DOWNLOAD PDF EYEWITNESS SCIENCE

Chapter 1 : Eyewitness Books | Awards | LibraryThing

Eyewitness is a natural history television series produced by BBC and DK Vision. The series is based on the Dorling Kindersley Eyewitness Books series of children's books. More Science to.

Reliability[edit] Psychologists have probed the reliability of eyewitness testimony since the beginning of the 20th century. This distortion is known as the post-event misinformation effect Loftus and Palmer, After a crime occurs and an eyewitness comes forward, law enforcement tries to gather as much information as they can to avoid the influence that may come from the environment, such as the media. Many times when the crime is surrounded by much publicity, an eyewitness may experience source misattribution. Source misattribution occurs when a witness is incorrect about where or when they have the memory from. If a witness cannot correctly identify the source of their retrieved memory, the witness is seen as not reliable. While some witnesses see the entirety of a crime happen in front of them, some witness only part of a crime. These witnesses are more likely to experience confirmation bias. Witness expectations are to blame for the distortion that may come from confirmation bias. For example, Lindholm and Christianson found that witnesses of a mock crime who did not witness the whole crime, nevertheless testified to what they expected would have happened. These expectations are normally similar across individuals due to the details of the environment. Evaluating the credibility of eye-witness testimony falls on all individual jurors when such evidence is offered as testimony in a trial in the United States. An overview of this research by Laub and Bornstein shows this to be an inaccurate gauge of accuracy. Estimator variables are characteristics of the witness, event, testimony, or testimony evaluators. Systematic variables are variables that are, or have the possibility of, being controlled by the criminal justice system. Both sets of variables can be manipulated and studied during research, but only system variables can be controlled in actual procedure. Suggestibility is the term used when a witness accepts information after the actual event and incorporates it into the memory of the event itself. Compared to older children, preschool-age children are more likely to fall victim to suggestions without the ability to focus solely on the facts of what happened. Reconstructive memory Many of the early studies of memory demonstrated how memories can fail to be accurate records of experiences. Because jurors and judges do not have access to the original event, it is important to know whether a testimony is based on actual experience or not. He told participants a complicated Native American story and had them repeat it over a series of intervals. With each repetition, the stories were altered. Even when participants recalled accurate information, they filled in gaps with information that would fit their personal experiences. His work showed long term memory to be adaptable. People attempt to place past events into existing representations of the world, making the memory more coherent. Instead of remembering precise details about commonplace occurrences, a schema is developed. A schema is a generalization formed mentally based on experience. Tuckey and Brewer found pieces of information that were inconsistent with a typical robbery decayed much faster than those that were schema consistent over a week period, unless the information stood out as being extremely unusual. The use of schemas has been shown to increase the accuracy of recall of schema-consistent information but this comes at the cost of decreased recall of schema-inconsistent information. Elizabeth Loftus and Misinformation effect Elizabeth Loftus is one of the leading psychologists in the field of eyewitness testimony. She provided extensive research on this topic, revolutionizing the field with her bold stance that challenges the credibility of eyewitness testimony in court. She suggests that memory is not reliable and goes to great lengths to provide support for her arguments. She mainly focuses on the integration of misinformation with the original memory, forming a new memory. Some of her most convincing experiments support this claim: In one of her experiments, Loftus demonstrates that false verbal Information can integrate with original memory. Participants were presented with either truthful information or misleading information, and overall it showed that even the false information verbally presented became part of the memory after the participant was asked to recall details. This happens because of one of two reasons. First, it can alter the memory, incorporating the misinformation in with the actual, true memory. Second, the original memory and new information may both reside in memory in turn creating two conflicting ideas that compete in recall. It was

