



**Lineup member similarity influences the effectiveness of a salient rejection option for eyewitnesses**

Journal:	<i>Psychiatry, Psychology and Law</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Eyewitness , Salient , Lineup Similarity, Identification, Non-Verbal, Rejection Option, Wildcard

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Preprint Only

**Abstract**

Visually salient lineup rejection options have not been systematically studied with adult eyewitnesses. We explored the impact of using a non-verbal, salient rejection option on adults' identification accuracy for lineups containing low or high similarity fillers. The non-verbal, salient rejection option had minimal impact on accuracy in low similarity lineups, but in high similarity lineups its inclusion increased correct rejections for target-absent lineups as well as incorrect rejections in target-present lineups, relative to a verbal rejection condition. The improved performance in target-absent lineups suggests that adults, like children, may experience pressure to choose and guess during difficult tasks. This pressure is reduced when a prominent non-verbal rejection option is displayed in the lineup. However, the salient rejection option also appears to increase the attractiveness of avoiding a difficult choice between the target and highly similar fillers. Implications of these findings for the experimental literature and justice system are discussed.

**Keywords**

Eyewitness Identification, Lineup Similarity, Salient Rejection Option, Wildcard

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

3

Lineup member similarity influences the effectiveness of a salient rejection option for eyewitnesses

Eyewitnesses have a demonstrated propensity for mistakenly identifying an innocent person from a lineup (Smith & Cutler, 2013). Misidentifications have the potential to implicate an innocent suspect of involvement in a crime and are a leading cause of false convictions (Connors, Lundregan, Miller, & McEwan, 1996; Gross & Shaffer, 2012; Wells et al., 1998). Although young children are particularly likely to identify an innocent person from target-absent lineups (Davies, Steven-Robb & Flin, 1988; Pozzulo & Lindsay, 1998), this problem is not exclusive to them; adult witnesses also demonstrate low correct rejection rates and a tendency to incorrectly identify innocent lineup members (e.g., Lindsay, Pozzulo, Craig, Lee, & Corber, 1997). Parker and Ryan (1993), for example, found that only 42% of adults in a target-absent condition correctly rejected the lineup. As misidentifications can have such harmful implications, large bodies of research have focused on how to improve the accuracy of eyewitness identification by decreasing the identification of innocents. Although some strategies have been successful at reducing misidentifications (e.g., instructions about how the target may or may not be present; Steblay, 1997), there is still much room for improvement.

One method that has shown some success with child eyewitnesses is the inclusion of a visual image in the lineup representing the absence of the perpetrator and allowing children to reject the lineup through non-verbal means (Harvard & Memon, 2012; Zajac & Karageorge, 2009). Children's poor performance on target-absent lineups is believed to be related to a lack of awareness of rejection as an option and the guessing that stems from perceived pressure to make a selection from the lineup (Lindsay & Pozzulo, 1997; Gross & Hayne, 1996). When the lineup contains a non-verbal rejection option that is displayed alongside the lineup members'

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

4

1  
2  
3 photographs, children can choose a lineup member or they can choose the rejection option. Thus,  
4  
5 the perceived pressure to choose need not result in a positive identification.  
6  
7

8         Adult and child witnesses who are informed that the culprit “may or may not be present”  
9  
10 are less likely to misidentify an innocent lineup member, relative to witnesses who are not given  
11 such instructions (Keast, Brewer, & Wells, 2007; Steblay, 1997). This suggests that witnesses of  
12 all ages are susceptible to the implicit assumption that when a lineup member is present, a lineup  
13 member should be selected. The success of providing adults with a pre-lineup admonition  
14 suggests they may also benefit from strategies to make the rejection option more salient and  
15 more similar to a lineup member selection. Salient rejection options in photolineups have been  
16 used with young adults (e.g., Leippe, Eisenstadt, & Rauch, 2009); however, the utility of such a  
17 method has not been systematically examined with an adult population. Thus, the present study  
18 extended the use of the salient rejection option to adults to examine the impact on identification  
19 accuracy.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 34 **Increasing the Saliency of Rejections**

