David White

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/5442394/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Variability in photos of the same face. Cognition, 2011, 121, 313-323.	2.2	453
2	The Glasgow Face Matching Test. Behavior Research Methods, 2010, 42, 286-291.	4.0	396
3	Robust representations for face recognition: The power of averages. Cognitive Psychology, 2005, 51, 256-284.	2.2	241
4	Face recognition accuracy of forensic examiners, superrecognizers, and face recognition algorithms. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2018, 115, 6171-6176.	7.1	212
5	Passport Officers' Errors in Face Matching. PLoS ONE, 2014, 9, e103510.	2.5	208
6	Perceptual expertise in forensic facial image comparison. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2015, 282, 20151292.	2.6	99
7	Error Rates in Users of Automatic Face Recognition Software. PLoS ONE, 2015, 10, e0139827.	2.5	72
8	The Other-Race Effect does not Rely on Memory: Evidence from a Matching Task. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 2011, 64, 1473-1483.	1.1	70
9	Superâ€recognizers: From the lab to the world and back again. British Journal of Psychology, 2019, 110, 461-479.	2.3	62
10	Feedback training for facial image comparison. Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 2014, 21, 100-106.	2.8	57
11	Redesigning photo-ID to improve unfamiliar face matching performance Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 2014, 20, 166-173.	1.2	56
12	Evaluating the feature comparison strategy for forensic face identification Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 2017, 23, 47-58.	1.2	55
13	Viewers base estimates of face matching accuracy on their own familiarity: Explaining the photo-ID paradox. Cognition, 2015, 141, 161-169.	2.2	53
14	Thinking forensics: Cognitive science for forensic practitioners. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2017, 57, 144-154.	2.1	51
15	Do professional facial image comparison training courses work?. PLoS ONE, 2019, 14, e0211037.	2.5	51
16	Variation in Photos of the Same Face Drives Improvements in Identity Verification. Perception, 2015, 44, 1332-1341.	1.2	43
17	Face Matching Impairment in Developmental Prosopagnosia. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 2017, 70, 287-297.	1.1	43
18	Identity-level representations affect unfamiliar face matching performance in sequential but not simultaneous tasks. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 2015, 68, 1777-1793.	1.1	37

DAVID WHITE

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Crowd Effects in Unfamiliar Face Matching. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 2013, 27, 769-777.	1.6	36
20	Evaluating Training Methods for Facial Image Comparison: The Face Shape Strategy Does Not Work. Perception, 2014, 43, 214-218.	1.2	33
21	Model forensic science. Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2016, 48, 496-537.	1.2	32
22	UNSW Face Test: A screening tool for super-recognizers. PLoS ONE, 2020, 15, e0241747.	2.5	28
23	Two sources of bias explain errors in facial age estimation. Royal Society Open Science, 2018, 5, 180841.	2.4	27
24	Improving face identification with specialist teams. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 2018, 3, 25.	2.0	26
25	Effects of active and passive exploration of the built environment on memory during wayfinding. Applied Geography, 2018, 101, 68-74.	3.7	25
26	Are forensic scientists experts?. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 2018, 7, 199-208.	1.1	25
27	Diagnostic feature training improves face matching accuracy Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition, 2021, 47, 1288-1298.	0.9	21
28	Individual differences and the multidimensional nature of face perception. , 2022, 1, 287-300.		20
29	Not looking yourself: The cost of selfâ€selecting photographs for identity verification. British Journal of Psychology, 2016, 107, 359-373.	2.3	19
30	Choosing face: The curse of self in profile image selection. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 2017, 2, 23.	2.0	19
31	GFMT2: A psychometric measure of face matching ability. Behavior Research Methods, 2022, 54, 252-260.	4.0	18
32	Enhancing CCTV: Averages improve face identification from poorâ€quality images. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 2018, 32, 671-680.	1.6	13
33	Understanding Professional Expertise in Unfamiliar Face Matching. , 2021, , 62-88.		13
34	Perceptual impairment in face identification with poor sleep. Royal Society Open Science, 2016, 3, 160321.	2.4	12
35	Public attitudes towards the use of automatic facial recognition technology in criminal justice systems around the world. PLoS ONE, 2021, 16, e0258241.	2.5	11
36	Constructing faces from memory: the impact of image likeness and prototypical representations. Journal of Forensic Practice, 2014, 16, 243-256.	0.5	10

DAVID WHITE

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Person recognition: Qualitative differences in how forensic face examiners and untrained people rely on the face versus the body for identification. Visual Cognition, 2017, 25, 492-506.	1.6	10
38	More than a sum of parts: robust face recognition by integrating variation. Royal Society Open Science, 2018, 5, 172381.	2.4	9
39	Familiarity does not inhibit image-specific encoding of faces Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 2019, 45, 841-854.	0.9	8
40	Tracking sexual dimorphism of facial width-to-height ratio across the lifespan: implications for perceived aggressiveness. Royal Society Open Science, 2022, 9, 211500.	2.4	8
41	In the Dock: Chimeric Image Composites Reduce Identification Accuracy. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 2012, 26, 140-148.	1.6	7
42	Are face recognition abilities in humans and sheep really â€̃comparable'?. Royal Society Open Science, 2019, 6, 180772.	2.4	6
43	Human Factors in Forensic Face Identification. Advances in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2017, , 195-218.	1.3	6
44	Search templates that incorporate within-face variation improve visual search for faces. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 2018, 3, .	2.0	5
45	Towards a â€~manifesto' for superâ€recognizer research. British Journal of Psychology, 2019, 110, 495-498.	2.3	5
46	Partitioning natural face image variability emphasises within-identity over between-identity representation for understanding accurate recognition. Cognition, 2022, 219, 104966.	2.2	5
47	Masked face identification is improved by diagnostic feature training. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 2022, 7, 30.	2.0	4
48	Performance of typical and superior face recognizers on a novel interactive face matching procedure. British Journal of Psychology, 2021, 112, 964-991.	2.3	3
49	Top-down influences on working memory representations of faces: Evidence from dual-target visual search. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 2021, 74, 174702182110143.	1.1	3
50	Asymmetric contextual effects in age perception. Royal Society Open Science, 2020, 7, 200936.	2.4	3
51	Commercial Face Recognition Doesn't Work. , 2009, , .		1
52	UNSW Face Test: A screening tool for super-recognizers. , 2020, 15, e0241747.		0
53	UNSW Face Test: A screening tool for super-recognizers. , 2020, 15, e0241747.		0
54	UNSW Face Test: A screening tool for super-recognizers. , 2020, 15, e0241747.		0

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	UNSW Face Test: A screening tool for super-recognizers. , 2020, 15, e0241747.		0