than another which could influence responses. Future
9
10 research should ensure that there are several targets for each experimental category to prevent any target
11
12 effects.

13
14
15
16
17 To conclude, the findings from the present study suggest contact may be a mechanism underlying own race
18
19 bias. Caucasian participants who had low levels of contact with Asians showed a significant own-race bias,
20
21 whereas Asians who had high levels of contact with Caucasians showed no own race bias. The level of interracial
22
23 contact was positively correlated with correct identification for the other race target for TP lineups and correct
24
25 rejections for the other race target for TA lineups. Future research investigating the own-race bias should
26
27
28
29 examine further how quality of contact with other races together with other factors such as length of exposure
30
31 to the face may influence accuracy. Furthermore, for real criminal investigations levels of interracial contact
32
33 should be considered when suspect is a different race to the witness.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

Notes

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. In this study only one target face for each race was used. In face recognition research participants would be presented with a number of faces for each race and a large number of faces where they have to decide which ones are 'old' and which ones are 'new'. However, in the eyewitness paradigm the aim is to simulate the situation of a witness viewing one (or two) suspect(s) and then trying to identify them later from a lineup. A few others studies using the eyewitness paradigm to examine the own race bias have also used only one target face per race (Brigham et al., 1985; Kask & Bull, 2009; Pezdek et al., 2003).

2. VIPER video identification procedure electronic recording, is one of the most commonly used methods for lineup identification in the UK.

References

Bar-Haim, Y., Ziv, T., Lamy, D. & Hodes, R.M. (2006). Nature and nurture in own-race face processing.

Psychological Science, 17, 159-163. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01679.x

Beal, C. R., Schmitt, K. L., & Dekle, D. J. (1995). Eyewitness identification of children: Effects of absolute judgements, nonverbal response options and event encoding. *Law and Human Behavior*, 19, 197- 216.

Bothwell, R. K., Brigham, J. C., & Malpass, R. S. (1989). Cross-racial identifications. *Personality and Social*

Psychology Bulletin, 15, 19-25. doi: 10.1177/0146167292183005

Brigham, J. C., Bennett, L. B., Meissner, C. A., & Mitchell, T. L. (2007). The influence of race on eyewitness

memory: In R. Lindsay, D. Ross, J. Read, & M. Toglia (Eds.), *Handbook of eyewitness psychology: Memory for People* (pp. 257-281). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brigham, J. C., & Malpass, R. S. (1985). The role of experience and context in the recognition effaces of own- and other-race persons. *Journal of Social Issues*, 4, 139-155.

Brigham, J. C., & Ready, D. J. (1985). Own-race bias in lineup construction. *Law & Human Behavior*, 9, 415–424.

doi: 10.1007/BF01044480

Brigham, J. C., Ready, D. J., & Spier, S. A. (1990). Standards for evaluating the fairness of photograph lineups.

Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 11, 149-163. doi: 10.1207/s15324834basp1102_3

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3 Ceci, S. J., Ross, D. F., & Toglia, M. P. (1987). Suggestibility of children's memory: Psycholegal implications.

4
5
6 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 116, 38-49.

7
8
9
10 Chance, J.E., Turner, A.L., & Goldstein, A.G. (1982). Development of differential recognition for own- and other-
11
12 race faces. *Journal of Psychology*, 112, 29–37.

13
14
15
16 Corenblum, B., & Meissner, C. A. (2006). Recognition of faces of ingroup and outgroup children and adults.

17
18
19 *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 93, 187-206. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2005.09.001

20
21
22
23
24 Cross, J. F., Cross, J., & Daly, J. (1971). Sex, race, age, and beauty as factors in recognition of faces. *Perception &*
25
26 *Psychophysics*, 10, 393-396.

27
28
29
30
31 De Herring, A., de Liedekerke, C. Deboni, M & Rossion, B. (2010). The role of experience during childhood in
32
33 shaping the other-race effect. *Developmental Science*, 13, 181-187. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00876

34
35
36
37
38 Farah, M. J., Tanaka, J. W., & Drain, H. M. (1995). What causes the face inversion effect? *Journal of*
39
40 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 21, 628-634.

41
42
43
44 Farah, M. J., Wilson, K. D., Drain, H. M., & Tanaka, J. W. (1995). The inverted face inversion effect in
45
46 prosopagnosia: evidence for mandatory, face-specific perceptual mechanisms. *Vision Research*, 35, 2089-2093.

47
48
49 doi:10.1016/0042-6989(94)00273-0

50
51
52 Farah, M. J., Wilson, K. D., Drain, M., & Tanaka, J. W. (1998). What is "special" about face perception?

53
54
55 *Psychological Review*, 105, 482-498.

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Feinman, S., & Entwisle, D. R. (1976). Children's ability to recognize other children's faces. *Child Development*, 47, 506–510.

