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Editors’ Note

The leaves are starting to fall from the trees and the season of change and reflection is here again. Summer is over. While writing this Editors’ Note, we are particularly hit with that feeling of change. As you may know, both Chantal and I have officially announced our intentions to step down as Editors of Crime Scene next year, and we do this with mixed emotions. We worry about the future of Crime Scene, given no one has come forward to take on the task, to carry on the torch as some might say. Many people have held this torch prior to us, and they certainly deserve credit for getting Crime Scene to where it is today: David Simourd (who in 1994 started Crime Scene and stayed on till 1998!), Jim Muirhead (1998-00), Craig Dowden (2000-01), Daryl Kroner (2001-02) and Jeremy Mills (2001-05)! In addition, great thanks goes to all who assisted with Crime Scene and to each and every person who has contributed to it since its conception and made it what it has become – a fun and effective vehicle for knowledge transfer and communication between Section members.

We realized as we were compiling this list that Crime Scene is 14 years old. And, it’s gone from about 5 pages to almost 40! Being an Editor for Crime Scene is quite rewarding, so we really do encourage you to take a moment and consider taking on the role and continuing to carry the torch for our Section. As the Editor, you will come to know many more colleagues across the country and learn about new things happening in our field before most others do! In addition, you will be a member of the CJP Section Executive and contribute to the development of the Section within CPA. Ok, that’s our attempt at a sales pitch.

Before we move on, we have one more sales pitch to make. The North American Correctional and Criminal Justice (NACCJP) conference in 2011 needs volunteers. Specifically, the following positions need to be filled before a decision can be made as to whether this conference will take place: (1) Continuing Education Coordinator, (2) Marketing Coordinator, (3) Sponsorship Coordinator, and (4) Social Event Coordinator. Please contact Jeremy Mills (MillsJF@csc-scc.gc.ca) if you are interested.

Now, turning to the introduction of this Issue of Crime Scene, you may recognize two recurring themes as you peruse through the engaging content. The first theme is one of leadership, activism, and generally pushing the frontiers of knowledge. The second theme emphasizes responsivity issues in various special populations. This Issue provides an array of interesting articles. In addition to our expert columnists who are writing on mental health, clinical training in Canada, comparing CPA to the Police Association, fetal alcohol affected youth, and hockey, there are also four Special Feature articles and a Research Brief. Topics here are varied and include politics and criminal justice psychology, drug treatment courts, teaching sex offenders with intellectual disabilities, and judges’ abilities to detect false confessions. Don’t miss all the abstracts of recently defended theses and dissertations, Section business information, recent publications, book reviews and conferences, and last but certainly not least, the Students’ Water Cooler which highlights the research of the Student Poster Prize Winner at this year’s CPA Convention. This is another jam-packed issue and we hope you enjoy it!

As always, before closing, we would like to thank all those who contributed to this Issue and we would especially like to thank Leslie Helmus and Jennifer Walker who acted as Review Editors of this Issue.

Wishing you all a reflective and productive fall!!

Cheers,

Tanya & Chantal

Welcome to all New Members!

View from the Top

The 2008 Convention in Halifax was a great success. The outstanding line-up of pre-convention workshops, keynote speakers, presentations and poster sessions attracted an unexpectedly large attendance. The beautiful setting for the event, which was right on the waterfront of historic Halifax, provided a magnificent backdrop for both the work and play associated with the convention. The Criminal Justice Section was well represented throughout the convention and a huge “thank you” goes to all who contributed either with a workshop, invited or keynote address, presentation, or poster. Thanks also go to the crew who helped with the setup and cleanup of our well-attended hospitality event.

Now that the fall is here, it is time to start thinking about the 2009 Convention in Montreal from June 11-13. The deadline for abstract submissions is November 15th so get your abstracts in. Let’s keep criminal justice topics well profiled at the 2009 Convention, as we continue to work toward another North American Correctional and Criminal Justice (NACCJP) conference in conjunction with the 2011 Convention in Toronto.
Meanwhile, one important task for the Criminal Justice Section will be to provide input into the development of a National Mental Health Strategy on issues pertaining to criminal justice. Further information on the Commission is available in a column by Dr. D. Cotton in the April 2008 issue of Crime Scene or at www.mentalhealthcommission.ca. The Commission is eager to receive input from organizations that are actively involved in issues related to mental health services or people involved in the criminal justice system.

In terms of a national strategy, one major question is what should it look like? It should encompass primary, secondary, and tertiary levels of care and take into consideration publicly funded services including private practitioners, Employee Assistance Programs, and not-for-profit groups such as the Canadian Mental Health Association. From a criminal justice perspective, what are the important issues that need to be included in it? What are the barriers to accessing our services? Where are the biggest gaps in the provision of services? Input could be in areas of mental health promotion, prevention, diversion, or the role of psychology in the criminal justice system. For example, are there enough educational opportunities and internship settings for the training of new criminal justice psychologists? Would a Psychology Doctoral Program with a specialization in criminal justice, linked to appropriate internships, help relieve supply and demand problems? What could be done to help sites that are experiencing recruitment and retention difficulties? This is a golden opportunity for everyone to have some input into the development of Canada’s first Mental Health Strategy. Forward your ideas and suggestions to me at folsomjn@csc-scc.gc.ca and I will compile our input and forward it to the Commission.

To date, the Criminal Justice Section has taken a stand on an issue that the Mental Health Commission has been examining under one of its key initiatives – stigma and discrimination against people with mental illnesses. The issue is the release of mental health apprehension information by police services to an employer who requests a police record check on a potential employee. There are no standard “police record checks” and while some forces do not include apprehensions that are made under the Mental Health Act, others do. Our Section has endorsed the position of the Mental Health and the Law Advisory Committee of the Mental Health Commission of Canada that such information should never be released to employers. One reason for this position is that stigma and the resulting discrimination that accompanies mental illness is very real and the release of this information would likely have a negative impact on the potential employee. Apprehensions under the Mental Health Act constitute health care information that should not be released by police services any more than would information on a back injury resulting from a car accident. If some aspect

After Thoughts

Welcome to our feedback centre, After Thoughts, which includes opinions received on Crime Scene in general, as well as commentary on specific articles.

On Crime Scene April 2008 ...

Great work once again. Kudos to the Executive for their contributions as well.

Just a note to tell you how much I’ve enjoyed reading Crime Scene since joining your Section this year. I was particularly delighted to read the article in the April 2008 issue by Natalie Jones and Shelley Brown entitled “Positive Reframing: The Benefits of Incorporating Protective Factors into Risk Assessment Protocols.” I have done a number of risk/needs assessments in the school district in which I work and the balance of risk and protective factors are always evaluated; however, the research on protective vs. promotive factors was most interesting and will help me in my work. Thanks for a very informative journal.

Thanks for the new issue of Crime Scene. As always, it’s very well written and informative.

Very nice job! Thank you.

This is again, so good.

One of the best issues of Crime Scene so far. In particular, the Special Features section was amazing and had an excellent variety of both humourous and thought-provoking articles. Kevin Nunes’ research brief was a fascinating, comprehensive, and balanced summary of an interesting field. And I love reading Crime Scene to catch up on tidbits such as recent publications, job opportunities, and upcoming conferences. Great job!

As always, thank you for your feedback! And thank you to all those who submit material and help make Crime Scene a success!

If you find an article particularly thought-provoking, we encourage you to write a response.

We welcome all After Thoughts, whether they pertain to the content of Crime Scene or general issues in criminal justice! We hope to hear from you!

Email us at:
Tanya.rugge@ps.gc.ca or Chantal_Langevin@hc-sc.gc.ca
of psychological functioning is relevant to job performance, then that information should be obtained by some other means. Consent could be obtained from the potential employee to undergo a psychological assessment in the same way that an employer may require an assessment of physical strength if lifting a certain amount of weight is essential to job performance. If mental health information was not released in a police record check, the rights of people with mental health apprehensions would be protected in that they will not be arbitrarily discriminated against for employment.

Are there similar issues that you are aware of that you would like to see addressed by the National Mental Health Strategy? If so, please send them to me as soon as possible.

This is an exciting time in the field of psychology, where there are expanding opportunities for input into mental health issues within the criminal justice system. We have many well-known Canadian pioneers to be grateful to for opening doors for us with their seminal work. Make your voice heard and stay active in the field!

Jean Folsom

---

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

By Dorothy Cotton, Ph.D.

**Missing Perspectives in Correctional Mental Health**

I was recently at a meeting where a bunch of people from all walks of correctional life were discussing the best ways of providing mental health care in correctional facilities. There were people there from correctional systems all over the world, people who work with both adults and youths. There were administrators and various types of mental health professionals. But two types of people were notably absent. One missing component was the “consumer” point of view. While there was one man who has a history of bipolar disorder, there was clearly no one with a mental illness who has “done time.” There were also no representatives of non-correctional mental health systems. And, not coincidentally, there was no mention of the current vogue in mental health, the Recovery Model.

Mental health interventions do come and go, and trends change. We are all obviously aware of the deinstitutionalization move of the last few decades which has arguably led to an increase in the number of people with mental illnesses who are incarcerated. But it is telling that what is generally regarded as the guiding principle of mental health systems in this decade is never mentioned in correctional circles.

What is the Recovery Model? One of its leading proponents, William Anthony, indicates that recovery is a very personal process of changing one’s attitudes, values, feelings, behaviours, skills, goals, and roles in order to live a satisfying, hopeful, and contributing life, even given one’s limitations. Recovery does not necessarily imply that an illness will go away in full, as the term “recovery” might indicate in some contexts, but rather that the individual will develop new meaning and purpose in life which includes managing one’s life optimally. While proponents of the recovery model do generally accept that medical interventions may be an essential part of the treatment for psychiatric disorders, they also stress the importance of housing, employment, social support, meaningful activity, and self determination.

One of the unique aspects of the Recovery Model is its emphasis on responsibility for, and control of, the recovery process. This model maintains that such responsibility must be given in large part to the person who has the condition - the person variously known as the patient/client/consumer, or even offender. The model uses such terms as empowerment, enabling, decision-making, and social connectedness. In other words, the person with the mental illness is central to the process of recovery, and treatments, interventions, and rehabilitation all revolve around the “patient’s” wants, goals, and ideas. Rather than the mental health professional prescribing and directing interventions, the person with the mental illness is director.

One is reminded of the old adage that “the inmates are running the asylum.” Typically, this is taken to mean that nothing good is happening and things are out of control, or perhaps being run by people who ought to BE controlled as opposed to being in control.

Needless to say, the notion of the inmates running the asylum does not sit comfortably with those administering correctional facilities. Control is a top-down endeavour and inmates are definitely not at the top. But where does that leave the offender who is mentally ill? How does one jibe principles of recovery with principles of correctional rehabilitation? While there are some similarities, there are clear philosophical differences. And while it would be tempting to ignore the Recovery Model given its apparent incompatibility with correctional approaches, the literature does suggest that recovery principles combined with evidence-based practices leads to better outcomes overall.

Does it lead to better correctional outcomes as well as better mental health outcomes? Well, I have not seen any literature which addresses the application of recovery model principles to correctional systems.

Time for some research? Might be a good time to talk to our colleagues who do NOT work in the criminal justice system.
Surely the experts in mental health care are both those who work in the mental health system, and those who live with mental illness.

**WE HOPE TO SEE YOU AT CPA IN MONTREAL, JUNE 11-13, 2009!**

**DON’T FORGET TO SUBMIT YOUR ABSTRACT BY NOVEMBER 15, 2008!**

**Column: Training in Criminal Justice Psychology**
By Mark Olver, Ph.D., RD Psych (SK)
Director-at-Large: Clinical and Training

**Training Issues in Clinical-Forensic Psychology:**
**Clinical-Forensic Training Opportunities in Canada**

When I first took over the role of Director-at-Large Clinical/Training from Dr. Andrew Starzomski, several ideas were presented to me to further develop this position on the Executive, including conducting a survey of sites that provide opportunities for specialized training. With invaluable assistance from Dr. Denise Preston (CSC Regional Chief Psychologist, Ontario) and our colleagues on this project (Dr. Joe Camilleri, Leslie Helmus, and Andrew Starzomski), we conducted a national survey of training opportunities across CSC and a summary of the preliminary findings was presented at this past CPA conference in Halifax. Since CPA, Denise and I have accumulated further responses across the regions. In this column, I am taking the opportunity to briefly discuss the issue and some of these findings.

CSC is the single largest employer of psychologists in the country, and for good reason, with over 20,000 federal offenders in CSC facilities or supervised in the community. As we know, the duties of psychologists range from specialized assessments, treatment, crisis intervention, consultation, research, administration, and last but not least, the training and supervision of up-and-coming clinical forensic psychologists via internships and practica.

If one delves into the recommendations of clinical psychology for instance (vis-à-vis the scientist-practitioner or scholar-practitioner model), the ideal training scenario would seem to be one of specific coursework (e.g., techniques in risk assessment, correctional intervention), research, and specialized clinical training and supervision with offender groups that draws on best practice and applies recommendations from the literature.

However, despite what seems to be an active interest in pursuing training in forensic psychology as demonstrated by the existence of fully operating graduate programs with healthy enrolments (e.g., Carleton University, University of Saskatchewan, and Simon Fraser University, to name a few), recruitment and retention has been problematic at best with some regions being more heavily impacted by the shortage in staffing than others.

Our intentions in conducting a training survey were to identify professional training opportunities at CSC sites, increase our understanding of potential barriers to training and supervision, and to obtain sufficient information to create a registry of sites across the country. (The broader goal in the end is to survey sites outside of CSC as well.) In brief, we drafted a 15-item survey (with French translation) which we distributed electronically to the Regional Chief Psychologists and to psychology department heads at CSC facilities across the five regions. After a reminder six weeks later, the Regional Chief Psychologists were further contacted and asked some questions about training and staffing. We have since followed up by sending the survey to all psychology positions in facilities across the country.

