

**Roger Williams University**  
**College of Arts & Sciences**  
**PSYCH 342.01: Legal Psychology**  
**Fall 2004: MTH 2:00-3:25**

**Professor:** Dr. Garrett L. Berman  
**Office:** Feinstein (FCAS) 104  
**Office Phone:** (401) 254-3341  
**E-mail address:** gberman@rwu.edu  
**Office hours:** Monday 10:30-11:00; Thursday 3:30-5:00; Friday 12-1 and by appointment

**Course Description:** The application of social science research methods and psychological knowledge to contemporary issues in the criminal justice system. Course topics and discussions will include: eyewitness testimony, scientific jury selection, lineup construction, legal safeguards, juror decision making, the social scientist as an expert witness, pretrial publicity, confessions, and research methods used by legal psychologists. We will explore issues, debates, substantive information and lots of hot topics in the courts and the media.

**Course Objectives:** This course was designed to meet the following objectives:

1. Apply psychological principles to help understand the psychology of testimony, evidence, lineups, and expert testimony.
2. Analyze and play the role of the trial consultant in the jury selection process.
3. Encourage students to critically think about psychological variables and how they influence the criminal justice system.
4. Assisting students in critically examining research paradigms used to test concepts in psychology and law.
5. Demonstrate the relationship between social, cognitive, developmental, and clinical psychology and how these areas are utilized to help understand the legal system.
6. Discuss, distinguish, and compare the roles of forensic and legal psychologists.
7. Reduce anxiety associated with actively participating in class.
8. Be able to understand how psychological research is used (and/or ignored) in court decisions.
9. Learn how to conduct and analyze Jury Simulation Research to help prepare trial strategies.

**Textbook:** Costanzo, M. (2004). Psychology Applied to the Law. Thomson: Wadsworth.

**Exam Policy:**

There will be two examinations and a comprehensive final. Each exam will consist of multiple-choice questions and/or essay questions. Examinations will cover material from the lectures, videotapes, guest lecturers, and textbook. Each exam will be worth 100 points.

## Active Learning Exercises

**Oral Arguments:** Pairs of students will debate each other on a controversial topic in psychology and law. Each team member will have 5 minutes (10 minutes per group) to present his/her case. Upon completion of the debate, the topic will be open for discussion. Research (relevant books and journals) for each topic can be found at the end of the syllabus in the reference section.

**Mock Trial:** The class will be assigned a trial transcript including police reports, depositions, and stipulations. Students will play the roles of the attorneys, trial consultants, jury selection experts, detectives, expert witnesses and eyewitnesses. Students assigned the role of jury selection experts will select 6 to 12 jurors from an introduction to psychology course in a one hour voir dire based upon the profiles developed by the trial consulting team.

**On-Line Discussion Group:** Each student may join an on-line discussion group in psychology and law and Forensic Psychology. It is easy to subscribe to these lists. Once subscribed, messages will appear in your mailbox daily. The list users (which include legal psychologists, forensic psychologists, students and practitioners) discuss professional and practical implications of their careers and research. If appropriate, we will discuss these issues in class and reply to the list with our conclusions. You send commands to subscribe, unsubscribe and set subscription options to Listserv, a server that will generally respond back in a few minutes. See instructions below regarding this website:

### Listserv User Instructions: (Taken from AP-LS Website)

This is a very brief list of Listserv commands. A complete "General User's Guide" is available, in a variety of formats, from L-Soft International, Inc. via web at <http://www.lsoft.com/manuals/1.8d/user/user.html>

You send **commands only** to subscribe, unsubscribe and set subscription options to Listserv, a machine that will generally respond back in a few minutes, at [LISTSERV@UNL.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV@UNL.EDU)

To **post actual messages** to the members (people) of the list, send the e-mail to [PSYLAW-L@UNL.EDU](mailto:PSYLAW-L@UNL.EDU)

---

### How to Subscribe

Send an e-mail message to [LISTSERV@UNL.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV@UNL.EDU)

In the Message Field, NOT Subject field, type: **SUBSCRIBE PSYLAW-L**

The items above *are* case insensitive.

