
August | 2015

THE STATE OF STUDENT TRAINING IN LAW AND PSYCHOLOGY

Results from the 2015 Student Training Survey



American Psychology-Law Society

STUDENT COMMITTEE

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
DISCLAIMER	4
DATA ACCESS	4
SUGGESTED CITATION	4
BACKGROUND	5
METHOD	5
PARTICIPANTS, SAMPLE, AND DEMOGRAPHICS	6
TABLE 1: PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS—AGE (YEARS)	6
TABLE 2: PARTICIPANTS DEMOGRAPHICS—GENDER IDENTITY	7
TABLE 3: PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS—CULTURAL IDENTITY	8
TABLE 4: PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS—ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION	9
TABLE 5: SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS—AGE (YEARS)	11
TABLE 6: SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS—GENDER IDENTITY	12
TABLE 7: SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS—CULTURAL IDENTITY	13
TABLE 8: SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS—ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION	14
UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING	15
TABLE 9: UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING—INTENDED MAJORS	15
TABLE 10: UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING—SOURCE OF TRAINING LAW AND PSYCHOLOGY	16
TABLE 11: UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING—COVERAGE IN INTRODUCTORY OR SURVEY COURSE	17
TABLE 12: UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING—SUBSTANTIVE LEGAL PSYCHOLOGY	18
TABLE 13: UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING—SPECIALIZED PROGRAMMING	19
GRADUATE TRAINING	20
TABLE 14: GRADUATE TRAINING—SUBSTANTIVE PSYCHOLOGY	20
TABLE 15: GRADUATE TRAINING—RESEARCH DESIGN AND STATISTICS	21
TABLE 16: GRADUATE TRAINING—LEGAL KNOWLEDGE	22
TABLE 17: GRADUATE TRAINING—SUBSTANTIVE LEGAL PSYCHOLOGY	23
TABLE 18: GRADUATE TRAINING—LEGAL QUESTIONS	24
TABLE 19: GRADUATE TRAINING—SCHOLARSHIP AND TRAINING	25
TABLE 20: GRADUATE TRAINING—GRANT EXPERIENCE	26
TABLE 21: GRADUATE TRAINING—PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION	27
TABLE 22: GRADUATE TRAINING—PROFESSIONAL INTEREST	28
TABLE 23: GRADUATE TRAINING—TRAINING SATISFACTION	29
TABLE 24: GRADUATE TRAINING—YEARS TO COMPLETION	30
TABLE 25: GRADUATE TRAINING—FUNDING	31
TABLE 26: GRADUATE TRAINING—DEBT (US DOLLARS)	32
MASTER’S LEVEL TRAINING	33
TABLE 27: MASTER’S LEVEL TRAINING—DEGREE AND PROGRAM	33
TABLE 28: MASTER’S LEVEL TRAINING—SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS IN LAW AND PSYCHOLOGY	34
TABLE 29: MASTER’S LEVEL TRAINING—SUBSTANTIVE LEGAL PSYCHOLOGY	35
TABLE 30: MASTER’S LEVEL TRAINING—YEARS TO COMPLETION	36
TABLE 31: MASTER’S LEVEL TRAINING—DEBT (US DOLLARS)	37

CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING	38
TABLE 32: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—DEGREE AND PROGRAM	38
TABLE 33: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—APA/CPA ACCREDITATION.....	39
TABLE 34: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS IN LAW AND PSYCHOLOGY	40
TABLE 35: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING —SUBSTANTIVE LEGAL PSYCHOLOGY.....	41
TABLE 36: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—YEARS TO COMPLETION	42
TABLE 37: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—DEBT (US DOLLARS).....	43
TABLE 38: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—FORENSIC PRACTICA/EXTERNSHIPS.....	44
TABLE 39: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—FORENSIC PRACTICA/EXTERNSHIPS SUPPORTED	45
TABLE 40: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—FORENSIC PRACTICA/EXTERNSHIPS, SETTING	46
TABLE 41: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—FORENSIC PRACTICA/EXTERNSHIPS, POPULATION EXPERIENCE	47
TABLE 42: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—FORENSIC PRACTICA/EXTERNSHIPS, POPULATION SATISFACTION.....	48
TABLE 43: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—FORENSIC PRACTICA/EXTERNSHIPS, INTERVENTION EXPERIENCE.....	49
TABLE 44: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—FORENSIC PRACTICA/EXTERNSHIPS, ASSESSMENT EXPERIENCE	50
TABLE 45: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—FORENSIC PRACTICA/EXTERNSHIPS, REPORT WRITING EXPERIENCE.....	51
TABLE 46: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—FORENSIC PRACTICA/EXTERNSHIPS, SUPERVISION.....	52
TABLE 47: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—PREDOCTORAL INTERNSHIP.....	53
TABLE 48: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP/RESIDENCY INTEREST	54
TABLE 49: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP/RESIDENCY PLANNING	55
TABLE 50: CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—BOARD CERTIFICATION INTEREST	56
NON-CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING	57
TABLE 51: NON-CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—TRAINING PROGRAMS.....	57
TABLE 52: NON-CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS IN LAW AND PSYCHOLOGY	58
TABLE 53: NON-CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE	59
TABLE 54: NON-CLINICAL DOCTORAL TRAINING—POSTDOCTORAL PLANNING	60
JOINT PROGRAM TRAINING.....	61
TABLE 55: JOINT PROGRAM TRAINING—TRAINING PROGRAMS.....	61
TABLE 56: JOINT PROGRAM TRAINING—PROGRAM CRITERIA.....	62
GLOSSARY	64
REFERENCES	65

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Casey LaDuke, Chair of the American Psychology-Law Society (AP-LS) Student Committee (2014-2015). Support was provided by Meghann Galloway (Chair-Elect), Karen Mitchell Lane (Clinical Liaison), Erika Fountain (Experimental Liaison), Jaymes Fairfax-Columbo (Law Liaison), Caitlin Cavanaugh (Communications Officer), Elizabeth Gale-Benz (Campus Representative Coordinator), and Krystia Reed (Secretary).

We would like to thank Patricia Zapf (AP-LS President, 2014-2015) and Jenifer Woolard (AP-LS President-Elect, 2014-2015) for their support and insight regarding this project. We would also like to thank Kirk Heilbrun for his administrative support of this project.

Disclaimer

The 2015 Student Training Survey was conducted through Drexel University on behalf of the American Psychology-Law Society (APA Division 41). Drexel University's Institutional Review Board approved this research study (IRB#: 1502003427). Please contact the AP-LS Student Committee (aplsstudents@gmail.com) with questions regarding institutional review and approval.

Manuscripts based on data from this project may be submitted for peer-reviewed publication. Relevant sections of this report may be modified or removed upon acceptance of any manuscripts, in accordance with the conditions set forth by the relevant journals.

Data Access

The Student Training Survey data is available freely upon request. Requests for release of data must be submitted via the Student Training Survey website (www.apls-students.org/training-survey). Please include (a) the proposed use of the data, and (b) the projected timeline of use. Submissions will be reviewed and approved on an individual basis. In accordance with the conditions of the institutional approval for this project, data will only be released to current members of AP-LS who have completed this request process.

Suggested Citation

American Psychology-Law Society Student Committee (2015). *The state of student training in law and psychology: Results from the 2015 Student Training Survey*. Retrieved from www.apls-students.org/training-survey.

Background

In 1995, field leaders convened to discuss specialized training law and psychology. This “Villanova Conference” produced specific recommendations to further develop training in law and psychology at undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education levels (Bersoff et al., 1997). Professional training in law and psychology has developed significantly in the last few decades. To date, however, there has been no investigation whether the recommendations of the Villanova Conference were followed to benefit professional training in law and psychology.

The American Psychology-Law Society (AP-LS) Student Committee aimed to survey current undergraduate and graduate students about their training in law and psychology (hereafter “Student Training Survey”). The objective of the Student Training Survey is to provide students, professionals, and field leaders further recommendations to improve specialized training in law and psychology.

