



Wiley Series in the Psychology of Crime, Policing and Law

# Forensic Facial Identification

Theory and Practice of  
Identification from Eyewitnesses,  
Composites and CCTV



Edited by Tim Valentine and Josh P. Davis

WILEY Blackwell



# Forensic Facial Identification

---

---

**Wiley Series in**  
**The Psychology of Crime, Policing and Law**

Series Editors

**Graham M. Davies and Ray Bull**

*University of Leicester, UK*

---

---

The Wiley Series in the Psychology of Crime, Policing and Law publishes concise and integrative reviews on important emerging areas of contemporary research. The purpose of the series is not merely to present research findings in a clear and readable form, but also to bring out their implications for both practice and policy. In this way, it is hoped the series will not only be useful to psychologists but also to all those concerned with crime detection and prevention, policing, and the judicial process.

For other titles in this series please see [www.wiley.com/go/pcpl](http://www.wiley.com/go/pcpl)

# Forensic Facial Identification

Theory and Practice  
of Identification from Eyewitnesses,  
Composites and CCTV

---

---

Edited by

**Tim Valentine**

Goldsmiths, University of London

**Josh P. Davis**

University of Greenwich

**WILEY** Blackwell

This edition first published 2015  
© 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

*Registered Office*

John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

*Editorial Offices*

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at [www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell](http://www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell).

The right of Tim Valentine and Josh P. Davis to be identified as the authors of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

**Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty:** While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Forensic facial identification : theory and practice of identification from eyewitnesses, composites and CCTV / edited by Tim Valentine, Josh P. Davis.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-118-46911-8 (cloth) – ISBN 978-1-118-46958-3 (pbk.) 1. Eyewitness identification. 2. Face perception. I. Valentine, Tim, 1959– II. Davis, Josh P.

HV8073.F572 2015

363.25'8–dc23

2014047946

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover image: © Peter Stroh / Alamy

© mauro grigollo / iStockphoto

Set in 10/12pt Century Schoolbook by SPi Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India

# Contents

---

---

<i>Contributors</i>	vii
<i>Foreword</i>	xi
<i>Series Preface</i>	xv
<b>Part 1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1 Identification and Surveillance of Facial Images: Progress and Problems <i>Tim Valentine and Josh P. Davis</i>	3
<b>Part 2 Searching for Suspects and the Identification of Victims</b>	<b>15</b>
2 Interviewing for Face Identification <i>Fiona Gabbert and Charity Brown</i>	17
3 Facial Composites and Techniques to Improve Image Recognizability <i>Charlie Frowd</i>	43
4 Searching for Suspects: Mugshot Files and Showups (Street Identifications) <i>Victoria Z. Lawson and Jennifer E. Dysart</i>	71
5 Craniofacial Analysis and Identification <i>Caroline Wilkinson</i>	93

---

<b>Part 3 Identification by Eyewitnesses</b>	<b>127</b>
6 Lineup Composition and Lineup Fairness <i>Steven E. Clark, Molly B. Moreland, and Ryan A. Rush</i>	129
7 Estimator Variables and Memory for Faces <i>Hannah Ryder, Harriet M. J. Smith, and Heather D. Flowe</i>	159
8 Confidence and Accuracy of Eyewitness Identification <i>James D. Sauer and Neil Brewer</i>	185
<b>Part 4 Identification from CCTV Images</b>	<b>209</b>
9 Human Verification of Identity from Photographic Images <i>Josh P. Davis and Tim Valentine</i>	211
10 Expert Analysis: Facial Image Comparison <i>Gary Edmond, Josh P. Davis, and Tim Valentine</i>	239
11 Evaluating Automatic Face Recognition Systems with Human Benchmarks <i>Alice O'Toole and P. Jonathon Phillips</i>	263
<b>Part 5 Implications for Criminal Justice</b>	<b>285</b>
12 Eyewitness Identification and Facial Image Comparison Evidence in Common Law Jurisdictions <i>Andrew Roberts</i>	287
13 Forensic Facial Identification: A Practical Guide to Best Practice <i>Tim Valentine and Josh P. Davis</i>	323
<i>Index</i>	349

# Contributors

---

*Neil Brewer*

School of Psychology, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia  
e-mail: neil.brewer@flinders.edu.au

*Charity Brown*

Institute of Psychological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds,  
United Kingdom  
e-mail: pscibr@leeds.ac.uk

*Steven E. Clark*

Professor of Psychology, Director, Presley Center for Crime and  
Justice Studies, University of California, Riverside, United States  
e-mail: steven.clark@ucr.edu