found that jurors who hear about a violent crime are more likely to convict a defendant than of one from a nonviolent crime. To reduce this tendency for a juror to quickly accuse, and perhaps wrongly accuse, choosing to utilize expert psychological testimony causes the juror to critically appraise the eyewitness testimony, instead of quickly reaching a faulty verdict. Participants were measured in eyewitness performance in two areas: It showed that when a woman was recalling information about a woman, the resistance to false details was higher and the recall was more accurate. If a man was recalling an incident involving a man, similarly the recall was more accurate. However, when dealing with opposite genders, the participants gave into the suggestibility misinformation more easily and demonstrated less accuracy. In this specific experiment, if a misleading feature was presented, more than a third of the participants recalled that detail. Binet believed people were highly susceptible to suggestion, and called for a better approach to questioning witnesses. Though no cameras caught the moment of impact on film, many news stations covered the tragedy with footage taken after impact. According to theories about flashbulb memory , the intense shock of the event should have made the memory of the event incredibly accurate. This same logic is often applied to those who witness a criminal act. To test this assumption, participants were asked questions that planted false information about the event. Fifty-five percent of subjects reported having watched the moment of impact on television, and recalled the moment the plane broke out in flames-even though it was impossible for them to have seen either of these occurrences. One researcher remarked, "[V]ery critical sense would have made our subjects realize that the implanted information could not possibly be true. We are still at a loss as to why so few of them realized this. One study showed changing certain words and phrases resulted in an increase in overall estimations of witnesses. Geiselman, Fisher, MacKinnon, and Holland saw much improvement in eyewitness memory with an interview procedure they referred to as the cognitive interview. The approach focuses on making witness aware of all events surrounding a crime without generating false memories or inventing details. In this tactic, the interviewer builds a rapport with the witness before asking any questions. When implemented correctly, the CI showed more accuracy and efficiency without additional incorrect information being generated. Jury guidelines[edit] It has been suggested that the jury be given a checklist to evaluate eyewitness testimony when given in court. Shafer offers this checklist for evaluating eyewitness testimony: How well could the eyewitness observe the thing he reports? Were his senses equal to the observation? Was his physical location suitable to sight, hearing, touch? Did he have the proper social ability to observe: When did he report in relation to his observation? Are there additional clues to intended veracity? Was he indifferent on the subject reported, thus probably not intending distortion? Did he make statements damaging to himself, thus probably not seeking to distort? Did he give incidental or casual information, almost certainly not intended to mislead? Do his statements seem inherently improbable: Remember that some types of information are easier to observe and report on than others. Are there inner contradictions in the testimony? The new rules require judges to explain to jurors any influences that may heighten the risk for error in the testimony. The rules are part of nationwide court reform that attempts to improve the validity of eyewitness testimony and lower the rate of false conviction.

Chapter 2 : Testing the Accuracy of Eyewitness Testimony | Science Project

*Eyewitness Science: Matter [Chris Cooper] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. What are the primary four elements? How was the atom discovered? Find out the answers to these and other questions in this look at matter.*

