

SECOND EDITION

HANDBOOK OF
Psychology

VOLUME 11

Forensic Psychology

Randy K. Otto

Volume Editor

Irving B. Weiner

Editor-in-Chief

HANDBOOK OF PSYCHOLOGY

HANDBOOK OF PSYCHOLOGY

VOLUME 11: FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

Second Edition

Volume Editor

RANDY K. OTTO

Editor-in-Chief

IRVING B. WEINER



WILEY

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

This book is printed on acid-free paper. ∞

Copyright © 2013 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved.

Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.
Published simultaneously in Canada.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the Publisher, or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400, fax (978) 646-8600, or on the web at www.copyright.com. Requests to the Publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, (201) 748-6011, fax (201) 748-6008.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives or written sales materials. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a professional where appropriate. Neither the publisher nor author shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. If legal, accounting, medical, psychological or any other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person should be sought.

The contents of this work are intended to further general scientific research, understanding, and discussion only and are not intended and should not be relied upon as recommending or promoting a specific method, diagnosis, or treatment by physicians for any particular patient. The publisher and the author make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of fitness for a particular purpose. In view of ongoing research, equipment modifications, changes in governmental regulations, and the constant flow of information relating to the use of medicines, equipment, and devices, the reader is urged to review and evaluate the information provided in the package insert or instructions for each medicine, equipment, or device for, among other things, any changes in the instructions or indication of usage and for added warnings and precautions. Readers should consult with a specialist where appropriate. The fact that an organization or Web site is referred to in this work as a citation and/or a potential source of further information does not mean that the author or the publisher endorses the information the organization or Web site may provide or recommendations it may make. Further, readers should be aware that Internet Web sites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. No warranty may be created or extended by any promotional statements for this work. Neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for any damages arising herefrom.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. In all instances where John Wiley & Sons, Inc. is aware of a claim, the product names appear in initial capital or all capital letters. Readers, however, should contact the appropriate companies for more complete information regarding trademarks and registration.

For general information on our other products and services please contact our Customer Care Department within the United States at (800) 762-2974, outside the United States at (317) 572-3993 or fax (317) 572-4002.

Wiley publishes in a variety of print and electronic formats and by print-on-demand. Some material included with standard print versions of this book may not be included in e-books or in print-on-demand. If this book refers to media such as a CD or DVD that is not included in the version you purchased, you may download this material at <http://booksupport.wiley.com>. For more information about Wiley products, visit www.wiley.com.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

Handbook of psychology / Irving B. Weiner, editor-in-chief. – 2nd ed.
v. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-470-61904-9 (set) – ISBN 978-0-470-63917-7 (cloth : v. 11)

ISBN 978-1-118-28190-1 (ebk)

ISBN 978-1-118-28375-2 (ebk)

ISBN 978-1-118-28527-5 (ebk)

1. Psychology. I. Weiner, Irving B.

BF121.H213 2013

150–dc23

2012005833

Printed in the United States of America
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Editorial Board

Volume 1

HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY

Donald K. Freedheim, PhD

Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

Volume 2

RESEARCH METHODS IN PSYCHOLOGY

John A. Schinka, PhD

University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

Wayne F. Velicer, PhD

University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island

Volume 3

BEHAVIORAL NEUROSCIENCE

Randy J. Nelson, PhD

Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Sheri J. Y. Mizumori, PhD

University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Volume 4

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

Alice F. Healy, PhD

University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Robert W. Proctor, PhD

Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

Volume 5

PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Howard Tennen, PhD

University of Connecticut Health Center
Farmington, Connecticut

Jerry Suls, PhD

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Volume 6

DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

Richard M. Lerner, PhD

M. Ann Easterbrooks, PhD

Jayanthi Mistry, PhD

Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

Volume 7

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

William M. Reynolds, PhD

Humboldt State University
Arcata, California

Gloria E. Miller, PhD

University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

Volume 8

CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

George Stricker, PhD

Argosy University DC
Arlington, Virginia

Thomas A. Widiger, PhD

University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Volume 9

HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY

Arthur M. Nezu, PhD

Christine Maguth Nezu, PhD

Pamela A. Geller, PhD

Drexel University

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Volume 10

ASSESSMENT PSYCHOLOGY

John R. Graham, PhD

Kent State University

Kent, Ohio

Jack A. Naglieri, PhD

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, Virginia

Volume 11

FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

Randy K. Otto, PhD

University of South Florida

Tampa, Florida

Volume 12

**INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL
PSYCHOLOGY**

Neal W. Schmitt, PhD

Michigan State University

East Lansing, Michigan

Scott Highhouse, PhD

Bowling Green State University

Bowling Green, Ohio

Contents

Handbook of Psychology Preface xi
Irving B. Weiner

Volume Preface xiii
Randy K. Otto

Contributors xv

I NATURE OF THE FIELD 1

- 1 | **OVERVIEW OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY** 3
Randy K. Otto and Alan M. Goldstein
- 2 | **FORENSIC TRAINING AND PRACTICE** 16
Ira K. Packer and Randy Borum
- 3 | **ETHICS IN FORENSIC PRACTICE** 37
David A. Martindale and Jonathan W. Gould
- 4 | **LEGAL CONTOURS OF EXPERT TESTIMONY** 62
Steven K. Erickson and Charles Patrick Ewing
- 5 | **FORENSIC REPORT WRITING** 75
Richard L. DeMier

II FORENSIC EVALUATIONS IN CIVIL PROCEEDINGS 99

- 6 | **CHILD CUSTODY EVALUATIONS: CURRENT LITERATURE
AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS** 101
Jonathan W. Gould and David A. Martindale
- 7 | **ASSESSMENT IN A CHILD PROTECTION CONTEXT** 139
Karen S. Budd, Mary Connell, and Jennifer R. Clark

