



Legal Update: Juveniles and the Death Penalty

David DeMatteo, JD, PhD

On March 1, 2005, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its much-anticipated decision in *Roper v. Simmons*, 125 S. Ct. 1183, 543 U.S. ___, in which it held that it is unconstitutional to impose the death penalty on offenders who were under age 18 when they committed their crimes. Recognizing the existence of a national consensus against the juvenile death penalty, the Court held that “evolving standards of decency” render juvenile executions cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the 8th Amendment. The *Roper* decision has stimulated considerable discussion and debate about the Supreme Court’s judicial activism, the “lesser” culpability of juveniles, and adolescent development. While legal commentators debate the merits of the Court’s analysis regarding the existence of a national consensus against juvenile executions, social scientists advance widely varying views regarding adolescent development. This column will take a closer look at *Roper v. Simmons*. After briefly reviewing the history of the juvenile death penalty, this column will summarize the Supreme Court’s death penalty jurisprudence relating to juvenile offenders. Next, this column will discuss and analyze *Roper*, and conclude with a summary of relevant research.

The Execution of Juvenile Offenders

The first recorded execution of an offender for a crime committed as a juvenile occurred in 1642, when Thomas Graunger was convicted of bestiality and executed in Plymouth Colony, MA (Cothorn, 2000). Since 1642, at least 366 juvenile offenders have been executed (Streib, 2004). More recently, from 1973 to 2004, 228 juvenile death sentences were imposed (in 23 states) and 22 juvenile executions were carried out, which constituted 2.4% of the 930 executions during that period (Streib, 2004). Twenty-one of the 22 executions were carried out against offenders who were 17 at the time of the crime; the remaining offender was 16. During the first-half of the 20th century, roughly 20 offenders were executed for crimes committed under age 16. The most recent execution of an offender for a crime committed under age 16 occurred on January 9, 1948, when Louisiana executed Irvin Mattio, who was 15 at the time of his offense.

The Supreme Court & Juvenile Executions

Any discussion of the constitutionality of juvenile executions should begin with the 8th Amendment’s prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment. The 8th Amendment’s language is not precise, and its scope is not static. Therefore, to give meaning to the 8th Amendment and, more specifically, to determine whether a particular punishment is so disproportionate as to be cruel and unusual, the Supreme Court has traditionally referred to the “evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society” (*Trop v. Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86, 101 (1958)). Specifically, the Court looks for objective indicia of a national consensus (such as state statutes).

Legal Update cont. on p. 6

Also In This Issue ...

Conducting your first AP-LS conference presentation: Improving the experience for yourself and the audience by John Edens, John Petrilla, Laura Guy, and Barry Rosenfeld, p. 8

Research Briefs, p. 7

Information about the 2006 AP-LS Conference, p. 19

And the Call for Papers for AP-LS 2006, p. 23

And LOTS more ...

AP-LS News Editorial Staff

Editor-In-Chief

Barry Rosenfeld, Ph.D.
rosenfeld@fordham.edu

Incoming Editor-in-Chief

Jennifer Groscup, J.D., Ph.D.
jgroscup@jjay.cuny.edu

Production/Advertising Editor

Michele Galletta, Ph.D.
galletta13@aol.com

Associate Editor, Expert Opinion

Mary Connell, Ed.D.
mary@maryconnell.com

Associate Editor, Research Briefs

Marc Boccaccini, Ph.D.
PSY_MTB@shsu.edu

Associate Editor, Legal Update

David DeMatteo, J.D., Ph.D.
ddematteo@tresearch.org

Website Manager

Adam Fried, M.A.
afried@fordham.edu

The American Psychology-Law Society News is a publication devoted to dissemination of information, news, and commentary about psychology, mental health, and the law. The newsletter is published on-line three times per year; February 1, June 1, and October 1. Original contributions and unsolicited manuscripts are welcome, and will be published subject to editorial approval and space availability.

For information regarding editorial policies contact the incoming Editor, Jennifer Groscup, J.D., Ph.D., Dept. of Psychology, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 445 West 59th Street, New York, NY 10019 or jgroscup@jjay.cuny.edu.

Address changes for APA members should be directed to APA Membership Dept., 750 First St. NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242. Address changes for non-APA members, student members, or members-at-large should be made on-line, at www.ap-ls.org. Problems logging in or navigating this website should be directed to administrator@ap-ls.org.

Division 41/American Psychology-Law Society Executive Committee (EC) Meeting Minutes La Jolla, CA, March 3, 2005

Attending: Kimberly Coffman, Brian Cutler, Sol Fulero, Steve Golding, Gail Goodman, Edie Greene, Patty Griffin, Wendy Heath, Kirk Heilbrun, Margaret Bull Kovera, Brad McAuliff, Alison Redlich, Jennifer Robbennolt, Ron Roesch, Randy Salekin, Mario Scalora, Jennifer Skeem, Christina Studebaker, Gary Wells, Rich Wiener

1. Meeting was called to order at 8:10 a.m. by President Edie Greene.

2. Executive Committee meeting minutes from August 2004 were approved.

3. Treasurer's Report (see 2005 budget on p. 3)

Treasurer Margaret Bull Kovera reported that, as of the end of 2004, the Division has reached the goal of increasing financial reserves sufficient to cover two years of operating expenses if necessary. It is now time to consider new programming. It was suggested that funding proposals from the committees and for any other initiatives be submitted and reviewed prior to the next meeting in August 2005. The EC will then be able to consider revisions to the budget as a whole.

