

# **Careers in Psychology and the Law: A Guide for Prospective Students**

September 2004

A Publication of the Careers and Training Committee,  
American Psychology-Law Society,  
APA Division 41

Authors of the current version of this document include (in alphabetical order): Bette Bottoms, Mark Costanzo, Edie Greene, Allison Redlich, Jennifer Woolard, and Patricia Zapf. Former authors, to whom the current authors are indebted, include Kirk Heilbrun and Randy Otto.

## Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Overview of Psychology and the Law.....	3
Subspecialties.....	3
Licensure and certification.....	5
Salaries and compensation.....	5
Employment opportunities and demand for the specialty.....	7
Subspecialties in Psychology and Law: A Closer Look.....	7
Clinical and Forensic Psychology.....	7
Developmental Psychology.....	10
Social and Cognitive Psychology.....	12
Community Psychology.....	14
Training Opportunities in Psychology and Law.....	15
Postgraduate.....	16
Publications in psychology and law training.....	16
Biographies of Psychology and Law Professionals.....	17
Forensic/Clinical.....	17
Policy-Relevant.....	19
Trial Consultation.....	20
Non-Academic Research.....	22
Academic—Liberal Arts/Undergraduate.....	24
Academic—Graduate, Developmental Psychology.....	27
Academic—Graduate, Social Psychology.....	30
Academic—Graduate, Cognitive Psychology.....	32
Academic—Graduate, Community Psychology.....	34
Academic—Law School.....	37

## ***OVERVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY AND THE LAW***

The field of psychology and law involves the application of scientific and professional aspects of psychology to questions and issues relating to law and the legal system. There are a number of specialties that psychologists may pursue within the larger area of psychology and law. This field encompasses contributions made in a number of different areas--research, clinical practice, public policy, and teaching/training among them--from a variety of orientations within the field of psychology, such as developmental, social, cognitive, and clinical.

While mental health professionals and behavioral scientists have been involved with the legal system in a variety of ways for many years, the decade of the 1970s witnessed the beginning of more formalized interactions. These interactions included the establishment of the first psychology-law program at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, the formation of the American Psychology-Law Society (now Division 41 of the American Psychological Association), the initiation of an interdisciplinary journal (*Law and Human Behavior*) and a book series (*Perspectives in Law & Psychology*). Additionally, the American Board of Forensic Psychology was established in 1978 for the credentialing of psychologists specializing in forensic issues. Since that time the field has grown steadily, with an increased number of pre-doctoral and post-doctoral training programs, more journals and books devoted to psychology and law, the development of a specialized set of ethical guidelines for forensic psychologists, a regular conference held every March in addition to the annual summer meeting at the American Psychological Association convention, the involvement of psychologists in filing amicus briefs before the U.S. Supreme Court on issues relevant to psychology and law, and the presentation of a regular workshop series in clinical-forensic psychology by the American Academy of Forensic Psychology.

### ***Subspecialties***

**Clinical-forensic psychologists** who are primarily interested in forensic practice may work in secure forensic units, community mental health centers providing specialized services, jails, prisons, court services units, specialized agencies, or in private practice conducting forensic assessment and treatment relevant to legal decision-making. They may also be involved in teaching, training, or supervision in a department of psychology, a medical school, a hospital, an interdisciplinary institute, or a clinic. Such professionals may also be involved in conducting research and scholarship in areas such as violence risk assessment, treatment needs and response, and decision-making strategies.

**Developmental psychologists** also tend to be based in academic, medical, and professional school settings. They often become involved in legally relevant research and consultation with children and adolescents. There are important questions regarding the testimony of children (accuracy and

influences, for example), the knowledge and decision-making of adolescents involved in the juvenile justice system, and the needs of children and families involved in divorce or separation that are among the areas addressed by the research and consultation of developmental psychologists. In addition, such psychologists may become active in attempting to develop policy regarding children and families in the forms of federal and state legislation, or the implementation of such law on the community level.

**Social psychologists** are more likely to work in academic positions, such as psychology departments, medical schools, schools of criminal justice, or research and policy institutes. Frequently such individuals are very active in research, graduate training, and undergraduate teaching. They may also be involved in consulting with attorneys, courts, and agencies on issues relevant to their research in legal areas; examples include witness credibility, jury selection, and decision-making influences. Some non-university-based social psychologists work as consultants on a full-time basis, providing services to trial attorneys, while others may be employed by state or federal agencies (e.g. corrections, mental health) to conduct relevant research.

**Cognitive psychologists** are trained primarily as researchers and teachers in the areas of human perception and memory, and tend to focus their research and consultation on such legally-relevant questions as eyewitness identification, the accuracy of memory, and the detection of deception. Their employment settings are typically university-based. Their research can be extremely important when courts must weigh testimony about events that may have occurred months or even years ago. Providing the results of such research to courts and legislators by summarizing the "state of science" on a given question is a task of some cognitive psychologists. Recently, cognitive psychologists have begun to work with law enforcement agencies to develop investigative procedures to enhance the likelihood of accurate memory and testimony about crimes and accidents.

**Community psychologists** are likely to work in academia as well as out in the community. Community positions include working in government agencies, non-profit agencies, foundations, and community-based advocacy and service settings. For community psychologists who conduct law-related research, activities can span the range of policy and law formulation, implementation, evaluation, and change. For example, they might design and evaluate juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment programs, research adolescents' competence to participate in legal proceedings, investigate the impact of court involvement on the functioning of crime victims, or evaluate the effects of health care and welfare reform.

Finally, some psychologists receive more extensive training in law and obtain a J.D. (Juris Doctorate) or M.L.S. (Master of Legal Studies) in addition to their training in psychology. Such individuals may become involved in legal scholarship in areas of law relevant to the behavioral sciences, and may work in law schools as well as in other academic or applied settings described above. In addition

to law teaching and scholarship, such individuals may become involved in psychological research or practice (depending on their specialization within psychology), or legal practice as an attorney.

### ***Licensure and Certification***

For psychologists who are primarily researchers, educators, consultants to courts, and policy-makers, licensure or certification is usually not necessary. While such licensure might occasionally enhance the credibility of a psychologist before an individual court, many psychological scientists do not need to obtain licensure or certification status as a psychologist. It is accurate to describe them as experts on the empirical evidence relevant to a specific question. It is not accurate to describe them as delivering a diagnostic or forensic assessment service on a given individual, which is more closely related to the kind of "health care" service for which a license would be important. However, psychological scientists need to be well trained in their basic area of specialization, as well as familiar with the law (particularly the applicable statutes, case law, rules of evidence, and general expectations in the legal context) in order to be effective in consultation and testimony. They must also be knowledgeable about the law when conducting their research, so they can design studies and use variables to address questions that are particularly important and relevant to the law.

For psychologists whose practice tends to be with individuals, and involves the delivery of forensic assessment or treatment services, several levels of training and licensure/certification are important. First, it is important that such individuals be trained in the delivery of applied services (e.g., clinical, counseling, or school psychology) to individuals, groups, and families. Second, it is necessary to be trained specifically in the delivery of forensic services; such training should involve supervised experience and didactic work, and should also incorporate information about the legal system, applicable law and procedures, and standards and guidelines for forensic practice. Third, such psychologists should become licensed in the jurisdictions in which they practice. Finally, for psychologists wishing to specialize in the area of clinical-forensic practice, it is helpful to become board certified by the American Board of Forensic Psychology, a specialty board of the American Board of Professional Psychology.

### ***Salaries and Compensation***

Salaries for psychologists can vary according to the setting and nature of the work. In academic settings, the salary for a beginning assistant professor in 2005 might initially be in the \$40,000-\$58,000 range in Departments of Psychology. Why the wide range? There are many complicating factors, including whether institutions are private or public, whether they offer doctoral degrees, masters degrees, or only bachelors degrees, whether they are located in states with strong economies, etc. But generally, salaries will be somewhat higher at large research intensive universities as compared with smaller

teaching-oriented colleges. Salaries in medical school settings are typically somewhat higher, as they are established in comparison with medical professionals. Medical school positions, however, are very often limited in terms of the "hard money" they pay, meaning that an individual joining a Department of Psychiatry as an assistant professor might be expected to "earn" between 50-100% of his or her salary by obtaining grants, contracts, or through clinical services income. Even in university and other interdisciplinary settings, however, there is growing pressure on psychologists to generate sources of salary support to repay the department or school. Note that many academic psychologists are on an institution's payroll for only the academic year (9 or 10 months), and some supplement their income by paying themselves additional summer salary from research grants, private consulting, etc.

Salaries also vary in applied settings. Psychologists entering correctional settings will find striking differences between different systems. The median annual salary in the Federal prison system was \$40,900 in 2002. Salaries are likely to be slightly lower in a state correctional facility or local jail, although there can be a wide range of salary levels. Privately owned facilities compensate at much lower rates (e.g., in 2002, the median annual salary was \$21,390). There may also be discrepancies according to the level of training; some correctional facilities will seek to hire masters-level psychologists at salaries that may begin between \$25,000 - \$30,000 rather than doctoral-level psychologists, to whom they might be expected to pay about \$10,000 more.

There is variability as well in starting salaries in hospitals and community agencies. Currently, a starting salary for a doctoral-level psychologist will be between \$35,000 and \$40,000 in most settings. Occasionally it may be less, particularly in more rural settings, and salaries may be greater in some states and urban settings.

Some psychologists should expect to see their salaries increase at a rate roughly consistent with inflation (i.e., 3% a year), although this may not occur in universities or organizations experiencing financial difficulties. Generally a good rule of thumb is to determine the cost of living adjustments paid to staff of a particular organization during the last five years, in assessing the prospects for the next five. Psychologists also have the advantage of being able to establish a part-time practice or consulting business in addition to working with an organization or at a university. For example, clinical psychologists might see patients or do evaluations for courts. Experimental cognitive or social psychologists might occasionally consult on legal cases and/or give expert testimony in court cases. Some organizations and most universities have rules governing this, so it is important to know whether this is permissible. Part-time private practice does allow a psychologist to earn income at an hourly rate consistent with that charged by others in the field and geographic area. Such rates may vary a good deal (e.g., between \$100/hour and \$300/hour). Obtaining work at private rates is typically dependent on the psychologist's reputation, as well as the amount of private forensic work that is available in a given area.

