PSYCHOLOGICAL DETERMINANTS OF EYEWITNESS TESTIMONY: A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF MEMORY AND EMOTIONAL INFLUENCES IN LEGAL CONTEXTS

Godwin Shima Iorwanev[1]* & Andrew Zamani[2]

[1,2]Department of Psychology, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria

*godwinshima@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Theoretical frameworks are sets of interrelated propositions designed to systematically address phenomena by specifying relationships among key concepts. Within the criminal justice system, eyewitness accuracy and reliability are critical factors influencing legal outcomes. Understanding the psychological determinants of eyewitness testimony is essential to ensuring judicial fairness. This paper critically examines the psychological factors, specifically memory and emotional influences, that affect the reliability of eyewitness testimony. Through a comprehensive review of existing literature, the strengths and limitations of these theoretical perspectives are evaluated in relation to their practical implications for forensic psychology and legal practices. The paper considers how memory, as an active and reconstructive process, can be influenced by factors such as stress, emotion, and social dynamics, which may distort the accuracy of eyewitness recollections. The emotional impact of an event is explored through the lens of theories such as James-Lange's emotional theory, highlighting how fear or trauma can narrow attention and impair memory encoding. By synthesizing these psychological theories, this study aims to provide a deeper understanding of the complexities surrounding eyewitness testimony, suggesting that improvements in forensic practice may be achieved by integrating psychological insights into the judicial process.

INTRODUCTION

A theory can be described as a coherent system of interrelated constructs, definitions, and propositions, designed to systematically explain and predict phenomena by outlining relationships among variables (Kerlinger, 1973). Theories are developed through rigorous methodological approaches, primarily using deductive and inductive reasoning (Bryngeirsdottir et al., 2023). They are dynamic constructs that evolve through continuous testing, refinement, and integration of new knowledge across scientific disciplines. The role of theories in scientific inquiry is critical; they not only guide the interpretation of empirical data (Creswell & Creswell, 2023) but also facilitate the formation of conceptual frameworks that enable researchers to understand complex phenomena (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017). In the context of the justice system, eyewitness accuracy and reliability are not only essential but also fraught with cognitive and perceptual complexities that have profound implications for legal outcomes (Seale-Carlisle et al., 2024). To address these challenges, a multidisciplinary approach incorporating insights from psychology, law, and policing becomes indispensable. Collaborative efforts between psychologists, legal professionals, and law enforcement are crucial in advancing more reliable practices in eyewitness testimony (Wells, 2020).

The reliability of eyewitness testimony has long been questioned, with significant discourse surrounding its role in the justice system (Casey, 2024). Among the most notable critiques is the Devlin Report (1976), which urged judges and juries to give careful consideration to the potential fallibility of eyewitness identification evidence. This report sparked a broader debate, with some asserting that human memory, especially in facial recognition, is so prone to error that the utility of eyewitness evidence may be considerably diminished (Bull & Clifford, 1981). Such claims align with psychological research, which shows that eyewitness performance can vary dramatically — from near-perfect accuracy to gross inaccuracy —under the influence of myriad factors. Notably, research has also demonstrated a disconnection between a witness's confidence in their identification and the actual accuracy of their recollection (Bull & Clifford, 1981).

Within this domain, cognitive psychology provides a vital framework for understanding the psychological determinants influencing eyewitness reliability. Key factors such as perception and memory must be viewed not as static processes but as dynamic and reconstructive. Memory, for example, is a complex and fallible construct, susceptible to distortion and manipulation by various intervening factors (Kassin et al., 2022). This perspective challenges the traditional view that memory fades over time, instead suggesting that emotional, social, and cognitive factors can reshape the accuracy of recollections. This conceptual shift underscores the limitations of eyewitness testimony and the importance of recognizing how external factors, such as stress, emotional state, and social dynamics, can impair a witness's account's reliability.

One critical area of concern is the impact of emotional states on memory encoding and recall. According to the James-Lange theory of emotion, physiological responses to external stimuli, such as fear or anxiety, can significantly influence the formation of memories (James, 1884; Lange, 1885). In the context of eyewitness testimony, such emotional states can narrow an individual's focus, leading them to remember certain details—often those deemed most threatening—while overlooking others. The weapon-focus effect, for instance, demonstrates how a witness's attention may become fixated on a weapon during a violent crime, leading to impaired memory of other peripheral details, such as the perpetrator's appearance or the surroundings (Pickrell & Loftus, 1995). Emotional arousal thus serves as a double-edged sword, potentially enhancing some aspects of memory while undermining others, thus complicating the assessment of eyewitness reliability.

