Gender Differences in Eyewitness Memory

A natural question in evaluating a witness is whether men and women differ in how accurately they remember what they saw. The short and best-supported answer is that gender is not a meaningful predictor of overall eyewitness accuracy. The research on the question is decades old and decidedly mixed: many studies find no significant difference between the sexes in accuracy or in vulnerability to misleading information, and the differences that do appear are small and specific rather than global. Where patterns emerge, they reflect not that one sex remembers better than the other, but that each tends to pay closer attention to, and better remember, details relevant to its own gender. The one fairly consistent difference is not in accuracy at all but in confidence. This paper summarizes what the science does and does not support, and why it cautions strongly against using a witness's gender as a gauge of reliability. It assumes no background in psychology, the science here favors no party, and it treats gender as a question of empirical fact rather than stereotype.

A Contested and Largely Null Question

Interest in sex differences in testimony is as old as the field. The pioneering legal-psychology researcher William Stern claimed early in the twentieth century that men were the better witnesses — more accurate and less suggestible than women. That claim has not survived. Contemporary research, taken as a whole, does not support a general male or female advantage in eyewitness accuracy or in resistance to suggestion. Controlled studies repeatedly report no significant gender difference: in one, men and women who viewed and were questioned about complex scenes showed no reliable difference in either accuracy of recall or resistance to false information (Butts, Mixon, Mulekar, & Bringmann, 1995), a result echoed across much of the literature. The accumulated picture is that, on overall accuracy, the sexes perform about the same.

Each Sex Attends to Its Own: Gender-Relevant Detail

The most consistent and best-understood finding is not a difference in overall ability but a difference in what is attended to and therefore remembered. In a careful pair of experiments, Powers, Andriks, and Loftus (1979) found that female witnesses were more accurate about some features of a witnessed crime — notably aspects such as the clothing of the people involved and the actions of the incident — while male witnesses were more accurate about others, such as the perpetrator's general appearance and the surrounding scene. A broader observation followed: people tend to remember details relevant to their own gender better, so that women recall more about the female figures in a scene and men more about the male figures (Loftus, Banaji, Schooler, & Foster, 1987). More recent work fits this pattern, finding women somewhat more accurate for details about the people involved — especially descriptions of a victim — and men somewhat more accurate for details about the setting and the course of events (Areh, 2011).

This is an effect of interest and attention, not of general competence, and it parallels the own-group attentional patterns seen in the cross-race effect: we encode more fully the people and details that engage us. Its practical significance is modest and specific. It does not make either sex a generally superior witness; it suggests only that a given witness may have attended more closely to some aspects of a scene than others, in a way loosely associated with gender but driven by what drew their attention.

Confidence, Not Accuracy

If there is a reasonably reliable sex difference in this literature, it concerns confidence rather than correctness. Across several studies, men tend to express greater confidence in their eyewitness reports than women do, without being correspondingly more accurate (Christiansen, Ochalek, & Sweeney, 1984; Yarmey & Yarmey, 1997; Areh, 2011). Women, by contrast, are somewhat more likely to acknowledge uncertainty. Because jurors and others tend to treat a witness's confidence

as a signal of accuracy — an inference the research on confidence and accuracy shows to be unreliable — this asymmetry is the most forensically consequential gender-linked finding: a man's greater assurance on the stand is not evidence that his memory is more accurate than a woman's. The difference lies in the expression of certainty, not in the quality of the memory.

Emotion and Violence Affect Both

Some of the apparent gender effects in older studies are entangled with the emotional content of the event. Violent and highly arousing incidents tend to impair recall for both men and women (Clifford & Scott, 1978; Lipton, 1977), and any interaction with the witness's gender has been inconsistent across studies. The fairer reading is that the conditions that degrade memory — high stress, weapon presence, brief exposure, long delay — operate on witnesses of both sexes, and that these situational factors are far more powerful determinants of accuracy than the witness's gender, which contributes little once they are accounted for.

Gender Differences and the Law

The legal implication is largely a cautionary one. The science provides no basis for treating a witness as more or less reliable because of their gender; the overall accuracy of men and women as eyewitnesses is, for practical purposes, equivalent. The small differences that exist are content-specific — each sex tending to remember somewhat more about gender-relevant details — and cannot support a general inference about a particular witness's reliability. Arguments or assumptions that credit or discredit a witness on the basis of sex are unsupported by the evidence and trade instead on stereotype. The one finding with real forensic bite reinforces a caution made elsewhere: because men tend to report greater confidence without greater accuracy, a witness's certainty should not be taken as a measure of correctness, a point that connects to the reliability factors courts weigh for identifications (Neil v. Biggers, 1972; Manson v. Brathwaite, 1977; State v. Henderson, 2011).