Fitzgerald, R. J., & Price, H. L. (2015). Eyewitness identification across the life span: A meta-analysis of age differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141, 1228-1265.

Goldstein, A. G., & Chance, J. E. (1980). Memory for faces and schema theory. *Journal of Psychology*, 105, 47–59.

Goodman, G. S., Sayfan, L., Lee, J. S., Sandhei, M., Walle-Olsen, A., Magnussen, S., et al. (2007). The development of memory for own- and other-race faces. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 98, 233-242. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2007.08.004

Hancock, K. J., & Rhodes, G. (2008). Contact, configural coding and the other-race effect in face recognition. *British Journal of Psychology*, 99, 45-56. doi: 10.1348/000712607X199981

Havard, C. (2014). Are children less reliable at making visual identifications than adults? A Review. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 20, 372-388.

Havard, C (2017). Children's face identification ability. In Eds. M. Bindemann & A. Megreya. *Face Processing: Systems, Disorders and Cultural Differences*, New York, Nova Publishers.

Havard, C. & Memon, A. (2009). The influence of face age on identification from a video line-up: A comparison between older and younger adults, *Memory*, 17, 847-859. doi: 10.1080/09658210903277318

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3
4
5
6 Havard, C., Memon, A., Clifford, B. & Gabbert, F. (2010) A comparison of video and static photo lineups for child
7 and adolescent witnesses, *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 24, 1209 – 1221. doi: 10.1002/acp.1645
8
9

10
11
12
13 Havard, C., Memon, A. Laybourn, P. & Cunningham, C. (2011). Own age bias in video lineups: A comparison
14 between children and adults. Accepted for publication in *Psychology, Crime & Law*.
15
16

17
18
19 Hayward, W. G, Rhodes, G., & Schwaninger, A, (2008). An own-race advantage for components as well as
20 configurations in face recognition. *Cognition*, 106, 1017-1027. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2007.04.002
21
22
23

24
25
26 Hugenberg, K., Miller, J., & Claypool, H. M. (2007). Categorization and individuation in the cross-race deficit:
27 Toward a solution to an insidious problem. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 334-340.
28
29
30
31 doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2006.02.010
32
33

34
35
36 Innocence Project (2010) Innocence Project Case files retrieved from the web on 4th August 2010. Available at:
37
38 <http://www.innocenceproject.org/know/>
39
40
41
42

43
44 Jackiw, L. B., Arbuthnott, K. D., Pfeifer, J. E., Marcon, J. L. & Meissner, C. A. (2008). Examining the cross-race
45 effect in lineup identification using Caucasian and First Nations samples. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural*
46
47 *Science*, 40, 52-57.
48
49
50
51

52
53 Kask, K. & Bull R. (2009). The effect of different presentation methods on multi-ethnicity face recognition.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Psychology, Crime & Law, 15, 73-89. doi: 10.1080/10683160802131131

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

- 3 Kelly, D.J., Liu, S., Ge, L., Quinn, P. C., Slater, A. M., Lee, K., Liu, Q., & Pascalis, O. (2007). Cross-Race Preferences
4
5
6 for Same-Race Faces Extend Beyond the African Versus Caucasian Contrast in 3-Month-Old Infants. *Infancy, 11*,
7
8 87- 95. doi: 10.1207/s15327078in1101_4
9
10
11 Levin, D. T. (1996). Classifying faces by race: The structure of face categories. *Journal of Experimental*
12
13 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 22*, 1364–1382.
14
15
16 Levin, D. T. (2000). Race as a visual feature: Using visual search and perceptual discrimination tasks to
17
18 understand face categories and the cross-race recognition deficit. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*,
19
20 129, 559–574. doi: 10.1037/S0096-3445.129.4.559
21
22
23 Lindsay, R. C. L., Ross, D. F., Smith, S. M., & Flanigan, S. (1999). Does race influence measures of lineup fairness?
24
25
26 *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 13*, 109–119.
27
28
29
30
31 Lord Advocates' guidelines - The conduct of visual identification procedures (2007). Retrieved from the web on
32
33 05.10.07. <http://www.copfs.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/13547/0000269.pdf>
34
35
36
37
38
39 Megreya, A.M. & Burton, A.M. (2007). Hits and false positives in face matching: A familiarity-based
40
41 dissociation. *Perception and Psychophysics, 69*, 1175-1184.
42
43
44
45
46 Meissner, C. A., & Brigham, J. C. (2001). Thirty years of investigating the own-race bias in memory for faces: A
47
48 meta-analytic review. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 7*, 3-35. doi: 10.1037//1076-89/1.7.1.3
49
50
51
52
53 Meissner, C. A., Brigham, J. C., & Butz, D. A. (2005). Memory for own- and other-race faces: A dual-process
54
55 approach. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19*, 545-567. doi: 10.1002/acp.1097
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3 Michel, C., Caldara, R., & Rossion, B. (2006). Same-race faces are perceived more holistically than other-race
4
5 faces. *Visual Cognition*, *14*, 55-73. DOI: 10.1080/13506280500158761