*Josh P. Davis (Editor)*

Senior Lecturer, Psychology and Counselling Department, University  
of Greenwich, London, United Kingdom  
e-mail: j.p.davis@gre.ac.uk

*Jennifer E. Dysart*

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, John Jay College of  
Criminal Justice, New York, United States  
e-mail: jdysart@jjay.cuny.edu

*Gary Edmond*

School of Law, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia  
e-mail: g.edmond@unsw.edu.au

*Heather D. Flowe*

School of Psychology, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom  
e-mail: hf49@leicester.ac.uk

*Charlie Frowd*

University of Winchester, Winchester, United Kingdom  
e-mail: Charlie.Frowd@winchester.ac.uk

*Fiona Gabbert*

Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths, University of London, London, United Kingdom  
e-mail: f.gabbert@gold.ac.uk

*Victoria Z. Lawson*

Research Associate, CUNY Institute of State and Local Governance, New York, United States  
e-mail: Victoria.Lawson@islg.cuny.edu

*Molly B. Moreland*

Psychology, University of California, Riverside, United States  
e-mail: molly.moreland@email.ucr.edu

*Alice O'Toole*

The University of Texas at Dallas, School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Richardson, United States  
e-mail: otoole@utdallas.edu

*P. Jonathon Phillips*

Electrical Engineer, National Institute of Standards and Technology, United States  
e-mail: jonathon.phillips@nist.gov

*Andrew Roberts*

Senior Lecturer, Melbourne Law School, Melbourne, Australia  
e-mail: arob@unimelb.edu.au

*Ryan A. Rush*

Visiting Assistant Professor of Psychology, Wabash College,  
United States  
e-mail: rushr@wabash.edu

*Hannah Ryder*

School of Psychology, University of Leicester, Leicester, United  
Kingdom  
e-mail: hr98@le.ac.uk

*James D. Sauer*

School of Medicine (Psychology), University of Tasmania, Hobart,  
Australia  
e-mail: jim.sauer@utas.edu.au

*Harriet M.J. Smith*

Division of Psychology, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham,  
United Kingdom  
e-mail: harriet.smith2011@my.ntu.ac.uk

*Tim Valentine (Editor)*

Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths,  
University of London, London, United Kingdom  
e-mail: t.valentine@gold.ac.uk

*Caroline Wilkinson*

Director of Face Lab, Liverpool School of Art & Design, Liverpool  
John Moores University, Liverpool, United Kingdom  
c.m.wilkinson@ljmu.ac.uk



# Foreword

---

---

The criminal justice system involves a pantheon of values, and it is not always easy to figure out the best course of action when one of those values appears to clash with another. And so it is the case with our value about avoiding the wrongful prosecution of innocent people and our value about ensuring the correct prosecution of guilty people. *Forensic Facial Identification* is a superb edited volume whose contributors collectively worry about both of these values, how to balance them, and how scientific evidence on facial identification can help us think about the legal structures that should exist in a world that has a good balance.

*Forensic Facial Identification* is primarily about the problem of distinguishing accurate eyewitness testimony from mistaken testimony. It is broader than most books on eyewitness testimony in that it concerns not only identification of eyewitnesses who might have actually seen the robbery, or been a victim of the rape, but also the identification of perpetrators from closed-circuit television images, as is becoming increasingly common with the proliferation of cameras throughout our society. And it also concerns the identification of deceased individuals by reconstructions of their faces as they appeared in real life, as happened, for example, when Osama bin Laden was captured and killed. How do you think we know for sure that the man who was shot and killed on May 2, 2011, inside a private residential compound in Pakistan was really the Saudi Arabian bin Laden? The introductory chapter does a splendid job of briefly reviewing these topics – and ones not mentioned – that readers will find in each chapter so there is no need to repeat this review here.

*Forensic Facial Identification* is broader than most books on eyewitness testimony in other ways. Each chapter begins with a specific case

that is used by the chapter authors to guide discussion. The cases, and discussions, cover many regions of the world, mostly the UK and US, but also Australia and New Zealand in particular. The cases are sometimes famous, as is that of the murder of the foreign minister Anna Lindh in Sweden in 2003, and sometimes not famous, as in the case of a fast food worker in Manchester, UK, who was accused of rapes in 2009 and 2010. The cases are historical, as in the case of Adolf Beck who was convicted in 1896 in London for defrauding women. Most are more modern, as in the numerous cases of wrongful conviction uncovered by the New York-based Innocence Project.

