

PSY 133

PSYCHOLOGY & LAW

FALL 2004 – TUFTS UNIVERSITY

PROFESSOR: Samuel R. Sommers
227 Psychology, x7-5293
sam.sommers@tufts.edu

OFFICE HOURS: Tuesdays 2:00 – 3:00
Wednesdays 1:00 – 2:00
Or by appointment via e-mail

COURSE DETAILS: Mondays & Wednesdays, 4:00 – 5:15
Anderson 306
Course documents available via Blackboard

COURSE GOALS:

- To lead you to think about psychology – and, more specifically, social psychology – from different perspectives
- To demonstrate the applicability of psychological theory and research to a real-life, applied setting
- To develop your ability to criticize and discuss published research
- To provide you with experience designing or actually conducting an original empirical investigation

REQUIREMENTS:

- Pre-requisites include PSY 13 (Social Psychology) and PSY 32 (Experimental Psychology). We will review important concepts and theories as necessary, but I will also assume that you have some basic knowledge of social psychological theories and research methodology.
- This is a seminar, not a lecture. You are expected to attend regularly and to participate actively. There is a heavy reading load for this course, comprised mostly of research articles from psychology journals. You must read all assignments before we meet and you must come to class prepared for discussion. Do not take this course if you are not willing to meet these expectations! Demand for the class is high and spots are limited – if you are filling one of these spots, do not plan to skip assignments or sit passively in the back of the classroom.

- You are also expected to check e-mail regularly. Announcements, assignment clarifications, and collaborative work will be done via e-mail.

COURSE STRUCTURE:

Class meetings will be a combination of mini-lectures, guest speakers, demonstrations, group activities, and discussion. There is no textbook for the course, but rather a coursepack. Careful and critical reading of these coursepack articles will be essential in determining your final grade and how much you get out of this course. We will go through the coursepack articles in sequence (see list on final pages of this syllabus), and each class I will clarify which readings should be done for the following class.



MAJOR ASSIGNMENTS:

- **Exams** – There will be two noncumulative exams during the course of the term. They will consist of identifications, other short response questions, and short essays. There will be *no* final exam during finals period.

- **Reaction Papers** – You are required to write a reaction paper each week. Reaction papers are due at the *beginning of class* as indicated by the schedule included in this syllabus. The purpose of these papers is for you to think about the readings and generate discussion questions before we meet. It does no good to write these papers after we have our discussion, which is why they cannot be turned in late. There are 12 weeks in the course (excluding the first day of class and the last day we meet). Your 10 best reaction papers will factor into your final grade. This means you can miss reaction papers for two weeks without adversely affecting your grade.

Reaction papers should be typed and no longer than one single-spaced page. In these papers you should analyze one (or more) of the readings for the day in question. You can raise questions for discussion, relate the reading to real-world events, critically analyze the method or results of a study, etc. It is good to pose questions in these papers; it is even better to give some sense of how one might try to answer those questions. General suggestions for research that could address the issues you raise are always nice to include.

- **Final Research Paper** – For your final paper, you will choose one of two assignment options. One possibility is to design and implement an original empirical research project. You can work in groups on this study, but each group member will have to turn in his/her own paper based on this research at the end of the semester. The second option is to write a research proposal. If you choose to do this, you will work on your own to conduct a literature review, propose a detailed design for a study, and discuss the potential findings/implications of the investigation. This paper is envisioned as a long-term project, so guidelines for the assignment will be distributed early in the semester.

WRITING FELLOWS:

This course enables you to work with a Writing Fellow on your final paper. All writers, no matter how experienced, benefit from the revision process and from sharing their work with others and. No psychologist would ever dream of submitting a first draft of a paper to a journal for review! Author notes of published articles almost always acknowledge several people who have read previous versions of the paper and offered suggestions for revision; authors typically spend weeks if not months editing and rewriting their manuscripts. Your experience with research papers should be no different.

You are required to meet with one of the Writing Fellows at least twice during the course of the semester. Early in the term, you will meet with a Fellow to discuss a polished draft of your Introduction (including a literature review and hypothesis statement). Several weeks before the finished product is due at the end of the semester, you will meet to discuss a polished draft of the entire paper. The Writing Fellows will help you communicate your ideas more clearly and effectively. They are not responsible for addressing the course-related content of the paper, nor for grading your paper. Meeting twice with a Fellow is a course requirement, but I urge you to use them as a resource throughout the process of writing this paper.

