

Forensic Briefs

Episode 34 Raquel Aldana – Immigration Evaluations

In this episode of *Forensic Briefs*, Professors Michelle Guyton and Alexander Millkey continue their discussion with Professor Raquel Aldana from UC Davis. Together they explore how trauma, truth, and storytelling intersect in immigration law, particularly in forensic evaluations for asylum and refugee cases. Aldana highlights how legal and psychological frameworks often fail to fully capture lived experiences of trauma, emphasizing the importance of culturally informed, compassionate approaches that allow immigrants' narratives to be heard, validated, and contextualized within broader systems of justice.

This podcast is presented solely for educational and entertainment purposes. The content presented is not designed to be advice specific to any one person or situation. This podcast is not intended as a substitute for the advice of a qualified mental health professional or lawyer.

- Dr. Millkey** Well, Michel, here we are again on forensic briefs. Who will we be talking to today?
- Dr. Guyton** Alex, I am delighted to tell you that Professor Rachel Aldana is rejoining us, to continue our conversation that we started in our last podcast with her.
- Dr. Millkey** The, the work that you referred to that's being done at the center for Gender and Refugee Studies at UC San Francisco. Do you have a sense of what it is in those forensic evaluations that the courts are finding probative and compelling? I know, for example, you know, like here in Oregon where I practice and I mostly do, state, state sorts of things, things will be defined in law or administrative rules about what the law can consider when, making decisions, even decisions regarding, for example, a downward departure in sentencing or something like that.
- Dr. Millkey** I guess I'm wondering if there are things that are defined federally by law or administrative rule, and how forensic evaluations can find the nexus there to be helpful to the finder of fact.
- Prof. Aldana** Yeah, that's a great, great, great question. So the conversation we're having. So I just want to I sort of put this there out there is based on things I learned at the Cornell conference that we organized. So it's not it's not my own research, but I think it's so I'm I'm only letting you know what I learned in that space.

Prof. Aldana And what I learned in that space is that part of the conversation that was happening is to study how and whether these sort of more I don't want to call them generic, but more instruments that are broader than just one particular case, because the idea is a lot of the forensic science is applicable not just in one individual case, but it's applicable to all cases.

Prof. Aldana So we want to make sure want to improve access. So I think the idea was to create a very rigorous and important template, right, that lawyers could use who could not afford to hire that individual forensic person. Right. But they could still use this document. Right. And the litigation and I think my recollection of the discussion is that they were still trying to assess what the response was going to be from the immigration courts.

Prof. Aldana Added to that, I think, is an understanding that this this space in the immigration space. One advantage, which can also be a disadvantage, but one advantage is that it's heavily unregulated, which is completely the opposite to the criminal space, because I think your experience is probably in the criminal space where there is a lot of regulation, because the forensic evidence has been used for a really, really long time.

Prof. Aldana And there are rules that governs the use of forensic evidence. The immigration space is a space where there is no right to paid lawyers, and there's also, therefore no resources and the right to have forensic evidence either. And so what has happened is that the forensic reports have sort of inserted themselves into this space in the absence of funding, and then the absence of formal expectations and formal processes.

Prof. Aldana And and so it's an opportunity to shape what the regulations should be and what the law should be. And so in that sense, it's an opportunity. And it's also an opportunity to say this is not criminal law. So maybe the rules should be a little bit more flexible, in terms of what should be included. And I think that's the good news.

Prof. Aldana But I also want to say, right, that there are potential pitfalls to this, which is that the regulations could become very strict. Right? As, as, as we've seen in the criminal space, without the funding that usually accompanies the criminal space and could make it even more prohibitively expensive to be able to resort to these, these instruments. The other possibility, which, you know, we document in the in the study that we that we ran, is that because law and science is so like they're not connected law went this way and science is going this way, that instead of science influencing law, the the law is going to sort of just take from science what

