

UNIVERSITY *of* York

This is a repository copy of *Learning faces from variability*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/96187/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Ritchie, Kay Laird and Burton, A. Mike orcid.org/0000-0002-2035-2084 (2017) Learning faces from variability. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*. pp. 897-905. ISSN 1747-0226

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2015.1136656>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



Learning faces from variability

Journal:	<i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	QJE-SIP 15-210.R1
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Ritchie, Kay; University of York, Burton, Mike; University of York, ;
Keywords:	face learning, variability, face recognition

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

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

Learning faces from variability

Kay L. Ritchie & A. Mike Burton

Department of Psychology, University of York, UK

Corresponding author: Mike Burton, Department of Psychology, University of York,
York, YO10 5DD, England, United Kingdom. Email: mike.burton@york.ac.uk

Key words: Face learning, face recognition, variability.

Abstract

Research on face learning has tended to use sets of images which vary systematically on dimensions such as pose and illumination. In contrast, we have proposed that exposure to naturally varying images of a person may be a critical part of the familiarisation process. Here, we present two experiments investigating face learning with “ambient images” – relatively unconstrained photos taken from internet searches. Participants learned name and face associations for unfamiliar identities presented in high or low within-person variability, i.e. images of the same person returned by internet search on their name (high variability) versus different images of the same person taken from the same event (low variability). In experiment 1 we show more accurate performance on a speeded name verification task for identities learned in high compared to low variability, when the test images are completely novel photos. In experiment 2 we show more accurate performance on a face matching task for identities previously learned in high compared to low variability. The results show that exposure to a large range of within-person variability leads to enhanced learning of new identities.

Introduction

It is well established that we are poor at recognising unfamiliar people. Matching different images of unfamiliar faces is a difficult task for human observers (Bruce et al, 1999, 2001; Clutterbuck & Johnston, 2002, 2004; Megreya & Burton 2006, 2007). Furthermore, in real-world settings people are highly error-prone when matching a live person to a photo-ID (Kemp, Towell & Pike, 1997). Experienced passport officers show poor levels of matching ability, no better than untrained students (White, Kemp, Jenkins, Matheson & Burton, 2014). In contrast to these poor performance levels for unfamiliar faces, recognition of familiar faces is excellent, remaining robust even in highly distorted or degraded images (Burton et al, 1999; Hole, George, Eaves & Rasek, 2002). Given this discrepancy between familiar and unfamiliar faces, it is imperative to understand how we learn new faces: how representations make the transition from unfamiliar to familiar. However, rather little is known about this process.

Much of the recent work on face learning has emphasised the systematic exposure to different photos of the same person, asking how learning-set images generalise to novel test images. Popular dimensions on which to manipulate learning sets include head angle and illumination (Longmore, Liu & Young, 2008; Liu, Bhuiyan, Ward & Sui, 2009). Liu and colleagues showed that extensive training with different images of the same face presented in multiple head angles led to accurate recognition of the same face presented in a different illumination. However, training with different illuminations did not produce high accuracy when the same face was presented in different head angles. The authors demonstrate that pose plays a more important role than illumination in forming generalizable representations.

Longmore and colleagues (2008) demonstrated in six different experiments that learning pictures is far easier than learning people. Participants learned identities presented in full-face and profile views and were tested on the same images as well as in novel views and lighting. Participants were more accurate at recognising the image they had learned than an image showing a different head angle. Furthermore, participants who had learned an identity from only full-face photographs could recognise the same identity presented in a three-quarter view, but not in a profile view. The complementary pattern of results was found for identities learned in a profile view. Performance in the three-quarter view condition was no better when participants learned two head angles than one.