Dues income for 2004 was down approximately 10% from 2003. The Division should expect to see some drop in dues income for 2005, even without a drop in membership, because non-APA members may now pay dues by credit card using the newly improved web site. Similarly, conference co-chairs need to note that when registration fees are being paid by credit card it reduces the income from the fees.

1. Bylaws Revision

Secretary Jennifer Robbennolt reported that the proposed revisions to the By-Laws had passed. Beginning in August 2006, the Treasurer's term will be 5 years. A 5-year term of office had also been proposed for the APA Council Representatives. How-

ever, because APA limits the term of this office to 3 years, this change will not take effect and the original 3-year term will continue in effect. The revisions also change the term of office for the Editor of *Law and Human Behavior* to a single 5-year term, clarify the membership categories, and make provision for electronic voting.

2. Newsletter

Jennifer Groscup was selected to succeed Barry Rosenfeld as the next editor of the newsletter.

3. Springer-Verlag

Sharon Panulla from Springer-Verlag, publisher of *Law and Human Behavior*, reported to the EC about the Kluwer-Springer merger and noted that there has been much turnover in the company. She reported that they have completed the backfile digitization of the journal and are moving to an article focused (as opposed to issue focused) approach. She will report back to President Edie Greene and *LHB* editor Rich Wiener in 1 month about her progress in getting *LHB* on Westlaw.

4. APA Council report

Gail Goodman and Patty Griffin attended the mid-February meeting of the APA Council. They reported that the Council had approved several task forces (including task forces on mental illness and the death penalty, the sexualization of girls, socioeconomic status, and terrorism) discussed the UN World Conference on Racism, rejected a new division on human-animal interactions, and conducted a cultural awareness exercise.

5. Mailing List

The EC approved a set of guidelines for the use of the AP-LS e-mail address list. The AP-LS e-mail address list will be open to AP-LS members for research purposes only. The guidelines place limits on the number of requests members can make, require IRB approval of the research project, set fees for usage, and set requirements for the subject line, informed consent, and attachments. The mailing list will not be available for any commercial or for-profit venture (with the exception of workshops and conferences or ventures sponsored by AP-LS and affiliated organizations such as AAFP). The guidelines will be posted on the AP-LS website.

6. Contact with American Academy of Psychiatry and Law (AAPL)

Steve Golding asked that the EC support a stronger relationship between AP-LS and AAPL. In particular, he suggested that the two groups consider creating membership opportunities for those who are members of the other organization, coordinating the scheduling of conferences, working together on projects such as practice guidelines, and working jointly on research projects and presentations. The EC asked that the Committee on Relations with Other Organizations work to build a stronger relationship with AAPL.

7. Proposed AP-LS DVD Project

Gary Wells proposed that AP-LS coordinate and fund a series of "great lectures" in psychology and law that would be circulated free (or at a nominal cost) on DVDs. Ideally, the lectures would be done in such a way as to be appropriate for legal practitioners, high school students, or college students and would showcase the best research that the interface of psychology and law has to offer. After discussion, it was suggested that a pilot DVD lecture be created to help gauge the feasibility and costs of the project and that, subsequently, a more specific proposal be presented to the EC.

8. AP-LS Annual Program

Jennifer Skeem and Brad McAuliff, 2005 AP-LS Program Chairs, proposed that the EC create a committee to update our approach to the AP-LS conference, particularly given its growing size and annual scheduling. The EC agreed that a committee should be appointed to develop concrete mechanisms for improving the conference planning process.

2006 AP-LS Program Chairs will be Annette Christy, Jennifer Groscup, and Tonia Nicholls.

9. APA Liaisons

Edie Greene has appointed liaisons to the Practice Directorate (Kathy Stafford), Science Directorate (Brian Bornstein), and Public Policy Directorate (Natacha Blain) of APA. The liaisons have been asked to research and forward information of relevance to Division 41 members. Brian Bornstein reported via e-mail about the opportunities and services that the Science Directorate provides. These include research/funding opportunities, training/workshops, honorifics/awards, and information (publications, web-based news releases, etc.). The Directorate also contains several science-related boards and committees that produce relevant information (or on which members might want to serve), such as the Board of Scientific Affairs and the Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment. More detailed information can be obtained from their website (www.apa.org/science).

10. Committee Reports

Book series

Ron Roesch reported via e-mail that the new book series with Oxford University Press is well underway. The following books are in press or in preparation:

Haney, C. (in press). *Death by design: Capital punishment as a social psychological system*. NY: Oxford University Press.

