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The Problem: Gender Disparities in Psychology and the Law

Gender differences in professional development and achievements plague many professions, and the field of psychology and the law is no different. For example, Ceci and Williams (2010) reported troubling discrepancies across various areas of science; although women have made steady gains in the proportion of degrees received (half or more of degrees in many fields are awarded to women), female faculty are scarce in tenure-track universities. Only a small minority (less than 16%) of faculty positions in the top 100 universities in the U.S. are held by women. Looking across fields and universities, women are particularly underrepresented at senior ranks. Although 40% of faculty who received their degrees within the past ten years are women, only 15% of faculty holding the rank of Professor are women (Monroe, Ozyurt, Wrigley, & Alexander, 2008). This phenomenon has been referred to as the “leaky pipeline,” where women start out in junior positions but trickle out over the years and don’t attain senior positions at the same rate as men (see Pell, 1996).

The leaky pipeline appears among AP-LS members as well. In psychology, women have been earning the majority of undergraduate and graduate degrees for at least twenty years (e.g., women earned 66.7% of doctoral degrees in psychology in 2002). However, 75% of AP-LS members who hold the rank of Professor are men, even though the rates of Associate and Assistant Professor members are evenly split by gender. Gender differences in professional achievements are also evident among non-academic members of the field. For example, although nearly half of American Academy of Forensic Psychology (AAFP) workshop attendees are women, women rarely apply for
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the ABFP exam. Only 20% of Board Certified Forensic Psychologists are women, even though women are as likely as men to pass the exam. If we examine recognition for early career AP-LS members, women are well represented, with 44% of Saleem Shah awards going to women. However, only two women have ever received the AP-LS award for Distinguished Contributions to Psychology and Law (Skeem, Griffin, Hall, & Eno Louden, 2008).

Current explanations

Several explanations for the disparate achievements of women in science have been proposed, none of which are mutually exclusive. For example, a survey of clinical and counseling psychology graduate students in Canada revealed that women were less interested than men in pursuing careers in academia (Singer, Cassin, & Dobson, 2005). Women were more likely to report wanting a career in clinical practice, and the most widely cited reason for this was flexibility (90% of respondents). This desire for flexibility may be at least partly explained by a desire to have children, as the time when academics are in graduate school and on the tenure track overlaps with women’s reproductive years. The conflict that emerges when professionals try to balance competing demands from work and family negatively affects satisfaction for both men and women (Ceci & Williams, 2010; Reddick, Rochlen, Grasso, Reilly, & Spikes, 2011). However, the fact that women primarily bear the burden of childrearing seems to dissuade them from pursuing tenure-track or leadership positions (Ceci & Williams, 2010).

Across the U.S., universities have sought to understand these issues so that remedies can be put in place. Many, including the University of Texas at El Paso and the University of California, Irvine, conducted surveys as part of NSF’s ADVANCE program. The current survey was designed to examine gender differences in professional development among AP-LS members. The survey was based on the University of California, Irvine NSF ADVANCE survey, and examines issues related to work climate, workload, productivity, job satisfaction, work/life balance, and leadership among AP-LS members.

Method

Procedure

Participants were recruited via several routes. First, an invitation email was sent to all AP-LS members via the organization’s official listserv. Second, emails were sent to specialty listervs frequented by AP-LS members, including the AP-LS Professional Development of Women listserv and the PSYLAW-L listserv. Third, a notice was posted to the main webpage of AP-LS alerting members to the survey.

 Those interested in the survey were directed to the survey’s website, which was hosted by QuestionPro. The first webpage participants were directed to asked participants to describe the setting they worked in. Based on their response, they were directed to one of three versions of the survey, as described later. The first 400 people who completed the survey were mailed a $5 Starbucks gift card. After completing the survey, participants were directed to another website to provide mailing address to receive this incentive. Therefore, participants’ responses remained anonymous.

Measure

To account for the types of settings AP-LS members work in, we created three versions of the survey: faculty, non-faculty, and student. These surveys were based on a
prior ADVANCE survey used at University of California, Irvine. However, we made modifications where needed to address the unique situations that arise in each setting. The survey was composed of the sections described below. Each section included a free-response space for respondents to type in additional comments about the topic. In addition, each survey concluded with a section regarding participants’ interest in various types of programming from the Professional Development Committee, and a section asking respondents to report the percentage of their time engaged in various activities, which are not presented here for brevity.

Demographics and personal background. All participants provided data on their gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree attained, and present job title or educational standing (e.g., undergraduate student, graduate student). The survey included several questions regarding participants’ family life. Participants were asked how many children they had and their ages, whether the participant currently lives with a spouse or partner, and if so, whether the spouse or partner was employed.

Satisfaction. Satisfaction in three domains was measured: satisfaction with specific aspects of the job or educational program, overall satisfaction with job and salary, and satisfaction with workload. In the section regarding job satisfaction, participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with support from others affecting their job or educational program. For example, faculty rated support from colleagues, the accessibility of their chair and/or administration, the availability of resources, feedback on their performance, flexibility to choose aspects of their job, and mentoring opportunities. Non-faculty professionals rated satisfaction with support from colleagues, accessibility of their supervisor, feedback on their performance, availability of resources, opportunities for professional development, and opportunities for other professional activities such as mentoring and teaching. Students rated their satisfaction with flexibility to choose aspects of their education, support from their mentor, support from other faculty, support from peers, and feedback on their performance. General satisfaction was measured with two items related to participants’ overall position: salary and their job (or program) in general. All items were rated on a four-point scale (Very Satisfied, Somewhat Satisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied).

Workload satisfaction was measured via items asking participants to rate their satisfaction with the amount of time spend on various areas of their workload. Faculty were asked to rate satisfaction with time spent doing service, research/scholarship, mentoring/advising students, and teaching. Non-faculty professionals rated satisfaction with time spent doing clinical practice, research/scholarship, mentoring students/supervising interns, and teaching. Students rated their satisfaction with time spent working on classes, research/scholarship, externships/internships, and teaching/TAing. All items were rated on the same four-point scale described above.

Work-Family Issues. All participants were asked to rate their satisfaction in three areas: balancing family and social obligations with work or school, adequate maternity/paternity leave, and employer support for family and social obligations. These items were rated on the same four-point scale described above.

Workload. Participants were asked to report what percent of their time was devoted to a range of activities, with the instruction that the total percentage across all activities add up to 100%. Faculty reported the percent of time spent teaching, supervising students,
performing service, conducting research, writing, consulting or providing expert testimony, and clinical practice. Non-faculty professionals reported the percent of time engaged in teaching, supervising students or interns, performing service, conducting research, writing, consulting or providing expert testimony, and clinical practice, and administrative work. Students were asked to report the percentage of time spent teaching/TAing, working on coursework, externships or internships, conducting research, writing, outside paid work, and receiving supervision. All versions of the survey also included a field where other activities not represented by the options listed could be entered.

**Leadership.** All participants were asked to indicate whether they (a) currently held a leadership position such department chair or AP-LS leadership roles, and (b) whether they had ever held such a position. We collapsed these items into a single index of whether the participants had ever held a leadership position.

**Productivity.** Participants were asked to indicate the number of publications and presentations they had authored in the past year, and how many of these they first authored. The survey solicited this information regarding a range of formats, including peer reviewed articles, chapters, paper presentations, and poster presentations.

**Climate.** All participants were asked to rate the number of times they had experienced any of the following events: questions or disparaging remarks about their qualifications; inappropriate references to their personal life; inappropriate references to their age; inappropriate references to their looks/demeanor; overbearing, intimidating, or offensive verbal behavior; unusually disruptive or inappropriate behavior in their classroom; negative comments about their spouse or partner; unwanted romantic or sexual attention; physical intimidation; physical or sexual harassment; asked to take on additional or ad hoc responsibilities without financial compensation; excluded from key processes; discouraged from participation at meetings by faculty or other students or administrators; and asked to do something they felt was stereotypical of their gender. These were rated on a four-point scale: Never, 1-2 times, 3-4 times, and 5 or more times. Because of the infrequency of these behaviors occurring, we recoded these into occurred or never occurred.

**Participants**

In sum, 787 members accessed the survey. After removing respondents who accessed the survey but did not complete more than the Demographic section, the final sample size was 738. By version, they were: 160 faculty, 194 non-faculty professionals, and 384 students. The percentage in each version who were women was 56.3%, 54.6%, and 73.3%, respectively. Given the large proportion of women in the student section, it appears that we were able to recruit an adequate number of men to complete the survey. Most participants reported their ethnicity as Caucasian (84.6% to 89.2% for each version).

Faculty respondents were largely Assistant Professors (45.6%), with 22.5% being Associate and 22.5% being Professors. Non-faculty professionals reported a range of positions, with the largest groups being clinicians in private practice (35.6%) and clinicians in government agencies (32.5%). Other positions for non-faculty included: clinicians in private organizations (8.2%), researchers in private organizations (7.2%), and researchers in government agencies (3.6%). The majority (85.7%) of student respondents were graduate students.
Across all participants, most reported not having children. Specifically, 65.5% of non-faculty, 55.0% of faculty, and 83.6% of students reported not having children. There were no differences in having children by participants’ gender.

Results

To reduce the number of comparisons, where possible, we combined the items in individual sections by computing mean scores: this was done only when there was a significant correlation among all the items in a given section. For items tapping satisfaction, we converted these into numeric scores where 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 4 = Very Satisfied. We then used t-tests to compare men and women. Where appropriate, we used chi-square analyses to compare men and women for categorical (e.g., yes or no) items.

Satisfaction

Job satisfaction. For both faculty and students, the items assessing specific types of satisfaction were significantly correlated, so we computed mean scores across these items for each participant. For non-faculty, we examined the individual items as they were not all significantly correlated. Overall, faculty members reported that they were just above “Somewhat Satisfied”, with a mean score of 3.2 (SD = 0.58; 3 = “Somewhat Satisfied”). Male and female faculty reported similar levels of satisfaction with their jobs, with mean scores of 3.29 (SD = 0.63) and 3.13 (SD = 0.54), respectively (t(156)= 1.69, p = .09). Students reported similar levels of satisfaction as faculty, with an overall mean of 3.22 (SD = 0.55). Again there were no gender differences, with mean satisfaction for male students being 3.23 (SD = 0.63) and female students’ mean score being 3.21 (SD = 0.51; t(378)= 0.25, p = .80).

Because the job satisfaction items were not significantly correlated for non-faculty, we compared the items individually and applied a Bonferroni correction to reduce the likelihood of Type I error. There were no significant differences for job satisfaction for male and female non-faculty. The item with the lowest overall satisfaction was availability of

Figure 1. Overall satisfaction with job or program
resources, with mean items of $M = 2.84$ ($SD = 0.88$) for men and $M = 2.71$ ($SD = 1.0$) for women. The area where non-faculty were most satisfied was support from colleagues, where men’s mean rating was 3.36 ($SD = 0.75$) and women’s was 3.37 ($SD = 0.74$).

**Overall satisfaction.** Only male and female non-faculty differed in their satisfaction with their salary, with men being “Somewhat Satisfied” ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.86$) and women being less satisfied ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 0.97$; $t(184) = 2.53$, $p = .012$). Faculty in general reported being similarly less than “Somewhat Satisfied” ($M = 2.91$, $SD = 0.91$ for men and $M = 2.79$, $SD = 0.85$ for women). Students reported being even less satisfied with their stipends ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 0.90$ for men and $M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.99$ for women).

Gender differences in overall job satisfaction were present for faculty, $t(151) = 2.12$, $p = .036$, but not for non-faculty or students. As shown in Figure 1, female faculty were less satisfied than men.

**Workload satisfaction.** There were no gender differences in workload satisfaction for any group. In general, most respondents reported being “Somewhat Satisfied” with their workload. We computed mean scores across all workload satisfaction items for faculty and students as they were significantly correlated. Male and female faculty reported mean levels of satisfaction with their workload of 3.24 ($SD = 0.69$) and 3.05 ($SD = 0.57$; $t(155) = 1.91$, $p = .06$) respectively. Male and female students also reported similar levels of satisfaction with their workload ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 0.67$ and $M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.60$) respectively; $t(355) = -0.29$, $p = .72$.

The workload satisfaction items were not significantly correlated for non-faculty, so we examined them separately. Again, there were no gender differences in respondents’ satisfaction with their workload. The highest ratings were for the amount of time spent on

**Figure 2. Satisfaction with balancing work and family.**
clinical practice, where respondents were “Somewhat Satisfied” ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.86$ and $M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.78$, respectively for men and women; $t(152) = 1.34$, $p = .18$). Non-faculty professionals’ lowest satisfaction was for the amount of time spent on research ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 0.91$ and $M = 2.68$, $SD = 0.78$, respectively for men and women; $t(108) = 0.86$, $p = .39$).

**Work-Family Issues**

We examined the three items regarding work-family issues separately as they were not significantly correlated. In response to the item asking respondents’ satisfaction with balancing family and social obligations with work responsibilities, gender differences emerged only for faculty. As shown in Figure 2, men reported higher levels of satisfaction than women ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.82$ and $M = 2.61$, $SD = 0.95$, respectively for men and women; $t(153) = 3.25$, $p < .001$). Male and female non-faculty reported similar levels of satisfaction ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.87$ and $M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.85$, respectively), as did male and female students ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 0.90$ and $M = 2.83$, $SD = 0.82$, respectively).

With the exception of students, both male and female respondents reported similar levels of satisfaction (i.e., “Somewhat Satisfied”) with support for family and social obligations. Male and female faculty reported mean satisfaction of 3.18 ($SD = 0.90$) and 3.05 ($SD = 0.71$). This was similar to the rates of satisfaction reported by non-faculty ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 0.88$ for men and $M = 3.25$, $SD = 0.85$ for women). On the other hand, there were gender differences in satisfaction for this type of support for students: male students reported being more satisfied than female students ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 0.81$ and $M = 2.89$, $SD = 0.83$, respectively for men and women; $t(327) = 3.39$, $p < .001$).

When asked about having adequate maternity or paternity leave, most respondents indicated that this did not apply to them. Specifically, 53% of faculty, 64.9% of non-faculty, and 78.9% of students selected “Not Applicable” for this item.

*Figure 3. Percent ever holding a leadership position.*
Leadership

There were significant gender differences in ever having held a leadership position for faculty and for students. Among all respondents, approximately half (49.4% of men and 44.4% of women) report having ever held a leadership position. As shown in Figure 3, examining the settings separately, male faculty were more likely than female faculty to have ever held a leadership position: 82% versus 55.3%, $X^2(1) = 11.3, p < .001$.

We examined this finding more closely by rank for faculty, and found that the discrepancy was more pronounced for junior ranks. As shown in Figure 4, 60.9% of male Assistant Professors and 43.2% of female Assistant Professors had ever held a leadership position; the figures for male and female Associate Professors were 86.7% and 63.2%, respectively. Most Professors reported having held a leadership position (100% of men and 88.2% of women), but the cell sizes for this rank were small ($n = 19$ and $n = 17$). There were no significant differences in the percent of male and female non-faculty who had ever held leadership positions (52.5% and 45.4%, respectively). Female students were more likely than male students to have ever held a leadership position (40.4% versus 26.5%; $X^2(1) = 5.87, p = .015$).

Publications and funding

We found no gender differences in respondents' levels of productivity or rate of securing internal or external funding. On average, faculty reported having $3.69 (SD = 3.32)$ publications of any type in the past year, with $M = 2.47 (SD = 2.90)$ of these being first authored. Non-faculty professionals reported an average of 0.89 publications, with a wide range of values being reported (range = 1 to 15, $SD = 2.04$). Students reported a mean of 1.63 publications ($SD = 7.63$) and 1.99 ($SD = 2.35$) conference presentations (papers and posters). In terms of funding, 38.9% of faculty reported receiving extramural funding, and 44.6% reported receiving intramural funding, with no gender differences in the proportion of faculty receiving either type of funding. Most non-faculty and students
reported not receiving funding; for example only 11 individual non-faculty reported receiving funding.

Climate
There were no significant gender differences in having experienced any of the negative events assessed in the climate section. However, there were differences for both faculty and non-faculty in the perception of equal opportunities for men and women. In response to the question “Overall, do you think that female colleagues in your community have the same opportunities as men?” female faculty and non-faculty were less likely to respond “yes” than their male counterparts. As shown in Figure 5, 90.3% of male faculty agreed that women have the same opportunities as men, but only 71.8% of female faculty did, \( X^2(1) = 7.6, p = .007 \). Similarly, 81.3% of male non-faculty responded “yes” to this statement, whereas 55.8% of female non-faculty did, \( X^2(1) = 12.82, p < .001 \). The rate of students responding “yes” to this statement was 89.7% for both men and women.