Moreover, the interplay between memory and emotion is not one-directional. While anxiety and stress can narrow a witness’s attention and lead to memory distortions, there is evidence to suggest that positive emotions may similarly distort recollections in ways that enhance or idealize certain details (Kaplan et al., 2015). The dual nature of emotional influence, as both a potential enhancer and inhibitor of memory, underscores the complex ways in which psychological factors shape eyewitness testimony. It is therefore crucial to recognise that the very factors that may help memory recall can also cause significant biases, making witnesses' recollections unreliable in certain situations.

This complexity is further compounded by individual differences, such as age, gender, and race, which can all significantly affect eyewitness accuracy. For example, studies have consistently shown that children tend to be less reliable eyewitnesses compared to adults (Fitzgerald et al., 2015; Jiang et al., 2024; Cotterill et al., 2025), though some other studies pointed to a potential "peak age"

beyond which adult memory may degrade (Wright et al., 2019). Similarly, gender differences in eyewitness memory performance have produced mixed results, with some studies suggesting that females, in particular, may be more accurate than males, particularly in low-stress environments. In contrast, high-stress situations appear to diminish the accuracy of female witnesses more than that of males (Cave & Chen, 2016). Additionally, cross-racial identification, in which individuals struggle to identify faces of a race different from their own accurately, adds another layer of complexity to assessing eyewitness reliability (Wright et al., 2019).

The social environment in which eyewitness testimony is delivered also plays a pivotal role. Factors such as post-event discussion, co-witness influence, and courtroom dynamics can all undermine the accuracy of witness accounts. The lineup procedure, for instance, has long been a subject of scrutiny, with studies showing that witnesses often base their identification on features such as clothing or physical similarity to a suspect, rather than accurately recalling specific features of the perpetrator (Bull, 1981). Patterson's (1978) suggestions for reforming lineup procedures—such as introducing a sequential, rather than simultaneous, presentation of suspects—aim to mitigate these issues by reducing the cognitive load placed on witnesses. Furthermore, Bull (1981) has proposed that a more dynamic approach to lineups, where witnesses view suspects one at a time in a walking format, could reduce the risks associated with static identification procedures.

In light of these considerations, the potential for erroneous eyewitness identification is not only a consequence of individual psychological determinants but also the broader systemic practices within the justice system. The question of how to balance the various psychological, social, and procedural factors to arrive at a reliable eyewitness account is not straightforward. As Samuel Butler famously remarked, "Life is the art of drawing sufficient conclusions from insufficient data." This sentiment underscores the inherent uncertainty in eyewitness testimony and the need for judicial systems to incorporate a more nuanced understanding of the psychological complexities involved.

Significance of the study

This research will serve the following purpose:

1. Improve the understanding of the factors that affect eye-witness reliability from their testimonies.
2. Provide a framework that enables Forensic and Correctional Psychologists to support the judicial processes of establishing eye-witness reliability.
3. Reduce the tendency of the trial judges to rely only on the eyewitness account for proper legal decisions in criminal cases.
4. Stimulate legal reform regarding eyewitnesses and witnesses in general at every stage of criminal justice delivery.

Theoretical overview

Memory Theories

A considerable body of research has applied signal detection theory, also known as sensory decision theory, to elucidate the role of memory in determining the reliability of eyewitness testimony (Yang et al., 2025). Within the criminal justice system, the prevailing belief among legal professionals and the general public is that eyewitness evidence is inherently unreliable. This widely held view, however, tends to overlook the broader cognitive context in which eyewitness reports are formed. A more comprehensive approach to eyewitness cognition incorporates not only the memory judgments of the witness but also their confidence in the identification (Carlson et al., 2025), which is often assumed to be indicative of accuracy. When these elements are considered together, it becomes evident that eyewitness evidence, far from being inherently flawed, can be highly reliable and comparable to other forms of evidence in both police investigations and courtroom proceedings.

Signal detection theory provides a more detailed understanding of eyewitness decision-making by highlighting the role of meta-cognitive factors—such as the witness's confidence—and by analyzing the trade-offs between different types of errors. These errors are not confined to false identifications of the innocent but also encompass the failure to identify the guilty (Seale-Carlisle et al., 2024). This framework has proved instrumental in transforming how eyewitness evidence is perceived and utilised within legal contexts. A striking example of the pitfalls of eyewitness testimony is the case of Jennifer Thompson and Ronald Cotton. In 1984, Thompson's mistaken identification of Cotton led to his wrongful conviction. However, after DNA testing exonerated Cotton ten years later, the case became emblematic of the flaws inherent in the use of eyewitness testimony (PBS, 2018; Cannino et al., 2010). Such cases underscore the critical importance of scrutinising the cognitive mechanisms underpinning eyewitness memory and the implications for legal practices.

