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1. What are the hypotheses for study one?

There were several hypotheses, though they only analyzed two of them. First, they predicted that participants would choose a suspect more frequently in the target present condition than when told the suspect may or may not be present or when they were given no information about the suspect being present. Second, they predicted that participants would be more confident in their choice than all other conditions.

1. What is the independent variable(s) for study one? Make sure you tell me how many IVs there are and how many levels there are for each IV

There was one independent variable in study one with three levels: 1). Some participants were given lineup instructions which said the target was present in the lineup. 2). Some participants were given instructions in which the target “might” be present. 3). Some participants were not given any instructions.

1. What is the dependent variable(s) for study one? Note: there are several of these, so focus on the ones the author analyzed.

There were several of these, the three most important of which were 1). A manipulation check in which they were asked to recall the instruction they were given prior to the lineup. 2). Whether the participant actually chose a suspect from the lineup. 3). How confident they there were in their lineup choice.

1. What did they find in study one? Give the general outcome

As predicted, participants who were told the participant was in the lineup were more likely to choose a lineup suspect and were more confident in their choice than participants in the “might” be present or no instruction conditions

1. What are the hypothesis for study two?

Like study one, the authors predicted that participants would both choose and have more confidence in their choice than participants in the target “might” be present condition (This second study lacked the “no instruction” condition). They also predicted that participants would be more willing to choose a suspect and have more confidence in that choice when there were eight lineup members compared to four members. Finally, they predicted that those given target present instructions and an eight person lineup would be most willing to choose and have more confident in their choice than those in all other conditions.

1. What is the independent variable(s) for study two? Make sure you tell me how many IVs there are and how many levels there are for each IV

There were two independent variables in this study. The first one was lineup instructions (target present versus target “might” be present). The second one was the number of participants in the lineup (eight versus four members)

1. What is the dependent variable(s) for study two? Note: there are several of these, so focus on the ones the author analyzed.

Like study one, there were three important dependent variables. 1). A manipulation check in which they were asked to recall the instruction they were given prior to the lineup. 2). Whether the participant actually chose a suspect from the lineup. 3). How confident they there were in their lineup choice.

1. What did they find in study two? Give the general outcome

Like study one, participants in the target present condition chose and were more confident in their choice than participants in the target “might” be present condition, but only when given an eight person lineup. The target present and target “might” be present conditions had similar results for four person lineup conditions.

1. I want you to review the references and spot the reference(s) that is not in APA format and rewrite it for me according to APA rules. Note: there may be as few as zero and as many as ten incorrect references, so make sure to look at them all!

There were two incorrect APA references. They should look like the following:

Brigham, J., Ready, D., & Spier, S. (1990). Standards for evaluating the fairness of photographic lineups. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *11*, 149-163. DOI: 12323-38271

Pezdek. K., Blandon-Gitlin, I., & Moore, C. (2003). Children’s face recognition memory: More evidence for the cross-race effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 760-763. DOI: 38765-DY2972

Abstract

Two studies looked at eyewitness confidence in lineup studies. In study one, 551 undergraduate participants saw a picture of a target “suspect”. They then viewed an eight person lineup that altered the lineup instructions (they were told the target was either present, might be present, or they were not given any information, though in reality the target “suspect” was always missing). The authors predicted that participants would both choose a suspect and be more confident in their choice when told the target was present compared to the other two conditions. Results confirmed this prediction. In study two, 337 participants also received either the target present or might not be present instructions, though they were given a lineup that differed in size (eight versus four members). Like study one, participants in the target present condition chose and were more confident in their choice than participants in the target might be present condition, but only when given an eight person lineup. This implies that telling someone that a person is present in a lineup can lead them to find a suspect, but only if they have a lot of lineup choices.
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