

**Illinois Lineup Evaluation Project Protocol and Code Book**  
**Roy S. Malpass, Laura A. Zimmerman, Stephen J. Ross, & Lisa D. Topp**  
With the assistance of  
**Vanessa Uribe, Dannette De Leon, Sarah Ramirez and Jessica Belisle**  
**University of Texas at El Paso**

Incoming case data from three police jurisdictions in Illinois (Joliet, Evanston, Chicago) typically includes a lineup report and a police report. These reports contain information about the crime, the witness, the suspect, the lineup procedure and outcome. The forms are not standardized between the three jurisdictions, making it important to search carefully through each case for the necessary information. Additionally, not all cases contain both reports and some contain extra sheets of information. Thus, coders need to assess each case based on the information given. Coders should attempt to retrieve all pertinent data from the case information. It is necessary to search through and read both the lineup and the police report and compare information in order to get a clear picture of the case activities.

91

### **General Procedure**

**Coding Data:** Each case will be hand-coded by one coder and a second coder will double-check the information by comparing Coder 1's data to the case reports. The two coders will discuss any discrepancies and verify the correct information in the case reports. If the coders cannot reach a consensus on how to code an item, or if procedural questions arise during the coding process, the coders should consult with the lead investigators.

**Entering Data:** After all data has been coded and verified, it will be entered into an excel spreadsheet. All data will be entered twice. Two sheets are provided on the spreadsheet. Use the sheet labeled "Punch 1" to enter one complete set of the data. Use the "Punch 2" data sheet to enter another complete set of the same data. Different researchers should enter data on these two sheets, so that no single researcher enters the same case information twice. Excel will compare the data from the two sheets and highlight any differences between them. Researchers will go back to the cases to determine which entry is correct and make changes on the sheet titled "Final punch." Once all corrections are made the "final punch" sheet will be imported into SPSS for data analysis.

**Police reports:** Double check that the lineup discussed on the lineup report is the same lineup discussed in the police report. If these two reports are different, pull this data from the batch and file in a separate file. An attempt will be made to get the correct police report and/or lineup report.

### **Coding Procedures**

**Coding Key:** Refer to the coding key to assign numbers to each item.

**Missing and ambiguous data:** If information is unclear, contradictory, or indecipherable, code the item as '9'. If data is missing, mark that space on the coding sheet with a dash or check mark to indicate that you searched for the information but could not find it. Use code '9' for data that is unclear, contradictory, or indecipherable from a coder standpoint (unsure what the writing means, can't read the writing, information on the police report does not match information on the lineup report). Consider missing data from an officer reporting standpoint (no reference to gender on reports and the name is gender neutral = missing data). Consider as missing data any item that an officer does not explicitly state. For example: If the report does not state that photos in a sequential lineup were shown after the witness made an identification, then mark it as missing data.

**Jurisdiction:** Enter the code corresponding to the jurisdiction named at the top of the lineup reports.

**Jurisdiction Page #:** Find at the bottom of each page. Once the columns are filled in on the first sheet for a jurisdiction (which includes 2 pages worth of code rows), start a new set of sheets. Label the first set as Jurisdiction Page #1a and 1b, the next set as 2a and 2b, etc.

**Identification #:** Think of the identification number as the same thing as the "subject number" used in most research projects. This number identifies each lineup report and will be used to track and sort data sheets and data. Each case may contain multiple suspects and/or multiple witnesses. Each witness and suspect in the case will be assigned an identification number. For example: within the same case #, assign ID #1 to witness 1 and suspect 1, ID #2 to witness 2 and suspect 1, ID #3 to witness 2 and suspect 2, etc.

### **Case Information**

**Case #:** Police case numbers will be assigned research case numbers for this evaluation. A key will track the police case numbers and research case numbers. Prior to coding, a lead researcher will assign a research case number to each case. When coding, use the number that is hand-written next to the police case number. For example: Police report says "Case# 04-42410," and hand written next to that number is "= 2" This means that the research case number is 2. Each jurisdiction designates case numbers differently. For Joliet, Case # = D.T.#; for Evanston, Case # = Case#; for Chicago, Case # = RD#.