Reconstructive Theory

Building on foundational work by Bartlett, Bransford, and Johnson, reconstructive theory posits that memory is not a flawless reproduction of past events but a dynamic, reconstructive process shaped by prior knowledge, contextual influences, and post-event information (Bartlett, 1932; Bransford & Johnson, 1972). In this light, eyewitness recall cannot be viewed simply as a straightforward retrieval of observed details but rather as a complex synthesis of the witness's perceptions, subsequent experiences, and the cognitive framework they employ to interpret the event. This reconstruction process highlights the fallibility of eyewitness testimony, as memories are susceptible to distortion by a range of external factors, including biases, suggestive questioning, and emotional states.

In particular, eyewitness testimony is profoundly influenced by the emotional state of the witness. Emotional arousal, particularly during traumatic events, can narrow attention and alter the encoding of memories, often focusing the witness's recall on specific, emotionally salient details while excluding less emotionally charged aspects of the event (Körner et al., 2024). As a result, witnesses may be unable to recall critical information that could influence the accuracy of their identification.

The dynamic and fallible nature of eyewitness testimony thus complicates the reliability of memory in legal settings, raising important questions about the weight of such evidence in criminal trials.

Perceptual Load Theory

Perceptual load theory, initially proposed by Sweller (1988) in the context of cognitive load theory, offers a compelling framework for understanding the limitations of working memory. According to Sweller, working memory is constrained in its capacity to process information, which has significant implications for how individuals attend to and encode details of their experiences. In this theory, the cognitive load imposed by a task can be classified into three categories: intrinsic, extraneous, and germane load. Intrinsic load refers to the inherent complexity of the task, extraneous load pertains to irrelevant cognitive demands, and germane load involves the cognitive resources required to understand and integrate new information.

In the context of eyewitness memory, the efficiency of selective attention is influenced by the level of perceptual load in the task at hand. Research by Lauce (1995, 2005) suggests that tasks with high perceptual load may enhance attentional focus by reducing interference from irrelevant distractors. However, high perceptual load can also lead to inattentional blindness, a phenomenon in which witnesses fail to notice critical stimuli because their attention is overloaded by the task at hand (Lavie et al., 2014). In one study, Cartwright-Finch and Lavie (2007) demonstrated that individuals presented with a high perceptual load were less likely to notice unexpected stimuli, such as an unusual shape, compared to those presented with a low load. This suggests that the ability to encode and recall details of an event may be compromised by cognitive overload, which could reduce the accuracy of eyewitness testimony.

The role of perceptual load in eyewitness memory has also been explored in relation to the effects of post-event discussion. Wright et al. (2000) and Clark and Wells (2008) argued that the interaction between perceptual load and social environmental factors—such as the influence of co-witnesses—may contribute to the fallibility of eyewitness testimony. Their studies found that when witnesses engage in post-event discussions, they are more likely to incorporate misinformation into their recollections, particularly when one co-witness is dominant in the conversation. This underscores the complex interaction between cognitive and social factors in shaping eyewitness memory and highlights the potential for memory contamination during group discussions.

In contrast, Memon et al. (2006) and Wright et al. (2019) have suggested that post-event discussions may not always lead to memory distortion, particularly in children. Their findings indicate that, in some cases, children can resist the influence of misleading information from co-witnesses and maintain accurate recollections of an event. This variability in eyewitness susceptibility to social influence suggests that the relationship between memory, perception, and social dynamics is far from straightforward. As Paterson et al. (2019) argue, while social conformity can influence memory recall, individuals may not always succumb to external pressures, and in certain cases, they may retain accurate memories even in the face of conflicting information.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Memory Theories

The utility of memory theories lies in their ability to provide a framework for understanding the factors that influence eyewitness testimony. Research by Loftus (1995) demonstrates that reconstructive memory theory can explain many of the inaccuracies observed in eyewitness reports, such as those resulting from suggestive questioning or post-event contamination. By highlighting the reconstructive nature of memory, this theory challenges the assumption that eyewitness recall is a direct and reliable representation of past events. However, while memory theories offer valuable insights, they fail to adequately address the variability in individual susceptibility to cognitive distortions. Factors such as age, cognitive abilities, and stress levels can significantly affect how individuals process and recall information, making it difficult to predict the reliability of eyewitness testimony based solely on memory theories (Memon et al., 2006).

Moreover, memory theories do not fully account for the interaction between cognitive processes and emotional or social factors, which may further complicate the accuracy of eyewitness reports. As such, while these theories provide an important foundation for understanding eyewitness reliability, they must be considered in conjunction with other theoretical perspectives, including those related to emotional processing and social influences, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that shape eyewitness memory.