One case that is mentioned frequently (in several chapters) is a recent case that was decided by the New Jersey Supreme Court (*State v. Henderson*). Since the present authors did not go into much detail about this case, and it has been so significant in the US, I thought I would use my “forward platform” to say a bit more about it. In that murder case, the defendant Larry Henderson was accused of being involved in a shooting in an apartment in Camden, New Jersey. About two weeks after the murder, a surviving witness who had been in the apartment identified Henderson from a set of photos. A subsequent identification at trial resulted in Henderson’s conviction. It might seem like an open and shut case, but actually there were serious problems with the initial identification. It turns out that the witness only picked Henderson’s photo after the investigating officers put on some “pressure” and did some “nudging”, as the behaviour of those officers would later be characterized. More specifically, it appears that when the key witness first looked at the photos, he did not see anyone he recognized. He finally narrowed things down to two photos but was indecisive. Pressure and nudging cracked the indecisiveness. On top of this, it turned out that the witness himself had, during the day and just prior to the shooting, consumed large amounts of alcohol and crack cocaine. Henderson appealed his conviction, and when that appeal was heard by the New Jersey Supreme Court in 2011, the criminal justice world paid attention. That decision showed a deep appreciation of the eyewitness problems in the case and a sophisticated appreciation of the science of eyewitness testimony, and the ruling rather dramatically changed the legal standard for how eyewitness evidence is assessed in a criminal case.

What now happens in New Jersey is this. A defendant who can show some evidence of suggestive influences on witness testimony is entitled to a court hearing in which all the psychological factors bearing on the testimony are reviewed and analysed. After this scrutiny, if the judge still decides to admit the testimony at trial, then the judge must also provide to the jury a set of instructions that can guide them on how to

think about the eyewitness evidence. Over the next year or so, those instructions were crafted by a committee, which produced a 26-page document that can be found on the internet at: [www.judiciary.state.nj.us/criminal/ModelCrimJuryChargeCommHENDERSONREPORT.pdf](http://www.judiciary.state.nj.us/criminal/ModelCrimJuryChargeCommHENDERSONREPORT.pdf)

Curious as to what happened to Henderson after his successful appeal, psychology professor John Wixted found a prosecutor who gave him an update. According to this source, another hearing was held in which it was determined that proper procedure had been followed during Henderson's initial trial, which meant that his original guilty verdict was upheld. Of course the procedure might have been "proper" during the trial, but that does not mean that the early identification "activities" shouldn't make us suspicious about whether the identification of Henderson was truly accurate. For now, we have to live with that uncertainty.

The Henderson decision changed the way eyewitness evidence is handled not only in cases where there are questions about the role of law enforcement in producing an identification, but in cases where law enforcement played little or no role. There was a companion case to Henderson that has not received nearly the same attention, but is important because it extends these safeguarding procedures to a wide array of cases. The companion case (*New Jersey v. Chen*) involved some titillating facts. One Sunday in 2005, Mr Kim got a phone call from his ex-girlfriend, Cecilia Chen, the first such call since they had ended their relationship in 2000. Kim told Chen he was happily married and expecting a child; Chen told Kim she was not doing well and wondered about what would have happened had they not broken up. Three days later, Kim's wife Helen was home alone, five months pregnant, and recovering from surgery. A woman came to the Kim home, said her car had broken down and she needed to use the bathroom and phone. The intruder then stabbed Helen with a kitchen knife. Soon thereafter, in discussions with his wife, Kim thought the intruder might be Chen. They accessed Chen's website and looked at photos of her, and Helen became "ninety percent positive" after viewing one particular photo. So we have a case in which key aspects of the identification process were independent of any law enforcement, but nonetheless rather suggestive. Cases with such facts would also, after Henderson, be entitled to the same legal safeguards, namely the hearing and the judicial warnings.

The policy innovations resulting from the Henderson case will hopefully reduce the likelihood of mistaken identification and wrongful conviction that can result. It remains to be seen whether subsequent research confirms the effectiveness of this bold direction.

*Forensic Facial Identification* not only presents the basic science in each chapter, but also discusses other policy recommendations. There

are recommendations concerning the procedures used to obtain an identification in the first place, such as double-blind testing. There are recommendations concerning the interviewing process, such as taking steps to avoid allowing errors to creep into the early descriptions of witnesses. There are recommendations about the use of composites, mugshot searches, showups, and street identifications, face matching and more. Collectively these authors express their appreciation of procedures that will provide some protection for a suspect who is innocent. But what about catching the guilty? Sadly, some of the reforms may come with a cost, because they reduce correct identifications. So what to do? The editors of *Forensic Facial Identification* came to a resolution that I very much appreciated: (spoiler alert; skip if you don't want to know yet)

...the potential disadvantage from adopting these recommendations is no reason to abandon the more important duty to avoid wrongfully prosecuting innocent suspects. Indeed a mistaken identification may result in an investigation being terminated because an innocent person has been charged, leaving the guilty free to commit further offences. The justice obtained from maximizing the rate of suspect identifications from unfair procedures would give a false sense of security.