**District:** Only Chicago has district #'s. Find this number on the line for "District of Crime."

**Detective/Star #:** This is the number written next to the investigator or detective's name. If more than one lead investigator is named, write the star number of the first detective listed.

**Date:** The date the investigator wrote the report. Find on the first line of the lineup reports.

**Wanted Flyer:** Only Joliet asks if a wanted flyer was published. For Chicago and Evanston, look through the reports. Code 'yes' if a wanted flyer was made, 'no' if not.

**Composite:** Same as Wanted Flyer

### **Crime Information**

**Date of Offense:** Find this information on the police reports either under 'date of original report' or under 'date of occurrence.'

**Time of Offense:** Generally only found for Chicago, but may be written for other jurisdictions. For Chicago, the time is written next to the date of occurrence. They use military time, e.g. 9:00 pm = 21:00.

**Offense/Crime:** Use the crime codes used by police. Refer to the crime code table to find code that matches the crime written on the lineup report.

**Multiple offenders:** On lineup report, find "Crime involved multiple offenders" and circled will be yes or no. Code as yes or no. Also, look in the police report for the number of offenders. The number of suspects does not necessarily equal the number of offenders. If there is more than one offender, write the number of offenders on the additional comments sheet.

### **Suspect Information**

**Suspect #:** Prior to coding, a lead researcher will assign a suspect number to each suspect. When coding, use the number that is hand-written next to the suspect's name. For example: Police report says "Joe Smith," and hand written next to that number is "= 2." This means that this is suspect number two for this jurisdiction. If a suspect's name appears on more than one lineup report, that suspect will have the same number on each report.

**Suspect gender:** Gender does not generally appear on the lineup report, although some officers specify gender on the "suspect age/race" line. Usually gender is written as 'F' for female and 'M' for male. If gender is not specified on the lineup report, it can usually be found within the context of police report by the use of pronouns (i.e., he, she, his, etc.). Some names are gender specific (i.e., John, Emily) but try to verify this assumption with references to gender in the police report. Many names are gender neutral (i.e., Erin, Jamie).

**Suspect age:** On the lineup report, find age written on the “suspect age/race” line. Double-check that this information is consistent with the information on the police report.

**Suspect race:** On the lineup report, find age written on the “suspect age/race” line. Double-check that this information is consistent with the information on the police report.

**Appearance change:** On the lineup report, is the question “Suspect appearance changed since the crime?” ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ should be circled in response to this question. Officers sometimes write in “unk,” if this is written in or circled, code a 3 = unknown. If nothing is circled or written in the police report, code as dash (-) for missing data.

### Witness Information

**Witness #:** Prior to coding, a lead researcher will assign a witness number to each witness. When coding, use the number that is hand-written next to the witness’ name. For example: Police report says “Mary Jones,” and hand written next to that number is “= 4.” This means that this is witness number four for this jurisdiction. If a witness’s name appears on more than one lineup report, that witness will have the same number on each report.

**Witness gender:** Gender does not generally appear on the lineup report, although some officers specify gender on the “witness age/race” line. Usually gender is written as ‘F’ for female and ‘M’ for male. If gender is not specified on the lineup report, it can usually be found within the context of police report by the use of pronouns (i.e., he, she, his, etc.). Some names are gender specific (i.e., John, Emily) but try to verify this assumption by finding references to gender within the police report. Remember, many names are gender neutral (i.e., Erin, Jamie).

**Witness age:** On the lineup report, find age written on the “witness age/race” line. Double-check that this information is consistent with the information on the police report.

**Witness race:** On the lineup report, find age written on the “witness age/race” line. Double-check that this information is consistent with the information on the police report.

