

Running Head: PERSONALITY AND RECOGNITION

Title: The Relationship between the Big 5 Personality Traits and Eyewitness
Recognition.

Lee J. Curley^{1*}, Dr Rory MacLean¹, Dr Jennifer Murray¹

1. School of Life, Sport, and Social Sciences, Psychology Subject Group, Edinburgh
Napier University, Edinburgh, EH10 4BN.

Word count (exc. figures/tables): 4964.

*Requests for reprints should be addressed to Lee Curley, School of Life, Sport, and
Social Sciences, Psychology Subject Group, Edinburgh Napier University, Sighthill
Campus, Sighthill Court, Edinburgh, EH10 4BN, Scotland, UK (e-mail:
10004435@live.napier.ac.uk).

Abstract

The aim of the current research was to identify which, if any, personality traits are related to recognition in an eyewitness task. A correlational design was used with the co-variables being personality traits and correct (false) recognition. Eighty participants viewed a video clip, which showed a female being robbed. Participants completed a personality inventory. They were then supplied with misinformation, and finally completed a memory recognition task relating to the video clip. Spearman's correlations were run identifying Openness as the only personality trait to be significantly associated with correct recognition scores. No predictor variables were found. The study may have highlighted that recognition is a favourable way to evaluate eyewitness testimony as it is not linked with, some, estimator variables.

The Relationship between the Big 5 Personality Traits and Eyewitness Recognition in a Forensic Setting

This article examines the relationship between personality traits and eyewitness memory in a forensic setting. Specifically, the current research aims to establish whether the personality trait of Neuroticism, and one of its sub-traits (anxiety), have a positive relationship with false recognition when participants have been exposed to misinformation (i.e. false information; Loftus, 1992). In addition, this study examines the relationship that personality traits have with recognition, rather than recall. The majority of research to date has focused upon recall rather than recognition (Porter, Birt, Yuille, & Lehman, 2002); and it is evident from previous literature that there is a difference between recall (the conscious remembering of information without the presence of stimuli) and recognition (identification of a stimuli from previous events) (Horselenberg, Merckelbach, Breukelen, & Wessel, 2004).

Recognition is a more automatic process while recall is thought to be a more conscious process (Hasselmo & Wyble, 1997; Holliday, Reyna, & Hayes, 2002; Jacoby, 1991; MacLean, 2013). However, the main distinction between recognition and recall is that recognition is centred on the judgment of a present object, person or event and whether the stimulus has been shown before. Whereas, when recall is occurring when volunteers depend solely on their memory when asked to recall objects, people or events (Yonelinas, Aly, Wang, & Koen, 2010). This suggests that there may be a gap in the current literature, as the relationship that recognition has with personality may be different from that found between recall and personality.

There are two main reasons as to why recognition will be studied in this research over recall. One reason to study recognition over the traditional recall is because of the different cognitive processes and brain areas associated with the two (Newell, & Dunn, 2008). For instance, when the symptoms of scopolamine – a memory impairment drug (Azizi-Malekabadi et al., 2012; Strachan, 2012) - are simulated in the hippocampus then recall and not recognition is affected (Hasselmo & Wyble, 1997). Interestingly, the posterior hippocampus is associated with neuroticism also (DeYoung et al., 2010). This may insinuate that recognition has less of a relationship with personality traits, such as neuroticism, as the inhibition of the hippocampus would affect someone's recall and their level of neuroticism but would not affect their recognition. A second, and final, reason to study recognition is because much of an **eyewitness** job relates to recognition. For example, line-ups and some facial composite software is based up on recognition. Therefore, research is needed to establish how personality traits have differing relationships with recognition, rather, than recall in a forensic setting. Furthermore, the current study hopes to establish the relationships that personality traits have with recognition in a forensic design in an attempt to rectify the gaps in the literature.

The importance of investigating and understanding which factors may influence or be related to eyewitness recognition is also paramount. Unreliable eyewitness testimony may cause innocent individuals to be convicted for a crime they did not commit or, conversely, may lead to the release of a guilty party putting the general public in danger. Indeed, it has been proposed that poor eyewitness testimony is a major cause of wrongful convictions (Areh & Umek, 2004; Wells, 1978). Therefore, it seems logical for psychologists to try and identify which stable and which changeable variables that may be able to predict how

correct an **eyewitness** testimony is. One such set of (relatively) stable potential predictor variables is personality.

For instance, in one study (Hyman & Billings, 1998) participants were told correct and false stories from their childhood and were asked to recall the information they remembered surrounding these stories in subsequent interviews. The results highlighted that talkative individuals (i.e., extraverts; Goldberg, 1990) may be more vulnerable to misleading information as they produced the most false memories. Therefore, it could be argued that talkative individuals produce more false information because they are more confident in their acceptance of a memory than quiet individuals (Heinström, 2003). While this research indicates that there may be a difference in talkative and quiet individuals, this is a simplistic way to measure stable personality traits in relation to false memories and misinformation. More recent research has moved on to measure clearly defined personality traits using standardised, reliable and valid personality measures (e.g., Areh & Umek, 2004).

