

**Early Career Professionals in Law and Psychology:
The State of Training and Areas of Needed Support**

Jason A. Cantone, J.D., Ph.D.

Tiffany D. Clomax, Psy.D.

Jennifer Woolard, Ph.D.

Kathleen Kemp, Ph.D.

Recommendations provided in this report come from the report authors and do not necessarily represent the views of AP-LS, the AP-LS Executive Committee, or any institution associated with the authors. Comments can be provided to the first author at jasoncantone@gmail.com.

Acknowledgements

This project began during the American Psychology-Law Society (AP-LS) presidential term of Jennifer Woolard. The AP-LS Committee on Early Career Professionals and the AP-LS Executive Committee have both provided thoughtful remarks throughout the process that led to the underlying survey document and report.

Additionally, the following people were instrumental in the review of an earlier draft document: James Andretta, Jennifer Perillo, Eve Brank, Emily Mackelprang, Jennifer Groscup, Casey LaDuke, Victoria Pietruszka, Lindsay Malloy, Kevin Douglas, Nadja Shreiber Compo, and Ian McCandliss.

Institutional Approval

The independent research was conducted through Georgetown University and approved by the Georgetown University Institutional Review Board.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Key Terms.....	5
Executive Summary of Results	6
Method	9
Results and Discussion	11
I. Sample Demographics	11
II. Organization Affiliation and Plans for 2019	15
III. Law and Psychology Education: When It Occurs	23
IV. Law and Psychology Education: What Is Learned	29
V. Professional Training	37
VI. Publications and Presentations	44
VII. Satisfaction with Graduate Training and the Needs of ECPs	53
VIII. Debt and Funding Sources	72
IX. Pre-Doctoral Internships and Post-Doctoral Fellowships and Residencies	80

Introduction

In 2015, the American Psychology-Law Society (AP-LS) Student Committee issued an expansive report entitled “The state of training in law and psychology: Opportunities, needs, and recommendations for students, professionals, and field leaders.”¹ Across eighty-four pages and fifty-five tables, the authors provided thoughtful analysis of law and psychology training on both the undergraduate and graduate level; examined the topics graduate training covered, as well as professional guidance, experience with grants, scholarships, and training opportunities; and offered analysis on graduate students’ satisfaction with their training and expected debt load.

When the report was presented at the American Psychological Association (APA) annual convention,² an attendee posed whether early career professionals (ECPs) should also be surveyed, as they had already completed their graduate training and might better understand, compared to graduate students, whether their graduate training met their early professional needs and whether it was indeed satisfactory. Shortly after, that attendee (the first author of this report) joined with Jennifer Woolard, then-AP-LS President, and Kathleen Kemp, then-chair of the AP-LS Early Career Professionals Committee, to initiate an independent study that would adapt the graduate student survey for ECPs. This report is the result of that multi-year effort.

This ECP survey generally maintained the same questions and format as the graduate student survey, with a few notable exceptions. For one, some sections were expanded: satisfaction with training, how well graduate training prepared the respondent for their career, what their career includes, experience with grants, pre-doctoral, and post-doctoral opportunities. The sections focused on undergraduate perceptions of training were removed, as those questions would be better answered by the graduate survey report. While the graduate student survey presented the results by respondent group (e.g., undergraduates, clinical doctoral students), this report presents the results by topic area, with tables differentiating responses of each respondent group. Future work should compare these results with those of the 2015 graduate student survey to better determine how graduate students’ perceptions of their graduate training correspond with ECPs’ perceptions of not only their training, but also whether their training prepares them for their careers.

All in all, the intent of this project and report is to provide new information on ECPs’ perceptions of their education and training opportunities, what ECPs’ needs are, and how AP-LS could best address those needs. In 2007, AP-LS formed the Committee on Early Career Professionals to initiate programs and provide assistance to ECPs. More than a decade later, the Committee has sponsored programs at conferences, funded research through its annual grant-in-aid program, and offered leadership opportunities for ECPs looking to better understand and serve AP-LS. It is urged that the Committee, alongside the AP-LS Executive Committee, work to

¹ American Psychology-Law Society Student Committee (2015). The state of training in law and psychology: Opportunities, needs, and recommendations for students, professionals, and field leaders. Retrieved from www.APLS-students.org/training-survey.

² LaDuke, C. (Chair and Discussant), Brank, E., Groscup, J., Heilbrun, K., & Woolard, J. (Discussants) (2015, August). The current state of graduate training in law and psychology. Panel presented at the 123rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.

further address the areas where ECPs expressed a need for support, and also collaborate to respond to the ECP respondents' call for increased diversity training within the field. Many AP-LS efforts have sought to address the needs of ECPs, but, as the results below show, there is still work to do.

Key Terms

Before reporting the results, it is important to clarify some key terms used throughout this report.

APA American Psychological Association

AP-LS American Psychology-Law Society (Division 41 of APA)

ECP Early Career Professional.

While AP-LS uses a definition of being within 7 years of receiving the terminal degree, this report uses the more expansive APA definition of being within 10 years of receiving the terminal degree. However, this report uses the AP-LS-utilized “early career professional” rather than the APA-utilized “early career psychologist” in reference to ECPs.³

Doctoral—Clinical/Applied

Respondents in this category selected “PhD or PsyD in clinical psychology, forensic psychology, or clinical forensic psychology” when identifying their program. Two respondents who selected “other” and identified their program as “PhD-Counseling Psychology” were also included in this category, per APA definitions of “Clinical/Applied” programs.

Doctoral—Social Science

Respondents in this category also selected a variety of fields, including developmental, legal psychology, criminal justice, experimental and legal psychology, experimental psychology, cognitive psychology, social psychology, and social and community psychology.

Joint degree

Respondents in the two joint program categories completed simultaneous programs in law and psychology. This included JD/PhD programs, as well as PhD/MLS (Master of Legal Studies) programs. In this report, these respondents are then split into two joint degree sub-categories — clinical/forensic and joint degree—social science.

³ See American Psychological Association, Early Career Psychologists, at <https://www.apa.org/careers/early-career/> (last accessed July 8, 2019).

Executive Summary of Results and Recommendations

The 119 respondents who completed the survey provided a wealth of information presented below across 37 tables in eight substantive categories, starting with sample characteristics. Each section starts with an overview and recommendation, followed by an overview of the data before the data itself is then discussed. Each section ends with the respective tables for that section. Although we are unable to determine how representative the respondents are to the population of AP-LS ECPs, this report offers new data on how ECPs assess their graduate training and whether it has prepared them for their early careers. The executive summary below offers a summary of some of the most interesting findings, with some corresponding recommendations. Recommendations provided in this report come from the report authors and do not necessarily represent the views of AP-LS and the Executive Committee.

- **Diversity.** Based on the self-identified demographics of our respondents, there is still a tremendous need to better diversify the field of law and psychology. Respondents overwhelmingly self-identified as White (81%) and female (83%). This sample echoes the demographics reported in an earlier APA ECP survey.⁴ In the survey, respondents also identified a need for more diversity awareness and recruitment when asked how AP-LS could better serve ECPs. Additionally, there is further need to expand graduate training opportunities on diversity-related issues. Fewer than half of respondents reported receiving training in socio-cultural issues in law and psychology, and less than one-fifth reported receiving training regarding harassment and discrimination claims.
- **ECP Engagement in AP-LS.** Only 5% of respondents said that AP-LS addressed their needs extremely well, with most stating moderately well. In addition, very few respondents (11%) said they were very likely to seek out an AP-LS leadership position in 2019, though joint degree respondents were most likely to state that. Elsewhere in the survey, ECPs noted a need for expanded professional development and other resources. Such an expansion might lead in the future to a higher percentage noting that AP-LS addresses their needs as ECPs.
- **Professional Development.** ECPs would benefit from graduate training programs, and AP-LS, further expanding professional development opportunities. The data shows that respondents did not receive professional training in a variety of areas, such as guidance on going into the non-academic job market. Master's respondents, in particular, were especially unlikely to receive any professional training on topics such as how to write a CV. Joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents were most likely to report professional training in general research practices, publishing, and presenting at conferences to name a few. Master's and joint degree—social science respondents were most likely to report they would seek out new job opportunities in the next year. About 43% of combined doctoral respondents and 71% of joint degree—social science respondents reported receiving no guidance on going into the non-academic job market.

⁴ American Psychological Association, ECPs at a Glance, obtained from Dr. Eddy Ameen, Associate Executive Director: Early Career and Graduate Student Affairs, on file with authors.

- **Expanded AP-LS Opportunities.** The ECP respondents were very interested in AP-LS providing new opportunities to address their professional needs. When provided with seventeen areas of professional development, at least 42% of respondents indicated that they were somewhat or very interested in further opportunities. The topics of most interest were: peer networking, professional networking, establishing collaborations outside of academia, and obtaining leadership positions. Respondents were asked to offer general opinions regarding future AP-LS conference programs and educational opportunities. Respondents identified the need for AP-LS to expand the focus on diversity, networking, and mentorship, as well as identifying how AP-LS could better address the specific needs of ECPs (e.g., seminars related to obtaining licensure and board certification, dealing with loan debt, and "how to balance all the obligations as a junior faculty member").
- **Graduate Training.** Based on the data, respondents' graduate training included fewer than expected topics of substantive legal psychology and specific legal questions. Surprisingly, fewer than half of respondents reported learning about law and psychology by participating in a formal law and psychology course while in graduate school. Almost all respondents reported receiving a variety of research and statistics training, but training in legal knowledge areas was generally low (except for joint degree respondents). As will be discussed below, many topics included within substantive legal psychology and specific legal questions were not regularly included in graduate training. The only topics with more than two-thirds of respondents reporting training were introductory/general law and psychology, social psychology and the law, competence to stand trial, and the role of expert witnesses. Based on the data, there appears to be a need to more closely examine the law and psychology curriculum to assess whether there is a need to expand training in areas relevant to AP-LS ECPs.
- **Experiences in Non-Academic Settings.** While a strong majority of doctoral—clinical/applied and joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents reported educational experiences in non-academic settings (generally corrections) while obtaining their degrees, very few other respondents did. Law and psychology could benefit from expanding these non-academic educational opportunities for all graduate students, especially master's and social science doctoral students, such as working with courts, advocates, or in other legal psychology-related workplaces that offer experiential learning opportunities. Respondents also expressed a need for more training in policy areas, a need which AP-LS could address through future efforts.
- **Publications and Presentations.** More than half of respondents planned to submit an article for publication in a peer-reviewed journal in the next year, especially joint degree and doctoral—social science respondents. Joint degree respondents were most likely to report having a first-authored or non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal article upon graduation. Doctoral—social science respondents reported the most paper and poster presentations both before and after graduation.
- **Satisfaction with Graduate Training.** Respondents were generally satisfied with their experience conducting research within their lab, but satisfaction varied regarding other

graduate training areas. Almost half of respondents were very or somewhat dissatisfied with opportunities to gain policy experience. This could also be an area of expansion for AP-LS as programming is usually psychology-related. Furthermore, joint social science and master's respondents were generally not satisfied with supervision and support in the manuscript submission process or in professional development activities.

- **Debt Load.** Respondents' average student debt load at the time of graduation was a little over \$100,000, with about \$89,000 attributable solely to graduate training. Doctoral—social science respondents reported the lowest debt load, while doctoral—clinical/applied (especially PsyD) respondents reported the highest. This corresponds with earlier data obtained by APA discussed below. Debt has a serious effect on the success of ECPs and AP-LS should expand its work on addressing the high debt load and provide prospective students with more comprehensive information regarding the cost of graduate education.
- **Funding Sources.** During graduate training, most master's respondents relied on loans, most doctoral—social science respondents relied on a teaching or research assistantship and two-thirds reported a stipend. Doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were more likely than doctoral—social science respondents to rely on loans. Joint degree respondents were most likely to note a stipend, with joint degree non-clinical/forensic respondents most likely to have a research assistantship.
- **Pre-doctoral Internships.** Almost every doctoral—clinical/applied and joint degree clinical/forensic respondent applied for a pre-doctoral internship through APPIC. Respondents applied to an average of 15 internships and almost all entered the match process only once. Only about one-third used the AP-LS Student Committee or AP-LS general website to learn about internships. All joint degree clinical/forensic respondents reported that their pre-doctoral internship was APA approved, while 88% of the doctoral clinical respondents did. Only about one-third used the AP-LS Student Committee or AP-LS general website to learn about internships. AP-LS could work to further expand the visibility of these resources for future applicants.
- **Clinical practica/externships.** Almost all of the clinical practica/externships included supervised forensic experience, generally supported forensic/justice (jail) and inpatient psychiatric hospital settings, included individual supervision by a licensed psychologist, and served adult offenders and individuals with severe mental illness who offended.

Method

On October 16, 2018, all members of the AP-LS e-mail list received a personalized invitation to complete the survey, with an embedded Qualtrics survey link. An invitation to complete the survey also appeared in the October 2018 and November 2018 e-mailed AP-LS Newsletters. Unfortunately, AP-LS does not maintain information on ECPs so we are unable to direct the survey only to ECPs, or gauge the response rate for the survey or whether it generalizes to the AP-LS ECP population. The authors recommend that AP-LS create a mechanism to track ECPs so that future resources can be directly sent to this group of members.

Respondents who clicked on the survey link first read an informed consent document that provided the specific goals of the survey, sample criterion, and promise of confidentiality. The electronic survey was anonymous and no personal identifying information was collected. Respondents were then asked to provide what year they completed their terminal graduate degree. Respondents who selected “before 2008” were routed out of the survey. All other respondents continued to the initial questions.

A total of 122 individuals responded to the Early Career Professionals Survey. Of these, three were excluded from analyses because they indicated that they had graduated from their terminal program before 2008. The study utilized the American Psychological Association (APA) definition of early career (10 years post-terminal degree) rather than the current AP-LS definition (7 years post-terminal degree). This resulted in a sample of 119 respondents. The demographics for this sample are provided in Section I. Two respondents from Juris Doctorate (JD) programs completed the survey. Because of this low number, their information is not separately provided in the below tables but is included in the overall data presented in each table. For this reason, the individual categories will generally not add up to the overall number.

Although very few terminal master’s graduates ($n = 4$) responded to the survey, their answers are provided separately below. One completed a counselor education program; three completed psychology-forensic programs. The low number of terminal master’s respondents at least partially stemmed from one survey advertisement defining ECPs as up to 10 years post-doctorate rather than post-terminal degree. Interpretations of the master’s data should be made with great caution. While there is an argument to remove the master’s degree respondent data from this report, they remain because the researchers believe it is important to better understand the needs of terminal master’s degree holders as they pursue careers in law and psychology. APA is currently in the process of determining whether and how to accredit master’s-level programs in psychology for the first time in the association’s 126-year history. Between 2008 and 2017, there has been a 28% increase in the number of psychology master’s degrees awarded,⁵ but little has been done to understand this educational group’s specific training and needs.

⁵ American Psychological Association. (2019). Master’s and Doctoral Degrees Awarded in Psychology, 2008-2017: By Subfield, Institution Type, State, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity. Washington, DC, available at <https://www.apa.org/workforce/publications/2017-postsecondary-data/report.pdf>.

Thirty-five doctoral social science graduates responded to the survey. Their self-identified doctoral programs and field of study varied. Nine selected developmental, six selected legal psychology, six selected criminal justice, four selected experimental and legal psychology, four selected experimental psychology, three selected cognitive psychology, two selected social psychology, and one selected applied social and community psychology.

Sixty-four doctoral clinical or applied graduates responded to the survey. The survey defined clinical as “PhD or PsyD in clinical psychology, forensic psychology, or clinical forensic psychology.” When asked to further define their program, 32 respondents selected PhD-Clinical Psychology, 14 selected PsyD-Forensic Psychology, 13 selected PsyD-Clinical Psychology, and 1 selected PhD-Forensic Psychology. Two respondents selected “Other” and wrote PhD-Counseling Psychology. They were added to this category of doctoral—clinical/applied respondents. This corresponds with APA guidance on the definition of “Clinical/Applied” programs. Two respondents did not specify their sub-program.

Six joint program clinical/forensic and law graduates responded to the survey. Four were JD/PhD clinical and/or forensic graduates and two were PhD/MLS clinical and/or forensic graduates. Seven joint program social science graduates responded to the survey. Six were JD/PhD experimental graduates and 1 was a PhD/MLS experimental graduate.

Respondents then completed a series of questions which included general demographic items, their organizational affiliations and professional plans for 2019, their training in psychology and law (including when they learned about law and psychology and what was learned (e.g., substantive psychology, research design and statistics, legal knowledge, substantive legal psychology, and specific legal questions), the professional training they received, debt and funding sources, publications and presentations, satisfaction with elements of their graduate training, areas where AP-LS could provide additional professional development opportunities, and the specific needs of ECPs.

Results and Discussion

The 2015 graduate student report presented the results and discussions separately for undergraduate, terminal master's, clinical doctoral, non-clinical doctoral, and joint programs. However, the below report presents the results separated by substantive areas, allowing for discussion of differences between the respondent categories. This section begins with a discussion about the sample demographics, which highlights that there is a tremendous need for more diversity within law and psychology.

I. Sample Demographics

Overview. ECP respondents were generally in their early thirties, female (83%), and White (81%). Compared to ECP data obtained by APA, this sample of ECPs is younger and slightly more likely to self-identify as White and female.

Recommendation. Over the past decades, AP-LS has undertaken many initiatives related to diversity. While we do not have longitudinal data showing the diversity of ECPs over time, we encourage AP-LS to continue and expand its efforts to address the need for more diversity in the field of law and psychology and within AP-LS membership. In addition, we recommend that AP-LS create a clear mechanism to track the number of ECPs and the diversity of the membership.

