

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. ALAN FISCHER III

Case No. 22CR0011-RJL

DECLARATION OF EXPERT CHRISTINE L. RUVA, PH.D.

CHRISTINE L. RUVA declares, under penalty of perjury, that the following is true and correct.

Professional Background & Qualifications

I am a Professor of Psychology and campus Chair at the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee. In 2001 I earned my Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of South Florida in the area of Cognitive Science, where I focused on the application of cognitive science to the legal system. For over 25 years I have explored the effects of pretrial publicity on jurors' decisions, perceptions, emotions, memories, interpretation of trial evidence, and deliberation behavior.

As outlined in my *curriculum vitae* (Appendix A) I began researching the influence of pretrial publicity (i.e., media coverage of cases making their way to trial) on jury decision making while in graduate school, and continued this program of research in the years since earning my Ph.D. I have conducted a number of studies on the effects of pretrial publicity on both juror and jury decision making with the goal of understanding how pretrial publicity influences jurors' verdict decisions, perceptions, emotions, memories, and jury deliberations. I have also explored whether remedies of deliberation, judicial instructions, and voir dire lessen the biasing influences of pretrial publicity. My training as a cognitive psychologist focused on basic memory processes of encoding (getting information into the memory system), retrieval (getting information out of the system), as well as how people determine the source of their memories, and how people use information to form impressions and make judgments and decisions.

To date, on the topic of pretrial publicity's effect on juror/jury decision making I have twenty publications: fourteen articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals, one book, and five book chapters (one in press). I have made approximately thirty-seven presentations on the topic of pretrial publicity at national and international conferences (all peer-reviewed). As a cognitive scientist who studies effects of pretrial publicity I have consulted and testified as an expert regarding the prejudicial influence of pretrial publicity on jurors' decisions, impressions, memory, and deliberation behavior.

Introduction

My analysis and conclusions are a culmination of my expertise in how pretrial publicity (PTP) influences jurors' decisions, as well as my review of Exhibits A and B of the Defendant Fischer's Motion to Transfer Venue, as well as the Motion to Transfer itself. And my review of the Declaration of Walter Daughterity, who is the data science expert who conducted a review of the methodology and data analysis approach used in Exhibits A and B mentioned above. Dr. Daughterity concluded that "[I]n my professional opinion, the methodology used in Exhibits A and B is consistent with standard data science practice for analyzing large data sets, and has been appropriately applied." I begin with a summary of how PTP influences jurors' decisions and the

mechanisms responsible for these biasing effects. I end with a summary of research on the effectiveness of voir dire to identify and remedy bias (juror rehabilitation).

Effects of Negative (Anti-Defendant) Pretrial Publicity (PTP) on Juror Bias and Decisions

Extensive research supports the contention that negative (anti-defendant) PTP can bias juror decision making by rendering a juror incapable of determining a verdict based solely on trial evidence (see Hoetger et al., 2022 and Steblay et al., 1999 for review). In 1999, Steblay et al. conducted a meta-analysis on prior research exploring the effects of PTP on jurors' decision and bias. Meta-analysis is a statistical technique that combines the results of several studies to determine the overall effect of particular variables under study. In Steblay et al.'s meta-analysis, the different influences of pretrial publicity on verdicts were investigated by performing 44 empirical tests representing 5,755 participants. They found that participants exposed to negative (anti-defendant) PTP were more likely to render guilty verdicts than those exposed to no PTP. A subsequent meta-analysis was conducted by Hoetger et al. (2022) who examined research conducted after Steblay et al.'s (1999) meta-analysis. It included 77 unique tests representing 11,240 participants. Consistent with the earlier meta-analysis, negative PTP increased juror and jury guilty verdicts.

Research has found that PTP imparts its biasing effects on juror's decisions by influencing their perceptions of the defendant's credibility and their ability to discriminate the source of case information (PTP vs. trial; Ruva & Guenther, 2015; Ruva & McEvoy, 2008; Ruva et al., 2007), as well as eliciting emotional responses in jurors (Kramer et al., 1990; Ruva et al., 2011), and causing predecisional distortion that biases interpretation of trial evidence in the direction of the PTP bias (Hope et al., 2004; Ruva et al., 2011; Ruva et al., 2012). I briefly expand each of these mechanisms responsible for PTP's biasing effect on jurors' decisions in the subsections below.

Additionally, the amount of PTP affects juror bias. Shaffer (1986) found that the number of PTP articles appearing in a newspaper as well as respondents' estimates of their amount of PTP exposure were predictors of guilt. More recently, Daftary-Kapur et al. (2014) found that juror bias increased as the amount of negative PTP increased. Specifically, jurors exposed to larger amounts of negative PTP were more likely to find the defendant guilty than those exposed to lower amounts of PTP. This is important given that Exhibit A and B suggests that the relative amount of January 6th mentions in the media was greater in D.C. than other districts included in the study (Exhibit A) and that specific Google searches were proportionally greater (Exhibit B). I understand that that the state challenges the validity of the methodology used, but this conflicts with the data science expert who attests "[I]n my professional opinion, the methodology used in Exhibits A and B is consistent with standard data science practice for analyzing large data sets, and has been appropriately applied."

Emotional PTP

High-profile cases like those of January 6th defendants, are likely to include sensationalized media coverage or PTP (Bakhshay & Haney, 2018), which has the potential for eliciting emotional responses in jurors (e.g., fear, anxiety, hostility, and anger). Recently researchers have begun to explore the mechanisms responsible for PTP's biasing effect on juror verdicts. One mechanism that has received attention is emotion (see Feigenson, 2006 and 2016 for review).

One way PTP influences verdict outcomes is by eliciting emotional responses (e.g., anger, disgust, hostility, fear, and anxiety) that in turn affect jurors' decisions. Specifically, those exposed to anti-defendant PTP are angrier, which then results in a greater likelihood of a guilty verdict (Dumas et al., 2014; Ruva et al., 2011). Emotion can influence legal decisions by affecting how the information is processed, biasing decisions in the direction of the emotion, and providing informational cues (Feigenson, 2016). Thus, negative emotions could negatively bias jurors' processing of probative information, which can be detrimental for a defendant (Salerno & Perter-Hagene, 2013). Specifically, emotional responses elicited by PTP are extralegal in nature and are problematic when they bias jurors' processing of trial evidence and ultimately their decisions (Ruva et al., 2011). Finally, jurors exposed to emotional PTP developed a stronger bias against the defendant and reported more negative emotion than those exposed to factual PTP (Kramer et al., 1990). Importantly, a *time delay* was unable to diminish the biasing effect of emotional PTP on verdicts.

