

# Criminal Psychology and its Role in the Criminal Justice System: A Thematic Analysis

KUSUM SHARMA<sup>1</sup>, DR. SUNIL DUTT CHATURVEDI<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, School of Law and Legal Studies, Singhania University, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan,

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, School of Law and Legal Studies, Singhania University, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan

*Abstract- Criminal Psychology is an increasingly central area in the contemporary criminal justice system of investigation of crime, assessment of offenders, trial and rehabilitation. This paper reviews six related topics: the theoretical underpinnings of criminal behaviour, offender typology (with particular emphasis on psychopathy), investigative issues such as profiling and interrogation science, courtroom involvement (eyewitness evidence, competency assessment, jury decision-making), risk assessment and offender rehabilitation (based on the principles of risk-need-responsivity), and new and developing areas of research including neurocriminology and developmental prevention. The analysis highlights the substantial progress that has been made in applied criminal psychology over the last century, while also emphasizing the rather enduring limitations, such as the translation of generally applicable scientific results into a specific legal decision, the difficulty of assigning a single individual to a specific risk of offending, and the normative aspects of issues which are not amenable to empirical investigation. The paper concludes that the single greatest value that criminal psychology brings to justice is as a catalyst for both technical production and ethical reflection on the nature of justice institutions and the functions they serve.*

**Keywords:** Criminal Psychology, Forensic Assessment, Offender Profiling, Psychopathy, False Confessions, Eyewitness Testimony, Risk-Need-Responsivity, Rehabilitation, Neurocriminology, Developmental Prevention

## I. INTRODUCTION

When Hans Gross argued at the close of the nineteenth century that a thorough grasp of the criminal mind was indispensable to competent legal investigation, few anticipated how comprehensively that claim would be borne out. Over the following century, criminal psychology grew from a marginal specialism into a field that touches every stage of the justice process — from the police station to the

sentencing hearing, from the parole board to the design of preventive interventions. Its practitioners evaluate suspects' mental states, advise investigators on probable offender characteristics, design rehabilitative programmes, and inform policy on crime prevention.

Yet this breadth creates complications. Questions that appear purely empirical — can recidivism be accurately predicted? does a particular programme reduce reoffending? — carry substantial normative freight. What counts as an acceptable false-positive rate in risk assessment is a moral and political question, not a scientific one. Whether neuroimaging evidence should mitigate a sentence requires philosophical judgements about agency and responsibility that no scanner can supply. Criminal psychology, at its most honest, acknowledges these limits even as it pushes the boundaries of what systematic enquiry can illuminate.

This paper conducts a thematic analysis of criminal psychology's engagement with the criminal justice system across six domains: theoretical foundations of criminal behaviour; offender typology and psychopathy; investigative applications; courtroom contributions; risk assessment and rehabilitation; and the emerging terrain of neurocriminology and prevention science. Each section draws on representative literature and concludes with critical reflection on limitations and ethical dimensions.

## II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR

### 2.1 Biological and Neurological Perspectives

The first scientific theory of criminal behaviour was advanced by Cesare Lombroso, who, in an 1876 treatise, identified habitual offenders as evolutionary

throwbacks, marked by distinctive physical stigmata. His central insight—that there are important individual differences in crime-relevant characteristics that have biological roots—survived, stripped of its nineteenth-century excesses, despite deeply flawed methodology. Modern research supports a moderate heritable component of antisocial behaviour. Genetic influences account for 40-50 percent of variance of persistent offending. Crucially, heritability does not imply determinism: what is inherited are a set of temperamental qualities, heightened impulsivity, decreased fear reactivity, diminished empathy, which interact with environmental conditions across development. This interaction was exemplified in the landmark research of Caspi et al., who identified a polymorphism in the MAOA gene that significantly moderated the long-term behavioural effects of childhood maltreatment.