1
2
3 The Longmore et al (2008) and Liu et al (2009) studies suggest that learning of unfamiliar
4 faces, measured by subsequent recognition, is dependent on viewpoint. These studies are
5 consistent with work on perceptual learning. Intensive training has been shown to improve
6 fine-grain discrimination of object and pattern features, with improvements in the visual
7 domain being specific to the trained dimensions in more difficult tasks, but with some
8 evidence of generalisation in easier tasks (see Fahle, 2005). Training in one face view has
9 been shown to lead to long-lasting increased sensitivity to that specific face orientation, but
10 generalises across face sizes and face identities (Bi, Chen, Weng, He & Fang, 2010). Training
11 in one face orientation has also been shown to lead to exemplar-specific improvements in
12 face recognition (Hussain, Sekuler & Bennett, 2009). However, both these studies used one
13 computer-generated face image per identity.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 In contrast to the experiments described above, which use systematically-controlled facial
24 images, there has recently been a rise in interest in the notion of ‘ambient images’ (Jenkins,
25 White, van Montfort & Burton, 2011; Murphy, Ipser, Gaigg & Cook, 2015; Sutherland et al,
26 2013). These are images which vary in unsystematic ways, for example a set of images
27 which would be generated by an internet search on the name of a celebrity. Such image sets
28 pose considerable problems for the experimenter, because it is clear that viewers can
29 recognize a wide range of photos a familiar face, varying across a very large range of
30 dimensions: e.g. changes in the person due to expression, ageing, health; changes in the
31 environment such as lighting and pose; changes in the camera such as focal length,
32 perspective setting etc. Such variations are often not recoverable, i.e. we can recognize a
33 picture of Barack Obama without knowing the focal length of the camera used – even though
34 this will have a very large effect on the image (Burton, Schweinberger, Jenkins & Kaufmann,
35 2015).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 While there is a natural inclination for scientists to eliminate variability due to sources which
47 cannot easily be quantified, we have argued that *unsystematic* variability is, in fact, critical to
48 face learning (Burton, 2013; Jenkins et al, 2011). This argument rests on the notion that
49 individual faces have *idiosyncratic* variability. So, the ways in which one face varies are not
50 (completely) the same as the ways in which another varies. If this is true, it explains the
51 long-term puzzle of face matching. People find it hard to know whether two pictures of an
52 unfamiliar person come from the range of images that could possibly depict that person,
53 because they have no prior experience of this range. On the other hand, the wide experience
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 with a familiar face provides one with a representation of the variability possible for that
4 person – and hence it is easy to judge whether two novel images fall within it. In recent
5 work, we have demonstrated that there is supporting evidence for this proposal in analysis of
6 the physical properties of different images of the same person (Burton, Kramer, Ritchie &
7 Jenkins, in press). People do, indeed, present variation in idiosyncratic ways, and so this
8 information is available to support the human learning system.
9
10
11
12

13
14 One recent study has investigated the role of within-person variability on face learning by
15 exposing participants to naturally occurring, or ambient images (Murphy et al, 2015).
16 Participants saw the same eight identities on each trial, with either the same six images of
17 each identity repeated on each trial, or with a new six images of each identity appearing on
18 each trial. The latter condition resulted in 96 unique images of each identity being viewed,
19 and so participants in this condition were exposed to a wider range of variability within each
20 identity. Exposure to variability within each identity led to a trial-by-trial decrease in
21 estimation of the number of identities present, showing that participants were able, over time,
22 to cohere together the images of each identity. Participants were also better at subsequently
23 identifying the people for whom they had seen more images and variability, supporting
24 previous work showing improved learning with increased numbers of exposures (see Shapiro
25 & Penrod, 1986).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 In the present studies, we manipulate within-person variability in a face learning task, while
37 keeping the number of unique images in each condition consistent. We create high
38 variability sets of images through simple internet search for foreign celebrities, unknown to
39 our participants. However, we also create low-variability sets by taking individual frames
40 from video interviews with these celebrities. Such low-variability images vary in pose and
41 expression, but are similar in other respects (e.g., age, hairstyle, lighting, camera). Our
42 hypothesis is that learning a new face through exposure to high variability images will
43 support better learning (i.e. better recognition of a novel photo seen later) than exposure to
44 low variability images.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Experiment 1a**

54 In this experiment, we used a face/name association technique. In the learning phase
55 participants were shown a series of photographs of each identity paired with that person's
56 name. The test phase was a speeded name verification task in which participants were shown
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a name followed by a photograph, and asked to indicate whether or not the photograph
4 showed the person named. In the learning phase, half of the identities were learned from ten
5 highly variable photographs, the other half from ten less variable photographs. The images in
6 the test phase were always completely novel.
7
8
9

10 **Methods**

11 *Participants*

12
13 Twenty participants (7 male; mean age: 22 years, range: 18-30 years) took part. All were
14 students or other members of Aberdeen University.
15
16
17
18