35  
36         There have been several efforts to reduce misidentification by increasing the saliency of  
37 the rejection option for eyewitnesses. As mentioned above, a common strategy is to include  
38 verbal instructions that inform the witness that the person they saw committing the crime may or  
39 may not be present in the lineup. This method has been moderately effective at increasing  
40 accuracy with adults (Steblay, 1997). The second approach, which has received a fair amount of  
41 empirical attention with children, involves the use of visual cues to represent a rejection option  
42 that can be chosen in the same manner as a lineup member. Early on, Davies, Tarrant and Flin  
43 (1989) included a line drawing (i.e., ‘Mr. Nobody’) in the lineup and Beal, Schmitt, and Dekle  
44 (1995; Experiment 1) used a card containing the words “not here”; both methods demonstrated  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

5

1  
2  
3 some success in reducing false identifications in target-absent lineups. A more recent method  
4 that has also shown success is the inclusion of a silhouette figure with a question mark (i.e., the  
5 wildcard; Zajac & Karageorge, 2009 and the mystery man; Harvard & Memon, 2012). For  
6 example, Zajac and Karageorge (2009) were able to reduce inaccurate identifications by 25% in  
7 target-absent lineups that contained the wildcard compared to a control condition, without  
8 impacting correct identifications in target-present lineups. Likewise, Dunlevy and Cherryman  
9 (2013) used a similar approach and found that including a tree image in the lineup increased  
10 correct rejections and reduced incorrect filler identifications. Thus, the nonverbal rejection  
11 option has shown consistent, but modest, effectiveness with child witnesses. The reason for this  
12 success, as suggested by the research, is that a visual ‘not here’ cue increases accuracy by  
13 allowing a witness to ‘choose’ from a lineup in order to make a rejection decision (Harvard,  
14 2013) without any verbal effort (Zajac & Karageorge, 2009). That is, a primary utility of the  
15 visual ‘not here’ cue is that it eliminates the need to verbally reject the lineup—rather, the  
16 witness can point to an item and still indicate the culprit is not present. The success of the  
17 wildcard and other similar procedures has led some researchers to routinely including such an  
18 option in their research with children (e.g., Pozzulo, Dempsey, Bruer, & Sheahan, 2012).

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Although the practice is not as common, some researchers have used non-verbal, salient  
42 rejection techniques with adult populations. Pozzulo and colleagues (2012), for example, used a  
43 silhouette figure in their lineup with adult witnesses to indicate that the target may be absent  
44 from the lineup. Similarly, other studies have included a ‘not here,’ ‘none of the above,’ or ‘I  
45 don’t know’ box in the lineup and on the witness response forms (e.g., Pozzulo & Dempsey,  
46 2006). Despite its inclusion in some research, the effects of using a visual salient rejection option  
47 in the lineup with adult witnesses have not been systematically examined. It is possible that, like  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

6

1  
2  
3 with child witnesses, providing adult witnesses with a visual representation of the absence of a  
4 perpetrator and eliminating the need to verbally reject the lineup will decrease misidentifications  
5  
6 from target-absent lineups without reducing accuracy in target-present lineups. The evidence that  
7  
8 the ‘may or may not be present’ instruction has been moderately effective with adults (Stebly,  
9  
10 1997) suggests that there may be additional benefit to strengthening the instructions related to  
11  
12 ‘not choosing’. The salient rejection option may provide adults with the additional emphasis  
13  
14 needed to reject target-absent lineups.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Testing the applicability of salient rejection methods for all ages is important to promote  
21 consistency in eyewitness lineup procedures. As Pozzulo and colleagues (2008) argue, having  
22 different procedures for different age groups can be problematic. For example, having different  
23  
24 procedures can result in confusion regarding when different procedures should be used (i.e., at  
25  
26 what age does the “child” become old enough for an “adult” procedure?). A unified procedure is  
27  
28 ideal because it would allow for easy and consistent training and use. Providing evidence on the  
29  
30 utility of a salient rejection option with adults provides insight into how consistently this method  
31  
32 can be applied and, thus, reduces potential concerns that can stem from recommending different  
33  
34 procedures for different age groups.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 **Rejection Saliency and Lineup Composition**

42  
43 Eyewitness lineups typically include a suspect (guilty or innocent) and fillers (known  
44 innocents; Wells & Turtle, 1986). The similarity between the suspect and fillers is a fundamental  
45  
46 lineup construction issue. A recent meta-analysis showed that when suspect-filler similarity is  
47  
48 low, witnesses are inclined to select the suspect regardless of whether that person is guilty or  
49  
50 innocent (Fitzgerald, Price, Oriet, & Charman, 2013). Thus, lineups containing dissimilar fillers  
51  
52 can make the suspect’s identity obvious. This was the approach taken by Zajac and colleagues  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

7

(Karageorge & Zajac, 2011; Zajac & Karageorge, 2009), who tested the wildcard exclusively on biased lineups to demonstrate the utility of the visual rejection option in the ‘worst case scenario.’ Although the wildcard was effective under those circumstances, it is unclear whether their findings would generalize to lineups that contain fillers that resemble the suspect.

