

SAMQUEST-Journal of Emerging Innovations

E-ISSN 3108-1207

Vol.2, Issue 1, pp.99-107, Jan-June 2026

Available online at: <https://www.samglobaluniversity.ac.in/archives/>

---

## Review Article

# The Paradox of Fear: A Comprehensive Review of Emotional Arousal and Eyewitness Accuracy in Criminal Justice

Lakshya Bhardwaj<sup>1</sup>, Vaishali Vardiya<sup>4</sup>, Nitya Pathak<sup>2</sup>, Sneha Yadav<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1&2</sup>, Faculty of Science, Life Science SAM Global University

<sup>3&4</sup> Student, B.Sc. Forensic Science, Faculty of Science, Life Science

SAM Global University, M.P., INDIA

Corresponding author Email : [akshyabhardwaj125@gmail.com](mailto:akshyabhardwaj125@gmail.com)

Received: 26/05/2026; Accepted: 16/06/2026; Published: 22/07/2026

---

## Abstract

**Background:** Eyewitness testimony is a critical component of criminal investigations and trials, yet it is inherently susceptible to error. The experience of fear during a crime is a potent emotional state that fundamentally alters cognitive processes, including attention and memory. This review critically synthesizes the interdisciplinary literature on the impact of fear on eyewitness observation accuracy, focusing on theoretical mechanisms, the weapon focus phenomenon, individual differences, and the implications for forensic practice amidst a changing scientific landscape. This narrative review integrates findings from experimental psychology, cognitive neuroscience, and forensic case analysis over the past six decades. The influence of fear on memory is non-linear, primarily mediated by attentional narrowing as described by the cue-utilization hypothesis. The weapon focus effect (WFE) has been a central paradigm in which a weapon captures attention at the expense of perpetrator details. While historical meta-analyses confirmed significant effect sizes, recent large-scale, preregistered studies with over 1,300 participants have failed to replicate the WFE, suggesting its robustness may be contingent on specific methodological conditions, key moderators such as trait anxiety, professional training, age, and crime type further shape outcomes. Contemporary

scholarship emphasizes that fear does not uniformly impair memory but can enhance central detail retention while degrading peripheral information, a pattern that may vary cross-culturally

Forensic practitioners must integrate evidence-based protocols that account for the complex effects of fear. Recent replication failures call for caution in universally applying findings like the WFE in legal settings without considering boundary conditions. Expert testimony and judicial instructions should reflect the current scientific consensus, including ongoing debates, to prevent miscarriages of justice and ensure that legal decisions are informed by the most accurate available science.

## Keywords:

Eyewitness Memory, Emotional Arousal, Weapon Focus Effect, Forensic Psychology, Investigative Interviewing, Replication Crisis.

## 1. Introduction

The reliance on eyewitness testimony within criminal justice systems is a practice steeped in historical precedent and intuitive logic. Jurors often place significant weight on the account of a witness who claims to have seen a crime unfold, operating under the assumption that human memory functions like a reliable recording device [1]. This perception, however, stands in stark contrast to decades of psychological research demonstrating that memory is a reconstructive process, highly susceptible to distortion from the moment of encoding through to retrieval [2].

The fallibility of such testimony is most tragically illustrated by the work of innocence organizations, which have consistently identified eyewitness misidentification as a contributing factor in approximately 70% of wrongful convictions later overturned by DNA evidence [3].

Crime scenes are, by their nature, environments of high emotional intensity. Victims and bystanders frequently experience acute fear--a complex state involving a cascade of physiological and neurobiological responses designed for survival, not for providing an accurate legal account [4]. The legal system has historically treated fearful witnesses as more credible, implicitly endorsing the belief that emotionally charged events are 'seared' into memory. This paper critically examines the scientific validity of this assumption.

Fear, defined as an acute response to an immediate threat, triggers a neurobiological cascade involving the amygdala and the release of stress hormones like cortisol and adrenaline [5]. While these mechanisms enhance survival-oriented responses, they fundamentally alter cognitive processes. The theoretical framework for understanding these effects is grounded in the distinct stages of memory: encoding (initial perception), consolidation (stabilization), storage (retention), and retrieval (recall). Fear primarily impacts encoding by directing attentional resources, but its effects can propagate through all subsequent stages [6].