As previous literature on memory and misinformation indicates the possibility of personality traits having some relationship with an **eyewitness** memory (McDougall & Pfeifer, 2012), careful consideration of whether personality can be used to predict correct and false eyewitness memories is required. One of the most widely used trait approaches to personality in relation to eyewitness memory is the Big 5 approach (MacRae & Costa, 1997; Revelle & Loftus, 1992; Schaie, Willis & Caskie, 2004). A trait approach proposes that every individual has traits that combine to create the personality/character of an individual (Goldberg, 1990). All the traits are on a continuum, from low to high, which is

perfect for forensic/legal research as it may allow a relationship to be shown between the Big 5 traits and accuracy.

The five personality traits that exist in this approach are: Extraversion (sociability), Neuroticism (emotional stability), Conscientiousness (relates to preparation), Openness (associated with having an open mind) and Agreeableness (connects to empathy) (Barrick & Mount, 1991). The Big 5 approach has been supported by confirmatory factor analysis and lexical analysis (Goldberg, 1990). Additionally, twin studies have shown that the Big 5 approach may also be supported by a genetic element (Jang, Livesley, & Vernon, 1996). Thus, the Big 5 approach, which was found from research that highlighted that five factors of personality existed in the human lexicon (Chaplin, John, & Goldberg, 1988, Goldberg, 1990), may be universal (Heine, & Buchtel, 2009) and externally valid.

Past research has indicated that some personality traits may have a significant relationship with memory (Wells & Olson, 2003). For example, personality traits such as Neuroticism (Wells & Olson, 2003), and Openness (Rasmussen & Berntsen, 2010), have a positive relationship with various aspects of memory. Additionally, Neuroticism, Extraversion and psychoticism (a trait relating to antisocial behaviour) may be related to eyewitness testimony (Areh, & Umek, 2004; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1967/2006). Areh and Umek (2004) found that 26% of the variance in the accuracy of eyewitness testimony was related to these personality traits. It would therefore appear that there is a relationship between personality traits and memory.

In addition, reconstructed memories (Deffenbacher, Bornstein, McGorty, & Penrod, 2008) may be associated with an individual's personality (Porter et al., 2000). Specifically,

personality traits may help an individual to reconstruct memories (Porter et al., 2000). Therefore, some personality traits may aid memories (Arana, Meilan, Perez, 2008; Areh & Umek, 2004), whereas others may hinder them (Porter et al., 2000). Each of the Big 5 personality traits (Extraversion, Openness, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism) will now be discussed in regards to their relationship with correct/false eyewitness memories.

Porter et al. (2000) suggested that Extraversion is related to individuals producing partial false memories, and it is thought that this may be due to extraverts having increased confidence in their abilities and hence may be more inclined to express memories that they have imagined (Heinström, 2003). However, it has also been suggested that individuals who are high on Extraversion may give correct eyewitness testimony (Areh & Umek, 2004), and that Extraversion may not affect recall at all (McDougall & Pfeifer, 2012). It is clear, therefore, that the relationship between Extraversion and eyewitness memory is not well understood at present.

Openness may be positively related to certain aspects of autobiographical memory (i.e. personal history/memories; Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000; Eysenck & Keane, 2010), suggesting a correlation between eyewitness memory and Openness (Rasmussen & Berntsen, 2010). Additionally, it has been found that a sub-trait of Openness, (i.e. values), has a positive relationship with false memories in the presence of misinformation (Liebman et al, 2002; Zhu et al, 2010). Likewise, open individuals in interviews have a high vulnerability to false memory production (Porter et al., 2000). This may be because open individuals are more willing to examine alternative information after a memory has formed (Goldberg, 1990), which may cause this alternative information to reconstruct their

memory (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hemmer & Steyvers, 2009; Lakshmanan & Krishnan, 2009).

Conscientiousness has been shown to be positively related to prospective memory (remembering to carry out an action) (Arana et al., 2008). In addition, high conscientious scores have no relationship with false memories (Porter et al., 2000). In contrast, Agreeableness has been shown to have some relationship with memory. Two sub-traits of agreeableness, altruism and modesty, are significantly related to false memories in the presence of misinformation (Zhu et al., 2010). Moreover, previous research may demonstrate that Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Openness are related to recognition.

Neuroticism's relationship with eyewitness memory is more complex. Research suggests that the traits may not be affected by the number of words recalled (McDougall & Pfeifer, 2012), yet individuals high in Neuroticism have more memory lapses than non-neurotic individuals (Flehmig, Steinborn, Langner, & Westhoff, 2007). Further, some psychologists have even proposed that individuals high in Neuroticism are the most accurate eyewitnesses when making identifications (Shapiro & Penrod, 1986; Wells & Olson, 2003). These differences in previous findings may be explained by a sub-trait of Neuroticism: anxiety (Studer-luethi, Bauer & Perrig, 2012). The increased anxiety and arousal of some neurotic individuals may create false memories, related to the attentional control theory (Studer-luethi et al., 2012). This theory suggests that the central executive, which is the control system of working memory is vulnerable to anxiety and high physiological arousal, such as increases in adrenaline (Flehmig et al., 2007; Studer-luethi et al., 2012). Consequently, this proposes that all individual's memories relating to

witnessing a crime may be affected because of the state anxiety of watching a crime take place (Kennedy Schwab, Morris, & Beldia, 2001).