At the time of this writing, we have received 16 responses from 15 facilities, with one of these responses representing an entire region comprising nine institutions and four training sites. Of these respondents, 13 reported providing training opportunities in clinical-forensic psychology, with the sites representing prisons, regional treatment centres, and community facilities (e.g., parole offices). Although at first blush this response rate may appear low, further correspondence with the Regional Chief Psychologists suggested there to be at least 18 training sites across the five regions (representing 16/18 or an approximate 89% response rate). Moreover, some additional facilities responded who do not currently provide training/supervision, but expressed interest in doing so.

The training opportunities potentially available to students were broad and varied and included a range of assessment activities (risk, diagnostic, neuropsych), treatment (group and individual), crisis/suicide intervention, and the provision of these kinds of services to diverse offender groups (e.g., sex offenders, violent offenders, female offenders). Some sites provided research opportunities for students’ dissertations and theses as well. Sites on average supervised about two trainees per year, and the majority of sites had some form of coordinated contact with the local university or internship site (e.g., via meetings with interns, contact with the Director of clinical training, etc.).

The comments by psychology staff who provided training/supervision to interns and practicum students suggested they viewed these opportunities in very positive terms. However, several common barriers to providing further training/supervision were identified, with the most common...
reasons cited simply being too busy, or a perceived lack of support for these activities (e.g., reduction in work volume to free up time for training/supervision). Although most sites had at least one psychologist employee who had received training in the form of a practicum or internship rotation previously, several sites reported retaining few of their trainees for further employment afterward.

Perhaps predictably, most sites across regions reported being understaffed. Follow-up correspondence with the Regional Chief Psychologists showed wide variability in need: vacancies in psychologist positions ranged from about 10% to 30% with the Ontario and Prairie Regions having the highest number of vacancies.

Tentatively, it appears that the sites providing training and supervision provide a broad range of excellent opportunities and site supervisors seem to find this a rewarding, important, and worthwhile professional activity. Barriers do exist in providing more training and supervision, and when such opportunities are available, concerns do remain in retaining trainees for permanent employment afterward. A more detailed report of our findings and possible recommendations will be forthcoming.

I was sitting in Le Grand Salon at the Queen Elizabeth Hotel in Montreal when I had one of those “Huh???” moments - not to be confused with an “aha!” moment. I don’t know if this happens to other people as often as it happens to me, but every now and then I find myself looking dispassionately at where I am and what I am doing, and I wonder how I got there. This was one of those moments. I was at the closing banquet and awards gala at the annual convention of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP). I am an associate member of this organization. That, in and of itself, is enough to give me a “huh?” moment. I am not sure that I actually meet any of the criteria to belong to this group but I was put up for membership by several members of the Board so here I am. Whenever I attend one of their conferences (and this is my fourth), I am reminded of the famous words of my namesake Dorothy in The Wizard of Oz who commented something to the effect that “We’re not in Kansas anymore.” I have been to psychology conferences at this same hotel but I can tell you, police chief conferences are not the same. There is no doubt that their culture is different. Imagine a CPA conference which includes a several course formal (and I mean tux-and-long-gown formal) meal, dance etc. with all the wine you can drink included. Imagine a CPA annual general meeting where pretty well all the voting members attend - and vote - on a variety of resolutions. Imagine a psychology conference where everyone actually wears their name tag and there are security people who happily escort you out the door if you do not, regardless of what important person you claim to be. Imagine a psychology conference where no one walks out of the boring sessions. And imagine that instead of endless rows of books, that the Exhibits section contains cars and busses and weapons and amazing array of flashing lights.

This is clearly NOT a group of psychology practitioners. It is a very different culture with different traditions, different expectations, different habits.

This is of course one of the challenges that face those of us who work with police services. How do we bridge the gulf between us and them? How do we even become aware of the differences - preferably before we do something dumb?

I like to think of these issues as essentially the same issues we face when we attempt to provide services to any cultural group that is different from our own. How do we blend our culture with theirs?

In social psychology, we talk about “Acculturation”, the exchange of cultural features that results when groups come into ongoing firsthand contact. There are a variety of ways that this can play out:

- assimilation, where people lose their original culture and convert to the new culture lock, stock and barrel;
- marginalization, where people lose their old culture but never really quite acquire the new one, thus ending up with no real cultural affiliation (e.g., alienated);
- segregation, when the two groups just continue on their separate merry ways; and
- integration, where people both maintain aspects of their own culture but also adapt features of the new culture.

It is interesting to watch psychologists who work with police services and see how they handle the cultural differences. In some cases, psychologists don’t even seem to realize there are such differences and they continue on as they always have. In some case I have seen psychologists be very critical
of the police world and end up alienated from it. I have also seen psychologists get assimilated, giving up psychology traditions and priorities and essentially becoming police wannabees.

For those of us who want to work in the police world but not be swallowed by it, how can we achieve this? Being aware of the process is of course part of it. The bigger challenge is often learning what we need to know in order to provide good services. You might try...

- Go on ride-alongs. Most police services are happy to take you along on a shift so that you have a better idea of what they actually do.
- Read what they read. I recommend a subscription to Blueline magazine, a national police magazine (www.blueline.ca). It is inexpensive but will keep you up to date on what police consider their issues to be, and how they approach them. The RCMP also has a magazine and CACP puts out a magazine called (cleverly) Police Chief which is available online (www.cacp.ca).
- Take a cop to lunch. You might want to chat up the HR person at any police organization you do work for, or perhaps a senior executive, and find out what the issues are for that department and what problems they consider primary. Once you have done this, they will likely have other ideas about how you can become more familiar with their operation.
- Stop watching those cop shows on TV. They really give you a warped idea of what policing is all about.
- Take all the U.S.-based literature with a grain of salt. Obviously we have to rely on U.S. literature in many areas but the fact is that there is a fairly significant difference between policing here and in the U.S. It is Canadian policing that you need to immerse yourself in.

And that really is the point, in the end. In order to both understand and appreciate a culture, some degree of firsthand exposure to their culture is really essential.

---

**Column: Beyond a Reasonable Doubt**

By Garry Fisher, Ph.D.

**Co-Director-at-Large: Psychology in the Courts**

**Fetal Alcohol Affected Youth: Some Criminal Justice System Implications**

Increasingly, Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders (FASD) are being identified and diagnosed with challenging implications for the courts when these youths become involved in the criminal justice system.

In Manitoba, a specific Court Assessment Project was initiated several years ago. To date, approximately 40 youth have undergone a formal assessment process, with information forwarded to the Court related to their functional abilities and diagnosis. This project has three components: (1) a group of Court Assessment Project workers gather background information, provide support to the youth and family during the assessment process, and provide follow-up intervention or community liaison to assist in program planning; (2) psychologists provide psychometric data across the six psychological domains (there are nine domains in total) of general intellectual functioning, memory, attention/concentration, level of academic achievement, adaptive functioning abilities, and executive functioning; and (3) physicians from a Genetic Disorders Clinic conduct a medical examination and provide diagnoses.

Across time, several issues have arisen surrounding the impact of FASD, with a general sense that individuals with this difficulty should be seen by the courts as having a sense of “diminished responsibility” with respect to their behaviour. Diagnostically, an FASD or ARND (Alcohol-Related Neurodevelopmental Disorder) conclusion is found when a history of maternal alcohol consumption while the child was in utero is confirmed, and when severe deficits (as defined by two standard deviations below the mean) in a minimum of three domain areas occur. From a practical perspective, these diagnostic criteria are relatively straightforward. From an intervention perspective, however, given that any three out of the nine domain areas could demonstrate severe deficits, the pattern on a day-to-day basis is one in which youth with a similar diagnosis may have very different patterns of functional strengths and weaknesses, as they may differ in which domain areas deficits are found to occur. Treatment planning issues and information conveyed to the Court thus need to be considered more on an individual as opposed to group basis. Issues of responsibility are complex. FASD youth seem aware of their behaviour, and can “pass” fitness issues such as in their capacity to instruct their lawyer. Of greater issue is an underlying sense of limited ability to engage consistently in good decision-making and to control tendencies toward behavioural impulsivity; these concerns derive more from neurodevelopmental deficits as opposed to being more “personality” in nature (such as what
may be expected in Conduct Disorder or Oppositional Defiant Disordered individuals.

Discussion of “what FASD adolescents are like” assumes a high degree of commonality among youth with this diagnosis. In reality, these adolescents may have quite different clinical pictures, and broad generalizations seem inappropriate. As a result, an FASD diagnosis is somewhat different than what psychologists may typically encounter. For example, an individual diagnosed as “Depressed” would reasonably be expected to experience feelings of sadness and/or hopelessness/helplessness. With FASD, different domain areas in which deficits may be found result in differing clinical impressions and needs across individuals. At a Court level, therefore, more individual assessment of capacity from a fitness perspective, and differing sets of recommendations related to intervention are necessary. At an institutional level, often-found patterns of behavioural impulsivity and failure to keep track of events through deficits in working memory create behavioural problems in terms of general supervision and compliance with the social and behavioural expectations inherent in a correctional environment.

The group of adolescents thus far seen through the Court Assessment Project may be typified as being primarily property types of offenders (car thieves), who demonstrate recurrent criminal justice system involvement with short-lived times in the community due to a pattern of failing to follow supervision expectations (such as abiding by curfews). Generally, it appears that executive functioning deficits seem to be one domain that quite consistently demonstrates problems for many of these youths. It is likely that deficits in organizational and planning abilities, incapacity to develop good problem-solving strategies, and inability to inhibit tendencies toward impulsive responding all contribute to recurrent community supervision failures.

Although preliminary in nature, results of psychological testing across the 42 youth, the majority of whom are between 14 and 17 years old, find patterns of generalized intellectual deficits. The mean WISC-III Full Scale IQ finds an average of 72 (standard deviation of 9.46), with WAIS-III Full Scale IQ estimates averaging 76 (standard deviation of 7.50). In examining other deficit areas, the mean WISC-III Full Scale IQ estimates averaging 76 (standard deviation of 7.50) is found for Executive Functioning (BRIEF Global Executive Functioning System, and the Behavioural Rating Inventory for Executive Functioning (BRIEF Global Executive Composite T score mean of 74, standard deviation: 7.02).

In summary, with respect to FASD adolescents, it is recommended that practicing clinicians approach the Court in providing information related to a specific individual’s pattern of strengths and weaknesses, as well as implications regarding any concerns about criminal responsibility or fitness. Across time, FASD youth have posed significant challenges in terms of risk of recidivism. Even at earlier stages of criminal justice system interface, such as during police interviewing processes, they have often been found to be quite inconsistent in the information they provide (making it appear as though they are lying), or are vulnerable to offering false confessions due to their confusion regarding the questions asked of them. Both of these are related to difficulties in tracking and recalling events across time, as well as the presence of more generalized cognitive impairments.

The contribution of Dr. K. Somers, C.Psych. in completing some of the clinical assessments associated with the findings reported, and Ms. A. Hills, in doing psychometric work and data analysis, should be greatly acknowledged.

SEND US AN AFTER THOUGHT TO LET US KNOW WHAT YOU THINK OF THE NEW COLUMN: KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER

Column: Knowledge Development and Transfer
By Joseph A. Camilleri, Ph.D.,
Director-at-Large: Web Coordinator

How Hockey and Facial Features Can Inform Risk Assessment Research

In this Issue’s column, I review one article that studied the relationship between facial metrics and aggression and describe how morphological variables might be of interest to forensic psychology research.

In your face: Facial metrics predict aggressive behaviour in the laboratory and in varsity and professional hockey players (Carré & McCormick, 2008).

This recent paper from Brock University might be of particular interest to Canadian readers of Crime Scene because it marries two interests: hockey and aggression etiology (it sure caught my attention). The researchers were interested in identifying a physical correlate of aggressive behaviour. Recently, there have been a number of studies that investigated whether certain facial characteristics are honest signals of personality characteristics and behaviours. Knowing that a higher facial width-to-height ratio results from
more testosterone during pubertal development (e.g., on average men have a higher ratio than women), and that testosterone also has organizational effects on behavioural dispositions, Carré and McCormick (2008) tested the hypothesis that facial width-to-height ratio predicts within-sex variation in aggression. Although the relationship between testosterone and aggression has been studied quite extensively (see, for example, Book, Starzyk, & Quinsey, 2001), fewer studies have addressed morphological correlates of aggression.

One theoretical explanation for why there may be facial cues of aggressiveness is that in our ancestral past, the ability to identify aggressors would have provided an advantage when choosing who to compete with for resources. Similarly, the ability to advertise one’s aggressiveness without having to engage in such acts would alleviate any attendant costs.

Not only did Carré and McCormick find a relationship between facial width-to-height ratio and reactive aggression in men, this ratio correlated with penalty minutes per game among athletes in the National Hockey League! This latter result was found when collapsing across all teams, and when looking at each Canadian team individually. Anyone who knows of Tie Domi should not be surprised with these findings.

While reading this article I contemplated the practical utility of this research. The most striking result was that the ratio accounted for 29% of the variability in penalty minutes. The strength in predicting overt behaviour suggests this ratio might be a useful risk factor in predicting violent recidivism. The most striking result was that the ratio correlated with penalty minutes. The ability to advertize one’s aggressiveness without having to engage in such acts would alleviate any attendant costs.

Not only did Carré and McCormick find a relationship between facial width-to-height ratio and reactive aggression in men, this ratio correlated with penalty minutes per game among athletes in the National Hockey League! This latter result was found when collapsing across all teams, and when looking at each Canadian team individually. Anyone who knows of Tie Domi should not be surprised with these findings.

While reading this article I contemplated the practical utility of this research. The most striking result was that the ratio accounted for 29% of the variability in penalty minutes. The strength in predicting overt behaviour suggests this ratio might be a useful risk factor in predicting violent recidivism. Though many static risk assessments include historical and psychological characteristics, none that I am aware of include physical characteristics. In addition to facial metrics, other physical characteristics have been associated with antisociality, such as physical asymmetry (Lalumière, Harris, & Rice, 2001). A question worth investigating, therefore, is whether including these physical correlates of aggression improves the predictive accuracy of currently available assessments.