**NOTE:** Do not include your electronic signature, as Listserv will try to interpret each line as a command.

---

### How to Unsubscribe

Send an e-mail message to [LISTSERV@UNL.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV@UNL.EDU)

In the Message Field, NOT Subject, type: **UNSUBSCRIBE PSYLAW-L**

The items above *are* case insensitive.

**NOTE:** Do not include your electronic signature block, as Listserv will try to interpret each line as a command.

---

### **Subscription Options:**

When you subscribe to a listserv, your subscription options will be set to the defaults of that list. Most of the time the defaults will probably serve you well. However, you may choose to alter these settings to suit your needs. All **commands** are sent via e-mail to [LISTSERV@UNL.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV@UNL.EDU) and the commands are placed in the Message Field (NOT Subject)

#### **To view your present settings**

QUERY PSYLA-L

#### **To change option setting**

SET PSYLA-L OPTION

SELECTED OPTIONS

For full list of options goto <http://www.lsoft.com/manuals/1.8d/user/user.html>

---

You may leave the list at any time by sending a "SIGNOFF PSYLA-L" command to [LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU). You can also tell LISTSERV how you want it to confirm the receipt of messages you send to the list. If you do not trust the system, send a "SET PSYLA-L REPRO" command and LISTSERV will send you a copy of your own messages, so that you can see that the message was distributed and did not get damaged on the way. After a while you may find that this is getting annoying, especially if your mail program does not tell you that the message is from you when it informs you that new mail has arrived from PSYLA-L. If you send a "SET PSYLA-L ACK NOREPRO" command, LISTSERV will mail you a short acknowledgement instead, which will look different in your mailbox directory. With most mail programs you will know immediately that this is an acknowledgement you can read later. Finally, you can turn off acknowledgements completely with "SET PSYLA-L NOACK NOREPRO". Following instructions from the list owner, your subscription options have been set to "NOACK REPRO DIGESTS" rather than the usual LISTSERV defaults. If you wish to receive the postings on a message-by-message basis, simply issue a SET PSYLA-L NODIGEST command to [LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU). For more information about subscription options, send a "QUERY PSYLA-L" command to [LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU).

Contributions sent to this list are automatically archived. You can get a list of the available archive files by sending an "INDEX PSYLA-L" command to [LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU). You can then order these files with a "GET PSYLA-L LOGxxxx" command, or using LISTSERV's database search facilities. Send an "INFO DATABASE" command for more information on the latter.

Please note that it is presently possible for other people to determine that you are signed up to the list through the use of the "REVIEW" command, which returns the e-mail address and name of all the subscribers. If you do not want your name to be visible, just issue a "SET PSYLA-L CONCEAL" command. More information on LISTSERV commands can be found in the LISTSERV reference card, which you can retrieve by sending an "INFO REFCARD" command to [LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV@CRCVMS.UNL.EDU).

---

Students may also subscribe to an on-line U.S. Supreme Court decisions network. This is a free e-mail service that forwards you U.S. Supreme Court decisions within hours of their release. These decisions will be discussed in class if deemed relevant. To subscribe to the

U.S. Supreme Court decisions in Bulletin format send an e-mail message to:

**LISTSERV@LISTSERV.LAW.CORNELL.EDU**

The message needs to read: Subscribe liibulletin Your name

After becoming a psychology and law list serve member, you will receive electronic information welcoming you to the community. Students may forward this notice to me to indicate your on-line status.

-----  
The American Psychological Association has 55 divisions. Division 41 of APA is the AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGY--LAW SOCIETY (AP-LS). AP-LS members consist of legal psychologists, applied social and cognitive psychologists, forensic psychologists, trial consultants, and attorneys. Information concerning the activities and new developments in the field of legal psychology can be found at the website:

<http://www.unl.edu/ap-ls/>

Students are required to peruse the website, read one recent article posted on the website and become familiar with the activities affiliated with the organization.



**Course Schedule:** The following course schedule is a guide. All dates, exams, and reading assignments are subject to change based on my discretion. Any changes will be announced during class.