Application of Memory Theories

The practical application of memory theories in the criminal justice system is evident in the use of cognitive interviewing techniques and adjustments to eyewitness lineups. Cognitive interviews, which encourage witnesses to recall events freely without interruptions or leading questions, have been shown to reduce memory distortion and increase the accuracy of eyewitness testimony (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992). In addition, modifications to lineup procedures, such as using sequential rather than simultaneous presentations of suspects, aim to mitigate the cognitive biases that influence eyewitness identification (Wright et al., 2000). These strategies are grounded in the principles of memory theories and provide a means of enhancing the reliability of eyewitness evidence in legal settings.

Emotional Theory

James-Lange's theory of emotion posits that emotions are a consequence of physiological responses to external stimuli, and that the emotional experience is shaped by the interpretation of these bodily changes (James, 1884; Lange, 1885). According to this perspective, the mere witnessing of an event triggers a physiological response, which is then perceived and interpreted as an emotion. This theoretical framework has profound implications for eyewitness testimony (EWT), particularly in how emotional states influence memory encoding and recall. Emotional arousal, especially in the context of traumatic events, can substantially alter an individual's ability to accurately recall details of the incident. For instance, in highly charged situations, individuals may focus their attention on specific, salient features of the event, such as a weapon, at the expense of peripheral details, such as the environment or other individuals present. This phenomenon, known as the weapon-focus

effect, has been extensively studied and serves as a prime example of how emotion can narrow attention and distort memory (Pickrell & Loftus, 1995).

However, while high-arousal negative emotions, such as fear, may impair the accuracy of memory by narrowing attention, positive emotions can have a different effect. Research suggests that positive emotions may, in some instances, enhance memory recall, although often with selective biases. For example, under conditions of positive emotional arousal, witnesses may recall certain details more vividly but may also imbue their recollections with idealised or distorted characteristics. This dual effect—where emotion can both facilitate and hinder the accuracy of eyewitness testimony—complicates the overall reliability of emotional accounts, particularly when such recollections involve high levels of emotional intensity (Humphreys & Kramer, 1999).

The relationship between emotional states and memory also extends to the physiological and psychological effects of anxiety. The heightened arousal caused by anxiety triggers the body's fight-or-flight response, leading to elevated heart rates, increased blood pressure, and heightened vigilance (Scherer, 2004). While these physiological responses may sharpen focus on immediate threats, they can also overload cognitive resources, making it difficult to encode and retain specific details. In extreme cases, anxiety-induced sensory overload may create significant gaps in memory. This narrowing of focus—an adaptive response to perceived danger—can lead to a distortion of memory by prioritising certain aspects of the event while overlooking others. The psychological consequences of anxiety are equally profound; the emotional intensity of fear can cause a cognitive narrowing, where attention is disproportionately focused on the source of threat. As a result, peripheral details may be missed or misremembered, rendering the witness's testimony less accurate (McGaugh, 2003). The interplay between anxiety, stress, and memory processing underscores the complexity of eyewitness accounts in emotionally charged situations.

Strengths of Emotional Theory

James-Lange's theory, with its emphasis on the physiological and psychological effects of emotional states, provides a useful lens through which to understand the dynamics of eyewitness testimony. It highlights the capacity of external stimuli to elicit intense emotional responses that can shape both the encoding and recall of memories. In the case of eyewitnesses to a crime, the emotions triggered by the event—fear, anxiety, or shock—can profoundly affect what details are remembered and how they are interpreted. The narrowing of attention, a hallmark of emotional response, may limit the scope of the memory trace, focusing recall on certain features while disregarding others. Although this narrowing can obscure the complete recollection of the event, it may also serve to sharpen memory for those details deemed most critical, such as the appearance of the perpetrator or the weapon used.

Moreover, emotional theories help to contextualise the impact of motivation and expectation in shaping eyewitness testimony. For example, the emotional significance of an event can drive witnesses to focus on particular aspects of the crime, potentially enhancing memory for some details. As suggested by social psychology, motivation plays a key role in determining how attentively an individual processes information and how accurately they are able to recall it later (Loftus, 1995). This intersection of emotional experience and cognitive processing illustrates how

external factors, including the social context of the event, contribute to shaping the reliability of eyewitness memory.

Weaknesses of Emotional Theory

Despite its strengths, the emotional theory, particularly James-Lange's approach, is not without its limitations. One of the most significant criticisms is that it generalises emotional responses to any event that triggers fear, not just those that occur in the specific context of a crime scene. This broad applicability of the theory raises questions about its relevance in forensic psychology, where the nuances of real-world traumatic experiences may differ substantially from controlled laboratory conditions (Scherer, 2004). Many of the studies supporting emotional theory have been conducted in laboratory settings, where participants, motivated by the desire to comply with experimental protocols, may exhibit heightened emotional responses that do not accurately reflect the more subdued emotional reactions observed in real-life witnesses. This raises concerns about the ecological validity of laboratory-based findings and the extent to which they can be applied to real-world eyewitness situations.