Other Developments

Using basic research to solve real-world problems is an important topic in any area of applied psychology. The American Journal of Community Psychology, for example, recognized the significance of bridging the gap between science and practice by devoting an issue to this topic (Volume 41, Issue 3-4). One article that might be of interest is on child maltreatment and youth violence (Saul et al., 2008). Their public health approach to prevention outlines the link between research on violence and the development of prevention strategies.

**References**


* denotes reviewed article

---

**Recently Defended Dissertations & Theses**

**The Psychology of Partner Sexual Coercion**

Joseph A. Camilleri, Ph.D.
Queen’s University

There have been few investigations of sexual coercion in relationships. I conducted several studies to develop a measure of partner sexual coercion and to identify its proximate causes and the relevant personal characteristics of male perpetrators. Community participants’ self-reported propensity to engage in various tactics to obtain sex from a reluctant partner clustered into a subscale relating to sexual coercion and a subscale pertaining to sexual coaxing. These subscales had excellent internal reliability, construct validity, criterion validity, and were used to test predictions in subsequent studies. I tested the application of Lalumière et al.’s (2005) three-path model for the development of sexually coercive behavior in general to sexual coercion in relationships. Self-reported interest in partner sexual coercion in a community sample was significantly related to psychopathy, but not age or neurodevelopmental insults. I confirmed the importance of psychopathy in this model by comparing men who raped their partner to other sex offender groups. Another characteristic of sex offenders, sexual deviance, was tested for its application to partner rapists. Unlike non-partner rapists, men who raped their partner exhibited low sexual arousal to rape scenarios, similar to community controls. Cuckoldry risk, a hypothesized proximate cause of partner sexual coercion, was also tested. Direct cues of cuckoldry risk were related to self-reported propensity for partner sexual coercion, whereas indirect cues of cuckoldry risk were related to sexual coaxing. In a forensic sample, most partner rapists had experienced cuckoldry risk prior to committing their offence, and they experienced more cuckoldry risk events than partner assailants. A necessary condition of the cuckoldry risk hypothesis is that men should exhibit sexual arousal to cues signaling cuckoldry risk. Men
in a community sample exhibited as much sexual arousal to stories depicting partner infidelity as they did to stories depicting consenting sex with their partners, and men who were currently in relationships showed greater arousal to stories of infidelity than consenting sex. Taken together, my results suggest psychopathy and cuckoldry risk are important contributors to partner sexual coercion.

For further information, please contact Dr. Joseph Camilleri at: jcamilleri@wsc.ma.edu.

Parental Involvement in Youth Justice Proceedings
Julia M. C. Broeking, Ph.D.
University of Toronto

Despite the important roles envisioned for parents under Canadian youth justice legislation, there is a lack of research on parental involvement in legal proceedings. Using a mixed-methods design with multiple data sources, in the present study I investigated parents’ involvement in youth justice proceedings. The following research questions were examined: What are youths' and youth justice officials' attitudes to, and perceptions of, parents' involvement under current legislation? What is the extent and nature of parental involvement and what factors predict these? What is the relationship between parental involvement and outcomes at various stages in the youth justice process? Is Canada's youth justice legislation effective and meeting its goal of parental involvement? Sources of data included interviews with 121 young people who had come into contact with the youth justice system, as well as six key informant groups: police (n = 10), judges (n = 7), defence counsel (n = 8), crown counsel (n = 7) counsel, and probation officers (n = 9). Interview data were supplemented by observations (N = 450) of youth court proceedings. Results suggested that many parents had limited involvement in certain aspects of their children’s legal proceedings but that involvement varied depending on the context (i.e., police vs. court). Youth and different groups of justice officials showed distinct perceptions of parental roles and responsibilities across the two contexts. Findings indicated that level of parental involvement was related to youth and parent factors, relational variables, and socio-contextual factors. Results also suggested that appropriate parental involvement can bring positive outcomes for youth (e.g., granting of bail). Findings are discussed in terms of theoretical and practical implications, and directions for future research are outlined.

For further information, please contact Dr. Julia Broeking at: jbroeking@sympatico.ca.

Predicting the Offending Trajectories of Canadian Juvenile Probationers: A Latent Growth Curve Modeling Approach
Annie K. Yessine, Ph.D.
Carleton University

This study sought to identify the distinctive criminal pathways, and specify the early characteristics that predict future offending trajectories for a Canadian sample of young offenders. The sample was comprised of 514 male and female adjudicated juveniles who were followed into middle adulthood. Using latent growth curve mixture modeling, the results revealed the existence of two main types of offenders who differed in composition, offending activity, and desistance throughout the life-course. One group, representing approximately 12% of the offenders, showed a chronic high level of offending behaviour throughout the life-course. The offending frequency/severity of this group increased steadily from adolescence onwards. The remainder of the sample was characterized by infrequent and/or less serious involvement in criminal behaviour over the years. The offending pattern of this latter group remained fairly stable although it tended to show a slight decline in frequency/severity from age 26 onwards. The offenders classified in the chronic high trajectory group disproportionately engaged in a wider variety of offences as well as more of the violent crimes. Of the criminogenic risk/needs domains studied, the youths’ patterns of associations and their use of alcohol and/or drugs predicted group membership. Not surprisingly, the chronic high trajectory group comprised more offenders who had negative and unconstructive ties with their peers and who had substance use problems than the stable low group. Overall, the findings are consistent with Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber’s (1996), Moffitt’s (1993), and Patterson, Reid, and Dishion’s (1992) theoretical taxonomy. Policy and practical implications are discussed and directions for future research are suggested.

For further information, please contact Dr. Annie Yessine at: YessineAN@csc-scc.gc.ca.

Neuropsychological and Personality Risk Factors of Aggression in Forensic and Non-forensic Psychiatric Inpatients
Yukiko Konomi, Ph.D.
The Adler School of Professional Psychology, Chicago

The current study investigated the factors that are associated with aggressive behavior in forensic and non-forensic psychiatric inpatients using Nussbaum’s (1997) psychobiological model of aggression, which classifies behaviour in three subtypes: predatory, defensive, and irritable. A total of 80 clinical records of the most recent...
admissions to the adult inpatient units at the Whitby Mental Health Centre (WMHC) were reviewed for number of violent incidents that resulted in seclusion placement. To test predicted theoretical associates of the model, a number of clinically utilized psychometric instruments were examined in relationship to the types of seclusion placements including the Integrated Visual and Auditory Continuous Performance Test (IVA), Iowa Gambling Task, Temperament and Character Inventory, Personality Assessment Inventory, and State Trait Anger Expression Inventory – 2nd Edition. Approximately 87% of seclusions were classified as irritable in nature and significantly correlated with IVA Full-Scale Attention, IVA Full-Scale Response Control, AGG, ANT, Trait Anger, Anger Control-In, and Anger Control-Out. The stepwise regression analysis indicated that IVA-Full Scale Attention and AGG-P accounted for 69.2% of the variance. There was no significant difference between the two subject groups with regards to the frequency and the type of violent incidents. In conclusion, the results of the current study indicated that Nussbaum’s aggression classification model is effective in describing the nature of the incidents and identifying risk factors of inpatient violence in both forensic and non-forensic populations. Findings have clinical implications for inpatient violence risk management.

For further information, please contact Dr. Yukiko Konomi at: konomiy@wmhc.ca.

Consistency and Credibility of Intimate Partner Abuse Reports: An Examination of Pathological or Generalisable Phenomena
Sarah L. Desmarais, Ph.D.
Simon Fraser University

Despite mixed research findings, there remains a pervasive belief in the legal community that testimonial inconsistencies are detrimental to eyewitness, complainant, and defendant credibility generally, and to domestic violence complainants in particular. Studied extensively in other contexts, little research has examined consistency of reports of intimate partner abuse (IPA) victimization over time and its role in perceived credibility. The first study of this dissertation compared consistency of reports of IPA victimization with consistency of everyday autobiographical memory event prevalence. Study 1 participants (n = 276) completed two calendar-based online surveys approximately six weeks apart. Participants who self-identified as experiencing psychological, physical, or sexual abuse in a romantic relationship (n = 138) completed questions assessing IPA victimization and participation in leisure activities (LA). A matched sample of 138 comparison participants completed only the LA questions. Few differences between report consistency of abusive experiences and everyday memory events were found. When significant effects were observed, results demonstrated differences between categories of autobiographical memory events within but not between IPA and LA reports. The second study investigated whether IPA allegations are received with scepticism, and if so, why. Study 2 participants (n = 374) evaluated the effectiveness of a ‘complainant’ reporting on IPA victimization or LA participation during two interviews. Complainant gender and consistency of reports across repeated interviews were manipulated. Results demonstrated that consistent complainants were evaluated more favourably than were inconsistent complainants, as were LA compared with IPA complainants. Further analyses supported the role of social categorization in evaluations of complainant effectiveness, demonstrating that when a complainant is seen as a member of one’s own group, credibility is enhanced: Compared to complainants reporting on IPA victimization, LA ‘complainants’ were judged to be more similar and more likely to belong to the same group as participants, which was associated with more positive evaluations of LA than IPA complainant effectiveness. Overall, findings suggest that although actual differences in consistency of event prevalence are few, reports of IPA victimization are received with greater scepticism than reports of everyday events. Such prejudice may contribute to disbelief of IPA allegations, potentially precluding appropriate legal intervention.

For further information, please contact Dr. Sarah Desmarais at: sarah.desmarais@ubc.ca.

The Role of the Therapeutic Alliance in Psychotherapy with Sexual Offenders
Daniel B. Rothman, Ph.D.
University of Manitoba

The present study investigated which components of the therapeutic alliance (i.e., therapist empathy, unconditionality, positive regard, and congruence; the client-therapist bond; client-therapist collaboration on the tasks and goals of treatment) were predictive of positive therapeutic outcomes (i.e., global functioning; attainment of specific treatment goals; healthy intimacy development; reduction in cognitive distortions) in psychotherapy with a population of male sexual offenders. Participants were 44 men participating in either community- or institutionally-based treatment. Hierarchical regression analyses, guided by an exploratory factor analysis, indicated that the quality of the therapeutic alliance was significantly predictive of indices of treatment outcome, producing medium to large effect sizes. In particular, therapist empathy was significantly associated with most outcome indices, accounting for up to 28% of the variability in outcome. The findings were robust, and generally unaffected by ancillary variables such as risk level.
and treatment duration. Quantitative results were largely consistent with qualitative data, which indicated that participants attributed treatment success to factors associated with therapeutic style, instillation of hope, social connectedness, and healthy skill development. Results are consistent with the general psychotherapy literature and suggestive of a fundamental role for the therapeutic alliance in the treatment of sexual offender populations. Implications are discussed with regard to the treatment of sexual offender populations.

For further information, please contact Dr. Daniel Rothman at: daniel@fps-ea.com.

### Motivational Decision-Making and Violence in Forensic Psychiatric Inpatients: A Neurobiological Perspective of Aggression

**Stephanie Bass, M.A.**  
**University of Toronto**

This study provides behavioural support for a novel neurobiological decision-making model proposed by Nussbaum (2005), as it applies to an aggression typology (Nussbaum, Saint-Cyr, & Bell, 1997), using a forensic inpatient sample. The Iowa Gambling Task (IGT; Bechara, Damasio, Damasio, and Anderson, 1994) was the main focus of this study. It was analyzed using two different scoring methodologies: the traditional method of subtracting disadvantageous from advantageous choices by 20-trial blocks, and a novel method based on Yechiam, Busemeyer, Stout, and Bechara’s (2005) expectancy-valence model. The Yechiam et al. (2005) approach provides scores for three separate aspects of decision-making (attentional, learning, and response-choice consistency). The results show that the Predatory aggression group had the worst performance on the IGT based on traditional scoring, indicating poor decision-making skills in the face of immediately available motivational cues. Irritable and Delusional Defensive aggression groups, likely reflecting cognitive impairment associated with their primary psychiatric disorders, scored at around chance levels. Further, Predatory aggression was best predicted by the traditional scoring method of the IGT, while Irritable aggression was optimally predicted by cognitive decision-making processes reflected by the expectancy-valence model equations. Further, real-life decision-making is best predicted from IGT scores based on the final three blocks of the task. Based on these findings, the utilization of the aggression typology and the inclusion of these clinical measures could enhance and refine violent risk assessment, suggest targeted treatment for the specific aggression types, and monitor response to the interventions prior to releasing the individuals into the community.

For further information, please contact Stephanie Bass at: stephanie.bass@utoronto.ca.

### Effectiveness of the Probation and Parole Service Delivery Model (PPSDM) in Reducing Recidivism

**Terri L. Simon, M.A**  
**University of Saskatchewan**

In 2001, the province of Ontario implemented a new policy aimed at incorporating “best practices” from the literature into probation and parole services. This new policy, named the Probation and Parole Service Delivery Model (PPSDM), has several objectives, including: a) employ assessment-based decisions; b) assume a case management approach in probation and parole supervision; c) consider risk to reoffend and criminogenic needs in intervention and supervision; d) reserve the highest level of supervision for those most at risk to reoffend; and, e) use the least intrusive levels of intervention necessary while ensuring public safety. The policy also included the development of five supervision “streams” based on risk level, criminogenic needs, and other factors, for which supervision and intervention standards differ (Coté, 2003). A random sample of 200 from each of the five streams was chosen from 2004 and 2005 and matched to a sample supervised prior to PPSDM implementation (from 1998) resulting in an overall sample of 2890 offenders. The groups were compared on various measures of recidivism to determine whether the PPSDM has been effective in reducing recidivism. No significant differences in recidivism rates were found between the comparison and PPSDM groups. However, the recidivism was marginally less severe for the PPSDM groups, along with higher rates of “fail to comply” type offences. These results suggest possible increased enforcement of technical violations, which may have contributed to the lack of significant differences in recidivism rates. Results are discussed in relation to effective correctional practices and policy implementation.

