



Forensic Psychology

PSY_3_FPS

<http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/psycho/teaching/forenpsy-main.shtml>

Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences

2009/10

Level 6

become what you want to be

Table of Contents

1.	Unit Details.....	
	Short Description	
3.	Aims of the Unit.....	
4.	Learning Outcomes.....	
4.1	Knowledge and Understanding	
4.2	Intellectual Skills.....	
4.3	Practical Skills	
4.4	Transferable Skills.....	
5.	Assessment of the Unit.....	
6.	Feedback.....	
7.	Introduction to Studying the Unit.....	
7.1	Overview of the Main Content	
7.2	Overview of Types of Classes	
7.3	Importance of Student Self-Managed Learning Time	
7.4	Employability	
8.	The Programme of Teaching, Learning and Assessment	
9.	Student Evaluation	
10.	Learning Resources.....	
10.1	Core Materials.....	
10.2	Optional Materials	
	NOTES	

1. UNIT DETAILS

Unit Title:	Forensic Psychology
Unit Level:	6
Unit Reference Number:	PSY_3_FPS
Credit Value:	15
Student Study Hours:	150
Contact Hours:	30
Private Study Hours:	120
Pre-requisite Learning (If applicable):	None
Co-requisite Units (If applicable):	None
Course(s):	BSc Psychology
Year and Semester	Year 3, semester 2
Unit Coordinator:	Dr Rachel Wilcock
UC Contact Details (Tel, Email, Room)	Extension Block, Room E341, ext 5857 wilcockr@lsbu.ac.uk Office hours: Tuesday 11-1pm
Teaching Team & Contact Details	Dr Anne Ridley ridleyam@lsbu.ac.uk
Subject Area:	Psychology
Summary of Assessment Method:	Essay (2,500 words) 40% 2 hour unseen written examination 60%

2. SHORT DESCRIPTION

This unit will introduce students to research in Forensic Psychology that focuses on evidence from vulnerable witnesses, the courtroom, and rehabilitation of offenders. The unit will draw on knowledge students gained from core units earlier in the course such as Cognitive Psychology and Social Psychology and demonstrate how this is relevant to Criminal Justice. Students will be expected to read about research in the area and to critically evaluate it in terms of generalisability and ecological validity. Students should expect to read journal articles in advance of lectures and seminars and come prepared. Material presented in the seminars (as well as the lectures) will be assessed. Some lectures on the course deal with highly disturbing aspects of human behaviour. It is important therefore that the subject matter is treated with respect and that all present are sensitive to the feelings of others when discussing these issues.

3. AIMS OF THE UNIT

- Introduce students to major topics in Forensic Psychology
- Help students understand how psychological theory from a variety of areas contribute to our understanding of Forensic Psychology
- Provide an opportunity to critically evaluate relevant research and see how research can affect practice

4. LEARNING OUTCOMES

4.1 Knowledge and Understanding

By the end of the unit students should be able to:

- Outline the scope of Forensic Psychology
- Describe how psychology contributes to our understanding of issues relating to detecting deception, the courtroom, and treatment of offenders
- Critically evaluate relevant research
- Explain the application of research to real world practice

4.2 Intellectual Skills

This unit will promote the ability to:

- Generate and explore research questions
- Critically evaluate and present research findings
- Successfully apply multiple perspectives to issues in forensic psychology
- Apply psychological theory to practical situations using a problem solving approach
- Handle primary source material critically

4.3 Practical Skills

By the end of the course students will have:

- Enhanced their ability to search databases for relevant literature

4.4 Transferable Skills

By the end of the course students should be able to:

- Employ evidence based reasoning to evaluate selected theories and explanations
- Make critical judgements and evaluations about relevant research
- Be sensitive to contextual and interpersonal factors
- Discuss and debate controversial issues
- Communicate effectively using written and spoken language

5. ASSESSMENT OF THE UNIT

Elements of Assessment

One 2-hour unseen examination (2 essays out of 6 options) will contribute 60% of the mark.
One coursework essay of 2,500 words will contribute 40% of the mark.

Relationship between learning outcomes and assessment

The assessments (both essay and exam) will require students to demonstrate how psychology contributes to our understanding of topics covered in the course and how research in these areas impacts on real world practice. Students will also have to critically evaluate relevant research when answering the coursework essay and questions in the exam.

Assessment Criteria & Feedback Proforma

The categorical marking scheme will be used (see Course Guide)

The Department feedback proforma for essays will be used (see Course Guide)

Details on submission of coursework

1. When handing in coursework, you must:

- complete the coursework submission form and attach it to the front of your coursework;
- take the coursework to the Faculty Office. Your submission form will be date stamped and a receipt issued. Please keep all receipts. You must not hand coursework to your unit co-ordinator or other lecturer.

