Filename: LineupComparisons

This file has six worksheets for six experiments (labelled E1, E2, E3a, E 3b, E4, and E5). In each experiment, participants were randomly assigned to a condition, watched a video of a target committing a mock crime, took part in a brief distractor task, attempted to identify the target out of a lineup, answered a validation question, and provided demographic information. The lineups were either target-present or target-absent. Participants chose a lineup member or chose the "not present" option and then rated their confidence. The stimuli for E1-E4 were the same.

E1 contains data from 1,995 participants assigned to a sequential video lineup condition or a simultaneous video lineup condition.

E2 contains data from 2,272 participants assigned to a sequential video lineup condition or a sequential photo lineup condition.

E3a contains data from 3,102 participants assigned to a 1-lap condition, 2-lap condition, or lap choice condition. The lineups were videos.

E3b contains data from 3,003 participants assigned to a sequential video lineup condition or a sequential photo lineup condition. The lineups were photos.

E4 contains data from 2,014 participants assigned to a 6-member sequential video lineup condition or a 9-member sequential video lineup condition.

E5 contains data from 2,019 participants assigned to a sequential video lineup condition or a simultaneous video lineup condition. This experiment was the same as E1 with a different video and lineups.

Filename: ConfidenceInstructions

This file has one worksheet that contains data from 5,228 participants in one experiment. In this experiment, participants were randomly assigned to one of five conditions, watched a video of a target committing a mock crime, took part in a brief distractor task, attempted to identify the target out of a lineup, answered a validation question, and provided demographic information. The conditions were either for participants to rate their confidence or given a biasing instruction (from very liberal to very conservative). The lineups were either target-present or target-absent. Participants chose a lineup member or chose the "not present" option and then rated their confidence if they were in the confidence condition.

These data have been published. Reference: Mickes, L., Seale-Carlisle, T. M., Wetmore, S. A., Gronlund, S. D., Clark, S. E., Carlson, C. A., Goodsell, C. A., Weatherford, D., & Wixted, J. T. (2017). Using lineup instructions to manipulate response bias and its relationship to the confidence-based ROC in eyewitness identification. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 31,*467-477. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3344.

Filename: VerbalDescriptions

This file has four worksheets for 5 experiments (labelled E1_E2, E3, E4, and E5). In experiments 1-4, participants were randomly assigned to a condition (verbal description or control), watched a video of a target committing a mock crime, took part in a brief distractor task, attempted to identify the target out of a lineup or a showup, answered a validation question, and provided demographic information. The lineups were either target-present or target-absent. Participants chose a lineup member or chose the "not present" option and then rated their confidence.

E1_2 contains data from 1,560 participants. In Experiment 1 (E1), participants described the target in the video immediately after watching the video. In Experiment 2 (E2), participants described the target in the video 20 minutes after watching the video. All participants were tested on a 6-person simultaneous lineup.

E3 contains data from 1,197 participants. In this experiment, participants described the target in the video immediately after watching the video and were tested on a showup.

E4 contains data from 1,196 participants. In this experiment, participants described the target in the video 20 minutes after watching the video and were tested on a showup.

E5 contains data from 128 participants. In this experiment, participants read a description written by participants in the E3 or E4 and tried to identify the target from a target-present lineup.

These data have been published. Reference: Wilson, B. M., Seale-Carlisle, T. M., & Mickes, L. (2018). The effects of verbal descriptions on performance in lineups and showups. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 147,* 113-124*.* doi: 10.1037/xge0000354

Filename: LineupComparisonsUS_UK

This file has one worksheet that contains data from 2,249 participants in two experiments. In both experiments, participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions, watched a video of a target committing a mock crime, took part in a brief distractor task, attempted to identify the target out of a lineup, answered a validation question, and provided demographic information. The conditions were to be tested on a lineup that is used in the UK or US. The lineups were either target-present or target-absent. Participants chose a lineup member or chose the "not present" option and then rated their confidence if they were in the confidence condition. The difference between the experiments is that in Experiment 2, participants could select to see a lineup member(s) more than twice in the UK condition.

These data have been published. Reference: Seale-Carlisle, T. M. & Mickes, L. (2016). US lineups outperform UK lineups. *Royal Society Open Science.* DOI: 10.1098/rsos.160300