

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Alan Tomkins Publications

Public Policy Center, University of Nebraska

---

March 1996

## EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN PSYCHOLOGY AND LAW/ CRIMINAL JUSTICE: Historical Foundations, Present Structures, and Future Developments

James R. P. Ogloff

*Simon Fraser University*, james\_ogloff@sfu.ca

Alan Tomkins

*University of Nebraska*, atomkins@nebraska.edu

Donald N. Bersoff

*Hahnemann University and Villanova University School of Law*, donald.bersoff@drexel.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/publicpolicytomkins>



Part of the [Public Policy Commons](#)

---

Ogloff, James R. P.; Tomkins, Alan; and Bersoff, Donald N., "EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN PSYCHOLOGY AND LAW/CRIMINAL JUSTICE: Historical Foundations, Present Structures, and Future Developments" (1996). *Alan Tomkins Publications*. 13.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/publicpolicytomkins/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Public Policy Center, University of Nebraska at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Alan Tomkins Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN PSYCHOLOGY AND LAW/CRIMINAL JUSTICE: Historical Foundations, Present Structures, and Future Developments

**JAMES R. P. OGLOFF**

*Simon Fraser University*

**ALAN J. TOMKINS**

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

**DONALD N. BERSOFF**

*Hahnemann University and Villanova Law School*

Although psychology had a brief—and rather dramatic—foray into the legal system early in this century, it was only after World War II that psychology started to systematically permeate the legal system. Building on the interest psychologists and other social scientists had on the law, education and training in the areas of psychology and law/criminal justice has undergone considerable growth and development over the past two decades. The authors discuss the early developments and current models of this education and training. Implications of the increased interest and training in psychology and law/criminal justice, and directions for future developments in these areas, also are explored.

**D**uring an invited address at the 1981 meeting of the American Psychological Association (APA), Judge David Bazelon told the audience that:

*The authors are grateful to Jennifer Pistillo and Kerry Beldin for their research assistance on parts of this article. Address all correspondence to James Ogloff Department of Psychology, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada V5A 1S6, james\_ogloff@sfu.ca.*

Over the years I have developed a passionate ambivalence about the behavioral sciences. As a federal judge for more than three decades, I have tried to open the courthouse doors-but never hand over the keys-to the insights you and your colleagues can offer. At the same time, both on and off the bench, I have also seen behavioral science at its worst. Sometimes I have found the emperor naked. Other times his clothes have been visible, but all too visibly tattered. Some think me as a disappointed lover. But I am told that it takes continued love to be able to feel continued disappointment. (Bazelon, 1982, p. 115)

In that speech, he urged social scientists to become more involved in the law and the public arena. It would appear that social scientists needed little prodding to get them immersed in many issues occurring in the legal system. Indeed, some 16 years after Bazelon's invitation, Melton (1987~) was urging psychologists to "focus on 'thinking like a lawyer' and becoming a comfortable guest, if not an insider, in the legal community" (p. 293). Melton argued that becoming more familiar with the legal system would ensure that psychologists (a) re- search issues that are legally relevant, (b) frame their results in a way that lawyers can recognize and apply, (c) know how to disseminate their work to lawyers and judges, and (d) increase their credibility as experts.

What better way for social scientists to become comfortable in the legal community than to be trained in psychology and law/criminal justice? Such training allows one to obtain structured information about the law and the legal system. A number of authors previously have considered the importance of training and education in psychology and law (see, e.g., Freeman & Roesch, 1992; Grisso, Sales, & Bayless, 1982; Hafemeister, Ogloff, & Small, 1990; Ogloff, 1990; Roesch, Grisso, & Poythress, 1986; Tornkins & Ogloff, 1990; Wexler, 1990). Less attention, however, has been paid to training in criminal justice per se (Wallace, 1990). In this article, we begin with a discussion of the early developments of education and training in psychology and law/criminal justice. We then describe current models of education and training in these areas. Finally, we explore the implications of the formal and systematic introduction of psychology into law/criminal justice and note directions for future developments in these areas.

## EARLY DEVELOPMENTS

### LAW SCHOOLS

Prior to the late 19th century, the training of lawyers occurred by way of an apprentice model that existed until the mid-to-late 19th century. Even then, legal education did not look like it does today.

During the last thirty years of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth, although the norm for formal American legal education moved from one to two to three years, it did so essentially as an undergraduate curriculum. (Stevens, 1983, p. 36)

It was Harvard University, which, in the decades after 1870, “turn[ed] the legal profession into a university-educated one—and not at the undergraduate level but at a level that required a three-year post- baccalaureate degree” (Stevens, 1983, p. 36).

During the same era that professional legal education migrated to academia, the view of law itself was undergoing a significant change. The view was changing from law as “natural” in origin and “formal” (i.e., rational or deductive) in its application to law as social or sociological in nature (Friedman, 1985). The first school of thought that emerged to compete with dominant views of legal formalism was *sociological jurisprudence* (White, 1972). This perspective, which began at the turn of the century and took root by the first decade of the 20th century, “insisted . . . [on] empirical observations of changing social conditions and [the replacement of] pseudologic with ‘experience’ “ (White, 1976, p. 252). It was not enough to “know the law” by studying judicial opinions. The social contexts from which law was derived and that law would ultimately influence also needed to be examined and understood (Purcell, 1973). Sociological jurisprudence looked to empirical and social realities to inform the law, but it did not depend solely on realities to drive and explain the law.

By the second decade of the 20th century, a group of legal theorists, who became known as the *legal realists*, advocated going even further than sociological jurisprudence would condone (Purcell, 1973; Twining, 1973; White, 1972). For these theorists, the empirical and social realities related to law *were* the law. According to the legal realist perspec-

tive, sociological jurisprudence did not rely extensively enough on social realities, in general, or on social science, in particular (Schlegel, 1979, 1980; Tornkins & Oursland, 1991). Led by legal academics, most of whom were affiliated with the law schools at Columbia University and Yale University, legal realists advocated drawing upon the social sciences for methodologies and perspectives from which to examine law, legal process, and legal decision making (Kalman, 1986; Schlegel, 1979, 1980; Twining, 1973, 1985).

Thus, sociological jurisprudence, to some extent, and legal realism, quite explicitly and extensively, provided a legal framework that brought social science into law. By the second decade of the new century and continuing through the next 20 years, several of the nation’s most eminent law schools began to integrate social science into their law courses. Psychologists and other social scientists were hired as part of law faculties beginning in the late 1920s (Kalman, 1986; Loh, 1981; Schlegel, 1979, 1980; Stevens, 1983). Following such a promising start, it is curious that social science never became a major component of legal education, but it served a useful role.

Ultimately, legal realism would lose its potency as a way of conceptualizing law and the legal process (Purcell, 1973). Although it became even rarer to find a social scientist on a law school faculty, the social-science-and-law movement survived the demise of legal realism (Purcell, 1973; Schlegel, 1989; Stevens, 1983).

The major influence of social science materials and perspectives on legal education can be found in the casebooks published for use in law schools (Schlegel, 1989; Stevens, 1983). From the 1930s through the present, social scientific perspectives have been incorporated into legal education, primarily within casebooks or courses. By the 1950s, there were several examples of social science being integrated into law courses, and there even were free-standing law courses devoted to social science (Foote, 1958; Kalven, 1948; Lasswell & McDougal, 1943; Levin, 1958). By the early 1970s, law schools began to join with psychology departments to offer formal interdisciplinary training programs in psychology and law; law schools even opened up more doors to social scientists, bringing them once again into law schools (Grisso et al., 1982; Melton, 1990; Melton, Monahan, & Saks, 1987; Tapp, 1976).

By the early 1980s, law and social science would become a mainstream part (albeit a small part) of legal education. For example, a special symposium on Social Science in Legal Education, in the December 1985 issue of the *Journal of Legal Education*, contained articles contributed by Teitelbaum (1985), Trubek and Plager (1985), Getman (1985), and Kaye (1985); see also Priest (1983). Indeed, in 1983 the dean of Harvard Law School—the law school long known for its institutional reluctance to embrace the realist, social science perspectives in its legal education (Kalman, 1986; Stevens, 1983)—wrote that “we ignore the social sciences at our peril” (Bok, 1983, p. 570). By the mid-1980s, the incorporation of social science into law would be aided by the appearance of casebooks designed to integrate law and social science (Loh, 1984; Monahan & Walker, 1985a). Thus, nearly three quarters of a century after their first, tentative associations, social science had found a secure place in legal education.

#### PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENTS

Whereas legal education was strongly rooted in the United States by the middle of the 19th century, scientific psychology was just beginning in this period. Scientific psychology emerged from branches of philosophy (e.g., phenomenology, philosophy of the mind) and the natural sciences (e.g., biology, physiology, physics) (Boring, 1950). The evolution of scientific psychology, although anticipated by several American philosophers and scientists, was primarily attributable to Europeans (Boring, 1950; Woodworth, 1943). Indeed, the “father” of scientific psychology is typically identified as Wilhelm Wundt, who founded the first, formal psychological laboratory at the University of Leipzig (Germany) in 1879.

By the 1880s, European scientific psychology was making its way to America (Boring, 1950). It was led by American students who had traveled to Leipzig to study in Wundt’s laboratory. Within 20 years, scientific psychology had thoroughly penetrated U.S. university research and education (Cattell, 1896; Morawski, 1992).

Law was of minor interest to some psychologists almost immediately. As early as 1889, psychology students at Clark University were allowed to take courses related to law, such as a course in the “allied topic” of criminology, titled “Crime and Modern Theories of the Crim-

inal” (Sanford, 1890). A handful of psychologists in U.S. universities examined law-related issues in their research (Bartol & Bartol, 1987). The first was James McKeen Cattell (1895), one of whose many interests was the functional capacities of people in various situations. One of these capacities was the ability to accurately recollect events, and one of the situations was the “court of justice” (p. 761, quoted in Bartol & Bartol, 1987, p. 4).

Other psychologists were interested in issues related to the psychology of testimony (e.g., Bolton, 1896, cited in Bartol & Bartol, 1987; Loftus, 1979). For the most part, however, “American psychologists did not immediately embrace the study of legal issues” (Bartol & Bartol, 1987, p. 5), and the preceding examples of psychology’s interest in law did not reflect a deep or abiding interest by early U.S. psychologists.

There was greater interest in the law among European psychologists. French and, especially, German psychologists, apparently intrigued by the early American work in law, began to investigate empirically the psychology of testimony. They were especially interested in the accuracy of perceptions in criminal contexts and in the reliability of perceivers’ testimony about their perceptions (Bartol & Bartol, 1987; Loftus, 1979; Loh, 1981). This work was primarily available to psychologists in the United States through European scientific journals. However, the leading German *Assuage* (remembrance) psychologist, William Stern (1910, 1939) was one of the European psychologists invited to Clark University in 1909 to lecture American academics about European psychology (the “big name” among the lecturers being Freud).

The Assuage work of Stern and other European psychologists appears to have had an impact on American psychologists (e.g., Whipple, 1909, 1917), with perhaps the greatest influence being on Hugo Munsterberg. The first director of Harvard’s Psychological Laboratory, Munsterberg is considered to be the founder of applied psychology (Boring, 1950; Hale, 1980; Moskowitz, 1977). Among the applications he encouraged was that of psychological knowledge to the law (Loh, 1981). Writing frequently in popular periodicals, Munsterberg exhorted the legal profession to take note of empirical realities regarding such matters as eyewitness identification and testimony. In *On the Witness Stand* (1908), a book in which he brought these articles together into

one work, Munsterberg complained that the time for psychology's input to the law had already come, and he chastised the legal community for its stubbornness in not accepting the lessons offered by those experimental psychologists studying eyewitness and other criminal law matters. Clearly, it would have been reasonable at that time to anticipate that Munsterberg's work would signal the development of a significant interest by psychologists in the law.

Perhaps it would have, had not the response from the legal community to Munsterberg been such an angry one. The great legal evidence scholar, Northwestern University's John H. Wigmore (1909), lambasted Munsterberg in a satire published in the *Illinois Law Review*. In that piece, Munsterberg's work was placed under the scathing scrutiny of a cross-examination in a mock libel trial in which Munsterberg was accused of claiming more than his science could support or offer. Not surprisingly, Munsterberg was found guilty of exaggerating his claims. Other lawyers also castigated Munsterberg's claims; these insults ranged from accusing Munsterberg of practicing "yellow psychology" (Moore, 1907, as cited in Loh, 1981, pp. 316-317) to accusing him of being "presumptuous" (Cairns, 1935, p. 169). After Munsterberg's initial foray, psychology's interest in the law waned for nearly 40 years.

Although psychologists did not systematically focus on law again for almost four decades, significant exceptions occasionally arose. For example, at Yale University in 1929, an Institute of Human Relations was started as part of that university's interest in an interdisciplinary understanding of human behavior, including behavior in social contexts such as law. The Yale "interdisciplinary efforts enjoyed only limited and short-term success" (Cahan & White, 1992, p. 232).

The schism between psychology and law started to diminish after World War II (Bartol & Bartol, 1987; Loh, 1981). Two phenomena facilitated a renewed interest in law by psychologists. The first was the advent of clinical psychology as an important allied health profession. The second was the successful application of psychological perspectives in a major court case.

*The advent of clinical psychology.* The growth of clinical psychology had two consequences for law. First, it fostered an even greater in-

terest among psychologists in the *profession* of psychology. As with other professions, there are certain professional issues that require the involvement of the law (e.g., regulation of the practice of the profession, payment for professional services, and limitation of service delivery to those who hold specific credentials). Second, the law became more receptive to the participation of clinical psychologists in legal proceedings (see, e.g., Hoch & Darley, 1962; *Jenkins v. United States*, 1962; Louisell, 1955, 1957; McCrary, 1956; Perlin, 1977; Poythress, 1979; Schofield, 1956). Consequently, psychologists were called on to make predictions of dangerousness, make clinical assessments relevant to insanity defense pleas, and make assessments and/or offer testimony about other mental health issues.

Naturally, as psychologists were invited (or allowed) to participate in the legal arena, psychologists' interest in the law deepened. Clinical psychologists were especially likely to recognize that "law permeates [psychologists'] lives and directly affects psychologists in both their research endeavors (e.g., laws relating to protection of human subjects and confidentiality of research records) and professional activities (e.g., licensure, malpractice, and third-party-reimbursement laws)" (Grisso et al., 1982, pp. 267-268). Graduate programs in clinical psychology began to offer courses related to the role of psychology as a profession and its regulation by the law. By the 1970s, psychology departments were regularly offering courses—or parts of courses—devoted to law.

*The application of psychological knowledge in court.* As the legal fight to end state-sanctioned segregation in public schools reached its crescendo, the NAACP lawyers involved in the myriad lawsuits that were mounted began to look to social science as one of the weapons to include in their battle (Kluger, 1976; Tomkins & Oursland, 1991). Psychologists were prominent among those who ended up participating in the fight against segregated schooling. Most notable among these efforts were the studies conducted by Kenneth Clark, a New York psychologist. Clark, who had previously investigated the self-esteem of African American school children (Clark, 1950/1963; Clark & Clark, 1947/1958), examined the impact of segregation on the children suing to end their inferior, separate education. Clark's work was highlighted by the courts, first at the trial court level (Kluger,

1976) and ultimately by the Supreme Court in its opinion outlawing segregated education (*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 1954). In addition, other social scientists-led by psychologists-had submitted an *amicus curiae* brief to the Supreme Court arguing against upholding segregation (Appendix to Appellants' Brief, 1954). This brief also appeared to have an influence on the Supreme Court justices (Loh, 1984).

Although the strength of the psychological research involved (Cahn, 1955; van den Haag, 1960) and its influence on the Supreme Court's decision (Kluger, 1976) ultimately came into question, the Supreme Court's reference to psychological research in such a major case established psychology as a potentially useful tool in law. This was enough to encourage some psychologists to focus their research efforts on legal issues (Loh, 1981). As a result, applied psychological research from a variety of areas (e.g., cognitive psychology, social psychology, psychophysiology) has been employed in a broad range of areas of law (e.g., eyewitness testimony, discrimination, jury decision making, and lie detection).

#### DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIALIZED AND JOINT DEGREE PROGRAMS

By the late 1960s and early 1970s, there appeared to be an interest within the psychological community in examining law in relation to clinical psychology issues and in recognizing the potential usefulness of psychological research and perspectives for social policy and legal decision making. The result of this interest was that psychology and law really began to take firm hold of the psychology community (Bartol & Bartol, 1987; Grisso et al., 1982; Monahan & Loftus, 1982; Tapp, 1976, 1977; Tapp & Levine, 1977b).