Students may be required to provide electronic copy of written work submitted. In such instances, the individual student will be written to, **using their LSBU email address**, requesting electronic submission. Failure to provide electronic copy within **TWO WEEKS** of a written request will result in the work being deemed an incomplete submission, and no mark will be given. The work will then have to be referred* for a capped mark. When Extenuating Circumstances have already been accepted for a unit, this will not negate the proper investigation of any component of that unit for any allegation of academic misconduct, nor the subsequent imposition of any appropriate penalty for proven misconduct.

*Students can normally only be referred in three units in one academic year.

2. Unless you have obtained a formal extension from your year tutor, coursework submitted:
- up to two weeks after the deadline date will receive a maximum mark of the pass mark (40%);
 - more than two weeks after the deadline will not be marked.
3. Extensions are only granted for valid reasons (see Course guide). Concrete evidence (e.g. medical certificate) will normally be required by the Year Tutor. If you want an extension of the deadline date, you must:
- get a copy of the form for late submission from the Faculty Office;
 - fill in Part A of the form, giving reasons why you cannot meet the existing deadline date;
 - supply the Year tutor with relevant documentary evidence;
 - ask the Year Tutor to fill in Part B – the decision whether to agree the request rests with the Year Tutor;
 - attach the form to the front of your coursework when you submit it (keep a copy for your records).
 - each extension form is only valid for one piece of coursework. The maximum extension is two weeks.

The Faculty Office is at times very busy, especially when course work is due to be submitted or handed back. Staff in the Office endeavour to do their best to give support and answer individual student requests. In return, it is expected that students exercise patience and behave courteously whilst waiting at the counter. In all social exchanges in the classroom and in the university as a whole, students and staff are expected to follow the guidelines of acceptable behaviour as outlined in the University Equal Opportunities Document. A copy of this document is available for reference in the Faculty office and the Student Handbook contains a summary of its core principles.

6. FEEDBACK

Feedback will normally be given to students 20 working days after the submission of an assignment.

7. INTRODUCTION TO STUDYING THE UNIT

7.1 Overview of the Main Content

Week	Lecture
1	Introduction and child witnesses – Anne Ridley
2	Child Witnesses – Anne Ridley
3	Older witnesses – Rachel Wilcock
4	Detecting deception – Rachel Wilcock
5	Factors effecting juror decision making – Rachel Wilcock
6	Consolidation week – private study
7	Expert witnesses - Rachel Wilcock
8	Judgement and decision making – Anne Ridley
9	Bail and sentencing – Anne Ridley
10	Intervention with offenders – Brendan O'Mahony
11	Assessing recidivism – Brendan O'Mahony
12	Consolidation week – private study

7.2 Overview of Types of Classes

Lectures will take place to introduce students to the major issues for each of the subject headings above. Some sessions will be a mix of lecture style delivery alongside group work activities and discussions. Other sessions will consist of a lecture followed by a seminar. During class discussions it is hoped that all

students will take part in discussion of the issues. Reading in advance of sessions is essential. Students who have clearly not read the necessary material may be required to leave.

7.3 Importance of Student Self-Managed Learning Time

The unit requires 120 hours of private study time. In order to obtain the maximum benefit from the course I strongly recommend that you read relevant chapters in the core texts, preferably before lectures. At this level you should also be reading appropriate journal articles.

7.4 Employability

This course will provide students hoping to go on to a career in Forensic Psychology with knowledge of different issues within the Criminal Justice System, such as factors relating to the courtroom and to rehabilitation of offenders. Additionally the course will equip you with academic skills such as analytical thinking, problem solving, and good communication skills both written and verbal which are used in many different professions.

8. THE PROGRAMME OF TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

Week 1. Introduction and Child Witnesses

Introduction Objectives:

- To provide an overview of the unit, discuss key and additional reading, and the assessment.
- To consider what Forensic Psychology is.
- To briefly look at how to become a chartered Forensic Psychologist or follow other routes within the area.

Learning outcomes:

By the end of the first part of the lecture students should be able to:

- Understand what the course is about and how it will run.
- Be aware of what Forensic Psychology is.
- Understand the different career options in this area.

Synopsis:

To begin there will be a quick introduction to the unit and to forensic psychology, as well as to possible career paths within the area.

Essential reading:

Adler, J. R. (2004). Forensic psychology: Debates and practice. Devon: Willan Publishing.

Blackburn, R. (1996). What is forensic psychology? *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 1, 3 -1

<http://www.bps.org.uk/careers/areas/forensic.cfm>

Week 1 and Week 2. Child Witnesses

Objectives:

To cover a number of important aspects about children within the legal system.