6
7
8
9 Michel, C., Rossion, B., Han, J., Chung, C-S., & Caldara, R. (2006). Holistic processing is finely tuned for faces of
10
11 our own race. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 608-615. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01752.x

12
13
14
15 Pezdek, K., Blandon-Gitlin, I., & Moore, C. (2003). Children's face recognition memory: More evidence for the
16
17 cross-race effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 760- 763. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.760

18
19
20
21
22 Police and Criminal Evidence Act (1984) Codes of Practice (2008). Retrieved from the web on 01/04/09:
23
24 <http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/operational-policing/powers-pace-codes/pace-code-intro/>

25
26
27
28
29 Pozzulo, J. D., & Lindsay, R. C. L. (1997). Increasing correct identifications by children. *Expert Evidence*, *5*, 126-
30
31 132.

32
33
34
35
36 Pozzulo, J. D., & Warren, K. L. (2003). Descriptions and identifications of strangers by youth and adult
37
38 eyewitnesses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 315.

39
40
41
42
43 Rhodes, G., Brake, S., Taylor, K. & Tan, S. (1989). Expertise and configurational coding in face recognition.
44
45 *British Journal of Psychology* *80*, 313–331.

46
47
48
49
50
51 Rhodes, G., Hayward, W. G., & Winkler, C. (2006). Expert face coding: Configural and component coding of
52
53 own-race and other-race faces. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *13*, 499-505.

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

3 Roberts-Thomson, T (2009).The Demographics of Leicester. Retrieved from the web on 20th August 2010:
4

5
6 <http://www.leicester.gov.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?allid=52551>
7
8
9

10
11 Sangrigoli, S., & de Schonen, S. (2004). Recognition of own-race and other-race faces by three-month-old
12 infants. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 45, 1219–1227. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-
13 7610.2004.00319.x
14
15
16

17
18
19
20
21 Sangrigoli, S., Pallier, C., Argenti, A. M., Ventureyra, V. A.G., & de Schonen, S. (2005). Reversibility of the other-
22 race effect in face recognition during childhood. *Psychological Science*, 16, 440–444. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-
23 7976.2005.01554.x
24
25
26

27
28
29
30 Shapiro, P. N., & Penrod, S. (1986). Meta-analysis of facial identification studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100,
31 139–156. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.100.2.139
32
33
34

35
36
37 Slone, A. E., Brigham, J. C. & Meissner, C. A. (2000). Social and cognitive factors affecting the own-race bias in
38 Whites. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology* , 22, 71-84.
39
40
41

42
43
44 Smith, S. M., Stinson, V., & Prosser, M. A. (2004). Do they all look alike? An Exploration of Decision-Making
45 Strategies in Cross-Race Facial Identifications. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 36, 144-153.
46
47
48

49
50
51 Sporer, S. (2001). Recognizing faces of other ethnic groups: An integration of theories. *Psychology, Public*
52 *Policy, and Law*, 7, 36-97. 10.1037/1076-8971.7.1.36
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3 Sporer, S. L., Trinkl, B., & Guberova, E. (2007). Matching faces: Differences in processing speed of out-group
4
5 faces by different ethnic groups. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38*, 398-412. doi:
6
7 10.1177/0022022107302310
8
9

10
11
12
13 Tanaka, J. W., & Farah, M. J. (1993). Parts and wholes in face recognition. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental*
14
15 *Psychology A, 46*, 225-245.
16

17
18
19 Tanaka, J. W., & Farah, M. J. (2003). The holistic representation of faces. In M. A. Peterson & G. Rhodes (Eds.),
20
21 *Perception of faces, objects, and scenes: Analytic and holistic processes* (pp. 21-47). New York, NY: Oxford
22
23 University Press.
24

25
26
27 Tanaka, J. W., Kiefer, M., & Bukach, C. M. (2004) A holistic account of the own-race effect in face recognition:
28
29 evidence from a cross cultural study. *Cognition, 93*, B1-B9. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2003.09.011
30
31

32
33
34 Valentine, T., Darling, S., & Memon, A. (2007). Do strict rules and moving images increase the reliability of
35
36 sequential identification procedures? *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 21*, 933–949. doi: 10.1002/acp.1306
37

38
39
40 Valentine, T., Harris, N. Colom Piera, A. & Darling, S. (2003). Are police video identifications fair to African-
41
42 Caribbean suspects? *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 17*, 459-476.
43
44

45
46
47 Walker, P. M., & Hewstone, M. (2006). A perceptual discrimination investigation of the own-race effect and
48
49 intergroup experience. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 20*, 461-475. doi: 1 0.1002/acp.1191
50
51

52
53
54 Waterman, A. H., Blades, M., & Spencer, C. (2000). Do children try to answer nonsensical questions? *British*
55
56 *Journal of Developmental Psychology, 18*, 211-225.
57
58
59
60

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Wells GL. 1993. What do we know about eyewitness identification? *American Psychologist*, 48, 553– 71

Zajac, R., & Karageorge, A. (2009). The wildcard: A simple technique for improving children's target-absent lineup performance. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 23, 358-368.