2005 Revised Budget

INCOME	Budget
Dues & Contributions	\$ 125,000.00
LHB Editorial Expenses	\$ 17,500.00
Interest Income	\$ 1,000.00
Royalties	\$ 40,000.00
Advertising	\$ 3,000.00
TOTAL INCOME	\$ 231,500.00

EXPENSES

Meetings & Conferences:

APA Convention Program	\$ 17,000.00
APA EC Meeting	\$ 3,000.00
APLS EC meeting at APA	\$ 10,000.00
Biennial EC Meeting	\$ 10,000.00
Biennial Expenses	\$45,000.00
Div. Leadership Conference	\$ 2,000.00
APA Program Chair Conf.	\$ 1,500.00
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 88,500.00

Publications:

Newsletter Expenses	\$ 18,000.00
Subscriptions to LHB	\$ 73,000.00
Editor Expenses for LHB	\$ 17,000.00
Web Site Expenses	\$ 5,000.00
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 113,000.00

Administrative Costs:

General Operating Exp.	\$ 11,250.00
Presidential Expenses	\$ 400.00
Treasurer Expenses	\$ 400.00
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 12,050.00

Awards and Committees:

Awards & Dissertations	\$ 4,000.00
Grants-in-Aid	\$ 10,000.00
Interdisciplinary Grant	\$ 3,000.00
Student Committee	\$ 3,000.00
Education Outreach Comm.	\$ 2,000.00
Cong. Briefing Series	\$ 3,000.00
Careers & Teaching Comm.	\$ 1,000.00
Relations w/ Other Orgs.	\$ 2,000.00
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 28,000.00

TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 241,550.00
-----------------------	----------------------



Posey, A. J., & Wrightsman, L. S. (in press). *Trial consulting*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Koch, W. J., Douglas, K. S., Nicholls, T. L., & O'Neill, M. (in press). *Psychological injuries: Forensic assessment, treatment and law*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Slobogin, C. (in preparation). *Proving the unprovable: The role of law, science, and speculation in adjudicating culpability and dangerousness*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Stefan, S. (in preparation). *Emergency department treatment of the psychiatric patient: Policy issues and legal requirements*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Additional submissions are welcome.

Dissertation Awards Committee

Jennifer Groscup reported via e-mail that 12 dissertations were submitted for the 2004 Dissertaiton Awards. This number is up significantly from last year when 6 dissertations were submitted and up from 2 years ago when 11 were submitted for consideration. The winners for 2004 are:

1st place: Jodi Viljoen, PhD (Simon Fraser University)

2nd place: Candice Odgers, PhD (University of Virginia)

3rd place: Martin Hildebrand, PhD (University of Amsterdam)

Educational Outreach Committee

Lavita Nadkarni reported via e-mail that the list of available speakers has steadily increased. Over this past year, AP-LS has co-sponsored one speaker, Alison Redlich, who presented at the annual meeting of the New York State Defenders Association; her presentation was titled "The Totality of Circumstances in Juvenile Interrogations: Weighing the Factors." The Committee has also been involved in assisting other individuals locate speakers on specific topics, although financial support from AP-LS was not sought.

Grants-in-Aid Committee

Mario Scalora via e-mail reported that the committee reviewed 12 proposals for the Fall 2004 funding cycle; 92% received funding totally \$4,100. Because the number of applications and the costs of research have increased in recent years, Mario requested additional funding to support the committee's activities. It was decided that the committee would be asked to submit a proposal for a new budget at the August meeting as part of the revised budgeting process for 2006.

Law and Human Behavior

Rich Wiener reported via e-mail that the journal remains strong. It continues to be frequently cited both in practice and in scholarly papers. The submission rate remains high, as does the rejection rate for submitted papers. During the period beginning January 1, 2004 and ending with December 31, 2004, potential contributors submitted 145 unsolicited, new manuscripts; 37 revisions of older papers, and 12 additional papers in response to calls for special editions and special sections. (The total number of manuscripts submitted equals 194.) The number of new unsolicited submissions climbed to a new record this year, a 12% increase from 2003 following a nearly 40% increase between 2001 and 2002. The rejection rate for the journal for 2003 was calculated at 78%, consistent with the 79% in 2002. The estimated rejection rate for 2004 has climbed to 82% (including the special edition; 85% without the special edition.) The rejection rate is likely to remain at that rate during 2005.

In January 2006, Brian Cutler will begin his term as editor. He has appointed three additional associate managing editors to assist in processing the influx of papers submitted to the journal each year. In the meantime, Rich has appointed Brian Bornstein as Chief Associate Editor with the job of assisting with article review, production, and flow.

Rich reported that Springer Publishing, (formerly Kluwer and Plenum Publishing before that) has undergone yet another employee shake-up. As a result of the shake-up Springer fell behind in the distribution of the journal in 2004. Rich recommended that the EC carefully review the current *Law and Human Behavior* publishing contract and examine alternatives to Springer in the future.

Committee on Relations with Other Organizations

Michele Galietta reported via e-mail that the committee has decided to focus on increasing communication and activities within APA via the newly appointed liasons with Directorates and increasing visibility and utility of APLS for those in applied settings. The committee plans to host a series of meetings between professionals and researchers to facilitate a dialogue aimed at disseminating research and informing research questions. In addition, the committee plans to host some regional conferences or a series of smaller presentations to practitioners in various settings by AP-LS researchers.

