

Results of the Illinois Lineup Project

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

Contents and Page Locations

Topic	Narrative	Table
Identification Procedure Frequencies by Jurisdiction.	3	8
The Most Frequent Crimes.	3	9
Effects Of Simultaneous V. Sequential Presentation On Identification Rates Overall And For Three Jurisdictions.	3	10
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation And Identification Location on Identification Rates.	3	11
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Cross v. Own Race on Identification Rates.	4	12
Effects Of Familiarity With The Suspect On Identification Rates.	4	13
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation And Presentation Medium (Live v. Photo) on Identification Rates.	5	14
Effects of Number of Viewings on Identification Rates in Sequential Lineups.	5	15
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Number of Suspects In The Lineup On Identification Rates.	5	16
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Witness Status (Victim/Bystander) on Identification Rates.	6	17
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Delay Between Crime		

17

And Identification on Identification Rates.	6	18	²
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation, and Witness Age on Identification Rates.	6	19	
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and number of offenders in The Crime on Identification Rates.	7	20	
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Witness injury on Identification Rates.	7	21	
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Violence on Identification Rates.	7	22	
Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Weapon Presence on Identification Rates.	7	23	

Results of the Illinois Lineup Project

Identification Procedure Frequencies by Jurisdiction.

This table displays the frequencies of simultaneous and sequential lineups, according to whether they were presented live or by photo, in each of the three jurisdictions.

The complete results are shown in Table 1.

The Most Frequent Crimes.

This list of crimes is derived from the case reports and includes all crime categories having a frequency of 10% or more of the records from any one of the three jurisdictions. The list is shown in order of their total percentages across the jurisdictions.

The complete results are shown in Table 2.

Effects Of Simultaneous V. Sequential Presentation On Identification Rates Overall And For Three Jurisdictions.

Simultaneous and sequential lineups had differential impacts on overall eyewitness identification rates. Analyses were conducted on 548 identification reports of which 319 included simultaneous lineups and 229 included sequential lineups. Results indicated that witnesses who viewed a simultaneous lineup identified the suspect more often than those witnesses who viewed a sequential lineup (suspect identification rates of 59.9% and 45% respectively). In addition, witnesses who viewed a simultaneous lineup chose a filler less often than those who viewed a sequential lineup (filler identification rates of 2.8% and 9.2% respectively). Witnesses who viewed a simultaneous lineup were less likely to choose no one than were those who viewed a sequential lineup (no identification rates of 37.6% and 47.2% respectively). In short, simultaneous lineups led to an increase in overall witness choosing rates marked by an increased likelihood to identify the suspect, and a decreased likelihood of identifying a filler as compared to the choosing rates of witnesses in sequential lineups.

The overall pattern of results for suspect identifications (simultaneous > sequential) was present in Chicago and Evanston, however no differences between simultaneous and sequential lineups was observed for the Joliet sample, where the percentage of suspect identifications with sequential lineups was not different from suspect identifications for simultaneous lineups in the other two jurisdictions. The cause for the absence of differences in the Joliet sample cannot be determined based on information available in this research.

The overall pattern of non-identifications (sequential > simultaneous) was found in Evanston but not in the other two jurisdictions.

The complete results are shown in Table 3.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation And Identification Location on Identification Rates.

The location of the lineup task, police station or elsewhere, was evaluated to determine whether location influences witness identification rates. The analysis is restricted to photo lineups because live lineups were not conducted outside of the police station.

Of the 332 reports included in the analysis, 173 were recorded at the police station and 159 were recorded elsewhere. Analyses revealed that there were no significant differences

between simultaneous and sequential lineups on suspect identification rates when the lineups were conducted outside of the police station.

When lineups were conducted at the police station differences between simultaneous and sequential lineups were found. Witnesses viewing a simultaneous lineup were more likely to identify a suspect (68.5%) and less likely to make no identification (30.4%) than witnesses who viewed a sequential lineup (44.4% and 49.4%, respectively). Additionally, witnesses viewing a simultaneous lineup at the station were more likely to identify the suspect (68.5%) than when they viewed a simultaneous lineup elsewhere (47.2%). No differences were observed between locations for sequential lineups.