Method

Between March and April 2015, advertisements for the Student Training Survey were disseminated in-person at the annual AP-LS conference (March 19-21, 2015, in San Diego, CA) and via the AP-LS Student Affiliate email list, AP-LS Student Committee Campus Representative email list, AP-LS Student Committee Facebook page (www.facebook.com/apls.sc), and AP-LS Student Committee Twitter feed ([@APLSsc](https://twitter.com/APLSsc)). The inclusion criteria were that participants must (a) be currently enrolled within an undergraduate or graduate degree program, and (b) have an expressed interest in training in law and psychology.¹

Interested individuals first accessed the electronic consent page and provided their consent to take part in the research. Participants next completed the Student Training Survey, including items related to their training and practical experience in law and psychology. Survey methods were used to ensure participants only viewed items related to their stated experience. The Student Training Survey was anonymous and no personal identifying information was collected at any time.

Selected data from the Student Training Survey are presented in the following sections. Further results and the complete dataset used to generate the presented results are freely available upon request (see Data Access, above).

¹ For the purposes of this project, “law and psychology” broadly refers to the application of psychological research, theory, or practice to the legal system or legal issues (Otto & Fulero, 2006).

Participants, Sample, and Demographics

A total of 262 individuals responded to the Student Training Survey. Of these, 10 individuals were excluded from analyses because they indicated they were not current students ($n = 6$) or did not provide information regarding their student status ($n = 4$). This resulted in a sample of 252 participants. The demographics for this sample are provided below.

Table 1: Participant demographics—Age (years)

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	251	17	65	27.89	6.89
Undergraduate	45	17	61	25.18	9.12
Master's level	54	21	50	27.48	6.36
Clinical doctoral	98	23	65	29.57	6.75
Non-clinical doctoral	39	22	50	27.51	4.97
Joint	15	25	34	27.47	2.48

Table 2: Participants demographics—Gender identity

	<i>n</i>	Female (%)	Male (%)	Transgender (%)	Other (%)
Overall	252	211 (84)	39 (16)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)
Undergraduate	45	38 (84)	6 (13)	0 (0)	1 (2)
Master's level	54	42 (78)	12 (22)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Clinical doctoral	99	88 (89)	10 (10)	1 (1)	0 (0)
Non-clinical doctoral	39	31 (80)	8 (21)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Joint	15	12 (80)	3 (20)	0 (0)	0 (0)

NOTE: Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 3: Participant demographics—Cultural identity

	<i>n</i>	White or Caucasian (%)	Black or African American (%)	Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish (%)	Asian or Asian American (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native (%)	Other (%)
Overall	252	205 (81)	22 (9)	20 (8)	9 (4)	5 (2)	7 (3)
Undergraduate	45	37 (82)	5 (11)	3 (7)	1 (2)	2 (4)	1 (2)
Master's level	54	41 (76)	7 (13)	3 (6)	2 (4)	1 (2)	3 (6)
Clinical doctoral	99	78 (79)	6 (6)	11 (11)	6 (6)	2 (2)	3 (3)
Non-clinical doctoral	39	34 (87)	3 (8)	3 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Joint	15	15 (100)	1 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

NOTE: Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 4: Participant demographics—Organizational affiliation

	<i>n</i>	AP-LS Student Affiliate			APA Student Affiliate		
		Yes (%)	No (%)	Unsure (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Unsure (%)
Overall	252	203 (81)	33 (13)	16 (6)	142 (56)	91 (36)	19 (8)
Undergraduate	45	22 (49)	15 (33)	8 (18)	14 (31)	23 (51)	8 (18)
Master's level	54	41 (76)	9 (17)	4 (7)	31 (57)	19 (35)	4 (7)
Clinical doctoral	99	89 (90)	8 (8)	2 (2)	78 (79)	20 (20)	1 (1)
Non-clinical doctoral	39	36 (92)	1 (3)	2 (5)	10 (26)	26 (67)	3 (8)
Joint	15	15 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (60)	3 (20)	3 (20)

Of the sample of 252 participants, 39 participants did not provide sufficient information to be included in further analyses. This includes participants in the undergraduate ($n = 7$), terminal Master's ($n = 14$), clinical doctoral ($n = 10$), non-clinical doctoral ($n = 6$), and joint program samples ($n = 2$).

A final sample of 213 participants has been included in further analyses. This subsample includes participants in undergraduate ($n = 38$), terminal Master's ($n = 40$), clinical doctoral ($n = 89$), non-clinical doctoral ($n = 33$), and joint programs ($n = 13$). The demographics for this subsample are provided below.

Table 5: Sample demographics—Age (years)

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	212	17	65	28.00	7.04
Undergraduate	38	17	61	25.71	9.67
Master's level	40	21	50	26.95	5.72
Clinical doctoral	88	23	65	29.77	6.99
Non-clinical doctoral	33	22	50	27.27	5.20
Joint	13	25	34	27.69	2.56

Table 6: Sample demographics—Gender identity

	<i>n</i>	Female (%)	Male (%)	Transgender (%)	Other (%)
Overall	213	177 (83)	34 (16)	1 (1)	1 (1)
Undergraduate	38	31 (82)	6 (16)	0 (0)	1 (3)
Master's level	40	31 (76)	9 (23)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Clinical doctoral	89	79 (89)	9 (10)	1 (1)	0 (0)
Non-clinical doctoral	33	26 (79)	7 (21)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Joint	13	10 (77)	3 (23)	0 (0)	0 (0)

NOTE: Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 7: Sample demographics—Cultural identity

	<i>n</i>	White or Caucasian (%)	Black or African American (%)	Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish (%)	Asian or Asian American (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native (%)	Other (%)
Overall	213	177 (83)	20 (9)	14 (7)	7 (3)	3 (1)	5 (2)
Undergraduate	38	31 (82)	5 (13)	3 (8)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (3)
Master's level	40	32 (80)	6 (15)	1 (3)	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (3)
Clinical doctoral	89	70 (79)	6 (7)	9 (10)	5 (6)	2 (2)	3 (3)
Non-clinical doctoral	33	31 (94)	2 (6)	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Joint	13	13 (100)	1 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

NOTE: Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 8: Sample demographics—Organizational affiliation

	<i>n</i>	AP-LS Student Affiliate			APA Student Affiliate		
		Yes (%)	No (%)	Unsure (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Unsure (%)
Overall	213	174 (82)	25 (12)	14 (7)	125 (59)	74 (35)	14 (7)
Undergraduate	38	20 (53)	12 (32)	6 (16)	14 (37)	18 (47)	6 (16)
Master's level	40	31 (76)	5 (13)	4 (10)	23 (58)	15 (38)	2 (5)
Clinical doctoral	89	80 (90)	7 (8)	2 (2)	71 (80)	17 (19)	1 (1)
Non-clinical doctoral	33	30 (91)	1 (3)	2 (6)	9 (27)	21 (64)	3 (9)
Joint	13	13 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (62)	3 (23)	2 (15)

Undergraduate Training

Undergraduate students ($n = 38$) were surveyed about their training experiences in law and psychology. The sample of undergraduate students included full-time students ($n = 34$, or 90%), part-time students ($n = 2$, or 5%), and full-time online students ($n = 2$, or 5%). The grouped results from these items are presented below.

Table 9: Undergraduate training—Intended majors

	<i>n</i>	%
Psychology	35	92
Criminal Justice	4	11
Criminology	3	8
Legal Studies	0	0
Forensic Sciences	2	5
Social Work	0	0
Other	6*	16

NOTE: "What is/are your major or intended major(s)?" Participants could choose multiple items.

*Applied Behavior Analysis ($n = 2$, or 5%), Forensic Psychology, Cognitive Science, Sociology, Integrative Studies (all $n = 1$, or 3%).

Table 10: Undergraduate training—Source of training law and psychology

	<i>n</i>	%
Introductory course	15	40
General survey course	4	11
Survey course specific to law and psychology	13	34
Seminar specific to law and psychology	11	29
Other	0	0

NOTE: “How is law and psychology taught at your institution?” Participants could choose multiple items.

