

Subject Index

- Ackerman-Schoendorf Scales for Parent Evaluation of Custody (ASPECT)*, 258–268
- Activities of daily living (ADL): *see* Guardianship, assessment for;
- Guardianship, assessment instruments
- Actual understanding, meaning of, 455
- Actus reus*, meaning of, 5, 193
- Adjudicative competence, 72–73
- assessment instrument, 90–101
- Admissibility of expert testimony, 17
- Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, 234
- Adult Functional Adaptive Behavior Scale (AFABS)*, 334–338
- Alzheimer's disease, 311
- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry guidelines, child protection cases, 244, 247
- American Academy of Forensic Psychology, continuing education program, 12
- American Bar Association (ABA) standard, insanity defense, 196–197, 204–205
- American Law Institute (ALI) standard, insanity defense, 196–197, 204–206, 218
- American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children (APSAC) guidelines, child protection cases, 243–244
- American Psychological Association (APA) child protection cases, 243, 246
- psychology and law study, 12
- American Psychology-Law Society, 13
- Amnesia, and competence to stand trial, 33, 72
- Appreciation of criminality, as psychological standard, 204–205
- Approximation standard, parental competence, 238
- Assessment of Living Skills and Resources (ALSAR)*, 333
- Assisted competence, meaning of, 457
- Association of Family and Conciliation Courts (AFCC) guidelines, child protection cases, 246
- Autonomy issue
- competence to consent to treatment, 392–393
- guardianship, 313

- Barthel Index*, 333
- Behavioral control, loss of, 218–219
- Bender-Gestalt Visual Motor Test*, 247
- Best interests of child standard, 235, 237–239, 257
- Biber Figure Test*, 332
- Bricklin Perceptual Scales (BPS)*, 268–274
- Brockton Social Adjustment Scale*, 376
- Canterbury v. Spence*, 393
- Capacity to Consent to Treatment Instrument (CCTI)*, 405–412
- Capacity to understand, meaning of, 455
- Causal components, 29–32
- assessment tools, 30–32
- competence to consent to treatment assessment, 400–402, 456–457
- competence to stand trial assessment, 85–87, 142
- competency to waive *Miranda* rights assessment, 159–161, 189
- forensic assessment instruments design, 469–471
- guardianship, assessment for, 325–328, 383–385
- insanity assessment, 206–207
- legal importance of, 29–30, 85–86
- parental competence assessment, 252–254
- research needs/directions, 142, 189, 223–224
- theory, limitations of, 32
- and treatment provisions, 86
- Cause/explanation of deficits: *see* Causal components
- Child abuse/neglect: *see* Parental competence; Parental competence assessment
- Child Abuse Potential Inventory (CAPI)*, 281–290
- Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974, 232
- Child custody: *see* Parental competence; Parental competence assessment
- Children's Apperception Test*, 247
- Civil cases
- competence to care for property, 8
- competence to consent in research, 9
- competence to consent to treatment, 8–9
- parental competence, 7–8
- Clinical applications
- competence to consent to treatment assessment, 458–460
- competence to stand trial assessment, 146–148
- competency to waive *Miranda* rights assessment, 190–192
- guardianship, assessment, 387–389
- insanity assessment, 225–226
- Clinical incompetence, versus judicial incompetence, 310–311
- Cobbs v. Grant*, 394
- Cognitive abilities
- deficits: *see* Intellectual deficits
- for financial management tasks, 323–324
- intelligence tests, 332
- meaning of, 193
- Cognitive control, loss of, 218–219
- Collateral interviews
- in forensic report, 203
- in parental competence assessment, 248
- types of, 201
- Colorado v. Connelly*, 153
- Community Competence Scale (CCS)*, 370
- Comparisons between examiners, and procedures related to tests, 47
- Competence Assessment for Standing Trial for Defendants with Mental Retardation (CAST-MR)*, 108–115
- Competence to care for self or property and complexity of property, 33
- See also* guardianship; guardianship, assessment for
- Competence to consent to treatment, 391–398
- autonomy issue, 392–393
- competence element, 394
- disclosure element, 391, 393–394
- functional abilities required, 395, 398–399
- informed consent, 8–9, 391–392
- legal process, 396–397
- legal standard, 393–396, 398–399
- meaning of, 392
- of minors, 395–396
- voluntariness element, 391, 394
- Competence to consent to treatment
- assessment, 397–404
- causal component, 400–402, 456–457
- functional component, 398–400, 453–456

