Do you have a strategic plan?

by Brian Cutler

In my column for the fall 2012 newsletter, I shared some thoughts that I hoped would be useful to junior faculty members faced with navigating the tricky waters of the academy. Four people told me they liked the column. This outcome far exceeded my expectations, so I chose to write on this theme again for this newsletter.
As of this writing, I have spent nearly 13 years in academic administration as an associate dean and department chair at three universities. In these capacities I have often had the pleasure (ha!) of participating in strategic planning processes. At first, my enthusiasm for strategic planning was modest at best . . . comparable, perhaps, to my routine at the gym: It is uncomfortable and time-consuming while it is happening, it feels great when it’s over, and it is good for me in the long run. My appreciation for planning has increased over the years, however. Note that I have dropped “strategic” from the phrase for now, as I mean, really, what other planning is worth doing?

Do YOU have a strategic plan? If not, why not? If so, you may turn the page and continue on to the next newsletter feature. Why is it useful to have a plan for your professional development? Your plan is beneficial in several respects. First, it guides your choices. Productive colleagues are faced with more opportunities than they can handle. Your plan helps you decide which opportunities to accept and which ones to decline. Don’t underestimate the importance of these decisions. Just talk to a colleague who has difficulty saying “no.” Look for the nearest blood pressure monitor, he or she will be there. Second, your plan helps you prioritize your tasks and manage your time. Use the following heuristic: Spend more time on stuff that is part of your plan and less time on the other stuff. Third, your plan helps you to communicate to your chair, dean, review committee, promotion and tenure committee, etc., what you have been doing, why you have been doing it, what you plan to do, and why you need a course off next semester. They will want to invest in you.

When planning, it is important to distinguish between goals and means to goals. Goals should be visionary and ambitious. For example, set a goal of becoming internationally recognized in your field of research. Or set a goal of becoming recognized at your university as an exceptional teacher. Or set a goal of becoming recognized in your university, community, or profession for public service. Ideally, your goal should align with your employer’s goal and your stage in your career. If you set goals that are not valued by your employer, you won’t enjoy much support or extrinsic reward. Be honest with yourself. If your personal professional goals do not align well with your employer’s, considering looking for a new employer with a better fit or simply accept that your employer will (reasonably) invest its resources in the work of others whose goals have better
alignment, and don’t be bitter about it. Once you are satisfied with your goal or goals, develop shorter-term objectives and outcomes that you can track formally or informally. These can be one-year, two-year, five-year objectives that guide your decision-making on a day-to-day basis.

I mentioned above that you should not mistake means to goals as goals. For example, I have heard several colleagues over the years express an ultimate goal of getting tenure at their universities. Although clearly tenure belongs in the category of “good thing to have,” it should be a means to a goal rather than a goal in and of itself. When treated as a goal, it leads to uncomfortable and ultimately unanswerable questions such as “what does it take to get tenure here.” It creates the impression that one wants to do the minimum required rather than a reputation of being highly ambitious and an academician with great potential. Make the goal loftier, such as to develop an outstanding publication record. That record should earn you tenure (a means to ultimately achieving your goal) and more personal and professional reward.

When brewing your plan, keep in mind that it is perfectly reasonable to have multiple goals. You do not need to be unidimensional and work only toward a single goal. You can have contingency goals in case one or more goals do not work out for you. For example, you can have a goal of moving to a different job and work toward it but also work toward goals that you can obtain in your current position. Hopefully you won’t have conflicting goals!

Let me be clear about one thing. I am not advocating personal strategic planning because I am living proof that it works. On the contrary, my trajectory better supports the belief that one can be successful in the absence of thoughtful planning. But I wish someone had advised me much earlier in my career to develop such a plan. I have one now, but it has not yet been submitted for peer review.

Oh and by the way, if attending the AP-LS conference in San Juan aligns with your strategic plan, I look forward to seeing you there!
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The 2012 Annual Conference of the American Psychology-Law Society will be held at the Caribe Hilton Hotel in San Juan, Puerto Rico March 14-17, 2012. Preconference Continuing Education Workshops will be offered on March 14, 2012. The Conference will begin on Thursday, March 15th and will run through Saturday, March 17th, 2012.

The program is available for electronic viewing at the conference website (http://www.apls.org/conferences/apls2012/index2012). If you have not already visited the conference website, please be sure to do so. The website has links to register for the conference and pre-conference workshops and reserve a room at the Caribe Hilton. The early-bird registration price ($245 for Members, $180 for Early Career Professionals, and $65 for Students), ends on January 31, 2012. To register for the conference, please visit https://cyberstore1.apa.org/cyb/cli/casinterface1/aplsreg/

APLS 2012 Hotel Registration is now available. The Caribe Hilton hotel in San Juan is set on an exclusive peninsula, made up of 17 acres of lush tropical gardens. This acclaimed San Juan resort offers a secluded beach and lavish accommodations and is conveniently located between historic Old San Juan and the Condado area, just a 15-minute drive from the airport. A block of rooms have been reserved for March 10, 2012 - March 22, 2012. The special room rate will be available until February 12th or until the group block is sold out, whichever comes first. Due to early booking, the conference rate may already be sold out for some of the nights of the conference. All room rates are INCLUSIVE of 9% room tax and 14% resort fee. Please note that your credit card will be charged for the cost of one night at the time of booking.

AP-LS Student Conference Attendees: The AP-LS Student Section is happy to announce that they will be organizing a room match service again this year for students. This service is available to any student attending the conference in need of a roommate or who has a room and would like to split the cost with an additional person (both at the conference hotel and surrounding hotels). If you would like to be part of the room match service, please email Lauren Kois at laurenkois@gmail.com. You are welcome to contact anyone on the list. Please delete your entry once you have successfully matched with another student.
Pre-Conference Workshops

Several pre-conference continuing education workshops will be offered on Wednesday March 14, 2012 including three full-day workshops (8:00 am – 5:00 pm; 8 CEs) and three half-day workshops (8:00 am – 12:00 pm & 1:00 pm – 5:00 pm; 4 CEs). Full-day workshops include: Forensic Applications of the MMP-2-RF presented by Yossef Ben-Porath, Developments in Risk Assessment: An Update presented by Kirk Heilbrun; and Presenting Expert Testimony in Court presented by Mary Alice Conroy. Half day workshops include Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) presented by Candice Odgers, Working with Data from the Pathways to Desistance Study presented by Edward Mulvey and Carol Schubert; and Disputed Confessions: Psychological Consultation and Testimony presented by Gregory DeClue.

Within-Conference CE Sessions (Sponsored by CONCEPT)

We are pleased that CONCEPT will offer Continuing Education (CE) Credits for psychologists for some of the sessions at this year’s conference. There will be a $30 administrative fee in order to obtain CE from CONCEPT. For more information on the sessions for which CE Credit will be offered and the procedures for obtaining CE Credit, please see the conference program and/or go to the CONCEPT website (https://secure.concept-ce.com/live-ce-courses/conference-ces/ap-ls.html).

Plenaries

The opening session will take place from 12-2 on Thursday March 15. The Conference Co-Chairs have organized an exciting opening plenary session titled, “New applications of psychology-law research: Investigative interviewing and eyewitness identification in terrorism contexts.” Professor Ray Bull from the School of Psychology, University of Leicester, UK will present, “The Lockerbie Bombing Case - Who Was Involved in Blowing up PanAm Flight 103? Advice Sought By The Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission Concerning The Crucial Eyewitness.” Susan E. Brandon from the Department of Defense will present, “Challenges to the application of evidence-based methods of interviewing to intelligence collection contexts.”

The Conference Co-Chairs are pleased to announce that on Friday from 10:45 to 12:15, Paul Frick, Chair of the Department of Psychology at the University of New Orleans, will present a plenary on the current status of DSM-V with a focus on APD, Conduct Disorder, and Intermittent Explosive Disorder/Disruptive Mood Dysregulation Disorder. His talk is titled, “Current Status of the DSM-V and its Implications for Forensic Psychology.”

On Saturday from 10:45 to 12:30, Brian Cutler, President of AP-LS, has organized the presidential plenary session, in which a panel of invited speakers will discuss the translation of psychology-law research into policy and practice.

Poster Sessions

We are thrilled by the number of high quality submissions we received for the conference and we have added an extra poster session to the program to accommodate more poster presentations during the conference. Poster sessions will be held Friday from 6:30-8pm, Saturday from 12:30-2pm, and Saturday from 6:30-8pm.

Special Sessions and Events

We are pleased to announce the following special sessions and events. Please check the conference program and website for more information on each.
Thursday: From 8am to 10am, The Professional Development for Women in Psychology and Law: Challenges, Goals, and Next Steps will be discussed by Helen L. Coons, Ph.D. ABPP from the Women’s Mental Health Associates in Philadelphia. From 3:50-4:50pm, an invited Panel: Outstanding and Mentoring Award Winners will feature Brian Bornstein, Mark Costanzo, Edie Greene, N. Dickon Reppucci, and Ron Roesch. The AP-LS business meeting will be held on Thursday at 6:00 pm followed by a Welcome Reception on the Caribe Hilton’s gorgeous beach.

Friday: Students, early career professionals, and others will be interested in “Show me the Money: Navigating the Path to Funding from Graduate School to Late Career” from 12:20 pm-1:20 pm. From 4:15-5:15, a Saleem Shah 20th Anniversary Memorial Session has been organized titled, “Saleem Rules: Lessons in Mentoring, Knowing What’s Right and Changing the World” and from 5:20-6:20 the Saleem Shah Early Career Award for Excellence in Psychology and Law Research will be awarded. We will host a reception from 6:30 pm -8:00 pm during the evening poster session.

Saturday:

From 3:00-4:00, the Distinguished Contributions to Psychology and Law Award will be presented. From 4:15-5:15, the American Academy of Forensic Psychology Beth Clark Distinguished Service Contribution Award will be presented and from 5:20 to 6:20, the American Academy of Forensic Psychology Distinguished Contribution to Forensic Psychology Award will be presented. We will also host a reception from 6:30 pm -8:00 pm during the evening poster session.

Call for Student Volunteers. If you are interested in being a student volunteer for the AP-LS 2012 Annual Conference in San Juan, Puerto Rico, please send an email to Kathy Gaskey, AP-LS Administrative Assistant (apls@ec.rr.com). Volunteers will be providing assistance with the conference registration area and/or monitoring concurrent sessions throughout the conference. We are asking for a commitment of 6-8 hours of volunteer time. Kathy will be developing a volunteer schedule to cover the registration table/CE workshops (Wednesday through Friday) and the concurrent sessions (Thursday through Saturday). This schedule will be sent to all volunteers for sign-up after the conference program is completed. As a thank you for volunteering, student volunteers will get free registration for the conference. Kathy Gaskey, AP-LS administrative assistant (apls@ec.rr.com), will work with you to process your registration as a student volunteer.

In the weeks leading up to the conference, we encourage everyone to check the conference website for additional updates. If you need information not available on the website, please contact us at aplsconference2012@gmail.com. We look forward to seeing you in San Juan!!

Karen Galin, Diane Sivasubramaniam, and Jennifer Woolard
In the past year, several state courts as well as the U.S. Supreme Court have reviewed a variety of cases regarding the admissibility of eyewitness identification evidence and the use of evidentiary safeguards, such as expert testimony and instructions to educate the jury. For example, the court in New Jersey v. Henderson decided to modify the existing criteria used to determine eyewitness identification admissibility in pre-trial hearings (see Manson v. Brathwaite below) as well as develop new jury instructions on eyewitness identification. Additionally, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has agreed to review a lower court’s rejection of expert testimony on issues affecting eyewitness identification accuracy in Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Walker. Most recently, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the New Hampshire Supreme Court decision in Perry v. New Hampshire, ruling that eyewitness identifications are admissible unless it can be demonstrated that the police created suggestive (lineup and especially show up) identification procedures.

Perry v. New Hampshire was the first such case involving eyewitness identification before the U.S. Supreme Court since Manson v. Brathwaite in 1977. Manson resulted in a two prong test for courts to determine the admissibility of eyewitness identification. First, the courts determine whether there was suggestive action by actors of the state (i.e., police). If suggestive action was taken, the reliability of the identification must be assessed by reviewing the opportunity of the witness to view the criminal at the time of the crime, the witness’ degree of attention, the accuracy of his prior description of the criminal, the witness’ certainty, and the time between the crime and the identification, as outlined in Neil v. Biggers (1972). However, Manson made it clear that identifications can still be ruled admissible despite the presence of suggestive procedures when the identification is deemed reliable according to the five criteria. The defendant has the burden of demonstrating the identification was made under suggestive circumstances that police improperly created and is unreliable based on the totality of the circumstances.