Undergraduate participants who indicated training in survey courses and seminars specific to law and psychology ($n = 17$) estimated their institutions supported an average of 2.76 ($SD = 2.59$, $range = 1-10$) courses devoted to law and psychology.

Table 11: Undergraduate training—Coverage in introductory or survey course

	<i>n</i>	%
Mentioned in text (informal)	4	25
Chapter in text (formal)	5	31
Mentioned in class (informal)	0	0
Discussion in class (formal)	7	44

NOTE: “How are topics related to law and psychology taught in the relevant introductory or survey courses at your institution?” Only includes individuals who indicated training in law and psychology in introductory and general survey course (*n* = 16; see Table 10).

Table 12: Undergraduate training—Substantive legal psychology

	<i>n</i>	%
Introductory/general	27	71
Psychology of criminal behavior	22	58
Forensic assessment	14	37
Forensic treatment	10	26
Social psychology and law	17	44
Juvenile offending	11	29
Victimology	9	24
Law and mental health	16	42
Legal concepts	12	32
Ethical issues	12	32
Socio-cultural issues	8	21
Professional practice	4	11
Contemporary research	10	26

NOTE: “Which of the following topics are covered in the course(s) devoted to law and psychology at your institution?” Items adapted from Bartol & Barol (2012), Bersoff et al. (1997), and Burl et al. (2012). Participants could choose multiple items. See Appendix for item definitions.

Table 13: Undergraduate training—Specialized programming

	<i>n</i>	%
No specialized programming	14	37
Informal concentration/ course series	15	40
Formal track, minor, or major	15	40
Capstone experience (i.e., practicum, research, thesis)	7	18

NOTE: “Which of the following specialized programs does your institution offer in law and psychology?” Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997). Participants could choose multiple items.

Graduate Training

Graduate students ($N = 175$) in terminal Master's ($n = 40$), clinical doctoral ($n = 89$), non-clinical doctoral ($n = 33$), and joint-degree programs ($n = 13$) were surveyed about their training experiences in law and psychology. The results from these items across all graduate training programs are presented below. Further breakdown of relevant results by graduate program, and the results from program-specific items are presented in the following sections of this report.

Table 14: Graduate training—Substantive psychology

	Overall (%)	Master's (%)	Clinical doctoral (%)	Non-clinical doctoral (%)	Joint (%)
Biological Bases of Behavior	119 (68)	14 (35)	85 (96)	12 (36)	8 (62)
Cognitive/Affective Aspects of Behavior	139 (79)	19 (48)	86 (97)	24 (73)	10 (77)
Social Bases of Behavior ¹	153 (87)	26 (65)	85 (96)	29 (88)	13 (100)
Individual Differences ²	138 (79)	25 (63)	84 (94)	20 (61)	9 (69)
History and Systems	109 (62)	9 (23)	82 (92)	9 (27)	9 (69)
Ethics	135 (77)	23 (58)	87 (98)	15 (46)	10 (77)
Statistics/Research Methods	163 (93)	35 (88)	87 (98)	29 (88)	12 (92)
Foundations of Psychological Evaluation/Measurement ³	122 (70)	18 (45)	84 (94)	11 (33)	9 (69)
Psychological Therapy/ Foundations of Intervention	113 (65)	18 (45)	85 (96)	2 (6)	8 (62)
Clinical and Professional Training ⁴	111 (63)	15 (38)	82 (92)	5 (15)	9 (69)

NOTE: "In which of the following areas have you received instruction in *substantive psychology*?"
Items adapted from APA (2013). Participants could choose multiple items.

¹I.e., social psychology, multicultural perspectives.

²I.e., developmental, psychopathology.

³I.e., intellectual, personality, case conceptualization.

⁴I.e., clinical practica, teaching, consultation.

Table 15: Graduate training—Research design and statistics

	Overall (%)	Master's (%)	Clinical doctoral (%)	Non-clinical doctoral (%)	Joint (%)
Naturalistic observation	51 (29)	12 (30)	31 (35)	6 (18)	2 (15)
Case studies	83 (47)	25 (63)	48 (54)	7 (21)	3 (23)
Survey research	128 (73)	27 (68)	67 (75)	22 (67)	12 (92)
Program evaluation	77 (44)	11 (28)	45 (51)	12 (36)	9 (69)
Quasi-experimental methods	121 (69)	27 (68)	62 (70)	23 (70)	9 (69)
Experimental methods	145 (83)	27 (68)	77 (87)	30 (91)	11 (85)
Descriptive statistics	146 (83)	25 (63)	80 (90)	28 (85)	13 (100)
Univariate statistical analysis	134 (77)	20 (50)	71 (80)	30 (91)	13 (100)
Multivariate statistical analysis	129 (74)	17 (43)	69 (78)	30 (91)	13 (100)
Meta-analysis	82 (47)	10 (25)	46 (52)	17 (52)	9 (69)
Hierarchical linear modeling	74 (42)	8 (20)	36 (40)	23 (70)	7 (54)
Computational modeling	26 (15)	4 (10)	13 (15)	8 (24)	1 (7)
Data management	71 (41)	10 (25)	42 (47)	12 (36)	7 (54)
Coding	99 (57)	14 (35)	57 (64)	18 (55)	10 (77)
Data mining	29 (17)	1 (3)	21 (24)	6 (18)	1 (7)
Other	14* (8)	3 (8)	6 (7)	5 (15)	0 (0)

NOTE: "In which of the following areas have you received instruction in *research design and statistics*?" Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997) and authors. Participants could choose multiple items.

*Structural Equation Modeling ($n = 5$), Psychometrics ($n = 2$), Categorical data analysis ($n = 1$), Item Response Theory ($n = 1$), Longitudinal ($n = 1$), Multivariate Techniques ($n = 1$), Qualitative research ($n = 1$), general survey ($n = 1$).

Table 16: Graduate training—Legal knowledge

	Overall (%)	Master's (%)	Clinical doctoral (%)	Non-clinical doctoral (%)	Joint (%)
Civil procedure	58 (33)	11 (28)	32 (36)	4 (12)	11 (85)
Criminal procedure	95 (54)	20 (50)	50 (56)	14 (42)	11 (85)
Evidence	45 (26)	7 (18)	21 (24)	8 (24)	9 (69)
Constitutional law	45 (26)	11 (28)	21 (24)	3 (9)	10 (77)
Administrative law	20 (11)	2 (5)	11 (12)	1 (3)	6 (46)
Civil law	46 (26)	7 (18)	27 (30)	3 (9)	9 (69)
Criminal law	89 (51)	21 (53)	47 (53)	9 (27)	12 (92)
Torts	31 (18)	3 (8)	15 (17)	0 (0)	13 (100)
Contracts	16 (9)	3 (8)	5 (6)	0 (0)	8 (62)
Business law	12 (7)	2 (5)	5 (6)	1 (3)	4 (31)
Intellectual Property law	8 (5)	2 (5)	2 (2)	0 (0)	4 (31)
Wills and estates	10 (6)	1 (3)	3 (3)	0 (0)	6 (46)
Property law	11 (6)	0 (0)	2 (2)	0 (0)	9 (69)
Legal research	50 (29)	5 (13)	19 (21)	13 (39)	13 (100)
Mental health law	112 (64)	24 (60)	67 (75)	10 (30)	11 (85)
International law	7 (4)	0 (0)	4 (5)	0 (0)	3 (23)
Conflict of laws	12 (7)	3 (8)	4 (5)	1 (3)	4 (31)
Tax law	2 (1)	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (8)
Employment law	10 (6)	0 (0)	4 (5)	0 (0)	6 (46)
Family law	38 (22)	6 (15)	21 (24)	2 (6)	9 (69)
Client counseling	47 (27)	8 (20)	35 (39)	0 (0)	4 (31)
Alternative dispute resolution	17 (10)	6 (15)	6 (7)	0 (0)	5 (39)
Behavioral sciences and the law	106 (61)	21 (53)	53 (60)	20 (61)	12 (92)
Expert witnesses	103 (59)	24 (60)	54 (61)	15 (46)	10 (77)
Psycholegal research	99 (57)	22 (55)	47 (53)	20 (61)	10 (77)
Other	8 (5)	2 (5)	2 (2)	2 (6)	2 (15)