The complete results are shown in Table 4.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Cross v. Own Race on Identification Rates. Suspect identification rates were higher for persons of the same race as the witness, for both simultaneous and sequential lineups.

Filler identifications were higher for same race sequential lineups (12.6%) compared with cross-race sequential lineups (3.4%) and compared with both simultaneous cross-race and same race lineups (4.3% and 2%, respectively).

Witnesses shown sequential cross-race lineups made substantially more non-identifications (64.4%) than those shown sequential same-race lineups (37.3%) as well as simultaneous same (33.7%) and cross race (44%) lineups.

The complete results are shown in Table 5.

Effects Of Familiarity With The Suspect On Identification Rates.

The degree to which the witness was familiar with the suspect was evaluated to determine whether familiarity influenced witness identification rates. A total of 620 identification reports were included in these analyses. Of these 620 reports, 71 included suspects known to the witness, 81 included suspects "familiar" to the witness, and 468 included suspects unknown to the witnesses (see the *Illinois Lineup Evaluation Project Protocol and Code Book* for "know", "familiar", and "don't know" classification criteria). Analyses revealed differences in suspect identification rates. Witnesses who claimed to know the perpetrator were much more likely to identify the suspect than those who said they were familiar with the perpetrator (95.8% > 71.8%), and witnesses who said they were familiar with the perpetrator were more likely to identify the suspect than those who did not know the suspect at all (71.8% > 50.4%).

Non-identifications showed a contrasting pattern. If the witness claimed to know the perpetrator non-identifications of the suspect were very infrequent (4.2%). When witnesses said they were familiar with the perpetrator the rate of non-identifications increased to 21.0%, and when the perpetrator was previously unknown to the witness non-identifications rose to 45.1%.

Filler identifications were few overall. Witnesses who claimed to know the perpetrator never identified a filler. Witnesses who said they were familiar with the perpetrator and those who did not know the perpetrator at all were more likely to identify a filler in the lineup (7.4% and 5.1% respectively). These patterns were consistent across all 3 jurisdictions and across simultaneous and sequential lineups.

Personal knowledge of the perpetrator is a power factor in identification, leading to nearly 96% suspect identification. It is unlikely that other factors, such as lineup type, would have

any influence on these witnesses, and for this reasons these 71 witnesses are not included in subsequent analyses involving identification rates.

The complete results are shown in Table 6.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation And Presentation Medium (Live v. Photo) on Identification Rates.

The influence of live versus photographic presentation of lineups was also analyzed. Live simultaneous lineups resulted in more suspect identifications than live sequential lineups and more than photographic simultaneous or sequential lineups. Of the 92 live-simultaneous lineups, 70.7% resulted in a suspect identification whereas only 45.4% of the 108 live-sequential lineups, 55.5% of the 227 photo-simultaneous lineups, and 44.9% of the photo-sequential lineups resulted in suspect identifications.

Live simultaneous lineups led to significantly fewer filler identifications than live-sequential lineups. Of the 92 live simultaneous lineups, 1.1% resulted in a filler identification in contrast to the 9.3% of the 108 live-sequential lineups. There were no differences between the photographic and live presentations in filler identifications.

Live simultaneous lineups resulted in fewer non-identifications than live sequential lineups and fewer than photographic lineups of either type. There was no difference in non-identifications among live sequential, photo sequential and photo simultaneous lineups. Of the 92 live-simultaneous lineups, 28.3% resulted in a non-identification whereas 45.4% of the 108 live-sequential lineups, 41.4% of the 227 photo-simultaneous lineups, and 49.2% of the photo-sequential lineups resulted in non-identifications.

The complete results are shown in Table 7.

Effects of Number of Viewings on Identification Rates in Sequential Lineups.