<b>September</b>	02-09	Introduction to Psychology and the Law American Psychology Law Society <b>Readings:</b> Chapter 1: History of Psychology and Law
	13	Psychology vs. The Law (Similarities/Differences) <b>Readings:</b> Chapter 2: Interrogations, Confessions, and Lie Detection
	16	<b>Guest Lecture:</b> Dr. Melissa Russano Confession Research and Police Interrogation techniques
	20	Confessions and Interrogation techniques <b>Readings:</b> Chapter 2: Interrogations, Confessions, and Lie Detection Chapter 4: Competence and Insanity
	23	Competency to Stand Trial <b>Readings:</b> Chapter 4: Competence and Insanity
	27-30	The Insanity Defense <b>Readings:</b> Chapter 4: Competence and Insanity
<b>October</b>		
	<b>04</b>	<b>Examination 1: Chapters 1,2,4, lectures, and videotapes</b>
	07	Lineup Construction <b>Readings:</b> Chapter 6: Memory as Evidence
	<b>11</b>	<b>No Classes: Columbus Day</b>
	12	<b>Monday Classes Meet:</b> <b>Readings:</b> Chapter 6: Eyewitness Identification
	14	Lineup Outcomes and Presentation <b>Readings:</b> Chapter 6: Identification and Evaluation of Criminal Suspects
	18	Eyewitness Identification and Legal Safeguards Viewing of Dateline "Eyewitness Testimony" <b>Readings:</b> Chapter 3: Profiles and Syndromes
	21	<b>Guest lecture:</b> Mike DiLauro. Public Defender's Office for State of Rhode Island

## October

25 Legal Safeguards  
**Readings:** Chapter 3: Profiles and Syndromes

28 **Examination 2 (Chapters 3, 6)**  
**Readings:** Chapter 5: Juries and Judges

## November

01 Jury Selection  
**Readings:** Chapter 5: Juries and Judges

04 Jury Selection Tools  
**Readings:** Chapter 5: Jury

08 Learning how to conduct Focus Groups  
Viewing of "Focus Groups"

11 **In Class Debates/Oral Arguments**  
**Readings:** Chapter 5: Jury Trials I: Representation and Selection

15 Jury Deliberations Viewing of "Enter the Jury Room"  
**Readings:** Chapter 5

18 Death Qualified Juries  
**Readings:** Chapter 9: Sentencing, Imprisonment, and the Death Penalty

22 Case Preparation  
**Readings:** Chapter 9: Sentencing, Imprisonment, and the Death Penalty

24-28 **No Classes: Happy Thanksgiving**

29 Change of Venue and Pretrial Publicity  
**Readings:** **Readings:** Chapter 9: Sentencing, Imprisonment, and the Death Penalty

## December

02 Mock Trial Preparation including jury selection from introduction to psychology sections

06-09 **Mock Trial Simulation in Ralph Pappitto School of Law**

13 Review trial strategies (**Mock Trial Paper Due**) and Complete Oral Debates

21 **Final Exam- 4:00-6:00 Cumulative (Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, presentations, lectures, and films)**

## Grading:

Exams (N=2)	35 percent
Final Examination	15 percent
Mock Trial Paper	25 percent
Oral Arguments	15 percent
Attendance and Participation	10 percent

## Selected Books in Legal Psychology

Bartol, C. R., & Bartol, A. M. (2004). *Introduction to Forensic Psychology*. Sage Publications.

Ceci, S. J., & Bruck, M. (1995). *Jeopardy in the courtroom: A scientific analysis of children's testimony*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Cutler, B. L., & Penrod, S. D. (1995). *Mistaken identification: The eyewitness, psychology, and the law*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Finkel, N. (1995). *Common sense justice: Juror's notions of the law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Foley, L. A. (1993). *A psychological view of the legal system*. Dubuque, IA: Brown and Benchmark.

Hans, V. P., & Vidmar, N. (1986). *Judging the jury*. New York: Plenum Publishers.

Horowitz, I. A., & Willging, T. E. (1984). *The psychology of law: Integrations and applications*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.

Johnson, R. (1998). *Death work: A study of the modern execution process*. West/Wadsworth: Belmont, CA

Loftus, E. F. (1979). *Eyewitness Testimony*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Loftus, E. F., & Ketcham, K. (1991). *Witness for the defense: The accused, the eyewitness and the expert who puts memory on trial*. St Martin's Press: New York.

