





Forensic Psychology

CHAPTER OBJECTIVES

- Define forensic psychology.
- Review career areas in the forensic sciences.
- Distinguish forensic psychology from forensic psychiatry.
- Identify and describe the major subareas of forensic psychology.
- Review the educational, training, and certification requirements to become a forensic psychologist.

When the space shuttle *Columbia* disintegrated upon reentry into the Earth's atmosphere on February 1, 2003, “forensic investigators” from various federal agencies were immediately sent to the crash sites in an effort to identify the causes of the accident. They were forensic scientists trained to uncover evidence that may or may not eventually end up in a court of law. Likewise, when a bomb nearly detonated in New York's Times Square in 2010, this near catastrophe was investigated by scientists representing various federal and state agencies. Also in 2010, both independent and government-employed scientists began to study the cause and effects of the explosion aboard the Deepwater Horizon oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico that resulted in the deaths of 11 workers and the subsequent spillage—over 86 days—of an estimated 75,000 barrels of oil a day into the Gulf. As these examples indicate, the term *forensic* refers to anything pertaining or potentially pertaining to law, both civil and criminal.

Investigations of this sort almost invariably occur whenever there are unexpected and unexplained events that are not obvious natural disasters. In these contexts, scientists can perform numerous functions. They may be able to determine whether human factors—for example, terrorism, sabotage, or negligence—caused the tragedies. The information they provide can help in identifying those responsible. In the case of the oil spill, scientists tried to determine not only how the explosion occurred, but also how to stop the leakage and the extent of damage to wildlife and the environment.

Forensic science has become an all-encompassing professional activity and a popular career choice among students. Nearly every conceivable profession, including psychology, has a forensic specialization. Many people

are confused about the various “forensic” areas and assume that professionals within these fields do largely the same thing. It will become clear, however, that they do not. Although **forensic psychology** is the subject of this text, it is helpful to begin with illustrations of other forensic sciences for comparison purposes. In other words, it is important for readers to know at the outset what forensic psychology is *not*.

The Forensic Sciences

Examples of the forensic professions, in addition to forensic psychology, include forensic engineering, forensic linguistics, forensic oceanography, forensic medicine, forensic computer investigation, forensic social work, forensic pathology, forensic anthropology, forensic archaeology, and forensic accounting. The focus of each discipline is evident from the terms. Forensic linguistics, for example, is concerned with the in-depth evaluation of language-related characteristics of text, such as grammar, syntax, spelling, vocabulary, and phraseology, either to profile an offender or to determine whether specific writing samples are from the same author (H. C. Black, 1990). Forensic anthropology refers to the identification of skeletal, badly decomposed, or otherwise unidentified human remains. Forensic pathology is that branch of medicine concerned with diseases and disorders of the body that relate to questions that might come before the court. The forensic pathologist—popularized in television shows such as *CSI*, *Bones*, and *NCIS*, and in the novels of Patricia Cornwell—examines the bodies of crime victims for clues about the victim’s demise. Forensic anthropologists and forensic pathologists often work in conjunction with homicide investigators to identify a decedent; discover evidence of foul play; and help establish the age, sex, height, ancestry, and other unique features of a decedent from skeletal remains.

Forensic laboratories are usually maintained or sponsored by governmental agencies specifically to examine physical evidence in criminal and civil matters. The scientists working in these laboratories are expected to prepare reports and provide courtroom testimony on the physical evidence if needed. Alternately, private laboratories provide services to governmental agencies on a contractual basis or employ scientists who conduct independent research.

Scientists from both public and private laboratories may be asked to examine and testify about latent fingerprints, hair fibers, firearms and ballistics, explosives and fire debris, toxic material, and other pertinent evidence found at or near a crime scene or tragic accident. Some forensic labs are better at investigating certain types of evidence than others. For example, a lab maintained by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) was instrumental in investigating a major product-tampering case that occurred in the United States in 1982. Seven persons in the Chicago area collapsed and died soon after taking Tylenol capsules. The capsules had been purchased in six different stores, and victims included a 12-year-old girl, a woman who had just returned from the hospital after giving birth, and three members of one family. Chemical investigation revealed that the capsules had been laced with cyanide. FDA chemists developed fingerprinting-like techniques that allowed authorities to trace the cyanide back to the specific manufacturer and distributor (Stehlin, 1995). The cyanide compound was identified as potassium cyanide with a purity of 90%. The compound is usually used in industries involved in metal electroplating, metal extraction, and both photographic and cinematographic film processing. Unfortunately, despite the fact that the poison was identified and the source was traced, the perpetrator was never found. The FDA lab continues to apply the “fingerprinting” techniques to identify cyanide origins, and since 1980, FDA chemists have developed techniques to screen for more than 250 of the most toxic poisons commonly available to the public (Stehlin, 1995).

With increased threats of mass violence and events such as the anthrax scare that followed the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, D.C., quick forensic chemical-detection methods such as those described above have become especially crucial. In addition to terrorism-related

concerns, also critical are forensic techniques that can address more common crimes, such as drug trafficking, computer crimes, and a wide variety of white-collar offenses that involve fraudulent documents. We highlight a few of these techniques below.

Example of Forensic Science: Forensic Entomology

Forensic laboratories often employ scientists who specialize in **forensic entomology**, which is the study of insects (and their arthropod relatives) as it relates to legal issues. This specialty is becoming increasingly important in criminal and civil investigations. For example, entomological investigations of termite infestation may be used to support civil litigation dealing with real estate, pest control, or landlord–tenant disputes. In another context, forensic entomology may be useful in investigations of food contamination. Scientists try to determine where an infestation occurred (e.g., which plant or store), when it occurred, and whether it was accidental or the possible result of human tampering. (Whether there actually was negligence or criminal intent, though, is left to the courts to decide.)

In criminal investigations, forensic entomology is used to determine the time since death (postmortem interval), the location of the death, placement or movement of the body, and manner of death. For example, because insects will feed first on soft-tissue areas of the head, such as the eyes and nasal passages, and any open wounds, they often will neglect undamaged flesh that will be left intact to harden. Consequently, the feeding patterns of insects often provide invaluable clues about the nature of a death.

Forensic entomology can also be applied to investigations of drug trafficking. Insects are sometimes found in drugs, and the identity of these insects can help in pinpointing where the drugs were produced or packed. In some cases, forensic entomologists can establish from the DNA of body or head lice whether two individuals had contact with each other (Mumcuoglu, Gallili, Reshef, Brauner, & Grant, 2004). Forensic entomology can also help in determining whether parents or caregivers have abused their children by intentionally using wasps or bees to sting them as a form of punishment. Fortunately, these instances are rare.

Another Example: Questioned Documents

Still another science represented in forensic laboratories is forensic document examination. This science analyzes handwriting, print fonts, the authenticity of signatures, alterations in documents, charred or water-damaged paper, the significance of inks and papers, photocopying processes, writing instruments, sequence of writing, and other elements of a document to establish authorship and authenticity. The process is often called **questioned document examination or analysis**. The questioned document may be a check, a threatening letter, a hold-up note, a credit application or receipt, a will, an investment record, a tax form, or a medical record (R. Morris, 2000). Questioned document analysis can be applied to many types of investigations, including fraud, homicide, suicide, sexual offenses, blackmail, bombings, and arson. Questioned handwriting analysis, for example, may include the forensic examination of a signature, handwritten letter, entries on a form, or even graffiti on a wall (R. Morris, 2000). A forensic document examiner (FDE) may be asked to examine and render opinions on the authorship of writing on building walls; recover engraved or obliterated writing on different types of surfaces; or determine the brand or model of typewriters or keyboards, printers, embossers, inks, and printing processes (R. Morris, 2000).

Closely related to forensic document analysis is forensic ink analysis, a little-known crime-fighting tool that is sometimes used to show that certain documents have been backdated or altered. Most of the ink analysis today is done by the U.S. Secret Service's Forensic Services Division, "which maintains the world's largest library of ink samples with more than 7,000 entries" (Maremont, 2003, p. A4). There is also a small group of

private forensic experts who do ink analysis, primarily for medical malpractice suits, patent battles, or cases involving disputed wills. The ink analysis is especially effective in examining the ink of ballpoint pens, which contains a variety of different dyes and drying properties. Ink analysis played a role in the 1973 conviction of mass murderer Juan Corona, who hacked to death 25 migrant workers near Yuba City, California (Maremont, 2003). Usually, however, ink analysis is used in investigations of business fraud or, in rare cases, by the Internal Revenue Service for income tax cases.

Computer Evidence Recovery

Anyone who has experienced hard drive failure can recall the momentary panic it engenders. Surprisingly, most “lost” data can actually be recovered. Furthermore, as embarrassed politicians, their staffs, and high-profile professionals and public figures have learned, e-mail messages do not inevitably disappear in cyberspace, even with the press of the delete key.

Computer evidence recovery, also called forensic data recovery, involves e-mail and Internet analysis, along with sophisticated hard drive, diskette, and memory stick recovery techniques of orphaned, fragmented, and erased data. A computer evidence recovery specialist has the training to search, seize, and analyze magnetic media originating from a variety of operating systems pursuant to the execution of a search warrant or subpoena. Without specialized training, though, a law enforcement officer armed with a search warrant would not be advised to open computer files from the office of a person suspected of Internet fraud or one suspected of distributing child pornography. The major goal of the specialist or investigator is to recover the data without modifying the original media or the image of the media. These skills are used in a wide variety of investigations, such as financial fraud, embezzlement, sexual harassment, child pornography, program vandalism, identity theft, document forgery, software piracy, narcotics trafficking, and money laundering. Computer evidence recovery was a key law enforcement technique in bringing to justice Robert Hansen who, while he was an FBI agent, engaged in spying for the Soviet Union and Russia for over 15 years.

The data evidence recovery process involves an analysis of the computer make and capacity, the computer's time and date settings, hard drive partitions, data and operating system integrity, computer virus evaluation, files, and software. The analysis will also usually involve careful evaluation of *shadow data*, which is the information that remains on a disk, hard drive, or memory stick even after the data are ostensibly erased, damaged, or lost. Many people engaging in various forms of illegal activity think they are safe by making deletions or using software designed to cover their tracks, not realizing that a well-trained computer data recovery expert can access almost any information sent or received. As an example, Wardwell and Smith (2008) describe a method that was used in a child exploitation case to recover data from CD-RW discs that the suspect had erased.

