

St. Jerome's University in the University of Waterloo
Department of Psychology
PSYCH*230 – Spring 2013
PSYCHOLOGY AND LAW

(This schedule is tentative and subject to minor changes)

Instructor: Laurie A. Manwell

Email: lmanwell@uwaterloo.ca

Class Time & Room: Mon. & Wed. 10:00-11:20 am; Room STJ2017

Office Hours: After class and/or by appointment (STJ1026)

Website: <https://learn.uwaterloo.ca>

Teaching Assistant: Kristina Schrage (kschrage@uwaterloo.ca) STJ2021 meet by appointment

Course Description:

This course is a general overview of psychology and law. Psychological principles drawn from a variety of subdisciplines (e.g., social, clinical, cognitive, behavioural neuroscience) will be surveyed in terms of their relevance and application to the legal system. The goal is to provide you with basic information and a working vocabulary about psychological concepts and principles as they pertain to phenomena encountered in the criminal justice system. This course will look at important research in the area and examine the contemporary methodologies being used in social and forensic psychology. This course is designed to develop the ability to use scientific methods to examine behaviors that occur in a legal context and to lay the foundations for further study in the areas of psychology and law. Topics may include jury selection and decision-making, eyewitness testimony, insanity defense, competency assessment, risk assessment, and attitudes toward law and the legal process.

Prerequisite for this course: PSYCH 101/121R

Required Textbooks:

Pozzulo, J., Bennell, C. & Forth, A. (2012). *Forensic Psychology, 3rd Edition*. Toronto, ON: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Harris, S. (2010). *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values*. NY: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Course Website:

There is a course website at <https://learn.uwaterloo.ca> which is password protected and is mandatory for meeting course objectives, including assignments and lecture preparation. Students are expected to familiarize themselves with the website and to contact the instructor, GTA and classmates between classes, especially in preparation for group project presentations.

Formal Assessment:

The purpose of this course is to ***engage*** students in an overview of key concepts, empirical approaches and theoretical perspectives in the study of psychology and law and ***critically examine*** their significance and impact on society. ***Engagement*** and ***critical analysis*** are core components of this course; thus, there will be a significant amount of reading, writing, and discussion required to analyze these ideas. Students can achieve a B+ by reading the assigned chapters before class and summarizing the key points after class. This course requires autonomy, initiative, and innovation; these criteria need to be reflected in the group research projects to receive at least a B level grade. To receive an A+, students should demonstrate as strong understanding of the course content as it relates to society, particularly in the group presentations, essays, and case studies. In general, grades advance or drop depending on both content and style; for an A-/A/A+, the project must demonstrate exceptional thoughtfulness, reasoning, and presentation. "A" projects involve difficult and time-consuming work – and a tremendous investment in your education and development! A solid "B" is a mark of achievement which reflects critical reasoning and/or thorough research and solid writing skills. In cases of medical or otherwise compassionate circumstances, students should contact the instructor and/or TA to determine what arrangements can be made to ensure that course requirements are met and students successfully pass the course.

Course requirements are as follows:

- 1) **Midterm Test: 20%** (Multiple Choice and Short Answer) (Mon. June 17 in class)
- 2) **Team Project and Presentation: 20%**
(Proposals due Wed. May 22 in class; Returned in Week 4 in class)
(Presentations in class in Weeks 8 to 11 inclusive)
- 3) **In-Class Case Study: 20%** (Due: In class Week 12)
- 4) **Project Essay: 20%** (Due: In class Week 13 hard copy only)
- 5) **Final Exam: 20%** (Multiple Choice and Short Answer) (TBA)

Team Project and Presentation (20%):

This project is designed to engage students in critical analysis of the impact of a specific experiment, or related series of experiments, on psychology and the law. The theme of the project will be the following: *“Choose a scientific experiment on psychology and the law – either historical or current – and describe its significance to society, both when it was conducted and its relevance today. First, briefly describe the key components of the experiment, specifically highlighting how they relate to concepts covered in the course. Second, briefly describe the significance of the experimental findings, including how the results were interpreted at the time they were discovered and their relevance today.”*