It is clear that the relationship between personality traits and eyewitness memory is not fully understood at present, and that the majority of the literature has focused on recall rather than recognition. The current research using a personality inventory, a recognition test and a misinformation sheet in conjunction with a video clip aims to investigate whether personality traits (and the sub-trait of anxiety) are related to, and can predict, eyewitness memory performance. Further, the current research is novel, and it would be interesting to see if the personality trait relationships with recognition, in the current study, differ from previous research, which has focussed more on recall. It is hypothesised:

H₁: Neuroticism will be negatively related to correct eyewitness memory.

H₂: Anxiety and Neuroticism will be positively related to false memories.

H₃: Conscientiousness will not be significantly related to correct or false recognition.

H₄: Neuroticism will be a predictor of false eyewitness memory.

H₅: Extraversion will have a significant relationship with both correct and false recognition.

H₆: Openness will have a significant association with false and correct recognition.

H₇: Agreeableness will have a significant link with both false and correct recognition.

Methodology

Design

A correlational design was used, with the co-variables being: the personality traits derived from the Big 5 model (MacRae & Costa, 1997) and selected from the International

Personality Item Pool (2013), e.g. Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and the sub-trait of Neuroticism, Anxiety; and measures of accuracy in an eyewitness memory task, i.e., correct (correct) and false (false) recognition scores. Additionally, two multiple regressions were conducted. In these multiple regressions the personality traits were run as predictor variables, and the recognition scores (both true and false) were conducted as criterion variables.

Participants

Eighty participants (40 males, 40 females; aged 18-25 years), who were a mixture of students and non-students, were recruited using opportunity sampling. They were recruited using social media, and from psychology classes. All participants were aged between 18-25 years to reduce the impact of age related differences acting as a potential extraneous variable in the eyewitness memory task (Karpel et al., 2001).

Materials

All participants received an information sheet and consent form prior to participation and a debrief sheet at the conclusion of the study.

Video clip.

A video clip was filmed by the researchers, which showed a staged assault and theft of a female undergraduate student (age 20; who was small and had dark hair) by two males of the similar ages (one aged 21 and the other aged 20). The video lasted 14 seconds. The clip showed two males approaching the female and asking for, and then forcibly taking her mobile phone from her. The video clip was filmed using an iPod, which allowed the participants to both hear and see the staged crime. Further, the iPod was used in order to

show the video clip to the participants as it increased the ecological validity of this research. This is because individuals may view crimes, such as “happy slapping”, on instruments such as an iPods and iPhones, and then have to provide eyewitness testimony. Additionally, it must be mentioned that the participants held the iPod in a landscape fashion, whilst viewing the crime, and that the screen of the iPod was 4 inches.

Personality inventory.

The personality inventory was derived from the International Personality Item Pool (2013). Six scales were used in the personality inventory: five of the scales related to each of the Big 5 personality traits (i.e., Agreeableness, Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion; MacRae & Costa, 1997); one additional scale was selected to measure Trait Anxiety, a subscale of Neuroticism. The personality inventory included 42 questions (i.e. seven questions for each of the scales), such as “I am the life of the party”. Participant responses on the personality inventory were rated on a 5-point Likert scale. This allowed each of the scales to be measured *as a composite score ranging from 7 – 35*. In each of the traits, the greater the score you receive from the inventory the higher you are in that particular trait.

Likewise, a Cronbach’s alpha was conducted, which highlighted that the personality traits of Extraversion ($\alpha = .72$), Neuroticism ($\alpha = .78$), and Agreeableness ($\alpha = .74$) all had acceptable alpha scores (George & Mallery, 2003). The other traits being measured had alpha levels below .70, (Conscientiousness, $\alpha = .66$, Openness, $\alpha = .61$), but were above .60. These values are in accordance with Goerge and Mallery’s (2003) and together demonstrate acceptable internal consistency. Furthermore, the personality inventory did not have poor internal consistency.

Misinformation sheet.

A misinformation sheet was used to create confabulations following the video clip. This misinformation sheet provided statements to participants, such as “The victim’s purse was taken”, which was false as her mobile phone was taken. Participants were told that the information on the misinformation sheet was correct and was a summary of the main events in the video clip. Overall 20 pieces of misinformation were supplied to participants.

Distractor task.

A maths puzzle (i.e., Zenos paradox; Prime, 2014) was used as a distractor task. In this task the participants were asked to predict when a faster greyhound (speed of 20 miles per hour, mph) will catch up with a slower rabbit (15mph) when the rabbit has had a head start of 10 miles.