Forensic data recovery also may be a powerful tool to clear a person of wrongdoing. For example, Clark (2002) describes a case of a successful businessman living in an upscale neighborhood, happily married with two children, who was accused of accessing and distributing child pornography. One evening, police appeared at his door to execute a search warrant. They seized his computer, took him into custody, and charged him with distribution of child pornography, though he strongly denied the allegations. His attorney contacted a computer evidence recovery service, which was able to demonstrate that the pornography was stored in his computer on dates the man wasn't even in town. Apparently, he had unknowingly downloaded a “Trojan Horse,” enabling the computer cracker to have access to his computer. (Distinctions sometimes are made between a computer *cracker*, who maliciously breaks into computers for the purpose of damaging data or sending out viruses, and a *hacker*, who tries to get through holes in computer codes to prove a point or play a joke.)

The computer specialist in the above case was able to prove that someone else had been storing the pornography on the individual's computer without his knowledge.

As is apparent from the previous illustrations, forensic investigations usually require expertise in chemistry, biology, physics, or other sciences, including the science of computer technology. Although television, movies, and popular novels provide numerous graphic examples of forensic examinations of evidence, the extensive scientific preparation required to work in forensic laboratories is usually not emphasized. The scientists depicted typically have access to state-of-the-art equipment, and they are often glamorous and/or have complex emotional lives. Many students express a keen interest in the forensic sciences and seriously consider pursuing a career in the field without fully understanding what it is or what is required to reach their goal. The field of forensic psychology involves a very different type of preparation and is significantly different in content, but it too requires considerable preparation. Nonetheless, there are many different avenues to entering this field, as will become apparent in this text.

❖ Forensic Psychology: An Overview

Forensic psychology—like many specialties in psychology—is difficult to define precisely. As John Brigham (1999) writes, if you ask a group of psychologists who interact with the legal system in some capacity, “Are you a forensic psychologist?” many will say yes, some will say no, and a majority will probably admit they really do not know. Referring to his own testimony in court, Brigham notes that, when asked the question, his most accurate current response would be, “Well, it depends.” As Brigham points out, the professional literature on the subject adopts one of two prominent definitions. Some of the literature refers to forensic psychology *broadly* as the *research* and *application* of psychological knowledge to the legal system, whereas some of it prefers a more narrow approach, limiting forensic psychology to the *application* and *practice* of psychology as it pertains to the legal system. We (Bartol & Bartol, 1987) have offered the following definition: “We view forensic psychology broadly, as both (1) the research endeavor that examines aspects of human behavior directly related to the legal process . . . and (2) the professional practice of psychology within, or in consultation with, a legal system that embraces both civil and criminal law” (p. 3). Ronald Roesch (cited in Brigham, 1999) suggests a narrow definition: “Most psychologists define the area more narrowly to refer to clinical psychologists who are engaged in clinical practice within the legal system” (p. 279). This definition may be too restrictive because it seems to imply a specialty called “forensic *clinical* psychology.” Furthermore, it excludes—among others—clinicians who offer counseling services to inmates and perform other corrections-related tasks. The broad definition, on the other hand, includes not only clinicians (also called practitioners) but also social, developmental, counseling, cognitive, experimental, industrial-organizational, and school psychologists—some but not all of whom are clinicians. The common link is their contribution to the legal system. We recognize, however, that only a small proportion of their work may be performed in this context.

DeMatteo, Marczyk, Krauss, and Burl (2009) note that the lack of consensus for defining forensic psychology as well as the activities it comprises has continued. “[T]here is considerable disagreement over the scope of forensic psychology and what activities (i.e., research, assessment, and treatment) and roles should appropriately be considered the exclusive province of forensic psychology” (p. 185). They point out that increasing dissatisfaction with narrow conceptualizations recently led the American Psychology-Law Society to endorse a broad definition (see Committee on the Revision of the Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychology, 2006; hereinafter “Committee”), one that would embrace the contributions of researchers as well as clinicians. Nevertheless, in its most recent draft of the guidelines (Committee, 2010), the group still favors an approach narrower than that taken in the present text.

In this text, we will continue to adopt a *broad* definition of forensic psychology but will focus primarily on forensic practice and what psychologists working in the field actually do. That is, we emphasize the professional *application* of psychological knowledge, concepts, and principles to civil and criminal justice systems. It should be understood, however, that this application must be based on solid research; thus, the research prong of our original definition (Bartol & Bartol, 1987) has not disappeared. The practice of forensic psychology, as it will be treated here, includes investigations, studies, evaluations, advice to attorneys, advisory opinions, and depositions or testimony to assist in the resolution of disputes relating to life or property in cases before the courts or other law tribunals. It can—and does—encompass situations before they reach the court as well as those situations following the court decision. It includes activities as varied as the following: courtroom testimony, child custody evaluations, screening and selection of law enforcement candidates, and clinical services to offenders and staff in correctional facilities. It also includes research and theory building in criminology; the design and implementation of intervention, prevention, and treatment for youth offenders; and counseling of victims of crime. Almost a decade ago, Tucillo, DeFilippis, Denny, and Dsurney (2002) observed,

A growing number of clinicians provide expert witness testimony addressing a variety of issues, such as competency to stand trial, criminal responsibility, child custody, personal injury or handicap, and suitability to work in law enforcement. In addition to this major trend in clinical psychology and neuropsychology, developmental and experimental psychologists have come into demand for their expert opinions on such matters as the reliability of eyewitness testimony and lie detection. (p. 377)

This growth has continued, and it is reflected in the development of professional organizations devoted to research and practice in the field, significant increases in the number of books and periodicals focusing on the topic, the development of undergraduate and graduate training programs, and the establishment of standards for practitioners working in the discipline (DeMatteo, Marczyk, et al., 2009; Heilbrun & Brooks, 2010; Otto & Heilbrun, 2002). (See Focus 1.1 for important historical benchmarks in forensic psychology.)

For our purposes, forensic psychology will be divided into five subspecialties: (1) police psychology, (2) psychology of crime and delinquency, (3) victimology and victim services, (4) legal psychology, and (5) correctional psychology. Police psychology, correctional psychology, and legal psychology tend to be the more *applied* branches of forensic psychology, whereas the psychology of crime and delinquency and of victimology tend to be more *research* focused. It should be noted, though, that each branch has both research and applied aspects. Furthermore, psychologists conducting research in one area of forensic psychology may consult with or train practitioners in other areas. Likewise, the clinical experience of applied psychologists helps to inform theory development and suggest hypotheses to research psychologists. Finally, many practitioners do engage in research, although a very common complaint among them is the lack of time and resources for doing that.

FOCUS 1.1. HISTORICAL BENCHMARKS IN FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

1893—First psychological experiment on the psychology of testimony is conducted by J. McKeen Cattell of Columbia University.

1903—Louis William Stern of Germany establishes a periodical dealing with the psychology of testimony (*Beiträge zur Psychologie der Aussage [Contributions to the Psychology of Testimony]*).

(Continued)

(Continued)

1908—Publication of Hugo Münsterberg's *On the Witness Stand*, arguably one of the first professional books on forensic psychology. The book launched Münsterberg's career in forensic psychology, and some scholars consider Münsterberg, a Harvard professor of psychology, the father of forensic psychology.

1911—J. Varendonck was one of the earliest psychologists to testify in a criminal trial, which was held in Belgium.

1913—First time that psychological services are offered within a U.S. correctional facility (a women's reformatory in New York State).

1917—William Marston develops the first modern polygraph.

1917—Louis Terman becomes the first American psychologist to use psychological tests in the screening of law enforcement personnel.

1918—First inmate classification system developed by psychologists, established by the New Jersey Department of Corrections. New Jersey also becomes the first state to hire full-time correctional psychologists on a regular basis.

1921—First time an American psychologist testifies in a courtroom as an expert witness (*State v. Driver*, 1921).

1922—Karl Marbe, a psychology professor at the University of Würzburg, Germany, becomes the first psychologist to testify at a civil trial.

1922—Psychologist-lawyer William Marston becomes the first to receive a faculty appointment in forensic psychology, as "professor of legal psychology" at American University. Marston also conducted the first empirical research on the jury system.

1931—Howard Burt's *Legal Psychology* is published—the first *textbook* in the forensic area written by a psychologist.

1961—Hans Toch edits one of the first texts on the psychology of crime, *Legal and Criminal Psychology*.

1964—Hans J. Eysenck formulates the first comprehensive and testable theory on criminal behavior advanced by a psychologist and publishes it in the book *Crime and Personality*.

1968—Martin Reiser becomes the first full-time police psychologist in the United States. He is hired by the Los Angeles Police Department and became instrumental in establishing police psychology as a profession.

1972—Under the guidance and leadership of the American Association for Correctional Psychology (AACP), Stanley Brodsky, Robert Lewinson, and Asher Pacht, correctional psychology becomes recognized as a professional career.

1974—The first successful interdisciplinary psychology and law program is developed at the University of Nebraska—Lincoln.

1978—The American Board of Forensic Psychology begins professional certification of diplomates in forensic psychology.

1978—The American Psychological Association approves a clinical internship in corrections at the Wisconsin Department of Corrections.

1991—The American Academy of Forensic Psychology and American Psychology-Law Society publishes *Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists*.

2001—The American Psychological Association recognizes forensic psychology as a specialty.

2006—The Committee on the Revision of the Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychology recommends a broader definition that encompasses research as well as clinical practice.

Here are examples of things that forensic psychologists (depending on their specialty) may be asked to do:

Police Psychology

- Assist police departments in determining optimal shift schedules for their employees.
- Assist police in developing psychological profiles of serial offenders.
- Establish reliable and valid screening procedures for law enforcement officer positions at various police and sheriff departments.
- Train police officers on how to deal with mentally ill citizens.
- Provide counseling services to officers after a shooting incident.
- Provide support services to the families of law enforcement officers.

Psychology of Crime and Delinquency

- Evaluate the effectiveness of preschool intervention strategies designed to prevent violent behavior during adolescence.
- Conduct research on the development of psychopathy.
- Consult with legislators and governmental agencies as a research policy advisor on the prevention of stalking.
- Consult with school personnel on identifying troubled youth who are potentially dangerous.
- Develop a psychological test for assessing risk among the mentally ill.

Victimology and Victim Services

- Evaluate and treat persons who are the victims of crime or witnesses of crime.
- Conduct psychological assessments for personal injury matters having to do with such things as auto accidents, product liability, sexual harassment and discrimination, and medical negligence or worker's compensation.
- Educate and train victim service providers on psychological reactions to criminal victimization, such as post-traumatic stress disorder.
- Assess, support, and counsel those who provide death notification services.
- Educate service providers on the impact of multiculturalism when victims seek mental health and support services.

Legal Psychology

- Conduct child custody evaluations, visitation risk assessments, and child abuse evaluations.
- Assist attorneys in jury selection through community surveys and other research methods.

- Perform evaluations of a defendant's competency to stand trial.
- Consult with attorneys and the courts concerning custody decisions, conflict resolution, and the validity of assessment procedures used in the evaluation of various psychological conditions.
- Conduct competency evaluations for the civil court.

