

Profile information current as at 29/04/2024 12:03 pm

All details in this unit profile for PSYC13021 have been officially approved by CQUniversity and represent a learning partnership between the University and you (our student). The information will not be changed unless absolutely necessary and any change will be clearly indicated by an approved correction included in the profile.

General Information

Overview

Forensic Psychology is the area of behavioural science concerned with psychology and the law. In this unit, you will discuss how psychological principles and practices can be applied to topics such as police recruitment and procedures, suspect interviewing, false confessions, courtroom practices and witness reliability, understanding criminal behaviour, mental competency, and justice. You will also discuss general psychological principles as they relate to the legal systems within Australia and other countries as well as specific case studies.

Details

Career Level: Undergraduate Unit Level: Level 3 Credit Points: 6 Student Contribution Band: 10 Fraction of Full-Time Student Load: 0.125

Pre-requisites or Co-requisites

Pre-requisites: CA10 and CQ01- Must complete PSYC11008, PSYC11009, PSYC12014, and PSYC12013 or PSYC12010. CF59- Must have completed PSYC12048 and (PSYC12010 or PSYC12012 or PSYC12013 or PSYC12014 or PSYC12047). p.p1 {margin: 0.0px 0.0px 0.0px 0.0px; font: 14.0px Calibri; -webkit-text-stroke: #000000} span.s1 {font-kerning: none} CC43- Minimum of 96 credit points, which must include PSYC12048 and PSYC12047.

Important note: Students enrolled in a subsequent unit who failed their pre-requisite unit, should drop the subsequent unit before the census date or within 10 working days of Fail grade notification. Students who do not drop the unit in this timeframe cannot later drop the unit without academic and financial liability. See details in the <u>Assessment Policy and</u> <u>Procedure (Higher Education Coursework)</u>.

Offerings For Term 2 - 2018

- Adelaide
- Bundaberg
- Distance
- Rockhampton
- Townsville

Attendance Requirements

All on-campus students are expected to attend scheduled classes – in some units, these classes are identified as a mandatory (pass/fail) component and attendance is compulsory. International students, on a student visa, must maintain a full time study load and meet both attendance and academic progress requirements in each study period (satisfactory attendance for International students is defined as maintaining at least an 80% attendance record).

Website

This unit has a website, within the Moodle system, which is available two weeks before the start of term. It is important that you visit your Moodle site throughout the term. Please visit Moodle for more information.

Class and Assessment Overview

Recommended Student Time Commitment

Each 6-credit Undergraduate unit at CQUniversity requires an overall time commitment of an average of 12.5 hours of study per week, making a total of 150 hours for the unit.

Class Timetable

Regional Campuses Bundaberg, Cairns, Emerald, Gladstone, Mackay, Rockhampton, Townsville

<u>Metropolitan Campuses</u> Adelaide, Brisbane, Melbourne, Perth, Sydney

Assessment Overview

Group Discussion
Weighting: 15%
Written Assessment
Weighting: 45%
Examination
Weighting: 40%

Assessment Grading

This is a graded unit: your overall grade will be calculated from the marks or grades for each assessment task, based on the relative weightings shown in the table above. You must obtain an overall mark for the unit of at least 50%, or an overall grade of 'pass' in order to pass the unit. If any 'pass/fail' tasks are shown in the table above they must also be completed successfully ('pass' grade). You must also meet any minimum mark requirements specified for a particular assessment task, as detailed in the 'assessment task' section (note that in some instances, the minimum mark for a task may be greater than 50%). Consult the <u>University's Grades and Results Policy</u> for more details of interim results and final grades.

CQUniversity Policies

All University policies are available on the CQUniversity Policy site.

