Vol. 13, No. 1 January 2006

CRIME SCENE

Psychology Behind Bars and In Front of the Bench

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

WHAT'S INSIDE

REGULAR FEATURES ...

SPECIAL FEATURES ...

STAYING CONNECTED ...

Visit Our Website at: www.cpa.ca/cjs/CJS_Welcome.html

Regular Features …

Editors' Note

Well, the augmentation and redesign of the last issue of *Crime Scene* was met with rave reviews! The comments shared were both complimentary and motivating. We anticipate that the issues to follow in 2006 will be just as good or better.

In this issue, the regular columns associated with professional areas address a variety of fascinating topics including the use of statistical predictions rules in police investigations, the value of eyewitness testimony in trials, impulsivity, and the experiences of students participating in an internship training program. The newsletter also hosts two special feature articles – one as a tribute to Dr. Paul Gendreau and the other presents the results of the Continuing Education Questionnaire. Discussion at the Students' Water Cooler continues with an article outlining potential topics for discussion among our student readers.

The Executive believes regional participation in the Section is important to promote cross-country representation in our activities. As one way to get professionals across Canada talking and sharing ideas, we created the Regional Perspectives Series in the last issue of *Crime Scene*, and invited regions to submit commentary on offender treatment. Unfortunately we did not receive any submissions to publish in this issue. So, we think it would be valuable to find out from our readers what their thoughts are on regional representation in *Crime Scene* and the Regional Perspectives Series. We plan to use this feedback to either guide the column or put it to rest. Therefore, we would appreciate readers answering the following questions: (1) is regional representation in *Crime Scene* important?, (2) what issues should be addressed in the column?, and (3) how can regions be engaged? Responses to these questions can be forwarded via email to us by March 3rd, 2006. We will collate any thoughts received and outline next steps for the series in the April issue of *Crime Scene*.

For readers who have not yet accessed the CJP website, it has been updated and contains the Executive members' biographies as well as most past issues of *Crime Scene*. As mentioned in the last issue, this site has a link to the CPA Annual Convention under *Events*. We hope many of you made submissions for CPA 2006!

Crime Scene is only as good as the participation of its readers and the contributions we receive, so we continue to encourage readers to provide submissions. If you would like to give recognition to a Section member, have news to share about members or yourself, are aware of job opportunities, or have an article for the newsletter, please let us know. The next issue of *Crime Scene* will be distributed in April 2006 and we will be accepting submissions until March 3rd, 2006. Once again, we would like to thank everyone who made a contribution to this issue, and for meeting our timelines!

Happy New Year everyone!! And we hope all our readers manage to stick with any resolutions made! Talk to you in the Spring.

Cheers,
Chantal & Tanya

View from the Top

I trust that each of you have had a relaxing and enjoyable Christmas and holiday time. This New Years edition of *Crime Scene* brings good news. Our section has joined with the Criminal Justice Section of Division 18 of APA under the leadership of Dr. Robert Morgan and with the American Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychology under the leadership of Dr. John Gannon to support, in principle, a North American Conference for Correctional and Criminal Justice Psychology in 2007. The conference is proposed to run concurrently with CPA in 2007. Negotiations with CPA are still in the early stages but there is precedent for this type of venture. As soon as our plans are confirmed we will be sending out a special announcement to our membership with more details and ways you can become involved in what we hope will be the largest gathering of Criminal Justice psychologists – ever.

Going Back to School

I recently taught a social psychology course at a local college that has begun offering a university degree program. Let me say that it has been "a few" years since I was exposed to a general social psychology textbook. As with most of us, once we begin to "specialize" in graduate school we rarely look back to the broader view of our discipline. Even those of you full-time academics most frequently teach within your area specialty. Of course there were the classics within the text – Albert Bandura's social cognitive learning theory, Leon Festinger's cognitive dissonance, Philip Zimbardo's guard/prisoner role playing experiment, and no social psychology text would be complete without a review of Milgram's obedience experiments, to name a few. As I said, it has been a few years so I frequently encountered the "Oh ya" experience as I bumped into research that I remembered thinking as an undergraduate was "cool". However, as with our own (Criminal Justice) specialty, social psychology in

general has not stood still. I found myself learning new and interesting phenomena with much the same fascination as I did ??? years ago. Perhaps most importantly, I began to think about how some of these relatively recent developments could be applied to my own discipline.

One example, for instance, is the recent work by Anne Wilson and Michael Ross of the University of Waterloo on temporal self-comparison. Building on Albert's (1977) temporal comparison theory, they reported on a series of studies that demonstrated quite convincingly that current self-ratings are more positive than ratings of the self in the past. There seems to be a tendency to disparage our past selves in favour of our current selves, though this same tendency does not seem to be extended to others. They were able to create a temporally distant self simply by the way they worded the rating questions. The reason that I found this particularly interesting is that I have found in my own research with offenders that many are quite willing to admit to past antisocial acts while at the same time preserving their own sense of self by insisting that they are now not the same (a better) person. Of course, there may be some issues of impression management (though our research suggests these concerns are somewhat overblown) but armed with the knowledge that people *in general* are prepared to disparage their past selves in favour of today offers an appealing explanation of why self-report among offenders is predictive of future antisocial behaviour. Particularly if that self-report focuses on past antisocial acts which are among the better predictors of future antisocial behaviour. The central lesson that I learned from teaching this introductory social psychology course is that it is still fun to learn. The second lesson was focusing on our specialty without the occasional return to the general to find out "what's new" *may* be hampering our progress. After all, it was the application of general psychological principles to our specific clienteles that spawned the specialty discipline.

Congratulations!

The success of self-report in predicting future antisocial behaviour is also a seg-way as I extend to Dr. Wagdy Loza the congratulations of our Section on his successful nomination to receive the Significant Contribution Award for 2006. Over the past 10 years, Dr. Loza has worked to develop and validate a self-report instrument for use with offenders, the Self Appraisal Questionnaire. His many scientific publications over the years have served to underscore the utility of self-report with offenders despite worries of impression management and his work promotes Canadian correctional psychology both at home and internationally. Congratulations Wagdy.

Regards to all,

Jeremy

Column: In The Trenches: The Practical Experience of Forensic and Correctional Psychology

By Dorothy Cotton, Ph.D.
Director-at-Large: Police Psychology

…Impulsivity…

It seems that the longer I am a psychologist, the less I know. There are concepts and ideas that seemed perfectly clear to me when I was a puppy, but which over the years, have become increasingly foggy. Take the concept of impulsivity. Seems pretty straightforward on the surface. There are a bunch of *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM) diagnoses that include impulsivity. We talk a lot about the notion of impulsivity as it applies to criminal behaviour. We have all kinds of tests and rating scales that measure it. But when it comes down to defining it…well…that's another story.

What is impulsivity (or impulsiveness perhaps - we actually can't even decide what to call it)? Depending on whom you ask, it is (or includes):

- failure of response inhibition,
- sensation seeking,
- inability to anticipate the consequences of one's actions,
- inability to delay gratification,
- distractibility,
- difficulty with emotional regulation,
- foreseeing but not caring about consequences,
- inability to resist urges,
- self regulatory deficits,
- acting without thinking,
- defects in planning,
- problems managing impulses, and
- … a whole bunch of other things.