Conclusions
This survey shed light on some general concerns of AP-LS members that mirror issues that have been found in other professions. Many of the discrepancies we found were related to women in academia. Specifically, female faculty members were less satisfied with their salary and reported lower overall job satisfaction than did their male counterparts. Further, despite the large number of women currently serving in leadership positions in AP-LS, female faculty who responded to the survey were less likely to have ever held a leadership position than their male colleagues. This difference was even more pronounced at junior ranks. It is important to not interpret this as women “catching

Figure 5. Percent agreeing that female colleagues have the same opportunities as men.
up” with men in terms of leadership positions later in their careers—women are less likely to receive tenure than men, and few members of AP-LS who hold the rank of Professor are women. It is more likely that women drop off the tenure track (perhaps due to lower satisfaction), and the ones who do remain hold leadership positions. The reasons why female faculty are engaged in fewer leadership activities are unclear. Recent research in academic settings suggests that women are more likely to provide service to professional organizations, but less likely to hold leadership positions within their home institutions or in research centers, and that leadership positions are strongly related to social relationships (Parker & Welch, 2011). Thus, many women may be active in leadership positions within AP-LS, but more men are engaging in leadership because this leadership encompasses both the university setting as well as professional organizations.

The area of work/life balance was of concern to members across settings and ranks. For example, female faculty reported lower satisfaction with balancing work and family, and female students reported lower satisfaction with support for family and social obligations. This is a common concern that has a strong effect on professional outcomes; Rosser (2004) found that perceptions of work/life balance was associated with job satisfaction, and low levels of perceived balance and satisfaction predicted intention to leave the job. Finding ways to increase work/life balance, then, may help plug the leaky pipeline by preventing women from leaving academic and other positions.

Interestingly, the majority of respondents in our survey reported that maternity and paternity leave policies do not apply to them, even though a significant proportion of faculty and non-faculty reported having at least one child. It is possible that men and women don’t believe these policies apply to them until they are actively planning to have a child. However, it is important to consider these issues early, as they have a direct effect on career outcomes. For example, Mason and Goulden (2004) found that men who have a child within 5 years of receiving their doctorate degree were 38% more likely than similarly situated women to earn tenure. Tenured women are much less likely than men to have children (44% versus 70%)—women with children in academia are likely to serve in less stable, adjunct and part-time positions. Much of this may be due to maternity leave policies, as programs highlighting the availability of leave have increased the rate of rate of both male and female faculty having children (Mason & Goulden, 2004). This issue may even more complicated for those in private practice, as the logistics of working out time off may be done solely by the individual practitioner.

What does this mean for AP-LS? The organization can offer support in these areas. The Professional Development of Women Committee has been active since 2008, and has offered programming at each conference since then highlighting many of the issues addressed in the survey. For example, the committee has held workshops on leadership, work-life balance, and strategic career planning. Future sessions could focus on issues such as the need to identify family leave policies and how to navigate these. Another possibility is linking female members with mentors who are senior women in the field. We encourage senior women to become involved in efforts by the Mentorship Committee to ensure that junior women have access to mentoring by women who can help them negotiate challenges. Finally, we suggest that AP-LS continue to support women in leadership positions. The organization has had recent successes in this area with women being Past President and the new editor of Law and Human Behavior—these are important steps towards increasing the impact of women in AP-LS.
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Competing for (and hopefully winning!) an Academic Position

This is my third and final presidential column. At the close of the Division 41 Business Meeting at the APA Convention, I will pass the leadership torch to Bill Foote and then assume the role of Past President. In this capacity I will chair the Nominations and Awards Committee, but, sadly, I will have no column-writing privileges. I will miss this writing these columns, surely more than you will miss reading them. Let’s look forward to Dr. Foote’s able leadership and words of wisdom.

My first two columns contained my unabashed thoughts about faculty development. In keeping with this theme, I have devoted this column to marketing oneself with the goal of becoming a faculty member. My heart goes out to the junior scholars who are striving to obtain coveted tenure-earning faculty positions so that they can pursue their teaching and research in Psychology and Law. The prospect of finding a position in the context of a weak economy, the tendency of universities to fill vacancies with contract faculty, and the increasing competition for the few available positions is daunting indeed. From the perspective of a hiring committee chair, the quality of the applicant pools is outstanding! But for graduate students who wish to realize their academic dreams, the future is . . . well . . . let’s just say you won’t need your Ray-Bans to block out the glare.

Nevertheless, there are things that graduate students and other junior faculty members can do to increase their competitiveness for tenure-stream faculty positions. I have compiled some thoughts and suggestions toward this end. Not every suggestion will work for every candidate – and one need not take every suggestion. But one would do well to heed the general principle of differentiation: one must differentiate oneself from other candidates (in positive ways!).
Suggestion 1: Publish! Peer-reviewed publications continue to be a deciding factor, for they are the currency of our business. Universities at various levels require at least some degree of independent scholarship. Research universities have high expectations for scholarship. It is widely believed that future ability to publish is best predicted by past ability to publish. So, don’t make excuses. Remain engaged in research with the goal of publishing. Don’t fret over whether you are first-, second-, or third-author. Fret if you do not have publications!

Suggestion 2: Teach! Teaching experience looks favorable. Search committees must predict whether candidates will be successful in the classroom. What predicts success in the classroom better than teaching one or more classes successfully? Inquire about teaching opportunities in your department, even if you do not have to teach for your assistantship. If such teaching opportunities are not available in your department, inquire about teaching a course as a part-time faculty member at a local community college. In addition, you will want to be able to say more than “I taught a course.” “I taught a course” could mean that you did a bang-on job, winning the hearts and minds of your students, or that you barely survived a no-confidence vote by your students, or anything in between. Be prepared to provide evidence of your effectiveness. Keep summaries of student evaluations, both the quantitative and qualitative data. Have a faculty member observe your teaching and provide a written evaluation. Provide evidence of your effectiveness together with your course syllabus in your job application.

Suggestion 3: Cast a wide net! If you limit yourself geographically (e.g., a 100-mile radius of your extended family, 40 mile radius of your partner’s employer, 10 miles from Starbucks), you are in for a very rough ride. Be prepared to go where the jobs are. Be open-minded about the quality of life anywhere there is a university. When I first applied for academic jobs back in 1886 or 1986, I must have applied to 50 or 60 universities, from California to the New York Island, from the red wood forest, to the gulf stream waters, and Canada. From that batch of applications, I still haven’t heard from about 15 search committees. I haven’t wanted to bother them, but I’m thinking that it’s time to inquire about my status. If living in a certain region is essential for you, be prepared to leave academia. And remember, your first job need not be your last job. After a couple of years of successful service at one university, you can market yourself as a more experienced faculty member and likely move to another. Also cast a wide net with respect to the type of institutions to which you apply. Universities and colleges come in all shapes and sizes, from community colleges to flagship, research institutions. Consider the wide variety of options, and be sure to tailor your application to the type of institution to which you apply.

Suggestion 4: Be a team player! Although search committees will not try to sell their departments on the basis of the exciting service opportunities they provide, department service is essential and an important component of university citizenship. We need people who will pull their weight and not make work for the rest of us. Demonstrate your willingness and ability to be a team player by taking on a
Suggestion 5: Develop online teaching skills – or better – teach a course online. Set aside any preconceived notions about online teaching, and especially set aside the prejudicial opinions of faculty members who have not tried it and know little about it. Many universities are looking to offer more courses online. Very few junior faculty members have experience with online teaching. One can easily distinguish oneself by cultivating skills and demonstrating enthusiasm for online teaching. I teach online and find it more effective and rewarding than face-to-face teaching.

Suggestion 6: Nail the application landing! There is no need to convince those who have studied social psychology that first impressions are important. First impressions determine whether your application gets a second look, never mind the short list. Your application letter needs to be efficient and specific to the department. It needs to be very well-written. It needs to express enthusiasm and vision. Your CV needs to be in a conventional, easy-to-understand format with your most impressive research and teaching accomplishments on the first page. Do not let your CV speak for itself. Highlight your most impressive accomplishments in your cover letter. This is not the time for modesty!

Suggestion 7: Persevere! I have colleagues who took 5-10 years to earn their first tenure track position. They worked through post-docs and visiting positions before being hired as Assistant Professor. Looking at them now, you wouldn’t know that they had to work through this period before achieving their positions. Throughout their visits, they learned new techniques, established new collaborations, lived in new places, and carried on their scholarship and teaching. They are not bitter, and they valued their faculty positions all the more for the difficulty of landing the job.

In sum, marketing yourself is a critical requirement for winning an academic position. Indeed, the same marketing skills will become useful in later points in your career, such as applying for promotion, tenure, and administrative position, or another position. To those who are searching, I wish all of you success and fulfillment!
The Internet is a centerpiece of modern life—nearly everyone has access to it and most adults use it regularly, some almost constantly. The proliferation of computers and “smart” hand-held mobile devices has resulted in many Americans having round-the-clock access to the vast informational resources of the Internet. According to a survey conducted in early 2012 by the Pew Research Center, 80% of American adults use the internet (including over 88% of those aged 49 and younger), 82% of Internet users do so every day, and 92% of users report obtaining information via a search engine such as Google.

Of course, some of those using the Internet are jurors, and a problem arises when they use it to gain information about a trial they are deciding. Through voir dire and other mechanisms, the courts have long sought to ensure that juries reach their decisions based solely on the evidence presented at trial as opposed to what they learn through some outside source such as the newspaper or television. In this sense, juror Internet use is not a new problem—the Internet is just one more medium by which jurors can be exposed to “extralegal” information. And theory suggests there is reason for concern about this new medium. Building on the well-established Story model of juror decision making, I argue in the new Director's Cut model that jurors have a natural and deep-seated urge to know the whole story behind a trial (Devine, 2012). In short, when jurors have easy access to information that is perceived to be relevant and helps them to establish a narrative framework for trial-related events, they will desire to use it.

The courts have not been oblivious to the dangers of juror Internet use. Model instructions prohibiting juror use of the Internet have been offered by professional organizations such as the American College of Trial Lawyers (ACTL) and the United States Judicial Conference Committee on Court Administration and Case Management (CACM). Two-thirds of the states (Lacy, 2011) have adopted pattern instructions that tell jurors to refrain from seeking case-related information over the Internet and to inform the judge if they happen to come across such information accidentally—or learn of other jurors' using such information. A survey of all active and senior federal district court judges by the Federal Judicial Center in late 2011 produced 508 respondents, of whom 60% reported using the CACM model instructions and only 6% said that they had not specifically addressed jurors’ use of social media (St. Eve & Zuckerman, 2012). Thus, it would seem that nearly all jurors are told in some fashion to refrain from seeking or using trial-related information via the Internet—but do they comply?

There is a small but growing scholarly literature on the problems associated with juror Internet use as well as potential remedies for it (e.g., Artigliere, 2011; Brickman, Blackman, Futterman, & Dinnerstein, 2008). Unfortunately, there is almost no empirical research to inform our understanding of the frequency and impact
of internet-based information-seeking behavior (IBISB) by jurors. In reviewing the literature for a new book on jury decision making (Devine, 2012), I found not a single published, peer-reviewed study on juror Internet use or its impact.

In the absence of research, we are left to speculate about answers to a series of important questions: (1) What proportion of jurors engage in IBISB in a typical trial? (2) How often are different kinds of trial-related information accessed by jurors using the Internet? (3) How likely is trial-related information obtained via the Internet to be shared during deliberation? (4) When shared, how much impact does such information typically have on the jury’s verdict? (5) Which legal instructions are most effective in deterring jurors from IBISB?

Given the obvious potential impact of juror IBISB, one thing is clear—we need data. The ideal study would involve surveying or interviewing representative samples of real jurors about their IBISB in the wake of an actual jury trial. This research would be useful for estimating the frequency of juror IBISB and the impact of such information when shared during deliberation. As judges are often reluctant to allow researchers to ask jurors about legally sensitive questions, and jurors may be influenced by social desirability in responding, studies of IBISB by actual jurors should allow for anonymous responses that can be grouped by jury but disconnected from the real-life trial that produced them. Another way to examine juror IBISB would involve mock juries. Stimulus materials from an actual (perhaps ongoing) trial would be used and the nature and frequency of the IBISB of study participants assessed in the presence or absence of instructions regarding its appropriateness. Such research would provide an upper-bound estimate of the frequency of IBISB by jurors (in that university students will be more likely than the typical juror to use the Internet), and assess the effectiveness of different ways of instructing jurors to refrain from IBISB.

To sum up, juror use of the Internet is increasingly possible and likely, but we know little about how frequently it occurs or what impact it has. The underlying questions are empirical, and it is time for researchers to respond.
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After several initial considerations of the question (Savitsky & Karras, 1984; Grisso, Miller & Sales, 1987; Grisso & Schwartz, 2000), the most recent decade produced a significant number of studies of juveniles’ competence-related abilities, finding them deficient when compared to their adult counterparts. The largest scale study to date on this topic was the MacArthur Foundation’s Juvenile Competence Study (Grisso et al., 2003). The study examined 927 adolescents (age 12-17) living in either juvenile justice facilities or the community and 466 young adults (age 18-24) who resided in either jails or the community. It found that juveniles below age 15, on average, performed worse on standard measures of competence to stand trial, with regard to understanding and reasoning. Sixteen to seventeen year olds performed similarly to young adults. Intellectual disability and psychosocial immaturity were also found to put youth at greater risk of facing harsher punishments at younger ages, that the issue of competence to stand trial was raised in juvenile matters with any frequency. Since that time, the field of law and psychology has made significant contributions to both our understanding of the capacities of juveniles in relation to competence, as well as the development of juvenile competence to stand trial (JCST) assessment tools.

After several initial considerations of the question (Savitsky & Karras, 1984; Grisso, Miller & Sales, 1987; Grisso & Schwartz, 2000), the most recent decade produced a significant number of studies of juveniles’ competence-related abilities, finding them deficient when compared to their adult counterparts. The largest scale study to date on this topic was the MacArthur Foundation’s Juvenile Competence Study (Grisso et al., 2003). The study examined 927 adolescents (age 12-17) living in either juvenile justice facilities or the community and 466 young adults (age 18-24) who resided in either jails or the community. It found that juveniles below age 15, on average, performed worse on standard measures of competence to stand trial, with regard to understanding and reasoning. Sixteen to seventeen year olds performed similarly to young adults. Intellectual disability and psychosocial immaturity were also found to put youth at greater risk for decisional incapacities. Studies since that time have demonstrated results consistent with these findings (e.g., Viljoen, Odgers, Grisso, & Tillbrook, 2007; Viljoen & Roesch, 2005) and have found that judges now take age and psychosocial immaturity into account in their competence determinations (Mayer Cox, Goldstein, Dolores, Zelechoski & Messenheimer, 2012). These studies indicated that the evaluation of juveniles’ competence to stand trial required special procedures that took developmental variables into account (Heilbrun, Hawk, & Tate, 1996; Ryba, Cooper, & Zapf, 2003), but it was not until 2005 that a structured juvenile-specific interview was developed (Grisso, 2005).

Current and Emerging Issues

Despite these advances in empirical research and clinical practice, states have lagged in addressing JCST legislatively. Moreover, while legislative issues are beginning to be addressed, they may be inhibited by our failure to have dealt with a key issue in this area— the need for juvenile remediation services.
Some states created legislation that addressed the unique needs of juveniles as early as the mid-1990s (Redding & Frost, 2001). It was not until approximately the last five years, however, that there has been an increase in the number of states attending to this issue. Courts and evaluators desire more guidance regarding the application of this concept in delinquency proceedings. In response to this need, the National Youth Screening and Assessment Project (NYSAP), an affiliate of the MacArthur Foundation Models for Change initiative, began in 2008 to provide technical assistance to states in the process of developing juvenile competence legislation. Since the beginning of this technical assistance effort, at least five states have developed juvenile competence legislation, with at least eight more in the process of developing and implementing juvenile competence statutes or policy.

To further assist states in their legislative efforts, NYSAP recently released a free resource for states entitled Developing Statutes for Competence to Stand Trial in Juvenile Proceedings: A Guide for Lawmakers (Larson & Grisso, 2012). The guide is divided into four modules, each outlining an essential content area that must be considered to create JCST legislation. The four modules are: (1) Definitions of Competence to Stand Trial; (2) Procedural Issues; (3) Competence Evaluations by Mental Health Examiners; and (4) Remediaion and Dispositional Issues. Through these four modules, the guide reviews sixteen key issues in JCST legislation and evaluates potential solutions to each question.

With this recent legislative movement, we must look ahead to the conclusion of the competency process. States are now reaching the point where they have implemented new juvenile competence legislation and policy, only to find that services are largely unavailable to remediate juvenile competence. Research in this area would be of great benefit in moving along the legislative process in many states, where contention often focuses on remediation services and sometimes stalls the process before it can achieve momentum.