Respondents ranged in age from 24 to 50 ($M = 32.87$, $SD = 4.14$). See Table 1. As would be expected, master's level graduates were the youngest demographic with a mean age of 28.25 years. Respondents from joint degree social science programs were the oldest demographic with a mean age of 35. The sample skews younger than the representative member data on ECPs from a 2007 APA survey, which found only 25 percent of ECPs were under age 35 (and 53% in the 35-44 range). The younger average in this sample is likely due to a combination of two factors. First, APA uses 10 years post-doctorate to define ECPs, while AP-LS uses 7 years post-terminal degree. The survey used the APA definition. However, because of the difference in definition, AP-LS ECPs more than 7 years post-terminal degree might have been less likely to consider themselves ECPs and open and complete the survey. Second, whether or not this speculation is true, the data shows that the ECP respondents were generally those who most recently completed their terminal degree. For example, 14 percent completed their final graduate degree in 2018, 22 percent in 2017, and 18 percent in 2016. In comparison, only 16 percent of respondents completed their final graduate degree in 2009, 2010, and 2011 combined. Because AP-LS does not maintain a clear mechanism of tracking the number of ECP members, it is difficult to direct resources to this specific group. We recommend that such a mechanism be established. One suggestion would be to require year of terminal degree completion in membership applications.

Overall, 83% ($n = 97$) of the respondents indicated that they were female. See Table 2. This ranged from 100% of the master's level respondents ($n = 4$) self-identifying as female

to 50% ($n = 3$) of the joint degree clinical or forensic respondents identifying as female. Though respondents were given multiple options for gender identity, all respondents selected the binary female or male option. The sample skews more female than the APA ECP survey data which found: 75% female, 24% male, 1% transgender.

Options for reporting racial and cultural identity generally mirrored those provided on the 2015 graduate student survey, though with some exceptions to make the categories more current. First, “Latinx” replaced “Latino/Latina”. Second, respondents were allowed to select multiple options, and the combinations were reported in Table 3 as separate categories rather than being counted multiple times in separate categories. For example, two doctoral—clinical/applied respondents selected both “White” and “Black or African American,” reported in their own column. In the 2015 graduate student report, those two respondents would have been counted in both the “White” and “Black or African American” columns. Finally, respondents were also offered an open-ended “Other” category.⁶

The sample overwhelmingly self-identified as White ($n = 95$; 81%). Only 19% ($n = 22$) of respondents from all programs surveyed identified as a racial minority. None of respondents from joint degree social science programs identified as a racial minority, while one of the joint degree clinical/forensic respondents self-identified as Black/African American. The master’s respondents evenly split between White ($n = 2$; 50%) and Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish ($n = 2$; 50%). In the 2007 APA survey of ECPs, 77% self-identified as White, 7% each self-identified as Asian or Hispanic/Latino, 5% self-identified as Black/African American, and 4% self-identified as multi-racial. However, it is difficult to compare the APA and AP-LS survey results because 25% of the APA ECP respondents did not specify race/ethnicity, whereas all AP-LS respondents answered this question.

Overall, respondents took just under six years to complete their terminal degree. As expected, master’s respondents took the least time ($M = 4.25$ years) and joint degree respondents took the most time ($M = 7.00$ years [joint degree—clinical/forensic]; $M = 7.79$ years [joint degree—social science]). See Table 4.

⁶ The survey resulted in a thoughtful discussion of how terminology for questions about race and ethnicity could be improved. For example, although respondents could select multiple options, better data might result from keeping separate demographic factors such as Hispanic, Latinx, and Spanish. Furthermore, additional demographic questions regarding disability status, country of residence, and sexual orientation were discussed but not included in the survey. Future research should more closely identify the membership of AP-LS, both of ECPs and more broadly.

Table 1: Participant demographics—Age (years)

	<i>n</i>	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	115	24	50	32.9	4.1
Master's	4	24	34	28.3	4.7
Doctoral – social science	35	26	50	33.4	4.9
Doctoral – clinical/applied	62	25	42	32.7	3.7
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	30	36	32.5	2.8
Joint degree social science	7	30	40	35.0	3.6

Note. Four respondents did not respond to this item.

Table 2: Respondents demographics—Self-Identified Gender identity

	<i>n</i>	Female (%)	Male (%)	Transgender (%)	Other (%)
Overall	117	97 (83%)	20 (17%)	--	--
Master's	4	4 (100%)	--	--	--
Doctoral – social science	35	27 (77%)	8 (23%)	--	--
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	55 (87%)	8 (13%)	--	--
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	--	--
Joint degree social science	7	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	--	--

Table 3: Participant demographics—Self-Identified Race/Ethnicity

	<i>n</i>	White (%)	Black or African American (%)	Hispanic Latinx, or Spanish (%)	Asian or Asian American (%)	White and Black or African American (%)	White and Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish (%)	White and Arab American or Middle Eastern
Overall	117	95 (81%)	5 (4%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	8 (7%)	2 (2%)
Master's	4	2 (50%)	--	2 (50%)	--	--	--	--
Doctoral – social science	35	29 (83%)	1 (3%)	--	--	--	4 (11%)	1 (3%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	50 (79%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	4 (6%)	1 (2%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	--	--	--	--	--
Joint degree social science	7	7 (100%)	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note. Respondents could choose multiple items. Only selected options are provided above, including columns representing respondents who selected more than one option.

Table 4: Number of Years to Complete Highest Degree

	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	117	2	12	5.70	1.42
Master's	4	2	5	4.25	1.50
Doctoral – social science	36	4	10	5.53	1.34
Doctoral – clinical/applied	62	4	9	5.62	1.00
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	5	10	7.00	1.67
Joint degree social science	7	6	12	7.79	1.96

Note. Respondents were informed to start the count when they entered the entire program. For example, doctoral respondents who also obtained master's degrees while enrolled in the same training program would consider the time of obtaining both a master's and doctorate degree in their count.

II. Organizational Affiliation and Plans for 2019

Overview. The questions represented in Tables 5-7 below provide an initial assessment into the average involvement of ECPs in AP-LS and their plans for 2019. Overall, the respondents were almost all dues-paying AP-LS members (93%), with almost half (43%) dues-paying APA members. Doctoral and joint degree clinical respondents were most likely to be APA members. About half (55%) attended the 2018 AP-LS conference and, at the time of survey which occurred just before or at the same time notifications were given for 2019 AP-LS conference presentations, about half (49%) planned to attend the 2019 AP-LS conference. Joint degree respondents were most likely to attend the 2018 AP-LS conference and plan to attend the 2019 conference. Doctoral—social science and joint degree—social science respondents were most likely to plan to attend a non-AP-LS conference in 2019, though doctoral—social science and joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents were most likely to submit a poster or presentation for any conference. Doctoral—social science respondents were most likely to plan to apply for a research grant, though no respondent group was very likely to apply for an AP-LS grant. More than half of respondents planned in 2019 to submit an article for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, especially joint degree and doctoral—social science respondents. Master’s and joint degree—social science respondents were most likely to seek out new job opportunities. Very few overall respondents (11%) were very likely to seek out a leadership position in AP-LS, though joint degree respondents were most likely to seek out such a position.

Recommendation. AP-LS should further its efforts to encourage ECPs and other members to seek out leadership positions, and examine why about half of ECPs did not attend the 2018 AP-LS Conference or plan to attend the 2019 AP-LS conference.

As shown in Table 5, 93% of the respondents identified as dues-paying members of AP-LS, ranging from 92% (doctoral social science respondents) to 100% (master’s, joint degree clinical/forensic, and joint degree social science respondents). About half (43%) of respondents identified as dues-paying members of APA. There was more membership variability between respondents here. Doctoral—social science and joint degree social science respondents were least likely to be APA members (19% and 29%, respectively). Joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents were most likely to be APA members (67%).

More than half of respondents (55%) attended the 2018 AP-LS conference in Memphis. See Table 6. The highest attendance (77%) came from the joint program respondents (combined). Only half (49%) of clinical/applied doctoral program graduates attended; none of the master’s program graduates did.

Respondents were also asked a series of questions on five-point scales regarding their likelihood of engaging in specified activities in 2019. See Table 7. Of note:

Membership

- About 83% of respondents were very likely to renew or join AP-LS, ranging from 67% of master's respondents to 100% of joint degree social science respondents.
- Only 35% of respondents were very likely to renew/join APA, with master's and doctoral clinical program respondents more likely to renew/join.

Conference Attendance

- About half (49%) of respondents were very likely to attend the 2019 AP-LS conference, particularly joint program respondents.
- More than a third (39%) of respondents were very likely to attend a non-AP-LS conference, with the highest likelihood from doctoral—social science and joint degree social science respondents.
- More than half (58%) of respondents were very likely to submit a poster or paper for presentation at a conference, with the highest likelihood from doctoral social science (89%) and joint degree clinical/forensic (83%) respondents. Seventy-five percent ($n = 3$) of master's respondents indicated they were either somewhat unlikely or very unlikely to submit a poster or paper in 2019.

Grant Applications

- About a quarter (26%) of respondents were very likely to apply for a research grant, though 47% of doctoral social science respondents selected very likely. On the other hand, 57% of doctoral clinical/applied respondents indicated they were very unlikely to apply for a research grant.
- Few respondents (9%) indicated they were very likely to apply for an AP-LS grant. The majority of respondents (60%) indicated they were either somewhat unlikely or very unlikely to apply.

Planned Publications

- More than half (57%) of respondents were very likely to submit a publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Every respondent from doctoral social science and joint degree clinical/forensic programs reported they were very likely or somewhat likely to submit, while only 25% of master's respondents and 37% of clinical/applied doctoral respondents stated they were likely to submit.
- Very few respondents (3%) stated they were very likely to submit an article for publication in a law review, though 31% of joint degree program respondents (combined) stated they were very likely or somewhat likely to do so in the next year.
- The overwhelming majority of respondents (73%) indicated they were somewhat unlikely or very unlikely to write a book chapter or book.

Employment

- There was a fairly even split regarding whether respondents were likely to seek out new job opportunities. Overall, 43% stated they were very or somewhat likely, and 49% stated they

were very or somewhat unlikely. However, 100% of the master's respondents stated they were very or somewhat likely to do so, while 67% of joint degree clinical/forensic respondents were very or somewhat unlikely to do so.

AP-LS Leadership Interests

Only 11% of respondents stated they were very likely to seek out an AP-LS leadership position. The most interest came from joint degree respondents, with a third of joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents very likely to seek out a position in 2019. These results only examined planned leadership interest in AP-LS. In addition, the survey did not define “leadership position” so respondents might differ on whether they defined it as meaning only AP-LS Executive Committee positions or also service on AP-LS committees. However, despite this finding, as described later in this report, the ECP respondents were still very interested in additional information on how to obtain leadership opportunities within AP-LS. Additional research should examine leadership interest within ECPs’ professional roles. As shown in prior research, “despite the large number of women currently serving in leadership positions in AP-LS, female faculty who responded to the survey was less likely to have ever held a leadership position than their male colleagues. This was even more pronounced at junior ranks.”⁷

Additionally, while not reported in the tables, all respondents were asked about their likelihood of applying for board certification in forensic psychology in the next year. As would be expected, all social science respondents responded with “very unlikely.” The only respondents somewhat or very likely to do so were graduates of the doctoral –clinical/applied programs (8% very likely; 11% somewhat likely) and joint-degree clinical or forensic programs (0% very likely; 17% (n = 1) somewhat likely).

⁷ Buck, J.A., Eno Loudon, J., Hall, T., Huss, M., Meissner, C. & Pivovarov, E. (2012, Summer). Gender Differences in Professional Development Among AP-LS Members: Results of the Professional Development of Women Survey, *AP-LS Newsletter*, available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283074125_Gender_Differences_in_Professional_Development_Among_AP-LS_Members_Results_of_the_Professional_Development_of_Women_Survey.

Table 5: Participant demographics—Organizational affiliation

	<i>n</i>	AP-LS dues-paying member			APA dues-paying member		
		Yes (%)	No (%)	Unsure (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Unsure (%)
Overall	118	110 (93%)	6 (5%)	2 (2%)	51 (43%)	65 (55%)	2 (2%)
Master's	4	4 (100%)	--	--	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	--
Doctoral – social science	36	33 (92%)	3 (8%)	--	7 (19%)	29 (81%)	--
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	59 (94%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	36 (57%)	26 (41%)	1 (2%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	6 (100%)	--	--	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	--
Joint degree social science	7	7 (100%)	--	--	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	--

Table 6: 2018 AP-LS Conference Attendance

		Did you attend the 2018 AP-LS Conference in Memphis?	
	<i>n</i>	Yes (%)	No (%)
Overall	117	64 (55%)	53 (45%)
Master's	4	--	4 (100%)
Doctoral – social science	35	23 (66%)	12 (34%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	31 (49%)	32 (51%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	5 (83%)	1 (17%)
Joint degree social science	7	5 (71%)	2 (29%)

Table 7: Expected Activities in the Next Year. How likely are you in 2019 to ...

	<i>n</i>	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Renew/join AP-LS						
Overall	117	97 (83%)	18 (15%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	--
Master's	3	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	--	--	--
Doctoral – social science	36	31 (86%)	4 (11%)	--	1 (3%)	--
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	51 (81%)	11 (18%)	1 (2%)	--	--
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	--	--	--
Joint degree social science	7	7 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Renew/join APA						
Overall	116	41 (35%)	15 (13%)	6 (5%)	21 (18%)	33 (28%)
Master's	4	3 (75%)	--	--	1 (25%)	--
Doctoral – social science	34	6 (18%)	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	9 (27%)	15 (44%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	25 (40%)	13 (21%)	1 (2%)	9 (14%)	15 (24%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	4 (67%)	1 (17%)	--	--	1 (17%)
Joint degree social science	7	2 (29%)	--	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
Attend the 2019 AP-LS Conference						
Overall	118	58 (49%)	17 (14%)	11 (9%)	15 (13%)	17 (14%)
Master's	4	--	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	--	1 (25%)
Doctoral – social science	36	22 (61%)	5 (14%)	1 (3%)	5 (14%)	3 (8%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	25 (40%)	11 (18%)	6 (10%)	9 (14%)	12 (19%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	5 (83%)	--	--	1 (17%)	--
Joint degree social science	7	6 (86%)	--	1 (14%)	--	--

Table 7, Continued.

	<i>n</i>	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Attend a non-AP-LS conference (e.g., APA, Law and Society)						
Overall	118	46 (39%)	21 (18%)	18 (15%)	19 (16%)	14 (12%)
Master's	4	1 (25%)	--	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	--
Doctoral – social science	36	20 (56%)	6 (17%)	1 (3%)	6 (17%)	3 (8%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	19 (30%)	13 (21%)	12 (19%)	10 (16%)	9 (14%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)
Joint degree social science	7	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
Submit a poster or paper for presentation at a conference						
Overall	118	68 (58%)	8 (7%)	7 (6%)	13 (11%)	22 (19%)
Master's	4	1 (25%)	--	--	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
Doctoral – social science	36	32 (89%)	3 (8%)	--	1 (3%)	--
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	26 (41%)	4 (6%)	6 (10%)	11 (18%)	16 (25%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	5 (83%)	--	--	--	1 (17%)
Joint degree social science	7	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	--	--	2 (29%)
Apply for a research grant						
Overall	118	31 (26%)	22 (19%)	9 (8%)	12 (10%)	44 (37%)
Master's	4	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	--	--	2 (50%)
Doctoral – social science	36	17 (47%)	9 (25%)	3 (8%)	6 (17%)	1 (3%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	11 (18%)	6 (10%)	6 (10%)	4 (6%)	36 (57%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	--	2 (22%)	1 (17%)
Joint degree social science	7	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	--	--	2 (29%)

Table 7, Continued.

	<i>n</i>	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Apply for an AP-LS grant						
Overall	118	11 (9%)	23 (20%)	13 (11%)	25 (21%)	46 (39%)
Master's	4	1 (25%)	--	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
Doctoral – social science	36	6 (17%)	9 (25%)	4 (11%)	10 (28%)	7 (19%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	3 (5%)	11 (18%)	6 (10%)	10 (16%)	33 (52%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	--	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)
Joint degree social science	7	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	--	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
Submit an article for publication in a peer-reviewed journal						
Overall	118	67 (57%)	19 (16%)	7 (6%)	5 (4%)	20 (17%)
Master's	4	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	--	--	2 (50%)
Doctoral – social science	36	32 (89%)	4 (11%)	--	--	--
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	23 (37%)	13 (21%)	6 (10%)	4 (6%)	17 (27%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	6 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Joint degree social science	7	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	--	--	--
Submit an article for publication in a law review						
Overall	118	4 (3%)	6 (5%)	12 (10%)	28 (24%)	68 (58%)
Master's	4	--	--	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
Doctoral – social science	36	1 (3%)	3 (8%)	2 (6%)	10 (28%)	20 (56%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	--	2 (3%)	6 (10%)	12 (19%)	43 (68%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	--
Joint degree social science	7	2 (29%)	--	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)

Table 7, Continued.

	<i>n</i>	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Write a book chapter or book						
Overall	118	8 (7%)	9 (8%)	15 (13%)	31 (26%)	55 (47%)
Master's	4	--	--	--	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
Doctoral – social science	36	3 (8%)	7 (19%)	6 (17%)	10 (28%)	10 (28%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	4 (6%)	1 (2%)	7 (11%)	13 (21%)	38 (60%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	--
Joint degree social science	7	--	--	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	2 (29%)
Seek out new job opportunities						
Overall	118	33 (28%)	18 (15%)	10 (9%)	29 (25%)	28 (24%)
Master's	4	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	--	--	--
Doctoral – social science	36	9 (25%)	5 (14%)	5 (14%)	10 (28%)	7 (19%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	15 (24%)	12 (19%)	5 (8%)	15 (24%)	16 (25%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	2 (33%)	--	--	1 (17%)	3 (50%)
Joint degree social science	7	3 (43%)	--	--	3 (43%)	1 (14%)
Seek out a leadership position in AP-LS						
Overall	118	13 (11%)	18 (15%)	24 (20%)	35 (30%)	28 (24%)
Master's	4	--	--	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
Doctoral – social science	36	2 (6%)	5 (14%)	9 (25%)	14 (39%)	6 (17%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	7 (11%)	11 (18%)	10 (16%)	16 (25%)	19 (30%)
Joint degree clinical/forensic	6	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	--
Joint degree social science	7	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	--

Note. All respondents did not complete all items in this table.