Recognition test

A forced choice recognition test was used, containing 20 questions in a binary answer system, which would highlight whether the participant falsely or correctly recognised what happened in the video clip. For example, “Does the Mugger [a local colloquialism for ‘robber’] ask for the victim’s phone or her purse?”; if participants answered ‘phone’, their recognition was correct, whereas if they answered ‘purse’ their recognition was false and based on the misinformation. The recognition task was design to be an inventory. The participants were allowed to take as much time on the recognition test as they desired.

Procedure

Participants were told that the research was to establish if there was a link between personality traits and eyewitness characteristics. The participants were told the true procedure of the study. However, the participants were told that the misinformation sheet was a summary of what happened in the video and that the recognition test was an inventory relating to eyewitness testimony. Nevertheless, the participants were tested individually in a dedicated laboratory room. Following informed consent, participants were shown the video clip. They then completed the personality inventory. Following this, they read the misinformation sheet and were informed that the information on the sheet was correct. After this, participants performed the distractor task to create a gap between the experimental tasks and the recognition task, to align the study somewhat to be more akin to the delay experienced in a real life eyewitness situation. The delay was not standardised and related to the participants solving the Zeno's paradox or giving up. Finally, participants completed the recognition test. Afterwards, each participant was fully debriefed about the true aims of the study.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

As shown in Table 1, the mean, median, and standard deviation scores for the personality traits and sub-trait are relatively consistent, with only Agreeableness appearing higher than the other traits and sub-trait with a mean and median of 28.15 and 28, respectively. Higher correct recognition scores are present when compared to false recognition scores, with the range of scores being approximately equal across these two measures. Parametric testing (for the regression) was conducted as scale data was created by combing questions together.

Similarly, there was not enough outliers in the data set to affect the distributions. This is because the maximum number of outliers was for the personality trait of Openness ($N = 3$). The only other personality trait to have outliers was agreeableness ($N = 2$). This should not affect the data as 80 participants completed the questionnaires. Additionally, three extreme scores were present for correct and incorrect recognition. These extreme scores were participants 15, 60 and 63 for both variables. Therefore, because the data was non-parametric (had outliers and extreme scores) Spearman's correlation was conducted.

Table 1 about here

Inferential Statistics

Correlations

A Spearman's correlation was run with the eight co-variables to test the seven hypotheses as ordinal data was collected for the personality inventory. The findings, which show two tailed p-values, are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 about here

Only Openness was significantly related to correct recognition (positive relationship; $r_s(80) = 0.289, p=0.009, r^2 = 0.0835$ weak effect size) and false recognition (negative relationship; $r_s(80) = -0.304, p=0.006, r^2 = 0.092$ weak effect size). No other significant relationships were found between eyewitness testimony and personality traits. Trait Anxiety was significantly positively related to Neuroticism ($r_s(80) = 0.550, p < 0.01, r^2 = 0.303$ moderate effect size), but was not related to the eyewitness testimony measures.

Multiple Regression

A multiple regression was used to identify whether or not certain personality traits/sub-traits could predict whether participants would correctly recognise or falsely recognise information from the video clip. This was ran despite extreme scores being presented as it was unlikely that three extreme scores out of a sample of 80 would affect the results in relation to the forecasting ability of personality traits. A simultaneous regression method was used to see if the personality traits could predict false recognition. See Tables 3 and 4 for more details. A non-significant regression equation was found ($F(5, 79) = .715$; $P = .614$) with the following results $R^2 = .046$ and $R = .215$. for the predictability of false recognition from the personality traits. This shows that there is not a strong correlation between predicted and actual scores, and that only 4.6% of false recognition can be predicted by personality traits/sub-traits.

To double check that the outliers and extreme scores were not having an impact, the regression was re-conducted without the outliers. A non-significant regression equation was found ($F(5, 71) = 1.367$; $P = .248$), which presented the following results $R = .306$ and $R^2 = .094$ for the predictability of false recognition from the personality traits. This shows that the outliers and extreme scores did not have an impact on the significance of the regression. However, it did inflate the variance from 4.6% to 9.4%.

Tables 3 and 4 about here

Similarly, a multiple regression testing the extent to which personality traits could predict correct recognition presented the following results: $R = .225$ and $R^2 = .051$ (5.1% of

variance). Similarly to the previous regression, the regression equation was found to be non-significant ($F(5, 79) = .789; P = .561$).

Once again the multiple regression was repeated without the outliers and extreme scores. A non-significant regression equation was found ($F(5, 71) = 1.180; P = .329$) with the following results $R = .286$ and $R^2 = .082$ for the predictability of correct recognition from the personality traits. This shows that the outliers and extreme scores did not have an impact on the significance of the regression. Nevertheless, it did increase the variance of the model from 5.1% to 8.2%.