Source Monitoring

Given the type, amount, and timing of media coverage surrounding the events taking place on January 6th in the D.C. area, and large number of defendants, it is likely that jurors exposed to this media coverage will have a tough time distinguishing between information they gained through media exposure and information presented at trial. This type of memory error is referred to as a source memory error or source misattribution. Source misattributions can arise because recollecting information about an event and the source of that information are two separate cognitive acts (Johnson et al., 1993), and memory performance for event information (e.g., specific facts in the media) is better than memory for source information (Kelly et al., 2002). Ruva and associates have found that mock-jurors believe, with high confidence, that information presented only in the PTP was presented at trial (Ruva & Guenther, 2015; Ruva & McEvoy, 2008; Ruva et al., 2007). Importantly, these source misattributions increase as the delay between initial exposure to PTP and trial increases (Ruva & McEvoy, 2008). In addition, these source misattributions are mechanisms through which PTP biases jurors' decisions. Specifically, mock-jurors mistakenly believe that information learned from PTP was learned at trial and these source misattributions influence their verdict decisions (Ruva & Guenther, 2015; Ruva & McEvoy, 2008; Ruva et al., 2007). Thus, even if jurors are instructed not to use information learned outside of trial when making their decisions, they may be unable to comply, despite their best efforts, because they misattribute the source of information.

Predecisional Distortion

It is a common assumption that people can be unbiased if they set their mind to it. Unfortunately, there is a wealth of social science research that suggest otherwise. The impact of PTP bias on juror decision-making is immense and difficult to overcome. One reason for this is that jurors exposed to PTP interpret new evidence at trial in a different way than jurors who have not been exposed. In fact, bias from PTP may persist even when squarely contradicted by trial evidence.

Pretrial publicity affects memory for a trial by influencing what trial evidence jurors pay attention to and how jurors interpret trial evidence. *Predecisional distortion theory* (type of primacy effect) predicts that jurors will weigh trial evidence to support their pre-existing beliefs rather than objectively (Carlson & Russo, 2001). Consistent with this theory studies show that

jurors exposed to negative PTP weigh the trial evidence to support anti-defendant outcomes (Carlson & Russo, 2001; Hope et al., 2004). Another study found that jurors exposed to PTP distorted witness testimony in the direction consistent with their exposure – *i.e.*, jurors exposed to anti-defendant PTP demonstrated a pro-prosecution bias, while jurors exposed to pro-defendant PTP exhibited a pro-defense bias (Ruva et al., 2011). Research also finds that exposure to PTP can affect how jurors discuss evidence during deliberations, with evidence discussion biased in the direction of the PTP bias (Ruva & Guenther, 2015; Ruva & LeVasseur, 2012; Ruva et al., 2022).

Relatedly, research into the *primacy effect* demonstrates that it is difficult for individuals to overcome their first impressions, and they therefore interpret later information to be consistent with those first impressions (Hurlstone et al., 2014; Ruva & McEvoy, 2008). Individuals remember early information better than later information, and thus, early information holds a bigger influence on decision-making and impressions (Daftary-Kapur et al., 2014).

Importantly, the bias associated with predecisional distortion and primacy effects is *unconscious*. That is, jurors are not aware that they are encoding (taking into memory) trial evidence in a biased manner and therefore are *not able to control this bias*. We cannot control what we are not conscious of.

Repetition & Spacing of PTP Across Time.

As stated in Ruva (2018), “research going back over a century, has found that when learning episodes are spaced across time, rather than presented only once or over a short period of time, memory is enhanced, resulting in increased retention over longer periods of time (see Cepeda et al., 2006 for review). The size of this distributed or spaced learning effect is often large (see Donovan & Radosovich, 1999 and Janiszewski et al., 2003 for reviews), making these memory traces strong enough to withstand significant delays.”

Effects of PTP on Jury Deliberations

Although individual jurors’ decisions can be biased by PTP, the courts often believe that jury deliberations will remedy these biases (Studebaker & Penrod, 1997). These assumptions are problematic due to psychological mechanisms described above that influence jurors’ processing of trial information (e.g., predecisional distortion and emotion) and their ability to differentiate sources of case information (i.e., PTP and trial), as well as group-related mechanisms that might accentuate bias (group polarization) and spread bias (social contagion).

Deliberations might fail to reduce PTP bias and might increase it because during deliberations jurors’ discussion of trial evidence is distorted in the direction of their PTP bias. Juries exposed to negative-defendant PTP are more likely than no-PTP juries (no PTP exposure) to discuss ambiguous trial evidence (which does not support the defense or prosecution) as supporting the prosecution, and less likely to discuss it as supporting the defense (Ruva & Guenther, 2015; Ruva & LeVasseur, 2012). In contrast, the valence of trial evidence discussion is biased towards the defense for negative-prosecution PTP juries (Ruva et al., 2022). What would happen if PTP-biased jurors deliberated with jurors not exposed to PTP—would the unbiased jurors correct the biased jurors? This is the question that Ruva and associates (2017; 2020; 2022) set out to answer.

They found evidence of social contagion or the spread of bias during mixed jury deliberations (i.e., half of the jury members were exposed to PTP, and half were not exposed to PTP). Content analyses of the jury deliberations revealed that the no-PTP jurors were exposed to PTP, as well as to biased discussion of trial evidence, during deliberations with PTP-exposed jurors (Ruva et al., 2021). Then after deliberations, the no-PTP jurors' verdicts were biased in the direction of the PTP (e.g., negative-defendant PTP = increased likelihood of guilty verdict after deliberations). Thus, rather than reducing bias, deliberation on mixed juries resulted in a spread of PTP bias.

Importantly, this biased discussion of trial evidence by PTP-exposed juries is a mechanism through which PTP imparts its biasing effects on guilt decisions (Ruva et al., 2022; Ruva & Guenther, 2015; Ruva & LeVasseur, 2012). Specifically, the deliberations of PTP-exposed juries are biased in the direction of the PTP (prosecution or defense), and this biased discussion results in a greater likelihood of a guilt decision consistent with the PTP bias (e.g., negative-defendant PTP = guilty verdict).

In summary, PTP imparts its biasing effects on jurors' decisions by (1) eliciting emotional responses that influence information processing, (2) source misattributions in which PTP information is attributed to the trial, (3) affecting how jurors process trial information (primacy effects and predecisional distortion), (4) group processes that result in accentuation and spread of bias. Therefore, exposure to PTP fundamentally changes the way jurors process trial information and deliberate in the jury room (see Ruva, 2018 for review).

Effectiveness of Voir Dire to Diagnose and Remedy Bias

Research finds that limited voir dire, wherein prospective jurors are asked closed-ended questions in a group format, is an ineffective safeguard against PTP bias (Hans & Jehle, 2003). This ineffectiveness is due to the assumption that jurors can/will self-report and self-correct bias. While PTP-exposed jurors might be aware that they hold some bias against or for the defendant, jurors are typically unaware of the extent of their bias or how it influences cognitive processing (Ruva, 2018). This lack of awareness of bias is problematic for self-reporting and self-correcting bias (Crocker & Kovera, 2010; Jones & Ruva, 2023; Kerr et al., 1991). Importantly, bias correction requires jurors to be aware of their bias, motivated to correct it, and know its direction and degree to not over or under correct (i.e., the flexible correction model—Wegener & Petty, 1997).