The difficulty of a target-present lineup task is largely a product of lineup member similarity. Compared with low similarity lineups, witnesses are less likely to correctly identify a target from moderate or high similarity lineups (Fitzgerald et al., 2013). From these data, we can infer that if the person who committed the crime is in a lineup with dissimilar fillers, the witness has a relatively easy identification task. Any witness with a reasonable memory of the culprit can be expected to consider the culprit’s photograph to be a much better match than any of the other photographs to their memory of the culprit. In this situation, the discrepancy between the strong feeling of familiarity of the culprit’s photograph and the weak feeling of familiarity for all the fillers should render the rejection option to be an undesirable option, regardless of its salience.

We are particularly interested in the effect of a salient, non-verbal rejection option on responses to lineups containing the target and a set of highly similar fillers. Such a lineup presents a more demanding identification task in which the witness must decide from among several members who match their memory of the culprit to some extent. In contrast to the low similarity lineup, the witness may only detect a small discrepancy in the feeling of familiarity between the target and the highly similar fillers. The strong competition of the highly plausible fillers can be expected to reduce the witnesses’ confidence in whether the target or any of the lineup members is the person they are attempting to identify. In this situation, the presence of a salient, non-verbal rejection option could encourage witnesses to reject the lineup rather than choose from among a set of similar-looking lineup members.

**Present study**

Following Zajac and Karageorge (2009), we were interested in examining the difference between verbal (control) and non-verbal (salient) rejection techniques. Thus, we examined the use of a visual image in the lineup as a method to reduce false identifications in adult witnesses by providing a salient, non-verbal selection option. Our second objective was to understand how the similarity of the fillers to the target influences the utility of this method. Examining a visual rejection option with similar fillers is important to establish ecological validity of this lineup technique, as recent surveys have revealed that police officers typically match fillers to the suspect's appearance (Police Executive Research Forum, 2013). In order for the present study to address this issue and remain comparable with Zajac and Karageorge's (2009) 'worst case scenario' design, we also included lineups containing dissimilar fillers.

Consistent with previous research with children (e.g., Zajac & Karageorge, 2009), we hypothesized that the presence of a salient rejection option would increase accuracy when the task was easy (i.e., lower similarity lineup). However, given the increased difficulty in correctly identifying a target from lineups containing high relative to low similarity fillers, Fitzgerald et al., 2013), we hypothesized that highly similar fillers would result in an increased tendency to select the salient non-verbal rejection option as an easy 'way out'. We hypothesized that perceived lineup difficulty would be unaffected by the presence of the target and that the salient, non-verbal rejection option would increase target-absent and target-present lineup rejections when fillers were similar to the target. As a consequence of the increased attractiveness of the rejection option, we predicted that highly similar fillers combined with a salient, non-verbal rejection option would increase correct rejections from target-absent lineups and decrease correct identifications from target-present lineups.



## Method

### Participants

We recruited 310 undergraduate students ( $M_{age} = 21.4$ ,  $SD = 5.0$ ; 77% women; 79% White)<sup>1</sup> from a Psychology Department participant pool. All participants received partial course credit as compensation.

### Design

Participants were randomly assigned to one of eight conditions in a 2 (rejection option: non-verbal (salient) vs. verbal (control)) x 2 (similarity: lower vs. higher) x 2 (target: present vs. absent) between-subjects design.

### Materials

**Target event video.** Participants viewed a brief video depicting a workplace theft. The video began with a young woman entering a kitchen and placing a brown paper bag labelled “Sally” into a refrigerator. Shortly after Sally exited the kitchen, a man entered and opened the refrigerator. Upon spotting Sally’s lunch, the man took it and exited the scene. The thief was in view for 16 seconds.

**Lineups.** All lineups contained six lineup members, who were presented simultaneously in 2 x 3 array. Prior to constructing the lineups, we collected similarity ratings from judges who were otherwise independent from the main experiment. These judges ( $n = 22$ ) provided pairwise similarity ratings between photographs of the thief and 277 potential fillers on an 11-point Likert scale (0 = not at all similar, 10 = highly similar). Mean ratings for the set ranged from 0.75 to 6.00 ( $M = 3.02$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ).

