



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders

Journal homepage: <http://ees.elsevier.com/RASD/default.asp>



Review

An evaluation of *Miranda* rights and interrogation in autism spectrum disorders

Lindsay M. Salseda ^{a,b}, Dennis R. Dixon ^{a,b,*}, Tracy Fass ^b, Deborah Miora ^b, Robert A. Leark ^b

^a Center for Autism and Related Disorders, USA

^b California School of Forensic Studies, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 17 May 2010

Accepted 18 June 2010

Keywords:

Autism spectrum disorders

Miranda rights

Competency

Interrogation

ABSTRACT

The primary deficits present in autism spectrum disorders (ASD) may lead to increased susceptibility to involvement in the criminal justice system. The same deficits may also cause individuals with ASD to be more vulnerable to interrogation techniques and other aspects of the legal system. Due to the increased level of vulnerability as well as impairments in social cognition, individuals with ASD may have difficulty understanding their legal rights, more specifically their *Miranda* rights. This review explores *Miranda* comprehension in general and how the specific deficits found in ASD may impact *Miranda* comprehension.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Contents

1. Crime and autism spectrum disorders	80
2. <i>Miranda</i> rights	81
3. Juvenile <i>Miranda</i> comprehension	82
4. Intellectual disabilities and <i>Miranda</i> comprehension	83
5. Discussion and conclusion	84
References	84

Autism spectrum disorders (ASD) are a heterogeneous group of disorders that share common core symptoms. The general consensus among researchers is that these disorders are best described as falling along a spectrum of symptoms rather than disorders with discrete boundaries (Barrett, Prior, & Manjviona, 2004; Buitelaar, Van der Gaag, Klin, & Volkmar, 1999; Prior et al., 1998; Tryon, Mayes, Rhodes, & Waldo, 2006; Verté, Geurts, Roeyers, Oosterlaan, & Sergeant, 2006; Volkmar, Lord, Bailey, Schultz, & Klin, 2004). The primary characteristics that define ASD include communication deficits, repetitive behaviors, impaired social interaction, and restricted interests (Hill and Frith, 2003).

Of particular importance to a discussion of competency is the domain of social skills. Persons with ASD experience a number of difficult social situations (Sperry and Mesibov, 2005). In particular, Sperry and Mesibov (2005) have identified specific themes: relationships at work, developing and maintaining personal relationships, appropriate behavior around members of the opposite sex, and personal perspectives on having ASD. Each of these themes has the potential to create a

* Corresponding author at: Center for Autism and Related Disorders, 19019 Ventura Blvd, Tarzana, CA 91356, USA. Tel.: +1 818 345 2345. E-mail address: d.dixon@centerforautism.com (D.R. Dixon).

difficult situation for the person with ASD to navigate and likely leads to false assumptions in others regarding the behavior of persons with ASD.

One particular area of skill deficit that is problematic for persons with ASD is perspective taking. Numerous theoretical constructs have been devised to account for perspective taking skill deficits, namely, Theory of Mind. Some researchers have suggested that deficits in perspective taking skills that are found in persons with ASD might account for the social impairments that are present in ASD (Hill and Frith, 2003). Regardless of why these skill deficits are present, it is clear that persons with ASD have difficulty identifying and understanding emotions in others (Heerey, Keltner, & Capps, 2003). The inability of children with ASD to understand or detect emotions may result in negative consequences in many areas of their lives. Thus, it is essential to assess what areas may be affected and implement proper treatment. If such intervention is implemented early in a child's life, the likelihood of negative behaviors such as aggression may be reduced in the future. Further, deficits in perspective taking may be linked to behaviors that place those with ASD at risk of entering the criminal justice system. An improved understanding of these skill deficits may allow society, specifically members of the court, to have a more accurate view of people with ASD.

The behavioral presentation of persons with ASD may put them at risk for involvement in the criminal justice system. The same deficits may also cause individuals with ASD to be more vulnerable to interrogation techniques and other aspects of the legal system. Due to the language deficits, poor social skills, and odd mannerisms, vulnerability to interrogation techniques may increase. Researchers have indeed shown that individuals with ASD are at an increased level of vulnerability to interrogation when compared to typical-functioning individuals (North, Russell, & Gudjonsson, 2008). Due to the increased level of vulnerability as well as impairments in social cognition, individuals with ASD may have difficulty understanding their legal rights, more specifically their *Miranda* rights. The purpose of this review is to explore the connection between the deficits present in ASD and a potential lack of *Miranda* comprehension in these individuals.