Some models for remediation of juveniles’ incompetence do exist (Warren et al., 2009), and others have explored the potential for competence remediation on a theoretical level (Viljoen & Grisso, 2007), but no evidence-based practice has been established. If services for juveniles do not exist, we risk states reverting to refusing to hold JCST hearings or assess JCST, as players within the legal system may believe if a juvenile is found incompetent there is “nothing we can do anyway.” If evidence-based services are not developed to address juvenile remediation, we may risk back-sliding to the pre-1990s status of juvenile’s due process rights in this area. If attorneys do not believe their clients will truly be restored, especially when the issue is related to developmental immaturity (Viljoen, McLachlan, Wingrove, & Penner, 2010), they may not raise the issue. Simply applying adult procedures and services is at best inadequate and, at worst, potentially harmful. However, perhaps most concerning is the situation in which inadequate juvenile remediation services are put into place. In such situations, juveniles could be held for competence remediation, lengthening the time to resolution of their charges, only to be provided services that do not truly remediate their incompetence. Further, if ineffective services are provided, youth risk being returned to the court as competent when they are not truly capable. We must look forward and address these practical considerations regarding the current lack of juvenile-specific competence remediation services, not only to assist states in avoiding a potential stumbling block in their legislative efforts, but to ensure that youth’s due process rights are fairly and adequately addressed.
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False confessions are known to be one of the main contributing factors to wrongful convictions. Among proven false confessions, mental illness stands out as a dispositional factor that increases the risk, particularly when psychologically manipulative police interrogation techniques are used. In this issue’s Actual Innocence Research column, our guest editor, Jennifer Cermak, describes a wrongful conviction case in which a person with mental health problems was induced by police to provide false self-incriminatory statements to a murder. Though the precise prevalence of false confessions is unknown (and unknowable), wrongful conviction cases like William Kelly’s described here, may be preventable with increased training and knowledge of law enforcement.

The guest editor, Jennifer Cermak, earned her Bachelor’s degree in Psychology from the University of Nebraska at Omaha and is currently completing her Master’s degree in Forensic Psychology at Marymount University in Arlington, Virginia. She is also a research assistant at the Federal Bureau of Prisons and a research intern at the Vera Institute of Justice. Jennifer’s research interests include wrongful conviction and criminal justice policy reform in relation to persons with mental illness. Jennifer gained a working knowledge of issues centering on law enforcement and persons with mental illness as a state probation officer for the Nebraska SupremeCourt, and as a member of the Heartland Crisis Intervention Team.
Suspects with Mental Illness and False Confessions during Interrogation

Jennifer N. Cermak
Marymount University

An estimated two million persons with mental illness were booked into jails nationwide in 2007 (Steadman, Osher, Clark Robbins, Case, & Samuels, 2009). Though not surprising, such a number has significant implications for the vulnerability of persons with mental illness who come into contact with the law. Those who are suspected of having committed a crime are at an increased risk for falsely confessing in the face of highly suggestible, but widely used, interrogation tactics. To illustrate this issue, the case of William Kelly is presented. I then provide a brief overview of research into certain interrogation tactics and why these tactics make suspects with mental illness particularly susceptible to false confessions. In conclusion, I briefly touch on some potential research approaches in addressing this issue.

Case Overview¹

In Pennsylvania, February 1990, two men were training their hunting dogs when they discovered the body of a young woman buried in a landfill. Investigators later determined that the victim had been sexually assaulted and then bludgeoned to death. The victim was identified as a woman who had been reported missing. She had been seen last at a local bar with a man resembling the description of William Kelly. Investigators questioned and later arrested Kelly, who admitted to the murder. During questioning, he told investigators that the victim attempted to steal money from him at the bar and that he killed her later that night with either a wooden board or a tree limb—he could not remember which—when she tried to run away. Initially, Kelly denied that he had sexual intercourse with the victim. He then recanted and stated that they did have intercourse, but that he did not ejaculate. Serological testing of the seminal fluid recovered from the victim's body excluded Kelly, but prosecutors nevertheless believed that he was indeed the perpetrator and had not ejaculated. It is important to note that during the time of this case, serology testing was not synonymous with DNA testing. Serology tests only identified the blood type of the person who deposited the semen. In present day, however, serology tests can be used for the extraction of DNA from bodily fluids.

Following his confession, Kelly was determined to have a mental illness, and prosecutors became uncertain whether they would be able to prove intent to commit murder. Kelly was consequently offered a plea bargain, which he accepted after learning his confession would be admitted as evidence at trial. He pled guilty to murder in the third degree and was sentenced to serve 10 to 20 years in prison.

¹Information about the case was gathered from the Innocence Project.
Two years later, another man by the name of Joseph Miller was being investigated for similar murders in the area. Investigators were led to the same landfill, where the skeletal remains of two women were also found. Miller’s confessions to these murders caused Kelly’s case to be re-opened, ultimately revealing that the seminal fluid on the young woman’s body belonged to Miller. Investigators re-interviewed Kelly and became confused when he recanted his confession, but still claimed to have knowledge of the event. Kelly was subsequently interviewed by a forensic psychologist, who determined that he suffered from bipolar disorder and alcohol dependence with a history of blackouts. The psychologist indicated that his mental illness made him particularly susceptible to suggestion during the original police interview and that he may not have been able to “distinguish what he did in reality from what the police believed he might have done” (Innocence Project, n.d.). It was concluded that his mental illness made him susceptible to believing he had committed the murder during a blackout, incorporating information given to him by investigators into his memory to create a storyline about what could have happened.

With such compelling evidence of innocence, Kelly’s conviction was vacated three years to the day the young woman went missing. He wrongly served two and a half years in prison.

**Interrogation Tactics**

The Inbau-Reid technique is the most widely used method of interrogation in the United States (Leo, 2004; Redlich, 2004). It is designed to manipulate suspects’ emotions and break down their resistance to confessing by both minimizing and maximizing their culpability. Interrogators minimize culpability through the use of tactics such as gaining rapport by sympathizing with suspects and developing likely scenarios which serve to morally excuse or justify their behavior. Maximization tactics, such as presenting false evidence to increase anxiety and suggesting the possibility of harsh punishment, are used at the same time. The combination of these tactics forces suspects to choose between confessing to a crime in a manner that suggests little-to-no or harsher moral condemnation (Leo, 2004). Simply put, such tactics persuade suspects to think that it is in their best interest to confess. These techniques are highly suggestible especially for suspects with mental illness.

**Vulnerability of Suspects with Mental Illness**

The William Kelly case is an excellent example of the vulnerability of suspects with mental illness to confess to crimes not committed. Before discussing the susceptibility of these suspects to falsely confess during interrogation, it is important to understand why they are at risk. Persons with mental illness can demonstrate a variety of behavioral and cognitive deficits. Though dependent on the diagnosis and its implications for executive functioning, possible symptoms may include impulsivity and lack of self-control, mood disturbances, disorganized thought patterns and distorted perceptions, or feelings of hopelessness. In addition, personalities may be characterized by compliance or submissiveness, the need for attention, or emotional instability in interactions with others (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). These are only a few of the symptoms and personality characteristics that can be seen in persons with mental illness who are at risk for false confessions in response to the pressures of interrogation.

Studies have linked disordered personality and mental illness with risk for false confessions during interrogation (Gudjonsson, Sigurdsson, Bragason, Einarsson, & Valdimarsdottir, 2004; Redlich, Summers, & Hoover, 2010). Suspects with mental illness may be more likely to provide self-incriminating information, because their symptoms and personality characteristics interfere with their attention, judgment, and decision-making abilities (Redlich, 2004). These suspects often attribute their false confessions to feeling pressured by police, wanting the interrogation to end and believing they can go home afterwards, or initially thinking they actually committed the crime (Gudjonsson et al., 2004; Redlich et al., 2010).
In research pertaining to false confessions among non-mentally ill persons, the perceived strength of evidence is shown to be an important factor in producing admissions of guilt. When false evidence is perceived to be compelling, it strengthens the effects of both external (e.g., interrogation tactics) and internal pressures (e.g., feelings of guilt, need for compliance) to confess (Gudjonsson et al., 2004). This concept can also be applied to false confessions among suspects with mental illness. As Redlich (2004) points out, social skill deficits stemming from lack of assertiveness make it difficult for these suspects to give corrective feedback and deny commission of the crime when presented with evidence police do not actually possess. Such a combination of interrogation and mental illness factors can be connected to the vulnerability of suspects in believing they are responsible for a crime they did not commit.

**Research Ideas**

In an effort to reduce the risk for false confessions, Redlich (2004) suggests that the objectives of crisis intervention training for police could also be incorporated into interrogation training. The focus of crisis intervention training is to give police knowledge of and skills to work with persons with mental illness in their everyday duties. This knowledge could be applied to raise awareness of interrogation issues related to suspects who have mental health problems (Redlich, 2004); and also to serve as a catalyst for research into whether the integration of crisis intervention and interrogation training would reduce the use of coercive interrogation tactics with suspects who are mentally ill. To do this, researchers could develop an integrated interrogation training curriculum and conduct mock interrogation studies. Researchers could first conduct a comparison study of the use of coercive tactics by officers with either traditional or integrated interrogation training. A subsequent study investigating differences in the rates of (mock) false confessions among persons with mental illness exposed to officers with either type of training could also be conducted. Researchers might also test the influence of both traditional and integrated interrogation training on the subjective experiences of persons with mental illness during interrogation. For example, participants could be surveyed regarding the degree to which and why they experienced more or less anxiety and pressure to confess to a mock crime. Finally, researchers could select participants based on mental disorder diagnosis and control for co-occurring risk factors (e.g., level of education, comorbid substance use). These findings would lead to a better understanding of one’s propensity to falsely confess given certain disorders and types of interrogation training.

**Conclusion**

The case of William Kelly underscores the vulnerability of mentally ill suspects to highly suggestive interrogation tactics. While certainly not every suspect with mental illness may be at increased risk for false confession, it is important to recognize that they may be more sensitive than suspects without mental illness to the effects of interrogation practices. Not all persons with mental illness present with the same constellation of symptoms and personality characteristics. Thus, not every person with mental illness is equally doomed to falsely confess. However, the understanding that mental illness may be a predisposing factor to false confessions in some cases helps us to address the issue and take steps in the right direction by making new contributions to actual innocence research.
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The meeting was called to order at 8:03 a.m.


II. Introductory
   a. Participants introduced themselves and Cutler reviewed voting responsibilities. Voting member for the current meeting are those people who hold the following positions: President, Past-President, President-Elect, Treasurer, Secretary, Members-at-large, Student Section Chair, and APA Representatives.
   b. Cutler requested declarations of conflicts of interest for agenda items. i. Kovera declared conflict for Law and Human Behavior Editor agenda item.
   c. Gaskey reviewed handouts (updated agendas)

III. Levett moved to approve meeting agenda; Groscup seconded.
    a. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. Levett moved to approve minutes from August, 2011, meeting; Groscup seconded.
    a. Motion passed unanimously.

V. Committee Reports
   a. APA Council (Foote)
      i. Nothing controversial from Council meetings. Available to answer questions about the written report presented to EC.
   b. Conference Advisory Committee (Neuschatz)
      i. Still looking for nominations for conference co-chairs.
      ii. Written report presented to EC summarizing recent activities:
          1. Determining APLS 2012 student travel awards
          2. Working to obtain external funding for student travel awards
          3. Identifying co-chairs for upcoming conferences
          4. Identifying locations for future conferences
   c. Continuing Education (Galin)
      i. Discussed whether to have CE at 2013 conference and timing of application.
      ii. Written report summarizing pre-APLS CE workshops
   d. Corrections
      i. When scheduling APLS meetings please be aware of potentially conflicting conferences that those with
         a Corrections focus might be involved in, e.g., ACJS.
   e. Early Career Professionals (Guy)
      i. Discussed committee name, noting potential limitation of “Early Career Psychologists.”
         1. Levett moved to approve name change to “Early Career Professionals;” Groscup
seconded.
   a. Motion passed unanimously.
   ii. Discussion of effect of requirement of matching funds on applicants' eligibility for ECP grants. Issue returned to Committee with request for formal proposal.
   iii. Discussion of changing application deadline dates to encourage proposals.

f. Fellows Committee (Cutler and Kovera) i. Barry Rosenfeld and Mario Scalora appointed.

g. Students Grants-in-Aid i. Looking to add Committee member with Social/Experimental background; please contact Committee Chair with suggestions

h. Professional Development of Women
   i. Written report presented to EC with results of survey.

i. Teaching, Training, and Careers (Berman)
   i. Request for newsletter column submissions with teaching tips, successful activities, suggestions, syllabi.

j. Law and Human Behavior (Kovera)
   i. Submissions up substantially over same time last year.
   ii. Written report outlining
      1. submission rates
      2. appointment of new Associate Editors (DeMatteo, Douglass, McAuliff) to join current Associate Editor Zapf
      3. Transition from Springer to APA as publisher
      4. Reintroducing student editorial board

k. Newsletter (Huss) i. Highlighted the new format for the newsletter; request for feedback

l. Book Series (Zapf)
   i. Discussed proposal from Oxford Press for distributing APLS books as e-books. Consensus was that if Oxford can arrange such distribution and marketing then APLS might agree, but little interest in the proposal as presented.
   ii. Oxford is moving toward selling books in softcover rather than hardcover.

m. Psychology, Public Policy, and Law (Roesch)
   i. Submissions have increased, and Roesch arranged a page limit increase for upcoming issue.
   ii. Smooth transition progressing toward new editorship under Michael Lamb.

n. Student Section (Kois)
   i. Student Section arranged a successful breakfast at conference (approx. 80 attendees)
   ii. Several conference events geared toward students

o. APA Conference update (Galin)
   i. Looking forward to 2012 APA conference with theme of Expert Witnesses, including special programming
   ii. Hospitality suite is available at conference so please take advantage by stopping by for informal networking or reserving it for events.

p. Social Media Committee (Cutler)
   i. Committee has developed Facebook page, as well as apps for the convention.
   ii. Motion by Levett to change name from Social Network Committee to Social Media Committee. Groscup seconded.
      1. Motion passed unanimously.

q. Nominations and Awards (Griffin)
   i. Committee has developed slate for next elections
      1. President (Zapf, Skeem) and Members-at-Large (Eno Louden; Kalbeitzer)
   ii. Distinguished Award to Grisso.

r. Levett moved to accept reports, Groscup seconded. i. Motion passed unanimously.
VI. Strategic Planning Update (Cutler)
   a. Committee is moving forward
   b. Terms of Reference project (reformalizing Committee charges)
      i. Reviewed committee terms, discussion as to adding procedural aspects
      ii. Discussed aligning committee charges with goals as developed in Mission Statement
      iii. Vision/Mission/Values Statement—continue work and solicit feedback; Cutler will bring something to EC by August 2012

VII. Proposed Resolution on Interrogations of Criminal Suspects (Otto)
   a. Discussion of APA’s proposed changes.
   b. EC requested more information about APA’s proposed changes.
   c. Vote on proposed changes was postponed until after conference, pending more information as to who proposed changes and why.

VIII. Membership Committee (Foote)
   a. Foote presented update as to ECP membership survey/data issues.
   b. Discussion of action items
      i. #1: Dues reduction over 7 years rather than just 3
         1. Foote moved action item #1; Groscup seconded.
         2. Motion passed.
      ii. #2: $10,000 travel fund for ECP’s to attend Annual meeting. 1. Foote withdrew item after discussion
      iii. #3: authorization from EC to initiate general membership survey to determine services APLS can offer that would add value to APLS membership. 1. Committee will proceed with proposed survey

IX. Bylaws Update (Cutler)
    a. Committees will be established to revise Bylaws
    b. Law and Human Behavior Editor’s Term—Proposal to change Bylaws to reflect new language on LHB Editor’s Term.
       i. Levett moved to accept changes; Groscup seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

X. Dissertation Committee (Kalbeitzer)
    a. Explained current process of soliciting and reviewing submissions; Committee has been discussing whether to revise process. Solicited feedback from other APA Divisions.
    b. Suggestions to only look at abstracts; increase number of committee members.
    c. EC discussed these suggestions; Committee will proceed with revisions and report back to EC.

XI. Minority Affairs Committee (Hunt; Kavanaugh)
    a. Discussing recruitment, e.g., Ambassador’s Program (outreach to Historically Black Colleges and others), which has been defunct.
    b. Move forward with proposal to design informational video/social media/chat room and report to EC.
    c. With goal of increasing membership of underrepresented persons, look into giving discounts to members of other Divisions. Look back to earlier such efforts with Corrections Committee. Move forward with getting information and report to EC.

XII. Treasurer’s/Budget Report (Brank)
    a. Division is in excellent financial shape. Still receiving royalties money from Springer.
    b. Available to answer questions about written report.
    c. Highlight 2 things from report:
       i. Committee Chairs receiving money should be ready to submit budget requests by May 1, though voting on budget is in August.
       ii. Brank reviewed procedures for reimbursement requests.
d. Request for more information on investments and portfolio’s unrealized gains.
e. Reminder about report regarding honoraria and future speakers.

XIII. Daniya Tamendarova (Managing Director @ APA) (by invitation)
a. Reviewed transition of *Law and Human Behavior* from Springer, in particular transferring past subscribers; availability of full text of *LHB* on APA website; good traffic on *LHB* site.
b. One concern—Springer continues to provide backfile on what they used to publish, though just to past subscribers. But they can’t sell content (APA sells content).
   i. Can APLS receive compensation for what Springer did sell?
c. Annual report re journal performance

XIV. Presidential Initiative (Foote)—Requesting $5000 from EC as seed money to look into developing a “Forensic Psychology Toolbox” for private practitioners.
   a. Approved by EC.

