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Age-Related Expectations of Child Witness Credibility

Age-related expectations of credibility were examined in a child witness study. The within-subjects factors were witness age (4, 8, 12, 16, 20 years) and type of credibility rating (honesty vs. cognitive ability). The between-subjects factors were type of assault (physical vs. sexual), role of witness (victim vs. bystander), and participant gender. Men (n = 31) and women (n = 61) from a first-year psychology course read vignettes describing a crime (adapted from Nightingale, 1993) and rated the witness' cognitive ability and honesty at each age (adapted from Ross, Lindsay, & Marsil, 1996). The results indicated that the witness was perceived to be more honest and more cognitively able as she aged. Similarly, defendant guilt ratings rose as the witness aged. Women gave higher cognitive ability and honesty ratings than did men. Suggestions for future research on witness credibility and the implications for the judicial system are discussed.

It is quite common in North American courtrooms to see a child testifying about his or her memory for a crime. The appearance of children in the courts has raised some concerns about the abilities of child witnesses. Are children able to accurately remember past events? Are child witnesses perceived as honest witnesses? Studies of jurors’ perceptions of child witnesses are important because children may be the only witnesses to crimes, and thus their testimony can be decisive in the judicial process. All jurors are adults, and they will hold preconceptions, perhaps even misconceptions about children and their abilities as witnesses.

Children’s Cognitive Abilities and Honesty

Ross, Dunning, Toglia and Ceci (1990) noted that witness credibility is based on two important factors: expertise and trustworthiness. In this paper we will refer to these factors as “cognitive ability” and “honesty”. A child’s cognitive ability may be judged by perceptions of his/her memory in general, understanding of events, consistency in testimony, intelligence, competency in answering questions in court, and suggestibility (Ross, Lindsay & Marsil, 1996). Recent studies have suggested that mock jurors feel that children are not as cognitively competent as adult witnesses, but that this ability grows with age (e.g., Goodman et al., 1998).

For example, Leippe, Romanczyk, and Manion (1992) videotaped testimony from children and adults who described their experiences with a male confederate who administered a bogus “skin sensitivity” test. The videotaped testimony was presented to university students.
who assessed the witnesses’ credibility. The results indicated that participants felt that adults had better memories for the events and were better judges of their own memory capabilities than children. These findings are congruent with research in the area of child memory, which suggests that children’s memories are less accurate when compared with adults (e.g., Quas & Schaal, 2002). Children are also more prone to confuse the sources of their memories (e.g., Lindsay, Johnson, & Kwon, 1991) and are more susceptible to misinformation (e.g., Crossman, Scullin, & Melnyk, 2004).

Ross et al. (1990) identified honesty as the second important component of witness credibility. In contrast to beliefs of cognitive ability, jurors generally tend to believe that young children are honest but that honesty declines with age (Leippe & Romanczyk, 1989; Nightingale, 1993). This decline in honesty is particularly evident in cases of sexual assault. Bottoms and Goodman (1994) found that younger witnesses were rated as more credible than older witnesses in their study involving a mock sexual abuse trial. The authors suggested that a belief in children’s sexual naiveté probably influenced juror perceptions. Jurors may have believed that children are incapable of fabricating instances of sexual abuse (Nightingale, 1993).

Guilt Ratings

Some studies have found that witness age can negatively affect guilt ratings; the likelihood of guilty votes often decreases with age (e.g., Gabora, Spanos & Joab, 1993; Nightingale, 1993). In contrast, other studies have found that guilt ratings increase with witness age (e.g., Goodman, Golding, Hegelson, Haith, & Michelli, 1987; Leippe & Romanczyk, 1989; Ross et al., 1990). Nightingale (1993) suggested that the conflicting results in the literature may be explained by differences in experimental design between studies (e.g., whether the child was a victim or bystander, the age of the witness, and the nature of the case).

Age-Related Expectations of Witness Credibility

Although there appears to be some consensus in the literature on issues such as witness honesty and cognitive abilities, the age-credibility relationship remains unclear. Some studies have found that as age increases, the credibility of the witness also increases (Goodman et al., 1987; Leippe et al., 1992; Nightingale, 1993). For example, in the Leippe et al. (1992) study discussed above, participants rated accurate and inaccurate videotaped reports (for adults and children). Adults were rated as more believable and accurate (i.e., more credible) than children even when both made equally accurate statements.