The central aim of this review is to provide a critical synthesis of the empirical literature on how fear influences observation accuracy in crime-related contexts. We will explore the theoretical underpinnings of this relationship, critically evaluate key phenomena such as the weapon focus effect in light of recent replication challenges, analyze moderating variables that explain individual differences, and discuss the nuanced contemporary debate on stress and memory. Finally, we will translate these findings into actionable forensic implications for investigative interviewing, identification procedures, and courtroom practice, emphasizing the need for evidence-based protocols that acknowledge both established science and areas of scientific uncertainty.

## **2. Theoretical Foundations: Mechanisms Of Fear And Memory**

### **2.1 Defining the Fear Response in a Forensic Context**

In forensic settings, a precise definition of fear is crucial. It must be distinguished from general stress or anxiety. While anxiety is a future-oriented state of apprehension about a potential threat, fear is an acute, present-oriented response to an identifiable and immediate danger, such as an assailant with a weapon [7]. This distinction is vital because the cognitive effects of acute fear differ from those of chronic anxiety.

Acute fear activates the sympathetic nervous system and the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, leading to the release of catecholamines (adrenaline, noradrenaline) and glucocorticoids (cortisol) [5]. The amygdala, a key structure in emotional processing, evaluates the threat and orchestrates this response, which in turn modulates memory consolidation [8]. This adaptive survival mechanism ensures that information directly related to the threat is prioritized, leading to a selective memory pattern: excellent recall of the threat source (e.g., a weapon) but potentially poor recall of peripheral details (e.g., the perpetrator's face).

### **2.2 The Yerkes-Dodson Law and the Inverted-U Relationship**

The Yerkes-Dodson Law provides a foundational framework for understanding the relationship between arousal and performance. This principle posits an inverted-U relationship: performance improves with moderate arousal but deteriorates under very low or very high arousal [9]. Applied to eyewitness memory, this suggests that a moderate level of fear may focus attention and enhance the encoding of crime-relevant details. However, as fear escalates to the intense levels typical of violent crime, cognitive performance declines. Attentional resources become overwhelmed and captured by the threat, impairing the encoding of complex or peripheral information, including the perpetrator's appearance [10]. This law also interacts with task complexity; more demanding cognitive tasks, such as accurately remembering a stranger's face, are impaired at lower arousal levels than simpler tasks [9].

### **2.3 Easterbrook's Cue-Utilization Hypothesis**

Easterbrook's cue-utilization hypothesis offers a mechanistic explanation for the inverted-U

relationship. It proposes that emotional arousal progressively narrows the range of cues an individual processes from the environment [11]. As arousal increases, attention becomes focused on the central, threat-relevant cues, while peripheral cues are progressively excluded. This attentional narrowing is adaptive when it filters out irrelevant information, but it becomes maladaptive when important information--such as the perpetrator's identifying features--falls outside this narrowed 'attentional beam' [12]. This hypothesis directly explains the core phenomenon of the weapon focus effect, where a weapon, as the central threat, captures attention at the expense of other crucial details.

## 2.4 Fear Across the Stages of Memory

The impact of fear is not uniform across the three stages of memory. During encoding, attentional narrowing, as described by Easterbrook, determines which elements of an event are initially registered [11]. During consolidation, stress hormones like adrenaline and cortisol enhance the stabilization of the memory trace, but this enhancement is selective for the information that was already prioritized during encoding [13]. The storage phase may show differential forgetting curves, with emotionally salient information sometimes being more resistant to decay [14]. Finally, retrieval can be affected by state-dependent memory, where information is more easily recalled when the individual's emotional state matches the state at encoding. This means a witness interviewed in a calm environment may struggle to retrieve details encoded during a state of high fear [15].