1. Crime and autism spectrum disorders

At the outset of this discussion, it is important to be clear that there is no evidence to suggest that persons with ASD are any more likely to commit crimes than those who are not on the spectrum. However, a discussion on the specific characteristics of ASD that may contribute to an individual with ASD finding themselves in the legal system is warranted. For example, Woodbury-Smith et al. (2005) examined whether the cognitive deficits present in individuals with ASD had an effect on their susceptibility to offending. The authors evaluated three groups, including adults with ASD and a history of offending, adults with ASD and no history of offending, and a general population group of individuals without ASD and no history of offending. Results of their study were mixed, with no differences found among groups regarding perspective taking skills, executive function, or recognition of facial expression of sadness. However, their data did indicate a greater impairment in recognition of emotional expression of fear in the ASD offender group as compared to the ASD non-offender group. This impairment in recognition of emotional expression of fear could have contributed to the offenses committed by this ASD group. For example, they may not have been able to recognize the expression of fear in their victim's faces, inhibiting them from understanding the harm they were causing.

While the study by Woodbury-Smith et al. (2005) evaluated the legal system in general, others have evaluated specific factors that predict violent crime in persons with ASD. A recent study by Langstrom, Grann, Ruchkin, Sjostedt, and Fazel (2009) evaluated the impact of specific violent-crime risk factors such as gender, age, comorbid psychotic disorders, and substance use disorders with an ASD diagnosis. Participants included 422 individuals from Sweden who had been diagnosed with either autistic disorder ($n = 317$) or Asperger's disorder ($n = 105$). A subset of these participants ($n = 31$) had also been convicted of a violent crime. For the purpose of this study, Langstrom et al. (2009) defined violent crime to include homicide, attempted homicide, common assault, aggravated assault, arson, robbery, and unlawful threat or harassment. The authors found that among persons with an ASD, additional factors such as older age, male gender, and a diagnosis of either a psychotic disorder or a substance use disorder were more likely to commit a violent crime than persons with an ASD without those risk factors. When comparing autistic disorder with Asperger's disorder, a higher percentage of participants with Asperger's had been convicted of a violent crime.

An early case study by Baron-Cohen (1988) provided details concerning a 21-year-old male who was diagnosed with Asperger's disorder and often displayed violent behaviors. Baron-Cohen (1988) hypothesized that the individual engaged in the behavior due to a lack of ability to understand his victim's thoughts, feelings, and point of view. Further case studies have been discussed by Schwartz-Watts (2005) who described three individuals who were charged with murder and then subsequently diagnosed with Asperger's disorder. In two of the cases, a clear presentation of symptoms and behaviors specific to Asperger's disorder confirmed the diagnoses. Schwartz-Watts (2005) suggested that specific idiosyncrasies related to the ASD, such as aversion to touch, were important antecedents to the behavior and as such, should be considered as mitigating factors in sentencing. Though, it is essential to point out that there is no known link between criminal behavior and disorders such as Asperger's disorder. Rather, the presence of these disorders impacts the context in which the crime occurred.

Barry-Walsh and Mullen (2004) provided a review of five individuals who had a history of offending and had been diagnosed with Asperger's disorder. These researchers emphasized the deficits of those with Asperger's disorder, including impairments in social interaction, verbal and non-verbal communication, and rigidity in behavior. In all of the cases described, the offenders believed their actions were acceptable provided the circumstances (Barry-Walsh and Mullen, 2004).

A deeper and more accurate understanding of the deficits that are present and the behavioral correlates with Asperger's disorder would allow for a better understanding of the context of the crimes. If the deficits in individuals with Asperger's disorder are better understood, the likelihood of a fair trial is greater.