The maximum time of presentation is 10 min – no exceptions – and there will be up to five minutes for Q & A with the instructor and class. Students *must* provide the instructor with any presentation aids (e.g., powerpoint slides, podcast, video, interactive demonstration, etc...) **a minimum of 48 h prior to presentation** and in a format that is compatible with Windows 7. Failure to do so will result in a 10% penalty and risk of 0% for the presentation if there are problems during the presentation session. *There will be no re-scheduling of presentations for any reason.* **The presentation must be based on one of the approved research articles listed in Appendix D – all of these articles will be made available on MLS.** The presentation can be creative in format (e.g., student made video/podcast, powerpoint presentation, interactive demonstration, mini-debate, newscast and/or interview with the lead experimenter, etc...). **All teams** must have **five members** and it is strongly recommended to find a group quickly with the help of the instructor in class (e.g, team activity sessions) and through the discussion board on MLS. Students should form groups based on their preferred topics and dates for their presentation. The instructor will provide time in lecture to facilitate forming teams for the presentations. **A hard-copy of the research article and a one-page maximum project proposal with all student names, IDs, and signatures, is due in class in Week 3 and will be returned in Week 4 in class as *Approved, Conditionally Approved, or Not Approved* by the instructor; the date that the group is assigned to present on will be included. All projects must be approved by the instructor in writing to receive a final grade; failure to submit a proposal on time will result in an immediate deduction of 10% of the final grade. If students wish to start early – and thus reserve a preferred date of presentation - the proposal can be submitted before Week 3 and will be returned by the instructor as soon as possible.** Students will have time during classes to work with the instructor and/or GTA and peers on the project. REFER TO APPENDIX A FOR MARKING RUBRIC.

Project Essay (20%):

The topic of the essay will be very similar to the project presentation and must be completed **independently**: *“Choose a scientific experiment on psychology and the law – either historical or current – and describe its significance to society, both when it was conducted and its relevance today. First, describe in detail the key components of the experiment, specifically highlighting how they relate to concepts covered in the course. Second, describe in detail the significance of the experimental findings, including how the results were interpreted at the time they were discovered and their relevance today. What future experiments can you envision building upon and expanding this work in the future? Provide a research-based argument for your case.”*

The essay must be based on one of the approved research articles listed in Appendix D – all of these articles will be made available on MLS. Students are **permitted and strongly encouraged** to use the same research article that they use for the team project presentation. Students must include a *minimum* of 2 primary, 2 secondary, and 2 tertiary articles. The essay must be between 3-5 pages (1.5 spaced, 12-pt Times Roman Font, 1” margins all around; must be APA style). Students will have time during class to work with the instructor and peers on the proper development of a research-based essay. REFER TO APPENDIX B FOR MARKING RUBRIC

In Class Case Study: (20%)

The case study is designed to engage students in actively applying the knowledge gained from the team project to a current, ongoing high profile criminal case (TBA). The case study will begin at the start of the term and each week we will add to the knowledge base of the case throughout the term. The theme of the case study will be the following: *“Apply the concepts studied in your team project to the current criminal case. Access any information available in the public forum – either historical or current – and analyze it based on the principles your team presented on.”*

I will assign two teams to each case study group to work collaboratively on this throughout the term. Case study teams will gather the relevant information on the case, pose a series of questions about the case, and then answer those questions throughout the term. At the end of the term, teams will give an informal, five-minute summary of their findings regarding the case. The groups will also submit their case folder with a two-page maximum summary statement on the case. Students will have time during classes to work with the instructor and/or GTA and peers on the project. REFER TO APPENDIX C FOR MARKING RUBRIC.

Midterm Test:

In the event of a missed term test, a mark of zero will be recorded for that test. Make-up tests will only be given in the following circumstances:

- a) student produces official documentation of a legitimate medical problem (i.e., doctor’s note) occurring on the day of the test, and
- b) student is available to write the **make-up for midterm test on June 19 after class.**

In the cases where a make-up test is required, it is the student’s responsibility to contact the instructor prior to the make-up period. In the case of problems requiring the absence of a student for a period of time which does not enable him or her to write the make-up test, the marks for the missed test will be added to the weighting of the final exam (i.e., miss midterm test and the final is worth 40%). There will be no exceptions to this policy.

