International Journal of Research in Interdisciplinary Studies
Volume 3, Issue 9, September 2025
https://www.ijris.com | ISSN (Online): 2584-1017

The Interconnection of Psychology and Forensic Science: Answers from Literature Review

Vedant V. Pandya*
Professor, Department of Business Administration, M. K. Bhavnagar University, Bhavnagar, India

Abstract—This paper delivers an in-depth post-doctoral review of the symbiotic relationship between psychology and forensic science. Tracing historical roots from Münsterberg's early 20th-century experiments to modern neuroscientific and AI-driven approaches, it elucidates how psychological theories and methods underpin critical forensic activities—eyewitness memory enhancement, deception detection, offender profiling, investigative interviewing, risk assessment, and jury decision-making. The review dissects cognitive, social, developmental, personality, and neuropsychological components applied across forensic subfields, examines methodological techniques from laboratory paradigms to virtual reality simulations, and compares international frameworks in North America, Europe, Asia–Pacific, Latin America, and Africa. It assesses contemporary knowledge, identifies key research and practice gaps—ecological validity, cross-cultural generalizability, ethical guidelines—and surveys enabling technologies, including eye-tracking, neuroimaging, statement analysis software, and AI-based deception detectors. Emerging trends, such as trauma-informed interviewing, continuous monitoring of physiological markers, and hybrid human–AI investigative teams, are explored. The paper concludes by proposing a roadmap for future interdisciplinary research, practitioner training, and policy development to strengthen the evidence base at the intersection of psychology and forensic science.

***Index Terms*—Forensic Psychology, Cognitive Interview, Deception Detection, Investigative Interviewing, Risk Assessment, Neuroimaging, Artificial Intelligence, Virtual Reality, Cross-cultural Validity.**

1. Introduction

The last century has witnessed an ever-deepening integration of psychology into forensic science. As the scientific study of behavior and mental processes, psychology offers theories of cognition, memory, personality, and social dynamics that are indispensable to forensic practice—from evaluating eyewitness testimony reliability to constructing offender profiles, from conducting ethical interrogations to understanding jury deliberations (Bartol & Bartol, 2019; Gudjonsson, 2003). In turn, forensic challenges—such as wrongful convictions, high-profile confession controversies, and emerging cybercrimes—drive psychologists to refine theoretical models, develop novel methodologies, and question long-standing assumptions (Loftus, 1979; Kassin, Dror, & Kukucka, 2013).

This paper argues that psychology and forensic science form a dynamic, bidirectional relationship. Psychology furnishes forensic science with rigorous research paradigms and evidence-based techniques, while forensic applications stimulate new questions and experimental designs in psychological science. Technology—spanning neuroimaging, eye-tracking, natural language processing, and machine learning—has catalyzed this convergence, enabling more precise measurement of cognitive and emotional phenomena in applied settings (Vrij, 2008; Farah et al., 2014). This paper attempts to address these questions: (i) How did the relationship between psychology and forensic science originate, evolve, and develop?, (ii) What is the nature of the relationship between these two disciplines?, (iii) Which psychological components are applied in forensic science?, (iv) In which areas of forensic science is psychology most influential?, (v) What techniques operationalize psychological principles in forensic contexts?, (vi) How do international jurisdictions differ in integrating psychology into forensic practice?, (vii) What is the current status of knowledge on the psychology–forensic science nexus?, (viii) What research and methodological gaps remain?, (viii) What current trends characterize this relationship? and (ix) Which software, hardware, and AI tools facilitate the integration of psychology into forensic workflows? The paper traces historical origins and key evolutionary phases. Bidirectional nature of relationship is delineated. Core psychological components and their forensic applications are examined. Methodological techniques are reviewed. An international comparative analysis is provided followed by assessment of the contemporary knowledge base. Research Gaps are identified and emerging trends are explored. Enabling technologies and AI are surveyed. Finally, the paper concludes with directions for future research, training, and policy.