Adrian Raine's synthesis of neuroimaging data finds structural and functional differences in prefrontal regions, amygdala and corpus callosum in serious violent offenders. These results have deep implications for evaluations of criminal responsibility, yet brain science cannot resolve the normative questions that they raise.

**2.2 Psychodynamic and Developmental Perspectives**  
Freud's view that some offenders commit offences because of unconscious guilt and Aichhorn's therapeutic approach to delinquent youth opened up lines of enquiry beyond rational-choice accounts of crime. The developmental tradition has had a more lasting influence. Moffitt's widely cited taxonomy distinguishes between life-course-persistent antisocial individuals – whose offending starts in early childhood, is characterised by neuropsychological risk factors, and represents a disproportionate share of serious crime – and the much larger adolescence-limited group whose delinquency is contextually driven and usually desists without intervention. These patterns were confirmed longitudinally in the Cambridge Study. Reliable early predictors of chronic offending included hyperactive temperament, low attainment, poor parental supervision and socioeconomic deprivation.

**2.3 Social Learning and Sociological Frameworks**  
Bandura's social learning approach showed how aggressive behaviour is learned through observation, modified by reinforcement and controlled by cognitive representations of expected outcomes. Sociologically. Sutherland extended this insight to the effect that criminal behaviour, including the attitudes and rationalisations that motivate it, is learned in close social networks. Hirschi's social control theory did not address the causes of crime, but rather what prevents crime, and the answer lay in the strength of the bonds of attachment, commitment, involvement and shared beliefs that tie the individual to conventional society. Merton's strain theory, on the other hand, located criminal motivation in the structural disjunction between culturally endorsed aspirations and legitimate means of realising those aspirations, a framework that remains relevant to explain economically motivated and gang-related offending.

### III. OFFENDER TYPOLOGY: THE CASE OF PSYCHOPATHY

**3.1 Defining and Assessing the Construct**  
Psychopathy has received the most sustained empirical attention and the most acute legal controversy in forensic typologies. The interpersonal-affective traits measured by Robert Hare's Psychopathy Checklist-Revised, a 20-item operationalisation of the classic clinical description of Cleckley, include grandiosity, callousness, shallow emotional life, and manipulateness. The lifestyle-antisocial dimension reflects impulsivity, irresponsibility, and persistent norm violation. The instrument exerts extraordinary influence in parole, sentencing and civil commitment decisions because high PCL-R scores predict general and violent recidivism reliably across correctional populations.

This influence has been subjected to serious critique. Skeem and colleagues argue that the PCL-R antisocial items, which assess criminal history rather than personality, inflate the apparent predictive validity and blur the distinction between psychopathic personality and the mere record of prior convictions. Concerns about inter-rater reliability, clinician allegiance effects, and the use of high PCL-R scores

as evidence of irreversible dangerousness in capital sentencing proceedings remain unanswered.

### 3.2 Neurobiological Correlates

Neuroimaging studies have consistently demonstrated reduced structural volume and task-related hypoactivation in the amygdala, anterior cingulate cortex and prefrontal regions in psychopathic individuals. Blair's work links these neural results to specific functional deficits in the processing of distress cues, providing a plausible mechanism for the characteristic failure of the psychopathic individual to learn from the suffering of others. In a large imaging study of incarcerated offenders, Kiehl found that decreases in paralimbic grey matter predicted faster postrelease recidivism, over and above standard actuarial scores. These results sharpen a question that neuroscience cannot itself answer: if the capacity for moral learning is impaired at a neurological level, what theory of responsibility should govern the attribution of blame?

