

Crime Scene

Psychology Behind Bars and In Front of the Bench

The Official Organ of the Criminal Justice Section of the Canadian Psychological Association

Section Executive:

Chair

Daryl Kroner, Ph.D.
KronerDG@csc-scc.gc.ca

Secretary/Treasurer

Karl Hanson, Ph.D.
HansonK@sgc.gc.ca

Past Chair

David Nussbaum, Ph.D.
David_Nussbaum@camh.net

Editor Crime Scene

Jeremy Mills, Ph.D.
MillsJF@csc-scc.gc.ca

Student Representative

Joseph Camilleri
camilleri_j@hotmail.com

Directors at Large

J. Stephen Wormith, Ph.D.
wormith@duke.usask.ca

Carson Smiley, Ph.D.

SmileyWC@csc-scc.gc.ca

What's Inside

Editor's Note

View from the Top ~ President's Comments

Mentoring

Report on Section Business Meeting

R. Karl Hanson, Ph.D.

Report on the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice (NAACJ) 2002-2003

J. Stephen Wormith, Ph.D.

2003 Crime Scene Challenge - Is it time to test the null?

2003 CJS Student Award Winning Poster

Psychopathy in the Court: Facts, Fiction and Reality

By Heather Clark

Recent Publications

Kudo Korner

Members on the Move

Post Doctoral Fellow Opportunity

Tenure Stream Position in Psychology

Nominations for Section Awards

The Editor's Note

This issue is jam-packed with interesting items for our section members. CPA was another successful year for our section with a full slate of symposia and a good turn out on poster day.

Some highlights of the convention.

Joe Camilleri organized a student conversation hour for student in the CJS with a view to improving communication and undertaking initiatives to benefit our student members. One of the outcomes was to create a separate 'student e-mail list' to aid in communication. Also, we hope to produce a special "Student Edition" of Crime Scene later this year.

The "Student Poster Award" was given to Heather Clark, a student of Adelle Forth.

Other unofficial awards include: The 'Largest Sample' award went to Stephen Wormith who presented LSI-OR data on 97,000+ offenders. Unfortunately Stephen was stuck when he was asked if he individually checked 10% of the cases for correct data entry.

The 'Buns of Steel' award went to those few who sat for 7 hours through 3 symposia and the SBM on day one of the convention.

The Section elections became the Section acclamations as the Executive was returned unopposed to the same positions.

The Section also decided to adopt a logo and established a competition with a \$100 award for the winning design. The logo is to be unveiled at CPA next year in St. Johns, NFLD.

Another important development was the Section's decision to host another Banquet in 2004.

Thus far I have not offered an editorial comment, preferring instead to welcome other contributions to Crime Scene. However, I would like to offer

some thoughts on APA that was held in Toronto in August. This year as most of you know APA struggled to attract its members to APA because of the media coverage of SARS in Toronto. The reduced registration fee deadline was extended right up to the beginning of the convention. The SARS 'outbreak' was not really an outbreak at all. A cousin of mine who works as a technician at Scarborough Grace Hospital (ground zero in some respects for SARS in Toronto) visited us with her family in July (and no she was not required to be masked during her visit). She worked through the crisis and was responsible for collecting and testing samples throughout the hospital. She was inconvenienced somewhat by a "working quarantine" - but otherwise life was pretty much normal even at the centre of the crisis. She related that most people infected got better, and the majority that died, did so as SARS complicated a pre-existing serious condition. In no way is this meant to diminish the loss to those families who lost loved ones, but the reaction to SARS does speak volumes for those of us who use statistical probability in our research and who use statistical probability to inform the public 'don't worry that person is only a low risk to re-offend'.

Many of us use statistical probability as a tool to offer support for our theories of behaviour - in effect to argue for the way the world 'is'. We also use statistics to correct the public's misconception of risk. For example, statistics on sex offender recidivism are often offered to counter the public's fear of rampant sex offender recidivism after release. However, when we consider risk as it applies to ourselves we seem to fall into the same trap as the 'uniformed' public. The risk of contracting SARS in Toronto was always miniscule, even at the height of the concern. So why did many of our number, who are highly educated in probability, stay away? One could argue it was how they assessed risk.

If one looked at the purely actuarial likelihood that they would contract SARS in Toronto, then they would have been there with bells on. Given the higher rates of violent crime in many US

cities, visiting Toronto with SARS may likely have represented a reduced risk for mortality than staying in their home city without SARS.

However, there were apparently many who took less of an actuarial approach and took more of a structured clinical judgment approach allowing for clinical over-ride due to a specific risk factor. In this situation, the SARS information was a risk factor that was clinically assessed as being much higher than actuarial information would support - in effect SARS was a 'vivid risk factor' that prompted many to assess the risk of travel to Toronto as too high.

My conclusion then is that those of us who took a more actuarial approach to travelling to APA attended and had a great time in Toronto. Those who employed a structured clinical judgment approach were swayed by a vivid risk factor, stayed home and missed a good time.

As a side-bar that may show 'lay-people' can just as accurately assess risk - 450,000 people (many of them out-of-towners) spent a cozy 12 hours or more together at a Stones concert in Toronto. Does this mean that Mick Jagger has a better handle on risk than many of our own?

JM

View from the Top

Daryl Kroner, *President*

Ever wonder what the key ingredient is for having a strong profession? Is it the amount of produced printed material? Nope. Political clout? Nope. Mean income of the profession? Nope. Purpose? (important, but still no). Number of newcomers to the profession (getting close, but still no).