## 3. The Weapon Focus Effect: A Paradigm Under Scrutiny

### 3.1 Conceptual Foundations and Early Evidence

The weapon focus effect (WFE) is the most extensively studied phenomenon illustrating fear's impact on eyewitness accuracy. It refers to the finding that the presence of a weapon during a crime impairs a witness's memory for the perpetrator and other peripheral details [16]. Initial studies in the late 1970s and 1980s, often using slide or video simulations, consistently found that participants who saw a crime involving a weapon were less able to identify the perpetrator from a lineup and provided fewer accurate descriptions of their appearance [17]. This effect became a cornerstone of eyewitness research,

recognized as a reliable phenomenon with significant implications for violent crimes.

### 3.2 Meta-Analytic Confirmation

The cumulative evidence for the WFE was quantified through several influential meta-analyses. Steblay's (1992) seminal meta-analysis of 19 tests found a significant, albeit small, effect for lineup identification accuracy and a moderate effect for the accuracy of perpetrator feature descriptions [18]. This established that the WFE was a statistically reliable phenomenon. A subsequent meta-analysis by Fawcett and colleagues (2013) confirmed these findings, reporting significant effect sizes for both identification and feature accuracy. Their moderator analyses also explored factors like threat level and exposure duration, providing a more nuanced understanding of the effect's magnitude [19]. These meta-analyses solidified the WFE as a well-established finding in the scientific community.

### 3.3 Recent Replication Challenges

Despite its historical standing, the robustness of the WFE has recently been challenged by large-scale, preregistered replication attempts. West, Mulligan, and Bornstein (2025) conducted a series of five experiments with over 1,300 participants, systematically attempting to replicate the effect using materials from previous studies [20]. Their results provided weak support for the replicability of the WFE. They did not find a significant effect on target description or lineup identification in any of their experiments; in some cases, they observed anti-WFEs where memory was *better* for armed perpetrators. Their meta-analysis of the data found a non-significant effect of weapon presence on memory outcomes [21].

These findings suggest that the WFE may be less robust than previously assumed, or that it is highly dependent on methodological factors such as presentation modality (video vs. slides), the nature of the sample (student vs. non-student), and the realism of the threat [20]. This replication crisis within the field calls for a cautious re-evaluation of how confidently such findings are applied to the legal system.

### 3.4 Underlying Mechanisms: Threat, Novelty, and Context

Theoretical explanations for the WFE have centered on two main mechanisms: the threat/arousal hypothesis

and the unusual-item hypothesis. The threat/arousal hypothesis, grounded in Easterbrook's theory, posits that weapons capture attention because they signal danger and induce fear [22]. The unusual-item hypothesis suggests that weapons capture attention because they are novel or unexpected in a given context [23]. Research, such as the classic study by Pickel (1999), has shown that both threatening and unusual objects can impair memory, but the impairment is consistently greater for threatening objects [24]. This suggests a dual-mechanism, where the combination of threat and unusualness makes weapons particularly potent at capturing attention.

### 3.5 Cross-Cultural Considerations

Emerging cross-cultural research introduces another layer of complexity. Studies on cultural differences in cognitive style have shown that individuals from Western cultures (e.g., the United States) tend to process scenes analytically, focusing on a central, salient object, while those from Eastern cultures (e.g., East Asia) tend to process scenes more holistically, attending to the relationship between the object and its background [25]. Gutchess and colleagues (2018) found that the emotion-induced memory trade-off (enhanced central object memory at the expense of background memory) was robust in a Western sample but reduced in a Turkish sample [26]. This suggests that the WFE, which is a manifestation of this trade-off, may be less pronounced in individuals from more holistic cultures. This hypothesis awaits direct empirical testing but highlights the importance of considering cultural factors.

### 3.6 Evolution of Expert Consensus

The shifting scientific status of the WFE is reflected in surveys of eyewitness experts. Kassin and colleagues' 1989 survey found that only 57% of experts considered the WFE sufficiently reliable for court testimony [27]. By 2001, this figure had risen to 87%, reflecting the impact of the accumulating meta-analytic evidence [28]. The 2014 National Academy of Sciences report on eyewitness identification further solidified its standing [29]. However, the recent replication failures reported in 2025 [20] suggest that expert consensus may need to be revisited. This evolution from skepticism to confidence and back to cautious scrutiny exemplifies the self-correcting nature of science.