*Forensic Facial Identification* should be applauded for its heroic efforts to offer society a true sense of security. Hopefully its messages will be read by many who care about fairness, and how psychological science can help us achieve it.

**Elizabeth F. Loftus**  
*University of California, Irvine*

# Series Preface

---

---

The Wiley Series in the Psychology of Crime, Policing and the Law publishes both single and multi-authored monographs and edited reviews of important and emerging areas of contemporary research. The purpose of this series is not merely to present research findings in a clear and readable form, but also to bring out their implications for both practice and policy. Books in this series are useful not only to psychologists, but also to all those involved in crime detection and prevention, child protection, policing and judicial processes.

As the originator of this book series, it has always been my ambition to have a volume devoted to issues surrounding facial identification. It was an early interest of both myself and the co-editor of the series, Professor Ray Bull. Each of us was involved in research into the vagaries of facial identification and we were responsible, with our co-authors, for some of the earliest books and papers published in the UK on this topic (see Clifford & Bull, 1978; Davies, Ellis, & Shepherd, 1981; Shepherd, Ellis, & Davies, 1982). However, we readily acknowledge the primacy of the pioneering work of Elizabeth Loftus (Loftus, 1979), who has provided a forward for this new book.

While research in the UK and the US into facial identification and misidentification stemmed from a common concern over miscarriages of justice based on confident but unreliable witnesses, the drivers and direction which research then took in the two countries was rather different. In the US, a wider range of offences result in jury trials, and the courts have traditionally shown a liberal approach to the admission of testimony by experts which might inform the jury on issues relevant to the evidence (Cutler & Penrod, 1995). Defence attorneys were not slow to grasp the significance of early research by psychologists on eyewitness reliability, but Elizabeth Loftus and another pioneer, the late

Robert Buckhout, still faced considerable resistance to the admission of their testimony in cases where issues of identification formed an important element in the prosecution case. Despite reverses, research on the vagaries of identification has gained in credibility as a growing number of American State Courts now admit evidence from suitably qualified psychologists in cases of disputed identification (Loftus, Doyle, & Dysart, 2013). For Loftus, this courtroom experience helped to highlight issues of concern which subsequently became the subject of research (Loftus, 1986)

In the UK, the interest of psychologists in facial identification did not stem from the adversarial cockpit of the courtroom. British courts have traditionally taken a more conservative view on the admissibility of experts in criminal trials, particularly in relation to the credibility of witnesses, where the *Turner* ruling (Mackay, Colman, & Thornton, 1999) effectively prevents psychologists from commenting on the accuracy or reliability of witnesses in the criminal court: this is a matter for counsel to explore and juries alone to decide. However, miscarriages of justice based on mistaken identification have a long history in the British courts (Davies & Griffiths, 2008), culminating in a Government enquiry led by the distinguished judge, Lord Devlin. Among the recommendations of his report (Devlin, 1976) was that “research should be directed to establishing ways in which the insights of psychology can be brought to bear on the conduct of parades and the practice of the courts” (p.149). Devlin’s recommendation helped to ensure that state funding and support flowed toward psychologists involved in improving police procedures and practices, in order to minimize the risk of misidentification, rather than dealing with its consequences in the courts.

Since those early days, the study of facial memory has matured and spread across the globe, raising new issues, and there has been much cross-fertilisation as *Forensic Facial Identification* amply demonstrates. However, those early origins can still be discerned. The North American tradition can be seen in research on such issues as the relationship between confidence and accuracy and the composition and fairness of lineups, while the UK approach is reflected in studies of witness interviewing for identification, facial composite techniques and identification from closed-circuit television.

The editors, Tim Valentine and Josh Davis, both have established reputations in the field. Tim has played a crucial role in the development of video identification procedures, a technique which appears to offer a fairer and more accurate test for establishing a positive identification compared with traditional methods, while Josh has contributed important insights into identification from CCTV. Through their

standing, they have been able to call upon a range of distinguished international contributors, to offer authoritative perspectives on all aspects of human facial identification. This handbook will be read with profit and interest by practitioners and researchers in law, psychology and policing, who seek safe and effective methods of prosecuting the guilty and safeguarding the innocent.