Interdisciplinary and specialized training was introduced at the doctoral, internship, postdoctoral, and continuing education levels (Fenster, Litwack, & Symonds, 1975; Freeman & Roesch, 1992; Grisso, 1987, 1991; Grisso et al., 1982; Heilbrun & Annis, 1988; Lawlor, Siskind, & Brooks, 1981; Levine, Wilson, & Sales, 1980; Melton, 1987c; Otto, Heilbrun, & Grisso, 1990; Poythress, 1979; Roesch et al., 1986; Tapp, 1976, 1977). A wealth of published materials became available for the interested student, teacher, researcher, and professional, including

“psychological textbooks devoted entirely or substantially to forensic assessments and testimony” (Grisso, 1987, p. 831), as well other texts devoted to a wide variety of issues in psychology and law (Abt & Stuart, 1979; Bermant, Nemeth, & Vidmar, 1976; Monahan, 1976; Saks & Hastie, 1978; Sales, 1977a, 1977b; Tapp & Levine, 1977a; Toch, 1961). Standards and requirements for continuing education and credentialing in forensic psychology also were implemented (Grisso, 1987; Kaslow, 1989; Kunke, 1980; Otto et al., 1990).

By 1979, a survey by Grisso et al. (1982) showed that 85 psychology department chairs (out of 365 respondents) reported that their department offered one or more courses at the graduate level in which half or more of the course content examined psycholegal issues. Most of these courses were introduced after 1973. The survey revealed that 10 departments offered formal law-related programs; it also documented that five graduate psychology departments actually offered joint degrees (J.D./Ph.D.) in psychology and law.

The first truly integrated, successful law-and-psychology program was initiated by Bruce Sales at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in 1974 (Grisso, 1991; Melton, 1990). Stanford University apparently tried to start a psychology and law program in 1972, but the program was not successful (Grisso et al., 1982). Soon, other programs were started, the most noteworthy being those at Johns Hopkins University- University of Maryland, and Hahnemann University-Villanova University in 1979. They represent the first three programs to share the goal of training psychology-law graduate students so that they could “bring the information base, research methods, and concerns of psychology to bear upon questions of law and policy” (Roesch et al., 1986, p. 89).

By 1987, Melton (1987c) labeled psycholegal research and training “psychology's growth industry” (p. 681). Forensic psychology was by far the most common type of psychology and law (this is not surprising, given economic realities favoring those who are clinically trained and the demand for clinical psychological services within the legal system; Grisso, 1987), but psycholegal interdisciplinary training efforts ranged far beyond the focus of clinical-forensic psychology (Ogloff, 1990; Tomkins, 1990). Nearly three quarters of a century from the time that Munsterberg had called for an application of psychology to law, his call had been answered.

### CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS

Criminal justice may be considered to have begun as part of the overall psychology-law interface (Bartol, 1980; Cohn & Udolf, 1979; Ellison & Buckhout, 1981; Monahan, 1976, 1986; Sales, 1977a). Early psychological interest in law was actually focused primarily on criminal justice matters (e.g., Sanford, 1890, p. 284 [Clark University course on Crime and Modern Theories of the Criminal]; see also the eyewitness studies: e.g., Cattell, 1895; Munsterberg, 1908, Stern, 1910). In fact, although psychology was on a hiatus in its influence on general law and legal education, psychologists were continuing to make contributions to criminal justice issues, ranging from police selection to lie detection (Bartol & Bartol, 1987). However, as criminal justice came into its own in the university, it became less the province of psychology and more the province of law enforcement and criminological sociology (Wallace, 1990, 1991; Ward & Webb, 1985). Psychologists continued to be involved in assessing police department applicants (Bartol & Bartol, 1987), but they otherwise appear to have turned their attention away from criminal justice.

Psychology returned to the criminal justice fold toward the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s. The major contribution was Hans Toch's (1961) edited book, *Legal and Criminal Psychology*, which, according to Bartol and Bartol (1987), "represents the earliest attempt to integrate, in an interdisciplinary fashion, the empirical research of psychologists relevant to criminal behavior and legal issues" (p. 17). By the late 1960s, contemporaneous with the emergence of modern psychology and law, psychologists again had become actively involved in criminal justice research and training, as well as in other applications (Brodsky, 1973, 1977; Gormally & Brodsky, 1973; Nietzel & Moss, 1972). By the time that psychology and law came of age in the 1970s, a significant portion of the psycholegal research was focused on criminal justice issues (Loh, 1981).

As previously noted, criminal justice education does not appear to be extensively associated with psychology. The beginning of criminal justice education is associated with August Vollmer, the police chief of Berkeley, California (Meadows, 1987; Sherman, 1978). In 1901, Vollmer established a police training school that relied on faculty from the University of California, Berkeley. Vollmer's police training pro-

gram eventually evolved into that university's School of Criminology. However, it was not until the 1960s that criminal justice education really expanded in the United States (Wallace, 1990).

The number of undergraduate and graduate programs in criminal justice has grown dramatically since the 1960s. Although psychological perspectives are included in many of these programs (Tapp, 1976, p. 368), sociological perspectives appear to have become much more prevalent (Wallace, 1990). The growth and nature of contemporary programs in criminal justice will be discussed later in this article.

### SUMMARY

Although psychology had a brief and rather dramatic foray into the legal system early in this century, it really was only after World War II that psychology started to systematically permeate the legal system. Significant in the growth of psychology in law was the development of clinical psychology and its utility for assessing criminal defendants for criminological or mental health purposes. Only in the 1960s and 1970s was experimental psychology systematically introduced into the legal system. By the early 1980s, however, a large number of undergraduate courses in psychology and law had been developed within universities, and a number of graduate courses and programs, including joint degree programs, had been implemented.

Although it may be said that criminal justice began partly as a result of the psychology-law or sociology-law interface, the area has developed in an independent manner. Furthermore, the growth of criminal justice programs, especially since the 1960s, can be seen as nothing short of dramatic when compared to the slower growth of psychology and law, particularly if one considers the relative number of undergraduate and graduate programs that have been introduced. In the following section, we examine the current models of education and training in psychology and law/criminal justice.

### CURRENT MODELS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

As we noted above, three joint-degree programs in psychology and law were introduced in the 1970s. Of those original three, only two are

fully operational at present (Hahneman University/Villanova University and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln). An additional two J.D./Ph.D. programs and one J.D./Psy.D. program are now in existence (see the appendix). Given these data, one would assume that Melton's (1987c) view of psychology and law as a growth industry was incorrect. However, due to the highly specialized and intense nature of the joint degree programs, one must look beyond them to the scope of psychology and law courses offered at law schools and psychology departments, as well as internship training and continuing education, to determine the extent to which the area of psychology and law has developed. As we note below, based on these indices, psychology and law has grown rapidly since the 1970s, and chances now are very good that students in law will be exposed to the area of psychology at some time during their education—if not by taking courses in the area, then by being exposed to psycholegal research in their courses and textbooks.

#### LAW SCHOOLS

To ensure that the area of psychology and law will remain viable and continue to increase its influence on the law generally, it is critical that psycholegal research permeate law school curricula. If law students are exposed to psycholegal research during their training, they may be more inclined to have an awareness of, and to turn to, that work later in their practice of law. Indeed, examples abound where law clerks, working in firms and the judiciary, have made their supervisors aware of some psychological research that may be relevant to a matter at hand. Thus, considerable effort should be taken to ensure that psychological research finds its way into the law school curriculum.

Psychological information may enter law school curricula in three basic ways. First, law professors may employ some psychological research or related information in their lectures or via the casebooks they use. For example, a course on trial advocacy may make reference to psychological research on persuasion or jury decision making. Second, law schools may participate in joint degree programs with psychology departments (see discussion below). Third, and falling in between these first two avenues, law schools may offer courses devoted to psychology and law topics. For example, one of us is an adjunct professor at a

traditional law school that does not offer a joint degree program in psychology and law. Nonetheless, he occasionally teaches the law school's course called Psychology and Litigation, with most of the students having no background in psychology or social science. There has been a movement within law schools to recognize the importance of interdisciplinary training. Indeed, Hafemeister et al. (1990) reported that between 1979 and 1988 the percentage of law schools approved by the American Bar Association that offered interdisciplinary joint degree programs (of any kind) increased from 59.4% to 77.1%. By riding on this wave of interest in interdisciplinary training, psycholegal researchers and practitioners may be successful in their attempts to develop psychology and law courses in law schools. To maximize the chances for success of such attempts, it is recommended that rather than approaching a law school by oneself, it may be better to identify a law professor with some interest and/or knowledge in psychology and law who would be willing to collaborate on the development of a course. If one does not have the inclination to develop an entire course in psychology and law, one still can make oneself available as a guest lecturer in law school courses.