Extended voir dire which typically involves judges and attorneys conducting more thorough questioning (Salerno et al., 2021) is more effective at identifying bias when questioning focuses on case-specific factors and attitudes (Hans & Jehle, 2003; Lieberman, 2011). This type of questioning leads to better predictors of legal judgments (Crocker & Kovera, 2010; Salerno et al., 2021). However, while extended questioning aids the identification of jurors' explicit biases (Salerno et al., 2021), it is unlikely to uncover jurors' unconscious biases or reduce juror bias (Daftary-Kapur & Penrod, 2018; Jones & Ruva, 2023). For example, Dexter et al. (1992) and Jones et al. (2021) found that jurors exposed to negative-defendant PTP continued to be more likely than nonexposed jurors to find the defendant guilty after participating in an extended voir dire focused on increasing bias awareness and educating on how to combat bias. Therefore, extended voir dire shows promise in identifying explicit bias, but should not be relied upon to correct bias. Importantly, even if PTP-exposed jurors believe that they can set aside bias and

render a verdict based solely on the evidence presented at trial, they might be unable to do so due to source misattributions (Ruva et al, 2007; Ruva & Guenther, 2015) and predecisional distortion (Hope et al., 2004; Ruva et al., 2011) that are outside of conscious control (see Ruva, 2018 for review). Therefore, when there has been pervasive and prejudicial PTP surrounding a case jurors should be probed on their exposure—both kind and amount—and not on whether they are biased or can put aside bias (*United States of America v. Dzhokhar A. Tsarnaev*, 2021).

The failure of juror rehabilitation might also be due to social desirability effects (Hans & Jehle, 2003). During rehabilitation, judges might convey to jurors an expectation of impartiality. This expectation pressures jurors to provide answers they believe the judge wants to hear (Crocker & Kovera, 2010). As a result, jurors might be unwilling to report biases to avoid displeasing the judge. Thus, while judicial rehabilitation can result in jurors reporting being less biased, it does not reduce bias (Salerno et al., 2021). Again, this could be due to social pressures or an inability or unwillingness to self-diagnose bias.

Conclusion

Social science research provides evidence of PTP’s biasing influence on jurors’ emotions, memories, processing of trial evidence, and ultimately their decisions. Of particular relevance to the current case is that pervasive media coverage of cases making their way to trial administered over extended periods of time create a bias that is so strong that judicial remedies will likely be unable to cure it. The cumulative effect of news media in D.C. surrounding the January 6th cases from June 2020 through November 2, 2023, is likely great and compounded by continued media coverage that will occur with preliminary hearings, and publications of depositions and findings. Unfortunately, once the jury pool is tainted, remedies to reduce or eliminate this taint have been found to be ineffective (Jones et al., 2022; Ruva, 2018). That is, even if PTP-exposed jurors want to abide by jury instructions and base their verdict decisions only on evidence presented at trial, they are likely to be unable to do so due to predecisional distortion, source memory errors, and emotion—all of which are outside of jurors’ conscious control. It is my conclusion that there is evidence that the media coverage surrounding the January 6th cases will make it difficult to seat an impartial panel of jurors from the D.C. area for the Fischer trial.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed February 26, 2024.

Christine L Ruva

Christine L. Ruva

References

- Bakhshay, S., & Haney, C. (2018). The media's impact on the right to a fair trial: A content analysis of pretrial publicity in capital cases. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 24(3), 326–340. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000174>
- Brief for Supreme Court of the United States, as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents, *United States of America v. Dzhokhar A. Tsarnaev*, (2021) (no. 20-443). https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20-443/188719/20210827141929242_20-443bsacShirinBakhshayTarikaDaftaryKapurYaelDanieliAngelaJonesMargaretBullKoveraStevenDPenrodChristineLRuva.pdf
- Carlson, K. A., & Russo, J. E. (2001). Biased interpretation of evidence by mock jurors. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 7, 91-103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-898X.7.2.91>
- Cepeda, N. J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J. T., & Rohrer, D. (2006). Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 354-380. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.3.354>
- Crocker, C. B., & Kovera, M. B. (2010). The effects of rehabilitative voir dire on juror bias and decision making. *Law and Human Behavior*, 34, 212-226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-009-9193-9>
- Daftary-Kapur, T., Penrod, S. D., O'Connor, M., & Wallace, B. (2014). Examining pretrial publicity in a shadow jury paradigm: Issues of slant, quantity, persistence and generalizability. *Law and Human Behavior*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000081>
- Daftary-Kapur, T., & Penrod, S. D. (2018). Pre- and midtrial publicity in the age of internet and social media. In C. Najdowski & M. Stevenson (Eds.), *Criminal juries in the 21st century: Psychological science and the law* (pp. 1-19). Oxford Scholarship Online. <http://doi.org/0.1093/oso/9780190658113.001.0001>
- Dexter, H. R., Cutler, B. L., & Moran, G. (1992). A test of voir dire as a remedy for the prejudicial effects of pretrial publicity. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 819-832. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00926.x>
- Donovan, J. J., & Radosevich, D. J. (1999). A meta-analytic review of the distribution of practice effect: Now you see it, now you don't. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 795-805. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.5.795>
- Dumas, R., Lepastourel, N., & Testé, B. (2014). Press articles and influence processes: The different effects of incriminating information and crime story information on judgments of guilt. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 20(7), 659–672. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2013.854790>
- Feigenson, N. (2016). Jurors' emotions and judgments of legal responsibility and blame: What does the experimental research tell us? *Emotion Review*, 8, 26-31. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1754073915601223>

- Feigenson, N., & Park, J. (2006). Emotions and Attributions of Legal Responsibility and Blame: A Research Review. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30(2), 143–161. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9026-z>
- Hans, V. P., & Jehle, A. (2003). Avoid bald men and people with green socks? Other ways to improve the voir dire process in jury selection. *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, 78(3), 1179–1201. <https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/facpub/298>
- Hoetger, L. A., Devine, D. J., Brank, E. M., Drew, R. M., & Rees, R. (2022). The impact of pretrial publicity on mock juror and jury verdicts: A meta-analysis. *Law and Human Behavior*, 46(2), 121–139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000473>
- Hope, L., Memon, A., & McGeorge, P. (2004). Understanding pretrial publicity: Predecisional distortion of evidence by mock jurors. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 10, 111-119. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-898X.10.2.111>
- Hurlstone, M. J., Hitch, G. J., & Baddeley, A. D. (2014). Memory for serial order across domains: An overview of the literature and directions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(2), 339–373. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034221>
- Janiszewski, C., Noel, H., & Sawyer, A. G. (2003). A meta-analysis of the spacing effect in verbal learning: Implications for research on advertising repetition and consumer memory. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30, 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1086/374692>
- Jones, A. M. & Ruva, C. L. (2023). Implicit and ingrained: Reducing unconscious bias among jurors. In E. Verona & B. Fox (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of evidence-based criminal justice practices*. Routledge. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8911-786X>
- Jones, A.M., **Wong, K., Meyers, C.N., & Ruva, C.L.** (2022). Trial by tabloid: Can implicit bias education reduce pretrial publicity bias? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 49(2), 259-278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548211026956>
- Johnson, M. K., Hashtroudi, S., & Lindsay, D. S. (1993). Source monitoring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 3-28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.114.1.3>
- Kelly, A., Carroll, M., & Mazzoni, G. (2002). Metamemory and reality monitoring. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 16(4), 407–428. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.803>
- Kerr, N. L., Kramer, G. P., Carroll, J. S., & Alfini, J. J., (1991). On the effectiveness of voir dire in criminal cases with prejudicial pretrial publicity: An empirical study. *American University Law Review*, 40, 665-701. Retrieved from: <https://www.wcl.american.edu/journal/lawrev/40/kerr.pdf>
- Kramer, G. P., Kerr, N. L., & Carroll, J. S. (1990). Pretrial publicity, judicial remedies, and jury bias. *Law and Human Behavior*, 14(5), 409–438. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01044220>
- Lieberman, J. D. (2011). The utility of scientific jury selection: Still murky after 30 years. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(1), 48–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721410396628>
- Ruva C. L., & Coy, A. (2020). Your bias is rubbing off on me: The impact of pretrial publicity and jury composition on guilt decisions, trial evidence interpretation, and impression formation. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*. 26 (1), 22-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/law0000220>