2. Historical Origins and Evolution

Hugo Münsterberg's seminal work, *On the Witness Stand* (1908), challenged the judiciary's uncritical acceptance of eyewitness testimony by demonstrating how memory is reconstructive and susceptible to suggestion (Münsterberg, 1908). Through controlled experiments, he showed that leading questions and social pressures could distort recollections, laying the groundwork for applying psychological science to legal questions.

*Corresponding author: vedantvp@gmail.com

The cognitive revolution of the 1950s and 1960s repositioned memory as an active, interpretive process (Neisser, 1967). Elizabeth Loftus and collaborators extended this paradigm to forensic contexts, revealing the misinformation effect—false information introduced post-event can become incorporated into memory—through landmark studies using automobile-crash scenarios (Loftus & Palmer, 1974; Loftus, 1979). Field recency experiments by Yuille and Cutshall (1986) reinforced these findings in real crime scenes, prompting law enforcement to reevaluate interview methods.

The establishment of the American Psychology–Law Society in 1969 (Golding, 2006) and similar bodies internationally—such as the British Psychological Society's Division of Forensic Psychology—formalized forensic psychology, promoting specialized training, research conferences, and peer-reviewed publications. Graduate programs in forensic psychology proliferated, integrating coursework in law, ethics, and investigative methods.

The 1980s and 1990s saw the emergence of distinct subdomains. Investigative Interviewing is grounded in social and cognitive psychology, protocols like the Cognitive Interview (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992) and PEACE model (Milne & Bull, 2006) optimized witness recall and minimized false confessions. Behaviourally based typologies, influenced by personality theory, aimed to predict offender characteristics from crime-scene patterns led to the emergence of the subdomain called Criminal Profiling. (Canter & Youngs, 2009). Risk Assessment is an actuarial and structured professional judgment tools, such as the HCR-20, applied clinical and statistical models to forecast recidivism (Douglas et al., 2013). Jury Decision-Making emerged as a Research into group dynamics, persuasion, and stereotype activation informed jury instructions and voir dire processes (Saks & Kidd, 1999).

In recent decades, neuroscientific methods—EEG, fMRI—have probed the neural correlates of deception and moral reasoning, though ethical and legal admissibility remain contested (Farah et al., 2014). Simultaneously, artificial intelligence and machine learning have been harnessed to analyze linguistic cues, facial microexpressions, and physiological signals for lie detection and risk profiling, marking a new frontier in forensic-psychological synergy (Vrij, Granhag, & Porter, 2010; Perez-Rosas et al., 2015).

3. Nature of the Relationship

The interplay between psychology and forensic science is characterized by three interrelated dynamics:

Theory-to-Practice Translation: Psychological theories provide testable frameworks for forensic applications. Memory models inform interview protocols; social influence research guides jury selection and interrogation strategies; personality constructs shape profiling and risk assessment tools (Gudjonsson, 2003; Bartol & Bartol, 2019).

Practice-to-Theory Feedback: Forensic casework and field observations generate novel research questions. The prevalence of false confessions, for example, spurred experimental studies on coerced compliance and memory distrust (Kassin et al., 2013). High-profile wrongful conviction cases catalyze investigations into lineup procedures, juror biases, and expert testimony standards (Cutshall et al., 1986; Yuille & Cutshall, 1986).

Methodological Cross-Pollination: Experimental designs, psychometric validation procedures, naturalistic field studies, and computational modeling are shared across disciplines, enhancing rigor. Forensic psychologists employ both lab-based manipulations and ecological assessments, while forensic scientists borrow from social psychology's coding schemes and behavior analysis techniques (Köhnken, 1996; Richards, 2015).

These dynamics underscore the inseparable bond: psychology provides foundational knowledge, and forensic science offers rich, applied contexts for advancing psychological theory.