**Witness knows suspect?:** This information is not always explicitly stated. Look in the police report for this information. If it is not explicitly stated or obvious that the witness did or did not know the suspect, *assume the witness did not know the suspect*. If the witness did know the suspect (they grew up together, her cousin, know him from the neighborhood, etc), then code it as ‘knows’. Code a ‘did not know’ in cases that explicitly state that the witness and suspect were strangers. For example: “I have never seen him before”, “two strange guys grabbed me in the parking lot,” “the suspect was unknown to the witness,” etc. If the witness has seen the suspect before, it does not mean they knew the suspect. For example: If the witness states “I’d seen him around the neighborhood,” or “he had come into the store a few times before” this indicates that the witness was familiar with the suspect but did not actually know him or her. Coded

this as 'familiar' since the witnesses did not actually know the suspect, but the suspect was not completely unknown either.

**Direct victim or bystander?:** Determine from the police report if the witness was a direct victim of a crime or a bystander who witnessed the event. For example, if a person was robbed at gunpoint, he/she is a direct victim. If a store employee is reporting a theft from the store, he/she is a bystander.

**Witness injured?:** Determine from the police report if the witness suffered any injuries during the crime.

**Weapon present:** Determine from the police report if a weapon was present during the crime. Code for type of weapon (see code sheet) and note on additional comments any notes about the witness' observation of the weapon. If a weapon was present, but the type of weapon was not specified, code a 4 = unknown/other.

### Lineup Information

**Where LU presented:** Find this information in the police report. Officers usually state where they met with the witness to present the lineup. For example: "The witness came to the police station to view the lineup," "I met the witness at her home").

**Type of presentation:** Refers to live or photo lineups. On the lineup reports, 4<sup>th</sup> line down, officers circle or check either, "photo spread" or "physical lineup."

**Type of lineup:** Refers to simultaneous or sequential. Find below specification of presentation type, the question "Sequential procedure employed?" Officers mark 'Yes' or 'No'. If the identification was from a mugbook, code the lineup type as 'mugshot.' Write in additional comments if a mugshot was identified or not.

**If Seq, all photos shown?:** The procedure is to show all the photos even after the witness makes an identification. But, it is not always stated that this procedure was followed. Often, this information is in the police report. For example: "the witness said 'yes' to #3 and said 'no' to all remaining photos." Some officers report that they tell witnesses prior to viewing the lineup that they will be shown all photos even after they make an identification. If it is not stated that all photos were shown or not shown, code as a dash (-) for missing data.

**# of photos in LU:** Find this information on the lineup report where it says "Suspect's Position: (blank) out of (blank)." The first number designates the suspects position, the second number designates how many photos/people were in the lineup.

**# of suspects in LU:** See line "Crime involved multiple offenders." If the answer is 'no', only one suspect appeared in the lineup. If the answer is 'yes', look in the police report for this suspect and the other suspects to establish if all suspects appeared in different lineups. Often the police reports contain the names of all lineup members.

Check that the suspects' names do not appear in each other's lineups. If the names are different for each suspect, they did not appear in each other's lineups.

**Suspect position in LU:** Find this information on the lineup report where it says "Suspect's Position: (blank) out of (blank)." The first number designates the suspects position, the second number designates how many photos/people were in the lineup.

### **Lineup Administrator Information (if different from investigating detective)**

**Blind Administrator:** The policy is to use blind administrators only for sequential lineups. On the lineup report is a section for blind administrator information. If the officer used a sequential lineup, code a 'yes' on the code sheet. If the officer used a simultaneous lineup, code as a 'no'.

**Name/Star #:** Code the star number of the blind administrator. This is the number written after the blind administrator's name and rank.

**Rank:** Find rank of blind administrator written after to the blind administrator's name. Use the code sheet to code rank. For example: Detective = 1.

**Unit:** Find unit where blind administrator is assigned written after the blind administrator's name, rank, and star number. This is usually a numerical designation. If words are used to designate the unit, code it as a '9'.

**Date requested:** Find on the lineup report under "Date/Time blind administrator requested."

**Time requested:** Find on the lineup report under "Date/Time blind administrator requested." It is written after the date requested and is expressed in military time (e.g., 11:00 pm = 23:00).

**Date arrived:** Find on the lineup report under: Date/Time blind administrator arrived.

**Time arrived:** Find on the lineup report under "Date/Time blind administrator arrived." It is written after the date requested and is expressed in military time (e.g., 11:00 pm = 23:00).