Correctional Psychology

- Establish reliable and valid screening procedures for correctional officer positions at correctional facilities.
- Assess inmates entering prison for both mental health needs and suitability for prison programs.
- Provide individual and group treatment for inmates.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of programs for juvenile and adult offenders, such as victim–offender reconciliation programs, sex offender treatment, or health education programs.
- Develop a stress management program for correctional personnel.

It should be mentioned that the above list would be shortened considerably if we were to adopt a narrower definition of forensic psychology. Forensic psychologists also teach in colleges and universities and conduct research that is relevant to the legal system, such as research on eyewitness testimony, the comprehension of *Miranda* rights, and jury decision making. Throughout the book, text boxes in most of the chapters will introduce you to professionals who are engaged in these activities.

The work settings in which forensic psychologists are found include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Private practice
- Family courts, drug courts, and mental health courts
- Child protection agencies
- Victim services
- Domestic violence courts and programs
- Forensic mental health units (governmental or private)
- Sex offender treatment programs
- Correctional institutions (including research programs)
- Law enforcement agencies (federal, state, or local)
- Research organizations (governmental or private)
- Colleges and universities (teaching or research)
- Juvenile delinquency treatment programs
- Legal advocacy centers (e.g., for the mentally ill or developmentally disabled)

In today's economic climate, many students are worried that they will not secure employment upon graduation from college or upon earning an advanced degree. A *New Yorker* magazine cover (May 24, 2010), titled "Boomerang Generation," says it all. A young man is seen posting his just-minted PhD degree on the bedroom wall of his childhood home, among the academic and sports trophies of his youth, as his discouraged parents look on.

It is a reality that government grants and positions are being cut, and these affect scientists at all levels. Forensic psychology has thus far not been extensively damaged, however, and the outlook for career opportunities in its many facets is bright (Clay, 2009). Keep in mind, though, that with greater competition for available dollars comes greater accountability in the provision of services. For example, in the treatment arena, treatment providers are asked to document that their services are effective, in other words, that they are based on research evidence. As we will see later in the book, "evidence-based treatment" has become an important term in the correctional lexicon as well as in other areas of human service. Therefore, the need for psychologists capable of conducting evaluation research is great.

Forensic Psychology Compared to Forensic Psychiatry

Psychologists, especially clinical, counseling, and forensic psychologists, are often confused with psychiatrists by the public and the media. Today, the lines of separation between the two professions are becoming increasingly blurred. Clinical, counseling, and some forensic psychologists, along with psychiatrists, are trained to provide direct treatment services to persons with emotional, cognitive, or behavioral problems.

Psychiatrists are medical doctors (MDs) (or, in some cases, doctors of osteopathy [DOs]), who specialize in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of mental, addictive, and emotional disorders. Psychologists do not hold a medical degree, although some may have earned related degrees, such as a Master of Public Health (MPH). Another major distinction between the two has been the license to prescribe drugs, including psychoactive drugs. Traditionally, psychologists have not been permitted by law to prescribe any medication. Now, even that distinction is beginning to disappear. On March 6, 2002, New Mexico became the first state in the United States to allow properly trained psychologists to prescribe psychoactive drugs, or drugs intended to treat mental disorders. On May 6, 2004, Louisiana became the second state in the country to pass a law authorizing properly trained psychologists to prescribe certain medications for the treatment of mental health disorders. In that state, these psychologists are called “medical psychologists.” Psychologists in the military also have prescription privileges. To date, though, psychologists in no other states have gained prescription privileges, although legislation has been introduced in numerous states. In April 2010, Oregon became the most recent state to deny these privileges. Medical associations typically have resisted extending prescription privileges, maintaining that this will lead to abuses and decrease the quality of patient care. Nevertheless, even among clinical psychologists there is not universal support for prescription privileges or authority, although most surveys find at least a majority in favor (e.g., Baird, 2007; Sammons, Gorny, Zinner, & Allen, 2000).

Many psychiatrists, like psychologists, work in a variety of forensic settings, including the court, correctional facilities, and law enforcement. Psychiatrists who are closely associated with the law are often referred to as **forensic psychiatrists**. In some areas, such as issues relating to insanity determination by the courts, psychiatrists are more visible—and sometimes more preferred—than psychologists. As we will discuss in a later chapter, this reflects a greater comfort on the part of some judges with the medical model approach to mental disorder (Melton, Petrila, Poythress, & Slobogin, 1997). Psychologists and psychiatrists seem to be equally involved in pretrial assessments of juveniles and custody evaluations, while psychologists are more likely than psychiatrists to consult with law enforcement and offer treatment in the correctional system. Law-related research tends to be the bailiwick of psychologists, although some psychiatrists are engaged in conducting and publishing such research also.

Finally, clinical social workers are often found working in forensic arenas. Social workers may counsel victims of crimes or families of victims and offenders, and provide substance abuse and sex offender treatment to offenders, among other functions. In many correctional facilities, social workers are part of the treatment team, typically under the supervision of psychologists. In corrections, as in other areas, collaboration among professionals is crucial. Therefore, although our text focuses on the work of psychologists, it is important to stress that contributions from other disciplines cannot be overlooked.

Ethical Issues

With the increasing opportunities available to forensic psychologists, numerous pragmatic and ethical issues also have been raised. Prescription authority, mentioned briefly above, is one example. Other ethical issues have been raised regarding dual relationships between the psychologist and the client, conflicts of interest, issues of confidentiality, and the tension between punishment and rehabilitation (A. Day & Casey, 2009; Ward & Birgden, 2009). In recent years, contentious issues have revolved around psychologists participating in military interrogations, treating death row inmates to render them competent to be executed, making recommendations in child custody

cases, labeling juveniles as psychopathic, and establishing proper boundaries between assessment and treatment. For example, with respect to establishing boundaries, Greenberg and Shuman (1997, 2007) have argued forcefully that a psychologist should not both conduct a forensic examination and treat the same individual, even though the psychologist might be very competent in both roles. In fact, Greenberg and Shuman consider the forensic and therapeutic role irreconcilable if exercised with the same individual. Some practitioners have objected strongly to this view, suggesting that if adopted it would deprive therapists of the opportunity to testify objectively about their clients (Heltzel, 2007). This and other controversial topics will be covered in the chapters ahead.

Careers in Psychology

Since the 1970s, there has been an enormous expansion of the profession of psychology in general (Reed, Levant, Stout, Murphy, & Phelps, 2001). Psychology encompasses a wide spectrum of topics, ranging from engineering designs (human factors) to animal behavior, and has a place in every imaginable setting. Psychologists can be found in “personnel selection and training, developing user-friendly computer software, the delivery of psychological services to victims of natural and man-made disasters, the profiling of serial killers, the creation of effective commercials that increase the sale of a product, and so on” (Ballie, 2001, p. 25). Currently, there are over 152,000 members and affiliates of the **American Psychological Association (APA)** (www.apa.org). The APA, based in Washington, D.C., is the largest association of psychologists worldwide. Another 18,000 psychologists from the United States and abroad, whose specialties span the entire spectrum of scientific, applied, and teaching areas, are members of the **Association for Psychological Science (APS)** (www.psychologicalscience.org), the second-largest psychological organization in the United States. The APS, also based in Washington, D.C., is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the advancement of scientific psychology. In addition to the APA and APS, psychologists belong to many other professional organizations at the national, state, and local levels. It is estimated that there are at least 300,000 practicing psychologists worldwide who provide a wide range of services (Donn, Routh, & Lunt, 2000; Lunt & Poortinga, 1996).

Education and Training

About 75,000 undergraduate psychology majors graduate each year from the nation’s colleges and universities (APA, 2003a; B. Murray, 2002b). Starting salaries for graduates with a bachelor’s degree range from \$18,000 to \$45,000, depending on the job type and location, with an average of approximately \$29,000. Psychology majors most often find employment in the areas of management, teaching, counseling, social work, and sales. As most psychology graduates become quickly aware, the bachelor’s degree does provide a basic foundation in the field of psychology, but it does not adequately prepare a person to be a professional psychologist. The minimum educational requirement for psychologists is the master’s degree. In addition, specialization in psychology usually begins at the graduate level, although many undergraduate programs offer concentrations in certain areas, such as social psychology, education psychology, or human development. Graduate programs in psychology most often offer graduate degrees in experimental, biopsychology, developmental, cognitive, clinical, counseling, school, and industrial/organizational psychology. The last four represent the more applied or practitioner’s side of psychology. Most recently, as we will see shortly, forensic psychology has become a fifth applied branch in the field, although the other four applied sectors have historically made significant contributions to various forensic topics and settings.

Graduate Training: Master’s Level

At the master’s level, clinical, counseling, and school psychology attract the most students (B. Murray, 2002b). In some states, graduates of master’s degree programs in psychology—with the appropriate clinical

training—may be eligible for licensure as psychological associates (LPAs) or psychologist-master's level (MacKain, Tedeschi, Durham, & Goldman, 2002). In other states, graduates with master's degrees in psychology are not allowed to practice *psychology* (at least they aren't allowed to use the label) and are instead licensed with *nonpsychology* titles, such as licensed mental health counselor, marriage and family therapist, or psychotherapist (MacKain et al., 2002).

In a survey conducted in North Carolina, Sally Joy MacKain and her associates (2002) asked state and private employers if they employed LPAs. Through this method, they were able to identify 345 master's-level psychologists working within the state. The researchers discovered that 158 were employed at mental health centers, 108 were with the state department of corrections, 54 were working at residential centers that serve the developmentally disabled, and 25 were employed at state psychiatric hospitals. Employers indicated that LPAs were as marketable as other master's-trained clinicians, such as social workers and counselors. Eighteen percent of the employers stated they were more likely to hire psychologists than other master's-trained clinicians, and 49% said they were "just as likely to hire them." In fact, some employers reported difficulty in finding enough LPAs for their positions. Salaries for LPAs ranged from \$27,000 to \$45,000 with a median of \$30,500, a range similar to that of other master's-level clinicians.

In addition to employers, MacKain et al. (2002) also surveyed 60 LPAs. More than half the graduates interviewed (54%) stated they were definitely planning or were considering entering a doctoral program within the next 5 years, suggesting that the opportunities presented by the LPA alone may be limited. Of the LPAs, 36% were employed in community mental health centers, 24% were working in state corrections or the courts, 16% were involved in private inpatient or outpatient facilities, 10% were in university or college settings, and 8% were in nonprivate agencies. Currently, there is no accreditation of master's programs in psychology through the APA. However, since 1995, applied master's programs have been able to seek accreditation from the Master's in Psychology Accreditation Council (MPAC) (Hays-Thomas, 2000). Approximately 14,500 master's degrees in psychology are awarded each year (APA, 2003a).

