The relation between consistency and accuracy of eyewitness memory

Jurors and other decision-makers often assess the accuracy of witnesses' (or other informants' memory based on the consistency of their recollection over repeated tests or interviews. When witnesses contradict themselves across testimony or they remember an event on a later interview that they could not recall earlier, jurors question the accuracy of their memories. I examine attorneys' and judges' assumptions about memory functioning, and present several experiments that examine the empirical relationship between consistency and accuracy of recollection. The results confirm some, but not all, of the legal assumptions about the diagnostic value of inconsistency. Based on the empirical evidence, I make some recommendations to the legal system about interpreting inconsistent witness recollection.