The research conducted thus far regarding criminal behavior in individuals with ASD has included very few participants. While case studies are important during the early stages of a research topic, larger scale studies are needed to more fully develop our understanding of these factors across the population. Further, all of these studies have relied upon retrospective analysis of individuals who committed crimes, and only one, Woodbury-Smith et al. (2005), contrasted persons with ASD who committed crimes to those who did not. In essence, the case studies show a tacit assumption that persons with ASD must be at a higher risk of offense due to their deficits, something that has yet to be demonstrated empirically. Indeed, there is little to suggest that persons with ASD are at a higher risk of committing a crime than those without ASD. However, due to the language deficits, poor social skills, and odd mannerisms found in ASD, there is reason to expect that persons with ASD may find themselves at a higher risk of suspicion by law enforcement officers.

There are many facets of the legal system that an individual can find themselves involved in. Mayes (2003) reviewed four issues that are of concern for individuals with ASD. These included competency to stand trial, capacity to commit a criminal offense, sentencing, and evidentiary matters. Since a diagnosis of ASD does not exempt an individual from criminal responsibility, an emphasis is placed on the role that varying degrees of impairment plays in these legal matters. Mayes (2003) reviewed cases involving competency to stand trial and found that individuals with more severe impairments were more often found incompetent compared to those with less severe impairments. Future research exploring the knowledge of legal authorities regarding ASD may be beneficial to both the legal system as well as individuals with ASD. In addition, testing individuals with ASD to gauge their understanding of the legal system may provide insight into how ASD deficits may negatively affect their active and passive involvement in the legal system. One facet of the legal system of particular interest is level of *Miranda* comprehension.

2. *Miranda* rights

Miranda v. Arizona (1966) was a landmark case that provided protection against self-incrimination for a suspect subject to police interrogation. As a result of this case and the outcome of its litigation, a law was created stating that all suspects must be presented a statement of their rights before they are questioned or interrogated by the police. Although *Miranda* rights vary across jurisdictions, every version of *Miranda* rights includes the following four rights: the right to remain silent, anything the suspect says can be used against them in a court of law, the right to an attorney, and the right to a court appointed attorney if the suspect cannot afford one (*Miranda v. Arizona*, 1966). This case also stated that any type of confession that was obtained by compulsion must be excluded from trial, even if it included true information. A confession should only be considered admissible if a waiver of *Miranda* rights was made 'knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently' (*Miranda v. Arizona*, 1966). All three of these standards are included in order to assess different aspects of the interrogation process and a defendant's understanding of *Miranda* warnings. For example, "voluntarily" requires that the defendant was not coerced into making a confession and usually includes a review of police procedures during interrogation. The term "knowingly" evaluates the defendant's comprehension of the *Miranda* warning and "intelligently" evaluates the defendant's awareness of the implications of his or her confession (Greenfield and Witt, 2005).

The court often must consider whether or not these three conditions, regarding waiving *Miranda* rights, have been met. A psychologist may be asked to evaluate whether these three requirements were met when any question of admissibility arises. An evaluation would include gaining an understanding of the condition of the defendant at the time of the interrogation as well as their current understanding of *Miranda* warnings. Once a full evaluation has been completed, the results can aid the court in forming an opinion by presenting the defendant's assessment results in comparison to normative data of persons matched on similar attributes such as court experience, age, and socioeconomic status (Melton, Petrila, Poythress, & Slobogin, 1997).

To evaluate *Miranda* competency in the general population, the most commonly used assessments focus on either general intelligence or are designed to measure understanding of terms and concepts in *Miranda* rights specifically. For example Lally (2003) surveyed 64 American Board of Professional Psychology diplomats in forensic psychology to gather information regarding actual and accepted use of an assortment of psychological tests across six areas of forensic practice. These categories included the following: recommended, acceptable, equivocal-unacceptable, equivocal-no opinion, unacceptable and no opinion. The WAIS-III and the Grisso (1998) instruments were the two most recommended assessments for evaluating competency to waive *Miranda* rights. The four Grisso instruments that have been developed to evaluate competency to waive *Miranda* rights include comprehension of *Miranda* rights, comprehension of *Miranda* Rights-recognition, comprehension of *Miranda* rights-vocabulary, and function of rights in interrogation (Grisso, 1998).