For Peer Review

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

Table 1. Mean ratings for the target and foils for the Caucasian and Asian raters

| Rater | Faces | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|-----------|------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Caucasian | Caucasian Target | 3.71 | 1.59 |
| Asian | | 4.50 | 1.45 |
| Total | | 4.11 | 1.55 |
| Caucasian | Caucasian Target | 3.86 | 1.460 |
| Asian | | 3.57 | 1.51 |
| Total | | 3.71 | 1.46 |
| Caucasian | Caucasian Foils | 4.00 | .88 |
| Asian | | 3.79 | .98 |
| Total | | 3.89 | .92 |
| Caucasian | Asian Foils | 4.14 | .66 |
| Asian | | 3.79 | 1.19 |
| Total | | 3.96 | .96 |

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

Table 2. The percentage of responses for the target present lineups (frequencies are in parentheses)

| Witness | Caucasian target | | | Asian target | | |
|---------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| | Correct ID | Foil ID | Incorrect rejection | Correct ID | Foil ID | Incorrect rejection |
| Caucasian | | | | | | |
| 7-9 years | 60.9 (28) | 23.9 (11) | 15.2 (7) | 17.4 (8) | 73.9 (34) | 8.7 (4) |
| 12-14 years | 57.1 (24) | 26.2 (11) | 16.7 (7) | 23.8 (10) | 45.2 (19) | 16.7 (7) |
| *Total | 59 (52) | 25.1 (22) | 16 (14) | 20.6 (18) | 59.6 (53) | 12.7 (11) |
| Asian | | | | | | |
| 7-9 years | 42.4 (14) | 24.2 (8) | 33.3 (11) | 35.9 (14) | 35.9 (14) | 28.2 (11) |
| 12-14 years | 40 (14) | 31.4 (11) | 28.6 (10) | 33.3 (12) | 25 (9) | 41.7 (15) |
| Total | 41.2 (28) | 27.8 (19) | 31 (21) | 34.6 (26) | 30.5 (23) | 35 (26) |

* NB Totals have been rounded up so might add up to more than 100 percent.

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

Table 3. The percentage of responses for the target absent lineups (frequencies are in parentheses)

| Witness | Caucasian target | | Asian target | |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Correct rejection | False ID | Correct rejection | False ID |
| Caucasian | | | | |
| 7-9 years | 37 (17) | 63 (29) | 19.6 (9) | 80.4 (37) |
| 12-14 years | 66.7 (28) | 33.3 (14) | 40.5 (17) | 59.5 (25) |
| Total | 51.9 (45) | 48.2 (43) | 39.9 (26) | 70 (62) |
| Asian | | | | |
| 7-9 years | 43.6 (17) | 56.4 (22) | 42.4 (14) | 57.6 (19) |
| 12-14 years | 52.8 (19) | 47.2 (17) | 57.1 (20) | 42.9 (15) |
| Total | 48.2 (36) | 51.8 (39) | 49.8 (34) | 50.3 (34) |

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

Table 4. The percentage of choosing for both lineups (frequencies are in parentheses)

| Witness | Did not choose | Chose on one lineup, | Chose on both lineups |
|------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Caucasian | | | |
| 7-9 years | 4.3 (4) | 34.8 (32) | 60.9 (56) |
| 12-14 years | 13.1 (11) | 51.2 (43) | 35.7 (30) |
| Total | 8.7 (15) | 43 (76) | 48.3 (86) |
| Asian | | | |
| 7-9 years | 16.7 % (12) | 40.3 % (29) | 43.1 % (31) |
| 12-14 years | 12.7 % (9) | 63.4 % (45) | 23.9 % (13) |
| Total | 14.7 (21) | 51.9 (74) | 33.5 (44) |

Running heading: Own race bias from video lineups

Table 5. The percentage of responses for the inter-racial contact questionnaire (frequencies in parentheses).

| Witness | Total number of other race persons known | | | | |
|-----------|--|---------|---------|---------|------------|
| | None | 1 or 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 or more |
| Caucasian | 75. (132) | 5.1 (9) | 2.8 (5) | 4.5 (8) | 12.5 (22) |
| Asian | 2.1 (3) | .7 (1) | 3.5 (5) | 2.8 (4) | 90.8 (129) |

For Peer Review