The key ingredient: Mentoring. This provides the vehicle for the knowledge and passion that characterizes a strong profession. Much of what happens in a mentoring relationship cannot be experienced or learnt elsewhere. The successful

completion of a professional task (i.e., risk assessment, police selection, consulting with courts) cannot solely be gleaned from books or journals. Successful professional careers include making contextually wise decisions, which can best be observed and learnt in a mentoring relationship.

There are the obvious formal mentoring relationships, usually associated with a training facility, but the mentoring can take other forms. These include; short-term vs. long-term, task vs. process, formal vs. informal, group vs. individual.

The cost of mentoring is high. Whether it is a graduated student working in an internship at low pay or someone giving of their professional time. The cost also goes beyond just money. There are the emotional and cognitive energies. The cost is worth it.

Our Criminal Justice Section would do well to highlight, facilitate, and more importantly develop a mentoring tradition beyond formal training facilities. Without it, the good criminal justice events for professional development at a CPA conference (or other such activities), will just be another social event.

Report on the Section Business Meeting CPA Hamilton, 2003

Karl Hanson, *Secretary/Treasurer*

June 12, 2003

The meeting began with the presentations to this year's award winners: Career Contribution Award – Marnie Rice, Alan Leschied; Significant Contribution Award – Pamela Yates. Congratulations all!

When a new award is created, there is a backlog of worthy individuals. Nevertheless, in the

future, only one Career Contribution Award would be presented each year. Unsuccessful nominations would automatically be considered for future years. There were no limits placed on the number of Significant Contribution Awards, and the same individual can receive the award more than once.

On Friday, the \$100 prize for the best student poster was awarded to Heather Clark – a student of Adelle Forth at Carleton University (thanks to Jeremy Mills, David Simourd and Karl Hanson for judging).

Daryl Kroner, our fearless leader, reported that the section is doing well, being the third largest and among the most active. He also reported that as Chair he receives several invitations each year to attend conferences. Often the choice of delegates is not obvious, so if you are interested in representing the section at conferences, let Daryl know and you may get an all-expense-paid trip to Moosejaw.

Karl Hanson, the Secretary-Treasurer, reported that membership and revenue are up over the last two years. Currently, we have 180 full members and 66 student members (246 total), and \$2823.86 in the bank. Last year's banquet cost \$1315.65, so given annual income of approximately \$1000, this type of event can only be held every second year. After much discussion about why we received only 87¢ interest this year compared to 95¢ interest last year, the financial report was accepted.

Joseph Camilleri, the student representative, corrected previous misinformation by stating that the Student Section is actually the biggest section in CPA (not Clinical). This year Joe organized a conversation session for students in criminal justice and forensic psychology, and there now is separate mailing list for the section's student members. He also promised to rehabilitate our neglected website.

Jeremy Mills, Crime Scene editor, stated that the objective of 3 issues per year was met:

September, January, and just prior to the convention. Contact Jeremy if you want an audience for your latest musing or research findings. Information about the activities of the section members is much welcome (new jobs, awards, criminal proceedings).

Also discussed at the meeting was the desire for somebody to write a brief history of the Criminal Justice Section. It would make a great student project. Those interested should contact Daryl Kroner.

Now that we are beginning to take ourselves serious, we need a logo. So, a Logo Contest was approved, with a prize of \$100. See elsewhere in Crime Scene for details.

Finally, the section had such confidence in its leadership that the complete executive was returned by acclamation.

Prepared by R. Karl Hanson

Report on the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice (NAACJ) 2002-2003

J. Stephen Wormith, *Director at Large*

During the 2002-2003 year, the undersigned continued to represent the Canadian Psychological Association on the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice (NAACJ), which is an 'umbrella' organization for various voluntary sector and professional organizations that are national in scope and have a particular interest in Canada's justice system. NAACJ is funded by an operating grant from Solicitor General Canada and currently consists of 24 organizations. Over the past year, the NAACJ budget permitted the Chairpersons of the Criminal Justice Psychology Section, Dr. David Nussbaum and Dr. Daryl Kroner, to attend

a number of events. These included the usual consultations with government, particularly the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC), the Solicitor General and the Justice Department.

Over the last year, we were particularly fortunate to be able to send CPA member to two conferences under the NAACJ banner. Dr. Carson Smiley and the undersigned were invited to attend a 'What works' conference in Montreal, sponsored by Solicitor General of Canada in March, 2003. This was an excellent opportunity for criminal justice psychologists to learn about recent developments in the field of offender treatment and to meet with international experts. This past year also marked the implementation of the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* (YCJA), which replaced the *Young Offenders Act* on April 1, 2003. Marking this event was a youth justice conference entitled 'The Voluntary Sector and Youth Justice in Canada: Where Social Justice Meets Criminal Justice.' It was hosted by the John Howard Society of Canada and sponsored by the federal Department of Justice. Again, through our membership in NAACJ, CPA received funding to send five members from across the country to attend the conference in Mississauga, Ontario in March, 2003. Highlights

of this conference will appear in the next issue of *Crime Scene*, the Criminal Justice Psychology section's newsletter.