4. Psychological Components Applied in Forensic Science

Fisher & Geiselman (1992) noted that cognitive models of perception, attention, encoding, and retrieval underpin strategies to enhance eyewitness accuracy. Context reinstatement, open-ended questioning, and sequential lineups derive from cognitive interview research, reducing memory contamination. Another component of Psychology is called Social Psychology that is directly applied in Forensic Sciences. Principles of conformity, authority, groupthink, and persuasion inform interrogation methods and jury management. As described by Milne & Bull (2006) and Kassin & Wrightsman (1983), the PEACE model's emphasis on rapport and transparency contrasts with coercive techniques identified as risk factors for false confessions. The field of Developmental Psychology is another component of Psychology that has direct application into Forensic Sciences. It is age-related cognitive and moral development informs approaches to interviewing children and adolescents. Ceci & Bruck (1993) and Poole (2016) observed that research on suggestibility and repeated interviews has led to protocols limiting interviewer bias and preserving testimony integrity in vulnerable populations. The field of Personality and Clinical Psychology uses Psychometric instruments—Psychopathy Checklist–Revised (PCL-R), MMPI-2—assess offender traits, malingering, and competency (Hare, 1991; Graham et al., 2000). Douglas et.al. (2013) observed that structured clinical judgment models integrate personality assessment with actuarial data for risk management. The field of Neuropsychology and Psychophysiology uses Neural and physiological measures—EEG markers of cognitive load, fMRI patterns associated with deception—offer supplementary tools for lie detection and risk prediction, though field validation and legal admissibility remain debated (Farah et al., 2014; Vrij, 2008).

5. Areas of Application in Forensic Science

The area of Eyewitness Testimony uses techniques derived from memory research—Cognitive Interview, Context Reinstatement and they enhance recall by leveraging encoding-specificity and free-report prompts (Geiselman et al., 1985). Field studies confirm reduced error rates when protocols are faithfully applied (Köhnken, 1996). Milne & Bull (2006) are of

the opinion that the Investigative Interviewing and Interrogation uses the PEACE framework emphasizes non-coercive tactics—engagement, open questions, summarization—to elicit accurate accounts while safeguarding suspect rights. According to Gudjonsson (2003), research shows rapport-based approaches yield higher-quality information than adversarial methods. Criminal Profiling as a part of Investigative Psychology, employs statistical clustering and behavioral evidence analysis to generate offender profiles. Empirical studies support geographic profiling algorithms—such as Rossmo's formula—that predict offender anchor points based on crime-scene spatial data (Canter & Youngs, 2009). Risk Assessment and Management use Structured Professional Judgment tools (HCR-20, VRAG) combine clinical insights with actuarial risk factors to forecast violence and recidivism, guiding parole and treatment decisions (Douglas et al., 2013). Jury Decision-Making uses Jury simulation paradigms and examine the impact of pretrial publicity, jury instructions, and deliberation processes on verdicts. Experimental findings inform simplified legal instructions and graphic aids to reduce cognitive overload (Saks & Kidd, 1999; Bornstein, 2013). The field of Correctional and Rehabilitation Programs use Cognitive-behavioral interventions in correctional settings and implement social learning and self-regulation theories to reduce reoffending, demonstrating moderate effect sizes in meta-analyses (Andrews & Bonta, 2010).

A. Techniques for Applying Psychology in Forensic Science

Forensic Sciences makes use of the body of knowledge of Psychology through several techniques. Experimental Paradigms are the Laboratory-based staged-crime and eyewitness experiments that manipulate variables—stress, suggestion, time delay—to isolate factors affecting memory and decision-making (Loftus & Palmer, 1974). Psychometric Assessment: are Rigorous test development—item analysis, factor analysis, norming—is applied to instruments like the PCL-R and competency assessments, ensuring reliability and validity (Hare, 1991). Interview Protocols and Coding Schemes through Standardized protocols (Cognitive Interview, PEACE) and coding manuals for nonverbal cues (FACS) provide structured guidelines for practitioners and researchers (Ekman & Friesen, 1978; Fisher & Geiselman, 1992). Field Studies and Evaluations are the Observational research in police stations and courtrooms that assesses real-world fidelity to protocols and maps ecological barriers to implementation (Richards, 2015). Computational and Simulation Modeling are the Agent-based and system dynamics models simulate jury deliberations and investigative workflows, enabling virtual policy experiments (Bornstein, 2013). Neurophysiological Monitoring through EEG and fMRI study correlate neural activation patterns with deceptive responses or moral reasoning tasks, offering insights into cognitive load and truthfulness (Farah et al., 2014).