Whether an expert may explain this body of research to a jury is governed by the general standards for expert evidence — Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals (1993), as extended by Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael (1999), or the Frye general-acceptance test still followed in some jurisdictions (Frye v. United States, 1923) — and a witness may testify only from personal knowledge (Fed. R. Evid. 602). Given how mixed the findings are, the most accurate testimony on this subject is often that the science does not support gender-based judgments of reliability — a conclusion that informs the trier of fact without licensing inferences the data cannot bear.

Special Issues in Legal Practice

The principles described above apply with equal force to every party in a legal proceeding. Memory operates the same way regardless of who is asking the questions, and the science summarized here favors no side. What differs between the parties is not the science but the vantage point — the particular places where memory issues tend to surface, and the particular errors each party is best positioned to guard against. The two summaries below identify those recurring issues. They are offered for orientation, not as litigation strategy; in every case the controlling question is what the evidence in that case will, and will not, support, and the expert's role is to inform the trier of fact rather than to advocate for either side.

Special Issues for Prosecutors

For the State, the principal value of this research is defensive: it forecloses arguments that a witness should be doubted, or credited, because of their sex. The error best guarded against is allowing a gender stereotype — that women are more emotional and less reliable, or that men are more objective — to color the assessment of a witness, when the evidence shows no general difference in accuracy between the sexes. Where a witness's account concerns details of the kind each gender

tends to attend to less closely, that is a matter to weigh on the specific facts, not a basis for a categorical judgment. And because men's greater expressed confidence does not signal greater accuracy, the State should neither over-rely on a confident male witness's certainty nor discount a more tentative female witness's account for its caution. Anchoring credibility assessments in the conditions of observation and in corroboration, rather than in the witness's sex, keeps the evidence sound.

Understood this way, the science protects the State's witnesses of both sexes from stereotype-driven attacks and helps ensure that a jury weighs each account on its actual merits rather than on assumptions about gender.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the research bears chiefly on resisting unwarranted inferences from a witness's gender and on the confidence asymmetry. The error best guarded against is overclaiming in either direction — arguing that a witness is unreliable because of their sex, or that gender-linked differences establish error in a particular account — when the literature is mixed and the overall accuracy of men and women is comparable. The more defensible points are specific: that a witness may have attended less closely to aspects of a scene outside the range each sex tends to focus on, and that a male witness's pronounced confidence is not, by itself, a mark of accuracy, since men tend to report greater certainty without greater correctness. Examining the conditions of observation and the basis for the witness's confidence is the sounder course than relying on gender as such.

The corresponding safeguard is to ensure the trier of fact understands what the science establishes: that gender is not a reliable predictor of eyewitness accuracy; that any differences are small, content-specific, and driven by attention rather than ability; and that men's greater expressed confidence does not track greater accuracy. Where admissible, expert explanation of this research can help the factfinder set aside gender stereotypes and weigh each witness's account on its own conditions.

References

Areh, I. (2011). Gender-related differences in eyewitness testimony. Personality and Individual Differences, 50(5), 559–563. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.11.027

Butler, M. A., & Pallone, N. J. (2002). Accuracy of recall among "eyewitnesses" to a simulated robbery: Intrapersonal and stimulus determinants. Current Psychology, 21(3), 253–264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-002-1019-6

Butts, S. J., Mixon, K. D., Mulekar, M. S., & Bringmann, W. G. (1995). Gender differences in eyewitness testimony. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 80(1), 59–63. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1995.80.1.59

Christiansen, R. E., Ochalek, K., & Sweeney, J. D. (1984). Individual differences in eyewitness memory and confidence judgments. The Journal of General Psychology, 110(1), 47–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.1984.9709950

Clifford, B. R., & Scott, J. (1978). Individual and situational factors in eyewitness testimony. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63(3), 352–359. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.63.3.352

Lipton, J. P. (1977). On the psychology of eyewitness testimony. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62(1), 90–95. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.62.1.90

Loftus, E. F., Banaji, M. R., Schooler, J. W., & Foster, R. A. (1987). Who remembers what? Gender differences in memory. Michigan Quarterly Review, 26(1), 64–85.

Powers, P. A., Andriks, J. L., & Loftus, E. F. (1979). Eyewitness accounts of females and males. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64(3), 339–347. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.64.3.339

Yarmey, A. D., & Yarmey, M. J. (1997). Eyewitness recall and duration estimates in field settings. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27(4), 330–344. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1997.tb00633.x

Legal Authorities

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).
Federal Rule of Evidence 602.
Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).
Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).
Manson v. Brathwaite, 432 U.S. 98 (1977).
Neil v. Biggers, 409 U.S. 188 (1972).
State v. Henderson, 208 N.J. 208, 27 A.3d 872 (2011).

Related topic papers: Confidence and Accuracy · The Cross-Race Effect · Memory for Persons · Emotion, Trauma and Memory · Estimator vs. System Variables · Reconstruction and Recall