XV. Brian Bornstein (by invitation)
a. Developing proposal for “Interdisciplinary Training and Scholarship” grant to NSF
   i. Reviewed efforts to make APLS more inter- and multi-disciplinary, prompted by NSF meeting.
   ii. NSF grant to fund grad students to have a year in a sister social science discipline (analogous to LSA and ABF program)
   iii. Seeking institutional support and possible financial commitment in order to submit to NSF in July
   iv. Plans to submit budget request
b. Discussion, including questions regarding inclusion of law schools
c. EC supported proposal in principle, requested submission of specific budget proposal at future meeting.

XVI. APLS Webpage (Cutler)
a. APA offering to host webpage at no cost to Division
   i. Benefits include
      1. consistency with APA page
      2. Searches on APA website would also retrieve APLS content
      3. Free
   ii. One concern identified was loss of website name
      1. Discussion noted that ap-ls.org can just be redirected to APA site.
b. APLS is on list to be added; APA will get to it around November.
c. Foote moved to transition to APA web page; Cutler seconded.
   i. Motion passed unanimously.

XVII. Proposal for Data Collection at Conference (Cutler)
a. Discussion: Approve in principle but leave to CAC to develop procedure for application, amount to charge researchers
b. Set up tables in exhibit area
c. Current proposal turned down because no existing procedure in place.

XVIII. New Business
a. Otto
   i. Discussed building connections with psychiatry/psychiatrists.
   ii. Preliminary discussions about developing advisory report regarding interdisciplinary collaboration with American Academy of Psychiatry and Law in particular.

XIX. Levett moved to adjourn; Groscup second; passed unanimously (11:48 a.m.)

Respectfully submitted,
Jeremy A. Blumenthal
Secretary
The first half of 2012 has been very busy at LHB. We had a record number of submissions for the month of January, with more submissions in a single month than in any month since we started using the Editorial Manager system in 2004. As of mid-May, submissions are up 46% compared to the same period last year. It is unclear whether this is a temporary spike in submissions or whether this increase represents a more general trend, perhaps due to increased visibility now that APA is publishing the journal. Despite the increased submission rate, the editorial team remains committed to providing feedback to authors within 60 days of submission.

Our move to APA has certainly brought at least one change to the operation of the journal. A few months ago, the editorial team began receiving reports on each submitted manuscript from iThenticate, a content management system that compares submitted manuscripts against millions of scholarly publications and web content, reporting similarities between the manuscript and previously published material. Many of you may be familiar with Turnitin.com, a system that many universities now use so that faculty can easily check student papers for instances of plagiarism. The same company that provides the Turnitin.com service also sells iThenticate, so there are some similarities between the two systems. APA has subscribed to iThenticate for over a year, using it to check accepted manuscripts for duplicate material before publication. Now editors of journals published by APA receive similarity reports for each manuscript at the time a manuscript is submitted.

iThenticate reports contain a similarity index, which provides the percentage of the manuscript that appears to be duplicate material. To be honest, this index is not particularly helpful. Manuscripts with low scores (e.g., in the 6-9% range) may still contain duplicative material. Manuscripts with higher scores (e.g., over 25%) sometimes have no content that is truly overlapping. I have seen scores like these generated by authors with multiple manuscripts on similar topics; the system does not differentiate between similarities in writing style and duplication of material.

The report also provides a color-coded version of the manuscript that highlights any text that appears in another source, a list of the sources with overlapping material, the number of overlapping words in each source, links to online versions of the source, and the percentage of the submitted manuscript that overlaps with each source. This portion of the report is much more useful than the overall similarity index as the system identifies many “matches” that we would not consider problematic (e.g., the line numbers on a manuscript that the Editorial Manager system generates when the manuscript is submitted are often highlighted as matches with other manuscripts). After evaluating the identified matches, editors can remove false alarms from the analysis.
In the remainder of this column, I would like to answer some questions that I have received about the iThenticate system and how we at LHB are using it.

**When the editorial team at LHB looks at these reports, what are you looking for? What will you consider to be inappropriate duplication?**

Primarily, we are examining the matches for continuous blocks of text (20 words or more) that appeared in other sources. There is no doubt that short phrases of text will be duplicated across manuscripts, especially when the manuscripts were authored by the same person and address a similar topic. We are not concerned about this type of duplication. Similarly, we understand that there may be only so many ways that one can describe a particular psychological test or a standard experimental manipulation, especially in a Method section. We expect some level of duplication to appear in these descriptions. We are looking for larger blocks of duplicate text, especially those that appear in the Introduction or Discussion sections of the manuscript.

**I am writing a manuscript on a topic that I have addressed before in previously published work. Is it okay for me to duplicate material from that work?**

If you put the duplicate material in quotations and properly cite your previously published paper, then sure it is okay. However, it is not okay to cut and paste text from previously published work, even if you authored the piece from which you are taking the text. In the most recent revision (e.g., sixth edition) of the APA Publication Manual, APA added a section expressly on the topic of “self-plagiarism” (or cannibalism as one of my advisors refers to it). See Section 1.10 of the manual for additional information on APA’s position on self-plagiarism.

**What will happen if I submit a manuscript with content that overlaps with previously published work?**

Although we considered public floggings (kidding), we abandoned this idea quickly. The truthful answer is: it depends. If the overlap is significant (e.g., multiple large blocks of duplicate text), we may return the manuscript without review, noting the sources that contain duplicate material, and allowing the author an opportunity to submit a revised version of the paper without the overlapping content as a new manuscript. The new manuscript would be reviewed without prejudice. Of course, the author would also have the option of pursuing a different outlet for the paper. If there is less overlap (e.g., a few sentences), we may send the manuscript for review as is and ask the authors to remove the duplicate material if we wish to consider a revised version of the manuscript for publication.

We know that this matter is sensitive for authors and we strive to make decisions about overlapping content (like all of our decisions) that are fair and respectful of authors while upholding the quality of our society’s journal. If you have feedback for us on the topic of iThenticate or any other aspect of *Law and Human Behavior*, please send a note to me at mkovera@jjay.cuny.edu.
SALEEM’S RULES

Thomas Grisso
Panel Members: John Monahan, Ed Mulvey and Henry Steadman

Presented at the 2012 Conference
of the American Psychology-Law Society
at San Juan, Puerto Rico

On the 20th anniversary of the death of Saleem Shah

We welcome you all to this session to honor Saleem Shah. Those of us on this panel represent the elders in this tribe we call AP-LS. One of the things elders do is pass on the traditions—the history—the ethos of their culture. They speak of things woven into the beginnings of the culture, but that might be obscured as the culture grows. Saleem Shah was among the most important threads in that early fabric of AP-LS, and we want to help you recognize him in what the organization has become.

Most importantly, we want to tell you about him as a mentor. We’ll focus not only on what he taught us, but how he taught us. We believe that you can learn something about how to be better mentors by hearing about the mentoring we received from him.

Who was this man, Saleem Shah? Why do we name our awards for him?

A CV-like description of Saleem’s career sounds impressive but not particularly remarkable. He obtained his Ph.D. in clinical psychology at Pennsylvania State University in 1957. For a few years he worked at the Spring Grove State Hospital in Cumberland, Maryland. Then from 1959 to 1966 he was on the staff, and eventually Chief Psychologist, of Legal Psychiatric Services, the court clinic in District of Columbia.

In 1968 he became Branch Chief of the Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency at the National Institute of Mental Health in Bethesda. After about 20 years he became a Senior Research Scholar at NIMH. The year before that—1986—we gave Saleem the very first APLS Award for Distinguished Contributions to Psychology and Law. Then, in November 1992—20 years ago this year—his life was ended by a drunk driver crossing into his lane as he was driving to his home in Catonsville, Maryland.

That description of Saleem reveals little about why he is remembered and was mourned so keenly by those of us who knew him. We can go a bit further by examining the studies that his Center funded. Seeing in retrospect, many of them were very original—the opening preludes to lines of research that defined the early field and branched out to create its identity. Among these were:
If we had room and time enough, we could create branching trees arising from each of these projects to show how they generated whole fields of research in which others joined.

But this still does not get to the heart of the matter. To understand why he is remembered, we have to tell you who he was, not as a professional with a career, not as a source of funding for APLS’s earliest works—but how he lived his life, what he taught others, and what he meant to them.

Certain approaches to doing this would be terribly confusing. For example, asking people then what Saleem was like, you could have heard all of the following adjectives without contradiction:

- generous and demanding
- inspiring and exasperating
- emotional and empirical
- principled and result-driven
- open-minded and convinced that he was right.

And these were not nuances. All of those traits stood out clearly and boldly for anyone to see.

It may seem difficult to imagine him being an inspiring mentor with so many difficult qualities. What you need to understand is that driving all of that—and I borrow Hank Steadman’s words here—Saleem “was a friend and a man of principle: a model for how to live one’s life with unselfish purpose, unimpeachable integrity, and an unrelenting sense of what is right.” When he was demanding, exasperating, doggedly result-driven, and stubbornly arguing his cause, you knew that his intentions were to make you better, not to enhance himself, and to show you a way to make the world better for persons with mental illnesses who were in the justice system.

His was an unusual sort of mentoring. Basically, when you got a grant from Saleem’s center, you got Saleem. If you allowed him, he became your mentor, often in surprising ways that some of us will be describing. And that is the context in which we want to reflect on Saleem today. We want to tell you what we learned from him about how to do our work in this world.

To help do this, I want to offer you what I call “Saleem’s Rules.” NCIS fans will recognize the analogy. Special Agent Gibbs is a hard man to work for, but he is an unfailing mentor. There are said to be 51 “Gibbs’ Rules” for criminal investigation and staying alive. But they are not written down. Those on his team whom he mentors learn them by experience.

I have developed Saleem’s Rules by studying an issue of Law and Human Behavior (February, 1995) in which several of us wrote articles about how Saleem influenced our lives and the field of psychiatry, psychology and law. As you peruse these articles, you find themes arising with remarkable similarity in
people’s narrations of what Saleem was like. Saleem’s Rules are a synthesis of what they say they learned from him.

Rule 1: You have to care about whatever you study.

What Saleem cared about was the dignity of people with mental illnesses in the legal system, especially the quality of our response to them, both clinically and legally. I don’t know when or how this developed. It was very near the surface whenever he was mentoring us, and it permeated his interests at all levels—from forensic evaluations, to legal decisions about mentally ill persons, to forensic mental health systems. The word “mission” appears several times in peoples’ descriptions of Saleem—not in the religious sense, but as a duty and a calling. It guided all he did, and his mentoring steered us in directions that would fulfill that mission.

Rule 2: If a study might find truth, but not help people, it’s not worth doing.

Saleem was very result-driven. There was something you could count on whenever you began to tell Saleem about a research idea you were cooking. You’d describe the problem and your brilliant design, he would listen carefully and thoughtfully, and when you were done, he was likely to say: “To what end?” He had little patience for studies that would only test hypotheses. They had to have utility.

Ecford Voit, who worked for Saleem at NIMH, recalls Saleem’s description of the work of the review panel that evaluated grant proposals for the Crime and Delinquency Center. “The committee,” Saleem once wrote, “should not function as though its only concern is to evaluate the scientific merit of the proposal.” But that was, in fact, the only concern that NIMH itself acknowledged at the time, in order to avoid an appearance of favoritism in reviewing proposals.

Rules 1 and 2 came together in the way Saleem saw the role of his Center. He actually conducted seminars for his Review Panel on the importance of evaluating proposals not only on scientific merit, but also on whether they had potential to fulfill the mission—to create legally-fair and clinically-beneficial conditions for persons in the legal system.

Rule 3: If you say you’ll do it, you’re accountable—and I’m accountable to help you do it.

Typically, when one is awarded a grant from NIMH, one gets the funding and does the work and reports back to the agency at the end. But when you got a grant from Saleem’s center, you got Saleem. You got his numerous phone calls—often at 5:00 PM when you were getting ready to go home—to see how your grant was going. You got his guidance when things were not going well, and you got his suggestions about a recommended change in course when you thought things were actually fine. You were likely to get a call sometime in the year saying that he was going to visit your lab next week and check things out. No other director at NIMH—before or since—so consistently ran their research branch this way.

Rule 4: You won’t solve most problems by thinking like a _________. (Insert any discipline)

Saleem had little patience for professionalism. The 1970s was a time when forensic psychology and forensic psychiatry were competing for recognition in the courts. Most lawyers were skeptical of both disciplines, and criminologists were following their own path. Saleem valued them all, but had particular disdain for lines of thought that were dominated by any one of them. The problems he saw that needed to be solved were far too big for any one discipline’s theories and ways of thinking. Clinicians had to be scientists, and scientists had to be clinicians. Both of them had to understand the social systems and organizations in which their contributions were expected to lead to things of value. As a mentor, he was constantly directing you across disciplinary lines to help you find the concepts that you needed for solving important problems.

Rule 5: Research never changes policy or practice—you do.

Saleem was not satisfied with a successful research project until it had been translated in a way that might change policy or practice. After all, that was what justified doing the research in the first place. He tended to see at least the first steps in this translation as belonging to the researchers.
So he usually had suggestions for you as your project neared an end. The suggestions, however, came across as “imperatives”—things that you were nearly obligated to do because you had developed something that could serve the mission. He convinced you; then he provided the means for you to do it. Sometimes it was publication of your results in the monograph series that he developed for his NIMH center. Sometimes, it was additional funding he would provide to hold conferences at which you’d describe your research to judges, lawyers, or justice system personnel. In my case, it was a road trip that took me to eight state hospitals, to translate my fancy academic ideas for forensic evaluations into something clinicians could actually use.

**Rule 6: If you don’t know something empirically, you’re not an expert.**

Saleem gave me a manuscript he wrote that was never published. He wrote it in 1963, when he was Chief Psychologist at the court clinic in District of Columbia, before his NIMH days. This was the year after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled, in *Jenkins v. U.S.*, that courts could choose to accept expert testimony on diagnostic matters from psychologists, not only psychiatrists. Psychology was excited at this new opportunity, and the American Psychological Association told Saleem that they might like to fund him to do a white paper and some legal research on the potential.

The manuscript I have is a version of Saleem’s proposal. APA decided not to fund his work, and when one reads the paper, one can guess the reasons. He wrote that before rushing into the courtroom, (quote), “It would be far more desirable for behavioral scientists to concentrate on making more precise, reliable, valid and accurate their instruments and methods for assessment and prediction of behavior.” Don’t rush into this, he said—don’t bow to guild interests and a new market for psychologists—don’t join psychiatry in simply making guesses about people’s futures. Do the work that’s necessary to first show that what you have to say has some sort of empirical validity. What you see here is his integrity and his unwillingness to bow to professional interests if it’s not in society’s broader interests. It was a strong message that he continued to provide us when he mentored our projects in later years.

**Rule 7: Don’t be influenced by opposing views—unless they are right.**

Saleem usually entered an intellectual conversation with a strong opinion. He often argued it just as strongly, and he often walked away at the end of the debate with the same opinion as when he arrived. But he was open to influence. He could change his opinion if you could give him the right argument. Some of that potential is seen in a little vignette that Linda Teplin relates. Something she’d written had been rejected for publication. She told Saleem that she thought it might be because the reviewers didn’t like her because of theoretical differences. Saleem admonished her: “Don’t worry about whether they rejected the article because they don’t like you. Read what they have to say and worry about whether they were right!” The mentoring message was clear. Weigh people’s views on the basis of the quality of their arguments. It’s your responsibility to decide whether they are right or wrong based on their logic, not on who they are or whether you like them or they like you.

**Rule 8: The best food is Indian food.**

Saleem had strong preferences in his everyday life as well about how to enjoy himself. He liked Indian food and knew where to get it all over the world. Usually he concluded his meals with a single Jack Daniels on the rocks. He dressed for comfort, not show, most often as you see him here. [Photo] He had a keen sense of humor. Again, Linda Teplin relates that at dinner when she was first getting to know Saleem, he told her that he had six children, and she said, “Oh yes, of course, large families are a tradition in your culture.” He replied: “Hell no, not in my culture. I married an Irish Catholic!”

Today we honor Saleem by describing the values that guided his work and the manner in which he passed on those values to those whom he mentored. The panel members here, as well as members of the audience who knew Saleem, will offer examples of how *Saleem’s Rules* influenced their lives. May those values continue to be part of the fabric of our tribe called AP-LS as it continues to mature in service to individuals and society.
COMMUNITY, CORRECTIONAL, & FORENSIC TREATMENT

The authors investigated the relationship between length of participation in a community-based re-entry program and the likelihood of recidivism among 75 males between the ages of 18 and 25 using structured telephone interviews. The results revealed that increased length of participation significantly reduced the likelihood of recidivistic convictions in the juvenile, but not the adult system.

Researchers investigated the use of the PCL-R as a predictor of therapeutic success in substance use disorder (SUD) treatment among 102 male forensic patients. Results revealed that patients who dropped out of treatment had significantly higher PCL-R scores than patients who successfully completed treatment. Authors conclude that the PCL-R can be used to predict which patients will complete SUD treatment.