III. Law and Psychology Education: When It Occurs

Overview. As undergraduates, joint degree social science respondents were most likely to learn about law and psychology in an introductory course or law and psychology course, while master's and doctoral—social science respondents were most likely to learn about law and psychology in a general course. More than half of respondents reported that their graduate institution offered a law and psychology course, with almost all joint degree respondents stating that their institution offered such a course. About a quarter of respondents reported that their graduate institution offered an advanced law and psychology course, and less than a quarter of respondents indicated that law and psychology was taught in an introductory course or general course at their graduate institution. In addition, fewer than half of respondents reported learning about law and psychology as a graduate student in any of the course options, with the most selecting advanced law and psychology course (45% overall) and second most selecting law and psychology course (40% overall). Respondents were also asked about educational experiences in non-academic settings. While most doctoral—clinical/applied (70%) and joint degree—clinical/forensic (83%) respondents reported educational experience in a correctional experience setting, few respondents reported educational experience in any other non-academic settings. Law and psychology education could benefit from non-academic experiences for non-clinical doctoral students and expanded experiences for master's and non-clinical doctoral students (e.g., working in court clinics or legal offices, shadowing attorneys or forensic psychologists, working in policy/advocacy settings, or gaining experience in other governmental or legal psychology-related workplaces).

Recommendation. Based on the data, there is room for expanding the lessons of law and psychology into the general psychological curriculum both for undergraduates and for graduate students pursuing law and psychology advanced degrees. AP-LS should also take a role in identifying appropriate opportunities to bring law and psychology into a variety of educational settings outside of the classroom.

Coursework for undergraduates

As undergraduates, respondents learned about law and psychology in a variety of courses as well as independent research. About one-fifth did so in an introductory course (ranging from 19% for doctoral respondents to 43% for joint degree non-clinical forensic respondents), about one-third did in a general course (ranging from 21% for doctoral—clinical/applied respondents to 50% ($n = 2$) of master's respondents), almost half of respondents did in a specific law and psychology course (ranging from 17% ($n = 1$) of joint degree clinical/forensic respondents to 71% of joint degree social science respondents), and less than one-fifth of respondents did in an advanced law and psychology course (ranging from none of the joint degree clinical/forensic respondents to 28% of doctoral—social science respondents). Joint degree social science respondents were most likely to learn about law and psychology in an introductory course and law and psychology course. See Table 8. It must also be considered, however, that some individuals learned about

law and psychology not through a course but through independent research or conversations with a mentor or instructor. Some of these were included in the “other” options described below.

More than half of respondents reported that their graduate institution offered a specific law and psychology course for undergraduates (ranging from 25% for master’s to 83% for joint degree—clinical/forensic and 86% for joint degree—social science). See Table 9. This is notably higher than the percentage of respondents who stated they, themselves, learned about law and psychology in a specific undergraduate law and psychology course. For example, 17% of joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents said they learned about law and psychology in a specific undergraduate law and psychology course while 83% said their graduate institution offered such a course. It might be that respondents’ graduate institutions were more likely to offer law and psychology courses than their undergraduate institutions or, as one member of the AP-LS Executive Committee noted, it might also be that forensic psychology has become increasingly popular and more schools are beginning to offer such courses.

About a quarter of respondents (27%) indicated that their graduate institution offered an advanced law and psychology courses for undergraduates (ranging from 17% joint degree—clinical/forensic to 39% doctoral—social science). However, these numbers do not take into account respondents who attended graduate school at institutions without undergraduates.

Coursework for graduate students

Respondents also provided when they learned about law and psychology as a graduate student. See Table 10. Less than half reported learning law and psychology in a specific law and psychology course (40%, ranging from 33% of doctoral—social science respondents to 83% of joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents) or advanced law and psychology course (45%, ranging from 41% of doctoral—clinical/applied respondents to 83% of joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents). Master’s degree and joint degree—clinical/forensic were the only respondent groups with half or more of respondents reporting learning about law and psychology topics during a law and psychology course, and advanced law and psychology course. Surprisingly, joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents were almost twice as likely to report learning about law and psychology in a specific law and psychology course and/or advanced law and psychology course (83% each) than joint degree—social science respondents (with 43% selecting each). Only about one-third of doctoral—social science or doctoral—clinical/applied respondents reported a law and psychology graduate course, and about forty percent reported such training in an advanced law and psychology graduate course. Few respondents reported learning about law and psychology in an introductory (14%) or general (22%) course. As stated by one member of the AP-LS Executive Committee, this lower-than-expected rate of enrollment in a specific law and psychology (advanced or not) course might be a good thing for AP-LS as an organization if it means that ECPs are seeing benefits in joining and being part of AP-LS despite not having formal law and psychology training. This warrants additional research, however.

Other settings and programs

Respondents also noted their law and psychology educational experiences in non-academic settings. See Table 11. Law and psychology education could benefit from expanded non-

academic experiences, particularly for master's and non-clinical doctoral students. The most common non-academic setting was correctional facility, an experience that 70% of doctoral—clinical/applied and 83% of joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents reported. While most doctoral—clinical/applied (70%) and joint degree—clinical/forensic (83%) respondents reported educational experience in a correctional experience setting, few respondents reported educational experience in any other non-academic settings.

The next most common was a forensic hospital, an experience shared by 51% of doctoral—clinical/applied and 67% of joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents. The master's degree and non-clinical respondents endorsed a variety of non-academic settings, with none reported by more than three respondents. Master's respondents reported having received experience in court clinics, forensic hospitals, district attorney's offices, and probation/parole departments. However, one master's respondent reported three of these non-academic settings and two reported no such experience. Very few doctoral—social science reported experience in any non-academic setting. Only one-third of doctoral—social science respondents, compared to 97% of doctoral—clinical/applied respondents, reported experience in at least one of the provided applied settings. For joint degree respondents, 83% of clinical/forensic and 71% of social science respondents reported experience in at least one of the settings. Although not shown in Table 11, one joint degree social science respondent noted experience working in the legislative branch and two doctoral clinical/applied respondents noted experience with mediation. The ten “other” responses, almost entirely provided by doctoral clinical/applied respondents, generally focused on outpatient treatment facilities and community health clinics.

In some ways, this is not surprising as some programs require applied setting experience for clinical/forensic students. In at least one law and psychology graduate program, social science law and psychology students do a “policy practicum” in an applied setting. More of these experiences might be recommended, and are desired by ECPs as shown in the data in this report.

Respondents also identified other educational settings where they learned about law and psychology as undergraduates or graduate students. A few respondents noted that they had no experience learning law and psychology as an undergraduate. Other respondents reported that, as undergraduates, they learned about law and psychology through discussion with professors and an undergraduate advisor, a forensic psychologist guest lecturer, independent study, an undergraduate internship at a correctional facility, and research opportunities/lab experience with professors. One respondent noted, “We did not learn about forensic psychology at my undergraduate school. When I told them I wanted to go into this line of work, I was told it was not a good idea.” AP-LS might better serve future ECPs, and its membership broadly, with further development and dissemination of resources regarding the job opportunities within law and psychology. Additionally, a few respondents noted that they did not learn about law and psychology as an undergraduate but did as part of a terminal master's program before enrolling in a doctoral program.

As graduate students, respondents reported that they also learned about law and psychology through brownbag meetings, clinical practica, colloquia, conferences, ethics coursework, and law courses.

Table 8. When you learned law and psychology while an undergraduate

	<i>n</i>	Introductory course	General course (e.g., Social Psychology)	Law and Psych course	Advanced Law and Psych course	Do not know or do not recall
Overall	118	25 (21%)	34 (29%)	52 (44%)	19 (16%)	20 (17%)
Master's	4	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	--
Doctoral – social science	36	7 (19%)	15 (42%)	17 (47%)	10 (28%)	2 (6%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	12 (19%)	13 (21%)	27 (43%)	7 (11%)	15 (24%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	--	1 (17%)
Joint degree social science	7	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)

Note: Respondents could select multiple items. Percentages are the number of respondents within the program category that selected each option.

Table 9. When law and psychology was taught to undergraduates in your terminal program

	<i>n</i>	Introductory course	General course (e.g., Social Psychology)	Law and Psych course	Advanced Law and Psych course	Do not know or do not recall
Overall	118	26 (22%)	26 (22%)	66 (56%)	32 (27%)	32 (27%)
Master's	4	--	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
Doctoral – social science	36	7 (19%)	8 (22%)	24 (67%)	14 (39%)	6 (17%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	15 (24%)	13 (21%)	30 (48%)	14 (22%)	23 (37%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	--
Joint degree social science	7	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	6 (86%)	2 (29%)	--

Note: Respondents could select multiple items. Percentages are the number of respondents within the program category that selected each option. Both respondents who completed J.D. programs responded with “do not know or do not recall.”

Table 10. When you learned law and psychology while a graduate student

	<i>n</i>	Introductory course	General course (e.g., Social Psychology)	Law and Psych course	Advanced Law and Psych course	Do not know or do not recall
Overall	118	17 (14%)	26 (22%)	47 (40%)	53 (45%)	5 (4%)
Master's	4	--	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)
Doctoral – social science	36	4 (11%)	6 (17%)	12 (33%)	16 (44%)	1 (3%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	12 (19%)	17 (27%)	24 (38%)	26 (41%)	1 (2%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	--	--	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	--
Joint degree social science	7	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)

Note: Respondents could select multiple items. Percentages are the number of respondents within the program category that selected each option.

Table 11: Law and psychology experience in non-academic settings

	Overall	Master's	Doctoral – social science	Doctoral – clinical/applied	Joint degree clinical/ forensic	Joint degree social science
<i>n</i>	118	4	36	63	6	7
Court clinic	15 (13%)	1 (25%)	--	11 (17%)	--	2 (29%)
Forensic hospital	38 (33%)	1 (25%)	1 (3%)	32 (51%)	4 (67%)	--
Forensic juvenile facilities	29 (25%)	--	1 (3%)	26 (41%)	2 (33%)	--
Public defender's office	8 (7%)	--	--	6 (10%)	1 (17%)	--
Correctional facility	54 (46%)	--	3 (8%)	44 (70%)	5 (83%)	1 (14%)
Private clinical practice	29 (25%)	--	1 (3%)	25 (40%)	3 (50%)	--
District Attorney's office	2 (2%)	1 (25%)	1 (3%)	--	--	--
Judicial branch	7 (6%)	--	1 (3%)	1 (2%)	2 (33%)	1 (14%)
Other government agency, non- Legislative/Judicial	6 (5%)	--	2 (6%)	2 (3%)	1 (17%)	1 (14%)
Private law practice	3 (3%)	--	--	--	1 (17%)	1 (14%)
Probation/parole department	19 (16%)	1 (25%)	--	18 (29%)	--	--
Specialty law group (e.g., Innocence Project)	8 (7%)	--	1 (3%)	3 (5%)	--	1 (14%)
Consulting or lobbying firm	4 (3%)	--	3 (8%)	--	--	1 (14%)
Other	10 (8%)	--	1 (3%)	9 (14%)	--	--

Note: Respondents could select multiple items. Percentages are the number of respondents within the respondent type that selected each option.

IV. Law and Psychology Education: What Is Learned

Overview. Respondents identified which areas they received training in at their graduate institution across five categories: research design and statistics; substantive psychology; legal knowledge; substantive legal psychology; specific legal questions. Respondents from clinical-focused programs were more likely to report training in the substantive psychology categories, particularly the biological bases of behavior, history and systems, and ethics. Almost all of the respondents reported research and statistics training in seven major areas (general research methods; descriptive statistics; univariate statistical analysis; experimental methods; multivariate statistical analysis; and survey research). There was variation in other areas. Very few respondents reported training in computational modeling, coding, or data mining. Training in legal knowledge areas was also generally low. Criminal law and criminal procedure were the only two topics that more than 40% of respondents identified as part of their training. As expected, joint degree respondents reported increased training in legal knowledge areas. There was also a lower-than-expected reporting of training in the thirty-two examined areas of substantive legal psychology and specific legal questions. The only topics with more than two-thirds of respondents reporting training were introductory/general law and psychology, social psychology and the law, competence to stand trial, and the role of expert witnesses. In addition, fewer than half of respondents reported training in socio-cultural issues in law and psychology (including only one-third of doctoral—social science respondents), and less than one-fifth reported training regarding harassment and discrimination claims (including only 8% of doctoral—social science respondents).

Recommendation. While no graduate training is expected to (or should) provide thorough training in every topic listed below, there is room for AP-LS to assess and strengthen the law and psychology curriculum across sub-disciplines in several areas. Additionally, AP-LS should expand its focus on diversity, furthering discussion of socio-cultural issues in law and psychology and providing current training on issues of harassment and discrimination.

Respondents generally reported a high level of training in research and statistics. As shown in Table 12, the seven research and statistics topics that at least 75% of respondents reported receiving training in were:

- General research methods (96% overall)
- Descriptive statistics (91% overall)
- Univariate statistical analysis (89% overall)
- Experimental methods (87% overall)
- Multivariate statistical analysis (87% overall)
- Survey research (83% overall)
- Quasi-experimental methods (78% overall)

None of the other eleven research and statistics topics were reported by more than 60% of overall respondents. However, there was some variation between respondent groups. Joint degree-clinical/forensic respondents were most likely to receive training in program evaluation (67%) and data management (83%). Clinical respondents were most likely to receive training in psychometrics (79% for doctoral—clinical/applied and 67% for joint degree clinical/forensic respondents), while experimental respondents were most likely to receive training in writing syntax (82% for joint degree-social science and 72% of doctoral—social science respondents). Very few respondents reported training in computational modeling (9%), coding (17%), or data mining (12%). Future work should examine whether training programs are adjusting to big data and computing trends to prepare students for these real-world challenges. These topics also offer new opportunities for all AP-LS members.

Almost all doctoral—clinical/applied respondents received training on all eight substantive psychology topics provided, ranging from 94% for history and systems to 100% for multiple topics. See Table 13. Additionally, joint degree clinical/forensic respondents were also very likely to receive training on all of the topics, with each topic reported by either 83% or 100% of the respondents. However, the only topics for which more than 80% of doctoral—social science or joint program—social science respondents received training were cognitive/affective bases of behavior (88% and 86%, respectively) and social bases of behavior (86% and 100% respectively). Doctoral—social science and joint degree—social science respondents were comparatively unlikely to receive training on biological bases of behavior (33% and 14%, respectively) and history and systems (25% and 14%, respectively), and were also the least likely to report ethics training (55% and 71%, respectively). As expected, relatively few non-clinical respondents reported training in psychological therapy/intervention and clinical/professional training.

Overall, the legal knowledge topics that respondents were most likely to receive training in were criminal law (59% overall) and criminal procedure (54% overall). See Table 14. Joint degree respondents were generally the most likely to report training in these topics. Although legal training can occur outside of joint degree programs, no more than 40% of respondents reported training in any of the other legal knowledge topic areas. Every joint degree respondent (clinical/forensic and non-clinical/forensic) reported training in criminal law, torts, and legal research and writing. Other legal knowledge topic areas that most joint degree respondents received training in were civil procedure, constitutional law, contracts, and property law – each of which tend to be required courses the first year of law school. The other legal knowledge areas generally identified were alternative dispute resolution, evidence, business law, and family law.

For the substantive legal psychology topics, there was less consensus than expected. The only two topics in which more than two-thirds of overall respondents reported receiving training were introductory/general law and psychology (78%) and social psychology and the law (67%). Although the sample sizes were smaller, the joint degree respondents were the only group to report that 100% received training in a topic (social psychology and the law and cognitive psychology and the law for joint degree non-clinical/forensic; mental health law and legal concepts in law and psychology for joint degree clinical/forensic). Joint degree respondents were

more likely than doctoral respondents to report training in juvenile offending and contemporary research topics in law and psychology. Doctoral respondents were more likely than joint degree respondents to report training in forensic assessment, forensic treatment, victimology, and police and investigative psychology. See Table 15.

Overall, more than two-thirds of respondents reported being trained in only two of the specific legal questions topics: competence to stand trial (70%) and the role of expert witnesses (75%). Joint degree clinical/forensic respondents were most likely to report training in the role of expert witnesses, civil commitment, and the death penalty, while joint degree social science respondents were most likely to report training in eyewitness identification. Among both the doctoral and joint degree respondents, clinically-focused respondents were most likely to report training in competence to stand trial, criminal responsibility, and risk of violence in offenders. Non-clinically focused respondents were more likely to report training in confessions, jury selection, sentencing decisions, and eyewitness identification. See Table 16.

Additionally regarding training on specific legal questions, fewer than one-fifth of respondents received training on harassment and discrimination claims. However, joint degree respondents were much more likely to receive this training: with 71% of joint degree—social science and 50% of joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents saying yes. Likewise, when asked about substantive legal psychology topics, joint degree respondents were most likely to report training in socio-cultural issues in law and psychology, though only notably more often than doctoral—social science respondents. Further research should more deeply examine the representation of topics of diversity, culture, harassment, and discrimination within the law and psychology curriculum. In addition, efforts could be made to better examine whether graduate students themselves face harassment and discrimination during their graduate training.