## IV. CRIMINAL PSYCHOLOGY IN INVESTIGATIVE PRACTICE

### 4.1 Offender Profiling

Offender profiling emerged as a formalised discipline through the FBI's Behavioural Science Unit, whose agents systematised investigative practice by distinguishing organised from disorganised crime scenes and inferring probable offender characteristics from their features. David Canter's investigative psychology offered a more rigorous alternative, grounding profiling in academic social psychology and subjecting claims to multivariate statistical testing, producing particularly useful tools in geographic profiling. However, a meta-analysis by Snook and colleagues found that professional profilers showed no consistent predictive advantage over untrained comparison groups across profiling tasks, suggesting that public and courtroom confidence in the technique substantially outstrips the available evidence. The most defensible use of profiling is as a hypothesis-generating tool, not a mechanism for confident suspect identification.

### 4.2 Interrogation Psychology and False Confessions

Psychologically coercive interrogation methods — including prolonged isolation, strategic deception about evidence, and sustained social pressure — are effective at securing confessions but unreliable at securing true ones. Gudjonsson's taxonomy identifies three false confession types: voluntary (produced to escape an aversive situation), and internalised (in which the suspect comes genuinely to believe their own guilt through psychological manipulation). Juveniles, individuals with intellectual disabilities, and highly suggestible persons are disproportionately vulnerable. Garrett's analysis of DNA exonerations found false confessions implicated in approximately one quarter of wrongful convictions, a finding that strongly supports mandatory recording of custodial interviews, adoption of non-coercive evidence-gathering protocols such as the PEACE model, and enhanced judicial scrutiny of confession evidence.

## V. PSYCHOLOGY IN THE COURTROOM

### 5.1 Eyewitness Testimony

Elizabeth Loftus's programme of research fundamentally altered scientific understanding of eyewitness reliability, demonstrating through decades of experiment that memory is reconstructive rather than reproductive and systematically vulnerable to post-event contamination. Her classic study with Palmer showed that varying a single verb in a question about a filmed collision altered both speed estimates and participants' recollection of non-existent broken glass, establishing the misinformation effect as one of the most replicated phenomena in cognitive psychology. The own-race bias — substantially reduced accuracy in cross-race identifications — and the weak relationship between eyewitness confidence and accuracy further compound reliability concerns. The Innocence Project found eyewitness misidentification implicated in approximately 69 percent of DNA exoneration cases, motivating Wells and colleagues' procedural reforms — blind lineup administration, sequential presentation, pre-lineup instructions, and immediate confidence recording — now adopted in several jurisdictions.

## 5.2 Competency, Criminal Responsibility, and Mental Health

*Dusky v. United States* set the constitutional standard for competency to stand trial which requires a rational and factual understanding of proceedings and a rational ability to assist counsel. Implementing this standard is a psychological task and there is a large literature on assessment instruments and clinical protocols to help with this. Mental health defences, particularly the insanity plea, are far rarer in practice than public perception suggests, accounting for under one percent of felony trials in the United States. Appelbaum has argued that the fundamental tension between medicine's illness model and law's presumption of rational agency cannot be resolved by empirical evidence alone but reflects a deeper disagreement about what criminal punishment is for and what responsibility means.

## 5.3 Jury Decision-Making

Jurors are susceptible to confirmation bias, the representativeness heuristic, and attribution errors that can distort evidence evaluation in systematic ways. Sommers and Ellsworth documented racial disparities in verdict preferences among white mock jurors that were most pronounced when evidence was ambiguous, illustrating how extralegal factors can influence supposedly evidence-based decisions. Judicial instructions to disregard such factors show limited effectiveness when biases operate below the threshold of conscious deliberation, a finding with significant implications for the design of trial procedures.

# VI. RISK ASSESSMENT AND OFFENDER REHABILITATION

## 6.1 The Shift to Actuarial Risk Assessment

Decades of comparative research have established that actuarial risk instruments — which aggregate statistically validated risk factors into structured scores — outperform unstructured clinical judgement in predicting recidivism and violence. Widely used tools include the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide, the HCR-20 structured professional judgement framework, and the Static-99 for sexual offenders. A critical conceptual advance has been the distinction between static factors — historical features that

assessment captures but cannot alter, such as age at first offence — and dynamic criminogenic needs, which are both associated with recidivism and amenable to intervention. This distinction provides the conceptual backbone of the Risk-Need-Responsivity model, directing the intensity and content of intervention toward the factors most likely to reduce future harm.