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to experimenter error, demographic information for 34 participants was not obtained.

1  
2  
3        **Similarity manipulation.** We used the similarity ratings to construct lineups that varied in  
4 the extent to which fillers resembled the thief. Fillers were rated as less similar to the thief in the  
5 lower similarity condition ( $M = 2.63$ ) than in the higher similarity condition ( $M = 5.40$ ).  
6  
7

8  
9  
10        **Target presence manipulation.** Target-present lineups contained the thief from the video  
11 and five fillers. In target-absent lineups, the thief was replaced with a similar-looking innocent  
12 suspect (similarity rating:  $M = 4.92$ ). The spatial position of the suspect was fully  
13 counterbalanced across participants.  
14  
15

16  
17        **Rejection option manipulation.** In the non-verbal (salient) condition, a blank silhouette  
18 figure (the wildcard; Zajac & Karageorge, 2009) was located in the middle of the lineup,  
19 between the two rows of lineup members. In the verbal (control) condition, the blank silhouette  
20 figure was absent.  
21  
22

## 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 **Procedure**

30  
31        The study was advertised as an investigation of event impressions. The consent form  
32 explained that participants would watch and discuss a video. Participants viewed the target event  
33 video in an individual testing room. After watching the video, participants completed a 20-  
34 minute distracter task (rating the similarity between pairs of women's faces). Participants then  
35 reported everything they could remember from the video. The experimenter subsequently  
36 explained that she was interested in whether they could identify the thief from a lineup.  
37  
38

39  
40        A computer program was used to administer the lineup. The experimenter who launched  
41 the computer program did not know which lineup would be administered (i.e., double-blind).  
42 Before presenting the lineup, the computer program instructed participants that the thief may or  
43 may not be present in the lineup (i.e., nonbiased instructions). Prior to displaying the lineup, the  
44 computer program explained the response options that would be available. In the non-verbal  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(salient) condition, participants could press a number from “1” through “6” to select a lineup member or they could press the number “0” to select the ‘wildcard’. In the verbal (control) condition, participants could press a number from “1” through “6” to select a lineup member or they could verbally instruct the experimenter that the thief was absent. The difference in these two rejection techniques (verbal and non-verbal) were employed to be comparable with the verbal versus non-verbal procedures used by Zajac and Karageorge (2009). In both conditions, the options for selecting a lineup member or rejecting the lineup were reiterated at the top of the screen that displayed the lineup.

## Results

### Lineup Identification Choice

To begin our analyses, we conducted a hierarchical log-linear analysis (HILOG) that included our three manipulated variables and identification response as the dependent variable. The 2 (similarity: lower, higher) x 2 (rejection manipulation: verbal (control), non-verbal (salient)) x 2 (target: absent, present) x 3 (lineup response: suspect, filler, reject) HILOG revealed no significant four- or three-way interactions. The highest order interaction was a two-way effect. Partial association analyses indicated each of the three manipulated variables influenced lineup response (see Table 1). The effect of target presence,  $\chi^2(2) = 146.53, p < .001$ , was driven by high suspect identification rates when the target was present and high rejection rates when the target was absent. This shows that witnesses generally had a good memory of the target. The effect of similarity,  $\chi^2(2) = 21.42, p < .001$ , was driven by a general pattern of higher suspect identification rates and lower filler identification rates in the lower relative to higher similarity lineups. The effect of rejection manipulation,  $\chi^2(2) = 12.37, p = .002$ , was driven by higher rejection rates in the non-verbal (salient) condition than in the verbal (control) condition.