Lubet, S. (1998). *Expert Testimony: A guide for expert witnesses and the lawyers who examine them*. National Institute for Trial Advocacy: Chicago, IL.

Memon, A., Vrig, A., & Bull, R. (1998). *Psychology and Law: Truthfulness, Accuracy and Credibility*. New York, McGraw Hill:

Nakell, B., & Hardy, K. A. (1987). *The arbitrariness of the death penalty*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Nietzel, M. T., & Dillehay, R. C. (1986). *Psychological consultation in the courtroom*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Ogloff, J. R. P. (Eds.) (2002). *Taking Psychology and Law into the twenty-first century*. Volume 14 in the Perspectives in Law and Psychology Series: Volume 14. NY: Kluwer Publishing.

Roesch, R., Hart, Stephen, D., Ogloff, J. R. P. (Eds.) (1999) *Psychology and Law: The state of the discipline*. Volume 10 in the Perspectives in Law and Psychology series. NY: Kluwer Publishing.

Wrightsman, L. S., Nietzel, M. T., & Fortune, W. H. (2002). Psychology and the legal system, Fifth Edition. Wadsworth

Wrightsman, L. S., & Willis, C. E., & Kassin, S. M. (1987). *On the witness stand*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

**Many of the selections above are located in the Roger Williams Library**

---

---

### **Special Issues of Journals dedicated to Psychology and Law**

Goodman-Delahunty, J. (Ed.). (2001). The other-race effect and contemporary criminal justice: Eyewitness identification and jury decision making. Psychology Public Policy and Law, 7.

Costanzo, M., & White, L. T. (Eds.). (1994). The death penalty in the United States [Special issue]. Journal of Social Issues, 50(2).

Haas, K. C., & Inciardi, J. A. (Eds.). (1988). Challenging capital punishment: Legal and social science approaches [Special issue]. Sage, Criminal Justice System Annuals, 24.

Sales, B. D. (Ed.). (1995). Suggestibility of child witnesses -- the social science amicus brief in State of New Jersey v. Margaret Kelly Michaels [Special issue]. Psychology, Public Policy and Law, 1.

### **Empirical Articles**

Berman, G. L., & Cutler, B. L. (1996). Effects of inconsistencies in eyewitness testimony on mock-juror decision making. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 170-177.

Berman, G. L., Narby, D. J., & Cutler, B. L. (1995). Effects of inconsistent eyewitness statements on mock-jurors' evaluation of the eyewitness, perceptions of defendant culpability and verdicts. Law and Human Behavior, 19, 79-88.

Brigham, J. C. (1999). What is forensic psychology anyway? Law and Human Behavior, 23, 273-298.

Ceci, S. J., & Bruck, M. (1993). The suggestibility of the child witness: A historical review and synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 403-439.

Cutler, B. L., Penrod, S. D., & Martens, T. K. (1987). Improving the reliability of eyewitness identification: Putting context into context. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 629-637.

Cutler, B. L., Penrod, S. D., & Martens, T. K. (1987a). The reliability of eyewitness identification. The role of estimator and system variables. Law and Human Behavior, 11, 233-258.

Diamond, S. S. (1990). Scientific jury selection: What social scientists know and do not know. *Judicature*, 73, 178-183.

Dillehay, R. C., & Sandys, M. R. (1996). Life under *Wainwright v. Witt*: Juror dispositions and death qualification. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20, 147-165.

Greene, E., & Dodge, M. (1995). The influence of prior record evidence on juror decision making.

Liss, M. B. (1992). Psychology and law courses: Content and materials. *Law and Human Behavior*, 16, 463-471.

McCauley, M. R., & Fisher, R. P. (1995). Facilitating children's eyewitness recall with the revised cognitive interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 510-516.

Strier, F. (1999). Wither Trial Consulting? Issues and Projections. *Law and Human Behavior*, 23, 93-115.

Wells, G. L., (1993). What do we know about eyewitness identification. *American Psychologist*, 48, 533-571.