Class Attendance:

The material covered in this course is conceptually difficult, highly technical, and often quite different from everyday language for talking about psychology and law. In addition, a significant portion of your final mark will be based upon collaborative work in and outside of class. Consequently, regular class attendance is strongly recommended and expected. If you miss a class, you are responsible for obtaining missed notes, announcements, or any other information relevant to the course, the assignments, or the exams from a classmate before the next class. It is not an instructor’s responsibility to provide information presented in class because a student has missed one or, as is more often the case, several classes.

Hints for Success:

****Read the course syllabus completely and carefully. Refer to it throughout the term.****

1. Read the textbook chapters and assigned readings *before* the material is presented in lecture.
2. Attend all lectures; print the lecture slides and make notes during and after lectures.
3. Use the lecture note outlines and any material posted on UW LEARN made available to you.
4. If you are having trouble with course material see GTA or myself immediately – don’t wait until it is too late.
5. Refer to marking rubrics when working on assignments; they explain exactly what you will be marked on.
6. Join a project team and begin collaborating early in the term. **Keep in constant and consistent communication through UW LEARN in a highly professional and cooperative manner.** If any concerns arise please try to resolve them in an open and supportive manner and please do approach the instructor if you require any assistance in doing so. The purpose of the team project and case study is to practice professional collaboration on a topic that is meaningful, interesting and highly educational. It is also meant to be a **challenging and enjoyable experience for all involved!** 😊

****Read the course syllabus completely and carefully. Refer to it throughout the term.****

Learning Contract:

1. Everyone has the *right to learn* and the *responsibility* not to deprive others of this right.
2. Every student is accountable for his or her own actions.
3. In order for you to get the most out of this class, please consider the following:
 - Attend all scheduled classes and arrive on time prepared with lecture notes.
 - **Laptops and other devices are restricted to class-related activities only.**
 - Late arrivals and early departures are very disruptive.
 - Please let the instructor know immediately if you have a problem that is preventing you from performing satisfactorily in this class.
4. Each student and his/her success in this course is very important to me; please help me help you achieve your professional and personal goals for this course! 😊

UW POLICY REGARDING ILLNESS AND MISSED TESTS AND OTHER INFORMATION

University of Waterloo Examination Regulations (www.registrar.uwaterloo.ca/exams/ExamRegs.pdf) state that:

- A medical certificate presented in support of an official petition for relief from normal academic requirements must provide all of the information requested on the “University of Waterloo Verification of Illness” form or it will not be accepted. This form can be obtained from Health Services or at uwaterloo.ca/health-services/student-medical-clinic/services/verification-illness.
- If a student has a test/examination deferred due to acceptable medical evidence, he/she normally will write the test/examination at a mutually convenient time, to be determined by the course instructor.
- The University acknowledges that, due to the pluralistic nature of the University community, some students may on religious grounds require alternative times to write tests and examinations.
- Elective arrangements (such as travel plans) are not considered acceptable grounds for granting an alternative examination time.

Late Policy:

- The penalty for late assignments handed in on the same day but AFTER the designated time period (i.e. during class) is 2%. After that, a 5% penalty is applied each day (including Saturday and Sunday).

Academic Integrity: In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo and its Federated University and Affiliated Colleges are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

Discipline: A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offences, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offence, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about “rules” for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Associate Dean. When misconduct has been found to have occurred, disciplinary penalties will be imposed under St. Jerome’s University Academic Discipline Policy and UW Policy 71 – Student Discipline. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy 71 - Student Discipline, <http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-71>.

Grievance: A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. In such a case, contact the St. Jerome’s University Grievance Officer.

Appeals: A student may appeal the finding and/or penalty in a decision made under St. Jerome’s University Academic Discipline Policy or Grievance Policy if a ground for an appeal can be established. In such a case, contact the St. Jerome’s University Appeals Officer.

Academic Integrity website (Arts): http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/arts/ugrad/academic_responsibility.html

Academic Integrity Office (UW): <http://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/>

Note for students with disabilities: The AccessAbility Services (AS) Office, located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the AS Office at the beginning of each academic term.