NOTE: "In which of the following areas have you received instruction in *legal knowledge*?" Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997) and authors. Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 17: Graduate training—Substantive legal psychology

	Overall (%)	Master's (%)	Clinical doctoral (%)	Non-clinical doctoral (%)	Joint (%)
Introductory/general	128 (73)	26 (65)	67 (75)	24 (73)	11 (85)
Forensic assessment	118 (67)	27 (68)	76 (85)	7 (21)	8 (62)
Forensic treatment	91 (52)	22 (55)	56 (63)	8 (24)	5 (39)
Social psychology and law	79 (45)	19 (48)	31 (35)	20 (61)	9 (69)
Juvenile offending	79 (45)	21 (53)	43 (48)	10 (30)	5 (39)
Psychology of criminal behavior	86 (49)	28 (70)	43 (48)	12 (36)	3 (23)
Law and mental health	99 (57)	22 (55)	59 (66)	9 (27)	9 (69)
Ethical issues	114 (65)	24 (60)	67 (75)	12 (36)	11 (85)
Victimology	40 (23)	17 (43)	16 (18)	6 (18)	1 (8)
Socio-cultural issues	64 (37)	16 (40)	32 (36)	10 (30)	6 (46)
Police and investigative psychology	55 (31)	20 (50)	24 (27)	8 (24)	10 (77)
Professional practice	63 (36)	12 (30)	43 (48)	4 (12)	4 (31)
Legal concepts	74 (42)	18 (45)	34 (38)	13 (39)	9 (70)
Contemporary research	72 (41)	15 (38)	31 (35)	18 (55)	8 (62)

NOTE: "In which of the following areas have you received instruction in *substantive legal psychology*?" Items adapted from Bartol & Barol (2012), Bersoff et al. (1997), and Burl et al. (2012). Participants could choose multiple items. See Appendix for item definitions.

Table 18: Graduate training—Legal questions

	Overall (%)	Master's (%)	Clinical doctoral (%)	Non-clinical doctoral (%)	Joint (%)
Competence to stand trial (adult)	123 (70)	33 (83)	74 (83)	8 (24)	8 (62)
Criminal responsibility	111 (63)	29 (73)	62 (70)	10 (30)	10 (77)
Capacity to confess	65 (37)	22 (55)	30 (34)	10 (30)	3 (23)
Sexually violent predators	89 (51)	28 (70)	49 (55)	7 (21)	5 (39)
Risk of violence (adult)	112 (64)	25 (63)	68 (76)	11 (33)	8 (62)
Jury selection	53 (30)	18 (45)	18 (20)	12 (36)	5 (39)
Capital sentencing	61 (35)	12 (30)	31 (35)	11 (33)	7 (54)
Eyewitness identification	83 (47)	27 (68)	26 (29)	23 (70)	7 (54)
Capacity to consent to treatment	73 (42)	17 (43)	45 (51)	7 (21)	4 (31)
Substituted judgment	14 (8)	3 (8)	8 (9)	1 (3)	2 (15)
Civil commitment	83 (47)	21 (53)	49 (55)	6 (18)	7 (54)
Harassment and discrimination claims	15 (9)	2 (5)	8 (9)	0 (0)	5 (39)
Workplace disability	19 (11)	1 (3)	15 (17)	0 (0)	3 (23)
Child custody	58 (33)	11 (28)	40 (45)	4 (12)	3 (23)
Competence to stand trial (juvenile)	80 (46)	22 (55)	42 (47)	10 (30)	6 (46)
Risk of violence (juvenile)	77 (44)	21 (53)	41 (46)	11 (33)	4 (31)
Child protection	36 (21)	11 (28)	19 (21)	5 (15)	1 (8)
Disposition/transfer	47 (27)	13 (33)	23 (26)	6 (18)	5 (39)
Sentencing (general)	57 (33)	14 (35)	26 (29)	11 (33)	6 (46)
Other	10 (6)	1 (3)	6 (7)	3 (9)	0 (0)

NOTE: "With which of the following *legal questions* have you received substantive instruction?" Items adapted from Grisso, Goldstein, and Heilbrun (2009). Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 19: Graduate training—Scholarship and training

	Overall (%)	Master's (%)	Clinical doctoral (%)	Non-clinical doctoral (%)	Joint (%)
Research development	107 (61)	21 (53)	47 (53)	29 (88)	10 (77)
Master's thesis	87 (50)	31 (53)	31 (35)	25 (76)	10 (77)
Doctoral thesis	112 (64)	0 (0)	77 (79)	30 (91)	12 (92)
Conference presentation of research	124 (71)	17 (43)	65 (73)	31 (94)	11 (85)
Publication of research	114 (65)	18 (45)	54 (61)	32 (97)	10 (77)
Instructing undergraduate courses	71 (41)	8 (20)	31 (35)	24 (73)	8 (62)
Conducting workshops	22 (13)	2 (5)	13 (15)	7 (21)	0 (0)
Experience in legislative, administrative, and judicial settings	58 (33)	11 (28)	30 (34)	11 (33)	6 (46)
Other	13 (7)	6 (15)	5 (6)	1 (3)	1 (8)

NOTE: "In which of the following areas have you received instruction in *scholarship and training*?"
 Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997). Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 20: Graduate training—Grant experience

			<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	Grants	Applied	175	0	20	0.84	2.40
		Awarded	175	0	10	0.37	1.12
	Research fellowships	Applied	175	0	10	0.52	1.24
		Awarded	175	0	6	0.34	0.89
Master's	Grants	Applied	40	0	4	0.18	0.68
		Awarded	40	0	2	0.13	0.40
	Research fellowships	Applied	40	0	1	0.08	0.27
		Awarded	40	0	1	0.10	0.30
Clinical doctoral	Grants	Applied	89	0	10	0.54	1.71
		Awarded	89	0	7	0.30	0.95
	Research fellowships	Applied	89	0	6	0.42	1.03
		Awarded	89	0	5	0.33	0.86
Non-clinical doctoral	Grants	Applied	33	0	20	2.12	3.40
		Awarded	33	0	10	0.76	1.82
	Research fellowships	Applied	33	0	10	1.45	1.97
		Awarded	33	0	6	0.58	1.15
Joint	Grants	Applied	13	0	15	1.69	4.09
		Awarded	13	0	4	0.62	1.19
	Research fellowships	Applied	13	0	3	0.23	0.83
		Awarded	13	0	5	0.54	1.39

NOTE: “How many grants have you applied for?” and “How many grants have you been awarded?”

Table 21: Graduate training—Professional preparation

	Overall (%)	Master's (%)	Clinical doctoral (%)	Non-clinical doctoral (%)	Joint (%)
Health and mental health policy	70 (40)	19 (48)	39 (44)	5 (15)	7 (54)
Training of law enforcement personnel, lawyers, judges	52 (30)	14 (35)	22 (25)	8 (24)	8 (62)
Assessment of court functioning and administrative processes	41 (23)	10 (25)	18 (20)	6 (18)	7 (54)
Mediation and dispute resolution	22 (13)	3 (8)	14 (16)	1 (3)	4 (31)
Case and jury consultation	45 (26)	12 (30)	15 (17)	13 (39)	5 (39)
Working within legislative committee staffs	15 (9)	3 (8)	5 (7)	3 (9)	4 (31)
Service as an expert witness	86 (49)	12 (30)	48 (54)	16 (49)	10 (77)
Social science research	112 (64)	22 (55)	49 (55)	30 (91)	11 (85)
Clinical research	82 (47)	15 (38)	60 (67)	2 (6)	5 (39)
Clinical practice—General assessment	103 (59)	12 (30)	82 (92)	2 (6)	7 (54)
Clinical practice—General intervention	99 (57)	8 (20)	82 (92)	2 (6)	7 (54)
Clinical practice—Forensic assessment	97 (55)	17 (43)	70 (79)	2 (6)	8 (62)
Clinical practice—Forensic intervention	74 (42)	8 (20)	57 (64)	2 (6)	7 (54)
Legal practice	14 (8)	0 (0)	5 (7)	1 (3)	8 (62)
Government	27 (15)	5 (13)	10 (11)	6 (18)	6 (46)
Judiciary	15 (9)	3 (8)	5 (6)	2 (6)	5 (39)
Teaching—Psychology	118 (67)	21 (53)	57 (64)	31 (94)	9 (69)
Teaching—Law	21 (12)	2 (5)	7 (8)	3 (9)	9 (69)
Industry	13 (7)	1 (3)	5 (6)	7 (21)	0 (0)
Other	3 (2)	2 (5)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)