Wells G. L. & Bradfield, A. M. (1998). Good you identified the suspect: Feedback to eyewitness distorts their reports of the witnessing experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 360-376.

Wells, G. L., Small, M., Penrod, S. J., Malpass, R. S., Fulero, S. M., & Brimacombe, C. A. E. (1998). Eyewitness identification procedures: Recommendations for lineups and photospreads. *Law and Human Behavior*, 22, 603-647.

### **List of Supreme Court Cases**

Batson v. Kentucky (1986), 54 U.S.L.W. 4425

Ballew v. Georgia, 435 U.S. 223 (1978).

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc, 113 S. Ct. 2786 (1993).

Frye v. U.S., 293 Fed. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923)

Lockhart v. McCree, 476 U.S. 162 (1986).

Maryland v. Craig, 497 U.S. 836 (1990).

Neil v. Biggers, 409 U.S. 188 (1972).

## Oral Arguments

Pairs of students will debate each other in an adversarial manner. Students will debate on some psycholegal issue deemed controversial. Some ideas include:

1. Is plea bargaining a good or a bad idea and should plea bargaining be abolished?
2. Should death-qualified juries be allowed or prohibited?
3. Should therapists warn others of a client's dangerousness?
4. Are repressed memories of sex abuse authentic and should they be allowed in court?
5. Should the death penalty be abolished?
6. Should the insanity defense be abolished?
7. Does Scientific Jury Selection work? Should the criminal justice system abolish the use of trial consultants in the courtroom?
8. Should Juveniles who commit violent crimes be tried in adult criminal court? What are the advantages and disadvantages, psychologically?
9. Should Victim Impact testimony be allowed at the sentencing hearing?
10. All pretrial information regarding criminal cases should be made immediately available to the press.

On the day of your presentation, each team will make available to the class a typed summary of relevant points and documents relevant to their argument (e.g., empirical studies, Supreme Court decisions). You will have 5-7 minutes to present your case. When the teams have completed their presentations, the rest of the class will be able to ask questions. Each member of the class will anonymously complete an evaluation regarding (a) which team had the winning case (b) which individual presented the most persuasive argument and (c) a numerical rating of argument strength and quality (0-10) for each presenter's case. Arguments should be based on empirical research supporting one's position. Personal opinion will not count towards student's grades.



## Mock Trial

During the course of the semester we will select a topic for the mock trial. Each student will receive the facts of the case in writing. Students will then choose their roles in the trial (attorney, jury selection expert, eyewitness, detective, trial consultant, etc.). Students will have 10 minutes at the trial to present his/her testimony (normally broken down into 5 minutes for both direct and cross-examination). Defense and prosecuting attorneys will be given 7 minutes for opening arguments and 7 minutes for closing arguments



After assigning roles to the class, students are responsible for meeting with their respective team (defense or prosecution) and discussing trial strategy. Approximately, one week before the trial begins, the jury selection experts for each team will conduct a voir dire in an introductory psychology course. Jury selection experts will rely on information provided by the trial consulting team whose responsibilities include: developing instruments to assess attitudes, conducting focus groups and/or mock trials, to assess the attitudes of the jury pool about the crime and appropriate strategy and presentation of evidence.

Read carefully the instructions below:

Once you choose a role in the trial, you need to review relevant theories from the texts, relevant research from the scientific literature, and outside resources including case law, statutes, and legal personnel. I want your argument based on course content. Before the trial begins, each student is required to turn in a 5 to 7 page APA style typed paper describing the points you will make when you play your role and why these points are appropriate to the role you're playing. In the paper, include any relevant references and psychological theory. The last page of your paper could include your experiences of participating in a mock trial.