- Prof. Aldana** it thinks it needs. So a lot of lawyers, one of the things we document in our study is that a lot of lawyers are looking for mental health diagnoses, and specifically looking for PTSD, and that's a distortion of science, because not every person who has experienced trauma exhibits PTSD. Right? But we know that immigration judges want to see a PTSD diagnosis so that they want,
- Prof. Aldana** So they can validate the trauma and find it credible. And so the problem is that there could be in this unregulated space, there's also potential for distortions that arise because the law is more powerful than the science in this space. And so therefore we're just going to take the science that we think we need in ways that, I think isn't helpful necessarily to a more honest and fair assessment of the science.
- Prof. Aldana** And also, in the end, hurts I think the victims as well.
- Dr. Guyton** I appreciate you saying a lot of that, because I think even for those of us who do not work in the immigration space, but in criminal or civil domains, you know, we do get this sense from legal actors, whether that's the attorneys or even sometimes the systems themselves, that there should be a diagnosis. And I know, you know, and I've given feedback sometimes in civil cases where I say, well, the person doesn't have PTSD, you know, but they did experience X, Y, or Z that there can be this disappointment that this label right, which I think means one thing to clinicians means another thing to attorneys may mean another thing to the adjudicator.
- Dr. Guyton** Right. And so it's sort of this, this language PTSD is a nice way to package this person has been harmed by what happened to them. But we know that that is so much more broad and diffuse and complex. So at least there's that overlap amongst all the systems in terms of of that in the nexus that you're speaking about.
- Prof. Aldana** Can I just say one thing? I'm sorry, Michelle, but I want to also give credit to we had two collaborators and our project for the Survey of Forensic Immigration reporting. It's Dr. Carmen Velasquez and Dr. Sharon Howard. And then I also worked with Dr. Leah Escarra. And though the two doctors who are doing forensic immigration reports are the ones who gave us all of these insights.
- Prof. Aldana** Right. Because I think that part of our project is also educating lawyers who mean really well. Right. The immigration lawyers mean really well, but

they're also advocates, and they're functioning at the space of what the law requires. But they also don't know enough science. Right. And I think that our project is to say you're also to blame because you have all of these expectations and you're not bridging law and science.

Prof. Aldana What you're doing is you are hiring the forensic immigration experts, trying to dictate what they should say to you, or being disappointed when you don't get what you want. But it's a distortion of science. And if you recognize that, maybe we can start to have a conversation that is more informed, right? That can also not hurt your client, but actually try to help them, even though it's more complicated to do that right, by pushing back on the law and saying the fact that there is no PTSD, a diagnosis does not negate trauma, right?

Prof. Aldana And then using what we know. So in our report we talk about the Istanbul Protocol, which is, you know, a document that is important to document trauma. And there's a lot of really good norms in there that was that was borne out of this collaboration between mental health and medical professionals and law to think about best practices for doing this work.

Prof. Aldana And it was incredible to learn that so few lawyers and mental health and medical professionals in the US have ever heard of the Istanbul Protocol. And so to us, it's an education project that also requires educating the lawyers, the mental health professionals.

Dr. Guyton Well, and let me just, shout out the title of your paper. It's called Adjudicating Credibility: Documenting the Role of Mental Health Immigration Forensic Assessments. And it's published in 2025. So very, very hot off the presses. And I hear you talking about education. Was that the original goal, of the project was to sort of educate or, you know, what led you to develop and do this survey?

Prof. Aldana I mean, I think education was a big part. If we think about, moving beyond the publication. Right. Ideally we would do trainings. Ideally, we would also not just do trainings of lawyers and others who are participating in forensic reports. But ideally we would also actually try to train policy makers, you know, so that law could be informed through this, that is these days feels really naive and aspirational.

Prof. Aldana Right. But I think initially when we convened, we had everything on the table, like, how can we how can we talk to lobbyists who know how to talk to legislators to bring this message? How do we partner with professional health organizations, you know, whether in the medical field or in law? Or do

we create new associations, new partnerships so that we can have a space on the table to to try to inform policymaking?

Prof. Aldana And we haven't completely abandoned that. But, you know, it's it seems very pie in the sky at the moment.

Dr. Guyton There's always space for pie in the sky at some point as a as a guiding star, perhaps. And I want to maybe just back it up a little bit, because some people who are listening to this conversation may know very little about immigration evaluations. And how does a forensic mental health professional function in that role. So can you tell us a little bit about, you know, what are the types of referral questions or and what types of immigration, procedures are these evaluations used?

Prof. Aldana Yeah, I mean, it's a very new field, right. And it's also an emerging field, in part in great part because as I said, there isn't an expectation that these forensic reports should be a part of the adjudication and there's no money. And I think the money piece matters a lot. One of the things that I've talked a lot with Dr. Velasquez and Dr. Howard is the complexity of the expectation, sometimes from lawyers and clients, that these forensic reports should be free or nominal in fee, and how the absence of a real possibility of revenue generation from this disincentivize this people going into the field.