In contrast, other studies have found that as age increases, credibility in fact decreases or no clear relationship is found (Bottoms & Goodman, 1994; Gabora et al., 1993; Ross et al., 1990). Ross et al. (1990) found that, contrary to previous research, an 8-year-old was rated as more credible than a 21-year-old. They explained their finding in terms of the role of stereotypes. They concluded that jurors may have a stereotype of child witnesses as unreliable and inaccurate. However, seeing and hearing the videotaped testimony of a child can disconfirm such negative stereotypes (Ross et al., 1990). Overall, the child witness research demonstrates that the age-credibility relationship is complex.

Type of Assault

What factors in addition to the age of the witness can affect juror perceptions of witness credibility? Perry and Wrightsman (1991) stated that the nature of the crime can affect whether honesty or cognitive ability is more important in assessing children’s credibility. Whether the child is involved in a sexual or physical assault can affect how jurors assess the credibility of the witness (Bottoms & Goodman, 1994; Golding, Sego, Sanchez, & Haseman, 1995; Goodman, et al., 1998; Nightingale, 1993). For example, Duggan (1987, as cited in Isquith, Levine, & Scheiner, 1993) investigated perceptions of child witnesses in a mock sexual abuse trial. The
victim was a 5-, 9-, or 13-year-old female. The results indicated that the 9-year-old was deemed most credible, the 13-year-old the least credible, and the 5-year-old in-between the two. Duggan (1987, as cited in Isquith et al., 1993) suggested that the older child was judged as somewhat responsible for the abuse, and so was seen as less credible.

What about non-sexual crimes? Bottoms (1993) noted that child witness credibility decreased in situations in which credibility rested on being able to understand and recount the events accurately. An example of such a crime would be witnessing a physical assault where remembering how the events unfolded is of importance. Thus, the nature of the crime can affect whether the child’s honesty (e.g., sexual assault) or cognitive ability (e.g., physical assault) is most salient to the jurors.

Role of Witness

Another factor that may affect juror perceptions of witness credibility is the role the witness played in the crime. The witness could be a bystander to, or a victim of, a crime. In the sexual assault case mentioned above, the child-as-victim would likely be seen as honest when compared with older witnesses (Ross et al., 1990). However, the child-as-bystander would likely be seen as less cognitive able when compared with older witnesses (Bottoms, 1993). In this case, the accuracy of the child’s statement, not the child’s truthfulness, is of most importance (Goodman & Bottoms, 1993).

Juror Gender

Characteristics of the jurors can affect their perceptions of child witnesses. Some studies have found significant main effects of juror gender. Women have been found to: rate child victims as credible more than men (Bottoms & Goodman, 1994); rate the believability of child witnesses higher than men (Golding, Sanchez, & Sego, 1997; Golding et al., 1995); and vote guilty more often than men in sexual assault cases (Gabora et al., 1993). Bottoms (1993) suggested that women may be more offended than men by child sexual assault, are more pro-victim, and perhaps less skeptical of children’s abilities.

Overview of the Current Study

The present study was conducted not to resolve the age-credibility controversy, but rather to measure individuals’ age-related expectations of witness abilities. This study examined university students’ stereotypes of witnesses of varying ages. In order to examine these stereotypes directly, participants were asked to consider one witness as being of different ages. Without entering the courtroom and seeing an actual witness, do individuals have preconceptions of a witness’ cognitive abilities and honesty? What patterns or changes in a witness’ abilities do individuals expect to see as the child ages?

Whereas previous studies have manipulated age between-subjects, in the present experiment a mixed design was employed in which witness age was a within-subjects factor (4, 8, 12, 16, and 20 years). There were three between-subjects factors: type of assault (sexual or physical), type of witness (victim or bystander), and gender of participant (male vs. female). The dependent variables were ratings on 7-point Likert scales of perceived cognitive ability and honesty of witnesses at all ages specified above. Another dependent measure was the verdict decision (guilt ratings on a 7-point scale) across witness age. In the final dependent measure, participants were asked how certain they would have to be about the guilt or innocence of the defendant in order to vote guilty.

It was hypothesized that, overall, perceptions of cognitive ability would increase with age. Older witnesses would be rated as more cognitively able than younger witnesses, particularly in the physical assault and witness conditions where cognitive ability would be of great importance. It was hypothesized that younger witnesses would be rated as more honest than older witnesses across conditions, particularly in the sexual assault and victim conditions where honesty would be of most importance. It was also hypothesized that women would rate the
witness as more believable than would men, particularly in sexual assault cases. Finally, it was hypothesized that guilt ratings would increase as witness age increased.

