

Expert testimony in psychology article reviews examples

[Law](#), [Criminal Justice](#)



Psychology

Youngstrom and Busch (2000) examine the ramifications of the Supreme Court decision in *Kumho Tire Co. Ltd v. Carmichael* on expert testimonies in court and then analyze the implications on psychologists deposing as experts. The authors note the recent Supreme Court decision that current legal standards for admission of scientific evidence also apply to other expert testimony based on 'training, experience and other sources of expertise besides empirical support' (Youngstrom & Busch, 2000). The authors trace the evolution of acceptance of expert opinion in court. Earlier, techniques generally accepted in the scientific community were acceptable. In *Carmichael's* case, the courts ruled that experts who did not base their evidence on scientific bases but rather on experience and observation would not be ruled as per the standards for scientific experts. The Supreme Court overruled this decision, bringing all expert testimony on par with scientific standards.

The implications for psychologists are that their methods would now have to be considered to be generally acceptable, acceptable to peer review and evaluation, should avoid false positives and should have been subjected to testing and validation, on the lines of other scientific experts. The authors aver that such standards would be initially challenging to psychologists, including forensic scientists, but would serve to improve psychological testimony and standards over the long term (Youngstrom & Busch, 2000).

Reference

Youngstrom, E. A., & Busch, C. P. (2000). Expert testimony in Psychology: Ramifications of Supreme Court decision in ' Kumho Tire Co. Ltd. v. Carmichael'. *Ethics & Behavior* 10/2, 185-193.