Table 12. Training areas received at graduate institution. (Percentage Selecting “Yes”)

	Overall	Master’s	Doctoral – social science	Doctoral –clinical/ applied	Joint degree clinical or forensic	Joint degree social science
Research Design and Statistics						
General Research Methods	113 (96%)	4 (100%)	34 (94%)	63 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (86%)
Field Studies	37 (31%)	1 (25%)	11 (30%)	21 (33%)	3 (50%)	1 (14%)
Case Studies	46 (43%)	2 (50%)	6 (16%)	36 (57%)	2 (33%)	--
Survey Research	98 (83%)	3 (75%)	29 (81%)	54 (86%)	6 (100%)	6 (86%)
Program Evaluation	50 (42%)	2 (50%)	12 (33%)	28 (44%)	4 (67%)	4 (57%)
Quasi-Experimental Methods	93 (78%)	3 (75%)	26 (72%)	54 (86%)	5 (83%)	5 (71%)
Experimental Methods	103 (87%)	3 (75%)	31 (86%)	57 (90%)	6 (100%)	6 (86%)
Descriptive Statistics	107 (91%)	4 (100%)	32 (88%)	58 (92%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)
Univariate Statistical Analysis	106 (89%)	3 (75%)	33 (92%)	57 (90%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)
Multivariate Statistical Analysis	103 (87%)	3 (75%)	35 (97%)	52 (83%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)
Psychometrics	70 (59%)	1 (25%)	15 (42%)	49 (77%)	4 (67%)	1 (14%)
Meta-analysis	60 (51%)	3 (75%)	20 (55%)	32 (51%)	3 (50%)	2 (29%)
Hierarchical Linear Modeling	47 (40%)	1 (25%)	18 (50%)	25 (40%)	1 (16%)	2 (29%)
Computational Modeling	11 (9%)	1 (25%)	2 (6%)	8 (12%)	--	--
Data Management	50 (42%)	2 (50%)	19 (52%)	21 (33%)	5 (83%)	3 (43%)
Writing Syntax	58 (44%)	--	26 (72%)	23 (36%)	3 (50%)	6 (86%)
Coding	20 (17%)	--	8 (22%)	10 (16%)	--	2 (29%)
Data Mining	14 (12%)	--	4 (11%)	8 (13%)	1 (16%)	1 (14%)

Note: For each area, respondents responded to, “In which of the following areas did you receive training at your graduate institution? Please check all that apply. This training may occur through courses, practical experience, or supervision at any point during your program” Percentages represent the percentage of respondents in that program area category selecting yes.

Table 13. Training areas received at graduate institution. (Percentage Selecting “Yes”)

	Overall	Master’s	Doctoral – social science	Doctoral –clinical/ applied	Joint degree clinical or forensic	Joint degree social science
Substantive psychology						
Biological Bases of Behavior	83 (70%)	2 (50%)	12 (33%)	63 (100%)	5 (83%)	1 (14%)
Cognitive / Affective Bases of Behavior	110 (93%)	3 (75%)	32 (88%)	63 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (86%)
Social Bases of Behavior	110 (93%)	4 (100%)	31 (86%)	62 (98%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)
History and Systems	76 (64%)	2 (50%)	9 (25%)	59 (94%)	5 (83%)	1 (14%)
Ethics	97 (82%)	3 (75%)	20 (55%)	63 (100%)	5 (83%)	5 (71%)
Foundations of Psychological Evaluation/Measurement	84 (71%)	2 (50%)	13 (36%)	63 (100%)	5 (83%)	1 (14%)
Psychological Therapy / Foundations of Intervention	73 (62%)	2 (50%)	4 (11%)	62 (98%)	5 (83%)	--
Clinical and Professional Training Areas	76 (64%)	2 (50%)	5 (14%)	63 (100%)	5 (83%)	1 (14%)

Note: For each area, respondents responded to, “In which of the following areas did you receive training at your graduate institution? Please check all that apply. This training may occur through courses, practical experience, or supervision at any point during your program” Percentages represent the percentage of respondents in that program area category selecting yes.

Table 14. Training areas received at graduate institution. (Percentage Selecting “Yes”)

	Overall	Master’s	Doctoral – social science	Doctoral –clinical/ applied	Joint degree clinical or forensic	Joint degree social science
Legal Knowledge						
Alternative Dispute Resolution	24 (20%)	--	1 (3%)	15 (24%)	3 (50%)	4 (57%)
Civil Procedure	47 (39%)	2 (50%)	4 (11%)	28 (44%)	4 (67%)	7 (100%)
Evidence	42 (36%)	2 (50%)	8 (22%)	21 (33%)	4 (67%)	5 (71%)
Constitutional Law	33 (28%)	--	7 (19%)	13 (21%)	5 (83%)	6 (86%)
Criminal Law	70 (59%)	2 (50%)	9 (25%)	44 (69%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)
Criminal Procedure	64 (54%)	1 (25%)	8 (22%)	41 (65%)	6 (100%)	6 (86%)
Torts	27 (23%)	--	3 (8%)	9 (14%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)
Contracts	16 (14%)	--	1 (3%)	2 (3%)	5 (83%)	6 (86%)
Business Law	8 (7%)	--	--	--	1 (16%)	5 (71%)
Intellectual Property Law	4 (3%)	--	--	--	1 (16%)	2 (29%)
Property Law	12 (10%)	--	1 (3%)	--	4 (67%)	5 (71%)
Legal Research and Writing	37 (31%)	1 (25%)	5 (14%)	16 (25%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)
International Law	1 (1%)	--	--	1 (2%)	--	--
Employment Law	7 (6%)	--	--	3 (5%)	1 (16%)	3 (43%)
Family Law	23 (19%)	--	1 (3%)	12 (19%)	4 (67%)	4 (57%)
Client Counseling	19 (16%)	3 (75%)	1 (3%)	10 (16%)	3 (50%)	1 (14%)
Federalism Issues	20 (17%)	--	1 (3%)	13 (21%)	3 (50%)	3 (43%)
Trial Advocacy	17 (14%)	--	3 (8%)	10 (16%)	3 (50%)	--

Note: For each area, respondents responded to, “In which of the following areas did you receive training at your graduate institution? Please check all that apply. This training may occur through courses, practical experience, or supervision at any point during your program” Percentages represent the percentage of respondents in that program area category selecting yes.

Table 15. Training areas received at graduate institution. (Percentage Selecting “Yes”)

	Overall	Master’s	Doctoral – social science	Doctoral –clinical/ applied	Joint degree clinical or forensic	Joint degree social science
Substantive Legal Psychology						
Introductory/General Law and Psychology	92 (78%)	3 (75%)	26 (72%)	52 (83%)	5 (83%)	5 (71%)
Forensic Assessment	71 (60%)	3 (75%)	7 (19%)	56 (89%)	4 (67%)	--
Forensic Treatment	62 (53%)	3 (75%)	6 (16%)	48 (76%)	4 (67%)	--
Social Psychology and the Law	79 (67%)	3 (75%)	30 (83%)	35 (57%)	4 (67%)	7 (100%)
Cognitive Psychology and the Law	74 (62%)	3 (75%)	28 (78%)	32 (51%)	3 (50%)	7 (100%)
Juvenile Offending	66 (56%)	3 (75%)	17 (47%)	34 (54%)	5 (83%)	6 (86%)
Psychology of Criminal Behavior	65 (55%)	3 (75%)	13 (36%)	41 (65%)	5 (83%)	3 (43%)
Mental Health Law	68 (58%)	3 (75%)	6 (16%)	48 (76%)	6 (100%)	5 (71%)
Ethical Issues in Law and Psychology	74 (63%)	2 (50%)	8 (22%)	53 (84%)	4 (67%)	6 (86%)
Victimology	21 (18%)	--	7 (19%)	14 (22%)	--	--
Socio-cultural Issues in Law and Psychology	57 (48%)	2 (50%)	12 (33%)	35 (55%)	4 (67%)	4 (57%)
Police and Investigative Psychology	38 (32%)	3 (75%)	16 (44%)	18 (29%)	1 (16%)	--
Correctional Psychology	52 (44%)	3 (75%)	6 (16%)	37 (59%)	5 (83%)	1 (14%)
Professional Practice in Law and Psychology	54 (46%)	1 (25%)	3 (8%)	45 (71%)	5 (83%)	--
Legal Concepts in Law and Psychology	75 (64%)	1 (25%)	17 (47%)	44 (69%)	6 (100%)	6 (86%)
Contemporary Research in Law and Psychology	71 (60%)	2 (50%)	21 (58%)	38 (60%)	5 (83%)	5 (71%)

Note: For each area, respondents responded to, “In which of the following areas did you receive training at your graduate institution? Please check all that apply. This training may occur through courses, practical experience, or supervision at any point during your program” Percentages represent the percentage of respondents in that program area category selecting yes.

Table 16. Training areas received at graduate institution. (Percentage Selecting “Yes”)

	Overall	Master’s	Doctoral – social science	Doctoral –clinical/ applied	Joint degree clinical or forensic	Joint degree social science
Specific Legal Questions – Selected Choice						
Competence to Stand Trial	83 (70%)	3 (75%)	15 (42%)	54 (86%)	5 (83%)	4 (57%)
Criminal Responsibility	72 (61%)	3 (75%)	8 (22%)	51 (81%)	5 (83%)	4 (57%)
Confessions	55 (47%)	2 (50%)	23 (64%)	20 (32%)	3 (50%)	6 (86%)
Risk of Violence in Offenders	75 (64%)	3 (75%)	12 (33%)	52 (83%)	5 (83%)	2 (29%)
Jury Selection	50 (42%)	1 (25%)	21 (58%)	20 (32%)	2 (33%)	6 (86%)
Sentencing Decisions	49 (42%)	1 (25%)	16 (44%)	23 (37%)	3 (50%)	6 (86%)
Eyewitness Identification	61 (52%)	3 (75%)	28 (77%)	19 (30%)	3 (50%)	7 (100%)
Capacity to Consent to Treatment	41 (35%)	3 (75%)	4 (11%)	28 (44%)	3 (50%)	2 (29%)
Role of Expert Witnesses	89 (75%)	3 (75%)	23 (64%)	50 (79%)	6 (100%)	6 (86%)
Judicial Decision Making Processes	61 (52%)	--	20 (56%)	30 (48%)	5 (83%)	6 (86%)
Civil Commitment	57 (48%)	1 (25%)	3 (83%)	42 (67%)	6 (100%)	4 (57%)
Harassment and Discrimination Claims	20 (17%)	1 (25%)	3 (8%)	8 (13%)	3 (50%)	5 (71%)
Child Custody	40 (34%)	1 (25%)	3 (8%)	30 (48%)	3 (50%)	2 (29%)
Child Protection	25 (21%)	2 (50%)	4 (11%)	15 (24%)	1 (16%)	2 (29%)
Death Penalty	56 (47%)	1 (25%)	16 (44%)	27 (43%)	6 (100%)	5 (71%)
Other	6 (5%)	1 (25%)	1 (3%)	4 (2%)	--	--

Note: For each area, respondents responded to, “In which of the following areas did you receive training at your graduate institution? Please check all that apply. This training may occur through courses, practical experience, or supervision at any point during your program” Percentages represent the percentage of respondents in that program area category selecting yes.

V. Professional Training

Overview. Respondents were asked about professional training opportunities at their graduate institution. All respondents reported training on general research methods, but there was much variation in the other examined areas. Master's respondents, in particular, were especially unlikely to receive professional training. None reported training on professional development (e.g., how to write a CV). However, three-quarters reported training on how to write a master's thesis and how to present research at conferences. All doctoral—social science respondents reported training on how to write a dissertation and all but one received training on how to present research at conferences. As compared to doctoral—social science respondents, doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were less likely to receive training on teaching practices (52% vs. 72%), guidance on going on the academic job market (57% vs. 92%), and how to write a master's thesis (63% vs. 97%). Joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents were most likely to report professional training in the selected topics. Joint degree—social science respondents were significantly less likely to report professional training, as compared to all but master's respondents. Combined, about 43% of doctoral respondents (and 71% of joint degree—social science respondents) reported receiving no guidance on going on the non-academic job market.

Recommendation. Based on the data, there is a need for expanded professional guidance and training opportunities during graduate training. AP-LS should consider expanding their offerings of relevant seminars and workshops both at the annual conference and throughout the year. Additionally, with few receiving guidance on the non-academic job market, and data on the types of careers students pursue, expanded programs on obtaining a non-academic job would likely be welcomed. While it is unknown what percentage sought this guidance, this is an area that AP-LS has addressed in the past and should continue to address.

All master's respondents reported that they received training on general research practices during a specific course devoted to the topic and at lab meetings, but three-quarters of the master's respondents reported never receiving training on how to publish their work, teaching practices, conduct workshops or symposia, or guidance on going on the non-academic job market. None of the master's respondents reported receiving professional guidance training, which includes important professional elements such as writing a CV. See Table 17.

All doctoral—social science respondents reported training on general research practices and how to write a dissertation. About two-thirds of the doctoral—social science respondents reported learning about general research practices during a course devoted to the topic, at lab meetings, and via one-on-one mentoring. Learning how to write a master's thesis or dissertation, how to publish your work, and guidance on going on the academic job market generally occurred during one-on-one mentoring. Training on how to present research at conferences generally occurred via one-on-one mentoring (86%) or at lab meetings (61%). About two-thirds of doctoral—social science students reported learning about professional development during one-on-one mentoring. About half of respondents reported training on teaching practices via either a

course devoted to the topic or one-on-one mentoring, and only a little more than half received guidance on going on the non-academic job market. Fewer than one-fifth of respondents reported learning about professional development via any of the other options (and 16% said they never received that training at all).

When doctoral-social science respondents indicated receiving professional training (e.g., general research practices, how to write a master's thesis, how to write a dissertation, how to present research at conferences, and how to publish your work), it was generally part of one-on-one mentoring. Thus, respondents who did not attend an institution with an assigned mentor or lab might be especially unlikely receive guidance on these important professional topics. Again, AP-LS should consider expanding educational opportunities regarding these professional topics to prepare students for their careers.

All doctoral—clinical/applied respondents received general research practices. As compared to doctoral—social science respondents, the doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were less likely to receive any training on teaching practices (52% vs. 72%), guidance on going on the academic job market (57% vs. 92%), and how to write a master's thesis (63% vs. 97%). Doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were slightly more likely than doctoral—social science respondents to learn about general research practices in a course devoted to the topic, and less likely to receive research training via lab meetings or one-on-one mentoring. Doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were also less likely to receive training at lab meetings on how to present research at conferences. Learning how to write a master's thesis or dissertation, how to present research at conferences, and how to publish your work generally occurred during one-on-one mentoring. Only about half of the doctoral—clinical/applied respondents reported guidance going on the non-academic job market.

As compared to the doctoral respondents, the joint degree respondents were much less likely to report receiving any of the professional training topics as part of a substantive course, a course devoted to the topic, or during brownbags. Professional training, when it occurred, took place during lab meetings or via one-on-one mentoring.

For joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents, the only professional training topic that occurred during a substantive course was general research practices, and the only topics that occurred during brownbags were general research practices and how to present research at conferences. Joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents were most likely to report professional training across the examined topics, particularly during one-on-one mentoring. All but one reported one-on-one training with a mentor on how to write a master's thesis, how to write a dissertation, how to present at research conferences, how to publish your work, and professional development.

Joint degree—social science respondents were significantly less likely to report professional training, as compared to all but master's respondents. Less than one-third of respondents reported guidance on going on the non-academic job market, while only 57% reported training on how to write a master's thesis or dissertation, how to publish their work, professional development, teaching practices, or guidance on going on the academic job market.

However, one respondent (14%) reported a substantive course that included professional development and guidance on going on the academic and non-academic job market. For all the topics except for teaching practices, the largest percentage of respondents reported that, when training occurred, it was via one-on-one mentoring.