It would seem that the 'lightning rod' issue of the year has been CSC's announced plans to introduce the concept of correctional 'operating regimes' in its federal institutions. Member organizations of NAACJ have been quite critical and outspoken about the concept, which has been perceived by some as a means of simply making maximum security facilities more austere and punishing, all under the rubric of instilling motivation among offenders. It is expected that there will be ongoing discussions as many of the details are not yet known or established. It is suggested that CPA and its members, particularly those in the Criminal Justice Psychology section, continue to monitor these developments and if they see necessary, report concerns to the CPA Board. It is expected that details about these and other items will be conveyed to the CPA membership at the annual business meeting of the Criminal Justice Psychology Section in Hamilton.

The Crime Scene Challenge

The following "Challenge" was sent to 5 experts for their views and responses

The Challenge:

As the Editor of Crime Scene, I have undertaken to encourage debate and the sharing of current research between our readers.

To that end, I have constructed a question from observations regarding the testing of scientific hypotheses. I have approached a number of experts in the field to respond in 400 words or less. Being succinct was part of the challenge.

We are hoping that the various views will be informative and also provide direction and leadership in this important area of criminal justice research.

The Preamble:

I do not think that I am alone in chaffing at reviewers comments that reject research because among the hypotheses was a "testing of the null". In a recent paper my colleague and I argued that measures of anger expression may have utility in predicting proximal interpersonal problems among offenders (institutional misconduct) but they would not necessarily predict post-release failure. There was some support for the former hypothesis and no relationship with recidivism as expected and expressed in the latter hypothesis. However, technically yes, we did test the null when we expressed our hypothesis in respect to anger not being related to post-release recidivism. This was not lost on one reviewer who suggested the results were therefore all suspect.

What to do? In response we acknowledged the reviewer was correct but pointed out that the power to detect an effect was adequate. Further, we pointed out that intellectual honesty compelled us to hypothesize as we did for it would not have been difficult to marshal sufficient research to hypothesize for an effect and then point out its absence with the same or similar conclusions. Graciously, the Editor agreed and the paper was accepted.

I will also admit that while we do not make it a common practice, this was not the only occasion in which we 'tested the null'.

The Question:

The Crime Scene Challenge to you is, "Is it time to test the null". With increasing data on power analysis available are "one-way" predictions still the only hypotheses with scientific merit and validity.

The Responses:

We are indebted to those who have responded. We received a response from 5 individuals we approached. Their responses follow in the order received by the Editor.

Approached: Paul Gendreau, Kimberly Barchard, Ron Blackburn, Karl Hanson, Ron Holden

Response to Challenge

Paul Gendreau
Department of Psychology
gendreau@unbsj.ca

It is not the time to test the null, the counter null, a 1/2 or 3/4 null. Its a waste of time particularly if one is wedded to $p < .05$. And a power analysis doesn't help either. Please see anything by Hunter & Schmidt & others like Cohen [for summaries & the appropriate references see Canadian Psychology, 2001, vol 43, 205-211. What is needed is replication or approximations thereof that can be assessed by meta-analysis. So, its the point estimate & the CI & practical meta-analytic applicable statistics like the Common Language effect size indicator/ROC curves & fail safe measures if you want to understand the value of your findings.

Furthermore, there always is an effect. You have to decide if the result falls within Meehl's crud category or has important cost implications. Indeed, you could have a statistically significant effect that is truly crud because the sample size was so large. Also, remember that small effects can be of great import. So called traditional statistical tests add nothing in regard to addressing such issues as the ultimate benefits of a treatment or predictive measure.

Finally, if sceptics need further convincing please do a meta-analysis. In a recent one conducted on the effects of prison treatment programs on misconducts we came across the usual silliness. Potentially useful results ignored because they didn't meet the holy grail of $p < .05$ & "one-off" inflated results that likely represented sampling error. What a mess! No wonder my francophone statistician colleagues refers to us [e.g. psychologues] as the "ughs" for the way we mishandle statistics.

Kimberly A. Barchard
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Kim.Barchard@ccmail.nevada.edu

When is Null Hypothesis Significance Testing Appropriate?

Because we have complete control over Type I error rates (α) but not Type II error rates (β), there are some circumstances in which null hypothesis significance testing is informative, useful, and appropriate, and other situations when it is not. When we reject the null hypothesis, we are relatively confident that we made a good decision and are justified in getting excited (and changing educational, clinical, and political policy). When we retain the null hypothesis, however, we may have made either a good decision or a Type II error. Because we lack complete control over β , we are not statistically justified in getting excited just because we retained the null hypothesis.

Null hypothesis significance testing works well most of the time, because most research follows a reject-support model: rejecting the null hypothesis supports your theory. For example, often we believe that two variables are related or two groups are different. We hypothesize that there is no relationship or no between-group difference, and are pleased when we successfully reject this hypothesis. In reject-support situations, null hypothesis significance testing is an efficient and precise method of examining research questions. It can be supplemented but not replaced by confidence intervals, descriptive statistics, graphs, and other effect size estimates.

Other research follows an accept-support model: retaining the null hypothesis supports our theory. For example, if we want to show that a treatment had no effect, that generic and name-brand drugs are equally effective, that men and women (or different ethnic groups) have equal skills in some area, or that the assumptions of another statistical procedure have been met, then we believe the null hypothesis and want to retain it. However, retaining the null is ambiguous because β is not completely under our control. In these cases, researchers should design studies with very high power (such as .90 or more) and then form confidence intervals. This will allow researchers to make claims such as "I am 95% confident that the true difference between the groups is between 1 and 2 points, which is a trivially small difference" or "I am 95% confident that the true population correlation is between -.03 and .04, thus accounting for less than .2% of the variance". Null hypothesis significance testing by itself is inconclusive in accept-support hypothesis models, but using confidence intervals or other effect size estimates can allow researchers to examine their theory using appropriate and precise statistics.