8	PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF EMOTIONAL DAMAGES IN TORT CASES	172
	William E. Foote and Craig R. Lareau	
9	DISABILITY AND WORKER'S COMPENSATION	201
	Lisa Drago Piechowski	
10	ASSESSING EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT	225
	Nancy L. Baker, Melba J. T. Vasquez, and Sandra L. Shullman	
11	FORENSIC ASSESSMENT FOR HIGH-RISK OCCUPATIONS	246
	David M. Corey and Randy Borum	
12	FORENSIC EVALUATION IN AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT CASES	271
	William E. Foote	
13	CIVIL COMPETENCIES	295
	Eric Y. Drogin and Curtis L. Barrett	
14	CIVIL COMMITMENT AND INVOLUNTARY HOSPITALIZATION OF THE MENTALLY ILL	308
	Craig R. Lareau	
15	EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT OF SEXUAL OFFENDERS	332
	Mary Alice Conroy and Philip H. Witt	
III	FORENSIC EVALUATIONS IN DELINQUENCY AND CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS	357
16	FORENSIC EVALUATION IN DELINQUENCY CASES	359
	Thomas Grisso and Christina L. Riggs Romaine	
17	CAPACITY TO WAIVE <i>MIRANDA</i> RIGHTS AND THE ASSESSMENT OF SUSCEPTIBILITY TO POLICE COERCION	381
	Naomi E. S. Goldstein, Alan M. Goldstein, Heather Zelle, and Lois Oberlander Condie	
18	ASSESSMENT OF COMPETENCE TO STAND TRIAL	412
	Kathleen Powers Stafford and Martin O. Sellbom	
19	EVALUATION OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY	440
	Alan M. Goldstein, Stephen J. Morse, and Ira K. Packer	
20	SENTENCING DETERMINATIONS IN DEATH PENALTY CASES	473
	Mark D. Cunningham and Alan M. Goldstein	

IV SPECIAL ASSESSMENT ISSUES 515

21 | **EVALUATION OF MALINGERING AND RELATED RESPONSE STYLES 517**
Richard Rogers and Scott D. Bender

22 | **VIOLENCE RISK ASSESSMENT 541**
John Monahan

23 | **CLINICAL AND FORENSIC ISSUES IN THE ASSESSMENT OF PSYCHOPATHY 556**
Stephen D. Hart and Jennifer E. Storey

24 | **CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE EVALUATIONS 579**
Kathryn Kuehnle and Mary Connell

V FORENSIC CONSULTATION 615

25 | **EYEWITNESS MEMORY FOR PEOPLE AND EVENTS 617**
Gary L. Wells and Elizabeth F. Loftus

26 | **VOIR DIRE AND JURY SELECTION 630**
Margaret Bull Kovera

27 | **TRIAL CONSULTATION 648**
Eric Y. Drogin and Curtis L. Barrett

Author Index 665

Subject Index 693

Handbook of Psychology Preface

The first edition of the 12-volume *Handbook of Psychology* was published in 2003 to provide a comprehensive overview of the current status and anticipated future directions of basic and applied psychology and to serve as a reference source and textbook for the ensuing decade. With 10 years having elapsed, and psychological knowledge and applications continuing to expand, the time has come for this second edition to appear. In addition to well-referenced updating of the first edition content, this second edition of the *Handbook* reflects the fresh perspectives of some new volume editors, chapter authors, and subject areas. However, the conceptualization and organization of the *Handbook*, as stated next, remain the same.

Psychologists commonly regard their discipline as the science of behavior, and the pursuits of behavioral scientists range from the natural sciences to the social sciences and embrace a wide variety of objects of investigation. Some psychologists have more in common with biologists than with most other psychologists, and some have more in common with sociologists than with most of their psychological colleagues. Some psychologists are interested primarily in the behavior of animals, some in the behavior of people, and others in the behavior of organizations. These and other dimensions of difference among psychological scientists are matched by equal if not greater heterogeneity among psychological practitioners, who apply a vast array of methods in many different settings to achieve highly varied purposes. This 12-volume *Handbook of Psychology* captures the breadth and diversity of psychology and encompasses interests and concerns shared by psychologists in all branches of the field. To this end, leading national and international scholars and practitioners have collaborated to produce 301 authoritative and detailed chapters covering all fundamental facets of the discipline.

Two unifying threads run through the science of behavior. The first is a common history rooted in conceptual and empirical approaches to understanding the nature of behavior. The specific histories of all specialty areas in psychology trace their origins to the formulations of the classical philosophers and the early experimentalists, and appreciation for the historical evolution of psychology in all of its variations transcends identifying oneself as a particular kind of psychologist. Accordingly, Volume 1 in the *Handbook*, again edited by Donald Freedheim, is devoted to the *History of Psychology* as it emerged in many areas of scientific study and applied technology.

A second unifying thread in psychology is a commitment to the development and utilization of research methods suitable for collecting and analyzing behavioral data. With attention both to specific procedures and to their application in particular settings, Volume 2, again edited by John Schinka and Wayne Velicer, addresses *Research Methods in Psychology*.

Volumes 3 through 7 of the *Handbook* present the substantive content of psychological knowledge in five areas of study. Volume 3, which addressed *Biological Psychology* in the first edition, has in light of developments in the field been retitled in the second edition to cover *Behavioral Neuroscience*. Randy Nelson continues as editor of this volume and is joined by Sheri Mizumori as a new co-editor. Volume 4 concerns *Experimental Psychology* and is again edited by Alice Healy and Robert Proctor. Volume 5 on *Personality and Social Psychology* has been reorganized by two new co-editors, Howard Tennen and Jerry Suls. Volume 6 on *Developmental Psychology* is again edited by Richard Lerner, Ann Easterbrooks, and Jayanthi Mistry. William Reynolds and Gloria Miller continue as co-editors of Volume 7 on *Educational Psychology*.

Volumes 8 through 12 address the application of psychological knowledge in five broad areas of professional practice. Thomas Widiger and George Stricker continue as co-editors of Volume 8 on *Clinical Psychology*. Volume 9 on *Health Psychology* is again co-edited by Arthur Nezu, Christine Nezu, and Pamela Geller. Continuing to co-edit Volume 10 on *Assessment Psychology* are John Graham and Jack Naglieri. Randy Otto joins the Editorial Board as the new editor of Volume 11 on *Forensic Psychology*. Also joining the Editorial Board are two new co-editors, Neal Schmitt and Scott Highhouse, who have reorganized Volume 12 on *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*.