19 *Materials*

20
21 Images of each of twenty Australian celebrities (ten female) were taken from a
22 UK/Australian database, developed for bi-lateral research. Pre-checks with UK participants
23 from our testing population (but not participating in the main experiment) confirmed that
24 these Australian faces were not familiar to our participant group. The 'high variability'
25 images were obtained from a Google Image search. Each image showed the full head, and
26 was unconstrained in terms person variability such as facial expression, and in terms of
27 environmental variability such as lighting and camera characteristics (see figure 1A). The
28 'low variability' images were stills from interview videos of each of the celebrities. These
29 images varied in head angle and facial expression, but not other person-specific dimensions
30 such as hair style or age. These 'low variability' images did not vary greatly in lighting or
31 camera characteristics (see figure 1B). Background information was visible in all images. The
32 images were presented centrally measuring 5.2 x x7.8cm on a 37.7 x 30.2 screen. The
33 experiment was run using Matlab Pyschtoolbox.
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




Figure 1. Example faces for experiment 1a. A, high variability images of the same person taken from a Google search (in the case of the experimental stimuli). B, low variability images of the same person taken from one interview video. The test image was always a previously unseen image. [Copyright restrictions prevent publication of the actual images used, though these are available from the authors. Images in figure 1, also used in figure 3, are illustrative of the experimental stimuli, and depict someone who did not appear in the experiments but has given permission for the images to be reproduced here.]

Procedure

In the learning phase, participants saw ten images of each of the twenty faces, blocked by identity. Each image was presented centrally with the name of the person presented above. These were the real names of the Australian celebrities depicted and they remained on the screen throughout the block of images of that given ID. Individual images were presented for 5sec and there was an inter-stimulus interval of 500ms. Participants were instructed to try to learn each person, and there was a short rest break between blocks of faces. Participants saw the high variability set for half of the identities and the low variability set for the remaining identities, counterbalanced across identities between participants.

The test phase of the experiment was a speeded name verification task. A name was displayed on the screen for 1500ms, and immediately replaced by an image which remained on the screen until response. On half of the trials, the face matched the name. Participants responded via button press indicating whether the image showed the same person as the name or not, and were instructed to respond as quickly and as accurately as possible. The response buttons were counterbalanced between participants with half responding “same” with the left hand and half with the right. This phase used ten completely novel images of each identity (never seen during the learning phase). Match trials showed the person named, and mismatch trials showed an image of a different person of the same sex. There were five match trials and five mismatch trials for each identity.

Results and Discussion

None of the participants indicated prior familiarity with any of the identities. Figure 2 shows mean accuracy and reaction time data, with RTs based only on those trials on which participants responded correctly.




Figure 2. Accuracy and reaction time data for experiment 1a. Light bars denote identities learned from a high variability set, dark bars denote identities learned from a low variability set. Error bars denote the standard error of the mean.

A paired samples t-test on mean accuracy shows better performance for faces learned in high than low variability ($t(39) = 2.22, p < .05$). Reaction times are shown only for trials on which

1
2
3 a correct response was given, and reveal no difference between conditions ($t(39) = 1.67$,
4 $p > .05$).
5
6

7
8 In this experiment, participants were more accurate at responding to identities they had
9 learned in high compared to low variability. The test images in the previous experiment were
10 always completely novel, yet the possibility remains that this advantage arises because
11 images at test more closely resemble some of the high than low variability learning images.
12 To rule this out as a possible explanation, experiment 1b uses previously unseen low
13 variability images at test.
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Experiment 1b**

20
21 This experiment is identical to the previous study, except that here we use previously unseen
22 low variability images at test. These images by nature closely resemble the low variability
23 images in the learning phase. If mere image similarity between learning and test is the
24 explanation for our results in experiment 1a, then we would expect more accurate responses
25 to images learned in low compared to high variability when tested on low variability images
26 here.
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Methods**

33 *Participants*

34
35 A further twenty participants (7 male; mean age: 24 years, range: 19-61 years) took part,
36 none of whom had participated in the previous experiment. All were students or other
37 members of Aberdeen University.
38
39
40
41

42 *Materials and Procedure*

43
44 The materials and procedure were very similar to those used in experiment 1a. The images
45 used in the learning phase were those used in experiment 1a with participants learning 20 IDs
46 from high and low variability image sets. The test images were previously unseen images
47 from the low variability set (see figure 3). All participants saw the same test images at test.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3. Example stimuli for experiment 2. A, high variability images taken from a Google search (in the case of the experimental stimuli). B, low variability images taken from one interview video. The test image was always a previously unseen low variability image.