## 6.2 The Evidence for Rehabilitation

Martinson's influential 1974 review concluded that rehabilitative programmes had produced no reliable reductions in reoffending, a finding seized upon across the political spectrum to justify a punitive turn in corrections. Subsequent meta-analyses reversed that verdict. Gendreau and colleagues demonstrated that structured interventions targeting specific criminogenic needs consistently produced meaningful recidivism reductions across correctional settings. Lipsey's comprehensive analysis of juvenile programmes found that the most effective — those grounded in social learning theory, implemented with fidelity, and matched in intensity to participant risk level — achieved reductions of 20 to 40 percent relative to controls. Cullen characterised this accumulation of evidence as one of applied criminology's genuine intellectual achievements.

The RNR model synthesises these findings into three actionable principles: match intervention intensity to risk level; target empirically validated criminogenic needs; and adopt cognitive-behavioural methods that match individual learning styles. Critics note that the model's individual focus can obscure structural and social determinants of offending that programme-level intervention cannot address.

## 6.3 Restorative Justice

Restorative approaches reframe crime as a rupture in social relationships requiring repair through dialogue, acknowledgement, and reintegration rather than merely as an offence against the state requiring proportionate punishment. Drawing on Braithwaite's theory of reintegrative shaming, programmes such as victim-offender mediation and family group conferencing consistently achieve comparable or superior recidivism outcomes to conventional prosecution while generating substantially higher

victim satisfaction and greater sense of procedural fairness for all parties.

## VII. EMERGING FRONTIERS: NEUROCRIMINOLOGY AND PREVENTION

### 7.1 Neurocriminology

Neurocriminology — the application of neuroscientific methods to the study, prediction, and management of criminal behaviour — raises some of the most consequential questions the justice system has yet confronted. Raine's research documents associations between prefrontal hypoactivation, reduced amygdala volume, corpus callosum abnormalities, and violent offending, while Kiehl's imaging data suggest that neurobiological assessment may eventually supplement standard actuarial instruments. Neuroscientific evidence is entering criminal proceedings as mitigating evidence with increasing frequency, with courts responding cautiously, admitting such evidence while warning against deterministic readings of group-level statistical data in individual cases.

Farahany has argued for principled frameworks distinguishing legitimate mitigation claims from scientifically unwarranted excuse arguments. Greely proposes admissibility criteria centring on demonstrated validity, relevance to a recognised legal element, and judicial instruction preventing jurors from over-weighting brain scan imagery. Glannon's philosophical analysis recommends a compatibilist approach that integrates neurological evidence into refined assessments of diminished responsibility rather than either ignoring it or treating it as definitively negating agency.

### 7.2 Developmental Prevention

The developmental research programme offers a compelling case for reorienting crime prevention toward early childhood investment. Farrington and Welsh's comparative reviews identify effective programmes — including home visiting for at-risk families, pre-school enrichment, and school-based social skills training — that reduce later offending in randomised controlled trials. Greenwood's cost-benefit analyses show these interventions compare

favourably with incarceration on economic grounds alone. The political challenge is that prevention benefits accrue over long time horizons while costs are immediate, disadvantaging early intervention in political competition with more visible enforcement responses.

## VIII. ETHICAL DIMENSIONS AND CRITICAL TENSIONS

Forensic psychologists occupy a structurally ambiguous position, operating in an adversarial system that creates pressure toward partisan testimony while professional guidelines demand objectivity and scientific integrity. Maintaining those standards requires active resistance to confirmatory reasoning and allegiance effects that can compromise neutrality even among genuinely committed professionals.