**How admin. found:** Find on the lineup report for Evanston and Chicago under "Document in detail how you found blind administrator." The Joliet lineup reports do not contain a request for this information. If information is written in this section, code as 'in-house' if lead investigator asked for assistance from an officer at his or her station. Code as 'called' if the investigator called someone in from outside. Use the code 'other' for all other methods used to find an administrator. Write information about how this administrator was found on *additional comments sheet*.

## Identification Information

**Language used in ID:** Typically, nothing is written about the language used. For this category, it is OK to assume the language used was English unless otherwise stated. If the name is of an ethnic origin that implies English may not be their first language (Jose Hernandez, Chan Wong), double check that the investigator did not seek the aid of officer who speaks the witness' native language or use a translator. If a translator was used, code the language used as the language the translator used to speak to the witness. See code sheet for language codes.

**Admonitions:** Find this information in the police report. If officers state that standard admonitions were given, code as 'standard' on the code sheet. If the officers report admonitions that deviate from the standard departmental admonitions (refer to each jurisdiction's witness instruction policy), code as 'other' on the code sheet and write details about the specific instructions given to the witness on the *additional comments sheet*. If there is no indication that admonitions were given, code as a dash (-) for missing data.

**# of viewings by wit:** Find this information in the police report. Chicago and Evanston provide an additional sequential lineup report which indicates the procedures used during "first viewing" and "second viewing." If "second viewing" is left blank, assume only one viewing was administered. Joliet does not provide this sheet, instead, find the procedural information within the police report.

**Suspect ID:** Find this information in the police report. Code this information as 'yes' if the witness identified the suspect, or 'no' if the witness did not identify the suspect.

**Filler ID:** Find this information in the police report. Code this information as 'yes' if the witness identified a filler, or 'no' if the witness did not identify a filler.

**Confidence:** Find this information on either the lineup report or police report. Officers sometimes write this information under "additional comments." For Chicago and Evanston, the sequential lineup report contains a section "Certainty of witness." Joliet does not directly ask for this information, nor does Chicago or Evanston for simultaneous lineups. Witnesses may express confidence as a percentage (e.g., "the witness was 80% sure") or as a statement (e.g., "the witness pointed to #4 but stated he was not sure," "the witness started shaking as said they were positive #5 was the guy"). When an indication of confidence is reported, code as a 'yes' and write detail about the confidence statement on the *additional comments sheet*. In cases where an implication of confidence is stated ("the witness hesitated but then chose #2," "he immediately pointed to #3"), but no explicit request for confidence was made or the witness did not directly state how confident they were, code as "no." But statements such as these about the characteristics of the witness' identification are informative, so code a 1 in 'additional comments' and write the information on the *additional comments sheet*.

**Additional comments:** If additional comments are written on the lineup report, or if additional information is given in the police report that seems important, code this as a 'yes' and write the information on the *additional comments sheet*.

**# of photos presented:** For simultaneous lineups, this will be the same as the number of photos in the lineup. For sequential lineups, this is the number of photos shown up until the witness made the identification. HOWEVER, if witnesses viewed photos after the ID, the number of photos presented should include those photos also. If witnesses viewed photos after the identification, the number of photos presented should equal the number of photos in the lineup. If it is unknown whether witnesses viewed photos after a sequential identification, consider it missing data and code as a dash (-). This should correspond with the coding for variable "If seq, all photos shown?"

**Coder Initials – Code 1:** The person who first codes the information from the police reports should initial this box. This way if any questions arise, this coder can be consulted.

**Coder Initials – Code 2:** The person who double-checks the coded information should initial this box. This way if any questions arise, this coder can be consulted.

### **Additional Comments sheets**

Use the *Additional Comments / Other Information* sheet to record all information from the police cases that cannot immediately be coded. Use a separate sheet for each jurisdiction and number each page for that jurisdiction. Include on this sheet, information about admonitions, confidence statements, and how the administrator was found. Write details about the inconsistencies found in the lineup and police reports on this sheet. For each line of information, record the ID # that corresponds to the ID # for the report where the information is coming from. Once all information is recorded, codes will be designated based on patterns of information and will subsequently be entered into the data set.