Ron Blackburn, Ph.D.
University of Liverpool, UK

A response to the challenge: "Is it time to test the null"?

I have to admit that I don't really understand the problem. I am probably missing some erudite points about power analysis and balancing the probabilities of rejecting the null hypothesis of no difference or relationship and rejecting the alternative hypothesis. However, although it is often not made explicit, all hypothesis testing involves deciding between the two hypotheses. Testing the null hypothesis is hence integral to much of our research. Your criticised example presumably involved two independent comparisons of alternative and null hypotheses and seems to me quite innocuous.

Although we are usually interested primarily in the 'one-way' predictions of a difference or relationship, and hence in supporting the alternative hypothesis, there are many occasions when we hope to favour the null hypothesis. For example, in comparing groups on some measure, we need to establish that their variances do not differ. Again, in examining relationships of variables through factor analysis, we hope to establish that a variable loads one factor but not another. We may also legitimately hope to fail to reject the null hypothesis in seeking to disconfirm or refute some theory.

If there is a problem, it may be in not distinguishing between research questions, which reflect theories of relationships in the world, and statistical hypotheses, which are about parameter values, significance tests, confidence intervals, etc. The translation of the former into the latter entails compromises. Meehl (1978) argued from a neo-Popperian perspective that progress in psychology has been slow because of an excessive reliance on statistical significance testing and that 'the null hypothesis, taken literally, is always false'. Null hypothesis testing seems to be in the spirit of the Popperian falsifiability of theories, but significance tests are rarely sufficient to answer theoretical questions. We use statistical inferences as aids to our psychological decisions, and we have to play the game by the statistician's rules. But we should not let the tail wag the dog. Hypotheses with scientific merit come from good research questions, not from inferential statistics.

In brief, then, my response to your challenge is that we already regularly test the null hypothesis. Given our continuing reliance on statistical testing, it seems neither a vice nor a virtue.

Meehl, P. E. (1978). Theoretical risks and tabular asterisks: Sir Karl, Sir Ronald, and the slow progress of soft psychology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 806-834.

R Karl Hanson, Ph.D.
Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada

Is it time to test the null?

Any scientific method that is incapable of establishing "no effect" cannot advance knowledge. There must be some method for determining whether two variables are associated or not. Otherwise, we have no way of knowing whether "blonds have more fun" or that astrological birth signs predict recidivism.

The curious logic of the traditional $p < .05$ null hypothesis testing may be incapable of the task, but there is a simple alternative: report the effect size and its standard error (confidence intervals). No single study is sufficient to estimate the degree of relationship between two variables. Science advances by orderly replication. When a series of conceptually similar studies all find the same thing, then we can be confident in the results.

An applied example: Sex offenders who deny their offences are often considered to be at high risk for sexual recidivism. There have been at least nine longitudinal studies (total sample of 1780) examining the relationship of categorical denial ("I did not do it") and sexual recidivism (Hanson & Morton, 2003). The average effect size was $d = .02$, with a 95% confidence interval ranging from $-.15$ to $.19$ (d is the standardized mean difference or approximately twice the phi coefficient). The amount of variability across the studies was no more than would be expected by chance. Even if the real association was at the extreme ends of the confidence interval, denial would have no more than a trivial association with sexual recidivism (direction unknown).

Denial may be a useful clinical variable, based on its relationship to the offenders' willingness to change and the effect of the offenders' stance on victims. Nevertheless, evaluators are without justification when they claim that an otherwise low risk sexual offender is actually high risk based on the offender's failure to admit to his sexual crimes.

Yes, it is time to test the null. We are already testing it, and we must continue if knowledge is to advance.

Hanson, R. K., & Morton, K. E. (2003, June). Recidivism risk factors for sexual offenders: An updated meta-analysis. Presentation at the Canadian Psychological Association Annual Convention, Hamilton.

IS IT TIME TO TEST THE NULL?

Ronald R. Holden
Queen's University at Kingston, Ontario

Researchers sometimes wish to prove the null hypothesis, H_0 . Yet, we know that statistical analyses can only:

1. Reject H_0 , OR
2. Fail to reject H_0 (or retain or accept H_0).

Statistics CANNOT PROVE H_0 .

A statistically non-significant result is ambiguous. It could reflect a true H_0 . Non-rejection of H_0 is, then, a correct decision. However, non-significance could occur when H_0 is actually false. Then, an error in not rejecting H_0 happens. This error, a Type II error, has a probability, $\hat{\alpha}$. $\hat{\alpha}$ is related to statistical power ($\hat{\alpha} = 1 - \text{Power}$) and power is influenced by sample size. Increasing sample size enhances power and decreases $\hat{\alpha}$. Thus, if the non-rejection of H_0 occurs, larger samples have smaller Type II error probabilities than smaller samples. Consequently, a larger sample, with a non-significant result, has a greater probability that H_0 is true than the same result obtained for a smaller sample. Nevertheless, because $\hat{\alpha}$ will never be zero, there is always a chance that the non-significant result is a mistake. Consequently, H_0 cannot be proven.