Learning outcomes:

By the end of these lectures you should be knowledgeable about:

- some of the problems children encounter in the legal system.
- factors involved in the development and accuracy of children's autobiographical memory.
- how misleading information affects children's memory and how interview techniques can increase the suggestibility effect.
- the effectiveness of props and other memory enhancing techniques.
- how interview techniques can be improved to increase children's recall
- Children's identification skills
- Disclosure of child abuse and the match between the testimony of victims and suspects
- Jury and barrister perceptions of children in court
- The limited research on child suspects

Synopsis:

Children are often the only witnesses in cases of sexual abuse and therefore their testimony is essential in the resulting court cases. This lecture will explore the main problems of using children as witnesses. Are they accurate? How suggestible are they? What special problems does cross-examination pose? What factors affect their accuracy and what they report? We will also consider methods that can be used to enhance children's memory. The limited research on children as suspects will also be considered.

Core reading:

Lamb, M. E., Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y., & Esplin, P. W. (2008). *Tell me what happened: Structured investigative interview of child victims and witnesses*. Chichester: Wiley

Lassiter, G. D. (2004). *Interrogations, confessions and entrapment*. New York: Springer. Chapter 5, Chapter 6.

Westcott, H. L., Davies, G. M. & Bull, H. R. C. (2002) *Children's Testimony*. Chichester: Wiley. Particularly Chapters 8, 9 and 11.

Additional reading:

Carter, C. A., Bottoms, B. L., & Levine, M. (1996). Linguistic and Sociemotional Influences on the Accuracy of Children's reports. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20, 335-358.

Cordon, I. M., Goodman, G. S., & Anderson, S. J. (2003) in Van Koppen, P.J & Penrod, S. J. (Eds.). *Adversarial versus Inquisitorial Justice*. New York: Kluwer Academic

As an introduction read one or other of the following chapters:

Kapardis, A. (2003) *Psychology and Law* (2nd Edition). Cambridge: CUP
Chapter 4. Children as witnesses.

Howitt, D. (2002) *Forensic and Criminal Psychology*. Harlow: Pearson/Prentice Hall. Chapter 15. Children as Witnesses.

Other essential readings will also be made available via Blackboard.

Week 3: Older witnesses

Objectives:

- To explain the effects of aging on eyewitness performance
- To examine the effects of aging in terms of older witnesses' recall of a crime event
- To consider how best to interview older adult witnesses
- To examine the effects of aging in terms of older witnesses' ability to identify a crime perpetrator, and how we may aid their performance

Learning outcomes:

By the end of the lecture and seminar students should be able to:

- Explain how aging affects the cognitive factors involved in eyewitness tasks
- Give an account of how and why older witness statements differ to young adults
- Critically evaluate the literature that investigates the use of the CI with older witnesses

- Describe how older witness performance on lineups differs to younger witnesses, and how their performance could be aided

Synopsis:

The mean age of the population in many countries is rising and older adults are remaining fit, active and healthy for longer. Thus it is likely that we will have more people over the age of 60 witnessing crime than ever before. This lecture will explore the main problems of using older adults as witnesses. Initially, we will look at how older witnesses are perceived by lay people i.e. potential jurors. We will examine the effect of cognitive aging on eyewitness tasks (interviewing and identification). Finally, we will consider methods that can be used to enhance older witnesses' performance both on line-ups and during investigative interviews.

Essential reading:

Wilcock, R. The Aging Eyewitness. In J. Adler & J. Gray (Eds) Forensic Psychology: Concepts, Debates and Practice 2nd edition. Willan. In press.

Additional reading:

Brimacombe, C.A.E., Quinton, N., Nance, N., & Garrioch, L. (1997). Is age irrelevant? Perceptions of young and old adult eyewitnesses. Law and Human Behavior, 21, 619-634.

Mueller-Johnson, K. & Ceci, S.J. (2004). Memory suggestibility in older adults: Live event participation and repeated interview. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 18, 1109-1127.

Wilcock, R. & Bull, R. In press. Novel Lineup Methods for Improving the Performance of Older Eyewitnesses. Applied Cognitive Psychology.

Wright, A.M. & Holliday, R.E. (2007). Enhancing the recall of young, young-old and old-old adults with cognitive interviews. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 21, 19-43.

Week 4: Detecting Deception

Objectives:

To introduce how Psychologists have defined lying and explain the different sorts of lies we tell.

To explain the reasons why we lie, and how often we lie.

To consider how well people are able to detect deception.

To explain the statement validity analysis (SVA) technique for detecting deception and critically evaluate its use.