You may wish to view these policies:

- Grades and Results Policy
- Assessment Policy and Procedure (Higher Education Coursework)
- Review of Grade Procedure
- Student Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure
- Monitoring Academic Progress (MAP) Policy and Procedure Domestic Students
- Monitoring Academic Progress (MAP) Policy and Procedure International Students
- Student Refund and Credit Balance Policy and Procedure
- Student Feedback Compliments and Complaints Policy and Procedure
- Information and Communications Technology Acceptable Use Policy and Procedure

This list is not an exhaustive list of all University policies. The full list of University policies are available on the <u>CQUniversity Policy site</u>.

Previous Student Feedback

Feedback, Recommendations and Responses

Every unit is reviewed for enhancement each year. At the most recent review, the following staff and student feedback items were identified and recommendations were made.

Feedback from Student feedback

Feedback

Humour: Large numbers of students commented on the lecturer's sense of humour and style of delivery.

Recommendation

Current approach to be continued.

Feedback from Student feedback

Feedback

Group assignment: some students were unable to make contact with fellow students and this delayed starting the first assignment.

Recommendation

Group assignment instructions to be revised with contingency plans for when students do not engage with each other.

Feedback from Student feedback

Feedback

Exam length: some students requested a longer exam (three hours instead of two) as it would allow an opportunity to display greater knowledge/depth of reading. However, most were happy with existing length.

Recommendation

Expectations of what is required in the exam will be reinforced during the teaching period.

Unit Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of this unit, you will be able to:

- 1. Understand the philosophical similarities and differences underlying the disciplines of psychology and the legal system
- 2. Have a knowledge of the accomplishments of legal psychologists
- 3. Be aware of the particular challenges facing psychologists interacting with the legal system
- 4. Have further developed your research and writing skills.

Alignment of Learning Outcomes, Assessment and Graduate Attributes



Alignment of Assessment Tasks to Learning Outcomes

Assessment Tasks	Learning O	outcomes		
	1	2	3	4
1 - Group Discussion - 15%	•			•
2 - Written Assessment - 45%	•		•	•
3 - Examination - 40%	•	•		

Alignment of Graduate Attributes to Learning Outcomes

Graduate Attributes	Learni	ng Outco	mes	
	1	2	3	4
1 - Communication				•
2 - Problem Solving				•
3 - Critical Thinking	•	•	•	•
4 - Information Literacy		•	•	•
5 - Team Work				
6 - Information Technology Competence				•
7 - Cross Cultural Competence				
8 - Ethical practice	•		•	
9 - Social Innovation				
10 - Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultures				

Alignment of Assessment Tasks to Graduate Attributes

Assessment Tasks	Gra	duat	e Att	ribut	es					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 - Group Discussion - 15%	•		•			•		•		
2 - Written Assessment - 45%	•		•	•				•		
3 - Examination - 40%		•	•							

Textbooks and Resources

Textbooks

PSYC13021

Prescribed

Legal Psychology in Australia

Edition: 1 (2015) Authors: Nolan, M. & Goodman-Delahunty, J. Thomson Reuters Sydney , NSW , Australia ISBN: 9780455223889 Binding: Paperback

View textbooks at the CQUniversity Bookshop

IT Resources

You will need access to the following IT resources:

- CQUniversity Student Email
- Internet
- Unit Website (Moodle)

Referencing Style

All submissions for this unit must use the referencing style: <u>American Psychological Association 6th Edition (APA 6th</u> edition)

For further information, see the Assessment Tasks.

Teaching Contacts

Karena Burke Unit Coordinator k.j.burke@cqu.edu.au

Schedule

Week 1 - 09 Jul 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Introduction to forensic psychology	Nolan & Goodman-Delahunty (2015). pp. 1-28.	
Week 2 - 16 Jul 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Offender profiling	Nolan & Goodman-Delahunty (2015). pp.38-48.	Psychic detectives - activity and online discussion (details on Moodle)
Week 3 - 23 Jul 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Forensic science: oxymoron	Kassin, S. M., Dror, I. E., & Kukucka, J. (2013). The forensic confirmation bias: Problems, perspectives, and proposed solutions. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 2(1), 42-52.	
Week 4 - 30 Jul 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic

Eyewitness testimony	Nolan & Goodman-Delahunty (2015). Chapter 2.	Bizarre questions - activity and online discussion (details on Moodle)
Week 5 - 06 Aug 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Children as witnesses	Nolan & Goodman-Delahunty (2015). pp. 232-246 Supplementary material can also be found at pp. 424-432 & 441-451.	Offender profiling (Assessment 1) Due: Week 5 Monday (6 Aug 2018) 9:00 am AEST
Vacation Week - 13 Aug 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Week 6 - 20 Aug 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Interviewing and interrogation	Nolan & Goodman-Delahunty (2015). Chapter 3.	
Week 7 - 27 Aug 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Detecting truth and deception	Nolan & Goodman-Delahunty (2015). Chapter 4.	
Week 8 - 03 Sep 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Mental disorder and the law	Nolan & Goodman-Delahunty (2015). Chapter 5.	
Week 9 - 10 Sep 2018		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Module/Topic Sexual harassment	Chapter Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong. The Guardian.	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST
	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong.	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9
Sexual harassment	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong.	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9
Sexual harassment Week 10 - 17 Sep 2018	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong. The Guardian.	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST
Sexual harassment Week 10 - 17 Sep 2018 Module/Topic	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong. The Guardian. Chapter Walters, M.A., Brown, R. & Wiedlitzka, S. (2016). Causes and motivations of Hate Crimes. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research report 102. Manchester: Equality and Human	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 1 - activity and online discussion (details
Sexual harassment Week 10 - 17 Sep 2018 Module/Topic Hate crimes	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong. The Guardian. Chapter Walters, M.A., Brown, R. & Wiedlitzka, S. (2016). Causes and motivations of Hate Crimes. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research report 102. Manchester: Equality and Human	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 1 - activity and online discussion (details
Sexual harassment Week 10 - 17 Sep 2018 Module/Topic Hate crimes Week 11 - 24 Sep 2018	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong. The Guardian. Chapter Walters, M.A., Brown, R. & Wiedlitzka, S. (2016). Causes and motivations of Hate Crimes. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research report 102. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission.	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 1 - activity and online discussion (details on Moodle)
Sexual harassment Week 10 - 17 Sep 2018 Module/Topic Hate crimes Week 11 - 24 Sep 2018 Module/Topic	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong. The Guardian. Chapter Walters, M.A., Brown, R. & Wiedlitzka, S. (2016). Causes and motivations of Hate Crimes. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research report 102. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission.	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 1 - activity and online discussion (details on Moodle) Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 2 - activity and online discussion (details
Sexual harassment Week 10 - 17 Sep 2018 Module/Topic Hate crimes Week 11 - 24 Sep 2018 Module/Topic Jury decision making	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong. The Guardian. Chapter Walters, M.A., Brown, R. & Wiedlitzka, S. (2016). Causes and motivations of Hate Crimes. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research report 102. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission.	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 1 - activity and online discussion (details on Moodle) Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 2 - activity and online discussion (details
Sexual harassment Week 10 - 17 Sep 2018 Module/Topic Hate crimes Week 11 - 24 Sep 2018 Module/Topic Jury decision making Week 12 - 01 Oct 2018	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong. The Guardian. Chapter Walters, M.A., Brown, R. & Wiedlitzka, S. (2016). Causes and motivations of Hate Crimes. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research report 102. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission. Chapter Nolan & Goodman-Delahunty (2015). Chapter 7	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 1 - activity and online discussion (details on Moodle) Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 2 - activity and online discussion (details on Moodle)
Sexual harassment Week 10 - 17 Sep 2018 Module/Topic Hate crimes Week 11 - 24 Sep 2018 Module/Topic Jury decision making Week 12 - 01 Oct 2018 Module/Topic	Funnell, N. (2016, September 15). If universities want to know about sexual assault, they're doing it wrong. The Guardian. Chapter Walters, M.A., Brown, R. & Wiedlitzka, S. (2016). Causes and motivations of Hate Crimes. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research report 102. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission. Chapter Nolan & Goodman-Delahunty (2015). Chapter 7 Weathered, L. (2013). Wrongful convictions in Australia. University of Cincinnati Law Review, 80(4),	How not to talk to children (Assessment 2) Due: Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 1 - activity and online discussion (details on Moodle) Events and Submissions/Topic The case of Paul Ingram Part 2 - activity and online discussion (details on Moodle)

