Implicit Memory

The overview that follows is offered to help the trier of fact understand implicit memory — the ways a past experience can shape present behavior and judgment without any conscious recollection of that experience. The subject is less familiar than conscious remembering, but it matters to the law because it explains one of the quietest engines of mistaken identification: the feeling that a face or fact is familiar, arising from a source the witness cannot consciously recall. Its purpose is to define the terms a court is likely to encounter, to summarize the research, and to do so in plain language and without favoring any party.

Two Kinds of Memory: Explicit and Implicit

Psychologists distinguish two broad forms of memory. Explicit (or declarative) memory is the conscious recollection of facts and events — the kind a witness draws on to testify about what happened. Implicit (or nondeclarative) memory is the influence of past experience on current behavior and perception without conscious awareness of remembering anything (Schacter, 1987; Graf & Schacter, 1985). A person exhibiting implicit memory does not feel that they are recalling the past; they simply act, perceive, or judge differently because of it. The distinction is fundamental: implicit memory operates outside the awareness that the law associates with a witness's "recollection," yet it can still shape what a witness believes and reports.

Forms of Implicit Memory

Implicit memory takes several forms. The most studied is repetition priming: having encountered a word, object, or face once, a person processes it more quickly and fluently the next time, even with no memory of the earlier encounter (Tulving & Schacter, 1990). Procedural memory — the memory for skills such as riding a bicycle or driving — is also implicit; it is expressed in performance rather than conscious recall. So is simple conditioning. What these share is that the effect of the past shows up in behavior or in a feeling, not in a conscious memory of the original event. At the level of the brain, these forms of memory depend on systems separate from those that support conscious recollection and, notably, do not require the hippocampus — the structure essential to forming new conscious memories.

Separate Systems: The Evidence from Amnesia

The clearest proof that implicit and explicit memory are different systems comes from amnesia. Patients who, because of hippocampal damage, cannot form any new conscious memories nonetheless show normal priming and can learn new motor skills — improving with practice while sincerely denying that they have ever performed the task before (Warrington & Weiskrantz, 1970). The implication for the law is striking: a person can be genuinely, measurably influenced by an experience that they cannot consciously remember at all. Absence of conscious memory does not mean the experience left no trace, and a trace left implicitly can affect later judgments without the person's knowledge.

Fluency, Familiarity, and Misattribution

The feature of implicit memory that matters most in the courtroom is that it generates a feeling of familiarity whose source is hidden from the person who feels it. When a stimulus has been encountered before, it is processed more fluently, and that fluency registers as a vague sense of familiarity. People then unconsciously attribute the feeling to a plausible cause — often the wrong one. In a classic demonstration, ordinary names read once in a list were, a day later, mistakenly judged to belong to famous people: the names felt familiar, and participants misattributed that familiarity to fame rather than to the earlier exposure (Jacoby, Kelley, Brown, & Jasechko, 1989). The same mechanism makes a repeated statement feel truer simply because it has been heard

before — the illusory-truth effect (Hasher, Goldstein, & Toppino, 1977). In each case the person experiences a genuine feeling and draws a confident but mistaken inference about where it came from.

Unconscious Transference and Mugshot Exposure

Applied to identification, this misattribution of familiarity is among the recognized causes of mistaken identification. In unconscious transference, a witness identifies a person who is familiar from some innocent context — a bystander at the scene, a person seen elsewhere — as the perpetrator, because the face feels familiar and the witness misattributes that familiarity to the crime (Ross, Ceci, Dunning, & Toglia, 1994). Prior exposure to images works the same way: a witness who has viewed a suspect's photograph in a mugshot book, a single photo, or the media may later "recognize" that person in a lineup, the familiarity flowing from the photo rather than from the crime (Deffenbacher, Bornstein, & Penrod, 2006). What makes these errors so dangerous is precisely their implicit character: the witness cannot introspect on the true source of the familiarity, experiences the recognition as genuine, and may report it with sincere confidence.

What Implicit Memory Does and Does Not Show

Two cautions keep the concept in its proper place. First, implicit memory is not conscious recollection and cannot substitute for it: it explains why a witness may feel that a face or fact is familiar, but a feeling of familiarity is not a memory of the event and does not establish that the familiarity arose from the event in question. Second, "implicit memory" should not be confused with "implicit bias," a separate and more contested idea about unconscious attitudes; this paper concerns memory — the unrecognized influence of prior exposure on familiarity and behavior — not attitudes toward groups. Properly understood, implicit memory is a tool for explaining how mistaken but sincere feelings of recognition arise, not a theory that licenses speculation about a witness's hidden motives.