**Graham M. Davies**  
*University of Leicester*

## REFERENCES

- Clifford, B.R., & Bull, R. (1978). *The Psychology of Person Identification*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Cutler, B.L., & Penrod, S.D. (1995). *Mistaken Identification: The Eyewitness, Psychology and the Law*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, G.M., Ellis, H.D., & Shepherd, J.W. (1981). *Perceiving and Remembering Faces*. London: Academic Press.
- Davies, G.M., & Griffiths, L. (2008). Eyewitness identification and the English courts: A century of trial and error. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 15, 435–449.
- Devlin, Lord P. (1976). *Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department on the Departmental Committee on Evidence of Identification in Criminal Cases*. London: HMSO.
- Loftus, E.F. (1979). *Eyewitness Testimony*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Loftus, E.F. (1986). Ten years in the life of an expert witness. *Law and Human Behavior*, 10, 241–263.
- Loftus, E.F., Doyle, J.M., & Dysart, J. (2013). *Eyewitness Testimony: Civil and Criminal* (5th ed.). Charlottesville, VA: Lexis Law Publishing.
- Mackay, R.D., Colman, A.M., & Thornton, P. (1999). The admissibility of expert psychological and psychiatric testimony. In A. Heaton-Armstrong, E. Shepherd, & D. Wolchover (Eds.), *Analysing Witness Testimony: A Guide for Legal Practitioners and Other Professionals* (pp. 321–334). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shepherd, J.W., Ellis, H.D., & Davies, G.M. (1982). *Identification Evidence: A Psychological Evaluation*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.



**Part 1**

# **Introduction**

---



# Identification and Surveillance of Facial Images: Progress and Problems

---

---

TIM VALENTINE AND JOSH P. DAVIS

Eyewitness testimony is older than the law. Even today, with sophisticated forensic science, eyewitness testimony forms the bedrock of many criminal cases. Whenever a witness gives testimony in court, jurors, judge(s) or magistrate(s) are faced with two basic questions: Is this witness giving an honest account? If so, can their account be relied upon as accurate? There are many reasons why a witness may deliberately give false testimony or identify a defendant they know to be innocent. The witness may be seeking revenge, have been intimidated into giving a false account, or be motivated to deflect blame away from the true culprit. Legal procedure is designed to expose a dishonest witness. In an adversarial system, for example in the UK, US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, the defence have the right to test the testimony of prosecution witnesses through cross-examination. Equally the prosecution cross-examines witnesses for the defence. Cross-examination has been described as “the greatest legal engine ever invented for the

### Case study

“George Davis is innocent” daubed on walls and bridges was a familiar sight around London in the late 1970s. The graffiti referred to a man convicted for an armed robbery, which targeted a wages delivery at the office of London Electricity Board (LEB), Ilford, on April 4, 1974. Acting on information received, two plain-clothed policemen were watching the building. Two guns were carried by the robbers, and as they made a desperate getaway, one of the policemen at the scene was shot in the leg, and several motorists were hijacked at gunpoint.

At trial in March 1975 the prosecution primarily relied upon identification evidence by the police officers at the scene, and by police and other witnesses at other locations as the robbers switched vehicles during a dramatic car chase. Blood samples, recovered from the scene of a crashed getaway car, did not match any of the defendants. George Davis was the only one of four defendants to be convicted. He was sentenced to 20 years in prison. The conviction was upheld by the Court of Appeal in December 1975.

There was a high-profile campaign against George Davis’ conviction, which involved much graffiti around London. The campaign gained notoriety when the Headingley cricket pitch was dug up during an England v. Australia test match, preventing play from continuing. In May 1976 the Home Secretary took the exceptional step of exercising the Royal Prerogative of Mercy to release Davis without referring the case back to the Court of Appeal. The Home Secretary deemed the conviction to be unsafe because of doubts over the police evidence, but Davis was not held to be innocent.

In 1977, George Davis was caught in the act of an armed robbery on the Bank of Cyprus. He pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 15 years in prison. He was released in 1984 but convicted of armed robbery for a third time in 1987.