Table 17. Professional training received at graduate institution. (Percentage Selecting “Yes”)

	Never	As part of a substantive course	During a course devoted to this topic	During department/division brownbags	At lab meetings	Via one-on-one mentoring
Master’s						
General research practices	--	1 (25%)	4 (100%)	--	4 (100%)	3 (75%)
How to write a master’s thesis	1 (25%)	--	2 (50%)	--	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
How to write a dissertation	3 (75%)	--	--	--	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
How to present research at conferences	1 (25%)	--	2 (50%)	--	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
How to publish your work	3 (75%)	--	--	--	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
Professional development (e.g., how to write a CV)	4 (100%)	--	--	--	--	--
How to write or edit a book	4 (100%)	--	--	--	--	--
Teaching practices	3 (75%)	--	1 (25%)	--	1 (25%)	--
Conducting workshops and symposia	3 (75%)	--	--	--	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
Guidance on going on the academic job market	2 (50%)	--	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
Guidance on going on the non-academic job market	3 (75%)	--	--	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
Doctoral – Social Science						
General research practices	--	17 (47%)	26 (72%)	16 (44%)	24 (67%)	24 (67%)
How to write a master’s thesis	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	7 (19%)	2 (6%)	13 (36%)	33 (92%)
How to write a dissertation	--	--	3 (8%)	3 (8%)	13 (36%)	34 (94%)
How to present research at conferences	1 (3%)	7 (19%)	3 (8%)	13 (36%)	22 (61%)	31 (86%)
How to publish your work	4 (11%)	5 (14%)	3 (8%)	8 (22%)	12 (33%)	29 (81%)
Professional development (e.g., how to write a CV)	6 (16%)	7 (19%)	6 (17%)	6 (17%)	7 (19%)	23 (63%)

	Never	As part of a substant ive course	During a course devoted to this topic	During department/ division brownbags	At lab meetings	Via one-on- one mentoring
How to write or edit a book	30 (83%)	1 (3%)	--	--	1 (3%)	4 (11%)
Teaching practices	10 (28%)	3 (8%)	17 (47%)	7 (19%)	3 (8%)	17 (47%)
Conducting workshops and symposia	27 (75%)	--	--	3 (8%)	3 (8%)	6 (17%)
Guidance on going on the academic job market	3 (8%)	2 (6%)	4 (11%)	13 (36%)	11 (31%)	30 (83%)
Guidance on going on the non-academic job market	15 (42%)	3 (8%)	2 (6%)	8 (22%)	5 (14%)	16 (44%)
Doctoral –clinical/ applied						
General research practices	--	31 (49%)	50 (79%)	14 (22%)	25 (40%)	27 (42%)
How to write a master's thesis	23 (37%)	7 (11%)	8 (13%)	3 (5%)	14 (22%)	34 (54%)
How to write a dissertation	2 (3%)	15 (24%)	19 (30%)	8 (13%)	18 (29%)	50 (79%)
How to present research at conferences	6 (10%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)	14 (22%)	24 (38%)	49 (78%)
How to publish your work	12 (19%)	5 (8%)	1 (2%)	4 (6%)	20 (32%)	44 (70%)
Professional development (e.g., how to write a CV)	6 (10%)	12 (19%)	7 (11%)	16 (25%)	13 (21%)	37 (59%)
How to write or edit a book	46 (73%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	--	4 (6%)	11 (18%)
Teaching practices	30 (48%)	6 (10%)	15 (24%)	5 (8%)	2 (3%)	17 (27%)
Conducting workshops and symposia	46 (73%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	5 (8%)	6 (10%)	17 (27%)
Guidance on going on the academic job market	27 (43%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	13 (21%)	8 (13%)	28 (44%)
Guidance on going on the non-academic job market	28 (44%)	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	14 (22%)	4 (6%)	27 (43%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic						
General research practices	--	3 (50%)	4 (67%)	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	4 (67%)
How to write a master's thesis	1 (17%)	--	1 (17%)	--	2 (33%)	5 (83%)

	Never	As part of a substant ive course	During a course devoted to this topic	During department/ division brownbags	At lab meetings	Via one-on- one mentoring
How to write a dissertation	1 (17%)	--	--	--	2 (33%)	5 (83%)
How to present research at conferences	1 (17%)	--	--	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	5 (83%)
How to publish your work	1 (17%)	--	--	--	5 (83%)	5 (83%)
Professional development (e.g., how to write a CV)	1 (17%)	--	--	--	3 (50%)	5 (83%)
How to write or edit a book	4 (67%)	--	--	--	1 (17%)	1 (17%)
Teaching practices	2 (33%)	--	3 (50%)	--	1 (17%)	1 (17%)
Conducting workshops and symposia	3 (50%)	--	--	--	3 (50%)	3 (50%)
Guidance on going on the academic job market	1 (17%)	--	--	--	1 (17%)	4 (67%)
Guidance on going on the non-academic job market	1 (17%)	--	--	--	1 (17%)	4 (67%)
Joint degree social science						
General research practices	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	6 (86%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	4 (57%)
How to write a master's thesis	3 (43%)	--	--	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	5 (71%)
How to write a dissertation	3 (43%)	--	--	--	1 (14%)	4 (57%)
How to present research at conferences	2 (29%)	--	--	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	4 (57%)
How to publish your work	3 (43%)	--	--	--	1 (14%)	4 (57%)
Professional development (e.g., how to write a CV)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	--	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	3 (43%)
How to write or edit a book	6 (86%)	--	--	--	--	1 (14%)
Teaching practices	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	--	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
Conducting workshops and symposia	5 (71%)	--	--	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)

	Never	As part of a substant ive course	During a course devoted to this topic	During department/ division brownbags	At lab meetings	Via one-on- one mentoring
Guidance on going on the academic job market	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	--	--	1 (14%)	3 (43%)
Guidance on going on the non-academic job market	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	--	--	1 (14%)	1 (14%)

Note: Respondents could select more than one option. Not all respondents responded to all options.

VI. Publications and Presentations

Overview. Joint degree—clinical/forensic and doctoral—social science respondents were most likely to report having a first-authored peer-reviewed journal article upon graduation, while joint degree—social science respondents were most likely to report having a non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal article upon graduation. Master’s respondents were rarely published upon graduation. These trends continued in the reported publications since graduation, though joint degree—social science respondents reported fewer publications after graduation than before. Regarding presentations, respondents had given about 10 poster or paper presentations upon graduation and have given about 7 presentations since graduation. Master’s and doctoral—clinical/applied respondents reported the fewest presentations both before and after graduation, with joint degree—clinical/forensic and doctoral—social science respondents reporting the most presentations before and after graduation, respectively.

Recommendation. AP-LS should continue to offer training and events to explain the publication process to graduate students and ECPs, especially given some dissatisfaction with supervision and support in the manuscript submission process noted in the next section.

Publications

Respondents provided the number and type of publications (defined as in press or published) they had upon graduation. Respondents provided a raw number, adjusted into the categories provided in Table 18 and Table 19. It is important to use caution when comparing the numbers of publications before and after graduation, as the ECP respondents vary in how long it has been since they graduated. Respondents with many pre-graduation and no post-graduation publications, for example, might be respondents completing the survey within months of graduation rather than respondents who stopped publishing post-graduation. Of the four responding terminal master’s students, one respondent reported a first authored article in a non-peer-reviewed journal since graduation. The master’s respondents’ results are not provided in the tables or analysis below.

By graduation, 81% of doctoral-social science respondents reported having at least one first-authored peer-reviewed journal article; 42% reported having only one peer-reviewed journal article, while 19% reported having authored between three and five peer-reviewed journal articles. Most doctoral-social science respondents (75%) also had at least one non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal article, with respondents split between having 1 (17%), 2 (25%), and 3-5 (22%). About a quarter reported at least one non-first-author non-peer-reviewed journal/practice article or book chapter, and at least one first authored encyclopedia entry. Since graduation, 75% had at least one first-authored peer-reviewed journal article, 64% had at least one non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal article, 42% had at least one first-authored book chapter, and 33% had at least one non-first-authored book chapter.

Doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were much less likely than doctoral—social science respondents to have publications upon graduation. Thirty-eight percent had at least one first author peer-reviewed journal article and about half had at least one non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal article. Other publications were rare. The most common other type of publication was a non-first-authored book chapter (22% reported at least one). That trend generally continued after graduation. Thirty-two percent of respondents reported at least one first-authored peer-reviewed journal article since graduation, while 40% reported at least one non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal article. Other publication types were rarely selected. The most common other type of publication since graduation was a first-authored book chapter, with 16% of respondents reporting authoring at least one.

In contrast, although the number of respondents is small, upon graduation, every joint degree—clinical/forensic respondent reported at least one first-authored peer-reviewed journal article and all but one respondent reported at least two non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal articles. Half reported at least two non-first-authored book chapters. One-third reported one first-authored and one non-first-authored law review article, and one-third reported two non-first-authored encyclopedia entries. Since graduation, these respondents continued to actively publish, with all but one joint degree—clinical/forensic respondent reporting at least one first-authored peer-reviewed journal article and at least one non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal article. Half reported one first-authored book chapter since graduation.

Every joint degree—social science respondent reported at least one non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal article, while 71% reported at least one first-authored peer-reviewed journal article. More than half (57%) of respondents in this category reported at least one first-authored law review article, while almost half (43%) reported at least one non-first-authored non-peer-reviewed journal/practice article. Similarly, more than half (57%) reported at least one first-authored book chapter, while almost half (43%) reported at least one non-first-authored book chapter. After graduation, the joint degree—social science respondents were less likely to publish. More than half (57%) reported at least one first-authored peer-reviewed journal article and at least one non-first-authored peer-reviewed journal article. About one-quarter (28%) reported at least one first-authored law review article. No other publication type was reported by more than one respondent.

Very few respondents reported having published books and reviews (e.g., book, film). These publications are not included in the tables.

Respondents also noted nine “other” publications completed upon graduation. These included official blog posts, a commissioned monograph, and a section of a textbook. Six respondents selected an “other” category for publications since graduation. These publications were generally technical or government reports.

Presentations

Respondents also provided the number of combined paper and poster presentations they completed at the time of graduation and since graduation. Respondents averaged about 10 presentations upon graduation, with master's ($M = 0.75$) and doctoral—clinical/applied ($M = 7.70$) respondents notably below the mean. Joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents noted the most presentations ($M = 14.50$). See Table 20. Respondents have averaged about 7 presentations since graduation (as of November 2018), with master's ($M = 1.75$) and doctoral—clinical/applied ($M = 4.98$) again reporting the fewest. Doctoral—social science respondents ($M = 10.59$) reported the most. See Table 21. Again, as with publications, additional analysis will need to examine the rate of presentations over time, as respondents who graduated earlier would have more time to make presentations.

Table 18. Number and type of publications (in press or published) upon graduation

	Number of publications upon graduation				
	0	1	2	3-5	More than 5
Doctoral Social Science program (<i>n</i> = 36)					
Peer-reviewed journal article: First Author	7 (19%)	15 (42%)	5 (14%)	7 (19%)	2 (6%)
Peer-reviewed journal article: Non-first Author	9 (25%)	6 (17%)	9 (25%)	8 (22%)	4 (11%)
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article - First Author	30 (83%)	4 (11%)	--	1 (3%)	--
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article – Non-First Author	27 (75%)	5 (14%)	4 (11%)	--	--
Law review article - First Author	33 (92%)	3 (8%)	--	--	--
Law review article – Non-First Author	33 (92%)	3 (8%)	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry - First Author	28 (78%)	5 (14%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	--
Encyclopedia entry – Non-First Author	31 (86%)	5 (14%)	--	--	--
Book chapter - First Author	30 (83%)	3 (8%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	--
Book chapter – Non-First Author	27 (75%)	5 (14%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	--
Doctoral Clinical/Applied program (<i>n</i> = 63)					
Peer-reviewed journal article: First Author	39 (62%)	11 (17%)	7 (11%)	3 (5%)	3 (5%)
Peer-reviewed journal article: Non-first Author	32 (51%)	11 (17%)	4 (6%)	11 (17%)	5 (8%)
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article - First Author	57 (90%)	3 (5%)	--	3 (5%)	--
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article – Non-First Author	60 (95%)	1 (2%)	--	2 (3%)	--
Law review article - First Author	62 (98%)	1 (2%)	--	--	--
Law review article – Non-First Author	60 (95%)	3 (5%)	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry - First Author	55 (87%)	7 (11%)	--	1 (2%)	--

	Number of publications upon graduation				
	0	1	2	3-5	More than 5
Encyclopedia entry – Non-First Author	61 (97%)	2 (3%)	--	--	--
Book chapter - First Author	57 (90%)	4 (6%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	--
Book chapter – Non-First Author	49 (78%)	12 (19%)	1 (2%)	--	1 (2%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic (n = 6)					
Peer-reviewed journal article: First Author	--	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	--
Peer-reviewed journal article: Non-first Author	1 (17%)	--	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article - First Author	6 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article – Non-First Author	5 (83%)	--	1 (17%)	--	--
Law review article - First Author	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	--	--	--
Law review article – Non-First Author	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry - First Author	6 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry – Non-First Author	4 (67%)	--	2 (33%)	--	--
Book chapter - First Author	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	--	--	--
Book chapter – Non-First Author	3 (50%)	--	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	--
Joint degree social science (n = 7)					
Peer-reviewed journal article: First Author	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	--	1 (14%)	--
Peer-reviewed journal article: Non-first Author	--	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	--
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article - First Author	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	--	--	--
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article – Non-First Author	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	--	--

	Number of publications upon graduation				
	0	1	2	3-5	More than 5
Law review article - First Author	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	--	--
Law review article – Non-First Author	5 (71%)	--	--	2 (29%)	--
Encyclopedia entry - First Author	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry – Non-First Author	7 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Book chapter - First Author	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	--	1 (14%)	--
Book chapter – Non-First Author	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	--	--

Table 19. Number and type of publications (in press or published) since graduation

	Number of publications since graduation				
	0	1	2	3-5	More than 5
Doctoral Social Science program (<i>n</i> = 36)					
Peer-reviewed journal article: First Author	9 (25%)	8 (22%)	7 (19%)	9 (25%)	3 (8%)
Peer-reviewed journal article: Non-first Author	11 (36%)	6 (17%)	3 (8%)	10 (28%)	6 (17%)
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article - First Author	29 (81%)	2 (6%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article – Non-First Author	30 (83%)	4 (11%)	1 (3%)	--	1 (3%)
Law review article - First Author	36 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Law review article – Non-First Author	35 (97%)	1 (3%)	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry - First Author	30 (83%)	1 (3%)	4 (11%)	1 (3%)	--
Encyclopedia entry – Non-First Author	35 (97%)	--	--	1 (3%)	--
Book chapter - First Author	21 (58%)	12 (33%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	--
Book chapter – Non-First Author	24 (67%)	9 (25%)	3 (8%)	--	--
Doctoral Clinical/Applied program (<i>n</i> = 63)					
Peer-reviewed journal article: First Author	43 (68%)	5 (8%)	4 (6%)	5 (8%)	6 (10%)
Peer-reviewed journal article: Non-first Author	38 (60%)	12 (19%)	1 (2%)	6 (10%)	6 (10%)
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article - First Author	58 (92%)	2 (3%)	3 (5%)	--	--
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article – Non-First Author	58 (92%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	--
Law review article - First Author	63 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Law review article – Non-First Author	62 (98%)	1 (2%)	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry - First Author	60 (95%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	--	--

	Number of publications since graduation				
	0	1	2	3-5	More than 5
Encyclopedia entry – Non-First Author	60 (95%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	--	--
Book chapter - First Author	53 (84%)	8 (13%)	--	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Book chapter – Non-First Author	55 (87%)	5 (8%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	--
Joint degree clinical or forensic (n = 6)					
Peer-reviewed journal article: First Author	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	--	--
Peer-reviewed journal article: Non-first Author	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	--	--
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article - First Author	5 (83%)	--	--	1 (17%)	--
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article – Non-First Author	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	--	--	--
Law review article - First Author	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	--	--	--
Law review article – Non-First Author	6 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry - First Author	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry – Non-First Author	5 (83%)	--	1 (17%)	--	--
Book chapter - First Author	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	--	--	--
Book chapter – Non-First Author	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	--	--	--
Joint degree social science (n = 7)					
Peer-reviewed journal article: First Author	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	--	2 (29%)	--
Peer-reviewed journal article: Non-first Author	3 (43%)	--	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article - First Author	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	--	--	--
Non-peer-reviewed journal article or practice article – Non-First Author	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	--	--	--

	Number of publications since graduation				
	0	1	2	3-5	More than 5
Law review article - First Author	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	--	1 (14%)	--
Law review article – Non-First Author	7 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Encyclopedia entry - First Author	6 (86%)	--	1 (14%)	--	--
Encyclopedia entry – Non-First Author	7 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Book chapter - First Author	6 (86%)	--	--	1 (14%)	--
Book chapter – Non-First Author	6 (86%)	--	1 (14%)	--	--

Table 20: Number of paper/poster presentations upon graduation

	<i>n</i>	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	114	0	34	9.93	8.09
Master's	4	0	1	0.75	.50
Doctoral – social science	36	2	34	13.72	7.58
Doctoral – clinical/applied	60	0	28	7.70	7.52
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	5	28	14.50	9.48
Joint degree social science	7	5	22	12.29	5.52

Table 21: Number of paper/poster presentations since graduation

	<i>n</i>	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Overall	112	0	50	6.85	10.27
Master's	4	0	3	1.75	1.50
Doctoral – social science	34	0	43	10.59	10.95
Doctoral – clinical/applied	61	0	50	4.98	9.21
Joint degree clinical or forensic	5	0	16	6.40	6.03
Joint degree social science	7	0	46	9.00	16.60

VII. Satisfaction with Graduate Training and the Needs of ECPs

Overview. Only 5% of respondents said that AP-LS addressed their needs extremely well, with most stating moderately well. Respondents were also asked about whether they were prepared for selected career areas and whether their current career path includes that area. Clinical respondents were generally much more likely to report that they were prepared for clinical research and clinical practice than report that their current career path includes that area. Identified gaps between training and needed career skills revealed a need for more training in: policy development, analysis and evaluation, training of legal professionals, and how to work with or for the judicial system, teaching, and service as an expert witness. While respondents were generally satisfied with some elements such as experience conducting research within their lab, opportunities for improvement became evident. Master's and joint social science respondents were dissatisfied with opportunities for publishing as a first or supporting author. Joint clinical/forensic respondents were dissatisfied with opportunities for participating in grant writing/applications. Almost half of respondents were very or somewhat dissatisfied with opportunities to gain policy experience. Joint social science and master's respondents were generally not satisfied with supervision and support in the manuscript submission process or in professional development activities. When provided with seventeen areas of professional development, at least 42% of respondents indicated that they were somewhat or very interested in AP-LS providing professional development opportunities in all of them. The topics of most interest were: peer networking, professional networking, establishing collaborations outside of academia, and obtaining leadership positions. Joint degree clinical/forensic respondents most highly rated that their graduate program adequately addressed these areas. In future programming and conferences, ECPs also suggested that AP-LS could expand offerings focused on diversity, networking, and mentorship.

Recommendation. Based on the respondent data, there are numerous areas where AP-LS should offer additional support to improve satisfaction and meet the needs of ECPs. These include expanding opportunities for policy experience and further professional development regarding peer networking, professional networking, establishing collaborations outside of academia, and obtaining leadership positions. Additionally, AP-LS could further work to expand diversity-focused efforts.