Consider a study interested in “proving” H_0 . Holden et al. (1999) reported non-significant statistics with power levels of .83, .99, and .99 for small, medium, and large effects, respectively. In not rejecting H_0 , there was a probability, $\hat{\alpha}$, of .17, .01, or .01 for a Type II error if a small, medium, or large effect, respectively, actually existed. Holden et al. concluded that there was more than adequate power to detect a non-trivial effect, if it existed. Had H_0 been proven? Not really, but it was certainly embraced!

Current recommendations endorse a minimum power of .80. This value implies a 20% probability (1 - .80) of a Type II error. No wonder we reluctantly endorse H_0 . Suppose a power of .95 was the standard. If the probability of a Type II error was less than .05 (1 - .95), would we be more accepting of H_0 ? Definitely! Still, we COULD NOT PROVE H_0 . A small Type II error probability would still exist. Although our discipline presently strives for a power standard of .80, perhaps as our understanding of statistical power evolves, our willingness to embrace H_0 and our use of terminology to describe our failure to reject H_0 (e.g., fail to reject, or retain, or accept, or even prove H_0) will also evolve.

Holden, R. R., Magruder, C. D., Stein, S. J., Sitarenios, G., & Sheldon, S. (1999). The effects of anonymity on the Holden Psychological Screening Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27, 737-742.

Email: holdenr@psyc.queensu.ca

2003 CJS Student Award Winning Poster

Psychopathy in the Court: Facts, Fiction and Reality

Heather Clark

Department of Psychology, Carleton University

Supervisor: Adelle Forth, Ph.D.

June 2003

Summary

Research examining expert testimony regarding psychopathy has found a diagnosis of psychopathy or Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD) is related to a more severe sanction than cases where neither diagnosis is given (Zinger & Forth, 1998). These issues are of paramount importance when considering the Dangerous Offender (DO) provisions of the criminal code as a DO declaration results in an indeterminate sentence, the most stringent sanction in Canadian law.

The rate of DO designations has increased in recent years. In 1991 ten offenders received a DO designation whereas in 1999 thirty offenders were declared a DO. Between the years 1978 and 2000, 297 people were declared a dangerous offender. Over 90% of offenders designated a DO had a history of sexually offending (Solicitor General Canada, 1996).

A DO designation requires a high level of risk for violence or sexual violence and a lack of prospects for future community control. Prospects for community control are determined by an offenders amenability to treatment (R. v Johnson, 2001). The construct of psychopathy as measured by the Psychopathy Checklist Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003) is directly applicable to each of these areas. It is predictive of violence

(Hemphill, Wong, & Hare, 1998), predictive of sexual offending (Rice & Harris, 1997) and associated with a poor treatment prognosis (Rice, Harris, & Cormier, 1992; Seto & Barbaree, 1999).

It is essential that experts correctly diagnose psychopathy and APD as well as provide accurate testimony regarding implications of each diagnoses. Surprisingly, these issues have received scant attention in research. Furthermore, previous research illustrates examples where experts provided inaccurate testimony regarding the level risk and amenability to treatment of a psychopath (Edens, 2001; Zinger & Forth, 1998).

This study examined expert testimony on psychopathy and its association with level of risk for violence, level of risk for sexual violence, amenability to treatment and outcome of the DO hearing. Crown and defence testimony were separated to examine the degree of concordance regarding testimony on level of risk and amenability to treatment.

Method

Participants

We selected a random sample of 51 DO and 4 LTO decisions across Canada, excluding Quebec from the years 1991 to 2002 using Quicklaw databases. The mean age of the sample was 37.

Results/Discussion

Most of the DO applications in this sample were successful, 84% were declared a DO, 11.8% a Long Term Offender, and only 3.9% were unsuccessful. Psychopathy was not significantly related to a label of an extreme risk for violent offending. This may result from a ceiling effect as offenders put forward for DO status tend to have a lengthier criminal history (Bonta, Zinger, Harris, Carriere, 1998). Furthermore, psychopathy was not significantly associated with a label of an extreme risk for sexual offending. This is consistent with previous research that found psychopathy does not predict the number of sexual offences of an offender (Brown & Forth, 1997).

A significant relationship was found between a diagnosis of psychopathy and a label of not amenable to treatment ($\chi^2(1, n = 32) = 4.72, p < .05$). Psychopaths were labeled not amenable to treatment at over twice the rate of non psychopaths. Furthermore, in some cases experts stated treatment may increase the offending of a psychopath. For example, in *R v D.R.M* (2002),

Psychopathy is a very significant consideration in dangerous offender proceedings. That is so because it appears to be common ground that truly psychopathic offenders cannot be cured and that treatment of a psychopath is virtually impossible because a true psychopath will often use treatment to mask a cure while in fact improving his or her re-offence capabilities. (Davis J, para. 56)

Expert witnesses who testified for the crown were significantly more likely to testify an offender was a higher risk for violence than defence witnesses ($t(10) = 3.43, p < .05$). Furthermore, crown witnesses were more likely to testify an offender was a poor treatment candidate than defence witnesses ($t(18) = -3.59, p < .05$). This may suggest the possibility of bias toward the side an expert is testifying for. However, there was no difference in testimony of crown and defence witnesses in the level of risk for sexual violence an offender poses.

Replication with a larger sample size is required before any inferences can be made from the results of this study. Although using court decisions is beneficial as it provides information about factors a judge considers important for their decision, coding court transcripts may provide more information on expert testimony.