To explain non-verbal cues and critically evaluate their utility for detecting deception.

Learning outcomes:

Explain how Psychologists have defined lying and the different sorts of lies we tell.

Give reasons for why people lie, and how frequently people tell lies.

Critically evaluate our ability to detect deception.

Describe and critically evaluate the SVA technique for detecting deception

List and critically evaluate non-verbal cues for detecting deception.

Synopsis:

The lecture will begin by reviewing how Psychologists have defined lying and differentiating between the different sorts of lies we tell. Psychologists have conducted research to examine the reasons why we tell lies and also how frequently we tell lies and this research will be reviewed. Prior to examining methods of detecting deception we will investigate how well people are able to tell when someone is lying. The remainder of the lecture will focus on the German technique of statement validity analysis which originated in Germany for use with children's allegations of sexual abuse. Criteria based content analysis is conducted on a statement and the more criteria that are present the more likely that the statement is true. Therefore SVA is a truth verifying technique.

During the seminar we will be going over non verbal cues to detecting deception. We will be doing a quiz where we examine your beliefs as to what are non-verbal cues to deception, we will look at the lay public's perception of non-verbal cues before looking objectively at actual non-verbal cues.

Essential reading:

Vrij, A. (2008). *Detecting Lies and Deceit. Pitfalls and Opportunities*. Chichester: John Wiley. second edition (Read chapter 8 for the lecture and chapter 3 for the seminar)

Additional reading:

Mann, S. & Vrij, A. (2002). Suspects, lies and videotapes: An analysis of authentic high-stake liars. *Law and Human Behavior*, 26, 365-376

Memon, A. (2003). Telling and detecting lies. In A. Memon, A. Vrij, & R. Bull. *Psychology and Law: Truthfulness, Accuracy and Credibility* (p7-36). Chichester: John Wiley

Vrij, A., Akehurst, L., Soukara, S., & Bull, R. (2002). Will the truth come out? The effect of deception, age, status, coaching, and social skills on CBCA score. *Law and Human Behavior*, 26, 261-283.

Vrij, A. (2005). Criteria based content analysis: A qualitative review of the first 37 studies. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 11, 3-41.

Week 5. Factors Affecting Juror Decision Making

Objectives:

- To explain different models of juror decision making
- To examine the effect of different sorts of evidence on juror decision making
- To consider the effect of factors beyond evidence brought in to court
- To consider the impact of pre trial publicity on juror decision making

Learning outcomes:

By the end of the lecture students should be able to:

- Evaluate different models of juror decision making
- Critically evaluate research concerned with the effect of evidence on juror decision making
- Critically assess the effect of additional factors (characteristics of the defendant and inadmissible evidence) on juror decision making
- Critically examine the impact of pre trial publicity on juror decision making

Synopsis:

Throughout the course of this lecture we will consider different factors that affect jury decision making. To begin with we will consider models of how jurors make decisions, these involve mathematical models and also the popular cognitive story model. Following on from this we will look at the impact of different types of evidence that jurors are likely to hear on decision making. Finally in this lecture we will consider the influence of factors beyond evidence brought to court. We will examine how characteristics of the defendant and inadmissible evidence including pre-trial publicity effect jury decision making. In the seminar time we will view 12 Angry Men. During the film there are many issues raised which directly relate to the topics discussed in the lecture. There will be an opportunity to discuss these further at the end of the seminar.

Essential reading:

Levett, L.M. Danielson, E.M., Bull Kovera, M., & Cutler, B.L. (2005). The psychology of jury and juror decision making. In N. Brewer & K. D. Williams (Eds.). *Psychology and Law: An Empirical Perspective*. New York: Guildford Press. p365-406.

Cutler, B.L., Penrod, S.D., & Dexter, H.R. (1990). Juror sensitivity to eyewitness identification evidence. *Law and Human Behavior*, 14, 185-191.

Devine, D.J., Clayton, L.D., Dunford, B.B., Seying, R., & Pryce, J. (2001). Jury decision making: 45 years of empirical research on deliberating groups. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 7, 622-727. (this is a very long paper but I can point you to the most relevant parts)

Lloyd-Bostock, S. (2000). The effects on juries of hearing about the defendant's previous criminal record: A simulation study

Mitchell, T.L., Haw, R., Pfeifer, J.E., Meissner, C.A. (2005). Racial bias in mock juror decision-making: A meta-analytic review of defendant treatment. *Law and Human Behavior*, 29, 621-637.

Steblay, N., Hosch, H.M., Culhane, S.E., & McWethy, A. (2006). The impact of judicial instruction to disregard inadmissible evidence: A meta-analysis. *Law and Human Behaviour*, 30, 469-492.