Graduate Training: Doctoral Level

At the doctoral level, clinical psychology attracts the largest number of students of all the applied specialties and is considered the entry-level credential for the independent practice of psychology (APA, 1978; Hayes-Thomas, 2000). Every year, approximately 1,200 students earn PhDs and another 700 students earn PsyDs in clinical psychology (B. Murray, 2002a, p. 33). The *PhD* degree (Doctor of Philosophy) requires a dissertation and is well accepted in the academic world as appropriate preparation for scientists and scholars in many fields across the globe (Donn et al., 2000). It is regarded primarily as a research-based degree. A *dissertation* refers to a substantial paper based on the PhD candidate's original research, which should make a significant contribution to the research literature. The *PsyD* (Doctor of Psychology) is a graduate degree designed primarily for students who wish to become practitioners rather than researchers. The first PsyD program was established in 1968 by Donald R. Peterson at the University of Illinois (Peterson, 1968). Although many PhD psychologists have questioned the soundness of the PsyD since its early beginnings, especially in view of its limited research focus, the degree has received increasing professional recognition in recent years and has attracted the interest of many students. More than 50 institutions have awarded 9,000 PsyDs during the past 30 years. Overall, approximately 4,300 doctoral degrees in psychology are awarded each year (APA, 2003a, n.p.).

Usually, salaries for those with the doctorate are highest in the private sector and lowest for those in academe (college or university teaching and research). The overall median 9- to 10-month faculty salary was \$76,090 in 2009, whereas the overall 11- to 12-month median salary for doctoral-level psychologists in the applied field was \$120,000 (Finno, Michalski, Hart, Wicherski, & Kohout, 2010). The salary for a beginning assistant professor might be in the \$40,000 to \$60,000 range. Those working for the government fall somewhere

in between an academic salary and a salary in the applied field, with a 2009 median salary of \$86,293. Interestingly, one private practitioner quoted in Clay (2009) estimated that forensic psychologists in clinical practice typically earn \$200,000 to \$400,000 a year.

Licensure

According to Tucillo et al. (2002), by 1977 every U.S. state had laws relating to the licensure of psychologists, and in 1990 all Canadian provinces regulated the practice of psychology. In 1987, in an effort to encourage standardized licensing requirements, the APA developed the Model Act for State Licensure of Psychologists (see APA, 1987) to serve as a prototype for drafting state legislation (Tucillo et al., 2002). One of the chief criteria to qualify for licensing is possession of the doctoral degree. Professional psychologists are also ethically obligated to comply with the standards pertaining to their practice, as outlined by the **Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct** (American Psychological Association, 2002, 2003b, 2010). Guidelines are also offered in a number of areas associated with research and clinical practice. A good example is the **Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists** (Committee on Ethical Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists, 1991), which are presently under revision. Among other things, the “Specialty Guidelines” assert that “forensic psychologists are responsible for a fundamental and reasonable level of knowledge and understanding of the legal and professional standards that govern their participation as experts in legal proceedings” (1991, p. 658). An important distinction between standards and guidelines should be noted. Psychologists are expected to comply with *standards*, and there is an enforcement mechanism in place in case they do not. For example, a violation in the Code of Ethics could result in a complaint to the APA’s Professional Conduct Board and, ultimately, loss of one’s license to practice psychology (although such drastic consequences are rare). By contrast, the *guidelines* are aspirational; psychologists are strongly encouraged—but not required—to abide by them.

Employment

A survey on where psychologists with new doctorates find employment indicated that about three-fourths are employed in higher education or human service settings (such as schools or hospitals) (D. Smith, 2002c). The rest were working in business, government, or private practice. About 25% of new doctorates find employment in academic positions at 4-year colleges and universities. Most of the graduates have a strong foundation in research methodology and analysis that allows them to work in a variety of occupations. “Rather than being stereotyped as a professor or therapist, more and more psychologists are being seen as applied scientists” (Ballie, 2001, p. 25).

The Applied Specialties

At present, there are five subspecialties of applied psychology: clinical, counseling, school, industrial/organizational, and forensic psychology. Although these subspecialties may have distinct features, journals, associations, and interests, they also have many things in common. The similarities between counseling psychology and clinical psychology, in particular, are far greater than the differences. The clinical psychologist typically experiences 9 or 12 months of supervised internship in a clinical setting, where the theories and methods acquired in graduate training can be applied to human behavior problems. The counseling psychologist will have received much the same training as the clinical psychologist, including the internship. In the past, the major distinction between the two was their focus. The **counseling psychologist** was trained to evaluate and treat (counsel) persons with adjustment problems, such as those relating to education, job, and personal and marital

relationships. The **clinical psychologist** was trained to evaluate and treat persons suffering more serious behavior and mental problems found in mental hospitals or psychiatric clinics. This distinction is rapidly becoming blurred, however.

Both counseling and clinical psychologists are employed in a wide assortment of settings, including college and university counseling centers, university research and teaching positions, independent practice, health care settings, hospitals, and the legal-forensic system. About 40% of the doctoral-level practitioners are in private or independent practice (Reed et al., 2001). Both counseling and clinical psychologists (at the doctorate level) are licensed in all 50 states, usually under the same designation of “licensed practicing psychologist.”

In clinical and counseling practice throughout the United States, psychologists are finding that their clients are often from cultural backgrounds different from their own. “The majority of service providers are European Americans with middle-class values and orientation; a sizeable portion of the diverse client populations are African-Americans and underserved with mixed values and orientations” (E. F. Morris, 2001, p. 563). A growing Black middle and upper class contribute to the diversity. In addition, psychologists are encountering in their practices more persons of Latino, Asian, Native American, and Middle Eastern heritage. It is extremely crucial for practicing psychologists to be knowledgeable about and sensitive to the cultural values and norms held by persons to whom they are providing service. This may be especially important for forensic psychologists. Members of racial and ethnic minorities are often overrepresented in the populations these psychologists serve (Carter & Forsyth, 2007). Furthermore, the psychologists are often not chosen by those they evaluate or treat, but they nevertheless are called on to assist in making decisions that may drastically affect the lives of these individuals.

Clinical and counseling psychologists who are service providers to diverse populations should at a minimum be aware of their own assumptions and biases regarding cultures that are different from their own, understand their clients’ worldviews, and use only culturally appropriate interventions and techniques (C. D. Erickson & Al-Timini, 2001; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). It is interesting to note that only half of the doctoral-level clinicians in one survey felt competent to provide services to African Americans despite their training exposure and diverse clientele (Allison, Crawford, Echemendia, Robinson, & Kemp, 1994; E. F. Morris, 2001).

The APA (1993) has begun to take notice of this important issue by publishing its “Guidelines for Providers of Psychological Services to Ethnic, Linguistic, and Culturally Diverse Populations.” The guidelines emphasize, for example, that psychologists “consider the validity of a given instrument or procedure and interpret resulting data, keeping in mind the cultural and linguistic characteristics of the person being assessed” (p. 46). The guidelines further recommend that “psychologists who do not possess knowledge or training about an ethnic group seek consultation with, and/or make referrals to, appropriate experts as necessary” (p. 46). The APA (2005) also has published “Guidelines for the Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology,” which includes sections on cultural differences.

It should also be recognized by forensic psychologists that the legal system they are working with might be unprepared to deal with many complex issues not only of culture, ethnicity, and race, but also of sexual orientation. Same-sex marriages or unions, adoptions by gay and lesbian couples, custody evaluations when one party seeking custody is gay or lesbian, and same-sex domestic violence are examples.

School psychology is a specialty involved in the evaluation, diagnosis, and reduction of social, emotional, and cognitive problems of school-age children. In many ways, the tasks of **school psychologists** are very similar to those of child clinical psychologists, but school psychologists tend to be more focused on the school environment and its influences on the child. They work not only with children with problems but also with parents, teachers, and school administrators. Many school psychologists do not have a PhD or other doctoral

degree, but many states provide certification and licensing for school psychologists who have the requisite master's degree and an internship within a school setting. Qualified school psychologists are always in demand, and some years have seen major shortages (Dittmann, 2002). Compounding the shortages is the fact that approximately 45% of the students in public schools are from racial or ethnic minorities, often with very different linguistic experiences (Sue, Bingham, Porché-Burke, & Vasquez, 1999). As we will see shortly, school psychologists are increasingly becoming involved in forensic settings.

Industrial/organizational (I/O) psychologists help develop strategies that build better organizations and improve the well-being of employees. They work in a variety of areas within the organization, including selection and placement, training and development, organizational development and change, performance measurement and evaluation, quality of work life, consumer psychology, and human factors. The I/O psychologist may assist in fashioning accommodations for the disabled, offer employee workshops on sexual harassment, or counsel employees who have experienced workplace victimization. The training for this specialty usually involves a heavy emphasis on research design, statistics, knowledge of the research literature as it relates to organizations, and a 1-year internship within a relevant organization.

Forensic Psychology as a Specialty

In August 2001, the Council of Representatives of the American Psychological Association voted to recognize forensic psychology as another specialty. Although this is an important step forward, recall that other specialties also provide services in forensic settings. At the time, the council adopted a narrow rather than broad definition of forensic psychology: “It was ultimately decided that the petition for specialization should define forensic psychology narrowly, to include the primary clinical aspects of forensic assessment, treatment, and consultation” (Otto & Heilbrun, 2002, p. 8). As DeMatteo, Marczyk, et al. (2009) posit, this definition

only encompasses clinically based areas of psychology and therefore excludes practitioners without clinical degrees. Under this narrow and restrictive definition, research psychologists in the fields of social, experimental, and cognitive psychology would not be considered forensic psychologists, despite the obvious contribution that these researchers can make in certain legal contexts (e.g., reliability of eyewitness testimony, perceptions of jurors). (p. 185)

As noted above, several years later, the Committee on the Revision of the Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychology (2006) recommended a broader definition that would encompass both clinical practice and research. The latest—fifth—draft of these yet-to-be-adopted new guidelines (Committee, 2010) continues to include the research prong.

Educational and Training Requirements in Forensic Psychology

The growth in the field is demonstrated by the continuing development of graduate programs in forensic psychology throughout the world, particularly in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. In August 2010, the website GradSchools.com was listing 101 forensic psychology graduate programs, at both the MA and PhD or PsyD levels. Some were campus based and others were online programs. In the United States alone, it is estimated that nearly 50 programs offer graduate training in forensic psychology. Approximately 12 offer a master's degree specifically in the area, while most doctoral programs are in broader areas but allow students to obtain a formal concentration in forensic psychology, legal psychology, or psychology and law (DeMatteo, Marczyk, et al., 2009). A small minority of programs offer a PhD specifically in forensic psychology. (See Focus 1.2 for a list of representative programs.)