References

- Bonta, J., Zinger, I., Harris, A., Carriere, D. (1998). The dangerous offender provisions: Are they targeting the right offenders? *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 40, 377-400.
- Brown, S. L. & Forth, A. E. (1997). Psychopathy and sexual assault: Static risk factors, emotional precursors, and rapist subtypes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 848-857.
- Edens, J. F. (2001). Misuses of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in court: Two case examples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 1082-1094.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist - Revised*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hemphill, J. F., Hare, R. D., & Wong, S. (1998). Psychopathy and recidivism: A review. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 3, 139-170.
- R. v. D.R.M.* (23 May 2002), No. 48399 (B.C.S.C.).
- R. v Johnson* (4 October 2001), 025295 (B.C.C.A).
- Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (1997). Cross-validation and extension of the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide for child molesters and rapists. *Law and Human Behavior*, 21, 231-241.
- Rice, M. E., Harris, G. T., & Cormier, C. A. (1992). An evaluation of a maximum security therapeutic community for psychopaths and other mentally disordered offenders. *Law and Human Behavior*, 16, 399-412.
- Seto, M. C., & Barbaree, H. E. (1999). Psychopathy, treatment behavior, and sex offenders recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14, 1235-1248.
- Solicitor General Canada. (1996). *High risk violent offenders*. Ottawa CAN: Solicitor General Canada.
- Zinger, I., & Forth, A. E. (1998). Psychopathy and canadian criminal proceedings: The potential for human rights abuses. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 38, 238-275.

Recent Publications

Mills, J. F., Kroner, D. G., & Hemmati, T. (in press). The Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (MCAA): The Prediction of General and Violent Recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*.

Recent research has demonstrated that antisocial attitudes and antisocial associates are among the better predictors of antisocial behavior. This study tests the predictive validity of the Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (MCAA: Mills & Kroner, 1999) in a sample of adult male offenders. The MCAA is comprised of two parts: Part A is a quantified self-report measure of criminal friends and Part B contains four attitude scales: Violence, Entitlement, Antisocial Intent and Associates. The MCAA scales showed predictive validity for the outcomes of general and violent recidivism. In addition, the MCAA significantly improved the

prediction of violent recidivism over an actuarial risk assessment instrument alone. Discussion centers on the contribution that antisocial attitudes and associates make to risk assessment.

Dowden, C., & Andrews, D.A. (in press). The importance of staff practice in delivering effective correctional treatment: A meta-analytic review of Core Correctional Practice. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*.

Several meta-analyses have rendered strong support for the clinically relevant and psychologically informed principles of human service, risk, need and general responsivity. However, each of these reviews has focused on specific program components and not the characteristics of the staff or the specific techniques used to deliver the program. The present meta-analytic review examines the role

of Core Correctional Practices (Andrews & Carvell, 1998) in reducing recidivism and provides strong preliminary evidence regarding their effectiveness. Staff characteristics and training in core skills must be addressed to ensure the maximum therapeutic impact of correctional treatment programs.

Dowden, C., Antonowicz, D., & Andrews, D.A. (in press). A meta-analytic inquiry into the effectiveness of relapse prevention in reducing criminal recidivism. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*.

Although relapse prevention models have been applied within offender treatment, there has been little controlled outcome research evaluating its effectiveness. This meta-analysis of forty tests of relapse prevention treatment revealed moderate mean reductions in recidivism (.15) and certain elements of the relapse prevention model (i.e. training significant others in the program model/identifying the offense chain) yielded stronger effects than others (i.e. provision of booster sessions/aftercare and developing coping skills). Further analyses revealed that the clinically relevant and psychologically informed principles of risk, need, and general responsivity yielded the strongest reductions in recidivism. The implications for future research and treatment are discussed.

Dowden, C., & Blanchette, K. (2002). An evaluation of the effectiveness of substance abuse programming for women offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 46, 220-230.

Although a recent meta-analysis reported that substance abuse treatment was associated with moderate reductions in recidivism for female offenders, very few of the tests of treatment

(k=4) focused on adults. The purpose of this study was to contribute to this relatively sparse area of scientific inquiry by exploring the effectiveness of substance abuse programming in reducing recidivism for a sample of 98 federally sentenced women offenders in Canada. Results revealed a significant reduction in general recidivism for treated substance abusers. Moreover, the data indicated that violent reoffending was also reduced for the treated group, though the difference did not reach statistical significance.

Dowden, C., & Brown, S.L. (2002). The role of substance abuse factors in predicting recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Psychology, Crime, and Law*, 8, 1-22.

The present study examined the utility of several substance abuse factors in predicting general and violent recidivism. A quantitative meta-analytic review was used to examine five substance abuse predictor categories. Forty-five studies were selected for inclusion, producing 116 individual effect size estimates. Overall, the meta-analysis generated a weighted mean effect size of .10 between substance abuse and general recidivism. A combined alcohol and/or drug problem predictor category yielded the highest mean effect size ($Mz+ = .22$), followed by drug abuse ($Mz+ = .19$), parental substance abuse ($Mz+ = .13$), and alcohol abuse ($Mz+ = .12$). Interestingly, substance abuse convictions were not related to general recidivism ($Mz+ = -.02$). The results not only confirm the overall predictive relationship between substance abuse and criminal recidivism but also suggest that appropriately identifying the type of substance abuse factor may enhance the predictive utility of several risk assessment instruments.