Some theorists (like Eysenck) make a distinction between functional and dysfunctional impulsivity, with the former suggesting a quick thinking and fast acting kind of person who does not get in trouble (after all, sometimes quick IS good) and the later referring more to people who get themselves in hot water when they are impulsive.

Barratt (of Barratt Impulsivity Scales fame) talks about the components of impulsivity:

- motor impulsiveness (acting without thinking),
- cognitive impulsiveness (making quick cognitive decisions), and
- non-planning impulsiveness (lack of concern about the future).

Webster, in his book aptly entitled "Impulsivity", maintains that impulsive people are best described by five overarching characteristics: (1) lack of personal plans; (2) interpersonal dysfunction; (3) distorted self esteem; (4) rage, anger and hostility; and (5) taxing irresponsibility.

The definition does not become any clearer if you look at the DSM and the diagnoses that specify impulsiveness as a characteristic. They range from Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) to bipolar disorder; they include a slew of personality disorders and substance use disorders - to say nothing of pyromania, pathological gambling and trichotillomania. It is difficult indeed to see what common thread joins these very disparate diagnoses.

The picture does not get any clearer when one attempts to look at measures of impulsivity. There seem to be three general types of measures:

- cognitive and neuropsychological tests and procedure, such as the Wisconsin Card Sort, the Stroop, time estimation tasks, and go/no-go tasks;
- personality measures, such as the Eysenck scale - and virtually every other major personality scale; and
- behavior checklists, such as the aforementioned Barratt, the Wender, and the various Connors and Brown scales.

If you are wondering how the scores on these three types of measures relate to each, the answer is generally, they don't. The literature is rife with conclusions, such as:

- correlations between personality and time estimation measures ranged from 0 to .25;
- relationships between the Barratt, the Wender, the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) and other personality measures, as well as response inhibition task and a self-control choice tasks were "uniformly low";
- no relationship was evident between behavioural scales and personality measures; and
- even different behavioural scales do not correlate among themselves very well - the same is the case with personality measures and neuropsych measures.

Factor analyses of groups of these tests tend to show a variety of separate factors - much like what Barratt hypothesized.

So where does that leave those of us who work with offenders or others who might have diagnoses that include an impulsivity component? It just might mean that we are asking the wrong questions and using the wrong vocabulary. To say that someone is impulsive and that this might be a risk factor for determining future behaviour is probably just not a very useful thing. Perhaps we need to more clearly spell out what we mean when we talk about a specific individual. It just might make more sense to describe that person as unable to inhibit responses, or as having difficulty planning ahead or anticipating consequences - or whatever.

At least it would help me. Because when someone says they are impulsive, I just have no idea what that means.

KNOW SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE OF INTEREST TO STUDENTS, DROP US AN EMAIL!

Column: Training in Criminal Justice Psychology

By Andrew Starzomski, Ph.D.,
Director-at-Large: Clinical and Training

The Student Perspective: What are Some Unique Aspects of Forensic Training?

In this column I want to present some of the key experiences and views of those in the process of acquiring training in our field. Late this past summer I had a chance to sit down with the two interns who were finishing their year at the Nova Scotia Hospital's Internship training programme. They were interested in sharing their forensic training experience highlights in a *Crime Scene* column. Both interns had split their year evenly on two six-month forensic and outpatient mental health rotations. One intern had not worked in the forensic field before, the other had some experience with juveniles on probation. Our forensic rotation is a blend of sexual offender work with men on probation or community sentences, plus inpatient service with individuals found Not Criminally Responsible by Reason of Mental Disorder. We had a relatively broad-ranging discussion about the various ways the forensic rotation was a unique and challenging part of their last major training experience before graduation. What follows are some of the main themes from that discussion.

Differences Between Forensic and Outpatient Settings:

The interns stated that the ever-present focus on violence risk issues in forensic assessment and treatment led to unique challenges. Foremost among these was the process of conceptualizing a client in a holistic way that, while not obscuring the person as a whole, could nonetheless inform key aspects of treatment and management of their risk. In other words, the centrality of a client's offending and their risk factors is unfamiliar to those new to the field and takes considerable time and processing to understand.

The interns also noted that ascertaining the degree to which some clinical skills and approaches learned in non-forensic settings are applicable or helpful in a forensic setting is an exercise in discovery. Trying to determine 'what works for

whom' takes on a whole new level of meaning for those new to a criminal justice setting.

On a related note, the interns also spoke about the experience of learning to deal with the tensions that frequently arise between risk management issues and clinical care issues. These matters relate to, for example, the flow of information (e.g., "who needs to know what, and when do they need to know it?"). Criminal justice settings involve institutional, professional discipline, health and justice services occupying prominent positions in the context of one's clinical interactions with clients. There is never a shortage of decisions faced about how to facilitate productive working relationships with forensic clients in an environment rife with various parties seeking to be part of those relationships as well. The basic process of trying to establish and maintain trusting relationships requires a set of skills and efforts not usually seen in many civil mental health settings. Having a chance to work on these issues across many cases and long stretches of time appears especially valuable to those coming in to the field.

What to Look For in a Forensic Setting:

There are a wide range of settings and elements conducive to productive training in criminal justice psychology. By their account, the following were especially valuable aspects of specialized criminal justice training available at our site that other settings offer as well:

- *Testimony.* During their training year our interns had the chance to see various supervisors giving expert evidence in provincial court and also before criminal code review boards, which they found extremely helpful. Such appearances are among the most dreaded for many of those who enter the field.
- *Institution and Community.* The interns spoke with me about the benefits of being involved in work both at inpatient and community settings.
- *Timeframes.* The chance to work with some clients over an extended period was available in the internship, and both interns were especially pleased that they had chances to do long-term interventions (e.g., more than six months) with some clients in our care. That kind of work gave them the chance to experience what could be done with clients outside the frame of psychoeducational approaches that dominate much of the group therapy that comprises clients' rehabilitation. Those longer-term contacts also gave interns the chance to develop more confidence in their instincts and skills for working with interpersonal elements of client behaviour that can surface in the therapeutic relationship and that tie in to their criminality and risk for violence.
- *Supervisor Diversity.* Settings that feature numerous supervisors, who are involved with varying types of clinical work and who operate from different psychotherapeutic approaches, was also a valued component of the interns' training.

Personal Development:

Forensic work requires adequate and accurate preparation in the form of thorough file review, which frequently includes details of criminal behaviour that can elicit reactions of disgust, sadness, surprise and anger. Gaining experience with attending to and working with one's reactions as part of supervision is a key element of training in this field. On similar notes, being face to face with clients' anger, manipulation and chronicity in clinical sessions in turn requires the trainee to grapple with emotions and experiences they may not have faced in other settings. Carving out one's identity as a clinician who can confidently take on such immediate challenges is a key part of the experience for the forensic intern.

In sum, one of the main outcomes of hearing the interns' perspectives for me was a renewed appreciation for the complexity and rigour of working in the forensic domain. We clearly have a unique role to play in bringing our professionalism, scientific perspective and expertise in broad themes and facets of human behaviour to the criminal justice domain. Those students and psychologists entering the field look to more seasoned professionals for ideas, support and modeling for how to navigate through, and shape, these health, justice and academic systems. Reflecting on the themes that came out of that meeting reminded me about the broad range of skills, settings and scenarios we face in this field, which is for most a big part of the attraction to the work.