B. International Comparisons

Forensic psychology's professional regulation, key practices, and challenges vary significantly across different regions of the world, reflecting diverse legal systems, cultural contexts, and levels of resource availability.

In North America, the field is highly structured with stringent professional regulation, characterized by APA-accredited programs and a requirement for formal licensure. Practitioners commonly use adaptations of the PEACE model and the Cognitive Interview for investigative purposes, and there are well-defined standards for expert testimony. Key challenges include an overreliance on the polygraph and a lack of consistent standards across different states.

The United Kingdom has a centralized approach overseen by the British Psychological Society's (BPS) Division of Forensic Psychology. The PEACE model of interviewing is nationally mandated, and professionals must adhere to robust requirements for Continuing Professional Development (CPD). The primary challenge in this region is managing resource constraints, especially within smaller jurisdictions.

The practice of forensic psychology in Continental Europe is diverse, with psychologists holding varied roles and a notable dominance of psychiatrists in the field. The discipline is growing, with emerging forensic psychology curricula and increasing cross-border case exchanges. However, it faces hurdles such as varying legal admissibility of psychological evidence and the absence of a unified regulatory body.

In the Asia–Pacific region, the field is advancing with growing certification pathways. Key practices include pilot programs for the Cognitive Interview and strengthening academic–police partnerships. Progress is often hindered by cultural stigma surrounding psychology and a limited infrastructure for training professionals.

Forensic psychology in Latin America is in a nascent stage, supported by informal professional networks and emerging academic programs. The Cognitive Interview is being introduced through training sessions run by NGOs, and regional conferences are helping to build the professional community. Major obstacles include chronic funding shortages and the need for language adaptation of assessment tools.

In Africa, the development of forensic psychology is largely driven by capacity-building initiatives from international organizations like the UNODC and Interpol. Current practices are foundational, consisting of basic workshops and pilot programs for adaptive tools. The region faces significant challenges, including severe infrastructure deficits and limited cross-disciplinary collaboration.

Psychological integration reflects legal traditions (adversarial vs. inquisitorial), professional regulation, and socio-cultural attitudes toward mental health and law enforcement (Heilbrun, Grisso, & Goldstein, 2002; Westera, Kebbell, & Milne, 2013).

C. Current Status of Knowledge

Empirical consensus exists on core findings. Context reinstatement and open-ended recall reduce commission errors by up to 30% and lead to Memory Enhancement (Geiselman et al., 1985). Lengthy, high-pressure interrogations correlate strongly with false confession rates (Kassin et al., 2013). Untrained observers average 54% accuracy; polygraph and

fMRI achieve 70–80% in controlled settings but face legal admissibility hurdles (Vrij, 2008; Farah et al., 2014). Structured tools outperform unstructured clinical judgment by 10–20% in predicting violence (Douglas et al., 2013). Simplified instructions and pre-deliberation modules decrease verdict incoherence (Saks & Kidd, 1999). However, translation into standardized practices is uneven, hampered by resource limitations, divergent legal frameworks, and practitioner resistance to change (Milne & Bull, 2006; Richards, 2015).

D. Research and Methodological Gaps

Laboratory paradigms must be complemented by field validations to ensure applicability in high-stakes, real-world contexts (Köhnken, 1996). Most psychometric tools and protocols lack norming on non-Western populations, limiting their global utility (Gudjonsson, 2003). Few studies track long-term impacts of interventions—e.g., does Cognitive Interview training sustain improved recall over years? MRI and EEG in lie detection raise privacy, consent, and potential coercion issues, requiring robust ethical guidelines (Farah et al., 2014). Machine learning models trained on skewed datasets risk perpetuating bias; explainable AI frameworks are needed for legal acceptability (Perez-Rosas et al., 2015). A unified curriculum integrating psychology, law, and forensic methods is absent, leading to uneven practitioner competence (Heilbrun et al., 2002). Addressing these gaps will require multi-site collaborations, funding initiatives, and dialogue between researchers, practitioners, and policymakers.