Actuarial risk instruments incorporate factors — criminal history, neighbourhood, employment record — that correlate strongly with race and socioeconomic status, raising concerns that risk-based detention punishes people for who they are rather than for what they have done, and that in structurally unequal societies actuarial justice reproduces and amplifies existing patterns of discrimination.

Early identification and intervention programmes run the risk of net-widening — bringing more and more people under surveillance and intervention who would otherwise never have come to official notice. Rutter and colleagues warned that enthusiasm for early intervention may outstrip the evidence base for the risk tools on which it relies, and that children's and families' rights to protection from unwarranted state interference must be actively protected even in the name of preventive goals.

More generally, criminal psychology must resist the temptation to present itself as a value-free technical expertise. Its questions — who should be punished, how severely, by what means — are necessarily normative. Psychologists who obscure this fact make not only an epistemological error but also shield the value choices embedded in their practice from the ethical scrutiny those choices merit.

## IX. CONCLUSION

Since Gross first encouraged judges to give the criminal mind a voice in a scientific study, criminal psychology has made great strides. It has produced influential theories of criminal behaviour, practical aids to investigation and adjudication, and evidence-based frameworks for rehabilitation that have measurably improved correctional outcomes. Aside from these successes, the field has faced many recognized challenges: research and practice are still not very close; the risks associated with inferring from probabilistic science to individual legal decisions are often overlooked; and the normative assumptions underlying forensic practice have been subjected to less critical scrutiny than would be preferable.

With the advent of “neurocriminology,” these stakes are heightened. The foundations of criminal liability for current justice systems are severely challenged if serious persistent offending is associated with markedly shaped developmental processes, not because neuroscientists should be careful, but because philosophers need to be prepared. Perhaps the most important contribution that criminal psychology will make to justice in the coming decades will be its ability to make the system look at itself with honesty to see what it is doing, and whether or not it can justify the act.

The success of the measure of the field is not the beauty of the models nor the complexity of the instruments but the fairness of the institutions that the findings of the field help shape. To keep that reminder sensibly in mind — and to overcome the various distractions that would hinder us from contemplating it — is the most pressing as well as the most lasting ethical challenge for the field.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Aichhorn, August. *Wayward Youth*. New York: Viking Press, 1935.
- [2] American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 5th ed. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing, 2013.
- [3] American Psychological Association. 'Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychology.' *American Psychologist* 68, no. 1 (2013): 7–19.
- [4] Anderson, Craig A., and Brad J. Bushman. 'Human Aggression.' *Annual Review of Psychology* 53 (2002): 27–51.
- [5] Andrews, Don, and James Bonta. *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 5th ed. New Providence, NJ: LexisNexis, 2010.
- [6] Appelbaum, Paul. *Almost a Revolution: Mental Health Law and the Limits of Change*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [7] Bandura, Albert. *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- [8] Blair, James, Derek Mitchell, and Karina Blair. *The Psychopath: Emotion and the Brain*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
- [9] Braithwaite, John. *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- [10] Brewer, Neil, and Gary Wells. 'The Confidence–Accuracy Relationship in Eyewitness Identification.' *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 12, no. 1 (2006): 11–30.
- [11] Canter, David. *Criminal Shadows: Inside the Mind of the Serial Killer*. London: HarperCollins, 1994.
- [12] Canter, David, and Laurence Alison, eds. *Profiling in Policy and Practice*. Dartmouth: Ashgate, 1999.
- [13] Caspi, Avshalom, et al. 'Role of Genotype in the Cycle of Violence in Maltreated Children.' *Science* 297, no. 5582 (2002): 851–854.
- [14] Cullen, Francis T. 'The Twelve People Who Saved Rehabilitation.' *Criminology* 43, no. 1 (2005): 1–42.
- [15] Cullen, Francis T., and Paul Gendreau. 'Assessing Correctional Rehabilitation.' *Criminal Justice* 3 (2000): 109–175.
- [16] Davis, Deborah, and William O'Donohue. 'The Road to Perdition.' In *Handbook of Forensic*