Multiple viewings of a lineup were uniquely a part of the sequential procedure. Fifty-one (22.3%) of the 229 sequential lineups contained a second viewing. Witnesses who viewed a lineup twice were less likely to identify the suspect. Of the 51 reports wherein the witness viewed the lineup twice, 27.5% identified the suspect whereas 50.0% of the 178 reports in which the witness viewed the lineup once resulted in a suspect identification. Further analyses revealed that of the 51 sequential identifications in which the witness viewed the lineup twice (2 passes), 7 were removed from any interpretation because the reports of the witness' decision in the first viewing were not recorded.

Of the remaining 44 reports, 39 (89%) involved the witness making the same (confirmatory) choice in the second viewing as s/he made in the first viewing. Of the 5 reports where the witness changed his/her decision between the first and second viewing, 3 (7%) involved the witness making no decision in the first viewing and identifying the suspect in the second viewing, 1 (2%) involved the witness making no decision in the first viewing and excluding all members as the perpetrator after the second viewing, and 1 (2%) involved the witness changing his decision from a tentative ID of a filler in the first viewing to a positive ID of the suspect after the second viewing.

The complete results are shown in Table 8.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Number of Suspects In The Lineup On Identification Rates.

The vast majority of lineups contained only one suspect (n=464), and the results for these are the same as for the overall analysis of the effects of simultaneous and sequential lineups on identifications: simultaneous lineups lead to a higher rate of suspect identifications and a lower rate of non-identifications than sequential lineups.

Lineups containing two suspects (n=46) were approximately 9% of the total. Their pattern of identifications was quite different, but only for sequential lineups. Sequential lineups with multiple suspects lead to considerably fewer suspect identifications (12.5%), more filler identifications (18.8%) and more non-identifications (68.8%) compared with simultaneous lineups (57.1%, 7.1% and 37.5%, respectively) and 1-suspect sequential lineups (50.8%, 6.9% and 42.9%, respectively).

Lineups containing 3 suspects were very few (n=13) and none were administered in sequential format. The number of cases is too small for statistical analysis.

The complete results are shown in Table 9.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Witness Status (Victim/Bystander) on Identification Rates.

Whether the witness was a victim or a bystander was evaluated to determine the effects on identification rates. Of the 542 reports included in the analysis, 308 were made by victims and 234 by bystanders. Analysis revealed that overall there were no significant differences between victims and bystanders on identification rates.

Examination of the simultaneous v. sequential comparison revealed that victims were more likely than bystanders to identify the suspect in a simultaneous lineup. Also, victims were more likely to identify a suspect in a simultaneous lineup than in a sequential lineup. No significant differences were observed between victims and bystanders for sequential lineups. However, both victims and bystanders were more likely to identify fillers in a sequential than a simultaneous lineup.

The complete results are shown in Table 10.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Delay Between Crime And Identification on Identification Rates.

Delay between crime and identification and lineup type were analyzed to determine whether these variables interact to influence witness identification rates. Of the 548 identification reports, 137 were made less than 48 hours after the crime occurred, 110 between 48 hours and one week after the crime occurred, 170 between one week and 31 days after the crime, and 131 made after 31 days. The analysis shows that the overall pattern of differences between simultaneous and sequential lineups occurs at each degree of delay. No overall effect of delay was observed.

The complete results are shown in Table 11.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation, and Witness Age on Identification Rates.

Witness age was examined to determine whether age influences the pattern of identification rates in simultaneous and sequential lineups. Of the 548 identification reports included in this analysis, 97 were made by witnesses 17 years of age or younger, 445 reports by witnesses between the ages of 18 and 69, and 6 by witnesses 70 years of age or older.

The analysis shows that witness age does not lead to patterns of identification in simultaneous and sequential lineups that are different from the overall pattern discussed earlier, and no differences between age groups were observed.

The complete results are shown in Table 12.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and number of offenders In The Crime On Identification Rates.