The *Handbook of Psychology* was prepared to educate and inform readers about the present state of psychological knowledge and about anticipated advances in behavioral science research and practice. To this end, the *Handbook* volumes address the needs and interests of three groups. First, for graduate students in behavioral science, the volumes provide advanced instruction in the basic concepts and methods that define the fields they cover, together with a review of current knowledge, core literature, and likely future directions. Second, in addition to serving as graduate textbooks, the volumes offer professional psychologists an opportunity to read and contemplate the views of distinguished colleagues concerning the central thrusts of research and the leading edges of practice

in their respective fields. Third, for psychologists seeking to become conversant with fields outside their own specialty and for persons outside of psychology seeking information about psychological matters, the *Handbook* volumes serve as a reference source for expanding their knowledge and directing them to additional sources in the literature.

The preparation of this *Handbook* was made possible by the diligence and scholarly sophistication of 24 volume editors and co-editors who constituted the Editorial Board. As Editor-in-Chief, I want to thank each of these colleagues for the pleasure of their collaboration in this project. I compliment them for having recruited an outstanding cast of contributors to their volumes and then working closely with these authors to achieve chapters that will stand each in their own right as valuable contributions to the literature. Finally, I would like to thank Brittany White for her exemplary work as my administrator for our manuscript management system, and the editorial staff of John Wiley & Sons for encouraging and helping bring to fruition this second edition of the *Handbook*, particularly Patricia Rossi, Executive Editor, and Kara Borbely, Editorial Program Coordinator.

Irving B. Weiner
Tampa, Florida

Volume Preface

This volume presents a current description of the specialty of forensic psychology. The chapters represent contemporary topics and areas of investigation in this rapidly expanding specialty. Topics were selected to reflect forensic psychology's applicability to both the civil and criminal justice systems. This volume is organized into five parts, grouping topics with common themes. The reader will first develop an understanding of the nature of the specialty—*what* it is and *why* it is different from other areas of psychology—and, next, *how* forensic psychologists gather, use, and produce information. Although the majority of psychologists who identify themselves as specializing in forensic matters focus on assessment of persons whose mental states are at issue in some type of legal proceeding (e.g., a plaintiff alleging emotional harm in a personal injury lawsuit or a criminal defendant pleading not guilty by reason of insanity), forensic psychology as a specialty area is considerably broader. For example, some forensic psychologists serve as consultants to law enforcement agencies and evaluating job candidates, some consult with attorneys on matters of jury selection or pretrial publicity and change of venue, and others offer what is referred to as social framework testimony in an

attempt to educate the legal decision maker about matters before it, such as the accuracy of eyewitnesses or the vulnerability of children to suggestive questioning. Although this volume provides chapters on a wide variety of pursuits, the focus is clearly on matters of forensic evaluation.

Part I includes chapters that address more general issues that are arguably relevant to all forensic subspecialty practice areas. Parts II and III are comprised of chapters that address a range of civil and criminal forensic evaluation matters. Chapters in Part IV are devoted to some special assessment issues, and chapters in Part V focus on pursuits well beyond forensic psychological assessment. Although this volume may serve as an undergraduate or graduate textbook, the chapters were written to stand on their own. As was the case with the first edition—which was so well edited by Alan Goldstein (to whom I remain indebted)—this volume seeks to reflect the developments in, and the current state of, the specialty. Accordingly, some chapters from the first edition were excluded and others were added.

Randy K. Otto

Contributors

Nancy L. Baker, PhD, ABPP

School of Psychology
Fielding Graduate University
Santa Monica, California

Curtis L. Barrett, PhD, ABPP

School of Medicine
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

Scott D. Bender, PhD, ABPP

Department of Psychiatry and
Neurosciences
University of Virginia School of Medicine
Charlottesville, Virginia

Randy Borum, PsyD, ABPP

Department of Mental Health Law
and Policy
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

Karen S. Budd, PhD

Department of Psychology
DePaul University
Chicago, Illinois

Jennifer R. Clark, PsyD

Private Practice
Mexico City, Mexico

Lois Oberlander Condie, PhD, ABPP

Children's Hospital Boston
Boston, Massachusetts

Mary Connell, EdD, ABPP

Private Practice
Fort Worth, Texas

Mary Alice Conroy, PhD, ABPP

Department of Psychology
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas

David M. Corey, PhD, ABPP

Private Practice
Lake Oswego, Oregon

Mark D. Cunningham, PhD, ABPP

Private Practice
Dallas, Texas

Richard L. DeMier, PhD, ABPP

Department of Psychology
U.S. Medical Center for Federal Prisoners
Springfield, Missouri

Eric Y. Drogin, JD, PhD, ABPP

Department of Psychiatry
Harvard Medical School
Boston, Massachusetts

Steven K. Erickson, JD, PhD, LLM, ABPP

School of Law
Widener University
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Charles Patrick Ewing, JD, PhD, ABPP

College of Law
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

William E. Foote, PhD, ABPP

Department of Psychology
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Alan M. Goldstein, PhD, ABPP
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
City University of New York
New York, New York

Naomi E. S. Goldstein, PhD
Department of Psychology
Drexel University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Jonathan W. Gould, PhD, ABPP
Private Practice
Charlotte, North Carolina

Thomas Grisso, PhD, ABPP
Department of Psychiatry
University of Massachusetts Medical School
Worcester, Massachusetts

Stephen D. Hart, PhD
Department of Psychology
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Margaret Bull Kovera, PhD
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
City University of New York
New York, New York

Kathryn Kuehnle, PhD
Department of Mental Health Law and Policy
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

Craig R. Lareau, JD, PhD, ABPP
Department of Psychology
Patton State Hospital
Patton, California

Elizabeth F. Loftus, PhD
Department of Social Ecology
University of California–Irvine
Irvine, California

David A. Martindale, PhD, ABPP
Private Practice
St. Petersburg, Florida

John Monahan, PhD, ABPP
School of Law
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Stephen J. Morse, JD, PhD, ABPP
College of Law
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Randy K. Otto, PhD, ABPP
Department of Mental Health Law
and Policy
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