NOTE: “For which of the following professional activities do you believe your training has prepared you?” Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997). Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 22: Graduate training—Professional interest

	Overall (%)	Master's (%)	Clinical doctoral (%)	Non-clinical doctoral (%)	Joint (%)
Health and mental health policy	45 (26)	9 (23)	26 (29)	3 (9)	7 (54)
Training of law enforcement personnel, lawyers, judges	46 (26)	13 (33)	22 (25)	7 (21)	4 (31)
Assessment of court functioning and administrative processes	34 (19)	8 (20)	19 (21)	4 (12)	3 (23)
Mediation and dispute resolution	15 (9)	3 (8)	10 (11)	0 (0)	2 (15)
Case and jury consultation	47 (27)	13 (33)	20 (23)	11 (33)	3 (23)
Working within legislative committee staffs	14 (8)	3 (8)	5 (6)	4 (12)	2 (15)
Service as an expert witness	98 (56)	22 (55)	56 (63)	15 (46)	5 (39)
Social science research	91 (52)	20 (50)	33 (37)	29 (88)	9 (69)
Clinical research	45 (26)	7 (18)	35 (39)	1 (3)	2 (15)
Clinical practice—General assessment	67 (38)	10 (25)	52 (58)	2 (6)	3 (23)
Clinical practice—General intervention	60 (34)	11 (28)	46 (52)	1 (3)	2 (15)
Clinical practice—Forensic assessment	113 (65)	23 (58)	83 (93)	2 (6)	5 (39)
Clinical practice—Forensic intervention	92 (53)	16 (40)	70 (79)	1 (3)	5 (39)
Legal practice	12 (7)	3 (8)	5 (6)	0 (0)	4 (31)
Government	28 (16)	5 (13)	13 (15)	7 (21)	3 (23)
Judiciary	6 (3)	2 (5)	4 (5)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Teaching—Psychology	118 (67)	29 (73)	52 (58)	29 (88)	8 (62)
Teaching—Law	23 (13)	3 (8)	9 (10)	4 (12)	7 (54)
Industry	10 (6)	0 (0)	3 (3)	7 (21)	0 (0)
Other	6 (3)	2 (5)	3 (3)	1 (3)	0 (0)

NOTE: “Which types of positions do you intend to pursue following the completion of your degree program?” Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997). Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 23: Graduate training—Training satisfaction

		<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Research (within lab)	Overall	175	1	5	3.50	1.30
	Master's	40	1	5	3.05	1.41
	Clinical doctoral	89	1	5	3.33	1.19
	Non-clinical doctoral	33	1	5	4.24	1.06
	Joint	13	1	5	4.23	1.17
Research (outside lab)	Overall	175	1	5	3.06	1.12
	Master's	40	1	5	2.85	1.12
	Clinical doctoral	89	1	5	2.96	1.09
	Non-clinical doctoral	33	1	5	3.30	1.19
	Joint	13	3	5	3.85	0.80
Conference presentations	Overall	175	1	5	3.85	1.24
	Master's	40	1	5	3.18	1.43
	Clinical doctoral	89	1	5	3.79	1.18
	Non-clinical doctoral	33	4	5	4.64	0.49
	Joint	13	1	5	4.31	1.18
Publishing (first author)	Overall	175	1	5	3.30	1.33
	Master's	40	1	5	2.78	1.44
	Clinical doctoral	89	1	5	3.30	1.27
	Non-clinical doctoral	33	1	5	3.91	1.18
	Joint	13	1	5	3.38	1.19
Publishing (other author)	Overall	175	1	5	3.36	1.34
	Master's	40	1	5	2.90	1.36
	Clinical doctoral	89	1	5	3.37	1.37
	Non-clinical doctoral	33	1	5	3.73	1.18
	Joint	13	2	5	3.77	1.24
Publication mentorship	Overall	175	1	5	3.35	1.28
	Master's	40	1	5	2.90	1.32
	Clinical doctoral	89	1	5	3.37	1.22
	Non-clinical doctoral	33	1	5	3.79	1.24
	Joint	13	1	5	3.54	1.33

NOTE: "How satisfied are you with the following?" Based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 5 (Very Satisfied).

Table 24: Graduate training—Years to completion

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	175	0	8	4.45	1.79
Master's	40	0	5	1.93	0.80
Clinical	89	2	8	5.11	1.26
Non-clinical	33	2	6	4.89	1.14
Joint	13	6	7	6.54	0.52

NOTE: “How many years do you anticipate to take to complete your degree?” This data should be interpreted with caution, as it appears participants did not respond to the item in a consistent manner (i.e., total years to completion vs. additional years until completion of their degree programs).

Table 25: Graduate training—Funding

	Overall (%)	Master's (%)	Clinical doctoral (%)	Non-clinical doctoral (%)	Joint (%)
Stipend	83 (47)	7 (18)	40 (45)	24 (73)	12 (92)
Teaching Assistantship	77 (44)	10 (25)	33 (37)	26 (79)	8 (62)
Research Assistantship	51 (29)	5 (13)	23 (26)	17 (52)	6 (46)
Administrative position	9 (5)	1 (3)	6 (7)	0 (0)	2 (15)
Student loan	118 (67)	31 (78)	70 (79)	8 (24)	9 (69)
Personal loan	17 (10)	2 (5)	15 (17)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Other	38* (22)	12 (30)	19 (21)	5 (15)	2 (15)

NOTE: "How are you funding your graduate training?" Participants could choose multiple items.

*External employment ($n = 10$), personal savings ($n = 5$), fellowships ($n = 3$), scholarships ($n = 3$), paid clinical placements ($n = 2$), family support ($n = 1$), GI Bill ($n = 1$), government student grants ($n = 1$), tuition waiver ($n = 1$), Veteran's benefits ($n = 1$), and work study ($n = 1$).

Table 26: Graduate training—Debt (US dollars)

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	172	0	400,000	87,250	93,124
Master's	39	0	350,000	52,256	58,848
Clinical doctoral	88	0	400,000	127,875	101,130
Non-clinical doctoral	32	0	130,000	21,906	32,348
Joint	13	0	320,000	78,076	90,556

NOTE: "Approximately how much student loan debt do you believe you will owe after graduation?"

Master's Level Training

Graduate students in Master's programs ($n = 40$) were surveyed about their training experiences in law and psychology. Results from general and program-specific items are presented below, including comparisons between participants in MA programs and MS programs where relevant.

Table 27: Master's level training—Degree and program

Degree	Program	<i>n</i>	%
MA programs	Overall	28	70
	<i>Psychology</i>	5	13
	<i>Forensic psychology</i>	18	45
	<i>Legal psychology</i>	1	3
	<i>Criminal justice</i>	1	3
	<i>Other</i>	3 ¹	8
MS programs	Overall	11	28
	<i>Psychology</i>	3	8
	<i>Forensic psychology</i>	4	10
	<i>Forensic mental health counseling</i>	1	3
	<i>Other</i>	3 ²	8
Other		1 ³	3

NOTE: "In which type of Master's *degree* program are you currently enrolled?" and "In which type of Master's program are you currently enrolled?" Items adapted from AP-LS (2015). Based on $n = 40$.

¹Forensic and Legal Psychology ($n = 3$).

²Forensic mental health ($n = 2$); Psychology & Law ($n = 1$).

³MS Psychology and MA Forensic Psychology ($n = 1$).