- Psychology, ed. O'Donohue and Levensky, 897–996. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2004.
- [17] De Backer, Stephane, et al. 'Neuroimaging in Criminal Cases.' *Neuroethics* 9, no. 2 (2016): 151–163.
- [18] Douglas, John E., and Mark Olshaker. *Mindhunter: Inside the FBI's Elite Serial Crime Unit*. New York: Scribner, 1995.
- [19] Douglas, John E., et al. *Crime Classification Manual*, 3rd ed. Hoboken: Wiley, 2013.
- [20] Douglas, Kevin S., Jill D. Ogloff, and Stephen Hart. 'Evaluation of a Model of Violence Risk Assessment.' *Psychiatric Services* 54, no. 10 (2003): 1372–1379.
- [21] *Dusky v. United States*, 362 U.S. 402 (1960).
- [22] Farahany, Nita. 'Neuroethics: Why Neuroscience Matters for Ethics.' *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 8 (2012): 391–411.
- [23] Farrington, David P. 'Childhood Risk Factors and Risk-Focussed Prevention.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, 4th ed., ed. Maguire et al., 602–640. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [24] Farrington, David, and Brandon Welsh. *Saving Children from a Life of Crime*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [25] Fiske, Susan, Amy Cuddy, and Peter Glick. 'Universal Dimensions of Social Cognition.' *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 11, no. 2 (2007): 77–83.
- [26] Freud, Sigmund. 'Criminals from a Sense of Guilt.' In *Standard Edition*, vol. 14, 332–333. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.
- [27] Garrett, Brandon. *Convicting the Innocent*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- [28] Gendreau, Paul. 'The Principles of Effective Intervention with Offenders.' In *Choosing Correctional Options that Work*, ed. Alan Harland, 117–130. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.
- [29] Gendreau, Paul, Tracy Little, and Claire Goggin. 'A Meta-Analysis of the Predictors of Adult Offender Recidivism.' *Criminology* 34, no. 4 (1996): 575–607.
- [30] Glannon, Walter. *Brain, Body and Mind: Neuroethics with a Human Face*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- [31] Glenn, Andrea L., and Adrian Raine. 'Neurocriminology.' *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 15 (2014): 54–63.
- [32] Greenwood, Peter W. *Changing Lives: Delinquency Prevention as Crime-Control Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- [33] Greely, Henry T. 'Neuroscience and Criminal Responsibility.' In *A Primer on Criminal Law and Neuroscience*, ed. Morse and Roskies, 175–200. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [34] Grisso, Thomas, and Paul S. Appelbaum. *Assessing Competence to Consent to Treatment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- [35] Gross, Hans. *Criminal Psychology: A Manual for Judges, Practitioners, and Students*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1911.
- [36] Gudjonsson, Gisli H. *The Psychology of Interrogations and Confessions: A Handbook*. Chichester: Wiley, 2003.
- [37] Hanson, R. Karl, and Monique Bussière. 'Predicting Relapse.' *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 66, no. 2 (1998): 348–362.
- [38] Hare, Robert D. *Without Conscience*. New York: Guilford Press, 1999.
- [39] Hart, Stephen D., and Christopher D. Webster. *The Violence Prediction Scheme*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1994.
- [40] Hirschi, Travis. *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- [41] Howells, Kevin, and Clive Hollin, eds. *Clinical Approaches to Violence*. Chichester: Wiley, 1989.