**Grades for the mock trial will be associated with your discussion of the psycholegal issues associated with your role in the trial and will include:**

1. Discussion of psycholegal issues associated with your role in the trial
2. Psychological theories, empirical studies and/or statutes relevant to your role or testimony:
3. Aspects of your role that could have or has been found in the literature to influence juror decision making
4. Writing Style
5. Team Participation (whether it's your fault or not)
6. Courtroom Performance



## Internet Legal Resources

American Psychology-Law Society (AP-LS): Division 41 of APA  
<http://www.unl.edu/ap-ls/>

National Institute of Justice Website. Eyewitness Evidence: A Trainer's Manual for Law Enforcement.  
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/eyewitness/188678.html>

American Academy of Forensic Psychology:  
<http://www.abfp.com/aafp/>

Dr. Hooper's Forensic Psychiatry Resource Page (U. of Alabama)  
<http://ualvm.ua.edu/~jhooper/>

Dr. Gary Wells Website for Lineups and Eyewitness Identification  
<http://www.psychology.iastate.edu/faculty/gwells/homepage.htm>

## Law Sources

U.S. Supreme Court Decisions: Full text; searchable by subject; 1990-present  
<http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/supct.table.html>

## Legal Publications

U.S. Law Week: The Supreme Court  
<http://www.bna.com/supreme.html>

The National Law Journal  
<http://www.ljextra.com/nlj/>

## Legal Organizations

American Civil Liberties Union—ACLU  
<http://www.aclu.org>

National Institute of Justice  
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/>

The Innocence Project  
<http://www.innocenceproject.org/>  
August 18, 2004; 148 exonerated

**JUSTICE DEPARTMENT RELEASES GUIDE ON EYEWITNESS EVIDENCE**  
**Guide and Other Work Called for by Attorney General Reno**  
**Taken Directly from "Eyewitness Evidence: A Guide for Law Enforcement"**

WASHINGTON, D.C.--The Justice Department's National Institute of Justice (NIJ) released "Eyewitness Evidence: A Guide for Law Enforcement," which provides information to law enforcement officials responsible for the collection and preservation of eyewitness evidence.

Based on Attorney General Reno's personal interest in this subject, NIJ Director Jeremy Travis convened a working group of leading practitioners and experts to develop the guide.

"Because of the role that eyewitnesses play in supplying critical evidence about crimes, I asked NIJ to explore this issue," said Attorney General Janet Reno. "The recommendations in this guide will be an invaluable resource for jurisdictions across the country, and can be incorporated as needed to fit unique local circumstances."

The guide is not intended to benchmark legal criteria for the admissibility of evidence. Rather, it sets out rigorous criteria for handling eyewitness evidence that are as demanding as those governing the handling of physical trace evidence.

"When the Attorney General asked us to explore this issue, we brought together not only law enforcement officials, but prosecutors, defense attorneys, and researchers," said NIJ Director Jeremy Travis. "This product represents a combination of the best current thinking on police practices and psychological research."

In May 1998, NIJ established the Technical Working Group for Eyewitness Evidence to identify, define, and assemble a set of investigative tasks that could be performed in every investigation involving eyewitness evidence. The 34-member working group continues to work to identify "best practices" and relay this information to criminal justice professionals who can practically apply this knowledge. A sample of the working group members is listed below.

The group is developing a syllabus to support the new guide and a CD-ROM that can be distributed to interested criminal justice professionals with additional information on eyewitness evidence issues.

For a copy of the guide, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at 1-800/851-3420. Additional information about NIJ and the Office of Justice Programs is available at: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij>.

### **Sample of WORKING GROUP MEMBERS**

Commander Ella M. Bully (Ret.), Detroit Police Department ; Sgt. Paul Carroll (Ret.); Chicago Police Department , James Doyle; Attorney at Law Boston, Massachusetts; Ronald P. Fisher, Ph.D. Florida International University; Mark R. Larson King County Prosecutor's Office, Seattle, Washington; Capt. Donald Mauro, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office; First Sgt. Roger Broadbent ; Virginia State Police; Caterina DiTraglia; State of Missouri; Public Defender System Roy S. Malpass, Ph.D., University of Texas El Paso; William Hodgman; Los Angeles County DA's Office; Rod C.L. Lindsay, Ph.D., Queen's University; Kingston, Ontario; John Turtle, Ph.D.,

Ideas and Active Learning Exercises associated with this syllabus were taken from a variety of sources including: the AP-LS website, Eyewitness Evidence: The guide for law enforcement, publications in Teaching of Psychology describing debates/mock trial exercises, and personal communication with Legal Psychologists teaching similar courses.