## 4. Moderating Variables: Individual Differences In Fear's Effects

### 4.1 The Role of Trait Anxiety

Not all witnesses are equally affected by fear. Trait anxiety, a stable personality characteristic reflecting a tendency to perceive situations as threatening, moderates the stress-memory relationship. Individuals high in trait anxiety show an attentional bias toward threat, detecting it more rapidly but also having difficulty disengaging attention from it [30]. This can be a double-edged sword in a forensic context. While they may be more likely to notice a weapon, their difficulty disengaging could result in more severe attentional narrowing, further impairing memory for the perpetrator's face [31]. This complex interaction means that high-anxiety witnesses may produce both more accurate threat-related details and more errors on peripheral details, making their overall reliability difficult to predict.

### 4.2 Professional Training and Experience

A key question for the justice system is whether professionals like police officers are immune to fear-induced memory errors. Research suggests that training can mitigate some effects but does not confer immunity. Officers often show better overall memory for crime events compared to civilians, likely due to their training and experience [32]. However, they still demonstrate stress-induced memory impairment, particularly under high-threat conditions. The protective effect of training may stem from automatized observation routines or reduced novelty of weapons, but it does not eliminate the fundamental effects of high arousal on attentional resources [32].

### 4.3 Age and Developmental Factors

Age is another critical moderator. Children are particularly vulnerable to stress during encoding due to their developing attentional control systems, making them more susceptible to the WFE [33]. Their memories are also highly vulnerable to suggestive interviewing techniques [34]. Elderly witnesses face different challenges, including age-related declines in attentional control and working memory capacity, which can increase their susceptibility to stress-induced errors [35]. These developmental differences necessitate specially adapted investigative protocols for both child and elderly witnesses.

#### 4.4 The Nature of the Crime

The specific characteristics of the crime also shape the impact of fear. Crimes involving weapons have been the primary focus of research, but the effect may vary with weapon type (e.g., a firearm vs. a knife), its perceived lethality, and how it is used. Physical assaults, which involve direct bodily contact and pain, may induce a stronger stress response than a simple weapon display, potentially leading to even more severe memory impairments [36]. Conversely, verbal threats may produce a different pattern, as they lack a tangible object to capture attention. Investigators must consider the nature of the crime when evaluating the likely effects on a witness's memory.

### 5. THE CONTEMPORARY STRESS-MEMORY DEBATE

#### 5.1 Moving Beyond the "Stress Impairs Memory" Myth

Recent scholarship has critiqued the oversimplified narrative that "stress impairs memory." Marr and colleagues (2023) argue that this statement is not empirically warranted, as it ignores the multifaceted nature of stress and its differential effects on various types of memory [37]. They emphasize that stress effects are not uniform but depend on the timing of the stressor, the type of information being remembered (central vs. peripheral), and individual differences in stress response. This critique does not deny that stress can impair memory, but rather calls for a more nuanced, evidence-based approach that acknowledges the complexity of the interaction.

#### 5.2 Boundary Conditions for Fear-Enhanced Memory

Under specific conditions, fear can enhance memory. Central details of a threatening event are often exceptionally well-remembered due to the stress-hormone-mediated enhancement of consolidation [13]. Moderate, survivable fear can focus attention productively, potentially leading to better encoding of task-relevant information [10]. Furthermore, information that is directly relevant to survival, such as threatening facial expressions, may receive preferential processing regardless of overall stress levels [8]. These boundary conditions explain why witnesses sometimes provide highly accurate and detailed accounts of a traumatic event.

#### 5.3 Ecological Validity and Methodological Rigor

A persistent challenge in this field is the ecological validity of laboratory studies. Simulated crimes cannot replicate the intense fear of a real-life assault. This limitation raises concerns about whether laboratory findings generalize to the real world. The recent replication failures by West et al. (2025) may, in part, reflect the artificiality of online and laboratory paradigms, where participants do not experience genuine threat [20]. Field studies using real-world witness accounts provide valuable but methodologically challenging complementary evidence, often lacking a definitive "ground truth" for what actually occurred [38]. The divergence between laboratory findings and real-world complexity underscores the need for continued research across diverse methodologies.