Additionally, critics argue that laboratory experiments often fail to account for the complexities of real-life events, where emotions such as fear may interact with a variety of other cognitive, social, and environmental factors. For example, witnesses may not only be focused on the threat posed by the perpetrator but also on the presence of other individuals, the location of the crime, or the social dynamics between witnesses. As such, the emotional theory, in its traditional formulation, does not adequately capture the multifaceted nature of memory recall in real-world scenarios.

Application of Emotional Theory

The application of emotional theory in the evaluation of eyewitness testimony is particularly relevant when considering the impact of intense emotions—such as fear, anxiety, or shock—on the encoding and retrieval of memories. For instance, during a robbery, a witness might experience acute fear, which could impair their ability to recall specific details about the appearance of the perpetrator, focusing instead on the weapon or other immediate threats (Loftus, 1995). This phenomenon is especially pertinent in cases where the emotional intensity of the event is high, and the psychological state of the witness influences both the depth and accuracy of their recollections. Understanding the role of emotion in shaping eyewitness testimony can therefore help legal professionals assess the reliability of witness accounts more critically.

Furthermore, some studies have demonstrated that the emotional significance of an event can enhance eyewitness accuracy by heightening the witness's motivation to remember key details. In a legal context, witnesses may recognise the gravity of their testimony and the consequences that their recollections may have on the outcome of the case. This recognition can, in turn, lead to increased effort in recalling the event, potentially mitigating the distortions caused by emotional arousal (Bower, 1981). The interaction between emotional states and motivation suggests that emotional theories provide a valuable framework for understanding the factors that affect the reliability of eyewitness testimony in criminal proceedings.

Comparing and Contrasting Memory and Emotional Theories

While memory and emotional theories share some conceptual similarities, particularly in their reliance on cognitive processes to explain eyewitness behaviour, they differ in the factors they emphasise. Memory theories tend to focus on the cognitive mechanisms involved in perception, encoding, and retrieval, with an emphasis on how factors such as perception, cognitive load, and interference shape memory accuracy. In contrast, emotional theories place greater emphasis on the emotional and physiological responses that accompany the perception of an event, highlighting how emotional states—such as fear or anxiety—narrow attention and influence the recollection of details (Bartlett, 1932; McGaugh, 2003).

While memory theories examine the cognitive processes underpinning eyewitness recall, emotional theories consider the psychological and physiological responses to stress and trauma, offering insights into how these factors influence the reliability of eyewitness testimony. By synthesising both perspectives, a more comprehensive understanding of eyewitness memory can be achieved, one that takes into account both cognitive and emotional dimensions of the witness's experience.

General Critique

The theories reviewed in this study—particularly those concerning memory factors and emotional influences—offer a comprehensive lens through which the complexities of eyewitness testimony can be examined. The Memory Factor theories, most notably Signal Detection Theory, provide valuable insights into eyewitness cognition, particularly in relation to the judgments witnesses make during identification tasks. According to this framework, the reliability of eyewitness evidence can be assessed by considering not only the cognitive processes involved but also the confidence that witnesses place in their identification choices. When viewed in conjunction with other cognitive components, Signal Detection Theory suggests that eyewitness testimony can, under certain conditions, be highly reliable, comparable to other forms of evidence in both police investigations and courtrooms (Green & Swets, 1966).

Reconstructive memory theory further refines our understanding of eyewitness testimony by challenging the assumption that memory functions as a perfect recording of past events. According to this theory, eyewitness recall is not a mere replay of what was observed, but rather a reconstruction that draws upon the individual's perceptual processes, past experiences, and cognitive frameworks. This perspective reveals the inherently fallible nature of memory, highlighting the numerous factors that shape recollections, including biases, emotional influences, and external information (Bartlett, 1932; Bransford & Johnson, 1972). In this context, eyewitness testimony becomes a dynamic and evolving process, susceptible to various distortions that complicate the assessment of its accuracy.

While reconstructive theory provides critical insights into the malleability of memory, it is equally important to consider the role of emotional states in shaping eyewitness recollections. Emotional reactions, such as fear or anxiety, can significantly alter the way witnesses process and store information, as well as the details they focus on during an event (McGaugh, 2003). Studies have shown that high levels of stress can lead to a narrowing of attention, causing witnesses to

concentrate on a limited set of details while overlooking others (Loftus, 1995). This emotional focus, often on threatening stimuli such as a weapon, can impair the broader accuracy of eyewitness accounts. Moreover, emotional states, such as post-trauma stress or heightened anxiety, can distort the retrieval of memories, further undermining the reliability of eyewitness testimony.