Women in Psychology and Law Committee

Regina Schuller & Beth Schwartz reported via e-mail that the committee organized a lunch discussion during the La Jolla conference. These luncheon discussions continue to be an organized yet informal way for those in attendance to discuss various issues related to both academics and professionals in the field of Psychology and Law. Beth and Regina have co-chaired the committee since 1999 and will be stepping down as co-chairs.

APA 2005 Program Committee

Jennifer Hunt and Eric Elbogen reported via e-mail that 67 of 81 submitted proposals have been accepted (82.7%). John Monahan has been asked give an invited address. To maximize the Division's time, arrangements have been made to co-sponsor 3 programs with other APA Divisions.

The program chairs for the 2006 APA Program will be Eric Elbogen and Amy Bradfield.

Careers and Training Committee

Allison Redlich reported via e-mail that the committee received seven applications for the *APLS Award for Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring in the Field of Psychology and Law*, which is almost double the number of applications from the previous year. This year's award will be given to Bette Bottoms and James Ogloff. In 2006, the Committee plans to break up the award into two distinct awards. The Committee is still discussing the best way to do this but most likely it will be separated by professionals from "comprehensive" (i.e., 2- and 4-year institutions without graduate programs) and professionals from "research intensive" (i.e., MA- and Ph.D.-granting institutions). In addition, the committee has set a new eligibility criterion for the award that nominees must have their degrees for at least seven years.

An updated version of the *Careers in Psychology and Law for Prospective Students* paper (first written several years ago by Edie Greene, Randy Otto, and Kirk Heilbrun) is now posted on the AP-LS website. The committee is also in the process of updating the *Predocutorial Internships in Psychology and Law* guide (and on creating a postdoctoral internship version), the *Graduate Training Programs in Psychology and Law*, and the *Handbook of Teaching Materials*.

The Committee co-organized a symposium with the APLS Mentoring Committee for the 2005 APLS conference.

Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychology (SGFP)

Randy Otto reported via e-mail that the first full draft of the revised SGFP has been posted to the SGFP Discussion list. The Revision Committee is reviewing comments on the draft posted to this SGFP discussion list over the
AP-LS NEWS, Summer 2005

next few months and planned a discussion for the La Jolla meeting. The draft will be posted on the APLS website, along with directions for signing up for the revisions discussion list.

The EC decided to have the membership vote on the proposed draft. Christina Studebaker will prepare a ballot for e-mail vote under the revised By-Laws.

Fellows Committee

Kirk Heilbrun reported via e-mail that the Committee had received one completed nomination for Fellow of AP-LS/Division 41. The committee will have a decision on this nomination made and forwarded to APA by their deadline of 2-14-05. Information soliciting nominations (including self-nominations) for Fellow will be run in the AP-LS News and posted on the website. To avoid confusion, the committee will explore alternative labels for the Society's new AP-LS Fellow category.

Forensic Specialty Council

Ira Packer reported via e-mail that the Forensic Specialty Council (representing both AP-LS and ABFP) was reorganized in 2004. Ira Packer was appointed to serve as the Chair of the Council and the representative to the APA's Council on Specialties (COS), replacing Kirk Heilbrun. The Forensic Specialty Council will meet in La Jolla and will discuss the definition of "forensic psychology," the Education and Training Guidelines, and the criteria to be used for APA accreditation of Postdoctoral Programs in Forensic Psychology.

Nominations and Awards

Slate of candidates for 2006:

President: Saul Kassin, Joel Dvoskin
Secretary: Wendy Heath, Patty Zapf
Member-at-large: Kevin Douglas, Chris Meissner
Council representative: Barry Rosenfeld, Beth Wiggins

The EC approved the creation of a new award for "Best Undergraduate Pa-

per." Awards for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place will be awarded at the AP-LS annual meeting.

Jennifer Robbennolt and Edie Greene reported on their attempts to clarify and systematize the awards given by AP-LS. The EC approved the resulting document which provides a description of each award, eligibility requirements, and application or nomination procedures. These descriptions will be posted on the AP-LS website.

Student Section

The Student Section is sponsoring a workshop for students regarding how to prepare for job talks and contract negotiations. The Student Section has worked with the Mentoring Committee and the Career and Training Committee in the planning of the Mentoring and Careers seminar for students and new faculty and the Mentoring Breakfast. The student section has revised its bylaws to reflect newly formed liaison positions.

Ad Hoc Mentoring Committee

Wendy Heath reported via e-mail that the Committee is currently recruiting "year-round" AP-LS Mentors from both clinical and non-clinical (academic and practice) areas. The names and a short biographical statement for each of these mentors will be listed on the upcoming AP-LS mentorship website. Anyone interested in being an AP-LS mentor may contact Wendy. At the La Jolla conference, the committee sponsored a symposium entitled, "Advice for Graduate Students and Beginning Professionals," (jointly sponsored by the Careers and Training Committee) and a Mentorship breakfast.