E. Current Trends and Emerging Directions

Virtual Reality (VR) and Augmented Reality (AR) are used as Immersive crime-scene reconstructions for training investigators and jurors (Millen et al., 2017). Trauma-Informed Interviewing technique integrate trauma theory to improve rapport and minimize retraumatization of witnesses (Poole, 2016). Recently, Continuous Physiological Monitoring Wearable sensors have been observed for tracking heart rate variability and galvanic skin response during interrogations as covert lie indicators (Vrij et al., 2016). Hybrid Human–AI Teams combine human judgment with AI-driven analysis to balance empathy with data-driven detection (Gratch et al., 2014). Remote Forensic-Psychology Services include Telehealth platforms delivering expert testimony and evaluations in underserved regions (St-Yves, 2019). These trends reflect a shift toward technology-enabled, victim-centered, and ethically conscious forensic-psychological models.

F. Technologies, Software, and Hardware

Modern forensic psychology employs a sophisticated suite of tools and technologies to analyze behavior, assess credibility, and train professionals. These methods range from software-based analysis to advanced physiological monitoring and virtual reality simulations.

To systematically analyze interviews, forensic experts use qualitative data analysis software like NVivo and ATLAS.ti. These tools allow for the detailed qualitative coding of verbal and nonverbal behaviors, helping researchers and practitioners identify patterns and themes in subject responses. Eye-tracking devices, such as those from Tobii Pro and SMI, are used for gaze pattern analysis during interviews and lie-detection tasks. By tracking where a person looks and for how long, these tools provide insights into cognitive processes, attention, and potential deception. Advanced neuroimaging systems, including Brain Products EEG (electroencephalography) and Siemens fMRI (functional magnetic resonance imaging), are used to investigate the neural correlates of deception and cognitive load. This research helps identify the brain activity associated with lying and truth-telling. Tools like OpenFace and Emotient are used for facial microexpression analysis. They perform automated FACS (Facial Action Coding System) coding to detect fleeting, involuntary facial expressions that can reveal a person's true emotional state, even when they are trying to conceal it. Statement Validity Assessment (SVA) is a comprehensive technique used to evaluate the credibility of a person's testimony. A core component of SVA is Criteria-based Content Analysis (CBCA), which provides a structured framework for the systematic evaluation of indicators of credibility within a statement. Software such as LIWC (Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count) and programming libraries like Python's NLTK (Natural Language Toolkit) are used for linguistic and text analysis. These tools help detect deception cues by analyzing features like pronoun use, emotional tone, and sentence complexity. Emerging AI-based deception detection systems, including Converus EyeDetect and Syanapse Lie AI, use multimodal algorithms. These platforms integrate and analyze various physiological and behavioral data streams—such as eye movement, voice pitch, and body language—to assess credibility. Virtual Reality (VR) simulations, created with platforms like Unity3D and experienced through headsets like the Oculus Rift Pro, are becoming valuable training tools. They are used to create immersive crime-scene walkthroughs for investigators and to provide realistic, interactive scenarios for suspect interview training. Wearable physiological sensors, such as the Empatica E4 wristband and Shimmer3 sensors, enable the continuous monitoring of a subject's physiological state. During interviews, these devices track key biometrics like Heart Rate Variability (HRV) and Electrodermal Activity (EDA) to measure stress and arousal levels in real-time.

These technologies augment practitioner capabilities, facilitate large-scale research, and enable real-time data analysis in the field (Ekman & Friesen, 1978; Vrij et al., 2010; Perez-Rosas et al., 2015).

G. Role of Artificial Intelligence

AI permeates multiple facets of the psychology–forensic science interface. Deception Detection uses Supervised machine learning models trained on facial, vocal, and physiological features achieve 75–90% accuracy in controlled studies, outperforming chance-level human judgment (Perez-Rosas et al., 2015). Predictive Risk Modeling are algorithms that integrate static (criminal history) and dynamic (behavioral observations) factors to forecast reoffending, informing parole boards and treatment planning (Bonta & Andrews, 2016).