ASSIGNMENTS:

Your final grade will be determined as follows:

- Exam #1 (25%)
- Exam #2 (25%)
- Final Research Paper (25%)
- Reaction Papers (15%)
- Participation (10%)

NOTE: Failure to attend class regularly *will* lower your participation grade.

LATE POLICY:

For the final research assignment, any paper turned in after its deadline will be penalized 1/3 grade for each day it is late (e.g., an A- becomes a B+ if it is one day late, a B if it is two days late). Exam dates are fixed and *nonnegotiable*. In general, **if you have questions about a grade, concerns about an assignment, or extenuating personal circumstances that you feel I should know about, you need to bring them to my attention ASAP.** By the end of the term, it is too late to do anything about most of these concerns and issues, so do not wait until the week before grades are due to talk with me about these matters. I am generally (at least in my own mind) a reasonable and understanding person, so please do



come to me with any concerns or questions you may have – just don't wait until it's too late to do anything about them!

SCHEDULE OF TOPICS & READINGS
(subject to change as the semester progresses)

Date	Topic	Assignments
------	-------	-------------

Introductory Issues:

W 9/8	Introduction	
-------	--------------	--

M 9/13	Criminal Behavior	1. Conklin (2004) 2. Turvey (2002)
--------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Reaction Paper #1

Police Investigations:

W 9/15	Intro to Investigation	1. Swanson et al. (2003)
--------	------------------------	--------------------------

M 9/20	Confession Evidence	1. Kassin & Kiechel (1996) 2. Kassin (1997) 3. Ofshe (1992)
--------	---------------------	---

Reaction Paper #2

W 9/22	Lie Detection	1. Saxe et al. (1985)
--------	---------------	-----------------------

Guest Speaker:

Trooper Brandon Arakelian
Massachusetts State Police

M 9/27	Racial Profiling	1. Harris (2002) 2. Correll et al. (2002)
--------	------------------	--

Reaction Paper #3

The Courtroom:

M 11/1 Intro to the Courtroom 1. Wrightsman et al. (2002)

7:00 Film Screening: "12 Angry Men," Tisch Library, Room 314

W 11/3 Jury Selection 1. Hans & Vidmar (1982)
2. Batson v. Kentucky (1986)

Reaction Paper #8

M 11/8 Death Qualification 1. Cox & Tanford (1989)
2. Bersoff & Ogden (1987)
3. Lockhart v. McCree (1986)

Reaction Paper #9

W 11/10 Trial Consulting

Guest Speakers:

Scott Berman, MBA & Robert Duboff, J.D.
HawkPartners, LLC

7:00 Film Screening: "Inside the Jury Room," Tisch Library, Room 304

M 11/15 Jury Deliberations 1. Ellsworth (1988)

Reaction Paper #10

W 11/17 Inadmissible Evidence 1. Kassin & Sommers (1997)
2. Studebaker & Penrod (1997)

M 11/22 Defendant Characteristics 1. Sigall & Ostrove (1975)
2. Sommers & Ellsworth (2001)

Reaction Paper #11

W 11/24 NO CLASS

M 11/29 Insanity Defense 1. Low et al. (1986)

W 12/1 Psychology in Court 1. Wrightsman (2001)
2. McCleskey v. Kemp (1987)

Reaction Paper #12

M 12/6 Correctional Psychology 1. Bartol & Bartol (2004)

W 12/8 EXAM #2



REFERENCE LIST

Bartol, C. R., & Bartol, A. M. (2004). Correctional psychology. In *Psychology and law: Theory, research, and application* (3rd ed., pp. 305 - 342).

Batson v. Kentucky. 476 U.S. 79 (1986).

Bersoff, D., & Ogden, D. (1987). In the Supreme Court of the United States: Lockhart v. McCree: Amicus Curiae Brief. *American Psychologist*, 42, 59 - 68.

Bottoms, B. L., & Davis, S. L. (1997). The creation of satanic ritual abuse. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 16, 112 - 132.

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

Clancy, S. A., Schachter, D. L., McNally, R. J., & Pitman, R. K. (2000). False recognition in women reporting recovered memories of sexual abuse. *Psychological Science*, 11, 26 - 31.