Method

Participants

Ninety-six participants from a first-year psychology course at a medium-sized Canadian university participated for course credit (31 men, 61 women, 4 did not disclose their gender). The mean age of the participants was 20.80 years (SD = 4.49), ranging from 18 to 39 years.

Between-Subjects Variables

A mixed-design was employed, where the three between-subjects factors under study were type of assault, role of witness, and participant gender. Participants individually read a vignette describing an assault that was adapted from Nightingale (1993). The witness described in the vignette was always female. There were four versions of the vignette (2 type of assault x 2 role of witness). Two described a sexual assault (of the child vs. her mother). The other two described a physical assault (of the child or her mother). Twenty-four participants were randomly placed in the type of assault (physical or sexual) and role of witness (victim or bystander) conditions. Please see Appendix A for an example of one of the vignettes. The vignettes differed only in the choice of words describing the type of assault and whether the witness was a victim or a bystander.

Dependent Measures

Participants were instructed to read the vignette and fill out the questionnaire individually. They were asked to rate their agreement on 7-point scales (1 = strong disagreement, 7 = strong agreement) for 13 credibility statements (9 cognitive ability items and 4 honesty items, adapted from Ross et al., 1996) for 13 credibility statements (9 cognitive ability items and 4 honesty items, adapted from Ross et al., 1996) for the witness at five age levels (4, 8, 12, 16, and 20 years). Thus, for every credibility statement (e.g., “Elizabeth Sharpe’s suggestibility at age 4, 8, 12, 16, and 20 years of age. The cognitive ability and honesty items were randomly ordered in the questionnaire.

The nine cognitive ability items were averaged for each witness age. Thus, there were five scaled cognitive ability measures, one at each witness age (e.g., “cognitive ability age 4”). The four honesty items were also averaged for each witness age, resulting in five scaled honesty measures (e.g., “honesty age 8”). Thus there were two within-subjects variables: witness age (4, 8, 12, 16, and 20 years) and type of rating (cognitive ability vs. honesty). All cognitive ability and honesty results reported below involved these ten scaled measures.

After completing the credibility ratings, participants then decided on the defendant’s guilt (“guilt” rating) on a 7-point scale for every witness age. Finally, participants rated how sufficient their belief in the guilt of the defendant would have to be in order for them to actually vote guilty (“sufficient belief” rating). For a complete list of the dependent measures, please see Appendix B. After completion of the questionnaire, participants were thanked for their participation and were thoroughly debriefed.

Results

Cognitive Ability and Honesty Ratings

A mixed-design 2 (type of crime — physical vs. sexual) x 2 (role of witness — victim vs. bystander) x 2 (participant gender — male vs. female) x 2 (type of rating — cognitive ability vs. honesty) x 5 (witness age — 4, 8, 12, 16, 20 years) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on the scaled cognitive ability and honesty variables, with type of rating and witness age as the within-subjects factors (all other variables were between-subjects factors).

Witness Age

The within-subjects tests revealed a significant main effect of witness age, \( F(4, 320) = 144.47, p < .01, \eta^2 = .644. \) Follow-up paired-samples t-tests were performed on cognitive
ability and honesty ratings at each age, for a total of 10 t-tests. The post-hoc analyses revealed that for the cognitive ability items, all five age conditions differed significantly from each other (all \( p's < .01 \)). As the witness aged, cognitive ability ratings significantly increased (Means = 3.52, 4.01, 4.87, 5.50, and 5.72 for ages 4, 8, 12, 16, and 20, respectively, see Figure 1). Similarly, for honesty items, all five age conditions differed significantly from each other (all \( p's < .01 \)). As the witness aged, honesty ratings significantly increased (Means = 3.75, 3.92, 4.19, 4.60, and 4.88, for ages 4, 8, 12, 16, and 20, respectively, see Figure 1).

How did honesty and cognitive ability ratings compare across witness age? Follow-up t-tests compared cognitive ability and honesty ratings at each age (see Table 1 for means and t-values). Honesty items were higher than cognitive ability items at age 4, there were no differences in ratings at age 8, and cognitive ability ratings were higher than honesty ratings at ages 12, 16, and 20. Thus at age 4, honesty ratings were higher, but by age 12, cognitive ability ratings surpassed honesty ratings and remained significantly higher through ages 16 and 20.