Much research conducted since Manson implies that the reliability of at least some of the Manson criteria is questionable. Specifically, research related to a witness’ view demonstrates that the amount of exposure to a criminal’s face is not a
very strong predictor of identification accuracy (Shapiro & Penrod, 1986) and is often overestimated by eyewitnesses (Loftus, Schooler, Boone, & Kline, 1987). Research also reveals that the presence of a weapon tends to shift a witness’ attention away from a criminal’s face, thus reducing the likelihood of an accurate identification (i.e., weapon focus effect; Steblay, 1992). Lastly, much interest has focused on the relationship between confidence (i.e., certainty) and identification accuracy. This variable is particularly vulnerable to suggestive procedures. That is, eyewitnesses are more likely to inflate their level of confidence in an identification when they have been given confirmatory feedback (Bradfield, Wells, & Olson, 2002) or when a suspect stands out in a lineup relative to other members (Charman, Wells, & Joy, 2011). Confirmatory feedback and the use of poor fillers in a lineup can also influence eyewitnesses’ self-report of their view and attention (Wells & Bradfield, 1998). It appears that basing admissibility decisions on these criteria while failing to acknowledge their susceptibility to the influence of suggestive procedures is shaky at best.

APA filed amicus briefs in Perry v. New Hampshire and Commonwealth v. Walker to draw attention to relevant research and the importance of using experts to educate the jury. Beyond the factors typically considered by courts, extensive social science research suggests a witness’ accuracy can be affected by stress (Deffenbacher, Bornstein, Penrod, & McGarty, 2004), when the perpetrator is a different race than the eyewitness (Meissner & Brigham, 2001), and lineup instructions (Steblay, 1997). The APA briefs also recount research that demonstrates that the traditional safeguards of jury charges and cross-examination have been ineffective at educating jurors on these issues (Cutler, Dexter, & Penrod, 1990; Penrod & Cutler, 1995), but research does appear to support the use of experts (Geiselman & Mendez, 2005; Cutler, Penrod, & Dexter, 1989). Ultimately, the U.S. Supreme Court in Perry ruled contrary to the APA’s recommendation that a due process inquiry be granted in cases involving eyewitness identifications obtained under suggestive circumstances regardless of police action. The Supreme Court affirmed the state court’s decision that due process protection against unreliable identification evidence applies only to identifications made under suggestive circumstances that are caused by the police.

New Jersey v. Henderson presents a different circumstance. Indeed, Henderson goes as far as any court ever has in embracing psychological research regarding eyewitness identification. In recognizing problems with the Manson test, the court in Henderson appointed a Special Master to hear testimony from experts on human memory and eyewitness identification. Drawing on the Special Master Report, the court exhaustively reviewed the aforementioned research as well as a litany of other related topics (e.g., meta-analyses, post-identification feedback susceptibility, and the use of simultaneous lineups and show-ups). The Special Master also addressed the general acceptance of these matters among experts (Kassin, Tubb, Hosch, & Memon, 2001).

In its ruling, the court in Henderson recognized a point raised earlier by Wells and Quinlivan (2009). Namely, suggestive procedures have the ability to impact the factors used to assess reliability. In order to prevent the possible negative effects of erroneous identifications and address the issues with the Manson test, the court decided to change its standards regarding both pretrial hearings and in-court procedures dealing with eyewitness evidence. First, in order to prompt a pretrial admissibility hearing, the defense must demonstrate suggestive conditions were present. At the pretrial hearing, the State must provide evidence that the identification
was reliable and not obtained under suggestive circumstances. Yet, “the ultimate burden remains on the defendant to prove a very substantial likelihood of irreparable misidentification” (State v. Henderson, 39). If the defendant is unable to establish suggestiveness, the jury will be charged with the task of determining whether the identification was reliable based on the evidence presented in court. To assist jurors in this endeavor, the court directed a committee to develop new jury instructions addressing case-specific estimator variables.

The consideration of psychological research by the Special Master in Henderson and by various other state courts indicate increased acceptance of and reliance on psychological research in determining decisions involving eyewitness identifications. Psychologists should be encouraged to continue conducting research and seeking out opportunities for future collaboration with the courts.
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Scholars commonly point out that our knowledge about wrongful convictions likely reflects only the tip of a much larger iceberg; that is, we only know about the erroneous convictions that are discovered and overturned. Wrongful convictions are more common than exonerations, and the exonerations of which we are aware are not representative of all errors of justice (Gross, Jacoby, Matheson, Montgomery, & Patil, 2005). But these insights beg an obvious question: What determines which convictions are reviewed, investigated, and potentially overturned? The answer lies in the post-conviction review process utilized by innocence projects and advocacy groups. Important as it is, this review process, the topic of this month’s column, has been the subject of little investigation by social scientists. Our author discusses the case of Michigan exoneree Walter Swift, who was wrongly convicted of rape and robbery and spent 26 years in prison before being exonerated. After describing the case, he discusses research investigating potential bias in the post-conviction review process.

Our guest-author this month is Andrew M. Smith. Andrew earned his Honors and Master’s degrees in Criminology and Justice at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT). He is currently completing his PhD in Social Psychology at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada. His research interests include eyewitness identification procedures, post-conviction review, wrongful conviction, and judicial decision-making. Andrew also volunteered as a case-reviewer for the Association in Defence of the Wrongly Convicted (AIDWYC).

We strongly encourage others (particularly students) to be guest author. If you would like to be a guest author (or have questions), please email Allison at aredlitch@albany.edu.
Examining Bias in the Post-Conviction Review Process

Andrew M. Smith

Queen’s University

The Case

On May 21, 2008 Walter Swift was exonerated of the rape and robbery of a pregnant schoolteacher, for which he spent 26 years in prison. Mr. Swift’s conviction was based primarily on the victim’s eyewitness identification from a suggestive lineup procedure.

The crime occurred on September 2, 1982. The 35-year-old victim was playing with her 7-month-old son when she was attacked from behind. The perpetrator dragged her to her upstairs bedroom where he undressed and raped her. He raped her once more and stole $160 and her wedding band before leaving the house.

The victim described the perpetrator as a cleanly shaved, Black male, 15 to 18 years of age, 5’10” tall, with a braided hairstyle. Investigating Officer Paavlova showed the victim hundreds of photos of Black males between ages 15 and 25. The victim selected eight photos from the mugshots she was shown because the individuals shared various features with the perpetrator.

Before the eyewitness selected the eighth photo, Officer Paavlova decided that she would bring the next person selected in for a live lineup identification procedure. Walter Swift was the eighth person selected by the eyewitness. Based on these unfortunate chance circumstances, Mr. Swift was included in a lineup identification procedure.

At the time of the identification procedure, Mr. Swift did not have braids and had a moustache. Mr. Swift was included in the lineup amongst four fillers who varied widely in age, height, and build. Officer Paavlova told the eyewitness that the man whose photo she had selected was in the lineup. The eyewitness made a hesitant identification of Walter Swift. Not convinced by the identification, Officer Paavlova scheduled a polygraph for Mr. Swift. A department sergeant later cancelled the polygraph, issued a warrant for Swift’s arrest, and explained to Officer Paavlova that, although Mr. Swift may not
have committed this crime, he was certain that he had gotten away with a previous crime. Mr. Swift was charged with sexual assault and robbery.

Two months later Mr. Swift was tried and found guilty by a Detroit jury after a two-day trial. Before sentencing, Officer Paavlova visited the judge and explained that she felt Mr. Swift was innocent of the crime. Mr. Swift was sentenced to 20 to 40 years in prison. The Innocence Projected accepted Mr. Swift’s case in 1998 and requested a search for biological evidence. All evidence had been lost or destroyed, however.

The investigation continued, nevertheless. Alongside Innocence Project personnel, Niamh Gunn, a student from Ireland, worked on the case at the Innocence Project in the summer of 2003. She would continue working on the case for five years after returning to Ireland. Largely because of her efforts, Officer Paavlova and the prosecutor from Mr. Swift’s trial both signed affidavits in favor of quashing Mr. Swift’s conviction.

On May 21, 2008 alongside Wayne County Prosecuting Attorney, Kym Worthy, the Innocence Project asked a Michigan Judge to overturn Mr. Swift’s conviction. Walter Swift was freed that afternoon after spending 26 years in prison for a crime he did not commit. The joint prosecution-defense motion to set aside Mr. Swift’s conviction emphasized a shoddy identification procedure and reports of biological analyses conducted in 1982, supporting Swift’s innocence. Although the biological analysis conducted in 1982 was not as reliable as modern day DNA testing, it suggested that Mr. Swift was innocent. Prior to having his conviction overturned in 2008, Mr. Swift had appealed his conviction on several occasions. The Michigan Court of Appeals rejected Mr. Swift’s first appeal in March of 1984. In November of 1984, Mr. Swift appealed his conviction for the second time and was rejected once again, this time by the Supreme Court of Michigan. Finally, Mr. Swift’s motion for a new trial was rejected in December of 1987. Mr. Swift’s experience in the post-conviction review process exemplifies the uphill battle a wrongfully convicted individual must go through in seeking to establish innocence.

**Research Ideas**

After exhausting all of his or her appeals, an individual claiming to have been wrongfully convicted may apply to a grassroots organization such as the Innocence Project or the Canadian organization Association in Defence of the Wrongly Convicted (AIDWYC) for assistance in the post-conviction review process. It is common for such grassroots organizations to have an upper-level (first-level) case-reviewer prescreen cases and pass along those that may be meritorious to less senior (second-level) case-reviewers (Medwed, 2003), often law students. The advent of testing DNA-based evidence was instrumental in establishing that wrongful convictions do occur (Scheck, Neufeld, & Dwyer, 2003). Unfortunately DNA evidence is not available in the majority of cases. Either the perpetrator does not leave DNA at the scene of the crime or, as in Walter Swift’s case, by the time post-conviction review begins all DNA evidence has been lost or destroyed. DNA evidence is also not exculpatory per se. DNA-based evidence works in conjunction with other exculpatory evidence to increase the efficacy of post-conviction review. Despite the benefits of DNA-based evidence, the majority of exonerations to date have been accomplished in absence of such evidence (Gross et al., 2005). Because DNA-based evidence is only available in a fraction of cases, greater emphasis needs to be placed
on exonerating those for whom DNA-based evidence does not exist.

Case assessments are much more equivocal in the absence of DNA-based evidence. It becomes more difficult for post-conviction case-reviewers to distinguish between those cases in which an applicant is factually innocent and those cases in which an applicant is factually guilty in the absence of DNA-based evidence. When evidence is ambiguous, biased processing is more likely to occur (Chaiken & Maheswaran, 1994; Dror, Peron, Hind, & Charlton, 2005). Biased processing can be both true and false, and positive and negative (Petty & Wegener, 1999). In a utilitarian sense, if a case-reviewer is motivated a priori to establish that an applicant is innocent and that applicant does in fact turn out to be innocent, then one would be correct to conclude that the biased processing was a true positive. If that same applicant turns out to be guilty, however, then one would be correct to conclude that the biased processing was a false positive. Alternatively, biased processing could be viewed as inherently negative because the decision to assist or not (overturn convictions or not) is indiscriminant; i.e., the decision does not depend on an objectively reasoned evaluation of the evidence available.

Smith, Cutler, and Findley (2011) examined the potential for biased processing in post-conviction review. Participants were presented with discovery from an actual eyewitness case and half were instructed that the case was “fresh” meaning not previously adjudicated while the other half were told that the case was “referred” meaning that the case had been recommended for review by a group of law students who believed that the applicant was potentially convicted in error. The evidence was identical for the two groups. Participants in the “referred” condition rated the applicant as less likely to be guilty and the viewing conditions as more impoverished than participants in the “fresh” condition suggesting that participants in the “referred” condition engaged in a more theory-driven (or biased) process of elaboration than did those participants in the “fresh” condition.

In the case of Walter Swift, it is unknown if Niamh Gunn engaged in theory- or data-driven processing of case information. It would be an impossible task to make such an assessment in hindsight. What is known is that Niamh Gunn persisted for over five years before the case was resolved. Fortunately she did, as her efforts led to the exoneration of a most probably innocent man. But what if Mr. Swift was guilty? The problem with biased processing is that one does not know a priori if an applicant is innocent. Certainly not all applicants that apply for post-conviction review are innocent. Given that there are many more applicants than there are human resources to review claims of wrongful conviction, it is important that the post-conviction review process work as effectively and efficiently as possible. At any given time there are potentially thousands of innocent applicants whose cases are not being reviewed because of the lack of human resources. If reviewers are reluctant to abandon a priori assumptions of innocence in spite of strong evidence to the contrary, then the review process is not working as effectively or efficiently as it could be. Of course, there will never be a perfect model of post-conviction review, but it is important that researchers empirically examine how post-conviction review might be made more effective and efficient.

If the context by which second-level case-reviewers receive claims of wrongful
convictions biases them towards an assumption of innocence, how can this bias be mitigated? One potential solution is to make the bias explicit. Agencies might explicitly instruct second-level case-reviewers that applicants are not innocent by virtue of the fact that their cases passed first-level review and that it is their job to investigate the case more thoroughly in an attempt to reach an ultimate determination of guilt or innocence. If making the bias explicit increases objective processing of case materials, then it provides a partial solution to this model of post-conviction review with minimal effort and slight modification. There is reason to suspect, however, that making the bias more explicit might not be sufficient to lead to the desired outcome of increased objectivity. Because individuals correct for perceived bias as opposed to actual bias (Petty & Wegener, 1993), reviewers might overcorrect (Wegener & Petty, 1995). That is, reviewers might perceive the context in which they receive the case to have a greater effect on the manner in which they are processing the case than it actually has and might correct to the extent that they could have a bias towards guilt. It would be interesting to examine whether making the innocence bias explicit influences case-reviewer evaluations; specifically, if making this bias explicit increases objective processing of case materials or leads to overcorrection and a guilt bias.