Prof. Aldana Right. And so you have an access problem because you have very few professionals who are actually doing this for these this kind of work for the reasons that I just alluded. So money matters because the resources, right, drives a lot of issues of accessibility. So because it's novel and emergent, right? I also think that it has been a practice that you learn through doing.

Prof. Aldana And one of the things, the reasons why we wanted to document the practices, because we sort of have an inkling, we had an inkling, which we confirmed, right, that there isn't like written guidelines, written practices. And so there's people doing a lot of different things. And I think there is a need to start to develop these norms and best practices.

Prof. Aldana Right. Because now we have enough, enough of people doing them and, and, and enough data, I think, to be able to move into a better organization. So having given that context, the way it functions is that it usually it's clients who are represented by lawyers, to be honest. Right. Which is already a filter because not every immigrant can access lawyers.

Prof. Aldana And obviously if you are an immigrant, you wouldn't even know that you need a forensic immigration report or to how to get one. So usually right, it

still is the immigrants who are represented by counsel, who have access to the forensic reports. And so it's really a relationship between the immigration lawyer and the forensic expert. So then it creates this confusion about who is the client and who are you writing this report for because it braces.

Prof. Aldana I'm not I'm not a mental. This is your area. I don't know what the ethics are, but I'm speaking from Dr. Howard and Dr. Velasquez. They have said to me that a lot of times there are these ethical dilemmas that emerge because of the expectations of lawyers who are the advocates in this proceeding, and your own expectations of professional and neutrality and some of the things that you're doing in your space.

Prof. Aldana Right. So you're not supposed to be, a biased, participant. Right. And so but that's how it functions, is the lawyers who, who will secure the forensic report. And sometimes they can pay. Sometimes they try to get it pro-bono. And what I understand is that there is, for example, physicians for Human Rights, which is a nonprofit, had been providing a lot of particularly the medical forensic reports and in nearly all cases.

Prof. Aldana So there's been an emergence of nonprofit, right, and civil society, and medical professionals who are willing and able to volunteer their time to something like this, to, to do this. But there's also private practitioners who are making some money from this practice. And so that's how it functions. Who hire them. They, they provide the report.

Prof. Aldana The lawyers are asking questions that sometimes are about validating the trauma. Right? Like, is there I think there is a difference between the medical forensic report, obviously, and the mental health reports, because medical reports are trying to see if there's any physical traces of trauma, whereas the mental health reports. I think the question is, is the ways that people are exhibiting their mental health today consistent with someone who has endured trauma.

Prof. Aldana So that's where the mental health diagnosis comes in. There's also questions about credibility, which is interesting. And in our piece we talk a lot about this is in immigration law. There's this real emphasis on is the client credible in their story. And a lot of times lawyers are hoping that the forensic report is going to validate credibility. But the problem is that credibility is a legal determination by an immigration judge, and it doesn't exist in the mental health field.

Prof. Aldana You know, what you have is a concept called malingering. And they're very different. But our forensic survey indicated that there is an interprofessional understanding of these terms. Right. So lawyers are expecting the mental health professionals to answer questions like is my client care credible without knowing that that's not something that mental health professionals should be doing number one.

Prof. Aldana But importantly, it distorts like terms and terminology or conflicts, terms and terminologies and terminology. That ends up, I think, kind of unless somebody knows this ends up confusing and distorting science again. So we see a need really to have a true education. I think this instruments have been very helpful. So let me pause here and say we didn't do this study, but others have done studies that show that the presence of forensic and remote migration report matter.

Prof. Aldana They change outcomes. They do make a difference. But we think that they could be better. Right. And we also think that access could be broader. So that's part of the project that we're undertaking is just bringing action to this issue.

Dr. Guyton Can I just ask a clarifying question really quick? Is this like are we talking about like asylum evaluations, like if somebody's seeking asylum in the US or are there other types of immigration proceedings.

Prof. Aldana Yeah. In our report, we actually asked that what kinds of cases and, and asylum was number one answer. But yeah. No, it's all over the place. It's also U-visas and T-visas and VAWA [Violence Against Women Act] cases, its CJS cases. So it's really any case as we suspected where trauma matters to the immigration remedy that these reports are being sought.

Dr. Millkey When you say credibility, as you say, there's, disconnect between what I think we, evaluators are often looking at and what the, immigration courts are looking at. What do they what do you mean, with credibility? What does that.