Though word is not yet back from the 2006 CPA convention selection committee, I am hopeful that my proposal for a conversation session about training issues will be accepted for Calgary next June. I will use that session as a forum for establishing some priorities and directions around training based on input from psychologists working in various places within the criminal justice system. I hope to see you there, and feel free to send along any ideas about training that you would like to see considered there or in some other forum: Andrew.starzomski@cdha.nshealth.ca.

DON'T FORGET TO LET US KNOW WHEN YOU HEAR ABOUT:

- Employment Opportunities
- Members on the Move
- Recently Published Articles

Column: CCOPP's Stories*
(*Canadian Committee of Police Psychologists)

By Craig Bennell, Ph.D.,
Director-at-Large: Police Psychology

A Call for the Use of Statistical Prediction Rules in Police Investigations

Police investigators routinely make important decisions, many of which affect people's lives. An investigator might have to determine whether a suspect is lying, whether a suicide note is genuine, whether a bite mark was made by an adult, etc. Two-alternative decisions of this type are referred to as diagnostic tasks in most settings, and across a range of fields, including radiology, engineering, and psychology, they are now often dealt with through the use of statistical prediction rules (SPRs). However, despite the fact that many researchers and practitioners are becoming more familiar with these tools, they are all but unknown in the policing domain. This is unfortunate given the bulk of empirical evidence, which tends to support their use.

Importantly, this does not need to be the case. The same goals and problems exist in each of the above fields and SPRs can be as useful in policing as they are every where else. Ultimately, the goals in all of these areas are to increase the accuracy and utility of the decisions that are made. The problems are to identify the best predictor variables for a given task and to set an appropriate decision threshold for determining when an event of interest has occurred (or will occur in the future). These are problems, of course, because typically there will be many predictor variables from which to choose (with only some being useful) and rarely will it be obvious where a decision threshold should be placed.

Enter SPRs and, of equal importance, a method for evaluating the predictive accuracy of these rules. Given the abundance of statistical methods now available, the choice of a prediction tool is largely a matter of preference (e.g., one could use a regression model, a neural network, a genetic algorithm, etc.). However, more and more often, receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis is being viewed as the technique of choice for evaluating these tools. Indeed, in the most recent issue of *Law and Human Behaviour*, two of our colleagues, Marnie Rice and Grant Harris, recommended that this procedure be the standard method for measuring diagnostic accuracy in forensic psychology.

As most of you will know, much of the value of ROC analysis comes from the fact that it can provide a meaningful measure of diagnostic accuracy in the form of the area under a ROC curve (AUC). Unlike most measures of accuracy, such as the percentage correct, the AUC does not depend on the arbitrary selection of a decision threshold. Instead, it reflects the position of an entire ROC curve in its graph, constructed by examining the relative frequencies of all possible decision outcomes for a given task across many thresholds. The AUC, therefore, is a more valid indicator of decision-making performance. But what does this mean for the police decision-maker?

Basically, what it means is that ROC analysis can be used to examine issues arising in the policing context in a way that is more valid compared to what is currently done. In my own research in the area of police decision-making, I have encountered at least five policing issues that would benefit greatly from the use of ROC analysis. It could be used to establish the predictive accuracy of a specific diagnostic system, identify the most accurate predictors for a given diagnostic task, set decision thresholds in order to maximize decision-making utility, compare the ability of different decision-makers, or examine the impact of situational factors on decision-making performance.

To demonstrate the value of SPRs generally, and ROC analysis specifically, consider the common investigative task of deciding whether two crimes have been committed by the same offender. In the absence of forensic evidence, behavioural evidence must be relied on to complete this task. This can include an analysis of information related to the type of victim that was selected, the time of day when the offence took place, the geographic location(s) of the attack, behaviours exhibited at the crime scene, and so on. The question for the police investigator is, given two crimes, which piece(s) of information will result in good decisions.

What the investigator has to do is identify behaviours that are likely to be repeated across crimes committed by the same offender, but these behaviours cannot be exhibited by all other offenders. In our studies of this task, which have focused solely on burglary, we have found that police personnel perform at levels approximating an AUC of .60. The reason our participants do not perform better than this is that they tend to rely on behaviours that are low in predictive power. For example, it is rare for individuals not to focus on the type of property stolen when establishing links (e.g., they will indicate that cash was taken in both crimes). Yet, in our samples, cash is nearly always the only item that offenders steal.

Such a scenario would suggest that SPRs may be of some use. And it turns out that they are. For example, when examining the SPRs we have developed for the purpose of linkage analysis, we often achieve AUCs in excess of .80, even when the SPRs are applied to new samples. Why do these SPRs perform better than police personnel? For one reason, they rely on variables that consistently outperform (in

terms of their predictive power) the behaviours that are focused on by the individuals we have tested.

By far, the best linking variable relates to the distance between offence locations, what we refer to as the inter-crime distance. It turns out that the closer two offences are, the more likely they are to have been committed by the same offender. It is in fact this one variable that accounts for the superior performance of our SPR. This variable is rarely, if ever, mentioned by our participants. Fortunately, we have recently discovered that this SPR can be used to improve the performance of police personnel. For example, simply by telling these individuals about our findings, we are able to increase their accuracy significantly, to about .70. However, our participants still hold on to many of their existing beliefs, and rarely do they perform as well as the SPR.

The fact that inter-crime distance is a good linking variable brings me to the second advantage of ROC analysis (the first advantage being that it provides a valid method for comparing different decision-makers [SPRs and humans] on a given task). The second advantage relates to the use of ROC analysis for setting thresholds. Given that inter-crime distance is an effective linking variable, this begs the question: how close do two crimes have to be to one another before we should decide that they are linked?

The answer to this question turns out to be crucial. For example, in one of our studies, the ratio of hits to false alarms varied drastically when we shifted the threshold by only a few kilometres. At a threshold of 3 km, the hit rate was .91, whereas the false alarm rate was .50. At a threshold of 1 km, the hit rate was .72, whereas the false alarm rate was only 0.08. These are not small differences. They indicate that, simply by adjusting the threshold slightly, one could massively decrease the likelihood of making a false alarm (saying two crimes were linked when they aren't) while reducing the chance of making a hit (saying two crimes are linked when they are) by a much smaller amount. The optimal threshold for this sample ended up being about 2.5 km. Although we have yet to do so, providing this additional information to individuals would likely increase their ability to make good decisions, perhaps putting them on par with our SPR.

Although I have focused on one investigative task, the same argument applies to many others (indeed, research in my lab has shown that the above findings mirror what happens with many other investigative tasks). The value of SPRs has been shown in other areas and I see no reason why the same would not be true in policing. Given the recent creation of our sub-section on police psychology, and a great newsgroup to go along with it, it seems a perfect opportunity to begin discussing these issues. Indeed, the mix of practitioners and researchers that make up this group is what is needed to make this happen. Police psychology is certainly lagging behind other sub-disciplines of forensic psychology. Addressing the issue raised in this article may be one way to start catching up. All comments are welcome.