The role of perceptual load and the psychosocial environment in shaping eyewitness memory must also be considered. Research has demonstrated that external factors—such as post-event discussions and lineup procedures—can influence how a witness recalls an event. The process of discussing the event with co-witnesses can lead to memory contamination, particularly when misinformation is introduced during the conversation (Wright et al., 2000). Furthermore, the social dynamics of the lineup, such as the pressure to identify a suspect or the influence of stereotypes, can have a profound impact on eyewitness accuracy (Dent & Gray, 1975). These factors point to the significant role that the social and psychological context plays in shaping eyewitness memory and highlight the need for caution when evaluating the reliability of such testimony.

A major issue in eyewitness testimony is the influence of lineup procedures. Traditional identification parades, particularly static photo lineups, have been criticised for introducing biases that compromise the reliability of eyewitness identification. The problem is compounded by the fact that witnesses are often asked to identify a suspect from a group of individuals, despite the possibility that the actual perpetrator may not be present. This scenario can lead to the so-called “relative judgement effect,” where witnesses may identify the person who most closely resembles their recollection of the perpetrator, even if that individual is not the actual criminal (Fitzgerald, 2018). As noted by Bull (1980), such lineups fail to account for the cognitive biases that may influence the identification process. To address this issue, Bull (1981) has suggested a reformulation of the lineup procedure, advocating for a system in which witnesses view suspects one at a time, rather than in a simultaneous parade. This approach, known as the sequential lineup, is believed to reduce the cognitive load on witnesses and minimise the risk of misidentification (Wright et al., 2000). Such procedural adjustments have the potential to enhance the accuracy of eyewitness identification by reducing the social pressures and cognitive biases inherent in traditional lineup methods.

The psychological impact of lineup procedures is further complicated by the issue of "false memory implantation." Research has shown that the process of questioning or re-exposure to certain details can lead to the creation of false memories, particularly when witnesses are repeatedly exposed to suggestive or misleading information (Loftus, 1995). The ethical concerns surrounding these practices are significant, as they may result in the unwitting distortion of eyewitness memories, potentially leading to wrongful convictions. Such concerns have prompted calls for more rigorous protocols in the collection of eyewitness evidence, as well as greater attention to the potential psychological consequences of these procedures.

The ethical implications of misleading or suggestive questioning are also evident in the practice of co-witness exposure. When witnesses discuss an event with others who may have seen it from a different perspective, they risk incorporating false details into their own recollections, thus distorting the accuracy of their testimony. This phenomenon, known as "social conformity," is especially pronounced when dominant witnesses exert pressure on others to conform to their

version of events (Paterson et al., 2019). While some research suggests that witnesses may resist the influence of co-witnesses, the potential for memory contamination remains a significant concern, particularly in cases where multiple witnesses are involved in the identification process.

Despite the considerable strengths of eyewitness science in highlighting the psychological factors that influence the reliability of testimony, the existing theories and practices are not without their limitations. Theories such as reconstructive memory and emotional theory have illuminated key aspects of how memory and emotion interact, yet they often fail to account for the wide variability in individual susceptibility to these processes. Factors such as age, cognitive abilities, and stress levels can all influence how a person processes and recalls an event, complicating efforts to predict the reliability of testimony based solely on these theories (Memon et al., 2006). Moreover, while procedural reforms such as the sequential lineup offer potential improvements, they too are not immune to the inherent cognitive biases that affect eyewitness memory. The challenge remains, therefore, to develop more nuanced and empirically grounded methods for assessing the accuracy of eyewitness testimony, taking into account the full range of psychological, social, and procedural factors at play.

Conclusion

This study has underscored the multiplicity of factors influencing the reliability of eyewitness testimony, emphasising the interplay of cognitive, emotional, and situational determinants. These factors are not merely individual but are shaped by the context in which the testimony is elicited, including the methods of questioning, the emotional state of the witness, and the procedural environment surrounding the event. While the cognitive frameworks explored—such as the reconstructive nature of memory and the emotional modulation of recall—offer significant insights, the reliability of eyewitness accounts remains contingent on the careful consideration of these complexities within judicial proceedings.

The criminal justice system, for all its reliance on eyewitness testimony, remains susceptible to errors in identification, exacerbated by the cognitive biases inherent in human memory and emotional responses. The paper has demonstrated that memory, far from being a passive retrieval of past events, is instead an active and reconstructive process, vulnerable to distortions influenced by stress, trauma, and suggestion. Moreover, the emotional responses that accompany eyewitness experiences, especially in high-stress or traumatic situations, can significantly narrow attention and skew memory encoding, potentially leading to inaccuracies that are not immediately apparent in the witness's account. In light of these findings, it is clear that judicial systems must adopt more nuanced approaches to assessing eyewitness testimony, incorporating psychological insights into procedural practices to mitigate the risks of wrongful convictions.