FOCUS 1.2. REPRESENTATIVE DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

Alliant International University	PhD or PsyD in Forensic Psychology
Arizona State University	Law and Psychology JD/PhD
California State Univ., Fresno	Joint PhD in Forensic and Behavioral Sciences
Carlos Alibizu Univ., Miami	PhD Clinical Psych with forensic concentration
Dalhousie University	PhD with forensic specialization
Drexel University	JD/PhD or PhD with forensic concentration
Edith Cowan University	PhD in Forensic Psychology
Florida International University	PhD with emphasis in Legal Psychology
Fordham University	Clinical PhD with forensic concentration
Illinois School of Professional Psych	Clinical PhD with forensic concentration
John Jay College of Criminal Justice	PhD in Forensic Psychology
Massachusetts School of Prof. Psych	Clinical PhD with forensic concentration
Nova Southeastern University	PsyD with clinical forensic concentration
Pacific University	PsyD with emphasis in Forensic Psychology
Sam Houston University	PhD in Clinical Psych with emphasis in Forensics
Simon Fraser University	PhD in Clinical-Forensic Psychology and PhD in Law and Forensic Psychology
University of Alabama	PhD with Psychology-Law concentration
University of Florida	JD/PsyD joint degree
University of Illinois at Chicago	PhD with Psychology and Law concentration
University of Nebraska	JD/PsyD joint degree
University of Nevada–Reno	PhD in Social Psych with Psych & Law concentration
Widener University	JD/PsyD joint degree

Thus, it is a mistake to believe you need a degree specifically in forensic psychology to work in the field. Many graduate programs in clinical psychology, counseling psychology, and criminal justice, among others, have forensic concentrations that provide students with academic and *training* opportunities in forensic psychology, whether through specific course work or internships. Furthermore, many psychologists recommend a broad background in psychology, such as would be obtained by a clinical or counseling degree, rather than a

degree in forensic psychology. In reality, there are different avenues through which to work in forensic psychology, as you will see when you read the personal perspectives provided throughout this text.

Most of the graduate programs in the United States concentrate on either clinical or counseling psychology as it relates to corrections or on social psychology as it relates to legal psychology or psychology and law. Some universities offer a combined JD (law degree) and PhD as part of the academic package. Formal programs offering specific degrees in police psychology are virtually nonexistent in the United States and Canada, although there are several programs called “investigative psychology” in the United Kingdom. Academic and research institutions in Canada have long supported research in correctional psychology, and the curricula in Canadian forensic programs reflect this strong research or empirical emphasis. It is important to mention, also, that students with psychology backgrounds often enroll in doctoral programs that confer degrees in criminal justice, such as the distinguished programs at the State University of New York at Albany, the University of Cincinnati, and the University of Maryland. Although they are not psychologists, professors and researchers with doctoral degrees in criminal justice make significant contributions to research, teaching, and practice in this area. (Dr. Emily Salisbury, profiled in Personal Perspective 1.1, is an example.)

PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE 1.1



Pathways to a PhD

Emily J. Salisbury, PhD

OK, I admit it—I had to dig through my notes from graduate school and look up the precise definition of “forensic psychology.” Despite efforts to have me diligently memorize this definition during my Master of Forensic Psychology program, the exact words had escaped me: “The research and application of psychological knowledge to the legal system.” No doubt, this definition is outlined somewhere in the early pages of this textbook. If you’re reading this text, you probably are taking a course in forensic psychology or a related subject area. Some of you may even hope to be a “forensic psychologist.” However, it’s important to understand that this label is somewhat misleading—that is,

you don’t have to be a forensic psychologist to work in the world of forensic psychology.

Students immediately perk up when I tell them I have a degree in forensic psychology (perhaps because of the mass influx of television shows focusing on anything “forensic” or crime-related). But I am not a psychologist, and I don’t even teach in a psychology department at my university. I teach and conduct research within a Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJ) department, and my PhD is in criminal justice (and I’m not the only faculty member in my CCJ department with a background in psychology). As students who may be interested in this field for a

profession, you may find it useful to learn how my academic path led me to where I am now, since I work in the realm of forensic psychology without actually being a clinical or forensic psychologist.

While grinding through my MA (yes, I used the word "grind" because it truly was an enormous leap from undergraduate to graduate-level study), many topics interested me, but I kept coming back to the ideas of risk assessment and the principles of effective correctional intervention. In other words, I was intrigued with the method of identifying offenders likely to recommit crimes, and the types of programs that can improve the lives of these offenders and increase the likelihood that they stop committing criminal acts. Not surprisingly, basic principles of psychology have a lot to say about changing offender behavior!

By the time I was approaching graduation, I knew I had learned a tremendous amount, but had no idea what I wanted to do with this prestigious advanced degree in forensic psychology. For a time, I was convinced that all I wanted were my nights and weekends back from studying—I swore I could not endure one more exam, let alone another 5 years of school, even with a PhD on the horizon. Several women in my small cohort (we were all women that year—not an uncommon scenario these days in graduate school) graduated and went on to work in the "field" as research analysts specializing in legal research for government or private firms; one was even hired as an investigator for the NCIS (Naval Criminal Investigative Service). We were all jealous of her.

But a couple of other women were convinced they wanted to pursue a PhD, including my best friend in the program. Jen was recruited to

attend the University of Cincinnati, and upon her return from visiting the school, she encouraged me to seriously reconsider this option. But 5 more years!?! Could I do it? The thought of having to do this massive thing called a dissertation felt overwhelming. Yet, in the end, after much reflection and consultation with mentors like Curt Bartol, I knew that (a) I wanted to push myself; (b) if I waited, life would become more complicated, making the goal more challenging to achieve; (c) there would be many "baby steps" along the way to prepare me for the dissertation; and (d) if I could attend with my best friend, it wouldn't be so bad.

My psychology background during the early years of my criminal justice PhD program was extremely beneficial, especially at a program such as Cincinnati's. The faculty appreciated and emphasized psychological perspectives, and they were experts in the specializations I was interested in—risk assessment and correctional rehabilitation. Furthermore, I learned that although the field of criminology and criminal justice originally developed within sociology, it has become its own distinct area of study and increasingly multidisciplinary. It integrates not only sociology, but also psychology, biology, genetics, gender and ethnic studies, public administration, public health, and many other fields. My psychology background fit very well with criminology and the study of individual, micro-level causes of criminal behavior. Indeed, if you want to know something about how to effectively change offending behavior at a basic, individual level, you need to know something about how and why people behave the way they do and what is likely to assist them in making that change (i.e., psychology!).

(Continued)

(Continued)

Yet, in other ways, I had quite a bit of catching up to do during my doctoral career. I had taken only one survey criminal justice course and had never taken a sociology course. I was barely aware of the most basic criminological theories that you learn in Crim 101. Fortunately, I felt prepared enough overall, especially in the most difficult areas of statistics and research methodology (which tend to be relatively rigorous in psychology programs), and never worried that I couldn't "hang" with the rest of my cohorts. It was tough, especially with a full year of statistics during the first year, but Jen and I helped each other make it through.

Within the first few weeks of my second year at Cincinnati, I felt anxious and concerned that I had not yet connected with a faculty member to advance my research skills (an important aspect to a PhD student's academic development). Literally a day later, I received an e-mail from Dr. Pat Van Voorhis asking me if I was interested in joining her federal research grant developing a gender-responsive risk and needs assessment specifically for women offenders. I felt very relieved and fortunate to have the opportunity. My experience as a research assistant allowed me to develop my applied research skills, such as learning how to code and enter data into databases like SPSS, developing relationships with criminal justice agencies, understanding the importance of institutional review board (IRB) processes, and preparing and delivering research presentations to stakeholders.

Looking back on it now, I am very grateful that I had the opportunity to pursue graduate work in the fields of forensic psychology and criminology because I love continuing to learn about these subjects, sharing my knowledge

with students, and conducting research in these areas. Although the demands of academic work are high, a professor's lifestyle can be very flexible and rewarding. Part of the work required of academic scholars is to simply *think* and immerse oneself deeply into the inquiry. This essentially means that professors don't ever really leave work behind at the office—in fact, they often have two offices, one at school and one at home. As you can imagine, then, I never truly got my "nights and weekends back" as I had once hoped. But I've learned to manage the intensity. I also understand that not many people get paid to think about social problems and how to more effectively understand and begin to solve them.

With that said, I don't wish to over-romanticize the profession. There are certainly days that the job is very difficult and taxing (i.e., when you know students aren't reading material; when a coauthor refuses to meet writing deadlines; and, of course, when you have to deal with the overall stress surrounding the goal of tenure and the publication requirements to achieve it). However, the rewards far outweigh the challenges. I enjoy learning and teaching students how to learn—I get to do both of these constantly as part of my job and share it with others.

For those of you thinking of pursuing graduate work, regardless of whether you seek a career in academe, I encourage you to speak to mentors, professors, and current graduate students to see what life will really be like as a graduate student, and to choose a program wisely, based on your needs and interests. It is especially important to research the faculty with whom you will be working. If your interests don't match well, the program will likely not be

a good fit for you. Lastly, but perhaps most importantly, it's critical to find out what funding opportunities are available, since the time commitment of graduate school is similar to that of a full-time job.

For those of you thinking, "I never want to give up my nights and weekends—I'm so done studying after undergrad!" you'd be surprised at how quickly the years go by when you are studying issues that interest you.

Dr. Salisbury is an Assistant Professor in the Division of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Portland State University. She earned an MA in forensic psychology from Castleton State College, and a PhD in criminal justice from the University of Cincinnati. She loves playing soccer and tennis, backpacking, and exploring Oregon's cities and landscapes.

In addition to obtaining a doctorate, some clinicians become certified or become diplomates in forensic psychology. A **diplomate** is a professional designation signifying that a person has been certified as having advanced knowledge, skills, and competence in a particular specialty. Diplomate certification in forensic psychology attests to the fact that an established organization of peers has examined and accepted the psychologist as being at the highest level of excellence in his or her field of forensic practice. The psychologist must be licensed to qualify for diplomate status. Some of the psychologists profiled in boxes throughout this book are diplomates in forensic psychology.

In approximately 17 states, forensic psychologists must obtain licenses or state-issued certificates in order to engage in forensic practice, such as conducting competency evaluations or providing treatment services in a psychiatric facility. Virtually all of the laws relating to this certification were passed after the year 2000, which is testament to the growth in this field. Heilbrun and Brooks (2010) have published a helpful table summarizing these statutes.