Column: Beyond a Reasonable Doubt

By Joanna Pozzulo, Ph.D.
Director-at-Large: Psychology in the Courts

The Bug Effect

I recently started my subscription to University Affairs. When my first copy arrived (December, 2005), I was quite intrigued to read the headline, "The CSI effect" (McCabe, 2005), thinking the article would have something to do with crime shows and their influence on the general public's awareness of forensic issues. I turned the page only to see the caption, "*The old days of eyewitness testimony in criminal trials are largely over".* What luck I thought, a perfect topic for debate.

Has the 'criminal trial' become one where only forensic anthropologists, entomologists and other "forensic science" types are welcome? Is there no place for eyewitness testimony? Or testimony from eyewitness experts? Are psychologists who research forensic issues not considered "forensic scientists"? Are they less of a scientist than forensic entomologists?

A quote in the University Affairs article by Dr. Gail Anderson, one of relatively few Canadian forensic entomologists, states, *"Witnesses can have poor memories, bad eyesight and questionable motives. Physical evidence, if it is done correctly, does not lie."* (p. 20). I pondered her statement for a while, then, wondered how knowledgeable are other scientists with regards to psychological science in general and eyewitness research in particular? What if eyewitness evidence is done correctly?

Yes, eyewitnesses can make mistakes. We have seen erroneous eyewitness identification be the primary evidence convicting innocent defendants (Wells et al., 1998). Some of these innocent defendants have spent 10, 15, even 20 years or more incarcerated. But, and this is a big but, eyewitnesses are also correct. Witnesses can describe what happened. Witnesses can describe what the culprit looked like. Witnesses can correctly identify the culprit. Across several research studies, it is not uncommon to see correct identification rates at 75% or higher (when the culprit is in the lineup presented, e.g., Leippe, Romanczyk, & Manion, 1991). Moreover, just as there are procedures that can make the collection of physical evidence more reliable, there are procedures that can make the collection of eyewitness

evidence more reliable. For example, the Cognitive Interview (Fisher & Geisleman, 1992) can increase the quantity and accuracy of a witness' recall. Interviewing witnesses individually, rather than in a group, can limit the amount of misinformation later reported. The Sequential Lineup (Lindsay & Wells, 1985) can decrease false positive rates when the culprit is not among the lineup members presented.

Regardless of eyewitness accuracy, does physical evidence trump eyewitness evidence, making it irrelevant? For starters, physical evidence needs to be present. What if there isn't any? For some crimes, there is no physical evidence available that can be collected. Consider a bank robbery where the culprit wore gloves. Even assuming that physical evidence is available, police need suspects in which to match the evidence. An eyewitness can provide a link, albeit at times fuzzy, from the crime to the culprit. Without this link, even good physical evidence may be useless. Consider an assault where DNA is available. However, the DNA for this offender is not stored in any databank. DNA, even the most carefully collected, cannot communicate to who it belongs.

Considerable debate has occurred between the pages of journal articles and in Canadian courtrooms regarding the expert testimony of psychologists on eyewitness issues. Should psychologists who study eyewitness issues be allowed to provide expert testimony, to inform the court? You can find the psychologists themselves falling on both sides of this debate (e.g., Ebbesen & Konecni, 1996; McCloskey & Egeth, 1983). You also could probably find judges who disagree on this issue. However, as Yarmey (2001) articulates, some Canadian courts (in Ontario) have ruled that expert eyewitness testimony not be allowed. Arguments for not allowing expert eyewitness testimony include, the position that eyewitness research findings are common sense, that findings are contradictory, and that the expert testimony may be too prejudicial. However, we can find numerous examples of results not fitting a 'common sense' prediction (e.g., confidence is related to accuracy). Some eyewitness issues produce more contradictory results than others (arousal vs. lineup instructions). Why not allow testimony on the eyewitness issues that have a general consensus? Lastly, is it not the function of judges and juries to decide on the appropriate weight for various pieces of evidence? How is a psychologist testifying on eyewitness issues different than an expert testifying on the approximate time of death based on body decay?

I do not believe the day has come where eyewitness testimony has no place in criminal trials. Call me naive, but I believe that there are different types of evidence each with their role and place in criminal investigations and trials. One type of science (or scientist) does not make another type obsolete, not yet at least.

Newsgroup discussion regarding this article or other pertinent issues to members involved in court issues can be sent to Joanna_pozzulo@carleton.ca. A members list will be circulated via email to facilitate and disseminate relevant discussion.

References

Ebbesen, E.B., & Konecni, V.J. (1996). Eyewitness memory research: Probative v. prejudicial value. *Expert Evidence, 5,* 2-28.

Fisher, R.P., & Geiselman, R.E. (1992). *Memory-enhancing techniques for investigative interviewing.* Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Leippe, M.R., Romanczyk, A., & Manion, A.P. (1991). Eyewitness memory for a touching experience: Accuracy differences between child and adult witnesses. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 367-379.

Lindsay, R.C.L., & Wells, G.L. (1985). Improving eyewitness identification from lineups: Simultaneous versus sequential lineup presentations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70,* 556-564.

McCabe, D. (December 2005). The CSI effect. *University Affairs.*

McCloskey, M., & Egeth, H.E. (1983). Eyewitness identification: What can a psychologist tell a jury? *American Psychologist, 38,* 550-563.

Wells, G.L., Small, M., Penrod, S., Malpass, R.S., Fulero, S.M., & Brimacombe, C.A.E. (1998). Eyewitness identification procedures: Recommendations for lineups and photospreads. *Law and Human Behavior, 22,* 603-647.

Yarmey, A.D. (2001). Expert testimony: Does eyewitness memory research have probative value for the courts? *Canadian Psychology, 42,* 92-100.

Recently Defended Dissertations & Theses

An Empirical Analysis of the Relationships Among Antisocial Attitudes, the Use of Techniques of Neutralization, and Criminal Behaviour

Annie K. Yessine, Carleton University

Masters Thesis Abstract

This study examined the relationships among antisocial attitudes, the use of techniques of neutralization, and criminal behaviour. This was accomplished within the context of evaluating the effectiveness of the Counter-Point program in reducing its intermediate targets of change, and subsequently rates of recidivism. Data were collected from a sample of federally incarcerated male offenders released in the community. Results revealed significant post-program reductions in antisocial attitudes and neutralization.

Neutralization failed to account for variability in rates of recidivism while assessments of antisocial attitudes significantly contributed to the prediction of suspensions and revocations. Notably, changes in antisocial attitudes made incremental contributions to the prediction of outcome. After controlling for pre-existing differences in criminogenic need, risk, and prior treatment, completion of Counter-Point predicted longer survival in the community. Early program drop-out was associated with significant increases in rates of recidivism following release. In spite of concerns relating to treatment attrition as well as fundamental responsivity issues, this study illustrated that Counter-Point is a clinically appropriate rehabilitative intervention. Findings are discussed in terms of the contribution that the antisocial attitudes and the neutralization constructs can make to the development of a better understanding of criminal behaviour, and to the delivery of effective correctional programs.

For further information, please contact Annie Yessine at: Annie.Yessine@psepc.gc.ca.

INTERESTED IN SUBMITTING AN ARTICLE FOR THE NEXT EDITION?