Multiple offender crimes were nearly 40% more frequent than single offender crimes (317 > 229). Multiple offender crimes lead to a substantial difference between simultaneous and sequential lineups that was not observed for single-offender crimes. Witnesses to multiple offender crimes and shown simultaneous lineups made more (71.4%) suspect identifications compared to those shown sequential lineups (40.2%). Those shown sequential lineups made more filler identifications (11.1%) than those shown simultaneous lineups (3.0%). Witnesses to multiple offender crimes and shown simultaneous lineups made fewer non-identifications (26.3%) compared to those shown sequential lineups (50.4%).

The number of offenders did not produce differences in suspect identifications, filler identifications or non-identifications for sequential lineups. For simultaneous lineups, however, multi-offender crimes lead to more suspect identifications (71.4% > 51.1%) than single offender crimes, and fewer non-identifications (26.3% < 46.2%).

The complete results are shown in Table 13.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Witness injury on Identification Rates.

No differences were found in identification rates based on whether or not the witness was injured during the crime. Comparisons were made between simultaneous and sequential lineups for suspect, filler, and no identifications. Witness injury did not influence these identification rates.

The complete results are shown in Table 14.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Violence on Identification Rates.

Crimes were categorized as either violent or non-violent. Violent crimes were defined as those involving physical injury or direct threat of injury (homicide, armed robbery, sexual assault) while non-violent crimes were those that caused indirect harm (burglary, fraud, petty theft). Comparing identification rates for violent and non-violent crimes across simultaneous and sequential lineups revealed no differences. Both simultaneous and sequential identification rates were similar whether the crime was violent or non-violent.

The complete results are shown in Table 15.

Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Weapon Presence on Identification Rates.

No differences were found in identification rates based on the presence or absence of a weapon during the crime. Some studies have found that when a weapon is present during a crime, witnesses are less accurate when making later identifications, but an effect of weapon presence was not found in the present study, for either simultaneous or sequential lineups.

The complete results are shown in Table 16.

Illinois Lineup Project: Tables**Table 1. Identification Procedure Frequencies by Jurisdiction**

n=616	Simultaneous		Sequential		Total
	Photo	Live	Photo	Live	
Chicago	81	90	66	110	347
Evanston	27	9	32	3	71
Joliet	159	0	39	0	198

Table 2. Most Frequent Crimes, by Jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction	Total	Chicago	Evanston	Joliet
Total # Cases	616	351	70	195
aggravated assault	19.5	20.2	8.6	22.1
armed robbery	19.3	23.9	4.3	16.4
robbery	13.0	19.1	8.6	3.6
homicide	11.9	17.9	5.7	3.1
petty theft	8.9	2.6	8.6	20.5
assault/battery	7.6	3.7	11.4	13.3
sexual assault	5.0	5.1	14.3	1.5
burglary	2.4	0.9	11.4	2.1

Table 3.a. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation on Identification Rates.

n=548	Total	
	Simultaneous (319)	Sequential (229)
Suspect ID	59.9	45
Filler ID	2.8	9.2
No ID	37.6	47.2

Table 3.b. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation on Identification Rates, By Jurisdiction

n = 548	Chicago		Evanston		Joliet		Total	
	Sim. (151)	Seq. (167)	Sim. (31)	Seq. (27)	Sim. (137)	Seq. (35)	Sim. (319)	Seq. (229)
Suspect ID	57.0	43.1	67.7	25.9	61.3	68.6	59.9	45
Filler ID	0.7	10.2	0	11.1	5.8	2.9	2.8	9.2
No ID	42.4	48.5	32.3	63.0	33.6	28.6	37.6	47.2

Table 4. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation And Identification Location on Identification Rates.