Ira K. Packer, PhD, ABPP
Department of Psychiatry
University of Massachusetts Medical
School
Worcester, Massachusetts

Lisa Drago Piechowski, PhD, ABPP
Department of Clinical Psychology
American School of Professional
Psychology
Washington, District of Columbia

Richard Rogers, PhD, ABPP
Department of Psychology
University of North Texas
Denton, Texas

Christina L. Riggs Romaine, PhD
Department of Psychiatry
University of Massachusetts Medical
School
Worcester, Massachusetts

Martin O. Sellbom, PhD
Department of Psychology
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Sandra L. Shullman, PhD
Department of Psychology
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio

Kathleen Powers Stafford, PhD, ABPP
Private Practice
Hudson, Ohio

Jennifer E. Storey, MA
Department of Psychology
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia

Melba J. T. Vasquez, PhD, ABPP

Private Practice
Austin, Texas

Gary L. Wells, PhD

Department of Psychology
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Philip H. Witt, PhD, ABPP

Private Practice
Somerville, New Jersey

Heather Zelle, JD

Department of Psychology
Drexel University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PART I

Nature of the Field

CHAPTER 1

Overview of Forensic Psychology

RANDY K. OTTO AND ALAN M. GOLDSTEIN

DEFINITION OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY	3
A BRIEF HISTORY OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY	3
ORGANIZATION OF THIS VOLUME	5

SUMMARY	13
REFERENCES	13

DEFINITION OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

The word *forensic*, derived from the Latin, *forensis*, means “forum,” the place where trials were conducted in Roman times. The current use of the term *forensic* typically denotes some involvement of a particular field of study in a legal forum. There is no uniform or commonly accepted definition of forensic psychology—many exist. More narrow definitions limit forensic psychology to applications of clinical psychology to legal matters—typically in the context of evaluating litigants whose mental states are at issue in legal proceedings—whereas broader definitions include applications of all areas of psychology (e.g., clinical, developmental, social, experimental) to legal matters. An example of this narrower scope is provided by the American Psychological Association’s definition of forensic psychology as a specialty: “the professional practice by psychologists within the areas of clinical psychology, counseling psychology, neuropsychology, and school psychology, when they are engaged regularly as experts and represent themselves as such, in an activity primarily intended to provide professional psychological expertise to the judicial system” (Heilbrun, 2000, p. 6). In contrast, a broader perspective is provided in the Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychology (American Psychological Association, in press), which define forensic psychology as “professional practice by any psychologist working within any subdiscipline of psychology (e.g., clinical, developmental, social, cognitive) when applying the scientific, technical, or specialized knowledge of psychology to the law to assist in addressing legal, contractual, and administrative matters.” For purposes of this volume forensic psychology is defined broadly as the application

of psychological research, theory, practice, and traditional and specialized methodology (e.g., interviewing, psychological testing, forensic assessment, and forensically relevant instruments) for the express purpose of providing assistance to the legal system.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

Psychologist Hugo Münsterberg, a student of Wilhelm Wundt and a professor at Harvard University, is generally credited with founding the field of forensic psychology. His landmark book, *On the Witness Stand* (1908), is comprised of an introduction and eight essays that describe how psychologists could be of assistance to the legal system. Relying in part on his own experience as an expert witness, Münsterberg considered topics as diverse as eyewitness identification, false confessions, hypnosis as a crime prevention measure, and the potential value of precursors of the modern-day polygraph and concluded that it was “astonishing that the work of justice is ever carried out in the courts without ever consulting the psychologist” (p. 194). In response to publication of Münsterberg’s text, John Wigmore, a law professor and leading scholar on the law of evidence, published a satirical article in the *Illinois Law Review* (1909) mocking psychology’s potential to assist the legal process. Wigmore’s criticisms did have some merit. Münsterberg’s book lacked any references, and Bartol and Bartol (1999) described some of his claims as “exaggerated” and “rarely empirically based” (p. 6).

Indeed, Münsterberg’s claims for the contributions that psychology could make to the legal system may have been

4 Nature of the Field

premature since, at the beginning of the 20th century, psychology was in its infancy and certainly lacked sufficient scientific foundation to support the admissibility of “expert” testimony. Thus, despite Münsterberg’s impassioned pleas for psychology’s involvement in the legal system, his suggestions were largely ignored. However, Münsterberg certainly generated interest in the possibility that someday psychology might make contributions to the judicial process. That Münsterberg saw what is now referred to as forensic psychology as being broadly defined and having the potential to make many contributions to the law is indicated by his observation that psychologists, in addition to providing insights into the characteristics of individuals in particular cases (e.g., witnesses or defendants), could also contribute to what was known about the legal system more generally:

I have written the following popular sketches, which select only a few problems in which psychology and law come in contact. They deal essentially with the mind of the witness on the witness stand; only the last, on the prevention of crime, takes another direction. I have not touched so far the psychology of the attorney, of the judge, or of the jury—problems which lend themselves to very interesting experimental treatment. (Münsterberg, 1908, p. 11)

Around this same time, psychologists and other mental health professionals began providing assistance to the courts in matters of delinquency and dependency, by evaluating children who were the subject of proceedings that were occurring in “juvenile courts”—the first of which was established in Chicago in 1899—and making recommendations for interventions and dispositions. Indeed, some commentators (see, e.g., Otto & Heilbrun, 2002) have observed that this involvement constitutes psychologists’ first real contributions to the legal process, and it is the forensic evaluation role that has gone on to define for many what forensic psychology is today.

Because they were not physicians, psychologists were sometimes barred from testifying in legal proceedings on the grounds that they did not have the requisite expertise to testify about matters involving the psychological functioning of litigants and others. However, in 1962, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals held in *Jenkins v. United States* that psychologists could provide expert opinions about mental illness at the time a defendant was alleged to have committed a criminal offense. In the court’s opinion, Judge David Bazelon, after reviewing the training and qualifications of psychologists, concluded that physicians were not uniquely qualified to offer expert testimony on matters involving mental disorders, and courts, when

considering who should be permitted to provide expert testimony about such issues, should consider factors such as the proffered expert’s training, skills, experience, and knowledge. Subsequent to this decision, psychologists entered the courts with increasing frequency and offered expert testimony on a wide range of legal issues.