Another interesting area of research on the post-conviction review process is how new evidence discovered by reviewers influences their perceptions of the case. After one has already developed an opinion of the case, how does new information in congruence or conflict with that reviewers’ opinion affect the reviewers’ opinion moving forward? In the instance that new information is congruent with the reviewers’ opinion one might expect that it will increase the extremity of the opinion. In the instance that information is in conflict with the reviewers’ opinion, one might expect in accord with the confirmation bias (e.g., Nickerson, 1998), for the case-reviewer to discount this conflicting information. One might take this research one step further and examine how confidence in opinion moderates the effects of new congruent or conflicting information.

**Conclusion**

A growing body of research is examining both the antecedents (e.g., Cutler, 2012) and consequences (e.g., Grounds, 2004) of wrongful convictions, yet, little is known about the post-conviction review process. In particular, very little is known about the potential for biased processing in the post-conviction review process and how to overcome biases in the review process. This is an area burgeoning with research opportunities. Studies such as the aforementioned might provide guidance for developing future models of post-conviction review and improving existing post-conviction review models.

(Footnotes)

1 Case information was collected from the Innocence Project (http://www.innocenceproject.org/Content/Walter_Swift.php) and Swickard (2008; http://truthinjustice.org/walter-swift.htm).

1 Although common, this model of post-conviction review is certainly not universal. In some models, second-level case reviewers participate directly in the screening process (Medwed, 2003).
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Are competency evaluators competent?

W. Neil Gowensmith, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Graduate School of Professional Psychology, Forensic Psychology Program
University of Denver

Every day, courts rely heavily on the opinions of forensic evaluators to make decisions on a variety of psycholegal issues. But what if those opinions are sometimes unreliable or—even worse—invalid?

More than 60,000 forensic mental health evaluations are submitted to criminal courts each year (Melton, Poythress, Petrila & Slobogin, 2007). Research shows that courts follow the recommendation of forensic experts in 85-99% of all cases (Gowensmith, Murrie, & Boccaccini, 2010; Pirelli & Zapf, 2011; Zapf et al., 2004). These high concordance rates underscore the trust that courts place in the opinions of forensic experts, and they suggest that courts believe the opinions in forensic evaluation reports to be reliable, valid, and trustworthy.

However, a growing body of literature casts some doubt on these assumptions. This emerging research indicates that the psycholegal opinions of forensic experts—even in neutral and objective field conditions—may at times suffer from low reliability or be embodied in poor quality evaluation reports.

Inter-rater reliability

How often do evaluators who assess the same defendant reach the same opinion? A series of studies suggests that this inter-rater agreement rate is lower than courts might assume. Researchers examined more than 800 evaluation reports on more than 275 defendants that were submitted to the Hawaii Judiciary between September 2007 and December 2008, comparing the psycholegal opinions from each set of forensic evaluators and calculated their rates of agreement (Gowensmith, Murrie, & Boccaccini, 2010, in press; Gowensmith, Murrie, & Boccaccini, 2011; McNichols, Gowensmith, & Jul, 2011). These evaluations addressed competence to stand trial (CST), legal sanity (criminal responsibility), violence risk, readiness for
post-acquittal conditional release (CR), and readiness for permanent discharge from CR.

Overall, we found that rates of unanimous agreement among three independent evaluators in routine practice all working on the same case were low to moderate. Evaluators agreed unanimously on 71% of initial CST cases, but on only 61% of subsequent CST cases. Evaluators also agreed about defendants’ violence risk level in 67% of cases. However, evaluators agreed about defendants’ legal sanity in only 55% of cases, readiness for CR in only 54% of cases, and readiness for permanent discharge from court jurisdiction in only 52% of cases. However, in each of these psycholegal categories, courts followed the majority opinion of the evaluators in at least 85% of cases.

Other evaluation issues

Other studies have shown that the actual report quality of forensic evaluations may be poorer than might be expected. A series of studies reviewed the quality of 450 forensic evaluation reports submitted to the Hawaii Judiciary between 2005 – 2010. Overall, report quality in all psycholegal categories was poor to mediocre, with only 25% of all CST evaluation reports (Robinson & Acklin, 2010), 3.3% of legal sanity evaluation reports (Fuger et al., 2011), and no readiness for CR reports scoring in the “high” quality range (Ngyuen et al., 2011). However, courts again followed the majority recommendations of these evaluators in more than 85% of all cases.

Further, forensic evaluators have their own internal and external biases that may influence their forensic reports and psycholegal opinions. Recent research on “adversarial allegiance” indicates that forensic evaluators are unwittingly more likely to score measures of psychopathy and sexual recidivism in the direction of the counsel that retained them (Murrie et al., 2009). Also, certain personality characteristics in evaluators themselves seem to influence how they rate defendants on levels of psychopathy (Miller et al., 2011). Finally, some emerging research suggests that defendants’ ethnicity might impact forensic evaluators’ opinions of their competence to stand trial (Gowensmith, McCallum & Nassab, 2011).

Conclusions

Of course we cannot assume that these findings apply to all jurisdictions or forensic circumstances. Most forensic practitioners routinely submit reliable, valid and high quality work to the courts and strive to remain objective and impartial when forming their psycholegal opinions. Forensic psychology has advanced tremendously over the past few decades, embodying the mutual influence of research and practice. Consequently, courts trust our work and give our reports a high measure of influence in the courtroom. However, the studies reviewed earlier indicate that as a whole, forensic practitioners still have ample room for improvement.

What can be done to improve reliability and quality of our forensic reports and to minimize the impact of harmful biases on our psycholegal opinions? The answer is probably multi-faceted. Forensic evaluators should strive to remain competent in their areas of expertise, attend trainings and review recent research. They should receive focused training in forensic assessment. In addition, forensic evaluators should be continually cognizant of internal and external biases – financial, psychological, or other – and actively maintain an individualized check and balance system to avoid these perils.
Systematically, states may wish to consider enhancing their own forensic evaluator certification processes and standards. Several states are actively examining the issue of forensic evaluator certification. Some (Georgia, Massachusetts, Florida) have recently adopted more rigorous certification standards, while many others (Hawaii, Virginia, Kansas, Texas, Oregon, Alaska, Colorado) are currently doing so. The results of our studies seem to support those efforts. Our research suggests that highlighting specific training issues—such as discerning between substance abuse and psychosis in evaluations of legal sanity, or utilizing formal risk assessment measures in evaluations of violence risk, for example—will most likely lead to improved report quality, evaluator reliability, and unbiased forensic opinions. The courts and also the defendants we evaluate deserve nothing less.
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Because of the field’s interdisciplinary nature, it is difficult to find comprehensive rankings of academic journals geared toward Psychology & Law. These journals are oftenscattered throughout different “categories” in traditional indices, and most indices only cover a selection of the relevant journals. This article describes four different measures of impact for academic journals that are potential outlets for psychology & law research, followed by a current list of how each of those journals is ranked by those four measures. While these sorts of rakings are helpful to faculty who are receivingannual, probationary, promotion, or tenure reviews, they are but heuristic measures and are not intended to imply anything about the quality of an individual articles appearing in a particular journal.

Journal Citation Reports (JCR)

Journal Citation Reports is a product of Thomson/Reuters and is derived from data in the Social Science Citation Index. Each year, JCR calculates the number of citations each journal received for articles appearing in the previous two years. For example, the 2010 JCR reports that articles appearing in the 2008 and 2009 volumes of Law and Human Behavior were cited a combined total of 186 times in the year 2010. Further, in the years 2008 and 2009, Law and Human Behavior published 82 articles. Thus, those 82 articles that appeared in 2008-2009 were cited an average of 2.27 times in 2010 (186/ 82=2.27). The 2.27 figure is referred to as the journal’s impact factor—the average number of times an article appearing in the journal will be cited after 1-2 years. The impact factor of a journal is often used a heuristic measure of that journal’s prestige, though there is much controversy and a large literature discussing the appropriateness of linking impact factors to prestige andimportance.

When examining JCR for psycholegal journals, it is important to note that the JCR is quite comprehensive within psychology
and the social sciences; however, its database contains only a limited selection of legal journals and law reviews. Therefore, the JCR list is biased toward each journal’s impact within the psychology / social sciences. Article Influence (AI)

Article Influence (AI) is an alternative measure of journal impact. Developed by researchers at the University of Washington (and hosted on their website, Eigenfactor.org), AI uses a similar method to the JCR impact measure, but adjusts for the importance of the journals that are citing the ranked journal. In other words, a journal that receives 100 cites from top-tier journals will have a higher AI than a journal that receives 100 cites from low-ranked journals. Further, AI uses five-year citation data and removes self-citations, which are meant to correct for some of the common criticisms of the JCR metric. The AI score indicates the per-article “influence” of the journal. In other words, AI is the average influence of an article that appears in a particular journal. AI scores are standardized for journal-to-journal comparisons, and have no intrinsic meaning. A score of 1.00 is the average AI across all 7611 scientific journals in the researchers’ database.

Westlaw Impact Factor (WL)

These journals appear in the Law Journal Rankings compiled annually by Washington and Lee University’s Law School. The impact factors are calculated similarly to the JCR list, but from articles that appear in the Westlaw law journal database. Westlaw is a comprehensive database of over 1600 legal journals and law reviews (compared to only 133 covered by JCR), but it does not contain any non-legal social science journals. Therefore, the WL ranking is biased toward each journal’s impact within research articles. Using specialized software to query the GS database, each of the journals found in either the JCR or Westlaw database listings was searched for all articles published in the years 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010. Next, the total number of citations each of those articles received as of December 2011 was calculated. Dividing the total citation count by the number of articles published provides a measure that is similar to Impact Factor, as it is the average number of times those articles have been cited. Google Scholar includes citations within book chapters, pre-print and working articles, and journals that are not indexed by mainstream indices, the effect of which would be to inflate the citation counts. However, this database may also count book reviews, editor’s notes, and commentaries as “articles,” which would decrease the citation count. In an effort to produce more accurate calculations, editor commentaries, introductions to special issues, and reviewer acknowledgments were excluded from the calculations.

List of Psycholegal Journals by Impact Measure

Each of metrics presented in the list is based on a different method and dataset. To get a sense of a journal’s overall impact & importance within the field of psychology and law, it is necessary to examine each of the metrics. This list takes a broad view of “psychology and law” and includes journals that 1) are interdisciplinary, 2) contain at least some emphasis on the law, and 3) express at least some interest in psychology, psychiatry, or the social sciences. This is not an exhaustive list, and readers are encouraged to contact the author with suggestions for future lists. This list also excludes traditional disciplinary psychology journals that occasionally publish psycholegal research.
## Impact Measure
### (Rank Within Measure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>JCR</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th>WL</th>
<th>GS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review of Law and Social Science</td>
<td>1.00 (10)</td>
<td>0.90 (3)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4.06 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Sciences and the Law</td>
<td>1.51 (6)</td>
<td>0.60 (6)</td>
<td>0.12 (7)</td>
<td>7.33 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice and Behavior</td>
<td>1.59 (3)</td>
<td>0.63 (5)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11.29 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Law and Psychiatry</td>
<td>1.22 (8)</td>
<td>0.33 (11)</td>
<td>0.03 (8)</td>
<td>6.59 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Empirical Legal Studies</td>
<td>1.57 (4)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.20 (1)</td>
<td>10.85 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Forensic Psychiatry &amp; Psychology</td>
<td>0.62 (13)</td>
<td>0.23 (12)</td>
<td>&lt;0.01 (13)</td>
<td>3.61 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice</td>
<td>0.54 (14)</td>
<td>0.17 (13)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.85 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Law and Society</td>
<td>0.77 (12)</td>
<td>0.35 (10)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4.13 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Psychiatry and Law</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.01 (10)</td>
<td>0.55 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurimetrics</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.50 (4)</td>
<td>2.52 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Human Behavior</td>
<td>2.27 (1)</td>
<td>0.89 (4)</td>
<td>0.28 (6)</td>
<td>14.28 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Social Inquiry</td>
<td>0.97 (11)</td>
<td>0.59 (7)</td>
<td>0.60 (2)</td>
<td>6.73 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society Review</td>
<td>1.56 (5)</td>
<td>0.94 (2)</td>
<td>0.54 (3)</td>
<td>5.79 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Criminological Psychology</td>
<td>1.31 (7)</td>
<td>0.49 (8)</td>
<td>0.01 (10)</td>
<td>7.04 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law</td>
<td>0.49 (15)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.01 (10)</td>
<td>2.10 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, Crime, and Law</td>
<td>1.13 (9)</td>
<td>0.42 (9)</td>
<td>0.02 (9)</td>
<td>7.15 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, Public Policy, and Law</td>
<td>2.16 (2)</td>
<td>1.32 (1)</td>
<td>0.44 (5)</td>
<td>12.88 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Journal is not included in this database.