Given the susceptibility of eyewitness memory to distortion, the importance of developing empirically grounded, psychometrically validated methods for evaluating eyewitness reliability cannot be overstated. A more systematic and scientifically informed approach to eyewitness evidence, one that integrates psychological expertise with legal procedures, could significantly improve the accuracy of criminal adjudication.

Recommendations

It is imperative to reform current lineup procedures by adopting sequential lineups across legal settings. Sequential presentations, as opposed to simultaneous lineups, have been shown to reduce the likelihood of misidentifications by prompting witnesses to focus on each suspect individually, reducing reliance on relative judgment. Legal protocols should also include explicit instructions to witnesses that the perpetrator may not be present, reducing the pressure on them to make an identification.

A collaborative approach between legal professionals and psychologists specialising in eyewitness memory should be implemented to assess eyewitness testimony more rigorously. By involving forensic psychologists in the early stages of criminal investigations, particularly in evaluating the accuracy of eyewitness accounts, legal systems can mitigate the risk of misidentification. This collaboration should aim to integrate psychological expertise into courtroom proceedings to ensure a more informed interpretation of eyewitness evidence.

Legal education curricula must be revised to include comprehensive training on the cognitive and psychological factors influencing eyewitness memory. Judges, lawyers, and law enforcement officials should be educated on how memory and emotional states can distort recollections. This would equip legal professionals with the necessary tools to critically assess the reliability of eyewitness testimony and improve the fairness of trials.

A system should be introduced to review eyewitness testimony post-event, involving forensic psychologists who assess whether cognitive biases or emotional influences have distorted the witness's memory. This review process would serve as a safeguard, ensuring that eyewitness accounts are accurate and reliable before they are used in court to make significant legal decisions.

Eyewitness confidence should not be assumed to correlate with the accuracy of their testimony. Therefore, legal systems must establish more robust methods for evaluating eyewitness accounts, considering factors beyond witness confidence. The application of signal detection theory to assess eyewitness performance could offer a more objective framework for determining identification accuracy and reduce reliance on subjective factors such as confidence.

Finally, there must be continuous research and policy reform, driven by advancements in cognitive psychology. The criminal justice system should remain open to incorporating the latest scientific findings into eyewitness identification practices. Ongoing interdisciplinary research between psychology and law should be encouraged, with the aim of refining and updating legal procedures to reflect the most current understanding of eyewitness memory and its limitations.

References

Bryngeirsdottir, H. S., & Halldorsdottir, S. (2023). Using Qualitative Data to Synthesize a Theory on Post-Traumatic Growth Following Intimate Partner Violence. *The Qualitative Report*, *28*(10), 2871-2886. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2023.6678

Bull, R. (1981). Psychological factors in eyewitness testimony. In *Lawyers and Psychologists: The Way Forward* (No. 1). British Psychological Society, St. Andrews House, 48 Princess Road East, Leicester LE1 7R.

Bull, R., & Clifford, B. (1976). Identification: The Devlin Report. *New Scientist, 70*, 307–308.

Bull, R., & Clifford, B. (1980). Psychological processes in criminal identification. *Police Research Bulletin, 34*, 48–50.

Bull, R., & Green, J. (1980). The relationship between physical appearance and criminality. *Medicine, Science, and the Law, 20*, 77–83.

Carlson, C. A., Lockamyeir, R. F., Carlson, M. A., et al. (2025). Comparing the strength of the confidence-accuracy versus response time-accuracy relationship for eyewitness identification. *Scientific Reports, 15*, 11064. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-96224-y

Casey, S. (2024). Eyewitness testimony: Reliability and influence in the justice system. *Journal of Forensic Psychology, 9,* 340. https://doi.org/10.35248/2475-319X.24.9.340

Cave, K. R., & Chen, Z. (2016). Identifying visual targets amongst interfering distracters: Sorting out the roles of perceptual load, dilution, and attention zoom. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics, 78*(7), 2101–2116. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-016-1141-7

Cavior, H., Hayes, S., & Cawior, N. (1975). Physical attractiveness of female offenders. In A. Brodsky (Ed.), *The female offender* (pp. xx–xx). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Chen, Z., & Cave, K. R. (2016). Zooming in on the causes of the perceptual load effect in the Go/No-Go paradigm. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 42*(5), 680–693. https://doi.org/10.1037/xhp0000190

Clark, S. E., & Wells, G. L. (2008). On the diagnosticity of multiple-witness identifications. *Law and Human Behavior, 32*(5), 406–422. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-007-9115-7

Clifford, B., & Bull, R. (1978). *The psychology of person identification*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Cotterill, B. F. (2025). How temperament impacts children as eyewitnesses. *BPS Future, 1*(147), 18. https://doi.org/10.53841/bpsfu.2025.1.147.18

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dent, H., & Gray, F. (1975). Identification on parade. *Neuroscience and Behavioral Physiology, 1*, 366–369.