For further information, please contact Terri Simon at: terri.simon@usask.ca.
From time to time over the last three decades (gosh, has it been that long?), I have found myself reflecting on the role, or lack thereof, of the Criminal Justice Psychology (CJP) Section in the political area. Given that we have once again entered the most political of times as we do every five (or is that four?) years, I am prompted to share the following musings.

What is the role of psychology, the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA), and, more specifically, the CJP Section in the political area? These are questions that seem to trigger a collective sense of uneasiness. As social scientists and advocates for the best interest of our individual and collective clientele, as per CPA ethical guidelines, one would think that we have more than a passing role to play. Yet my sense is that too often we remain silent on important political issues that relate to the application of criminal justice in Canadian society. Maybe it is our Canadian, psychological, and professional nature not to do so.

I suspect that there are at least three understandable, indeed, excusable reasons for our history of being a relatively passive observer in the Canadian political scene. First, we are a collection of polite, Canadian professionals and it does not suit our nature or self-image to be seen as railing against the winds of politically driven policies. Rather, we quietly and calmly accept our task of working within the strictures imposed upon us. Contrast this with the current deliberations in the American Psychological Association (APA), which is challenging the U.S. government over its ‘cruel and unusual’ practices at Guantanamo Bay and elsewhere. Through a groundswell movement, members of APA have been successful to bring this issue to the fore of APA by forcing a motion of condemnation that is currently being voted on by mail-in ballot among all 10,000 APA members. One’s immediate reaction to such a comparison might be, “Well fortunately we have no such facility or government-supported practices in Canada.” True, but we certainly do have our own special detention facility, about which we know very little and it would be even less if it weren’t for a few vocal defense lawyers.

I suggest that a second reason for our political silence comes from a belief that we must remain above the morass of political nonsense that we see on the evening news and so distain. This position is built, in part, on our sense of independence that might be contaminated, or worse yet, perceived to be contaminated by entering political waters. Our training is couched in principles of scientific objectivity, itself an elusive if not impossible ideal to which we aspire. But to engage the political level is tantamount to losing our scientific way. By remaining silent, we don’t sully our scientific and professional hands.

A third reason for our relative inactivity relates to our “social location” in the criminal justice community. Many of our members are government employees. A former commissioner of CSC was fond of remarking, with pride, that the Correctional Service of Canada is the largest employer of psychologists in Canada, while provincial corrections also contribute significantly to the employment market of psychologists. As civil servants, we, including your humble scribe, have been trained, not only in clinical confidentiality, but in good, and required, civil servant practices of political non-interference and the oath of secrecy. By extension, other members may work in a consulting or fee-for-service basis, or feel beholden to government in return for access to offenders, the life blood for many of our research interests. In reality, we are cautioned by the ‘don’t bite the hand that feeds you’ sensibility. For better or worse, the dynamics of our professional relationship with government muzzles our experiential and evidence-based views about how the justice system ought to operate in Canada.

Yet other academic, professional, and criminal justice agencies, even in our own country, have been very active and vocal, and persistently so, in the political arena of justice. Recently, in August of this year, the Canadian Bar Association (CBA) invited the Minister of Justice to speak at its annual convention in Quebec. By all accounts, it was a lively event, to understate the obvious. Now I know you are probably thinking, “Well, what do you expect? They were lawyers!”

[Insert your favourite lawyer joke here]

But I ask in reply, when was the last time we had the Minister of Public Safety speak at any of our gatherings, let alone actually challenged a minister of the Crown? In Quebec, Minister Nicholson was hotly confronted about issues such as the “Tackling Violent Crime Act,” the government’s failure to become involved in death penalty sentences of Canadians beyond our own borders, the dismantling of the Law Commission of Canada, and the dwindling resources for
legal aid in Canada. Apparently, praise for the government’s justice policy “was virtually nonexistent” (Tibbetts, 2008).

Over the last decade, my representation of CPA on a loosely knit coalition of organizations, known as the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice (NAACJ), has also been a real eye opener about the kind of advocacy that exists behind the scenes in the criminal justice arena. Indeed, part of the fundamental, albeit self-proclaimed, mandate of such organizations as the John Howard Society, Elizabeth Fry Society, St Leonard’s Society, Canadian Criminal Justice Association, the Canadian Bar Association, Salvation Army, and all NAACJ members, is to represent the rights and interests of offenders across our country and to advocate for them. I am continually impressed with the energy and enthusiasm that these nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) have maintained over the long term. They remain indefatigable in their efforts on everything ranging from prisoner rights, due process, services for offenders (both individually and collectively), critical analyses of government policy, and demands for government accountability when things go awry, the most recent tragic example being the death of Ashley Smith at Grand Valley Institution in October, 2007. What does psychology, CPA, and the CJP Section say (i.e., how can they inform in a critical, but instructive, manner?) about such matters?

In other areas, academics seem readily available to jump into politically hot (and important) issues, sometimes on both sides of the fray. Think of global warming, or maybe a little closer to our (substantive) home, the government’s decision to remove its support of Insite, the safe injection site for drug addicts in Vancouver. Epidemiologists have vigorously weighed in on the ‘harm reduction’ side and Brian Day, president of the Canadian Medical Association, has challenged the Minister of Health, Tony Clement: “We have an opinion based on scientific evidence, the minister has come to a different conclusion,” and “the minister is off base in calling into question the ethics of physicians” (Piccard, 2008).

I dare say other disciplines are also more prominent in advocating positions based on their academic perspective in the arena of criminal justice politics. We are forever hearing the ‘social location’ mantra from our colleagues in criminology/sociology that blankets all matters of criminal justice (e.g., “Less poverty means less crime,” Cuthand, 2008).

[Insert your favourite sociologist/criminologist joke here]

As an extreme example of academic cross-over, my own campus boasts a faculty member, Janice MacKinnon, who not only took leave of her position to win a seat in the provincial legislature, but then was appointed Minister of Finance and now, having returned to academia, is seen commenting on Canadian politics regularly on Peter Mansbridge’s “At Issue” panel on the CBC. But then again, as she is a political scientist, this is quite understandable (and acceptable).

[Insert your favourite political scientist joke here]

Clearly, we, as a body, have not been totally silent and a tip of the hat really goes to those who have risen above the call of duty to make our voices heard. The recent letter, referred to later in this issue of Crime Scene, is an example of how an ad hoc working group of our members, spearheaded by Juanita Mureika, can come together and generate a coherent, purposeful document. In this case, the open letter addresses our serious concerns about the course of youth justice in Canada that the current government has proposed and was moving through the political process, at least until it was stalled, perhaps only temporarily, by the pending election.

As another example of our activities at the “small-p” political level, our chairperson, Jean Folsom, has recently issued a statement with the support of the Section Executive. Jean has written a letter to the Mental Health Commission of Canada’s Mental Health and the Law Advisory Committee in support of the Committee’s response to The Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC) draft policy on mental health discrimination and police records checks (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2007). Basically the committee’s position that has been conveyed to the OHRC is that police should simply never report mental health apprehensions on “police record checks.”

Some of our members, along with CPA staff, have from time to time jumped into the breach by intervening at the highest level of our political process, the government committee, in our case the Justice Committee. But my observation of this kind of highly visible effort, the presentation of a ‘brief’ to government, is just that, brief. The effort, which does require considerable presentation and either political connections or good luck to obtain is a ‘one off’ kind of activity that is not followed up with the kind of advocacy that is required to impact significantly on the political process.

Our collective presence in the popular media affords another mechanism for promoting sound, empirically based advice for the course of criminal justice (including police, courts, and corrections) in Canada. Yet I dare say our profile is miniscule in comparison to other nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that are active in the criminal justice system. This is not to suggest that we need a Canadian Dr. Phil on the airways, but we certainly could benefit from a more organized effort on this front. To this end, we are almost completely, with the minor exception of assistance from the CPA central office, dependent on voluntary contributions from our membership.
We should also note that some of our members’ academic writing has spoken to the politics of justice issues. Our good friend and mentor, Paul Gendreau, is perhaps our most visible and prolific example. You will agree that there is more than a little political innuendo to the following titles:

- “Does ‘punishing smarter’ work? An assessment of the new generation of alternative sanctions in probation” (Gendreau, Paparozzi, Little, & Goddard, 1993);
- “The rise and fall of boot camps: A case study in common-sense corrections” (Cullen, Blevins, Trager, & Gendreau, 2005);
- “Generating rational correctional policies: An introduction to advances in cumulating knowledge” (Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 2000);
- “Making prisons safer and more humane environments” (Gendreau, & Keyes, 2001);
- “The effects of prison sentences and intermediate sanctions on recidivism” (Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau, 2002);
- “Beyond correctional quackery: Professionalism and the possibility of effective treatment” (Latessa, Cullen, & Gendreau, 2002); and this, just in,
- “Sense, common sense, and nonsense” (Flagel & Gendreau, 2008), and not yet out,
- “The common sense revolution and correctional policy” (Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Paparozzi, in press).

But the good Doctor Gendreau is getting a little long in the tooth (tit for tat, Paul) and we need to rely on members with just a tad more youth and energy to assume the mantle. I say this because the journal audience is chronically apolitical and there is little to no natural seepage into the political brain trust of the country without a nonacademically based strategy, which we seldom have. If we do not want to be left tilting at windmills in a business that we fail to understand, parallel efforts are required to give our professional and academically based initiatives some political legs.

As noted at the outset, there is probably no better time to think about the politics of criminal justice psychology. I am hopeful that both the many big-P and small-p political issues will command a larger portion of our attention in the next five, or is that four, years. As CJP Section members, let’s inform the democratic process, even if it is “the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time” (Churchill, 1947).

As a footnote to this piece, you may be interested to learn that one of our own members and graduate students at the University of Saskatchewan, Karen Parhar (see p28, this issue), following the aforementioned lead of Professor MacKinnon, has been cast into the political arena. Karen has been nominated as the Liberal candidate for the riding of Saskatoon-Humbolt in the upcoming election. She advises that her “political platform” will be built, at least in part, on justice issues. But this is a rare event for psychology, CPA and the CJP Section.

References
Outcome studies assessing drug treatment court efficacy have yielded mixed results. Meta-analyses assessing the effectiveness of drug treatment courts in reducing recidivism have produced a wide range of effect sizes. The present study is a meta-analysis evaluating the two main factors believed to influence the results to date: methodological/ study quality and treatment quality.

Drug treatment courts, which function as a diversionary system for substance abusing offenders, offer an alternative to standard criminal justice processing and incarceration. The original goal of drug treatment courts was to alleviate the overflowing prison populations by diverting eligible offenders from institutions to judicially supervised treatment in the community. It was believed that these courts, and the associated substance abuse treatment, would assist the offender to overcome their addiction and as a result, reduce recidivism. Since the first court opened in Miami in 1989, they have become a popular alternative to incarceration for non-violent substance abusing offenders. Today, there are more than 1,700 drug treatment courts in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia, with more in the planning stages (Weekes, Mugford, Bourgon, & Price, 2007).

Given the popularity of drug treatment courts, a number of researchers have sought to answer the question of whether these drug treatment courts are effective in reducing recidivism. Three meta-analyses have been conducted to date assessing the effectiveness of drug courts in reducing recidivism. All three meta-analytic reviews have found positive effects but they have reported widely divergent results. Lowenkamp and colleagues (Lowenkamp, Holsinger, & Latessa, 2005) conducted the first meta-analytic review. Based on weighted effect sizes for 22 studies, they found that drug treatment courts produced an overall reduction in recidivism of 7.5%. The second meta-analysis, conducted by Latimer et al. (Latimer, Morton-Bourgon, & Chretien, 2006), reviewed a total of 54 studies and found an overall reduction in recidivism of 14%. The third meta-analysis, conducted by Wilson et al. (Wilson, Mitchell, & Mackenzie, 2006), included a total of 50 studies from which they reported an overall reduction in recidivism of 26%. In light of the fact that all three systematic reviews included many of the same studies, the disparity between the findings among them is alarming. What is the most accurate estimate of the effects of drug treatment courts on recidivism and why are these estimates so different?

Upon review of the literature, it becomes apparent that two major factors may be contributing to such mixed and inconsistent findings. One factor is the variability of the methodology of the studies included in these systematic reviews. All three meta-analytic reviews noted the prevalence of poor methodology among the drug treatment court outcome evaluations. Such study quality variability may play a role in the diverse findings. The second factor that likely plays a role in the contradictory findings is the variability of treatment quality. Treatment quality refers to issues of adherence to the principles of effective correctional treatment and the integrity of program implementation. There is a significant body of literature that has demonstrated the importance of correctional interventions adhering to the principles of risk, need, and responsivity in order to reduce recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 2006). Closely associated with these principles is the importance of integrity of program implementation, which has also been shown to influence the effectiveness of interventions to reduce recidivism (Latessa & Holsinger, 1998; Lowenkamp, Latessa, & Smith, 2006). For drug treatment courts, what goes on behind the closed doors of treatment can significantly impact their effectiveness (Taxman, 1999; Taxman & Bouffard, 2004), illustrating the importance of treatment quality. This issue of quality is particularly relevant for drug treatment courts given that they utilize a variety of treatment programs and often employ a multitude of treatment providers.

Given that study and treatment quality appear to be contributing to the divergent findings, it is important that they receive attention when attempting to determine drug treatment court effectiveness in reducing recidivism. To answer the question of whether drug courts work, it is essential to look at the role of study quality and treatment quality and their respective effects on treatment outcome studies.

As one of the primary purposes of this investigation was to examine the effects of study and treatment quality on previous meta-analytic reviews, only those studies that were included in the three previous reviews (Latimer et al., 2006; Lowenkamp et al., 2006; and Wilson et al., 2006) were included in the present study. Although efforts were made to obtain all 102 studies used in the original meta-analyses, the present review examined 96 studies/reports. These reports represent a total of 103 distinct drug treatment court comparisons (some reports included outcomes for more than one court) and a sample of 50,640 offenders.