Another level of certification is "board certification," which can add stature to an individual's credentials if he or she is called to testify in court. On a national level, the predominant organization that provides board certification in forensic psychology (as well as 12 other specialty areas) is the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP). In addition, the American Board of Forensic Psychology (ABFP) has provided board certification since 1978 and is now affiliated with the ABPP (Heilbrun & Brooks, 2010). Another certifying body is the American Board of Psychological Specialties (ABPS), which is affiliated with the American College and Board of Forensic Examiners. Criteria used by the various boards and organizations to grant credentials or titles vary widely (Otto & Heilbrun, 2002). According to Heilbrun and Brooks, with regard to board certification, the ABFP "appears to be the most rigorous, requiring a credentials review, a work sample review, and the passing of both a written and an oral examination for all candidates" (p. 229).

As referred to earlier, the American Academy of Forensic Psychology and the American Psychology-Law Society published the *Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists (SGFP)* (Committee on Ethical Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists, 1991), which is now under revision. According to Otto and Heilbrun (2002), "The primary goal of the SGFP is to improve the quality of forensic psychological services by providing guidance to psychologists delivering services to courts, members of the bar, litigants, and persons housed in forensic, delinquency, or correctional facilities" (p. 7).

We now turn to a discussion of the five major areas in the research and practice of forensic psychology to be covered throughout the text.

Police Psychology

Police psychology is the research and application of psychological principles and clinical skills to law enforcement and public safety (Bartol, 1996). Police psychologists are often not included in the umbrella category of forensic psychologist, and—like correctional psychologists—some do not consider themselves such. The term *police psychology* is somewhat imprecise because it appears to exclude other law enforcement agents, such as deputy sheriffs, fish and wildlife agents, airport security, marshals, constables, and many types of other state and federal agents. The term *law enforcement* is more encompassing. However, critics of that term note that enforcement of the law is only one of many tasks performed by police and that law is often enforced selectively. The real work of police is maintaining order, providing service, keeping the peace, and being coproducers—with citizens—of public safety. Rather than adopt one or the other viewpoint—each has its merits—we will use *police* and *law enforcement officers* interchangeably and broadly to include the wide variety of agents listed above.

The relationship between psychology and law enforcement has waxed and waned over the years, with considerable forensic psychology involvement followed by a period of quiescence. Overall, though, as law enforcement agencies have become more professional, law enforcement supervisors and directors better educated, and the public more critical and concerned, there has been a substantial increase in the need for services provided by police psychologists. They perform preemployment psychological assessments, fitness-for-duty evaluations (FFDEs), special unit evaluations, hostage team negotiations, and deadly force incident evaluations. Special unit evaluations include the selection and training of special weapons and tactics teams (SWATs), tactical response teams (TRTs), and hostage negotiation teams (HNTs). Forensic psychologists are also increasingly asked to do investigative-type activities, such as criminal profiling, psychological autopsies, handwriting analysis, and eyewitness (or earwitness) hypnosis. Larger police departments usually hire full-time, in-house police psychologists, whereas the smaller departments usually use psychological consultants.

In a survey of 152 police psychologists (Bartol, 1996), 89% of the respondents said they had PhD degrees, followed by EdD degrees (4.5%), master's degrees (3.6%), and PsyD degrees (2.7%). Most of the PhDs had obtained their degrees in clinical psychology (60.7%), counseling (17%), or industrial/organizational psychology (8%). Twenty-five percent of the respondents were women. Participants in the nationwide survey were also asked to indicate the type of services they provided to police during a typical month, as well as the amount of time they usually spent at each activity. Respondents said that preemployment screening and assessment consumed the largest percentage (34.3%) of their time. A significant amount of time was also spent in providing services to officers and their families (28.7%), followed by fitness-for-duty evaluations (6.8%), training of personnel (6.9%), and administrative work (3.9%).

Currently, there are no formal graduate programs in the United States specifically focused on police psychology. It is best for students entering the field to earn a doctorate in psychology (especially clinical, counseling, or industrial/organizational) and, while in the graduate program, work with a faculty member who is involved in police psychology and preferably has worked with the law enforcement community. It is also advisable to complete a doctoral or postdoctoral internship in an agency or organization that deals directly with police organizations. A few police departments (e.g., the Los Angeles Police Department, the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department, the Metro-Dade Police Department in Florida, and the New York Police Department) do offer pre- or post-training in police psychology. More common internships are those that involve a formal schedule of supervision and training, as well as an opportunity for some degree of police training, ranging from ride-alongs to attendance at a police academy. Regardless of the career path taken, it is critical that a person interested in police psychology become highly familiar with the nature of police work, its policies and procedures, and gain an understanding of the police culture. (Dr. Robert Woody discusses this in Personal Perspective 1.2. as does Dr. Ellen Kirschman in Chapter 2 [Personal Perspective 2.2].) Some practitioners estimate that

for police psychologists to be highly effective, socialization into the police culture may take up to 3 years beyond the usual academic and clinical training (Finn & Tomz, 1997). An aspiring police psychologist should also plan on being available 24 hours a day for the agency and be willing to work in different locations (e.g., on the street, at the academy, or in an officer's home).

PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE 1.2



The Reality of a Career in Law Enforcement

Robert Henley Woody, PhD, ScD, JD

Throughout my career as a psychologist and attorney, I have had many contacts with law enforcement personnel. I have also been a sworn law enforcement officer (LEO) (emphasizing training). I have been affiliated with a county sheriff's department, a city police unit, and a statewide coordinating agency.

In teaching undergraduate students in forensic psychology (primarily from the Departments of Psychology, Sociology, and Criminal Justice), I have been somewhat surprised at the great amount of interest in becoming a law enforcement officer, but there is often a lack of awareness of the reality of a law enforcement career. It seems that TV and film portrayals foster misconceptions—no, every LEO is not physically attractive; excitement and astute intellectual analyses are not part of the daily routine; a crime is not solved in an hour; and career outcomes are not always positive.

To enter law enforcement, a person must graduate from an accredited academy and usually must pass a written test (e.g., a state examination). There are variations among law enforcement

training academies, but generally the curriculum is tightly structured by the state-level coordinating agency, and the substance is geared to high school graduates. Reportedly, there is, because of cost, resistance politically and from within agencies to *requiring* any college-level training for certification or employment, and it is believed that the large majority of recruits completing the academy will not have a lasting career in law enforcement. Consequently, law enforcement is usually thought of as an occupation, not a profession per se.

At present, there is an inclination to admit recruits who represent diversity (e.g., in terms of race, gender), which may jeopardize reliable and valid selection criteria. In other words, the tests and selection criteria that have been used for years and may be valid for White males may not be valid for other individuals who are still qualified. Also, there is preference for youth; as one state-level authority said, "We don't want to invest resources in anyone who will not be able to give us at least 25 years of service."

(Continued)

(Continued)

Although objective "cognitive" examinations (e.g., multiple-choice questions) are used, dexterity and performance in the "high liability" areas are strict requirements, namely in defensive tactics, firearms, vehicular maneuvers, and first responder skills. Police agencies do not want to be sued if LEOs demonstrate a lack of these abilities. Physical fitness, good health, and a blemish-free personal history are essential.

Being hired does not assure continued employment, though. The first year of employment almost always represents additional "on-the-job training," and failure to satisfy the training officer assigned to oversee the "new hire" can lead to termination. In some agencies, an attrition rate of 50% for first-year hires is not unusual. A high attrition rate is costly and seems to be attributable to faulty selection procedures by both trainers and employing agencies.

Certainly agencies differ and personnel have unique assignments, presumably based on competencies. However, there is reason to believe that—as a general principle—the threshold requirement for continued employment is compliance with the chain of command. High intelligence and advanced education are not of particular value, as opposed to understanding the functions and having the personal and practical skills to fulfill expectations. In many departments, if an LEO has more intelligence or education than someone within the chain-of-command, it is likely to be viewed negatively.

Constant evaluation by the chain of command is a frequent source of stress, and one not often noted in the law enforcement research

literature. Day-to-day duties tend to be routine and uncreative (some LEOs might say monotonous). It takes years of high performance ratings and gradual skill-oriented training to advance in rank. Often, promotion is dependent on "following directions" and being a "team player."

Many LEOs report dissatisfaction and stress from the possibility of danger as well as from boredom, administrative policies, lack of career advancement, poor financial rewards, public disdain, and political interference. Also, there is always the looming possibility of illness or injury, which could restrict or end an LEO's career. In reality, however, the percentages of LEOs sidelined *significantly* by illness or injury is relatively small.

Despite the negatives, LEOs seem to like the field of law enforcement and recognize its contribution to bettering society. However, many LEOs are also prone to be disappointed in the lack of intellectual stimulation, job security, and chances for advancement.

Because of job dissatisfaction and stress, it is not surprising that, in their personal lives, some LEOs experience depression, marital conflicts and divorce, domestic violence, abuse of alcohol and other substances, and a range of unhealthy conduct. There is debate as to whether the incidence of these negative conditions is greater for LEOs than for the general population.

The foregoing comments do not constitute a condemnation of law enforcement. To the contrary, law enforcement is essential to society, and LEOs deserve admiration, praise, and rewards. Perhaps as importantly, they deserve support services to help them deal with the stressors of

law enforcement work. The basic message is that a career in law enforcement has rewards, but also uncertainties and adverse employment-related conditions. Rather than a long-time career, it is not unusual for an LEO who wishes to maximize personal opportunities to view an entry into law enforcement as but a stepping-stone on the career trail.

Dr. Woody is a Professor of Psychology and former Dean for Graduate Studies and Research at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. He is a psychologist, attorney, and musician, and a former sworn law enforcement officer. He is a Diplomate in Clinical and Forensic Psychology, ABPP; member of the Florida, Michigan, and Nebraska bar associations; and a licensed psychologist in Florida and Michigan. He has authored 33 books and over 200 articles for professional sources.

Psychology of Crime and Delinquency

The psychology of crime and delinquency is the *science* of the behavioral and mental processes of the adult and juvenile offender (Bartol, 2002). It is primarily concerned with how criminal behavior is acquired, evoked, maintained, and modified. Recent psychological research has focused on the offender's cognitive versions of the world, especially his or her thoughts, beliefs, and values and how those that are inconsistent with leading a lawful life can be modified. It assumes that various criminal behaviors are acquired by daily living experiences, in accordance with the principles of learning, and are perceived, coded, processed, and stored in memory in a unique fashion for each individual.

Criminal psychology examines and evaluates prevention, intervention, and treatment strategies directed at reducing criminal behavior. Research in crime and delinquency has discovered, for example, that chronic violence usually develops when children do poorly in school, do not get along with peers, have abusive parents, and attend schools that do not control disruptive and violent behavior (Crawford, 2002). Research has also found that social rejection by peers and others can lead to serious, violent offending: "A great deal of psychological functioning is predicated on belonging to the group and enjoying the benefits, both direct and indirect, of that belongingness" (Benson, 2002, p. 25). When this sense of belongingness is removed or restricted, a feeling of isolation and social exclusion occurs that tends to produce significant changes in behavior, such as an increase in aggression, violence, and other maladaptive behaviors. Under these conditions, human behavior may become impulsive, chaotic, selfish, disorganized, and even destructive. School shooters, for example, frequently express a sense of social isolation and rejection.