Steblay, N., Besirevic, J., Fulero, S.M., & Jimenez-Lorente, B. (1999). The effects of pretrial publicity on juror verdicts: A meta-analytic review. *Law and Human Behaviour*, 23, 219-235.

Week 6. Consolidation Week – Private Study

Week 7. Expert Witnesses

Objectives:

- To introduce what expert evidence is, who can give it, and when expert evidence is admissible in court.
- To discuss the role of expert witnesses in an adversarial system compared to an inquisitorial system.
- To examine the content of expert witness testimony.
- To consider the effect of expert witness testimony on juries.

Learning outcomes:

By the end of the lecture students should be able to:

- Explain what expert evidence is, who gives expert evidence, and when expert evidence is admissible in court.
- Critically evaluate the role of expert witnesses in an adversarial system compared to an inquisitorial system.
- Discuss the content of expert witness testimony
- Critically evaluate the effect of expert witness testimony on juries.

Synopsis:

The lecture will begin by introducing what expert testimony is, who is able to give expert testimony and the qualifications such a person is likely to have, and when expert evidence is admissible in court. Expert witnesses play different roles depending on whether they are in an adversarial system or an inquisitorial system. In an adversarial system if one side calls an expert witness then the other side is likely to also call an expert witness to counteract. In an inquisitorial system an expert witness is appointed as a 'friend of the court' in an educational position and will fail to take sides. The remainder of the lecture will look at the content of expert testimony on eyewitness issues and the likely effect this will have on juries. Jurors and lawyers are not always aware of the effect on eyewitness accuracy of factors such as the way in which questions are worded. We will consider what factors expert witnesses are likely to agree about and be prepared to give expert testimony on.

During the seminar we will be examining examples of cases where expert testimony has been used and looking at excerpts of expert testimony. Discussions will be focused around the issues present in these cases.

Essential reading:

Memon, A., Vrij, A & Bull, R. (2003) Psychology and Law: Truthfulness, Accuracy and Credibility. (2nd edition). Chichester: John Wiley. P 169-179.

Kassin, S.M., Tubb, V.A., Hosch, H.M., & Memon, A. (2001). On the "general acceptance" of eyewitness testimony research: A new survey of the experts. American Psychologist, 56, 405-416.

Additional reading:

Devenport, J.L. & Cutler, B.L. (2004). Impact of defense-only and opposing eyewitness experts on juror judgements. *Law and Human Behaviour*, 28, 569-576.

Leippe, M.R., Eisenstadt, D., Rauch, S.M., & Seib, H.M. (2004). Timing of eyewitness expert testimony, jurors' need for cognition, and case strength as determinants of trial verdicts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 524-541.

Levett, L.M. & Kovera, M.B. (2008). The effectiveness of opposing expert witnesses for educating jurors about unreliable expert evidence. *Law and Human Behavior*, 32, 363-374.

Matire, K.A. & Kemp, R.I. (2009). The impact of eyewitness expert evidence and judicial instruction on juror ability to evaluate eyewitness testimony. *Law and Human Behavior*, 33, 225-236.

Week 8. Judgement and decision making in legal contexts: Cognitive and Social models.

Objectives:

- To introduce normative (bottom-up) models as they relate to judgements and decisions in legal contexts.
- To introduce descriptive (top-down) processes that relate to judgements and decisions in legal contexts.
- To review social psychological models of decision making.

Learning outcomes:

By the end of this lecture students should be able to:

- Explain the strengths and limitations of normative and bottom-up decision making processes.
- Outline what is meant by descriptive and top-down decision making processes and the implications for justice.
- Demonstrate understanding of concepts such as likelihood estimates and the various methods of reasoning used to reach them, utility values and weighting and integration rules.
- Explain what is meant by 'mortality salience and terror management theory' in the forensic decision making context.
- Outline other social models of legal decision making.

Lecture synopsis:

Judgement and decision making is crucial in many aspects of life but nowhere more so than in investigative and forensic contexts where the liberty of citizens is at stake as a result of it. This lecture will be largely theoretical, introducing cognitive models of decision making (normative and descriptive), outlining their strengths and weaknesses. Complex concepts such as utility values, likelihood estimates and weighting and integration rules will be explained. Social models of decision making in the legal context will also be reviewed, and their relationship to cognitive theories considered.

Essential reading:

Michon, J. A. & Pakes, F. J. (1995) in Bull, R. & Carson, D. (1995). *Handbook of Psychology in Legal Contexts*. Chichester: Wiley. Chapter 6.2.

