

## References for Proposed APA Guidelines for Child Custody Evaluations in Family Law Proceedings

## Unknown "Working Group" (2021)

Total Number of Citations	61	
Forensic Journals & Books	33	54%
Professional Guidelines	12	20%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>74% of the citations are from forensic publications or from various other Guidelines</li> </ul>		
Introductory Textbooks	4	7%
Substance Abuse	7	11%
Tele-psychology	2	3%
"Trauma bonding"	1	2%
Hawthorne Effect	2	3%
Remaining Citations: Eliminate professional guidelines, substance abuse studies, introductory textbooks, and tele-psychology citations		33 forensic citations from forensic publications
		3 other citations (two Hawthorne effect, one "trauma-bonding")
Citations Prior to 2015	37	61%
Citations after 2015	24	39%
Forensic research citations from Before 2015:	19	60%
Forensic research citations from After 2015:	13	40%
<b>Attachment</b>		
Citations of Bowlby	0	
Citations of Ainsworth, Sroufe, Cassidy, Mains, Ruth-Lyons	0	
<b>Family Systems</b>		
Citations of Minuchin	0	
Citations of Bowen	0	
Citations of Haley, Madanes, Satir, Borzermenji-Nagy	0	
<b>Trauma</b>		
Citations of van der Kolk	0	
Citations of Perry	0	
Citations of Cicchetti	0	
<b>Personality Disorders</b>		
Citations of Beck	0	
Citations of Kernberg	0	
Citations of Millon	0	
Citations of Linehan	0	
<b>Child Development</b>		
Citations of Tronick	0	
Citations of Kohut	0	

## References for Proposed APA Guidelines for Child Custody Evaluations in Family Law Proceedings

## Forensic Publications

54% of all the citations are from forensic publications, with three journals accounting for the primary source (42%) of the forensic citations in the Reference section.

- **Family Court Review – 8 (24%)**
- **Journal of Child Custody – 4 (12%)**
- **American Journal of Family Law – 2 (6%)**

42% of the cited forensic studies come from three forensic journals.

Opinion piece publications account for most of the forensic publications cited (78%), with two survey research studies of opinions. Only 12% of the literature cited involved actual research studies.

- Opinion piece publications: 26 (78%)
- Survey research of opinions: 2 (6%)
- Research: 4 (12%)
  - MMPI meta-analysis
  - Research on note-taking accuracy
  - Research on validity of observational measures
  - Research on distance separations

84% of the forensic literature cited are opinion pieces, not direct research

Ackerman, M. J., & Pritzl, T. B. (2011). Child custody evaluation practices: A 20-year follow-up. *Family Court Review*, 49, 618-628.

- Survey research of opinions

Amundson, J. & Lux, G. (2019). Tippins and Wittman revisited: Law, social science, and the role of the child custody expert 14 years later. *Family Court Review*, 57, 88-106.

- Opinion piece

Austin, W. G., & Drozd, L. M. (2012). Intimate partner violence and child custody evaluation, part 1: Theoretical framework, forensic model, and assessment issues. *Journal of Child Custody: Research, Issues, and Practices*, 9(4), 250–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15379418.2012.749717>

- Opinion piece

Austin, W., Bow, J. N., Knoll, A., & Ellens, R. (2016). Relocation issues in child custody evaluations: A survey of professionals. *Family Court Review*, 54, 477-486. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fcre.12224>

- Survey research of opinions

Calloway, G. C., & Lee, M. (2017). Using research to assess children and “hear” their voices in court proceedings. *American Journal of Family Law*, 31, 140-157.

- Opinion piece

Child information Gateway, Department of Health and Human Services. (2018). *Determining the best interests of the child*. <https://www.childwelfare.gov/topics/systemwides/laws-policies/statutes/best-interest>