Loza, W. & Green, K. (2003). The Self-Appraisal Questionnaire: A self-report measure for predicting recidivism versus

clinician administered measures. A five-year follow-up study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(7), 781-797.

In this study Loza and Green (2003) examined the effectiveness of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire (SAQ; Loza, 1996), a self-report measure for predicting violent and non-violent recidivism, institutional adjustment and program assignment, as compared to four clinician administered and widely used risk prediction measures over a five year period. The Level of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R; Andrews & Bonta, 1995), the General Statistical Information on Recidivism (GSIR; Nuffield, 1982), the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 1991), the Violent Risk Appraisal Guide (VRAG; Harris et al., 1993), and the SAQ were administered to 91 federally sentenced Canadian male offenders prior to their release to the community. Follow-up data were collected for a 60-month period. Outcome criteria measures were violent and general recidivism. Results supported previous findings (Loza & Loza-Fanous, 2001) that indicated that the SAQ is at least as effective as the four other measures in predicting post-release outcome. The advantages of using the SAQ as a self-report measure as opposed to clinician administered measures were discussed.

Howes, R. (2003). Circumferential Change Scores in Phallometric Assessment: Normative Data. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 15, 365-375.

Phallometric testing is a procedure that has enjoyed considerable popularity as an objective component in the assessment of sexual offenders. The value of this procedure may be most notably compromised in the realm of interpretation, and problems in interpretation are particularly acute for those participants where full arousal is not obtained during testing. The calculation of Percent Full Erection (PFE) scores has of necessity involved a speculative component in such cases. Eliminating this

speculation through empirical investigation was the purpose of the current research. Circumferential change scores (from flaccidity to full erection) were obtained for 724 respondents at nine North American correctional facilities, allowing for the calculation of descriptive statistics and a determination of the distribution characteristics of these scores. The results provide an empirical basis for calculating PFE scores and interpreting phallometric data in those cases where full arousal is not obtained, and specific confidence levels associated with interpretation are offered. It is suggested that only through a more rigorous application of the principles of science will the procedure of phallometric assessment fulfill its true potential.

Harris, G.T. & Rice, M.E. (2003). Actuarial assessment of risk among sex offenders. In R. A. Prentky, E.S. Janus, & M. C. Seto (Eds.) *Understanding and managing sexually coercive behavior*. (pp 198-210). New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 989.

The appraisal of risk among sex offenders has seen recent advances through the advent of actuarial assessments. Statistics derived from Relative Operating Characteristics (ROCs) permit the comparison of predictive accuracies achieved by different instruments even among samples that exhibit different base rates of recidivism. Such statistics cannot, however, solve problems introduced when items from actuarial tools are omitted, when reliability is low, or there is high between-subject variability in the duration of the follow-up. We present empirical evidence suggesting that when comprehensive actuarial tools (VRAG and SORAG) are scored with high reliability, without missing items, and when samples of offenders have fixed and equal opportunity for recidivism, predictive accuracies are maximized near ROC areas of .90. Although the term "dynamic" has not been consistently defined, such accuracies leave little room for further

improvement in long-term prediction by dynamic risk factors. We address the mistaken idea that long-term, static risk levels have little relevance for clinical intervention with sex offenders. We conclude that highly accurate prediction of violent criminal recidivism can be achieved using highly reliable and thorough scoring of comprehensive multi-item actuarial tools using historical items (at least until potent therapies are identified). The role of current moods, attitudes, insights and physiological states in causing contemporaneous behavior notwithstanding, accurate prediction about which sex offenders will commit at least one subsequent violent offense can be accomplished using complete information about past conduct.

Rice, M.E. & Harris, G.T. (2003). The size and sign of treatment effects in therapy for sex offenders. In R. A. Prentky, E.S. Janus, & M. C. Seto (Eds.) *Understanding and managing sexually coercive behavior*. (pp 428-440). New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 989.

We review scientific criteria for the minimally useful evaluation of psychosocial treatment for sex offenders. The Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers recently supported a meta-analysis (Hanson et al., 2002) of the effectiveness of psychological treatments for sex offenders. It was concluded that current treatments for sex offenders reduce recidivism. In this chapter, we reevaluate the evidence. Whereas the random assignment studies yielded results that provided no evidence of treatment effectiveness, Hanson et al. reviewed approximately a dozen others (called "incidental assignment" studies) which yielded substantial positive results for treatment. Upon close inspection, we conclude that such designs involve noncomparable groups and are too weak to be used to draw inferences about treatment effectiveness. In almost every case, the evidence was contaminated by the fact that comparison groups included higher risk offenders who

would have refused or quit treatment had it been offered to them. We conclude that the effectiveness of psychological treatment for sex offenders remains to be demonstrated. Furthermore, we outline solutions that we think will lead to progress in the field of sex offender treatment.

Kudo Korner

Congratulations to CJS Members Dr. Jim Ogloff and Dr. J. Stephen Wormith for their award of Fellow of the Canadian Psychological Association.

Congratulations to Dr. Grant Harris who has been promoted to Director of Research at the Mental Health Centre Penetanguishene. Congratulations on this well-deserved promotion!

Congratulations to Dr. Marnie Rice who has been elected Fellow of the Royal Society.

It has been quite a year for awards!