Tables 5 and 6 about here

Discussion

Seven hypotheses were tested, investigating the relationship between personality traits and eyewitness recognition:

- H₁: Neuroticism will be negatively related to correct eyewitness memory.
- H₂: Anxiety and Neuroticism will be positively related to false memories.
- H₃: Conscientiousness will not be significantly related to correct or false recognition.
- H₄: Neuroticism will be a predictor of false eyewitness memory.
- H₅: Extraversion will have a significant relationship with both correct and false recognition.
- H₆: Openness will have a significant association with false and correct recognition.
- H₇: Agreeableness will have a significant link with both false and correct recognition.

In sum, only two of the hypotheses were upheld: H₃ – Conscientiousness would not be related to either correct or false recognition, as would be expected from previous literature; and H₆ – Openness would be associated with correct and false recognition. This latter finding indicated that Openness had a positive relationship with correct recognition, and a negative relationship with false recognition. These relationships had a weak effect size, however, suggesting that these relationships can only be seen when investigated within the specific experimental context (Walker, 2008), and must thus be interpreted with some caution. Nevertheless, this finding was in contrast to that found in previous research (e.g., Porter et al., 2000). Previous research proposed that Open individuals were vulnerable to false memory implantation (Porter et al., 2000), whereas the current findings would suggest that the more Open an individual is, the more likely they will recognise correct information about a crime, and the less likely they will be to falsely recognise information in relation to a crime.

The reason for this contrast may be attributable to the relatively low sample size used in Porter et al. 's (2000) research. Porter et al. 's (2000) research used only 50 participants, with three of the participants not adequately completing the personality measure, potentially indicating an issue with reliability related to the study's measurement of personality. The current research's findings indicate, in contrast to those of Porter et al. (2000), that individuals high in Openness may have more correct recognition than those who are low on Openness, and this may be because open individuals are more critical of misinformation as they process information in a more analytical way (Duff, Boyle, Dunleavy, & Ferguson, 2004). However, as the effect size in the current research was weak and the regression model was not found to be a significant predictor of false or correct recognition, further research is required, with adequate measurement and appropriate statistical analyses for the sample size and data type collected.

The remaining five hypotheses were not supported. In regard to H₁, Neuroticism did not relate to eyewitness recognition. While there has been some supporting research for the relationship between correct recall and Neuroticism, as discussed previously, other research indicates that no relationship exists between Neuroticism and false memories/recognition (Christiaansen, Ochalek, & Sweeney, 1984; Horselenberg et al., 2004; McDougall & Pfeifer, 2012). Thus, the current finding is not wholly unexpected and the function of the relationship between eyewitness accuracy and Neuroticism may lie in the different tasks associated with recall and recognition. Similarly, the lack of support for the remaining hypotheses may be, at least partially, a result of the current research pursuing recognition rather than recall as the outcome measure of interest.

The current study investigated recognition, whereas the majority of previous studies focussed on recall (Butler & Pallone, 2002; Holliday et al., 2002; Horselenberg et al., 2004; Hyman & Billings, 1998; MacLean, 2013; Porter et al., 2000; Tulving et al., 1994). Therefore, the differences surrounding recognition and recall may be based on different cognitive processes (Newell, & Dunn, 2008). For example, it has been suggested that recognition is unconscious, whereas recall is conscious and demands more cognitive effort (Holliday et al., 2002; Jacoby, 1991). Consequently, it is evident that what may have been being measured in the current research was the unconscious recognition of information in the video clip and the misinformation sheet, compared to previous research where the conscious recollection of previously shown materials was the target variable (Holliday et al., 2002). Furthermore, the lack of significance in the current study is interesting, and it may hint that the relationship that personality traits have with recall is different from the relationship that they have recognition.

Additionally, it could be argued that personality may affect recall more. Recall is more effortful so it may need to use other areas of the brain that are associated with personality, such as the posterior hippocampus which is an area of the brain related to Neuroticism (DeYoung et al, 2010) and the encoding of memory (Azizi-Malekabadi et al, 2012), in order to recall a reconstructed memory. This is evident by the fact that when the effects of scopolamine (Azizi-Malekabadi et al., 2012; Strachan, 2012) are replicated in the hippocampus, encoding is affected, which has a detrimental effect on recall but not recognition (Hasselmo & Wyble, 1997). Therefore, it could be argued that recognition may not be as influenced as much as recall by estimator variables such as personality traits. Furthermore, the differences found in this study compared with previous research are therefore likely to be based on the use of a recognition test in the current research, compared with previous research using recall tasks.

This has implications for both research and for practice. Researchers ought to carefully consider what their key outcome or target variable of interest is, and/or which cognitive process(es) they are interested in, prior to collecting data. Clearly both recall and recognition are involved in eyewitness testimony, and having a clear understanding of both is important. That is, when giving evidence to police or asked to give a witness statement within the courtroom, recall will be used; but when presented with an item of evidence, the accused or even a written or spoken version of the events, recognition will be used. Additionally, this difference in whether police focus on recognition or recall may affect how the eyewitness is questioned. For instance, a question that is focussed on recall may be “tell us everything you remember about an incident?” Whereas, recognition questions may be “Do you recognise the suspect from the line-up?” Plus, this research would seem to suggest that (apart from

openness) personality traits are less likely to link with correct and false recognition (in comparison to recall), which may hint that personality has less of a biasing effect on recognition (in contrast to recall), and the police may want to utilise this. This may also mean that recognition is affected less by estimator variables (in comparison to recall), which the police should consider. In short, future research is needed which focuses on how useful recognition may be in police investigations.