In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled that racial segregation in the public schools violated the equal protection clause of the Constitution (*Brown v. Board of Education*). In his opinion for a unanimous court, Chief Justice Earl Warren referenced research conducted by psychologists Kenneth and Marie Clark that was offered as evidence by attorneys representing the plaintiffs that racial segregation had deleterious effects on the psychological development and functioning of African American children. Although the value of the Clarks’ research and their resulting interpretations have been questioned (see, e.g., Wolters, 2005) the Supreme Court’s reference to their work is cited as evidence of the legal system’s increasing willingness to look to the expertise of psychologists in matters that go beyond assessment of litigants’ mental states. Since that time psychologists have offered what has been referred to as *social framework testimony* (Monahan & Walker, 2010) in a variety of matters that addresses such diverse topics as the (in)accuracy of eyewitness identification, the biasing effects of pretrial publicity, and consumer confusion in the context of trademark litigation. In addition, other foci of forensic psychology include providing treatment to legally involved populations, researching and consulting with attorneys on matters such as jury selection and case presentation, and studying the legal system and its operation (e.g., efficacy of drug courts, effects of transferring juveniles to criminal court for prosecution and sentencing).

Forensic psychology is unique as a specialty. By its very nature, it operates in another system as its practitioners attempt to provide assistance to attorneys, judges, juries, and the legal system more generally. This practice requires not only an understanding of how the legal system operates, but a working familiarity with statutes and case law that are relevant to the particular issues(s) at hand. At this time, only a minority of psychologists who identify themselves as forensic specialists have completed any kind of formal forensic training at the doctoral level. Rather, most have obtained a doctoral degree in some general specialty (e.g., clinical psychology, developmental psychology, experimental psychology, social psychology) and supplemented this with limited graduate coursework, a postdoctoral fellowship, or continuing education. However, within the past 25 years we have seen development

of more focused graduate training in the forensic arena (Packer & Borum, this volume).

Attempts to define forensic psychology as a specialty or subspecialty began in the 1970s. The American Psychology–Law Society was established in 1969 and, shortly thereafter, affiliated with the American Psychological Association as a division. In 1978, the American Board of Forensic Psychology (ABFP) was established to certify psychologists with competence in the forensic area. Shortly thereafter ABFP affiliated with the American Board of Professional Psychology. And, in 2001 the American Psychological Association formally recognized forensic psychology as a specialty.

The Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists, which provide guidance for psychologists engaged in forensic pursuits, were first published in 1991 (Committee on Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists), and were subsequently revised and adopted by the American Psychological Association Council of Representatives in 2011 as the Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychology. In addition, the American Psychological Association and other professional organizations (e.g., American Academy of Clinical Neuropsychology, National Academy of Neuropsychology) have published a variety of guidelines and position statements on matters of relevance to forensic psychologists (e.g., statements on impact of third-party observers on examinations, guidelines for conducting child custody and dependency evaluations, guidelines on use of response-style measures in forensic evaluations).

Finally, journals devoted to the area abound (e.g., *Law and Human Behavior*, *Psychology*, *Public Policy and the Law*, *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*), and a number of forensic psychology references have been published in their second or third editions (e.g., Grisso, 2003; Melton et al., 2007; Rogers, 2007). Thus, a little more than 100 years after Münsterberg first beseeched attorneys and judges to consider the contributions that psychologists could offer to the legal process, forensic psychology is a vibrant, well established specialty that continues to grow.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS VOLUME

Although the activities of forensic psychologists are diverse, the bulk of this volume is focused on forensic assessment activities. The initial section is devoted to professional issues that are of relevance to all forensic pursuits, the second section is concerned with evaluation of

persons whose mental state is at issue in criminal proceedings, the third section focuses on evaluation of persons involved in the criminal justice system, the fourth section includes chapters that address a variety of special assessment matters, and the last section is devoted to a variety of nonclinical, nonassessment activities in which forensic psychologists may become involved.

Overview

This section includes three chapters that address overriding issues that are relevant to all forensic practitioners: training in the specialty, the ethical obligations that shape the work of psychologists when engaged in forensic pursuits, and how the law shapes the practice of the specialty and how psychologists communicate their work and findings to the court.

Forensic Training and Practice

Historically, psychologists who specialized in forensic pursuits gained relevant knowledge and skills through on-the-job training and intermittent continuing education. A few texts devoted to forensic psychology practice were published in the 1970s and early 1980s (*The Role of the Forensic Psychologist*, Cooke, 1973; *Who Is the Client?*, Monahan, 1980), and a handful of doctoral programs devoted to the intersection of law and psychology were developed around this same time (University of Alabama, University of Nebraska, and Florida State University). Much has changed in the past half century. There are currently a large number of masters, doctoral, internship, and postdoctoral training programs devoted to forensic pursuits (go to www.ap-ls.org/education/GraduatePrograms.php for a listing and description of these programs) and continuing education opportunities abound, including an organized and ongoing program of study offered by the American Academy of Forensic Psychology (go to www.aafp.ws for review of current offerings).

Integral to demonstrating the establishment of a substantive specialty is the existence of training opportunities and a system or systems that allow practitioners to demonstrate their competence in the specialty area. In Chapter 2, Ira Packer and Randy Borum review the roles of social, developmental, cognitive, and clinical psychologists in the field and consider areas of focus, subspecialization, and psycholegal issues addressed by forensic psychologists. They describe graduate training in the field, doctoral programs, and joint degree programs (those that award the PhD or PsyD and the JD), and discuss levels of

training, internship offerings, postdoctoral fellowships, and continuing education.