Table 27: Master’s level training—Specialized programs in law and psychology

Program	Degree	<i>n</i>	%
Minor	<i>Overall</i>	1	3
	<i>MA programs</i>	0	0
	<i>MS programs</i>	0	0
	<i>Other</i>	1	3
Track/concentration/emphasis	<i>Overall</i>	10	25
	<i>MA programs</i>	6	15
	<i>MS programs</i>	3	8
	<i>Other</i>	1	3
Degree	<i>Overall</i>	22	55
	<i>MA programs</i>	16	40
	<i>MS programs</i>	5	13
	<i>Other</i>	1	3
No specialized program	<i>Overall</i>	11	28
	<i>MA programs</i>	7	18
	<i>MS programs</i>	4	10
	<i>Other</i>	0	0

NOTE: “Which of the following specialized programs does your institution offer?” Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997). Based on *n* = 40.

Due to the nature of the data, only those participants who reported attending MA programs *or* MS programs are included in further analyses (*n* = 39).

Table 28: Master’s level training—Substantive legal psychology

	Overall	% ¹	MA programs	% ²	MS programs	% ³
Introductory/general	25	64	21	75	4	36
Forensic assessment	26	67	22	79	4	36
Forensic treatment	21	54	16	57	5	45
Social psychology and law	18	46	15	54	3	27
Juvenile offending	21	54	15	54	6	55
Psychology of criminal behavior	27	69	23	82	4	36
Law and mental health	21	54	16	57	5	46
Ethical issues	23	59	19	68	4	36
Victimology	16	41	12	43	4	36
Socio-cultural issues	15	39	13	46	2	18
Police and investigative psychology	20	51	18	64	2	18
Professional practice	11	28	9	32	2	18
Legal concepts	17	44	15	54	2	18
Contemporary research	14	36	10	36	4	36

NOTE: NOTE: “In which of the following areas have you received instruction in *substantive legal psychology*?” Items adapted from Bartol & Barol (2012), Bersoff et al. (1997), and Burl et al. (2012). Participants could choose multiple items. See Appendix for item definitions.

¹Based on $n = 39$.

²Based on $n = 28$.

³Based on $n = 11$.

Table 29: Master’s level training—Years to completion

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	39	0	5	1.93	0.81
MA programs	28	1	5	1.96	0.86
MS programs	11	0	3	1.85	0.71

NOTE: “How many years do you anticipate to take to complete your degree?” This data should be interpreted with caution, as it appears participants did not respond to the item in a consistent manner (i.e., total years to completion vs. additional years until completion of their degree programs).

Table 30: Master’s level training—Debt (US dollars)

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	38	0	350,000	51,789	59,565
MA programs	27	0	350,000	53,962	69,069
MS programs	11	0	100,000	46,455	26,082

NOTE: “Approximately how much student loan debt do you believe you will owe after graduation?”

Clinical Doctoral Training

Graduate students in clinical doctoral programs ($n = 89$) were surveyed about their training experiences in law and psychology. Results from general and program-specific items are presented below, including comparisons between participants in PhD programs and PsyD programs where relevant.

Table 31: Clinical doctoral training—Degree and program

Degree	Program	<i>n</i>	%
PhD programs	<i>Overall</i>	48	54
	<i>Clinical Psychology</i>	31	35
	<i>Forensic Psychology</i>	5	5
	<i>Clinical Forensic Psychology</i>	8	9
	<i>Counseling</i>	4	4
PsyD programs	<i>Overall</i>	40	45
	<i>Clinical Psychology</i>	28	31
	<i>Forensic Psychology</i>	2	2
	<i>Clinical Forensic Psychology</i>	9	10
	<i>Counseling</i>	1	1
Other		1	1

NOTE: “In which type of Doctoral Clinical degree program are you currently enrolled?” and “In which type of Doctoral Clinical program are you currently enrolled?” Items adapted from AP-LS (2015). Based on $n = 89$.

Due to the nature of the data, only those participants who reported attending PhD programs or PsyD programs are included in further analyses ($n = 88$).

Table 32: Clinical doctoral training—APA/CPA accreditation

		<i>n</i>	%
PhD programs	<i>Yes</i>	41	47
	<i>No</i>	5	6
	<i>Unsure</i>	2	2
PsyD programs	<i>Yes</i>	30	34
	<i>No</i>	10	11
	<i>Unsure</i>	0	0

NOTE: “Is your program currently APA/CPA accredited?” Based on *n* = 88.

Table 33: Clinical doctoral training—Specialized programs in law and psychology

Program	Degree	<i>n</i>	%
Minor	<i>Overall</i>	2	2
	<i>PhD programs</i>	1	1
	<i>PsyD programs</i>	1	1
Track/concentration/emphasis	<i>Overall</i>	45	51
	<i>PhD programs</i>	28	32
	<i>PsyD programs</i>	17	19
Degree	<i>Overall</i>	15	17
	<i>PhD programs</i>	7	8
	<i>PsyD programs</i>	8	9
None	<i>Overall</i>	35	40
	<i>PhD programs</i>	16	18
	<i>PsyD programs</i>	19	22

NOTE: “Which of the following specialized programs does your institution offer?” Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997). Based on $n = 88$. Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 34: Clinical doctoral training —Substantive legal psychology

	Overall	% ¹	PhD programs	% ²	PsyD programs	% ³
Introductory/general	66	75	35	73	31	78
Forensic assessment	75	85	44	92	31	78
Forensic treatment	55	63	28	58	27	68
Social psychology and law	30	34	22	46	8	20
Juvenile offending	43	49	24	50	19	48
Psychology of criminal behavior	42	48	22	46	20	50
Law and mental health	58	66	33	69	25	63
Ethical issues	66	75	37	77	29	73
Victimology	15	17	8	17	7	18
Socio-cultural issues	31	35	17	35	14	35
Police and investigative psychology	24	27	14	29	10	25
Professional practice	42	48	25	52	17	43
Legal concepts	33	38	23	48	10	25
Contemporary research	30	34	21	44	9	23

NOTE: “In which of the following areas have you received instruction in *substantive legal psychology*?” Items adapted from Bartol & Barol (2012), Bersoff et al. (1997), and Burl et al. (2012). Participants could choose multiple items. See Appendix for item definitions.

¹Based on $n = 88$.

²Based on $n = 48$.

³Based on $n = 40$.

Table 35: Clinical doctoral training—Years to completion

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	88	2	8	5.15	1.17
PhD programs	48	2	7	5.33	1.14
PsyD programs	40	2	8	4.93	1.19

NOTE: “How many years do you anticipate to take to complete your degree?” This data should be interpreted with caution, as it appears participants did not respond to the item in a consistent manner (i.e., total years to completion vs. additional years until completion of their degree programs).

Table 36: Clinical doctoral training—Debt (US dollars)

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	88	0	400,000	127,875	101,130
PhD programs	48	0	400,000	92,333	96,614
PsyD programs	40	0	400,000	170,525	90,251

NOTE: “Approximately how much student loan debt do you believe you will owe after graduation?”

Table 38: Clinical doctoral training—Forensic practica/externships

		<i>n</i>	%
Overall ¹	<i>Yes</i>	73	83
	<i>No</i>	11	13
	<i>No response</i>	4	5
PhD programs ²	<i>Yes</i>	38	79
	<i>No</i>	9	19
	<i>No response</i>	1	2
PsyD programs ³	<i>Yes</i>	35	88
	<i>No</i>	2	5
	<i>No response</i>	3	8

NOTE: “Does your clinical program support any clinical practica/externships with supervised clinical forensic experience?”

¹Based on *n* = 88.

²Based on *n* = 48.

³Based on *n* = 40.

Table 39: Clinical doctoral training—Forensic practica/externships supported

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	63	1	15	5.43	3.33
PhD programs	35	1	10	4.85	2.80
PsyD programs	32	1	15	6.10	3.80

NOTE: “How many clinical practica/externships does your clinical program support with supervised clinical forensic experience?” Excludes outliers ($n = 4$).