For more information on salaries, please go to the Bureau of Labor Statistics website (<http://www.bls.gov/oco/>).

### ***Employment Opportunities and Demand for the Specialty***

Forensic psychology, and the larger area of psychology and law, have both enjoyed steady growth during the last three decades. The field has not been affected by the changes in our health care system to nearly the same extent as the "fee for service" delivery of psychological services in other areas. Research, consultation, and practice in areas of psychology relevant to the law should continue to expand over the next ten years. It is important to note, however, that while the need for services has remained constant or expanded, there is increased effort within psychology to provide relevant training, important research, and guidelines for the practice that should mean that those specializing in this area will be among the highest in demand for the delivery of services to courts, attorneys, and law-makers.

Psychology and law has also grown steadily within academic areas. Although some programs are specifically devoted to this specialty, it is more common to find faculties with one or two members who are interested in some aspect of psychology and law (see [Graduate Programs in Psychology and Law](#) for a listing of specialty programs). It is likely that the availability of these kinds of positions will be subject to other influences (such as the availability of faculty positions generally), but such availability should compare favorably with most other specialties.

### ***Subspecialties in Psychology and Law: A Closer Look***

#### ***Clinical and Forensic Psychology***

Broadly conceived, clinical psychology is concerned with the assessment and treatment of persons with mental disorders. Clinical psychologists assess and treat persons with a variety of mental disorders, ranging from less severe problems (e.g., marital difficulties, adjustment problems) to more severe disorders (e.g., psychotic disorders such as schizophrenia or mood disorders such as major depression or bipolar disorder). Clinical-forensic psychologists are clinical psychologists who specialize in the assessment and/or treatment of persons who, in some way, are involved in the legal process or legal system.

Clinical-forensic psychologists are employed in a variety of settings including state forensic hospitals, court clinics, mental health centers, jails, prisons, and juvenile treatment centers. Clinical-forensic psychologists can also work independently in private practice, although it is rare that a psychologist in private practice solely does forensic work. Finally, some clinical-forensic psychologists

are employed primarily as researchers in university or mental health settings, conducting research in this interesting area.

***Activities:***

Clinical-forensic psychologists are perhaps best known for their assessment of persons involved with the legal system. Because of their knowledge of human behavior, abnormal psychology, and psychological assessment, psychologists are sometimes asked by the courts to evaluate a person and provide the court with an "expert opinion," either in the form of a report or testimony. For example, clinical-forensic psychologists frequently evaluate adult criminal defendants or children involved in the juvenile justice system, offering the court information that might be relevant to determining (1) whether the defendant has a mental disorder that prevents him or her from going to trial, (2) what the defendant's mental state may have been like at the time of the criminal offense, or (3) what treatment might be indicated for a particular defendant who has been convicted of a crime or juvenile offense. Increasingly, clinical-forensic psychologists are being called upon to evaluate defendants who have gone to trial and who have been found guilty and for whom one of the sentencing options is the death penalty. In this case, psychologists are asked to evaluate the mitigating circumstances of the case and to testify about these as they relate to the particular defendant.

Clinical-forensic psychologists also evaluate persons in civil (i.e., non-criminal) cases. These psychologists may evaluate persons who are undergoing guardianship proceedings, to assist the court in determining whether the person has a mental disorder that affects his or her ability to make important life decisions (e.g., managing money, making health care decisions, making legal decisions). Clinical-forensic psychologists also evaluate persons who are plaintiffs in lawsuits, who allege that they were emotionally harmed as a result of someone's wrongdoing or negligence. Clinical-forensic psychologists may evaluate children and their parents in cases of divorce, when parents cannot agree about the custody of their children and what is best for them. Clinical-forensic psychologists are sometimes called on to evaluate children to determine whether they have been abused or neglected and the effects of such abuse or neglect, and offer the court recommendations regarding the placement of such children.

In addition to forensic assessment, clinical-forensic psychologists are also involved in treating persons who are involved with the legal system in some capacity. Jails, prisons, and juvenile facilities employ clinical psychologists to assess and treat adults and juveniles who are either awaiting trial, or who have been adjudicated and are serving a sentence of some type. Treatment in these settings is focused both on mental disorders and providing these persons with skills and behaviors that will decrease the likelihood that they will re-offend in the future. Clinical-forensic psychologists employed in mental health centers or in private practice may also treat persons involved in the legal system, providing either general



or specialized treatment (e.g., treatment of sex offenders, treatment of violent or abusive persons, treatment of abuse victims).

Researchers in this area are involved in a variety of activities. Some devote their energy to developing and examining the utility of specialized tests that are designed to assist in assessment of persons in legal settings (e.g., instruments designed to assess criminal defendants' capacity to participate in the criminal justice process). Others examine the effectiveness of various treatments with different kinds of populations (e.g., efficacy of specialized treatment for sex offenders or batterers). Still others study the impact of abuse or victimization, or the factors which put people at risk for violent behavior, criminal behavior, or victimization.

***Educational and Training Requirements:***

As is the case with clinical psychology more generally, a doctoral degree (i.e., Ph.D./Psy.D.) in clinical psychology and licensure as a psychologist is typically considered necessary for independent practice of clinical-forensic psychology. Persons with masters (M.A. or M.S.) degrees in clinical psychology are typically able to obtain employment in institutions, where they work under the supervision of a Ph.D. or Psy.D. psychologist. Students wishing to practice independently should consider a Ph.D. or Psy.D. in clinical psychology necessary, which typically involves 4 years of graduate study, followed by a 1 year internship.

Few Ph.D. or Psy.D. programs offer specialty training in clinical-forensic psychology. Indeed, most clinical-forensic psychologists are graduates of general clinical psychology programs who developed their specialty later in their training, either on internship, by way of completing a forensic fellowship, or by independent and continuing education study. Students interested in becoming clinical-forensic psychologists should consider a clinical Ph.D. or Psy.D. program which offers a forensic specialization (see [APLS/AAFP Predoctoral Internship Guide](#)) or enter a clinical doctoral program which houses a faculty member whose research and clinical interests are in the clinical-forensic area. Additional and more specialized training will occur at the internship and fellowship levels. As is the case with all graduate programs, admissions are competitive, and students are likely to maximize their chances of admission by obtaining high scores, good grades, research experience, and a sound foundation in psychology and the scientific method. Students who are leaning towards clinical practice should consider Psy.D. programs while those who might like to conduct research should focus on Ph.D. programs.

***A Note About Criminal Profiling:***

Due to depictions in popular media (e.g., *Silence of the Lambs*, *Profiler*, *CSI*), many students express an interest in and ask questions about criminal profiling, which may be described as a criminal investigative technique based, in part, on psychological expertise and knowledge. In reality, few law enforcement agencies employ such techniques and there is little call for such professionals. Those

interested in such work would probably do better to consider a career in law enforcement than clinical-forensic psychology.

The Behavioral Sciences Unit of the FBI, does employ a few FBI agents who engage in this activity. The FBI makes a distinction between mental health and law enforcement: FBI agents are law enforcement professionals, not mental health professionals. In order to work as a profiler, or with the FBI in any other role, it is necessary to become an FBI agent. Experience in criminal investigation is needed before an agent can even be considered for a profiling position, but only a small number of agents ever become profilers. Since this would be a difficult goal to achieve, the FBI encourages prospective applicants who are interested in being special agents to do so because they are interested in the range of opportunities available with the FBI, not because they want to be a profiler. Further information is available from their office in Washington, D.C. or through their website:

<http://www.fbi.gov>.

### ***Developmental Psychology***

Developmental psychology focuses on the psychological issues involved in human development across the lifespan. The psychological processes of interest to developmental psychologists include social, personality, cognitive, and neuropsychological development. Some developmental psychologists are interested in understanding developmental processes in young children whereas others work in the area of adolescent or adult development.

Many developmental psychologists are interested in the law and the legal process and a significant body of psychological knowledge with direct relevance to juvenile, family, and elder law issues now exists. Most developmental psychologists interested in the law are employed in colleges and universities where they teach and conduct research. Others are employed by governmental agencies, private foundations, or non-profit organizations. These settings typically involve some combination of advocacy and policy formulation and analysis. Still others work as independent consultants or less frequently, in private practices. On occasion, developmental psychologists may be asked to offer expert opinions in court but typically this testimony will concern general issues related to development and will not focus on assessment of a given individual. Developmental psychologists in the law differ from clinical-forensic psychologists in that the former are more likely to conduct research and formulate and evaluate policy, whereas the latter are more likely to assess and treat people who are involved in the legal system.

#### ***Activities:***

The range of activities in developmental psychology and law is broad. Traditional areas of inquiry have involved the welfare of children in a variety of legally relevant situations involving child

maltreatment, divorce and custody, medical and mental health treatment, child welfare, juvenile delinquency, and education, among others. Rather than assess and treat individual children, however, developmental psychologists may formulate and test theories about the effects of divorce and joint custody on children, the effects of restrictive environments on adolescent development, or long-term effects of physical, sexual, or emotional child abuse on adult functioning.

An important issue in both children's law and elder law is competence. Trial judges, appellate courts, legislators and policy writers make assumptions about the competence of children, adolescents and older individuals that are amenable to scrutiny by scientific research. For example, a thorny question in many cases involving children and adolescents is the degree to which they should be permitted to make binding decisions on matters involving their own welfare (e.g., to seek guidance counseling, to seek an abortion, to refuse or accept medical treatment, to state which parent they prefer for custody, to choose not to attend school) and the psychological capacities required for these decisions. A question of concern in juvenile and criminal cases involving juvenile offenders is the extent to which they understand the legal proceedings, the Constitutional protections to which they are entitled, and the implications of various resolutions of their cases. A difficult issue in many cases involving elderly individuals is the extent to which they are capable of conducting their own financial and personal affairs and whether a guardian should be appointed to assume these duties. The notions of consent and related capacities--the issues at the heart of all of these examples--have long been of interest to developmental psychologists and a great deal of research now exists on these topics.