Results and Discussion

Again, none of the participants indicated prior familiarity with any of the identities. Figure 4 shows mean accuracy and RT data.




Figure 4. Accuracy and reaction time data for experiment 1b. Light bars denote identities learned from a high variability set, dark bars denote identities learned from a low variability set. Error bars denote the standard error of the mean.

A paired samples t-test shows no effect on accuracy, meaning that participants were no more accurate with identities they had learned from low or high variability image sets ($t(39) = 0.07$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$). Again, reaction times are reported only for trials on which a correct response was given, and show faster responses for identities learned in low compared to high variability ($t(39) = 2.70$, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .16$).

As the test images in this experiment closely resembled the low variability learning images, the effect of variability on the speed of name verification is not surprising. Here we demonstrate an RT effect akin to image similarity effects found in perceptual learning experiments (Bi et al, 2010; Hussain et al, 2009; Longmore et al, 2008). What is surprising is that despite the dissimilarity between the test images and the high variability learning images, participants are able to identify the person pictured. This is a potentially surprising result as one might expect the similarity between test and learning images for the low variability set (including background information) to lead to a benefit for those faces. Instead learning

1
2
3 people in high variability confers on viewers the ability to extrapolate well – to the extent
4 here that performance is equivalent to having learned images similar to those used at test. Our
5
6 RT effect shows that the process involved in making this decision takes longer than when the
7
8 images at learning at test are very similar.
9

10 11 12 13 **Experiment 2**

14 This experiment employs a different dependent measure to assess the effect of variability on
15 face learning. Here, participants learn identities through high or low variability and then
16 complete a face matching task with new images of the learned identities, as well as new
17 identities. As face matching tasks have been shown to be good predictors of familiarity
18 (Clutterbuck & Johnston, 2002, 2004) we expect to see more accurate face matching for
19 identities learned in high compared to low variability.
20
21
22
23
24

25 26 **Methods**

27 *Participants*

28 Thirty participants (4 male; mean age: 19.3 years, range: 18-22 years) took part. All were
29 students at the University of York.
30
31
32
33

34 *Materials*

35 The stimuli for the learning phase were images for ten of the faces used in experiment 1 (5
36 female). For the matching phase of the experiment, completely novel images were used, two
37 of each identity for match trials, and one image of the target identity and one foil image for
38 mismatch trials. Foil images were obtained from a Google image search for the verbal
39 description of each ID. Images of 80 new identities were also used in the matching phase to
40 provide a baseline of matching performance for identities which had not been learned.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Procedure*


49 The learning phase followed the procedure used in experiment 1. Participants saw the high
50 variability set for half of the identities and the low variability set for the remaining identities,
51 counterbalanced across identities between participants.
52
53
54

55 The test phase of the experiment was a face matching task. Two images were displayed on
56 the screen and participants indicated via button press whether the two images showed the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 same person or two different people. The images remained on screen until a response was
4 made. Half of the trials were match trials and half mismatch. There were eight match and
5 eight mismatch trials for each of the learned identities, using novel images of each identity
6 not seen in the learning phase, and one match and mismatch trials for each of the new
7 identities. The new identities were simply shown so as to provide a measure of baseline face
8 matching performance for identities which had not been previously learned.
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 **Results and Discussion**

16 None of the participants indicated prior familiarity with any of the identities. Figure 5 show
17 mean matching performance across conditions.
18
19
20



21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Figure 5. Accuracy on face matching task. Light bars denote identities learned from a high
39 variability set, dark bars denote identities learned from a low variability set, white bars denote
40 identities that were not previously learned. Error bars denote the standard error of the mean.
41
42
43