**Type of Rating**

There was a significant within-subjects main effect of type of rating, \( F(1, 80) = 50.80, p < .01, \eta^2 = .388 \). Overall, cognitive ability ratings (\( M = 4.72 \)) were higher than honesty ratings (\( M = 4.27 \)). There was a significant within-subjects interaction of type of rating and participant gender, \( F(1, 80) = 5.31, p < .05, \eta^2 = .062 \). Women gave higher cognitive ability (\( M = 4.89, 4.55 \) for women and men respectively) and honesty (\( M = 4.58, 3.96 \) for women and men respectively) ratings than men (see Figure 2). There was a significant within-subjects interaction of type of rating and witness age, \( F(4, 320) = 40.93, p < .01, \eta^2 = .338 \). That is, as the witness aged, cognitive ability and honesty ratings increased (see follow-up t-tests for witness age above). All other within-subjects interactions were non-significant, (all \( p's > .05 \)).

**Witness Role, Type of Assault, and Participant Gender**

Between-subjects tests revealed a significant main effect of participant gender, \( F(1, 80) = 11.77, p < .01, \eta^2 = .128 \). Collapsing across honesty and cognitive ability ratings, women (\( M = 4.74 \)) gave higher ratings than did men (\( M = 4.26 \)). There were no significant main effects of type of assault and witness role and there were no significant between-subjects interactions (all \( p's > .05 \)).

**Guilt Ratings**

A 2 (role of witness) x 2 (type of assault) x 2 (participant gender) x 5 (witness age) mixed-design ANOVA was run on guilt ratings, with witness age as the sole within-subjects factor. There was a significant within-subjects main effect of witness age, \( F(4, 332) = 20.55, p < .01, \eta^2 = .198 \). There was also a significant linear trend for witness age, \( F(1, 83) = 24.80, p < .01, \eta^2 = .230 \), indicating that as witness age increased, guilt ratings also increased. Thus participants were more confident in the defendant’s guilt as the witness aged.

There was a significant within-subjects interaction of witness age, participant gender and type of assault, \( F(4, 332) = 3.19, p < .05, \eta^2 = .037 \). Two follow-up ANOVAs (witness age x participant gender) were performed on guilt ratings, one for each type of assault. In the physical assault condition, women (\( M = 5.76 \)) gave higher guilt ratings than men (\( M = 4.88 \)) for the 20-year old witness, \( F(1, 43) = 5.67, p < .05 \). In the sexual assault condition, women (\( M = 4.50 \)) gave higher guilt ratings than men (\( M = 4.30 \)) when the witness was 4 years old, \( F(1, 45) = 4.23, p < .05 \), and when the witness was 8 years old, \( F(1, 45) = 8.20, p < .01 \) (\( M = 4.88 \) and 3.47 for women and men, respectively, see Figure 3).

There was a significant between-subjects main effect of participant gender, \( F(1, 83) = 5.47, p < .05, \eta^2 = .062 \). Women (\( M = 4.90 \)) gave
higher guilt ratings than did men ($M = 4.32$). All other within- and between-subjects interactions were not significant, (all $p's > .05$).

**Sufficient Belief in Defendant Guilt**

A final 2 (type of assault) x 2 (role of witness) x 2 (participant gender) between-subjects ANOVA was run on sufficient belief guilt ratings. Note that witness age was not varied in this dependent measure. There were no significant main effects of type of assault, role of witness or participant gender, nor were there any significant interactions (all $p's > .05$). Sufficient belief ratings ranged from 2 to 7, with a grand mean of 5.56.

**Discussion**

The results of this study suggest that a positive relationship exists between witness age and credibility. The prediction that cognitive ability would increase with age was supported by the results. Jurors believed that a substantial jump in the witness’ cognitive abilities was made as the witness aged. In addition, an increase in perceived cognitive ability was still seen from 16 to 20 years of age, suggesting that cognitive development was perceived to continue even in late adolescence. The positive relationship between witness age and cognitive ability is consistent with prior studies (Goodman et al., 1998) and suggests that jurors are aware of the cognitive capabilities of children in comparison to adults.

The prediction that honesty would decrease with age was not supported, and in fact the reverse effect was found. Participants felt that witness honesty *increased* with age. This finding runs counter to previous studies which have suggested that younger witnesses are perceived to be more honest than older witnesses (e.g., Nightingale, 1993). Why was this reversal seen in the present study? It may be that the methods used across studies were quite different. Thinking of an individual child’s honesty at only one specific age (e.g., Nightingale, 1993) may be quite different from thinking about the honesty of one witness at different ages (present study).