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

12

1  
2  
3 The absence of a three-way interaction between target presence, rejection manipulation, and  
4 lineup response is noteworthy because it shows that the non-verbal rejection option increased  
5  
6 lineup rejections in both target-present (28% vs. 13%) and target-absent (80% vs. 61%) lineups.  
7  
8 We examined these effects further with tests of simple effects in target-absent and target-present  
9  
10 lineups.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 **Target-Absent.** When the target was absent, the non-verbal (salient) rejection option  
16  
17 generally worked as intended. Specifically, witnesses made more correct rejections in the non-  
18  
19 verbal condition (80%) than in the verbal (control) condition (61%),  $z = 2.59, p = .009, h = .42$ .  
20  
21 Although the rejection manipulation did not affect innocent suspect misidentifications, more  
22  
23 fillers were incorrectly identified in the verbal (31%) than the non-verbal condition (17%),  $z =$   
24  
25  $2.17, p = .03, h = .33$ . Therefore, the use of the non-verbal (salient) rejection option improved  
26  
27 accuracy in target-absent lineups.  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 Similarity also affected accuracy. Although similarity had no effect on innocent suspect  
33  
34 misidentifications, witnesses correctly rejected more low similarity lineups (82%) than high  
35  
36 similarity lineups (59%),  $z = 3.23, p = .001, h = .51$ , and incorrectly identified more high  
37  
38 similarity fillers (36%) than low similarity fillers (12%),  $z = 3.72, p < .001, h = .57$ . Thus,  
39  
40 witnesses were less accurate when the fillers closely resembled the target.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 Although innocent suspect selections were generally unaffected by any of the  
46  
47 manipulations, the rejection manipulation's effect on filler identifications and lineup rejections  
48  
49 depended on similarity (Table 1). In high similarity lineups, including the non-verbal rejection  
50  
51 option led to a 28% increase in correct rejections,  $z = 2.58, p = .005, h = .58$ , and a 27% decrease  
52  
53 in filler selections,  $z = 2.54, p = .01, h = .57$ . By contrast, in low similarity lineups, including the  
54  
55 non-verbal rejection led to only a 10% increase in the correct rejection rate and only a 3%  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 decrease in filler selections (both nonsignificant differences). Thus, the non-verbal (salient)  
4  
5 condition only had a substantial benefit when similarity was high.  
6  
7

8 **Target-Present.** Consistent with target-absent lineups, we observed a higher incorrect  
9  
10 rejection rate in the non-verbal (salient) condition (28%) than in the verbal (control) condition  
11  
12 (13%),  $z = 2.45$ ,  $p = .01$ ,  $h = .38$ . Target and filler identification rates were higher in the verbal  
13  
14 condition than in the non-verbal condition; however, neither of these differences was significant.  
15  
16

17  
18 Also consistent with target-absent lineups, higher similarity was associated with lower  
19  
20 accuracy. Correct identification rates were higher in the low (80%) than high (53%) similarity  
21  
22 condition,  $z = 3.68$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $h = .53$ . In addition, more rejections were made in the high (29%)  
23  
24 than low (13%) similarity condition,  $z = 2.49$ ,  $p = .01$ ,  $h = .42$  and more fillers were identified in  
25  
26 the high (18%) than low (8%) similarity condition,  $z = 2.00$ ,  $p = .05$ ,  $h = .32$ . This suggests that  
27  
28 when the fillers closely resemble the guilty suspect, witnesses have more difficulty identifying  
29  
30 the guilty suspect and, instead, incorrectly identify fillers or reject the lineup.  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Although filler selections were generally unaffected by any of the manipulations, the  
36  
37 rejection manipulation's effect on target identifications and lineup rejections depended on  
38  
39 similarity (Table 1). When similarity was high, including the non-verbal rejection option led to a  
40  
41 24% reduction in correct identifications,  $z = 2.13$ ,  $p = .02$ ,  $h = .48$ , and a 31% increase in  
42  
43 incorrect rejections,  $z = 3.03$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $h = .68$ . By contrast, in the lower similarity condition,  
44  
45 including the non-verbal rejection had no effect on correct identifications or incorrect rejections.  
46  
47 Thus, the non-verbal (salient) rejection option had no consequence in the lower similarity  
48  
49 condition and was detrimental in the higher similarity condition.  
50  
51  
52

### 53 Discussion

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

14

1  
2  
3 Our justification for exploring a non-verbal, salient rejection option with an adult  
4 population was threefold. First, like children, adults frequently misidentify innocent lineup  
5 members (Parker & Ryan, 1993). Second, although researchers have used salient, non-verbal  
6 rejection options with adult populations (e.g., Pozzulo et al., 2012), the utility of such methods  
7 has not been systematically examined with adults. Third, such exploration provides insight into  
8 how consistently this method can be applied in the justice system to potentially alleviate issues  
9 pertaining to different methods for different ages.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 In line with previous research on child witnesses (e.g., Zajac & Karageorge, 2009), the  
21 use of a non-verbal, salient rejection option increased correct rejection rates when the target was  
22 absent. However, in contrast to Zajac and Karageorge's (2009) findings that the wildcard had no  
23 negative impact on children's correct identification rates, the salient rejection option increased  
24 rejection rates when the target was present, thereby reducing accuracy. These effects were  
25 dependent on how closely the fillers resembled the guilty suspect. In the low similarity lineups,  
26 the salient rejection option had no strong impact on identification responses. In the high  
27 similarity lineups, the wildcard produced the same advantages with adults that have been found  
28 with children. That is, 28% more correct rejections were made in the salient (non-verbal) than  
29 the control (verbal) condition when the target was absent. However, as expected, these  
30 advantages also came at a cost; witnesses were also 30% more likely to incorrectly reject a  
31 lineup when target was present. These effects are comparable with some research on rejection  
32 instructions. Clark (2012), for example, found that lineup instructions increased accuracy in  
33 target-absent lineups and decreased accuracy in target-present lineups.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 The use of a non-verbal, salient rejection option was designed to help children overcome  
54 social pressure to choose from a lineup (Havard & Memon, 2012; Zajac & Karageorge, 2009).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