Ethics in Forensic Practice

Psychologists working in the legal system are faced with ethical challenges. Many of these are similar to challenges experienced by psychologists practicing in other specialty areas, and some are more specific to forensic practice. That the unique challenge of forensic practice was appreciated by organized psychology is evidenced by development of the “Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists” (Committee on Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists, 1991), inclusion of a special forensic practice section in the 1992 version of the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* (American Psychological Association, 1992; hereinafter APA), and development by APA of practice guidelines for some more focused forensic assessment activities, including evaluation of children and families in cases of disputed custody (American Psychological Association, 2010) and evaluation of children in caretakers in dependency (i.e., abuse/neglect) proceedings (American Psychological Association, 1998). In addition, practice guidelines and statements relevant to forensic practitioners have been published by a number of related professional organizations including the American Academy of Clinical Neuropsychology and the National Academy of Neuropsychology. Most recently, the forensic practice guidelines were revised (American Psychological Association, in press). Familiarity with such guidelines and statements is important for informed forensic practice.

The work of forensic psychologists is probably scrutinized more than the work of any other psychologists (Heilbrun, Grisso, & Goldstein, 2008). Reports and testimony summarizing the opinions reached by the psychologist are subjected to both criticism and formal cross-examination. The findings of forensic assessments often have profound effects on the lives of litigants, whether used to support a finding awarding or denying a parent custody of a child, grant a sum of money to a plaintiff in a personal injury case, or end or continue the involuntary hospitalization of a litigant previously adjudicated not guilty by reason of insanity. Psychologists are expected to be knowledgeable about specific statutes, case law, and rules of evidence, and have experience in conducting forensic assessments. The Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (American Psychological Association, 2002), of course, apply to *all* areas of professional psychological activity. However, because of the conflicts between

the demands of the legal system and the EPPCC, forensic psychologists sometimes face challenges in attempting to satisfy the court and meet their professional obligations. In Chapter 3, David Martindale and Jon Gould identify the unique demands encountered by forensic psychologists, discuss professional standards implicit in the competent professional practice of forensic psychology, and make clear that psychologists should practice in a way that is consistent not only with the APA’s Ethical Principles but with other relevant guidelines and standards, given the stakes involved in legal matters.

Legal Contours of Expert Testimony

Forensic psychologists typically conduct evaluations with the expectation that their findings will be presented via written reports or oral testimony. Whereas witnesses of fact (lay witnesses) are typically limited to testifying about knowledge they have acquired firsthand through their senses (generally, what they have seen and heard), experts are permitted to offer to the court not only what they have learned of themselves, but also resulting opinions and the underlying reasoning.

Steven Erickson and Charles Ewing (Chapter 4) examine the structure and function of expert testimony that impact psychologists who enter the courtroom. They review the general legal rules that govern expert testimony, including the Federal Rules of Evidence, explain statutes and case law that determine who can be qualified as an expert and how that occurs, and discuss the law surrounding the admissibility of expert testimony and the limitations placed on experts when testifying. Selected practical aspects of the process of providing effective ethical expert testimony are provided as well, focusing on specific types of expert testimony, cross-examination, and the issue of immunity of experts from civil liability.

Forensic Report Writing

As previously noted, forensic psychologists typically conduct evaluations with the expectation that their findings will be presented to others (e.g., the judge, jury, or retaining attorney). Reports psychologists write that summarize the evaluation process, their main findings, the reasons or data that support their findings, and key opinions are integral to the forensic process. Indeed, well-written reports can obviate the need for oral testimony. Richard DeMier, in Chapter 5, reviews the nature and purpose of report writing, discusses some of the key research examining the report-writing practices of forensic psychologists, and provides some helpful direction to those seeking to

improve how they communicate their practices, findings, and opinions to the courts.

Forensic Evaluations in Civil Proceedings

Accurate assessment of examinees' emotional, behavioral, and cognitive functioning is crucial given the stakes involved in civil proceedings. Litigants in civil proceedings can receive financial awards, important personal rights can be restricted or removed in guardianship and related proceedings—including the right to manage one's finances and make health-care decisions, the right to parent or visit one's children can be removed or limited in dependency or family court proceedings, and persons' liberty can be restricted via different involuntary hospitalization proceedings.

Child Custody Evaluations

Assessment of parents and children in cases of disputed custody is one of the most complex and challenging forensic evaluation tasks (Fuhrmann & Zibbell, 2011). The vast majority of forensic evaluations involve assessment of one person (e.g., a personal injury litigant, a criminal defendant for whom trial competence is at issue, a person who is subject to guardianship or conservatorship proceedings) with respect to relatively specific, focused, and well-formulated psycholegal abilities. In contrast, forensic evaluations conducted in the context of custody disputes require assessment of multiple persons (e.g., parents, children, parents' significant others) in multiple spheres, and—too frequently—in the absence of well-defined criteria. Because the stakes are so significant in these matters, at least one parent is apt to be angry about or resentful of the examiners' opinions and recommendations. Consequently, ethics complaints against forensic psychologists involved in this area of assessment are not uncommon. In Chapter 6, Jonathan Gould and David Martindale describe the legal standards for the determination of custody in the United States, review child custody evaluation guidelines developed by professional organizations, and provide important recommendations for competent practice in this very important pursuit.

Assessment in a Child Protection Context

Many more children are involved in legal proceedings in response to allegations of abuse or neglect by caretakers than are involved in legal proceedings involving parental disputes regarding custody and visitation. Yet, matters relating to child custody evaluation have received

considerably more attention. This, of course, is unfortunate given what is at stake for children who are the subjects of dependency proceedings. Whereas in many cases of disputed custody the legal dispute often distills to which parent and what circumstances are *better* for the child, in dependency proceedings the question too often is *whether either parent or a particular parent can provide a basic and safe environment for the child* (Budd, Connell, & Clark, 2011). Thus, the stakes in many dependency proceedings are likely higher than the stakes in most custody proceedings. It is this very reason why it is of utmost importance that psychologists evaluating these children and their parents accurately describe their abilities and needs.

Chapter 7, by Karen Budd, Mary Connell, and Jennifer Clark, goes a long way toward the goal of improving evaluations conducted by psychologists in such contexts. The authors provide an overview of the legal context of dependency proceedings, discuss the relevant empirical literature regarding child abuse and neglect, review various methods of assessment data collection, and make recommendations regarding communicating findings and opinions to the court.