Still another possibility may lie in perceptions of “honesty”. Participants in the present study perceived the witnesses to be more cognitively capable than honest. A close examination of Figure 1 shows that there is a steep increase in cognitive ability ratings as witness age increases (mean range was 3.52-5.72). This suggests that jurors may be sensitive to the major cognitive changes a child undergoes. The honesty ratings also increased with age, but the change appeared to be less dramatic (mean range was 3.75-4.88). One could interpret this as evidence of participants’ belief that honesty does not change much as a person ages; one is either an honest person in general, or one is not.

It appears that, of the two measures of credibility, cognitive ability was most strongly affected by witness age. Participants seemed to have clearer conceptions of children’s cognitive development than their moral development. The differential ratings for honesty and cognitive ability can also lend support to Ross et al.’s (1990) two-factor model of credibility. Credibility appears to be multidimensional as a witness’ cognitive ability and honesty are not perceived to be the same, nor are they perceived to develop in the same way over time.

The prediction that age would interact with type of assault so that older witnesses would be perceived as more cognitively able (especially in the physical assault condition) and that younger witnesses would be perceived as more honest (especially in the sexual assault condition) was not supported by the results. This finding runs in contrast to previous research. Children are assumed to be sexually naive, and as a result, perceptions of children’s honesty tend to be positive because it is believed that children do not possess sexual knowledge and so could not fabricate a story of sexual assault (Nightingale, 1993). However, in the present study, the child witness was viewed as less capable of understanding and recounting the events in question and was viewed as less honest than an older witness, regardless of type of assault.

Why were perceptions of credibility not influenced by the type of crime? It may be that participants simply did not use type of crime as a
cue to determining witness credibility because they felt that credibility was not mediated in any way by type of crime. Jurors are aware of the cognitive abilities and honesty of children, but they may feel that the type of crime plays no role in deciding witness credibility.

The prediction that younger witnesses would be perceived as more honest when they were victim (vs. bystander) to a sexual assault also was not supported. Whether the witness was the victim of or bystander to a crime did not affect perceptions of the witness’ cognitive ability and honesty. This finding is in contrast to previous research, which suggested that witness role can be important because it can help determine whether cognitive ability or honesty is a crucial determinant of witness credibility (e.g., Goodman & Bottoms, 1993). As was the case with the influence of type of assault on perceptions of credibility, it may be that participants did not use the role of the witness as a cue when assessing credibility.

The hypothesis that women would find witnesses to be more believable than men was supported by the results. This finding is consistent with previous research suggesting that women may be more pro-victim than men (Bottoms, 1993). However, one cannot be certain that this gender difference is solely due to greater empathy on the part of women. The witness presented in the present study was always female. Women may be exhibiting a same-sex bias where they may be more sympathetic to the victim, because, like the participant, she is a female (Bottoms, Davis, & Epstein, 2004). Women may find it easier than men to see themselves in the witness’ position. It would be interesting to note if this gender difference would occur if the witness was male. Would men identify more with a male witness, and would their subsequent credibility ratings rise to the level of women’s ratings? Alternatively, it is possible that men could view a male victim in a more negative manner because of the stigma surrounding victims of sexual assault; some victims may be seen as somehow responsible for their abuse (Romano & De Luca, 2001).

The prediction that guilt ratings would increase with age was supported. This finding is consistent with the literature (e.g., Goodman et al., 1987). Older witnesses were rated as more cognitively able and honest than younger witnesses, so it is not surprising that they were also given higher guilt ratings. It must be noted that a link between witness credibility and guilt ratings was not made clear from this study, but that it is quite possible that such a relationship may exist. A significant gender difference was found in guilt ratings; women were more likely to vote guilty than men. Again, this may be evidence of women’s tendency to sympathize more with the victim. The significant interaction of age, gender and type of assault lends further support for this notion. Women gave higher guilt ratings than men when the witness was 4 and 8 years old; women were thus more punitive when the victim of a sexual assault was a young child.

No significant effect was found for sufficient belief in the guilt of the defendant. It is somewhat reassuring that the type of crime, type of witness, and sex of participant did not affect how sure participants felt they would need to be in order to vote guilty. This finding suggests that guilt ratings, rather than guilty votes (i.e., a dichotomous choice of guilty or not guilty) could be used for future analyses.