One limitation of this study, however, is that the ecological validity of this research may be poor because the research was conducted at a university, rather than in a police station with eyewitnesses who have witnessed a criminal act. Future research may wish to employ a procedure similar to police investigation to counter this. For instance, staging a criminal act live to eyewitnesses (i.e. participants) and then getting participants to be interviewed by an actor playing a detective. This may increase the ecological validity of the experiment and cause the stimuli and processes that occur in the experiment to be more in align with a real life **eyewitness** experience.

Additionally, future research may focus on finding out how personality traits have a different effect on recall and recognition. This could be employed by using a matched samples design. Consequently, participants could be given a personality test and matched into four groups (which will be stated after premise for research is stated) based on similarities in the personality trait of Openness. The personality trait of Openness should be focused on specifically as Openness in this study had a positive relationship with correct recognition, whereas previous research has suggested that open individuals are vulnerable to false memories (Porter et al., 2000). Then the participants could be shown the same crime. However, one half of the participants could be given a recognition test and the second half

of the participants could be given a recall test. The design of this study thus creates four groups: one group high in Openness that is shown a recognition test, a second group that is high in Openness that is given a recall test, a third group low in Openness given a recall test and a fourth group that is low in Openness that is given a recognition test. This would then show how the personality trait of Openness may effect recognition and recall differently.

In summary, only Openness was found to correlate with false and correct eyewitness recognition, with the findings indicating that people high in Openness were highly correct and produced less false recognition scores than those low in Openness. No other personality trait measured was related to false or correct eyewitness recognition, in contrast to past research findings which focused on recall. Thus, the estimator variables (personality traits) cannot be used to significantly predict how correct an eyewitness will be. In addition, the findings may be used, when considered in light of past research, to highlight the importance of investigating not only recall, but also recognition, in the context of personality traits in relation to eyewitness accuracy. This research has been relatively novel, and will hopefully provoke future similar studies to increase the knowledge that psychologists have about estimator variables in relation to recall versus recognition in eyewitness memory. Plus, the study may have highlighted that recognition is a favourable way to evaluate eyewitness testimony as it is not linked with, some, estimator variables, which may mean that recognition would allow institutional systems (both legal and forensic) to have more control with eyewitness testimony in comparison to when recall is used.

References

- Arana, J., Meilan, J., & Perez, E. (2008). The effects of personality variables in the prediction of the execution of different memory tasks in the laboratory. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 49*, 403-411. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2008.00671.x
- Areh, G., & Umek, P. (2004). Personality Characteristics and Validity of Eyewitness Testimony. In M. Gorazd., P. Milan., & B. Bojan (Eds.), *Policing in Central and Eastern Europe: Dilemmas of Contemporary Criminal Justice* (pp.1-6). Slovenia: Faculty of Criminal Justice.
- Azizi-Malekabadi, H., Hosseini, M., Soukhtanloo, M., Sadeghian, R., Fereidoni, M., & Khodabandehloo, F. (2012). Different effects of scopolamine on learning, memory, and nitric oxide metabolite levels in hippocampal tissues of ovariectomized and Shamoperated rats. *Arquivos de neuro-psiquiatria, 70* (6), 447-452. doi: 10.1590/S0004282X2012000600012
- Barrick, M., & Mount, M. (1991). The Big five personality dimensions and job performance- a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44* (1), 3-5. doi: 10.1111/j.17446570.1991.tb00688.x
- Butler, M., & Pallone, N. (2002). Accuracy of Recall among “Eyewitnesses” to a Stimulated Robbery: Intrapersonal and Stimulus Determinants. *Current Psychology, 21* (3), 253-364. doi: 10.1007/s12144-002-1017-8

- Chaplin, W. F., John, O. P., & Goldberg, L. R. (1988). Conceptions of states and traits: dimensional attributes with ideals as prototypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(4), 541-557. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.54.4.541](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.4.541)
- Christiaansen, R., Ochalek, K., & Sweeney, J. (1984). Individual Differences in Eyewitness Memory and Confidence Judgements. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 110, 47-52. doi: 10.1080/00221309.1984.9709946
- Deffenbacher, K. A., Bornstein, B. H., McGorty, E. K., & Penrod, S. D. (2008). Forgetting the once- seen face: Estimating the strength of an eyewitness' memory representation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 14 (2), 139-150. doi:10.1037/1076898X.14.2.139
- DeYoung, C., Hirsh, J., Shane, M., Papademetris, X., Rajeevan, N., & Gray, R. (2010). Testing Predictions from Personality Neuroscience: Brain Structure and the Big Five. *Psychol Sci*, 21 (6), 820-828. doi: 10.1177/0956797610370159
- Duff, A., Boyle, E., Dunleavy, K., & Ferguson, J. (2004). The relationship between personality, approach to learning and academic performance. *Personality and individual differences*, 36 (8), 1907-1920. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2003.08.020
- Eysenck, H. J. & Eysenck, S. (2006). *The biological basis of personality*. New Jersey, NJ: Transaction publishers. (Originally published 1967).