- Competence to consent to treatment assessment (*cont.*)
 informal procedures, 397–398
 interactive component, 402–403, 457
 judgmental and dispositional characteristics, 403–404
 research needs/directions, 453–458
 tests: *see* Competence to consent to treatment assessment instruments
- Competence to consent to treatment assessment instruments, 404–453
Capacity to Consent to Treatment Instrument (CCTI), 405–412
 clinical applications, 458–460
Hopemont Capacity Assessment Interview (HCAI), 412–416
Hopkins Competency Assessment Test (HCAT), 416–421
MacArthur Competence Assessment Tool for Clinical Research (MacCAT-CR), 428–434
MacArthur Competence Assessment Tool for Treatment (MacCAT-T), 421–428
Perceptions of Disorder (POD), 440–446
Thinking Rationally about Treatment (TRAT), 446–452
Understanding Treatment Disclosures (UTD), 435–440
- Competence to contract and execute will:
see Testamentary competence
- Competence determination, request for, 75
- Competence to dismiss counsel, 6
- Competence to plead guilty, legal precedent, 6
- Competence Screening Test* (CST), 130–139
- Competence to stand trial, 3–4, 69–82
 adjudicative competence, 72–73
 competence determination, 75
 competence evaluation procedure, 75–76
 decisional competence, 72–73, 83
 disposition/provision of treatment, 77–78
 evolution of doctrine, 3–4
 factual versus rational understanding, 84
 incompetence and treatment provisions, 77–78
 of insane person, 6
 judicial determination of competence, 76–77
 and juveniles, 73–74
- Competence to stand trial (*cont.*)
 legal definition of, 4, 43
 legal precedent, 4, 22, 43, 70–72
 legal process, steps in, 74–75
 rehearings on competence, 78
 state statutes, varieties of, 71–72, 75–76
 statistics on, 69–70
 weighted factors, 71
- Competence to stand trial assessment, 82–89
 ability domain, empirical analysis of, 140–141
 causal components, 85–87, 142
 clinician opinion, acceptance issue, 82
 functional ability concepts list, 83–84
 functional component, 139–140
 improvement in evaluations, 81–82
 information given to defendant, 76
 inpatient versus outpatient, 76, 78–80
 interactive components, 87–88, 144–145
 judgmental and dispositional and legal competence, 88–89, 145–146
 research needs/directions, 139–146
 tests: *see* Competence to stand trial assessment instruments
 time factors, 76
- Competence to Stand Trial Assessment Instrument* (CAI), 121–129
- Competence to stand trial assessment instruments, 90–138
 clinical applications, 146–148
Competence Assessment for Standing Trial for Defendants with Mental Retardation (CAST-MR), 108–115
Competence Screening Test (CST), 130–139
Competence to Stand Trial Assessment Instrument (CAI), 121–129
Fitness Interview Test-Revised (FIT-R), 101–108
Georgia Court Competence Test-Mississippi State Hospital (GCCT-MSH), 115–121
MacArthur Competence Assessment Tool-Criminal Adjudication (MacCAT-CA), 90–101
- Competency to waive *Miranda* rights, 4–5, 149–157
 decision variables, 154–155
 delusional defendant, 152–153, 158
 induction of waiver, methods of, 155
 intellectual deficits, 156–157, 158–160

- Competency to waive *Miranda* rights
 (cont.)
 intelligent waiver, 152–153
 and intoxicated persons, 162
 and juveniles, 26, 33, 153, 154, 155–156,
 160–161
 knowing waiver, 151
 legal standard, 150–155
 measurement by forensic assessment, 60
per se legal approach, 154
 tests for valid waiver, 5, 151, 154
 totality of circumstances approach, 151,
 153, 154, 161–162
 versus false statements, 150
 voluntary waiver, 153–154
- Competency to waive *Miranda* rights
 assessment, 157–163
 causal component, 159–161
 functional component, 157–159
 interactive component, 161–162
 judgmental and dispositional
 components, 163
 research needs/directions, 187–190
 tests: *see* Competency to waive *Miranda*
 rights assessment instruments
- Competency to waive *Miranda* rights
 assessment instruments, 164–186
 clinical applications, 190–192
Comprehension of Miranda Rights (CMR),
 164–172
Comprehension of Miranda Rights-
Recognition (CMR-R), 172–176
Comprehension of Miranda Vocabulary
 (CMV), 177–181
Function of Rights of Interrogation (FRI),
 181–186
Waiver Expectancy Interview, 187
Comprehension of Miranda Rights (CMR),
 164–172
Comprehension of Miranda Rights-Recognition
 (CMR-R), 172–176
Comprehension of Miranda Vocabulary
 (CMV), 177–181
Comprehensive Assessment and Referral
Evaluation (CARE), 333
- Conceptual elements of test, 50–54
 content validity, 51
 face validity, 51
 items/tasks of test, 53–54
 needs and requirements, 19–20
- Conceptual elements of test (cont.)
 objectives of, 43–46
 and operational definitions, 52–54
 psychological theories, 52
See also legal competence constructs
- Conceptual model, advantages of, 19–20,
 479–480
- Consent to participation in research: *see*
 Research participation
- Conservatorship
 use of term, 309
See also guardianship; guardianship,
 assessment for
- Constructs: *see* Legal competence
 constructs
- Construct validity of test, 59–61
 definition of, 59
 evidence accumulation in, 59–60
Miranda comprehension example, 60
 and predictive utility, 59, 62
- Content-referenced instruments, elements
 of, 57
- Content validity
 and concept definition, 51
 elements of, 51
 and test items/tasks, 53
- Context specific assessment: *see* Interactive
 components
- Continuous Paired Associate Test*, 332
Continuous Visual Memory Test, 332
Cooper v. Oklahoma, 73, 83
Coyote v. U.S., 152, 154
 Criminality, use of term, 204
Criminal Justice Mental Health Standards
 project, 196–197
- Criminal responsibility, 5–6
actus reus, 5
 and insanity defense, 5–6
mens rea, 5
- Criterion contamination, 200
- Criterion-referenced instruments
 elements of, 57
 limitations and legal competence testing,
 57–58
- Cutoff scores, negative aspects of, 58
- Data collection, and procedures related to
 tests, 47
Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
 17, 482