Interdisciplinary grants

No report available. Randy Salekin will be the Member-at-Large with responsibility for this program.

Committee on Ethnic Minority Affairs

No report available. The EC decided
EC Minutes cont. on p 26



The Supreme Court addressed the constitutionality of executing juvenile offenders in two cases prior to *Roper*. In *Thompson v. Oklahoma*, 487 U.S. 815 (1988), the Court held that the 8th Amendment prohibits executing offenders who were under 16 at the time of the crime. The Court found that a national consensus exists because all 18 states with a minimum age in their death penalty statutes required defendants to be at least 16 at the time of the crime. One year later, in *Stanford v. Kentucky*, 492 U.S. 361 (1989), the Court held that executing offenders who were 16 or 17 at the time of the crime did not violate the 8th Amendment, because the majority of death penalty states permitted the death penalty for 16 or 17 year-old offenders.

Roper v. Simmons

In 1993, Christopher Simmons (age 17) planned and committed capital murder. Prior to the murder, Simmons assured two friends that they could “get away with it” because they were minors. At 2 a.m. on the night of the murder, Simmons and a friend entered the home of Shirley Crook by reaching through an open window and unlocking the back door. They covered Mrs. Crook’s eyes and mouth with duct tape, bound her hands, and drove her to the state park. Once at the state park, they reinforced the bindings, tied her hands and feet with electrical wire, covered her head with a towel, wrapped her whole face in duct tape, and threw her from a railroad trestle spanning the Meramec River.

The State of Missouri tried Simmons as an adult, and he was convicted of first-degree murder and sentenced to death by lethal injection. Simmons’s post-conviction relief efforts in the state courts were not successful, and the federal courts denied his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. In 2002, Simmons filed a new petition for state post-conviction relief based on the Supreme Court’s decision in *Atkins v. Vir-*

ginia, 536 U.S. 304 (2002), which overruled an earlier decision (*Penry v. Lynaugh*, 492 U.S. 302 (1989)) and held that the 8th Amendment prohibits executing mentally retarded offenders. In his petition, Simmons argued that the reasoning of *Atkins* establishes that the U.S. Constitution also prohibits executing offenders who were under 18 at the time of the crime. The Missouri Supreme Court agreed, and it set aside Simmons’s death sentence and resentenced him to life in prison. Dissatisfied with the Missouri Supreme Court’s decision, the Attorney General of Missouri sought review in the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court granted certiorari to reconsider the issue decided 15 years earlier in *Stanford* – i.e., whether it is constitutionally permissible to execute an offender who was older than 15 but younger than 18 at the time of the crime. In Justice Kennedy’s majority opinion (joined by J.J. Stevens, Souter, Ginsburg, and Breyer), the Court held that the 8th Amendment (applicable to states via the 14th Amendment) prohibits imposing the death penalty on offenders who were younger than 18 when they committed their crimes. In reaching its decision, the Court relied on three factors: (1) evidence of a national consensus against juvenile executions, (2) the lesser culpability of juveniles, and (3) international practices concerning juvenile executions.

First, the Court found a national consensus against juvenile executions because 30 states prohibit the juvenile death penalty; 12 that have no death penalty, and 18 that have the death penalty but exclude juveniles. The Court also noted that juvenile executions are exceedingly rare in the 20 states that permit juvenile executions; since 1995, only 3 states (OK, TX, and VA) have executed offenders for crimes committed under age 18. Accordingly, based on the rejection of the juvenile death penalty in the majority of states, its infrequent use in states that permit juve-

nile executions, and the consistency in the trend toward abolition of the practice, the Court concluded that there is sufficient evidence of a national consensus against juvenile executions.

Second, the Court noted three differences between juveniles and adults which demonstrate that juveniles cannot be classified among those who are most deserving of execution: (1) juveniles lack maturity and have an underdeveloped sense of responsibility; (2) juveniles are more susceptible to negative influences and outside pressures; and (3) a juvenile’s character is not fully formed. The Court found that these differences make juvenile offenders less culpable. Of particular note is the Court’s reliance on social science research in reaching this conclusion (citing Arnett, 1992; Steinberg & Scott, 2003). The Court also stated that the two purposes of capital punishment – retribution and deterrence – would not be served by imposing the death penalty on juveniles. Therefore, given these considerations, the Court concluded that there was justification for a categorical rule prohibiting the execution of juvenile offenders.