Goodman-Delahunty, J. ForsterLee, L & ForsterLee, R (2005). Dealing with the Guilty Offender in N. Brewer & K. D. Williams (Eds.). *Psychology and Law: An Empirical Perspective*. New York: Guildford Press.

Additional reading:

Eysenck, M. W. & Keane, M. T. (2005) *Cognitive Psychology: A student's handbook*. Hove: Psychology Press. Chapter 15 (for a general review of the cognitive literature on decision making).

Hastie, R. (2001). Problems for Judgment and Decision Making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 653-683. (available on-line via LISA – this is a general review of decision making which would be useful background reading and for critically evaluating the research covered in this lecture and the following one).

Howitt, D. (2005) Forensic and Criminal Psychology. (2nd Edition) Harlow: Pearson/Prentice Hall. Chapter 20.

Seminar: Content to be advised.

Week 9. Bail and sentencing.

Objectives

- To outline what is meant by 'bail' and the role of magistrates.
- To review the research by Mandeep Dhami and others into the role of normative and descriptive (non-compensatory) decision making processes when magistrates make bail decisions.
- To explain the various purposes of sentencing convicted criminals, and factors which are taken into account.
- To consider research into judicial biases: gender, race, age and attractiveness.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this lecture students should be able to:

- Describe the concept of bail and the role of magistrates
- Outline and critically evaluate research by Mandeep Dhami into bail decision making among magistrates.
- Discuss the various possible purposes of sentencing convicted criminals to custodial sentences and the factors which affect these decisions.
- Review the research into judicial biases.

Lecture synopsis:

In this lecture, we will be looking at decision making in the applied context. We will start by explaining what is meant by bail and the role of magistrates in deciding bail. We will move on to review research by Dhami into whether normative or descriptive (non-compensatory) processes are used by magistrates when reaching their decisions. The second half of the lecture will be about sentencing. What is its purpose? What factors affect how judges reach their decisions when sentencing? Are judges prone to bias?

Essential reading:

Dhami, M. (2006) in Brooks-Gordon, B. & Freeman, M. (Eds.). Law and Psychology (Current Legal Issues). Oxford: OUP.

Dhami, M. (2003). Psychological Models of Professional Decision Making. Psychological Science, 14, 175-2003. (available on-line via LISA)

Goodman-Delahunty, J. ForsterLee, L & ForsterLee, R (2005). Dealing with the Guilty Offender in N. Brewer & K. D. Williams (Eds.). Psychology and Law: An Empirical Perspective. New York: Guildford Press.

Kapardis, A. (2003). Psychology and Law. (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 6.

Additional reading (all available on-line via the Library):

Epstein, L, Martin, A. D. (2004). Does age (really) matter? A response to Manning, Carroll, and Carp. Social Science Quarterly, 85, 19-30.

Manning, K. L., Carroll, B. A. & Carp, R. A. (2004) Does age matter? Judicial decision making in age discrimination cases. Social Science Quarterly, 85, 2-18.

Manning, K. L., Carroll, B. A. & Carp, R. A. (2004) A reply to Epstein and Martin's "Does age matter?" Social Science Quarterly, 85, 31-36.

Week 10. Interventions with Offenders

Objectives:

- To introduce a key area of forensic psychology namely, 'what works' with offenders in terms of reducing crime.
- To describe the terms 'risk' and 'need'
- To understand the main risk factors associated with offending using the research literature
- To understand how programmes and interventions are targeted to address an offenders risk/needs
- To understand what interventions other than accredited programmes may be of benefit in reducing risk.
- To describe the main types of interventions for offenders in England and Wales and how effective these programmes are considered to be

Learning outcomes:

By the end of this lecture students should be able to:

- Explain the concept of "what works" with offenders and evidence-based practice
- Define the concept of risk and need
- List the factors associated with offending from the research literature
- Describe the type of interventions in England and Wales that address these factors

Lecture synopsis:

This lecture examines how the research literature has influenced practice in forensic psychology in terms of working with offenders to reduce offending. It covers two key concepts in forensic psychology, risk and need. The main factors associated with reoffending are outlined. It is these factors that are assessed by forensic psychologists in order to plan interventions for offenders which are aimed to reduce an offenders risk and need and, therefore, reduce the chance that they will re-offend.

Essential reading:

Andrews & Bonta (2006). *Psychology of Criminal Conduct (4th Edition)*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing. Chapter 10 – Prevention and Rehabilitation, **Or** Howitt (2006). *Forensic and Criminal Psychology (2nd ed.)*. Harlow: Pearson. Chapter 22 – effective prison (see also box on RJ – victims chapter).