Psychological Evaluation of Emotional Damages in Tort Cases

The law allows those who have been harmed to bring suit against those they believe are responsible in order to be compensated for the harm they endured (Kane & Dvoskin, 2011). To prevail in a personal injury lawsuit, the plaintiff typically must demonstrate that he or she was harmed by the defendant's breach of some duty. The plaintiff must also demonstrate a relationship between the breach and the harm, such that the harm would not have occurred but for what the defendant did: the concept of *proximate cause*.

In Chapter 8 on personal injury evaluation, William Foote and Craig Lareau first review the legal framework of personal injury cases and the law of torts. They then offer an assessment model that can be employed by the examiner. They discuss in detail how the forensic psychologist can go about assessing the plaintiff's functioning both before and after the alleged breach, the distress endured by the plaintiff (if any), the extent of impairments and injuries to the plaintiff's functioning, the likely cause of any impairments or injuries, and the prognosis and steps necessary to restore the plaintiff to his or her preincident functioning.

Disability and Worker's Compensation

Persons whose ability to work is significantly impaired as the result of emotional, behavioral, cognitive, or physical

impairments may be entitled to important and significant public (e.g., Social Security benefits, Supplemental Security Income, worker's compensation benefits) and private (via purchased disability insurance) benefits (Drago Piechowski, 2011). Crucial to decision making regarding whether claimants are entitled to such benefits are comprehensive and accurate assessments of their emotional, behavioral, and cognitive functioning, and how such affect their ability to work. But the mere presence of illness or impairment is not enough. Rather, there must be an illness or impairment that has a significant impact on the claimant's work-related abilities. In Chapter 9, Lisa Piechowski reviews various disability benefits programs and provides a model for assessing persons referred for evaluation in these matters.

Employment Discrimination and Harassment

Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act bars discrimination based on race, sex, religion, or national origin. Forensic psychologists may be asked to evaluate persons who allege emotional harm stemming from alleged discrimination and harassment. In Chapter 10, Nancy Lynn Baker, Melba Vasquez, and Sandra Shullman present the legal bases underlying these claims. Forms of illegal discrimination, including harassment, sexual harassment (heterosexual and same-sex), hostile environment, and retaliation are considered and the professional literature on sexual and racial discrimination is reviewed. The roles of the forensic psychologist are described, and specialized assessment methods to employ when evaluating persons alleging employment discrimination and harassment are presented.

Forensic Assessment for High-Risk Occupations

Forensic psychologists are sometimes asked to examine job candidates for high-risk occupations (e.g., law enforcement personnel, firefighters, security, commercial pilots) to assess how their emotional and behavioral functioning may impact their job performance, if hired. In addition, referrals are made to conduct fitness-for-duty evaluations when questions exist about a current employee's ability to perform the full duties associated with his or her position. Because these evaluations impact examinees' employment status, they are subject to considerable legal requirements and regulations, they present many unique challenges that are not present in other types of forensic evaluations, and examiners may be at increased risk for ethics or licensing complaints stemming from dissatisfied examinees. The complicated nature of this

subspecialty is reflected, at least in part, by board certification in Police and Public Safety Psychology now being available by the American Board of Professional Psychology (go to www.abpp.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3688 for more information about this newly established board). In Chapter 11, David Corey and Randy Borum discuss the many complicated legal issues surrounding these evaluations, review representative ethical issues involved, and review appropriate assessment approaches.

Forensic Evaluation in Americans With Disabilities Act Cases

Whereas the Civil Rights Act of 1964 banned discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, and national origin, it was not until passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) that discrimination against persons with physical and mental disabilities was prohibited. Designed in part to allow persons with disabilities to achieve maximal functioning in the workplace, this legislation outlawed discrimination on the basis of disability for hiring, training, compensation, and benefits (Goodman-Delahunty, 2000).

In Chapter 12, William Foote examines the issue of disability in the workplace and how the ADA fits with existing disability systems. He details the impact of discrimination on the basis of disability, with a focus on mood disorders, learning disabilities, and substance abuse disorders. Foote presents assessment methodologies that can be used to evaluate persons making ADA claims, and he considers issues such as the assessment of damages and the impact of the employer's failure to provide reasonable accommodations. He also explores the topics of disparate treatment and disparate impact assessments, reprisals for pursuing claims, and the impact of harassment and hostile work environments on those with disabilities.

Civil Competencies

The American culture's value of autonomy is reflected in the law's recognition that all adults, absent significant impairment or limitations, enjoy the right to manage their personal affairs absent interference from or meddling by the state (Melton et al., 2007). However, questions may arise regarding a person's ability to make informed, reasoned judgments that are in his or her best interests. These questions may be raised in matters involving the ability to make health-care decisions, manage one's finances, or execute a will or contract (Drogin & Barrett, 2010).

Concerns about a particular person's capacities may develop at or around the time the decision of interest is to be made, after the decision of interest has been made, or before the decision is to be made. Decision-making capacity can be affected by a variety of emotional, behavioral, or cognitive impairments.

Eric Drogin and Curtis Barrett (Chapter 13) describe the role of forensic psychologists in the assessment of a variety of civil competencies. After providing a review of the legal concept of competence they discuss a variety of civil competencies that may be brought into question, discuss various assessment approaches, and review specific assessment tools.

Civil Commitment and Involuntary Hospitalization of Persons With Mental Illness

Although involuntary hospitalization is a civil matter, the stakes in these proceedings are high. Persons can be detained for extended periods of time and their liberty and autonomy are strictly limited as a result (Pinals & Mossman, 2011). In Chapter 14, Craig Lareau reviews the legal history of and rationale/justification for involuntary hospitalization, and discusses more recent legal developments including outpatient commitment and conditional release. He also reviews the commitment process and discusses the role forensic psychologists may play in the involuntary examination and hospitalization process with respect to assessment of risk for harm to self and others, assessment of decision-making capacity, and implementation of treatments and other interventions designed to minimize risk of harm.

Evaluation and Management of Sexual Offenders

With the exception of drug offenders, during the 1990s the sex offender population has increased faster than any other group of violent criminals (La Fond, 1998), and ways that the legal system can act against sex offenders have continued to expand during the early parts of the 21st century (Edwards, 2001; Vasquez, Maddan, & Walker, 2008; Witt & Conroy, 2008). Many states have expanded the criminal penalties for second offenses, approximately 40% of states have laws in place that allow for involuntary hospitalization of sex offenders after they have completed criminal sentences for their offenses, and all states have some requirements related to registration and/or community notification.