Another area of intense interest to developmental psychologists involves children in court--either as witnesses or victims of crime. Here, two concerns typically surface. The first is the child's right not to be traumatized or abused by the legal system. A significant barrier to prosecuting defendants in child sexual abuse cases is posed by the concern about causing the child further distress. Some states now allow a child's testimony to be videotaped for later display in the courtroom. Recent research has been undertaken to understand the effects on children of testifying. A second concern focuses on the accuracy of children as witnesses in court. Can children distinguish fact from fantasy? At what age do children understand what it means to tell the truth? Do children make things up? Despite some widely publicized cases involving false accusations, a number of studies suggest that children only rarely make up detailed memories of completely non-existent events. On the other hand, young children can be highly suggestible, especially in response to leading or repetitive questioning. A long history of research on memory development, suggestibility, semantics, and social demand characteristics is relevant to this issue.

Many developmental psychologists are interested in studying the juvenile justice system and, in particular, some of the nontraditional methods for dealing with delinquent adolescents known as diversion

programs. Developmental psychologists have also developed, implemented, and evaluated interventions designed to prevent or treat delinquent behavior. Although most states have revised and tightened their juvenile codes in the recent past to emphasize more punitive responses to juvenile crime, meta-analytic research demonstrates that some rehabilitative interventions can reduce recidivism, even among violent youth.

#### ***Educational and Training Requirements:***

Developmental psychologists who work on legally-relevant topics have typically been trained in traditional developmental psychology graduate programs, although some have attended formal psychology and law graduate programs that offer a developmental emphasis. During the course of graduate school they have worked with a faculty member with interests in the law or have developed those interests independently. Some students work with state or local courts, policymakers, or advocacy organizations on research and policy issues. On occasion, they may acquire a law-related interest during post-doctoral training, although such specialized training is not required for employment. There is no internship or licensure requirement.

Developmental psychologists who work in the legal arena may or may not have formal legal training. Although some knowledge of the law will result in more legally sophisticated research and advocacy, formal legal training is certainly not a requirement. In fact, many of these professionals tend to learn about the law by immersing themselves in psychological work that is related to law and legal processes or collaborating with legal or public policy scholars. Employment at colleges and universities and high-level administrative positions in various agencies and organizations require a Ph.D. degree but individuals with masters' level degrees (M.A. or M.S.) can also work in the private and public sectors, although job opportunities may be limited.

#### ***Social and Cognitive Psychology***

Social psychology concerns the impact of social influences on human behavior. Social psychologists typically explain behavior in terms of situational factors, rather than dispositional factors. Cognitive psychology focuses on how humans think, reason, and remember. Cognitive psychologists are interested in understanding the influences on thoughts and thought processes. Although these fields are distinct sub-disciplines of psychology, and students are traditionally trained in one or another, we combine them in this description because there is considerable overlap in their application to the law. For example, one legal topic that has interested both social and cognitive psychologists is the psychology of the jury. This institution can be analyzed by a social psychologist as a collection of individuals who must listen to, persuade, discuss, and perhaps compromise with each other. That same institution can be

examined by a cognitive psychologist as a medium for understanding both individual and group memory processes, decision making abilities, and problem solving skills.

Like developmental psychologists, most social and cognitive psychologists with legal interests are employed by colleges and universities where they teach and conduct research. Less frequently, they are employed by governmental agencies, private foundations, or non-profit organizations doing some combination of advocacy and policy formulation and analysis. Still other social and cognitive psychologists may be involved with the law as independent consultants. Some individuals who offer trial consulting services have been trained in traditional programs in social or cognitive psychology, for example. Any of these psychologists may be asked on occasion to offer expert opinions in court on issues related to social behaviors or thought processes.

***Activities:***

Many social and cognitive psychologists have become increasingly interested in conducting scientific research. One setting--the courtroom--has captured the attention of both social and cognitive psychologists because it provides a rich laboratory for psychological inquiry. In addition to questions related to jury decision making, a myriad of other issues related to the adversary system can be addressed by careful psychological research: judges' decision making capacities and the determinants of their sentences; criminal defendants' willingness to accept plea bargains, civil litigants' attempts at negotiation and settlement; the effectiveness of alternatives to trial (e.g., mediation, arbitration); litigants' beliefs about the justness and correctness of the legal proceedings; individuals' propensity to sue; and the specter of litigation affecting professional and personal relationships. Psychologists who work on these topics apply social and/or cognitive psychological theorizing to these complex legal questions. Not only has this work helped to refine psychological theory, it has also opened (if only a little) the historically closed doors of the courthouse and the state house to scientific scrutiny.

Although psychologists' interest in the veracity of testimony can be traced back to early in the 20th century, much recent work has concerned the memory capabilities of victims and witnesses to crimes and accidents. Research on these questions has its foundation in basic theorizing about human perception and memory, and psychologists who work on these issues typically have a firm grounding in those theoretical realms. Recent studies have focused on factors that influence the reliability of human memories for complex, fast-moving, and fear-arousing incidents. A related topic that has generated both a great deal of interest and considerable contentiousness is the reliability of repressed memories. Cognitive psychologists occasionally testify about the results of these studies as expert witnesses in trials that involve eyewitness testimony or repressed memories. The contentiousness often concerns the extent to which research findings can be applied to real-world situations.

A number of other issues have captured the attention of social psychologists who apply their knowledge of psychology to the law. Among these topics are regulatory compliance, discrimination, race and ethnicity, and sexual harassment and sexual assault. Other topics of interest to cognitive psychologists include investigative interviewing, psycholinguistic analysis of judicial language, and probabilistic reasoning and decision making about complex scientific and statistical information. Data on these topics and similar others are generated by scientific methodologies and are then disseminated to the legal community by way of advocacy, expert testimony, description in appellate briefs, or via publication or presentation to legal audiences.

### ***Educational and Training Requirements:***

Social and cognitive psychologists who work on law-related topics are typically trained in traditional social or cognitive psychology graduate programs that may or may not have a special focus on the law. These students often work with a faculty member who has law-related interests. Some recently-developed programs offer psychology and law as a minor and a few others elevate the program to a status comparable to more traditional areas of psychology. On occasion, a student who has received traditional graduate training in social or cognitive psychology and who wishes to move in the direction of psychology and law can do so during post-doctoral training, although such training is not necessary. Social and cognitive psychologists are not required to complete an internship and are not licensed.

Social and cognitive psychologists who work in the legal arena may or may not have formal legal training. Although some knowledge of the law will result in more legally sophisticated research and advocacy, formal legal training is certainly not a requirement. In fact, many of these professionals tend to learn about the law by immersing themselves in psychological work that is related to law and legal processes. The Ph.D. degree is required for employment at most colleges and universities and for some administrative positions in agencies. Students who opt for a masters degree may have some difficulty finding a research position although they may have more luck in the advocacy and policy realms.

### ***Community Psychology***

Community psychology focuses on the processes that link social systems and contexts with individual behavior with explicit attention to promoting health and empowerment and preventing problems in communities, groups, and individuals. Although community and social psychology share interest in the person and environment, community psychology orients more toward the social forces in the outside world and how they affect individuals, families, and communities. For some community psychologists interested in social change, the law represents the social institution that reflects and promotes the values and norms of a community, serving as both facilitator and barrier to social change efforts.

Like other psychologists, many community psychologists interested in psychology and law teach and conduct research in higher education settings. Unlike other areas of psychology, however, a number of community psychologists work outside academia in governmental agencies (e.g., General Accounting Office, state health and human services agencies), non-profit organizations (e.g., domestic violence shelter, child advocacy group), foundations, or other community-based advocacy and service settings.

***Activities:***

The community psychology approach uses an ecological perspective to examine issues at the individual, social system, societal and global levels. For example, a psychologist interested in juvenile delinquency prevention could investigate individual characteristics and circumstances (e.g., mental health problems), family dynamics (e.g., conflict and parenting skills), neighborhood parameters (e.g., social support systems), economic influences (e.g., stresses of poverty) and larger societal norms (e.g., emphasis on materialism). For community psychologists in academic and applied settings, activities span the range of policy and law formulation, implementation, evaluation, and change. For example, they might design and evaluate juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment programs, research adolescents' competence to participate in legal proceedings, investigate the impact of court involvement on the functioning of crime victims, or evaluate the effects of health care and welfare reform.

***Educational and Training Requirements:***

Community psychologists working in law-related areas are typically trained in community psychology graduate programs, several of which have special emphasis on law or policy. During graduate school, students usually work with a faculty member on research projects relevant to psychology and law. A number of community psychology programs emphasize field placements that integrate research and action, so students often obtain experience in state or local government, non-profit, or advocacy settings on research, policy, or intervention issues. Some graduate students develop additional expertise in other areas of psychology such as developmental, social, and quantitative. A few obtain law or policy degrees, but they are not required. The Ph.D. is required for employment at a college or university, and for some jobs in other settings. Students who obtain a master's degree may be able to find employment in advocacy, policy, service, or community action settings.

***Training Opportunities In Psychology & Law***

The field of psychology and law involves the application of psychological principles to legal concerns, and the interaction of psychology and law for individuals involved in the legal process. Psychologists trained in psychology and law provide psycho-legal research in a variety of areas, develop mental health legal and public policies, and work as both lawyers and psychologists within legal and clinical arenas.

The American Psychology-Law Society, Division 41 of the APA, is actively involved in the training and career development of psychologists within the field of psychology and law. Information on academic training programs is an important component for the continued growth of the field. We also have a listing and brief description of academic programs ([Graduate Programs in Psychology and Law](#)) that provide psychology and law training. This includes joint Ph.D./J.D. programs, Ph.D. programs with an emphasis on psychology and law, and M.A. programs with psychology and law course work.

As the field of psychology and law has grown in recent decades, a variety of training programs have been developed to meet the needs of students interested in interdisciplinary study and work. Detailed information about admission requirements, curricula, internships and practice opportunities, and job opportunities for graduates can be obtained by contacting the individual programs.

### ***Postgraduate training opportunities***

Many psychologists who work in the law obtained their training only after they completed their Ph.D. or Psy.D. (or perhaps after they completed their coursework prior to completing a dissertation). This is especially true for clinical-forensic psychologists. Typically, during the course of graduate training in another sub discipline of psychology, these students have become interested in some aspect of the law. They then conduct research or seek an internship in a setting that allows them to pursue that interest. Several post-doctoral training opportunities are now available in psychology and law and most do not require previous experience or training in the law. These experiences give the student an opportunity to develop high-level clinical and/or research skills that will assist them in understanding the legal contexts in which they will work. See current post-doctoral listings on the [jobs page](#).