Prof. Aldana We in law have a terrible definition of credibility. And it came out of the Real ID Act that was passed in 2005. And it was in response to the 911 Commission report. And so it was already coming from a place of assumptions like, oh, people are committing fraud, so how do we detect fraud? And so we have to strengthen, right, the credibility norms to make them really hard.

- Prof. Aldana** Right. And so the Congress codified a definition of credibility and part informed by the case law that came before it, but also making it tougher. And it came up with this definition that was completely ignoring science. Let me give you a sense of what is expected for you to be credible, for you to be credible about your trauma, your story, number one, has to be consistent.
- Prof. Aldana** And by consistency, that means that you have to have internal consistency. Your story has to match like you know perfectly. Also, your story has to match externally, like if there is corroboration or if there is, you know, news reports or whatever. So one of the expectations is that your memory is going to be impeccable because you're going to be able to remember facts and you're going to be able to tell that story and those facts repeatedly in a consistent way.
- Prof. Aldana** There's also an expectation of quote unquote, plausibility, which the way it's not even define what plausibility means. But in general, the more specific the more concrete, the more precise you are, the better. And in general, like the more chronologically that you can tell a story. Like, can you tell a story that can be coherent? Right. And there's that.
- Prof. Aldana** And then there's also this weird thing that immigration judges can take, quote unquote, demeanor into account, how you deliver the story without even defining what demeanor is. And so demeanor can be. Do you look at someone in the eyes? Do you look down to you cried? Are you stoic? And the weird thing is that the science that I've looked at is that that's a ridiculous way of telling, right?
- Prof. Aldana** Whether somebody is lying or not. And it doesn't account for cultural differences. So this is the definition that that lawyers are working with that they have to work with in order to convince the adjudicator. Right. And yet what I learned from speaking to mental health professionals is that, number one, trauma affects memory, like memory is faulty, period. But trauma in particular, right, will really affect the way you remember things.
- Prof. Aldana** And so one of the problems of the standard is that gaps in memory or memory that is disjointed or memory that might misremember things, and also just the way that we reconstruct memory by retelling is completely disconnected. Right? There's also the disconnection of the way, as I've alluded to before, the way trauma does or does not exhibit in mental health for people.
- Prof. Aldana** Right? So if we think that all people who experience trauma must then become sick with PTSD, then it must mean that if you don't have TSD, you

didn't have trauma. So there's there's all of these distortions that occur, right? Because we lawyers who are advocating on behalf of a client are trying to fit into this terrible definition that is inconsistent with science.

Prof. Aldana And the other end, I think the scientists who are trying to do this, reports are having I think maybe it's too much to ask them to push back and teach everyone you know as to why this is the wrong approach and what we've learned through our own just little survey of what is happening, is that what we think is happening is communication across purpose.

Prof. Aldana And there's obviously the time factor. You always need the reporting to weeks or whatever. And there is the back and forth. Like one of the questions we asked is, do you ask mental health evaluators to write reports? And what we learned is that, yeah, there is sort of that or should it be happening, should not be happening. But there is that like, well, could you include a mental diagnosis?

Prof. Aldana Could you say something about credibility? And we we're trying to say, you know, that we understand why lawyers are doing this, but we think in the end it's not actually helping, at least systemically, what I think should be happening, which is a true a true education right of science in terms of law. What I will say that in in retort to me, I think what or to our project and our emphasis, I think is right to say, isn't the real problem that you need to reform the law, because if lawyers have to work with it, the small don't you hard clients by not doing what the law requires.

Prof. Aldana And I don't disagree with that.

Dr. Millkey I'm afraid that I'm gonna belabor the point a little bit and also do a little bit of like reflecting back, which sometimes isn't a great look, but, so with credibility, you're saying that there's really three elements to this? I think one is, that a person's story is consistent, like internally consistent. The second is that it's plausible.

Dr. Millkey And plausibility, I think, means something a little different than the common usage of the term plausibility. It sounds like it sounds like it has to do with, like, coherence of the telling in some ways.

Prof. Aldana I mean, I don't, you know, plausibility means that I don't think it means different, but plausible means that the story has to sound consistent with usually, for example, they also introduce like the human rights report. So the

State Department and your story has to gel with what is known about the broader context or what is happening in that country.

Prof. Aldana So it has something plausible in that way. But what I am suggesting is that it's hard to establish plausibility unless you're able to tell a story that has a beginning, a middle and an end and some coherence. Because how do you measure plausibility if you don't even know what the story is? And so I think there is an expectation, an expectation to assess plausibility consistency.