44
45 We analysed match and mismatch trials separately as in previous studies (e.g., White, Burton,
46 Jenkins & Kemp, 2014). A one-way ANOVA on match trials showed a main effect of
47 condition ($F(2,58) = 11.29, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .28$), with follow-up Tukey HSD comparisons
48 showing higher accuracy for IDs learned in high compared to low variability, and those
49 learned in high variability compared to those not learned (both $p < .05$). The difference
50 between accuracy for IDs learned in low variability compared to those not learned was not
51 significant ($p > .05$). ANOVA on mismatch trials showed no effect of condition
52 ($F(2,58) = 2.05, p > .05$).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The results of this experiment show that learning a person through a highly variable set of
4 images leads to improved face matching. Interestingly, the effect is present only in match
5 trials and not mismatch trials. Although some previous work has shown that familiarity can
6 improve performance on both match and mismatch trials (Clutterbuck & Johnston, 2002,
7 2004, 2005), our pattern of results is not unprecedented. In many previous studies
8 investigating face matching, the experimental manipulation resulted in a change in either
9 match or mismatch performance, but rarely both (e.g. Megreya & Burton, 2006, 2007; White
10 et al, 2014; Menon, White & Kemp, 2015). In a series of experiments investigating the
11 comparative benefits of average images and arrays of images for face matching tasks, White
12 et al (2014) found advantages only for match trials. In fact, previous work has shown that
13 accuracy on match and mismatch trials is not correlated (Megreya & Burton, 2007) and so
14 our dissociation between match and mismatch performance could be indicative of two
15 different processes at work during face learning. Through our learning procedure, participants
16 learn to incorporate and tolerate high levels of within-person variability, without this leading
17 to a general acceptance of all images including images of foil identities. It is worth noting
18 that the same pattern of results exists in experiments 1a and 1b whereby the general
19 performance increase observed is due to elevated performance on trials where the name and
20 face depict the same person with no differences on trials where they depict different people.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **General Discussion**

35
36
37
38 Our results show that experiencing a relatively wide range of within-person variability from
39 face photographs produces better learning than experiencing a narrower range of variability.
40 Furthermore, we have demonstrated this with two rather different measures. Exposure to
41 high variability images leads to better name verification (experiment 1a) and better matching
42 (experiment 2) as compared to exposure to low variability images. Furthermore, even when
43 task demands favor learning of image-specific properties (experiment 1b), exposure to highly
44 variable learning images is very effective.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In our experiments, participants saw images of each ID sequentially as they learned the new
52 identity. The results suggest that participants were able to build up a representation of each
53 identity over time during this sequence. This supports a recent study which has shown that
54 participants build up a representation of someone's appearance over time, with identity
55 manipulations influencing performance on a sequential but not simultaneous matching task
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Menon, White & Kemp, 2015). We suggest that experiencing variability over time supports
4 an abstraction of representation of identity and may be a route to face learning.
5
6

7
8 In all of the studies presented here we have compared learning from high variability to
9 learning from low variability, yet we should point out that even our “low variability” image
10 set incorporates a wider range of variability than is traditionally seen in face learning
11 experiments. Our use of ambient images taken from internet searches and screen captures of
12 videos is not simply an attempt to appeal to a sense of “ecological validity” or, indeed, to
13 suggest that variability seen in the real world is confined to that seen in our experiment. We
14 are simply seeking to use less controlled stimuli than have been used in the past in order to
15 preserve within-person variability. Even our low variability stimuli incorporate, in an
16 uncontrolled way, changes in head angle and lighting which have been studied under
17 controlled conditions previously (Liu et al, 2009; Longmore et al, 2008). Our low variability
18 stimuli also show variance in expression and small changes in distance from camera. Our
19 high variability sets include all of these forms of within-person variance, as well as changes
20 in weight, age, hairstyle, makeup etc. This shows a naturally occurring, wide range of
21 differences within each individual identity. We have argued previously that much of this
22 variability is idiosyncratic, and is critical to a perceiver becoming familiar with a specific
23 person (Burton, 2013; Burton, Jenkins & Schweinberger, 2011; Burton et al, in press; Jenkins
24 et al, 2011). For this reason it seems likely that even our low variability stimuli give rise to
25 more accurate face learning than repeated, or extended, presentation of a single image.
26 Previous studies using single-image learning have shown better learning for longer exposure
27 durations. (e.g. MacLin, MacLin & Malpass, 2001; Read, Vokey & Hammersley, 1990;
28 Reynolds & Pezdek, 1992). It is therefore possible that our low-variability images mimic
29 repeated presentation of single images in viewers’ perceptions, though we think it unlikely
30 (see figure 3A). How much variability is necessary to benefit learning, or to optimise it, is an
31 interesting question for future research.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 We did not employ a training technique in our learning experiments as has been used
50 previously to ensure 100% accurate face learning prior to test (Longmore et al, 2008). The
51 use of such a technique ensures that participants have learned each of the initial images of
52 each identity accurately before testing takes place with a new set of images. Crucial to our
53 design is keeping number of exposures consistent across identities and conditions, something
54 not always achieved through the use of training techniques. Furthermore, we did not want
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participants to learn specific images of the identities, rather we were allowing participants to
4 construct their own mental representation of each of these new people in order to try to learn
5 them – an approach which, we argue, more naturally mimics real life face learning.
6
7