Third, the Court looked to foreign laws and international authorities, noting that the U.S. is the only country that continues to sanction juvenile executions. Since 1990, only seven countries other than the U.S. have executed juvenile offenders (Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Nigeria, the Congo, and China), and each of these countries has since abolished the juvenile death penalty or publicly disavowed the practice. Noting that world opinion is not controlling on its 8th Amendment analysis, the Court nonetheless concluded that looking to foreign laws is instructive in interpreting the 8th Amendment’s prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment. In a strong dissent, Justice Scalia (joined by C.J. Rehnquist and J. Thomas) argued that the Court’s decision simply reflects the moral judgment of the five-Member majority. He dis-

agreed that a national consensus exists against juvenile executions, noting that less than half of the states that permit capital punishment (18 of 38 states) prohibit juvenile executions. He also noted that only four states banned juvenile executions since *Stanford* (whereas 16 states banned executing mentally retarded offenders between *Penry* and *Atkins*), and he questioned whether a legislative change in four states was sufficient to trigger a constitutional prohibition. After accusing the Court of “picking and choosing” the social science research that supports its views, Justice Scalia remarked that the conflicting research offers “scant support” for a categorical prohibition of juvenile executions. In a separate dissent, Justice O’Connor argued against a categorical age-based rule, advocating instead for a case-by-case approach in which sentencing juries are required to give appropriate mitigating weight to a defendant’s youth and immaturity.

Analysis of the *Roper* Decision

With the *Roper* decision, the Supreme Court continued its recent trend of narrowing the class of persons eligible for capital punishment. Just as *Atkins* excludes all mentally retarded offenders from the death penalty, *Roper* categorically excludes all juvenile offenders. The impact of *Roper* will be immediate. The 72 offenders (across 12 states) who are currently awaiting execution for crimes committed as juveniles will be moved off death row and resentenced to the harshest punishment available in that state (typically life without parole), and all offenders who commit capital murder as a juvenile can no longer receive a death sentence.

There are, however, criticisms that can be levied against a bright-line rule excluding an entire class of people from the death penalty. Perhaps the major concern is that the class of people excluded from the death penalty will be both under-inclusive and over-inclusive. In terms of under-inclusiveness, there will likely be instances in which the “in-

capacities” associated with being an adolescent will persist when an individual turns 18. As conceded by the Court in *Roper*, “The qualities that distinguish juveniles from adults do not disappear when an individual turns 18.” It is therefore conceivable that some adults will possess the characteristics relied on by the Court in *Roper* to exempt juveniles from the death penalty. There is also an over-inclusiveness concern, because there will inevitably be a portion of juveniles who possess the maturity and understanding that would seem to justify the imposition of the death penalty.

Relevant Research

The *Roper* decision raises several important questions regarding adolescent cognitive and brain development. The latest neurodevelopmental imaging studies suggest that the brain is still growing and maturing well beyond adolescence, and a recent NIMH study suggests that brain maturation may not peak until age 25 (Beckman, 2004). Research also suggests that the frontal lobe, which plays an integral role in strategic decision-making and planning goal-directed behavior, is one of the last parts of the brain to mature structurally (Gogtay et al., 2004). Other research suggests that adults behave differently from adolescents because adults use existing brain structures in a different way. For example, to inhibit impulsive behavior, adolescents rely primarily on the prefrontal cortex, whereas adults exhibit a more complex response that relies on more distributive and collaborative interactions

among several areas of the brain (Beckman, 2004). Not all brain researchers agree, however, on the conclusions that can be drawn from neuro-imaging studies. For example, neuroscientist Elizabeth Sowell of UCLA believes that too little data exist to connect behavior to brain structure (Beckman, 2004).

Several organizations, including the American Psychological Association (APA), filed amicus curiae briefs in support of Simmons that included relevant social science and neuroscience research. The APA’s amicus brief, which was prepared with assistance from several AP-LS members, relied on behavioral studies and neuropsychological research to argue that developmentally immature decision-making, combined with incomplete neurological development, diminishes an adolescent’s blameworthiness. Therefore, according to the APA, executing juvenile offenders would not further the constitutional purposes of the death penalty.

Conclusion

For the second time in three years, the U.S. Supreme Court has narrowed the class of persons eligible for the death penalty. The decision to categorically exclude all juvenile offenders from the death penalty will inevitably have both supporters and detractors, and fallout from the *Roper* decision can be expected to continue for some time. Given the Supreme Court’s seemingly firm division on the constitutionality of juvenile executions, the rule announced in *Roper* will likely remain untouched until the composition of the Court changes.

References

- Arnett, J. J. (1992). Reckless behavior in adolescence: A developmental perspective. *Developmental Review*, 12, 339-373.
- Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002).
- Beckman, M. (2004). Crime, culpability, and the adolescent brain. *Science*, 305, 596-599.
- Cothran L. (2000). *Juveniles and the death penalty*. Washington, DC: Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

ERRATA

There was a minor error in the last Legal Update column (Winter 2005, Vol. 25, No. 1) dealing with the California decision expanding *Tarasoff*. The last sentence of the third paragraph should say “Virginia and Texas,” not “Virginia and Washington.” The parenthetical cites are correct, but the text is wrong. We apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused.



Conducting Your First AP-LS Conference Presentation: Improving the Experience for Yourself and Your Audience

John F. Edens
Southern Methodist University

John Petрила
University of South Florida

Laura S. Guy
Simon Fraser University

Barry Rosenfeld
Fordham University

You walk to the podium. You are about to give your first presentation at AP-LS. You prepared to talk for 15 minutes but the “big name” before you went 5 minutes over his time because he had “just this one last point I simply must make.” You are nervous, as you’ve only practiced in front of the mirror and your classmates. You also realize you have 50 slides and you try not to divide that number by the 10 minutes you now have. As you open your mouth to talk, John Monahan walks in the room. You reach for a glass of water, but find that “big name” also finished the water after his presentation. Mouth dry, you realize you can barely remember the name of your major professor, let alone the subject of your talk. You take a deep breath, deciding that the audience first needs to understand your methodology in detail...