Post-graduate training opportunities in other sub-disciplines of psychology and law are arranged informally.

### ***Publications in Psychology and Law Training***

Below is a list of publications describing the training opportunities available to the student interested in psychology and law.

Bersoff, D. (1999). Preparing for two cultures: Education and training in law and psychology. In Roesch, R., Hart, S., & Ogloff, J. (Eds.). *Psychology and law: The state of the discipline*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.

Bersoff, D., Goodman-Delahunty, J., Grisso, T., Hans, V., Poythress, N., & Roesch, R. (1997). Training in law and psychology: Models from the Villanova conference. *American Psychologist*. Vol 52(12), 1301-1310.



- Freeman, R. & Roesch, R. (1992). Psycholegal education: Training for forum and function. In D.K. Kagehiro & W.S. Laufer (Eds.) *Handbook of psychology and law*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Kuther, T. L. (2003). *Your career in psychology: Psychology and law*. Wadsworth.
- Melton, G., Huss, M., and Tomkins, A. (1999). Training in forensic psychology and the law. In Hess, A. and Weiner, I. (Eds), *The handbook of forensic psychology* (2nd ed.). NY: Wiley.
- Ogloff, J.R., Tomkins, A.J., & Bersoff, D.N., (1996). Education and training in psychology and law/criminal justice: Historical foundations, present structures, and future developments. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 23, 200-235.

### ***Biographies from Psychology-Law Professionals***

In the next section are short personal statements solicited from successful Ph.D.-level psychologists whose work relates to psychology and law issues. Biographers were asked to describe how they choose their career path, how they ended up in their current position, and what advice they would give to aspiring students. Our hope was to give interested students a glimpse of career options and the steps some people took to get there. To ensure a wide variety of professionals, biographies were solicited from 10 different categories: 1) Forensic/Clinical; 2) Policy-Relevant; 3) Trial Consulting; 4) Non-Academic Research; 5) Academic—Liberal Arts/Undergraduate Professor; 6) Academic—Graduate, Community Psychology Professor; 7) Academic—Graduate, Social Psychology Professor; 8) Academic—Graduate, Cognitive Psychology Professor; 9) Academic—Graduate, Developmental Psychology Professor; and 10) Academic—Law School Professor.

### ***Forensic/Clinical***

Dr. Patricia Zapf, Associate Professor of Psychology, Director of Clinical Training, John Jay College of Criminal Justice at The City University of New York

I first became interested in the study of forensic psychology as an undergraduate at the University of Alberta in Edmonton. I was completing an honors degree in psychology and my thesis had to do with the relationship between personality characteristics and the types of crime that were committed by adolescent offenders. Fascinated, I began delving deeper into the literature on crime and psychology and became convinced that I wanted to go on to graduate study in the area of forensic psychology. I applied to the two (at that time) Canadian clinical doctoral programs that had an emphasis in forensic psychology.

I received my PhD in Clinical-Forensic Psychology from Simon Fraser University in British Columbia in 1999. During the course of my graduate studies, I worked for the Correctional Service of Canada in a maximum-security institution as an institutional psychologist conducting psychological risk assessments for the parole board of Canada. I also worked as an intake interviewer at a Provincial Pretrial

Facility interviewing all inmates upon intake and screening for mental health and special placement needs. I conducted research on competency to stand trial at a forensic psychiatric facility interviewing actively psychotic individuals to determine their competence-related abilities. To conclude my clinical training, I completed a one-year internship at the Florida Mental Health Institute in Tampa.

I always knew that I wanted to be an academic. Conducting research and working with students is something that I have always been interested in and from which I gain a lot of satisfaction. I took my first academic position at the University of Alabama where I was an assistant professor for three years in the Clinical Psychology and Law program. After three years in Alabama, I was recruited to John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City to come and assist in developing a Doctoral Program in Forensic Psychology. This has been a very rewarding experience and, now, five years into my career, I am the Director of Clinical Training and Deputy Director of the largest Doctoral Program in Forensic Psychology in North America.

In addition to my academic position, I also do some private practice work where I conduct evaluations for the courts with respect to competency to stand trial, criminal responsibility, mitigation evaluations in capital cases, and risk assessments. I testify as an expert witness on these issues and have been retained by counsel to consult on cases where other professionals have done less-than-adequate evaluations.

I believe that the most important ingredient to getting what you want is determination. Work hard, get good grades, and take part in as many experiences as possible while in graduate school. This is the time to experience it all as this will help you to figure out what you like and what you don't. Take nothing for granted and try to maintain a good balance between your personal and professional life.

Dr. Antoinette Kavanaugh, Clinical Director, Juvenile Justice Division, Cook County Juvenile Court Clinic, Chicago, IL

Cook County Juvenile Court is the oldest Juvenile Court in the country and is a very large court system. The Cook County Juvenile Court Clinic (CCJCC) does many things, among which is conducting court-ordered forensic evaluations of youths and their families involved in the Juvenile Justice and Child Protection Divisions of the Court. As Clinical Director, I conduct juvenile justice forensic evaluations (e.g., sentencing, fitness, Miranda, and Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity), supervise doctoral level clinicians who also conduct evaluations as well as masters level professionals who are the liaisons to the courtroom, and train judges and lawyers about issues related to forensic psychology. I love my job! It is an exciting combination of clinical and administrative work. My job is unique in that it allows me to play a role in individual cases and bring about systems change in juvenile forensic work.

My graduate training was not forensic but was psychodynamic in nature, and primarily with adults. Now I realize my training gave me a solid clinical foundation, which is fundamental when conducting evaluations. During graduate school I participated in mock trials at the law school, through this and other experiences, I realized that I wanted to become a forensic psychologist. I completed my internship at Cook County Hospital in Chicago. This allowed me to work with adults, adolescents, and children while providing exposure to forensic evaluations. During internship, I decided that I wanted my clinical focus to be working with adolescents and adults. As I felt I needed more clinical experience with adolescents, I also completed an Adolescent Fellowship at Cook County Hospital. After this fellowship, I completed a Forensic Postdoctoral Fellowship at the University of Massachusetts, where my area of emphasis was conducting forensic evaluations of adolescents. By far, my forensic fellowship was both the most difficult and most rewarding year of training to date. It was difficult because my knowledge of forensic issues was very limited. Consequently, I had a steep learning curve, but it was well worth it. The things that made it worth it were: first and foremost the supervision (good supervision is invaluable), second the variety of cases, and last but not least were the other fellows. After my postdoc, I worked at the Clinical Evaluation and Services Initiative (CESI) in Chicago. This was a McArthur sponsored project in which we designed a new model for the court clinic, piloted and implemented the model court wide; thus becoming the CCJCC. I am not a researcher per se. However, as a clinical forensic psychologist it is imperative that I am knowledgeable of the research, literature, and case law in the areas in which I practice.

Finally, if you are contemplating becoming a clinical forensic psychologist---go for it! I urge you to develop your clinical skills. You cannot conduct a forensic evaluation without utilizing your clinical skills. However, you also cannot conduct a forensic evaluation without being knowledgeable of the forensic area at hand. Consequently, you also need forensic training; nationally there are many opportunities for obtaining this training.

#### ***Policy-Relevant***

Dr. Heather O-Beirne Kelly, Science Public Policy Office, American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

In Washington, I think one of the most fascinating intersections of psychology and law occurs in Congress. I work in the Science Public Policy Office of the American Psychological Association (APA), and part of my job is to bring science, and the science of psychology in particular, to bear on the federal legislative process. This can take the form of lobbying Members of Congress directly on substantive issues about which a body of psychological research has something to say, and it can also entail more

indirect ways of highlighting the relevance of scientific psychology on Capitol Hill, such as holding briefings and bringing in psychologists to testify before Congressional committees.

There are many pathways into policy jobs as a psychologist, and I probably gravitated towards this world earlier in my career than most. I was an undergraduate psychology major at Smith College, and then worked in the Washington area for four years doing mostly non-profit development and fundraising before heading back to the University of Virginia for a doctorate in clinical psychology. UVa also has a fantastic community psychology program, and my graduate research interests in adolescent development took on a more community-level flavor while I was there. One graduate summer I came up to D.C. to work in APA's Public Policy Office on a sexual education research project related to federal funding, and I was bitten by the policy bug all over again.

After the PhD and a clinical internship year at Children's Hospital here in D.C., I knew I didn't want full-time academia or clinical work, but something more policy related and ideally, flexible enough to allow me time at home with our young kids. This job is a perfect fit in terms of that flexibility (I work three days a week), but also in terms of combining my scientific and political interests and, frankly, in accommodating my short attention span! The pace of the research process didn't suit me, while clinical work was rewarding but also incredibly draining and stressful. I find the fast-paced, often hectic world of science lobbying and Capitol Hill exciting, intellectually challenging, and yet not at all stressful. Projects have quick turnarounds and the topical variety is highly stimulating – one day I might be trying to convince a Hill staffer of the importance of basic research at the National Science Foundation, and the next I might be translating applied human factors research on perception into a briefing sheet for a Senator interested in night vision goggles.

The best preparation for this kind of work (other than really good writing and public speaking skills and a hefty dose of extroversion) are: a) a passion for “big” science and its place in the larger world – if you prefer discussion sections to methods sections, this might be for you! b) experience in translating research for a lay audience, which you can practice with your own work; c) graduate training and/or practical experience in community psychology, public policy, law, and political science; d) experience in local, state and federal advocacy, which you can seek at any point in your career, especially through professional associations like APA.

### ***Trial Consultation***

Dr. Dan Wolfe, Senior Trial Consultant, TrialGraphix

As a trial consultant, I've always had a passion for my profession. I've brought that passion to many of the famous trials I've worked on—the OJ Simpson, Rodney King, John DuPont cases, to name a

few—but perhaps the highlight of my career was a trial in which I helped an innocent man on death row go free.

The case was the infamous Rolando Cruz trial. Mr. Cruz had been wrongfully convicted of raping and murdering a young girl. He spent 12 years on death row before the police admitted that they had coerced a confession out of him. The case garnered a lot of media attention. I had the privilege of working pro bono alongside some excellent lawyers on the case, one of whom is now a Federal District Judge, the other a professor at Northwestern.