Deadline is March 3, 2006

Correlates of Sexual Offending Activity in a Sample of Sexually Abusive Adolescents

Erik Gaudreault, Carleton University

B.A. Honours Thesis Abstract

With little research regarding correlates of adolescent sexual offending, the current investigation partially replicated and expanded upon the work of Carpentier, Proulx, and Lussier (2004). Static, criminogenic, and non-criminogenic factors were coded on 93 sexually abusive adolescents to examine the number of victims, the level of violence used in sexual offences, and the escalation in the intrusiveness of sexual activity -- for offenders with more than one victim. Analyses revealed that age of onset, sexual or psychological abuse, family dysfunction, impulsivity, and social problems were significant predictors of the number of victims; physical or psychological abuse, aggressiveness, family dysfunction, substance abuse, loneliness, and social skills significantly predicted the level of violence; while the age of onset, psychological abuse, aggressiveness, solitary sexual behaviours, family dysfunction, and social skills significantly predicted an escalation in the intrusiveness of sexual activity. It appears that static and dynamic factors offer useful information in understanding sexually abusive adolescents.

For further information, please contact Erik Gaudreault at: Erik.Gaudreault@psepc.gc.ca.

SPECIAL FEATURES ...

Special Feature: A Tribute to Dr. Paul Gendreau

By Alan W. Leschied, Ph.D., C.Psych.
University of Western Ontario

Paul Gendreau is set to retire as the Director of the Centre for Criminal Justice Studies at the University of New Brunswick. This isn't meant to be a farewell to someone who we credit so much with being a part of our professional lives – rather it is a tribute.

Dr. Paul Gendreau is approaching retirement from his position as Director of the Centre for Criminal Justice Studies at the University of New Brunswick. It will come at the end of this academic year. Paul is among a handful of people who, as a leader in the field of the psychology of criminal conduct, influenced us most personally. And let's face it, he is one of our great characters!

Paul has not only been amongst one of Canada's leading psychologists, but he is among a handful of the most influential contributors to the scientific literature in correctional psychology of this century. He has influenced a generation of scientists, policy analysts and practitioners world-wide in the area of correctional practice.

When Paul began his career as a psychologist, there were few who would pretend that we knew enough to consider anything but harsh, punitive responses in 'correcting' those who were antisocial. In an era when we hopelessly threw our collective hands into the air and pled "nothing works" when it came to correctional practice, Paul published an article entitled "Effective Correctional Practice: Bibliotherapy for Cynics." The year was 1979. It quickly became one of the oft quoted phrases that led professionals in the area to question the trend of viewing the housing of antisocial persons as the only recourse for law violators.

Paul's influential writing and research attracted the attention not only of a school of psychologists/ criminologists, students and practitioners but policy analysts within all levels of government. He ventured to Jamaica, the US and New Zealand, to name a few countries, advising senior government policy-makers and politicians regarding correctional practice and policy.

In Ontario, Paul used his position as the Senior Psychologist at the Rideau Correctional Centre to convene policy and research conferences that brought like-minded contributors in the field of correctional research together. Quickly, Canada became viewed as a leader in the field of correctional research where its position has been cemented with colleagues such as Drs. Andrew, Bonta and Motiuk to name but a few. Those influenced either directly or indirectly by Paul now hold senior positions in numerous correctional agencies, universities and governments throughout the world.

Paul's career as a psychologist has not been limited to the criminal justice field. He has utilized his knowledge and wisdom to guide the profession in ways that have bridged the research divide to support applications in the field both for practitioners and policy makers. He served on the Board of Directors of the Canadian Psychology Association, with a term as President. He has been the recipient of numerous awards including the prestigious Margaret Mead Award. He has in recent years served as the Director of the Criminal Justice Institute at the University of New Brunswick.

Few in the profession of psychology have been as influential as Paul. Paul possesses a world-wide reputation for excellence and in shaping a generation in a science that has done nothing short of redirecting an entire body of work and practice.

So that should be enough to affirm Paul's place in our hearts. But to tell the truth, while Paul has been a beacon of integrity for our professional lives, it is probably through his character that we have our fondest associations. So think of it, who else do you know would challenge Bill James, the baseball statistics guru, by generating data to assess the wisdom of bringing in left-handed relief pitchers to pitch to left-handed batters – and then publish the results. And at the same time, publish the latest reviews of Ottawa's restaurants in "Where to Eat in Canada". You might recall listening to Paul's late night radio show in the Kingston area that was heavily laden with Del Shannon tunes. And then there is Paul's guitar work. An evening at the Opinicon Resort in May of any given year would not be complete without finding leading international researchers and practitioners in the criminal justice field, cranking out yet another rendition of "My Little Runaway", with Paul playing the melody line on his Gibson.

In retirement we may not hear so much from Paul on who the latest "fart-catcher" is or have that pleading voice asking why people just can't report correlations in their data so they fit neatly into his next meta-analysis. We'll probably still learn of his golfing escapades or maybe regaled with what the women's basketball team at UNB was able to achieve under his guidance. As long as in retirement he doesn't go too far away – we would miss his character!

HAVE A PUBLICATION THAT'S JUST BEEN RELEASED? LET US KNOW.

Special Feature: The Case For and Against Continuing Education Credits (Part 2)

By Andrew Harris, Ph.D.
Director-at-Large: Continuing Education

Firstly, thank you to those who took the time to answer the e-mailed questionnaire on continuing education (CE) credits. Secondly, I'd like to say "WOW!!!" The questionnaires brought up a number of very interesting and important areas of concern that I, for one, had never thought of. Despite this, the interesting issues raised included tax implications, privacy concerns, continuing education allowances, civil litigation, the value of peer interactions to individual practitioners, and professional autonomy. Just reading these questionnaires was a learning experience. People were very passionate about professional development and expressed this clearly in a commitment to high quality CE. I will begin with the data – reported in short summary. This small and admittedly unrepresentative questionnaire consisted of 14 questions aimed at tapping the appetite for, and concerns surrounding, a program of CE credits. Twenty people sent replies to the questionnaire, though of course, not everyone replied to each question. Overall, the response rate was very low.

Question 1: Do we want to be bothered with exploring the question of Continuing Education at all? Seventeen people stated "yes", 1 "no", and 2 "no data". CE activity was described as "essential" and "irresponsible not to". One of the more interesting comments was that there is apparently no evidence in the literature that CE contributes to professional performance. It was also pointed out that participating in formalized continuing education activities could have beneficial tax consequences for those of us with self-directed professional incomes. Apparently, tax write-offs and expenses are more easily claimed when engaged in "official" CE activities.

Interestingly, existing professional continuing education requirements, required by the provincial colleges, seem to differ significantly from one province/territory to another. Respondents, on the whole, did not like the idea of mandatory participation and felt that any system should be

introduced gradually to allow themselves and employers to adapt to the increased demands for CE activity.

People were concerned that learning activities claimed for CE credit should have high quality and up-to-date content that was vetted in some way to maintain quality control. A general concern was that some people might be able to pass sub-standard courses/lectures/workshops off for CE credit when these workshops might not be of a reasonable standard. Additionally, some were concerned that the people "agitating" for the development of a CE process were trying to "construct" a demand for CE courses, a demand that the more entrepreneurial amongst us were seen as being only too happy to fill.

Question 2: How many hours of "effort" should be put into CE each year? The average suggested was 36 hours with a range from 10 to 64 hours per year. Of the 16 people who responded directly with a figure in hours, 13 out of 16 stated a figure between 30 and 40 hours per year.