- Ruva, C. L., Diaz Ortega, S.E., & O'Grady, K.A. (2022). What drives a Jury's Deliberations? The influence of pretrial publicity and jury composition on deliberation slant and content. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*, 28(1), 32-52. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000310>
- Ruva, C. L., & Guenther, C. C. (2015). From the shadows into the light: How pretrial publicity and deliberation affect mock jurors' decisions, impressions, and memory. *Law and Human Behavior*, 39(3), 294-310. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000117>
- Ruva, C. L., Guenther, C. C., & Yarbrough, A. (2011). Positive and negative pretrial publicity: The roles of impression formation, emotion, and predecisional distortion. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38, 511-534. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854811400823>
- Ruva, C. L., Guenther C. C. (2017). Keep your bias to yourself: How deliberating with differently biased others affects mock-jurors' guilt decisions, perceptions of the defendant, memories, and evidence interpretation. *Law and Human Behavior*, 41(5), 478-493. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000256>
- Ruva, C. L., & LeVasseur, M. (2012). Behind closed doors: The effect of pretrial publicity on jury deliberations. *Psychology. Crime & Law*, 18(5), 431-452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2010.502120>
- Ruva, C. L., & McEvoy, C. (2008). Negative and positive pretrial publicity affect juror memory and decision making. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 14(3), 226-235. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-898X.14.3.226>
- Ruva, C., McEvoy, C., Bryant, J. D. (2007). Effects of pre-trial publicity and jury deliberation on juror bias and source memory errors. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 21(1), 45-67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1254>
- Richard A. Shaffer (1986) Pretrial publicity: Media coverage and guilt attribution ¹, *Communication Quarterly*, 34(2), 154-169. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01463378609369630>
- Stebly, N. M., Besirevic, J., Fulero, S. M., & Jimenez-Lorente, B. (1999). The effects of pretrial publicity on juror verdicts: A meta-analytic review. *Law and Human Behavior*, 23, 219-235. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022325019080>
- Salerno, J. M., Campbell, J. C., Phalen, H. J., Bean, S. R., Hans, V. P., Spivack, D., & Ross, L. (2021). The impact of minimal versus extended voir dire and judicial rehabilitation on mock jurors' decisions in civil cases. *Law and Human Behavior*, 45(4), 336-355. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000455>
- Salerno, J. M., & Peter-Hagene, L. C. (2013). The interactive effect of anger and disgust on moral outrage and judgments. *Psychological Science*, 24(10), 2069-2078. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613486988>
- Studebaker, C. A., & Penrod, S. D. (1997). Pretrial publicity: The media, the law, and common sense. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 3(2-3), 428-460. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8971.3.2-3.428>
- Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1997). The flexible correction model: The role of naive theories of bias in bias correction. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 141-208). Academic Press.

APPENDIX A
CHRISTINE L. RUVA, PH.D.

Department of Psychology
The University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee
8350 N. Tamiami Trail, SMC, Room B322
Sarasota, Florida 34243
E-mail: ruva@usf.edu

Office Phone: (941) 359-4629

Website: <https://www.usf.edu/arts-sciences/departments/psychology/people/cruva.aspx>

EDUCATION & PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

- 2001 *University Of South Florida.* Tampa, FL
Degree: Ph.D.
Major: Cognitive Psychology
Minor: Law and Communication
Dissertation: “Effects of Collaboration and Pretrial Publicity on Juror Bias and Source Monitoring Errors” (Co-chairs: Judith B. Bryant, Ph.D. & Cathy McEvoy, Ph.D.)
- 1997 *University Of South Florida.* Tampa, FL
Degree: M.A.
Major: Cognitive Psychology
Thesis: “The Impact of Age, Speech Style, and Question Form on Perceptions of Witness Credibility and Trial Outcome” (Chair: Judith B. Bryant, Ph.D.)
- 1990 *University of Tampa,* Tampa, FL
Degree: B.A.
Major: Psychology
- 1991 *State of Florida Department of Corrections,* Basic Recruit Certificate:
Correction/Probation Officer - 395 hours July - September 1991

ACADEMIC & PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

- 2020-present *Professor and Campus Chair,* Psychology, University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee
- 2019-2020 *Professor and Chair,* Psychology, University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee
- 2011-2019 *Associate Professor and Chair,* Psychology, University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee
- 2004-2011 *Assistant Professor,* Psychology, University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee
- 2003-2004 *Visiting Assistant Professor,* Psychology, University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee
- 8/01 – 5/03 *Visiting Assistant Professor,* Psychology, University of South Florida Tampa
- 5/91– 8/93 *Correctional/Probation Officer,* State of Florida Department of Corrections.

Duties: Managing a caseload of ~100 felony offenders and subsequently sex offenders.

PUBLICATIONS (Bold indicates student author)