Prof. Aldana There is an expectation of telling a story like a lawyer will tell a story. Right? Oh, that's all I'm saying. Is that it? It's not that, that the norms dictate that. It's that there is there is sort of a expected practice that the story is going to sound, will have coherence, will have facts, will have details, will be chronological.

Prof. Aldana And lawyers think like that. So in and so maybe it's helpful for me to tell you in, in, in immigration what you do is you submit an affidavit with the story, like, so you say, this is my story. And let me tell you, there's a lot of lawyers writing those stories for the client after numerous interviews and, of course, clients, when they tell the story.

Prof. Aldana Right, they're not going to tell the story the way it ends up in that report for a host of reasons, sometimes having to do with memory, sometimes having to do with how trauma is impacting their ability to tell the story, but sometimes also just education level, sometimes also cultural differences. I mean, it's multi-layered and multifaceted, but there is definitely I want to stay away from the word coaching because that would be an ethical violation.

Prof. Aldana But there is definitely advocacy happening. Like simply in the ways that lawyers interpret the story that they are hearing and communicate it to the lawyers, and then they have to get a forensic immigration report that also validates that story and validates the credibility of that story. Does that make sense? So it's the translation of the of that to how judges expect to see it, that I think it's the problem.

Dr. Millkey That that does make sense to me. So it's lots of different things, but in large part it has to do with presenting a narrative in a way that is both consistent. Well, that is, that is consistent with the thinking of a judge who has been trained in a Western law school and has come up through that sort of cultural milieu.

Prof. Aldana That it also has to be consistent. So sorry that this isn't clear, but what happens is and sadly, asylum seekers in particular have to tell their story

multiple times because, say, for example, they arrive at the border and when the border was still open and this was happening, they would have to do a credible fear interview. So there is like the credible fear screening, and then they have to tell their story to an asylum officer or they have to tell their story too.

Prof. Aldana So I think some of the things, some of the ways that they tell their story gets, gets it gets put in writing. Right. And so there's now a written record. So there's also an expectation by judges that your story has to be consistent over all of these documents. And also internally consistent like when you tell the story. So there is that expectation that if you have too many like but before you set the date was December 15th and now you're saying the date is December 20th.

Prof. Aldana And that's what I mean by the consistency not being scientifically sound in terms of just memory, because who's going to remember, right, December 15th from December 20th, but also like who is who like memory just period is faulty. But importantly, memory is especially faulty when you have been the victim of trauma. And none of that right is is really coherent in the ways that we expect credibility terminations to go in law.

Dr. Guyton And I think, too, it requires a cultural assumption about the importance of dates and times and chronology. And we know that time is one of those things that is experienced differently, prioritized differently, spoken about differently, in different cultures. Right? And especially for someone who is maybe, you know, fleeing a dangerous situation. They're not looking at a calendar.

Dr. Guyton You know, they're not looking at they're watching and determining these kinds of things. And so I think there's just really this cultural, piece that, you know, Western culture prioritizes time in a very specific manner. That may not be so. And other, cultural, groups. And then you have the influence of trauma on top of all of that, plus just the retelling of stories over time.

Dr. Guyton That changes the way that we remember it, right? Or we focus on one detail, or we forgot to include that detail one time when we told the story, but then we remembered it later. Somebody asked us to question that, right? So, I mean, it totally makes sense to me as someone who talks to people about traumatic events on a somewhat regular basis, that, you know, those accountings differ.

Dr. Guyton On the basis of many different things. But let me, let me bring you to we keep talking about your study that you and your colleagues have done. Let's

talk about it a little bit. Like what is it that you did? And what were you trying to look at in your, in your survey?

Prof. Aldana Yeah. I mean, when we did the literature review, we actually did not find any other, you know, academics. I always want to claim we are the first, but I will tell you, we didn't find any. We are the first.

Dr. Guyton You are the first! Yay, okay.

Prof. Aldana That is trying to just document the practice of how in the version forensic reports are being done, what I'm proud of the most in terms of the ways that we went about this project, is that from the very beginning, we constructed a survey instrument. I mean, it took us a long time because we had two practitioners, Doctor Howard and Doctor Velasquez, who have done these immigration forensic reports.

Prof. Aldana I also had a trained, scientist, as she is a psychologist, neuropsychologist who knows how to do these, Dr. Guarra, who knows, who's been trained at UC Davis as a researcher and really knows how to do survey design, really, really help us do the survey. And then we had, me as the lawyer bringing in the legal pieces.