Question 3: Should a certain percentage of CE time be set aside for study of ethics and legal issues? Five people responded, "yes", 7 responded "no", and in 7 cases no answer was provided. One respondent reminded us that the majority of complaints to the Colleges come from the ethics and legal areas and not the clinical practice areas. However, the prevailing wisdom appears to be that the individual practitioner needs the ability and freedom to steer their practice as they see fit. One person responded that each year a certain amount of CE time should be spent "outside the box" in an attempt to keep our professional perspectives open and to keep abreast of issues peripheral to our direct areas of practice.

Question 4: Whether CE "hours" should be able to be carried over from year to year? Ten voted "yes", 5 "no", and 5 "no data". One person brought up an interesting idea - that the ability to "bank" hours over a short duration might allow practitioners on parental leave or who take soujourns/sabaticals outside their normal CE routine to have enough "hours" to see them through these leave periods.

Question 5: How should CE credits be documented? Twelve out of 20 respondents felt that each practitioner should be responsible for maintaining their own record. Several people stated that this would be no more work because they already have to document (self-assessment) CE type activities for their College. Concern was expressed over who could potentially have access to this type of information and another was concerned as to how this information (or lack thereof) might be used in civil litigation against the practitioner. Another respondent said that the British Columbia College has a "one-page" sheet that is seen as an effective record of CE activities.

Question 6: Should "home study" or "self-directed learning" count as CE time? To this question the answer was basically "yes". Twelve respondents gave their opinions as to what percentage of hours could be obtained through "home study" or "self-directed learning". The average of these twelve opinions was 45% with a range from 25% to 100%. Only one person felt 100% was appropriate and the next highest opinion was 60%. Other comments centered on the idea that the person should complete some form of evaluation and document the learning activity.

Question 7: Should CE credit be available for reading a book or journal article? Thirteen people were of the opinion "yes", five cast "no" votes, with two "no data". Suggestions were made that this type of activity be limited to 25% to 30% of CE credits and some concern was raised that journal reading for CE credit was no help to members arguing for increased resources to attend professional development activities.

Question 8: Should conference presentations count for CE credit? Thirteen people responded in the affirmative, four in the negative, one "it depends", and two "no data". Comments centered around the idea that credit should not be available for giving the same presentation multiple times and it was suggested that a reasonable tariff would be to claim one day's worth of CE credit for every two hours presentation time.

Question 9: How many CE credits for conference attendance? Of those that responded to this question directly, eight were of the opinion that a half-day at a conference should count for 3.5 "hours" CE time and that a full day attendance should count for 7 "hours".

Question 10: Should teleconferences or "blog" participation count? Ten people voted "no", six "yes", one "maybe" and three "no data". Once again there were concerns about the quality of the interaction and that it should not just be idle chat.

Question 11: Should attending "grand rounds" count as CE? While admittedly aimed at those who work in an institutionalized setting, nine said "yes", five "no", one "maybe", and five "no data". "Yes" concerns were that topics might be too peripheral to our area of practice, and that there should be a cap on the number of claimable hours for this type of activity. "No" concerns included the idea that there would be no control over the quality of the learning and that topics, once again, might be too peripheral to be helpful.

Question 12: Should attendance at non-psychology conferences be allowed CE credit? Twelve people responded "yes", 3 "no", 1 "maybe" and 5 "no data". All of the expressed concerns here were whether the topic under discussion would be sufficiently close to our area of practice to be relevant. One person gave an opinion that in addition

to claiming the hours; this type of learning activity might require a short statement as to the relevance of the information sought.

Question 13: What do you do now for professional development that you think others should do or that could be a useful educational activity? Presented below is a simple frequency count of what people feel is important.

Conference attendance and participation	12
Reading journals	9
Networking with peers	5
Attending workshops	4
Reading books	3
Supervising graduate students	2
Conducting research	2

Other activities, listed once each, were reading a list-serve, writing professional articles, reviewing articles, and professional supervision. While all worthy activities, perhaps the most interesting comments concerned "networking with peers". I found this most interesting as it demonstrated for me the necessity of face-to-face professional interaction in CE – that it is also a social as well as intellectual activity. It seems that some form of networking, seen as direct peer-to-peer consultation/ interaction, should be taken into consideration and granted CE credit in any proposed scheme of CE credits.

Question 14: Would you attend a workshop for forensic/correctional psychologists offered the day before CPA's annual conference? Eleven people stated "yes", 4 "no", 1 "maybe" and 4 "no data". The most frequent comment here was that the presence of an actual topic-specific workshop would give more leverage to those who have to request funds to attend such professional meetings as CPA.

Observations:
One concern that was evident throughout all of the responses was a real commitment that there should be some "quality control" involved – that this program should be a serious learning program. Respondents were concerned about the relative "weights" of various types of CE. For example, reading a book on "wildflower appreciation therapy" should not count as much as attending a structured workshop requiring the production of graded content and involving written feedback. This is difficult as the hours spent engaging in each of these activities might be equivalent but it is felt that, inherently, one would be "worth" more than the other. The possibility was raised by several people that a certain percentage of the hours would have to be acquired in "quality assured" activities. All respondents gave a strong impression that CE credit cannot just be sitting around listening to minor updates on what you already know; CE activity should have a significant "learning" component. CE activity must expand and increase your personal competence and not just be part of fighting a "holding battle" against professional obsolescence.

Some were of the opinion that having formal CE requirements would strengthen their hand when negotiating funds and leave with employers to attend appropriate CE activities. In addition, formal requirements would be useful in lobbying for a "Continuing Education Allowance", for members of professional colleges who are required to maintain their licenses to maintain their employment.

The obvious question at this point is "so what?" – what did we learn from this brief and non-representative survey? I think that even the most cynical would allow that when it comes time to write a CE policy for this section, the responses given here should be taken into consideration in the initial draft. There is no reason that we cannot structure our CE program to our own liking and best benefit.

The subject of CE credits is obviously large and complex. Therefore, in future articles I will attempt to provide you with information on the present CE requirements for Psychologists and "Associates" in each province and territory, the tax implications of participating in a formalized CE program, the privacy and legal implications of participating (or not) in a CE program, and I will attempt to track down the elusive "one-page" CE documentation sheet that is apparently in use in British Columbia.

Please feel free to forward any thoughts or comments on the CE issue to Andrew.Harris@psepc.gc.ca.

Staying Connected …

Section Business

There is no Section Business to report, per se; however, we thought we would provide a brief update on what is going on behind the scenes. Executive members continue to work on their individual mandates, all doing great work for our Section members. In addition, plans have started for the 2007 *Celebration of Excellence* Banquet. As you may recall, the decision was made to postpone the banquet this year, in order that it be held in central Canada, every odd-numbered year, as centrally located CPA Conventions have had higher attendance rates over the years. Hence, the next banquet will be in Ottawa on June 7, 2007. The banquet organizers (Chantal, Terri-Lynne Scott and Tanya) are beginning to explore venues - unfortunately we do not have

an expense account to conduct field experiments at the various dining possibilities that Ottawa has to offer! Although plans are not finalized, we are aiming for the next banquet, our third, to be a national success! Make sure to keep your calendars open, as the banquet is a fantastic opportunity to network, for both students and professionals!