8
9
10 Many authors have proposed that recognition of unfamiliar faces is predominantly image-
11 bound (Bruce, 1982; Hancock, Burton & Bruce, 2000; Megreya & Burton, 2008) and so in
12 traditional face learning paradigms varying pose and lighting, the similarity between the
13 images presented at learning and test has been a good predictor of performance (Braje, 2003;
14 Krouse, 1981; Longmore et al, 2008). However, such studies eliminate the possibility of
15 studying ambient variation in the images of faces that people actually learn in daily life. It
16 seems that this variation is, in fact, a very powerful source of information for people
17 acquiring representations of novel faces. If one is able to extract information about the
18 idiosyncratic ways in which people vary, then this can lead to generalizable representation,
19 useful across many types of novel visual context (Burton, 2013; Jenkins et al, 2011).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 In addition to informing our understanding of face learning, these results also have interesting
29 practical implications. Previous studies investigating the ability of security professionals to
30 recognise unfamiliar faces has shown that relatively poor performance by passport officers
31 (White et al, 2014), and police (Krouse, 1981). The ability to familiarise viewers with new
32 identities relatively quickly through exposure to within-person variability may be useful in
33 applied settings. For example, passport-issuing staff who are required to recognise known
34 criminals applying for new passports under false identities, or police looking for a particular
35 suspect in a crowd may be able to exploit this fast route to learning a new identity for
36 practical purposes.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Acknowledgements**

47 The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research
48 Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC
49 Grant Agreement n.323262, and from the Economic and Social Research Council, UK
50 [ES/J022950/1].
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Bi, T., Chen, N., Wneg, Q., He, D., & Fang, F. (2010). Learning to discriminate face views.
7
8 *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 104, 3305-3311.
9
10 Braje, W. L. (2003). Illumination encoding in face recognition: Effect of position shift.
11
12 *Journal of Vision*, 3, 161–170.
13
14 Bruce, V. (1982). Changing faces: Visual and non-visual coding processes in face
15
16 recognition. *British Journal of Psychology*, 73, 105–116.
17
18 Bruce, V., Henderson, Z., Greenwood, K., Hancock, P. J. B., Burton, A. M., & Miller, P.
19
20 (1999). Verification of identities from images captured on video. *Journal of*
21
22 *Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 5(4), 339-360.
23
24 Bruce, V., Henderson, Z., Newman, C., & Burton, A. M. (2001). Matching identities of
25
26 familiar and unfamiliar faces caught on CCTV images. *Journal of Experimental*
27
28 *Psychology: Applied*, 7(3), 207-218.
29
30 Burton, A. M. (2013). Why has research in face recognition progressed so slowly? The
31
32 importance of variability. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 66(8), 1467-
33
34 1485.
35
36 Burton, A. M., Jenkins, R., & Schweinberger, S. R. (2011). Mental representations of familiar
37
38 faces. *British Journal of Psychology*, 102, 943-958.
39
40 Burton, A. M., Kramer, R. S. S., Ritchie, K. L., & Jenkins, R. (in press). Identity from
41
42 variation: Representations of faces derived from multiple instances. *Cognitive Science*.
43
44 Burton, A. M., Schweinberger, S., Jenkins, R., & Kaufmann, J. (2015). Arguments against a
45
46 configural processing account of familiar face recognition. *Perspectives on*
47
48 *Psychological Science*, 10(4), 482-496.
49
50 Burton, A. M., Wilson, S. Cowan, M., & Bruce, V. (1999). Face recognition in poor-quality
51
52 video: Evidence from security surveillance. *Psychological Science*, 10(3), 243-248.
53
54 Clutterbuck, R., & Johnston, R. A. (2002). Exploring levels of face familiarity by using an
55
56 indirect face-matching measure. *Perception*, 31, 985–994.
57
58 Clutterbuck, R., & Johnston, R. A. (2004). Matching as an index of face familiarity. *Visual*
59
60 *Cognition*, 11(7), 857-869.
Clutterbuck, R., & Johnston, R. A. (2005). Demonstrating how unfamiliar faces become
familiar using a face matching task. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 17(1),
97-116.
Fahle, M. (2005). Perceptual learning: Specificity versus generalization. *Current Opinion in*