Implicit Memory and the Law

Implicit memory bears on the law chiefly through the reliability of identifications and the meaning of a witness's confidence. Because a feeling of familiarity can originate in an innocent prior exposure that the witness cannot trace, an identification may be both honestly and confidently made and yet wrong — a mechanism at the heart of unconscious transference and mugshot-exposure errors. Where such errors flow from procedures arranged by law enforcement — showing a witness a mugshot or single photo before a lineup — they fall within the framework that screens identifications produced by unnecessarily suggestive procedures (Perry v. New Hampshire, 2012), and courts have increasingly recognized that confident identifications can be mistaken for reasons the witness cannot report (State v. Henderson, 2011). A witness's competency is unaffected (Federal Rule of Evidence 601); the issue is the weight and source of the identification.

Whether an expert may explain implicit memory, fluency-based familiarity, and unconscious transference is governed by the rules on scientific and expert evidence — Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals (1993), Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael (1999), and Federal Rule of Evidence 702 in federal court and the states that follow them, and the general-acceptance test of Frye v. United States (1923) elsewhere. Such testimony is offered to inform the trier of fact that a sense of recognition can arise from a source the witness cannot identify, and therefore that familiarity and confidence are not proof that the witness is recalling the charged event — not to opine on whether a particular identification is correct, a judgment the law reserves to the fact-finder.

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, an understanding of implicit memory helps protect an identification from avoidable sources of familiarity that do not come from the crime. The errors the prosecution is best positioned to guard against are procedural exposures that can implant a misleading sense of recognition: showing a witness a single photo or a mugshot before a lineup, allowing the witness to encounter the suspect's image in the media, or placing in a lineup someone the witness may know from an innocent context. An identification obtained without such prior exposures, under proper conditions, is correspondingly more defensible, and documenting the witness's exposure history allows the State to meet rather than be surprised by a transference claim. An interpretive caution also applies: a witness's sincere sense that a face is familiar is genuine, but it is not, by itself, proof that the familiarity arose from the crime, and the case is best anchored in the conditions of the identification and in corroboration.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the recurring task is to identify when a witness's recognition may rest on familiarity from a source other than the crime — recognizing that the witness may be entirely sincere and unable to know the difference. Implicit memory means that a face can feel familiar because the witness saw it as a bystander, encountered it elsewhere, or was shown a photograph or mugshot before the identification, with the witness misattributing that familiarity to the offense. The relevant inquiries are what the witness was exposed to before the identification, whether any prior images or encounters could account for the sense of recognition, and whether the procedure allowed innocent familiarity to be mistaken for memory of the crime. Where such exposures occurred, they bear on the reliability of the identification and, if police-arranged, on its suggestiveness. The law contemplates that these matters be placed before the trier of fact through cross-examination, through challenge to the identification procedure, and, where the governing standard is met, through expert testimony (Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 1993; Frye v. United States, 1923). The aim is not to treat every feeling of familiarity as false, but to ensure that recognition is not assumed to come from the crime when it may come from somewhere else.

References

Deffenbacher, K. A., Bornstein, B. H., & Penrod, S. D. (2006). Mugshot exposure effects: Retroactive interference, mugshot commitment, source confusion, and unconscious transference. Law and Human Behavior, 30(3), 287–307. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9008-1

Graf, P., & Schacter, D. L. (1985). Implicit and explicit memory for new associations in normal and amnesic subjects. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 11(3), 501–518. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.11.3.501

Hasher, L., Goldstein, D., & Toppino, T. (1977). Frequency and the conference of referential validity. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 16(1), 107–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(77)80012-1

Jacoby, L. L., Kelley, C., Brown, J., & Jasechko, J. (1989). Becoming famous overnight: Limits on the ability to avoid unconscious influences of the past. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56(3), 326–338. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.3.326
Ross, D. F., Ceci, S. J., Dunning, D., & Toglia, M. P. (1994). Unconscious transference and mistaken identity: When a witness misidentifies a familiar but innocent person. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79(6), 918–930. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.918
Schacter, D. L. (1987). Implicit memory: History and current status. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 13(3), 501–518. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.13.3.501
Slotnick, S. D. (2017). Cognitive neuroscience of memory. Cambridge University Press.
Squire, L. R., & Wixted, J. T. (2011). The cognitive neuroscience of human memory since H.M. Annual Review of Neuroscience, 34, 259–288. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-061010-113720
Tulving, E., & Schacter, D. L. (1990). Priming and human memory systems. Science, 247(4940), 301–306. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.2296719
Warrington, E. K., & Weiskrantz, L. (1970). Amnesic syndrome: Consolidation or retrieval? Nature, 228(5272), 628–630. https://doi.org/10.1038/228628a0

Legal Authorities

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).
Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).
Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).
Perry v. New Hampshire, 565 U.S. 228 (2012).
State v. Henderson, 208 N.J. 208, 27 A.3d 872 (2011).
Fed. R. Evid. 601.
Fed. R. Evid. 702.

Related topic papers: Source-Monitoring Errors · Eyewitness Misidentification · Episodic Memory · Confidence and Accuracy · Misinformation Effect · Eyewitness Identification Procedures