Advanced NLP pipelines detect deception markers—e.g., reduced first-person pronouns, increased negations—enabling automated credibility assessments (Hancock et al., 2013). Virtual Interview Agents are Conversational AI that simulate suspects and witnesses, standardizing training environments and enabling skill assessments without human role-players (Gratch et al., 2014). Emerging Explainable AI (XAI) frameworks aim to render AI-driven decisions transparent, a prerequisite for legal admissibility and ethical compliance (Doshi-Velez & Kim, 2017). While promising, AI applications face challenges: potential for algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, overreliance on technology, and the need for interdisciplinary oversight to ensure ethical and legal soundness.

6. Conclusion and Future Directions

The synergy between psychology and forensic science has produced transformative advances in understanding and investigating crime. From Münsterberg's early memory experiments to today's AI-driven deception detectors, psychological science has been integral to forensic innovation. Conversely, forensic applications have generated crucial feedback for refining psychological theories, particularly in memory, social influence, and cognition. Yet, significant challenges remain. Ensuring ecological validity, achieving cross-cultural generalizability, establishing ethical frameworks for emerging technologies, and standardizing interdisciplinary training are priority areas. Future research should emphasize: (i) Multi-Context Field Validation that conduct large-scale evaluations of laboratory-derived protocols—Cognitive Interview, PEACE—in diverse real-world settings, (ii) Cross-Cultural Instrument Adaptation develop psychometric tools and interview protocols for underrepresented populations, ensuring linguistic and cultural appropriateness. Longitudinal Impact Studies track outcomes of forensic-psychological interventions (e.g., interview training, risk assessments) on case resolution, recidivism, and witness well-being. Ethical AI Governance establish interdisciplinary committees to develop guidelines for AI use in high-stakes contexts, ensuring transparency, fairness, and accountability. Integrated Training Programs create accredited curricula blending psychology, law, criminology, and forensic methods to produce practitioners with comprehensive competencies. By pursuing these directions, scholars and practitioners can fortify the evidence base, enhance the integrity of forensic processes, and ultimately contribute to a more just and accurate legal system.

References

[1] Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Routledge.

[2] Baltrusaitis, T., Zadeh, A., Lim, Y. C., & Morency, L.-P. (2018). OpenFace 2.0: Facial behavior analysis toolkit. In *2018 13th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2018)* (pp. 59–66).

[3] Bartol, C. R., & Bartol, A. M. (2019). *Introduction to forensic psychology: Research and application* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

[4] Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2016). *Psychological risk assessment and management in criminal justice and forensic psychiatry: International perspectives*. Routledge.

[5] Bornstein, B. H. (2013). Deliberating with the jury: Investigating the effects of interactive deliberation technologies. *Law and Human Behavior, 37*(5), 376–388.

[6] Canter, D., & Youngs, D. (2009). *Investigative psychology: Offender profiling and the analysis of criminal action* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

[7] Ceci, S. J., & Bruck, M. (1993). *Jeopardy in the courtroom: A scientific analysis of children's testimony*. American Psychological Association.

[8] Cutshall, J. L., et al. (1986). Accuracy of eyewitness testimony: Realism and applicability of laboratory results to actual criminal cases. *Law and Human Behavior, 10*(4), 337–353.

[9] Doshi-Velez, F., & Kim, B. (2017). Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608*.

[10] Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1978). *Facial Action Coding System: A technique for the measurement of facial movement*. Consulting Psychologists Press.

[11] Farah, M. J., Hutchinson, J. B., Phelps, E. A., & Wagner, A. D. (2014). Functional MRI lie detection: Too good to be true? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 18*(12), 675–677.

[12] Fisher, R. P., & Geiselman, R. E. (1992). *Memory-enhancing techniques for investigative interviewing: The Cognitive Interview*. Springer-Verlag.

[13] Geiselman, R. E., Fisher, R. P., MacKinnon, D. P., & Holland, H. L. (1985). The Cognitive Interview: Improving the retrieval of crime scene memories. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 13*(1), 74–80.

[14] Golding, S. L. (2006). Introducing forensic and legal psychology. In D. A. Krauss, R. M. Friedman, & S. L. Golding (Eds.), *The handbook of forensic psychology* (pp. 1–37). Wiley.