15

1  
2  
3 However, some researchers argue that young adults do not require the same level of assistance as  
4 they take greater caution from verbal instructions than children (Beal et al., 1995). The results of  
5 the present study suggest that the use of a non-verbal, salient rejection option is no more  
6 advantageous for adults than asking them to rejection the lineup verbally. This may be due to  
7 adults being able to retain and take greater caution from explicit, verbal rejection instructions  
8 than children (Beal et al., 1995) and that further reinforcing the rejection option using a visual  
9 image may make the rejection option too attractive for adults, particularly if the task is  
10 challenging.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**Practical Applications**

22  
23  
24 Although having one procedure for all eyewitnesses is ideal for practical reasons  
25 (Pozzulo et al., 2008), the present study suggests the cost of using a salient rejection option with  
26 adult eyewitnesses outweighs any benefits. In fact, there are clear harmful effects of using the  
27 wildcard as evidenced by a reduction in guilty suspect identifications with no decrease in  
28 innocent suspect identifications with the wildcard. At first glance, the wildcard appears to have  
29 potential usefulness as it increases correct rejections via reducing filler identifications when the  
30 target was absent. However, its failure to reduce innocent suspect identifications or increase  
31 guilty suspect identifications is evident of the harmful effects of using non-verbal, salient  
32 rejection option with adults. The importance of these findings for researchers is clear: Previous  
33 studies that have employed a salient rejection option with adults may have inadvertently reduced  
34 eyewitnesses' performance in target-present lineups—particularly if they used unbiased lineups  
35 with highly similar fillers. However, the implications of this research for the justice system are  
36 more dramatic. Unlike in experimental settings, investigators do not know whether the suspect in  
37 a lineup is guilty or innocent. When the lineup contains the guilty perpetrator and highly similar  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 fillers, using the salient rejection option may increase errors that, in turn, reduce the investigative  
4  
5 utility of the eyewitness evidence. When the guilty perpetrator is not in the lineup, the rejection  
6  
7 option has no impact on the reduction of misidentifications.  
8  
9

### 10 11 **Directions for Future Research**

12  
13  
14 There are at least two possible mechanisms by which our rejection manipulation could be  
15  
16 affecting identification responses. The visual rejection option may encourage lineup rejections  
17  
18 because of increased saliency and heightened awareness of the option to reject. Alternatively, the  
19  
20 visual rejection option may encourage lineup rejections because witnesses can ‘choose’ to reject  
21  
22 the lineup in the same manner as they can choose to select a lineup member and, thus, the  
23  
24 pressure to choose can result in either a positive or a negative identification decision. Although  
25  
26 rejection options have been manipulated in numerous studies (Beal et al., 1995; Davies et al.,  
27  
28 1989; Dunlevy & Cherryman, 2013; Havard & Memon, 2012; Karageorge & Zajac, 2011; Zajac  
29  
30 & Karageorge, 2009), neither the present study nor any previous study has been designed in such  
31  
32 a way that would allow for the relative contributions of these two potential mechanisms to be  
33  
34 disentangled. We suspect that in the present research, it was the increased saliency of the  
35  
36 rejection option that caused the visual rejection option to become particularly attractive when the  
37  
38 difficulty of the identification was increased by the inclusion of highly similar fillers. Therefore,  
39  
40 a rejection option that permits witnesses to reject the lineup nonverbally without affecting  
41  
42 salience could produce different results than we obtained. In any event, isolating the effects of  
43  
44 nonverbal and salient rejection options would be a promising area of future research. One way  
45  
46 to isolate these mechanisms may be through expanding the types of visual rejection options used  
47  
48 in research.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

17

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

Going forward, it will be important to further examine the efficacy of salient rejection options with variable lineup types and innovative salient rejection options. It is possible that the limitations of the salient rejection option are the result of the type of salient option used (i.e., the wildcard), so additional research is necessary to examine whether other methods of offering salient rejection options result in similar findings. In addition, applying the present design to child eyewitness population will supplement Zajac and Karageorge's (2009, 2011) findings and examine if using a salient rejection option with an unbiased lineup results in the same benefits as seen with a biased lineup.