Exam Week - 15 Oct 2018

Module/Topic

Chapter

Events and Submissions/Topic

Exam in exam weeks: details to be advised

Assessment Tasks

1 Offender profiling (Assessment 1)

Assessment Type

Group Discussion

Task Description

You will be assigned into a study group in Week 2. Each group will be asked to identify a single historical closed case (or sequence of cases involving the same offender/offenders), to collect and pool information on that case, and to then produce a single summary of that case (one submission per group).

Using journal articles, or books, and media reports, identify a solved case in which criminal offender profiling was used. Answer the following questions about that case:

1. Identify the case (offence type, location, year, etc).

2. What characteristics of the offender were identified? (e.g., race, age, etc).

3. Was the profile accurate? Which characteristics of the offender were accurately or inaccurately identified?

4. Was the profile useful in the investigation? Why/why not?

Your report, in its entirety, should be submitted on maximum of two A4 pages. The exact format is up to each student (within group differences in approach are permitted), with some possible options including: a standard essay; a Wikipedia-style page; a newspaper-style layout (e.g., multiple columns).

Further assessment details and rubric are available on Moodle.

Assessment Due Date

Week 5 Monday (6 Aug 2018) 9:00 am AEST Upload written report to Moodle

Return Date to Students

Week 7 Monday (27 Aug 2018) Feedback will be provided via Moodle

Weighting

15%

Assessment Criteria

Assignment will be marked according to the Rubric on Moodle. Marks available for each section of the report are as follows: Case summary (out of 20) Summary of the offender profile (out of 20) Assessing the accuracy of the profile (out of 20) Impact of the profile on the investigation (out of 20) Presentation and referencing (out of 20)

Referencing Style

American Psychological Association 6th Edition (APA 6th edition)

Submission Online Group

Submission Instructions

Upload through Moodle

Learning Outcomes Assessed

- Understand the philosophical similarities and differences underlying the disciplines of psychology and the legal system
- Have further developed your research and writing skills.

Graduate Attributes

Communication

- Critical Thinking
- Information Technology Competence
- Ethical practice

2 How not to talk to children (Assessment 2)

Assessment Type

Written Assessment

Task Description

This assignment is based on an original study by Hughes and Grieve (1980) which attempted to show how children will try to make sense of any question, no matter how strange it may be. Children, aged 5 and 7, were asked "bizarre" or "conceptually ill-formed" questions like, "Is milk bigger than water?", and "Is red heavier than yellow?" Although these questions were apparently meaningless, the children would typically give answers. A similar related study was also carried out by Waterman, Blades and Spencer (2001).

The assignment requires you to conduct two interviews (with either a child and an adult, or two children) featuring a series of "bizarre" questions. You will then write a brief report (1500 words maximum) based on those interviews. The report should follow the conventions of a psychological report (Abstract, Introduction, Method, Results, Discussion, References, Appendix).

Instructions

1. Read the articles by Hughes and Grieve (1980) and Waterman et al. (2001).

2. Based on your reading, create two original "bizarre" questions. Add these to the list below to create a total of eight questions.

- 1. Q1. Is milk bigger than water? Why?
- 2. Q2. What do feet eat for breakfast? Why?
- 3. Q3. Is red heavier than yellow? Why?
- 4. Q4. One day there were two flies crawling up a wall. Which fly got to the top first? Why?
- 5. Q5 Is a jumper angrier than a tree? Why?
- 6. Q6. One day there were two people standing at a bus-stop. When the bus came along, who got on first? Why?
- 7. Q7. INSERT YOUR OWN QUESTION HERE
- 8. Q8. INSERT YOUR OWN QUESTION HERE

3. Identify two family members or friends (the person must be someone known to you) and ask them to participate in an interview study (tips for conducting the interviewing will be posted on Moodle).