To assess study quality, the Collaborative Outcome Data Committee (CODC) Guidelines for Sex Offender Research were used (Beech et al., 2007b). The CODC Guidelines (Beech et al., 2007a; 2007b) are a comprehensive scale developed for the purposes of rating study quality of sex offender research in order to promote scientifically sound research evaluating the efficacy of sex offender treatment. The CODC Guidelines postulate that study quality is a
combination of confidence one can place in the results and the amount of bias inherent in the study and its design. These guidelines contain 20 items (an additional 21st item is specific to cross-institutional designs only) with 9 items assessing confidence and 11 items assessing the amount of and direction of bias present in the evaluation. Upon rating the 20 CODC Guidelines items, each study was then given a global rating for confidence, bias and direction of bias. Based on the global ratings, studies were divided into overall study quality groups consisting of: Rejected, Weak, Good, or Strong.

Treatment quality was assessed by evaluating program adherence to the principles of Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR). The RNR principles (Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990) were developed as a model for classification in order to effectively guide correctional treatment based on an offender’s assessed level of risk, areas of criminogenic need, and personal learning style. These factors have been shown to mediate the effectiveness of treatment across various offender groups and a variety of criminogenic needs (e.g., substance abuse, sexual offending; Andrews & Bonta, 2006). For each of the three principles a rating of “1” for “adherence” or “0” for “non-adherence” was assigned based on the information provided. As drug treatment courts are comprised of two distinct, but collaborative components, adherence to the RNR principles was coded separately for the court and for the treatment program.

The present study found that study quality greatly influenced the results of the drug treatment court evaluations. Much of the disagreement among the meta-analyses can be attributed to the range of methodological problems that plague the drug treatment court literature. Issues surrounding quasi-experimental study designs, treatment refusers as comparison groups, inappropriate management of high attrition rates, lack of intent-to-treat analyses, and inadequate search and controls for group differences are methodological problems that tend to bias evaluations in favour of treatment.

Rating studies with the CODC Guidelines found that most of the studies used to determine drug treatment court efficacy in previous analyses were “rejected” (74%) based on poor methodological quality. Removing these studies resulted in a more homogenous pool of studies, which produced an effect size \( (k = 25, OR = .711) \) resembling that of the most conservative estimate of the three meta-analyses. These findings confirm the hypotheses that study quality influences study results. As methodology gets poorer, the variance among studies increases. And, since methodology bias in the drug treatment court literature tends to favour treatment outcomes, as methodology gets worse and variance increases, reported treatment effect sizes increase respectively.

The role of treatment quality was also explored and the results confirmed the hypothesis that treatment quality was related to drug treatment court effectiveness. Studies rated as methodologically acceptable (Weak or Good) produced greater treatment effects as their adherence to the principles of risk, need, and responsibility increased. Homogeneity of studies also increased as adherence to the RNR principles increased. Drug treatment courts are inherently targeting one criminogenic need area, substance abuse. In spite of this, it appears as though treatment is often distracted by the use of programs that target issues modestly related to criminal behaviour (e.g., mental health, relaxation). Drug treatment courts could gain from integrating knowledge from the “What Works” literature regarding effective correctional programming. For example, making use of validated risk assessments to identify individual criminogenic need areas could improve the effectiveness of these correctional programs in reducing criminal behaviour in addition to improving an individual’s well-being.

It is also important for these programs to note that there are differences between substance abusing offenders and substance abusers who do not break the law. This crucial distinction makes it necessary for drug treatment court programs to integrate strategies that have proven effective in treating offender populations, rather than solely relying on substance abuse treatment and programs less related to criminal behaviour.

Overall, the findings from this study suggest that the drug treatment court literature is littered with methodological problems; study quality greatly influences study outcomes and attention must be paid to the direction of bias contained within a study. This study found that treatment efficacy was dependent upon adherence to the RNR principles of effective correctional programming. An assessment of adherence to the RNR principles showed that very few programs adhered to at least one of the principles, and none of the programs adhered to all three of the principles.

Although drug treatment courts present an alternative to incarceration, appropriate implementation of the drug treatment court model and adherence to the principles of effective correctional practices are required to produce the desired results. Accurately translating what takes place behind the closed doors of drug treatment courts depends on good quality evaluations. Presently, it is difficult to draw a conclusion from the few studies that were found to be methodologically sound. Using only methodologically acceptable evaluations \( (k = 25) \), this study found a 9.4% reduction in recidivism for drug treatment court participants as compared to their non-drug treatment court counterparts. It is hoped that future research in this area will consider the influence of methodology on study results and use that knowledge to guide decisions in designing and conducting
future evaluations. It is also hoped that drug treatment courts will make greater use of what is known regarding effective correctional treatment practices in order to improve treatment quality and reduce criminal behaviour.
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Special Feature:

Teaching Adult Sexual Offenders with Mild Intellectual Disabilities to Discriminate Between Safe and Dangerous Situations

By Stuart B. Toews

University of Manitoba

Persons with intellectual disabilities are over-represented in their rate of criminal activity, including sexual offences (Holland, Clare, & Mukhopadhyay, 2002). They are poorly understood and are often overlooked in research and practice. Relapse prevention training should teach clients to identify problematic situations and to respond appropriately to those situations (MacDonald & Pithers, 1989). Identifying dangerous situations is a crucial step in relapse prevention treatment.

The purpose of this study was to develop and evaluate an applied behavioural analysis program to teach adult sexual offenders with mild intellectual disabilities to discriminate between pictures of situations in which they were likely to offend (dangerous situations) and situations in which they were unlikely to offend (safe situations). The General Case approach (Horner, McDonnell, & Bellamy, 1986) was used to establish responses across appropriate stimulus conditions by presenting a variety of teaching examples consecutively within a session, training to a mastery criterion, and teaching a rule for responding. Picture simulations of people in natural situations in the community were used as stimuli. Participants were trained to make this discrimination in three settings, and they were tested for generalization to pictures with new target individuals.

Method

Participants. Four adult males participated in the study. They had been referred to the residential support program at Opportunities for Independence Inc. for committing at least one sexual offence. Participants underwent an examination of their intellectual abilities using the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scale – Third Edition (Wechsler, 1997) and the results placed all four participants in the Mild Mental Retardation range (see Table 1 below).

Pretreatment screening identified relevant high-risk categories for each participant. The researcher: (a) reviewed each participant’s case file for relevant information, such as reports by professionals and official police and court documents; (b) consulted with professionals and support workers who had direct experience with the participant; and (c) assessed the participant’s sexual interests using the Abel-Blasingame Assessment System for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ABID; Abel Screening Inc., 2005).
Table 1

Summary of Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>Groups at Risk</th>
<th>Convictions</th>
<th>Trained Target Groups</th>
<th>High-Risk Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mild MR</td>
<td>YF, YM, ADM, AF</td>
<td>Against AF</td>
<td>YF and ADF</td>
<td>Bus Stops On the Bus Rec Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mild MR</td>
<td>YF, YM, ADF, AF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>YF and ADF</td>
<td>Bus Stops On the Bus Rec Centre Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mild MR</td>
<td>YF, YM, ADF, AF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>YF and YM</td>
<td>Bus Stops On the Bus Rec Centre Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mild MR</td>
<td>ADF, AF</td>
<td>Against AF</td>
<td>ADF and AF</td>
<td>Bus Stops On the Bus Rec Centre Coffee Outings Shopping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FSIQ = Full Scale Intelligence Quotient, YF = Young Female, YM = Young Male, ADF = Adolescent Female, ADM = Adolescent Male, AF = Adult Female.

Multiple at-risk target categories were identified for each participant. Two of these high-risk groups were selected for training, as shown in Table 1. Adult males were not a high-risk category for any of the participants. The participants were at greatest risk of offending during periods without supervision, determined by reviewing weekly schedules and consulting with staff. Three settings common to all four participants were selected for training (Setting 1 was “a bus interior,” Setting 2 was “at a bus stop,” and Setting 3 was “at a recreational centre”).

Apparatus and Training Environment

Pictures (see Figure 1 for examples). Forty-eight pictures (3 sets of 16) were prepared for each of the three settings for each participant. Each set of 16 pictures (8 safe and 8 dangerous) contained: (a) 4 target individuals alone (4 pictures of dangerous situations), (b) a pair of target individuals (2 pictures of dangerous situations), (c) a target individual with an adult female (2 pictures of dangerous situations), and (d) each target individual paired with an adult male (8 pictures of safe situations).

Training environment. E-Prime (Psychology Software Tools, Inc. 2001) was used to administer testing and training exercises and record participants’ responses. Participant selections were made on a response box.

Reinforcement procedure. Praise and tokens were given for completing screening and testing activities and for meeting criterion in training sessions. Tokens had a $1.00 value and could be exchanged for backup reinforcers, such as a backpack or money, at the end of the study. In addition, a trophy was given for completing the study.

Pretests. The researcher read the pretest instructions and then started the computer program. The computer generated an auditory recording of the instructions and simultaneously displayed them in print on the wall of the training room. Participants were given 3 to 5 pretest sessions. The order of presentation of the settings was different for each participant. One half of the pictures in each 48-picture pretest depicted “safe” situations and the other half depicted “dangerous” situations, and the pictures were presented in a random order generated by the computer software program. A 48-picture set for one of the settings was presented in each session. No feedback about specific responses or overall performance was provided.

Rule training. Participants learned to recite a rule defining safe and dangerous situations. The computer software program used to carry out the rule training procedure contained 12 slides, with 6 slides providing textual and auditory prompting of the rule and 6 slides not providing prompting. The computer displayed and read a brief set of
instructions, and then introduced the rule. For instance, the computer displayed the text "SAFE is GIRL or BOY with MAN. DANGEROUS is GIRL or BOY not with MAN. Say this rule to the instructor" and announced, "The rule is: a situation is safe for me if a girl or boy is with a man. A situation is dangerous for me if a girl or boy is not with a man. Say this rule to the instructor."

**Discrimination training.** Immediately following rule training, in the same session, the participants began discrimination training with the picture set for one of the three settings. Each participant received this training with the same sequence of settings used in the first three pretests. Discrimination training began with a set of 16 pictures for one of the settings. The pictures were presented one at a time. The participant pressed one of two buttons on the response box to indicate whether the situation in the picture was safe or dangerous. The discrimination training program provided feedback and corrective measures following participant responses. If the response was correct, the program audibly stated and textually displayed, "Good choice, you are correct." If incorrect, the program audibly stated and textually displayed, "Bad choice, you are wrong. Say the rule to the instructor." If a participant achieved criterion performance of 15 or 16 correct responses in a 16-trial training block (94% or 100% correct), he was given a generalization test. Otherwise he continued training by repeating the training block until he either achieved criterion or used up the session time.

**Generalization testing.** A generalization test consisted of 16 pictures of the same previously trained setting containing new target individuals. The computer delivered the same instructions as those given during pretest sessions. No response feedback was provided. If the participant met criterion (15 or 16 correct responses), he completed the training with pictures in that setting. If not, he was given extended training using the generalization test pictures with pictures of the current setting (the 2nd set of 16 pictures for the setting). Extended training used the same procedures and performance criteria as regular training. A participant continued extended training until he achieved criterion performance. Then a generalization test was given using a 3rd set of pictures for the setting.

**Posttests.** Posttest sessions were conducted 1 week and 5 weeks after completion of training on the third setting. Each posttest consisted of a presentation of the 48-pictures for one setting. No response feedback was provided.

**Results**

**Participant 1 (See Figure 3).** Participant 1 obtained scores of 58%, 54%, and 52% correct in the three pretests (Pr1, Pr2, and Pr3). He completed the requirements of rule training in 6 trials with textual and auditory prompts of the rule and 6 trials without textual and auditory prompts. Following rule training in Session 4, he obtained 69% correct in the first block of discrimination training trials. He scored 100% correct in all subsequent blocks of discrimination training trials and generalization tests. He made 1 incorrect response in both the 1st and 5th week posttests.

![Figure 3. Participant 1’s percent correct responses for each phase of each session (S). Pr = Pretest, T = Training, G = Generalization Test, 1Po = 1st Week Posttest, and 5Po = 5th Week Posttest. Numbers associated with these abbreviations refer to the setting.](image)

**Participant 2 (See Figure 4).** Participant 2 obtained scores of 67%, 54%, and 63% correct in the first three pretests. In Session 5, he completed rule training and he reached criterion in the second block of discrimination training trials. He met criterion in all subsequent blocks of discrimination training trials and generalization tests. He scored 100% correct on all six posttests.

![Figure 4. Participant 2’s percent correct responses for each phase of each session (S). Pr = Pretest, T = Training, G = Generalization Test, 1Po = 1st Week Posttest, and 5Po = 5th Week Posttest. Numbers associated with these abbreviations refer to the setting.](image)

**Participant 3 (See Figure 5).** Participant 3 obtained scores of 88% correct on the first pretest with Setting 2 pictures, but only 63% correct on Setting 1 pictures in the second pretest. In the second pretest, he did not consistently associate the “safe” and “dangerous” responses with the correct keys on the response box. For the next pretest, a picture of a chair was pasted beside the “Safe” key and a picture of a gun was pasted beside the “Dangerous” key. In addition, he was
required to verbalize “safe” or “dangerous” to the instructor prior to pressing a key. He scored 90%, 92%, and 90% correct on the next three pretests. He was given rule training and completed the requirements in three attempts. He met criterion in all subsequent blocks of training trials and generalization tests. He obtained scores of 92%, 100%, and 100% correct in the three 1st week posttests and 96%, 100%, and 100% correct in the three 5th week posttests.