An alcohol-related violence intervention, Control of Violence for Angry Impulsive Drinkers (COVAID), was tested with 115 adult men sentenced in the UK and randomly assigned to COVAID or a control group. COVAID participants reported significant improvement on multiple measures utilized to evaluate program effectiveness, though no significant differences were found on other measures used. Preliminary support was found for the use of COVAID in treating offenders whose violence is alcohol-related.

The effectiveness of a community-based diversion program was examined by comparing the recidivism rates of adult intrafamilial child sex offenders who participated in the program ($n = 88$), compared to those who declined ($n = 120$). While differences between the groups were not statistically significant, analyses showed lower rates of sexual reoffending and longer time before sexual reoffense in the diverted group.


The study examined the prevalence, subtypes, and associated psychological and neuropsychological comorbidity of ADHD by gender in 3,962 inmates. The overall prevalence of ADHD was higher than adults in the general population with females exhibiting higher rate than males. The hyperactive-impulsive subtype was most prevalent for both genders and had lower levels of comorbid psychopathology than the combined and inattentive subtypes. The corresponding implications were discussed.


The study compared static demographic and psychological variables of juvenile violent ($n = 34$) and non-violent probationers ($n = 75$) in Hong Kong. The findings showed several significant differences between the two groups in terms of self-esteem, types of crimes, self-reported delinquency, age of onset, social bond, and impulsivity. Only social bond and impulsivity were found to relate to violent delinquency. Using the results, the authors suggested corresponding interventions.


This study evaluated the effectiveness of a pre-adjudication diversion program for youthful offenders with mental illness in Texas. Youth receiving specialized supervision from juvenile probation officers were less likely to be adjudicated for the initial offense than a group receiving traditional supervision. The use of specialized supervision was helpful in diverting the juveniles from adjudication, and to increase participation and access to services for juvenile offenders with mental health needs.


Using data from 641 violent crime victims seeking emergency medical treatment, the authors examined victim sexual orientation in violent crimes. Results showed that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) victims were more likely to be victims of sexual assault while heterosexual victims were more likely victims of general assault and shootings. LGBT victims exhibited more acute stress and anxiety. Victim sexual orientation also moderated trauma history and general anxiety symptoms.


Staff and prisoners rated the social climate of two Australian prisons: a mainstream prison and one that provides intensive rehabilitation programs. Results suggested that both groups rated the social climate as more conducive to rehabilitation at the specialized facility, though fewer differences were found between prisoner ratings across the facilities than in staff ratings.

Researchers conducted a longitudinal study to examine the effects of long-term imprisonment on mental health among 87 long-term prisoners with an average incarceration period of 14.6 years. Two assessment experts conducted evaluations at the beginning and end of incarceration. Results did not support a harmful effect of imprisonment on mental health. The rate of psychological disorders decreased, but remained high as compared to non-incarcerated populations.

This study evaluated the effectiveness of a mental health court jail diversion program that is aimed at probationers who are at risk of revocation, rather than focusing on early intervention efforts. Comparative analyses indicated that participants in this program tended to have lower rates of rearrest within one to two years, and this diversion program appeared effective in reducing probation revocations.

Results of a pilot program in Texas were discussed, with implications for the overall effectiveness of patient-centered medical homes in assisting the transition from jail to the community among released individuals with medical and mental illnesses. Authors suggest that patient-centered medical homes appear to provide integrated behavioral health and primary care services, and can be effective in diverting formerly-incarcerated individuals from re-offending.

Six juvenile drug courts were investigated. Three court systems implemented evidence-based strategies for approaching juvenile drug use, while the other courts implemented no significant changes. Fewer positive tests for marijuana and fewer violations for person offenses and property crimes were observed in the court systems which implemented evidence-based treatment. Self-reported substance use, however, did not differ across groups.

A simulation model was tested to estimate whether jail diversion programs were associated with a cost savings as compared to incarceration. Data from Travis County, Texas were used. Results suggested a net savings for the county, but only when the most serious misdemeanants and low-level felons were diverted. Additionally, costs were found to have shifted from the criminal justice system to the already-strained community mental health system.

Authors investigated the efficacy of the Criminal Justice Drug Abuse Treatment Studies (CJ-DATS) Targeted Intervention for Corrections (TIC) among 1,573 individuals involved with the criminal justice system. Results revealed significant improvements in the domains of knowledge, attitudes, and psychosocial functioning in response to the interventions. Improvements were not found consistently with regard to criminal thinking. The authors conclude that the findings lend support for the efficacy of the TIC interventions.

Authors investigated the effects of assessment methodology on self-reported sexual and physical violence among 515 incarcerated women. Results indicated women who completed a paper-and-pencil self-report questionnaire reported higher rates of physical and sexual victimization than women who were interviewed, although the questions employed by the two methodologies were identical. Authors conclude that anonymity increases the likelihood of reporting and that the study lends support for paper-and-pencil questionnaires for studying sensitive material.


The study examined the PAI scores and its association with substance abuse treatment behavior in 331 male offenders who were mandated for treatment. Results indicated that several scales predicted problematic conduct and subjective and objective ratings of treatment progress. The Aggression and Interpersonal scales exhibited general noncompliance and select treatment behavior respectively. The authors highlighted the importance of distinguishing lower and higher order dimensions on the PAI.


One hundred young male inmates were interviewed and administered questionnaires for alcohol and drug abuse upon incarceration and results were compared to 157 older male inmates. Results indicated that younger males were more likely to be hazardous drinkers but less likely to be aware of it and this may be due to lower rate of withdrawal symptoms. The authors suggested formal screening for alcohol abuse to reduce recidivism and related problems.


The length of time elapsing from arrest to enrollment into mental health court diversion programs was compared to the time from arrest to disposition for offenders traditionally processed through the criminal justice system. Results indicated the median time to mental health court enrollment was 70 days. The median time for traditional processing of offenders without mental illness was 37 days, and 76 days for offenders with mental illness.


This article is an extension of an earlier meta-analysis by Andrews et al. (1990) reviewing correctional interventions. Researchers recoded the 80 articles included in the original meta-analysis on variables related to provision of services. Costs of services were estimated, and analyses revealed no significant differences in costs of providing appropriate or inappropriate correctional services, or traditional punishment. Authors concluded that there are treatments which are therapeutically and fiscally effective, and recommended Risk-Need-Responsivity as a model from which to develop appropriate services.

Authors investigated variables that predict likelihood of discharge among 899 forensic psychiatric inpatients in a German hospital. Results indicated that age at first hospital admission and offense type were predictive of length of stay. Those with the most serious offenses, such as homicide and/or sexual assault, had lengthier hospital stays. Authors also note there were a high number of immigrants among the short-stay patients.


Authors investigated the use of a brief instrument designed to evaluate trauma, health problems, and psychosocial functioning among 1,397 female offenders in two prison-based substance abuse treatment programs. One facility was a special-needs facility (SNF) for co-morbid substance and mental health issues, while the other was a regular treatment facility (RTF). Results indicated that females in SNF reported more posttraumatic stress, psychological stress, hospitalizations, and health issues, than those in the RTF. Authors recommend the use of the short form to monitor progress and needs of offenders over time.

**FORENSIC ASSESSMENT**


Examined the validity scales L-r and K-r of the MMPI-2-RF with respect to the MMPI-2 L and K scales in a sample of 344 child custody litigants. Results indicated significant consistency between T-score elevations on both measures for both the L and K scales. The clinical scales also showed mean T-scores that were within normal limits. The RC scale intercorrelation patterns and alpha coefficient values were similar to other populations.


Examined the utility of the HCR-20 and the PCL: SV in predicting noncompliance with mental health diversion programs and rates of re-incarceration in a sample of 131 defendants in New York. Results supported the use of both instruments in assessing violence risk among those participating in diversion programs. The HCR-20 was found to more effectively predict noncompliance with treatment programming and re-incarceration than the PCL: SV.


The authors validated the Angry Aggression Scales (AAS), Behavior Inhibition System and Behavior Activation System scales (BIS/BAS), and reactive aggression and proactive power scales in 101 antisocial Norwegian youths with conduct problems and 101 prosocial controls. Results supported difference between the groups on one higher-order AAS factor, one BIS factor, and one higher-order BAS factor. The authors also argued for the support of the quadruple typology of aggression and violence.


The predictive validity of three youth risk assessment measures for sexual and non-violent recidivism was compared in a sample of 104 male youth sex offenders in Singapore. Results showed that the ERASOR significantly predicted sexual recidivism, and all of the measures predicted non-sexual re-offending. Researchers recommended the ERASOR as best-suited for assessing sexually offending youth in non-Western cultures.

The study reviewed 216 cases in Hawaii and examined the agreement between three independent clinicians for each felony case. Moderate agreement was found in which evaluators agreed on 71% of the cases and were less likely to agree in re-evaluations of defendants who were sent for restoration services. Judges were found to agree more with the majority and when they disagree, they were more likely to find defendants incompetent.


Authors aimed to develop scoring revisions for two risk assessment instruments (Static-99 and Static-2002) that would accurately assess offenders’ risk of re-offense based on age. Data gathered from over 8,000 sex offenders were used to create new age weights that improved the fit of the risk assessment instruments for prediction of recidivism in older offenders.


This study examined the psychometric properties of a measure used to assess locus of control in a large sample (n = 2,497) of sexual offenders in England and Wales who participated in the Sex Offender Treatment Programme (SOTP). The scale demonstrated good internal consistency and test-retest reliability, and weak to moderate convergent validity with scales assessing self-esteem, attachment styles, and other constructs. Results supported the scale’s usefulness.


Examined the incremental validity of self- and informant reports of psychopathic traits in predicting externalizing behaviors. The authors found that both types of reports are related to externalizing behaviors and exhibited some incremental validity. Self-reported psychopathy scores appeared to be slightly more useful than other forms of reported psychopathy scores. The results supported the use of both types of measures in understanding psychopathic traits and externalizing behaviors in nonforensic settings.


The authors compared the psychometric properties of both the full and short versions of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI) using prison (n = 558) and college (n = 322) samples. No difference in discriminant validity was found in the study. Overall, the PPI scale scores were more reliable and exhibited more construct validity than the PPI Short-Form. Implications of the psychometric difference is discussed.


Examined the convergent and discriminant validity of the French-language version of the ‘How I Think Questionnaire’ (HIT) in a sample of 336 adolescents (165 boys and 171 girls). Results indicated that HIT scores correlated significantly with the Self-reported Delinquency Scale. Using the HIT, delinquents living in
closed detention facilities differed significantly from those living in open facilities or under probation. The authors concluded the HIT is reliable and valid.


The authors used the Personality Assessment Inventory to assess psychopathological elevations across 3,197 offenders with and without substance problems. They found that offenders with substance problems were more likely to have increased mental health problems and risk factors for suicide or aggression. Females with substance problems exhibited higher depression, traumatic stress, and borderline features along with lower antisocial differences. Measurement issues regarding comorbidity and risk assessment are discussed.

Venables, N. C., & Patrick, C. J. (2012). **Validity of the Externalizing Spectrum Inventory in a criminal offender sample: Relations with disinhibitory psychopathology, personality, and personality features.** *Psychological Assessment, 24,* 88-100. doi: 10.1037/a0024703

The study used data from 235 male prisoners to evaluate the validity of the Externalizing Spectrum Inventory (ESI) relative to external criterion measures that included externalizing disorder symptoms assessed via diagnostic interviews, self-reported personality traits, and interviewed and self-reported psychopathic features. Results supported the validity of the ESI model and indicated its use in research for neurobiological correlates and etiological bases of externalizing proneness.


Self-report data from 57 Dutch juvenile delinquents were used to examine the psychometric properties of a modified psychopathy scale for youth. Total scores were correlated with many psychopathic features, including aggression, impulsivity, substance use, and low empathy. The scale appeared adequate at measuring traits associated with Factor 1 features of psychopathy, but findings were poorer in measured Factor 2 features.


A large sample of domestic violence perpetrators (*n* = 3,569) in Connecticut were assessed and followed-up in an 18-month period. The results indicated that the DVSI-R significantly predicted recidivism and supported its use as a risk assessment instrument. Additionally, structured clinical judgment about imminent risk-to-victim and risk-to-others correlated with the DVSI-R total risk scores in predicting recidivism but the scores appeared to be stronger predictors overall.

**DELIQUENCY/ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR**


Examined the relationship between psychotic disorders and violent behaviour in 55 female homicide offenders over an eight-year period. The results suggest that the likelihood of finding psychosis was 20.77 times higher in the offender group compared to the general population comparison group, while the likelihood of schizophrenia was 43.17 times higher in the offender group relative to the comparison group. Most of the mentally ill offenders had a long history of mental illness and higher known substance abuse than controls.

The authors investigated hostility among primary and secondary psychopathy with a sample of 148 violent offenders. Results revealed that primary psychopaths scored higher on impulsivity and hostility, and lower on empathy, than secondary (middle group) psychopaths and non-psychopaths. Differences between the middle and psychopathic group were small but significant, lending support to the theory that there are two distinct models of psychopathy, those that are emotionless, calculating, manipulative, and deceitful, and those who have a weak conscience and suffer from underlying pathology.


Undergraduate students completed a battery of surveys pertaining to various aggressive, problematic, and antisocial behaviors. Results indicated levels of reported social aggression were associated with antisocial behavior, substance use, and unethical behaviors. Relationships were independent of other measures of antisociality. Results were particularly strong with women. The authors suggest further research to examine whether social aggression constitutes a distinct antisocial behavior.


Five hundred and three boys were assessed across childhood through adulthood for changes in delinquent behavior. Those meeting criteria for conduct disorder or interpersonal callousness engaged in more persistent delinquent behavior relative to those with oppositional defiant disorder or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Symptoms of conduct disorder and interpersonal callousness were predictive of persistent delinquency when accounting for symptom overlap across diagnoses.


A sample of 127 incarcerated delinquent males was assessed regarding the presence of antisocial traits while participating in a specialized intensive treatment program. Assessment results indicated that many of the participants experienced changes in callous/unemotional traits, narcissism, and impulsivity. Additionally, changes in the antisocial characteristics measured predicted improvement in institutional behavior and treatment compliance.


Authors interviewed 30 incarcerated women and further examined the interviews of 8 women who first became involved with the criminal justice system after the age of 20. The women in this group reported similarities, including frequent loss, caretaking, and addiction as factors that contributed to their subsequent involvement in crime, and the presence of children as a factor that prevented criminal involvement.

The study explored the factors predicting general recidivism in a group of 165 male youth offenders in Singapore. Fifty-eight of the youths were gang-affiliated and results indicated that this subgroup of youths were more likely to score higher on risk assessment instruments and engaged in violent and other criminal activity. The authors recommended more intensive assessment and interventions for gang-affiliated youths.


Authors evaluated the use of the PCL-R in the assessment of psychopathy among sixty female German inmates. Results indicated a psychopathy prevalence rate of 17%. Predictive factors of psychopathy among the sample included physical proactive aggression, relational reactive aggression, and age, while prosocial and/or helping behavior were not significantly associated with psychopathy.

This archival study examined 93 cases of youths from 1976 to 2005 who perpetrate sexual homicides against same-sex victims. Ninety-five percent of the cases were male offender-male victims and 5% were female perpetrators-female victim pairings. The results indicated several demographic variables (e.g. age and race) and characteristics (e.g. victim demographics) that were more represented in these cases. The authors concluded that further research is needed to investigate the pathogenesis, etiology and risk factors.

Authors investigated gender differences and variables predictive of aggression among 150 adjudicated youth. Results revealed that girls exhibited significantly higher rates of physical and relational aggression, negative affect, anxiety, distress in response to social provocations, and empathy than boys, and that they were aggressive toward boys and girls. Boys were highly aggressive only toward other boys.

Files of 71 violent male offenders were reviewed to determine the frequency and severity of reactive and instrumental violence. Overall, 79% of violent offenses were categorized as purely instrumental or purely reactive. The hypothesis that reactive violent offenses were more severe than instrumental ones was supported, and the frequencies of each type of violent offending were negatively correlated. Findings supported the distinction between these types of violence.

Using 181 biological mothers from the Vancouver Longitudinal Study on the Psychosocial Development of Children, the study explored the intergenerational transmission of aggression and antisocial behavior. Results suggested that mothers who were juvenile delinquents had children who were more physically aggressive and had earlier onset of physical aggression after controlling for sociodemographics, social adversities, prenatal substance exposure, and adult criminal involvement. The role and impact of female delinquency is discussed.

**LEGAL DECISION-MAKING/JURY RESEARCH**

In a 3 (legal knowledge: legal training v. legal experience v. control) x 2 (information amount: high v. low) between-subjects design, German lay judges, law students and controls (n = 137) judged the premeditation of a perpetrator in real-world cases. Judgment congruency with the Court’s ruling increased with training, but judges showed lower congruency than controls. Legal training and experience corresponded with higher
confidence. Emotional reactions were stronger when more information was given for individuals without legal training but decreased for individuals with training.

Examined the effect of confirmation bias and the feature positive effect (FPE) on conviction rates. Participants (*n* = 188) read a case that had no additional information, extra incriminating evidence, a search for but lack of incriminating evidence, exonerating evidence, or a search for but lack of exonerating evidence. Participants who received incriminating evidence were more likely to convict than those in the control, exonerating evidence, failed-incriminating, and failed-exonerating conditions.