George Davis’ conviction for the armed robbery of the LEB wages office was quashed by the Court of Appeal on May 24, 2011 – 37 years after the original conviction. The principal grounds were concerns about the reliability of the identification of Davis from a live identity parade (lineup) by the two police officers who witnessed the robbery. Most notably the prosecution had not disclosed that one officer, PC Grove, had previously identified a different man from police photographs. Prior to the identity parade in which George Davis was identified, the investigating officer had told PC Grove that he had been mistaken in his identification of the photograph. Confidential

government papers are normally subjected to a 30-year embargo, after which the papers are held by the Public Record Office. In 2006 the embargo of the papers relating to the Home Secretary's 1976 decision to free George Davis was extended by 20 years.

*Sources:*

*Davis v R.* (2011) EWCA Crim 1258 (24 May 2011). Retrieved from <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2011/1258.html>

Wikipedia entry for George Davis (robber). Retrieved from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George\\_Davis\\_\(robber\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Davis_(robber))

discovery of truth”.<sup>1</sup> It is intended as a method to expose a dishonest witness, but psychological science shows that cross-examination is ineffective in distinguishing reliable eyewitnesses from those who are honest but mistaken (e.g., Valentine & Maras, 2011; Zajac & Hayne, 2003, 2006).

Courts have long acknowledged that a mistaken eyewitness may give convincing identification evidence. The extraordinary case of Adolf Beck, twice wrongly convicted on the basis of mistaken eyewitness identification, described in the case study in Chapter 6, resulted in the Criminal Appeal Act (1907) which established the Court of Criminal Appeal in London (Bogan & Roberts, 2011). Widespread concern about the reliability of eyewitness identification evidence in a number of English cases during the 1970s led the British government to set up an enquiry into eyewitness identification evidence (Devlin, 1976; see case study). Despite legal reforms in the UK since the 1970s, studies of police identification procedures have shown that a third of all identifications from live parades (Valentine, Pickering, & Darling, 2003; Wright & McDaid, 1996) and 40% of all positive identifications from video lineups are known to be mistaken, as the witness selected an innocent volunteer foil or filler (Horry, Memon, Wright, & Milne, 2012). The Innocence Project (2013) in New York has produced incontrovertible evidence of the devastating impact of mistaken eyewitness identification in the US. Over the last 20 years more than 300 prisoners have been exonerated by DNA evidence that proved they were actually innocent of the crimes of which they were convicted. The crimes were serious, mostly rape and murder, because physical evidence from which a DNA profile can be obtained is most likely to be available and collected in serious violent crimes. Mistaken eyewitness identification was the leading cause of wrongful conviction, and occurred in nearly 75% of cases.

<sup>1</sup>J. Wigmore, Evidence §1367 (J. Chadbourne rev. 1974).

In addition to the strong evidence of the high risk of mistaken eyewitness identification, research also demonstrates that approximately 40% of witnesses fail to identify anyone from a lineup. In many cases the witness may not have an adequate memory of the culprit. It may be that in an unknown proportion of these cases, the culprit was not included and the witness was making the correct decision. However, justice is served by developing procedures that both reduce the likelihood of an innocent suspect being identified, and enhance the likelihood that the actual perpetrator will be identified. Identification failures may leave a guilty suspect free to offend again.

The problem of distinguishing accurate from inaccurate identification is at the heart of *Forensic Facial Identification*. In the chapters that follow, distinguished scholars grapple with the problems of identification of suspects by eyewitnesses, from CCTV imagery, and identification of deceased victims from reconstructions of their facial appearance in life.

In many criminal investigations, the first problem the police may face is to identify a suspect. This issue is addressed in Part 2. If an eyewitness is available, the first step will be to interview the witness and in the course of that interview obtain a description of the offender. In Chapter 2 Fiona Gabbert and Charity Brown evaluate the relationship between the completeness and accuracy of a witness' description of the perpetrator and the likelihood that a subsequent identification from a lineup will be accurate. This is a difficult issue for the psychology of eyewitness identification because research findings are contradictory. Most researchers accept that, contrary to common-sense expectations, there is little relationship between the quality of a witness' verbal description of the perpetrator and their identification accuracy. On balance, laboratory research shows that a witness who gives a detailed description is no more likely to be able to identify the offender than a witness who can provide only a brief description. From their analysis of the literature Gabbert and Brown show that it is the inclusion of incorrect details in a verbal description that adversely affects identification accuracy. Therefore interview procedures that produce detailed descriptions by encouraging witnesses to provide details of which they are unsure are likely to impair eyewitness memory for the perpetrator and may increase the risk of a mistaken identification. Informed by this analysis, Gabbert and Brown provide practical advice for the employment of appropriate procedures most likely to obtain accurate descriptions from witnesses. These guidelines should help to safeguard the quality of any subsequent eyewitness identification.