Mary Alice Conroy and Philip Witt describe the impact of this legislation on forensic practice in Chapter 15. They

review sex offender legislation (including sexual violent predator statutes), issues related to evaluating the sex offender's mental state and risk for recidivism, and ethical concerns.

Forensic Evaluations in Delinquency and Criminal Proceedings

As noted previously, it was the doors of the juvenile court through which psychologists first entered the legal arena in a meaningful way. They continue to be heavily involved in these proceedings today. Similarly, many psychologists specialize in evaluation of criminal defendants, and a review of forensic psychologists certified by the American Board of Professional Psychology (www.abpp.com) reveals that evaluation of criminal defendants in the most common activity of this group of professionals.

The stakes are probably greatest in delinquency and criminal proceedings. Juvenile and adults found responsible for criminal offenses can have their liberty restricted for extended periods of time, and the death penalty remains in place in a majority of states. In this section three key issues that are considered by the criminal courts are addressed: competence, responsibility, and sentencing/disposition.

Forensic Evaluation in Delinquency Cases

Establishment of the first juvenile court in Chicago in 1899 reflected the legal system's understanding that juveniles were different from adults in many important ways, and that these differences required a special response when juveniles ran afoul of the law. The stated goal of the first juvenile courts—rehabilitation rather than punishment—was significantly different from that of criminal courts. Thomas Grisso and Christina Riggs Romaine note that, although the development of the knowledge base regarding how the abilities and limitations of juveniles are important to understanding their involvement with the legal system has lagged when compared to development in other forensic areas, there has been significant growth in the past decade. In Chapter 16, the authors review the current state of knowledge regarding the evaluation of juvenile offenders and use of various instruments and tools.

Capacity to Waive Miranda Rights and the Assessment of Susceptibility to Police Coercion

Confessions to crimes are valuable commodities, which, once introduced to a judge or jury, are exceedingly difficult for defense lawyers to overcome. Unchallenged,

inculpatory statements are devastating—typically, and at times mistakenly, taken as a clear sign of the defendant’s guilt. In *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) the U.S. Supreme Court noted that the process of interrogation is hidden from public scrutiny and ruled that the Constitution requires that suspects undergoing interrogation must be informed of their right to avoid self-incrimination. Only confessions that were provided subsequent to a knowing, voluntary, and intelligent waiver of one’s right to avoid self-incrimination are admissible and can be used to prove criminal responsibility Goldstein & Sevin Goldstein (2010). This issue has received increasing attention in the past decade as compelling evidence of convictions based on false and coerced confessions has been unearthed (Drizin & Leo, 2004).

In Chapter 17, Naomi Goldstein, Alan Goldstein, Heather Zelle, and Lois Oberlander Condie examine case law regarding the ability to waive *Miranda* rights and the validity of confessions. They describe research relevant to child, adolescent, and adult *Miranda* rights comprehension, and the relationship between understanding these rights and IQ, academic achievement, reading ability, familiarity with the criminal justice system, race, and socioeconomic status. Forensic assessment instruments, some in their second generation, that have been developed to assist in assessment of an individual’s ability to make a knowing and intelligent waiver are reviewed, and the use of traditional clinical tests as an adjunct to the evaluative process is described as well. The authors also explore the literature on false confessions: the significance of inculpatory statements, frequency of false confessions, and why some defendants may provide a false confession. The authors present methodology for evaluating those factors that may contribute to inculpatory statements that may not be truthful.

Assessment of Competence to Stand Trial

A defendant in a criminal case must be more than just a physical presence in the courtroom; he or she must have, at a minimum, “sufficient present ability to consult with his attorney with a reasonable degree of rational understanding . . . and a rational and factual understanding of the proceedings” (*Dusky v. U.S.*, 1960). Fitness-for-trial assessments are the most common of all criminal evaluations (Hoge, Bonnie, Poythress, & Monahan, 1992; Melton et al., 2007; Zapf & Roesch, 2008). Kathleen Stafford and Martin Sellbom review the legal framework of trial competence, placing it in historical perspective in

Chapter 18 of this volume. They describe the variables relevant to trial competence that are reported in the empirical literature. They examine the methodological approaches to assess competence to stand trial, including the use of forensic assessment instruments designed expressly for this purpose, and consider the issue of trial competence with special populations. Dispositional issues, including prediction of competence restoration, treatment of incompetent defendants, and permanent incompetence, are also discussed.

Evaluation of Criminal Responsibility

Perhaps no other area of the law engenders more attention than the insanity defense (Melton et al., 2007; Packer, 2009). The trial of John W. Hinckley for the attempted murder of President Reagan and his subsequent acquittal by reason of insanity (*United States v. Hinckley*, 1982) fanned the flames of the perceived injustices resulting from insanity defenses. However, public perceptions differ significantly from reality in terms of the frequency of insanity defenses, their rate of success, and what ultimately happens to those acquitted by reason of insanity. The evaluation of a defendant’s mental state at the time of an offense is central to the issue of criminal responsibility and the appropriateness of punishment. These assessments require the “reconstruction” of a prior mental state to assist the trier of fact in rendering a decision of legal responsibility.

In Chapter 19, Alan Goldstein, Stephen Morse, and Ira Packer explain the basic doctrines of criminal liability. They focus on mental state issues relevant to culpability, including negation of *mens rea*, provocation and passion, extreme mental or emotional disturbance, voluntary and involuntary intoxication, imperfect self-defense, and duress. The authors review the history of the insanity defense, including its development, changes, and recent reforms. Ethical issues and conflicts that arise when conducting these assessments are explored, and the authors describe a methodology for assessing a defendant’s mental state at the time of the alleged offense.

Sentencing Determinations in Death Penalty Cases

Unlike any other form of punishment, the death penalty is the ultimate, irrevocable sanction. The Supreme Court held that death penalty statutes must not be “capricious” and that specific guidelines are required to avoid the “uncontrolled discretion” of judges and juries, whereby “[p]eople live or die, dependent on the whim of 1 man or 12”