



Mind, Morality, and the Law (CRIM / PSYC 3111)

Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

Lakehead University Orillia Campus

Mondays and Wednesdays 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm: Room OA 1022

Instructor: Larry Fiddick

Office: OA 3031

Office Hours: Monday and Wednesday 12:00 pm – 1:00 pm

Email: lfiddick@lakeheadu.ca

Course Description:

An exploration of morality, law, and other social norms from a psychological perspective. What are the cognitive, developmental, emotional, and neurological influences on our understanding of social norms and norm-governed behaviour? The role of psychological factors in social deviance will also be explored.

Course Learning Objectives:

- To build knowledge of the core concepts and approaches to the psychological underpinnings of morality and social norms and their relevance to law and criminology;
- To develop oral and written skills in explaining what one has read and learned in terms that the student and others can understand;
- To develop oral and written skills in logical, persuasive, and well-supported argument;
- To work as a member of a collaborative group and resolve collectively any issues that may arise;
- To be able to apply the core concepts in the course to real world social phenomena.

Required Texts:

Despite being an established and robust area of psychological research, there are no (non-philosophical) textbooks on moral psychology. As a result, the course will rely instead on a collection of readings from the moral psychology literature that will be available on the course website on Desire2Learn.

However, you will be required to read Francis Fukuyama's book, *The Great Disruption*. The book provides a bridge between the foundations of morality and social norms and the wider impact that morality and social norms has on society. You will not be examined on the contents of book, though parts of the book will find their way into the lectures. Instead, you will need to read the book to present a chapter from the book and write a review of the book as described below.

Lecture Notes:

There will not be any formal lecture notes posted online as I will not use powerpoint to lecture. Instead I will have my own rough draft notes that will form the basis of the lectures / in-class discussions. I will write notes on the whiteboard, but it is your responsibility for writing this down for your own record. As a result it is highly recommended that you attend all the lectures so that you know what was presented in class and you are, therefore, responsible for.

Note: You will not be responsible for knowing the content of the student group presentations, at least to the extent that the presentations cover material that is not also covered in the lectures. However, you should still show up for the presentations as you will be asked to evaluate the group's presentation (see *Peer Evaluation* below) and this will count towards your mark for the course.

Schedule of Classes (this schedule is tentative and is likely to be revised)

Date	Topic	Reading
Jan. 6 & 8	What is Morality?	Required reading: Haidt <i>Morality</i>
Jan. 13 & 15	Moral Development and Reasoning	Required reading: Kohlberg & Hersh <i>Moral Development: A Review of the Theory</i> ; Smetana <i>Morality in Context</i> (pp. 83 – 95) Recommended reading: Kohlberg <i>From Is to Ought</i> Presentation: Wednesday – Fukuyama Chapter 8
Jan. 20 & 22	Morality in a Cross-Cultural Perspective	Required reading: Shweder et al. <i>Divinity and the Big Three Explanations of Suffering</i> (pp. 119 – 150) Recommended reading: Graham et al. <i>Moral Foundations Theory</i> ; Kohlberg <i>From Is to Ought</i> ; Shweder <i>Liberalism as Destiny</i> Presentations: <i>Monday – Fukuyama Chapter 9</i> <i>Wednesday –Fukuyama Chapter 10</i>
Jan. 27 & 29	Moral Emotions	Required reading: Haidt <i>The emotional dog and its rational tail</i> (pp. 814-825) Recommended readings: Greene et al. <i>An fMRI investigation of emotional engagement in moral judgment</i> ; Haidt <i>The Moral Emotions</i> ; Haidt et al. <i>Is it</i>

		<p><i>wrong to eat your dog?; Rozin et al. The CAD triad hypothesis</i></p> <p>Presentations:</p> <p>Monday – Fukuyama Chapter 11 Wednesday – Fukuyama Chapter 12</p>
Feb. 3 & 5	Morality from a Relational Perspective	<p>Required reading: Rai & Fiske <i>Moral psychology is relationship regulation</i></p> <p>Recommended reading: Fiske <i>The four elementary forms of sociality</i></p> <p>Presentations:</p> <p>Monday – Fukuyama Chapter 13 Wednesday – Fukuyama Chapter 14</p>
Feb. 10 & 12	Review (Feb. 10) & Midterm (Feb. 12)	
Feb. 17 & 19	Reading Week (No Classes)	
Feb. 24 & 26	Evolutionary Approaches to Morality	<p>Required reading: Krebs <i>The Evolution of Moral Behaviors</i></p> <p>Recommended reading: Cummins <i>Evidence for the Innateness of Deontic Reasoning</i>; Haidt <i>The emotional dog and its rational tail</i>; Trivers <i>Evolution of Reciprocal Altruism</i></p> <p>Presentations:</p> <p>Monday – Fukuyama Chapter 1 Wednesday – Fukuyama Chapter 2</p>
Mar. 2 & 4	Evolution and Synthesis	<p>Readings same as previous week</p> <p>Presentations:</p> <p>Monday – Fukuyama Chapter 3 Wednesday – Fukuyama Chapter 4</p>
Mar. 9 & 11	Law and Economics (Rational Norms)	<p>Required reading: Cosmides & Tooby <i>Evolutionary Psychology, Moral Heuristics, and the Law</i></p> <p>Recommended reading: Ostrom <i>Collective action and the</i></p>