- [42] Innocence Project. 'Eyewitness Misidentification.' Accessed March 2024. <https://innocenceproject.org/>.
- [43] Katz, Jack. *Seductions of Crime*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.
- [44] Kassin, Saul M. 'False Confessions.' *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 17, no. 4 (2008): 249–253.
- [45] Kassin, Saul M., and Gisli H. Gudjonsson. 'The Psychology of Confessions.' *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 5, no. 2 (2004): 33–67.
- [46] Kassin, Saul M., et al. 'On the General Acceptance of Confessions Research.' *American Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 34, no. 3 (2011): 87–98.
- [47] Kiehl, Kent A., and Morris B. Hoffman. 'The Criminal Psychopath.' *Jurimetrics* 51 (2011): 355–397.
- [48] Leo, Richard. *Police Interrogation and American Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- [49] Lilienfeld, Scott O., et al. 'Psychopathy and Developmental Stability.' *Personality Disorders* 3, no. 2 (2012): 206–220.
- [50] Lipsey, Mark W. 'The Primary Factors that Characterize Effective Interventions with Juvenile Offenders.' *Victims and Offenders* 4, no. 2 (2009): 124–147.
- [51] Lipsey, Mark, and David Wilson. 'Effective Intervention for Serious Juvenile Offenders.' In *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders*, ed. Loeber and Farrington, 313–345. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998.
- [52] Loftus, Elizabeth F. *Eyewitness Testimony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- [53] Loftus, Elizabeth F., and John C. Palmer. 'Reconstruction of Automobile Destruction.' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 13, no. 5 (1974): 585–589.
- [54] Lombroso, Cesare. *Criminal Man*. Trans. Mary Gibson and Nicole Hahn Rafter. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006 [1876].
- [55] Martinson, Peter. 'What Works?' *The Public Interest* 35 (1974): 22–54.
- [56] Meissner, Christian, and John Brigham. 'Thirty Years of Investigating the Own-Race Bias.' *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 7, no. 1 (2001): 3–35.
- [57] Menninger, Karl. *The Crime of Punishment*. New York: Viking Press, 1968.
- [58] Merton, Robert K. 'Social Structure and Anomie.' *American Sociological Review* 3, no. 5 (1938): 672–682.
- [59] Moffitt, Terrie E. 'Adolescence-Limited and Life-Course-Persistent Antisocial Behavior.' *Psychological Review* 100, no. 4 (1993): 674–701.
- [60] Moffitt, Terrie E. 'The New Look of Behavioral Genetics in Developmental Psychopathology.' *Psychological Bulletin* 131, no. 4 (2005): 533–554.
- [61] Monahan, John. 'Violence Risk Assessment.' *Washington and Lee Law Review* 57, no. 3 (2000): 901–918.
- [62] Monahan, John, et al. *Rethinking Risk Assessment*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- [63] Monahan, John, and Laurens Walker. *Social Science in Law*, 8th ed. New York: Foundation Press, 2014.
- [64] Mulvey, Edward P., Laurence Steinberg, and Alex Piquero. 'Theory and Research on Desistance.' *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 2, no. 3 (2004): 213–236.
- [65] Quinsey, Vernon L., et al. *Violent Offenders: Appraising and Managing Risk*, 2nd ed. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2006.
- [66] Rafter, Nicole Hahn. *Creating Born Criminals*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- [67] Raine, Adrian. *The Anatomy of Violence: The Biological Roots of Crime*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2013.
- [68] Redlich, Allison D., and Gail S. Goodman. 'Taking Responsibility for an Act Not

- Committed.' *Law and Human Behavior* 27, no. 2 (2003): 141–156.
- [69] Roesch, Ronald, and Stephen Golding. *Competency to Stand Trial*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980.
- [70] Rutter, Michael, Henri Giller, and Ann Hagell. *Antisocial Behavior by Young People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [71] Schwartz, Joseph A., et al. 'The Association Between Intelligence and Crime.' *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 42, no. 8 (2015): 872–893.
- [72] Sherman, Lawrence W., et al. *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1998.
- [73] Skarbek, David, and Emily Skarbek. 'Crime, Poverty, and Moral Beliefs.' *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 119 (2015): 441–455.
- [74] Skeem, Jennifer, et al. 'Psychopathic Personality.' *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 12, no. 3 (2011): 95–162.
- [75] Slobogin, Christopher. *Proving the Unprovable*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.