Crighton, D. & Towl, G.J. (2008) *Psychology in Prisons* (2nd Ed). BPS Blackwell: London

Willmot, P (2003) Applying Research on Recidivism to Prison Regimes (Chapter 5, pages 35-51), In G. Towl *Psychology in Prisons*. Oxford: BPS Blackwell.

Additional reading:

Harper, G. & Chitty, C. (2004). *The impact of corrections on re-offending: A review of 'What Works'*. Home Office, Research, Development and Statistics, Research Study No. 291. London: Home Office. – **Executive Summary**. (Access via LISA Internet link and www.homeoffice.gov.uk (see Research, development and Statistics publications))

Hollin, C.R. (2006). Offending behaviour programmes and contentions: Evidence based practice, manuals, and programme evaluation: in C.R. Hollin and E.P. Palmer (Eds.), *Offending Behaviour Programmes: Development Application and Controversies* (pp 33-67). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons

Lewis, S., Maguire, M., Raynor, P., Vanstone, M., & Vennard, J. (2007). What works in resettlement? Findings from seven Pathfinders for short-term prisoners in England and Wales. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 7 (1), Sage Publications.

McGuire, J. (1995). *What Works: Reducing Reoffending*. Wiley

Shapland et al (2006). *Restorative justice in practice*. Home Office Research Finding 274. (Please look up other RJ studies on the RDS website)

Week 11. Assessing Recidivism

Objectives:

- To introduce the area of crime measurement in criminology/forensic psychology
- To understand the concept of unrecorded crime, recorded crime and convictions
- To define the terms reconviction, re-offending and recidivism
- To understand the difference between reconviction and recidivism
- To understand the limitations and merits of reconviction (the main outcome measure used in UK forensic psychology)
- To understand how crime measurement methods are used to evaluate interventions for offenders

Learning outcomes:

By the end of this lecture students should be able to:

- Explain the main methods of measuring crime
- Define the terms reconviction, re-offending and recidivism and understand how they relate to each other
- Outline the advantages and disadvantages of reconviction as an outcome in forensic psychology
- To describe how reconviction is used to evaluate interventions for offenders

Lecture Synopsis:

In this lecture, the ways that crime is measured in England and Wales will be examined. The limitations of the different methods will also be addressed. Crime measurement is a useful practice in particular, to evaluate interventions for offenders. The outcomes reconviction, re-offending and recidivism will be defined. The pros and cons of main outcome in forensic psychology (reconviction) will be outlined as this forms the basis of the 'what works' with offenders debate.

Essential reading:

Maguire, M (2007). Crime data and Statistics (Chapter 10, pages 241-301). In M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (Eds, 4th ed) . Oxford Handbook of Criminology. Oxford. OUP

Friendship, C., Beech, A.R. & Browne, K.D. (2002). Reconviction as an outcome in research: A methodological note. *British Journal of Criminology*, 42, 442-444.

Kelly, L, Lovett, J & Regan, L (2005). *A gap or a chasm: Attrition in reported rape cases*. HORS 292. London: Home Office. Executive summary

Additional reading:

Andrews & Bonta (2006). *Psychology of criminal conduct* (4th Edition). Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing. Chapter 2 - Defining Criminal Behavior, Exploring Sources of Variation, and Major Findings from PCC

Friendship, C., Street, R., Cann, J. & Harper, G. (2004). Introduction: The policy context and assessing the evidence. In Harper, G. & Chitty, C. (2004). *The impact of corrections on re-offending: A review of 'What Works'*. Home Office, Research, Development and Statistics, Research Study No. 291. London: Home Office. (Access via LISA Internet link and www.homeoffice.gov.uk (see Research, development and Statistics publications))

Lloyd, C., Mair, G. & Hough, M. (1994). *Explaining reconviction rates: A critical analysis*. Home Office Research Study, No. 136. London: Home Office. (All Home Office research papers can be downloaded from the website: www.homeoffice.gov.uk (see Research, development and Statistics publications))

Nicholas, S., Kershaw, C. and Walker, A. (2007). Crime in England and Wales in 2006/07: A summary of the main findings. London: Home Office. (Access via LISA Internet link and www.homeoffice.gov.uk (see Research, development and Statistics publications))

Seminar. Case study and discussion

This seminar will involve reading a case study regarding a young person (offender). The information will be analysed in order to identify the needs of the offender in order to identify which type of interventions the offender would benefit from. This exercise will also be used to understand how information regarding an offender is analysed in order to assess risk of serious harm to others, risk of re-offending and the offender's vulnerability.