Later that night at the bar you tell your friends you think you did horribly. They say “you did fine” but don’t make direct eye contact with you when they say it...

As the recent AP-LS conference in La Jolla wrapped up, several attendees found themselves having the usual end-of-conference discussion regarding the quality of the presentations. The consensus, as is characteristic most years, was that the overall quality was very good but that there were a number of recurrent problems demonstrated—mostly, although by no means exclusively, by relatively novice presenters. This led to the typical iteration of what foibles were most detrimental to doing a quality talk. Unlike previous years, however, someone suggested that it might be useful to actually provide some pre-emptive feedback to those who will present at AP-LS (or any other academic conference) in the future. Hence this column. Our goal is to try and provide some constructive suggestions in the preparation and delivery of an academic presentation, particularly when the amount of time available is brief.

Preparing your Talk:

‘I’m sure they’ll want to look at the fourth footnote at the bottom of the third column of my 19th slide’ (or how Power Point can ruin your talk)

Power Point slides are often the source of significant audi-

ence frustration. There are several things worth remembering about them as you prepare your talk.

- Do not put too much information on an overhead or slide. The rule of thumb that experienced conference presenters recommend is between 6 and 8 lines of text – and THIS INCLUDES DATA slides. We have all sat through presentations where the audience is asked to look at a vast matrix of data using a font size of 8. It asks too much and the point you are trying to make will get lost. If you must make a point from an overcrowded overhead, use a pointer and be very clear what you are showing the audience. Simply pointing with your finger will not do the job.
- Related to the preceding point, do not use tables that have the equivalent font size to something you’d see in a journal. If it’s so small that no one can see it and you have to explain everything, you may as well not have put it up anyway. Hit the highlights, in LARGE FONT. In general, don’t use a font size less than 20 and if possible, stick with font sizes between 24 and 32,
- A conference presentation is not a thesis defense. Do not bring 50 slides to a 15-minute presentation. It’s just not possible to cover that much material, no matter how quickly you talk. And no one will be able to follow you even if you can speak that quickly. Life is short, and so is the time you have for your presentation. Sometimes less is better, far, far better. Another good rule-of-thumb is to have one slide for every minute of presentation time – and NEVER plan to go through more than 2 slides per minute unless you are an exceptional presenter who can really fly.
- Do not show a slide, say you aren’t going to cover it, and then spend 5 minutes on the slide you just said you were going to skip.

‘I just spent 5 months and many, many all-nighters collecting, analyzing, and writing all about my data, submitting my proposal to AP-LS...after all that, I don’t need to actually practice my talk too, do I?’

Analogous to the three most important words in real estate being ‘location, location, location,’ the key to a successful presentation is ‘rehearsal, rehearsal, rehearsal.’ Practice your talk ahead of time, preferably with an audience. Exposure

AP-LS NEWS, Summer2005

to and repetition of your own material is the key to controlling your anxiety level and being comfortable and flexible enough to deal with any curveballs that might get thrown at you. It might also convince you that you just can't get through 50 slides in 15 minutes.

- Although perhaps over the top, one very helpful method borrowed from clinical training is to film yourself giving your talk. It's surprising what habits you are likely to notice when you watch the film— who knew your fingers could run through your hair so often and that you could say 'ummmm' every 3rd word.
- If you are presenting your thesis or dissertation, do not assume you are exempted from the above pleas to practice simply because you (should) know the information inside and out. It's amazing what gaping holes in the hippocampus can appear magically when you're speaking in front of Dr. Biggest Name Ever in your area.
- Although we are big believers in practice and preparation, too much rumination does have a downside. Do not spend too much time trying to dream up every possible question that the most methodologically and statistically savvy audience member could think up regarding your multi-panel longitudinal mixed vector cluster analysis. Most in the audience will be more interested in the primary findings than the statistical minutia, and if they do come up with a question it's probably either (a) relatively easy, or (b) something you'd never have anticipated in a million years anyway. Have references for any unusual or exceedingly complex analyses and briefly summarize the key points. Also, it's not the end of the world to tell an audience member that you're not sure about something.

'My methodology could not be more fascinating. Plus I spent 3 years with it so how could it be uninteresting to anyone?'

Fifteen minutes is not enough time to describe your entire methodology. If you try to do so, you will lose a significant portion of the audience and you will find that you are ready to present your results just as the moderator holds up the 1-minute sign.