SCHEDULE OF TOPICS

Lecture	Topic	Readings	Events
WK1: May 6 & 8	- Course Introduction and Overview - Introduction to Forensic Psychology - The Moral Landscape	- Syllabus - Pozzulo: Ch. 1 (all) - Harris: Introduction (all)	- Lectures start 1 st day - Class activity for forming Project Teams in class
WK2: May 13 & 15	- Research Methods: A Neuroscientific Approach to Normative Judgment in Law and Justice - Neuroscience of Moral Truth - Psychology of Police Investigations	- <i>Online Reading:</i> Goodenough & Prehn (2004) - Harris: Ch. 1 (all) - Pozzulo: Ch. 3	- In-class time for work on preparing team proposals due Fri. May 24
WK3: May 22	- <i>Mon: Victoria Day (no class)</i> - Criminal Profiling: Guest Presentation by Dr. Chris Burris (STJ Faculty)	- Pozzulo: Ch. 3	- Proposals Due
WK4: May 27,29	- Investigations and Deception - Neuroscience of Good and Evil	- Pozzulo: Ch. 4 - Harris: Ch. 2	- Proposals Returned
WK5: Jun. 3 & 5	- Belief and the Brain - Moral Reasoning versus Normative Judgments - Role of Mental Illness in Court	- Harris: Ch. 3 - Pozzulo: Ch. 8	
WK6: Jun. 10 & 12	- Juries: Fact Finders - 12 Angry Men – Part I - 12 Angry Men - Part II	- Pozzulo: Ch. 7 - <i>Twelve Angry Men Play</i> by Reginald Rose	
WK7: Jun. 17 & 19	- Mon: Midterm Exam: 20% - Tutorial for Essay Writing - In Class Work Period for Projects/Cases	- <i>Online reading:</i> The Socratic Method of Inquiry	- Tutorial for writing A+ essays and time for working on presentations
WK8: Jun. 24 & 26	- Memories and Eyewitness Testimonies - Domestic Violence	- Pozzulo: Ch. 5 - Pozzulo: Ch. 13	Wed: Teams 1-5 Present
WK9: Jul. 3	- <i>Mon: Canada Day (no class)</i> - Memory and Eyewitness Testimonies and Domestic Violence Continued	- Pozzulo: Ch. 5 & 13 Continued	Wed: Teams 6-10 Present
WK10: Jul. 8 & 10	- Psychopathy and Violent Crime	- Pozzulo: Ch. 11	Wed: Teams 11-15 Present
WK11: Jul. 15 & 17	- Risk Assessment	- Pozzulo: Ch. 10	Wed: Teams 16-20 Present
WK12: Jul. 22 & 24	- Utopian Societies and the Law: Is There a Future of Happiness Based on Evidence from Neuroscience? - Psychology & Democracy: How Citizens are Manipulated by the State and the Media - Case Study Folders Due: 20%	- Harris: Ch. 5 (all) - <i>Online Reading:</i> Manwell (2010)	Case Study Presentations
WK13: Jul. 29	- Final Exam Review - Course Evaluations - Essays Due in Class: 20%		Good luck on final exams and have a fantastic summer!! ☺
	Final Exam: 20%	TBA: (Aug. 6-16)	

APPENDIX A

TEAM PROJECT AND PRESENTATION: 20% (15% Group, 5% Individual)

Content and Comprehension: /10

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work. Topic is not acceptable.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; unclear/incomplete reasoning for topic choice.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Adequate critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of primary and/or secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrates some principles learned throughout the course; incomplete description of principles of forensic psychology; cursory reasoning for topic choice.
- 7-8: More than adequate critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of primary and/or secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrated application of content and critical thinking principles to group work; correct description of experimental findings and their significance; uses evidence to support ideas as taught during lectures according to Pozzulo et al. (2012) and Harris (2010); reason for topic choice is clear and relevant.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the group demonstrates superior critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of primary and/or secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; accurate and thorough description of the experimental findings and their significance; group uses evidence to support arguments as taught during lectures and according to Pozzulo et al. (2012) and Harris (2010); group engages the audience with insight, critical arguments, and novel and/or unique perspective; the importance and relevance of the topic are clear and compelling; topic is meaningful and challenging.