- Ruva, C.L. (In Press). Pre-trial publicity's effects on jurors' and judges' decisions. In M. K. Miller, L. A. Yelderman, J. A. Cantone, & M. Huss (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of the psychology of legal decision-making*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ruva, C. L., **Smith, K. D., & Sykes, E. C.** (2023). Gender, generations, and guilt: Defendant gender and age affect jurors' decisions and perceptions in an intimate partner homicide trial. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 38 (23-24), 1289-1212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605231191227>
- Jones, A. M. & Ruva, C. L. (2023). Implicit and ingrained: Reducing unconscious bias among jurors. In E. Verona & B. Fox (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of evidence-based criminal justice practices*. Routledge. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8911-786X>
- Ruva, C. L. & **Sykes, E. C.** (2023). With theater, you have to be ready for anything: University response, expert testimony, and sample influence jurors' decisions and counterfactual endorsement in a crime control theater case. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 29 (5), 488-513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2022.2027947>
- Ruva, C.L., **Sykes, E. C., Smith, K. D., Deaton, L. R., & Erdem, S.** (2022). Battling bias: Can two implicit bias remedies reduce juror racial bias? *Psychology, Crime & Law*. Advance online publication. <https://10.1080/1068316X.2022.2115494>
- Ruva, C. L., **Diaz Ortega, S.E., & O'Grady, K.A.** (2022). What drives a Jury's Deliberations? The influence of pretrial publicity and jury composition on deliberation slant and content. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*, 28(1), 32-52. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000310>
- Jones, A.M., **Wong, K., Meyers, C.N., & Ruva, C.L.** (2022). Trial by tabloid: Can implicit bias education reduce pretrial publicity bias? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 49(2), 259-278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548211026956>
- Ruva C. L., & Coy, A. (2020). Your bias is rubbing off on me: The impact of pretrial publicity and jury composition on guilt decisions, trial evidence interpretation, and impression formation. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 26 (1), 22-35. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/law0000220>
- Hudak, E. M.,** Edwards, J. D., Andel, R., Lister, J. J., McEvoy, C. L., Ruva, C. L., & **Peronto, C. L.** (2019). The comparative effects of two cognitive interventions among older adults residing in retirement communities. *Journal of Cognitive Enhancement*, 3 (4), 349-358. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41465-019-00125-8>
- Ruva, C. L. (2018). From the headlines to the jury room: An examination of the impact of pretrial publicity on jurors and juries. In M. K. Miller and B. H. Bornstein (Eds.). *Advances in Psychology and Law*. (Vol. 3, pp. 1-39). New York, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75859-6_1
- Ruva, C. L., & **Guenther, C. C.** (2017). Keep your bias to yourself: How deliberating with differently biased others affects mock-jurors' guilt decisions, perceptions of the defendant, memories, and evidence interpretation. *Law and Human Behavior*, 41(5), 478-493. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000256>

PUBLICATIONS (Continued; **Bold** indicates student author)

- Ruva, C. L. (2016). The impact of pretrial publicity and need for cognition on mock-jurors' decisions and deliberation behavior. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 6(1): 20-31 <https://10.5923/j.ijpbs.20160601.04>
- Ruva, C. L., & **Guenther, C. C.** (2015). From the shadows into the light: How pretrial publicity and deliberation affect mock jurors' decisions, impressions, and memory. *Law and Human Behavior*, 39(3), 294-310. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000117>
- Otto, A.L., Penrod, S., Dexter, H., Ruva, C.L., Guenther, C.C., Yarbrough, A., Steblay, N.M., Fulero, S.M., & Jimenez-Lorente, B. (2014). Preliminary hearing. *Psychology*, 21(1), 45-67.
- Ruva, C. L., **Dickman, M. C., & Mayes, J. L.** (2014). Exposure to both positive and negative pretrial publicity reduces or eliminates mock-juror bias. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 4 (1). 30-40. <https://10.5923/j.ijpbs.20140401.05>
- Edwards, J. D., Ruva, C. L., O'Brien, J. L., Haley, C. B., Lister, J. J. (2013). An examination of mediators of the transfer of cognition speed of processing training to everyday functional performance. *Psychology and Aging*, 28, 314-321. <https://10.1037/a0030474>
- Ruva, C. L. & **Hudak, E.** (2013). Pretrial publicity and juror age affect juror decision making. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*. 19, 179-202. <https://10.1080/1068316X.2011.616509>
- Ruva, C. L., **Mayes, J. L., Dickman, M.C., & McEvoy, C.** (2012). Timing and type of pretrial publicity affect jurors' decisions, predecisional distortion, and emotion. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 108-119. <https://10.5923/j.ijpbs.20140401.05>
- Ruva, C. L. & **LeVasseur, M. A.** (2012). Behind closed doors: The effect of pretrial publicity on jury deliberations. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 18, 431-452. <https://10.1080/1068316X.2010.502120>
- Ruva, C.L. (2011). Pretrial publicity affects jury decision making. In Carla E. Wilhelm (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Psychology*. Nova Science Publishers: Hauppauge, NY.
- Ruva, C. L., **Guenther, C. C., & Yarbrough, A.** (2011). Deciphering the effects of positive and negative PTP: Examining the roles of impression formation, emotion and predecisional distortion. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38, 511-534. <https://10.1177/0093854811400823>
- Ruva, C.L. (2010). *How Pretrial publicity affects jury decision making*. Nova Science Publishers: Hauppauge, NY.
- Ruva, C.L. (2010). Pretrial publicity affects jury decision making. In F. Columbus (Ed.) *Perspectives on cognitive psychology*. Nova Science Publishers: Hauppauge, NY.
- Ruva, C. L. & McEvoy, C. (2008). Negative and positive pretrial publicity affect juror memory and decision making. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 14, 226-235. <https://10.1037/1076-898X.14.3.226>
- Ruva, C. L., McEvoy, C., & Bryant, J. B. (2007). Effects of pretrial publicity and collaboration on juror bias and source monitoring errors. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 21, 45-67. <https://10.1002/acp.1254>

PUBLICATIONS (Continued; **Bold** indicates student author)

Ruva, C. L. & Bryant, J. B. (2004). The impact of age, speech style, and question form on perceptions of witness credibility and trial outcome. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 1919-1944.
<https://10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02593.x>

TECHNICAL REPORTS, PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS & MEDIA PUBLICATIONS

Brief for Supreme Court of the United States, as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents, *United States of America v. Dzhokhar A. Tsarnaev*, (2021) (no. 20-443).
https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20-443/188719/20210827141929242_20-443bsacShirinBakhshayTarikaDaftaryKapurYaelDanieliAngelaJonesMargaretBullKoveraStevenDPenrodChristineLRuva.pdf.pdf

Ruva, C.L. & Michaels, J. L. (2018). Course sharing: Professional Seminar and Research Methods – Mock IRB Committee Assignment. *Society for the Teaching of Psychology* (APA, Div. 2): *e-Book Series*. <https://teachpsych.org/ebooks/index.php>.

Ruva, C.L. (2018). Bias, pretrial publicity, and deliberation. *Excited Utterance – Evidence and Proof Podcast*. The host of this program is Edward Cheng, Professor of Law at Vanderbilt Law School:
<https://excitedutterance.com/listen?offset=153051480028>

Kays, J. (2018). Bias by Design: A psychology researcher seeks to tease out how pretrial publicity impacts jurors. *USFSM Research Magazine*. <https://issuu.com/usfsarasota-manatee/docs/issuu2>

Ruva, C.L. (2017, August). The question of a fair trial vs. a free press. *Sarasota Herald-Tribune*.
<http://www.heraldtribune.com/news/20170831/question-of-fair-trial-vs-free-press>

Ruva, C. L. (2015). Source Monitoring Test. *APA Psyc Tests Database*

Stammers et al. (2015). POSTnote: Cognitive biases in court. House of Parliament: Parliamentary Office of Science & Technology. *Contributor to this brief.
<http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/POST-PN-0512>

PUBLISHED ABSTRACTS IN REFEREED JOURNALS (**Bold** indicates student author)

Porter, A., Cruz, J. P., & Ruva, C. L. (2013). *The CSI Effect: Expectation of Forensic Evidence and its Effects on Juror Verdicts* *Journal of Forensic Research*, 4 (4), (Published abstract).