n = 332	Police Station		Elsewhere	
	Sim.	Seq.	Sim.	Seq.
	(N = 92)	(N = 81)	(N = 125)	(N = 34)
Suspect ID	68.5	44.4	47.2	44.1
Filler ID	2.2	6.2	4.8	11.8
No ID	30.4	49.4	48.0	50.0

n = 332	Simultaneous		Sequential	
	Police Sta	Elsewhere	Police Sta	Elsewhere
	(N = 92)	(N = 125)	(N = 81)	(N = 34)
Suspect ID	68.5	47.2	44.4	44.1
Filler ID	2.2	4.8	6.2	11.8
No ID	30.4	48.0	49.4	50.0

Table 5. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Cross v Same Race on Identification Rates

n = 537	Simultaneous		Sequential	
	Cross (116)	Same (199)	Cross (87)	Same (135)
Suspect ID	51.7	64.8	32.2	53.3
Filler ID	4.3	2.0	3.4	12.6
No ID	44.0	33.7	64.4	36.3

n = 537	Cross		Same	
	Sim (116)	Seq (87)	Sim (199)	Seq (135)
Suspect ID	51.7	32.2	64.8	53.3
Filler ID	4.3	3.4	2.0	12.6
No ID	44.0	64.4	33.7	36.3

Table 6. Effect of Familiarity with Suspect on Identification Rates.

n = 620	Know (71)	Familiar (81)	Don't Know (468)
Suspect ID	95.8	72.8	50.4
Filler ID	0.0	7.4	5.1
No ID	4.2	21.0	45.1

Table 7. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation And Presentation Medium on Identification Rates: Two Views

n = 545	Live		Photo	
	Sim. (n = 92)	Seq. (n = 108)	Sim. (n = 227)	Seq. (n = 118)
Suspect ID	70.7	45.4	55.5	44.9
Filler ID	1.1	9.3	3.5	7.6
No ID	28.3	45.4	41.4	49.2

n = 545	Simultaneous		Sequential	
	Live (n = 92)	Photo (n = 227)	Live (n = 108)	Photo (n = 118)
Suspect ID	70.7	55.5	45.4	44.9
Filler ID	1.1	3.5	9.3	7.6
No ID	28.3	41.4	45.4	49.2

Table 8. Effects of Number of Viewings on Identification Rates in Sequential Lineups.

	1 View	2 Views
n=229	(n=178)	(n=51)
Suspect ID	50.0	27.5
Filler ID	8.4	11.8
No ID	43.3	60.8

Table 9. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Number of Suspects In The Lineup On Identification Rates

n = 523	1 Suspect (n=464)		2 Suspects (n=46)		3 Suspects (n=13)	
	Sim. (n=275)	Seq. (n=189)	Sim. (n=14)	Seq. (n=32)	Sim. (n=13)	Seq. (n=0)
Suspect ID	64.0	50.8	57.1	12.5	63.8	none
Filler ID	2.9	6.9	7.1	18.8	0.0	none
No ID	33.5	42.9	37.5	68.8	46.2	none

Table 10. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Witness Status (Victim/Bystander) on Identification Rates

Victim/Bystander x Identification Type		
n = 542	Victim (308)	Bystander (234)
Suspect ID	56.5	50.4
Filler ID	4.9	6.4
No ID	39.3	44.0

n = 542	Sim.		Seq	
	Victim (176)	Byst. (139)	Victim (132)	Byst. (95)
Suspect ID	65.9	52.5	43.9	47.4
Filler ID	2.3	3.6	8.3	10.5
No ID	32.4	43.9	48.5	44.2

n = 542	Victim		Bystander	
	Sim (176)	Seq (132)	Sim (139)	Seq (95)
Suspect ID	65.9	43.9	52.5	47.4
Filler ID	2.3	8.3	3.6	10.5
No ID	32.4	48.5	43.9	44.2

Table 11. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Delay Between Crime And Identification on Identification Rates: Two Views.