Along with an increase in the scope and amount of research in psychology and law (Roesch, 1990) has come an increase in the exposure of that work in law courses. To help ensure that research in psychology and law is recognized by law professors and others in the legal system, Melton (1987~) has recommended that psychologists attempt to publish their work in interdisciplinary journals that are indexed both on psychological abstract databases and legal periodical indexes (e.g., *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *Law and Human Behavior*, *Psychology*, *Public Policy*, and *the Law*). Furthermore, psychologists may do well to consider publishing their work in law reviews and other legal publications. Law reviews tend to publish extensive reviews of an area of law or case comments that critically review a recent appellate case. To the extent that psychology is relevant to an area of law or to an appellate decision, it is worthwhile to prepare an article that will be read by law students, lawyers, and, perhaps, members of the judiciary. In addition to law reviews, local, state, and national bar associations may publish newsletters or magazines targeted to their members. Such outlets may be ideal for providing law professors and lawyers with current in-

formation about psychological research in an area. Another strategy that we have found successful is to routinely share research findings with our law school colleagues who teach courses in which the findings are relevant. Sharing copies of articles with them may help increase their awareness of psychology and law, ensuring that some of the articles find their way into a professor's lecture, casebook, or course readings.

#### CONTINUING EDUCATION IN LAW

Given the dynamic nature of the law, and the fact that most jurisdictions require mandatory continuing education for lawyers, there is considerable opportunity for providing psychology and law information to lawyers via continuing education workshops. Again, in our experience, lawyers have considerable interest in learning about a variety of topics studied by psycholegal scholars. Therefore, psychologists who work in legal areas may wish to consider providing training to lawyers. Similarly, lawyers wanting further knowledge in some area of psychology may wish to contact a psychologist to provide continuing education. In addition to training opportunities for lawyers, an increasing number of education programs also have been mounted for judges. Therefore, again, psychologists may well be called upon to provide training to judges.

#### PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENTS

Within psychology, the area of psychology and law continues to enjoy rapid growth. For example, the membership of Division 41 of the American Psychological Association (American Psychology-Law Society) has grown steadily; the official journal of Division 41, *Law and Human Behavior*, increased its frequency of publication in 1990 from four to six times annually; and in 1995, the American Psychological Association began publishing a new association-sponsored journal, *Psychology, Public Policy, and the Law*.

Beginning in 1983, the American Psychology-Law Society began compiling copies of course syllabi used by professors in psychology and law courses. The first volume of the compilation provided relatively few syllabi, and those that were represented were rather mainstream (i.e., covering rather standard psychology and law topics). By 1994, the

third edition of the course syllabi included more than 50 syllabi, covering a broad range of topics, from overview courses in psychology and law to rather specific and diverse topics, such as civil law and psychology, mental health law, and social psychology and law. Most of the syllabi were from courses offered in psychology departments, but a few were from law school courses. Although the collection of syllabi was by no means representative or exhaustive, it did reflect an increase in the exposure of psychology and law in psychology departments, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

*Undergraduate education.* An indication of the increased exposure of psychology and law in the undergraduate curriculum emerges from the fact that some introductory textbooks in psychology now provide some coverage of psychology and law (e.g., Lahey, 1992; Smith, 1993). Similarly, mainstream psychology textbooks also offer coverage of psychology and law research. For example, recent undergraduate textbooks in social psychology (e.g., Aaronson, Wilson, & Akert, 1994; Baron & Byrne, 1994; Smith & Mackie, 1995), abnormal psychology (e.g., Holmes, 1994; Nevid, Rathus, & Greene, 1994), and psychological assessment (e.g., Aiken, 1994) all include extensive coverage of legal issues as they relate to the subject matter.

In addition to introducing students to the field of psychology and law in introductory and mainstream course textbooks, an increasing number of undergraduate college courses in psychology and law are being offered. There also has been an increase in the number of textbooks devoted to the area of psychology and law (e.g., Bartol & Bartol, 1994; Foley, 1993; Horowitz & Willging, 1984; Swenson, 1993; Wrightsman, Nietzel, & Fortune, 1994). It is important that, as a reflection of the market for psychology and law textbooks, Wrightsman et al.'s text now is in its third edition and Bartol and Bartol recently released their second edition.

*Graduate education.* An increased awareness of the area of psychology and law also has been observed at the graduate level (Freeman & Roesch, 1992; Tomkins & Ogloff, 1990). Although the areas of research and practice that fall within the realm of psychology and law have expanded (Ogloff, 1992), generally speaking, the growth of psychology and law has occurred in three areas. First, forensic clinical psychology

has developed as a subspecialty within clinical psychology, even offering diplomate certification by the American Board of Forensic Psychology (Kaslow, 1989; Otto et al., 1990). Growth within forensic psychology may be attributed to an increased awareness of (a) psychological factors contributing to criminal behavior and victimization and (b) psychological factors at the time of the offense, trial (e.g., competency to stand trial), and sentencing (e.g., Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Ogloff, Roberts, & Roesch, 1993; Roesch, Ogloff, & Golding, 1993). Increased attention also has been paid to psychological matters in civil forensic settings (e.g., custody and access evaluations; see Committee on Professional Practice and Standards, 1994). The second area of psychology and law that continues to grow deals with juries, jury selection, and jury decision making (Krivoshey, 1994). Finally, the area of eyewitness testimony, one of the foundation areas of psychology and law, has expanded to include the important-and controversial-topic of children's memories and children's competency to testify (Dent & Flin, 1992; Doris, 1991).

As with law school and undergraduate students, psychology and law information is likely to be most frequently transmitted to graduate students through their course work. Given the prevalence of research in psychology and law, and especially in the three areas noted above, students may well be assigned readings in these-and other-areas within psychology and law in their graduate courses. Also, students may choose to write term papers in their graduate courses on topics related to psychology and law.

In addition to the rather informal and unsystematic conveyance of psychology and law information in general graduate courses, many psychology departments have developed graduate courses in psychology and law. As discussed earlier, Grisso et al. (1982) found in 1979 that 23% of the psychology departments that responded to a survey indicated that their department offered one or more graduate courses in which half or more of the course content examined psycholegal issues. Although no more recent survey has been conducted in the United States, there is little doubt that the figure has remained at least the same and probably has grown. Regardless, it is safe to say that a significant portion of psychology departments offer graduate courses in some psychology and law topic.

#### SPECIALIZED AND JOINT DEGREE PSYCHOLOGY AND LAW PROGRAMS

A number of specialized and joint degree psychology and law programs have been developed that offer students interested in psychology and law a range of education opportunities. The appendix provides a list of the current formal training programs in psychology and law, including those that offer joint doctoral degrees in psychology and law.<sup>1</sup> There are three general types of specialized and joint degree programs: (a) joint degree programs, (b) Ph.D. programs with specialty training in psychology and law, and (c) Ph.D. forensic psychology programs.

*Joint degree programs.* As discussed previously, the first truly integrated, successful law and psychology program was initiated by Bruce Sales at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in 1974. Joint degree programs in psychology and law are characterized by offering graduates degrees in psychology (either the Ph.D. or M.A.) and law (either the J.D. or M.L.S.), and by having a distinct psychology and law curriculum apart from the traditional J.D. or Ph.D. curriculum: Not only are students able to receive simultaneous credits toward both degrees in a single course, but also at least some of these courses are ones that specifically examine psychology and law issues (Freeman & Roesch, 1992; Grisso, 1991; Grisso et al., 1982; Hafemeister et al., 1990; Melton, 1990; Roesch et al., 1986). Although the specific training goals of the programs may vary, they share the common goal of training scholars and practitioners interested in research and policy careers who will produce theoretically and methodologically sophisticated research integrating the psychology, law, and policy interface. It is believed that providing students with standard and complete training in law, in psychology, and in law and psychology, gives them an understanding and insight into the field of psychology and law that is comprehensive and unique.

Students in J.D./Ph.D. programs typically begin their graduate training by completing the entire standard first-year law school curriculum. Following that introductory year, however, students both take law school and psychology courses and begin their research. This model provides students with the true law school experience and allows them to interweave their psychology and law requirements to provide truly integrat-

ed training. Students in joint degree programs must complete all of the requirements for both degrees; however, the programs offer a limited number of integrated psychology and law courses (e.g., five) for which they receive credit toward both the psychology degree and the law degree. The integrated courses serve two ends: First, they provide students with insight into specific topics in the field of psychology and law. Second, they reduce the total number of credits necessary to complete the law degree and the psychology degree.

The specific integrated courses offered within the joint degree programs' curricula vary considerably; however, they follow a similar path. Students begin with a course that offers a broad overview of topics in psychology and law. Then, depending on the student's particular interests, or the focus of the program, students continue to complete courses that offer much more depth on more specific topics (e.g., research in jury decision making). Because requirements for the J.D. are generally based on the equivalent of 3 academic years of courses, and the Ph.D. requires courses, research, and, depending upon the program, practical training, students typically complete the requirements for the law degree before they complete the doctorate in psychology.