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES (**Bold** indicates student)

Sykes, E.C., & Ruva, C.L. (August 2023). The age of guilt: The effects of defendant age, victim age and stereotype on juror decisions. Poster presented at the American Psychological Association Conference (APA), Washington, DC. (**Refereed**).

Ruva, C.L., **Sykes, E.C., & Smith, K.D.** (March 2023). Victim race and victim-juror race congruence affect jurors' decisions and perceptions. Poster to be presented at the *International Conference for Psychological Science* (APS), Brussels, Belgium. (**Refereed**)

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES (Continued)
(**Bold** indicates student)

Smith, K.D., Aguilera Paez, M., Sykes, E., Ruva, C. L. (March 2023). Vicarious violence: Effects of media exposure to violence against people of color on emotionality. Data Blitz to be presented at the *American Psychology-Law Conference* (APA Div. 41), Philadelphia, PA. (**Refereed**)

Sykes, E., Smith, K.D., Ruva, C. L. (March 2023). Is congruence key? The effects of victim race and victim-juror race congruence in a spousal murder trial. Paper to be presented at the *American Psychology-Law Conference* (APA Div. 41), Philadelphia, PA. (**Refereed**)

Ruva, C.L., **Sykes, E.C., & Smith, K.D.** (March 2022). Gender, generations, and guilt: Defendant age & gender affect juror verdicts, impressions, and emotion. Poster to be presented at the *American Psychology-Law Conference* (APA Div. 41), Denver, Co. (**Refereed**)

Ruva, C. L., **Diaz Ortega, S. E., & O’Grady, K. A.** (March 2020). The Influence of Pretrial Publicity and Jury Composition on the Slant and Content of Deliberations. *Paper to be presented at the American Psychology-Law Conference* (APA Div. 41), New Orleans, LA. (**Refereed**)

O’Grady, K. A., Ruva, C. L., & **Diaz Ortega, S. E.** (March 2020). Are Your Discussions Unbiased? The Effects Of Pretrial Publicity, Jury Type, and NFC on Jurors’ Discussion Slant During Deliberations. *Poster to be presented at the American Psychology-Law Conference* (APA Div. 41), New Orleans, LA. (**Refereed**)

Diaz-Ortega, S., DeWeerd, L. J., Zabell, S. A., & Ruva, C. L. (March 2019). Freedom of the press or fair trial? Pretrial publicity’s influence on jury deliberation content. *Paper presented at the American Psychology-Law Conference* (APA Div. 41), Portland, Oregon. (**Refereed**)

Diaz-Ortega, S. E., Ruva, C. L., **DeWeerd, L. J., & Zabell, S. A.,** (March 2019). Jury decision making: Pretrial publicity influences jury decisions and the content of jury deliberations. *Poster presented at the International Convention of Psychological Science (ICPS), Paris, France.* (**Refereed**)

Ruva, C. L. (March 2019). Juror decision making: Effects of defendant age and sex on jurors’ verdicts, culpability judgements, and impressions of defendants and attorneys. *Poster presented at the International Convention of Psychological Science (ICPS), Paris, France.* (**Refereed**)

Ruva, C. L. (2018, March,). Your bias is rubbing off on me: How deliberating with differently biased others influence jurors’ guilt decisions, interpretation of trial evidence, and impressions of defendants and victims. *Paper accepted to be presented at the American Psychology-Law Conference* (APA Div. 41), Memphis, TN. (**Refereed**)

Ruva, C.L. & Michaels, J. L. (2018, January). Course sharing: Professional Seminar and Research Methods – Mock IRB Committee Assignment. *Poster presented at the National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology (NITOP) in St. Petersburg Florida.*

Ruva, C. L. & **Roberts, H.** (2018, March). What’s driving the decision? The effect of pretrial publicity and jury composition on the content of jury deliberations. *Paper accepted to be presented at the American Psychology-Law Conference* (APA Div. 41), Memphis, TN. (**Refereed**)

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES (Continued)

(**Bold** indicates student)

- Diaz-Ortega, S.**, & Ruva, C.L. (2017, November) Our Right to Bias? How Exposure to Pretrial Publicity Influences Gender Biases in Deliberations, Discussion of Trial Evidence and Judicial Instructions, and Verdicts. *Poster presented at the Meeting of the Society for Southeastern Social Psychologists (SSSP)*, Atlantic Beach, FL. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C. L., (2016, March). Keep Your Bias to Yourself: How Does Deliberating with Differently Biased Others Affect Jurors' Decisions, Memories, and Evidence Interpretation? Paper presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference (APA Div. 41), Atlanta, GA. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C. L., (2016, March). What Roles do Pretrial Publicity, Jury Composition, and Individual Characteristics Play in Jurors' Behavior and Decisions? Poster presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference (APA Div. 41), Atlanta, GA. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C. L., **Cimaszewski, F. A., & Adekanye, O.** (2015, March). Exploring the roles pretrial publicity, jury composition, and individual characteristics on juror deliberation behavior and decisions. Paper presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference (APA Div. 41), San Diego, CA. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C. L. (2014, July). How Do Jury Deliberations Affect Pretrial Publicity Bias? Symposium paper presented at the International Congress of Applied Psychology (Conference for the International Association of Applied Psychology), Paris, France. *Symposium title: Media, Crime Perception and Judgment. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C. L., **Cimaszewski, F. A., & Cunningham, T.** (2014, March)). Exploring the roles of pretrial publicity and emotion on juror judgments in a criminal trial. Paper presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference (APA Div. 41), New Orleans, Louisiana. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C. L., **Cunningham, T. & Cimaszewski, F. A.** (2014, March). Deliberating with similarly versus dissimilarly biased individuals: Influence on jurors' decisions and impressions. Paper presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference (APA Div. 41), New Orleans, Louisiana. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C. L. (2013, October). Exploring What Goes on Behind Closed Doors: Pretrial Publicity and Jury Deliberations. Invited speaker/delegate paper presentation at the International Conference on Forensic Research and Technology, Las Vegas, NV. (**Refereed**)
- Porter, A., Cruz, J. P., & Ruva, C. L.** (2013, October). The CSI Effect: Expectation of Forensic Evidence and its Effects on Juror Verdicts. Poster presentation at the International Conference on Forensic Research and Technology, Las Vegas, NV. (**Refereed**)
- Alvarez-Ruiz, L.** & Ruva, C. L. (2013, October). Effects of Pretrial Publicity on Eyewitness Memory. Poster presentation at the International Conference on Forensic Research and Technology, Las Vegas, NV. (**Refereed**)

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES (Continued)

(**Bold** indicates student)