**Acknowledgements**

This research was generously supported by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council Discovery grant to the fourth author. The authors thank Mike Hagen and Sarah Sangster for acting in the video as well as Ashley Desjardins and Tansi Summerfield for helping with data collection.

For Peer Review Only

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

## References

- 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
- 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. doi: 10.1007/BF01499325
- Clark, S. E. (2003). A memory and decision model for eyewitness identification. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 17*, 629-654. doi: 10.1002/acp.891
- Clark, S. E. (2012). Costs and benefits of eyewitness identification reform: Psychological science and public policy. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*, 238-259. doi: 10.1177/1745691612439584
- Clark, S. E., Erickson, M. A., & Breneman, J. (2011). Probative value of absolute and relative judgments in eyewitness identification. *Law and human behavior, 35*, 364-380. doi: 10.1007/s10979-010-9245-1
- Connors, E., Lundregan, T., Miller, N. & McEwen, T. (1996). Convicted by juries, exonerated by science: Case studies in the use of DNA evidence to establish innocence after trial. US Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs.
- Davies, G. M., Stevenson-Robb, Y., & Flin, R. (1988). Tales out of school: Children's memory for an unexpected event. In: M. Gruneberg, P. Morris, & R. Sykes (Eds.), *Practical aspects of memory: Current research and issues* (Vol. 1, pp. 122–127). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Davies, G., Tarrant, A., & Flin, R. (1989). Close encounters of the witness kind: Children's memory for a simulated health inspection. *British Journal of Psychology, 80*, 415–429. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8295.1989.tb02333.x

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

20

- 1  
2  
3 Dunlevy, J. R., & Cherryman, J. (2013). Target-absent eyewitness identification line-ups: Why  
4 do children like to choose. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, *20*, 284-293. doi:  
5  
6 10.1080/13218719.2012.671584  
7  
8  
9  
10 Fitzgerald, R. J., Price, H. L., Oriet, C., & Charman, S. D. (2013). The effect of suspect-filler  
11 similarity on eyewitness identification decisions: A meta-analysis. *Psychology, Public*  
12 *Policy, and Law*, *19*, 151-164. doi: 10.1037/a0030618  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Gross, J., & Hayne, H. (1996). Eyewitness identification by 5-to 6-year-old children. *Law and*  
18 *Human Behavior*, *20*, 359-373. doi: 10.1007/BF01499028  
19  
20  
21  
22 Gross, S. R., & Shaffer, M. (2012). *Exonerations in the United States, 1989–2012: Report by the*  
23 *National Registry of Exonerations*. Retrieved from  
24  
25 [http://globalwrong.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/exonerations\\_us\\_1989\\_2012\\_full\\_report](http://globalwrong.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/exonerations_us_1989_2012_full_report.pdf)  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 Havard, C. (2013). Are children less reliable at making visual identifications than adults? A  
33  
34 review. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, (ahead-of-print), 1-17.  
35  
36  
37 Havard, C., & Memon, A. (2012). The mystery man can help reduce false identification for child  
38  
39 witnesses: Evidence from video line-ups. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *27*, 50-59. doi:  
40  
41 10.1002/acp.2870  
42  
43  
44 Karageorge, A., & Zajac, R. (2011). Exploring the effects of age and delay on children's person  
45  
46 identifications: Verbal descriptions, lineup performance, and the influence of wildcards.  
47  
48 *British Journal of Psychology*, *102*, 161-183. doi: 10.1348/000712610X507902  
49  
50  
51 Keast, A., Brewer, N., & Wells, G. L. (2007). Children's metacognitive judgments in an  
52  
53 eyewitness identification task. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *97*, 286-314.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