Week 12. Consolidation Week – Private Study

9. [STUDENT EVALUATION](#)

**FACULTY OF ARTS & HUMAN SCIENCES
2008/2009 UNIT EVALUATION - SEMESTER 2**

UNIT TITLE:	FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY
UNIT REF NO:	PSY-3-FPS
COURSES:	BSc PSYCHOLOGY
DEPARTMENT:	PSYCHOLOGY
UNIT LEADER:	RACHEL WILCOCK

Number students registered:	17
Number UEQs returned:	8
Return rate:	47%

Full-time:	7
Part-time:	1
No response:	0

Combined Honours – Yes:	0
Combined Honours – No:	5
No response:	3

Foundation:	
HNC/HND:	
LL.B/B.A/BSc:	✓
Postgrad:	
Professional:	

Level 1:	0
Level 2:	1
Level 3:	7
Level M:	0
No response:	0

RATING OF STANDARD OF THE FOLLOWING:	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	No response
a) Lectures	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
	0	0	0	4	4	0
b) Seminars	0%	0%	0%	88%	13%	0%
	0	0	0	7	1	0
c) Information on Blackboard	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%
	0	0	2	4	2	0
d) Lab & practical sessions	0%	0%	0%	0%	13%	88%
	0	0	0	0	1	7
e) Overall quality of Unit	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%
	0	0	0	6	2	0

RATING OF USEFULNESS OF THE FOLLOWING:	Not at all useful	Not very useful	Useful	Very useful	Extremely useful	No response
a) Unit guide	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%
	0	0	2	4	2	0
b) Assessment	0%	0%	38%	38%	25%	0%
	0	0	3	3	2	0
c) Feedback	0%	13%	25%	50%	0%	13%
	0	1	2	4	0	1
d) Unit resources	0%	0%	38%	13%	13%	38%
	0	0	3	1	1	3

	In terms of their learning, what students found valuable about the Unit:		Those aspects which students would like to see improved:	
Contribution to subject knowledge	88%	7		

Unit Guide			0%	0
-------------------	--	--	-----------	----------

Lectures: Subject matter	75%	6	13%	1
Style of delivery	50%	4	13%	1
Handouts	75%	6	0%	0
Visual aids	25%	2	13%	1

Seminars: Subject matter	75%	6	0%	0
Understanding of topic	75%	6		
Workshops			13%	1
Discussions	63%	5	13%	1
Group work	63%	5	13%	1
Skills Development	13%	1	38%	3
Laboratory sessions	0%	0	0%	0

Assessments: Coursework	38%	3	0%	0
Exams	13%	1	0%	0
Projects	0%	0	0%	0

Resources: Library	25%	2		
Labs/studios	0%	0		
Equipment	0%	0		

Feedback: Usefulness			13%	1
Promptness			13%	1

Staff: Helpfulness of teaching staff	63%	5	0%	0
---	------------	----------	-----------	----------

Whether students had any other suggestions for improving the overall quality of the Unit:	Yes	No	No response
	0%	88%	13%
	0	7	1

10. LEARNING RESOURCES

10.1 Core Materials

None of the core books cover all of the topics covered in this course. However, between all these books you will find information on all topics covered in the course.

Andrews & Bonta (2006). Psychology of criminal conduct (4th Edition). Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.

Brewer, N. & Williams, K.D. (2005). Psychology and Law: An empirical perspective. New York: The Guildford Press.

Howitt, D. (2009). Introduction to forensic and criminal psychology (3rd Edition) Harlow: Pearson Longman

Kapardis, A. (2003). Psychology and Law: A critical introduction. (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Memon, A, Vrij, A & Bull, R. (2003). Psychology and Law: Truthfulness, Accuracy and Credibility. (2nd edition). Chichester: John Wiley.

10.1 Optional Materials

Adler, J. R. (2004). Forensic psychology: Concepts, debates and practice. London: Willan.

Harper, G. & Chitty, C. (2004). The impact of corrections on re-offending: A review of 'What Works'. Home Office, Research, Development and Statistics, Research Study No. 291. London: Home Office. (Access via LISA Internet link)

Maguire, M (2007). Crime data and Statistics. In M.Maguire, R. Morgan and R.Reiner (Eds, 4th ed) . Oxford Handbook of Criminology. Oxford. OUP

JOURNALS

In addition to the journal articles cited for individual lectures and seminars, the following journals are available through LISA.

Legal and Criminalological Psychology
Law and Human Behavior
British Journal of Criminology
International Journal of Law and Psychiatry
Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology
Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management

You should browse these journals looking for relevant journal articles to contribute to your revision and coursework. In addition you should also look through PsychArticles (one of the databases accessible through LISA on the internet). You can do a keyword search. Some relevant articles may come up in other more general journals available in the library. If the article is not available through the library it is worth reading the abstracts in Psycinfo, which should give a clear summary.

Dr Rachel Wilcock
January 2010