

Expansion of Psychology and Law in Europe and the Importance of Diversity and Inclusion:
A Practical Guide for Lasting Change.

Dr Julia Shaw*
Department of Psychology and Language Sciences, University College London.

Dr Linda Geven
Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Amsterdam.

Chapter in Liber Amicorum, Peter van Koppen.
In press. Accepted: 13.01.2020

*Primary contact: drjuliashaw@gmail.com.

In 2013, Shaw and Öhman published a paper with Van Koppen entitled “Psychology and Law: The past, present and future of the discipline”. The article included a summary of the growth of psychology and law (also referred to as legal psychology, criminal psychology, or forensic psychology) on an international scale, and highlighted the role of students for the growth of the discipline. It showed an increase in access to psychology and law through professional organisations and graduate programs around the world. This growth was at least partly the result of the efforts by the European Association of Psychology and Law (EAPL), an organisation which Van Koppen helped establish. The present chapter expands on the article by Shaw and colleagues (2013). It presents a snapshot of the discipline throughout Europe, and showcases its continued expansion.

Since publishing the article in 2013, two issues have received considerable attention. First is the issue of diversity and inclusion. There has been discussion of how we can make the sciences and academia more widely accessible, particularly to communities that have been historically excluded and understudied. Part of this conversation has to revolve around how to tackle harassment and discrimination, as members of minority and underprivileged groups are significantly more likely to be the targets of such behaviour. The question addressed in this chapter is whether those currently in psychology and law are fostering a discipline that attracts and retains diverse scholars and practitioners. It is the first critical written examination of diversity and inclusion in psychology and law in Europe.

The second issue that has received considerable prominence recently is open science. With a mix of improved transparency, easier collaboration, and higher accountability, open science practices seem alluringly futureproof. They also mean that scholars can no longer hide behind opaque datasets and methods. Often rejecting traditional financial models for academic publishing, and sometimes feeling like an intimidating amount of transparency,

many journals and scholars have yet to embrace the change. Accepting that the future of psychology and law hinges on more open science initiatives and practices is an important step. To keep up with this important change, all psychology and law journals should offer the option to include registered reports and give more importance to preregistered, open-data studies. Authors in psychology and law should also be prioritising publishing in journals which place value on these standards and provide the option to publish open-access articles. This enhances the ability for different labs to collaborate and replicate each others' research, moving towards a more cohesive, inclusive, and accessible discipline.

Together, these topics – the expansion of the discipline, diversity and inclusion, and open science – may seem like disparate issues. But to see them in isolation would be a mistake. Establishing programs and professional organisations in countries underserved by the discipline is one way to encourage diversity in the field - diversity in country of origin, ethnicity, and beliefs. Additionally, open science practices work bidirectionally: open science practices make for easier international expansion, and international expansion encourages the kind of scientific thinking that promotes open science. Open science practices are also directly complementary with a mission of promoting diversity and inclusion. Particularly individuals with fewer resources, and individuals living in remote locations are likely to - for the first time in history - have access to a wide range of scientific data and discoveries in psychology and law for free.

This chapter will focus on the expansion of psychology and law in Europe, and critically examine the role of diversity and inclusion. Although open-science practices are not discussed at length, we will keep in mind the importance of such practices for fostering a truly inclusive discipline. In an effort to help organisations create stronger communities for existing and emerging scholars, this chapter also provides a number of practical

recommendations, and a code of conduct that would ideally be adopted by all organisations, labs, and events promoting psychology and law.

Psychology and Law in Europe

There are many ways to measure the expansion of a discipline. We have focused on two datasets that were available to us: the number of psychology and law graduate programs, and the number of professional organisations dedicated specifically to psychology and law. Both datasets were compiled by the current co-president of the student society of the EAPL, Linda Geven.

Graduate Programs

Table 1 includes all programs known to the EAPL student society in late December 2019. This was created by integrating information provided by local representatives from around Europe. In 2019, the student society had international representatives in the UK, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Sweden, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Brazil, and Australia. The focus in this table is on graduate programs, because universities in Europe do not typically provide specialised programs at the undergraduate level, at most offering one or two modules on psychology and law within the context of a general psychology undergraduate degree. There are also some related courses offered as part of criminology degrees, which are also not included in the current dataset.