Respondents were asked how well AP-LS addresses the needs of ECPs. Only 5% of respondents stated extremely well and most respondents split between very well (27%), moderately well (39%), and slightly well (27%). Moderately well was the most common response for all respondent groups except for joint degree clinical or forensic, who most commonly selected slightly well. Joint degree social science respondents selected very well and moderately well in equal proportions (43%), though none selected extremely well. See Table 22.

In an attempt to better understand where ECPs might be dissatisfied with their graduate training and where there might be a disconnect between training and career paths, the respondents were asked a series of additional questions about their training.

Career Preparation and Career Paths

Respondents were first asked whether their graduate program prepared them for twenty different career areas and whether their current career path includes that area. The separate questions are combined in Table 23. There was generally a match between the responses, though gaps between what respondents reported they were prepared for and what they actually do in their career are highlighted below.

Clinical respondents were much more likely to report they were prepared for clinical research than report it was included in their current career path. For example, 83% of doctoral—clinical/applied and joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents stated they were prepared for clinical research, but 37% of doctoral and 50% of joint respondents stated that their career path includes clinical research. For social science research, clinical respondents also were more likely to report preparation than having it in their current career path. (Comparatively, all doctoral—social science and joint degree—social science respondents reported they were prepared for social science research, and all but two respondents reported current career paths that include social science research). Doctoral—clinical/applied and joint degree clinical/forensic respondents were also much more likely to state they were prepared for the following clinical practice areas than they were to state it is part of their current career path: general assessment, general intervention, and forensic intervention.

There appears to be a need for more training in policy development in non-health or mental health areas for joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents, policy analysis and evaluation in non-health or mental health areas, as well as policy analysis and evaluation in non-health or mental health areas for doctoral—social science and joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents, training of law enforcement personnel, lawyers, and judges for doctoral—social science respondents, teaching (both psychology and law) for joint degree—social science respondents, service as an expert witness for doctoral—clinical/applied respondents, and working with or for the judicial system for doctoral—social science and doctoral—clinical/applied respondents. Of course, there is a zero-sum game at play here. Additional training in one area will reduce the time spent on other areas. Still, AP-LS efforts focused on expanding specific training areas, such as policy, could offer ECPs desired support.

Satisfaction with Graduate Training

Respondents were also asked how satisfied they were on a series of graduate training program elements, on a 5-point Likert scale with a N/A option. See Table 24. With the exception of joint social science respondents, respondents were generally very satisfied with their experience conducting research within their lab. Respondents were less satisfied with their experience conducting research outside of their lab. Doctoral—social science respondents were

most satisfied (34% very satisfied), while all other respondent groups were most likely to select neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Respondents were generally very satisfied with opportunities to present at conferences, with the exception of master's respondents.

There was more variability with satisfaction with opportunities to publish as a first author, with doctoral—social science and joint clinical/forensic respondents more likely to be very satisfied (57% and 50%, respectively). Master's respondents split evenly between very dissatisfied and neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while joint social science respondents split evenly between somewhat dissatisfied and very satisfied. Doctoral—clinical/applied respondents provided wider variability, with the largest number (38%) very satisfied. Satisfaction with opportunities for publishing as a supporting author followed a similar pattern, though master's respondents were more likely to be neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and joint social science respondents were more likely to be somewhat dissatisfied.

Regarding opportunities for participating in grant writing/applications, there was also a broad spectrum of responses, with the largest number (27%) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Doctoral—social science respondents reported the highest satisfaction, while joint clinical/forensic respondents were most likely to be somewhat dissatisfied.

Almost half of respondents were very or somewhat dissatisfied with opportunities to gain policy experience. Only 6% of respondents were very satisfied, but 33% of joint clinical/forensic respondents each reported being somewhat dissatisfied or very satisfied.

Regarding supervision and support in the manuscript submission process, the highest satisfaction came from doctoral—social science (68% somewhat or very satisfied) and joint degree clinical/forensic (83% somewhat or very satisfied) respondents. Joint social science respondents reported the lowest satisfaction (57% very or somewhat dissatisfied). Respondents were more evenly split in whether they were satisfied with professional development opportunities. Doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were most often somewhat or very satisfied, joint clinical/forensic respondents most often somewhat satisfied, doctoral—social science respondents split between neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat, or very satisfied, and master's and joint social science respondents most often somewhat dissatisfied.

Professional Development: Opportunities for AP-LS

Respondents identified to what extent they were interested in AP-LS providing opportunities to expand their professional development in a variety of areas. At least 42% of respondents indicated that they were somewhat or very interested in AP-LS providing professional development opportunities for all topics. The following areas gained the most interest (overall % stating that they were somewhat or very interested):

- Peer networking (91%)
- Professional networking (87%)
- Establishing collaborations outside of academia (81%)
- Obtaining leadership positions (75%)
- Policy work (72%)

- Developing work-related experience (68%)
- Teaching skills (65%)
- Publishing in journals related to law and psychology (63%)
- Grant writing (59%)
- Developing independent research (57%)
- Publishing in additional media (i.e., magazines, newspapers) (53%)
- Publishing in journals outside of law and psychology (51%)

Almost half of respondents were interested in AP-LS providing opportunities on the following areas (overall % stating that they were somewhat or very interested):

- Publishing in law reviews (47%)
- Dealing with debt (45%)
- Presenting your work at conferences (44%)
- Publishing books and book chapters (44%)
- Managing the work of peers (42%)

Respondents were also asked to offer thoughts and opinions regarding the following open-ended question: “Do you have any suggestions for AP-LS conference programs, educational opportunities, or other offerings that you would consider important, valuable, and that you would use if offered? If so, please describe below.”

Responses generally focused on several themes including: expanding diversity, networking and mentorship opportunities, and issues specific to early career psychologists. Respondents were also interested in future offerings on research, board certification, policy-making/advocacy, and issues specific to master’s level clinicians. Respondents especially noted that AP-LS should better address issues related to diversity and multi-culturalism. Respondents felt there was a lack of emphasis placed on the recruitment and advancement of minority members within AP-LS. In addition, it was suggested that a stronger emphasis be placed on integrating issues of diversity into AP-LS conference programming.

Respondents also suggested many ideas for formal and informal mentorship and networking with advanced-career members including “meet and greets” between academic and practicing psychologists, and a stronger effort in reaching out to recent graduates to connect them to committees, groups, and leadership roles within AP-LS. Respondents expressed concern that many do not have access to mentors and would like more opportunities to facilitate professional mentoring relationships. Respondents were also interested in expanded opportunities to learn about non-traditional career paths and grant writing.

The majority of responses focused on issues directly related to ECPs. While some respondents noted an increased focus on ECPs within AP-LS (noting this survey as one example), others stated that AP-LS should and could do more. Specifically, respondents wanted programs and education on developing a private practice, seminars related to obtaining licensure and board certification, dealing with loan debt, obtaining employment, balancing obligations,

and obtaining grant funding. Of note, work-life balance and obtaining grants were two sessions offered at the 2019 AP-LS conference. One respondent said it would be helpful if AP-LS offered guidance on applying for academic jobs at small liberal arts colleges, as they present different challenges than R1 institutions. Another respondent mentioned it would be helpful for AP-LS to create an ECP LISTSERV similar to the one offered by APA so information can be more quickly shared. One respondent reported wanting more webinars and online trainings for individuals who are unable to attend the conference or have difficulty traveling in general. Further suggestions regarding the annual conference regarded offering child care and scholarships for ECPs to attend, and a stronger effort on selecting more affordable locations for conferences. Respondents also noted the need for opportunities for collaboration outside of academia, as well as further programming on publishing, and advanced statistical methods.

Table 22. How well AP-LS addresses the needs of early career professionals

	<i>N</i>	Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Slightly well	Not at all well
Overall	117	6 (5%)	31 (27%)	46 (39%)	32 (27%)	2 (2%)
Master's	4	--	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	--
Doctoral – social science	36	4 (11%)	10 (28%)	12 (33%)	9 (25%)	1 (3%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	62	1 (2%)	15 (24%)	26 (42%)	19 (31%)	1 (2%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	--
Joint degree social science	7	--	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	--

Table 23. Graduate Training in Potential Career Areas. (Number and % Selecting Yes)

Career Area		Overall (n = 117)	Master's (n = 4)	Doctoral – social science (n = 36)	Doctoral –clinical/ applied (n = 63)	Joint degree clinical or forensic (n = 6)	Joint degree social science (n = 7)
Clinical Research	Graduate Program Prepared Me	62 (53%)	3 (75%)	2 (6%)	52 (83%)	5 (83%)	--
	Current Career Path Includes	30 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (6%)	23 (37%)	3 (50%)	--
Social Science Research (social, developmental, experimental, legal)	Graduate Program Prepared Me	101 (86%)	4 (100%)	36 (100%)	47 (74%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)
	Current Career Path Includes	67 (57%)	2 (50%)	35 (97%)	18 (28%)	5 (83%)	6 (85%)
Health and mental health policy development	Graduate Program Prepared Me	16 (13%)	1 (25%)	1 (3%)	10 (15%)	3 (50%)	1 (14%)
	Current Career Path Includes	17 (14%)	1 (25%)	1 (3%)	12 (19%)	2 (33%)	1 (14%)
Health and mental health policy analysis and evaluation	Graduate Program Prepared Me	23 (19%)	2 (50%)	3 (8%)	14 (22%)	3 (50%)	1 (14%)
	Current Career Path Includes	17 (14%)	2 (50%)	2 (6%)	11 (17%)	1 (16%)	1 (14%)
Policy development in non-health or mental health areas	Graduate Program Prepared Me	17 (14%)	1 (25%)	5 (13%)	6 (10%)	1 (16%)	3 (42%)
	Current Career Path Includes	18 (15%)	1 (25%)	4 (11%)	7 (11%)	3 (50%)	3 (42%)
Policy analysis and evaluation in non-health or mental health areas	Graduate Program Prepared Me	22 (18%)	--	6 (16%)	11 (17%)	1 (16%)	3 (42%)
	Current Career Path Includes	19 (16%)	--	10 (27%)	5 (8%)	2 (33%)	2 (28%)
Working within legislative	Graduate Program Prepared Me	7 (6%)	--	3 (8%)	2 (3%)	2 (33%)	--
	Current Career Path	11 (9%)	--	4 (11%)	2 (3%)	2 (33%)	2 (28%)

Career Area		Overall (n = 117)	Master's (n = 4)	Doctoral – social science (n = 36)	Doctoral –clinical/ applied (n = 63)	Joint degree clinical or forensic (n = 6)	Joint degree social science (n = 7)
committee staffs	Includes						
Lobbying regarding psychological issues	Graduate Program Prepared Me	8 (7%)	--	1 (3%)	5 (8%)	2 (33%)	--
	Current Career Path Includes	9 (8%)	--	2 (6%)	5 (8%)	2 (33%)	--
Training of law enforcement personnel, lawyers, judges	Graduate Program Prepared Me	25 (21%)	2 (50%)	8 (22%)	10 (15%)	4 (66%)	1 (14%)
	Current Career Path Includes	40 (34%)	2 (50%)	15 (41%)	19 (30%)	2 (33%)	1 (14%)
Teaching – Psychology	Graduate Program Prepared Me	66 (56%)	--	23 (63%)	34 (53%)	5 (83%)	4 (57%)
	Current Career Path Includes	65 (55%)	--	28 (77%)	27 (42%)	4 (66%)	6 (85%)
Teaching – Law	Graduate Program Prepared Me	14 (11%)	--	6 (16%)	4 (6%)	2 (33%)	2 (28%)
	Current Career Path Includes	20 (17%)	--	9 (25%)	5 (8%)	2 (33%)	3 (42%)
Clinical practice – General assessment	Graduate Program Prepared Me	69 (58%)	2 (50%)	--	62 (98%)	5 (83%)	--
	Current Career Path Includes	53 (45%)	2 (50%)	--	50 (27%)	1 (16%)	--
Clinical practice – General intervention	Graduate Program Prepared Me	69 (58%)	2 (50%)	--	62 (98%)	5 (83%)	--
	Current Career Path Includes	38 (32%)	2 (50%)	--	35 (55%)	1 (16%)	--
Clinical practice – Forensic assessment	Graduate Program Prepared Me	65 (55%)	3 (75%)	1 (3%)	56 (88%)	5 (83%)	--
	Current	57	--	1	54	2	--

Career Area		Overall (n = 117)	Master's (n = 4)	Doctoral – social science (n = 36)	Doctoral –clinical/ applied (n = 63)	Joint degree clinical or forensic (n = 6)	Joint degree social science (n = 7)
	Career Path Includes	(48%)		(3%)	(85%)	(33%)	
Clinical practice – Forensic intervention	Graduate Program Prepared Me	57 (48%)	3 (75%)	--	50 (79%)	4 (66%)	--
	Current Career Path Includes	32 (27%)	--	--	32 (50%)	--	--
Service as an expert witness	Graduate Program Prepared Me	48 (41%)	3 (75%)	3 (8%)	38 (60%)	3 (50%)	1 (14%)
	Current Career Path Includes	56 (47%)	--	5 (13%)	50 (79%)	1 (16%)	--
Assessment of how the court functions and administrative processes	Graduate Program Prepared Me	38 (32%)	1 (25%)	3 (8%)	25 (39%)	4 (66%)	3 (42%)
	Current Career Path Includes	35 (29%)	--	2 (6%)	29 (46%)	1 (16%)	2 (28%)
Legal practice	Graduate Program Prepared Me	22 (18%)	1 (25%)	1 (3%)	10 (15%)	4 (66%)	4 (57%)
	Current Career Path Includes	19 (16%)	--	1 (3%)	14 (22%)	--	2 (28%)
Working with or for the judicial system	Graduate Program Prepared Me	40 (34%)	1 (25%)	3 (8%)	26 (41%)	5 (83%)	4 (57%)
	Current Career Path Includes	53 (45%)	--	10 (27%)	38 (60%)	2 (33%)	2 (28%)
Mediation and dispute resolution	Graduate Program Prepared Me	13 (11%)	--	1 (3%)	7 (11%)	--	4 (57%)
	Current Career Path Includes	9 (8%)	--	1 (3%)	4 (6%)	--	2 (28%)

Note: This table combines two separate. First, respondents were asked whether their graduate training program prepared them for each of the areas. Then, respondents were separately asked whether their current career path included that area.

Table 24. Satisfaction with elements of graduate training program

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
Experience conducting research within your lab	Overall	117	7 (6%)	6 (5%)	16 (14%)	27 (23%)	50 (43%)	11 (9%)
	Master's	4	--	--	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	--
	Doctoral social science	35	--	--	1 (3%)	9 (26%)	24 (69%)	1 (3%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	6 (10%)	6 (10%)	10 (16%)	13 (21%)	20 (32%)	8 (13%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	--	--	--	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	--
	Joint social science	7	--	--	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)
Experience conducting research outside your lab (i.e., external labs or groups)	Overall	117	8 (7%)	12 (10%)	30 (26%)	25 (21%)	25 (21%)	17 (15%)
	Master's	4	--	--	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
	Doctoral social science	35	--	5 (14%)	4 (11%)	11 (31%)	12 (34%)	3 (9%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	7 (11%)	6 (10%)	19 (30%)	11 (18%)	10 (16%)	10 (16%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	--	--	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)
	Joint social science	7	--	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
Opportunities for presenting at conferences	Overall	117	2 (2%)	7 (6%)	12 (10%)	22 (19%)	66 (54%)	8 (7%)
	Master's	4	--	--	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	--
	Doctoral social science	35	--	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	4 (11%)	28 (80%)	1 (3%)

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	1 (2%)	6 (10%)	9 (14%)	15 (24%)	29 (46%)	3 (5%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	--	--	--	--	5 (83%)	1 (17%)
	Joint social science	7	--	--	--	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)
Opportunities for publishing as a first author	Overall	117	9 (8%)	19 (16%)	19 (16%)	18 (15%)	50 (43%)	2 (2%)
	Master's	4	2 (50%)	--	2 (50%)	--	--	--
	Doctoral social science	35	4 (11%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	5 (14%)	20 (57%)	--
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	2 (3%)	12 (19%)	13 (21%)	10 (16%)	24 (38%)	2 (3%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	--	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	--
	Joint social science	7	--	3 (43%)	--	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	--
Opportunities for publishing as a supporting author	Overall	116	8 (7%)	18 (16%)	21 (18%)	20 (17%)	46 (40%)	3 (3%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	--	--	--
	Doctoral social science	35	3 (9%)	4 (12%)	4 (12%)	5 (15%)	18 (53%)	--
	Doctoral clinical/applied	62	3 (5%)	9 (14%)	15 (24%)	11 (18%)	23 (37%)	2 (3%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	--	1 (17%)	--	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	--
	Joint social science	7	--	3 (43%)	--	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	--

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
Opportunities for participating in grant writing/applications	Overall	117	13 (11%)	24 (21%)	32 (27%)	27 (23%)	18 (15%)	3 (3%)
	Master's	4	--	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	--	--	1 (25%)
	Doctoral social science	35	2 (6%)	4 (11%)	3 (9%)	16 (46%)	10 (29%)	--
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	9 (14%)	15 (24%)	22 (35%)	10 (16%)	6 (10%)	1 (2%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	--	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	--	1 (17%)	--
	Joint social science	7	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	--
Opportunities to gain policy experience	Overall	117	16 (14%)	36 (31%)	36 (31%)	11 (9%)	7 (6%)	11 (9%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	--	2 (50%)	--	--	1 (25%)
	Doctoral social science	35	5 (14%)	10 (29%)	9 (26%)	3 (9%)	2 (6%)	6 (17%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	9 (14%)	20 (32%)	22 (35%)	5 (8%)	3 (5%)	4 (6%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	--	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	--
	Joint social science	7	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	--	--
Supervision and support in the manuscript submission process (i.e., selecting journals,	Overall	117	13 (11%)	16 (14%)	21 (18%)	24 (21%)	37 (32%)	6 (5%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	--	2 (50%)	--	--	1 (25%)
	Doctoral social science	35	2 (6%)	5 (14%)	4 (11%)	5 (14%)	19 (54%)	--
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	8 (13%)	8 (13%)	13 (21%)	15 (24%)	14 (22%)	5 (8%)