Participant 4 (See Figure 6). Participant 4 obtained scores of 52%, 48%, and 52% correct in the three pretests. He required many blocks of discrimination training trials; consequently, Figure 6 shows percent correct scores for all training trials given in a session and using the same set of pictures, rather than percent correct scores for each 16-trial block. He received 16 blocks of training trials with Setting 2 pictures, 13 blocks of training trials with Setting 3 pictures, and 3 blocks of training trials with Setting 1 pictures. He met criterion when tested for generalization with Setting 2 pictures. For Setting 3 and Setting 1 pictures, however, Participant 4 met the criterion when tested for generalization in the same session as training, but dropped his performance below criterion when tested at the beginning of the next session. He scored 90%, 92%, and 92% correct in the three 1st week posttests and 96%, 90%, and 90% correct in the three 5th week posttests.

Procedural reliability. A sound recording was made of each session, checked for procedural steps correctly administered, and found to be 98% for Participants 1 and 2 and 100% for Participants 3 and 4.

Social validity. The participants’ responses indicated that they enjoyed the computer training, thought that the training was worthwhile, and thought the computer training would be helpful for other clients.

Discussion
The present study focused on one part of the chain of behaviors leading to an offense proposed by the relapse prevention model; namely, discriminating dangerous situations where offending would be likely to occur from safe situations where offending would be unlikely to occur. The purpose of this study was to develop and evaluate an applied behavioral analysis training package using General Case technology to teach adult sexual offenders with mild intellectual disabilities to discriminate between pictures of safe and dangerous situations.

Participants 1, 2, and 3 achieved criterion performance with pictures of all three settings over a small number of discrimination training sessions. Participant 4 achieved criterion performance with pictures of all three settings after extensive training, and did not maintain his performance above criterion across sessions. In summary, all participants achieved criterion performance for discrimination learning in all three settings and generalization to pictures with untrained target individuals. In addition, all participants showed improvements in their performance from pretesting to posttesting. These results show that the applied behavior analysis training package was effective for teaching adult sexual offenders with mild intellectual disabilities to discriminate between pictures of safe and dangerous situations.
Two components of the training package that were likely important for producing rapid learning and generalization were the use of multiple exemplars with adequate variation and teaching a rule. Each 16-picture block of training trials in the present study contained 2 exemplars of each high-risk category. Each model appeared in 6 or 7 pictures, which varied on multiple dimensions. These results suggest that 2 exemplars with 6 or 7 pictures per exemplar were sufficient for Participant 1, 2, and 3. Participant 4 did not generalize to pictures with new target individuals until he received extended training that included additional exemplars. Generalization was found after training with 5 exemplars with Setting 2 pictures, 5 exemplars with Setting 3 pictures, and 2 exemplars with Setting 1 pictures.

Computer-mediated training with picture simulations of situations in the community allowed participants to be tested and trained in a safe environment with teaching examples that would be infrequent or unsafe in the natural environment. As well, it provided a systematic and controlled presentation of the instructions and pictures, generated immediate feedback to the participant, and supplied a summary of participant performance.
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Special Feature: CPA Public Policy Committee Report
Submitted by Juanita Mureika, CPA Board Member and Public Policy Committee member (also CJ Section member)

The Public Policy Committee was formed in 2007 by the Canadian Psychological Association to “support and promote the application of psychology as a science and a profession to the advancement of human welfare through influence on public policy.” With goals of increasing awareness of relevant psychological research among policy makers, informing the public of psychological knowledge relevant to public policy during times of public discussion and debate regarding that policy, and encouraging psychologists to recognize and articulate the public policy implications of their research, where such implications exist, the Committee works in direct partnership with the CPA Head Office to ensure that psychological information and perspective is readily available to the public and to politicians to assist with decision-making.

The Public Policy Committee has chosen violence as its broad focus for 2008-2009, given the social impact of violence in all its forms, and the wealth of psychological evidence available to inform, educate, and hopefully change attitudes about the acceptability of violence in society. Initially, youth violence has been targeted, and two subcommittees have been formed to examine the reviews of the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) and bullying.

The sub-committee focused on the YCJA review, including Drs. Catherine Lee (Chair), Karen Cohen, Elizabeth Church, and Juanita Mureika, worked throughout the summer with invited experts Drs. Katherine Covell, Alan Leschied, and Steven Wormith to complete a submission which was sent to the Department of Justice prior to the August 15, 2008 deadline for public submissions.

The goal of the Public Policy Committee in responding to the call for input on the YCJA review was to alert the Department of Justice review committee to the interest and expertise of Canadian psychologists in issues surrounding youth criminal justice. Canadian psychology has a wealth of research evidence to support the need for early identification of mental health problems to facilitate prevention or management of potential behavioural manifestations of those problems through education and treatment programs. Timely and effective interventions have been demonstrated to deter the progression of violent behaviour in youth while other management techniques have been shown to exacerbate the cycle of violence that impacts youth behaviour. Psychological research informs on what works and what doesn’t work with youth and their families. In addressing the review committee, the CPA Public Policy Committee underscored psychological research which informs us on:

- risk and protective factors for youth offending,
programs showing promise for primary and secondary interventions with potentially violent youth, and
programs and interventions with those who have committed violent offences.

CPA advocated that an effective youth justice strategy, one that will both protect the public and help the offender, must build on our understanding of the risk factors that make a young person vulnerable to offending. Effective interventions that shift the balance among risk and protective factors should be available in all regions. These include: (1) parenting education programs, (2) family supports including poverty reduction strategies and accessible quality child care, (3) access to mental health and addiction services for youth as well as adults, and (4) sexual health and reproduction education in schools.

The CPA Public Policy Committee intends to follow up with the review committee on the YCJA in anticipation of opening a door for consultation with psychologists on specific issues with the YCJA as the process proceeds. Although the public consultation is closed at this point, it is important for all psychologists to follow any changes proposed to the YCJA, and to make their provincial legislators and the Department of Justice, Canada, aware of their concerns. Who else is better positioned to remind our government of the importance of ensuring developmentally appropriate prevention and intervention measures with at-risk youth than CPA and Canadian psychologists?

The submission sent to the Department of Justice by the Public Policy Committee can be found at: http://www.cpa.ca/cpasite/userfiles/Documents/Youth%20Criminal%20Justice%20Act0808.pdf.

---

**Research Briefs**

**Detecting False Confessions: Are Judges Better than Average?**

By Steven M. Smith, Marc W. Patry, & Veronica Stinson
Saint Mary’s University

“If he confessed, he must be guilty” you might think, but how true is that? Sometimes, innocent people confess to crimes they have not committed. John Mark Karr confessed to killing Jon Benet Ramsey, but as we now know his confession was false. Although the precise numbers are impossible to determine, false confessions occur with some regularity. The US Innocence Project found that out of 130 cases in which DNA evidence has resulted in post-conviction exonerations, 27% involved false confessions. There are also several examples of cases in Canada that involved suspected or confirmed false confessions, including Romeo Phillion, Jody Druken, the case of Darrelle Exner, and others.

Criminal suspects may confess to crimes they did not commit for a number of reasons; sometimes police can easily ascertain that a confession is false. Jon Mark Karr’s confession of Jon Benet Ramsey’s murder is a recent example. However, in the absence of disconfirming information (or in the presence of inculpatory evidence), it is often difficult to distinguish true from false confessions. Frequently, it is a judge that must make that determination. But how well can judges determine the truth of a defendant’s confession? In other words, once the case is before a judge, to what extent can he or she determine the truth of a confession?

Although police investigators believe that they can tell when a suspect is lying, the empirical evidence suggests that investigators are no better than untrained lay people (see Kassin, Meissner, & Norwick, 2005) and may indeed be worse. This notion is consistent with evidence that people from a variety of legally relevant professions (e.g., police, judges, psychiatrists) perform no better than at chance level when making judgments about deception (Ekman & O’Sullivan, 1991).

A look at the research that examines people’s ability to distinguish true from false confessions reveals similar results; performance generally is around 50% (chance level). Kassin et al. (2005) found that police investigators were less accurate than students, yet police officers were more confident in their conclusions (Kassin et al., 2005). Police officers’ confidence in their ability to detect deceptive statements is generally rooted in their on-job-experience as well as training, despite the fact that training appears to be marginally effective at best (Gran Hag & Strömwall, 2004; Leo, 1996). Because judges are expected to make decisions regarding confessions from defendants remanded for criminal trial, their ability to determine the authenticity of a confession serves as an important safeguard against miscarriages of justice.

Last year we were invited to give a talk regarding the psychology of interrogations and confessions at a gathering of Provincial Court Judges. At one point in the discussion, but before the “meat” of the topic was discussed, we provided judges with opportunities to assess the veracity of several videotaped confessions (adapted from Kassin et al., 2005). Most judges (N = 25) granted us permission to use their data for research purposes. The judges watched five videotaped
confessions (adapted from Kassin et al., 2005) and provided judgments regarding the veracity of each clip. The videos showed prison inmates confessing to crimes that they either committed (true confession) or did not commit (false confession). Three of the confessions were true and two were false. Judges estimated how accurate they, students, and police investigators would be at detecting false confessions; they also assessed the veracity of each of the confessions by making true/false judgments.

Judges’ accuracy across the five confessions varied from 36% to 64%; overall accuracy was 52%. Importantly however, these judges predicted that their own accuracy would be at chance level (52%). In other words, judges accurately predicted their actual performance, whereas police officers in earlier studies vastly overestimated their skill. Interestingly, judges predicted that students’ accuracy in assessing the veracity of confessions would be 40%, somewhat lower than Kassin et al.’s (2005) finding of a 53% accuracy rate for students. Judges’ estimates of police officers’ accuracy (42%) were more closely aligned with Kassin et al.’s (2005) findings of 47%.

Mirroring the Ekman and Sullivan (1991) findings, these data demonstrate that these Provincial Court judges’ evaluations of the authenticity of videotaped confessions are at chance level, but judges seem to have insight into their lack of ability to detect deception. Because true and false confessions are impossible to distinguish, legal safeguards that rely on judgments about the veracity of these statements will be ineffective. Videotaping the entire interrogation (not just the final confession) from a neutral standpoint should allow triers of fact to make more accurate judgments of voluntariness.

Note. These data were presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association in June, 2008 in Halifax, Nova Scotia.
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Know something that would be of interest to your colleagues, or to students? Drop us an email!
Public Safety Canada and currently consists of 18 organizations.

Much of the focus of NAACJ over the last year has centered around the ‘blue ribbon’ panel, chaired by Robert Sampson, that was appointed to conduct a review of the operation and infrastructure of Correctional Service Canada (CSC). One of the controversial recommendations from the panel was the elimination of statutory release. NAACJ conducted numerous planning meetings around the deliberation of the panel and various member organizations have made presentations to the panel. NAACJ members have also discussed various plans and strategies to respond to the panel’s report which was released in November, 2007.

I was unable to attend this year’s consultation meeting with CSC in February, 2008. Another consultation meeting with CSC is now planned for September, 2008. However, I was able to attend a meeting of the Advisory Committee of Research for CSC that was hosted by the recently confirmed Director General, Research Services, Dr. Brian Grant, in March, 2008. Stakeholders from various governmental (CSC and other departments) and nongovernmental organizations were in attendance. I represented the academic community. CSC research personnel presented a review of various ongoing research activities, including survey research on mental health offenders in CSC. The priority research areas for 2008-09 were are also reviewed. Discussions then focused on a mechanism for the development of research priorities in the future, which was followed by a discussion of potential research topics that might be included amongst future priorities. Finally, there was a discussion about the approval process for externally proposed research (i.e., research with CSC participants and/or data). It was reported that a more expedient process to review and approve research was under development and a commitment was made that proposals would be reviewed in a more timely fashion than has been the case in the last few years.

Minutes of the Section Business Meeting
June 13, 2008, Halifax, NS
By Tanya Rugge, Ph.D.
A/Secretary/Treasurer (at the time)

The Annual Section Business Meeting took place at the CPA conference in Halifax in June. The highlights are as follows:

- Membership continues to grow and is up 30% since last year, and currently sits at 399.
- The decision was made to raise membership fees from $10 to $20 for full members and from $2 to $5 for student members.

Volunteers are needed for the Next NACCJP Conference!

As you know, there is the possibility of another NACCJP conference in 2011 in Toronto....

But....

If we can’t get committed volunteers, there will not be a Conference!

The following positions need to be filled:

1. Continuing Education Coordinator
2. Marketing Coordinator
3. Sponsorship Coordinator
4. Social Event Coordinator

If you are interested, please contact Jeremy Mills at: MillsJF@CSC-SCC.GC.CA

We hope to hear from you!

- Support was evident for another NAACJP Conference in 2011 (Toronto) but in order to move ahead, volunteers need to make a commitment by mid-October 2009 (open positions include: Continuing Education
Coordinator, Marketing Coordinator, Social Event Coordinator, and Sponsorship Coordinator). If interested, please contact Jeremy Mills as soon as possible at: MillsJF@csc-scc.gc.ca.

- Although everyone was elected to stay in their respective Executive positions for the next year, the following people announced their intentions to step down from their Executive positions in June 2009:
  - Jean Folsom (Chair)
  - Guy Bourgon (DAL: Conference Programming)
  - Chantal Langevin (Review Editor, Crime Scene)
  - Tanya Rugge (Managing Editor, Crime Scene)

- Chantal and I announced that the dates of publication for Crime Scene will be changing, from April and September to May and October. In essence, each issue will be released one month later. The move from April to May will allow for more up-to-date conference information to be included and the move from September to October will better accommodate the summer holiday season.

- Jean reported that CPA’s intentions for future conferences are to limit the amount of oral presentations per Section (decrease space by 10%). Sections are to encourage more poster presentations as there will be unlimited space for this format.