The primary strengths of the joint degree programs lie in the comprehensive knowledge and insight graduates obtain about (a) psychology and law, separately, and (b) the field of psychology and law. Some other advantages include: (a) raising students' awareness, on a continuous and ongoing basis, of questions in law that relate to psychology; (b) increasing the likelihood (as a result of jointly trained graduates' broad knowledge of the law) that they will identify and investigate areas of law that do not bear an obvious link to psychology; and (c) increasing the range of graduates' career options.

Despite the apparent advantages that may exist for students who complete joint degree programs, the programs also have a number of weaknesses:

1. Because students must complete *all* requirements for both the law degree and Ph.D., it takes many years for students to graduate; this leads to great personal cost for students and results in high attrition rates in the programs.

2. Because graduates of joint degree programs are not likely to do research or practice psychology in broad areas of law, the large number of law courses students are required to take may be unnecessary.
3. The focus of joint degree training programs may be too broad to adequately train academic psychologists for a research career in psychology.

As a result of some of these weaknesses, some programs now offer alternatives to the J.D./Ph.D. stream. For example, the Law/Psychology Program at the University of Nebraska offers students a variety of training options in psychology and law, including: (a) J.D./Ph.D. degrees, (b) J.D.1M.A. degrees, (c) Ph.D.1M.L.S. (Master of Legal Studies) degrees, (d) Ph.D. in forensic psychology, and (e) postdoctoral training. These options enable students to choose the exact type of degree combination that best suits their interests and needs. The Master of Legal Studies degree, currently available to psychology and law students at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and Stanford University, is a non-professional degree that allows students to take a number of law courses that are in line with their particular areas of interest.

*Ph.D. programs with specialty training in law and psychology.* For students who do not wish to pursue formal legal training, there now exist a number of specialized training programs that offer Ph.D. psychology students training in the field of psychology and law. Students in these programs concentrate on obtaining the Ph.D. in psychology, while taking law courses and integrated psychology and law courses to enhance their familiarity with the law. Graduates of these programs typically conduct research or policy work in specific areas of psychology and law.

The strength of the specialized Ph.D. programs is that they offer students training in psychology and law, without requiring them to complete a law degree. Students typically focus on an area within the field of psychology and law and develop research and analytical skills in that area. The requirements of these programs are less demanding than those of the joint degree programs, thereby enabling students to focus on developing a program of research in a specific area of psychology and law, without taking unnecessary law courses. The disadvantage may be that

although graduates have considerable familiarity with law, they cannot be considered as broadly knowledgeable about the law as is a person who has a law degree.

*Ph.D. forensic psychology programs.* Although particular programs may vary, the forensic psychology programs typically provide training to graduate students in clinical psychology who wish to specialize in forensic psychology (i.e., areas of psychology that relate to civil and criminal law). The goal of such programs is to ensure that psychologists who work in forensic areas have a sound understanding of law and a knowledge of specific forensic applications. To this end, forensic psychology is similar to other areas of specialization within clinical psychology (e.g., neuropsychology or clinical child psychology). These programs are particularly useful for researchers or practitioners who wish to become familiar with areas of forensic psychology and law, without actually completing law courses or obtaining a law degree.

*Summary of specialized and joint degree psychology and law programs.* It is clear that the various models of training in psychology and law that exist provide students with a number of different training options. Although there is little doubt that the joint degree programs offer graduates the greatest insight into the law, this may not be necessary for individuals, depending upon their individual interests and career goals. Students intending to secure research careers in psychology with specialized knowledge of psychology and law may be most interested in the specialized Ph.D. programs. Those interested in practicing clinical psychology in the forensic arena may find the forensic programs most suitable. However, students with broad interests in psychology and law, and a willingness to complete a law degree and Ph.D., are most likely to find a joint degree program most stimulating and rewarding.

#### FORENSIC INTERNSHIPS AND POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING

Graduate students in clinical psychology may find available a number of forensic internships that either offer rotations in forensic psychology or are devoted exclusively to forensic psychology. Be-

yond graduate programs and predoctoral internships, further training in forensic psychology and in psychology and law may be obtained by psychologists in postdoctoral training programs. Such opportunities are still somewhat limited. For example, the Law/Psychology Program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln offers postdoctoral training in psychology and law to people who hold a doctoral degree in psychology. Similarly, the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Massachusetts Medical Center offers postdoctoral fellowships in forensic psychology for those psychologists who have completed a predoctoral internship in clinical psychology.

#### BOARD CERTIFICATION, WORKSHOPS, AND CONTINUING EDUCATION IN PSYCHOLOGY

Like lawyers, psychologists in many jurisdictions are required to complete continuing education credits as part of licensing requirements. Therefore, there are many opportunities for psychologists to obtain training in forensic psychology and in psychology and law. In addition to completing workshops in forensic psychology merely to satisfy continuing education credits, or to satisfy a desire to obtain more knowledge about forensic psychology for professional purposes, those who are interested work toward diplomate certification in forensic psychology, an option offered by the American Board of Professional Psychology (Kaslow, 1989; Otto et al., 1990).

#### CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS

As discussed earlier, criminology and criminal justice grew out of interest psychologists and sociologists had in the criminal behavior of people (Bartol & Bartol, 1987; Sanford, 1890). By the end of the 1970s, the focus of most of the joint degree psychology and law programs had drifted away from criminal justice, and students wanting to work on criminal justice issues were well advised to pursue their training at such psychology and criminal justice programs as those available at the University of Alabama and John Jay College of Criminal Justice of the City University of New York (Brodsky, 1973; Gormally & Brodsky, 1973; Tapp, 1976, p. 368).

Contemporary undergraduate and graduate training programs in criminal justice have developed independently of psychology and, in many cases, sociology. There are now well over 1,000 programs offering undergraduate training in criminal justice in North America, and about 40 awarding graduate degrees (Wallace, 1990). The scope of topics covered in these programs varies widely from rather traditional courses focusing on criminal behavior to increasingly diverse topics, such as policing, feminist legal theory, and white-collar crime.

Unfortunately, there is no single directory of undergraduate or graduate training programs in criminology or criminal justice programs. Furthermore, little attention has been paid to this area in the literature. Wallace (1990) carefully reviewed the field, providing useful information for students and educators in those areas. In particular, Wallace argued that criminal justice is moving away from what he termed traditional *sociological criminology* to more interdisciplinary behavioral science approaches.

It is clear that some systematic focus on training in criminology and criminal justice is needed. Eight years ago, Muraskin (1987) edited a volume, *The Future of Criminal Justice Education: Looking Toward the 21st Century*. However, no more recent work in the area could be found.

#### SUMMARY

It would appear that training in psychology and law/criminal justice has increased dramatically over time. At present, law students, psychology students, lawyers, judges, and psychologists are quite likely exposed to information about psychology and law either through formal education, exposure to literature, or continuing education training. A variety of training opportunities now offer students programs with differing degrees of emphasis on law, psychology, and psychology and law. Furthermore, psychologists may obtain diplomate status in forensic psychology, or they may complete postdoctoral training in psychology and law. Given its rapid growth, however, it is important for those involved in developing and operating the training programs to evaluate carefully the goals and methods of training employed.

#### FUTURE ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

As we have seen, psychology and law/criminal justice training programs have had a brief but explosive and exciting history and are currently enjoying great popularity. Such popularity, however, may be short-lived. In fact, Melton (1991) wrote a rather somber President's Column in the newsletter of the American Psychology-Law Society in which he raised several very serious issues concerning the nature and direction of psychology and law as an interdisciplinary, jurisprudential, and research enterprise. His concerns were summarized as follows:

Although the potential of the field to offer important insights about law and human behavior is great, it is not clear to me that the field is advancing systematically toward such a goal. Stated most succinctly, I am not sure that the field of psychology and law is going anywhere. (p. 1)

One of his concerns involved education in psychology and law, particularly the strength and stability of graduate training programs.

Although Melton's concerns are not to be readily dismissed, some of his pessimism may seem anomalous in light of the remarkable developments in the field. That this article is appearing in the 20th anniversary issue of *Criminal Justice and Behavior* is just one supporting piece of data. Not much younger are *Law and Human Behavior* now in its 19th year, and *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, about to publish its 13th volume. Perhaps most significant, as we noted previously, is the initiation in 1995 of a new journal, *Psychology, Public Policy, and the Law*, sponsored by the American Psychological Association.

There have been a number of other important developments, as well. In 1979, APA (a) retained its first in-house general counsel, Donald Bersoff, separately trained in psychology and law and (b) formed the ad hoc Committee on Legal Issues (COLI) as a think tank to advise it on law-related problems. With the joint creation of an in-house counsel position and COLI, APA began to participate as a friend of the court (*amicus curiae*) in more than 60 cases in the U.S. Supreme Court and in lower federal and state courts. These cases involved issues germane to science, practice, and the public interest, and in several significant cases, there was demonstrable

evidence that what APA had to say through its amicus briefs influenced the courts' opinions.