### **Common codes used by police**

DNA: Did Not Answer

Race codes: Chicago sometimes designates race of the witness and suspect as a number –

1 = African American



## Pre-Analysis Data-Filtering

Following the coding of each identification report (see coding protocol for information as to how the coding was conducted), the data was entered into two (2) exclusive databases by separate researchers. Once all of the data was entered into both databases, the two databases were compared to ensure that there were no discrepancies. If discrepancies were found, the corresponding ID report was pulled and the appropriate value for the variable under question was entered into both databases. When all discrepancies were corrected, the final dataset was imported into SPSS for statistical analysis. This data set consisted of 710 independent identification reports.

Prior to conducting any analyses, the data set was examined to determine if any variables should be modified. Four variables were modified in order to ensure that the analyses were conducted appropriately and that the results would be interpreted correctly. The first of these variables (named "witknows" in the dataset) classified the ID reports in relation to how well the witness knew the suspect in the case. This variable contained 3 categories. An ID report was classified in the "knows suspect" category when the witness stated that they knew the suspect very well, such as identifying the suspect by name or when stating that the suspect was a friend/family member. An ID report was classified as "suspect familiar" when the witness stated that he/she was familiar with the suspect. This classification was appropriate when the witness stated that he/she knew the suspect from the neighborhood, recognized the suspect from previous experiences, or had heard that the suspect was the individual who committed the crime. Finally, the "does not know suspect" category was used for all ID reports in which the witness stated that he/she did not know who committed the crime (see coding protocol for additional information regarding the classification criteria).

When examining the "witknows" variable, we found that 71 of the ID reports involved crimes where the witness knew the suspect. Of these 71 reports, 68 involved the witness identifying the suspect. None of these 71 reports involved a witness identifying a known innocent/filler. These results are not surprising since it would be expected that when a witness knows the individual that committed a crime he/she would be likely to identify that individual in a police lineup and would not be likely to identify an individual that was not the suspect. Interestingly, the 3 instances in which the witness rejected the lineup and did not identify the suspect occurred when the witness was presented with a sequential lineup. A z-test calculated on these two proportions (1.0 for simultaneous and .875 for sequential) was not significant, indicating that this result was not a function of a difference between simultaneous and sequential lineups.

In order to ensure that the results of any further analyses were not influenced by the ceiling effect found in the "knows suspect" condition, the data was filtered to only include those ID reports that involved a witness that was familiar with the suspect ("suspect familiar") or those reports in which the witness did not know who committed the crime ("does not know suspect"). Using this procedure, 146 of the original 710 ID reports were filtered out of the data set. Of these 146, 71 were reports in which the witness knew the suspect and 75 were reports in which the level of familiarity between

the witness and the suspect could not be interpreted or was not reported. The filtering of these reports from the data set resulted in 564 reports that met the inclusion criteria.

Further examination of the data set resulted in the modification of the dependent variables of interest in the subsequent analyses. These variables were suspect identification rates (suspid), known innocent/filler identification rates (fillerid), and lineup rejection rates (noid). Identification reports were classified for each of the variables into one of three categories. For each of these dependent variables, an ID report could either be a "yes", "no", or "tentative". A report was classified as "tentative" if the witness did not make an ID, but tentatively stated that one of the members could be the perpetrator. Of the remaining 564 reports, an additional 15 included a "tentative" response on one of these 3 dependant variables. Since the ambiguity of a "tentative" ID is difficult to interpret, these 15 reports were also filtered from the subsequent analyses leaving a total of 549 ID reports. Of these 549 reports, 59 were supplied by the Evanston Police Department, 172 were supplied by the Joliet Police Department, and 318 were supplied by the Chicago Police Department.

### **Multiple Identifications by a Single Witness**

Some witnesses identified more than one individual in a lineup. There are some cases in which the witness identified both the suspect and a filler and other cases in which the witness identified more than one filler. This causes the identification frequencies to add up to more than 100% because in a few instances more than one identification was made.