Examined whether different types of educative expert testimony can increase mock jurors’ knowledge of problems associated with hearsay witnesses. Studies 1 (*n* = 304) and 2 (*n* = 196) varied the length and types of expert testimony in a trial transcript. While all types of expert testimony did inform mock jurors’ knowledge, guilty verdicts decreased when multiple problems with hearsay were presented. The length of the testimony had no effect on verdict.

Explored the effect of mock jurors stereotypes and processing goals on verdicts. Participants (*n* = 281) read a case about a man accused of child molestation. Instructions (preponderance of evidence vs. reasonable doubt), defendant sexual orientation (straight vs. gay), and jury size (individual vs. group) were manipulated. Acquittals were higher in a group, with a straight defendant, and with reasonable doubt instructions. Individuals were unaffected by instructions, whereas groups were less likely to convict under reasonable doubt.

Judges from three states (*n* = 132) were surveyed about a case that varied in strength of evidence and amount of pressure under which a confession was given. The outcome measures were voluntariness of the confession and implicit and explicit measures of harmless error. Judges found high-pressure confessions to be improperly admitted into evidence. Despite this, the confession significantly increased their conviction rates even in the presence of weak evidence.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT, CONFESSIONS, & DECEPTION**

Examined adherence to recently published guidelines on interviewing eyewitnesses and victims in a sample of Florida police interviews (*n* = 26). Interviews were scored according to question type, positive techniques, and negative techniques. Results showed that police frequently used negative techniques and did not often use positive techniques.

To examine if confessions taint other evidence in real cases, the authors conducted an archival analysis of DNA exoneration cases. Consistent with the corruption hypothesis, results showed multiple evidence errors were significantly more likely in false-confession cases than in eyewitness cases. False confessions were accompanied by invalid forensic science, eyewitness identifications, and informants. In cases containing multiple errors, confessions were most likely to have been obtained first.

Explored the differential effects of the proximal versus distal consequences of confessing to prior criminal activity. In study 1 (n = 81), participants altered how frequently they admitted to behaviors to avoid proximal consequences (answering a set of repetitive questions) even though this increased the chance of distal consequences (meeting with a police officer). Study 2 (n=143) confirmed these results by reversing the order of the proximal and distal consequences.

Participants (n = 61) were asked to write a truth, an outright lie, or a concealment lie about activities recently completed. The written statements were coded with both SCAN (Scientific Content Analysis) and Reality Monitoring (RM). RM discriminated significantly between truths and outright lies and truths and concealment lies. SCAN did not discriminate significantly between any of the conditions.

Examined the effect of empathy and question type on eliciting investigation relevant information (IRI). Interviews with child sex offender suspects (n = 26) were analyzed for IRI, empathy, and whether a question was appropriate or inappropriate. Empathy was not related to IRI, while appropriate questions (compared to inappropriate) were associated with greater IRI.

Undergraduates (n = 31) were asked to recount a situation they genuinely felt remorseful about and one they did not but feigned remorse for. Facial, verbal, and body language variables were coded. Descriptions of falsified remorse were associated with a greater range of emotional expressions. Negative emotions were more commonly followed by other emotions—rather than a return to neutral emotion—in falsified versus sincere remorse.

Examined the effect of drawing on lie detection accuracy. Participants (n = 33) were randomly assigned to lie or tell the truth about their occupation. Participants were asked to give verbal details about their work and were randomly assigned to draw their work area either before or after giving these details. Lie detection accuracy was greater on drawing cues than verbal cues.

RISK ASSESSMENT/COMMUNICATION

Cale, J. & Lussier, P. (2012). Merging developmental and criminal career perspectives: Implications for risk assessment and risk prediction of violent/sexual recidivism in adult sexual aggressors of
Researchers assessed the recidivism rates of 204 convicted sexual aggressors who were incarcerated in Quebec. Information was collected about offenders’ antisocial histories and criminal careers, using interviews and police records. Those who re-offended had earlier onset of antisocial behavior and showed escalation of antisocial acts during youth. Support was found for including developmental and criminal career variables when assessing the risk of violent and/or sexual recidivism.


A group of 263 adult male sexual offenders who had been released from prison in Germany were evaluated with the STABLE-2000 and STABLE-2007, two dynamic risk assessment instruments. Results showed the STABLE-2007 had better predictive accuracy than the STABLE-2000 with regard to subsequent sexual reoffending. The STABLE-2007 was also found to increase the predictive accuracy of other risk assessment tools, such as the Static-99 and the SORAG.


This study describes the construction and validation of a new actuarial violence risk measure, the OASys Violence Predictor (OVP). Data from official records and the existing risk assessment system were used to identify static and dynamic risk factors for violent recidivism among a large sample of offenders (N = 15,918). This led to the creation of a 100-point scale (OVP), which was found to have greater predictive validity than existing risk assessment methods.


The predictive validity of the Australian Adaptation of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI-AA) was examined in a sample of 3,568 youth under juvenile justice supervision. Analyses focused on the subcomponents of the instrument, which represent static and dynamic risk-need domains. Results showed the domain scores independently predicted recidivism, while the combination of scores only resulted in small improvements in prediction.


Researchers investigated the construct validity of items included in two instruments used to assess risk of future sex offending by examining correlations between these items and scores on previously validated measures of the constructs in question. Results indicated that there were correlations between items intended to assess the same or similar constructs, including beliefs supportive of child molestation and pedophilic interests. However, the amount of convergence was lower than expected.

SEX OFFENDERS

Authors investigated the effects of offending behavior (e.g., using violence, avoiding/removing evidence, securing the crime scene) on sexual recidivism among 683 male sex offenders in 4 age groups using the Crime Scene Behavior Risk (CBR) Score. Results indicated that CBR-risk score provided incremental predictive validity beyond that of the Static-99 for all age groups, suggesting that crime scene behavior may contribute to predictions of future sexual offending behavior.

The study explored the relationship between three risk assessment scales and two assessments for risk-relevant psychopathological constructs. Psychopathology was measured with an adaptation of the Reynolds Adolescent Adjustment Screening Inventory. Results indicated that risk and protective factors were significantly negatively correlated. Psychopathology measures also correlated positively with risk factors and negatively with protective factors.

Authors investigated empathy among 12 sexual sadists and 23 non-sadistic sexual offenders who had been mandated to treatment, using the Multifaceted Empathy Test (MET). Results indicated that sexual sadists and non-sadistic offenders did not differ significantly in terms of capacity for emotional empathy, suggesting that sexual sadism is not a deficit in emotional processing, but rather an impairment in cognitive empathy.

Phallometric responses were compared between three groups: adolescent male sex offenders, adult male sex offenders, and adult male non-offenders. Sexual offenders’ responses differed from those of the control group, and phallometric measurements were found to predict recidivism. Phallometry was also found to be useful with adolescent male sex offenders.

Compared benefits received from participation in a diversion program between groups of incest offenders who were intrafamilial/biological fathers or extrafamilial/non-biological fathers. Found that the relationship between victim and offender was not related to acceptance into treatment, completion of treatment, or sexual re-offending. The authors suggest that policies and practices distinguishing biological and non-biological father offenders should be reconsidered.

**WITNESS ISSUES**

Second and fifth graders (in study 1, n = 40) memorized images of children paired with a phrase describing an activity. In study 2 (n = 40) the complexity of the stimuli was increased and in study 3 (n = 80) the stimuli were presented as a slideshow. In all studies, participants were asked to identify the pairs based on memory. Response latency was found to be more predictive of accuracy than confidence.

Examined the amount, accuracy, and consistency of information reported by 5- to 7-year-old children (n = 58) about a staged event that included touching. One and 7 months following, children were asked open and yes/no questions. Children interviewed with HBDs reported more information at 7 months, but a high proportion of inaccurate touches. Children rarely repeated touch-related information across interviews and did not incorporate errors made in the 1-month interview into their open-ended accounts 6 months later.


In four studies (n = 108; 110; 101; 113), authors investigated eyewitness suggestibility by manipulating number of initial tests taken (zero to six), delay between initial testing and misinformation exposure (30 min or 1 week), and whether initial testing was between- or within-subjects. Suggestibility increased as the number of initial tests increased, but this effect was qualified by the delay and whether initial testing occurred in a within- or between-subjects manner.


Participants (n=404) witnessed a mock crime, had either a strong or weak ecphoric experience when making their line-up identifications, and subsequently received no feedback, confirming feedback, or disconfirming feedback. Consistent with a cues-based conceptualization of the feedback effect, disconfirming feedback influenced witnesses with weak ecphoric experiences more than witnesses with strong ecphoric experiences, increasing the confidence-accuracy relationship.


Examined Estonian police officers’ interviewing tactics by analyzing investigative interviews with children (n = 66) in cases of physical or sexual abuse. Option-posing and direct questions were most frequently employed, but invitations produced significantly more information. Four to seven-year-old children were asked more suggestive questions than older children. As interviews progressed, the average number of explanations and general invitations per interview decreased, whereas the number of suggestive and option-posing questions increased.


The authors tested the effect of forensically aging outdated photos. In experiment 1, participants (n = 62) viewed a target’s photo that was outdated (age 7), current (age 12), or age progressed (age 12) and then was asked to select the target out of a line up (age 12). In experiment 2, participants (n = 75) viewed outdated and age progressed, current, or outdated photos. Accuracy was best for those who viewed the current photo and not different between the outdated, age progressed, and combination conditions.


Participants viewed a video of a bank robbery and were asked cued recall questions covering general knowledge and the video. Confidence ratings were collected, and correlations, calibration and discrimination
measures were calculated. All measures indicated a strong confidence–accuracy relationship that was better for general knowledge than eyewitness memory questions. However, there were no differences in confidence ratings for correct answers, suggesting that the differences could be limited to the evaluation of incorrect answers.

Examined the effect of eye closure on children’s eyewitness recall. Children (*n* = 72) watched a video clip and were asked to recall it and asked cued recall questions either with their eyes open or closed. On free recall, younger children were more likely to make errors. On cued recall, younger children and those in the eyes open condition were more likely to make errors.

Participants from Egypt and UK were presented with a staged crime committed by an own-race woman with or without a headscarf. Participants were then asked to identify the culprit from a line-up of 10 faces with or without headscarves. British participants showed an advantage when the culprit left her hair uncovered, but Egyptian participants showed an advantage when the culprit wore a headscarf. This Egyptian headscarf effect was also replicated using British faces.

Investigated the effects of a perpetrator’s accent on a witness’s memory. Study 1 (*n* = 179) found support for the fact that processing a message spoken with an accent (as opposed to one without an accent) required more cognitive resources. Study 2 (*n* = 191) found that witnesses who heard more detailed messages reported fewer correct details about perpetrator’s appearance. Study 3 (*n* = 156) replicated study 2’s effects and found that higher threat lead to less accurate recollection of details.

Children (*n* = 115) were interviewed about a personally experienced event. Half of the children were interviewed with a confederate who answered the interview questions first, while the other half were interviewed alone. Children were influenced by the confederate’s answers to withhold some critical details observed, but not to add details not observed. Truthful reports contained more information than did false reports.

Participants (*n* = 93) were in one of three conditions: alcohol, placebo or control. They observed a live staged theft and were subsequently either exposed to misinformation or not. After being interviewed about the theft their responses were measured on accurate details, inaccurate details and “don’t know” answers. All participants exposed to misinformation were susceptible to it but there were no differences between levels of intoxication.

Participants (*n* = 420) witnessed a mock crime video before being presented with a show-up of the perpetrator or an innocent suspect. They were tested either immediately or after a 3-week delay, with one of
the three report options: Spontaneous report, forced-report (accept/reject), or free-report (accept/reject/don’t know). Participants in the spontaneous report condition used it only 2.2% of the time. Free-report decisions were the most accurate, the most diagnostic and came at no cost to the number of correct answers.


Investigated whether pre-interview instructions or establishing a memory narrative increased children’s (ages 5 to 8) ability to answer “I don’t know” to unanswerable questions. Study 1 ($n = 98$) found that pre-interview questions increased the amount of accurate “don’t know” answers and did not decrease the amount of accurate answers to answerable questions. Study 2 ($n = 108$) found that the narrative increased children’s ability to say “I don’t know” and their accurate responses to answerable questions.

**OTHER**


Expanded the homicide adaptation theory to explain why high-profile killers achieve idol status. A first study ($n = 299$) looked at people’s perceptions of murderers and found that having committed a murder signaled fitness to observers. This increased participants’ inclination to interact with the target and their evaluation of him/her. Opposite sex participants viewed the target’s murder more favorably. The second study ($n = 161$) confirmed the findings and ruled out potential confounds.


Participants viewed a photograph of where a rape allegedly happened, after reading a short text on a rape case, while their eye-movements were recorded. The photograph contained two myth-consistent cues, expected and unexpected. Study 1 ($n = 60$) showed that participants higher in RMA fixated the expected cue earlier and for less time and had a longer initial fixation of the unexpected cue. These differences mediated participants’ verdicts and blame judgments. In Study 2 ($n = 30$), participants’ level of RMA was manipulated. This manipulation significantly affected eye-movement patterns.
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DIVISION 41 SPONSORED EVENTS

EXPERT WITNESS THEMED PROGRAMMING:

Paper Session: Expert Witness
8/02 Thu: 9:00 AM  9:50 AM, Convention Center Room W304F

Title: Are Expert Witnesses Biased by the Side That Hired Them? Research Findings and Recommendations
Daniel C. Murrie, PhD, Institute of Law, Psychiatry, & Public Policy, Charlottesville, VA
Lucy A. Guarnera, BS, University of Virginia
Marcus T. Boccaccini, PhD, Sam Houston State University
Michael Binns, BS, University of Virginia

Title: Influence of Neurological Evidence in Capital Sentencing Hearings
Sanjay Shah, JD, MS, Drexel University
David S. DeMatteo, JD, PhD, Drexel University
Kirk Heilbrun, PhD, Drexel University

Title: Impact of Defendant Ethnicity on Expert Witness’ PsychoLegal Opinions
William N. Gowensmith, PhD, University of Denver
Kate E. McCallum, BA, University of Denver
Nina S. Nassab, BA, University of Denver

Symposium: American Academy of Forensic Psychology Expert Testimony and the Use of GSS in Confession Cases
8/02 Thu: 12:00 PM 12:50 PM, Convention Center Room W104A

Chair:
Matt C. Zaitchik, PhD, Roger Williams University

Participants:
Title: Pitfalls in Testimony and ConfessionRelated Cases
I. Bruce Frumkin, PhD, Independent Practice, South Miami, FL

Title: The GSS in a Large U.S. Forensic Sample
Stephen J. Lally, PhD, Argosy University, Washington, DC

Title: Psychometric Properties
James E. Sexton, PhD, PsyD, Argosy University, Washington, DC

Invited Address: Margaret Bull Kovera, PhD
8/02 Thu: 1:00 PM – 1:50 PM, Convention Center Room W304G

Title: Legal Decisions About Scientific Evidence: Testing Behavioral Assumptions in the Law
Margaret Bull Kovera, PhD, City University of New York, John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Presidential Address
8/02 Thu: 4:00 PM – 4:50 PM Peabody Orlando Hotel, Celebration Room 6

Title: Expert Testimony on the Psychology of Eyewitness Identification
Brian Cutler, PhD, University of Ontario Institute of Technology, Oshawa, ON, Canada

Skill Building Session: Preparing the New Clinician for Court – Skill Building Through Simulation
8/03 Fri: 8:00 AM 9:50 AM, Convention Center Room W311F

Chair:
Patricia A. Stankovitch, PsyD, University of Saint Thomas
Participants:

**Title: The Interprofessional Center: Who Are We, and What Do We Do?**
Patricia A. Stankovitch, PsyD, University of Saint Thomas

**Title: Setting the Stage: Objectives for Our Simulation**
Virgil O. Wiebe, JD, University of Saint Thomas

**Title: Interdisciplinary Collaboration Surrounding the Role of Professional Witness**
George V. Baboila, MSW, LCSW, University of Saint Thomas

**Title: Expert and Lay Professional Witness Class Content**
Jennifer L. Wright, JD, University of Saint Thomas

**Symposium: So You Want to Be an Expert Witness**
8/04 Sat: 1:00 PM  1:50 PM, Convention Center Room W304E

Co-Chairs:
Lauren E. Kois, MA, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Alana N. Cook, MS, BA, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada

Participants:
Margaret Bull Kovera, PhD, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Patricia A. Zapf, PhD, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Barry Rosenfeld, PhD, Fordham University
Ronald Roesch, PhD, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada

Discussant:
Donald N. Bersoff, PhD, JD, Drexel University

**Symposium: The Ethical Expert Witness**
8/05 Sun: 9:00 AM  10:50 AM, Convention Center Room W311B

Chair:
William E. Foote, PhD, Independent Practice, Albuquerque, NM

Participants:

**Title: Informed Consent and Notification of Purpose**
Mary Connell, EdD, Independent Practice, Fort Worth, TX

**Title: Get Over It: There Is No Such Thing As an Objective Expert Know Your Biases and Control for Them**
Joel A. Dvoskin, PhD, University of Arizona
Title: Integrating the Specialty Guidelines and the Ethics Code: Forensic Dilemmas and Opportunities
Stephen H. Behnke, JD, PhD, APA Ethics Office, Washington, DC

Title: Second Referral, Same Examinee: A Decision Tree for Making Ethical Choices
William E. Foote, PhD, Independent Practice, Albuquerque, NM

Discussant:
Donald N. Bersoff, PhD, JD, Drexel University

DIVISION 41 – GENERAL PROGRAMMING
Paper Session: Emerging Juvenile Issues in Psychology and Law
8/02 Thu: 8:00 AM – 8:50 AM, Convention Center, Room W104A

Title: Conduct Problem Youth With Psychopathic Traits: Incremental Versus Entity Theories of Intelligence
Randall T. Salekin, PhD, University of Alabama
Kimberly M. Price, BS, University of Alabama
Kathryn Tant, BA, University of Alabama
Xinying Ang, BS, University of Alabama
Whitney S. Lester, MA, University of Iowa

Title: Mixed Method Study of the Impact of a Juvenile Violence Risk Assessment Instrument
Kevin Barnes Ceeney, MA, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Lin Fang, PhD, University of Toronto, ON, Canada
Sally H.P. Lam, MS, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Title: Bullying and School Shootings: Perceptions of Victim Culpability and Retributive Justice
Sherzine M. McKenzie, BA, Sam Houston State University
James W. Crosby, PhD, Sam Houston State University

Title: Psychopathy in Youth and Facial Affect Recognition: A Multimorph Investigation
Elizabeth W. Adams, BS, University of Alabama
Randall T. Salekin, PhD, University of Alabama
Ross D. Grimes, MA, University of Alabama

Paper Session: Assessment in Various Forensic Contexts
8/02 Thu: 10:00 AM 10:50 AM, Convention Center Room W308B

Title: Validation of the SIRSA in a Pretrial Criminal Defendant Sample
Debbie Green, PhD, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Brian J. Belfi, PsyD, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, New York, NY
Hima B. Reddy, MA, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Rebecca Jankowitz, JD, BA, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Conrad J. Roth, MA, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, New York, NY
Jessica Klaver, PhD, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, New York, NY

**Title:** Outcomes of Insanity Acquittees Transferred From Forensic to Civil Psychiatric Hospitals
Debbie Green, PhD, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Julie A. Yagoda, BS, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Yimi Omofuma, BA, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Brian J. Belfi, PsyD, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, New York, NY
Michal Kunz, MD, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, New York, NY

**Title:** Evaluation of the MMPI2RF VRINR and TRINR Scales in a Criminal Forensic Setting
Hima B. Reddy, MA, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Debbie Green, PhD, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Brian J. Belfi, PsyD, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, New York, NY
Conrad J. Roth, MA, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, New York, NY
Rebecca Jankowitz, JD, BA, Fairleigh Dickinson University

**Title:** Insanity Acquittees: A Descriptive Study of Factors Associated With Recommitment to a Forensic Psychiatric Hospital
Julie A. Yagoda, BS, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Michal Kunz, MD, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, New York, NY
Debbie Green, PhD, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Brian J. Belfi, PsyD, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, New York, NY
Michelle West, MA, Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center, Wards Island, NY

**Symposium: LGBT Issues Within the Criminal Justice System**
Co-Sponsoring with Division 44
8/03 Fri: 10:00 AM – 11:50 AM, Convention Center Room W311F

**Chair:**
Kevin L. Nadal, PhD, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice

**Participants:**

**Title:** Experiences of LGB Microaggressions in the Criminal Justice System
Julie Sriken, BA, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice

**Title:** LGBT Experience With the Courts: The Moderating Role of Gender Nonconformity
Alexis A. Robinson, MA, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice

**Title:** Experiences of Transgender Female Sex Workers
Kristin C. Davidoff, BS, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice

**Title:** Investigating Experiences of Male Sex Workers in New York City
Alexis Johnson, MA, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Discussant:
Kevin L. Nadal, PhD, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Symposium: A Novel Collaboration
Law and Psychology Training Clinics Assist Veterans
8/03 Fri: 5:00 PM  5:50 PM, Convention Center Room W304C

Co-Chairs:
Jessye CohenFilipic, MS, Virginia Commonwealth University
Leticia Y. Flores, PhD, Virginia Commonwealth University

Participants:
Title: Best of Both Worlds: The Law School Perspective
Stacey Rae Simcox, JD, College of William & Mary

Title: True Interdisciplinary Training and the Role for Psychology Students
Leticia Y. Flores, PhD, Virginia Commonwealth University

Paper Session: Social Psychology and Law
8/04 Sat: 8:00 AM  8:50 AM, Convention Center Room W106

Title: Social Indicators of Deception: Training to Detect Deception in Conspirators
Tripp E. Driskell, MS, Florida Maxima Corporation, Winter Park
James E. Driskell, PhD, Florida Maxima Corporation, Winter Park
Eduardo Salas, PhD, Institute for Simulation & Training, Orlando, FL

Title: Suggestive Questioning Affects Likelihood of Alibi Corroboration
Joshua D. Behl, BA, University of Florida
Megan R. Kienzle, MA, University of Florida
Lora M. Levett, PhD, University of Florida

Title: Does a Confession Affect the Likelihood of Alibi Corroboration for Friends and Strangers?
Megan R. Kienzle, MA, University of Florida
Lora M. Levett, PhD, University of Florida

Symposium: Widespread Incarceration of African American Males and Its Effects on Their Families and Communities
8/04 Sat: 9:00 AM  10:50 AM, Convention Center Room W304B

Chair:
Antoinette E. Kavanaugh, PhD, Independent Practice, Chicago, IL

Participants:
Title: Disproportionate Minority Confinement
Yara Costa, MS, Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Title: The High Conviction Rate of African American Adult Males
Ashly A. Henson, BS, Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Title: Intergenerational Impact of Incarceration on Youth: Family Cycle of Incarceration
Ma’lsah N. Bohannan, BA, Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Title: Effects of the High Conviction Rates Among Black Men on Black Women’s Health and Dating
Lori Howard, BS, Chicago School of Professional Psychology
Title: Economic Costs of Disproportionate Incarceration of African Americans
Lynnette K. Suarez, MA, Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Discussant:
Michelle HoyWatkins, PsyD, Chicago School of Professional Psychology

SkillBuilding Session: Forensic Evaluation of Traumatic Stress and Dissociation Malpractice and Personal Injury Cases
8/04 Sat: 11:00 AM  11:50 AM, Convention Center Room W311F

Chair:
Lisa M. Rocchio, PhD, Lisa M. Rocchio, PhD & Associates, Inc., Johnston, RI

Participants:
Title: Forensic Evaluation of Traumatic Stress and Dissociation in Civil Litigation
Lisa M. Rocchio, PhD, Lisa M. Rocchio, PhD & Associates, Inc., Johnston, RI

Title: Forensic Evaluation of Traumatic Stress and Dissociation in Malpractice Cases
Constance J. Dalenberg, PhD, Alliant International University San Diego

Paper Session: Contemporary Issues in Psychology and Law
8/05 Sun: 8:00 AM  8:50 AM, Convention Center Room W303C

Title: Efficacy of a Community Reentry Program on Recidivism
Julie S. Costopoulos, PhD, Florida Institute of Technology
Patricia Monaghan, MA, Florida Institute of Technology
Amy Plewinski, BA, Florida Institute of Technology
Erica Richardson, BA, Florida Institute of Technology

Title: Job Satisfaction in the Federal Bureau of Prisons: A Preliminary Analysis
Angela M. Webb, BS, Chicago School of Professional Psychology
Title: Factorial Survey of American and Russian Victims’ Fairness Judgment of Criminal Procedural Outcome  
Julia Rubinshteyn, BA, Marquette University  
Olga Semukhina, PhD, Marquette University

Title: Cultural Competence of Forensic Mental Health Students and Professionals  
Lauren E. Kois, MA, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
Preeti Chauhan, PhD, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Paper Session: Clinical Issues in Psychology and Law  
8/05 Sun: 11:00 AM 11:50 AM, Convention Center Room W103B

Title: Comparison of Comprehensive Models of Psychopathic and Borderline Personality Disorder  
Alana N. Cook, MS, BA, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada  
Brianne K. Layden, MA, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada  
Ashley A. Murray, MA, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada  
Simone Viljoen, MA, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada  
Charlotte R. McGinnis, MA, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada  
Stephen D. Hart, PhD, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada

Title: Refining the Construct of Antisocial Personality Disorder: Diagnostic Criteria and Subtypes  
Jared A. DeFife, PhD, Emory University  
Drew I. Westen, PhD, Emory University

Title: Oppositional Defiant Disorder and Its Dimensions  
Randall T. Salekin, PhD, University of Alabama  
Emily A.M. MacDougall, BA, University of Alabama  
Xinying Ang, BS, University of Alabama  
Ted Barker, PhD, Birkbeck College, London, England, United Kingdom

Title: Using Personality Structure to Identify Subtypes of Psychopathic Traits in Juveniles  
Samantha K. Litt, BA, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
Diana M. Falkenbach, PhD, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Poster Session I  
8/02 Thu: 11:00 AM 11:50 AM, Convention Center West Hall A4B3

Title: Adaptive Functioning: Psychopathy and Emotional Intelligence in Corporate and Student Samples  
Jacqueline Howe, BA, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
Christina Massey, MA, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
Diana M. Falkenbach, PhD, City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Title: Unresolved Ethical Challenges in Providing Mandated SexOffender Treatment
Susan G. Goldberg, PhD, JD, Duquesne University
Miho Outhouse, PsyD, State of Virginia, Alexandria

Title: Admissibility of Psychological Expert Testimony: Trends in Judicial Decision Making
Kelly M. McSorley, MS, Nova Southeastern University
Christine Fultyn, MS, MA, Nova Southeastern University
Samantha Smith, BS, Nova Southeastern University
Blake A. McGrane, BA, Nova Southeastern University
James Powderly, MA, Nova Southeastern University
Kenley Sullivan, BS, Nova Southeastern University
Jacqueline Kerner, MA, Nova Southeastern University
LeKisha Mixon, MA, Nova Southeastern University
Taylor L. Hoffman, BA, Nova Southeastern University
David L. Shapiro, PhD, Nova Southeastern University

Title: Effect of Treatment on Recidivism and Institutional Adjustment for Young Offenders: A 23 Year FollowUp
Peggy V. Nave, MA, Argosy University, Washington, DC
E. Sexton, PhD, PsyD, Argosy University, Washington, DC
Stephen J. Lally, PhD, Argosy University, Washington, DC

Title: Pretrial Publicity Affects Emotion, Trial Evidence Interpretation, Decisions, and Victim Credibility
Christine L. Ruva, PhD, University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee
Jami C. Worley, BA, University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee
Melissa Nieliwocki, AA, University of South Florida Sarasota—Manatee

Title: Prospective Jurors’ Attitudes Toward the Jury Selection Process
Wendy P. Heath, PhD, Rider University

Title: Preserving the Right to a Fair Trial: Examining the Prejudicial Value of Auditory Evidence
Emily R. Edwards, BA, University of Central Florida
Karen E. Mottarella, PsyD, University of Central Florida
Shannon N. Whitten, PhD, University of Central Florida

Title: Examination of the Role of Malignant Narcissistic Personality Disorder As a Root of Serial Homicide
Maria Pasqualetti, MSE, Chicago School of Professional PsychologyLos Angeles
Debra Warner, PsyD, Chicago School of Professional PsychologyLos Angeles
Jolene C. Harbaugh, PsyD, Chicago School of Professional PsychologyLos Angeles

Title: Psychopathy Evidence in AdolescentOffender Transfer Proceedings
Emily A.M. MacDougall, BA, University of Alabama
Jodi L. Viljoen, PhD, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada
Randall T. Salekin, PhD, University of Alabama

Title: Premorbid Psychiatric Diagnosis and Treatment of Juvenile Delinquents: A Case of Too Little Too Late
Michael J. Herkov, PhD, University of Florida
Max Simonsen, BA, University of Florida
Billy A. Palmer, AA, University of Florida

Title: Development of a MMPI Adolescent SexOffender Scale
Michael J. Herkov, PhD, University of Florida
Max Simonsen, BA, University of Florida
Billy A. Palmer, AA, University of Florida
Amanda Schwait, BA, University of Florida
Sarah Teltelbaum, BA, University of Florida
Scott Teitelbaum, MD, University of Florida

Title: Violence Risk Communication: Framing Actuarial Risk Probabilities With Potential Jurors
Collette E. Wagner, BS, School of Professional Psychology at Forest Institute

Title: Typology and Treatment of Female Sex Offenders
Stephanie Ravine, BS, AA, School of Professional Psychology at Forest Institute
Kristi Crane, MS, School of Professional Psychology at Forest Institute
Carlie Nikel, BS, AA, School of Professional Psychology at Forest Institute

Title: Male Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence: The Influence of Psychopathy, Borderline Personality, Attachment, and Trauma
Elizabeth A. Johnson, MA, Carlos Albizu University Miami Campus
Monique Levermore, PhD, Carlos Albizu University Miami Campus
Brooke Bauman, PhD, C.O.R.T.E., Delray Beach, FL
Ted B. Cunliffe, PhD, Carlos Albizu University Miami Campus

Title: Criminal Interrogations: An Evaluation of Police Investigators’ Techniques
Chelsea M. Holliday, BA, Florida Institute of Technology
Vanessa Edkins, PhD, Florida Institute of Technology

Title: Perceptions of Negative Consequences of Youth Sexting
Megan J. Murphy, BA, Drexel University
Heidi N. Strohmaier, BA, Drexel University
David S. DeMatteo, JD, PhD, Drexel University

Title: Evaluation of Police Training on LGBT Issues: Knowledge, Apprehension, SelfEfficacy, and Tactics
Audrey R. Harkness, BA, University of CaliforniaSanta Barbara
Tania Israel, PhD, University of CaliforniaSanta Barbara
Kevin Delucio, BA, University of CaliforniaSanta Barbara
Todd Raymond Avellar, BA, University of CaliforniaSanta Barbara
Jay N. Ledbetter, MA, University of CaliforniaSanta Barbara

**Title: Competency Restoration Programs and Practice Guidelines in Forensic Psychiatric Settings**
Enna E. Taylor, MS, Carlos Albizu UniversityDoral
Jason M. Smith, MS, Carlos Albizu UniversityDoral
David A. Landry, MS, Carlos Albizu UniversityDoral
Ted B. Cunliffe, PhD, Carlos Albizu UniversityDoral

**Title: The Sell Effect: Involuntary Medication Treatment Is a Clear and Convincing Success**
Robert E. Cochrane, PsyD, Federal Correctional Complex, Butner, NC
Maureen Reardon, PhD, Federal Medical Center, Butner, NC
Bryon Herbel, MD, Federal Medical Center, Butner, NC
Kristina Lloyd, PhD, University of Massachusetts Medical School

**Poster Session II**
8/04 Sat: 12:00 PM  12:50 PM, Convention Center West Hall A4B3

**Title: EQ, Criminal Personality Typologies, Life Histories, and Sexual Dysfunctions Among Sex Offenders**
Vigneswaran Veeramuthu, MEd, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai
Azlina Kosnin, PhD, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai
Jiar Kee Yeo, PhD, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai

**Title: Weighing the Evidence: Legal Implications of the Alleged CSI Effect**
Jennie P. Davis, BS, Drexel University

**Title: Personality Assessment Inventory and Violent and Nonviolent Offenders**
Joseph G. Pascetta, MA, Chicago School of Professional Psychology

**Title: Moderators of Parental Acrimony and Depression in Family Litigation Cases**
Jan Faust, PhD, Nova Southeastern University
Kate Hoefling, MS, Nova Southeastern University
Sarah M. Nelson, BA, Nova Southeastern University

**Title: Role of Empathy in Mock Juror Decisions in Sexual Harassment Cases**
Elaine J. Savoy, MA, University of Houston
Elizabeth A. Burris Garner, JD, University of Houston
MaryMadison Eagle, BS, University of Houston
John P. Vincent, PhD, University of Houston
Title: Application of Self-Construal in College Students Criminal Behavior
Christopher J. Romani, BA, Texas Tech University
Michelle C. Gates, MA, Texas Tech University
Erin E. Hardin, PhD, Texas Tech University

Title: Victim Impact Statements and Emotion Ratings Using Capital Penalty Phase Transcripts
Bryan P. Myers, PhD, University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Erin D. Cooke, MA, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Sarah Henry, BA, University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Narina Nunez, PhD, University of Wyoming

Title: Predicting Adherence to Forensic Interview Training
Natalie M. Therrien, BA, University of Regina, SK, Canada
Heather L. Price, PhD, University of Regina, SK, Canada
Kim P. Roberts, PhD, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, ON, Canada
Sarah J. Reiser, BA, University of Regina, SK, Canada

Title: A Gender-Responsive Developmental Treatment Model for Female Adolescent Sex Offenders
Mallika Moussavy, MA, Azusa Pacific University