Similar to Lally (2003), Brodsky, Ryba, and Shlosberg (2007) surveyed 401 psychologists to determine how often the Grisso (1998) assessments were used in evaluations of the capacity to waive *Miranda* rights, how the results were then interpreted, and what other practices were combined with the use of the Grisso (1998) instruments. The results of the survey revealed that, although *Miranda* evaluations seemed to be conducted less frequently than other types of evaluations, the Grisso (1998) instruments were often used. The authors recommended that collateral information be used to support findings in evaluations of capacity to waive *Miranda* rights. However, there are a limited number of assessment instruments

available for *Miranda* competency evaluations, making the Grisso (1998) instruments one of the only options for forensic practitioners.

Not all *Miranda* warning statements are the same. Recently, Rogers, Hazelwood, Sewell, Harrison, and Shuman (2008) surveyed prosecutors and public defenders about different versions of *Miranda* warnings. They culled 385 English versions of *Miranda* rights from across the United States. The authors conducted an analysis of reading comprehension on the 385 versions of *Miranda* rights using software programs including the Flesch-Kincaid (Flesch, 1950), the SMOG (McLaughlin, 1969), and the Flesch Reading Ease (Flesch, 1948). The Flesch-Kincaid determined the reading level of the material using a 75% cut off for comprehension. The SMOG also tested for reading level but required 100% comprehension. The Flesch Reading Ease estimated reading level and ease of comprehension based on sentence length and syllables per word.

In addition to level of reading comprehension, the *Miranda* warnings were also analyzed for sentence complexity using the Grammatik (Wampler and Williams, 1991). This tool takes proportion of compound sentences, frequency of clauses, and prepositional phrases into account in order to determine sentence complexity. The authors also conducted a search of unique words, resulting in a list of 726 unique words found throughout the *Miranda* warnings. As a result of all of the above mentioned analyses, Rogers et al. (2008) determined variations in *Miranda* warnings were present across the country. Variations in length, vocabulary, and content of *Miranda* warnings were all present.

The numerous variations in *Miranda* rights may lead to misconceptions when waiving one's rights (Rogers, 2008). These variations include length, reading levels, and oral versus written delivery. Another crucial problem in the process of *Miranda* waiver evaluations is the time gap between the evaluation and the time of waiver. In many cases, *Miranda* competency evaluations are conducted long after an individual waives his rights, making it difficult to judge if he was competent at the actual time of the waiver. It is difficult for practitioners to determine and weigh all the factors that led to the waiver of rights. Research regarding how the variations in *Miranda* rights affect different populations, specifically individuals with a diagnosis of an ASD, is needed. This avenue of research may motivate states to increase uniformity in *Miranda* rights, as well as making them easier to comprehend. In addition, it might also benefit attorneys defending clients with intellectual or developmental disabilities by increasing their understanding of the sorts of deficits possessed by these populations.

A clear application of *Miranda* rights to persons with ASD is of particular difficulty. Two areas of research and case law help to guide our understanding of the convoluted relationship between ASD and waiving *Miranda* rights. The first area is the case law regarding juvenile *Miranda* comprehension. Second is the research related to intellectual disabilities (ID) and *Miranda* comprehension.

3. Juvenile *Miranda* comprehension

Many significant juvenile court cases have taken place over the years and have had a great impact on the juvenile justice system. Many of these cases have directly dealt with a juvenile's capacity to waive *Miranda* rights. In the case *In re Gault* (1967), the U.S. Supreme Court acknowledged the constitutional rights of juveniles throughout the adjudication process. One of the rights that came into question was a juvenile's capacity to waive *Miranda* rights. Before this landmark case, a juvenile's rights were not seen as a primary concern because the focus of juvenile court was rehabilitative rather than punitive. One of the goals of the court was to make the rights of juveniles more equitable to those of adults regardless of the type of consequences. A result of this case was the clear need for psychological evaluation of juvenile competency. It became the psychologist's role to explore all the possible reasons for a juvenile's lack of understanding in regards to waiving *Miranda* rights. Possible reasons might include lack of knowledge, cognitive deficits, or immaturity in intellectual abilities. Currently, there is not a set age that distinguishes when an adolescent will or will not be able to fully understand the effects of waiving his *Miranda* rights. It is difficult for the courts to set an exact age because the intellectual and cognitive abilities of adolescents have a high range of variability. The case of *In re Gault* (1967) brought the juvenile's legal and constitutional rights into question and made the juvenile justice system more equitable.