The present study was conducted to address a conflict in the literature regarding the age-credibility relationship. Numerous studies have examined this relationship, but because of design differences (such as the stimulus used, the type of assault and age of the witness), studies in the area do not agree on the direction of this relationship, and even if such a relationship actually exists. The results of the present study support earlier studies, like that of Leippe et al. (1992), that suggested that a positive age-credibility relationship exists. In the present study, university students, who did not see a witness testify, believed that younger witnesses were not as cognitively capable or as honest as older witnesses.

A possibility for future studies is the use of a video-stimulus, as opposed to a written
vignette, to make the testimony more realistic. An advantage of using this method is that the stimulus resembles what actually happens in a real courtroom. Jurors are bombarded by a vast amount of information. Jurors are given the difficult task of deciding whether the witness was able to understand what occurred, and whether the witness is honest. The disadvantage of such a study is that the witness’ appearance, manner, interactions with lawyers and her general demeanor can also affect perceptions of the witness.

What are the implications for the judicial system if individuals hold stereotypes of child witnesses as less honest and cognitively capable compared to older witnesses? There may be far-reaching effects. Some child witnesses do not testify in court and instead can be replaced with hearsay witnesses (Ross, Lindsay, & Marsil, 1999). Thus, jurors’ preconceptions of child witnesses may never be challenged. One way in which stereotypes could be overcome is by instructing the jurors that all witnesses, regardless of age, should be evaluated based on their own merit.
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Appendix A

**Vignette**

**Bystander-Sexual Assault Condition**

Elizabeth Sharpe testified in a criminal case against her mother's boyfriend, Donald Kordic. Elizabeth Sharpe stated in her sworn testimony that Donald Kordic had sexually assaulted her mother, Julia Sharpe, in her home on the night of October 5. According to Elizabeth's testimony, on the night in question, Donald Kordic called Julia Sharpe into the kitchen to help him with dinner. While they were in the kitchen, Elizabeth stated that she entered the room and saw Donald Kordic grab her mother and hold her while he masturbated. He also made lewd comments and put his penis in Julia Sharpe's mouth. Donald Kordic testified the alleged events never took place. He stated that his relationship with Julia Sharpe was in trouble and that she had a restraining order issued after claiming an assault had occurred. Donald further testified that Julia owed him money for rent and that the false accusation was a way for Julia to avoid paying him the money she owed. He also stated that Julia coached Elizabeth about her testimony.
## Appendix B

### List of Dependent Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cognitive Ability Questions
1. At the time Elizabeth Sharpe claimed Donald Kordic committed the abuse, she knew what this sort of assault was.
2. Elizabeth Sharpe’s testimony would be consistent if she testified more than once.
3. Elizabeth Sharpe misinterpreted the behavior of Donald Kordic as an assault.
4. Compared with someone her own age, Elizabeth Sharpe is intelligent.
5. Elizabeth Sharpe’s memory for things other than assault would be accurate, such as the preparation of dinner.
6. Elizabeth Sharpe’s memory was accurate for the specific acts she claimed constituted assault.
7. Elizabeth Sharpe would be able to think, remember and answer questions lawyers ask.
8. Elizabeth Sharpe was suggestible.
9. Elizabeth Sharpe could tell the difference between as assault and other forms of touching behavior.

### Honesty Questions
1. Elizabeth Sharpe was a believable witness.
2. Elizabeth Sharpe would lie if her mother told her to.
3. Elizabeth Sharpe made up the story that her mother’s boyfriend committed the assault.
4. Elizabeth Sharpe’s testimony was the truth.

### Guilt Determination
1. I would vote guilty in this case.

### Sufficient Belief in Guilt
1. When people actually act as jurors, they must vote guilty or not guilty rather than complete a rating on a scale. What number of the scale above do you feel would correspond to a sufficient belief in the guilt of the accused that you would vote guilty?
Figure 1

*Cognitive Ability and Honesty Ratings Across Five Ages*

![Graph showing cognitive ability and honesty ratings across five ages.]

Table 1

*A Comparison of Means on Cognitive Ability and Honesty Items Across Five Ages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Cognitive Ability Means</th>
<th>Honesty Means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-2.72*</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>7.74*</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>9.63*</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>8.56*</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A * indicates a significant effect.
Figure 2

Women's and Men's Cognitive Ability and Honesty Ratings
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Figure 3

The Interaction of Witness Age, Type of Assault and Participant Gender on Guilt Ratings

![Line graph showing guilt ratings for different witness ages and types of assaults for men and women.]
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