- Executive members continue to work hard in their respective Director-at-Large (DAL) positions. Updates were also given by the following people:
  - Mark Olver (Director-at-Large: Clinical & Training): Mark conducted a survey that examined training opportunities across Canada; currently 10 of 18 sites had responded. Mark indicated that the next step may be to examine potential training sites that did not have current training opportunities.
  - Dorothy Cotton (Director-at-Large: Police Psychology): Dorothy continued to represent the Section in various police psychology interest groups. Currently there were 130-140 people on their listserve. Dorothy reported that there would be a second Canadian Police Psychology Forum in Toronto this September. Dorothy was also working with the Chiefs of Police to develop standardized practices for employment screening.
  - David Nussbaum and Garry Fisher (Directors-at-Large: Psychology in the Courts): Garry reported that this area of the Section had been quiet in the last year but that they were open to questions from people and he and David would continue to be available. Also, Garry reported that David was doing quite a bit of work in the area of NCR.
  - Guy Bourgon (Director-at-Large: Conference Programme): Guy reported that this year’s conference went off without a hitch. The proceedings from last year’s conference were still underway, with about 2/3 of the document being translated. Guy estimated that the proceedings document would be posted on the website and be ready for distribution in September 2009. All conference attendees will receive a hard copy.

  - Joe Camilleri (Director-at-Large: Website Coordinator): Joe reported that the website had moved from an independent server to the CPA server, which was certainly a positive move. Although all Executive members could now access the website to make changes, it was decided that Joe would remain the main point person and that all requested changes would continue to go through him. Discussions about advertising online surveys were taking place. Also, Joe had a started a new column in Crime Scene, “Knowledge Development and Transfer”, incorporating other areas of psychology.

  - Steve Wormith (Director-at-Large: NAACJ): Steve updated the Section on the NAACJ activities regarding the Blue Ribbon Panel. The NAACJ has made a number of presentations to the Committee as it went across the country. There are major ideological differences (e.g., building more prisons, abolishment of SR). The NAACJ continues to lobby and the next step is a meeting in mid-September.

  - Leslie Helmus (Student Representative): Leslie indicated that she continued to ensure the students were represented in Crime Scene. Also, Leslie and others were replicating a study of graduate opportunities, which currently had an 85% response rate.

If you have any questions, or would like additional information, please don’t hesitate to ask us.

---

### Criminal Justice Section Awards

It’s Award Nomination Time! Descriptions of the two Section Awards can be found below. If you would like to nominate a colleague for either award, please submit a nomination package to Dr. Jean Folsom by October 30th, 2008 (contact information indicated below).

#### 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.

Award recipients must be members of the CPA Criminal Justice Psychology Section during the year that the award is given.

Award Procedure
Nominations received by the Criminal Justice Executive must include a covering letter outlining how the nominee, qualifies for the award, a Curriculum Vitae of the nominee and other supporting documentation. This documentation could include, for example, a copy of the research article nominated as the "Significant Achievement," a description of a treatment program/facility, numbers of citations in the Social Citation Index, or letters/testimonials from clients and coworkers. The decision as to whether to give the award would be based on a vote of the full Criminal Justice Executive (including student members). Either, both, or neither of (1) the Significant Contribution Award and (2) the Career Award could be given each year.

The award would be announced in Crime Scene and Psynopsis. The Awards will be presented at the Canadian Psychological Association conference in June 2009 in Montreal, Quebec.

If you would like to nominate a colleague for either award, please forward the nomination package by email or to the address below under Private and Confidential cover.

Nominations must be received by October 30th, 2008.

Send packages to: Dr. Jean Folsom
Psychology Department
Regional Treatment Centre
555 King Street West, PO Box 22
Kingston, Ontario
K7L 4V7
Email: folsomjn@csc-scc.gc.ca

Have an After Thought?
WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU!

Recent Publications
Do you have a recent publication? List it here.


Despite the high incidence of both motor vehicle accidents and mental disorders in the general population, a literature examining correlates between the two is sparse. Almost 70 years ago, a Detroit psychiatrist, Lowell Selling, pioneered work in this area with a series of unfortunately forgotten journal articles. Beyond his seminal contribution, little has been published on this important area of crime. In this paper, we sketch out some potential links between driving behavior...
and mental disorders or states that may be considered in analyzing motor vehicle collisions, focusing specifically on hit-and-run collisions.


The increasing use of document reviews in forensic psychology requires that we consider the specific issues that may arise in presenting these in a legal forum, as well as the theoretical and ethical underpinnings that inform such tasks. Recent changes in ethical codes for psychologists seem to suggest a wider scope for document reviews even up to the point of diagnostic formulations. We suggest some ways to offer such opinions in a balanced, defensible, and objective manner.


This article reports on the effects of legislative reform on mentally disordered accused persons absolutely discharged from Review Boards in three Canadian jurisdictions. The sample included 592 accused randomly selected from all persons absolutely discharged in British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec. Of these, 291 were absolutely discharged by provincial Review Boards in the three-year period prior to the landmark Winko decision and 301 in the three-year period following the decision. Analyses of information collected from Review Board files revealed few significant post-Winko changes, instead highlighting differences in practice and policy between jurisdictions. The only observed change in characteristics across jurisdictions was an increase in the prevalence of substance abuse disorders following Winko. No significant effects on outcomes were observed. Although the long-term effects of Winko remain to be seen, the effects appear to be minimal to date. Treating the Winko decision as a case example, discussion focuses on how findings of the present study may contribute to our understanding of the impact of policy and legislative reform on mentally disordered accused.


Using a coding protocol based on a juror knowledge survey, this study focused on identifying changes, if any, in the prevalence and type of media portrayals of eyewitness issues over time in television crime dramas. Content of 263 episodes of 12 popular television crime dramas from the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s were coded for 35 specific eyewitness issues with respect to: (1) presence or absence, (2) type (e.g., explicit, implicit), and (3) meanings and implications of these presentations for eyewitness accuracy. Results demonstrated portrayals of eyewitness issues, and the broad topic of memory, generally increased since the 1980s, with prevalence highest in episodes from the 1990s. With rare exceptions, the meanings and implications of the presentation were not made explicit, but were implicitly depicted, inferred from character dialogue or episode events. In general, media portrayals failed to depict a relationship between eyewitness variables and memory accuracy, and, as a result of their omission, the relationships typically differed from those agreed upon by experts.


To date, reviews of partner rape have focused on the proximate (or immediate) causes of partner rape. Missing from these reviews, however, is theory and research that has examined the ultimate (or evolutionary) causes of partner rape. Here, we review this literature, and we discuss the complementarity of proximate and ultimate levels of analysis. We conclude by highlighting the importance of integrating multiple levels of analysis when studying men's sexual coercion of their intimate partners.


Mandating offenders to attend correctional treatment is a controversial function of the justice system, in part because of the uncertainty about the effectiveness of such practice. A meta-analysis was conducted to compare the effectiveness of mandated, coerced, and voluntary correctional treatment in reducing recidivism. A search of correctional treatment studies resulted in 129 studies meeting the inclusion criteria. In general, mandated treatment was found to be ineffective in several analyses, particularly when the treatment was located in custodial settings, whereas voluntary treatment produced significant treatment effect sizes regardless of setting. Few significant differences in effect sizes were found between levels of coercion. The implications of mandating correctional treatment for offenders are discussed.
Information Reviews

Have you read a book, article, or research report on which you would like to provide commentary – good, bad, provocative, or humorous? If so, write us and it could be included in this new Information & Book Review section.

BOOK REVIEW

Corrections, Mental Health, and Social Policy: International Perspectives

Editors: Robert K. Ax and Thomas J. Fagan
ISBN: 978-0-398-07756-3 (hardcover)
Reviewer: Andrew Harris, Ph.D.
Acting Director, Operations Research
Correctional Service Canada

Jails are “the only public institution left open to the homeless mentally disordered 24 hours a day.” (Ormston, 2003, p. 24).

The Canadian Mental Health Association says that one in five Canadians will directly experience mental illness in their lifetime (CMHA, 2005). Today is not my day – I think. In Canada, mental illness is firmly on the correctional agenda and as a result, I jumped at the chance to review Dr. Ax’s and Dr. Fagan’s new book Corrections, Mental Health, and Social Policy: International Perspectives (2007). In the introduction to their book, Drs. Fagan and Ax state that they are moved by the fact that almost 7 million Americans are currently under some form of correctional supervision and without doubt, a large part of that group has mental health concerns. With a Canadian lifetime prevalence rate of 20%, it should not be a surprise to anyone that a substantial proportion of the incarcerated population in Canada has mental health issues. This supposition is supported by a recent report from the Canadian Institute for Health Information (2008) entitled Mental Health, Delinquency and Criminal Activity which concluded that there was a higher prevalence of mental illness within prisons than within the general population.

This book has four distinct sections, the first looking at correctional mental health care, social policy, and the public health perspective of mental health in the United States. The second section looks at mental health systems and the services provided within custody in several foreign countries, namely England and Wales, France, Canada, and New Zealand. The third section of the book is entitled “Current Challenges to Correctional Systems” and includes a chapter on predicting psychiatric relapse and the role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s), as well as current problems of prison policy with regard to terrorism, the effects of prison gangs, current practices relevant to correctional mental health, and the death penalty. The fourth and final section is entitled “General Conclusions” and contains a single chapter entitled “Future Directions.”

The book gets off to a promising start with the first chapter written by Dr. Ax on the history of American correctional mental health. This informative chapter reviews such interesting things as the U.S. Supreme Court decision affirming inmates’ constitutional rights to proper medical care; however, the obvious question, “to what extent are mental health concerns included in this guarantee,” is unfortunately, not answered. This chapter provides an excellent short overview of "moral treatment" or "therapy" as it begins with Pinel, moving on through offender classification, touching on Szasz, (the criminalization of mental illness), and onto more modern mental health concepts. Overall, this is a useful and well-written chapter.

The second chapter by Jennifer Boothby on social policy contains some very interesting and sobering facts including that one-in-three American black men will likely be incarcerated at least once in their lifetime. This rate is six times higher than for white men in the United States. Also, apparently, there are now three times as many mentally ill people living in American correctional facilities than ever lived in psychiatric hospitals (Human Rights Watch, 2003). Comparatively in Canada, the Kirby/Keon Commission (2006) on mental illness was told by the Correctional Investigator for Canada, Howard Sapers, that between 1967
and 2004 there had been a 60% increase in the number of federal offenders displaying mental disorders.

Chapter three by R. Scott Chavez looks at U.S. prisons from a public health perspective but the mental health issues are lost among more traditional public health concerns such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and hepatitis. It also calls for increased surveillance of communicable diseases, national literature databases, and increased research. While important points, the emphasis should have been more clearly on mental health.

Section 2 of the book, entitled “Corrections and Mental Health in the Western European Tradition,” contains overviews of various correctional systems. Chapter four by Graham Towl and David Crighton reviews psychological services in English and Welsh prisons. Several references in this review are quite dated, in particular, the treatment outcomes studies. The vague chapters on corrections in France and New Zealand bracket a solid chapter by Stephen Wormith and Duyen Luong on the legal and psychological contributions to the development of corrections in Canada. While I will no doubt be seen as biased, the chapter by Wormith and Luong is more extensive, inclusive, and is notable for its regional references to programs in Alberta, Ontario, and New Brunswick. Generally, this Section would have benefited if the contributors from the different countries used a common template so that more direct comparisons and conclusions could be made.

Section 3, “Current Challenges to Correctional Systems” begins with a chapter by Paula Smith, Paul Gendreau, and Claire Goggin on “What Works” in predicting psychiatric hospitalization and relapse. This 19-page chapter includes a nine-page table of risk factors that will be very helpful to those who are building models or instruments to predict psychiatric relapse. To help grasp the context for this data, it would be useful for Crime Scene readers to read a recent report (Tremblay, 2008) by the Saint Leonard’s Society of Canada and the Canadian Criminal Justice Association, which contends that community-based services for the mentally ill never adequately provided for the deinstitutionalized and that many of these people are now in prison. In the following chapter of this book, Carol Gallo discusses the role of non-governmental organizations in the correctional enterprise. This useful chapter reviews the history of prison relief organizations, human rights standards, the functions and philosophy of NGO’s, and several other specific topics, and generally adds depth to the overall book.

The other chapters in Section 3, on prison policy and terrorism, prison gangs, and the death penalty seem somewhat out of place in the overall context of the book and definitely fall in the “social policy” realm. The final chapter in this section by Aven Senter, Robert Morgan, and Jon Mandracchia deals with correctional systems in non-Western countries. Although this chapter may have fit more appropriately in the second section, this chapter gives a very brief overview of what is known about three correctional systems and their differing perspectives. Readers should be aware that the correctional services of China, Russia, and South Africa not only keep information about their correctional operations very closed but also do not have the same empirical, academic, or publishing base that we value. As a result, much less is published on and known about these correctional systems. One interesting tidbit from this chapter is a report that the incidence of mental illness in the Russian prison population is 20%. This is interesting in that the Russian rate is approximately twice that of the Canadian rate (Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview, 2007). However, even within Canada, there are differences of opinion as a 2004 report in the Canadian Journal of Public Health indicates a high prevalence of lifetime and current mental disorders in Canadian offenders, with inmates having much higher rates of psychosis, depression, anxiety, and personality disorders than the general Canadian population.

The one chapter that constitutes Section 4 is entitled “Future Directions” by Thomas Fagan, Sheila Brandt, and Andrea Kleiver. It recommends increased cooperation and integration among criminal justice and community service providers, moving towards a more holistic and seamless service delivery system. This chapter reinforces an important theme that appears in several places in the book, which is the importance of continuity of care from intake through community supervision and potentially on to post-sentence for all offenders but especially for those with mental health concerns. This concept is no surprise to Canadians as the Canadian Senate Standing Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, heard in 2006 that prisons have “become warehouses for the mentally ill due to funding cuts and closures in community psychiatric facilities” (Canadian Mental Health Association, 2005, p. 1).