Compared to 2012, there has been a notable increase in psychology and law graduate programs. New additions to the list, representing countries with programs in 2019 that did not have any programs known to the EAPL in 2012, include Belgium, Italy, Portugal and

Romania. For all countries that were already on the list, we can see growth. Compared to 2012, all have had additions to the list of universities that offer programs; The Netherlands grew by three, Germany grew by four, Spain grew by two, Sweden grew by one. Notably, the UK grew by 16, which means that unlike in most countries where psychology and law programs are still rare, in the UK they are now commonplace.

Table 1. Graduate programs with a specialisation in legal and forensic psychology in Europe.

Country	Graduate programs
Belgium ($N = 1$)	Thomas Moore University
Germany ($N = 6$)	Medical School Berlin Medical School Hamburg Psychologische Hochschule Berlin University of Applied Sciences of Heidelberg University of Bonn University of Konstanz
Italy ($N = 1$)	University of Turin
Portugal ($N = 4$)	University of Porto University of Lisbon University of Coimbra University of Minho
Romania ($N = 1$)	Babeş-Bolyai University
Spain ($N = 6$)	Autonomous University of Barcelona Autonomous University of Madrid Catholic University of Valencia University of Barcelona University of Granada University of Santiago de Compostela
Sweden ($N = 2$)	Kristianstad University University of Gothenburg
The Netherlands ($N = 5$)	Erasmus University Rotterdam Maastricht University Tilburg University University of Amsterdam University of Groningen

The United Kingdom ($N = 36$)	Bournemouth University	University of Bath
	Canterbury Christ Church University	University of Bedfordshire
	Cardiff University	University of Birmingham
	Coventry University	University of Central Lancashire
	Edinburgh Napier University	University of Cumbria
	George Washington University	University of Gloucestershire
	Glasgow Caledonian University	University of Huddersfield
	Goldsmiths University of London	University of Kent
	King's College London	University of Leicester
	Kingston University London	University of Lincoln
	Manchester Metropolitan University	University of Liverpool
	Middlesex University London	University of Manchester
	Newcastle University	University of Nottingham
	Nottingham Trent University	University of Roehampton
	Portsmouth University	University of Winchester
	Royal Holloway University of London	University of Wolverhampton
	Sheffield Hallam University	University of Worcester
Teesside University	Wrexham Glyndŵr University	

Note: Countries not listed here have no specialised programs in psychology and law that are known to the EAPL student society. For more information on studying psychology and law in countries around the world, visit eaplstudent.com.

Professional Organisations

As expressed by Shaw and colleagues (2013), “the students of today are the experts of tomorrow” – and with more graduate students come more experts. The growth of graduate programs, resulting in increasing numbers of students graduating with relevant degrees, is likely one reason for the growing number of professional organisations in Europe.

In 2019, we knew of nine country-specific professional organisations that focused on psychology and law or forensic psychology, and one pan-European organisation. Some of these organisations have emerged in recent years and further attest to a growth of the discipline (e.g., Legal Psychology at Åbo Akademi University was founded in 2013). The location and names of these organisations are listed in Table 2. Not included here are other organisations that are not specifically focused on psychology and law, but touch heavily on

issues of interest to scholars in the field including the Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition (SARMAC), and the International Investigative Interviewing Research Group (iIRG).

Table 2. Professional associations for legal and forensic psychology in Europe.

Country	Association
Pan-European	European Association of Psychology and Law (EAPL)
Finland	Legal Psychology at Åbo Akademi University (LEPÅ)
Germany	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Psychology (DGPs) Section of Legal Psychology
Italy	Associazione Italiana di Psicologia Giuridica (AIPG) Società Italiana di Psicologia Clinica Forense (SIPCF)
Netherlands	Nederlands Instituut van Psychologen (NIP) Section of Forensic Psychology
Portugal	Sociedade Portuguesa de Psiquiatria e Psicologia da Justiça (SPPPJ)
Spain	Sociedad Española de Psicología Jurídica y Forense (SEPJF)
Sweden	Nordic Network of Psychology and Law (NNPL)
United Kingdom	British Psychological Society (BPS) Division of Forensic Psychology

Implications and Discussion

The increase in graduate programs and professional organisations provides evidence that psychology and law is a growing discipline. Why are more people entering the discipline, particularly at the graduate level? Two factors may be contributing to this.