Researchers have also found, however, that well-designed and carefully executed prevention programs can prevent violence and a lifelong career path of crime. For example, the Fast Track Prevention Program, developed by researchers at Duke University, Pennsylvania State University, Vanderbilt University, and the University of Washington, has shown highly promising results in reducing juvenile crime. We will discuss more such programs in the chapters on crime and delinquency. Of late, applied psychologists working in school settings have found an increased need for their services, as we noted above. This has led to a keen interest in a new subdivision of school psychology.

Forensic School Psychology

Educational programs are required for young people in correctional and psychiatric facilities throughout the country, and some states have established special school districts within these facilities (Crespi, 1990). The challenges for forensic school psychologists within these contexts are considerable. Although the primary focus

of public and private schools in the community is obviously education, such education in most correctional or psychiatric settings may be secondary to the reasons for confinement.

Rehabilitation of the juveniles—which includes but is not limited to education—is crucial. Consequently, assessment and counseling services are critical roles for the school psychologist within these settings. Although many forensic school psychologists primarily work with mentally disordered offenders and youth in correctional facilities, they also work with public and private schools on issues that potentially relate to the legal system. For example, a psychologist in a public school setting might be asked to assess a student's potential for being violent after being suspended from school temporarily as a result of sending threatening letters to his teacher.

Forensic school psychologists may not call themselves such—they may think of themselves simply as psychologists or school psychologists. However, if they routinely interact with a multitude of legal issues, we would consider them deserving of that special title. Forensic school psychologists may work with local schools concerning school suspensions and expulsions, as well as possible placement of a youth into a residential school program and its concomitant implications for the youngster's home school district. They face issues relating to the limitations of client privilege; tactics during contested special education cases; and expectations of judges, attorneys, and facility staff pertaining to mental status and the client's potential placement in institutional settings (Crespi, 1990).

The need for additional consultation with school psychologists within the public and private schools systems across the United States took on chilling urgency in the late 1990s when a rash of school shootings made headlines. Communities across the nation that had previously had a low profile—West Paducah, Kentucky; Jonesboro, Arkansas; Pearl, Mississippi; Springfield, Oregon—suddenly became well known because of the violence that erupted within their schools. Since then, sporadic episodes of a student taking a gun to school or a student killing a school principal have been publicized. The most striking case of mass murder was the killing of 12 students and one teacher at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, in April 1999. Twenty other students were injured, some seriously, during that incident. The two teenage boys who were responsible for the shootings apparently committed suicide in the school library during the tragedy. To the public and news media, the shooters appeared to be two ordinary boys from normal middle-class families living in a suburb of Denver. As more information became public, the shooters were described as isolated teenagers fascinated by weapons and often ridiculed by other students. Although there had been a number of school shootings prior to Columbine (at least 10 school shootings between 1996 and 1999), the Columbine shootings prompted a great deal of alarm and concern from parents across the United States. In addition, the media and some experts were quick to generalize about the “skyrocketing school violence problem” and demanded some kind of threat or risk assessment to identify those youth who might have similar intentions. Therefore, risk assessments became more common. Such an assessment would occur, for example, when a student makes a spoken or written threat to harm classmates or teachers. Once a youth has been assessed, he or she may then be counseled in the school setting or in the community or may even be expelled from school. As noted above, that assessment task often falls to the school psychologist.

Despite the media attention directed to Columbine and the other school tragedies, it is important to keep school violence in perspective. The school shootings described occurred during a time when juvenile violent crime was decreasing nationwide. Whenever the news media highlight certain events and dramatize their significance, the events seem to be more widespread and frequent to people than they really are. This phenomenon is called the **availability heuristic**. In reality, although the shootings were terrible and tragic, they were not representative of the juvenile crime picture as a whole. Furthermore, although the media understandably report incidents of children having guns on school premises and we periodically learn of still another instance, there is no documentation that this is a widespread problem. It is of course important to be alert for possible dangers facing school-age children and the adults who work with them in the schools, but the reality is that the risk of victimization in the school environment is smaller than in private homes or the community at large (O'Tool, 2000). Any risk, of course, is still unacceptable.

Victimology and Victim Services

Victimology refers to the study of persons who have experienced either actual or threatened physical, psychological, social, or financial harm as the result of the commission or attempted commission of crime against them. The harm may be direct or primary (experienced firsthand) or indirect or secondary (experienced by family members, relatives, survivors, or friends because of their closeness to the victim) (Karmen, 2001).

Violent victimization of children, such as terrifying abductions, school shootings, and sexual attacks, can disrupt the course of child development in very fundamental ways and can be associated with emotional and cognitive problems over the course of the life span (Boney-McCoy & Finkelhor, 1995). In adults, there is strong evidence that the effects of criminal victimization—such as assault, robbery, and burglary—are both pervasive and persistent (Norris & Kaniasty, 1994). Until recently, psychological services were received by a very small fraction of crime victims (2%–7%) (Norris, Kaniasty, & Scheer, 1990). In fact, it has only been within the past 30 years that criminal victimology has become recognized as a scientific and professional field of study (Karmen, 2001). Increasingly, forensic psychologists are beginning to play major roles in the research, evaluation, and treatment of crime victims from diverse cultural contexts and age groups. These activities will be covered in greater depth in Chapters 10, 11, and 12.

Students wishing to pursue a research career in victimology probably should obtain a research doctorate in psychology, criminal justice, social work, or sociology. Those desiring careers as practitioners in the field would be advised to obtain a doctorate in clinical or counseling psychology or an MSW (Master of Social Work). However, there are other training opportunities and career paths as well.

Over the past 25 years, for example, the field of victim services has become a rapidly growing profession, and not all of these services relate to crime victims. Today, there is greater understanding of victims' issues due to legislation enacted to support victims' rights, increased funding for victim services, efforts by victim advocates, and active research in victimology. Victim services concentrating on victims of sexual assault; domestic violence; and partner, child, and elder abuse have especially grown in recent years, and legislation has broadened the scope of understanding and services for victims. Colleges and universities now routinely offer courses, majors, and concentrations in victimology.

The National Victim Assistance Academy (NVAA), funded and sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Victims of Crime (OVC), has led the way in developing curriculum standards to be used at the national and state levels. The NVAA currently offers two distinct levels of training and education: (1) the Foundation-Level Academy and (2) the Advanced Topic Series. The Foundation-Level Academy, which began in 1995, is a comprehensive, 40-hour, academic-based course of study in victimology, victims' rights, and victim services for victim services professionals and allied professionals. The Advanced Topic Series involves workshops consisting of 20 to 24 hours of academic-based training in selected concentrations, such as program management, specific training/education, skills, and techniques.

Legal Psychology

Legal psychology is an umbrella term for the scientific study of a wide assortment of topics reflecting the close relationship between psychology and the courts. These topics include competencies and criminal responsibility (insanity defense), civil commitment, the psychology of the jury, the psychology of evidence, child custody determinations, family law issues, eyewitness identification, and the effects of pretrial publicity on jury decision making. As treated here, legal psychology includes both research and application of behavioral and social science to criminal and civil courts. Once they have earned their PhD degrees, people with a background in legal psychology often obtain post-doctoral positions in various agencies and research facilities like the Federal Judicial Center, the National Center for State Courts, the FBI, or the National Institute of Mental Health.

A caveat is in order, however. It is not unusual to see the terms *legal psychology*, *psychology and law*, and *forensic psychology* used interchangeably in academic and professional literature. Although we use *legal psychology* here as a subarea of forensic psychology, we recognize that this is not a universal approach. We also recognize the considerable overlap between legal psychology and the other subareas we have carved out. The psychology of evidence, for example, is of intense interest to police psychologists, who might be advising the law enforcement community on facial composites or the reliability of eyewitness testimony. In fact, we discuss these topics in the police chapters. The legal psychologist is far more likely than the police psychologist to be conducting research in these areas, however. Likewise, legal psychology and victimology intersect when psychologists perform risk assessments and some custody evaluations. The point here is that the various subareas of forensic psychology are not mutually exclusive. (See Focus 1.3 for an example of a specialization that may be valuable in several subareas of forensic psychology.)

FOCUS 1.3. FORENSIC NEUROPSYCHOLOGY

The term **forensic neuropsychology** refers to the application of knowledge from the neuropsychological profession to legal matters. Neuropsychology is the study of the psychological effects of brain and neurological damage and dysfunction on human behavior. Clinical neuropsychology is the applied branch of the field that focuses on the assessment and diagnosis of neurological damage. Forensic neuropsychologists provide information in legal cases on such things as dementia, brain damage, and intellectual functioning. The neuropsychologist may be asked to testify as to the extent of a person's impairment and be expected to answer questions relating to employment fitness, the need for a guardian or health care provider, chances of full recovery, or the extent of rehabilitation.

Interestingly, tragedies associated with wars bring this topic into focus. Many veterans of conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan have suffered traumatic brain injuries (TBIs) as a result of encountering improvised explosive devices (IEDs) in the course of their military duty. Likewise, children who were victims of child abuse or adult victims of domestic violence may also suffer TBI. With increasing awareness of the extent of these injuries, military veterans and victims of crime are in need of assessments from neuropsychologists. Neuropsychological assessment procedures and tests include measures that evaluate general intelligence, language, memory, attention, thought processes, perceptual-motor functioning, and emotional status.

Forensic neuropsychology is a profession that is developing very rapidly and has a very bright and promising future. The best career route for a student interested in this field is to pursue a PhD in clinical psychology with a heavy emphasis on biopsychology and an internship focusing on clinical neuropsychology. Many neuropsychologists are certified by the American Board of Clinical Neuropsychology.

One of the numerous topics holding considerable interest for legal psychologists is the psychology of false confessions, a topic we discuss again in Chapter 2. Most people are aware that suspects—for a wide variety of reasons—sometimes confess to crimes they did not commit. A suspect may be afraid, may want the notoriety attached to confessing, may desire to protect the real perpetrator, or simply may think that no one will believe in his or her innocence. What surprises many people, however, is this: Some suspects who are truly innocent come to believe they are truly guilty. Current research strongly suggests that skillful manipulation by law enforcement officers can lead to this form of false confession (Kassin, 1997; Kassin, Goldstein, & Savitsky, 2003; Kassin & Kiechel, 1996; Loftus, 2004). Loftus observes that “we have every reason to believe that some people

who are presented with false evidence that they committed a crime might actually come to believe that they did” (p. i). Legal psychologists have been at the forefront of studying this bizarre phenomenon.