In addition, as the two prior sections of this article have delineated, the last 20 years have seen the advent of a number of criminal justice programs at all levels of undergraduate and graduate training, as well as a number of well-regarded joint psychology and law programs. Only one of these programs has been discontinued; the rest continue to thrive under strong leadership and with a variety of subject matter foci.

These events clearly attest to the fact that the relationship between psychology and law/criminal justice has achieved remarkable development. It is surprising, then, that there has not yet been systematic scrutiny and extended public discussion of the training of future psycholegal scholars and practitioners. Aside from several articles that have been written about the growth of psychology and law, and the types of training programs that exist, there has been very little focus on evaluating, or even commenting on, the success of these programs. People debate the relative merit of joint degree programs but have no concrete evidence to support their positions. Hafemeister et al. (1990) provide information about the perceptions that graduates of joint degree psychology and law programs have about the relative merit of their training. However, no research has systematically compared career paths of graduates of joint degree programs with those of graduates of mainstream psychology programs who have research interests in psychology and law. Little, if any, current research has evaluated the impact of the growth of psychology and law on the law generally (cf. Hafemeister & Melton, 1987; Melton, 1987b).

A glance at objective evidence raises questions about the impact of the joint degree programs on the field of psychology and law. It is interesting to note that not one past president of APLS, not one director of a joint program, not one member of COLI, and not one member of the APA Board of Directors<sup>2</sup> has graduated from a joint degree program, even though the programs have been in existence for over 20 years. Perhaps this is because the joint degree programs take considerable time for students to complete, and the types of positions noted above typically are filled by senior colleagues. It will be interesting to see what the situation will be like in the next 10-15 years. Even less is known about the impact, and relative merit, of the specialized Ph.D. and forensic psychology training programs. Finally, virtually

nothing is known about the number and characteristics of undergraduate and graduate programs in criminal justice.

A steering committee appointed by APLS and the APA Education Directorate planned the National Invitational Conference on Education and Training in Law and Psychology, which was held at Villanova Law School from May 26 to 28, 1995, with about 50 participants. Its overarching purpose was to develop an agenda for psychology and law training into the 21st century, much the way the famous Boulder Conference of 1949 (Blank & David, 1964; Raimy, 1950) set the course for clinical psychology training for the remainder of the 20th century. More specifically, the conference looked at education and training in psycholegal studies at all levels—undergraduate, graduate (including single and dual degree programs), practicum experiences, internship settings, post-doctoral programs, and continuing education opportunities. In addition, and perhaps as important, the conference considered methods for recruiting students in psychology and law and criminal justice programs from presently underrepresented groups.

Participants dealt with the following, nonexhaustive list of questions:

1. Is there a real societal need for graduates trained in forensic clinical psychology, mental health policy, criminal justice, and psycholegal research?
2. Should the field be doing more at the undergraduate level to teach about law, criminal justice, and the social sciences and to stimulate future researchers, academicians, and practitioners to join the field?
3. What are the key elements of training required at the graduate level, for example, joint or dual degree programs and specialized master's or Ph.D. programs?
4. Are there common curricular requirements that joint degree programs, and other programs in law in psychology, should develop?
5. What kinds of positions are graduates from graduate programs in psychology and law obtaining? Are they at a competitive advantage or disadvantage in comparison to their counterparts from more traditional degree programs?
6. Is there a role for the accreditation of graduate programs offering training in criminal justice and joint and/or single degree programs in psychology and law?
7. How can the field generate enough financial support at the federal level for student stipends and research grants so that graduates, particularly from lengthy joint programs (6 to 7 years in duration), are not com-

pelled to work in settings (such as large law firms) simply to pay off debts accumulated during years of expensive education?

8. Are there enough settings in which forensically oriented students can get pre-and postdoctoral supervised experience in relevant and qualified settings?
9. How can the field enhance the legal sophistication of more generically trained psychologists, for example, through continuing education or master's degrees in law?
10. Conversely, how can the field enhance the sophistication of law students, lawyers, and the judiciary about social science methodology and pertinent research findings?

Products from the conference include a forthcoming article in the *American Psychologist*, as well as a book to be published by APA. We believe unreservedly that the development of the field must be subjected to close and systematic scrutiny and in a particularized and planned manner. The contributions of its adherents in the past 25 years have been of singular importance, but it is time to organize the future of education and training so that we can plan meaningfully for the next 25 years.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Although the extent to which training in psychology and law/criminal justice has affected the legal system is unclear, it is safe to say that our foothold in the door of the law is more firmly placed than Munsterberg's first attempt earlier this century. We believe that it is important to continue offering joint degree programs. Such programs are intended for those students who desire a broad-based education in law, psychology, and the intersection of the two areas. It is possible for a psychologist with an interest in a specific area of law to become expert in that area, and, conversely, for a lawyer with an interest in a particular area in psychology to become expert in that area; however, such approaches never can produce the true understanding and familiarity of both areas that is possible only by completing one's education in both professions. Programs with other emphases may complement the joint degree programs by offering more specialized training to students with interests in pursuing research in a particular area of psy-

chology and law, or those interested in practicing or doing research in forensic clinical psychology.

We recognize the fact that, for psychology and law to survive and flourish as an independent field, it is important that psychological information (research and related information) find its way into the legal system, preferably beginning by introducing law students to psychological articles as part of their training. Research is desperately needed to investigate the extent to which the psychology and law movement has or has not had an impact on contributing to the development of, or even changing legal policy.

Although this article offers considerable information concerning the development and current availability of training opportunities in psychology and law, research is needed to address a number of important questions. For example, the questions that would help develop training programs in psychology and law include: (a) What is the current extent of undergraduate and graduate courses/programs in psychology and law currently? (b) What are the job opportunities available to graduates of programs specializing in psychology and law? (c) What is the extent to which psychological research is actually making its way into the law school curriculum? and (d) How valuable, or necessary, do educators and practitioners/researchers in psychology and in law believe that psychology and law training is?

Furthermore, as we have discussed in this article, a number of important questions need to be addressed concerning methods of training in psychology and law, and the effectiveness of the various approaches that are available. Attention also is required to provide systematic information about the availability and nature of undergraduate and graduate criminal justice programs. Indeed, as we have noted in this article, the range of programs is great, although there is relatively little systematic information about them.

In closing, it is promising to reflect upon the interest and excitement that still exist in the areas of psychology and law/criminal justice. These areas have developed rapidly, and the quality of work in them continues to become more sophisticated and address numerous vital topics; in addition to their intrinsically interesting nature, these topics also provide important and insightful information to society about the significance of social science in law. The National Invitational Conference on Education and Training in Law and Psychology was a unique forum for exploring a number of is-

sues raised in this article. Only with constant consideration of the needs and effects of training, can we ensure that psychology and law/criminal justice remains a viable and vibrant field.

## APPENDIX

### Training Programs in Psychology and Law

#### J.D./Ph.D. Programs<sup>3</sup>

Dr. Bruce Sales  
University of Arizona  
Law and Psychology Program  
Department of Psychology  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ 85721

Dr. Donald N. Bersoff  
Law and Psychology Program  
Hahnemann University  
Broad and Vine  
Mailstop 626  
Philadelphia, PA 19102-1192

Dr. Steven Penrod  
Law/Psychology Program  
209 Burnett Hall  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Lincoln, NE 68588-0308

Dr. David L. Rosenhan  
Department of Psychology  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305-2130

#### J.D./Psy.D. Programs

Dr. Amiram Elwork  
Law-Psychology Program  
Institute for Graduate Clinical  
Widener University  
Chester, PA 19013-5792

#### J.D./M.A. Programs<sup>4</sup>

Dr. Harry Gollob  
Department of Psychology

2155 South Race Street  
University of Denver  
Denver, CO 80208

#### Ph.D. Programs

Dr. Gary Moran  
Department of Psychology  
University Park Campus  
Florida International University  
Miami, FL 33199

Dr. Lawrence S. Wrightsman  
Department of Psychology  
426 Fraser Hall  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66045

Dr. Murray Levine  
Department of Psychology  
SUNY at Buffalo  
Buffalo, NY 14260

Dr. James Ogloff<sup>5</sup>  
Graduate Program in Law and Psychology  
Department of Psychology  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby, BC Canada V5A 1S6

#### Ph.D. Forensic Psychology

Dr. Stan Brodsky  
Department of Psychology  
University of Alabama  
Box 870348  
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0348

Dr. Robert D. Hare  
Department of Psychology

## APPENDIX (Continues)

University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, BC Canada V6T 1Z4

Dr. Vern Quinsey  
Department of Psychology  
Queen's University  
Kingston, Ontario  
Canada K7L 3N6

#### M.A. Programs

Professor James Wulach  
Forensic Psychology Department

John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
445 West 59th Street  
New York, NY 10019

Dr. D. M. Thomson  
Department of Psychology  
Monash University  
Clayton, Victoria  
Australia 3168

## NOTES

1. The information in the appendix was obtained from the brochure, "Graduate Training Programs in Law and Psychology." The information was provided in response to repeated requests in the American Psychology-Law Society Newsletter announcing that the brochure was being developed. Therefore, other programs may exist that offer graduate training in law and psychology.
2. At the time of writing, James Ogloff, a graduate of the joint degree program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, is a member of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Psychological Association.
3. Although there is no formal J.D./Ph.D. Program at the university of Minnesota, there are faculty in both the law school and psychology departments who have an interest in psychology and collaborate with one another and with graduate students. Contact: Dr. Steven Penrod, Law School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.
4. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln also offers training leading to the J.D./M.A. combination.
5. The Graduate Program in Law and Psychology at Simon Fraser University offers training in both experimental law and psychology and clinical-forensic psychology.