Other Ways to Give The Science Behind Eyewitness Identification Reform Leading social science researchers identify two main categories of variables affecting eyewitness identification: Estimator variables are those that cannot be controlled by the criminal justice system. They include simple factors like the lighting when the crime took place or the distance from which the witness saw the perpetrator. Estimator variables also include more complex factors, including race identifications have proven to be less accurate when witnesses are identifying perpetrators of a different race , the presence of a weapon during a crime, and the degree of stress or trauma a witness experienced while seeing the perpetrator. System variables are those that the criminal justice system can and should control. They include all of the ways that law enforcement agencies retrieve and record witness memory, such as lineups, photo arrays, and other identification procedures. Several implementable procedures have been shown to significantly decrease the number of misidentifications by controlling system variables and reducing the chances of producing a biased result. The Innocence Project recommends that all jurisdictions immediately adopt the following policies: Blind administration Problem â€" Numerous studies show that lineup administrators, when they know who the suspect is, can strongly bias the eyewitnesses. Reform Solution â€" Implementing blind administration, where the officer administering the lineup is unaware of who the suspect is, can prevent these unconscious actions and significantly reduce the likelihood of misidentification. Lineup composition Problem â€" Lineup composition is crucial for a fair lineup , as a biased lineup can cause an innocent suspect to stand out and thus increase the likelihood of a false identification. Example â€" On July 17, , a young woman was raped by a black man whom she said was a total stranger. The victim was shown the color identification card, along with six black-and-white mug shots, and identified Anderson as her assailant. He was only eighteen years old when he was convicted of robbery, sodomy, abduction, and rape. Anderson was released under parole fifteen years later, but took another four years to be exonerated through DNA testing. Further, the suspect should look similar to the fillers for example, he should not be the only member of his race in the lineup, or the only one with facial hair. Eyewitnesses should also not view multiple lineups with the same suspect. Instructions Problem â€" Often, the witness feels pressure to pick a perpetrator out of a lineup, even if they are unsure of whether one of the individuals, is in fact, the perpetrator. Reform Solution â€" The person viewing the lineup should be told that the perpetrator may or may not be in the lineup and that the investigation will continue regardless of the lineup result. This reduces the pressure on the witness of feeling like they have to pick a perpetrator. The witness should also be told not to look to the administrator for guidance. Confidence Statements Problem â€" Studies show that eyewitnesses who were given confirmatory feedback on their identification inflated their recollections of the confidence they felt in their selections. Recording Problem â€" It is sometimes difficult to present findings of error or misconduct made by the lineup administrator at trial; alternatively, it may also be difficult for a prosecutor to show the jury that a lineup procedure was legitimately conducted. Reform Solution â€" Identification procedures should be videotaped whenever possible.

Chapter 3 : The Science Behind Eyewitness Identification Reform

*DK Eyewitness Books: Science: Discover the story of science and how it shaped our understanding of the world [DK] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Discover the story of scienceâ€"and how it shaped our understanding of the world.*

Testing the Accuracy of Eyewitness Testimony www. Consult the rules and regulations of the science fair that you are entering, prior to performing experiments or surveys. Here are suggested guidelines for obtaining permission for working with minors: Write a clear description of your science fair project, what you are studying, and what you hope to learn. Include how the child will be tested. Print out as many copies as you need for each child you will be surveying. Pass out the permission sheet to the children or to the teachers of the children to give to the parents. You must have permission for all the children in order to be able to use them as test subjects. Staging the Event Arrange to have a person who is unfamiliar to the class knock on the door, enter the class, interact with the teacher briefly, and then leave. You can think of your own scenarios, but some possible ideas are: The survey should probe how accurately the students remember the event. Here are some ideas for questions to get you started assuming a delivery person scenario: At what time did the delivery person enter the room? How long was the delivery person in the room? What did the delivery person bring? Did the delivery person leave anything behind? Did the delivery person take anything from the room? What did the delivery person say to the teacher? Please describe the delivery person, including as much of the following information as you can accurately remember: After the visitor leaves, give the students in the class sealed envelopes containing the survey. Half of the envelopes and surveys should be marked "complete now" and half should be marked "complete tomorrow. Analyzing the Results If you record the event, use your recording to double-check your own recall of the event before grading the surveys! For each component of the description, analyze the percentage of correct responses. Which components of the description were correctly observed most often? Which were correctly observed least often? Does the "average" response provide an accurate description of the subject? For numeric data, calculate the average, median, and standard deviation of the responses. A histogram showing the distribution of responses would be a good way to examine this data. How close is the average response to the actual number? For analyzing eyewitness accuracy of what was said, one idea would be to devise a rating scale for responses, perhaps something like this: How many were surprised to find that they had made mistakes? If you like this project, you might enjoy exploring these related careers: Psychologist Why people take certain actions can often feel like a mystery. Psychologists help solve these mysteries by investigating the physical, cognitive, emotional, or social aspects of human behavior and the human mind. Some psychologists also apply these findings in order to design better products or to help people change their behaviors. Read more Forensic Science Technician Guilty or not guilty? The fate of the accused in court lies with the evidence gathered at the crime scene. The job of the forensic science technician is to gather evidence and use scientific principles and techniques to make sense of it. It can be a grueling and graphic job, but very rewarding. If you like the idea of using science to help deliver justice, then you should investigate this career. Read more Variations Have test subjects view a scene from a film and then ask questions about recall of the scene. For example, you could select a scene depicting an automobile accident. Test the effect of misleading questions on later recall. Separate your "witnesses" into two groups. For one group, ask a question about something that was not in the scene e. Survey both groups about the accident scene at a later time e. Does the group exposed to the misleading question incorporate inaccurate information into their recall of the event? If so, how prevalent is the effect? Test the effect of wording on immediate recall. For one group, ask a question such as, "How fast were the cars moving when they smashed? Test the effect of distractions during screening on recall. Give each group identical instructions: For one group, the movie is shown uninterrupted. For the other group, have someone enter the room during the screening e. How do the two groups differ in the accuracy of their recall? Are they equally accurate for the portion of the scene before the distracting event occurred? During the distracting event? Following the distracting event? Design an experiment to test the effect of longer delays on recall. For another experiment related to forensic psychology,