Fare v. Michael (1979) was another landmark case that took a juvenile's rights into consideration. This case led to the recognition that juveniles do not have the same capabilities as adults when it comes to waiving their *Miranda* rights. *Fare v. Michael* (1979) took into account a juvenile's psychological immaturity and inability to properly waive his *Miranda* rights, predicated on having a full understanding of the possible consequences of the waiver. In addition to this case, *People v. Lara* (1967) also considered a juvenile's ability to 'knowingly and intelligently' waive her *Miranda* rights. In this case, many factors were considered when determining if waiver of rights could be upheld, including a defendant's age, intelligence, level of education, experience, and ability to understand the consequences of their statements. All of these factors were considered to make up what the court referred to as the 'totality of circumstances.' *People v. Lara* (1967) also took into account ID and low levels of intelligence as factors that might affect a juvenile's capacity to voluntarily confess to a crime. All of the aforementioned cases have greatly affected the juvenile justice system and, more specifically, a juvenile's waiver of *Miranda* rights.

Grisso (1980) conducted an analysis of both juvenile and adult understanding of *Miranda* rights. The juvenile participants included 431 adolescents from a detention center and a correctional facility. The adult participants included 203 ex-offenders and 57 non-offenders. The juvenile and adult participants were evaluated for *Miranda* comprehension with the comprehension of *Miranda* rights (Rights), comprehension of *Miranda* vocabulary (Vocab), and comprehension of *Miranda* rights true/false (Rights-TF) assessments. Grisso (1980) also used the function of rights in interrogation (Function) instrument to test the participants' understanding of the importance and role of *Miranda* rights in a legal setting. The Rights

instrument required participants to rephrase the four parts of the *Miranda* warnings, the Vocabulary instrument required participants to define key words found within the warning and the Rights-TF asked the participants to respond true or false to three statements for each of the four warnings to determine if they could select the statement that was similar to the real *Miranda* warning. Moreover; the Function instrument used a structured interview to determine the participants' understanding of the importance and role of *Miranda* rights in a legal situation. The juvenile participants under the age of 15 had significantly poorer comprehension of *Miranda* rights and poorer understanding of the function of their rights as compared to adults of similar intelligence. In addition; juveniles with past felonies and ex-offending adults both received higher scores on the Function test indicating their past experience in the legal system resulted in a better understanding of the importance of *Miranda* rights. Overall; the results revealed that juveniles under the age of 15 possess low levels of comprehension of the *Miranda* rights and would benefit from a safeguard that would protect their rights (Grisso, 1980).

Goldstein, Condie, Kalbeitzer, Osman, and Geier (2003) studied whether IQ, age, and past participation in special education had an effect on *Miranda* rights comprehension and the self-reported propensity to offer a false confession. Their participants included 55 male adolescents from a post-adjudication facility. The authors used a revision of the Grisso Instruments, which they developed specifically for this study, to test *Miranda* comprehension. The assessment tool they created is known as the *Miranda* rights comprehension instruments-II (MRCI-II). The MRCI-II contains five instruments including, comprehension of *Miranda* rights-II (CMR-II), comprehension of *Miranda* rights-recognition-II (CMR-R-II), function of rights in interrogation (FRI), comprehension of *Miranda* vocabulary-II (CMV-II), and perceptions of coercion during holding and interrogation process (P-CHIP). The CMR-II assesses understanding of *Miranda* rights by asking the participant to explain each individual right in his own words. The CMR-R-II also assesses the participant's understanding of his rights without calling on organized verbal skills. Instead, it requires the participant to match each right to a corresponding sentence when offered three options. The FRI assesses the participants' comprehension of the importance of *Miranda* rights in a legal or interrogation setting. The CMV-II assesses the participant's understanding of common vocabulary found in *Miranda* warnings. Finally, the P-CHIP uses hypothetical interrogation situations to assess the likelihood of a participant to offer a true or false confession.