First, is the prevalence and popularity of true crime and related entertainment media. These include documentaries like *Making a Murderer*, fictional shows like *Mindhunter*, and the podcast that was at the time the most popular the genre had ever seen – *Serial* (Buozis, 2017). All of these seem to have created a hype around psychology and law in recent years. This attention means that psychology and law as a discipline has penetrated social

consciousness, and this awareness is likely to have long-term beneficial effects for attracting people to the discipline.

Second, there has been a high level of public engagement. Many scholars in psychology and law have committed considerable time and effort to engaging with the public. Through Twitter, interviews, articles in popular outlets and newspapers, public lectures and talks, individuals within psychology and law are reaching huge numbers of potential students. As Jünger and Fähnrich (2019) found in an examination of the public engagement of scientists on Twitter, scientists bring the broader public into their scholarly communities and therein act as “bridge builders”, reaching diverse populations outside of science. The engagement of organisations, researchers, and practitioners with the public educates people on what jobs and opportunities are available within the discipline, and probably makes it seem more accessible. But how accessible is psychology and law really? To this we turn next.

Diversity and Inclusion in Psychology and Law

The discipline of psychology and law has always been international, and with that has inherently come diversity – particularly diversity of country of origin, culture, and language. From the beginning, the EAPL has had the goal of “bringing the discipline of Psychology and Law to all corners in Europe, including countries less established in the area” (Shaw, Öhman & Van Koppen, 2013). Another example of a specific effort to work across borders in Europe is the *House of Legal Psychology* (legalpsychology.eu). Started in 2013, this exchange program offers fully-funded doctoral positions in psychology and law. Each student completes their course at multiple universities, the University of Maastricht in the Netherlands, Portsmouth University in the UK, and Gothenburg University in Sweden. The program boasts international students from around the world – including Germany, the UK,

Turkey, the United States, Canada, Brazil, Lebanon, India, Ukraine, Trinidad and Tobago, Bolivia, the Netherlands, Israel, Ghana, Lithuania, Serbia and Korea.

Despite these efforts, when attending psychology and law conferences in Europe one is likely to perceive a relatively homogenous group of people – albeit from different age groups. This can lead to a number of blind spots when it comes to examining how the discipline may be excluding those who are not ‘like us’. It can lead to poor scientific design with negligible generalisability, a lack of recruitment efforts targeting diverse people, and a resulting vicious cycle of these two. Brady, Fryberg, and Shoda (2018) argue that the culture and experiences of scientists conducting research in psychology are rarely mentioned or considered, because incorrectly “the underlying assumption is that this reflection is unnecessary because the scientific method is objective” (pg. 11407). We cannot possibly hope to tell the story of the social aspects of humanity without having listened to the voices of people who are unlike ourselves. As expressed by Brady and colleagues,

“a lack of interpretive power (i.e., the ability to understand individuals’ experiences and behaviors in relation to their cultural contexts) undermines psychology’s understanding of diverse psychological phenomena. Building interpretive power requires attending to cultural influences in research” (pg. 11406).

Because of this, diversity and inclusion are absolutely critical to the pursuit of psychology and law. Brady and colleagues argue for creating change by implementing “culture-conscious practices”, with psychologists promoting the idea that who they are and what their background is has an important influence at all levels of the research process. Such inclusion and diversity need a concerted long-term commitment. One organisation committed to this goal can be found in the U.S. - The Minority Affairs Committee (MAC) arm of the American Psychology and Law Society (APLS), revitalised in 2005. According to the official website:

“The committee is committed to facilitating activities and developing opportunities within the psychology and law division that embrace, respect and value diversity. We are dedicated to the recruitment and retention of culturally and linguistically diverse students into psychology and law related doctoral programs, and faculty into psychology and law related academic and professional positions. The committee is comprised of 17 members (academicians, researchers, clinicians, practitioners, graduate and doctoral students) representing a diversity of backgrounds and expertise in the field” (apls.org)

This is an exemplary initiative. To our knowledge, there has been no equivalent to the MAC in any psychology and law organisation in Europe. Indeed, a structured and comprehensive conversation about diversity and inclusion in psychology and law has yet to take place. It is time to learn from one another and work to deliberately make psychology more inclusive and diverse in Europe.

Diversity. To have this conversation effectively, various types of diversity must be considered. For example, the discussion could turn to each protected characteristic that is covered by the Equality Act in the UK; age, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership, and pregnancy and maternity.