		<i>evolution of social norms; Hart Positivism and the Separation of Law and Morals</i> Presentations: Monday – Fukuyama Chapter 5 Wednesday – Fukuyama Chapter 6
Mar. 16 & 18	Religion (Nonrational / Hierarchical Norms)	Required reading: Boyer <i>Why Do Gods and Spirits Matter?</i> Recommended reading: Boyer <i>Religious thought and behaviour as by-products of brain function</i> Presentations: Monday – Fukuyama Chapter 7 Wednesday – Fukuyama Chapter 15
Mar. 23 & 25	Deviance and Moral Violence	Required reading: Daly & Wilson <i>The Logic of Same-Sex Conflict</i> , Bloom <i>The Root of All Cruelty?</i> Recommend reading: Blair <i>A cognitive developmental approach to morality: Investigating the psychopath</i> ; Fiske & Rai <i>Virtuous Violence</i> Presentations: Monday – Fukuyama Chapter 16
Mar. 30 & Apr. 1	Deviance and Moral Violence (Contd)	
Book reviews due April 1	Review for Final	

Assessments:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| 1) Weekly Quizzes | 15% |
| 2) Midterm | 25% |
| 3) Group Presentation | 15% |
| 4) Peer Commentaries | 5% |
| 5) Book Review | 15% |
| 6) Final | 25% |

Description of Assessments:

Weekly Quizzes

Each week, starting on the second week of lectures and excluding the week of the midterm and the final week of lectures, there will be a short online quiz (approximately 6 – 12 multiple-choice questions). The quizzes will test you on the **previous week's** lectures and assigned readings. At most there will be a total of 9 quizzes (we might occasionally skip a week or two beyond the midterm and final week). The quizzes will be posted online on the Desire2Learn webpage for the course, sometime around or the night before Monday morning. You will be given until midnight on the following Sunday to complete the week's quiz. Within this time period you will be given three opportunities to take the quiz. In other words, you can retake the quiz two times after your initial try. D2L will provide feedback on how well you did overall, but will not indicate how you did on particular questions. I leave it to you to figure out which questions you got wrong and correct your answers.

Each quiz will be converted into a percent mark and then all the quiz marks will be averaged to give your overall quiz mark. There will be no make-up quizzes. Given that they are posted online and you are given a week to complete them, you should be able to do so even if you cannot make it to lecture. (However, do talk to me in advance if there are any special circumstances that prevent you from completing a quiz to see if some compromise can be made).

****Note:** on the first quiz and only the first quiz, the *contents of the course outline* will be considered testable material.

Midterm

There will be a midterm exam worth 25% of your overall mark. The midterm will test all the lecture and readings covered prior to the exam. The midterm will consist of multiple choice questions like the quizzes, but unlike the quizzes it will be held in-class and you will not be given the opportunity to redo it.

Group Presentation

The class will be divided into 16 groups of your own choosing, though roughly equal in size. Each lecture, beginning in the third week of lectures each term but excluding the week of the midterm, one group will give a 15-20 minute powerpoint presentation on a specified chapter from the Fukiyama book.

In your group's presentation you will be expected to discuss:

- 1) What is the issue that the chapter addresses?
- 2) What are the relevant data, findings, phenomena that relate to the issue?
- 3) What is the main point / argument that Fukiyama tries to make with respect to the issue at hand?
- 4) Are there any other ways of interpreting the data. Findings, phenomena?
- 5) Overall, what is your assessment of Fukiyama's interpretation / argument?
- 6) How does this relate to your own understanding of criminology / psychology? / Does it alter or extend your understanding of criminology / psychology in any way?

Your group will be marked using the following marking scheme:

Group Presentation: Marking Criteria

<i>Section</i>	<i>Required particulars</i>	<i>Max. Mark</i>	<i>Mark</i>
Presentation Style	Clear, loud voice; use of body language; eye contact; appropriate use of notes, etc.	10	
	Explanations catered to the audience	10	
	Clarity of points	10	
Visual Aids (PPT slides)	Clear, visible, appropriate	10	
Content	What issue is addressed by chapter?	5	
	Relevant data, findings, phenomena	15	
	Fukiyama's point / argument	10	
	Other interpretations	10	
	Overall assessment	10	
	Relation to / impact on your own understanding	10	
Total		100	

Note: It would be wise to explicitly address each of the content areas indicated in the marking criteria. You might even set these off with headings indicating when you are addressing each point. It is important that you present things clearly and in an easily digestible manner as your mark for the presentation will be based on the presentation alone. I will not ask you for your powerpoint or notes. Your only opportunity to convey the requested information is during the presentation in real time. If you are not clear on some matter and I fail to see that you addressed a content matter, you could lose marks.