### Data Sources:
- **Journal Citation Reports:** Available online via Thomson/Reuters Web of Science. (http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/science_products/a-z/journal_citation_reports/) Data collected in July 2011 and is current through July 2012.
- **Article Influence:** Available online at http://www.eigenfactor.org. AI is also included in the JCR index listed above. Data collected in July 2011 and is current through July 2012.
- **Westlaw Impact:** Available online at http://lawlib.wlu.edu/LJ/index.aspx. Data collected in August 2011 and is current through spring 2012.
The first of January brought many changes to Law and Human Behavior. On that date, the American Psychological Association took over the publication of the journal from Springer and a new editorial team began receiving manuscripts. The transition to the new publisher has been very smooth, mostly because of the fantastic team at APA that is working diligently on our behalf. The journal has a new home on the Internet (http://www.apa.org/journals/lhb) and a new URL for manuscript submissions (http://www.editorialmanager.com/lhb). Despite these changes, authors are finding the journal. We had a record number of submissions for the month of January, with more manuscripts submitted in January than in any month since we started using the Editorial Manager system in 2004 and almost six times as many manuscripts submitted as were submitted in January 2011.

Changes in the Editorial Team

The new editorial team has been busy assigning many of you as reviewers to these manuscripts and will continue to keep you busy during your term on the editorial board. Let me take this opportunity to introduce them to you.

I couldn’t be more delighted that Patricia Zapf (John Jay College – CUNY) agreed to stay on as an Associate Editor. She was a critical member of the previous editorial team, primarily handling manuscripts on clinical forensic issues and we are lucky to have her continued commitment to the journal. Joining her in handling manuscripts in the clinical area is Dave DeMatteo (Drexel University). Because of the volume of manuscripts that we receive in the non-clinical areas of psychology and law, I have named two Associate Editors in that area to more evenly distribute the workload among the team: Amy Bradfield Douglass (Bates College) and Bradley McAuliff (California State University at Northridge). I am grateful to all of them for agreeing to serve in this capacity and I hope that they will receive your support as well.

Changes in Accessing Law and Human Behavior:

AP–LS members can now access LHB in 3 easy ways:

1) Full-text access to the Journal: All Society members (whether they are APA members or not) 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/) or browse the journal’s content at http://www.apa.org/
To look up your “My APA” account, please use the email address you have on file with AP-LS.

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/. 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.

3) iPhone and iPad Apps: You can access Law and Human Behavior on your mobile device via the APA Journals app. Download the free app from the iTunes app store to review the most recent tables of contents and article abstracts of your favorite APA journals, including Law and Human Behavior. You can get the APA Journals app here: http://itunes.apple.com/us/app/apa-journals/id402409500 (for iPhone) and http://itunes.apple.com/us/app/apa-journals-for-ipad/id414480941 (for iPad).

Please contact the APA Service Center at 800-374-2721 or email subscriptions@apa.org if you require any assistance or have any questions about your account.

Changes in the Manuscript Submission and Review Process

Over the past month, we have been working with the staff at APA to complete our transition from Springer to APA. This transition has been easier than we would have expected given APA’s decision to keep Editorial Manager as the software platform for the journal. As you may know, APA has its own proprietary software for managing the peer review process but recognized that Editorial Manager has many features that were not available in its own system and has allowed us to keep the system in place. Although there has been a slight change in the URL for the website (http://www.editorialmanager.com/lhb), if you mistakenly visit the old site you will be redirected to the new one.

APA is also allowing us to change aspects of the system that were not under our control when we were with Springer. I hope that you will notice some positive changes in the system when you are submitting your reviews. For example, the reviewer rating scales have been changed to drop down menus, so you will no longer need to go through the cumbersome task of typing your ratings into a text box.

There are also several changes to the manuscript submission process. Rather than typing your cover letter into a text box, authors now are required to upload a cover letter, in which the authors can provide relevant contact information, information about any conflict of interest, and assurances of compliance with ethical standards, of IRB approval, and that the manuscript is not under consideration elsewhere. We have also eliminated the required uploading of conflict of interest statements and IRB forms when initially submitting a manuscript for review. Given the high rejection rate of the journal, it seemed unnecessary to burden authors with this task until there was a greater chance of the manuscript being accepted. Going forward, submitting these forms will be an optional step when submitting a revision. If an author has not submitted the required forms when we make the editorial decision to accept a manuscript, the paper will not receive a final acceptance until the forms are submitted through the system.

Changes to the Student Reviewer Program
When a manuscript is submitted to an APA journal, it is a confidential document and a reviewer is prohibited from sharing it with anyone, including students even if the purpose is to train students how to review manuscripts. However, it is imperative that the next generation receives training in how to review manuscripts. To facilitate this type of training, I am reinstituting the practice of appointing a Student Editorial Board. The future success of our journal is in part determined by the ability of our reviewers to recognize high quality research and to make recommendations to authors regarding improvement of their manuscripts or their research designs. Unfortunately, most scholars are never trained how to write reviews—resulting in reviews that focus on minutiae (e.g., typos) rather than bigger issues like the importance of the research or design inadequacies.

Editorial Board members have been invited to recommend one graduate student to serve on the Student Editorial Board for the term of one year. The Editorial Board members will be responsible for working with the student board member to review manuscripts that the Editorial Board member is reviewing. Greater training and involvement of students in the review process will strengthen the peer-review process at Law and Human Behavior in the future and we may even see benefits of this process within a few years. We will recognize the members of the Student Editorial Board in the December issue of the journal, providing the students with a nice line item for their cvs.

What Has Not Changed

The new editorial team continues the commitment to providing decisions on manuscripts within 60 days of submission that was instituted by the previous editorial team. We are grateful to former Editor-in-Chief Brian Cutler and Associate Editor Kirk Heilbrun for leaving us a journal that is in great shape. Their footsteps are large and we are trying hard to fill them. If you have any suggestions for how we might improve the Society’s journal, please feel free to contact me at mkovera@jjay.cuny.edu. And please continue to send us your best work.
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.


Examined treatment patterns among 157 Swedish offenders with substance use problems who had undergone forensic psychiatric assessment. Three groups of treatment users were found: low treatment, planned substance abuse treatment and substance abuse emergency room visits, and planned psychiatric treatment. The offenders with a non-stable treatment pattern had less successful outcomes. The authors highlighted the importance of treatment history and the associations between treatment pattern and recidivism.


Male prisoners (*n* = 173) who were referred for neuropsychological evaluation were examined regarding past self-injury and/or suicide attempts. Over half of the prisoners reported such behavior. No group differences were found in the neuropsychological domains measured. However, functioning was generally poor across groups in all assessed domains.


To assess the impact of motivational interviewing (MI) in increasing offenders’ readiness to engage in changes, the study compared 58 men who participated in a brief MI intervention with a matched control group. Results showed that those who underwent MI were less likely to be reconvicted and...
they also had higher readiness to change after undergoing the intervention. A change in readiness to change predicted eventual reconviction.

Belenko, S., Fabrikant, N., & Wolff, N. (2011). The long road to treatment: Models of screening and admission into drug courts. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38, 1222-1243. doi: 10.1177/0093854811424690 Qualitative data from six drug courts were analyzed, resulting in the identification of two screening models: the prosecutor as gatekeeper in pre-trial diversion drug courts, and staff as gatekeeper in post-plea courts. Both models contained multiple stages of eligibility screening, including, but not limited to, clinical assessments and judicial approval. Implications for researchers regarding possible selection effects when studying drug court participants are discussed.

Champion, D. R., Harvey, P. J., & Schan, Y. Y. (2011). Day reporting center and recidivism: Comparing offender groups in a Western Pennsylvania County study. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 50, 433-446, 2011. doi: 10.1080/10509674.2011.583718 Authors investigated the efficacy of a day reporting program by comparing outcomes of 63 offenders sentenced to a day reporting center to outcomes among 63 offenders sentenced to electronic monitoring, house arrest, probation, or incarceration. Results indicated a significantly lower recidivism rate among those sentenced to day reporting, as compared to recidivism among the comparison group. Further, day reporting sentencing was shown to save the county a significant amount of money, due to decreased incarceration costs.

Christopher, P. P., McCabe, P. J., & Fisher, W. H. (2012). Prevalence of involvement in the criminal justice system during severe mania and associated symptomology. Psychiatric Services, 63, 33-39. This large-scale study (n = 43,093) examined trends in legal involvement and mental health symptoms among U.S. adults over the course of a year. Adults who experienced a manic episode during that time saw increased criminal justice involvement, particularly at the time of their most severe manic episode. Increased risk was associated with specific manic symptoms of grandiosity, increased high-risk behavior, and social/occupational impairment.

Coolidge, F. L., Marle, P. D., Van Horn, S. A., & Segal, D. L. (2011). Clinical syndromes, personality disorders, and neurocognitive differences in male and female inmates. Behavioural Sciences and the Law, 29, 741-751. doi: 10.1002/bsl.997. Examined the prevalence of psychological and neurocognitive problems in large sample of adult male and female inmates and a group of unincarcerated adult females. The two inmate groups were found to have similar prevalence rates of ranked personality disorder. The overall results suggest high levels of psychological and general neuropsychological dysfunction in the inmate sample and the authors recommended a comprehensive mental health screening of the inmate population.

Evans, E., Huang, D., & Hser, Y. (2011). High-risk offenders participating in court-supervised substance abuse treatment: Characteristics, treatment received, and factors associated with recidivism. Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research, 38, 510-525. doi: 10.1007/s11414-011-9241-3. Data from 78 high-risk and 1009 low-risk offenders who were receiving court-supervised substance abuse treatment were examined. Results indicated that high-risk offenders were younger, more likely to be male and had more prior contact with psychiatric and criminal justice systems at the time of intake compared to low risk offenders. The number of re-arrests was increased by the high-risk classification but decreased with receipt of more treatment services and longer treatment length. To reduce recidivism,
the authors suggested sufficient duration of treatment is important.


Researchers reviewed San Diego mental health records and coinciding county correctional records over a one-year period. Increased risk for re-incarceration among mentally ill persons was modified by environmental factors such as homelessness, health insurance, and timely access to community mental health services following initial release from incarceration. Receiving case management immediately following initial release resulted in lower re-incarceration rates.


The authors evaluated Correct Course, a program in which youth offenders are diverted to community services based on an individual needs assessment. The evaluation of 259 youth revealed a 7.7% recidivism rate at one-year post services, significantly lower than youth offenders not referred for an assessment. Further, the program was estimated to provide a cost savings of between $7500 and $22,000 per youth. Significant improvement in functioning was observed among the sample of youth offenders with the assessment.


Psychologists from the Federal Bureau of Prisons were surveyed regarding practica experiences offered to psychology doctoral students. Over one-fourth of the sites offered practica training, namely group and individual therapy and/or assessment. Urban and Mid-Atlantic facilities offered the most extensive clinical training, and training was offered at a similar frequency across sites of various security levels.


Data from 595 adult male incarcerated offenders were analyzed to determine which offenders were more likely to engage in criminogenic thinking. Results suggested that offenders who were younger, less educated, Black or Hispanic, single, had a psychological disorder, were not receiving mental health services, and who did not commit a violent index offense all endorsed higher levels of some types of criminogenic thinking. Implications for treatment in correctional settings and reducing recidivism are discussed.


The authors examined the effect of hospitalization length on re-arrests for general and violent offenses among a sample of 386 patients deemed not guilty by reason of insanity in New York State. The results revealed that length of treatment had little effect on general and violent re-arrests. Rather, demographics and prior criminal histories were significantly related to re-arrest outcome among this sample.


Authors investigated the short- and long-term psychological effects of wrongful convictions among 55 individuals who
had been wrongfully convicted and later exonerated, using in-person interviews. The results indicated several psychological effects among the exonerees, including clinical anxiety, depression, PTSD, or comorbid psychological disorders, highlighting the need for integrated approaches to address the psychological problems experienced by wrongfully convicted individuals.


The study investigated the rate of success of community reintegration among 48 female forensic psychiatric patients using a retrospective design with file reviews and a 3-year follow-up period. Those with more successful outcomes had more protective factors and fewer risk factors as measured by the Short-Term Assessment of Risk and Treatability. The vulnerability and the strength scale had good predictive validity but no incremental validity was found for the strength scale.


Researchers examined records of 76 female NGRI acquitees from Wisconsin who received a conditional release. A seven-year tracking period revealed almost one-third (31.6%) violated their conditional releases, which were subsequently revoked. No violations, however, involved a violent offense. Exacerbated mental health symptoms, on the other hand, were associated with revoked conditional release.


Male and female inmates were surveyed on a battery of psychological and criminal thinking measures. Mentally disordered thinking was evident at a significantly higher rate among female (46.1%) inmates than male (19.8%) inmates. Criminal thinking trends did not differ in relation to mental disorder. Mentally disordered males endorsed criminal attitudes at an elevated rate.

**FORENSIC ASSESSMENT**


The PCL:YV was used to assess 80 incarcerated adolescent females. Higher scores, indicating a greater number of psychopathic traits, were associated with several other variables, including earlier onset of criminal behavior and a greater number of symptoms of conduct disorder and alcohol dependence. The authors conclude that meaningful information can be gained by assessing psychopathic traits in this population.


A field reliability study examined inter-rater agreement in scoring of the Static-99 using samples from New Jersey (n = 135) and Texas (n = 600). Results showed strong agreement for total scores, but found differences in item scores given by evaluator pairs for about 45% of offenders in each state. Implications for administration and interpretation procedures regarding measurement error are discussed.