## REFERENCES

- Aaronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (1994). *Social psychology: The heart and the mind*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Abt, L. E., & Stuart, I. R. (Eds.). (1979). *Social psychology and discretionary law*. New York: Von Nostrand Reinhold.
- Aiken, L. R. (1994). *Psychological testing and assessment* (8th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1994). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Appendix to Appellants' Brief in the *School Segregation Cases*, The effects of segregation and the consequences of desegregation: A social science statement. (1953). *Minnesota Law Review*, 37, 427-439. (Reprinted from Appendix to Appellants' Brief, *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 [1954])
- Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (1994). *Social psychology: Understanding human interaction*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bartol, C. R. (1980). *Criminal behavior: A psychosocial approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bartol, C. R., & Bartol, A. M. (1987). History of forensic psychology. In I. D. Weiner & A. K. Hess (Eds.), *Handbook of forensic psychology* (pp. 3-21). New York: John Wiley.
- Bartol, C. R., & Bartol, A. M. (1994). *Psychology and law: Research and application*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Bazelon, D. L. (1982). Veils, values, and social responsibility. *American Psychologist*, 37, 115-121.
- Bermant, G., Nemeth, C., & Vidmar, N. (Eds.). (1976). *Psychology and the law*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Blank, L., & David, H. P. (1964). *Sourcebook for training in clinical psychology*. New York: Springer.
- Bok, D. (1983). A flawed system of law practice and training. *Journal of Legal Education*, 33, 570-585.
- Bolton, F. E. (1896). The accuracy of recollection and observation. *Psychological Review*, 3, 286-295.
- Boring, E. G. (1950). *A history of experimental psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Brodsky, S. L. (1973). *Psychologists in the criminal justice system*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Brodsky, S. L. (1977). Psychology at the interface of law and corrections. *Law and Psychology Review*, 3, 1-14.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Cahan, E. D., & White, S. H. (1992). Proposals for a second psychology. *American Psychologist*, 47, 224-235.
- Cahn, E. (1955). Jurisprudence. *New York University Law Review*, 30, 150-169.
- Cairns, H. (1935). *Law and the social sciences*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Cattell, J. M. (1895). Measurements of the accuracy of recollection. *Science*, 2, 761-766.
- Cattell, J. M. (1896). Address of the president before the American Psychological Association. *Psychological Review*, 3, 134-148.
- Clark, K. B. (1963). *Prejudice and your child* (2nd ed.). Boston: Beacon Press. (Reprinted from *Effect of prejudice and discrimination on personality development*, 1950, Washington, DC: White House Conference on Children and Youth)
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1958). Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 602-611). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. (Original work published 1947)
- Cohn, A., & Udolf, R. (1979). *The criminal justice system and its psychology*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

- Committee on Professional Practice and Standards. (1994). Guidelines for child custody evaluations in divorce proceedings. *American Psychologist*, 49, 677-680.
- Dent, H., & Flin, R. H. (Eds.). (1992). *Children as witnesses*. New York: John Wiley.
- Doris, J. (Ed.). (1991). *The suggestibility of children's recollections*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ellison, K. W., & Buckhout, R. (1981). *Psychology and criminal justice*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Fenster, C. A., Litwack, T. R., & Symonds, M. (1975). The making of a forensic psychologist: Needs and goals for doctoral training. *Professional Psychology*, 6, 457-467.
- Foley, L. A. (1993). *A psychological view of the legal system*. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Foote, C. (1958). The Law and Behavioral Science Project at the University of Pennsylvania: Family and criminal law. *Journal of Legal Education*, 11, 80-86.
- Freeman, R. J., & Roesch, R. (1992). Psycholegal education: Training for forum and function. In D. K. Kagehiro & W. S. Laufer (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology and law* (pp. 567-576). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Friedman, L. M. (1985). *A history of American law* (2nd ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Getman, J. G. (1985). Contributions of empirical data to legal education. *Journal of Legal Education*, 35, 489-494.
- Gormally, J., & Brodsky, S. L. (1973). Utilization and training of psychologists in the criminal justice system. *American Psychologist*, 28, 926-928.
- Grisso, T. (1987). The economic and scientific future of forensic psychology assessment. *American Psychologist*, 42, 831-839.
- Grisso, T. (1991). A developmental history of the American Psychology-Law Society. *Law and Human Behavior*, 15, 213-230.
- Grisso, T., Sales, B. D., & Bayless, S. (1982). Law-related courses and programs in graduate psychology departments. *American Psychologist*, 37, 267-278.
- Hafemeister, T. L., & Melton, G. B. (1987). The impact of social science research on the judiciary. In G. B. Melton (Ed.), *Reforming the law: Impact of child development research* (pp. 27-59). New York: Guilford.
- Hafemeister, T. L., Ogloff, J. R. P., & Small, M. A. (1990). Training and careers in law and psychology: The perspective of students and graduates of dual degree programs. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 8, 263-284.
- Hale, M. (1980). *Human science and social order: Hugo Munsterberg and origins of applied psychology*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Heilbrun, K., & Annis, L. (1988). Research and training in forensic psychology: National survey of forensic facilities. *Professional Psychology*, 19, 211-215.
- Hoch, E. L., & Darley, J. G. (1962). A case at law. *American Psychologist*, 17, 623-654.
- Holmes, D. S. (1994). *Abnormal psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Horowitz, I. A., & Willging, T. E. (1984). *The psychology of law: Integrations and applications*. Toronto, Canada: Little, Brown.
- Jenkins v. United States, 307 F.2d 637 (D.C. Cir. 1962) (en banc).
- Kalman, L. (1986). *Legal realism at Yale, 1927-1960*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Kalven, H., Jr. (1948). Law school training in research and exposition: The University of Chicago program. *Journal of Legal Education*, 1, 107-123.

- Kaslow, F. (1989). Early history of the American Board of Forensic Psychology. *Forensic Reports*, 2, 305-311.
- Kaye, D. (1985). Please pass the social science. *Journal of Legal Education*, 35,495-506.
- Kluger, R. (1976). *Simple justice: The history of Brown v. Board of Education and Black America? Struggle for equality*. New York: Knopf.
- Krivoshay, R. M. (1994). *Juries: Formation and behavior*. New York: Garland.
- Kunke, M. I. (1980). Forensic psychology: A threat and a response. *Professional Psychology*, 11, 72-77.
- Lahey, B. B. (1992). *Psychology: An introduction* (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Laswell, H., & McDougal, M. (1943). Legal education and public policy: Professional teaching in the public interest. *Yale Law Journal*, 52, 203-295.
- Lawlor, R. J., Siskind, G., & Brooks, J. (1981). Forensic training at internships: Update and criticisms. *Professional Psychology*, 12,400-405.
- Levin, A. L. (1958). The Law and Behavioral Science Project at the University of Pennsylvania: Evidence. *Journal of Legal Education*, 11, 87-93.
- Levine, D., Wilson, K., & Sales, B. D. (1980). An exploratory assessment of APA internships with legal forensic experiences. *Professional Psychology*, 11,64-7 1.
- Loftus, E. (1979). *Eyewitness testimony*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Loh, W. D. (1981). Perspectives on psychology and law. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 11, 314-355.
- Loh, W. D. (1984). *Social research in the judicial process: Cases, readings and text*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Louisell, D. W. (1955). The psychologist in today's legal world: Part I. *Minnesota Law Review*, 39, 235-260.
- Louisell, D. W. (1957). The psychologist in today's legal world: Part II. *Minnesota Law Review*, 41,731-750.
- McCrary, J. L. (1956). The psychologist as an expert witness in court. *American Psychologist*, 11, 8-13.
- Meadows, R. J. (1987). Beliefs of law enforcement administrators and criminal justice educators toward the needed skill competencies in entry-level police training curriculum. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 15, 1-9.
- Melton, G. B. (1987a). Guidelines for effective diffusion of child development research in the legal system. In G. B. Melton (Ed.), *Reforming the law: Impact of child development research* (pp. 280-300). New York: Guilford.
- Melton, G. B. (Ed.). (1987b). *Reforming the law: Impact of child development research*. New York: Guilford.
- Melton, G. B. (1987c) Training in psychology and law. In I. D. Weiner & A. K. Hess (Eds.), *Handbook of forensic psychology* (pp. 681-697). New York: John Wiley.
- Melton, G. B. (1990). Realism in psychology and humanism in law: Psycholegal studies at Nebraska. *Nebraska Law Review*, 69, 251-277.
- Melton, G. B. (1991). President's column. *American Psychology Law Society News*, 11(2), 1-3.
- Melton, G. B., Monahan, J., & Saks, M. J. (1987). Psychologists as law professors. *American Psychologist*, 42, 502-509.
- Monahan, J. (Ed.). (1976). *Community mental health and the criminal justice system*. New York: Pergamon.