Conklin, J. E. (2004). Biological and psychological explanations of crime. In

- Criminology* (8th ed., pp. 102 – 131). Boston: Pearson.
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The police officer's dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially threatening individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 1314 – 1329.
- Cox, M., & Tanford, S. (1989). An alternative method of capital jury selection. *Law and Human Behavior*, *13*, 167 – 183.
- Dwyer, J., Neufeld, J., & Scheck, B. (2001). Seeing things. In *Actual innocence: When justice goes wrong and how to make it right* (pp. 53 – 100). New York: Signet.
- Ellsworth, P. C. (1988). Are twelve heads better than one? *Law and Contemporary Problems*, *52*, 205 – 224.
- Hans, V. P., & Vidmar, N. (1982). Jury selection. In N. L. Kerr & R. M. Bray (Eds.), *The Psychology of the courtroom* (pp. 39 – 82). New York: Academic Press.
- Harris, D. A. (2002). Profiling unmasked; The hard numbers. In *Profiles in injustice: Why racial profiling cannot work* (pp. 48 – 90). New York: New Press.
- Kassin, S. M. (1997). The psychology of confession evidence. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 221 – 233.
- Kassin, S. M., & Kiechel, K. L. (1996). The social psychology of false confessions: Compliance, internalization, and confabulation. *Psychological Science*, *7*, 125 – 128.
- Kassin, S. M., & Sommers, S. R. (1997). Inadmissible testimony, instructions to disregard, and the jury: Substantive versus procedural considerations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 1046 – 1054.
- Lockhart v. McCree*. 476 U.S. 162 (1986).
- Loftus, E. F. (1989). Misinformation and memory: The creation of new memories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *118*, 100 – 104.
- Loftus, E. F. (1993). The reality of repressed memories. *American Psychologist*, *48*, 518 – 537.

- Loftus, E. F. (1997). Creating false memories. *Scientific American*, 11, 70 – 75.
- Loftus, E. F., & Palmer, J. C. (1974). Reconstruction of automobile destruction: An example of the interaction between language and memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 13, 585 – 589.
- Low, P. W., Jeffries, J. C., Jr., & Bonnie, R. J. (1986). *The trial of John W. Hinckley, Jr.: A case study in the insanity defense* (pp. 3 – 21; 126 – 137). Mineola, NY: Foundation Press.
- Mazzoni, G., & Memon, A. (2003). Imagination can create false autobiographical memories. *Psychological Science*, 14, 186 – 188.
- Ofshe, R. J. (1992). Inadvertent hypnosis during interrogation: False confession due to dissociative state, mis-identified multiple personality disorder and the satanic cult hypothesis. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 40, 125 – 156.
- Saxe, L., Dougherty, D., Cross, T. (1985). The validity of polygraph testing: Scientific analysis and public controversy. *American Psychologist*, 40, 355 – 366.
- Sigall, H., & Ostrove, N. (1975). Beautiful but dangerous: Effects of offender attractiveness and nature of the crime on juridic judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 410 – 414.
- Sommers, S. R., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2001). White juror bias: An investigation of prejudice against Black defendants in the American courtroom. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 7, 201 – 229.
- Studebaker, C. A., & Penrod, S. D. (1997). Pretrial publicity: The media, the law, and common sense. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 3, 428 – 460.
- Swanson, C. R., Chamelin, N. C., & Territo, L. (2003). *Criminal investigation* (8th ed., pp. 121 – 164). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Turvey, B. E. (2002) Criminal Motivation; Offender Characteristics. In *Criminal profiling: An introduction to behavioral evidence analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 335 – 355).

- Wells, G. L., & Bradfield, A. L. (1998). "Good, you identified the suspect": Feedback to eyewitnesses distorts their reports of the witnessed experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 360 - 376.
- Wells, G. L., & Olson, E. A. (2001). The other-race effect in eyewitness identification: What do we do about it? *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law, 7*, 230 - 246.
- Wells, G. L., & Olson, E. A. (2003). Eyewitness testimony. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 277 - 295.
- Wells, G. L., Smalls, M., Penrod, S., Malpass, R. S., Fulero, S. M., & Bimacombe, C. A. E. (1998). Eyewitness identification procedures: Recommendations for lineups and photospreads. *Law and Human Behavior, 22*, 1 - 39.
- Wrightsman, L. S. (2001). Roles and responsibilities of forensic psychologists. In *Forensic Psychology* (pp. 25 - 49). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Wrightsman, L. S., Greene, E., Nietzel, M. T., & Fortune, W. H., (2002). The trial process. In *Psychology and the legal system* (5th ed.; pp. 359 - 382). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.