A new measure to assess community males’ sexual arousal, propensity toward, and enjoyment of child sexual abuse was developed. Results from preliminary validation indicate that the Interest in Child Molestation Scale was a fairly reliable measure of its intended construct. A large portion of the sampled men (57%) did not strongly reject an interest in child sexual abuse. Possible future uses of this measure for theory and research are discussed.


The study retrospectively scored 827 civil psychiatric patients on an abbreviated version of the HCR-20 to examine its validity in females. Results obtained suggested small gender differences in its predictive accuracy (slightly, but non-significantly, better for men) but were largely limited to historical factors. The authors concluded that the HCR-20 does not appear to need adaptation for use with females but should be used cautiously and potential limitations should be noted.


The authors compared the rates of self-reported and clinician-reported aggression among a sample of 51 incarcerated female adolescent offenders, using the Little Aggression Inventory (LAI; Little et al, 2003). The results indicated clinician-reported aggression was positively correlated with self-reported aggression, both overt and relational, suggesting that clinicians are able to detect both overt, as well as retaliatory, covert instances of aggression.


The validity of the Risk Matrix 2000 was examined in a sample of 771 sex offenders who were released from Scottish prisons. Five-year outcomes were compared against those in the original Risk Matrix validation study, from 1979. The instrument had moderate predictive validity and performed similarly across the two studies, despite differences in time, sample characteristics, and base rates of reconviction.


The authors examined the efficacy of a prison re-entry program by comparing outcomes among Harlem Parole Reentry Court participants with a matched sample of traditional supervision parolees released during the period of November 2002 to February 2008. Results demonstrated a positive impact on re-conviction rates, as re-entry participants had fewer reconvictions upon release than traditional parolees. However, there was a negative impact on parole revocations, as participant revocation rates were higher among prison re-entry participants than that of the traditional parolees.


The authors examined the psychometric properties and correlates of the clinical, content, and supplementary scales of the MMPI-A among 315 male and 181 female
adolescents who had been mandated by the court for a psychological evaluation. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, scale intercorrelation matrices, and scale elevations were examined and reported. The results were comparable to that of the MMPI-A in traditional clinical evaluations and lend support for the usefulness of the MMPI-A in forensic settings.

Examine the psychometric properties of the Novaco Anger Scale-Provocation Inventory (NAS-PI) in 3 different groups: 142 male forensic psychiatric inpatients, 194 male forensic psychiatric outpatients and 320 male and female students. Results did not appear to support the original 3-subscale structure but the internal consistency and test-retest reliability was good. Forensic psychiatric outpatients displayed the highest NAS scores, followed by the students and the inpatients scored the lowest.

The authors investigated the effects of capacity, psychological distress, coping, and personality on self-injurious behaviour among 190 female prisoners by administering a series of questionnaires. Results were generally supportive of the Interpersonal-Psychological Theory in that a history of prior self-injurious behaviour and increased reckless behaviour were predictive of self-injury, and extraversion and decreased emotional coping predicted increased self-injurious engagement.

Construct and content validity of the personality-based and gender-sensitive Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality was examined across gender by asking 132 international mental health professionals to rate symptoms. Results indicated similarities between psychopathic men and women on both symptom and domain levels. Gender differences were found largely in the degree of the symptoms that were reported for both genders.

DELIQUENCY/ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR
Asscher, J. J., van Vugt, E. S., Stams, G. J. J. M., Dekovic, M., Eichelsheim, V. I., & Yousfi, S. (2011). The relationship between juvenile psychopathic traits, delinquency and (violent) recidivism: A meta-analysis. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 52, 1134-1143. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2011.02412.x Fifty-three studies involving over 10,000 juveniles over a 20-year period were analyzed to identify relationships between psychopathy, delinquency, and re-offenses. There was a moderate relationship between psychopathy and delinquency, as well as between psychopathy and violent recidivism. These relationships were moderated by means of measuring delinquency with reliance on adult observations (parents, therapist, teachers, etc.) demonstrating a stronger relationship than when using record data to measure delinquency.

This longitudinal study examined trends in young males’ relationships with caregivers and their offending patterns from age 7 to 16. Results suggest decreased delinquency
coincided with strengthened caregiver relationships and increased delinquency coincided with weakened caregiver relationships. Trends were observed particularly in the age 13-16 range. Younger children with weakened caregiver relationships exhibited less severe increases in delinquent behavior.


Researchers evaluated the effectiveness of an intervention program geared toward middle schoolers on summer break (and thus with less daily structure). Adolescent girls’ substance use and delinquency were reported over three years. Girls who received the intervention exhibited lower levels of substance abuse. Less delinquent behavior relative to those who received no intervention was observed but to a lesser degree. Increased positive behaviors were observed in the intervention group, which appeared to impact risk for delinquent behavior.


Examined the relationship between substance abuse and dependence and violent behavior in 41 incarcerated women with antisocial personality disorder (ASPD). Substance dependence was found to be highly prevalent in these women and symptom severity was associated with violent behavior in women dependent on opiates, alcohol and cocaine. The author highlighted the importance of assessing symptom severity and comorbidity in violence risk assessment in this population.


This study examined the predictive validity of scores on the Level of Service Inventory–Saskatchewan Youth Edition in a sample of 192 young offenders on probation. Results showed total scores and seven of eight subscale scores were correlated with recidivism. The extent to which scores were used to develop community management strategies was also studied. In general, scores were used to inform supervision intensity and interventions related to criminogenic needs.


The Measure of Offender Thinking Styles (MOTS) was administered to 688 adult male inmates and its psychometric properties examined. Results supported the original three-factor model of criminal thinking—Control, Cognitive Immaturity, and Egocentrism. The MOTS also demonstrated reliability and convergent validity with other measures of criminal thinking and attitudes. The authors concluded that it has value for use in an offender population.


Researchers coded interactions among young males referred for conduct disorder and their families, while callous-unemotional traits were assessed through measures completed by parents, teachers, and each child. Positive relationships between coercive parenting and conduct problems were observed among children with lower levels of callous-unemotional traits. Negative relationships between parental warmth and conduct problems were observed among
children with higher levels of callous-unemotional traits.


Individuals receiving substance abuse treatment were interviewed and administered a battery of tests assessing antisociality, psychopathy, as well as multiple tasks to measure distress tolerance. Antisociality scores were negatively associated with distress tolerance, while psychopathy scores were associated with higher distress tolerance. There was no interactive effect. The authors highlight differences between antisociality and psychopathy suggesting that both constructs are unique contributors to distress tolerance.


Researchers examined the extent that positive findings in earlier studies of multisystemic therapy with juvenile offenders extended beyond young adulthood. Felony convictions, misdemeanor convictions, and family-related civil court involvement were all significantly lower for those who had received MST 18-24 years prior as juveniles.


The authors administered the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) to 2,872 male inmates to measure the latent trait of criminal thinking. The PICTS was then subjected to item response theory analyses and results indicated that the Sentimentality subscale displayed poor measurement of general criminal thinking. The other 7 PICTS thinking style scales displayed moderate to good discrimination and had higher estimates at higher levels of trait dimension.

**LEGAL DECISION-MAKING/JURY RESEARCH**

Camilletti, C. R. & Scullin, M. H. (2012). Attorney and lay beliefs about factors affecting jurors’ perceptions of juvenile offender culpability. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 18*, 113-128. doi: 10.1080/1068316X.2011.613390 The authors examined factors influencing beliefs about juvenile offenders in two studies. In study 1, attorneys and undergraduates (n = 77) believed that the youthfulness of juveniles would affect their culpability, but that perceptions of crime trends would not. In study 2, undergraduates (n = 193) read a trial summary which included a photo of a youthful or adult looking juvenile. Perceptions of increasing juvenile crime, but not juvenile appearance, affected culpability.


The authors examined the effect of likelihood ratios on understanding of forensic reports. Judges, defense lawyers, and forensic science personnel (n = 285) read two reports that varied on whether the likelihood ration was presented in a visual or verbal format. Understanding was highest in forensic personnel and format of likelihood ratios had no effect.

The author examined the impact of client race on attorney plea bargaining. Practicing defense attorneys (n = 101) read a case summary which varied by client race (black or white) and evidence strength (strong or weak). Longer sentence plea bargains were recommended for black clients, independent of evidence strength.


The authors examined opinions of juvenile offenders and adjudication on juror decision making in three studies. In study 1, undergraduates (n = 60) watched a voir dire proceeding in which either juvenile qualifying questions were asked or not asked. In studies 2 (n = 196) and 3 (n = 138), participants also watched a mock. Juvenile qualification questions were related to pre-trial opinions only.


The authors examined the effects of mortality salience on death penalty decisions. Undergraduates (n = 165) read a capital punishment trial summary and were primed to think about their death, the victim’s death, the defendant’s death, or received no prime. Participants relied more on their attitudes towards the death penalty to make decisions when primed to think about the victim or defendant’s death.


The authors examined how perceptions are affected by a sexual assault victim’s emotional response. Undergraduates (n = 124) read a trial summary which varied by the victim’s emotional display (upset or calm) and time when the display is given (day following the incident or during the trial). Participants were more likely to believe the claim when the victim was upset and when her display was consistent over time.


The authors surveyed jurors’ behavioral expectations of child sex abuse testifiers. Prospective jurors (n = 261) participated in a 3 (Child Age: 5, 10, or 15) x 2 (Abuse Type: fondling or penetration) x 2 (Allegation Veracity: true or false) x 5 (Testimony Condition: live, support person, CCTV, preparation, or videotaped) mixed factorial design. They found that expectations varied according to the type of testimony given, with live testimony being viewed as the most stressful.


The authors examined mock jurors’ beliefs about eyewitness identification factors on their decision making in two studies. Undergraduates read a trial summary that varied by witness age (6, 11, 42, or 74) and weapon visibility (Study 1; n = 200) or a short or long witness identification time (Study 2; n = 200) and had their attitudes towards these factors measured. Verdict decisions were affected by witness age and weapon presence.

The authors examined different forms of instruction for improving comprehension of death penalty cases in two studies. In study 1, undergraduates \((n = 211)\) either read California’s original standard instructions or their newer ‘plain language’ instructions. In study 2, community members \((n = 225)\) read either standard instructions, instructions modified psycholinguistically, or instructions where key terms were explained with case facts. Non-standard instructions were associated with greater comprehension.


The authors examined level of experience and expectancy factors in the decision making of judges. Family court judges with experience in child abuse/neglect cases \((n = 133)\) read a scenario concerning the termination of parental rights. The authors varied the expectancy variables of sibling presence, parent support, and information on child’s adoptability. They found that expectancy variables influenced the judgments of experienced judges only; individual factors affected the judgments of inexperienced judges.


Undergraduates \((n = 306)\) read a crime scenario that varied by crime type (burglary or robbery), crime outcome (mild or severe), and defendant age (14 or 24), and then gave a verdict and sentence recommendation. Participants were more likely to convict those who committed a crime against a person and were more likely to give longer sentences to adult defendants, defendants who committed a crime against a person, and defendants who caused severe damage.


Prosecutors were presented with an assault case vignette in which veteran status (yes/no) and recent PTSD diagnosis (yes/no) were manipulated. Defendants were rated as less culpable when noted to be a veteran and/or had a recent history of PTSD. An interaction was found whereby prosecutors were most likely to offer alternative diversion treatment pleas when the defendant was a veteran with PTSD.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT, CONFESSIONS, & DECEPTION**


Undergraduates \((n = 120)\) were asked to either plan and complete a mock crime (liars) or a non-criminal activity (truth tellers). Participants were intercepted before they could complete the task and interviewed about their plans using early evidence disclosure or one of two strategic evidence disclosure methods. Liars were found to be more inconsistent; this effect was greater for the conditions of strategic evidence disclosure.

The authors examined the efficacy of a training workshop on Assessment Criteria Indicative of Deception (ACID) among 99 forensic professionals at a maximum-security forensic hospital. Professionals' deception detection accuracy was formally evaluated using written transcripts prior to and after completion of training. Results indicated that participants' accuracy significantly improved from 61% to 70% after completion of training, suggesting that training may improve forensic professionals' ability to detect deception.


The authors examined the impact of different individual factors on interrogative suggestibility. Participants (n = 64) completed measures of interrogative suggestibility, negative life events, and field dependence. Negative life events significantly correlated with suggestibility. Field dependence did not correlate with either suggestibility or negative life events.


The authors surveyed law enforcement officers (n = 63) about factors affecting alibi beliefs. They found that alibi that can be quickly investigated are more useful. Alibi believability is most affected by the presence of physical evidence or a statement from an unmotivated other.


Mock jurors (n = 156) did or did not receive explicit instructions to correct for the camera perspective bias prior to viewing a video of an authentic true or false confession. Results showed that mock jurors who received instructions to correct for the bias reported more lenient judgments of confessor guilt after viewing a suspect-focus confession compared to those who did not receive instructions. This leniency emerged in response to false, and not true, confessions.


The authors examined different aspects of minimization and maximization that may affect perceptions of expected outcomes in two studies. Participants read (study 1; n = 138) or participated in (study 2; n = 132) a scenario of a mock crime and interview that varied by suspect guilt and interview tactics that did or did not alter confession consequences. Tactics that influenced perceived consequences affected decisions to confess.