Recent Publications

Do you have a recent publication? List it here.

Bonta, J., & Yessine, A. K. (2005). *The national flagging system: Identifying and responding to high-risk, violent offenders.* (User Report 2005-04). Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Bonta, J., Bourgon, G., Jessman, R., & Yessine, A. K. (2005). *Presentence reports in Canada.* (User Report 2005-03). Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Bourgon, G., Morton-Bourgon, K.E., & Madrigano, G. (2005). Multisite investigation of treatment for asexually abusive juveniles. In B.K. Schwartz (Ed.), *The Sex Offender: Issues in assessment, treatment and supervision of adult and juvenile populations: Volume V* (pp. 15-1-15-17). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.

Loza, W., Neo, L. H., Shahinfar, A., Loza-Fanous, Amel (2005). Cross validation of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire: A tool for assessing violent and non-violent recidivism with female offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 49,* 547-560.

The Self-Appraisal Questionnaire (SAQ) is a 72 item self-report measure designed to predict violent and non-violent recidivism among adult male criminal offenders. It was administered to 91 female offenders incarcerated in Pennsylvania and 183 incarcerated in Singapore correctional systems. Results indicated that the SAQ has sound psychometric properties, with acceptable reliability, and concurrent and predictive validity for assessing violent and non-violent recidivism. There were no significant differences between the scores of African American and Asian offenders and the responses of the Caucasian offenders. Similar to the findings from male offenders, the present results provide some support for the validity of the SAQ in the prediction of violent and non-violent recidivism risk among Caucasian, African American and Asian female offenders.

Criminal Justice Listserv

The Div18CrimJustice listserv is a forum for the dissemination of information and discussion relevant to professionals with interests in criminal justice and correctional psychology.

Membership in the Listserv: Although, this listserv is comprised of many members of Division 18 of the American Psychological Association, membership in this division or APA is not required. In fact, it is assumed that this listserv will serve to facilitate discussion between all those involved in the general area of criminal justice including, for example, attorneys, practitioners, and academicians.

Becoming a Member of the Listserv: If you would like to be involved/included in this forum please send your name and email address to robert.morgan@ttu.edu. Once your information has been included on the listserv you will receive a "welcome to the listserv" email and directions about its purpose and guidelines for use.

Criminal Justice Directory: The Criminal Justice Directory is a database of psychologists, attorneys, physicians, public service professions, and students interested in the broad area of criminal justice. The directory is designed to facilitate the discussion of topics relevant to the areas of criminal justice and correctional/forensic psychology. Information included in the directory includes: Name, Position, Contact Information, and Professional/Research Interests. If you would like to be included in the Criminal Justice Directory, please contact Jon Mandracchia (jon.t.mandracchia@ttu.edu) or Robert Morgan (robert.morgan@ttu.edu).

Kudo Korner

Want to give kudos to a Section Member?
Contact us.

We would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Annie Yessine and Erik Gaudreault, who were both awarded a Certificate of Excellence by CPA for their recent theses.

Annie Yessine's M.A. thesis was on
Attitude Attitudes: Assessment and Treatment.

Erik Gaudreault's Honours thesis was on
Correlates of Sexual Offending Activity in a Sample of
Sexually Abusive Adolescents.

CONGRATULATIONS ANNIE & ERIK!
Well done!!!

★★★★★

We would also like to congratulate:

Barry Rosenfeld, who won the Book Award from the American Academy of Forensic Psychology, for his recent book *Assisted Suicide and the Right to Die*.
Barry is an Associate Professor in Clinical Psychology at Fordham University in New York.

Dan Shuman, for receiving the American Academy of Forensic Psychology's Award for
Outstanding Contributions to Forensic Psychology.
Dan is a Professor of Law at Southern Methodist University Dedman Law School in Dallas, Texas.

Alan Goldstein, who will be receiving the American Academy of Forensic Psychology's
Beth Clark Distinguished Service Contribution award.
Alan is Professor Emeritus at the
John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALL AWARD RECIPENTS!!!

★★★★★

Employment Opportunities

Know of any employment opportunities?
Let us know.

Upcoming Conferences

American Correctional Association's
Winter Conference
January 28-February 1, 2006 Nashville, Tennesse, U.S.A.
www.aca.org

4th International Conference on
Crime and Justice in the Caribbean
February 8-11, 2006 University of the West Indies,Trinidad
www.sta.uwi.edu

7th Annual Alberta Harm Reduction Conference
February 14-15, 2006 Lethbridge, Alberta
www.albertaharmreduction.ca

American Psychology-Law Society: 2006 Conference
March 2-4, 2006 St. Petersburg, Florida, U.S.A.
www.ap-ls.org

Canadian Psychological Association
67th Annual Convention
June 8-10, 2006 Calgary, Alberta
www.cpa.ca

Canadian Evaluation Society Conference
June 4-6, 2006 Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
www.evaluationcanada.ca

British Society of Criminology Conference
July 4-7, 2006 Glasgow, Scotland
www.britsoccrim.org

American Correctional Association's
136th Congress of Correction
August 12-17, 2006 Tampa, Florida, U.S.A.
www.aca.org

Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers
25th Annual Research and Treatment Conference
September 27-30, 2006 Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
www.atsa.com
Note: Submission Deadline is earlier this year
*** January 20, 2006 ***

American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting
November 1-4, 2006 Los Angeles, U.S.A.
www.asc41.com

American Psychology-Law Society: 2006 Conference

Jennifer Lavoie, M.A, Tonia Nicholls, Ph.D.,
Jennifer Groscup, J.D., Ph.D., Annette Christy, Ph.D.

The American Psychology-Law Society (AP-LS) is an organization that addresses the intersection between psychology and law. AP-LS holds an annual conference that brings together psychological and legal communities to discuss issues of mutual interest. In this brief, we hope to provide information about the organization and the conference, as well as encourage participation and attendance among Canadian students and psychologists who are interested in criminal justice issues.

American Psychology-Law Society:

The American Psychology-Law Society (AP-LS), Division 41 of the American Psychological Association (APA), is a

multidisciplinary organization dedicated to scholarly research, practice, and public service within the field of law and psychology (see www.ap-ls.org for additional information). The goal of the organization is to augment the understanding of law and associated institutions through the advancement and application of contributions made in psychology. AP-LS endeavours to meet this objective through: (1) the promotion of applied and experimental research; (2) the endorsement of educating psychology and legal personnel in each other's respective disciplines; and (3) informing relevant communities of emergent research, as well as service and educational activities within the field. With the dissemination of knowledge in mind, the annual AP-LS conference is a rich experience accentuated by the sharing of current research, innovative discussion, and connectivity.