Table 37: Clinical doctoral training—Forensic practica/externships, setting

	Overall	% ¹	PhD programs	% ²	PsyD programs	% ³
Child guidance clinic	12	16	5	13	7	20
Community mental health	43	59	20	53	23	66
Department/school clinical	19	26	8	21	11	31
Forensic/Justice (Jail)	66	90	34	89	32	91
Inpatient psychiatric hospital	57	78	29	76	28	80
Medical clinic/hospital	18	25	9	24	9	26
Outpatient psychiatric clinical/hospital	33	45	15	39	18	51
Partial hospitalization/intensive outpatient programs	18	25	5	13	13	37
Private practice	39	53	14	37	25	71
Residential/group home	18	25	7	18	11	31
Schools	12	16	2	5	10	29
University counsel/student mental health	14	19	5	13	9	26
VA medical center	23	32	9	24	14	40
Other	1	1	1	3	0	0

NOTE: “In which setting(s) does your program support clinical practica/externships with supervised forensic experience?” Items adapted from the APPIC Application for Psychology Internships.

Participants could choose multiple items.

¹Based on $n = 73$.

²Based on $n = 38$.

³Based on $n = 35$.

Table 38: Clinical doctoral training—Forensic practica/externships, population experience

	Overall	% ¹	PhD programs	% ²	PsyD programs	% ³
Juvenile offenders (below age 18)	62	85	31	82	31	89
Adult offenders (ages 18 to 65)	67	92	36	95	31	89
Elderly offenders (above age 65)	32	44	14	37	18	51
Sexual offenders	57	78	29	76	28	80
Violent offenders	52	71	29	76	23	66
Mentally ill offenders	65	89	33	87	32	91
Civilly committed individuals	37	51	19	50	18	51

NOTE: “With which clinical population(s) does your program support clinical practica/externships with supervised forensic experience?” Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997) and authors. Participants could choose multiple items.

¹Based on $n = 73$.

²Based on $n = 38$.

³Based on $n = 35$.

Table 42: Clinical doctoral training—Forensic practica/externships, population satisfaction

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	72	1	5	4.04	0.91
PhD programs	37	1	5	4.00	1.08
PsyD programs	35	2	5	4.09	0.78

NOTE: “How satisfied are you with the ability to work with client populations of interest in your clinical practica/externships?” Based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 5 (Very Satisfied).

Table 39: Clinical doctoral training—Forensic practica/externships, intervention experience

	Overall	% ¹	PhD programs	% ²	PsyD programs	% ³
Client consultation	36	49	17	45	19	54
Group counseling	66	90	34	89	32	91
Individual therapy	63	86	34	89	29	83
Intake/structured interview	66	90	33	87	33	94
Supervision of other students	19	26	13	34	6	17
Treatment planning with clients	55	75	27	71	28	80
None	2	3	1	3	1	3

NOTE: “What types of intervention experience are available through your clinical practica/externships with supervised forensic experience?” Items adapted from the APPIC Application for Psychology Internships. Participants could choose multiple items.

¹Based on $n = 73$.

²Based on $n = 38$.

³Based on $n = 35$.

Table 40: Clinical doctoral training—Forensic practica/externships, assessment experience

	Overall	% ¹	PhD programs	% ²	PsyD programs	% ³
Neuropsychological experience	46	63	21	55	25	71
Providing feedback to clients	52	71	28	38	24	69
Psychodiagnostic test administration	69	95	36	49	33	94
None	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: “What types of assessment experience are available through your clinical practica/externships with supervised forensic experience?” Items adapted from the APPIC Application for Psychology Internships. Participants could choose multiple items.

¹Based on $n = 73$.

²Based on $n = 38$.

³Based on $n = 35$.

Table 41: Clinical doctoral training—Forensic practica/externships, report writing experience

	Overall	% ¹	PhD programs	% ²	PsyD programs	% ³
Assessment report writing (self)	72	99	37	97	35	100
Observation of assessment report writing by supervisor	43	59	20	53	23	66
Observation of assessment report writing by peer	20	27	9	24	11	31
None	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: “What types of report writing experience are available through your clinical practica/externships with supervised forensic experience?” Participants could choose multiple items.

¹Based on $n = 73$.

²Based on $n = 38$.

³Based on $n = 35$.

Table 42: Clinical doctoral training—Forensic practica/externships, supervision

	Overall	% ¹	PhD programs	% ²	PsyD programs	% ³
Individual supervision – Licensed psychologist	70	96	36	95	34	97
Individual supervision – Licensed allied mental health professional	16	22	5	13	11	31
Individual supervision – Other (e.g., peer)	20	27	11	29	9	26
Group supervision	54	74	24	63	30	86
None	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: “What types of supervision are available through your clinical practica/externships with supervised forensic experience?” Items adapted from the APPIC Application for Psychology Internships. Participants could choose multiple items.

¹Based on $n = 73$.

²Based on $n = 38$.

³Based on $n = 35$.

Of the clinical doctoral participants surveyed ($n = 88$), 19 (22%) had recently applied for predoctoral internships ($n = 4$, or 5%, did not respond).

Of these 19 recent applicants, 11 (58%) were from PhD programs and 8 (42%) were from PsyD programs.

Table 47: Clinical doctoral training—Predoctoral internship

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	19	1	25	15.84	6.31
PhD programs	11	2	20	14.18	4.58
PsyD programs	8	1	15	18.13	7.88

NOTE: “To how many internship sites did you apply?”

Of the clinical doctoral participants surveyed ($n = 88$), 6 (7%) had recently applied for predoctoral internships ($n = 4$, or 5%, did not respond).

Of these 6 current predoctoral interns, 4 (67%) were from PhD programs and 2 (33%) were from PsyD programs.

These 6 current postdoctoral interns reported training a variety of clinical settings, including Forensic/Justice (Jail) ($n = 2$, or 33%), Community Mental Health ($n = 1$, or 17%), Inpatient Psychiatric Hospital ($n = 1$, or 17%), and Outpatient Psychiatric Clinic/Hospital ($n = 1$, or 17%).

These 6 current postdoctoral interns reported receiving specialized forensic training in a variety of ways, including forensic tracks/streams (i.e., 50% of time or greater) ($n = 3$, or 50%), supervised clinical research ($n = 1$, or 17%), and formal didactics ($n = 4$, or 67%).

Table 48: Clinical doctoral training—Postdoctoral fellowship/residency interest

		<i>n</i>	%
Overall ¹	<i>Yes</i>	55	63
	<i>No</i>	5	6
	<i>Unsure</i>	24	27
PhD programs ²	<i>Yes</i>	29	60
	<i>No</i>	2	4
	<i>Unsure</i>	16	33
PsyD programs ³	<i>Yes</i>	26	65
	<i>No</i>	3	8
	<i>Unsure</i>	8	20

NOTE: “Do you intend to pursue a postdoctoral fellowship/residency in law and psychology?”

¹Based on *n* = 88.

²Based on *n* = 48.

³Based on *n* = 40.

Table 49: Clinical doctoral training—Postdoctoral fellowship/residency planning

		<i>n</i>	%
Overall ¹	<i>Research</i>	3	3
	<i>Clinical</i>	35	40
	<i>Blended research and clinical</i>	32	36
	<i>Unsure</i>	10	11
	<i>Other</i>	1	1
PhD programs ²	<i>Research</i>	3	6
	<i>Clinical</i>	13	27
	<i>Blended research and clinical</i>	24	50
	<i>Unsure</i>	4	8
	<i>Other</i>	1	2
PsyD programs ³	<i>Research</i>	0	0
	<i>Clinical</i>	22	55
	<i>Blended research and clinical</i>	8	8
	<i>Unsure</i>	6	6
	<i>Other</i>	0	0

NOTE: “Which type(s) of postdoctoral fellowship/residency do you intend to pursue in law and psychology?”

¹Based on *n* = 88.

²Based on *n* = 48.

³Based on *n* = 40.

Table 50: Clinical doctoral training—Board certification interest

		<i>n</i>	%
Overall ¹	<i>Yes</i>	56	64
	<i>No</i>	5	6
	<i>Unsure</i>	23	26
PhD programs ²	<i>Yes</i>	35	73
	<i>No</i>	2	4
	<i>Unsure</i>	10	21
PsyD programs ³	<i>Yes</i>	21	53
	<i>No</i>	3	8
	<i>Unsure</i>	13	33

NOTE: “Do you intend to pursue board certification (ABPP or similar) in law and psychology?”