This study examined the effects of investigator bias on use of interrogation tactics. Undergraduates (n = 180) acted as guilty or innocent suspects in a mock crime study. Investigator (n = 8) bias was manipulated (no bias, innocent bias, guilty bias). Guilty bias investigators were more likely to use minimization tactics for innocent but not guilty suspects.

Undergraduate participants (N = 251) judged the veracity of 12 written narratives (truthful/deceptive) across three emotional categories: positive, negative, and neutral events. Overall accuracy was close to chance, although participants were more accurate in determining the veracity of truthful narratives. Accuracy was impaired for emotional (positive and negative) relative to neutral narratives. Psychopathy was not associated with levels of overall accuracy, but related to discriminative ability, and differential use of cues in decision making.

The authors examined the impact of situational factors on Miranda comprehension. Undergraduates (n = 123) participated in a mock crime study in which they did or did not steal a watch. Participants were interviewed and given Miranda which varied by either length (124 or 228) or mode (oral or written). Participating in the mock crime reduced Miranda understanding. No effect was found for length or mode.

Officers (n = 136) rated the accuracy of one of three mock transcripts of a rape complainant video interview: A ‘standard interview’; a ‘structured interview’; and a ‘cognitive interview’. Officers in the standard condition rated the complainant as less accurate and they were less likely to proceed with charges. Officers cited the main advantages of video interviewing as improved forensic quality and interviewing practices, and the ability to use the interview as good evidence.

RISK ASSESSMENT/COMMUNICATION
This study examined the ability of the classification system enacted under the Adam Walsh Act to predict future offending in a sample of 112 juvenile sex offenders. Over the follow-up period, offenders who met registration criteria did not reoffend at a higher rate than offenders not meeting such criteria. Results suggest that registration policies are not a valid and reliable way of assessing risk of future reoffense in this population.

A group of 254 cases of threats or inappropriate contact with political figures was analyzed. Fifteen variables were used to develop a classification model to help distinguish single-approach incidents from repeated stalking cases. Significant risk factors associated with repeated stalking included multiple methods of contact, target or policy-focused complaints, and grievance-driven communications. Most (71.4%) of the cases were correctly classified using this model.

This study examined the SVR-20’s accuracy in predicting recidivism in a sample of
493 sex offenders released from prison in Austria. Results indicated good predictive accuracy with regard to sexual recidivism for the sample, as well as for subgroups of rapists and child molesters. The SVR-20's subscales and individual items were found to have different degrees of association with future sexual and non-sexual violence.


Dynamic risk factors for reoffending were assessed in a sample of 419 male sex offenders using the Stable-2000. The men were classified based on their scores into four dynamic risk groups: low needs, typical, sexually deviant, or pervasive high-needs. These groups did not overlap with other offender classification strategies, suggesting that offenders with differing levels of dynamic risk factors require different levels of treatment and supervision.

**SEX OFFENDERS**


Recidivism data for 223 adolescent sex offenders in Switzerland were used to assess the predictive power of two risk assessment tools: The Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment Protocol (J-SOAP-II) and the Sexual Offence Severity (SOS) Scale. Logistic regression analyses indicated that, while the SOS Scale and some subscales of the J-SOAP-II were helpful in predicting recidivism, a more comprehensive set of variables is needed for increasing prediction accuracy.


Recidivism rates of 351 male adolescent sex offenders were examined using data from official sources in Canada. Over the eight-year follow-up period, 45% of the offenders were charged with a new offense, 30% were charged with a new violent offense, and 10% were charged with a new sex offense. Several developmental, social, and criminological risk factors were found to be predictive of recidivism.


The authors administered 10 psychometric measures to 97 incarcerated UK child molesters to identify and validate the Pathways Model. Results suggested a five-cluster model - intimacy deficits, antisocial cognition, multiple dysfunction pathways, impulsivity and boy predators. While the first three factors fit well with Ward and Siegret's model, the last two did not and represented psychological vulnerabilities that should be explored in future reconfigurations of the model.


The authors sought to address the inaccuracies that may result from estimating risk of sexual recidivism using actuarial instruments without consideration of dynamic risk factors using a sample of 246 convicted male sex offenders. Analyses identified multiple offense trajectories when static and dynamic risk factors were considered, and suggested that a sex crimes might be a transitory phase of the criminal career.
The latent structure of Multiphasic Sex Inventory-Assessed pedophilic interest. Psychological Assessment, 23, 1017-1022. doi: 10.1037/a0024625.

The study employed 3 taxometric procedures to analyze the latent structure of pedophilic interest in 371 convicted male child sex offenders in residential treatment centers using the Multiphasic Sex Inventory (MSI). Results suggested that pedophilic interest, measured by the MSI, has a dimensional latent structure. The authors concluded that it may be more accurate to use degree of pedophilic interest rather than dichotomous pedophile and non-pedophile to conceptualize pedophilic interest.


Emotional, cognitive, and behavioral dysregulation were studied in a sample of 256 psychiatric inpatients with a history of sexual offenses. Factor analysis identified two categories of dysregulation: emotional and cognitive. Three factors for behavioral dysregulation were found: criminal, sexual, and suicidal. Results suggested that emotional and cognitive dysregulation were predictive of criminal and suicidal behavior, and cognitive dysregulation was the only significant predictor of sexually maladaptive behavior.


The authors investigated the effects of gender, victim age, and offender treatment on public opinion toward sexual offenders among a community sample of 235 participants asked to read a hypothetical vignette and complete three assessment measures. Results indicated that victim age and treatment significantly affected opinions, such that younger aged victims and non-completion of treatment resulted in more negative attitudes toward sex offenders. No gender effects were found.


Researchers conducted a large-scale analysis of treated sex offenders released over a ten-year period. Reconviction rates for sexual (3.6%) or violent (4.6%) offenses were low and similar to other studies using this criterion for recidivism. Static items were particularly associated with recidivism; namely offender age at release and prior sexual/criminal history. Dynamic factors including pre-treatment measures of socioaffective traits were most strongly associated with recidivism.


Compared 12 alleged female sex offenders with a matched male group who were referred to a court psychiatric clinic. Most of the female sex offenders had children, prior arrests and reported past histories of sexual or physical victimization. A third had past history of psychiatric hospitalization and were mostly given non-paraphilic psychiatric diagnoses. Many similarities were found between male and female offenders but females more frequently had victims of both genders.

WITNESS ISSUES

The dud effect: Adding highly

The authors examine the ‘dud-alternative effect’ on lineups in four studies. In study 1, undergraduates \((n = 110)\) performed a lineup task in which either similar or dissimilar fillers were present. In study 2, participants \((n = 203)\) also rated the similarity of the fillers to their memory of the perpetrator. In study 3, participants \((n = 140)\) received either biased or unbiased instructions. In study 4, participants \((n = 212)\) were exposed to a greater range of dissimilarity of fillers. Dissimilar fillers were related to higher confidence in identifications.


The authors examined absolute and relative eyewitness judgments using the WITNESS model. WITNESS is a decision model that provides probabilities for selection of suspect, foil, and no identification. Simulations of the WITNESS model were examined. It was found that absolute judgments were better in suspect-matched lineups, but that no difference was found in same-foil lineups.


Children \((7-8\) and \(13-14\)-year-olds, \(n = 236)\) attempted identifications from target-present (TP) or target-absent (TA) videos, after delay (two days or two weeks). The most frequent responses were correct identifications in TP lineups, but false identifications in TA conditions. Under both TP and TA conditions, the 3-way interaction of delay, age and response was significant. Delay was the major contributor of variance, causing an increase in errors for both age groups in TP delayed lineups but only for the younger group in TA delayed line-ups.


The authors examined the effect of the ‘verbal over-shadowing effect’ on constructing facial composites. Participants \((n = 42)\) viewed a target and two days later were asked to construct a composite either immediately after describing the face, immediately but without describing the face, or 30 minutes after describing the face. Composites were worse when a description was given and there was no delay; no differences were found between the delay and no-description groups.


The identification performance of children \((5-6\) years, \(n = 180)\) and adults \((n = 180)\) was examined using three types of video lineup procedures: simultaneous, sequential and elimination. Age did not impact correct identifications in simultaneous and elimination lineups. The sequential video lineup reduced correct identifications for children. The elimination lineup increased correct rejection rates for adult witnesses in the target-absent lineup condition. Age was significantly associated with accuracy. Differences in correct rejection rates were observed between all groups.

Participants assumed the roles of witness and investigator ($N = 167$ pairs). Witnesses’ view of a simulated crime varied by distance: 2 or 9 ft. Participants made an identification and received positive feedback or no feedback. Significant effects for witnesses and investigators were associated with viewing condition and feedback. Investigators asked more positive, leading questions when they believed that the witness had identified the suspect. Evaluators ($n = 302$) viewed the videotaped interviews. Positive post-identification feedback led evaluators to judge witnesses as more credible.


VIPER is a video line-up identification system. A line-up in this system consists of seven to nine 15 second video clips presented in sequential order. The authors conducted a field study of identifications ($n = 1718$) made with this system. For identifications in which the suspect was a stranger ($n = 1044$), 44% of witnesses identified the suspect, 42% identified a foil, and 15% made no identification.

Olson, E. A. and Wells, G. L. (2012). The alibi-generation effect: Alibi-generation experience influences alibi evaluation. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 17, 151–164. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8333.2010.02003.x. Participants ($n = 147$) evaluated a suspect’s alibi before generating their own alibi or generated their own alibi before evaluating the suspect’s. Participants provided alibis from either 3 days or 30 days previous. In Experiment 2, participants ($n = 255$) were assigned to either generate-first, evaluate-first, or read-experience (in which they read about alibi-generation difficulty) conditions. Half were primed to think empathetically. Participants who generated their own alibi first rated the suspect’s alibi as more believable. This alibi-generation effect overshadowed alibi-latency in Experiment 1 and the empathy manipulation in Experiment 2.


In this case study, information provided in five interviews of a 9-year-old, and the interviewer’s notes during an initial unrecorded interview, was systematically analyzed to determine whether each unit of information was new, consistent (repeated) or contradictory in relation to earlier reported information and whether any informative detail provided in the witness’ initial interview was subsequently omitted. In addition, the witness’ accounts were compared with details provided by the victim upon her rescue.


Participants watched a mock crime video, and then completed a target-absent lineup identification and a retrospective memory questionnaire. Prior to the identification, participants were either exposed or not to pre-admonition suggestions (it was likely that the perpetrator was in the lineup) and received biased or unbiased lineup instructions. The pre-admonition suggestion increased false identifications in the unbiased lineup condition. Those who received the pre-admonition suggestion were more certain in their identifications and other testimony-relevant judgments.

Participants (*n* = 89) viewed a short film and were assigned to one of four conditions: (1) Laboratory discussion, (2) Family discussion, (3) Retell and (4) Control. Three weeks later participants gave an open free recall, and then 3 days later confidence judged the recalled information. The results showed significant differences between the four conditions on number of correct items, incorrect items, accuracy, confidence and calibration.


Researchers explored the relationships between the language of interviewer questions, children’s reports, and case and child characteristics in forensic interviews. Results indicated that the type of questions—either probing generic or episodic features of an event—was related to the specificity of information reported by children. Interviewers appeared to adjust their questioning strategies based on the frequency of the alleged abuse. Children alleging single instances of abuse were asked more episodic questions. In contrast, children alleging multiple incidents of abuse were asked a greater proportion of generic questions.


Researchers examined question structures that varied on numerous dimensions; whether they narrowed the response option to yes or no, whether they included highly specific detail about the event and whether they presumed the information being suggested to be true. Interview questions that narrowed the response option and contained specific details and questions that encouraged broader responses but presumed certain information were found to be the most harmful. Participants were more likely to agree with the misleading suggestions contained in these question structure and more likely to falsely report those suggested details at subsequent interview.


A video crime was viewed by 378 participants who then attempted to identify the culprit from a six-person sequential or simultaneous-format lineup that either included or did not include the culprit. Witnesses were provided either dichotomous forced-choice (FC) response categories (yes/no) or a not-sure option (NSO) (yes/no/not-sure). The not-sure option (NSO) significantly decreased witness choosing compared to the FC condition but only for sequential lineups. Both correct identifications and false alarms decreased. Diagnosticity was greatest for a sequential lineup with a NSO.


Researchers examined the utility of presenting chimeric images (formed from opposing halves of a pair of same or different faces) in court settings. Experiment 1 examined the accuracy of face matching with vertically split, aligned chimeric images, misaligned hemi-faces and full-face images. Experiment 2 replaced the misaligned images with opposing hemi-faces separated by a gap. The final experiment used horizontally split faces. All three experiments showed that matching was less accurate with aligned chimeric images than with full-face images.
Valentine, T., Davis, J. P., Memon, A. and Roberts, A. (2012). *Live showups and their influence on a subsequent video line-up*. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 26, 1–23. doi: 10.1002/acp.1796. Four experiments examined the reliability of live showups and their influence on a subsequent video line-up. Both culprits and innocent suspects previously identified were likely to be identified again in a subsequent lineup, with delays from a few minutes to a month. Only a weak effect of clothing bias was observed. There was strong evidence of commitment effects but no reliable evidence of source monitoring errors. The results suggest that the use of repeated identification procedures introduces an unfair bias against innocent suspects.