#### 5.4 Neurobiological Mechanisms

A deeper understanding of the neurobiological mechanisms provides crucial context. The stress response involves two primary systems: the sympathetic-adrenal-medullary (SAM) system, which releases catecholamines, and the HPA axis, which releases glucocorticoids. Catecholamines enhance memory consolidation for emotionally arousing events by activating the amygdala [13]. Glucocorticoids have a slower, more prolonged effect, influencing consolidation over hours and interacting with sleep [5]. The interaction between these systems helps explain the non-linear relationship: moderate stress may enhance consolidation via catecholamines without the impairing effects of high cortisol, while extreme stress can disrupt hippocampal function and impair memory [39].

### 6. Forensic Implications And Evidence-Based Practice

#### 6.1 Investigative Interviewing Protocols

Knowledge of fear's effects must inform investigative interviewing. The Cognitive Interview (CI), developed by Fisher and Geiselman, is a leading evidence-based protocol that incorporates techniques to aid recall without contamination [40]. Interviewers must recognize that fearful witnesses may provide accurate central details but poor peripheral descriptions. Applying pressure to elicit missing details can induce confabulation. Given the recent replication challenges,



interviewers should avoid assuming that the presence of a weapon inevitably led to poor memory. Instead, a case-specific assessment of the witness's emotional state and attentional focus during the event is essential. The timing of the interview is also critical; while immediate interviews minimize forgetting, interviewing a witness in a highly aroused state may impair retrieval due to state-dependent effects [15].

## 6.2 Reforming Eyewitness Identification Procedures

The American Psychology-Law Society's consensus recommendations (2020) provide a gold standard for conducting identification procedures [41]. These are particularly relevant for fearful witnesses. Double-blind administration prevents the administrator from inadvertently cueing the witness. Pre-lineup instructions that explicitly state the perpetrator "may or may not be present" reduce the pressure to choose, a pressure that fearful witnesses may be especially susceptible to. Collecting an immediate confidence statement, before any feedback, is crucial as witness confidence is highly malleable. Video-recording the entire procedure creates a permanent record for judicial review.

## 6.3 Expert Testimony in Court

Forensic psychologists can serve as expert witnesses to educate juries on the effects of fear on memory. The admissibility of such testimony is generally governed by standards of reliability and relevance [42]. Given the recent replication failures, expert testimony must present a balanced view, acknowledging the historical support for phenomena like the WFE while also addressing the methodological boundary conditions and recent challenges to its replicability [20]. Experts should refrain from opining on the accuracy of a specific witness, instead providing general principles that jurors can apply to the evidence. The evolving nature of the science must be communicated transparently.

## 6.4 Jury Instructions

Enhanced jury instructions can help prevent the overvaluation of potentially inaccurate eyewitness testimony. Following the National Academy of Sciences report, some jurisdictions, like New Jersey, have adopted instructions that inform jurors about factors affecting accuracy, such as the effects of stress and the presence of a weapon [29]. Effective

instructions should explain that fear can create a memory trade-off, where accurate memory for one detail (e.g., a weapon) does not guarantee accurate memory for another (e.g., a face). They should also address the malleability of confidence. The goal is to promote informed, critical evaluation of eyewitness evidence, neither overvaluing nor dismissing it outright.

## 7. Conclusion

The relationship between fear and eyewitness accuracy is profoundly complex. It is not a simple linear relationship but a dynamic interaction between neurobiological responses, attentional mechanisms, and individual differences. The well-documented weapon focus effect has served as a central paradigm for decades, illustrating how threat captures attention. However, recent large-scale replication failures [20] have injected a note of caution, suggesting that this effect may be less robust or more context-dependent than previously believed.

The theoretical foundations laid by the Yerkes-Dodson Law and Easterbrook's cue-utilization hypothesis remain vital for understanding the cognitive mechanisms at play. Yet, they must be applied with an appreciation for moderating variables such as trait anxiety, age, professional training, and the nature of the crime. The contemporary scientific debate emphasizes that fear can both enhance and impair memory, rejecting the overly simplistic "stress impairs memory" narrative [37].