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
drafting manuscripts, responding to feedback)	Joint clinical/forensic	6	--	--	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	--
	Joint social science	7	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	--
Support in professional development activities (i.e., writing a CV, preparing cover letters)	Overall	117	6 (5%)	19 (16%)	20 (17%)	36 (31%)	32 (27%)	4 (3%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	--	--	--
	Doctoral social science	35	1 (3%)	5 (14%)	8 (23%)	10 (29%)	10 (29%)	1 (3%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	2 (3%)	8 (13%)	9 (14%)	21 (33%)	20 (32%)	3 (5%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	--
	Joint social science	7	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	--

Table 25. Interest in AP-LS Professional Development Opportunities

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Not at all interested	Somewhat interested	Neither interested nor disinterested	Somewhat interested	Very interested
Professional Networking	Overall	117	3 (3%)	6 (5%)	7 (6%)	45 (39%)	56 (48%)
	Master's	4	--	--	--	--	4 (100%)
	Doctoral social science	35	2 (6%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	13 (37%)	14 (40%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	4 (6%)	28 (44%)	27 (43%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	--	--	--	2 (33%)	4 (67%)
	Joint social science	7	--	--	--	2 (29%)	5 (71%)
Peer Networking	Overall	117	3 (3%)	7 (6%)	9 (8%)	48 (48%)	50 (43%)
	Master's	4	-	-	-	-	4 (100%)
	Doctoral social science	35	2 (6%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)	14 (40%)	13 (37%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	5 (8%)	29 (46%)	25 (40%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	-	-	1 (16%)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)
	Joint social science	7	-	-	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)
Managing the work of peers	Overall	117	15 (13%)	18 (15%)	28 (24%)	35 (24%)	21 (18%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	-	-	2 (50%)	1 (25%)
	Doctoral social science	35	8 (23%)	5 (14%)	4 (11%)	12 (34%)	6 (17%)

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Not at all interested	Somewhat interested	Neither interested nor disinterested	Somewhat interested	Very interested
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	5 (8%)	12 (19%)	19 (30%)	17 (27%)	10 (16%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)
	Joint social science	7	-	-	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)
Establishing collaborations outside academia	Overall	117	6 (5%)	4 (3%)	12 (10%)	43 (37%)	52 (44%)
	Master's	4	-	-	1 (25%)	-	3 (75%)
	Doctoral social science	35	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	3 (9%)	13 (37%)	15 (43%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	4 (6%)	2 (3%)	7 (11%)	25 (40%)	25 (40%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	-	-	-	1 (17%)	3 (43%)
	Joint social science	7	-	-	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)
Presenting your work at conferences	Overall	116	19 (16%)	20 (17%)	26 (22%)	27 (23%)	24 (21%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	-	1 (25%)	-	2 (50%)
	Doctoral social science	34	7 (21%)	9 (27%)	8 (24%)	6 (18%)	4 (12%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	8 (13%)	9 (14%)	13 (21%)	19 (30%)	14 (22%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	-	2 (33%)
	Joint social science	7	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Not at all interested	Somewhat interested	Neither interested nor disinterested	Somewhat interested	Very interested
Publishing in journals related to law and psychology	Overall	117	16 (14%)	8 (7%)	19 (16%)	39 (33%)	35 (30%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	-	-	-	3 (75%)
	Doctoral social science	35	4 (11%)	3 (9%)	6 (17%)	13 (37%)	9 (26%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	10 (16%)	4 (6%)	9 (14%)	24 (38%)	16 (25%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	-	-	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	3 (43%)
	Joint social science	7	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	3 (43%)
Publishing in journals outside of law and psychology	Overall	117	20 (17%)	18 (15%)	19 (16%)	35 (30%)	25 (21%)
	Master's	4	-	1 (25%)	-	2 (50%)	1 (25%)
	Doctoral social science	35	5 (14%)	6 (17%)	4 (11%)	13 (37%)	7 (20%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	12 (19%)	11 (18%)	11 (18%)	17 (27%)	12 (19%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	1 (17%)	-	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)
	Joint social science	7	1 (14%)	-	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)
Publishing in law reviews	Overall	117	20 (17%)	18 (15%)	24 (21%)	34 (29%)	21 (18%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	-	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
	Doctoral social science	35	6 (17%)	2 (6%)	5 (14%)	16 (46%)	6 (17%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	13 (21%)	12 (19%)	16 (25%)	13 (21%)	9 (14%)

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Not at all interested	Somewhat interested	Neither interested nor disinterested	Somewhat interested	Very interested
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	-	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)
	Joint social science	7	-	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)
Publishing in additional media (i.e., magazines, newspapers)	Overall	116	20 (17%)	16 (14%)	19 (16%)	38 (33%)	23 (20%)
	Master's	4	-	-	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
	Doctoral social science	35	8 (23%)	5 (14%)	2 (6%)	10 (29%)	10 (29%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	11 (18%)	8 (13%)	15 (24%)	22 (35%)	7 (11%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	5	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	-	1 (20%)	2 (40%)
	Joint social science	7	-	2 (29%)	-	3 (43%)	2 (29%)
Publishing books and book chapters	Overall	117	21 (18%)	21 (18%)	24 (21%)	29 (25%)	22 (19%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	-	-	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
	Doctoral social science	35	7 (20%)	9 (26%)	5 (14%)	6 (17%)	8 (23%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	12 (19%)	10 (16%)	15 (14%)	17 (27%)	9 (14%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	-	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)
	Joint social science	7	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)
Developing independent research	Overall	117	17 (15%)	19 (16%)	15 (13%)	36 (31%)	30 (26%)
	Master's	4	-	-	1 (25%)	-	3 (75%)

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Not at all interested	Somewhat interested	Neither interested nor disinterested	Somewhat interested	Very interested
	Doctoral social science	35	6 (17%)	5 (14%)	6 (17%)	9 (26%)	9 (26%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	10 (16%)	14 (22%)	6 (10%)	19 (30%)	14 (22%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	-	-	-	3 (50%)	3 (50%)
	Joint social science	7	1 (14%)	-	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	1 (14%)
Developing work-related experience	Overall	116	12 (10%)	5 (4%)	20 (17%)	46 (40%)	33 (28%)
	Master's	4	-	-	-	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
	Doctoral social science	35	6 (17%)	2 (6%)	8 (23%)	14 (40%)	5 (14%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	5 (8%)	3 (5%)	9 (14%)	26 (41%)	20 (32%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	1 (17%)	-	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)
	Joint social science	6	-	-	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)
Dealing with debt	Overall	117	37 (32%)	10 (9%)	17 (15%)	21 (18%)	32 (27%)
	Master's	4	2 (50%)	-	-	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
	Doctoral social science	35	16 (46%)	3 (9%)	6 (17%)	6 (17%)	4 (11%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	14 (22%)	5 (8%)	8 (13%)	13 (21%)	23 (37%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	1 (17%)	-	2 (33%)	-	3 (50%)
	Joint social science	7	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Not at all interested	Somewhat interested	Neither interested nor disinterested	Somewhat interested	Very interested
Obtaining leadership positions	Overall	117	7 (6%)	5 (4%)	18 (15%)	50 (43%)	37 (32%)
	Master's	4	-	-	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)
	Doctoral social science	35	4 (11%)	2 (6%)	7 (20%)	11 (31%)	11 (31%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	2 (3%)	3 (5%)	8 (13%)	30 (58%)	20 (32%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	-	-	-	3 (50%)	3 (50%)
	Joint social science	7	1 (14%)	-	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
Grant writing	Overall	117	14 (12%)	14 (12%)	20 (17%)	28 (24%)	41 (35%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	-	-	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
	Doctoral social science	35	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	5 (14%)	9 (26%)	18 (51%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	9 (14%)	10 (16%)	14 (22%)	15 (24%)	15 (24%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	-	1 (17%)	-	1 (17%)	4 (67%)
	Joint social science	7	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	-	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
Teaching skills	Overall	117	15 (13%)	8 (7%)	19 (16%)	44 (38%)	31 (27%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	-	-	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
	Doctoral social science	35	5 (14%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)	13 (37%)	9 (26%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	5 (8%)	3 (5%)	13 (21%)	25 (40%)	17 (27%)

Topic	Respondent Group	<i>n</i>	Not at all interested	Somewhat interested	Neither interested nor disinterested	Somewhat interested	Very interested
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	2 (33%)	-	-	3 (50%)	1 (17%)
	Joint social science	7	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)
Policy work	Overall	117	10 (9%)	6 (5%)	17 (15%)	49 (42%)	35 (30%)
	Master's	4	1 (25%)	-	-	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
	Doctoral social science	35	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	16 (46%)	13 (37%)
	Doctoral clinical/applied	63	7 (11%)	4 (6%)	13 (21%)	25 (40%)	14 (22%)
	Joint clinical/forensic	6	-	-	-	2 (33%)	4 (67%)
	Joint social science	7	-	-	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)

VIII. Debt and Funding Sources

Overview. The average student debt load at the time of graduation, as identified by respondents, was a little over \$100,000, with about \$89,000 attributed solely to graduate training. Doctoral—social science respondents reported the lowest debt load, while doctoral—clinical/applied (especially PsyD) respondents reported the highest. During graduate training, most master’s respondents relied on loans, most doctoral—social science respondents relied on a teaching or research assistantship and two-thirds reported a stipend. Doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were more likely than doctoral—social science respondents to rely on loans. Joint degree respondents were most likely to note a stipend, with joint degree social science respondents most likely to have a research assistantship. During graduate training or after, about two-thirds of respondents applied for a grant/fellowship. Doctoral—social science respondents were most likely to do so, and about three-quarters receiving a grant during their graduate training. Doctoral—social science and joint degree—social science respondents were most likely to receive a grant/fellowship after graduation. The most common grant source applied for was AP-LS for all groups except for joint degree social science (which was the National Science Foundation).

Recommendation. The amount of debt that ECPs face when entering the profession is staggering and has a serious effect on ECPs’ lives. AP-LS must expand its efforts to address the high debt load and should provide prospective students with comprehensive information regarding the cost of graduate training.

Respondents were asked a series of questions about their debt and what funding sources they obtained during their graduate training.⁸ Respondents were first asked to “Please provide an estimate of your student debt load at the time of graduation.” This estimate included both undergraduate and graduate training. The average student debt load at the time of graduation was about \$103,000.⁹ See Table 26. The average student load ranged from \$36,095 for doctoral—social science respondents to \$148,379 for doctoral—clinical/applied respondents. Clinically-focused respondents reported higher debt loads. Within the group of doctoral—clinical/applied respondents, however, PhD clinical psychology respondents provided a significantly lower average debt (\$67,277, $n = 32$), compared to PsyD clinical psychology respondents (\$186,154, $n = 13$) and PsyD forensic psychology respondents (\$299,643, $n = 14$).

⁸ Amounts provided in Canadian Dollars were converted to U.S. dollars at the exchange rate used in February 2019.

⁹ Respondents who identified student debt were then asked, given the amount of debt, would you choose the same graduate path again? About two-thirds of respondents said yes (range of 60%-66.7%) with one exception: 83% (5 of 6) of respondents from joint-degree non-clinical/forensic programs said yes. Twenty-seven percent of responses overall were “I’m not sure.”

Respondents were then asked to calculate what percentage of that debt was attributed to their graduate education. One person did not answer this question, despite providing the estimate of their debt, so their information is not included in this further analysis. Respondents ranged from noting 0% to 100% of their debt stemmed from their graduate education. After mathematical calculations performed by the researchers, the overall average graduate training debt was \$89,285, ranging from \$27,056 for doctoral—social science respondents to \$130,787 for doctoral—clinical/applied respondents. Again, clinically-focused respondents reported higher debt loads and PsyD forensic psychology respondents reported the highest average graduate training debt (\$263,464, $n = 14$).

This level of AP-LS ECP student debt from graduate training is lower than the average obtained by an APA survey sent to 5,000 ECPs and reported in 2016.¹⁰ In that survey, the 525 ECP respondents reported an average \$99,023 final graduate debt (compared to \$89,285 here) and median \$80,000 final graduate debt (compared to \$45,000 here). The APA results also presented a striking difference between PsyD and PhD candidates, with PsyD graduates reporting final graduate debt of \$146,251 (mean) and \$138,500 (median) compared to PhD graduates reporting final graduate debt of \$78,527 (mean) and \$67,000 (median). Although only 14 forensic psychology Psy.D. graduates responded to our survey, their average graduate training debt was almost double the already high average reported by APA for Psy.D. graduates. The cost of a PsyD education is higher and worth examining by AP-LS and others.

Respondents then selected all of their funding sources during graduate training. See Table 27. Master's respondents generally relied on student loans (75%), with half noting scholarships/fellowships outside of an assistantship or a part-time job. None selected a teaching or research assistantship.

Most doctoral—social science respondents (81%) noted a teaching assistantship or research assistantship (72%) and about two-thirds noted a stipend. Doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were more likely to rely on student loans (75%), with about half noting a teaching assistantship and about a third noting a research assistantship, scholarship/fellowship outside of an assistantship, or part-time job.

Almost all joint degree respondents noted stipends (one joint degree social science respondent did not), with most also noting student loans and teaching assistantships (83% of joint degree clinical/forensic respondents; 71% of joint degree social science respondents). All joint degree social science respondents also noted a research assistantship, while two-thirds of joint degree clinical/forensic respondents did. About half of the joint degree respondents also noted scholarships or fellowships outside of an assistantship.

¹⁰ Doran, J.M, Kraha, A., Marks, L.R., Ameen, E.J., & El-Ghoroury, N.H. (2016). Graduate Debt in Psychology: A Quantitative Analysis, *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 10(1), 3-13.

Of the 16 respondents who selected “other”, fourteen explained further. Of those fourteen responses, nine were family/spousal financial assistance and two were personal savings.

While 64 respondents (55%) reported receiving a stipend, 67 respondents (57%) responded to the question asking for the estimated amount of their graduate stipend, averaged across their time in graduate school. See Table 28. The graduate stipend means were not statistically significantly different across groups. While all of the joint degree social science respondents reported stipends, only about half of master’s and doctoral—clinical/applied respondents did. The mean stipend across groups was \$15,752. The only respondent group reporting a higher mean was the doctoral—social science respondents, though that is likely due to two respondents reporting \$40,000 and \$30,000 graduate stipends. No other respondent reported a graduate stipend higher than \$25,000. Only one PsyD respondent reported a graduate stipend.

Respondents who obtained pre-doctoral internships were also asked to provide their estimated stipend. With the exception of one doctoral—clinical/applied respondent who stated the internship was unpaid, the mean stipend for the doctoral—clinical/applied and joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents was about \$28,000, with a range from \$24,000 to \$55,000. See Table 29.

Respondents also identified the grants or fellowships they have applied for during graduate training or after.¹¹ See Table 30. About two-thirds of respondents had applied for a grant or fellowship, ranging from half (master’s and doctoral—clinical/applied respondents) to almost all (doctoral—social science respondents). About half of respondents had received a grant/fellowship while in their graduate program, ranging from one-quarter (master’s respondents) to about three-quarters (for joint degree—social science (71%), doctoral—social science (78%), and joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents (83%)). Social science respondents were most likely to have received a grant/fellowship after their graduate program. Fewer than one-third of overall respondents have received one since graduation, compared to about half of doctoral—social science (53%) and joint degree—social science (43%) respondents.

Respondents also noted which grants/fellowships they applied for while in their graduate program. See Table 31. The largest number applied to AP-LS, which was the most common choice (or tied for most common) for all groups except for joint degree non-clinical/forensic. The National Science Foundation (NSF) was the most common choice for joint degree social science respondents, and second most common choice for doctoral—social science respondents. APA was the second most common choice for doctoral—clinical/applied respondents.

¹¹ Respondents were also asked how many grants or fellowships they received during their graduate program or after. Because it became clear in the open-ended responses that respondents differed in whether they counted travel awards in their count, the data is not reliable and not reported here.

Since graduating, fewer respondents have applied for grants/fellowships. See Table 32. Again, the most common were from AP-LS. Second most common for doctoral—social science and joint degree—social science respondents was NSF. Doctoral—social science respondents also applied for grants from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), while doctoral—clinical/applied respondents also applied for grants/fellowships from APA.

Respondents selecting “Other” were invited to write in where they applied for a grant or fellowship either during or after their graduate program. Twenty-two different responses were provided, with none written more than once.