Vallano, J. P. and Compo, N. S. (2011). *A comfortable witness is a good witness: Rapport-building and susceptibility to misinformation in an investigative mock-crime interview*. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 25, 960–970. doi: 10.1002/acp.1789. College adults (n=111) viewed a videotaped mock-crime, received post-event misinformation (or correct information) about the crime, and were subsequently interviewed by a research assistant who built rapport (or did not build rapport) before recalling the mock-crime. Results indicated that rapport-building increased the quality of witness recall by decreasing the percentage of inaccurate and misinformation reported, particularly in response to open-ended questions.

van Oorsouw, K. and Merckelbach, H. (2012). *The Effects of Alcohol on Crime-related Memories: A Field Study*. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 26:82–90. doi: 10.1002/acp.1799. This field study investigated to what extent memory of criminally relevant details is affected at zero, moderate, and high levels of alcohol intoxication. Participants (n = 76) were approached in bars and invited to watch a mock crime from a perpetrator perspective. After 3–5 days, they underwent a free and cued recall task about the mock crime. Both moderately and highly intoxicated individuals were less complete when recollecting crime details, recalling up to 33% fewer correct details. Intoxicated participants were less accurate during the cued recall task.


**OTHER**

Gekosi, A., Gray, J. M., & Adler, J. R. (2012). *Interviewing women bereaved by homicide: Assessing the impact of trauma-focused research*. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 18, 177-189. doi: 10.1080/10683161003718692 Examined the impact of participation in trauma-focused research among 14 women who were involved in a larger study on secondary victimization by criminal justice agencies. The authors utilized semi-structured interviews to explore the participants’ experiences. Results indicated that all participants gained something positive from participation, half experienced upset and none regretted their participation. The authors went on to highlight certain features of the interview and its use in future research.
Grieger, L. & Hosser, D. (2012). *Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder does not predict criminal recidivism in young adult offenders: Results from a prospective study.* *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 35*, 27–34. doi: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2011.11.005 Authors examined the effect of childhood and current symptoms of ADHD on general and violent recidivism, over a five-year follow-up period, among a sample of 283 male prisoners in Germany. The results indicated that while the rate of adult ADHD was six times greater among the prisoners than in the general population, ADHD was not found to be a predictor of recidivism. The results suggest the need to clarify the risk factors for delinquency, which may differ from those for recidivism.

Ross, J. M. (2011). *Personality and situational correlates of self-reported reasons for intimate partner violence among women versus men referred for batterers' intervention.* *Behavioural Sciences and the Law, 29*, 711-727. doi: 10.1002/bsl.1004. Examined personality and situational correlates of self-reported reasons for intimate partner violence (IPV) among 30 women and 56 men. Results indicated that women reported self-defense while men reported retaliation as their primary reasons for engaging in IPV. Women’s reasons for IPV were largely situational and related to borderline traits while men’s reasons were related to antisocial and borderline traits, and not situational factors.
The past months have been very productive for the Student Section. We are quickly reaching many of the goals we set forth for ourselves this year and are eagerly looking forward to the Conference in March!

Our Campus Representative Program continues to gain popularity; currently, more CRs than ever before serve the Student Section, and their level of dedication deserves recognition. As such, we will be awarding one CR a month for his or her outstanding service. The first awardee, CR of the month for January, 2012, was Hali Wood, an M.A. candidate at the New School. Congratulations and thank you for your hard work, Hali!

The Student Section’s Facebook page is Division 41’s foray into social media, and we are so pleased that we have obtained well over 300 “likes.” This page is intended to keep you up to date of news relevant to psychology and law, as well as grant, award, and training opportunities. Please “like” us on Facebook—your posts and comments are encouraged. We will be live “blogging” from the Facebook page during Conference, so be sure to check the page at that time.

Also online, we have updated the “Interviews with Professionals” section of our website. While the site was previously rich with advice from some of the most influential AP-LS members, it now has a wealth of information provided by even more psychology and law professionals. New topics include internship advice, how to collaborate across institutions, the job search after graduate school, and advice for soon-to-be Early Career Professionals. One of these interviews is in video format; we thank Drs. Jodi Viljoen and Kevin Douglas of Simon Fraser University for participating in the video interview. More interviews will be added to the site in the coming months, so visit often. A special thanks goes to our Web Editor, Lindsey Wylie, for revamping the site.

In terms of Conference activities, we have an exciting schedule ahead of us. A morning session will involve a light breakfast and discussion revolving around how to make the most of your conference experience. Our peer-reviewed symposium consisting of a panel of the past five years’ Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring Award winners—Brian Bornstein, Mark Costanzo, Ronald Roesch, Edie Greene, and N. Dickon Reppucci—is sure to be a hit with students and professionals alike. Make sure to bring questions for panel members! Finally, our evening social will provide a fun opportunity to network with other students in a casual environment. Complimentary drinks and light hors d’oeuvres will be provided.

Congratulations to all whose work was accepted for presentation at Conference and to those who won peer-reviewed Student Travel Awards. We look forward to seeing your presentations and encourage you to participate in the Student Presentation and/or Poster Competitions!

Finally, don’t forget that student member Conference volunteers’ registration fees are waived. If you would like to volunteer your time to save on conference costs, please contact Mrs. Kathy Gaskey at apls@ec.rr.com.

As always, please contact us with any questions. See you in San Juan!

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
The Jacobs Foundation would like to invite the American Psychological Association to nominate a candidate for the Klaus J. Jacobs Research Prize 2012. The prize in honour of the Jacobs Foundation’s late founder Klaus J. Jacobs is awarded annually in the first week of December in Zurich, Switzerland. We would also like to ask whether it is possible to distribute the call for nominations further to APA Members or post it on your website.

The prize in honour of the Jacobs Foundation’s late founder Klaus J. Jacobs is awarded annually in the first week of December in Zurich, Switzerland. The Klaus J. Jacobs Research Prize awards outstanding scientific contributions of individuals from all disciplines aiming at the improvement of young people’s development and perspectives worldwide. The prize is endowed with 1 Mio. Swiss Francs, of which 900’000 Swiss Francs are for use in a research project, 100’000 Swiss Francs are for related costs, such as travel, networking, and dissemination.

The prize addresses scholars from all countries who have achieved major breakthroughs in understanding and contributing to child and youth development and at the same time have the potential to advance the field by actively conducting research.

An international jury will choose the laureate from the pool of nominated candidates. The following individuals currently form the jury:

Professor Albert Bandura, Stanford University, USA
Professor Monique Boekaerts, Leiden University, the Netherlands
Professor Thomas W. Boyce, University of British Columbia, Canada
Professor Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Columbia University, USA
Professor Meinrad Paul Perrez, University of Fribourg, Switzerland
Professor Anne C. Petersen, University of Michigan, USA
Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Germany
Professor William Julius Wilson, Harvard University, USA

Your support in the nomination process would be very much appreciated. Please have your nomination submitted by 15 March 2012 at the latest. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me. To find out more about the Research Prize, please also visit our website: http://award.jacobsfoundation.org/
The APA Committee on Socioeconomic Status (CSES) would like to invite Division 41, American Psychology-Law Society, to select a monitor to CSES for 2012. Monitors are important in identifying and communicating possible areas of collaboration between divisions and committees.

The mission of the Committee on SES is to further the major purpose of the APA – “to advance psychology as a science and a profession and as a means of promoting health, education and human welfare”—by ensuring that issues of SES receive the full attention of the Association. The Committee identifies and acts as a catalyst in the Association’s efforts to address issues of SES and promote appropriate attention to SES in psychological research and practice. In this regard, the Committee: (a) collects information and documentation concerning SES; (b) promotes scientific understanding of the roles of poverty and SES in health, education, and human welfare; (c) develops approaches to the application of psychology that take into account the effects of SES on psychological development and well-being; and (d) advocates for social policy that will alleviate or reduce the disparities between SES groups.

Monitors function primarily to alert their division of CSES’ actions, programs, and policies that might have implications for their division’s mission, priorities, and responsibilities. Monitors will receive and review agendas prior to CSES meetings and minutes following CSES meetings for review. Monitors are not required to attend CSES meetings. However, they are invited to attend CSES-related meetings and events at the Annual Convention, held this August in Orlando, Florida.

Interested candidates should send a CV and brief letter of interest by February 24, 2012.
Position Title: Higher Education Academic Level B

Appointment Type: Ongoing

Swinburne University invites applications for one position at the rank of Higher Education Academic Level B (equivalent to North American Tenure-track Assistant Professor) in the field of Criminology.

Swinburne University of Technology aims to be a pre-eminent entrepreneurial university in the Asia-Pacific region, thriving on new ideas and knowledge. The successful candidate will be appointed within the Psychological Sciences and Statistics Academic Group in the Faculty of Life and Social Sciences. The Psychological Sciences and Statistics Academic Group recently started an undergraduate major in Forensic Science (Psychology) to complement its existing Bachelors degree in Psychology, and its Masters, Professional Doctorate, and Ph.D. programs in Psychology. The academic staff in the Psychological Sciences and Statistics group have been successful in attracting nationally competitive research grants, have well-appointed research labs, supervise undergraduate and postgraduate students, are accomplished in research and teaching, and are leaders in service to the university, community, and profession.

The successful applicant will be expected to teach across the existing undergraduate and postgraduate programs in Criminology and Psychology & Law. They will supervise honours and postgraduate students, and participate in collegial activities within the discipline. In addition, they will have a significant role in the creation of a new undergraduate major in Criminology, for online and face-to-face delivery.

Candidates must have a doctoral qualification in Criminology, Criminal Justice, Psychology & Law, or a cognate discipline, and should have an active research agenda or the promise of an active research agenda in a relevant area. The starting date for the position is July 1, 2012. Only those who have or will have a completed Ph.D. by July 1, 2012 are eligible to apply.

For further details on the position, and instructions on how to apply, please see: http://www.swinburne.edu.au/corporate/hr/jobs/index.htm

Swinburne University encourages applications from Indigenous people, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, people with disabilities, women and men.
The American Psychological Association Committee on Women in Psychology (CWP) announces its fifth annual Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology to be held on Monday, July 30, Tuesday, July 31 and August 1, 2012 in Orlando, FL and March 2013 in Washington, DC. This year we are accepting approximately 30 mid-career women psychologist who work full time in academic/academic medical settings, and approximately 30 mid-career women psychologists who work primarily in clinical or consulting settings. Mid-career women psychologists in leadership roles in integrated primary care settings in academic health centers, public, community or private sectors are encouraged to apply as well. This is a competitive process. Please complete the application for the group with which you most clearly identify and meet the eligibility criteria discussed below.

The overall mission of the LIWP is to empower, prepare and support women psychologists as leaders to promote positive changes in institutional, organizational and practice settings as well as APA and State, Provincial, and Territorial Associations (SPTA) governance, and increase the diversity, number, and effectiveness of women psychologists as leaders. The program’s mission supports APA’s goal to advance psychology as a science and profession and as a means of promoting health, education and human welfare.

**The APA Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology has several objectives:**

1. Ensure that mid-career and senior women in psychology have the knowledge and skills necessary to compete for leadership/senior management positions in academic, practice, and other professional settings as well as APA and SPTA governance.

2. Enhance the number and effectiveness of women psychologists holding leadership positions in academic, practice, and other professional settings as well as APA and SPTA governance.

3. Increase the diversity of women psychologists in academic, practice, and other leadership positions as well as APA and SPTA governance.

4. Create networks of women psychologists in leadership/senior management positions in varied professional settings including APA and SPTA governance.

5. Document the career movement, professional advancement as well as the perceived impact of the LIWP among participants.
Who Should Apply?

Mid-career (10-20 years post-doctoral degree) women psychologists who are APA members with demonstrated leadership experience, strengths and goals:

a) holding either full-time, paid faculty appointments at the associate professor or clinical associate professor level or above in academic or academic medicine settings

Or

b) working 20 or more hours per week primarily in clinical or consulting settings. If you are in a clinical setting, you must be a licensed psychologist to apply to the LIWP.

Or

c) if you are more than 20 years post-doctoral degree but view yourself as mid-career and not senior, provide careful justification for your application as a mid-career psychologist in academic, academic medical, clinical or consulting settings. Women of color, lesbian and bisexual women, transgender women, and women with disabilities are strongly encouraged to apply.

Program components

Highly interactive, skills-focused workshops with experts in the field. The core curriculum includes:

- Leadership Models
- Mid-Career Management, Goal Setting and Planning
- Negotiation Skills
- Mentoring Networks, including gender and diversity issues

Previous Institutes and Web seminars during the year have also addressed:

- Sustaining and Funding a Research Program
- Fiscal, Program, and Personnel issues
- Managing Work-Life Balance
- Strategic Planning
- Dealing with Difficult People

Individuals who participate will leave with clearly defined professional goals, identify next steps towards promotion and leadership positions, and have the opportunity to join a monthly mentoring forum for mid-career women in psychology. Applications and supporting materials (CV or resume and one letter of recommendation) are due by 5:00 pm eastern time on Monday, March 12, 2012. Applications submitted after the deadline or incomplete applications will not be considered. Please complete either the application for mid-career women in academic and academic medical settings or the application for mid-career women in clinical and consulting settings. The applications are not the same. You may also print out the completed application and: either fax it with accompanying documents to the Women’s Programs Office at (202) 336-6117 or send an email with your name and the track to which you are applying in the subject line.
If selected, participants will be asked to pay a $600 fee, which covers registration, program materials, and food (breakfast, lunch and snacks). In addition, participants are expected to attend a follow-up leadership program in March 2013 at the APA headquarters in Washington, DC; and complete questionnaires on an annual basis regarding career advancement and leadership training needs. Participants are also invited to Web seminars on leadership issues throughout the year; and have access to a list serve for LIWP participants, faculty and staff.