The results of this study revealed that older adolescents were able to comprehend their *Miranda* rights better than younger adolescents when IQ was controlled. Also, higher IQ resulted in greater *Miranda* comprehension. In addition, adolescents involved in special education programs had significantly lower *Miranda* comprehension compared to the adolescents not involved in special education. When testing for likelihood of self-reported false confessions, age was found to be the only noteworthy predictor. Results indicated that younger adolescents reported they would offer false confessions more often than older adolescents. The results of this study suggest that *Miranda* comprehension may be a skill that adolescents do not possess sufficiently (Goldstein et al., 2003).

Functional impairment in the areas of adjudicative competence and *Miranda* comprehension has been studied by Viljoen, Zapf, and Roesch (2007). The authors tested 152 defendants ages 11–17 using Grisso's *Miranda* instruments and the fitness interview test revised (FIT-R). When testing for impairments, Viljoen et al. (2007) used various levels of legal standards to test the two areas of competency. For example, the results were applied to both adult and adolescent norms as well as the "Understanding Only Standard" and the "Understanding and Appreciation Standard" in order to compare possible differences based upon standard used. Over fifty percent of the defendants aged 15 and under were impaired in the areas of competency when their results were applied to adult norms and the "Understanding and Appreciation Standard." In contrast, significantly fewer defendants were found to be impaired when their results were applied to adolescent standards and the "Understanding Only Standard" (Viljoen et al., 2007). This study demonstrates that the type of legal standard applied to a defendant can greatly affect whether they will be considered impaired. The results also support research conducted by Grisso (1980) and Goldstein et al. (2003) that has revealed poor comprehension of *Miranda* rights in adolescents. The results of this study coupled with research on the deficits commonly found in individuals with ASD also imply that these individuals are likely to experience added difficulties when faced with similar interrogation situations.

4. Intellectual disabilities and *Miranda* comprehension

A number of specific factors related to ID may impact *Miranda* comprehension. These factors may include a person's reaction to leading questions, suggestibility, and expressed confidence when given feedback. Further, persons with ID in general have poor comprehension of *Miranda* rights (Fulero and Everington, 1995). A combination of poor *Miranda* comprehension coupled with friendly feedback from law enforcement might cause an individual with ID to waive their *Miranda* rights without a complete understanding of the consequences of the waiver (O'Connell, Garmoe, & Goldstein, 2005). It is this coupling of poor comprehension with the social deficits found in ASD that places these individuals at particular risk for exploitation.

The role of suggestibility and acquiescence in waiving *Miranda* has specifically been evaluated in persons with ASD. North et al. (2008) compared a group of 26 individuals with "high-functioning Autism" to 27 individuals from a control group matched on both gender and IQ. The two groups were evaluated on suggestibility and compliance to determine if the ASD group was more susceptible to variables present in interrogative interviews. With regard to suggestibility, the authors found no significant difference between the two groups. However, the ASD group was significantly more compliant than the control group. Thus, when individuals with ASD are involved in interrogative situations, they may have vulnerabilities that are not present in the typical-functioning population.

5. Discussion and conclusion

Many of the deficits present in individuals with ASD may decrease level of *Miranda* comprehension as well as increase susceptibility to involvement in the legal system. In addition, language deficits, poor social skills, and stereotypical behaviors may increase vulnerability to interrogation techniques.

In conjunction with the deficits experienced by persons with ASD, these individuals also have to face the high level of variability found in the content of *Miranda* warnings if they become involved in an interrogation situation. Researchers have found variability in all aspects of *Miranda* warnings including reading level, length, content, and oral versus written delivery. Indeed, these variations were found in *Miranda* warnings across the United States. Creating a universal standard for *Miranda* warnings that can be used by all law enforcement officials may help to clarify expectations for what constitutes comprehension and thus reduce false assumptions by law enforcement officials regarding if a particular individual is competent to waive their *Miranda* rights. Research exploring how the present variations in *Miranda* warning affect individuals with ASD and other developmental disabilities may support the need for increased uniformity in these warnings.