- Opinion piece

- Chiu, E. Y. (2014). Psychological testing in child custody evaluations with ethnically diverse families: Ethical concerns and practice recommendations. *Journal of Child Custody*, 11, 107-127.
- Opinion piece
- Davis, G. (2015). A systematic approach to domestic abuse–informed child custody decision making in family law cases. *Family Court Review*, 53(4), 565–577. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fcre.12173>
- Opinion piece
- Deutsch, R. M. (2008). Divorce in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Multidisciplinary family interventions. *The Journal of Psychiatry & Law*, 36, 41-66.
- Opinion piece
- DiFonzo, J. H. (2014). From the rule of one to shared parenting: Custody presumptions in law and parenting. *Family Court Review*, 52, 213-228.
- Opinion piece
- Drozdz, L. M., Olesen, N. W., & Saini, M. A. (2013). *Parenting plan & child custody evaluations: Using decision trees to increase evaluator competence & avoid preventable errors*. Professional Resource Press.
- Opinion piece
- Drozdz, L., Saini, M., & Olesen, N. (Eds.). (2016). *Parenting plan evaluations: Applied research for the family court*. Oxford University Press.
- Opinion piece
- Emery, R. E., Otto, R. K., & O'Donohue, W. T. (2005). A critical assessment of child custody evaluations: Limited science and a flawed system. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 6, 1-29.
- Opinion piece
- Emery, R. E. (2011). *Renegotiating family relationships: Divorce, child custody, and mediation*. Guilford.
- Opinion piece
- Farina, F., Redondo, L., Seijo, D., Novo, M., & Arce, R. (2017). A meta-analytic review of the MMPI validity scales and indexes to detect defensiveness in custody evaluations. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 17, 128-138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.ijchp.2017.02.002>
- Meta-analysis on MMPI
- Geffner, R., Conradi, L., Geis, K., & Aranda, M. B. (2009). Conducting child custody evaluations in the context of family violence allegations: Practical techniques and suggestions for ethical practice. *Journal of Child Custody*, 6, 189-218.
- Opinion piece
- Johnson, B. D., Berdahl, L. D., Horne, M., Richter, E. A., & Walter, M. –g. (2014). A parenting competency model. *Parenting: Science and Practice*. 14(2), 92-120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2014.914914361>
- Opinion piece
- Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y., Sternberg, K. J., Hershkowitz, I., & Horowitz, D. (2000). Accuracy of investigators' verbatim notes of their forensic interviews with alleged child abuse victims. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24(6), 699-708).
- Research on note-taking accuracy

- Langan, E. B. (2016). The elimination of child “custody” litigation: Using business branding techniques to transform social behavior. *Pace Law Review*, 36, 375-437.
- Opinion piece
- Lund, M. E. (2015). The place for child custody evaluations in family peacemaking. *Family Court Review*, 53, 407-417.
- Opinion piece
- Melton, G. B., Petrila, J., Poythress, N. G., Slobogin, C., Otto, R. K., Mossman, D., & Condie, L. O. (2018). **Child custody in divorce**. In *Psychological evaluations for the courts* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 530–555). Guilford.
- Opinion piece
- Mihura, J. L. (2012). The necessity of multiple test methods in conducting assessments: The role of the Rorschach and self-report. *Psychological Injury and Law*, 5, 97–106.
- Opinion piece
- Op Neal, T. M. S., Slobogin, C., Saks, M. J., Faigman, D. L., & Geisinger, K. F. (2020). **Psychological assessments in legal contexts**: Are courts keeping “junk science” out of the courtroom? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 20, 135–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100619888860>.
- Opinion piece
- Saini, M., & Ma, J. (2012). Cultural dynamics of **divorce** and parenting. In K. Kuehnle & L. Drodz (Eds.), *Parenting plan evaluations: Applied research for the family court* (pp. 514-539). Oxford.
- Opinion piece
- Saini, M., & Polak, S. (2014). The ecological validity of parent-child observations: A review of empirical evidence related to custody evaluations. *Journal of Child Custody*, 11, 181-201.
- Research on validity of observational data
- Schore, A., & McIntosh, J. D. (2011). Family law and the neuroscience of attachment, part 1. *Family Court Review*, 49, 501-502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2011.01387.x>
- Opinion piece
- Shumaker, D. M., Miller, C., Ortiz, C., & Deutsch, R. (2011). The forgotten bonds: The assessment and contemplation of sibling attachment in divorce and parental separation. *Family Court Review*, 49, 46-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2010.01352x>
- Opinion piece
- Stevenson, M. M., Fabricius, W. V., Braver, S. L., & Cookston, J. T. (2018) Associations between parental relocation following separation in childhood and maladjustment in adolescence and young adulthood. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 24, 365–378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/law0000172>
- Research on distance separations
- Symons, D. K. (2010). A review of the practice and science of **child custody** and access assessment in the United States and Canada. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 41, 267-273.
- Opinion piece
- Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000).**
- Court case

Turkat, I. (2018). Psychologist recommendations in custody disputes can be harmful, even fatal. *American Journal of Family Law*, 32, 5-8.996

- Opinion piece

Waller, E. M., & Daniel A. E. (2004). Purpose and utility of child custody evaluations: From the perspective of judges. *Journal of Psychiatry & Law*, 32, 5-27.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/009318530403200102>

- Opinion piece

Warshak, R. (2015). Ten **parental alienation** fallacies that compromise **decisions in court** and in therapy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 46, 235-249.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pro0000031>

- Opinion piece

## Guidelines

Twelve Guidelines cited (20% of the citations are of other Guidelines)

APA Guidelines for:

- Testing
- **Child Custody Evaluations (1994)**
- Record Keeping
- **Child Custody Evaluations (2010)**
- Child Protection
- **Forensic Psychology**
- Telepsychology
- Psychological Assessment
- Developing Guidelines
- Ethics Code
- Cultural Competency

American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Association, & National Council of Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. AERA.