Approach to Project Topic: /10

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work. Topic is unacceptable.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited understanding of principles of forensic psychology; choice of topic too simplistic or obvious; unprepared to present; unable to answer questions.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Demonstrates some understanding of principles of forensic psychology; topic and presentation format are complimentary; choice of topic somewhat cursory but provides some opportunity for discussion and debate; prepared to present; minimal answers to questions.
- 7-8: More than adequate understanding of principles of forensic psychology; topic and presentation format complement each other; choice of topic is meaningful and relevant; well prepared to present; well informed answers to questions.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the group demonstrates superior understanding of principles of forensic psychology; topic and presentation format enhance each other; choice of topic is very significant compels the audience to re-evaluate their prior knowledge of the topic; more than well prepared to present; well informed, insightful answers to questions; thoroughly engages audience in the topic and perspectives; group takes a risk focusing on controversial and/or less well known information/positions.

Comments:

***Peer Evaluation: /5**

- 0 - 1: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work; failed to contribute to project.
- 1.5-2: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited preparation for group work on project; lack of cooperation and collaboration with group members; missed some group meetings and did not make-up missed work.
- 2.5-3: Acceptable. Demonstrates some preparation for group work; interacts with group members in a cooperative, supportive, and collaborative manner; listens and responds to ideas and offers own ideas; made up any missed work.
- 3.5-4: More than adequate preparation and participation in group activities for project; demonstrates consistent and positive interactions with group members that draw out peer strengths and support peer areas of learning (e.g., theatre student may share drama experience with non-theatre students for a re-enactment, whereas physics student may share principles of a simple experiment for a demonstration); openly shares insights and encourages others to reciprocate; equitable contributions to group work.
- 4.5-5 Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior preparation and participation; demonstrates consistent and positive interactions with group members that both supports and challenges peers to work outside of their own zone of comfort in ways that lead to success (e.g., practicing public speaking with a shy peer; sharing technical skills in multimedia with peers rather than just working alone; demonstrating trust and respect in ways that encourages peers to share radically different ideas without fear of ridicule; etc...); consistently engages with others by respectfully offering and critiquing ideas; equitable contributions to group work.

***On the day of your group’s presentation, each group member is to provide a peer evaluation mark (out of 5) for each member, including yourself, on this sheet. All of the marks assigned to each individual – including your self-evaluation mark - will be averaged for a final mark (out of 5).**

Your name: _____; Your mark: /5

Peer 1 name: _____; Peer 1 mark: /5

Peer 2 name: _____; Peer 2 mark: /5

Peer 3 name: _____; Peer 3 mark: /5

Peer 4 name: _____; Peer 4 mark: /5

Comments:

APPENDIX B

SUMMATIVE ESSAY: 20%

Content and Comprehension: /10

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; many grammatical and spelling errors.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Adequate writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrates that student has read the assigned readings and applied the content and critical thinking principles to his/her work; some grammatical and spelling errors.
- 7-8: More than adequate writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrates that student has read the assigned readings and applied the content and critical thinking principles to his/her work; student uses evidence to support arguments as taught during lectures and according to Pozzulo et al. (2012), Harris (2010); few grammatical or spelling errors.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; student uses evidence to support arguments as taught during seminars and according to Pozzulo et al. (2012) and Harris (2010); student engages the reader with insight, critical arguments, and novel and/or unique perspective; almost no grammatical or spelling errors.

Approach to Questions: /10

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work. Topic is unacceptable.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited reflective and/or critical thinking skills; did not answer any of the assigned essay questions.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Demonstrates some reflective and/or critical thinking skills; answered some of the essay questions or partially answered questions; incomplete evidence and arguments presented.
- 7-8: More than adequate reflective and/or critical thinking skills; partially answered all of the essay questions; supportive evidence and clear arguments presented.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior reflective and / or critical thinking skills; thoroughly answered all of the essay questions; strong evidence and balanced arguments presented; student engages reader topic and various perspectives; student takes a risk focusing on controversial and/or less well known information/positions.