see the Science Buddies project Testing for Bias in a Photo Lineup. Share your story with Science Buddies! Yes, I Did This Project! Please log in or create a free account to let us know how things went. Ask an Expert The Ask an Expert Forum is intended to be a place where students can go to find answers to science questions that they have been unable to find using other resources. If you have specific questions about your science fair project or science fair, our team of volunteer scientists can help.

Chapter 4 : Eyewitness Science | Awards | LibraryThing

Scientific American is the essential guide to the most awe-inspiring advances in science and technology, explaining how they change our understanding of the world and shape our lives.

Communications with witness before and after identifications Estimator variables - those factors which cannot be controlled by the criminal justice system, such as: Own-race bias Masking of cues to hair and hairlines Weapon focus Stress experienced by eyewitness Passage of time between crime and identification Attorneys considering challenging eyewitness identification should consult Chapter 3 of Alyson A. Procedures for Challenging Eyewitness Identification Evidence provides detailed information on motions to suppress, voir dire of witnesses, jury voir dire, working with experts, cross-examination, and other topics. In our own backyard: Innocent North Carolina man wrongfully convicted Ronald Cotton was wrongfully convicted of two rapes and burglaries in and Although innocent, Ronald Cotton served over 10 years in prison, primarily due to erroneous eyewitness identification. DNA testing in revealed that evidence from one victim did not match Cotton, but instead matched with another man who had confessed to the crime. Cotton was pardoned by the governor of North Carolina in To learn more visit: Newman of Duke University Law School. There is grave potential for prejudice, intentional or not, in the pretrial lineup, which may not be capable of reconstruction at trial. This legislation is one of the most comprehensive pieces of eyewitness identification reform legislation in the country and is codified at N. Rogers , N. Whether an identification procedure is unduly suggestive depends on the totality of the circumstances. A due process analysis requires a two-part inquiry. First, the Court must determine whether the identification procedures were impermissibly suggestive. If so, "the Court must then determine whether the [suggestive] procedures created a substantial likelihood of irreparable misidentification. Rawls , S. Rather, the court applied the North Carolina common law test for determining if the show-up was proper which is a two-step inquiry described above: Rawls, concluding that EIRA does not apply to show-ups and found that the trial court did not err in admitting an in-court identification following the show-up identification. Lawson which places the burden on the state to establish the reliability of the eyewitness identification and recognizes and requires courts to act in a manner consistent with the latest scientific research on eyewitness identification and memory. This opinion may be useful in NC cases involving show ups or where counsel is arguing for suppression on state constitutional grounds. For briefs on additional eyewitness identification issues, visit the Identification of Accused section of the Indigent Defense Services Brief Bank. Working with Experts Seeking expert knowledge regarding your case may be beneficial in three ways: Expert testimony on eyewitness identification has been excluded in several cases, so counsel should be prepared for a challenge to its admissibility. Contact Sarah Rackley Olson for additional information regarding admissibility of eyewitness ID expert testimony. A New Synthesis - John T. Wixted and Gary L. Wells published this article in Mar. Where lineup conditions are non-pristine, accuracy of even a high confidence suspect ID is seriously compromised. Pristine line-up procedures include using only one suspect per lineup; the suspect should not stand out in the lineup; a caution should be given that the offender might not be in the lineup; testing should be double-blind; and a confidence statement should be taken at the time of the identification. Full text of the article can be downloaded using the link above. Recent news articles - this page contains links to recent press coverage of local and national cases involving eyewitness identifications and is updated regularly. Brimacombe, Law and Human Behavior, Vol.