For the justice system, the implications are clear. Forensic practices must be grounded in the most current and rigorous science. Investigative interviewing should be guided by evidence-based protocols like the Cognitive Interview. Identification procedures must adhere to consensus recommendations to minimize suggestibility [41]. Expert testimony and jury instructions must reflect the full complexity of the science, including its uncertainties, to ensure juries are equipped to weigh evidence fairly.

The scientific community bears a responsibility to continue refining our understanding through rigorous, well-powered, and ecologically valid research, embracing the self-correcting nature of science. The ultimate goal is to prevent miscarriages of justice by ensuring that the criminal justice system's reliance on

eyewitness testimony is informed by the most accurate possible understanding of how fear shapes human memory. The stakes are immense, and the pursuit of this understanding is an ongoing imperative.

## DECLARATIONS

**Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate**  
Not applicable. This article is a narrative review of published literature and does not involve any new studies with human or animal participants conducted by the authors.

**Consent for Publication**  
Not applicable. The manuscript does not contain any person's data in any form.

**Availability of Data and Materials**  
Not applicable. This review is based entirely on previously published studies and publicly available sources cited in the reference list. No new data were generated or analyzed for this work.

**Competing Interests**  
The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**Funding**  
This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Authors' Contributions**  
Both authors contributed equally to the conceptualization, literature review, analysis, and writing of the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final version.

**Acknowledgements**  
The authors thank the institutional support provided by SAM Global University, M.P., India, for facilitating this research.

## References

1. Wells GL, Olson EA. Eyewitness testimony. *Annu Rev Psychol.* 2003;54:277-95.
2. Loftus EF. *Eyewitness Testimony.* Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1979.
3. Innocence Project. *The causes of wrongful conviction.* New York: Innocence Project; 2023.
4. American Psychological Association. *APA Dictionary of Psychology.* Washington (DC): APA; 2020.
5. Joëls M, Baram TZ. The neuro-symphony of stress. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2009;10(6):459-66.
6. Schacter DL. The seven sins of memory: insights from psychology and cognitive neuroscience. *Am Psychol.* 1999;54(3):182-203.
7. Eysenck MW, Derakshan N, Santos R, Calvo MG. Anxiety and cognitive performance: attentional control theory. *Emotion.* 2007;7(2):336-53.
8. Roozendaal B, McEwen BS, Chattarji S. Stress, memory and the amygdala. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2009;10(6):423-33.
9. Yerkes RM, Dodson JD. The relation of strength of stimulus to rapidity of habit-formation. *J Comp Neurol Psychol.* 1908;18:459-82.
10. Deffenbacher KA, Bornstein BH, Penrod SD, McGorty EK. A meta-analytic review of the effects of high stress on eyewitness memory. *Law Hum Behav.* 2004;28(6):687-706.
11. Easterbrook JA. The effect of emotion on cue utilization and the organization of behavior. *Psychol Rev.* 1959;66(3):183-201.
12. Wells GL, Loftus EF. Eyewitness memory for people and events. In: Weiner IB, Hess AK, editors. *The Handbook of Forensic Psychology.* New York: Wiley; 2013. p. 617-46.
13. Cahill L, Gorski L, Le K. Enhanced human memory consolidation with post-learning stress: interaction with the degree of arousal at encoding. *Learn Mem.* 2003;10(4):270-4.
14. Rubin DC, Kozin M. Vivid memories. *Cognition.* 1984;16(1):81-95.
15. Eich E. Mood and memory. In: Kahana MJ, Wagner AD, editors. *The Oxford Handbook of Human Memory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2020.