- Davis v. Davis*, 234
- Decisional competence, 72–73, 83
- Decisionmaking Instrument for Guardianship* (DIG), 359–363
- Declarative knowledge, meaning of, 323
- Delusional defendant
- competency to waive *Miranda* rights, 152–153, 158
 - insanity assessment, 207–208
 - versus idiosyncratic defendant, 402
- Dementia, diseases related to, 311
- Developmental disability, research needs/ directions on, 143–144
- Diagnostic Interview Schedule*, 350
- Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-IV*
- functional disorders, definition of, 218
 - and legal criteria for insanity, 194–195, 206
- Diagnostic testimony
- limitation in court, 12–13
 - meaning of, 12
- Dickerson v. U.S.*, 149, 150, 151
- Direct Assessment of Functional Status* (DAFS), 352–356
- Disclosure of defendant, in forensic report, 203
- Disclosure element, competence to consent to treatment, 391, 393–394
- Divorce and custody: *see* Parental competence; Parental competence assessment
- Drope v. Missouri*, 70
- Durable power of attorney, 310–311
- Durham v. U.S.*, 196
- Dusky v. United States*, definition of competence, 4, 22, 43, 70–72, 83
- Elderly: *see* Guardianship
- Empirical information
- ability domain, research needs/ directions, 140–141
 - to assess functional abilities, 27
 - and forensic test development, 463–464
- English common law, and competence doctrine, 3
- Environmental context
- difficulty in approximation of, 54
 - and functional abilities, 24
 - and test items/format, 53–54
 - types in legal process, 24
- Error reduction, and procedures related to tests, 46
- Ethical standards, 13
- Everyday Problems Test* (EPT), 356–359
- Ex Parte Devine*, 236
- Expert testimony
- admissibility of, 17
 - and insanity defense, 198–199
 - See also* forensic clinicians
- Face validity
- and concept definition, 51
 - elements of, 51
 - and test items/tasks, 53
- Factual versus rational understanding, 84, 146
- Fare v. Michael C.*, 33, 149, 150, 154
- Feuer v. United States*, 72
- Financial Capacity Instrument* (FCI), 363–366
- Financial judgment, meaning of, 324
- Financial management, cognitive skills needed for, 323–324
- Fitness Interview Test-Revised* (FIT-R), 101–108
- Forensic assessment
- conceptual model, value of, 19–20, 479–480
 - to describe functional abilities, 475–476
 - expert opinion formulation, 477–478
 - to explain functional deficits, 476–477
 - growth/improvement of field, 11–14
 - legal question, relationship to mental state, 14
 - prediction based on, 477
 - referral question, 474
 - selection of assessment methods, 474–475
 - shortcomings of: *see* Forensic assessment limitations
- Forensic assessment instruments
- benefits of use, 45–46
 - for competence to consent to treatment assessment, 404–453
 - for competence to stand trial assessment, 90–138
 - for competency to waive *Miranda* rights, 164–186
 - conceptual objectives of, 43–46
 - costs related to use, 481–482
 - development, history of, 42–43



<http://www.springer.com/978-0-306-47344-9>

Evaluating Competencies
Forensic Assessments and Instruments
Grisso, Th.
2003, XXI, 541 p., Softcover
ISBN: 978-0-306-47344-9