The great personal satisfaction the others and I derived from seeing this man finally set free is beyond measure. When you do something from the heart rather than the pocketbook, you are truly blessed. What I really mean by that is that to survive as a trial consultant, you must have a real passion that goes beyond just “liking it.” If you don't, you won't survive.

Raised in a small farming community in Colorado, I was taught to believe in the principle of helping (not only materialistically, but spiritually, emotionally, and psychologically) those less fortunate. My mom and dad instilled the idea that being compassionate and conscientious toward others wasn't just an afterthought, it was a way of life. It's a life theme that drew me to my chosen profession, and one that has served me very well through the years.

How did I choose this career? As a psychology/sociology undergraduate student, I was involved in a senior research project looking at juror decisionmaking in rape trials. The experience profoundly moved me. The many—and often emotionally powerful—ways that jurors view rape stirred my feelings. What struck me most about the senior research project was the valuable insight I was able to garner from the interface of law and psychology. I got to see firsthand the applied and practical implications of all those years of academics and reading about it in the classroom. It was amazing to me that there were real-world applications.

As a result of my interest in this subject, my supervisor encouraged me to look into law and psychology programs, which I did. Once accepted, I was fortunate to become the project director of a large grant starting my third year of the program. I dedicated myself solely to the analysis and understanding of juror decision-making. It was a fascinating time for me, to say the least.

When I finished up the program, I applied to traditional law and academic jobs, as well as applied research jobs, which included litigation consulting and trial consulting. I was offered a job and have been working in the field ever since.

My good fortune—and hard work—in this wonderful profession has led me to appearances as a commentator on CBS, ABC, and talk shows such as "Talk Back Live," and have been quoted in a wide range of media, including national publications such as *Newsweek* and *USA Today*. I have also authored many articles on the subjects of juries, juror perceptions, ethics in trial consulting, and the interrelation of

attorney gender and courtroom bias. Prior to joining TrialGraphix, I spent several years researching juror decision-making in complex cases while at FTI Consulting and Litigation Sciences, Inc.

A trial consultant since 1990, I have been in the national spotlight on numerous occasions working in criminal and civil cases involving celebrities and professional athletes.

The best part of my job is that it is continually challenging, even after all these years. My advice to anyone interested in going into trial consulting is to get educated in the fields I've mentioned, seek out a mentor, explore the discipline through an internship, network with others in the field, attend conferences, and read as much as you can about the law and consulting.

And above all, have a passion.

### *Non-Academic Research*

#### Dr. Marisa Reddy Randazzo, Chief Research Psychologist and Research Coordinator, National Threat Assessment Center, U.S. Secret Service

I currently serve as the chief research psychologist and research coordinator for the U.S. Secret Service, working in their National Threat Assessment Center. In this capacity, I direct all Secret Service research on threat assessment and various types of violence, including assassination, stalking, school shootings, workplace shootings, and terrorism. The day-to-day aspects of my job include developing research ideas, forming partnerships with other government agencies, collaborating with consultants, implementing study plans, overseeing the work of the project managers who run the studies, and translating research findings into training modules relevant for law enforcement operations. As part of my job, I regularly conduct training for local, state, and federal law enforcement personnel, for agencies in the U.S. intelligence community, and for school and corporate security personnel. On occasion, I have to brief members of Congress, Cabinet secretaries, and White House staff.

In general, my career has focused on understanding and preventing violent behavior, and on the interface of behavioral science and criminal justice. Throughout my 10 years with the Secret Service (the past eight as a full-time employee, and before that as a part-time research intern), my research and training activities have focused on applying threat assessment principles and behavioral analysis to better understand and prevent targeted violence against public officials and other protected persons; in schools and the workplace; and against critical infrastructures and information systems. Prior to joining the Secret Service full time, I was awarded the SPSSI James Marshall Public Policy Fellowship at the American Psychological Association (APA), where I worked with congressional staff on violence-prevention legislation and authored testimony for congressional hearings.

For students considering a career in psychology and law outside of academia, I highly recommend two things: (a) early and ongoing involvement in APLS to get a full understanding of the

breadth of career options in the field; and, (b) pursuing internship opportunities wherever possible. I credit being active in APLS as a student member with helping to land my first job within the Secret Service and with helping me explore opportunities in other psychology and law settings while still in graduate school. It was through serving as the chair of the APLS Student Section that I first met the psychologist who oversaw psychology and law research at the Secret Service and found out the Secret Service has an internship program.

I actually interned for the Secret Service for 20 hours a week for a year – without pay! --while in my last year of graduate school. The experience was a valuable lesson in helping me understand the type of environment in which I wanted to work and seeing real-life applications of psychology and law research. My other summer internships during graduate school – at the Federal Judicial Center, the RAND Corporation, and APA’s Public Policy Office - offered similar lessons in helping me clarify what I wanted out of my career. One piece of advice on pursuing internships: If an organization does not have an internship program, consider volunteering your time (photocopying, filing, answering phones, anything) or ask to spend some time shadowing one of their psychologists. Any exposure to a setting where you may want to work can offer insights into realities of the job (both good and bad!) and may even help strengthen your candidacy for a position by making you a ‘known’ applicant.

Dr. Allison D. Redlich, Senior Research Associate, Policy Research Associates, Delmar, NY

It is quite common that people don’t know what they want to do when they “grow up.” I think I knew in high school when I volunteered at a nearby state mental hospital. There I gained exposure to persons with chronic and severe mental illness. Some 15 years later, after remaining in psychology, but being minimally involved in issues surrounding mental health, I have come full circle and conduct research on mental health and the law. I am now at Policy Research Associates (PRA), a privately owned firm dedicated to the interface between mental health and criminal justice issues.

My first involvement with psychology and the law was through a research assistantship at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, working with Michael Lamb and his colleagues. During the two years I spent there, I assisted on projects relating to children’s disclosures of sexual abuse. I was hooked and knew I had much more to learn. From NICHD, I left for UC Davis to obtain my doctoral degree with Gail S. Goodman, the “founding mother” of child witness research. The five years I spent with Gail were extremely fruitful; in addition to gaining an education in psychology, generally, and psychology and the law, specifically, I gained an education in how to be a research psychologist. That is, being a researcher is not simply about “knowing your stuff” (which of course you need to succeed as well), but being a researcher also entails all of the unspoken rules and offerings of precious advice on how to achieve success. My first piece of advice is to seek out mentors and don’t just

limit yourself to your advisor. I have found that most people are nice, even the ones you find intimidating. Having a helpful, hard-working, and caring mentor—especially in graduate school—can make all the difference. If you are at the stage of applying to grad schools, go to the school in person and talk to your would-be advisor and talk to the current graduate students. I have seen several instances of people dropping out of programs because they lacked the proper mentorship to keep them on track.

After UC Davis, I completed a postdoctoral internship at Stanford University, in the Department of Psychiatry. Admittedly, it was difficult at first to step into a psychiatry department from a psychology department. The two are different disciplines with different methods and trainings. After some initial stubbornness, I adapted and was able to continue my education by learning about mental and substance use disorders in juvenile offenders. From there, it was an easy transition into my current position at PRA.

My official title is Senior Research Associate. What I do is conduct research, all day, every day. I still conduct research relevant to psychology and the law. More specifically, I work on projects concerning mandated treatment of persons with mental illness, the majority of which are funded by the MacArthur Network on Community Mandated Treatment. I also continue to conduct research on police interrogations and confessions. My position as a researcher in a non-academic setting allows me the freedom and time to study the issues that are important to me. Finally, I try not to limit my world to PRA. I remain active in societies, such as APLS and Child, Youth, and Family Services (Division 37, APA), consult on legal cases, and collaborate with colleagues.

Throughout my career, I have been fortunate to work with luminaries in the field. This is most certainly not something I had to give up when I came to PRA. I remain quite productive and feel like I'm on the cutting edge of research on mental health and the law. If I was asked as a graduate student whether I would end up in a "non-academic research" setting, I don't know what my answer would have been. I don't think it was something I had to decide at that point though. Thus, my second piece of advice is to keep your options open. Don't box yourself in to specific titles. Do what it takes to be prolific and productive and this by itself will give you the flexibility to choose what is right for you at any point on your career path.

### *Academic—Liberal Arts/Undergraduate Professor*

Dr. Mark Costanzo, Professor of Psychology, Claremont McKenna College

I am especially interested in jury decision-making, the death penalty, police interrogations, mediation as an alternative to litigation, and sexual harassment. I received my Ph.D. in social psychology from the University of California at Santa Cruz in 1986 and I am currently a Professor of Psychology and co-director of the Center for Applied Psychological Research at Claremont McKenna College (CMC). CMC is a small liberal arts college which is part of the Claremont consortium of colleges (Pomona,



Pitzer, Scripps, Harvey Mudd, and McKenna). Although I am primarily a teacher and researcher, I also consult with attorneys and occasionally serve as an expert witness. In addition to my research articles, I have written two books in the area of psychology and law -- *Just Revenge: Costs and Consequences of the Death Penalty* (St. Martin's Press, 1997), and *Psychology Applied to Law* (Wadsworth 2004).

I first became interested in psychology and law during graduate school when I was working as a consultant for a Public Defender's Office and spending too much time watching legal dramas on television. I began to see the legal system as an ideal arena for looking at how basic psychological processes--such as persuasion, motivation, decision-making, memory, and group dynamics--operate in the world outside the laboratory.

Prior to joining the faculty at CMC, I had no experience with small liberal arts colleges. Through my job at CMC, I have found that working at a small liberal arts college has several benefits. I am able to teach small, in-depth undergraduate seminars (e.g., Psychology and Law, Research Methods, Mediation and Dispute Resolution) and am encouraged to develop close working relationships with students. I feel fortunate to be able to work with talented undergraduate students who have the great luxury of being able to focus on their college education for four intense years. Also, because small liberal arts colleges tend to value cross-disciplinary scholarship, they tend to be welcoming environments for people who examine the legal system using the tools of psychological theory and methods.

I have much advice for students. My own students generally thank me for wise advice and then ignore it. My standard advice to undergraduates is to avoid premature specialization. By taking courses in many different fields, students can clarify their own interests and learn to see the connections between disciplines. Completing a major is secondary to the more important goal of developing essential skills—thinking critically, expressing ideas clearly, working effectively with other people, and acting in ethically responsible ways. I have two bits of specific advice. First, take a course in Psychology and Law or Forensic Psychology to get a sense of whether you might want to pursue a career in this exciting, expanding field. Second, try to do research in collaboration with a faculty member. Becoming involved in the research process will help you decide whether you are suited for a career in psychology and law.