¹Based on *n* = 88.

²Based on *n* = 48.

³Based on *n* = 40.

Non-Clinical Doctoral Training

Graduate students in non-clinical doctoral programs ($n = 33$) were surveyed about their training experiences in law and psychology. Results are presented below.

Table 51: Non-clinical doctoral training—Training programs

	<i>n</i>	%
Social psychology	5	15
Developmental psychology	5	15
Experimental psychology	1	3
Psychology and law	7	21
Psychology and social behavior	5	15
Legal psychology	5	15
Other	5*	15

NOTE: “In which type of Doctoral Social Science program are you currently enrolled?” Items adapted from AP-LS (2015).

*Psychology ($n = 1$); Cognitive psychology ($n = 1$); Criminal justice ($n = 1$).

Table 52: Non-clinical doctoral training—Specialized programs in law and psychology

	<i>n</i>	%
Minor	6	18
Track/concentration/emphasis	15	46
Degree	7	21
None	9	27

NOTE: “Which of the following specialized programs does your institution offer?” Participants could choose multiple items.

Table 53: Non-clinical doctoral training—Practical experience

	<i>n</i>	%
Forensic hospital	2	6
Forensic juvenile facility	2	6
Correctional facility	5	15
Private practice (psychology)	1	3
Public Defender's office	3	9
District Attorney's office	1	3
Private practice (law)	2	6
Specialty law group	2	6
Court clinic	0	0
Worker's compensation clinic	0	0
Probation/parole department	2	6
Mediation	0	0
Other	7*	21

NOTE: "In which settings have you received practical experience in law and psychology?" Items adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997) and authors. Participants could choose multiple items.

*Criminal justice networks ($n = 1$); Community re-entry service providers ($n = 1$); Police department ($n = 1$); Trial consulting firm ($n = 1$).

Table 54: Non-clinical doctoral training—Postdoctoral planning

	<i>n</i>	%
Postdoctoral position	21	64
Early career position	24	73
Unsure	4	12
Other	5*	15

Note: “What do you intend to pursue following the completion of your degree program?” Participants could choose multiple items.

*Industry (*n* = 2); Government (*n* = 1).

Joint Program Training

Graduate students in joint-degree programs ($n = 13$) were surveyed about their training experiences in law and psychology. Results are presented below.

Table 55: Joint program training—Training programs

	<i>n</i>	%
JD/PhD	8	62
JD/PsyD	1	8
PhD/MLS	4	31

NOTE: "In which type of joint-degree program are you currently enrolled?" Items adapted from AP-LS (2015).

Table 56: Joint program training—Program criteria

	<i>n</i>	%
Students are enrolled simultaneously in an accredited legal program (JD, MLS, or similar) and psychology program (PhD, PsyD, or similar)	8	62
The program is led by an individual designated as its administrative head	6	46
The program contains an identifiable and integrative law and psychology curriculum, in addition to ensuring that students complete all formal requirements toward both degrees	8	62
All criteria met	6	46

NOTE: “Which of the following best describes the components of your program?” Adapted from Bersoff et al. (1997). Excludes individuals who did not provide any information regarding criteria ($n = 5$, or 39%).

Joint program participants ($n = 13$) reported they anticipated an average of 6.54 years ($SD = 0.52$ years, $range = 6-7$ years) to finish their degree.

Joint program participants ($n = 13$) reported they believed they would owe an average of \$78,077 ($SD = \$90,556$, $range = \$0-\$320,000$) in debt upon graduation from their graduate program.

Of the joint program participants surveyed ($n = 13$), 6 (46%) reported their programs support forensic practica/externships.

Joint program participants whose programs support forensic practica/externships reported their programs support an average of 4.75 ($n = 4$, $SD = 0.50$, $range = 4-5$) forensic practica/externships.

Joint program participants whose programs support forensic practica/externships reported neutral-to-positive satisfaction ($n = 6$, $M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.52$, $range = 3-4$) with their ability to work with clinical populations of interest in their forensic practica/externships.

Joint program participants ($n = 13$) reported practical psycho-legal training in forensic hospitals ($n = 2$, or 15%), correctional facilities ($n = 2$, or 15%), and specialty law practices ($n = 1$, or 8%).

No joint program participant reported practical psycho-legal training in court clinics, Public Defender's offices, District Attorney's offices, worker's compensation clinics, forensic juvenile facilities, probation/parole departments, psychology private practices, law private practices, mediation, or any other practical setting (all items adapted from Bersoff et al., 1997, and authors).

Of the joint program participants surveyed ($n = 13$), 2 (15%) had recently applied for predoctoral internships ($n = 4$, or 31%, did not respond).

These recent predoctoral internship applicants reported applying to an average of 14.50 ($SD = 3.54$, $range = 12-17$) internship sites.

Of the joint program participants surveyed ($n = 13$), 3 (23%) reported they intended to pursue a postdoctoral fellowship/residency in law and psychology ($n = 2$, or 15%, reported they did not; $n = 4$, or 31%, reported they were unsure; $n = 4$, or 31%, did not respond).

Joint program participants ($n = 13$) reported they intended to pursue postdoctoral fellowships/residencies that were research ($n = 2$, or 15%), clinical ($n = 2$, or 15%), and blended research and clinical in nature ($n = 3$, or 23%) ($n = 2$, or 15%, reported they were unsure, and $n = 4$, or 31%, did not respond).

Of the joint program participants surveyed ($n = 13$), 3 (23%) reported intending to pursue board certification (ABPP or similar) in law and psychology, 3 (23%) reported not intending to pursue board certification (ABPP or similar) in law and psychology, and 3 (23%) reported they were unsure ($n = 4$, or 31%, did not respond).

Glossary

(Definitions adapted from Bersoff et al., 1997, unless otherwise noted.)

Law and psychology – The application of psychological research, theory, or practice to the legal system or legal issues (Otto & Fulero, 2006)

Introductory/general law and psychology – General overview of the integration of law and psychology

Forensic assessment – Clinical mental health assessment in forensic settings, including trial consultation and expert testimony

Forensic treatment – Rehabilitation and treatment of individuals involved in the legal system, or means to reduce recidivism among offenders

Social psychology and the law – Social/behavioral psychology research relevant to the legal system, such as eyewitness testimony and jury decision making

Juvenile offending – Child and adolescent offending, including the evaluation and treatment of juvenile offenders

Psychology of criminal behavior – General and violent offending and specific forms of criminal behavior

Law and mental health – Issues relevant to psychological science and practice in mental health law, such as disability, discrimination, civil commitment, civil and criminal competencies, and criminal sentencing

Ethical issues in law and psychology – Ethics in a forensic context or specific ethical guidelines pertaining to law and psychology

Victimology – Psychology of victims of criminal behavior

Socio-cultural issues in law and psychology – Race, ethnicity, or gender identity in the context of law and psychology

Police and investigative psychology – Psychology of police, public safety, and criminal investigations, such as profiling and interrogations

Professional practice in law and psychology – Licensure, confidentiality and privileged communications, responding to subpoenas

Legal concepts in law and psychology – Foundation legal concepts, including the structure of the legal system, procedural justice, standards for admissibility of scientific evidence

References

- American Psychological Association (2013). *Guidelines and principles for accreditation of programs in professional psychology*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychology-Law Society (2015). *Guide to graduate programs in forensic and legal psychology 2014-2015: A resource for prospective students*. Retrieved from <http://www.apadivisions.org/division-41/education/programs/guide.pdf>
- Bartol, C. R., & Bartol, A. M. (2012). *Introduction to forensic psychology: Research and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- 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*, 52, 1301-1310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.12.1301>
- Burl, J., Shah, S., Filone, S., Foster, E., & DeMetteo, D. (2012). A survey of graduate training programs and coursework in forensic psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 39, 48-53.
- Grisso, T., Goldstein, A. M., & Heilbrun, K. (Eds.) (2009). *Best practices in forensic mental health* (series). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.