Selections will be announced by Monday, May 9, 2011.

For additional information, please review frequently asked questions or contact Shari Miles-Cohen, PhD, Senior Director, Women’s Programs Office.
1. Via snail-mail at American Psychological Association, 750 First St., NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242
2. Via phone at (202) 336-6044
3. Via email.

The American Psychological Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology has been generously funded by APA Board of Directors, the APA Council of Representatives, the APA Women’s Programs Office, the National Institutes of Health Office of Research on Women’s Health, Psychologists in Independent Practice, the Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Psychology, the Society for the Psychological Study of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Issues, the Society for the Psychology of Women, and the Women’s Caucus of the APA Council of Representatives.

The Call for Applications to the 5th Annual APA Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology (2012-2013) has officially opened! The deadline to apply is March 12, 2012. To view the Call for Applications (also embedded at the bottom of this message) please visit: http://www.apa.org/pi/women/programs/leadership/call.aspx

Please note, the APA LIWP is open to mid-career* women psychologists in academic or academic medicine, and clinical or clinical consulting settings who are full APA members in good standing. Please review the Call for Applications for a complete list of eligibility criteria. There are two separate applications housed at the link above, be sure to complete the one for the track you identify with most. Check out the APA LIWP Frequently Asked Questions here: http://www.apa.org/pi/women/programs/leadership/faq.aspx.

* - mid-career is defined by the APA LIWP Executive Committee as being no more than twenty (20) years and no less than ten (10) years post-doctoral degree. If you are more than twenty years post-doctoral degree and feel you are “mid-career”, please explain why in the appropriate section of the application.

Should you have questions about the application itself, please direct them to Ms. Kari Hill (khill@apa.org), if you have questions about the application process or the program itself, please direct them to Dr. Shari Miles-Cohen (smiles@apa.org). Good luck and Happy New Year!

Kari Hill | Program Assistant, Women’s Programs Office
Dear Friends and Colleagues:

The Executive Committee of the American Psychology-Law Society (Division 41, American Psychological Association) is inviting nominations and self-nominations for potential co-chairs for the 2013 and 2014 AP-LS conferences to take place in Portland, OR and New Orleans, LA, respectively.

As many of you are well aware, co-chairing this conference is recognized as a significant milestone in a young scholar’s career. AP-LS has been fortunate to have many of our most prominent members assist the division in this capacity (e.g., Jim Ogloff, Brian Cutler, Margaret Kovera, Patricia Zapf, Jennifer Skeem). Serving as a co-chair offers the opportunity to work with leading researchers in the field of psychology and law, including working closely with the person who will be President of APLS during the conference. The efforts of a co-chair can amplify a young scholar’s presence within the discipline and provides widespread exposure for their university or institution.

The co-chairs are responsible for the entire scientific program which includes organizing the submissions, reviews, and planning the conference program. In addition, they arrange for all hotel amenities and attend to every detail for the four days of the conference (ordering food, calculating room requirements and audio visual aids) and assisting with any continuing education workshops. The co-chairs are responsible for inviting and selecting student travel award winners. They also coordinate all of the special events that take place at the conferences including invited speakers, parties, poster sessions, and committee meetings. The co-chairs coordinate the exhibitors and increasingly are involved in collaborating with agencies who are interested in donating funding to the conference. Finally, they are responsible for balancing the conference budget.

The bulk of this work will begin in late summer with a proposal submission deadline of early October and will remain steady up until the conference in March.
The chairs are fortunate to work very closely with Kathy Gaskey, Div. 41’s administrative assistant, the Executive Committee and the Conference advisory committee and are able to assist them in navigating many of these challenging tasks.

The successful applicants will be highly energetic and have exceptional communication and organizational skills, recognized expertise in their areas of research, and impeccable interpersonal skills. In closing, we want to clearly convey the magnitude of this undertaking so that you can make an informed decision when submitting nominations. Nominations and CVs may be submitted to either one of us at the email addresses below.

The nomination deadline is **April 15, 2012**.

All nominations should be submitted to the email address below.

Jeffrey Neuschatz, PhD
Chair, Conference Advisory Committee
neuschaj@uah.edu

The new free searchable APS Postdoc Exchange offers a better way to advertise postdoctoral openings to candidates across all of psychological science and related disciplines.

The Postdoc Exchange provides a more direct connection between those offering postdoctoral positions and those searching for them, something that is now often done by word of mouth. We hope this also encourages placing postdocs from different countries.

Postdoc Exchange Home
Search Listings
Place Listings
FAQ

Please take a look at this new online resource and send us your feedback. And feel free to share this e-mail with anyone who may be seeking a postdoc position or who has a position available.
The Committee on Early Career Psychologists is pleased to announce the travel award program for early career members from all areas of psychology (education, practice, public interest and science) to attend the 2012 APA Annual Convention in Orlando, Florida, August 2-5, at the Orange County Convention Center. Twenty award recipients will receive $750 to be applied toward their 2012 APA convention expenses. The program is designed to encourage attendance and increase representation of early career members at this year’s APA convention.

**Electronic submission instructions:** Please submit all materials in a single Word document. Put your name and the name of the award in the subject line (e.g. Jane Smith, Early Career Travel Award). The deadline for submission of materials is March 23, 2012, midnight (EST). Email or fax all materials to Sonja Wiggins (swiggins@ap.org); fax # 202-216-7628. Award winners will be notified in April 2012 and will be acknowledged during the Early Career Social Hour sponsored by the Committee on Early Career Psychologists at the APA convention on Friday, August 3, 2012 at 6PM.

All early career APA members (within seven years receipt of their doctorate) are encouraged to apply. Preference will be given to applicants who are first-time attendees, or whose primary work is in basic psychological science or those who will be presenting at the 2012 convention. The submission package must include the following information:

1. Brief statement (maximum one page) about your interest in attending the convention and how you will use this award to support your attendance. Please highlight any significant achievements in your career as well as any leadership positions you have held as an early career psychologists (within APA, other related scholarly or professional organizations such as state and local psychological associations) and indicate how you believe you would benefit from attending the convention. Also, please include in your statement if your primary work is in basic psychological science, if the 2012 convention will be your first APA convention and if you will be receiving other funding to help cover your expenses.

2. If you are presenting at the 2012 APA convention, please include an abstract of your presentation along with the title and the names of co-presenters. Please note that you do not need to be a presenter to be eligible for this travel award.

3. Include your Curriculum Vitae (the year you were awarded a doctorate in psychology should be clearly stated).

**Electronic submission instructions:** Please submit all materials in a single Word document. Put your name and the name of the award in the subject line (e.g. Jane Smith, Early Career Travel Award).

The deadline for submission of materials is March 23, 2012, midnight (EST). Email or fax all materials to Sonja Wiggins (swiggins@ap.org); fax # 202-216-7628. Award winners will be notified in April 2012 and will be acknowledged during the Early Career Social Hour sponsored by the Committee on Early Career Psychologists at the APA convention on Friday, August 3, 2012 at 6PM.
ON THE COUNT

Madness, Humor and Mental Health Care in a Maximum Security Prison

Michael Boccia, Ph.D.,
as told to and co-written by Peter Mars

ABOUT THE BOOK

The decade of the 1970’s was a fascinating chapter in the history of American correctional facilities, especially in the Northeast. It was as though the social tumult of the 1960’s had contagiously spilled over and into the sub-cultural existence of convicted felons in correctional facilities. The corrections world of the 70’s might be viewed as a resurgence of Freedom’s Ferment, Alice Felt Tyler’s brilliant account of Americans’ quest for social reform and utopian life in the first half of the nineteenth century. Among the frightening events of the 70’s were deadly prison riots, especially New York’s Attica Correctional Facility, inmate strikes, correction officer strikes, the infiltration of the deadly AIDS virus among prisoners, and the first murder in USA history of a female correction officer on duty in a maximum security prison.

On a positive note, a few prison systems began to introduce cutting edge, mental health services for inmates within each maximum security prison, based on a community mental health model.

On The Count exposes the reader to many challenging and interesting, true experiences to enrich one’s understanding of the mosaic often blood-stained, of daily life in the corrections community at that time. Many challenges in prisoner management have not changed since then.

“I’ve read the book and feel that it is an accurate account of the working of mental hygiene within the Department of Correctional Service Prison system.

Michael Strack, Retired
Deputy Commissioner of Corrections
NYS Department of Correctional Services

“As a sheriff for over forty years and keeper of a large county lock-up, I took extreme pleasure in reading On The Count as it gave great insight into what actually transpires in a correctional facility that is challenged by the housing of mentally impaired inmates. It is captivating in its truthfully raw, accurate, and eye-opening descriptions and dialogue as the reader is exposed to a world not generally seen by the public.”

Dennis C. Pike, Sheriff
Franklin County, Maine

“A candid, forthright look at the inner workings of a maximum security prison by a professional, educated participant. Brutally honest, humorous, in an easy-to-read format. Highly recommended for any Criminal Justice Major or practitioners.”

Capt. Gary L. Hoffman, Retired
Director of Education and Training
Office of the Sheriff
Charlotte County, Florida, USA

ON THE COUNT

“I’ve read the book and feel that it is an accurate account of the working of mental hygiene within the Department of Correctional Service Prison system. While reading the book it brought back memories of numerous incidents similar to those you mention in the book.”

Wayne Strack, Retired
Deputy Commissioner of Corrections
NYS Department of Correctional Services

Michael Boccia, Ph.D.,
as told to and co-written by Peter Mars

REVIEWERS’ COMMENTS FOR
Congress finalized action on the FY’12 appropriations by rolling together all remaining spending bills into a larger “megabus” vehicle. The U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R. 2055, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 on December 16th and the U.S. Senate passed the legislation the following day. Overall, federal spending in the “megabus” legislation came in at $915 billion. Within this package, there are a number of programs of great importance to psychology.

### Appropriations Alert: Graduate Psychology Education Program (GPE) Receives Full Funding In Extremely Difficult Budget Climate, Campus Suicide Prevention Funding Maintained

Congress affirmed the importance of addressing mental and behavioral health on college campuses by providing level funding for a small but important program that supports the prevention work of college counseling centers. The Campus Suicide Prevention program, authorized by the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act, and administered by SAMHSA received $4.975 million. In addition, for the second year, the program will receive another $10 million from the Prevention and Public Health Fund, thanks to the leadership of Senator Jack Reed (D-RI) who fought for those additional funds. The Suicide Prevention Resource Center received $4.957 million. Finally, the Youth Suicide Prevention Program for States and Tribes received $29.74 million.

### Graduate Psychology Education Program

We are delighted to announce that this appropriations bill included level funding of nearly $3 million for the Graduate Psychology Education Program (GPE). In an extremely difficult budget climate, the inclusion of this vital program represents an extraordinary feat for the psychology community. The overall budget for Health and Human Resources (HHS) was cut by nearly $700 million from fiscal year 2011. Moreover, the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), which administers the GPE grant program, received a $41 million reduction in funding. For context, funding for other HRSA programs under the Interdisciplinary Community Linkages (ICL) category were cut by over $7 million. These include cuts to Area Health Education Centers, Allied Health and Other Disciplines (which no longer includes GPE) as well as Geriatric Programs. Overall, Nursing Programs were cut by $10 million and Health Professions suffered a cut of $28.9 million.

This great success for the Graduate Psychology Education Program (GPE) is due in large part to the psychologists and psychology students who made a record-breaking 358 hill visits on behalf of GPE this year. It is the efforts of our psychologist-advocates that make this tremendous victory possible.
Conference and Workshop Planner
American Psychological Association
FJ McGuigan Young Investigator Prize
Awards of $25,000 for early career psychophysiological research
Submission deadline: March 1, 2012
For information see www.apa.org/science/mcguigan.html

National Institute of Mental Health
Various
Submission deadline: Various
For information on NIMH funding for research on mental health see www.nimh.gov

American Psychological Association
Early Career Awards 2012
Various awards compiled by the APA are available for ECPs
Submission deadline: various
For further information see www.apa.org/science/earlycareer/funding.html

American Psychological Association
Law and Social Sciences Division
Submission deadlines: January 15th and August 15th, yearly
For further information see www.nsf.gov

National Science Foundation
Law and Social Sciences Division
Dissertation Improvement Grants
Submission deadlines: January 15th and August 15th, yearly
For further information see www.nsf.gov

National Institute of Mental Health
Various
Submission deadline: Various
For information on NIMH funding for research on mental health see www.nimh.gov

Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI)
Clara Mayo Grants
Pre-dissertation research on sexism, racism, or prejudice
Maximum award: $1000
Submission deadlines: May 2nd, 2012
For further information see www.spssi.org

American Psychological Association
Student Awards
Various awards compiled by the APAGS are available for students
For further information see www.apa.org/apags/members/schawrds.html