

Study guide for 12 angry men

Law, Justice



Study Questions for Week 1-These will be discussed in class and may appear on quizzes or exams. What is ethics? " Ethics is the idea of what should be, rather than what is... It states how we are to act in the world, rather than how people are acting.' The goal of ethics is to a achieve " a good life" How do they impact our daily lives? Ethics determine how people tend to behave in society. Many people base their ethics on religious code. For example, In many parts of the middle east, women are denied the right to read or go to school because of the ethics taught in popular religious dogma. In America, where there is a large Christian standing, there are many arguments about whether homosexuals should be allowed to wed because of the ethics taught to Christians in The Bible. How do they impact our academic experiences? They " articulate the good habits that we should aquire, the duties that we should follow, and the consequences of our behavior." From The Ethics of Speech: Who is the presenter and what is his educational/academic background? The presenter is Artie Isaac Yale, B. A.; Columbia, M. B. A. Yale University (English) Columbia University - Columbia Business School Wexner Heritage Foundation . From The Ethics of Persuasive Speech (13 minute total): What is the importance of organization in preparing a persuasive speech? How are " evidence"and " credibility"related? Organization is important in preparing a persuasive speech in order to make sure the audience easily understands the information trying to be relayed to them. You want your points to come across strong, and having an unorganized speech makes your points harder to follow. Evidence is what shows support for your opinion or proposal to prove that your proposal satisfies the criteria (standard) needed to approve making a change. Credibility is the audience

belief in you and what you are saying to be true. Having credibility is a matter of whether or not the audience believes you have a right to persuade them on a specific topic. When you have credibility people are more likely to value your evidence as factual. . From the article, " What is Ethics in Research & Why It Is Important? ": What is its Importance? How can this be applied to the various disciplines of PACE? Ethics the " method, procedure, or perspective for deciding how to act and for analyzing complex problems and issues... promotes the aims of research, such as knowledge, truth, and avoidance of error... values that are essential to collaborative work. They " help to ensure that researchers can be held accountable to the public." as well as " help to build public support for research... promote a variety of other important moral and social values, such as social responsibility, human rights, animal welfare, compliance with the law, and health and safety. " The set ethics of the campus helps to insure " trust, accountability, mutual respect, and fairness" between the students and the teachers of the PACE program.

Study questions for 12 Angry Men: For the movie: What kinds of attributions were used by the jurors and how did these attributions affect their initial judgment of the boy? How did the use of schemas & stereotypes influence the juror's thinking? How was the [-> 0] (go to: [-> 1]) bias used by the jurors? Was there any indication that conformity played a role in the jury's decision making process? When some of the jurors eventually decided to vote NOT GUILTY, did they change their vote because of normative influence or informational influence. Was there evidence of the misinformation effect (ala Elizabeth Loftus) in the eye witnesses? Were there any examples of the fundamental attribution error or the actor/observer bias

in the film? - For the play: - Explain the term "protagonist." The protagonist is the main character of the play, usually containing a positive connotation, normally seen as the hero or heroine of the work. - Who is the protagonist in this play? There is no set protagonist in the play, it is a matter of opinion, all jurors are trying to decide on whether or not the boy is guilty, and all believe themselves to be justified considering the evidence, but the closest thing to a protagonist in the play would be Juror #8, who is fighting for the boy's life, even though he may be guilty. Explain the term "antagonist." The antagonist is typically the "nemesis" of the main character or "villain" of the play. They oppose the protagonist, putting obstacles in his way throughout his journey. - Who is the antagonist in this play? Although there is no set antagonist to the play, the closest thing to it would be Juror #3, who is insistent on finding the boy guilty. - What is the setting of this play (both time and place)? The year is 1957, the place is a court room/jury room. - Define the literary element "conflict." What is the conflict in this play? Conflict is the struggle between the opposing forces on which the action in a work of literature depends. The conflict of this play is the 12 Jurors having disagreements about whether or not the boy is guilty or innocent. - When the jury first votes on the guilt or innocence of the accused, Juror #8 is the only one to vote not guilty. Why does he vote this way? Because he found a knife just like the knife used to stab the boy's father in a store two blocks away from the boy's house making him wonder if someone else could have had the same knife. - At the end of Act I, Juror #8 is still the only juror to vote not guilty. He makes a proposal to the rest of the jurors. - Describe that proposal. - Explain why he makes it. He makes a proposal that all the jurors take an

anonymous vote not including himself, and that if after the vote there is still no one that find the boy not guilty, then he won't discuss it anymore, but if there is at least one other person who finds the boy not guilty, they will continue to sit and talk about it. He did this because he knows that some people may not speak up and say that they also have doubts about the boy being guilty because they are afraid of the backlash from the other jurors, how ever if it is done anonymously, someone may come forward. - Do we know the race or ethnicity of the accused in the play as read? It is not stated specifically in the play, however it can be inferred that he is a minority. Do we know in the movie? Explain in full sentences. We are not actually told the race or ethnicity of the accused specifically, but it can be inferred based on the time period in which the movie was filmed, the language that was used to refer to the accused and the place he grew up in (, poor, " common ignorant slob", " these people", slum kids etc) that the boy is African American. - Juror #8 makes an argument about a passing El train. (page 33) What is his point? Explain. Because the train was supposedly passing right as the woman saw the boy's father being stabbed, the old man downstairs could not have possibly heard the boy shouting, " I'm going to kill you" or distinguish his voice from another. - Nine explains why the old man who testified might not be a reliable witness (pages 33-34). Explain. Because the old man is lonely, no one ever asks for his thoughts or opinions, and " no one ever quotes him" He may have convinced himself that he heard the boy upstairs and saw him running down the hallway, seeing as how the court was in need of his testimony. - Review the end of Act II. A climatic event occurs that involves #3. Describe it. Explain why it is important. You may wish to

review Juror #8's comments on page 35 to answer this. Juror #3 realizes in his heart that he is being stubborn, is biased, and that it is true that it is possible the boy may not be guilty given the facts that were laid out. If he were to allow it to be hung jury purely on his account, a boy who very well may be innocent could be put to death, and that would be on his conscience, and so he changed his mind about voting guilty. - The woman who claims to have seen the murder through her window may not have been a reliable witness. Why? Explain what the jury decides might be a problem with her claim. The woman who claims to have seen the murder may not be a reliable witness because she wears glasses, it was late at night when the murder occurred so she most likely did not have her glasses on, the boy's window was 60 feet away from her own, and she was looking through passing train cars. - Did Juror #3 vote not guilty because he really changed his mind, or did he vote because he felt pressured by the other jurors? There is no one correct answer to this question, but you should be able to support your response with good arguments and supporting evidence from the play. I believe Juror #3 voted not guilty both because he felt pressured, but also because of all the testimony of the other jurors. I think that his insistency to vote guilty was strongly based on racial prejudices and it took the strong arguments of the other jurors to allow him to think past his personal bias. - List themes and "ethical issues" that are found in Twelve Angry Men. Justice- justice is the main theme of the play, a jury is trying to decide the whether or not to send a boy to prison for the rest of his life. Prejudice- racial prejudice is a prevailing theme in the play anonymity - No one's name is ever specifically stated in the play. Class an racial discrimination are both ethical

issues that arise in Twelve Angry Men, there is an obvious prejudicial bias with someone of the jurors because of the accused being a minority, they have made assumptions about the boy's character, and are quick to believe that he is guilty of the crime despite the faulty evidence and testimonies during the trial. [-> 0] - <http://www.psych.ualberta.ca/~jschimmel/psyc> [-> 1] - <http://www.psych.ualberta.ca/~jschimmel/psyc>