Title: The Casey Anthony Trial: Biases in Juror Perceptions
Jake E. Caldwell, AA, University of Central Florida
Maxine Najle, University of Central Florida
Amy Tam, University of Central Florida
Raven Cokely, University of Central Florida
Ronald Okolichany, University of Central Florida

Title: Interaction of Self-Esteem and Antisocial Peers and Boyfriends on Female Offending
Shannon Handa, University of California-Irvine
Jordan Bechtold, MA, University of California-Irvine
Elizabeth Cauffman, PhD, University of California-Irvine

Title: Implications of the Sell Decision
Jamie A. Bell, MA, School of Professional Psychology at Forest Institute

Title: Effect of Compliance With Jury Instructions on Damage Awards in Simulated Civil Sexual Harassment
Elizabeth A. Burris Garner, JD, University of Houston
MaryMadison Eagle, BS, University of Houston
Elaine J. Savoy, MA, University of Houston
John P. Vincent, PhD, University of Houston

Title: Juvenile Risk Factors Predicting Adult Psychopathy
Jenna C. Boulas, Creighton University
Kindra M. Seifert, BA, Creighton University
Matthew T. Huss, PhD, Creighton University
Mario J. Scalora, PhD, University of NebraskaLincoln

Title: Neighborhoods and Juvenile Offenders’ Perceptions of the Justice System
Susan Wensley, AA, University of CaliforniaIrvine
Caroline Sisk, BA, University of CaliforniaIrvine
Brande Otis, University of CaliforniaIrvine
Adam Boessen, BA, University of MissouriColumbia
Elizabeth Cauffman, PhD, Temple University

Title: Student Perceptions of Peers: An Analysis of Comfort Level in Regard to Race and Criminal History
Kendra M. Anderson, BA, University of Central Arkansas
Femina P. Varghese, PhD, University of Central Arkansas
Nathaniel Norwood, University of Central Arkansas
Emily Trower, University of Central Arkansas
Jasmyn Wilkins, University of Central Arkansas

Title: Methodological Concerns in Modifying Actuarial Instruments for Use With Archival Data
Hannah T. Neumann, BA, Palo Alto University
Victoria Pagano, BA, Palo Alto University
Christopher M. Weaver, PhD, Palo Alto University

Title: An Expert Witness in a Perfect Storm: Bullying, Asperger’s Syndrome, Weapons, and Columbine Worship
C. Rick Ellis, EdD, Spectrum Psychological and Forensic Services, Virginia Beach, VA

Executive Committee Meeting
8/01 Wed: 4:00 PM  7:50 PM, Peabody Orlando Hotel, Blue Spring Room II

Business Meeting, Division 41
8/02 Thu: 5:00 PM  5:50 PM, Peabody Orlando Hotel, Celebration Room 6

Division 41 Social Hour
8/02 Thu: 6:00 PM  7:50 PM, Peabody Orlando Hotel, Celebration Room 8
Please Consider Nominating a Colleague, a Student, or Yourself for the 2013 APA Distinguished Professional Practice and Student Award Nominations

**APA Award for Distinguished Professional Contributions to Applied Research**
http://www.apa.org/about/awards/applied-research.aspx

**APA Award for Distinguished Professional Contributions to Independent Practice**
http://www.apa.org/about/awards/private-sector.aspx

**APA Award for Distinguished Professional Contributions to Institutional Practice**

**APA/APAGS Award for Distinguished Graduate Student in Professional Psychology**
http://www.apa.org/about/awards/grad-profpsyc.aspx

**DEADLINE**: July 1, 2012

The APA Distinguished Professional Practice and Student Awards are awarded each year by APA and the recipients receive an honorarium of $1,000; the opportunity to present an invited address at APA's Annual Convention (2013 in Honolulu, HI); a waiver of convention registration fees; and reimbursement of up to $1,500 in expenses related to attendance at the convention.

For questions, please contact Sheila Kerr at (202) 336-5878 or skerr@apa.org
The AP-LS Committee for Early Career Professionals (ECPs) is pleased to provide an update on our recent activities and ongoing work related to the Grant-in-Aid program, conference events, and resources available to ECPs.

**Grant-in-Aid Program.** The Committee for ECPs administers a Grant-in-Aid program annually. In the most recent competition, we awarded grants ranging between $4,000 and $5,000 to four ECPs to assist with costs of conducting their research. We are very pleased to announce the recipients for the 2011-2012 Grant-in-Aid cycle:

**Caroline Greaves, Ph.D.**
*Forensic Psychiatric Services Commission, BC Mental Health & Addiction Services*
Project Title: Resiliency and Mental Health: Strengths and Protective Factors in Individuals with Severe Mental Illness Adjudicated under the Forensic Mental Health System

**Deah S. Quinlivan, Ph.D.**
*Florida Southern College*
Project Title: The Effects of Pre-Admonition Suggestion on Eyewitnesses’ Accuracy, Retrospective Certainty, Beliefs, and Expectations

**Joan A. Reid, Ph.D., LMHC, CRC**
*University of South Florida*
Project Title: Assessing Trauma Bonding in Trafficked Youth
$5,000

**Jay Singh, Ph.D.**
*University of South Florida*
Project Title: Cross-National Perspectives on the Practical Application of Structured Violence Risk Assessment Tools

Congratulations to this year’s awardees! We look forward to hearing about their results at a future AP-LS or APA conference. Of course, integral to the Grant-in-Aid program are the numerous reviewers who volunteer their time to provide valuable feedback to applicants. We would like to express out sincere thanks to the following individuals for serving as reviewers in the 2011-2012 Grant-in-Aid cycle:

Brian Bornstein  
Rob Cramer  
Keith Cruise  
Joel Dvoskin  
John Edens  
Melissa Farley  
James O. Finkenhauer  
Fiona Gabbert  
Abbie Goldberg  
Edie Greene  
Stephanie Halter  
Stephen Hart  
Kirk Heilbrun  
Amy Hyman Gregory  
Shayne Jones  
Sandy Jung  
Saul Kassin  
Kate Kuvalanka  
Jill Levenson  
Robert McGrath  
Dawn McQuiston-Surrett  
Christian Meissner  
Monica Miller  
John Monahan  
Bryan Myers  
Joanna Pozzulo  
Jennifer Robbennolt  
Corinne de Ruiter  
Michael Seto  
Dan Simon  
Elin Skagerberg  
Gina Vincent  
Vivienne de Vogel  
Aldert Vrij  
Stuart White  
Bernard Whitley  
Daniel B. Wright
Upcoming ECP Grant-in-Aid deadline: In response to suggestions from recent applicants, the deadline will be earlier this year to allow applicants to make use of reviewers’ feedback for the preparation of federal grants with late fall deadlines. This year, the deadline for receipt of submissions is October 15, 2012. Please find details at http://www.ap-ls.org/grantsfunding/ECPGrantsInAid.php

AP-LS Conference. This year, the conference co-chairs again offered reduced conference fees for ECPs who were within 3 years of their most recent degree (in addition, membership dues continue to be reduced for ECPs who are within 7 years of graduation). Dr. Marcus Patterson presented a workshop at the conference in San Juan entitled ‘The Why and How of Professional Development in Psychology.’ He reviewed recent research on factors and predictors of professional advancement in both the science and practice of professional psychology, and a lively discussion with much audience participation ensued. The ECP Committee also hosted an evening reception at the conference to promote networking opportunities. It was an excellent turnout, and we are looking forward to welcoming you to our social in Portland.

Upcoming APA Convention. If you are attending APA in Orlando this August, you will have the option of having a truly interactive conference experience. In early June 2012, you will be able to download the APA2012 app to your smartphone. The app will provide information about sessions and speakers, allow you to create a customizable convention schedule/personal itinerary, receive convention alerts via text messaging, and much more. As usual, the AP-LS ECP Committee will host a Hospitality Suite Social at APA. We hope to see you there!


If you have input for the ECP Committee on how best to support ECPs, if you would like to make a suggestion for a newsletter column or workshop topic, or if you would like to join the AP-LS Committee on ECPs, please contact the committee chair, Laura Guy, at laura.guy@umassmed.edu.

AP-LS Dissertation Award Program

The American Psychology-Law Society confers Dissertation Awards for scientific research and scholarship relevant to the promotion of the interdisciplinary study of psychology and law. Students who complete dissertations involving basic or applied research in psychology and law are encouraged to apply for these awards. To be eligible for these awards, you must be a member of AP-LS and defend your dissertation in 2012. First-, second-, and third-place awards will be conferred, and the winners will be invited to present their research at the 2013 AP-LS Conference, which is being held in Portland, Oregon.

To apply for the Dissertation Awards, please attach the following items in an e-mail to aplsdissertations@gmail.com by December 15, 2012: (1) the dissertation as it was submitted to the student’s university (in Word or pdf); (2) the dissertation with all author, advisor, and school identifying information removed (in Word or pdf); and (3) a signed letter of support (on letterhead) from the dissertation advisor. For more information, please contact Rachel Kalbeitzer (rkalbeitzer@gmail.com), Chair of the Dissertation Awards Committee.
ANNOUNCING:

THE 2012 SUMMER INSTITUTE IN
POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

at Stanford University from July 15 – August 4, 2012

Applications are being accepted for the 20th Annual Summer Institute in Political Psychology (SIPP), to be held at Stanford University July 15 to August 4, 2012. The SIPP program takes up to 60 participants and is filling up; there are still some spots available.

The Summer Institute offers three weeks of intensive training in political psychology. Political psychology is an exciting and thriving field that explores the origins of political behavior and the causes of political events, with a special focus on the psychological mechanisms at work.

Research findings in political psychology advance basic theory of human cognitive and social behavior and are an important basis for political decision-making in practice.

SIPP was founded in 1991 at Ohio State University, and Stanford has hosted SIPP since 2005, with support from Stanford University and from the National Science Foundation. Hundreds of participants have attended SIPP during these years.

The 2012 SIPP curriculum is designed to (1) provide broad exposure to theories, empirical findings, and research traditions; (2) illustrate successful cross-disciplinary research and integration; (3) enhance methodological pluralism; and (4) strengthen networks among scholars from around the world.

SIPP activities will include lectures by world-class faculty, discussion groups, research/interest group meetings, group projects, and an array of social activities.

Some of the topics covered in past SIPP programs include race relations, conflict and dispute resolution, voting and elections, international conflict, decision-making by political elites, moral disengagement and violence, social networks, activism and social protest, political socialization, and justice.

In 2012, SIPP will accept up to 60 participants, including graduate students, faculty, professionals, and advanced undergraduates.

For detailed information and to apply, visit this website:

http://www.stanford.edu/group/sipp/2012

Applicants are accepted on a rolling basis until all slots are filled, so applying soon maximizes chances of acceptance.
Fellow Students,

This has been a banner year for the Student Section. We are particularly pleased with the reception of student events held at the AP-LS 2012 Conference in San Juan. Our first pre-conference student informational breakfast was well received, with over 80 students in attendance. Both students and professionals gave rave reviews about Drs. Brian Bornstein, Mark Costanzo, Edie Greene, Dick Reppucci, and Ron Roesch’s candid discussion during our invited panel, “Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring Awards Winners.” The student social was one of the most attended events in recent years. The purpose of these events is to draw student members together, to learn from others’ academic and clinical experiences, and to provide networking opportunities for the next generation of psychology and law professionals. We hope that this was your experience in San Juan. As always, we encourage members to offer the Student Cabinet suggestions for improvement so that we can build upon these events for next year’s conference in Portland, Oregon.

The success of these events would not be possible without the work of student volunteers who helped with administrative conference tasks and student paper and poster presentation judging. We extend our gratitude to these students, and particularly to the Campus Representatives (CRs) who were on the forefront of recruiting students for these positions. A very special thanks goes to the CRs of the Month for February and March, Zoe Turner-Corn of John Jay College of Criminal Justice and Evan Lowder of the College of Saint Benedict, for who were crucial in promoting conference activities.

While the school year is coming to a close, we still have a number of goals to accomplish over the summer. Student officers will be working to compile a comprehensive catalog to be posted on our webpage of all forensic-focused clinical internships and post docs in time for the upcoming application cycle. In terms of Student Section organization, we will write our first set of bylaws, restructure student officer positions, and clarify if and how CR elections will be conducted in Fall 2012. We will host an invited panel, “So you want to be an expert witness…,” consisting of premier researchers and clinicians experienced in expert testimony at the 2012 APA Convention in Orlando, Florida. Also in our plans is a student gathering in the AP-LS hospitality suite during the Convention. Looking ahead to the conference in Portland next year, we will sponsor a panel featuring top past and present editors of psychology and law journals who will speak about the publication process. Excitingly, we are in the planning stages of organizing the inaugural AP-LS Conference Fun Run 5K Race, and are so far receiving an encouraging response.
Thanks again for your support of the Student Section. We hope to see you at the APA Convention in Orlando!

Best,

Lauren Kois, M.A.
Chair, AP-LS Student Section
lkois@jjay.cuny.edu

Alana Cook, M.A.,
Chair-Elect, AP-LS Student Section
alanac@sfu.ca

Outstanding Posters:
Laura Drislane, Florida State University: Indexing constructs of the triarchic model of psychopathy using items from the Psychopathic Personality Inventory
Ekaterina Pivovarova, Fordham University: Malingering Assessment of Psychopathology (MAP): A structured decision making tool to guide clinical judgment
Jennifer Perillo, John Jay College and the Graduate Center, CUNY: Bluffing about evidence: Do laypersons get it?

Outstanding Papers:
Miko Wilford, Iowa State University: Let’s make a deal: Exploring willingness to accept a plea bargain when guilty or innocent
Laura Thornton, University of New Orleans: Predictive utility of a specifier to the diagnosis of conduct disorder based on the presence of callous-unemotional traits
Caroline Titcomb, University of Alabama: From first impressions to verdict: predictive pathways in mock-juror decision-making

Diversity Award:
Rebecca Ojserkis, Amherst College: To act like an attorney or to act like a woman? The impact of presentation style on juror perceptions and decision–making

Corrections Award:
Ashley Murray, Simon Fraser University: Identifying differences in violence risk ratings between stalkers and intimate partner batterers to improve risk management strategies
CHILDREN AND CROSS EXAMINATION
TIME TO CHANGE THE RULES?

EDITED BY
John R Spencer
Michael E Lamb

In 2009, Stephen Barker was convicted of rape on the evidence of a little girl who was four-and-a-half years old at the trial, and about three-and-a-half when first interviewed by the police. The high point of the proceedings was the child’s appearance as a live witness in order for Barker’s counsel to attempt a cross-examination. This case focused attention on the need, imposed by current English law, for even tiny children to come to court for a live cross-examination. In 1989, the Pigot Committee proposed a scheme under which the whole of a young child’s evidence, including cross-examination, would be obtained out of court and in advance of trial. In 1999 a provision designed to give effect to this was included in the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act, but it has not yet been brought into force. The full Pigot proposal was implemented, however, in Western Australia, and similar schemes operate in a number of European jurisdictions. This book of essays examines a number of these schemes, and argues the case for further reforms in the UK.

BOOK DETAILS

June 2012 314pp Paperback 9781849463072

£30 / 39 / US$60 / CDN $60

THE EDITORS

John R Spencer QC is Professor of Law in the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of Selwyn College.

Michael E Lamb is Professor and Head of the Department of Social and Development Psychology and a Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge University

CONTENTS
1. Introduction
    JR Spencer
2. ‘Kicking and Screaming’-the Slow Road to Best Evidence
    Joyce Plotnikoff and Richard Woolfson
3. Alternative Routes:
    Accusatorial Jurisdictions on the Slow Road to Best Evidence
    Emily Henderson
4. Children’s Evidence in Legal Proceedings-the Position in Western Australia
    Hal Jackson
5. Cross-examining the Child Complainant: Rights, Innovations and Unfounded Fears in the Australian Context
    Annie Cossins
6. An Idea Whose Time has Come: The Reform of Criminal Procedure for Child Witnesses in New Zealand
    Emily Henderson
7. Child Witnesses in Austria
    Verena Murschetz
8. The Position in Norway
    Trond Myklebust
9. Conclusions
    JR Spencer
Accessing *Law and Human Behavior*:

*Law and Human Behavior (LHB)* is now published by the American Psychological Association (APA). AP–LS members can access *LHB* in 3 easy ways:

1) **Full-text access to the Journal:** All Society members can now access past and new *LHB* content through “My APA.” Log in to “My APA” via the APA home page ([http://www.apa.org/](http://www.apa.org/)) or browse the journal’s content at [http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/lhb/](http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/lhb/). To look up your “My APA” account, please use the email address you have on file with the Society.

2) **New Content Alerts:** You can subscribe for free electronic alerts (PsycALERT©) that will notify you whenever anything new becomes available on the *LHB* web page—this includes new issues of the journal and papers published through OnlineFirst (i.e., made available electronically ahead of publication in print). To subscribe to PsycALERT©, go to [http://notify.apa.org/](http://notify.apa.org/). Please subscribe using the email address you have on file with the Society—this will not only connect you with the TOC and abstracts but also automatically grant you access to full-text articles.
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