Over the years a number of assessment tools have been created to establish level of *Miranda* comprehension. These assessment tools are designed for both adult and juvenile populations and norms have been established within the typical-functioning populations. While a review of the psychometric properties of these assessments is beyond the scope of this review, it is important to point out that there is a high degree of variability regarding the psychometric development of these assessments, with some showing little to no consideration for reliability or validity. Although some of these assessment tools have been used to evaluate level of *Miranda* comprehension in individuals with ASD or ID, psychometric properties of these assessments have not been established with these populations. Therefore, practitioners should be cautious when selecting a tool to evaluate *Miranda* comprehension in persons with ASD. Creation of assessment tools specific to ASD populations that take into consideration the specific deficits in ASD, would help establish the proper procedures necessary for accurate evaluation.

Many noteworthy court cases have taken place over the years that have significantly affected the juvenile justice system. These cases have led to more equal rights for juveniles as well as recognition of the differences in comprehension ability between adults and children.

Although these cases have made considerable changes in the juvenile justice system, there are still problems that need to be addressed. For instance, there is currently no set age that distinguishes when an adolescent will or will not be able to fully understand the effects of waiving his *Miranda* rights (In re Gault, 1967). The fact that each individual juvenile possess varying levels of maturity, intellectual ability, and cognitive ability may prohibit the courts from ever determining such a standard. The same issues, only on a much more complex level, apply to setting standards for establishing *Miranda* competency for the individual with ASD.

It is clear that more research exploring the relationship between deficits in ASD and ability to comprehend *Miranda* rights is needed. Such research will benefit both individuals with ASD as well as the authorities involved in the legal system. It is unlikely that law enforcement personnel intentionally seek to violate the *Miranda* rights of individuals with ASD. Nonetheless, without a thorough understanding of the unique characteristics of ASD and how these impact *Miranda* comprehension, these violations are likely to occur. If legal authorities and law enforcement officials become more familiar with the defining features of ASD they may be better able to assist and interact with such individuals. This understanding and familiarity will go a long way in preventing the violation of personal rights in individuals with ASD.

References

- Baron-Cohen, S. (1988). An assessment of violence in a young man with Asperger's syndrome. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, 29, 351–360.
- Barrett, S., Prior, M., & Manjiviona, J. (2004). Children on the borderlands of autism: Differential characteristics in social, imaginative, communicative and repetitive behaviour domains. *Autism*, 8, 61–87.
- Barry-Walsh, J., & Mullen, P. E. (2004). Forensic aspects of Asperger's syndrome. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 15, 96–107doi:10.1080/14789940310001638628.
- Brodsky, S. L., Ryba, N. L., & Shlosber, A. (2007). Evaluations of capacity to waive *Miranda* rights. *Assessment*, 14, 300–309doi:10.1177/107302841.
- Buitelaar, J. K., Van der Gaag, R., Klin, A., & Volkmar, F. (1999). Exploring the boundaries of pervasive developmental disorder not otherwise specified: Analyses of data from the DSM-IV autistic disorder field trial. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 29, 33–43.
- Fare v. Michael, C. (1979). 442 U.S. 707.
- Flesch, R. (1948). A new readability yardstick. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 32, 221–233.
- Flesch, R. (1950). Measuring the level of abstraction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 34, 384–390.
- Fulero, S. M., & Everington, C. (1995). Assessing competency to waive *Miranda* rights in defendants with mental retardation. *Law and Human Behavior*, 19, 533–543.
- Greenfield, D. P., & Witt, P. H. (2005). Evaluating adult *Miranda* waiver competency. *The Journal of Psychiatry & Law*, 33, 471–489.
- Goldstein, N. E., Condie, L. O., Kalbeitzer, R., Osman, D., & Geier, J. L. (2003). Juvenile offenders' *Miranda* rights comprehension and self-reported likelihood of offering false confessions. *Assessments*, 10, 359–369doi:10.1177/1073191103259535.
- Grisso, T. (1980). Juveniles' capacities to waive *Miranda* rights: An empirical analysis. *California Law Review*, 68, 1134–1166.
- Grisso, T. (1998). *Instruments for assessing understanding & appreciation of Miranda rights*. Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Press.
- Heerey, E. A., Keltner, D., & Capps, L. M. (2003). Making sense of self-conscious emotion: Linking theory of mind and emotion in children with autism. *Emotion*, 3, 394–400doi:10.1037/1528-3542.3.4.394.
- Hill, E. L., & Frith, U. (2003). Understanding autism: Insights from mind and brain. *The Royal Society*, 358, 281–289doi:10.1098/rstb.2002.1209.
- In re Gault (1967). 387 U.S. 1.
- Lally, S. J. (2003). What tests are acceptable for use in forensic evaluations? A survey of experts. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 34, 491–498doi:10.1037/0735-7028.34.5.491.
- Langstrom, N., Grann, M., Ruchkin, V., Sjostedt, G., & Fazel, S. (2009). Risk factors for violent offending in autism-spectrum disorder: A national study of hospitalized individuals. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, 1358–1370doi:10.1177/0886260508322195.