Having obtained a description of the offender(s), in the absence of other evidence, the police may ask a witness to create a facial composite

or likeness from memory. The image can then be publicized in the hope that somebody will recognize it as an individual they know and will provide a name to the police. In Chapter 3, Charlie Frowd reviews the development of techniques and methods used to construct facial composite images. This field has shown remarkable development in recent years. In 2007 the best recognized images were facial sketches produced by skilled police artists, and these were recognized by only 8% of people who knew the depicted person (Davies & Valentine, 2007). Since then, new systems that evolve a facial composite using artificial but highly realistic facial images have become much more effective. In addition, a range of techniques have been developed that considerably improve the quality of facial composites after production. These include a new interview technique, construction of the composites with the external features of the face occluded, viewing the composite under circumstances of either perceptual distortion or caricatured animation, and morphing composites produced by multiple witnesses, or indeed, multiple composites produced by the same witness. In the most recent research, Frowd reports recognition of facial composites by 74% of people who were familiar with the individual depicted.

If the police attend a street crime, after taking a description from the witness, they may drive the witness around the area, or allow them to view a suspect who has been stopped on the basis of the description. The aim is to secure an identification of that suspect or to eliminate them from the investigation. This procedure, known as a street identification or showup, is inherently suggestive. In Chapter 4, Victoria Lawson and Jennifer Dysart review research that shows a showup is not as reliable as a lineup, but the outcomes can be surprisingly similar. Showups are widely used, and may often be the only practical means of investigating a street robbery. Therefore, the procedure is likely to remain an essential investigative tool, but its use does need to be regulated appropriately.

If no suspect is identified from a showup, the witness may be asked to view large numbers of mugshot images of known offenders. Lawson and Dysart also review the literature on mugshot viewings, which perhaps not surprisingly, given the large numbers of images that are viewed, results in very different outcomes from that of a showup.

If a witness does identify a suspect from a showup or a mugshot, it is common practice in both the UK and the US for the witness to view the same suspect in a lineup at a later date to collect “formal” identification evidence. The psychological science shows very clearly that repeated identification procedures with the same suspect and witness are very prone to mistaken identification. If a witness has made a mistake in a showup or mugshot, they are highly likely to repeat the same mistaken

identification from a lineup. Analysis of the Innocence Project (2013) cases show that mistaken identifications often arise when the victim identified the innocent suspect in repeated identification procedures. For example, Ronald Cotton and Johnnie Briscoe were both identified from police photographs prior to being identified from a lineup procedure by the same witness.

When human remains are found, the police may be faced with the problem of identifying the victim. A DNA profile can only identify somebody who is already on a database. In Chapter 5, Caroline Wilkinson reviews the methods used to reconstruct facial appearance, so that somebody who knew the victim may provide a name. Once the police have a possible identity, physical evidence (e.g. DNA, dental records) may be used to confirm the identification. Traditionally facial reconstruction is a highly skilled process that requires detailed anthropological knowledge and artistic skills, although computer technology now makes a substantial contribution. Using computational methods similar to those used to construct facial composites under the guidance of a witness, reconstructed facial appearances can be rotated and have global changes applied (e.g. ageing) to enhance the likelihood of identification.

Formal identification evidence from eyewitnesses is considered in Part 3. Recently there has been major reform of the identification procedures used in the UK. Until 2003, live identity parades remained the standard procedure. The Police and Criminal Evidence Act (1984) gave any suspect who disputes their identification the right to test the evidence in a formal procedure. Live parades were frequently held in purpose-built identification suites in which the witness viewed the lineup through a one-way mirror to shield the witness from the view of the lineup members. The use of such mirrors was not universal, and some witnesses were required to make their decision in full view of the suspect. The procedure was costly and difficult to administer. Half of all parades were cancelled because a bailed suspect did not attend or suitable volunteer foils could not be found (Pike, Brace, & Kyman, 2002). A police complaint was that the procedure was subject to manipulation by the defence, causing long delays. From the perspective of the witness, the procedure could be intimidating, especially for vulnerable witnesses, such as children, elderly witnesses and victims of sexual assaults.