4. Ask the series of 8 questions, recording the answers.

5. Once the questions are completed, thank the person interviewed and explain that the study was about how people are (usually) able to find meaning and give coherent reasoned answers to what are essentially meaningless questions.

References

Hughes M. and Grieve R. (1980) On asking children bizarre questions. *First Language*, 1, 149-60.

Waterman, A., Blades, M. and Spencer, C. (2001) Is a jumper angrier than a tree? *The Psychologist*, 14 (9), 474-477.

Further assessment details and rubric will be available on Moodle.

Assessment Due Date

Week 9 Monday (10 Sept 2018) 9:00 am AEST

Return Date to Students

Week 12 Monday (1 Oct 2018) Feedback will be provided via Moodle

Weighting

45%

Assessment Criteria

Assignment will be marked according to the Rubric on Moodle. Marks available for each section of the report are as follows: Abstract (out of 10) Introduction (out of 25) Method (out of 15) Results (out of 15) Discussion (out of 25) References (out of 10)

Referencing Style

<u>American Psychological Association 6th Edition (APA 6th edition)</u>

Submission

Online

Learning Outcomes Assessed

- Understand the philosophical similarities and differences underlying the disciplines of psychology and the legal system
- Be aware of the particular challenges facing psychologists interacting with the legal system
- Have further developed your research and writing skills.

Graduate Attributes

- Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Information Literacy
- Ethical practice

Examination

Outline

Complete an invigilated examination.

Date

During the examination period at a CQUniversity examination centre.

Weighting

40%

Length

120 minutes

Exam Conditions

Closed Book.

Materials

Dictionary - non-electronic, concise, direct translation only (dictionary must not contain any notes or comments).

Academic Integrity Statement

As a CQUniversity student you are expected to act honestly in all aspects of your academic work.

Any assessable work undertaken or submitted for review or assessment must be your own work. Assessable work is any type of work you do to meet the assessment requirements in the unit, including draft work submitted for review and feedback and final work to be assessed.

When you use the ideas, words or data of others in your assessment, you must thoroughly and clearly acknowledge the source of this information by using the correct referencing style for your unit. Using others' work without proper acknowledgement may be considered a form of intellectual dishonesty.

Participating honestly, respectfully, responsibly, and fairly in your university study ensures the CQUniversity qualification you earn will be valued as a true indication of your individual academic achievement and will continue to receive the respect and recognition it deserves.

As a student, you are responsible for reading and following CQUniversity's policies, including the **Student Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure**. This policy sets out CQUniversity's expectations of you to act with integrity, examples of academic integrity breaches to avoid, the processes used to address alleged breaches of academic integrity, and potential penalties.

What is a breach of academic integrity?

A breach of academic integrity includes but is not limited to plagiarism, self-plagiarism, collusion, cheating, contract cheating, and academic misconduct. The Student Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure defines what these terms mean and gives examples.

Why is academic integrity important?

A breach of academic integrity may result in one or more penalties, including suspension or even expulsion from the University. It can also have negative implications for student visas and future enrolment at CQUniversity or elsewhere. Students who engage in contract cheating also risk being blackmailed by contract cheating services.

Where can I get assistance?

For academic advice and guidance, the <u>Academic Learning Centre (ALC)</u> can support you in becoming confident in completing assessments with integrity and of high standard.

What can you do to act with integrity?





Seek Help If you are not sure about how to cite or reference in essays, reports etc, then seek help from your lecturer, the library or the Academic Learning Centre (ALC)



Produce Original Work Originality comes from your ability to read widely, think critically, and apply your gained knowledge to address a question or problem