Another topic of interest to legal psychologists is the creation of facial composites from the memory of eyewitnesses. Composites are considered indispensable aids to criminal investigation by most police agencies. Composites are reconstructions of faces through memory, and they are built either with the help of an artist’s sketching skills or by using the various commercial kits available to law enforcement. In recent years, kits have been replaced by computer-based systems where features are stored on disks and the face is put together on a video display unit. Interestingly, research by forensic psychologists has revealed that computer systems are no more effective in developing accurate facial composites than kits or artists (Koehn & Fisher, 1997; Kovera, Penrod, Pappas, & Thill, 1997). In addition, this research has consistently found that facial composites developed from the memory of eyewitnesses are poor models of the “real” face of the offender. However, facial composites may be helpful in narrowing the field of suspects and providing leads for law enforcement investigators. For example, a sketch of a bank robber, disseminated by the media, may sufficiently represent the true perpetrator that it leads to an acquaintance alerting police. Such sketches almost invariably produce many false leads, however. In one noteworthy rape case that will be mentioned again in Chapter 3, police circulated a composite based on the victim’s description of her assailant; a restaurant owner believed the composite resembled one of his busboys, and the busboy was arrested. The victim identified him in a lineup, and the individual was eventually convicted, despite his protestation of innocence. Years later, DNA evidence cleared him.

Family Forensic Psychology

Many legal psychologists are becoming increasingly involved in family law, so much so that specializing in **family forensic psychology** is a good career option. For example, the 2000 census indicated a baby boom in gay and lesbian families as well as a major increase of cohabitating, single-parent, and grandparent-led families (Grossman & Okun, 2003); the census of 2010 is not likely to see a decline. In 2007, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) reported that 39.7% of all births in the United States were to unmarried women. These changes affect the formation of families as well as family maintenance and dissolution, and they also present a challenge to our traditional ideas of what a family is and how families function.

Family courts are struggling with unprecedented issues over visitation and custody with lesbian, gay, and cohabitating parents who split up; whether surrogate mothers or donors of eggs or sperm have any parental rights; and the implications of children who are doing well living with a grandparent when a parent is released from jail and wants to reclaim these children. (Grossman & Okun, 2003, p. 163)

In recent years, issues relating to immigration status have led to questions about the legal rights of children whose parents entered the United States illegally or who entered legally but their visas expired and were not renewed. In addition, many legal immigrants must cope with the myriad challenges they face adjusting to schools, places of work, and housing situations. Practicing psychologists often consult with public and non-profit agencies that provide these families with counseling and other services.

Family forensic psychologists are concerned with abuse; adoption; alternative families; child support; divorce, including custody, relocation, and conflict resolution; elder law, including estate planning; family business; guardianship; juvenile justice; paternity; reproductive and genetic technologies; and other areas such as termination of parental rights. Family forensic psychology is involved in civil and criminal cases when the understanding of family dynamics and family systems is essential, for example, in cases involving visitation to prisons, release programs, and the impact of sentencing on family members (Grossman & Okun, 2003). The best-known areas of family forensic psychology involve child custody, family violence, and the assessment and

treatment of juveniles, all topics that will be covered in some detail later in the book. We will describe the other newer topics as we encounter them throughout various sections of the text.

Correctional Psychology

Correctional psychology is arguably the fastest growing branch of forensic psychology, though we acknowledge that many psychologists working in corrections prefer to call themselves “correctional psychologists” rather than “forensic psychologists.” The number of persons incarcerated in the United States is now over 2.3 million and growing daily (Sabol, Hinton, & Harrison, 2007). Although only a portion (7–10%) of these individuals qualify as “chronic offenders,” it is estimated that each chronic offender costs society about \$1.3 million over the course of the offender’s lifetime (Crawford, 2002). Of particular significance to psychologists is the large number of mentally disordered persons in the nation’s jails and prisons, a topic we will cover in detail later in the book. In addition to those incarcerated, more than 4 million persons are under correctional supervision in the community, such as on probation or parole. Clearly, there is a great need for the services of correctional psychologists.

Fortunately, correctional psychology has changed dramatically since the 1970s, when the prominent psychologist Ned Megargee (1974) remarked, “By and large, psychology as a scientific discipline has not made a substantial contribution to the applied area of corrections” (p. 44). Even so, Megargee himself had developed one of the first classification systems for use with inmates, which remains in use in many prisons today. Since that time, correctional and research psychologists have made substantial contributions to corrections, particularly pertaining to inmate classification systems, psychological assessments, program/treatment evaluation, crisis intervention strategies, and sex offender and substance abuse treatment.

As the number of opportunities for psychologists in corrections has proliferated, psychologists have increasingly discovered that correctional psychology is an exciting, rewarding, and challenging field (L. Richardson, 2003). The **correctional psychologist’s** major goal is to help in inmate rehabilitation, treatment, and reintegration into the community. Correctional psychologists also work with offenders who are serving their sentences, or part of their sentences, in the community, such as those on probation or parole. The services they provide may include crisis intervention, long-term and short-term therapy, group therapy, and substance abuse treatment. Psychologists in these settings administer a wide variety of psychological assessment techniques (intellectual, personality, aptitude, vocational, and educational), interpret results, and prepare comprehensive reports. Their recommendations are considered in decisions to release prisoners, change their security levels, or assign them to a variety of programs. Likewise, some of the same tasks are performed in juvenile correctional settings, which we will cover in the last chapter.

Correctional psychologists also offer consultative services relating to corrections staff, which may include screening and selection, employee assistance counseling, and mental health consultation with hostage negotiation or crisis support teams. Research opportunities are often available, particularly—although not exclusively—in the larger prison systems, including the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Research psychologists often study the psychological effects of correctional systems on prisoner behavior. Topics include the general effect of imprisonment on special populations of offenders, such as the mentally disordered or the elderly; the effects of crowding; the effects of isolation; and the outcome of various rehabilitative programs. Interestingly, psychologists who practice in correctional settings are sometimes criticized for aligning themselves with prison administrators, and they may be confronted with ethical quandaries, such as when asked to perform custody-related functions like supervising or restraining inmates. Nevertheless, many correctional psychologists find great personal and professional satisfaction working in these settings. In addition, as we will note in Chapter 12, there is ample evidence to support the positive impact of psychology on the correctional system.

Psychologists working in and as consultants to correctional facilities often join associations representing their common interests. Examples are the American Correctional Association (ACA) and the **International Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychologists (IACFP)**. The latter is guided by a series of recently updated standards (Althouse, 2010) that provide the minimum acceptable levels for psychological services offered to offenders, whether they are adults or juveniles held in local, state, or federal facilities, as well as in the community. The standards cover a wide range of principles as well as services, including staffing requirements, confidentiality issues, mental health screening, professional development, informed consent, segregation, and a host of other topics relating to this work.

Defining Forensic Psychology—A Recap

The foregoing sections indicate that the field of forensic psychology, as we define it broadly, provides ample opportunities for psychologists interested in interacting with some aspect of the law. We have devoted separate sections of this book to each of the five subareas defined above.

A decade ago, Otto and Heilbrun (2002) posited that if forensic psychology (particularly legal psychology) was to continue to grow and develop as a viable discipline, it had to become more mainstream. At the time, a relatively small group of forensic specialists devoted themselves full-time to this field, whereas a much larger group of psychologists provided occasional forensic services or provided such services only within a circumscribed area, such as child custody evaluations. They argued that forensic psychology, as a field, must acknowledge the fact that forensic practice was occurring at a variety of levels and for different reasons. The field must develop a plan to ensure that forensic practice overall was well-informed and competent. This plan was especially needed in the area of forensic testing and assessment.

More recently, Heilbrun and Brooks (2010) commented on the remarkable expansion of the field over the past decade, noting there has been substantial progress. “The field has matured: the recognition of the importance of the foundational science is stronger, and we are closer to identifying best practices across a range of legal contexts that are addressed by forensic psychology research and practice” (p. 227). In proposing an agenda for the next decade, they emphasize the need for interdisciplinary and intercultural collaboration; continuing improvement in the quality of forensic mental health assessments; a better integration of science and practice; and better outreach to a variety of settings, many of which are covered in this text. It appears that the field is gaining increasingly more adherents to the broad rather than narrow conceptualization of forensic psychology, although there is still debate about who should be considered a “forensic psychologist” (Committee, 2010).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As recently as 30 years ago, the term *forensic psychology* had barely been introduced into psychological or legal literature. Today, as we have seen, it is a commonly encountered term, but it still defies definition. Although some favor a narrow definition limiting it to clinical practice, the contributions of research psychologists may be undermined by such an approach. The Committee on the Revision of the Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychology (2006, 2010), as well as the writings of prominent forensic psychologists (e.g., DeMatteo, Marczyk, et al., 2009; Heilbrun & Brooks, 2010), recognize the importance of contributions from researchers. In addition, though, it is important to consider the context in which psychology is practiced. Limiting forensic psychology to work with civil and criminal courts does not recognize well enough the law-related functions performed by psychologists working with law enforcement, corrections, or victims. Finally, the many contributions of psychologists who study the psychology of crime and delinquency deserve to be included in this field. The legal

system surely can benefit, for example, from research on the developmental paths to delinquency or research on the prevention and control of sex offending.

We have persisted, then, in advocating for a broad definition of forensic psychology, one that could divide it into the five subareas covered in this chapter. In each of the areas discussed, numerous career opportunities exist. Both undergraduate and graduate programs have rapidly seen the need for preparation for careers in forensic psychology, whether by offering degree programs in the field or by offering concentrations within a broader program, such as a doctorate in clinical, counseling, or developmental psychology. Furthermore, professionals themselves are regularly offered opportunities for licensing, certification, and continuing education.

KEY CONCEPTS

American Psychological Association (APA)	Forensic neuropsychology
Association for Psychological Science (APS)	Forensic psychiatry
Availability heuristic	Forensic psychology
Clinical psychologist	Forensic school psychology
Computer evidence recovery	Industrial/organization (I/O) psychology
Correctional psychologist	International Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychology (IACFP)
Counseling psychologist	Legal psychology
Diplomate	Police psychology
Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct	Questioned document examination or analysis
Family forensic psychology	School psychologist
Forensic entomology	Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Contrast the narrow and broad definitions of forensic psychology.
2. Contrast forensic psychology and other forensic sciences.
3. Identify the five subspecialties of forensic psychology covered in this text and provide illustrations of the contributions of forensic psychologists in each one.
4. Explain the difference between the PhD and the PsyD.
5. What are the five applied branches or specializations in psychology, as recognized by the APA?
6. How has the American Psychological Association responded to the need to provide services to a diverse client population?
7. What is meant by the term “prescription privileges” when applied to psychologists? Briefly discuss the progress psychologists have made in obtaining these privileges and discuss possible objections that would be raised.