In addition to the mark I give your presentation, your fellow students will also provide their own grade of your presentation out of 100%. These grades will be averaged to give a peer review mark.

Your overall presentation mark will be based on 75% of the mark that I assign you and 25% of the mark that your peers assign you.

The presentation will be prepared / presented as a group, but **there is no requirement that each group member deliver a section of the presentation or work on a portion of the powerpoint slides**. It is up to each group to decide how best to allocate tasks in order to maximize your group mark.

Each member of the group will be asked to evaluate their fellow group members' efforts towards the production and delivery of the presentation. For each member of the group you will be asked to assign a mark from 0 to 100, where 0 means completely unhappy with the group member's effort and 100 means completely satisfied with the group member's effort. These effort marks will then be averaged for each person and each student's individual mark will be determined by multiplying the group mark by the average effort mark as a percent. So, if the group mark was 70 and the

particular student's effort mark was also 70, then that student will receive $70 \times 70\%$ or 49 (out of 100) overall for the presentation. Hence, a low effort mark can easily undermine the mark you get for this assessment. Consequently, avoid marking judging the quality of a group member's effort unless that is an issue, i.e., the quality of the effort is clearly unequal. So if you recognize that your group did B-quality work and you all contributed equally towards that B quality work, don't penalize yourself any further by giving each other B-level effort marks, e.g., 78. If everyone contributed equally, go ahead and give everyone 100.

My default will be to assume that each group member gave every other group member 100%. Hence, if you want to give everyone in your group 100%, then there will be no need to inform me of this. It is only if you judge one of your group members to have made less than a 100% effort that you should confidentially email me your evaluations of the persons in question (there is no need to share your effort marks with others).

Peer Evaluation

Each student taking part in a particular week's group presentation will be asked to confidentially rate the presentation out of 100%, following the university's standard grading scale (give the number, not the letter grade):

A+	90 to 100%	Excellent
A 1 st class standing	80 to 89%	Very Good
B	70 to 79%	Above Average / Good
C	60 to 69%	Average
D	50 to 59%	Below Average
E Failed	40 to 49%	Inferior
F Failed	1 to 39%	Failure

These marks will be used in the determination of the group's overall mark as noted above. Please take this exercise seriously. If I deem that the process is being abused or not taken seriously, I will not continue it in the Winter term.

Additionally, you will be asked to write some substantive comments on the presentation: its weaknesses, but especially on how it can be improved – help your fellow students out. You will be assessed on the quality of the comments that you give as follows. If you simply give a numerical grade, you will receive a mark of 0.5. If, in addition, you write a substantive comment (like, “the slides were difficult to read, you should put less on each slide and make the font bigger”) you will receive a mark of 1. For each additional substantive comment that you write, you will receive an additional mark up to a maximum of 5 marks – taking into account as well the merits of your comments. Each student's marks will be summed across all the presentations and the student with the most marks at the end of the course will receive a full 5% for the peer evaluation component of the grade. Everyone else will receive a mark proportionate to the total of the student with most marks. In other words, if the student with the most marks had 75 marks overall and you had 50 marks overall, then you would get $50/75 \times 5\%$, i.e., $.66667 \times 5\% = 3.33\%$.

You will make your evaluations of the group's presentation as they deliver it and I will collect these after the presentation. I will provide a piece of paper for you to write your name, mark and comments. I will evaluate your comments and assign you a corresponding mark, then remove your name from the comment sheet and later give it, minus your name, to the group that made the presentation. Hence, each group will hopefully receive extensive feedback on their presentation.

Book Review

Each student will write a book review of the Fukiyama book, *The Great Disruption*, that was used for the group presentations. The book reviews should NOT be a summarization of the book. The topic of the book review should be why a student of criminology or psychology should read the book, though it would be best if you did not explicitly label or frame your review as such. Rather than summarizing the book you should describe one (or possibly two) topic / idea or lack thereof of criminology or psychology and a topic / idea in the book that is relevant to this topic / idea / gap in the chosen field of study. Do not argue that the whole book is useful and then summarize the whole book. Concentrate on

some key topic / idea in the book and argue for its significance to someone interested in criminology or psychology. In doing so, you should be giving as much emphasis on the topic / idea in your chosen field as you do to the book. You should aim to give equal weight to your analysis of your chosen field, your analysis of the book, and how these (the field and the idea from the book) relate to one another. So while it is called a “book review”, do NOT think that the focus should be on the book. The focus should only be on a topic / idea from the book and how it informs or transforms one’s thinking about your chosen field of study. In other words, what does the book have to say that is particularly helpful or informative to someone interested in criminology or psychology?