Prof. Aldana And it was a lot of discussions, right, about what kinds of questions we should be asking and what we think we need to know. And we, we designed a survey. We, try to get as many responses as possible. We discussed the methodology in the study, and we did get a lot more than we thought we were going to get in terms of responses and a lot of rich data.

Prof. Aldana So we've only published one piece. We're working on a second. But, we decided to prioritize the first, which was really a focus on credibility is coming up. And these forensic immigration reports, we wanted to understand, given this disconnect that I've just been describing between law and science, about how credibility is determined, we wanted to assess what are how is it playing out in the forensic immigration reports, and is the way that it's playing out, when by helpful we mean is it helping to educate lawyers or adjudicators on science?

Prof. Aldana Is it helpful in maybe helping us highlight whether there's a greater interprofessional understanding of these things? Is that helpful? And that maybe there are instruments that are helpful in the mental health field that can help provide some guidance. I know, for example, I learned this through

doing this, that there are some psychological tools that you use to assess malingering and other things, and not so much a mental health diagnosis.

Prof. Aldana Right? How are those used? And we learned a ton, right from from this survey about this space. We learned a lot about I think in the end one one thing I will broad observation is that one hopeful thing is that I do think that both lawyers and mental health providers have a greater understanding of the disconnect between in science, and they both have skepticism about how law tries to assess credibility.

Prof. Aldana And I do think they are trying to work together to educate adjudicators. So that's the good news is I do think that there is some positive, out, you know, observations in that way. I also think the survey revealed that both of these actors also understand how little science informed or trauma informed practices exist within the adjudication itself.

Prof. Aldana So that was another common theme is that they see their audience that immigration judges as being completely unaware of these important differences.

Dr. Guyton Yeah. One of the things I wanted to know, what I found actually really kind of cool and interesting was that the majority of the mental health professionals that participated in your survey were bilingual. I think much more so than than you would get, you know, in other surveys that I read it and, and I guess I'm wondering a little bit about that because I thought, well, one that's really cool.

Dr. Guyton And then I thought, well, what about people like me, who are monolingual English speakers? Are we not participating in this process, right, sufficiently, and relying upon our colleagues, who are bilingual, bicultural, to do that. And I'm just wondering if this was, is this something that you see, in, in this work, and in immigration evaluations?

Dr. Guyton Or was that just maybe something related to, the particular nature of your sample?

Prof. Aldana Yeah. Well, let me say a few things about that, because it's really important. One is that, yes, they're very bilingual, but it's also true that they're very bilingual, only with Spanish and maybe a few other languages. And one of the things we try to show is that actually asylum seekers tend to speak other languages and not I mean, they of course, they are Spanish speaking asylum seekers, but it's not the overwhelming representation of asylum seekers.

Prof. Aldana And so we do see gaps in languages, period. But also I you know, one of the Dr. Velasquez, is one of the forensic experts that we work with who is bilingual. There's one who is monolingual, there's the one who is bilingual, and she feels completely overburdened, you know, and I think that one of the things that is true is that to the extent that monolingualism is and is sort of a broader characteristic of who the mental health provider is, it's if you think that only bilingual or multilingual people should work in this space.

Prof. Aldana I think we are missing, a potential, right, to expand the number of people who work producing immigrants and forensic reports. We're not suddenly going to change people's language abilities. And so I think there is a need to, to not, we don't want to signal that you have to be bilingual to do this work. But it also, I think, begs the question, and we have not written this up yet, but we did ask about interpreters and interpretation.

Prof. Aldana And I think that's a space that I think requires some deeper study of, you know, how interpreters, and the quality of interpretation can also be, challenge in the production of forensic immigration reports. I mean, we, we hint at the, the ways in which sharing the same language with your client can be so helpful to, to establish trust and things like that.

Prof. Aldana And I know that there's been some, a lot of writing about, good interpreters in this space, and I so I don't think it's impossible. I think it's an area to really delve into.

Dr. Millkey You have been listening to our conversation with Raquel Aldana. To listen to the full podcast, please go to [Forensic briefs.com](https://forensicbriefs.com) and select one of our subscription options.

Dr. Guyton This podcast is presented solely for educational and entertainment purposes. The content presented is not designed to be advice specific to any one person or situation. This podcast is not intended as a substitute for the advice of a qualified mental health professional or lawyer.