Devlin Committee. (1976). *Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department of the Departmental Committee on evidence of identification in criminal cases*. London: HMSO.

Doob, A., & Kirshenbaum, H. (1973). Bias in police line-ups: Partial remembering. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1*, 287–293.

Efran, L. (1974). The effects of physical appearance on the judgment of guilt, interpersonal attraction, and severity of recommended punishment in a simulated jury task. *Journal of Research in Personality, 8*, 45–54.

Ellis, H., Davies, G., & Shepherd, J. (1972). An investigation of the photo-fit system for recalling faces. Report to the Social Science Research Council. University of Aberdeen: Psychology Department.

Fitzgerald, R. J., & Price, H. L. (2015). Eyewitness identification across the life span: A meta-analysis of age differences. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*(6), 1228–1265. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000013

Fitzgerald, R. J., Price, H. L., & Valentine, T. (2018). Eyewitness identification: Live, photo, and video lineups. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 24*(6), 548–570. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2018.1472277

Garrett, B. (2012). *Convicting the innocent: Where criminal prosecutions go wrong*. Harvard University Press.

Humphrey, D. G., & Kramer, A. (1999). Experimental aging research. *Experimental Aging Research, 25*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/036107399244110

Irving, B. L., & Hilgendorf, E. L. (1980). *Police interrogation: Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure, Research Studies No. 182*. London.

Jenkins, R., et al. (2005). Recognition memory for distractor faces depends on attention load at exposure. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 12*, 314–320. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193760

Jiang, J. (2024). Challenges Of Obtaining Reliable Eyewitness Testimony from Children and Practical Implications. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *40*, 64-69. https://doi.org/10.54097/v44rfr48.

Kaplan, R. L., Van Damme, I., Levine, L. J., & Loftus, E. F. (2015). Emotional and false memory. *Emotion Review, 8*(1), 8–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073914550133

Kassin, S. M., Cardenas, S. A., Meterko, V., & Barksdale, F. (2022). Prosecution misconduct: Assessment of perspective from the bench. *Court Review, 58*(4), 162–168.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). *Foundations of behavioral research*. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Körner, H. M., Faul, F., & Nuthmann, A. (2024, October 8). Is a knife the same as a plunger? Comparing the attentional effects of weapons and non-threatening unusual objects in dynamic scenes. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 9*(1), 66. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-024-00579-1

Lavie, N., et al. (2014). Blinded by the load: Attention, awareness, and the role of perceptual load. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 369*(1641), 20130259. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0259

Loftus, E. F., & Palmer, J. C. (1974). Reconstruction of automobile destruction: An example of the interaction between language and memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 13*(5), 585–589. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(74)80011-3

MacDonald, E., & Lavie, N. (2011). Visual perceptual load induces inattention deafness. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics, 73*(4), 1055–1070. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-011-0087-5

Makkar, S. R., & Larisham, J. (2013). The effects of post-event processing on affect, belief, and interpretative biases. *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology, 4*(2), 232–247. https://doi.org/10.5127/jep.022212

Memon, A., Holiday, R., & Hill, C. (2010). *False memories and eyewitness testimony*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210500152641

Meterko, V., Henderson, J. S., & Gadtaula, P. (2023). Just data: Advancing the Innocence Movement. *The Wrongful Conviction Law Review, 3*(3), 163–165.

Mudd, K., & Govern, J. (2004). Conformity to misinformation and time delay negatively affect eyewitness confidence and accuracy. *North American Journal of Psychology, 6*(2), 227–238.

Murphy, K., & Greene, G. (2016). Perceptual load affects eyewitness accuracy and susceptibility to leading questions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Dublin, Ireland.

Pickel, K. L. (1998). Unusualness and threat as possible causes of weapon focus. *Memory, 6*(3), 277–295.

Ravitch, S. M., & Riggan, M. (2017). *Reason & rigor: How conceptual frameworks guide research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Seale-Carlisle, T. M., Quigley-McBride, A., Teitcher, J. E. F., Crozier, W. E., Dodson, C. S., & Garrett, B. L. (2025). New insights on expert opinion about eyewitness memory research.

Perspectives on Psychological Science, 20(5), 903–924. https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916241234837

Wells, G. L. (2020). Psychological science on eyewitness identification and its impact on police practices and policies. *American Psychologist, 75*(9), 1316–1329. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000749

Wright, H., Dursett, R., Anders, J., Buzzeo, J., & Sanders, M. (Bola). (n.d.). Improving working memory: Evaluation report. *King's College London*.

Yang, Y., Burke, J. L., & Healy, J. (2025, August 22). A multi-item signal detection theory model for eyewitness identification. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 10*(1), 54. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-025-00652-3