Table 26: Estimate of student debt load at the time of graduation

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum	Median
Total Student Debt Load						
Overall	117	\$102,601	\$126,617	\$0	\$600,000	\$50,000
Master’s	4	\$73,750	\$87,690	\$0	\$200,000	\$47,500
Doctoral – social science	36	\$36,095	\$45,277	\$0	\$180,000	\$23,711
Doctoral – clinical/applied	63	\$148,379	\$149,096	\$0	\$600,000	\$100,000
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	\$98,667	\$92,015	\$0	\$250,000	\$95,000
Joint degree social science	6	\$48,333	\$55,558	\$0	\$140,000	\$30,000
Debt Load Attributed to Graduate Training						
Overall	116	\$89,285	\$114,010	\$0	\$550,000	\$45,000
Master’s	4	\$69,438	\$89,261	\$0	\$200,000	\$38,875
Doctoral – social science	36	\$27,056	\$36,700	\$0	\$131,490	\$9,500
Doctoral – clinical/applied	62	\$130,787	\$133,926	\$0	\$550,000	\$70,000
Joint degree clinical or forensic	6	\$95,333	\$93,181	\$0	\$250,000	\$85,000
Joint degree social science	6	\$42,250	\$45,411	\$0	\$89,906	\$30,000

Table 27: Funding source during graduate training

	Overall	Master's	Doctoral – social science	Doctoral – clinical/ applied	Joint degree clinical/ forensic	Joint degree social science
<i>n</i>	117	4	36	63	6	7
Stipend	64 (55%)	1 (25%)	24 (67%)	27 (43%)	6 (100%)	6 (86%)
Teaching assistantship	74 (63%)	--	29 (81%)	35 (56%)	5 (83%)	5 (71%)
Research assistantship	60 (51%)	--	26 (72%)	23 (37%)	4 (67%)	7 (100%)
Admin. positions	6 (5%)	--	1 (3%)	4 (6%)	1 (17%)	--
Scholarships/f ellowships outside of assistantship	48 (41%)	2 (50%)	17 (47%)	21 (33%)	3 (50%)	4 (57%)
Student loans	79 (68%)	3 (75%)	18 (50%)	47 (75%)	5 (83%)	5 (71%)
Personal loans	6 (5%)	--	2 (6%)	3 (5%)	1 (17%)	--
Part-time job	38 (32%)	2 (50%)	12 (33%)	20 (32%)	2 (33%)	1 (14%)
Full-time job	6 (5%)	1 (25%)	2 (6%)	2 (3%)	1 (17%)	1 (14%)
Other	16 (14%)	1 (25%)	2 (6%)	12 (19%)	--	--

Table 28: Estimated amount of graduate stipend (average across graduate years)

	<i>n</i> (% of total)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum	Median
Overall	67 (57%)	\$15,752	\$5,774	\$2,500	\$40,000	\$15,000
Master's	2 (50%)	\$13,552	\$5,023	\$10,000	\$17,104	\$13,552
Doctoral – social science	23 (64%)	\$17,750	\$7,487	\$2,500	\$40,000	\$18,000
Doctoral – clinical/applied	30 (47%)	\$14,950	\$4,598	\$4,000	\$25,000	\$15,000
Joint degree clinical or forensic	5 (83%)	\$14,200	\$5,070	\$11,000	\$23,000	\$12,000
Joint degree social science	7 (100%)	\$14,357	\$3,637	\$12,000	\$22,000	\$12,500

Note. This only includes respondents who identified that they received a stipend. Thus, the means should not be taken as an average across all graduate students.

Table 29: Estimated annual stipend for pre-doctoral internship

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum	Median
Overall	61	\$28,027	\$9,817	\$0	\$55,000	\$26,000
Doctoral – clinical/applied	56	\$27,762	\$9,789	\$0	\$55,000	\$25,750
Joint degree clinical or forensic	5	\$31,000	\$10,770	\$24,000	\$50,000	\$28,000

Table 30: Number of ECPs who applied for and/or received grants or fellowships in graduate program or after

	Applied during or after?		Received while in graduate program?		Received after graduate program?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Overall	79 (67%)	39 (33%)	59 (50%)	59 (50%)	37 (31%)	81 (69%)
Master's	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
Doctoral – social science	34 (94%)	2 (6%)	28 (78%)	8 (22%)	19 (53%)	17 (47%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	32 (51%)	31 (49%)	20 (32%)	43 (68%)	14 (22%)	49 (78%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)
Joint degree social science	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	4 (57%)

Table 31: Number of ECPs who applied for the following grants or fellowships while in their graduate program

	AP-LS	APA	NIMH	NIJ	NSF	Major Canadian research agency	Other
Overall	37	16	3	7	21	8	17
Master's	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Doctoral – social science	18	5	0	5	12	5	9
Doctoral – clinical/applied	13	9	1	1	5	3	5
Joint degree clinical or forensic	2	2	1	0	0	0	2
Joint degree social science	3	0	0	1	4	0	0

Note: NIMH = National Institute of Mental Health; NIJ = National Institute of Justice; NSF = National Science Foundation. In the survey, Major Canadian research agency was qualified with “(e.g., SSHRC, CIHR)”.

Table 32: Number of ECPs who applied for the following grants or fellowships since their graduate program

	AP-LS	APA	NIMH	NIJ	NSF	OJJDP	Major Canadian research agency	Other
Overall	26	8	3	13	18	5	3	10
Master's	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Doctoral – social science	15	1	1	8	11	2	3	5
Doctoral – clinical/applied	7	6	2	3	4	2	0	4
Joint degree clinical or forensic	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
Joint degree social science	3	0	0	1	2	1	0	1

Note: NIMH = National Institute of Mental Health; OJJDP = Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; NIJ = National Institute of Justice; NSF = National Science Foundation. In the survey, Major Canadian research agency was qualified with “(e.g., SSHRC, CIHR)”.

IX. Pre-Doctoral Internships and Post-Doctoral Fellowships and Residencies

Overview. Almost every doctoral—clinical/applied and joint degree clinical/forensic respondent applied for a pre-doctoral internship through APPIC. They applied to an average of 15 internships and almost all entered the match process only once. To research internship sites, almost all used the APPIC directory. Only about one-third used the AP-LS Student Committee or AP-LS general website. About half of doctoral—clinical/applied respondents said their pre-doctoral internship gave them experience in a forensic/justice (jail) or inpatient psychiatric hospital setting, while all but two joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents reported experience in these two settings as well as medical clinic/hospital settings. Respondents were about evenly split between pursuing a postdoctoral fellowship/residency or not. Almost all of the clinical practice/externships included supervised forensic experience, generally supported forensic/justice (jail) and inpatient psychiatric hospital setting, included individual supervision by a licensed psychologist, and served adult offenders and mentally ill offenders. Very few supported elderly offenders. About two-thirds of respondents said they were able to work with client populations of interest to them “often”. Almost all respondents reported experience with individual therapy, intake/structured interviews, group counseling, psychodiagnostic test administration, providing feedback to clients, and assessment report writing. Every joint degree—clinical/forensic and 88% of doctoral—clinical/applied respondents pursued board certification related to law and psychology.

Recommendation. AP-LS should continue to offer workshops and programming on how to obtain internships, fellowships, and residencies. Only about one-third used the AP-LS Student Committee or AP-LS general website to learn about internships. AP-LS could further expand the visibility of these resources for future applicants.

The doctoral—clinical/applied and joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents were asked a series of additional questions regarding their experience with pre-doctoral internships. All doctoral respondents were asked about post-doctoral fellowships and residencies. The analysis below is split between these two areas.

Pre-doctoral internships

Every joint degree clinical/forensic respondent and 97% of doctoral-clinical/applied respondents reported that they applied for a pre-doctoral internship through APPIC. Both groups of respondents applied to 15 internships, on average, though there was more variation for the doctoral-clinical/applied respondents ($SD = 4.96$, range: 5-25) than the joint degree clinical/forensic respondents ($SD = 2.24$, range: 12-18). All of the joint degree clinical/forensic respondents entered the APPIC match process once, while 95% of the doctoral clinical respondents entered the process once and three (5%) entered it twice. All of the joint degree clinical/forensic respondents reported that their pre-doctoral internship was APA approved, while 88% of the doctoral clinical

respondents did (with 12% stating it was not APA approved). All respondents who reported starting a pre-doctoral internship reported that they completed it.

To search for and research internship sites, almost all of the doctoral-clinical/applied respondents utilized the APPIC directory (98%), though they also relied on word of mouth from others (67%), the AP-LS Student Committee website (36%), the AP-LS general website (29%), online search engines (17%), and other professional resources (16%). All of the joint degree clinical/forensic respondents utilized the APPIC directory, while four (80%) also relied on word of mouth from others and/or the AP-LS Student Committee website, three (60%) relied on the AP-LS general website, and two (40%) relied on other professional resources. None reported using an online search engine, but one reported using the Canadian Council of Professional Psychology Programs.

Respondents described the clinical/forensic experiences offered by their internship. About 75% of the doctoral clinical/applied respondents reported their internship was on the forensic track/stream, 62% reported didactics experience, 40% reported that there was major forensic rotation/experience, 21% reported there was minor forensic rotation/experience, and 17% reported supervised clinical research. For the joint degree clinical/forensic respondents, 40% each reported their internship was on the forensic track/stream or offered minor forensic rotation/experience, one (20%) each reported major forensic rotation/experience or supervised clinical research, and 60% reported didactics experience.

About half of the doctoral—clinical/applied respondents stated that their pre-doctoral internship gave them experience in a forensic/justice (jail) setting and/or an inpatient psychiatric hospital. See Table 33. Few reported experience in the other provided settings. For joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents, all but two (60%) reported experience in forensic/justice (jail), inpatient psychiatric hospital, and medical clinic/hospital settings.

Additionally, one doctoral-clinical/applied respondent each reported experience in a child guidance clinic, residential/group home, VA medical center, university-housed Child and Family Forensic clinic, civil commitment facility for sexually violent predators, and court clinic. One joint degree clinical/forensic respondent also noted court clinic experience.

Post-doctoral fellowships and residencies

Finally, respondents answered questions regarding post-doctoral fellowships and residencies. Respondents were about evenly split between pursuing a post-doctoral fellowship or residency or not. However, doctoral—clinical/applied respondents most often stated they had pursued such a position (68%), while, as expected, none of the master's respondents (and one-third or fewer joint program respondents combined) did. The three “other” responses included two respondents who had an “informal postdoc.” See Table 34.

Respondents identified what type of post-doctoral fellowship/residency they pursued. As would be expected, 100% of doctoral social science and joint degree social science respondents applied for a research position. The two joint degree clinical/forensic respondents applied for a research or clinical position. The forty-three doctoral—clinical/applied respondents applied to clinical (74%), research and clinical (21%), and research (2%) positions. Interestingly, about two-thirds of doctoral—clinical/applied (64%) and joint degree clinical/forensic (50%, 1 of 2) respondents said their position was not APA approved. As expected due to the nature of non-clinical research-focused post-doctoral fellowships, only one of the positions obtained by doctoral—social science and joint degree social science respondents was stated as APA approved.

Respondents who indicated that they had pursued such a position ($n = 62$) were then asked if they completed a position. About half stated they had. Seven of the thirteen “other” responses were that the respondent was still completing the postdoctoral fellowship or residency at the time of the survey; four were that the respondent had been hired and did not complete the position. As shown in the sample data, many respondents were within three years of completing their terminal degree. This could explain why only about half had completed their post-doc position at the time of the survey. See Table 34.

Respondents were also asked if their program supported clinical practica/externships with supervised forensic experience (i.e., intervention or assessment). Ninety-five percent of doctoral-clinical/applied respondents and 100 percent of joint degree clinical/forensic respondents said “yes.” Respondents who answered yes were then asked which settings were supported. See Table 35. The most commonly supported settings for doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were forensic/justice (jail) (83%) and inpatient psychiatric hospital (76%). All joint degree clinical/forensic respondents stated that their program supported supervised clinical practica/externships at an inpatient psychiatric hospital. The “Other” settings provided included probation department/office, forensic inpatient hospital, and private forensic assessment.

Respondents were also asked about the type of supervision that was available through their clinical practica/externship. All respondents who reported a clinical practica/externship reported individual supervision by a licensed psychologist, 81% of doctoral-clinical/applied and 100% of joint degree clinical/forensic respondents reported group supervision, 34% of doctoral-clinical/applied and 20% of joint degree clinical/forensic respondents reported individual supervision by a licensed allied mental health professional, and 24% of doctoral-clinical/applied and 20% of joint degree clinical/forensic respondents reported individual supervision by someone listed under “other” such as a peer.

Respondents also identified the clinical populations served in the supported supervised settings. See Table 36. The most commonly supported population in the settings the doctoral—clinical/applied respondents identified as being supported by their program were adult offenders (ages 18 to 65) (95%) and mentally ill offenders (86%)

though each of the populations were identified by almost half (43%) or more of respondents. One of the “other” responses specifically noted substance abuse offenders. All of the joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents identified that juvenile offenders and adult offenders were supported, and all but one respondent identified that violent offenders, mentally ill offenders, and civilly committed individuals were supported. The least supported population for both respondent groups was elderly offenders.

Respondents were also asked to what extent they were able to work with client populations of interest to them and their training. About two-thirds of doctoral clinical respondents said “often”, about one-third said “sometimes”, and one said rarely. For the joint degree clinical/forensic respondents, three (60%) said often and two (40%) said sometimes. No respondent selected never.

Respondents identified their intervention, assessment, and report writing experience during supervised clinical practica/externship settings. See Table 37. Regarding intervention, doctoral—clinical/applied respondents were most likely to report experience with individual therapy and intake/structured interviews (91% each), as well as group counseling (85%) and treatment planning with clients (78%). Some (24%) reported supervision of other students. All joint degree—clinical/forensic respondents reported experience with intake/structured interviews and treatment planning with clients, while all but one reported experience with group counseling, individual therapy, and supervision of other students. These respondents were least likely to report experience with client consultation, though three (60%) did, a percentage higher than for doctoral—clinical/applied respondents (41%).

Regarding assessment experience, there was similar variation between the two respondent groups with almost all respondents reporting experience with psychodiagnostic test administration, about 80% reporting experience with providing feedback to clients, and about half (55% doctoral; 40% joint degree) reporting neuropsychological experience.

All respondents reported experience with assessment report writing, while about half (50% doctoral; 40% joint degree) reported observation of assessment report writing by a supervisor.

Additionally, every joint degree clinical/forensic respondent and 88% of doctoral-clinical/applied respondents reported that they pursued board certification related to law and psychology.

Table 33. Pre-Doctoral Internship Settings for Clinical/Forensic Experience

	Doctoral – clinical/applied (<i>n</i> = 57)	Joint degree clinical or forensic (<i>n</i> = 5)
Community Mental Health	7 (12%)	1 (20%)
Forensic/Justice (Jail)	31 (54%)	3 (60%)
Inpatient Psychiatric Hospital	31 (54%)	3 (60%)
Medical Clinic/Hospital	3 (5%)	3 (60%)
Outpatient Psychiatric Clinic/Hospital	8 (14%)	--
Private Practice	5 (9%)	--

Table 34. Post-doctoral fellowships or residencies: Pursued and Completed

	Pursued postdoctoral fellowship or residency			Completed postdoctoral fellowship or residency		
	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other
Overall	62 (53%)	53 (45%)	3 (3%)	30 (48%)	19 (31%)	13 (21%)
Master's	--	4 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Doctoral – social science	15 (42%)	21 (58%)	--	6 (40%)	5 (33%)	4 (27%)
Doctoral – clinical/applied	43 (68%)	17 (27%)	3 (5%)	23 (54%)	12 (29%)	8 (19%)
Joint degree clinical or forensic	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	--	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	--
Joint degree non- clinical/forensic	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	--	--	1 (50%)	1 (50%)

Table 35. Supported Supervised Clinical Practica/Externship Settings

	Doctoral – clinical/applied (<i>n</i> = 58)	Joint degree clinical or forensic (<i>n</i> = 5)
Choice Child Guidance Clinic	10 (17%)	--
Community Mental Health	34 (59%)	1 (20%)
Department/School Clinic	20 (34%)	2 (40%)
Forensic/Justice (Jail)	48 (83%)	3 (60%)
Inpatient Psychiatric Hospital	44 (76%)	5 (100%)
Medical Clinic/Hospital	14 (24%)	--
Outpatient Psychiatric Clinic/Hospital	22 (38%)	--
Partial Hospitalization/Intensive Outpatient Programs	19 (33%)	--
Private Practice	32 (55%)	1 (20%)
Residential/Group Home	17 (29%)	--
Schools	14 (24%)	--
University Counsel/Student Mental Health	12 (21%)	--
VA Medical Center	8 (14%)	--
Other	4 (7%)	2 (40%)

Note: Respondents provided responses based upon the setting or settings they experienced.

Table 36. Clinical Populations in Supported Settings

	Doctoral – clinical/applied (<i>n</i> = 58)	Joint degree clinical or forensic (<i>n</i> = 5)
Juvenile offenders (below age 18)	42 (72%)	5 (100%)
Adult offenders (ages 18 to 65)	55 (95%)	5 (100%)
Elderly offenders (above age 65)	25 (43%)	2 (40%)
Sexual offenders	44 (76%)	3 (60%)
Violent offenders	44 (76%)	4 (80%)
Mentally ill offenders	50 (86%)	4 (80%)
Civilly committed individuals	28 (48%)	4 (80%)
Other	2 (3%)	--

Note: Respondents provided responses based upon the setting or settings they experienced.

Table 37. Experience in Supervised Clinical Practica/Externship Settings

	Doctoral – clinical/applied (<i>n</i> = 58)	Joint degree clinical or forensic (<i>n</i> = 5)
Intervention Experience		
Client consultation	24 (41%)	3 (60%)
Group counseling	49 (85%)	4 (80%)
Individual therapy	53 (91%)	4 (80%)
Intake/structured interview	53 (91%)	5 (100%)
Supervision of other students	14 (24%)	4 (80%)
Treatment planning with clients	45 (78%)	5 (100%)
None	2 (3%)	2 (40%)
Assessment Experience		
Neuropsychological experience	32 (55%)	2 (40%)
Providing feedback to clients	46 (79%)	4 (80%)
Psychodiagnostic test administration	57 (99%)	5 (100%)
None	1 (2%)	1 (20%)
Report Writing Experience		
Assessment report writing (self)	58 (100%)	5 (100%)
Observation of assessment report writing by supervisor	29 (50%)	2 (40%)
Observation of assessment report writing by peer	11 (19%)	2 (40%)
None	1 (2%)	--

Note: Respondents provided responses based upon the setting or settings they experienced.