Video identification procedures were introduced gradually in the UK between 2003, when video became an option, and 2008 when video became mandatory, unless it could be argued that a live parade was more suitable. The effect has been that video lineups have become universal. A major impact of the introduction of the video lineup has been to dramatically increase the number of procedures held. Devlin (1976) reported that 2143 live parades were held in the UK in 1973. This had increased

to 14,000 by 1994 (Slater, 1994). This increase was attributed to the effect of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (1984). At the time of writing, current estimates are that 110,000 video lineups are held annually.<sup>2</sup>

Approximately 20% of all witnesses make a known mistaken identification of volunteer foils or distracters from live parades organized by the British police (Valentine, Pickering, & Darling, 2003; Wright & McDaid, 1996). A recent study found that 26% of all witnesses mistakenly identify a volunteer from video lineups organized in England and Wales (Horry *et al.*, 2012). This increase is difficult to interpret. Perhaps proportionally more foils are identified because video lineups are of better quality. Foils for video lineups are selected from large databases of around 25,000 video clips. Therefore foils in video lineups may be more plausible than the foils in live lineups. Alternatively, because it is now easier to run an identification procedure, there may be a greater tendency to ask witnesses who had little opportunity to view the culprit to attend an identification procedure. Whatever the explanation behind these data, it is a cruel irony that there has been a huge increase in reliance on eyewitness identification evidence, in spite of Devlin's warning of the particular risks of this form of evidence. As a result of efforts to improve eyewitness identification procedures there are, almost certainly, more mistaken eyewitness identifications presented in court than in Devlin's day.

Reform of eyewitness identification procedures in the US has followed a very different path. Identification from an array of photographs has always been widely used for formal identification evidence in the US and Canada, but has never been permissible in the UK. In the US, research effort and procedural reform has focused on the issue of whether it is more effective if the photographs are presented all at the same time (simultaneously) or one at a time (sequentially) with the witness asked to make a decision to each photograph as it is presented. Steven Clark, Molly Moreland and Ryan Rush skilfully set out in Chapter 6 the essential issues from the complicated literature on methods of identification procedures, drawing from practice in both the US and the UK.

When a jury or judge hears testimony of eyewitness identification in court, it is necessary to make a judgement of whether the identification is reliable. The only information available to the court is the description of the event, the demeanour of the witness and any evidence of the witness' character that may be given in evidence. In Chapter 7, Hannah Ryder, Harriet Smith and Heather Flowe consider the effect that the circumstances of the event, and the characteristics of the offender and of

<sup>2</sup>Two systems provide video lineups for the British police. The estimate of 110,000 is the sum of procedures claimed to have been conducted using each system on their websites ([www.viper.com](http://www.viper.com); [www.promat.com](http://www.promat.com)).

the witness, have on the accuracy of eyewitness identification evidence. To what extent can these estimator factors be used to judge whether any given identification is accurate or not? The approach adopted by the courts in the US and the UK to address these issues is also discussed.

In Chapter 8, James Sauer and Neil Brewer evaluate the relationship between the level of confidence expressed by a witness and the quality of his or her memory for the perpetrator. These authors note that a positive identification of the suspect does not guarantee that the suspect is the culprit. Instead, an identification indicates that, of the lineup members presented, the suspect is the best match to the witness' memory of the culprit. They explain how cognitive and social factors can make a witness more or less likely to pick someone from the lineup. These influences on the witness' decision-making renders the identification less informative about the quality of the witness' memory. Basing their argument on the theoretical relationship between confidence and memory quality, Sauer and Brewer describe how, when appropriately measured, confidence can be indicative of the degree of a witness' recognition. They argue it would be foolish not to consider confidence when evaluating identification evidence. The protocols for collecting measures of confidence in the UK and the US are considered, and practical advice is given for collecting appropriate measures of confidence. Sauer and Brewer also discuss a radical new approach to collecting eyewitness identification evidence, which entirely excludes the necessity for the witness to make binary yes–no decisions, which are normally required when a witness chooses to identify one person from a lineup.

In view of the fragility of human memory, CCTV imagery appears to offer a valuable opportunity to avoid the need for eyewitnesses. At first sight, CCTV provides an irrefutable record of the appearance of the offender, and one important advantage is that when confronted with such imagery many offenders confess. But when the identification is disputed, verifying the identity of an offender caught on camera can be more difficult than expected. Identification from CCTV imagery or photographs is considered in Part 4. Josh Davis and Tim Valentine review the evidence on the human ability to match images of faces in Chapter 9. When the images are of people who are unfamiliar to the observer, 20–30% of judgements are mistaken even under ideal conditions. Using good quality images, in which the viewpoints of the images to be compared are similar, people make frequent simultaneous matching errors of judgement even under no time pressure. Two images of different people can appear very similar; and two images of the same person taken with different cameras can look very different. Both false positive and false negative errors are common. Unexpectedly, it turns out that the need to remember the appearance of an offender is not necessary