Comments:

APPENDIX C

GROUP CASE STUDY: 20% (10% Summary & Folder, 10% Individual)

Case Study Analysis and Summary Conclusion: /5

- 0-1: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work. Case study analysis is not acceptable.
- 1.5-2: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited application of principles of forensic psychology to the case study. Limited critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of sources, and logical flow of ideas; unclear or incomplete reasoning for case study conclusion.
- 2.5-3: Acceptable. Adequate application of principles of forensic psychology to the case study. Adequate critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrates some principles learned throughout the course; incomplete description of principles of forensic psychology; cursory reasoning for case study conclusion.
- 3.5-4: More than adequate application of principles of forensic psychology to the case study. More than adequate critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrated application of content and critical thinking principles to case study; correct description of experimental findings and their significance; uses evidence to support ideas as taught during lectures according to Pozzulo et al. (2012), Harris (2010); reason for case study conclusion is clear and relevant.
- 4.5-5: Outstanding application of principles of forensic psychology to the case study. Outstanding performance in which the group demonstrates superior critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of sources, and logical flow of ideas; accurate and thorough description of the experimental findings and their significance; group uses evidence to support arguments as taught during lectures and according to Pozzulo et al. (2012) and Harris (2010); group engages the audience with insight, critical arguments, and novel and/or unique perspective; the importance and relevance of the case study application is clear and compelling; case study summary and conclusion are meaningful and challenging.

Approach to Case Study: /5

- 0-1: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work. Case study analysis is unacceptable.
- 1.5-2: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited understanding of principles of forensic psychology; case study application is too simplistic or obvious; unprepared to present; unable to answer questions.
- 2.5-3: Acceptable. Demonstrates some understanding of principles of forensic psychology; case study application is somewhat cursory but provides some opportunity for discussion and debate; prepared to present; minimal answers to questions.
- 3.5-4: More than adequate understanding of principles of forensic psychology; case study application is meaningful and relevant; well prepared to present; well informed answers to questions.
- 4.5-5: Outstanding performance in which the group demonstrates superior understanding of principles of forensic psychology; case study application is very significant and compels the audience to re-evaluate their prior knowledge of the topic; more than well prepared to present; well informed and insightful answers to questions; thoroughly engages audience in topic and various perspectives; group takes a risk focusing on controversial and/or less well known information/positions.

Comments:

***Individual Evaluation by Instructor: /10**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work; missed many classes and/or group meetings; failed to contribute to case study in a meaningful manner.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited preparation for group work on project; lack of cooperation and collaboration with group members; missed some classes and/or group meetings and did not make-up missed work; did not equitably contribute to the case study.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Demonstrates some preparation for group work; interacts with group members in a cooperative, supportive, and collaborative manner; listens and responds to ideas and offers own ideas; missed minimal classes and/or group meetings; made up all missed work; contributed equitably.
- 7-8: More than adequate preparation and participation in group activities for project; demonstrates consistent and positive interactions with group members that draw out peer strengths and support peer areas of learning; openly shares insights and encourages others to reciprocate; equitable contributions to group work; did not miss any classes and/or group meetings.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior preparation and participation; demonstrates consistent and positive interactions with group members that both supports and challenges peers to work outside of their own zone of comfort in ways that lead to success; consistently engages with others by respectfully offering and critiquing ideas; equitable contributions to group work; did not miss any classes and/or group meetings.

Comments:

APPENDIX D

Approved Project and Essay Sources

Week 8: Teams 1-5

Pozzulo et al. (2012) Ch. 5: Memories and Eyewitness Testimonies

- Cole, W.G., & Loftus, E.F. (1979). Incorporating new information into memory. *American Journal of Psychology*, 92: 413-425.
- Douglass, A.B. & Steblay, N. (2006) Memory distortion in eyewitnesses: A meta-analysis of the post-identification feedback effect. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20: 859-869.
- Hans, V.P. & Dee, J.L. (1991) Media coverage of law: Its impact on juries and the public. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 35: 136-149.
- Heller, K.J. (2006) The cognitive psychology of circumstantial evidence. *Michigan Law Review*, 105: 241-304.
- Jackiw, L.B., Arbuthnott, K.D., Pfeifer, J.E., Marcon, J.L., & Meissner, C.A. (2008). Examining the cross-race effect in lineup identification using Caucasian and First Nations samples. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 40: 52-57.
- Loftus, E.F. (1975) Leading questions and the eyewitness report. *Cognitive Psychology*, 7: 560-572.
- Loftus, E.F. (1979). Reactions to blatantly contradictory information. *Memory and Cognition*, 7: 368-374.
- Loftus, E.F. (1979) The malleability of human memory. *American Scientist*, 67: 312-320.
- Loftus, E.F. (2004). Memories of things unseen. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13: 145-147.
- Loftus, E.F., & Palmer, J.C. (1974). Reconstructions of automobile destruction: An example of the interaction between language and memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 12: 585-589.
- McCloskey, M., & Egeth, H. (1983). Eyewitness identification - What can a psychologist tell a jury? *American Psychology*, 38: 550-563.
- McCloskey, M., & Zaragoza, M. (1985). Misleading post event information and memory for events: Arguments and evidence against memory impairment hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 114: 1-16.
- Wells, G.L., Malpass, R.S., Lindsay, R.C.L., Turtle, J.W., & Fulero, S.M. (2000). From the lab to the police station: A successful application of eyewitness research. *American Psychologist*, 55: 581-598.

Week 9: Teams 6-10

Pozzulo et al. (2012) Ch. 13: Domestic Violence

- Adams, S.M., Hazelwood, T.E., Pitre, N.L., Bedard, T.E., & Landry, S.E. (2009). Harassment of members of parliament and the legislative assemblies in Canada by individuals believed to be mentally disordered. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 20: 801-814.
- Archer, J. (2002). Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between heterosexual partners - a meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7: 313-351.
- Dutton, D.G. & Corvo, K. (2006) Transforming a flawed policy - a call to revive psychology and science in domestic violence research and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11: 457-483.
- Fremouw, W.J., Westrup, D., Pennypacker, J. (1997). Stalking in campus - prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 42: 666-669.
- Kropp, R., Hart, S., & Lyon, D. (2002) Risk assessment of stalking: Some problems and potential solutions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29: 590-616.
- Jones, D. (2008). Human behavior: killer instincts. *Nature*, 451: 512-515.
- McFarlane, J. Campbell, J.C., & Watson, K. (2002). Intimate partner stalking and femicide: Urgent implications for women's safety. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 20: 51-68.
- Muehlenhard, C.L., Kimes, L.A. (1999). The social construction of violence - The case of sexual and domestic violence. *Personality of Social Psychology Review*, 3: 234-245.
- Rosenfeld, B. (2004). Violence risk factors in stalking and obsessional harassment: A review and preliminary meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31: 9-36.