- Ruva, C. L. (2013, March). The Influence of Different Types of Pretrial Publicity on Mock-Jurors' Decisions, Evidence Interpretation, and Emotions. Paper presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference, Portland (APA Div. 41), Portland, Oregon. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C.L., **Worley, J. C., & Nieliwocki, M.** (2012, August). Pretrial publicity affects emotion, trial evidence interpretation, decisions, and victim credibility. Paper accepted and will be presented at the American Psychological Association Conference, Orlando, FL. (**Refereed**)
- Edwards, J. D., Ruva, C. L., Haley, C. B., & O'Brien, J. L., **Hudak, E. M.**, Lister, J. L. (April 2012). Divided attention gains mediate transfer of speed of processing training to everyday functioning. Paper submitted to be presented at the Cognitive Aging Conference, Atlanta, GA. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C.L., **Mayes, J. L., Dickman, M. C., & Worley, J. C.** (2012, March). Exposure to both positive and negative PTP can reduce or eliminate PTP bias and source memory errors. Symposium paper presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference, San Juan, Puerto Rico. (**Refereed**)
- Edwards, J. D., Ruva, C. L., Haley, C. B., & **Hudak, E. M.** (2011, September). Divided attention gains mediate transfer of speed of processing training to everyday functioning. Entertainment Software and Cognitive Neurotherapeutics Society Conference, San Francisco, CA. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C.L., **McGowan, A. M., Cirks, C. K., & Guenther, C. C.** (2011, March). The Impact of Pretrial Publicity and need for cognition on juror's decisions and deliberation behavior. American Psychology & Law Society *International Conference*, Miami, FL. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C.L., **Mayes, J. L., Dickman, M. C., & Guenther, C. C.** (2011, March). Timing and type of pretrial publicity affect jurors' decisions and predecisional distortion. American Psychology & Law Society *International Conference*, Miami, FL (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C.L. & **Hudak, E.M.** (2010, April). Pretrial publicity and juror age affect juror decision making. Paper presented at the Cognitive Aging Conference, Atlanta, GA. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C.L. & **Hudak, E.M.** (2010, March). Pretrial publicity and juror age affect juror decision making. Paper accepted to be presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference, Vancouver, BC. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C. L., **Guenther, C. C., & Yarbrough, A.** (2010, March). The emotional decision maker: Jurors' emotional responses to pretrial publicity mediate their decisions. Paper accepted to be presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference, Vancouver, BC. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C.L. & **Donaldson-Guenther, C.C.** (2009, March). Coding the effect of pretrial publicity on jury deliberations. Invited symposium paper presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference, San Antonio, TX. (**Refereed**)
- Ruva, C.L., **LeVasseur, M.A., & Frei, A.M.** (2009, March). Behind closed doors: Pretrial publicity affects the nature and quality of mock-jury deliberations. Paper presented at the American

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES (Continued)

- Donaldson-Guenther, C.C.** & Ruva, C.L. (2009, March). The effects of pretrial publicity on evidence evaluation: A story model framework. Paper presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference, San Antonio, TX. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C. L. & **LeVasseur, M.A.** (2008, May). Behind closed doors: A content analysis of the mock-jury deliberation process. Paper presented at the Association for Psychological Science Annual Convention, Chicago, IL. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C. L. & **LeVasseur, M.A.** (2008, March). Observing jury interaction: pretrial publicity affects the qualitative nature of mock-jury deliberations. Paper presented at the American Psychology & Law Society Conference, Jacksonville, FL. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C. L. (2007, May). Pretrial publicity affects memory for and interpretation of trial evidence. Paper presented at Association for Psychological Science Annual Convention, Washington, DC. **(Refereed)**
- Loftus, H.** & Ruva, C.L. (2007, March). Individual differences and their association with suggestibility and source monitoring errors. Paper presented at Off the Witness Stand: Using Psychology in the Practice of Justice, John Jay College, New York, NY. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C.L. (2006, November). Pretrial publicity and collaboration affect juror memory and decision making. Paper to be presented at the Psychonomic Society Annual Meeting, Houston, TX. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C.L. (2006, March). Eyewitness Memory: What judges and attorneys need to know. Presentation delivered at the Inns of Court, Tampa, FL.
- Ruva, C.L. (2005, May). Pretrial publicity and length of delay effect juror memory and decision making. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Convention, Los Angeles, CA. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C. L. (2004, March). Leveling the playing field? The effect of positive versus negative PTP on trial outcome and source monitoring errors. Paper delivered at the American Psychology-Law Society Annual Conference, Scottsdale, AZ. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C. L. (2003, May). Does exposure to pretrial publicity affect juror's memory for trial facts? Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Convention, Atlanta, GA. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C. L., McEvoy, C. & Bryant, J. B. (2002, June). Effects of collaboration and pretrial publicity on juror bias and source monitoring errors. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Society, New Orleans, Louisiana. **(Refereed)**
- Gonzalez, L. P.,** Bryant, J. B. & Ruva, C. L. (1999, April). Perceptions of witness credibility as a function of witness age and language translation. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM. **(Refereed)**

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES (Continued)

- Ruva, C., & Bryant, J. B. (1998, July). Perceptions of witness credibility as a function of witness age, speech style, and question form. Paper presented at the XVth Meetings of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Bern, Switzerland. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C., & Bryant, J. B. (1998, March). The impact of age, speech style, and question form on perceptions of witness credibility and trial outcome. Paper presented at the American Psychology-Law Society Biennial Conference, Redondo Beach, CA. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C., Bryant, J. B. & Brannick, M. (1996, March). Development of the Adults' General Beliefs about Children Scale for research on witness credibility. Paper presented at the Conference on Human Development, Birmingham, AL. **(Refereed)**
- Ruva, C. (1995, December). How does attorney questioning techniques and witness speech affect both perceived credibility of child witnesses and trial outcomes? National Science Foundation Conference (Women and Science), Washington, DC. **(Refereed)**

SELECTED PRESENTATIONS AT BAR/LEGAL ASSOCIATIONS

- Wild West Bench and Bar-B-Que Panel Presentation (November 17, 2023). Presentation entitled "In the Court of Public Opinion: Pretrial Publicity and Juror Bias". Stetson University College of Law, Gulfport Florida.
- Pinellas County Trial Lawyers Association/Pinellas Bar Association Presentation (October 25, 2023). Presentation entitled "*Trial by Tabloid: Media's Impact on a Defendant's Right to a Fair Trial*".
- Clearwater Bar Association Civil/Trial Section Presentation (April 25, 2023) for CLE credits: Presentation entitled "*Jury Psychology and Techniques for Voir Dire*"

SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Journal & Grant Reviewer (Ad Hoc)

1. Applied Cognitive Psychology
2. Behavioral Sciences and the Law
3. Communication Quarterly
4. Cambridge University Press
5. Communication Studies
6. Crime, Law, and Social Change
7. Criminal Justice & Behavior
8. Criminology & Public Policy
9. Journal of Applied Social Psychology
10. Journal of Experimental Psychology - Applied
11. Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology
12. Justice Quarterly
13. Law and Human Behavior
14. Legal and Criminological Psychology
15. NSF: Law & Social Science Program
16. Psychology, Crime, & Law
17. Psychiatry, Psychology, & Law

Conference & Symposium Reviewer

1. Reviewer for AP-LS conference submissions
2. Reviewer for APA conference for Div. 41 conference submissions
3. Reviewer & Judge for the Student Conferences at USF

Jury Consulting and Expert Testimony

- This work includes consulting on high-profile cases, writing reports for the court, and testifying in court as an expert witness regarding the impact of pretrial publicity on defendants' right to a fair trial guaranteed under the Sixth Amendment of the US Constitution. I have also consulted for other jury consultants in high-profile cases.