Flehmig, H. C., Steinborn, M., Langner, R., & Westhoff, K. (2007). Neuroticism and the mental noise hypothesis: Relationships to lapses of attention and slips of action in everyday life.

Psychology Science, 49 (4), 343-360. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.89.1.107

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Goldberg, L. (1990). An alternative "Description of Personality": The Big-Five factor structure.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59 (6), 1216-1229. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216)

Hasselmo, M. E., & Wyble, B. P. (1997). Free recall and recognition in a network model of the hippocampus: simulating effects of scopolamine on human memory function. *Behavioural brain research*, 89 (1), 1-34. doi: [10.1016/S0166-4328\(97\)00048-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4328(97)00048-X)

Heine, S. J., & Buchtel, E. E. (2009). Personality: The universal and the culturally specific.

Annual review of psychology, 60 (3), 369-394. doi:

10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163655

Heinström, J. (2003). Five personality dimensions and their influence on information behaviour.

Information Research, 9 (1), 1-24. Retrieved from:

<http://informationr.net/ir/91/paper165.html>

Hemmer, P., & Steyvers, M. (2009). A Bayesian account of reconstructive memory. *Topics in*

Cognitive Science, 1 (1), 189-202. doi: 10.1111/j.1756-8765.2008.01010.x

- Holliday, R. E., Reyna, V. F., & Hayes, B. K. (2002). Memory processes underlying misinformation effects in child witnesses. *Developmental Review, 22* (1), 37-77. doi: 10.1006/drev.2001.0534
- Horselenberg, R., Merckelbach, H., Breukelen, G., & Wessel, I. (2004). Individual differences in the accuracy of autobiographical memories. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 11* (3), 168-176. doi: 10.1002/cpp.400
- Hyman, I., & Billings, J. (1998). Individual differences and the creation of childhood false memories. *Memory, 6* (1), 1-20. doi: [10.1080/741941598](https://doi.org/10.1080/741941598)
- Jacoby, L. L. (1991). A process dissociation framework: Separating automatic from intentional uses of memory. *Journal of memory and language, 30* (5), 513-541. doi: [10.1016/0749-596X\(91\)90025-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(91)90025-F)
- Jang, K. L., Livesley, W. J., & Vemon, P. A. (1996). Heritability of the Big five personality dimensions and their facets: a twin study. *Journal of personality, 64* (3), 577-592. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1996.tb00522.x
- Kennedy, B. L., Schwab, J. J., Morris, R. L., & Beldia, G. (2001). Assessment of state and trait anxiety in subjects with anxiety and depressive disorders. *Psychiatric Quarterly, 72* (3), 263-276. doi: 10.1023/A:1010305200087

Lakshmanan, A., & Krishnan, H. S. (2009). How does imagery in interactive consumption lead to false memory? A reconstructive memory perspective. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 19* (3), 451-462. doi: [10.1016/j.jcps.2009.04.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2009.04.005)

Liebman, J. I., McKinley-Pace, M. J., Leonard, A. M., Sheesley, L. A., Gallant, C. L., Renkey, M. E., & Lehman, E. B. (2002). Cognitive and psychosocial correlates of adults' eyewitness accuracy and suggestibility. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*(1), 49-66. doi: [10.1016/S0191-8869\(01\)00135-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00135-0)

Loftus, E. F. (1992). When a lie becomes memory's truth: Memory distortion after exposure to misinformation. *Current directions in psychological science, 1* (4), 121-123. doi: 10.1111/1467-8721.ep10769035

MacLean, R. (2013). *Episodic/Semantic Memory, PSY09112, Cognitive Neuroscience*. Napier University, school of life sport and social sciences, Sighthill campus, (06/03/13).

McDougall, S., & Pfeifer, G. (2012). Personality differences in mental imagery and the effects on verbal memory. *The British Psychological Society, 103* (10), 556-573. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8295.2011.02094

Newell, B. R., & Dunn, J. C. (2008). Dimensions in data: Testing psychological models using state-trace analysis. *Trends in cognitive sciences, 12* (8), 285-290. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2008.04.009

Porter, S., Birt, A., Yuille, J., & Lehman, D. (2000). Negotiating False Memories: Interviewer and rememberer characteristics relate to memory distortion. *American Psychological Society*, 11 (6), 507-510. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.00297

Prime (2014). Zeno's Paradox of the Tortoise and Achilles. *Prime*. Retrieved, April 1st, 2013, from: <http://platonirealms.com/encyclopedia/Zenos-Paradox-of-the-Tortoise-andAchilles>.