Socio economic status is another, often invisible, barrier to entry and progression. Wealth inequality requires our urgent attention, including recognising which people can afford university, accept limited-term or part-time academic posts, or provide free research assistance ‘for experience’. These are all typical markers of success in psychology and law, meaning that degrees, work experience, and research experience all come at greater sacrifice to some than others. Alleviating this difference, and focusing on reaching and financially supporting individuals who have limited resources so they can join and succeed in the discipline will automatically bring with it other kinds of diversity.

Core questions for the discussion about diversity should be (1) How does each protected characteristic intersect with an individual's experience within psychology and law? (2) Which of these protected characteristics, or groups within them, are currently underrepresented, and why might that be the case? (3) Are there any 'leaky pipelines' where students or colleagues are dropping out of the discipline, and if so why? (4) How can we help the discipline attract high quality candidates with diverse backgrounds and traits?

Table 3 is intended for all psychology and law professional organisations, labs, and events to help improve diversity and inclusion throughout the professional pathway. Whether for students, faculty, or practitioners, looking critically at the whole process matters.

Table 3: How to improve diversity and inclusion in Psychology and Law

Item	Practical suggestions for implementation
Recruit widely	Consider advertising jobs and events in community forums, particularly online spaces where people might be who don't normally visit academic sites.
New measures of excellence	Consider broadening criteria for scholarly excellence by including community impact, mentorship, teaching excellence, and novelty of research.
Consider unfair systems	For jobs, studentships, and awards, include a way to honour different life circumstances and consider barriers and sources of hardship.
Mentorship	Provide visible role models, particularly for those currently underrepresented in psychology and law. Provide support to young scholars for grant and manuscript writing, and to those applying to academic and non-academic jobs.
Harassment and discrimination policy	Have a policy outlining what types of conduct are considered inappropriate, and what the consequences are of behaving inappropriately. Ideally this document is posted online, and all members of the organisation are made aware of it regularly.
Safe reporting	Ensure there is a safe way for everyone to report harassment, discrimination, and bullying. Include any or all of: (i) contact information for an individual to whom inappropriate behaviour can be reported, (ii) a whistleblowing hotline, (iii) an online reporting form, (iv) an anonymous online reporting tool (such as talkspot.com, projectcallisto.org, or vaultplatform.com).

Collaboration	Encourage collaboration between students, between students and practitioners, and between different organisations - particularly between organisations who don't traditionally work together.
Open science	Encourage pre-registration of studies, data sharing, and open-access publishing, and encourage publication of null findings.
Community engagement	Engage with the community by visiting schools or giving talks with local organisations, participate in science festivals and other ways to directly reach the local community. Engage with local NGOs and practitioners.
Science communication	Create ways to share information with those not as familiar with psychology and law. Encourage liaising with the university press office to share findings, encourage popular science writing and interviews, and sharing work on social media. Within this, consider visibly diverse role models.

Inclusion. In addition to attracting diverse candidates, retaining them and making sure they feel included is important. An example of how this matters can be found in research on sexism at conferences. Researchers have found that women who perceive a conference as sexist express increased intentions to leave academia (Biggs, Hawley, & Biernat, 2018). The authors argue this is because conferences signal the norms of a discipline. Particularly to new and aspiring women in the field, exclusivity and sexist language or behaviour signal a devalued status and a lack of fit. This is true in many other ways, and can help explain the “leaky pipeline” that can be seen for many underrepresented groups, not just for women. If the field does not include them, why should they stay? Even worse, if they are the targets of harassment, discrimination, or bullying, why should they continue to suffer?

The role of those already in psychology and law to make newcomers feel included and safe, particularly those who are underrepresented in the field. Particularly senior academics and experts need to lead by example and use their power to elevate others. In order to start the conversation, we could begin with how psychology and law conferences are structured. Here are some simple ways conferences and events can be more inclusive:

- (1) Centre events around something other than alcohol. Alcohol-centric events exclude people who don't drink for reasons including religion, culture, medical conditions, and pregnancy.
- (2) When measuring excellence, and creating awards, highlight the achievements of women, ethnic minorities, members of the LGBT+ community, and people with disabilities. Allow such contributions to shine, creating visible role models.
- (3) Make meals vegetarian or vegan by default, or have and clearly mark such meal options. Meals that include meat or seafood can exclude people who are Jewish or Muslim, or those who don't eat meat for other reasons.
- (4) Examine and communicate the accessibility of venues and content. Ask if any attendees need any adjustments made to accommodate their visible or non-visible disabilities. Proactively make changes where possible, so that you don't rely on those with disabilities to make requests. Inaccessible venues and content can exclude people who are ill, disabled, or have age-related declines in physical or mental health.
- (5) Make it clear that LGBT+ individuals are welcome. You can ask people to mark their preferred gender pronouns on conference badges, provide gender-neutral bathrooms, and explicitly state that your event is open to all.
- (6) Accommodate those who may need a comfortable, private space. This can be for religious practices including prayer, for breast-feeding or pumping, or to accommodate those with autism or anxiety.
- (7) Host inexpensive events. Expensive events or locations exclude those with fewer resources, including students – unless you can provide them with bursaries or subsidies.