American Psychological Association. (1994). **Guidelines for child custody evaluations** in divorce proceedings. *American Psychologist*, 49, 677-680.

American Psychological Association. (2007). Record keeping guidelines. *American Psychologist*, 68, 993-1004.

American Psychological Association. (2010). **Guidelines for child custody evaluations** in family law proceedings. *American Psychologist*, 65, 863-867.

American Psychological Association. (2013a). Guidelines for psychological evaluations in child protection matters. *American Psychologist*, 68, 20-31.

American Psychological Association. (2013b). **Specialty guidelines for forensic psychology**. *American Psychologist*, 68, 7-19.

American Psychological Association. (2013c). Guidelines for the practice of telepsychology. *American Psychologist*, 68, 791-800.

American Psychological Association. (in press). *Professional guidelines for psychological assessment and evaluation*. Author.

American Psychological Association. (2015). Professional practice guidelines: Guidance for developers and users. *American Psychologist*, 70, 823-831.

American Psychological Association (2017a). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct* (2002, Amended June 1, 2010 and January 1, 2017). <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx>

American Psychological Association (2017b). *Multicultural guidelines: An ecological approach to context, identity, and intersectionality*. <http://www.apa.org/about/policy/multicultural-guidelines.pdf>

Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment, American Psychological Association. (2007). *Statement on third party observers in psychological testing and assessment: A framework for decision making*. <https://www.apa.org/science/programs/testing/third-party-observers.pdf>

#### Introductory Textbooks

Groth-Marnat, G., & Wright, A. J. (2016). *Handbook of psychological assessment* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Wiley.

Hopwood, C. J., & Bornstein, R. F. (2014). *Multimethod clinical assessment*. Guilford Press.

Howard, J. A., & Renfrow, D. G. (2014). Intersectionality. In J. D. McLeod, E. J. Lawler, & M. Schwalbe (Eds.), *Handbook of the social psychology of inequality* (pp. 95–121). Springer.

Gallardo, M. E. (2014). *Developing cultural humility: Embracing race, privilege and power*. Sage

#### Substance Abuse Citations

7 citations for substance abuse (11%)

Boles, S. M., & Miotto, K. (2003). *Substance abuse and violence: A review of the literature*. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 8, 155-174.

Bracken, B. K., Rodolico, J., & Hill, K. P. (2013). Sex, age, and progression of *drug use in adolescents* admitted for substance abuse disorder treatment in the northeastern United States: Comparison with a national survey. *Substance Abuse*, 34, 263-272.

National Institute on Drug Abuse. (2018). Screening and assessment tools chart. <https://tinyurl.com/nida-screening>

Ondersma, S. J., Chang, G., Blake-Lamb, T., Gilstad-Hayden, K., Orav, J., Beatty, J. R., Goyert, G. L., & Yonkers, K. A. (2019). Accuracy of five self-report screening instruments for *substance abuse* in pregnancy. *Addiction*, 114, 1683-1693.

Soper, R. G. (2014, October 6). Intimate partner violence and co-occurring *substance abuse/addiction*. American Society of Addiction Medicine. <https://tinyurl.com/ASAM2014article>

*Substance Abuse* and Mental Health Services Administration. (n.d.). Screening tools. <https://tinyurl.com/samsha-screening>

Tucker, J. S., Miles, J. N., D'Amico, E. J., Zhou, A. J., Green, H. D., & Shih, R. A. (2013). Temporal associations of popularity and *alcohol use* among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 52, 108-115.

#### Telepsychology Citations

McCord, C., Bernhard, P., Walsh, M., Rosner, C., & Console, K. (2020). A consolidated model for *telepsychology* practice. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 76(6), 1060–1082. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22954>

57Sage, T. E., & Sage, M. (2016). *Social media* use in child welfare practice. *Advances in Social Work*, 17, 93-112.

"Trauma Bonding: citation
Reid, J. A., Haskell, R. A., Dillahunt-Aspillaga, C., and Thor, J. A. (2013). Contemporary review of empirical and clinical studies of <a href="#">trauma bonding</a> in violent or exploitative relationships. <i>International Journal of Psychology Research</i> , 8, 37-73.
Hawthorn effect of observation
Goodwin, M. A., Stange, K. C., Zyzanski, S. J., Crabtree, B. F., Borawski, E. A., & Flocke, S. A. (2017). The <a href="#">Hawthorne effect</a> in direct observation research with physicians and patients. <i>Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice</i> , 23, 1322-1328  61Henry, S. G., Jerant, A. J., Iosif, A., Feldman, M. D., Cipri, C., & Kravitz, R. L. (2015). Analysis of threats to research validity introduced by audio recording clinic visits: <a href="#">Hawthorne effect</a> , both, or neither? <i>Patient Education and Counseling</i> , 98, 849-856.