Although my primary appointment is at CMC, I also work with graduate students at Claremont Graduate University. I advise graduate students who are interested in psychology and law to find ways of working with the legal system during graduate school. More generally, I try to remind students that graduate school is a rare and precious opportunity to immerse themselves in their chosen discipline and to learn most of what there is to know about a few important issues.

Dr. Amy Bradfield, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Bates College

I am currently an assistant professor of psychology at Bates College in Lewiston, Maine. Bates is a small, residential liberal arts college of about 1700 students. I teach the required statistics course for our majors, a first-year seminar in social influence and an upper level course in psychology and law. My department has 8 full time faculty and about 65 senior majors every year.

My interest in psychology and law was piqued during my junior year at Williams College when I took Psychology and Law with Dr. Saul Kassin. Until that semester, I didn't even know that such an area existed. Needless to say, his course was fascinating and prompted my search of graduate schools in which I could pursue my interest in psychology and law. To that end, I chose the Iowa State University social psychology program, where I worked with Dr. Gary Wells, earning my Ph.D. in 2001 with a research focus on eyewitness testimony.

During graduate school, I always planned to return to a liberal arts environment. This career path appealed to me because of the close relationships I developed with faculty during college and because I believed that a liberal arts college would allow me to focus on psychology and law, while maintaining my interests in other areas. To a large extent, my assumptions have proven correct. I enjoy very close relationships with current and former students. I also love teaching a first-year seminar on social influence and our statistics course, two things I probably would not do had I chosen a position defined as "psychology and law."

I think that my broad training as a social psychologist as well as my research expertise in one area (eyewitness testimony) made me appealing to a liberal arts college. In addition, the fact that I earned a graduate minor in statistics allowed me to apply for positions in which departments were searching for someone to teach statistics and "any other courses in a specialty area". My experience suggests that defining oneself broadly might increase the possibility of finding a good match with a liberal arts college.

People sometimes shy away from liberal arts colleges, in part, because of a perception that teaching loads are unreasonably high and undergraduates are unable to contribute to research programs. In my experience, neither of these perceptions is true. At Bates, the teaching load is reasonable: 5 courses per year. The students are talented enough to contribute to my research program in meaningful ways. In fact, because each senior must conduct original research for a senior thesis, there is no dearth of students ready and willing to listen to ideas for a senior thesis. Of course, some students come with their own ideas which means that I do supervise theses outside my area of expertise or interest. However, as students become more familiar with my research program, the proportion of theses I supervise that are directly related to my own interests continues to grow. The liberal arts college has been a good fit for me, one that I find both fulfilling and challenging.

*Academic—Graduate, Developmental Psychology Professor*

Dr. Gail S. Goodman, Professor of Psychology, University of California, Davis

It was no accident that I ended up specializing in scientific research on psychology and law, especially as it relates to children. I grew up in Los Angeles, CA, the youngest daughter of an attorney and an elementary school teacher. Growing up hearing about my mother's experiences in an orphanage left a deep impression that has had a strong influence on the direction of my research.

Although my original goal was to become a child clinical psychologist, my honors thesis at UCLA on Piagetian theory convinced me that my true calling was as a researcher. I went on to receive a Ph.D. in developmental psychology from UCLA in 1977. However, my doctoral training was in basic cognitive development, with a focus on memory. My graduate program offered no training in psychology and law. To satisfy my desire for such knowledge, I audited several law school seminars (e.g., on the Constitutional Rights of Children) while serving as a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Denver. By that time, Dr. Elizabeth Loftus had published landmark work on memory malleability in adult witnesses. As a developmentalist, with sensitivity to child welfare, I wondered why there was so little research on children's eyewitness testimony, given how potentially important children's statements could be in certain types of legal situations (e.g., child maltreatment cases).

Back in the late 1970s, no one in psychology seemed to care about the topic of child witnesses. For example, my first concept paper to a granting agency was unsuccessful: The rejection letter was addressed to "Dr. Fail Goodman." Some early attempts to present papers and publish on child witnesses met with a similar lack of enthusiasm. However, a friend at *Psychology Today Magazine* arranged for me to publish an article there. The article won Honorable Mention from the American Bar Association in a contest on papers contributing to the American legal system. The *Journal of Social Issues* then accepted a proposal from me to edit a special issue on child witnesses.

At about the same time that the special issue was published, the topic of children's testimony became of national concern, as a result of several high-profile child sexual abuse cases (e.g., the McMartin Preschool case). I found myself being perhaps the only scientist in the world who at that time was specializing on child eyewitness testimony, including having conducted scientific research on such topics as children's memory for traumatic events and children's suggestibility concerning abuse allegations. It has never been my view that either children or adults are unsuggestible, but my students and I have found that many children, by age 4 or 5 years, are typically *less suggestible* about taboo abuse-related acts than about many other types of information. This was quite controversial at the time.

I was a new assistant professor and found myself way over my head. Although I am extremely hard working, I also tend to be shy, and I hated public speaking. I just wanted to do something for justice, children, and science. And suddenly, I was in the national limelight. I went on to become the first person

to obtain a federal grant on child eyewitness testimony and to have work on child witnesses cited pivotally in a U.S. Supreme Court decision. I continue my research today on child witnesses, as well as trauma and memory generally (and numerous other topics), with one of my great joys being mentoring graduate students. It is such an important time in one's life, to go from being an undergraduate to becoming a skilled professional. I am so grateful to have had an opportunity to fulfil my life dream of contributing both to child welfare and to science. It is part of my mission to help others fulfil their dreams as well.

I am currently a Professor of Psychology at the University of California, Davis, and Professor of Forensic Psychology at the University of Oslo, Norway. I've won many awards for research and teaching, and I spend my free time with my twin daughters, Lauren and Danielle, and my husband, Phillip Shaver, who is also a psychology professor.

My advice to students: Find a topic about which you feel passionate and then give it all you've got. In the end, there's nothing better than knowing you can make a difference. And if a shy, short person like me can do it, you can, too!

Dr. Elizabeth Cauffman, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of California, Irvine

When I entered college sixteen years ago at the University of California, Davis, I planned to be an engineer. My first engineering course convinced me otherwise. I did not enjoy the subject, nor was I particularly good at it. The social science courses were much more palatable, however, so I decided to follow in my mother's footsteps by majoring in psychology and pursuing a career as a clinician. I knew that this would require graduate training. I also knew that standardized test-taking was not one of my strengths. I therefore made a concerted effort to excel in class, in the lab, and in the department, in order to counteract what I knew would be unimpressive GRE scores. I worked hard on my courses (made easier by true interest), I volunteered as a lab assistant for Rebecca Eder (who was exploring young children's self concepts and their ability to mimic facial expressions), and I served on the Psychology Department's curriculum development committee. After two years of interviewing 3-5 year olds using puppets, and after being peed on a number of times, I knew that this was not the age group for me, but I was harboring a growing interest in developmental psychology. I had not yet abandoned my plan to become a clinician, but was growing increasingly familiar with the world of research, publication, and conference-going that occupies professors' time during the hours they aren't in class.

When the time came to apply to graduate programs during my senior year, my GRE scores were, as expected, low. In addition, I found myself inexplicably engaged to a first-year graduate student at Princeton. Undaunted, I drew a circle on a map and applied to clinical and developmental graduate programs located within 60 miles of Princeton, NJ. After applying, I flew to the area and toured each

department, arranging for informal interviews with department chairs and other faculty members, so that they could witness first-hand my potential (or at least my chutzpah), and so that they would (hopefully) overlook my GRE scores. This effort proved invaluable. During my visit to Temple University, I met Laurence Steinberg, who had just become chair of the Developmental Psychology Department. He warned me that it was his first interview as chair. I told him, “That’s fine, this is my first interview as a future graduate student.” I also met with Nora Necombe. They both asked if I would retake the GRE to improve my score. I don’t know how I did it, but I firmly refused. I told them that taking the test again would not help, that my record was otherwise exemplary, and that they would simply have to look past the test score to see me as a dedicated and industrious student with great potential. Miraculously, they did! I entered Temple’s doctoral program in developmental psychology. Knowing the dangers of working with young children, I joined Larry Steinberg’s adolescent development lab (adolescents, at least, are potty trained). Still, I hadn’t given up on my idea of becoming a clinician, so I found a part-time job as a counselor at a teen shelter in New Jersey. When I was forced to relinquish an 8-year old girl to her alleged abuser because she recanted her story, I decided that I did not have the stamina to endure a lifetime of such frustration. I would become a researcher, and would work to help these kids that way. During one lab meeting, I volunteered to work with Larry on a paper about adolescent development and juvenile justice issues. We debated about the age at which adolescents become competent to stand trial, to be tried in adult court, or to be considered culpable for their actions. We pored through the research to see what developmental psychology could tell us about these questions. This was the most interesting and exciting project I had ever worked on, and led naturally to a dissertation topic. (With dissertations, it is important that you be absolutely wild about the idea when you start, because that enthusiasm has to get you through many years of hard work.) During my final year of graduate school, Larry was working to establish a MacArthur Foundation research network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice. As his assistant, I attended meetings with many of the leading psychologists, criminologists, sociologists, historians, economists, and practitioners (judges, attorneys, etc.) from across the country, all of whom were trying to understand various aspects of adolescence and the law. It was the best classroom in the world. After finishing my Ph.D., I was offered a postdoctoral position at the Center on Adolescence at Stanford University. With Hans Steiner, a child psychiatrist, and Shirley Feldman, a developmental psychologist, I began to explore the mental health and developmental issues of youths in the California Youth Authority. This emphasis on clinical issues (such as the detection of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in incarcerated youth) placed me even deeper into the “interdisciplinary” category. This can make it hard to find a good “fit” in a traditional department, although interdisciplinary programs are growing in popularity. During two years on the job market as a post-doc, I received only two offers (neither of which was from a psychology department), so my next move was to the Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic

(WPIC) at the University of Pittsburgh to work in the Psychiatry and Law Program with Edward Mulvey. I'm neither a psychiatrist nor a lawyer, but there I was. At WPIC, survival as a researcher is predicated heavily on the ability to obtain outside funding for one's work. I was given two years to raise my salary through grant funding. Fortunately, in Ed Mulvey, I had an expert in the art of grant-writing as a mentor. During my years at WPIC, I received a 5-year Career Development Award (K01) from NIMH, a 4-year grant on psychopathy from the William T. Grant Foundation, a 2 year grant from NIJ to analyze data on female offenders from the 1920s, and a 2-year grant from the State of Pennsylvania to study mental health issues among kids in detention. Despite this success, though, I missed having students and I missed the feel of a more traditional academic department. So I went back on the job market once again. I recently accepted a position at the University of California, Irvine, in the Psychology and Social Behavior Department. So, it's yet another cross-country trip (number four, in case you've lost track) for another new chapter in my ever-evolving career.