Service to University, College, and Department (last 3 years)

1. Campus Chair of Psychology (2020 – present)
2. Center for Justice Research & Policy - Leadership Team Member (2020-present): <https://www.usf.edu/arts-sciences/centers/cjrp/>
3. Psychology Executive Committee Member (2020 – present)
4. Annual Evaluation Committee Member (2020 – present)
5. CDP Graduate Program Task Force (2021)
6. USFSM Chair of Psychology (2008 - 2020)
7. Chair of the USFSM Tenure & Promotion Committee (2017-2018 & 2019-2020)
8. Member of the USFSM Tenure & Promotion Committee (2018-2019)
9. Chair of the College of Science & Mathematics Tenure & Promotion Committee (2016 – 2020)
10. Chair of the College of Science & Mathematics Annual Review Committee (2016-2020)
11. Chair Psychology Assessment Committee (2007 – 2019)
12. Member of Awards & Rewards Committee (2017 – 2019)

RESEARCH SUPERVISION

Thesis and Dissertation Committees

1. Elizabeth Sykes: Psychology Master's Thesis (Chair), University of South Florida
 - Dates of Service: May 2023 to present.
 - Title: "TBD"
2. Bailey Hall: Clinical Psychology Master's Thesis, University of South Florida
 - Dates of Service: February 2022 to present.
 - Edelyn Verona is the Chair of thesis committee.
 - Title: "The Effects of Psychopathy Trait Descriptions on Mock Juror Decision Making"

Thesis and Dissertation Committees

3. Natalie Gordon: Psychology Ph.D. candidate Psychology and Law at John Jay College of Criminal Justice.
 - Date of Service: April 2019 – May 2021
 - Margaret Kovera is Chair this doctoral committee.
 - Title: “Increasing the Accuracy of Jurors’ Self Reports of PTP Bias During *Voir Dire*”
4. Andrea Ranieri: Psychology (Cognitive, Neuro, & Social area) USF Tampa
 - Date of Service: April 2016 – May 2019 (successfully defended)
 - Sandy Schneider Chaired this doctoral committee
 - Dissertation Title: “Can too much (descriptive) information be a bad thing? The effects of a priori outcome information on choice preference”
5. Lindsey Rhead: Psychology and Law Experimental Track Doctoral Student at John Jay College of Criminal Justice (CUNY)
 - Date of Service: November 2012 to July 2015
 - Margaret Kovera Chaired this doctoral committee
 - Dissertation Title: Juror Target Monitoring Errors in Multiple Defendant Trials
6. Stephanie Smith: Clinical Forensic Psychology, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology
 - Date of Service: May 2010 to June 2014 (successfully defended)
 - Jim Iaccino Chaired this doctoral committee
 - Dissertation Title: Moral Disengagement and Jury Decision Making
7. Elizabeth Gagnon: Aging Studies, University of South Florida Tampa
 - Date of Service: September 2010 to July 2012 (successfully defended)
 - Jerri Edwards Chaired doctoral committee
 - Dissertation Title: The Effects of Cognitive Stimulation and Computerized Memory Training among Older Adults

Undergraduate: Honors Thesis & Senior Research Projects Chaired

1. Laura Enciso (April 2022 – April 2023) – *Committee Chair*. Title “How do Individual Differences Influence Juror Decision Making? A Review on the Impact of Juror Bias on Cases of Domestic and Sexual Violence”
2. Alana Fleischer (October 2018 – December 2019) – *Committee Chair*. Title “Juror Decision Making Regarding Intellectual Disability”
3. Alexis Mansfield (Fall 2018 – December 2019) – *Committee Chair*. Title “Counterfactual Thinking About Crime Control Theater: Jurors’ Decision Making in a Registered”
4. Stephanie Diaz-Ortega (January 2017 – April 2019) – *Faculty Mentor* of Senior Research Project. Title "Our Right to Bias? How Exposure to Pretrial Publicity Influences Gender Biases in Deliberations, Discussion of Trial Evidence and Judicial Instructions, and Verdicts"
5. Priscilla Augustine (January 2015 – May 2017) – *Committee Chair*. Title “What are the Causes of Wrongful Convictions? The Relative Impact of Different Types of Forensic Evidence.”
6. Taylor Hill (January 2015 – December 2016) – *Committee Chair*. Title “Gender Bias in Jury Decisions: A Review of Current Literature.”

Undergraduate: Honors Thesis & Senior Research Projects Chaired (Continued)

7. Roberts, Haley (June 2014 – Present) – *Committee Chair*. Title “Who’s making the decision? Effects of Pretrial Publicity on Jury Deliberations.”
8. Oluwatosin S. Adekanye, Psychology Honors (January 2014 – May 2015) – *Committee Member*. Title “A Re-visitation of Stanovich and West’s Cars Paradigm Study of Myside Bias.”
9. Ashley Porter and Justo Cruz (spring and fall 2013) – *Committee Chair*. Title “The CSI Effect: Expectation of Forensic Evidence and its Effects on Juror Verdicts.”
10. Lorena Alvarez-Ruiz, Psychology Honors (fall 2012 - fall 2013) – *Committee Chair*. Title “Effects of Pretrial Publicity on Eyewitness Memory.”
11. Jami Worley, Senior Research Project (2010-2011) – *Committee Chair*. Title “The Importance of Trial Ambiguity: Understanding the Influence of Pretrial Publicity on Jurors’ Decisions and Emotions”
12. Mary Dickman, Psychology Honors (2010-2011) – *Committee Member*. Title “Attitudes toward Sexist Language and Epicene Reference”
13. Christina Donaldson-Guenther, Psychology Honors (2007-2008) – *Committee Chair*. Title “The Effects of Pretrial Publicity on Evidence Evaluation: A Story Model Framework”
14. Vivian Lotts, Psychology Honors (2006-2007). Differences Matter? The Effects of Misinformation and Delay on Eyewitness Performance”
15. Shermel Ward, Psychology Honors (2006-2007) – *Committee Chair*. Title “Improving Healthy Families America’s Ability to Prevent Child Abuse in More Families throughout the United States”
16. Holly Carvalho-Loftus, Senior Thesis (2005-2006) – *Committee Chair*. Title “Individual Differences and Their Association with Suggestibility and Source Memory Errors”

COURSES TAUGHT

1. Applied Cognitive Psychology
2. Cognitive Psychology
3. Child Psychology
4. Developmental Psychology
5. Directed Study/Research (Undergraduate & Graduate)
6. Learning
7. Psychology Honors & Thesis Supervision
8. Psychology Applied to Law
9. Psychology of Language
10. Perception
11. Professional-Seminar: Applying Psychology to the Legal System (Capstone Course)
12. Research Methods

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS & AWARDS

- 2022 USF Faculty Outstanding Research Achievement Award:
<https://www.usf.edu/research-innovation/news/2022/outstanding-research-achievement-awards.aspx>
- American Psychological Association
- American Psychology – Law Society (Div. 41 APA)
- Association for Psychological Science
- Psychonomic Society