The length of the review should be 1000 to 1250 words (which does not include title pages or reference sections and there should not be an abstract), but the length is not as important as the substance of what you write. A long review that says little because it keeps repeating the same point again and again will not be given a good mark. The book reviews are due on Apr. 1, at the end of the last lecture. The reviews should be double spaced and in APA format. A rubric outlining how the book reviews will be marked will be provided later in the term.

Final

There will be a final exam at the end of the term worth 25% of your overall mark that will cover the material since midterm. Again, the format of the final will be similar to that of the quizzes and the midterms, i.e., multiple choice questions. Like the midterm, it will NOT be online and you will NOT have the opportunity to retake it (outside those opportunities mandated by university policies).

Late Submission Policy

Given scheduling and the need for others to reply to or make use of your work, you will lose all of your marks on the group presentation if you do not present it as scheduled. Likewise, you will lose all marks for each peer evaluation that you fail to submit on the day of a presentation, though you will still receive marks for the other peer evaluations that you submit on time.

With respect to the book review, you will lose 33.3% of your mark for each day your review is late. In other words, if you turn in your review a day late and I assign it an initial mark of 90%, 33.3% of this mark (in this case 30%) will be deducted from your review to give a final mark of 60% for the review. If the review were turned in two days late, a further 30% would be deducted leaving you with a mark of 30% on the book review.

Academic Misconduct

From University Regulations, Regulation IX:

“The University takes a most serious view of offences against academic honesty such as Plagiarism, cheating and impersonation. Penalties for dealing with such offences will be strictly enforced.

The "Code of Student Behaviour and Disciplinary Procedures" including sections on Plagiarism and other forms of misconduct may be found on the Lakehead University Senate website. See the Code under Policies - Student Related in the University Policies at policies.lakeheadu.ca.

The following rules shall govern the treatment of candidates who have been found guilty of attempting to obtain academic credit dishonestly.

(a) The minimum penalty for a candidate found guilty of Plagiarism, or of cheating on any part of a course will be a zero for the work concerned.

(b) A candidate found guilty of cheating on a formal examination or a test, or of serious or repeated Plagiarism, or of unofficially obtaining a copy of an examination paper before the examination is scheduled to be written, will receive zero for the course and may be expelled from the University.

Students disciplined under the Code of Student Behaviour and Disciplinary Procedures may appeal their case through the Judicial Panel.

Note: "Plagiarism" shall be deemed to include:

1. Plagiarism of ideas as where an idea of an author or speaker is incorporated into the body of an assignment as though it were the writer's idea, i.e. no credit is given the person through referencing or footnoting or endnoting.
2. Plagiarism of words occurs when phrases, sentences, tables or illustrations of an author or speaker are incorporated into the body of a writer's own, i.e. no quotations or indentations (depending on the format followed) are present but referencing or footnoting or endnoting is given.
3. Plagiarism of ideas and words as where words and an idea(s) of an author or speaker are incorporated into the body of a written assignment as though they were the writer's own words and ideas, i.e. no quotations or indentations (depending on format followed) are present and no referencing or footnoting or endnoting is given."

A listing of University Regulations can be found at:

<http://navigator.lakeheadu.ca/Catalog/ViewCatalog.aspx?pageid=viewcatalog&catalogid=21&chapterid=3506&loaduseredits=False>

The code of student behaviour and disciplinary procedures can be found at:

<https://www.lakeheadu.ca/faculty-and-staff/policies/student-related/code-of-student-behaviour-and-disciplinary-procedures>

Lakehead University Grade Standings

As indicated above, Lakehead University's grade standings are as follows:

A+	90 to 100%	Excellent
A 1 st class standing	80 to 89%	Very Good
B	70 to 79%	Above Average / Good
C	60 to 69%	Average
D	50 to 59%	Below Average
E Failed	40 to 49%	Inferior
F Failed	1 to 39%	Failure

Accessibility Statement

Lakehead University is committed to achieving full accessibility for persons with disabilities. Part of this commitment includes arranging academic accommodations for students with disabilities and/or medical conditions to ensure they have an equitable opportunity to participate in all of their academic activities. If you are a student with a disability and think you may need accommodations, you are strongly encouraged to contact Student Accessibility Services (SAS) and register as early as possible. For more information, please contact Student Accessibility Services <http://studentaccessibility.lakeheadu.ca> (OA 1030, (705)330-4008 ext 2103 or oraccess@lakeheadu.ca)