People tend to recount their personal histories as if the outcome was inevitable, or as if they had always been working toward their present situation. In reality, one must choose a goal and make plans based on the information available at the time, but remain open to altering course if conditions change or unique opportunities arise. Equally important: remember that the journey is as important as the destination. This sort of career, especially, is one that you need to love to do well in, because it's all journey.

### ***Academic—Graduate, Social Psychology Professor***

Dr. Bette L. Bottoms, Professor of Psychology, University of Illinois, Chicago

I grew up on a farm in beautiful Southside Virginia, a couple hours from anything resembling an urban environment. I'm now a Professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois at Chicago. How did I get here? I often wonder that myself, so let's see if I can tell you.

I first became interested in the field of Psychology and Law when I was in college in the mid-1980s at Randolph-Macon Woman's College in Virginia (alma mater of Pearl Buck and home of the first psychology laboratory in the South). A professor named Frank Murray pointed me to a few exciting new books: John Monahan's *Predicting Violent Behavior* and Beth Loftus and Gary Well's *Eyewitness Testimony*. I was drawn to the topics and Mr. Murray encouraged me to write to Professors Loftus and Wells for their advice about how to enter this field of research. I still have the encouraging letters they took the time to write to me. I conducted my honor's thesis research on the accuracy of eyewitness memory. Then I was told that I had to go to something called "graduate school" to continue my studies. So I mailed out applications fairly randomly, including one to the University of Denver, where there was a cognitive developmental psychologist named Gail Goodman, who was at that moment starting the field

of children's eyewitness testimony. I took my first ever airplane flight and visited her laboratory, and I knew it was the place for me. I got my Master's Degree in cognitive psychology at D.U., then followed Gail to the State University of New York at Buffalo, where, with her and others' wonderful guidance, I got my Ph.D. in Social Psychology.

My graduate training was very broad, so I'm a mix of cognitive, developmental, social, and even a little community and clinical psychology. My work then and now is unified by the theme of children, psychology, and law. I study the accuracy of children's eyewitness testimony, techniques to improve children's reports of past events, jurors' perceptions of children's testimony, and various issues related to child abuse. If you're interested in the field, take a look at a book that I edited with colleagues Margaret Kovera and Brad McAuliff, *Children, Social Science, and Law*, from Cambridge University Press.

As I write this, I'm finishing my 12<sup>th</sup> year at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). Being a professor is one of the best jobs around, although this occupation seems to be a mystery to many students. To varying degrees, professors all teach, mentor students, conduct research and write, and do service for the university, the community, and the field. It's not an easy job, and it requires dedication and long hours. But it sure ain't digging ditches, either! You have incredible flexibility in terms of setting your own schedule, choosing what to study, and how to teach. You have the opportunity to work with lots of interesting colleagues and students. To a great extent, you are your own boss. And what about job security? At most colleges and universities, if you are successful in your first 6 years or so, you can be awarded tenure, which means you can never be fired (well, unless you really screw up). At UIC, which is a research-intensive university, there is a particular emphasis on conducting and publishing research, so that has been a big part of my job. But my career has also included a great deal of teaching, graduate student training, and service. I was even an Associate Dean for several years, where I learned a lot about the business of universities. I'm also active in the American Psychological Association, especially Division 41 (the American Psychology-Law Society) and Division 37 (Child, Youth, and Family Services), of which I'll be President in 2005. I like the varied and changing nature of my job – it's impossible to get bored.

So, what's my advice to you? Figure out what you enjoy doing, then work your tail off at it. Read the Careers in Psychology and Law document on this website to learn more about academic and other careers in this field. Don't bother going to graduate school unless you really like the topic and the nature of the work, and unless you are willing to work very hard to distinguish yourself. If you like what you are doing, then working hard is not onerous, and you will enjoy your professional life. But if this kind of career is not a match for your temperament or interests, do something else – there's a world of other great possibilities, and no time to waste being unhappy. Good luck!

*Academic—Graduate, Cognitive Psychology Professor*

Dr. Christian A. Meissner, Assistant Professor of Legal Psychology, Florida International University

I'm not sure that you actually *choose* a career – rather, I think it is probably more likely to find you. Ever since I was a child I had wanted to be a lawyer, and eventually a judge. My family had a rather extensive history in the legal system, from local police officers to federal agents and state attorneys. As a result, I was fascinated with the law and as long as I could remember I wanted to be a part of it. With this in mind, I headed to Pfeiffer University to pursue a degree that would prepare me for law school. I began as a criminal justice major, then changed to sociology before finally settling in the psychology department. I wasn't able to explain it, but something about psychology's approach to studying the human mind, particularly aspects of memory and decision-making, captivated my attention and interest. At the same time I decided upon psychology, I was pulled into the study of epistemology, phenomenology, and various other philosophical writings on human thought, intelligence, and decision-making. It seemed as though my studies were beginning to focus, but my own goals were still targeted on law school. Then along came that one event that seemingly set me in the right direction – I had a wonderful discussion with a new faculty member in the psychology department, Dr. Susan Kirkendol, who after hearing of my interests in law school suggested that she might offer a seminar in Psychology & Law. Although I didn't know it at the time, this seminar would shape my career goals and send me to graduate school at Florida State University to study eyewitness memory and juror decision-making with Dr. Jack Brigham. When you find your passion in life, you will know it, and graduate school at FSU was that type of experience for me. I thrived primarily because I absolutely loved what I was doing, from learning the details of cognitive and social processes in the classroom to conducting my own research, writing-up the results, and presenting them at conferences. In the end, I knew that I wanted a career in academia – I wanted to continue teaching in the classroom and conducting research that would have some practical benefit to society. I arrived at my current position (Assistant Professor of Legal Psychology at Florida International University) through a rather competitive application process, as academic faculty positions are not easy to obtain and I was but one among many excellent and qualified candidates. Of the fifteen or so positions that I had applied for, FIU was at the top of my list because it was one of the premiere programs in the field of Psychology and Law, and it would permit me to work with graduate students that would be most directly interested in my area of research. Today I supervise a handful of wonderful graduate students, and have had the wonderful pleasure of graduating several at the doctoral level. My research focuses on understanding the cognitive and social processes that govern eyewitness identification and juror decision-making, and I have recently begun conducting research on the psychology of interrogations and confessions. In addition to teaching and conducting research, I also provide consultation to attorneys and law enforcement groups on the proper conduct of lineups and interrogations, and I have also provided



expert testimony to the court on the issues. In the end, academia was the most wonderful profession I could have selected, although I suppose I should be happy that it selected me.

Dr. Kathy Pezdek, Professor of Psychology, Claremont Graduate University

I'm lucky because I have always had opportunities to do things that I really enjoy. It has been my experience, however, that good luck is more likely to come your way if you have worked hard to prepare for it. I received a Ph.D. in Cognitive Psychology from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. It was there that I began studying "visual memory." I was interested in what characteristics of a visual stimulus are retained in memory when the stimulus is "remembered," and the vulnerabilities of these memories to suggestive influences. This has continued to be the focus of my research throughout my career.

I am a researcher because I like doing research. The study of memory is inherently interesting to me and, as the daughter of an electrical engineer, I find the specificity of cognitive research methods appealing. But I am also a social being and much prefer working in a group than alone. This is why I am well-suited for an academic career. I have spent most of my adulthood as a Professor of Psychology at Claremont Graduate University, where I have directed the graduate program in Applied Cognitive Psychology. At any point in time I have a handful of studies in progress and a team of graduate students helping me with each of these. As far as I am concerned, any success I have achieved has been because of the graduate students I have had the pleasure of working with. So my academic job is not just days of teaching large classes of students. I do teach, and love that part of my work. But the most rewarding teaching that I do is really outside of the classroom in a research context, and I wouldn't give this up for anything.

For me, one of the draws of Cognitive Psychology has always been the fact that the work has so many possible applications to real world issues. The application that most naturally fits my research on visual memory has been the field of eyewitness memory. After all, understanding what characteristics of a visual stimulus – such as a perpetrator's face – are retained when the face is "remembered," is at the heart of eyewitness memory.

I have testified as an Expert Witness on Eyewitness Memory in more than 200 trials in Federal, State and Superior Courts. I did not plan to work in Courts as an Expert Witness, nor is it likely to have worked out if I had planned for this. The truth is that for me as well as anyone, my credibility in Court as an Expert Witness relies on my academic credentials and publication record. In other words, you have to be an "expert" at something before you can testify in Court as an Expert Witness. And, I truly believe that no one can be an expert at anything unless they really enjoy it – it's too hard and too much work otherwise.

Testifying in Court is tough; I would not want to do it full time. Where else do you spend hours sitting on a stage in front of a large group of people facing a smart, verbally articulate individual whose job it is to make you look like an idiot? But the truth is that my research is better because it is informed by the experiences I have had as an Expert Witness, and my work in Court is better because of the research that I do to back it up. There is a synergy here that makes my professional world work.

But, am I all work and no play? No! One of the best features of my career is that although it necessitates long hours of work, the hours are flexible. Most of the time I can work when I want and where I want. So I am at home much of the time where I can work near my family. And, yes, I do work too late at night, but I also am home most afternoons when our boys come home from school, and most days find time to run, row or do yoga. I don't have rigid lines that separate my family and my work – I know their world and they know mine, and I like it this way. For more information on Kathy Pezdek visit, [www.cgu.edu/faculty/pezdekk/](http://www.cgu.edu/faculty/pezdekk/).