- (8) Provide a code of conduct, and a safe way for people to report harassment, discrimination, and bullying. This must include a specific consideration of sexual harassment. A sample code of conduct for organisations and events can be found as a direct Word document download at <https://www.drjuliashaw.com/s/PL-Code-of-Conduct.docx>.

This is by no means a comprehensive list. It is intended to give a sense of the kind of multi-faceted approach that is necessary to build a truly inclusive discipline. For examples of initiatives and broader thinking about these issues, the report by the European University Association which discusses strategies and approaches to diversity, equity and inclusion with examples from across Europe is worth a read (Claeys-Kulik & Jørgensen, 2018).

Conclusion

This chapter shows the impressive growth of psychology and law in Europe, and that it is time for a structured approach to improving diversity and inclusion. This chapter also reveals many unknowns. For example, there has been no attempt to record the breakdown of diversity or inclusion in psychology and law, making it impossible to know just how representative it is of the wider European population. Understanding who is working in which capacity in psychology and law would also give a hint as to attrition within the discipline, and a clearer picture of who makes it into leadership positions.

The little we can see about who is in leadership roles within organisations is encouraging, at least when looking at gender. In 2019, of the 12 organizations in Table 2, 10 had a mixed-sex president and vice-president positions, one organization had a female president and vice-president, and one organization had a male president and vice president. Additionally, we are seeing more female journal editors, including Galit Nahari, the current editor of *Legal and Criminological Psychology*. This is a wonderful achievement and should

be celebrated. That being said, it is rather misleading to aim for an equal representation of men and women in leadership roles in psychology and law. Arguably the goal should be *proportional* representation. Given that the undergraduate and graduate programs in psychology and law are overwhelmingly comprised of women, the question is still – why are there proportionally fewer women the higher we go in the discipline? If we are starting with 80% females in graduate programs, a 50% rate of women in organisational leadership actually represents a loss of 30% - suggesting a significant gender imbalance regarding who moves into leadership roles. Additionally, the question might be asked, why are we recruiting fewer men into graduate programs in the first place? And why do we see almost no people from minority groups in leadership roles? It is not a war of the genders, or political correctness gone mad, or act of complaining to ask that such considerations be taken seriously. Scientists pride themselves in asking the right questions, and with so many of us being scientists we should seek to ask and answer even the questions that are self-critical. In the process, we must work to alleviate the burden to fight for change from the shoulders of those who are already disadvantaged. It is time for those of us in power to step up.

With critical but also practical advice, this chapter hopes to start a conversation about the kind of discipline we want to build in this new decade. The makeup of our organisations and events is a direct reflection of how far we are in the pursuit of excellence. True excellence can only come when we include diverse perspectives and experiences. True excellence can only happen when we regularly take a critical look at ourselves with a willingness for reform. True excellence lies in an open, inclusive, and diverse psychology and law.

References

- Biggs, J., Hawley, P. H., & Biernat, M. (2018). The academic conference as a chilly climate for women: Effects of gender representation on experiences of sexism, coping responses, and career intentions. *Sex Roles, 78*(5-6), 394-408.
- Brady, L. M., Fryberg, S. A., & Shoda, Y. (2018). Expanding the interpretive power of psychological science by attending to culture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115*(45), 11406-11413.
- Buoziš, M. (2017). Giving voice to the accused: Serial and the critical potential of true crime. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 14*(3), 254-270.
- Claeys-Kulik, A. L., & Ekman Jorgensen, T. (2018). Universities' Strategies and Approaches towards Diversity, Equity and Inclusion: Examples from across Europe. *European University Association, Geneva*.
- Jünger, J., & Fähnrich, B. (2019). Does really no one care? Analyzing the public engagement of communication scientists on Twitter. *New Media & Society, 14*61444819863413.