[15] Graham, J. R., Ben-Porath, Y., & McNulty, J. L. (2000). A comparison of the PCL-R and the MMPI-2 in an offender sample. *Assessment, 7*(1), 83–90.

[16] Gudjonsson, G. H. (1992). *The psychology of interrogations and confessions: A handbook*. Wiley.

[17] Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The psychology of interrogations and confessions* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

[18] Heilbrun, K., Grisso, T., & Goldstein, N. E. (2002). *Psychological evaluations for the courts: A handbook for mental health professionals and lawyers* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

[19] Hare, R. D. (1991). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist–Revised (PCL–R)*. Multi-Health Systems.

[20] Hancock, J. T., Curry, L. E., Goorha, S., & Woodworth, M. (2013). On lying and being lied to: A linguistic analysis of deception in online dating profiles. *Journal of Communication, 63*(3), 510–530.

[21] Heuer, L., & Reisberg, D. (1990). Vivid memories of emotional events: The accuracy of remembered minutiae. *Memory & Cognition, 18*(5), 496–500.

[22] Kacmarynski, D., & Jencius, S. (2016). Integrating forensic psychology in policing: A strategic approach. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice, 16*(5), 434–450.

[23] Kassin, S. M., Dror, I. E., & Kukucka, J. (2013). The forensic confirmation bias: Problems, solutions, and proposals. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 2*(1), 42–52.

[24] Kassin, S. M., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1983). *The American jury on trial: Psychological perspectives*. Basic Books.

[25] Köhnken, G. (1996). The German Cognitive Interview. In R. Henderson (Ed.), *Measuring witness memory* (pp. 64–77). Taylor & Francis.

[26] Loftus, E. F. (1979). *Eyewitness testimony*. Harvard University Press.

[27] Loftus, E. F., & Palmer, J. C. (1974). Reconstruction of automobile destruction: An example of the interaction between language and memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 13*(5), 585–589.

[28] Millen, J. E., et al. (2017). Virtual reality in forensic psychology: Simulated crime scenes and suspect interviews. *Journal of Forensic Sciences, 62*(2), 507–513.

[29] Milne, R., & Bull, R. (2006). *Investigative interviewing: Psychology and practice*. Wiley.

[30] Münsterberg, H. (1908). *On the Witness Stand: Essays on Psychology and Crime*. McClure, Phillips & Co.

[31] Neisser, U. (1967). *Cognitive psychology*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.

[32] Perez-Rosas, V., Abouelenien, M., Mihalcea, R., & Burzo, M. (2015). Liar, liar pants on fire: A new benchmark dataset for deception detection. In *Proceedings of ACL-IJCNLP 2015* (pp. 422–426).

[33] Pfister, T., Li, X., Zhao, G., & Pietikäinen, M. (2011). Recognising spontaneous facial micro-expressions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops* (pp. 1449–1456).

[34] Poole, D. A. (2016). Trauma-informed forensic interviewing. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 25*(4), 355–371.
[35] Richards, L. (2015). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
[36] Rossmo, D. K. (2000). *Geographic profiling*. CRC Press.
[37] Saks, M. J., & Kidd, P. S. (1999). Jurors' biases and jury instructions. *Law and Human Behavior, 23*(2), 185–216.
[38] St-Yves, M. (2019). The rise of teleforensic psychology: Adapting clinical practice to remote contexts. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 18*(3), 205–217.
[39] Vrij, A. (2008). *Detecting lies and deceit: Pitfalls and opportunities* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
[40] Vrij, A., Edward, K., Roberts, K. P., & Bull, R. (2016). Saccades and blinks as indicators of deception in a realistic executive lie-catching scenario. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 40*(2), 121–135.
[41] Vrij, A., Granhag, P. A., & Porter, S. (2010). Pitfalls and opportunities in nonverbal and verbal lie detection. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 16*(1–2), 101–118.
[42] Westera, N., Kebbell, M. R., & Milne, B. (2013). Investigative interviews in the UK and Australia: An international comparison of practice. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 20*(2), 198–210.
[43] Yuille, J. C., & Cutshall, J. L. (1986). A case study of eyewitness memory of a crime. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(2), 291–301.