Week 10: Teams 11-15

Pozzulo et al. (2012) Ch. 11: Psychopathy and Violent Crime

- Babiak, P., Neumann, C.S., & Hare, R.D. (2010) Corporate psychopathy - talking the walk. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 28: 174-193.
- Bandura, A. (1999) Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3: 193-209.
- Baumeister, R.F., Campbell, W.K. (1999). The intrinsic appeal of evil: Sadism, sensational thrills and threatened egotism. *Personality of Social Psychology Review*, 3: 210-221.
- Berkowitz, L. (1999). Evil is more than banal: Situationism and the concept of evil. *Personality of Social Psychology Review*, 3: 234-245
- Buckholz, J.W., Treadway, M.T., Cowan, R.L., Woodward, N.D., Benning, S.D., Li, R. et al. (2010) Mesolimbic dopamine system hypersensitivity in individuals with psychopathic traits, *Nature Neuroscience*, 13: 419-421.
- Darley, J.M. (1999). Methods for the study of evil-doing actions. *Personality of Social Psychology Review*, 3: 269-275.
- Dolan, M. & Fullam, R. (2004) Theory of mind and mentalizing ability in antisocial personality disorders with and without psychopathy. *Psychological Medicine*, 34: 1093-1102.
- Hamilton, V.L., Sanders, J. (1999) The second face of evil - Wrongdoing in and by the corporation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3: 222-233.
- Hare, R.D., Clark, D. Grant, M, & Thornton, D. (2000) Psychopathy and the predictive validity of the PCL-R – and international perspective. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 18: 623-645.
- Kirkman, C. A. (2005) From soap opera to science - towards gaining access to the psychopaths who live amongst us. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 78: 379-396.
- Miller, A.G., Gordon, A.K., Buddie, A.M. (1999) Accounting for evil and cruelty - Is to explain to condone? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3: 254-268.
- Newman, J.P., Curtin, J.J., Bertsch, J.D., Baskin-Sommers, A.R. (2010) Attention moderates the fearlessness of psychopathic offenders. *Biological Psychiatry*, 67: 66-70.
- Porter, S., ten Brinke, L., & Wilson, K. (2009) Crime profiles and conditional release performance of psychopathic and nonpsychopathic offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 14: 109-118.
- Quayle, J. (2008) Interviewing a psychopathic suspect. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 5, 79-91.
- Viding, E., Jones, A.P., Frick, P.J., Moffitt, T.E., & Plomin, R. (2008). Heritability of antisocial behavior at 9 – Do callous-unemotional traits matter? *Developmental Science*, 11: 17-22.
- Woodworth, M, & Porter, S. (2002) In cold blood - characteristics of criminal homicides as a function of psychopathy. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 111: 436-445.

Week 11: Teams 16-20

Pozzulo et al. (2012) Ch. 10: Risk Assessment

- Bonta, J. (2002) Offender risk assessment - Guidelines for selection and use. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29: 355-379.
- Boothby, J. & Clements, C.B. (2000) A national survey of correctional psychologists. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27: 715-731.
- Desmarais, S.L., Nicholls, T.L., Read, D., & Brink, J. (2010) Confidence and accuracy in assessments of short-term risks presented by forensic psychology. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 21: 1-22.
- Douglas, K.S., Guy, L.S., & Harr, S.D. (2009). Psychosis as a risk factor for violence to others - A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135: 679-706.
- Giancola, P.R., Parrott, D.J., & Roth, R.M. (2006). The influence of difficult temperament on alcohol-related aggression - Better accounted for by executive functioning? *Addictive Behaviors*, 31; 2169-2187.
- Grove, W.M., Zald, D.H., Lebow, B.S., Snitz, B.F., & Nelson, C. (2000) Clinical versus mechanical prediction - a meta-analysis. *Psychological Assessment*, 12: 19-30.
- Heflick, N.A. (2005). Sentenced to die: Last statements and dying on death row. *OMEGA*, 51: 323-336.
- Hoaken, P.N.S., & Stewart, S.H. (2003) Drugs of abuse and the elicitation of human aggressive behavior. *Addictive Behavior*, 28: 1533-1554.
- Manzoni, P., Brochu, S., Fisher, B., & Rhem, J. (2006) Determinants of property crime among illicit opiate users outside of treatment across Canada. *Deviant Behavior*, 27: 351-376.
- Mojtabai, R. (2006) Psychotic-like experiences and interpersonal violence in the general population. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 41: 183-190.
- Odeh, M.S., Zeiss, R.A., & Huss, M.T. (2006). Cues they use - Clinicians' endorsement of risk cues in predictions of dangerousness. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 24: 147-156.
- Quinsey, V.L., Jones, G.B., Book, A.S., & Barr, K.N. (2006) The dynamic prediction of antisocial behavior among forensic psychiatric patients: A prospective field study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21: 1539-1565.
- Rice, M.E., Harris, G.T., Lang, C., & Cormier, C. (2006) Violent sex offenses - how are they best measured from official records? *Law and Human Behavior*, 30: 525-541.
- Serin, R.C., & Lloyd, C. (2009) Examining the process of offender change: The transition to crime and desistance. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 15: 347-364.
- Swanson, J.W., Borum, R., Swartz, M.S., Hiday, V.A., Wagner, H.R., & Burns, B.J. (2001). Can involuntary outpatient commitment reduce arrests among persons with severe mental illness? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28: 156-189.
- Taylor, S.P., & Sears, J.D. (1988) The effects of alcohol and persuasive social pressure on human physical aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 14: 237-243.