**In Class Work for Literature Review—Part 1 Making a Synthesis Matrix and Writing an introduction**

1. **Read all the sample introductions under Course Content. Choose at least 2 to analyze sentence by sentence.**

* Liz Adams LR
  + Statement of Context:
    - “threat of terrorism looms large”
    - “question of what to do with captured terrorists looms large”
  + About-the-Topic sentences:
    - “Is it justified to torture [terrorists] to extract valuable and time-sensitive information, especially if there are potentially hundreds of thousands of lives at risk?”
    - Most research and literature states that torture is never justified, but dissenting opinions still exist.
  + Main points of the topic:
    - Themes are divided into “Yes, torture is justifiable” or “No, torture is not justifiable.”
    - Can be further subdivided based on legality and morality
    - (THEMATIC)
  + Sentence Providing Clear Idea of Focus and Scope:
    - Will discuss arguments for the justness/unjustness, legality/illegality, and morality/immorality of torture
    - Will attempt to provide a conclusive answer to “Is torture permissible?”
* Criminology Intro (Causa Sui):
  + Statement of Context:
    - When studying humans, abundance of perspectives and explanations exists.
      * Each explanation is connected, but seldom conclusive
  + About-the-Topic sentences:
    - Social Science: Individual’s behavior can be answered in exploration of the society in which that individual lives.
    - Criminologists ask
      * Why do people commit crimes?
      * Who is more likely to become a criminal?
  + Main points of the topic:
    - Evaluation of General Strain Theory
      * Focuses on strains of perceived injustices as a factor of criminal behavior
    - Can this theory apply to any type of crime?
    - Are certain kinds of strains indicative of violent behavior?
    - Can this theory be practically applied in the criminal justice system?
    - (METHODOLOGICAL)
  + Sentence Providing Clear Idea of Focus and Scope:
    - Will seek to evaluate the surety of general strain theory as it applies to the above questions

1. **Write your own introduction of 5-8 sentences.**

Blackstone’s ratio is well known as an honorable axiom among the criminal justice community. While frequently exaggerated, the idea that “it is better that ten guilty persons escape, than that one innocent suffer” (Blackstone, 1760) is shared among criminal justice professionals. This phrase works in theory, but the American criminal justice system still occasionally fails in practice. Since 1989, more than 2,417 people in the United States have been convicted for crimes they did not commit (National Registry of Exonerations, 2019). Of those 2,417, 23% were the result of false or misleading forensic evidence (National Registry of Exonerations, 2019). These 558 innocents are just as much victims as are the ones against whom crimes are perpetrated. While false convictions are indeed rare, this in no way implies that such incidents are any less important. There are several schools of thought explaining why forensic science fails in criminal investigations, each encapsulating certain facets of the issue but failing to explain the issue in its entirety. Hence, this literature review will examine the difference between the conventional “bad apples” perspective and the perspective offered by organizational theory, some possible errors that may adversely affect the justice process to include cognitive biases, and possible methods that could at bare minimum repair the damage inflicted by these injustices.

Blackstone, W.. (1760). *Commentaries on the laws of England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The National Registry of Exonerations. (2019, April 2). Retrieved from <https://www.law.umich.edu/special/exoneration/Pages/ExonerationsContribFactorsByCrime.aspx>

**The introduction should contain:  
--A brief statement of the context for the research (why this research is important to scholars and professionals in your field),   
--A sentence or two about past research on the topic,  
--A sentence or two breaking down the topic into main points that will be covered (or questions that will be answered) and giving an idea of the structure of the paper (chronological, methodological, or thematic),   
--A final sentence that provides a clear idea of the focus and scope of this review.**