#### *Academic—Graduate, Community Psychology Professor*

Dr. N. Dickon Reppucci, Professor of Psychology, University of Virginia

My first job was as an Assistant Professor at Yale University (1968-1973), where I was hired by Seymour Sarason to co-teach a seminar in community psychology, a newly developing interdisciplinary area, and to pursue my intervention interests in community settings. My training had been in developmental and clinical psychology, with expertise in behavioral approaches to mental health problems of adolescents and an understanding of the importance of the longitudinal study of development (a la my dissertation adviser, Jerome Kagan). However, Seymour nurtured my identity as a clinical/community psychologist with the emphasis on community. He encouraged me to pursue research and action focused on changing human service organizations, especially public elementary schools and correctional facilities for adolescent offenders, and to challenge prevailing myths, e.g., in a paper entitled, **The social psychology of behavior modification**, Terry Saunders and I attempted to quiet the fears of a behavioral takeover of the helping professions. In 1973, I was promoted to an Associate Professor, whose professional identity was strongly community/prevention. One major outcome of those years was the realization that interventions with juveniles constituted much more than individual or family therapy, and could be best served by adopting an ecological theoretical framework. Moreover, focus needed to be given to the helping professionals themselves and to the larger societal context that so influenced the developing child.

In 1976, I became Professor of Psychology and Director (1976-1980) of a newly developing Program in Clinical Psychology at the University of Virginia, which I believed could be developed to enhance these perspectives. I also initiated a small, free standing Community Psychology program that

allowed students to pursue similar goals but without extensive clinical training in individual psychology. I have directed this Community Psychology program for 28 years, and it has remained focused on these goals and the belief that to be an effective advocate for youth entails using scientific psychology to inform public policy. As with most programs, the research content has varied with faculty interest. Over the past 28 years, several of my Virginia colleagues have shared my interest in prevention and development, but my specific concern has been to integrate psychological research and theory in a manner that can inform the law about development and interventions with children. To pursue these aims, I have developed graduate and undergraduate courses on “Children and the Law” and have collaborated with graduate students in research and action projects related to child maltreatment, juvenile justice, child custody and adolescent decision-making in legal contexts. Because our research has taken genuine cognizance of legal issues, it has been used to inform both the law and public policy. I, of necessity, have become more knowledgeable about the law and have devoted my career to mentoring community and clinical graduate students with similar interests. Many of these students have gone on to very successful careers in academic and governmental institutions and I am very proud of their continuing accomplishments.

Dr. Jennifer Woolard, Associate Professor of Psychology, Georgetown University

My interest in law and policy stemmed from internship and class experiences as a psychology and sociology major at the University of Virginia. Working in a victim-witness assistance program and domestic violence shelter helped me understand that systems affect individuals and families in important ways I wanted to understand further. Unsure whether law school or graduate school was the best route after two years in the workforce, my choice became clear when I quickly sent in the graduate school application but couldn't make it to the mailbox with the law school application.

With its emphasis on an ecological systems approach to prevention, law, and social policy affecting children and families, the University of Virginia community psychology program was a terrific match. In retrospect, several choices and experiences in graduate school prepared me well for my current work. First, I took advantage of the skill and expertise of teachers and mentors in my own community area as well as several other areas, including developmental and quantitative psychology, and faculty at the law school interested in social science. In particular, Dick Reppucci (psychology) and Elizabeth Scott (law) modeled the teacher-scholar approach to socially relevant issues. Advanced training in methodology and statistical analysis has been incredibly helpful. Conducting interdisciplinary work while in graduate school gave me the experiences, both uplifting and frustrating, that I needed once I became a faculty member in an interdisciplinary academic unit. Second, I sought out several different field placements as part of my work, including stints as a staff member for the state Office of Prevention Services and the state legislative Commission on Family Violence Prevention, and as a consultant to statewide domestic

violence and sexual assault advocacy groups. I took my first steps learning the lingo and attempting to translate research into policy and practice, giving me a head start for later work.

I took a position as an assistant professor in the Center for Studies in Criminology and Law at the University of Florida. As one of two psychologists, my colleagues included sociologists, historians, social ecologists and lawyers, among others. My interests in adolescent development and juvenile justice were fostered by collaborations with colleagues within the Center as well as those in the law school and several other schools on Florida's large campus. I established connections to local schools, justice system facilities and statewide organizations as my research program developed. After several years I left the Center to join the faculty of Georgetown University in the Psychology Department, which initiated a graduate program in Human Development and Public Policy. The Washington, DC area has tremendous opportunities for research that spans psychology, law and public policy and I have continued the interdisciplinary approach by collaborating with colleagues in law, health sciences, and other departments as well as with several psychology faculty members.

My suggestion to students with interests that span social science and policy is to think broadly about your educational experiences, your field work outside the academy, and your options when searching for academic positions. Consider the pros and cons of traditional disciplinary departments, which can be fertile places to conduct such work, but don't limit yourself. Be open to interdisciplinary centers, institutes, and other options. Use practical experiences in the field, including working on project teams, to hone your research skills and your knowledge of what policymakers, practitioners, and families face in their daily lives. You probably won't become an expert, but the experience and appreciation will inform your work and enhance your credibility as you partner with those groups throughout your career.

The academic career has been (and will continue to be, I'm sure) hard but rewarding work. The flexibility and autonomy that comes with teaching and research has matched well for me and given me opportunities to work with academics, professionals, and families from a variety of backgrounds and interests on issues important to me.

### ***Academic—Law School Professor***

Dr. Jennifer K. Robbennolt, Associate Professor of Law, University of Missouri

I am an Associate Professor of Law at the University of Missouri School of Law and a Senior Fellow in the Center for the Study of Dispute Resolution. Before accepting my current position, I earned a law degree and a Ph.D. in social psychology in the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's Law/Psychology Program, clerked for a state supreme court judge, and spent two years as a Postdoctoral Research Associate and Lecturer at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and Department of Psychology at Princeton University.

As a psychologist working on research topics that implicate both psychological and legal questions, I have had the opportunity to explore areas as diverse as how citizens and judges determine punitive damages and the implications of these findings for tort reform, the role of empirical research in informing the law of intestacy, the role of the media in influencing the public's perceptions of the legal system as well as the decisions of various players in the system, and the role of apologies in the resolution of disputes.

The academic environment of a law school is both similar to and different from that of a department of psychology. While psychologists within departments of psychology may have primary interests in diverse areas of psychology, they have in common both a shared interest in the study of psychology and a shared commitment to the use of scientific methodologies to explore their questions of interest. In a law school, faculty members have primary interests in diverse areas of the law (ranging from constitutional law to the law of property or contracts, to criminal law and so on), and more diverse methodological approaches, but have a common interest in understanding, commenting on, and improving the law.

That there are fewer empirical researchers in a law school than in a psychology department is both the biggest challenge and the biggest opportunity. There are fewer natural opportunities for detailed discussion of research design or statistics. Instead, there is a wealth of practical experience that grounds one's research and stimulates one's ideas about areas of the law that are ripe for the insights of psychology, but that have been relatively neglected by psychologists. Moreover, the opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration and exchange abound – law faculty may have backgrounds in fields such as economics, sociology, journalism, political science, history, and the physical sciences. Thus, there are exciting possibilities for bringing psychology to areas of the law that have been less frequently examined by psychologists.

Another difference is that law faculty are less likely to work directly with graduate students in psychology, though may still sit on thesis committees. Instead, I am able to introduce psychological science to large groups of future attorneys.

It takes some effort to retain an identity as a psychologist when one's academic home is a law school. A desire to maintain a connection to psychology has implications for decisions about how to frame research questions, where to publish the results, and how to keep current with developments in psychology as well as law. While the challenges are plentiful, the opportunities make meeting those challenges worthwhile.

Dr. Jeffrey Rachlinski, Professor of Law, Cornell University

Like most kids in the United States, I was obliged in junior high school to undertake a personality inventory designed to identify sensible career choices. The results of the inventory produced “lawyer” and “psychologist” as the careers to which I was best suited. Upon entering college at the Johns Hopkins University, I majored in psychology, hoping to put off deciding between the two. In my sophomore year, I was fortunate enough to enroll in a course in law and psychology taught by Donald Bersoff, then the director of the joint program in law and psychology at the University of Maryland law school and the psychology department at Johns Hopkins. Upon being exposed to Professor Bersoff’s seamless synthesis of the two disciplines, I resolved never to truly make a choice.

I applied to several programs in law and psychology offered in the late 1980’s and eventually settled on Stanford. The small program had the advantage of having an advisor--David Rosenhan--who was appointed in both the law school and the psychology department. Unknown to me when I enrolled, it also had the advantage of having two psychologists, Amos Tversky and Lee Ross, whose work was beginning to have a big impact on the discipline of law.

I spent graduate school balancing time in the law school with research in the psychology department. The balance was not always successful. Maintaining research in the psychology department sometimes left me little time to prepare law school classes, and preparing law school classes often meant that research had to be put off.

In my law school classes, I was stuck by the pervasive influence of economics on law. Rational choice theory, rather than psychology, seemed to be legal scholars’ principal model of how people think. At the same time I was discovering the role of economics in law, I encountered Tversky’s extensive critiques of economics. Bringing some of the psychological research on judgment and choice to law would also enable law and psychology to branch out a bit beyond traditional areas of scholarship. The potential to bring psychology’s thinking to law through the critique of economics has become my work. My dissertation, for example, restructured a widely cited economic model of litigation developed by economists with Tversky and Kahneman’s Prospect Theory.

Upon completing my law degree, I entered private practice while completing the work for my dissertation. This lasted only a brief time, however, as I was fortunate enough to find a law school with a strong and growing interest in social science--Cornell. Although I have taught as a visiting scholar at four other law schools since then (Chicago, Penn, Virginia, Yale), I have remained at Cornell for the past ten years. I continue to conduct research and write on the application of the cognitive psychology of judgment and choice to areas of law that have previously treated economics as the only relevant social science. These include securities regulation, environmental law, products liability, corporate governance, and administrative law.

As far as advice, I recommend that any budding law-and-psychology scholar read Michael Saks' article, "The Law does not live by eyewitness testimony alone" (*Law and Human Behavior*, vol. 10, pp. 279-80, 1986). Forensic psychology, jury research, and eyewitness identification are laudable subjects-- but there is a whole world of unexplored opportunities for a law-and-psychology scholar willing to reach beyond them.