Chapter 5 : Eyewitness: Science research photography competition | World news | The Guardian

Editorial Reviews. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, Knopf's Eyewitness series is being flattered to a fare-thee-well these days. These four titles in the new Eye-Openers series, developed by Eyewitness creators Dorling Kindersley, possess similar characteristics--radiant color photography, abundant white space, striking graphics.

After Bloodsworth served nine years in prison, DNA testing proved him to be innocent. Such devastating mistakes by eyewitnesses are not rare, according to a report by the Innocence Project, an organization affiliated with the Benjamin N. Since the s, when DNA testing was first introduced, Innocence Project researchers have reported that 73 percent of the convictions overturned through DNA testing were based on eyewitness testimony. One third of these overturned cases rested on the testimony of two or more mistaken eyewitnesses. How could so many eyewitnesses be wrong? Eyewitness identification typically involves selecting the alleged perpetrator from a police lineup, but it can also be based on police sketches and other methods. Soon after selecting a suspect, eyewitnesses are asked to make a formal statement confirming the ID and to try to recall any other details about events surrounding the crime. At the trial, which may be years later, eyewitnesses usually testify in court. Because individuals with certain psychological disorders, such as antisocial personality disorder and substance dependence, are at high risk for criminal involvement, they are also at heightened risk for false identifications by eyewitnesses. Surveys show that most jurors place heavy weight on eyewitness testimony when deciding whether a suspect is guilty. But although eyewitness reports are sometimes accurate, jurors should not accept them uncritically because of the many factors that can bias such reports. For example, jurors tend to give more weight to the testimony of eyewitnesses who report that they are very sure about their identifications even though most studies indicate that highly confident eyewitnesses are generally only slightly more accurateâ€”and sometimes no more soâ€”than those who are less confident. In addition to educating jurors about the uncertainties surrounding eyewitness testimony, adhering to specific rules for the process of identifying suspects can make that testimony more accurate. Reconstructing Memories The uncritical acceptance of eyewitness accounts may stem from a popular misconception of how memory works. Many people believe that human memory works like a video recorder: On the contrary, psychologists have found that memories are reconstructed rather than played back each time we recall them. The act of remembering, says eminent memory researcher and psychologist Elizabeth F. Many researchers have created false memories in normal individuals; what is more, many of these subjects are certain that the memories are real. In one well-known study, Loftus and her colleague Jacqueline Pickrell gave subjects written accounts of four events, three of which they had actually experienced. The fourth story was fiction; it centered on the subject being lost in a mall or another public place when he or she was between four and six years old. After reading each story, subjects were asked to write down what else they remembered about the incident or to indicate that they did not remember it at all. Remarkably about one third of the subjects reported partially or fully remembering the false event. In two follow-up interviews, 25 percent still claimed that they remembered the untrue story, a figure consistent with the findings of similar studies. Given the dangers of mistaken convictions based on faulty eyewitness estimony, how can we minimize such errors? The Innocence Project has proposed legislation to improve the accuracy of eyewitness IDs. Although only a few cities and states have adopted laws to improve the accuracy of eyewitness identifications, there seems to be a growing interest in doing so. Expert Testimony In addition, allowing experts on eyewitness identification to testify in court could educate juries and perhaps lead to more measured evaluation of the testimony. Yet psychologist Gary Wells of Iowa State University and his colleague Lisa Hasel have amassed considerable evidence showing that the experimental findings do apply to courtroom testimony and that they are often counterintuitive. Science can and should inform judicial processes to improve the accuracy and assessment of eyewitness accounts. We are seeing some small steps in this direction, but our courts still have a long way to go to better ensure that innocent people are not punished because of flaws in this very influential type of evidence. Error-Prone IDs A number of factors can reduce the accuracy of eyewitness identifications. Here are some of them: Extreme witness stress at the crime scene or during the identification process. Presence of