1. **Use your annotated bibliography and introductory paragraph to create a synthesis matrix for your review.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Topic 1** | **Topic 2** | **Topic 3** |
| **Source** | **Bad Apples vs. Bad Orchard Perspective** | **Forensic Failures**  **(Unintentional/Cognitive Bias, Bad Science, etc.)** | **Possible Recompenses for Injustices Incurred** |
| **Edmond, G., Tangen, J. M., Searston, R. A., & Dror, I. E.** | Not only are forensic analysts needlessly exposed to ‘domain-irrelevant’ information, their own cognitively contaminated interpretations and opinions are then revealed to other witnesses—both laymen and experts. This back and forth can create a ‘biasing snowball effect’ where evidence is (increasingly) cross-contaminated, though represented, at trial and on appeal, as separate lines of evidence independently corroborating one another. | Adding to the complexity and dangers, forensic science evidence is routinely represented—in investigations, plea negotiations, trials and appeals—as independent corroboration for other strands of incriminating evidence. Claims about independence and corroboration persist even where the other strands of evidence (and vice versa) may have influenced the expert evidence. | It is not an appropriate response to these dangers to suggest that they are trivial or rare or can somehow be addressed through explanation and judicial warnings at trial. |
| **Fraser-Mackenzie, P. A. F.,**  **Dror, I. E.,**  **& Wertheim, K.** | The presence of a matching comparison exemplar led examiners to be less likely to decide that the latent fingerprint was suitable and more likely to decide that it was questionable compared to solo analysis. This effect persisted even when the latent print presented was highly suitable, suggesting a strong main effect. Knowledge of another examiner's previous determination that the latent print was unsuitable was found to increase the likelihood that the examiner would conclude that the latent print was unsuitable. However, knowledge of a previous “suitable” determination by another examiner did not increase the likelihood of a “suitable” conclusion by examiners. | Specifically, our main aim is to determine whether the presence of a matching or non-matching comparison exemplar can result in different suitability conclusions compared to suitability conclusions made when the suitability determination is undertaken in isolation. Other cognitive and contextual influences may further affect suitability determination, but they were not the object of this current study. | The finding that examiners with International Association for Identification (IAI) certification qualification appeared to be less affected by the contextual effect of comparison prints on suitability judgments indicates some initial evidence that certain types of training could assist in reducing errors in suitability judgments. However, even IAI certified examiners were not entirely immune to contextual biases indicates that there is room for improvement in the training of forensic examiners. |
| **Gabel, J. D., & Wilkinson, M. D.** | There is no question that scientific developments, particularly in the area of DNA, have advanced how criminal cases are investigated, prosecuted, and presented in court. Overlooked in the wake of such acclaim, however, is the fact that forensic science is far from infallible. While advances in DNA testing have provided a more exacting tool with which to explore guilt and innocence, scientific developments that call previously accepted forensic techniques into question often escape attention. | There is no actual evidence, however, that an individual's fingerprints are unique to all others in the world. Instead, like hair analysis, fingerprint analysis is another exercise in an examiner's subjective attempt to connect the dots.  Hair analysis has unquestionably produced wrongful convictions. A study of the first 200 prisoners exonerated by DNA evidence found that forty-three persons (nearly 22%) had been wrongly convicted largely on the strength of hair follicles found at the crime scenes. | Direct review of evidence; reform of local, state, and federal postconviction assistance for claims of innocence; increased use of postconviction DNA testing |
| **Kassin, S. M., Dror, I. E., & Kukucka, J.** | The FBI has rigorous standards of training, practice, and highly competent forensic examiners. The FBI, thus, is considered one of the best, if not the best forensic laboratories in the U.S., if not in the entire world. Thus, it was not easy to dismiss the error and claim the error to be the product of mere “bad apples.” The Mayfield case, preceded by a decade in which the U.S. Supreme Court had sought to curb the introduction at trial of experts in junk science, along with improprieties discovered in various state laboratories, now draws attention to forensic science and to the fact that is not infallible. | (1) Across many domains, experts are often overconfident in their abilities;  (2) The courts, for the most part, have blindly accepted forensic science evidence without much scrutiny;  (3) Errors are often not apparent in the forensic sciences because basic truths are often not known as a matter of certainty;  (4) Many forensic examiners work for police and appear in court as advocates for the prosecution;  (5) Many forensic examiners consider themselves objective and immune to bias. | It is important that legal decision makers be educated with regard to the procedures by which forensic examiners reach their conclusions and the information that is available to them during the analyses. In particular, both trial and appellate courts should be trained to ask “What did the examiner know and when did he or she know it?” and probe routinely for the possibility of contamination across items of evidence that are allegedly independent and corroborative. |
| **Reardon, S.** | In 2009, only 60% of publicly funded crime labs employed an examiner who was independently certified. This severely limited the capability of those labs, overworked the present forensic specialists, and possibly reduced the overall quality of the lab’s output. | The value of certain techniques is often overstated in court cases. Finger­print comparison, for instance, is often presented as an exact science, but researchers have only recently begun to study just how well people can match exemplars. A 2011 study found that professional examiners matched two finger­prints incorrectly once in every 1,000 times, and missed a correct match 7.5% of the time | Examiners should work “linear” rather than “circular,” thus initially examining the evidence from the crime scene and documenting their findings before making comparisons against a target. This will eliminate the potential influence of the target on how information is processed and how heavily it is weighted. |
| **Thompson, W. C.** | The problem with the “bad apples” metaphor is that it lacks explanatory power. Saying that bad forensic science is the product of bad forensic scientists is a bit like saying that crime is caused by criminals. The statement is undeniably true but does little to advance understanding of the underlying problem. Individualistic explanations channel our thinking toward individualistic solutions (replacing the “bad apples”) and divert attention from broader institutional, structural, and cultural factors that may contribute to laboratory foul-ups. We tend to think that replacing the bad apples solves the underlying problem without considering why we have so many bad apples in the first place, why we find more “bad apples” in some environments than others, and why the apples repeatedly seem to go bad in the same familiar way. | It is crucial to understand the systemic factors that lead to failures. The analysis must get beyond blaming "bad apples" and consider the operation of the system as a whole. What incidents might cause the failure of units? What measures might be put in place to minimize such incidents, or reduce the chances that they will lead to unit failure, or catch the unit failures when they occur? How can the independence of different units be maintained in order to reduce the likelihood of "common mode failures" and system accidents? These questions are more likely to lead to improvements than questions about which particular individuals in the system are the "bad apples." | There is no need for the DNA analyst to know (before completing the analysis and issuing a report) what the eyewitness said, and there is no need for the eyewitness (before testifying) to know the results of the DNA test. Cross-talk between different elements of the justice system undoubtedly occurs routinely without anyone giving it much thought. Effective communication within the system is generally seen as positive rather than negative. The analysis presented here, however, suggests that too much communication of the wrong types can contribute to system failures. |