Members on the Move

In July, 2003, Andrew Harris started a two-year secondment from the Corrections Research section of the Department of the Solicitor General of Canada to work as a psychologist at Warkworth Institution.

Post-Doctoral Fellow Opportunity

RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY - STUDIES ON CHILD AND ADULT EYEWITNESSES

Opportunity for a Post-Doctoral Fellow or a Research Associate in the *Child Memory and Learning Lab* at Wilfrid Laurier University.

You will participate in a program of research on children's and adults' eyewitness testimony

including, but not limited to, research on source monitoring and suggestibility. Training will be provided in both lab and field research using state-of-the-art equipment. You will be part of a large, dynamic lab and will be expected to supervise junior lab members, conduct statistical analyses, contribute to the writing of research reports and journal articles, prepare and present conference work, and liaise with local schools and police units. There will be opportunities to develop independent research. Funding for the position has been granted through a Premier's Research Excellence Award.

The Department of Psychology is a research-intensive department (30 Faculty members), the largest within the Faculty of Science, and has an active Masters and Ph.D. graduate program (www.wlu.ca/~wwwpsych/). Wilfrid Laurier University is the fastest growing university in Ontario and is located in Waterloo, an economically and culturally vibrant, mid-size city, located about an hour drive from Toronto.

Informal inquiries can be directed to Kim Roberts at (519) 884-0710 extension 3225# or kroberts@wlu.ca

Review of applications will begin immediately.

Applicants should submit a CV, letter of interest, representative reprints/preprints, and at least two letters of recommendation to:

Kim P. Roberts, Ph.D.
Wilfrid Laurier University
75 University Avenue West
Waterloo, ON, N2L 3C5
Canada

Tenure Stream Position in Psychology

The Department of Psychology at St. Thomas More College (STM), a Catholic College

federated with the University of Saskatchewan (U of S), invites applications for a tenure-stream position in Cognitive Developmental Psychology at the level of Assistant Professor, commencing July 1, 2004. Federation requires that the Department of Psychology at STM collaborate directly with, and become integral to, the scholarly work of the Psychology Department at the U of S.

The successful candidate will have a Ph.D. in Psychology with an established interest in Cognitive Developmental Psychology. The successful candidate will be expected to develop and maintain an active, externally funded program of research. S/he will contribute to the education and training of undergraduate and graduate students. Candidates in all areas of Cognitive Developmental Psychology are encouraged to apply. We are particularly interested in applications from candidates in the area of Psychology and the Law. The successful candidate will be expected to teach core courses in Developmental and/or Cognitive Psychology, including laboratory classes and will join and evolve a research team committed to the study of justice on an interpersonal, intercultural and international level. Applicants must send a letter describing teaching and research strengths, a curriculum vitae detailing background preparation, experience and publications (attach sample publications), documentation of teaching ability including teaching evaluations and arrange for three letters of reference. On October 1, 2003, we will begin to consider completed files and to arrange interviews. However the search will continue until a successful candidate is found. Interested candidates should submit their complete application to Dr. T. Marche, Department Head, Department of Psychology, St. Thomas More College, 1437 College Drive, Saskatoon Saskatchewan, S7N 0W6 or by email: tammy.marche@usask.ca Salary will be commensurate with qualifications and experience.

In compliance with Canadian Immigration requirements, this advertisement is directed in the first instance to Canadian citizens and permanent residents. St. Thomas More College is committed to diversity within its faculty. Women, Aboriginal people, people with disabilities, visible minorities and members of other designated groups are encouraged to self-identify on their application. For more information on the Psychology Department and St. Thomas More College visit <http://www.usask.ca/stm/>, contact Dr. Marche at 306-966-8915 (voice mail), 306-966-8904 (fax), or tammy.marche@usask.ca.

Nominations for Section Awards

Nominations for Section Awards are being received until December 1, 2003. The Executive has decided to make a decision on the awards earlier to allow recipients more time prior to the awards presentation. Below are the criteria for each of the two section awards.

If you choose to nominate someone for the award, please forward a covering letter explaining your support of the individual along with a copy of the nominee's Curriculum Vitae. Please note that only one Career Contribution Award will be made in any year.

The Significant Contribution Award

The Significant Contribution Award recognizes a specific work that has been recently completed (within the last year or two) that makes a significant contribution to the application of psychology to criminal behaviour, criminal justice, and/or law. The work could be theoretical, empirical or applied. For the theoretical and empirical works, the award would typically be based on a paper published during the previous year in an academic or professional journal. The applied contributions would address the creation and implementation

of psychological services to offenders or to the courts. The effective promotion and administration of psychologists and psychological services would also qualify as a significant contribution (e.g., setting up a treatment center, hiring 10 new psychologists). If a member of the section makes exceptional contributions on different years, then it is possible for the same individual to receive this award more than once.

The Career Contribution Award

This award recognizes a corpus of work accrued over a period of at least 10 years that makes a significant contribution to the application of psychology to criminal behaviour, criminal justice, and/or law. The work could be theoretical, empirical or applied. For the theoretical and empirical works, the award would typically concern a series of published works that have had an important influence on the field. Signs of this influence could include changes in practices (widespread use of treatment or assessment methods; changes in the law) as well as recognition by the academic community (e.g., citations). The applied contributions would recognize leaders in the criminal justice field who have demonstrated excellence in one of the following areas: the creation and implementation of psychological services to offenders or to the courts, the teaching and mentoring of new psychologists, and management and administration.