weapons at the crime because they can intensify stress and distract witnesses. Use of a disguise by the perpetrator such as a mask or wig. A racial disparity between the witness and the suspect. Brief viewing times at the lineup or during other identification procedures. A lack of distinctive characteristics of the suspect such as tattoos or extreme height. This story was originally printed with the title "Do the "Eyes" Have It? Issues in Common Knowledge and Generalization. Wells and Lisa E. Hasel in Beyond Common Sense: Psychological Science in the Courtroom. Psychological Science in the Courtroom: Edited by Jennifer L. Douglas and Scott O. Arkowitz is a psychology professor at the University of Arizona, and Lilienfeld is a psychology professor at Emory University.

Chapter 6 : Eye Witness, You Witness | Science project | calendrierdelascience.com

Eyewitness Science DVDs All > Science / Nature > SUPPLEMENTAL SCIENCE RESOURCES > Science DVDs / Videos > Eyewitness Science DVDs > Just like the Eyewitness books from DK, this series of DVDs from the same publisher will grab your attention and hold your interest from beginning to end.

In real life, eyewitness testimony is used help prove whether people are guilty or innocent. In a school setting, this might be a question of who started a fight or who spilled food in a cafeteria. For adults, eyewitnesses can help the police decide who caused a car accident or who robbed a house. If witnesses are involved, then it is important to know how accurate they are. How accurate are witnesses? How much do people remember seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting or feeling right after an event occurs? How much do people remember days after an event takes place? Researchers have studied human memory. They have found that people often remember events incorrectly. For example, people might remember details that did not occur, especially if someone else mentions those details, too. You will design an experiment to help you answer these questions. You will give people an ordinary task to do, like watching a movie. In the middle of this task, you will have an event take place, like a person bringing in popcorn. Without being prompted to try to remember exact details, how much will your witnesses be able to recall? How many details will people recall immediately after an event happens? After two weeks, what will people still recall? Is 20 people an appropriate sample size, in terms of number of subjects? They will provide eyewitness testimony. You will ask the subjects to answer five objective questions and check their answers. You will gather your witnesses again two weeks later, and retest their memory, to see if it has changed. Make a chart to visually demonstrate what percentage of questions people were able to answer correctly. You will use a sample size of twenty people for this experiment. A person whom a researcher is studying as part of an experiment. A person who actually sees or hears some act and can give a firsthand account of it. A statement that a witness makes, often in a court of law. Green is the right answer, and all other answers are wrong. If you ask if the subject liked the color of the shirt, that question is subjective. There is no right or wrong answer, so that is not a good question to use for this experiment. The number of observations that a researcher makes while conducting his or her experiment. In this case, the sample size is the number of people tested. Review the steps of this experiment with your parents, if you will be involving them or using your home. Find twenty classmates to participate in your experiment. These should be people whom you see often, as you will need to conduct two sessions with these people. The second session will take place two weeks after the first session. Since you do not want the subjects to know what the experiment is about, you can keep your invitation vague. Ask them to come over to watch a movie or a TV show as part of your science experiment. You can invite your subjects to come as one group or to come in two sets, depending on the size of the space you have available. Get the necessary supplies, including the popcorn. Decide what movie or TV show you want to play and where you will show it. Arrange for a parent or another friend to help you. This helper will deliver the popcorn while the rest of you are watching the movie. Ideally this person will be someone that the subjects do not know well. You may want to ask a neighbor or a friend from another school. Write a list of questions you will ask your subjects. You will want to ask at least five questions. Then, print enough copies of this questionnaire so that there are two copies for each subject. Here are some examples of questions you might ask. Make sure the questions are objective, so that you can clearly tell the right answers. What time did the person come into the room? What was the person carrying? How tall was the person? Did the person have any tattoos or other distinguishing features? If yes, describe them. You will want to make sure that you review the questions you have picked and both agree on the answers. Agree on what time you want the person to come in to the room, and write down something distinctive that you want the person to say. Here are some examples: I wish I could stay and watch, but I need go to the airport to catch a plane to Chicago. Think about your hypothesis. What results do you think you will get? Will most people be able to answer most questions correctly? Will people remember as much two weeks later as they remembered on the night of the event? On the day of the experiment, pop the popcorn, prepare the drinks assemble your questionnaires and pencils, and get the movie ready to be turned on. Have your helper come early to your