- Monahan, J. (1986). Slouching towards crime. *Yale Law Journal*, 85, 1536-1551.
- Monahan, J., & Loftus, E. F. (1982). The psychology of law. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 441-475.
- Monahan, J., & Walker, L. (1985). *Social science in law: Cases and materials*. Mineola, NY: Foundation Press.
- Moore, C. (1907). Yellow psychology. *Law Notes*, 11, 125-127.
- Morawski, J. G. (1992). There is more to our history of giving: The place of introductory textbooks in American psychology. *American Psychologist*, 47, 161-169.
- Moskowitz, M. J. (1977). Hugo Munsterberg: A study in the history of applied psychology. *American Psychologist*, 32, 824-842.
- Munsterberg, H. (1908). *On the witness stand: Essays on psychology and crime*. New York: Doubleday, Page.
- Muraskin, R. (Ed.). (1987). *The future of criminal justice education: Looking toward the 21st century*. Available from the editor, Long Island University, Brookville, NY.
- Nevid, J. S., Rathus, S. A., & Greene, B. (1994). *Abnormal psychology in a challenging world* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Nietzel, M. T., & Moss, C. S. (1972). The psychologist in the criminal justice system. *Professional Psychology*, 3, 259-270.
- Oglloff, J. R. P., (1990). Law and psychology in Canada: The need for training and research. *Canadian Psychology*, 31, 61-73.
- Oglloff, J. R. P. (Ed.). (1992). *Law and psychology: The broadening of the discipline*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Oglloff, J. R. P., Roberts, C. F., & Roesch, R. (1993). The insanity defense: Legal standards and clinical assessment. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 2, 163-178.
- Otto, R. K., Heilbrun, K., & Grisso, T. (1990). Training and credentialing in forensic psychology. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 8,217-232.
- Perlin, M. L. (1977). The legal status of the psychologist in the courtroom. *Journal of Psychiatry and Law*, 5,41-54.
- Poythress, N. G. (1979). A proposal for training in forensic psychology. *American Psychologist*, 34,612-621.
- Priest, G. L. (1983). Social science theory and legal education: The law school as university. *Journal of Legal Education*, 33,437-441.
- Purcell, E. A., Jr. (1973). *The crisis of democratic theory: Scientific naturalism and the problem of value*. Louisville: University Press of Kentucky.
- Raimy, V. C. (1950). *Training in clinical psychology*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Roesch, R. (1990). From the editor. *Law and Human Behavior*, 14, 1-3.
- Roesch, R., Grisso, T., & Poythress, N. G. (1986). Training programs, courses, and workshops in psychology and law. In M. F. Kaplan (Ed.), *The impact of social psychology on procedural justice* (pp. 83-108). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Roesch, R., Oglloff, J. R. P., & Golding, S. L. (1993). Competency to stand trial: Legal and clinical issues. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 2,43-51.
- Saks, M. J., & Hastie, R. (1978). *Social psychology in court*. New York: Von Nostrand Reinhold.
- Sales, B. D. (1977a). *The criminal justice system*. New York: Plenum.
- Sales, B. D. (1977b). *Psychology in the legal process*. New York: Spectrum.

- Sanford, E. C. (1890). Psychology at Clark University. *American Journal of Psychology*, 3, 284-285.
- Schlegel, J. H. (1979). American legal realism and empirical social science: From the Yale experience. *Buffalo Law Review*, 28, 459-586.
- Schlegel, J. H. (1980). American legal realism and empirical social science: The singular case of Underhill Moore. *Buffalo Law Review*, 29, 195-323.
- Schlegel, J. H. (1989). The ten thousand dollar question [Book review of Laura Kalman, *Legal Realism at Yale: 1927-1960*]. *Stanford Law Review*, 41, 435-467.
- Schofield, W. (1956). Law, psychology, and the expert witness. *American Psychologist*, 11, 1-7.
- Sherman, L. W. (1978). *The quality of police education: A critical review with recommendations for improving program in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. (1995). *Social psychology*. New York: Worth.
- Smith, R. E. (1993). *Psychology*. St. Paul, MN: West.
- Stern, W. (1910). Abstracts of lectures on the psychology of testimony. *American Journal of Psychology*, 21, 273-282.
- Stern, W. (1939). The psychology of testimony. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 34, 3-20.
- Stevens, R. (1983). *Law school: Legal education in America from the 1850s to the 1890s*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Swenson, L. C. (1993). *Psychology and law for the helping professions*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tapp, J. L. (1976). Psychology and the law: An overview. *Annual Review of Psychology* 27, 359-404.
- Tapp, J. L. (1977). Psychology and law: A look at the interface. In B. D. Sales (Ed.), *Psychology in the legal process* (pp. 1-15). New York: Spectrum.
- Tapp, J. L., & Levine, F. J. (Eds.). (1977a). *Law, justice, and the individual in society: Psychological and legal issues*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Tapp, J. L., & Levine, E. J. (1977b). Reflections and redirections. In J. L. Tapp & F. J. Levine (Eds.), *Law, justice and the individual in society: Psychological and legal issues* (pp. 3-9). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Teitelbaum, L. E. (1985). An overview of law and social science research. *Journal of Legal Education*, 35, 465-477.
- Toch, H. (Ed.). (1961). *Legal and criminal psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Tomkins, A. J. (Ed.). (1990). Training and career options [Special issue]. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 8, 193-300.
- Tomkins, A. J., & Oglloff, J. R. P. (1990). Training and career options in psychology and law. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 8, 205-216.
- Tomkins, A. J., & Oursland, K. (1991). *Social and social scientific perspectives in judicial interpretations of the Constitution: A historical view and an overview*, *Law and Human Behavior*, 15, 101-120.
- Trubek, D. M., & Plager, S. (1985). The place of law and social science in the structure of legal education. *Journal of Legal Education*, 35, 483-488.
- Twining, W. (1973). *Karl Llewellyn and the realist movement*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

- Twining, W. (1985). Talk about realism. *New York University Law Review*, 60, 329-384.
- van den Haag, E. (1960). Social science testimony in the desegregation cases: A reply to Professor Kenneth Clark. *Villanova Law Review*, 6, 69-79.
- Wallace, D. H. (1990). Training in law and behavioral sciences: Issues from the criminal justice perspective. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 8, 249-262.
- Wallace, D. H. (1991). Social science research and policy in education: An interdisciplinary approach. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 2, 219-237.
- Ward, R. H., & Webb, V. J. (1985). *Quest for quality*. New York: University Publications.
- Wexler, D. B. (1990). Training in law and behavioral sciences: Issues from a legal educator's perspective. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 8, 197-204.
- Whipple, G. M. (1909). The observer as a reporter: A survey of the "psychology of testimony." *Psychological Bulletin*, 6, 153-170.
- Whipple, G. M. (1917). Psychology of testimony. *Psychological Bulletin*, 14, 234-236.
- White, G. E. (1972). From sociological jurisprudence to realism: Jurisprudence and social change in early twentieth-century America. *Virginia Law Review*, 58, 999-1028.
- White, G. E. (1976). *The American judicial tradition: Profiles of leading American judges*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wigmore, J. H. (1909). Professor Munsterberg and the psychology of testimony: Being a report of the case of *Cokestone v. Munsterberg*. *Illinois Law Review*, 3, 399-445.
- Woodworth, R. S. (1943). The adolescence of American psychology. *Psychological Review*, 50, 10-32.
- Wrightsmann, L. S., Nietzel, M. T., & Fortune, W. H. (1994). *Psychology and the legal system* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.