21

- 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
- Leippe, M. R., Eisenstadt, D., & Rauch, S. M. (2009). Cueing confidence in eyewitness identifications: Influence of biased lineup instructions and pre-identification memory feedback under varying lineup conditions. *Law and Human Behavior*, *33*, 194-212. doi: 10.1007/s10979-008-9135-y
- Lippke, R. L. (2010). Punishing the guilty, not punishing the innocent. *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, *7*, 462-488. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/174552410X511446>
- Lindsay, R. C., Pozzulo, J. D., Craig, W., Lee, K., & Corber, S. (1997). Simultaneous lineups, sequential lineups, and showups: Eyewitness identification decisions of adults and children. *Law and Human Behavior*, *21*, 391-404. doi: 10.1023/A:1024807202926
- Parker, J. F., & Ryan, V. (1993). An attempt to reduce guessing behavior in children's and adults' eyewitness identifications. *Law and Human Behavior*, *17*, 11-26. doi: 10.1007/BF01044534
- Police Executive Research Forum. (2013). A National Survey of Eyewitness Identification Processes in Law Enforcement Agencies, <http://policeforum.org/library/eyewitness-identification/NIJEyewitnessReport.pdf> (accessed July 23, 2013).
- Pozzulo, J. D., & Dempsey, J. (2006). Biased lineup instructions: Examining the effect of pressure on children's and adults' eyewitness identification accuracy. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *36*, 1381-1394. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00064.x
- Pozzulo, J. D., Dempsey, J., Bruer, K., & Sheahan, C. (2012). The Culprit in Target-Absent Lineups: Understanding Young Children's False Positive Responding. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, *27*(1), 55-62. doi: 10.1007/s11896-011-9089-8.
- Pozzulo, J. D., Dempsey, J., Corey, S., Girardi, A., Lawandi, A., & Aston, C. (2008). Can a lineup procedure designed for child witnesses work for adults? Comparing simultaneous,

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

22

- 1  
2  
3 sequential, and elimination lineup procedures. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38,  
4  
5 2195-2209. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00387.x  
6  
7  
8 Pozzulo, J. D., & Lindsay, R. C. L. (1997). Increasing correct identifications by children. *Expert*  
9  
10 *Evidence*, 5, 126-132. doi: 10.1023/A:1008875802767  
11  
12  
13 Pozzulo, J.D., & Lindsay, R.C.L. (1998). Identification accuracy of children versus adults: A  
14  
15 meta-analysis. *Law and Human Behavior*, 22, 549-570. doi: 10.1023/A:1025739514042  
16  
17  
18 Smith, A.M., & Cutler, B. L. (2013). Introduction: Identification procedures and conviction of  
19  
20 the innocent. In B.L. Cutler (Editor), *Reform of Eyewitness identification Procedures* (pp.  
21  
22 3-21). American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/14094-001  
23  
24  
25 Steblay, N. M. (1997). Social influence in eyewitness recall: A meta-analytic review of lineup  
26  
27 instruction effects. *Law and Human Behavior*, 21, 283-297.  
28  
29 doi: 10.1023/A:1024890732059  
30  
31  
32 Wells, G. L. (1986). Expert psychological testimony: Empirical and conceptual analyses of  
33  
34 effects. *Law and Human Behavior*, 10, 83. doi: 10.1007/BF01044560  
35  
36  
37 Wells, G. L., Small, M., Penrod, S., Malpass, R. S., Fulero, S. M., & Brimacombe, C. E. (1998).  
38  
39 Eyewitness identification procedures: Recommendations for lineups and photospreads.  
40  
41 *Law and Human Behavior*, 22, 603-647. doi: 10.1023/A:1025750605807  
42  
43  
44 Wells, G. L., & Turtle, J. W. (1986). Eyewitness identification: The importance of lineup  
45  
46 models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 320-329. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.99.3.320  
47  
48  
49 Zajac, R., & Karageorge, A. (2009). The wildcard: A simple technique for improving children's  
50  
51 target-absent lineup performance. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 23, 358-36. doi:  
52  
53 10.1002/acp.1511  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## SALIENT REJECTION OPTION ADULT WITNESSES

23

Table 1

Identification response rates

Target	Rejection Option	Similarity	<i>n</i>	Response		
				Suspect	Filler	Rejection
Absent	Nonverbal (Salient)	Low	39	.03	.10	.87
		High	40	.05	.23	.73
	Verbal (Control)	Low	39	.10	.13	.77
		High	38	.05	.50	.45
Present	Nonverbal (Salient)	Low	39	.82	.05	.13
		High	39	.41	.15	.44
	Verbal (Control)	Low	39	.77	.10	.13
		High	37	.65	.22	.14