- Mayes, T. (2003). Persons with autism and criminal justice: Core concepts and leading cases. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 5, 92–100.
- McLaughlin, G. (1969). SMOG grading: A new readability formula. *Journal of Reading*, 12, 639–646.
- Melton, G. B., Petrila, J., Poythress, N. G., & Slobogin, C. (1997). *Psychological evaluation for the courts a handbook for mental health professional and lawyers* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Miranda v. Arizona (1966). 384 U.S. 436.
- North, A. S., Russell, A. J., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (2008). High functioning autism-spectrum disorders: An investigation of psychological vulnerabilities during interrogative interview. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 19, 323–334doi:10.1080/14789940701871621.
- O'Connell, M. J., Garmoe, W., & Goldstein, N. E. (2005). *Miranda* comprehension in adults with mental retardation and the effects of feedback style on suggestibility. *Law and Behavior*, 29, 359–369doi:10.1007/s10979-005-2965-y.
- People v. Lara (1967). 67 Cal. 2d 365.
- Prior, M., Eisenmajer, R., Leekam, S., Wing, L., Gould, J., Ong, B., et al. (1998). Are there subgroups within the autism spectrum? A cluster analysis of a group of children with autistic spectrum disorder. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 39, 893–902.
- Rogers, R. (2008). A little knowledge is a dangerous thing—Emerging *Miranda* research and professional roles for psychologist. *American Psychologist*, 63, 776–786.
- Rogers, R., Hazelwood, L. L., Sewell, K. W., Harrison, K. S., & Shuman, D. W. (2008). The language of *Miranda* warnings in American jurisdictions: A replication and vocabulary analysis. *Law and Human Behavior*, 32, 124–136doi:10.1007/s10979-007-9091-y.
- Schwartz-Watts, D. M. (2005). Asperger's disorder and murder. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 33, 390–393.
- Sperry, L. A., & Mesibov, G. G. (2005). Perceptions of social challenges of adults with autism-spectrum disorder. *The National Autistic Society*, 9, 362–376doi:10.1177/1362361305056077.
- Tryon, P. A., Mayes, S. D., Rhodes, R. L., & Waldo, M. (2006). Can Asperger's disorder be differentiated from Autism using DSM-IV criteria? *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 21, 2–6.
- Verté, S., Geurts, H. M., Roeyers, H., Oosterlaan, J., & Sergeant, J. A. (2006). Executive functioning in children with an autism spectrum disorder: Can we differentiate within the spectrum? *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36, 351–372.
- Viljoen, J. L., Zapf, P. A., & Roesch, R. R. (2007). Adjudicative competence and comprehension of *Miranda* rights in adolescent defendants: a comparison of legal standards. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 25, 1–19 doi:10.100/bsl.714.
- Volkmar, F. R., Lord, C., Bailey, A., Schultz, R. T., & Klin, A. (2004). Autism and pervasive developmental disorders. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45, 135–170.
- Wampler, B. E., & Williams, M. P. (1991). *Grammatik Windows [computer program]*. San Francisco, CA: Reference Software.
- Woodbury-Smith, M. R., Clare, I. C., Holland, A. J., Kearns, A., Staufenberg, E., & Watson, P. (2005). A case-control study of offenders with high functioning autistic spectrum disorders. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 16, 747–763doi:10.1080/14789940500302554.