Rasmussen, A., & Berntsen, D. (2010). Personality traits and autobiographical memory: Openness is positively related to the experience and usage of recollections. *Memory*, 18 (17), 774-786. doi: 10.1080/09658211.2010.514270

Revelle, W., & Loftus, D. (1992). The Implications of Arousal Effects for the Study of Effect and Memory. In S. Christianson (Ed.), *The Handbook of Emotion and Memory: Research and Theory* (pp. 113-151). New Jersey, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schaie, W., Willis, S., Caskie, G. (2004). The Seattle Longitudinal study: Relationship between Personality and Cognition. *Ageing, Neuropsychology and Cognition*, 11 (2-3), 304-324. doi: 10.1080/13825580490511134

Shapiro, N., & Penrod, S. (1986). Meta-analysis of facial identification studies. *Psychological bulletin*, 100 (2), 139-156.

Strachan, Y. (2012). Is Scopolamine the World's Scariest Drug? *Digital Journal*. Retrieved, the 12th of March, 2014, from: <http://digitaljournal.com/article/324779>.

Studer-Luethi, B., Bauer, C., & Perrig, W. (2012). Neuroticism affects working memory and training performance in regularly developed school children. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, 3 (1), 640-647. doi: 10.3758/s13421-015-0548-9

Tulving, E., Kapur, S., Craik, F. I., Moscovitch, M., & Houle, S. (1994). Hemispheric encoding/retrieval asymmetry in episodic memory: positron emission tomography findings. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 91 (6), 2016-2020. doi: 10.1073/pnas.91.6.2016

Walker, I. (2008). Null Hypothesis Testing and Effect Sizes. *Statistics for Psychology: Making Sense of our World through Analysis*. Retrieved, March 9th, 2014, from: <http://staff.bath.ac.uk/pssiw/stats2/page2/page14/page14.html>.

Wells, G. (1978). Applied Eyewitness-Testimony Research: System Variables and Estimator Variables. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 12, 1546-1557. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.36.12.1546

Wells, G., & Olson, E. (2003). Eyewitness Testimony. *Annual review Psychology*, 54, 277-295. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.14502

Yonelinas, A. P., Aly, M., Wang, W. C., & Koen, J. D. (2010). Recollection and familiarity: Examining controversial assumptions and new directions. *Hippocampus*, 20(11), 1178-1194. doi: 10.1002/hipo.20864

Zhu, B., Chen, C., Loftus, E., Lin, C., He, Q., Chen, C., Li, H., Moyzis, R., Lessard, J., & Dong, Q. (2010). Individual differences in false memory from misinformation: Personality characteristics and their interactions with cognitive abilities. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28* (3), 889-894. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.02.016

Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for the co-variables: Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Trait Anxiety, False Recognition and Correct Recognition.

Variables	Mean	Median	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Range
Personality Traits						
Extraversion	21.36	22.00	4.31	11.00	32.00	21.00
Openness	24.98	25.00	3.43	15.00	34.00	19.00
Agreeableness	28.15	28.00	3.67	18.00	35.00	17.00
Conscientiousness	23.49	23.00	4.37	16.00	32.00	16.00
Neuroticism	20.45	21.00	4.95	9.00	30.00	21.00
Sub-Trait						
Anxiety	20.59	21.00	5.00	5.00	35.00	30.00
Recognition Scores						
False recognition	5.19	5.00	2.51	1.00	16.00	15.00
Correct recognition	14.73	15.00	2.55	4.00	19.00	15.00

Table 2.

Table 2: Spearman's correlation coefficients for personality traits/sub-traits and recognition scores

	Correct Recognition	False Recognition
Personality Traits		
Extraversion	-.016	.009
Openness	.289*	-.304*
Agreeableness	.178	-.172
Conscientiousness	.042	-.030
Neuroticism	.027	-.054
Sub-Trait		
Anxiety	.065	-.055

*significant at $p < 0.05$

Table 3.

Table 3: Multiple Regression findings across false recognition.

	b	Beta	p
Extraversion	.038	.066	.622
Openness	-.146	-.199	.110
Agreeableness	-.041	-.061	.620
Conscientiousness	.015	.026	.843
Neuroticism	.019	.038	.747

Table 4.

Table 4: Multiple Regression findings across false recognition when outliers were removed.

	b	Beta	p
Extraversion	.031	.080	.555
Openness	-.145	-.246	.048
Agreeableness	-.047	-.090	.466
Conscientiousness	.026	.066	.622
Neuroticism	-.034	-.099	.422

Table 5.

Table 5: Multiple Regression findings across correct recognition.

	b	Beta	p
Extraversion	-.043	.074	.579
Openness	.157	.213	.087
Agreeableness	.034	.049	.686
Conscientiousness	-.012	-.021	.869
Neuroticism	-.027	-.053	.656

Table 6.

Table 6: Multiple Regression findings across correct recognition when outliers were removed.

	b	Beta	p
Extraversion	-.033	-.086	.532
Openness	.138	.236	.059
Agreeableness	.047	.092	.463
Conscientiousness	-.022	-.057	.675
Neuroticism	.024	.070	.569