- 1
2
3 *Neurobiology*, 15, 154-160.
- 4 Hancock, P. J. B., Bruce, V., & Burton, A. M. (2000). Recognition of unfamiliar faces.
5
6 *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4(9), 330–337.
- 7
8 Hole, G. J., George, P. A., Eaves, K., & Rasek, A. (2002). Effects of geometric distortions on
9
10 face-recognition performance. *Perception*, 31, 1221-1240.
- 11 Hussain, Z., Sekuler, A. B., & Bennett, P.J. (2009). Perceptual learning modifies inversion
12
13 effects for faces and textures. *Vision Research*, 49, 2273-2284.
- 14 Jenkins, R., White, D., van Montfort, X., & Burton, A. M. (2011). Variability in photos of the
15
16 same face. *Cognition*, 121, 313-323.
- 17
18 Kemp, R., Towell, N., & Pike, G. (1997). When seeing should not be believing: Photographs,
19
20 credit cards and fraud. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 11(3), 211–222.
- 21 Krouse, F. L. (1981). Effects of pose, pose change, and delay on face recognition
22
23 performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66, 651–654.
- 24 Liu, C. H., Bhuiyan, A., Ward, J., & Sui, J. (2009). Transfer between pose and illumination
25
26 training in face recognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception*
27
28 *and Performance*, 35(4), 939-947.
- 29
30 Longmore, C. A., Liu, C. H., & Young, A. W. (2008). Learning faces from photographs.
31
32 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 34(1), 77-
33 100.
- 34 MacLin, O. H., MacLin, M. K., & Malpass, R. S. (2001). Race, arousal, attention, exposure,
35
36 and delay: An examination of factors moderating face recognition. *Psychology, Public*
37
38 *Policy, and Law*, 7(1), 134-152.
- 39
40 Megreya, A. M., & Burton, A. M. (2006). Unfamiliar faces are not faces: Evidence from a
41
42 matching task. *Memory & Cognition*, 34(4), 865–876.
- 43 Megreya, A. M., & Burton, A. M. (2007). Hits and false positives in face matching: A
44
45 familiarity-based dissociation. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 69(7), 1175.
- 46 Megreya, A. M., & Burton, A. M. (2008). Matching faces to photographs: Poor performance
47
48 in eyewitness memory (without the memory). *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
49
50 *Applied*, 14(4), 364-372.
- 51 Menon, N., White, D., & Kemp, R. I. (2015). Identity-level representations affect unfamiliar
52
53 face matching performance in sequential but not simultaneous tasks. *The Quarterly*
54
55 *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. Advance online publication.
- 56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Murphy, J., Ipser, A., Gaigg, S., & Cook, R. (2015). Exemplar variance supports robust
4 learning of facial identity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*
5 *Performance*. Advance online publication.
6
7
8 Read, J. D., Vokey, J. R., & Hammersley, R. (1990). Changing photos of faces: Effects of
9 exposure duration and photo similarity on recognition and the accuracy-confidence
10 relationship. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*,
11 *16(5)*, 870-882.
12
13 Reynolds, J. K., & Pezdek, K. (1992). Face recognition memory: The effects of exposure
14 duration and encoding instruction. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *6*, 279-292.
15
16 Shaprio, P. N., & Penrod, S. (1986). Meta-analysis of facial identification studies.
17 *Psychological Bulletin*, *100*, 139-256.
18
19 Sutherland, C. A. M., Oldmeadow, J. A., Santos, I. M., Towler, J., Burt, D. M., & Young, A.
20 W. (2013). Social inferences form faces: Ambient images generate a three-dimensional
21 model. *Cognition*, *127(1)*, 105-118.
22
23 White, D., Burton, A. M., Jenkins, R., & Kemp, R. I. (2014). Redesigning photo-ID to
24 improve unfamiliar face matching performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
25 *Applied*, *20(2)*, 166-173.
26
27 White, D., Kemp, R. I., Jenkins, R., Matheson, M., & Burton, A. M. (2014). Passport
28 Officers' Errors in Face Matching. *PLoS One*, *9*, 8, e103510.
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