house or wherever you are conducting the experiment. Do not let the subjects see this person in advance. Once all your subjects have arrived, assemble them where you will be watching the movie. Tell your subjects that you will tell them the details of the experiment after the movie. At the agreed upon time, have your helper come into the room with the popcorn. Have the person serve the popcorn, saying whatever you agreed on. Then the helper should leave the room. Wait about ten minutes, or until the end of the scene in the movie you are watching. Then pause the movie and tell your subjects that you have questions for them. You can tell people that this experiment really is about their skills as a witness. Hand out the questionnaires and have people answer the five questions. Once the questions are answered, collect the questionnaires. Now you can enjoy the rest of the movie and the popcorn! Record your data on a form such as the sample table below. Two weeks later, have the subjects fill out the same questionnaire. You will see if they get the same or a different number of the questions right. Next, chart your data. A useful format might be a bar chart, which you can draw by hand, or create in a program like Microsoft Excel. Compare the data from the first questionnaire to the one from two weeks later. What differences do you see? What conclusions can you now draw about eyewitness testimony? If you want to study further, you could try these variations. You could ask multiple-choice questions instead of having your witnesses write in their answers without prompting. You could allow your witnesses to talk together to see if they come up with the right answers. In this case, you would let them talk together about the questions, but still fill out their individual questionnaires, so they could each give their own answers if they disagree with one another. You could plant a friend in the group of subjects. You will instruct this person to deliberately give the wrong answer to a question while the group is discussing what occurred, and see if this friend can convince the others. Change your experiment so that your helper is someone that the subjects know well. Does this alter the experiment? Tell half of your witnesses in advance that they will be asked to describe your helper. See if this improves their power of recall. Do not question your subjects on the day of the experiment. Only question them two weeks later, and see if this changes their percentage of correct answers to the questions. Please answer all of the following questions.

Chapter 7 : Eyewitness Science: Energy-ExLibrary | eBay

Email to friends Share on Facebook - opens in a new window or tab Share on Twitter - opens in a new window or tab Share on Pinterest - opens in a new window or tab.

Chapter 8 : Eyewitness to Science - Google Books

In this science project, you will learn about your subjects' ability to recall details of an calendrierdelascience.com will provide eyewitness calendrierdelascience.com will ask the subjects to answer five objective questions and check their calendrierdelascience.com will gather your witnesses again two weeks later, and retest their memory, to see if it has calendrierdelascience.com a chart to.

Chapter 9 : Eyewitness Science Series by John Gribbin

Marvel at the world around, inside, and beyond you with DK's richly illustrated, remarkably photographed and authoritatively researched science and nature books. Get lost in the wilderness in DK's best-selling Natural History and explore the key concepts of chemistry, biology, physics and more in th.