16. Loftus EF, Loftus GR, Messo J. Some facts about "weapon focus". *Law Hum Behav.* 1987;11(1):55-62.
17. Maass A, Köhnken G. Eyewitness identification: simulating the "weapon effect". *Law Hum Behav.* 1989;13(4):397-408.
18. Steblay NM. A meta-analytic review of the weapon focus effect. *Law Hum Behav.* 1992;16(4):413-24.
19. Fawcett JM, Russell EJ, Peace KA, Christie J. Of guns and geese: a meta-analytic review of the 'weapon focus' literature. *Psychol Crime Law.* 2013;19(1):35-66.
20. West JT, Mulligan NW, Bornstein BH. Four (and a half) preregistered failures to replicate the weapon focus effect in online samples. *Psychol Public Policy Law.* 2025;31(1):1-18.
21. West JT, Mulligan NW, Bornstein BH. Four (and a half) preregistered failures to replicate the weapon focus effect in online samples [Internet]. *Psychol Public Policy Law.* 2025 [cited 2026 Mar 30]. Available from: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12610937/>
22. Hope L, Wright D. The role of attention in the weapon focus effect. In: Lindsay RCL, Ross DF, Read JD, Toglia MP, editors. *The Handbook of Eyewitness Psychology.* Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum; 2007.
23. Mitchell KJ, Livosky M, Mather M. The weapon focus effect revisited: the role of novelty. *Psychol Crime Law.* 1998;4(1):1-20.
24. Pickel KL. The influence of context on the "weapon focus" effect. *Law Hum Behav.* 1999;23(3):299-311.
25. Nisbett RE, Masuda T. Culture and point of view. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2003;100(19):11163-70.
26. Gutchess AH, Iagolino A, Mikels JA. The emotion-induced memory trade-off: evidence from cross-cultural comparisons. *J Cross Cult Psychol.* 2018;49(7):1081-95.
27. Kassin SM, Ellsworth PC, Smith VL. The "general acceptance" of psychological research on eyewitness testimony: a survey of the experts. *Am Psychol.* 1989;44(8):1089-98.
28. Kassin SM, Tubb VA, Hosch HM, Memon A. On the "general acceptance" of eyewitness testimony research: a new survey of the experts. *Am Psychol.* 2001;56(5):405-16.
29. National Research Council. *Identifying the Culprit: Assessing Eyewitness Identification.* Washington (DC): National Academies Press; 2014.
30. Eysenck MW, Derakshan N. New perspectives in attentional control theory. *Pers Individ Dif.* 2011;50(7):955-60.
31. Strambaci C. *Trait-anxiety, environmental stressors and working memory: relevance for accuracy in eyewitness testimony [thesis].* Padua: Università degli Studi di Padova; 2023.
32. Stanny CJ, Johnson TC. Effects of stress induced by a simulated shooting on recall by police and citizen witnesses. *Am J Psychol.* 2000;113(3):359-86.
33. Goodman GS, Hahn A. Evaluating eyewitness testimony in children. In: Weiner IB, Hess AK, editors. *The Handbook of Forensic Psychology.* New York: Wiley; 1987. p. 258-82.
34. Bruck M, Ceci SJ. The suggestibility of children's memory. *Annu Rev Psychol.* 1999;50:419-39.
35. Mather M. The emotion paradox in the aging body and brain. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2012;1251:33-45.
36. Wagstaff GF, MacVeigh J, Boston R, Scott L, Brunas-Wagstaff J, Cole J. Can laboratory findings on eyewitness testimony be generalized to the real world? An archival analysis of the influence of violence, weapon presence, and age on eyewitness accuracy. *J Psychol.* 2003;137(1):17-28.
37. Marr C, Otgaar H, Quaedflieg CWEM, Sauerland M, Hope L. Correcting myths about stress and memory: a commentary on Pezdek



- and Reisberg, 2022. Front Psychol. 2023;14:1145210.
38. Valentine T, Pickering A, Darling S. Characteristics of eyewitness identification that predict the outcome of real lineups. Appl Cogn Psychol. 2003;17(8):969-93.
39. Payne JD, Nadel L, Allen JJ, Thomas KG, Jacobs WJ. The effects of experimentally induced stress on false recognition. Memory. 2002;10(1):1-6.
40. Fisher RP, Geiselman RE. The Cognitive Interview method of conducting police interviews: eliciting extensive information and promoting therapeutic jurisprudence. Int J Law Psychiatry. 2010;33(5-6):321-8.
41. Wells GL, Kovera MB, Douglass AB, Brewer N, Meissner CA, Wixted JT. Policy and procedure recommendations for the collection and preservation of eyewitness identification evidence. Law Hum Behav. 2020;44(1):3-36.
42. State v. O'Key, 321 Or 285, 899 P2d 663 (1995).
43. Et al. (*et alia*)