Before closing, I would like to note that Drs. Fagan and Ax have approached this subject matter before. Their previous text, Correctional Mental Health Handbook, 2003, lays a well-organized framework of understanding for those new to, or unfamiliar with, correctional mental health practice. In their Handbook, they rightly point out that few mental health practitioners have received specific corrections-based training and that new prison-based mental health clinicians often face some confusion between their main purposes of helping, diagnosing, and treating mentally ill offenders when these activities are seen as subordinate to the primary mission of the work setting (security). While their Handbook
provides a workable overview of correctional mental health with practical application, their current book will serve best as a reference that can be "dipped-into" for specific chapters when the need arises.

Overall, despite some shortcomings, the book contained many interesting facts and can serve as a reference book as required. I hope that Dr. Fagan and Dr. Ax continue their efforts in this area where they clearly lead with a bright torch.
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Kudo Korner
Want to give kudos to a Section Member? Contact us.

Congratulations to Dr. J. Thomas Dalby, who became a CPA Fellow at CPA’s Annual Convention this past June! Well done!

Annie Yessine was awarded the Certificate of Academic Excellence from CPA for the work completed on her thesis, entitled Predicting the Offending Trajectories of Canadian Juvenile Probationers: A Latent Growth Curve Modeling Approach (see Recently Defended Dissertations & Theses Section for more information). Congratulations Annie!

Congratulations to Dr. Steve Wong, who received the annual Career Contribution Award at this year’s CPA conference!

Kudos to Dr. Dorothy Cotton for her Fellowship in CPA and for her appointment as President of the College of Psychologists of Ontario! Congratulations!

CONGRATULATIONS TO THIS YEAR’S STUDENT POSTER PRIZE WINNER!!!
Caleb Lloyd of Carleton University! Male Offenders’ Perceptions of Self and Desistance: Exploring Predictive Validity A summary of Caleb’s research is highlighted in the Students’ Water Cooler!
Members on the Move

Dr. Joe Camilleri has accepted the position of Assistant Professor in the Psychology Department at Westfield State College (Westfield, Massachusetts).

Dr. Janine Cutler is no longer at OCI as she is now working as the Senior/Chief Psychologist at Grand Valley Institution for Women.

Dr. Daryl Kroner has accepted a position as Assistant Professor with the Centre for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Any more news? Contact us.

Have a publication that’s just been released? Let us know.

If you know of any employment opportunities, contact us!

Employment Opportunities

Correctional Service Canada

CAREER OPPORTUNITY

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) is currently recruiting indeterminate (full-time) Psychologists.

PSYCHOLOGIST (PS-03)
Candidates must clearly indicate how they meet the following essential qualifications:

- Graduation with a Master’s or doctoral degree from a recognized university with acceptable specialization in clinical, forensic, or counselling psychology or in another psychological specialty relevant to the position;
- Registration for autonomous practice of psychology by the provincial registering/licensing body in the province of practice;
- Experience in the provision of psychological services (including mental health services), such as assessment, counselling, or other psychological services with adults, either to groups or individuals;

General information:

CSC offers a comprehensive benefits package that includes an indexed pension plan, a health care plan, an employer-paid dental plan, a disability insurance plan, and generous leave benefits. Doctoral level registered psychologists can earn up to $88,387, including salary, a terminable allowance and a penological factor allowance; those registered at the Master’s level can earn up to $82,387. Salary is currently under review. Annual membership fees to regulatory bodies are also paid.

If you have a Master’s or doctoral degree in Psychology, but are not yet registered, challenging employment opportunities exist within CSC. These opportunities will allow you to apply your skills while under the supervision of registered personnel. Financial assistance for registration-related expenses is available.

If you are interested in applying for a position or would like further information, contact one of the Regional Chief Psychologists listed below.

ATLANTIC REGION: Mr. Bernard Galarneau, M.A.Ps., L. Psych.; (506) 851-6357; GalarneauBM@csc-scc.gc.ca

QUEBEC REGION: Mme. Line Bernier, MPs., Psychologue clinicienne; (450) 967-3477; BernierLI@csc-scc.gc.ca

ONTARIO REGION: Dr. Denise Preston, C. Psych.; (613) 545-8239; PrestonDL@csc-scc.gc.ca

PRAIRIE REGION: Dr. Karen Eamon, C. Psych.; (780) 238-2189; EamonKC@csc-scc.gc.ca

PACIFIC REGION: Dr. Zender Katz, R. Psych.; (604) 870-7757; Katzz@csc-scc.gc.ca
Have Comments on what you have read?
We want to hear from you!

Upcoming Conferences

Forum 2008: The Changing Face of Corrections
October 21-22, 2008  North Bay, Ontario
Contact: Natasha.gribbon@ontario.ca

Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers 27th Annual Research and Treatment Conference
“Teamwork in Trying Times: Improving Our Response to Sexual Abuse”  
October 22-25, 2008 Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A. www.atsa.com

The 11th International Institute for Restorative Practices World Conference

American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting
November 12-15, 2008 St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A. www.asc41.com

American Psychology-Law Society 2009 Annual Conference
March 5-8, 2009 San Antonio, Texas, U.S.A. www.ap-ls.org

Canadian Psychological Association 70th Annual Convention
June 11-13, 2009 Montreal, Quebec www.cpa.ca

139th Congress of Corrections
August 7-12, 2009 Nashville, Tennessee U.S.A. www.aca.org

American Psychological Association 117th Annual Conference
August 6-9, 2009 Toronto, Canada www.apa.org
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 Leslie, your Student Representative, at lesliehelmus@yahoo.ca.

And from your Student Representative ….

Hello!

As your student representative, I wanted to review some important things going on in our Section that relate to students. Firstly, at our Annual Section Business Meeting in June at the CPA conference, we decided to raise the student Section membership fee to $5.

Also, as many of you know, each year at the CPA conference each year our Section gives a cash prize of $200 for the best student poster presentation. This year our winner was Caleb Lloyd, a doctoral student from Carleton University conducting research on crime desistance. A summary of his fascinating research is presented in the Students’ Water Cooler section. Congratulations Caleb!! And for everyone who is already thinking ahead to their poster presentation at next year’s CPA conference (and remember, the deadline is November 15th!), I will remind you that our publications link on our Section website (www.cpa.ca/sections/criminaljustice/) includes an article written by Guy Bourgon (one of the judges for the student poster prize) about what makes a good poster.

Lastly, in the past year I have been working with Section Executive members Joe Camilleri and Mark Olver and non-Executive student member Kelly Babchishin on a survey of criminal justice training opportunities in psychology graduate programs at Canadian universities. The survey asks which programs offer criminal justice research and learning opportunities in their psychology graduate programs (formal or informal) and examines the size of these programs (e.g., number of faculty, students, courses). We presented the preliminary results of this research at the CPA conference in Halifax this summer. Currently we have exceeded our goal of a 90% response rate from Canadian universities with psychology graduate programs. If you are interested in the slides from our presentation, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I also wanted to remind you that my job on the Criminal Justice Section Executive consists of representing student issues to the Section Executive and ensuring that every Crime Scene issue has an article in the Students’ Water Cooler column. As your student rep, I invite you to contact me if you have any questions/concerns or if there is something you would like to discuss. Furthermore, I want to make sure the Students’ Water Cooler always has exciting content for students, so if there is anything you would like to write for the column, please contact me. Also, if there is any topic you would like to see covered (such as advice or information), please contact me and I will do my best to solicit that content myself. Best of luck to everybody in the upcoming school year!

Sincerely,
Leslie Helmus
lesliehelmus@yahoo.ca

★★★★ STUDENT POSTER PRIZE WINNER ★★★★

CPA Annual Convention 2008

WINNER
Congratulations to Caleb Lloyd
from Carleton University!

Male Offenders’ Perceptions of Self and Desistance: Exploring Predictive Validity
Caleb Lloyd & Ralph Serin
Carleton University

While the majority of offenders eventually desist from crime (Blokland, Nagin, & Nieuwbeerta, 2005; Piquero et al., 2001), evidence suggests that the process of ceasing criminal activity is not directly tied to the extinction of risk factors (Laub, Nagin, & Sampson, 1998; Stouthamer-Loeber, Wei, Loeber, & Masten, 2004). Up to this point, research has focused on the external markers and transition points associated with desistance, including commitment to quality marriages, employment, and substance abuse recovery (e.g., Sampson & Laub, 2005). While researchers argue that the internal mechanisms driving the desistance process are of key importance, the psychological mechanisms hypothesized to underlie the observable changes in life circumstances and reductions in criminal activity have not been adequately explored.

The transition from crime to desistance is an ongoing process involving both commitment to change and important intrapersonal moderators (Serin & Lloyd, in press). While commitment to a crime-free life is necessary, additional
engagement reflecting a personal stake in the desistance process is required for sustaining one’s commitment in the face of risk factors. Thus, certain cognitive constructs have been hypothesized to sustain change beyond an offender’s initial commitment to give up crime. While these constructs have intuitive appeal, adequate methods of measurement have not yet been developed. This has delayed our ability to provide a quantitative understanding of offender change.

The purpose of the present study was to develop self-report scales to capture psychological constructs hypothesized to relate to desistance in an offender population. It was hypothesized that personal attitudes favourable toward desistance would be positively inter-correlated while also correlating negatively with pro-criminal attitudes. In addition, it was hypothesized that offenders who endorsed desistance constructs would be more likely to sustain crime-free behaviour after being released from correctional institutions.

Method
One hundred forty-two male offenders (M age = 41.4) housed within minimum security federal institutions responded to four self-report questionnaires assessing their personal attitudes toward crime and desistance. Risk information was also collected from offenders’ files.

A ten-item questionnaire, the Agency for Desistance Attitudes scale, was created for this research. Sample items include “I’m smart enough to be able to learn skills and anything else I need to learn to help me live a crime-free life.” Calculation of Cronbach’s alpha indicates this scale has good internal consistency (α = .80).

A 32-item questionnaire, the Personal Outcome Expectancies for Crime scale, assesses offenders’ beliefs about what positive or negative experiences might occur if they commit further crimes. The questionnaire is divided into two subscales, each representing the positive or negative expectancies. Both the Negative and Positive Expectancy subscales have good internal consistency (αs = .89).

A 37-item questionnaire, the Personal Outcome Expectancies for Desistance scale, assesses offenders’ beliefs about the positive (α = .87) or negative (α = .70) experiences that might occur if they choose to desist from crime. In addition to two subscales representing the negative and positive expectancies, a third subscale also assesses offenders’ expectancy beliefs about what type of effort will be required for desistance to occur (α = .83).

Two items were used to assess the degree to which an offender believes desisting from crime is an immediate and effortless process (i.e., spontaneous). Sample items include “When someone wants to stop committing crimes, their life goes straight as fast as a light bulb turning on.” Internal consistency for the two items was good (α = .84).

In addition, the Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates scale (MCAA; Mills & Kroner, 2001) was used to assess antisocial attitudes and number of close antisocial associates. The Statistical Information on Risk scale (SIRR1; Nuffield, 1989) was used to assess risk to re-offend.

Results
As seen in the figure below, hypotheses were generally supported and the attitude constructs favourable toward desistance were positively inter-correlated. In particular, positive desistance expectancies were moderately correlated with both negative crime expectancies and beliefs indicating personal agency for achieving desistance goals. Moderate to strong correlations were observed between desistance effort expectancies, agency for desistance, and positive desistance expectancies.

In addition, attitudes unfavourable toward desistance were also inter-correlated. Small to moderate positive correlations were observed between antisocial associates, negative desistance expectancies, and beliefs that changing to a crime-free lifestyle would involve an effortful process. Finally, the cluster of desistance-supportive attitudes showed moderate negative correlations with the cluster of crime-supportive attitudes.

As seen in the table below, attitudes supportive of crime were significantly correlated with risk to re-offend. In contrast, attitudes supportive of desistance were not correlated with risk to re-offend.

Sixty offenders (42.3%) had been released when follow-up was completed (M = 94.0 days; range 1-393 days). Four offenders (2.8% of total sample; 6.7% of released) were returned due to revocation of parole, suspension of parole or new offence. Given the small sample and low base rate, predictive validity analyses are highly tentative. Further
follow-up is required before analyses will yield more meaningful conclusions.

However, as displayed in the table, some of the ROC analyses suggest it may be promising to continue exploring predictive validity with some of the desistance attitude scales.

Table 1. Correlations between Attitudes and Risk to Re-offend, Area Under the Curve (AUC) for Attitudes Predicting Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>SIR-R1</th>
<th>AUC (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial Associates</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.66 (.1, 1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Beliefs</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.43 (0, .88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Crime Beliefs</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.76 (.47, 1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Crime Beliefs</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.87 (.75, .99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Desistance</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.59 (.22, .96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Desistance Beliefs</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.67 (.22, 1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desistance Effort Beliefs</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.81 (.60, 1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01

Discussion

New measures of desistance-relevant variables cluster together in a manner consistent with contemporary desistance theory. Thus, offenders with attitudes supportive of desistance may be primed to extend the effort necessary to stay crime-free post-release. In addition, desistance attitudes are un-related to risk, which adds to the empirical support for a theoretical understanding of desistance as a unique process. Measuring desistance attitudes may be complementary to assessing risk factors.

Highly tentative ROC analyses suggest these measures may show promise for predictive validity after a greater percentage of the sample has been released. The present analyses are limited due to the fact that the full sample has not been released and fewer yet have re-offended. This precludes an informative discussion of predictive validity. In addition to a longer follow-up, measurement of the desistance constructs should be enhanced and refined for further study.
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For further information, feel free to contact Caleb Lloyd at: clloyd@connect.carleton.ca.

Coming Soon….

Our next Issue of Crime Scene will come out in May 2009, just before the Annual Convention. This gives everyone lots of time to get their submissions ready. Together, we are sure that we can produce another great Issue of Crime Scene. Also, don’t forget that the deadlines for abstract submissions for both CPA (November 15th) and APA (December 1st) are right around the corner!

Tanya & Chantal

Have a Minute?

Think of how you can contribute to Crime Scene.

Email us.

Wishing you all a smashing fall and a festive holiday season!