Delay X Sim/Seq X Identification Rates

n = 548	Simultaneous				Sequential			
	< 48 hours (N = 67)	48 hrs- 1wk (N = 68)	1 wk- 31 days (N = 108)	> 31 days (N = 76)	< 48 hours (N = 70)	48 hrs- 1wk (N = 42)	1 wk- 31 days (N = 62)	> 31 days (N = 55)
Suspect ID	56.7	52.9	61.1	67.1	47.1	40.5	40.3	50.9
Filler ID	4.5	4.4	0.9	2.6	12.9	7.1	4.8	10.9
No ID	40.3	42.6	38.0	30.3	41.4	52.4	54.8	41.8

Delay X Sim/Seq X Identification Rates

n = 548	< 48 hours		48 hrs- 1wk		1 wk- 31 days		> 31 days	
	Sim (N = 67)	Seq (N = 70)	Sim (N = 68)	Seq (N = 42)	Sim (N = 108)	Seq (N = 62)	Sim (N = 76)	Seq (N = 55)
Suspect ID	56.7	47.1	52.9	40.5	61.1a	40.3a	67.1	50.9
Filler ID	4.5	12.9	4.4	7.1	0.9	4.8	2.6	10.9
No ID	40.3	41.4	42.6	52.4	38.0	54.8	30.3	41.8

Table 12. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation, and Witness Age on Identification Rates: Two Views.

n = 548	Simultaneous			Sequential		
	17yr or less	18-69	70+	17yr or less	18-69	70+
	(N = 60)	(N = 256)	(N = 3)	(N = 37)	(N = 189)	(N = 3)
Suspect ID	56.7	60.5	66.7	54.1	43.4	33.3
Filler ID	3.3	2.7	0.0	8.1	9.5	0.0
No ID	40.0	37.1	33.3	37.8	48.7	66.7

Age X Sim/Seq X Identification Rates

n = 548	17yr or less		18-69		70+	
	Sim	Seq	Sim	Seq	Sim	Seq
	(N = 60)	(N = 37)	(N = 256)	(N = 189)	(N = 3)	(N = 3)
Suspect ID	56.7	54.1	60.5	43.4	66.7	33.3
Filler ID	3.3	8.1	2.7	9.5	0.0	0.0
No ID	40.0	37.8	37.1	48.7	33.3	66.7

Table 13. Identification Rates By Lineup Type And Number Of Offenders In The Crime: Two Views

n = 546	>1 offender		One Offender	
	Sim. (N = 133)	Seq. (N = 184)	Sim. (N = 117)	Seq. (N = 112)
Suspect ID	71.4	40.2	51.1	50.0
Filler ID	3.0	11.1	2.7	7.1
No ID	26.3	50.4	46.2	43.8

n = 546	Simultaneous		Sequential	
	>1 offender (N = 133)	1 offender (N = 117)	>1 offender (N = 184)	1 offender (N = 112)
Suspect ID	71.4	51.1	40.2	50.0
Filler ID	3.0	2.7	11.1	7.1
No ID	26.3	46.2	50.4	43.8

Table 14. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Witness injury on Identification Rates: Two Views.

n = 517	Simultaneous		Sequential	
	Injured	Not Injured	Injured	Not Injured
Suspect ID	69.1	58.9	64.7	40.6
Filler ID	3.6	2.8	2.9	10.6
No ID	29.1	38.3	35.3	50.0

Table 15. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Violence on Identification Rates: Two Views.

n = 544	Simultaneous		Sequential	
	Violent (N = 224)	Non-Violent (N = 94)	Violent (N = 193)	Non-Violent (N = 33)
Suspect ID	61.6	56.4	44.6	42.4
Filler ID	1.3	6.4	9.3	9.1
No ID	37.5	37.2	47.7	48.5

Table 16. Effects of Simultaneous v. Sequential Presentation and Weapon Presence on Identification Rates.

n = 536	Simultaneous		Sequential	
	No Weapon	Weapon	No Weapon	Weapon
	(N = 121)	(N = 190)	(N = 41)	(N = 184)
Suspect ID	62.0	58.4	39.0	46.7
Filler ID	5.8	1.1	12.2	8.7
No ID	32.2	41.1	48.8	46.2