2006 Conference:

The 2006 AP-LS conference will be held Thursday March 2nd through Saturday March 4th with workshops held before and after the conference. The conference will take place at the Hilton St. Petersburg in St. Petersburg Florida, in the downtown area on the waterfront. This year, there will be several full-day continuing education workshops on Wednesday March 1st and several half-day workshops on Sunday March 5th. The conference is expected to open at noon on March 2nd and continue through Saturday evening on the 4th, concluding with a social event. Similar to past conventions, the program schedule will include concurrent break-out sessions, two poster sessions, a business meeting, the Executive Committee meeting in which guidelines for forensic psychology will be discussed. Additionally, David Cooke (Head of Clinical Forensic Psychology, Glasgow Scotland, and Psychopathy Checklist researcher) will deliver an invited address entitled the *Construct of Psychopathy: Themes and Variations* and James Doyle (lawyer and expert in eye-witness identification testimony) will give the Presidential address. Several award winners will be giving invited addresses, including Kevin Douglas' Saleem Shah address and Barry Rosenfeld's AP-LS book series address. There will also be a special session on the Speciality Guidelines for Forensic Psychologists, to be chaired by Randy Otto. Several other special sessions are planned, including a research discussion of *Murder on a Sunday Morning*, a presentation on career preparation, a Women's Committee event, and a Mentoring breakfast.

While symposia, papers, and posters have already been submitted, the conference program is presently being developed and will be available on the conference website. This website contains all of the most recent information available (www.ap-ls.org/conferences/apls/apls2006.html). The website features online registration for the conference, workshops, and hotel reservations. Further information on invited addresses, special sessions, and general information about St. Petersburg can be found on the website. We hope you will find the conference informative. For additional information about workshops and sessions, please contact Tonia Nicholls at: tnicholls@forensic.bc.ca. Hope to see you in St. Petersburg!

Annual Meeting of the
American Psychology-Law Society
Division 41 of the APA
Hilton Hotel, St. Petersburg, FL
March 2nd -4th, 2006

Scientific sessions addressing:

Eyewitness testimony
Expert testimony
Assessment of psychopathy
Violence risk assessment
Children as witnesses
Jury decision making
Child custody evaluation
Domestic violence
Forensic evaluation
Criminal competencies & insanity defense
Child abuse & neglect
Confessions
Police line-ups

Conference Chairs:

Annette Christy, Ph.D., Jennifer Groscup, Ph.D., J.D., Tonia Nicholls, Ph.D.

CONTINUING EDUCATION March 1st & 5th
(Fees separate from conference)

TOPICS:

Contemporary Issues in Mental Health Law – John Petrila, J.D., LLM

Treatment of Offenders and Patients with High Risk Behavior – James R.P. Ogloff, J.D., Ph.D.

Advances in Assessing Pretrial Competencies – Richard Rogers, Ph.D., ABPP

Forensic Assessment of Psychological Injuries – William J. Koch, Ph.D., ABPP

Assessing and Managing Violence Risk – Kevin S. Douglas, LL.B., Ph.D.

Item Response Theory – Gina Vincent, Ph.D., Christine Michie, BSc

Conference FEES – Early Bird (pre-Jan 31)/Regular
Members: $185/$215
Non-members: $250/$280
Student Member: $55/$85
Non-Member Student: $80/$110
Student First Author: $0
Spouse: $55/$85

For Information Contact:
AP-LS/Division 41 APA, PO Box 638, Niwot, CO 80544-0638
div41apa@comcast.net Ph: 303-652-9154 Fax: 303-652-2723
http://www.ap-ls.org/conference/apls/apls2006.html

STATIC AND DYNAMIC RISK ASSESSMENT OF SEXUAL OFFENDERS

2-DAY TRAINING WORKSHOP

April 11 & 12, 2006 – Columbus, Ohio, USA

May 2 & 3, 2006 – Toronto, ON, Canada

Presented By:

Simcoe Psychology – Dr. Dana Anderson, C.Psych.

This 2-day workshop includes a research overview, specific instructions for administering and scoring the Static-99, Stable-2000, and Acute-2000, and several hands-on exercises. In addition to large group discussions, the practice utilizes role-play, and small-group and individual exercises to become proficient in using the risk measures for both incarcerated and community-supervised offenders. The workshop is designed for all stakeholders interested in best practices of risk assessment for sexual offenders, including treatment providers, supervising officers, managers, and researchers. Participants will not only learn the administration and scoring of the measures, but will also receive feedback and suggestions for obtaining information in adversarial contexts. Participants will also receive all of the measures, interview guides, and scoring sheets, with no restrictions on duplication for their own use.

To register or for further information go to www.simcoepsychology.com or email Dr. Anderson at dana.anderson@rogers.com.

Members on the Move

Vicki Leger and her family moved to Toronto, where Vicki is now Manager of the Research and Outcome Measurement Branch in the Ministry of Children and Youth Services! Congratulations Vicki!

Congratulations to Chantal Langevin and her husband David! Rhys Collar was welcomed into the world in September. A healthy and happy baby boy!

Joe Camilleri and his wife are expecting their first baby!

Any more news? Contact us.

Students' Water Cooler

The Students' Water Cooler is a forum designed to give students a voice. If you have any information, advice, or would like to communicate with other students through a submission, please contact us! In this edition, we are featuring a short welcome by Joe Camilleri (the Section's Student Representative). The winners of the Certificate of Excellence by CPA for their recent theses (Annie Yessine and Erik Gaudreault) can be found under the Recent Dissertations and Theses Section.

A Welcome from the Section Student Representative

Joseph A. Camilleri, M.A., *Student Representative*

As the Student Representative for the Criminal Justice Psychology (CJP) Section, I would like to welcome you to the second installment of Crime Scene's Students' Water Cooler! Over the past few years, your section has been identifying ways to support student members and to increase student participation. So far we have incorporated a student's page on the CJP website and provided sessions addressing the needs of CJP students at the annual CPA conference. This column is yet another way to disseminate important information while providing a venue for all students to have their say on topics that are important to them. Yes, that is right, you are invited contribute pieces for this column.

Studying criminal justice psychology in Canada has its own unique set of challenges and we hope that this column will serve as a dynamic forum for students, written by students, to discuss these challenges. Some of the topics that could be addressed include: (1) campus/program profile; (2) synopsis of any posters or presentations; (3) announcement of completed theses or dissertations; (4) clinical and applied research experience; (5) experiences of recent graduates who started a clinical, academic, or other type of job; (6) questions for professionals; (7) barriers to graduate training; (8) where to go for graduate training, post-docs, or internships; and (9) what jobs are available at graduation. If you find any of these topics to be of interest and would like to write an article, please contact the editors.

Also, the CJP Section is looking for ways to improve the website, particularly the student portion. If you have some time, please take a look (www.cpa.ca/cjs) and let me know if you have any comments or suggestions (4jac1@qlink.queensu.ca). I look forward to hearing from you!

Regional Perspectives Series

Where Do We Go From Here?

In the last Issue, we attempted to launch the Regional Perspectives Series, in an effort to increase national participation in *Crime Scene* and facilitate communication across the country. Unfortunately, we did not receive any responses to the treatment questions we posed. Consequently, we have decided to take a different approach for this Issue. We believe it pertinent to find out what our readers think. So, this time round, we are simply seeking perspectives on the issue of increasing regional representation. Specifically, we ask that readers think about, and respond to the following questions:

(1) is regional representation in *Crime Scene* important?

(2) what issues should be addressed in the column?

(3) how can regions be engaged?

The plan is to present reader commentary on these questions in the next Issue, and for the information to guide this column in the future (if a need for this column is determined). Please send all responses to us by March 3rd, 2006. We appreciate your input on this matter and look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Have a Minute?

Please send us your thoughts on

Regional Perspectives

Email us.

All the Best for a Smashing 2006!