- Unless you are presenting a study about methodology or you have done something that represents a methodological breakthrough (possible but unlikely), you should cover your methods briefly, note significant limitations and get to the point of your presentation, which will usually be your results. Too often, presenters rush through their results because they have lingered lovingly over their methods. Too often in such cases, the audience is left asking, "What did they find?"
- You may be part of a panel presenting multiple facets of one study. If the prior speaker has presented the methodology in enough detail, do not repeat it when your turn comes. It tends to irritate an audience when a speaker says "my colleague just presented the methodology for our study, so I won't repeat it here. Now, our methods consisted of the following..."
- What these points highlight is the need to triage your study. You can't present everything, so make choices about what points are most important for the audience. At AP-LS, you probably don't need to explain what the Dusky criteria are for competence to stand trial, but when you give the same presentation in your first job talk, you may. Think about the level of depth that is appropriate, and how much weight to give background, methods, results, and discussion since you will never have enough time to go through everything.

The Big Day:

'If people usually think I'm entertaining after 2 cups of coffee, imagine how interesting I'll be after 6!'

- Adhering to your normal routine (as much as possible) on the day of your

talk is generally a good idea. Anything that is markedly different (e.g., new suit, staying up all night, new shampoo) typically has little upside and can lead to unexpected outcomes (e.g., poorly fitting suit, oversleeping, allergic reaction to your shampoo). In particular, consume your normal allotment of stimulants and/or depressants prior to the presentation, whatever that 'normal' allotment happens to be. Being animated is great, but vibrating through the floor after your fourth mochachino (if you usually only have one) accomplishes little—and may be either funny or painful for the audience to watch, depending on how you handle your caffeine.

- Additionally, make sure that all your clothes are where they should be before you go to your session. Nothing shouts "Look at me mom – I dressed myself!" like bad static cling or a pant leg stuffed into a sock.

'It looked perfect on my computer. I'm sure it will look fine when I run it through the LCD projector for the first time in front of 50 people.'

- If at all possible, check out the room in which you are presenting and the equipment you're using, particularly to see if your Power Point presentation looks remotely like it looks on your computer. You may find that you cannot actually read the slides very well. The slides may be too crowded; the font may be too small (but not if you followed the suggestions above). Or in an attempt to convey your rich aesthetic sense you have chosen a color for your words that cannot be read against the color you have chosen for your background. It is wonderful to have good taste in matching colors. It is even better for the audience to be able to read your slides. Dark backgrounds with colored lettering sometime turns into 'dark on darker' when projected on a screen. As a safe choice, white



backgrounds with black or dark blue lettering or white lettering on a (very) dark background are hard to screw up. Common mistakes are the use of light-colors for text, like light blue, orange, and pink. These look great on your computer, where you have a backlit display, but appear very dark when projected through and LCD projector in a dim, but not pitch black room.

- Related to the above point, another good reason to do the “room check” of your presentation is that the format you have on your monitor is not always a perfect match with the projector and computer you will be using. Do not assume that just because your slide show works on your home computer (or any other computer for that matter) that it automatically will magically appear correctly on-screen through an LCD projector on your supervisor’s laptop bought back when Reagan was still president. Margins and tabs will often shift when you change computers, and can leave your tables misaligned and your text running off the page. Always check these things first, and it’s still a good idea to have overhead transparencies with you as a back-up.

The Talk Itself:

‘I’m the 4th of 4 presenters. Time to meditate on the meaning of life until it’s my turn.’

- It is very worthwhile for you to pay attention to what people speaking before you have said. There’s no need to plug through things that someone just spent 5 minutes on a few minutes ago. This is particularly indefensible for a symposium, where people should have some sense of what the other presenters had planned to say. If you are presenting in a symposium, make sure you know what other presenters will be covering so you can minimize redundancy and make the most of your allotted time.
- Monitor the time as the session progresses and have a clear idea in advance of what you can most rea-

sonably skip over if the previous presenters took their share of the time and more or if you are running long. Particularly if you are running short of time, what’s the take-home message for your audience? Don’t let that get lost in reviewing the alpha levels for the dependent measures in your ancillary hypotheses. Limitations of your research, future directions, etc., usually are self-evident and can be easily jettisoned in most instances.

- On the same note, do not be greedy with *your* time: Use only what’s yours and heed the time warnings of the moderator.

‘I’m part of a symposium with someone I cited 470 times in my dissertation (and she just happened to do the world’s most entertaining talk ahead of me). I may have to pass out now.’

- Everyone begins his or her career as an unknown. In addition, most of the people who will be listening to your talk, even the well-known ones, are very nice people who are quite used to watching graduate students and young professionals cut their teeth at conferences. All they expect is that you give it your best shot. So, although it is normal to have some anxiety when presenting with someone well known on the panel or in the audience, remember they were probably in a situation just like yours at some point in their career. Perhaps even think of it as an opportunity to make a positive impression.

‘Time to do my thing. I’m determined to make sure that the next 15 minutes are not my first and only 15 minutes of fame...or infamy...’

For the talk itself, there are many common presentation mistakes that should be avoided. As we noted above, many of these can be curtailed by spending adequate time rehearsing.

- Do not read your slides during your presentation. The audience is literate and can read them more quickly to themselves than you can out loud.

It is also deathly boring to listen to an individual read his or her slides. A typical audience response to being bored is to simply quit listening. Besides, if you’re following the rules about how much text, what font size, and how many slides you can get through, you can’t write it all out. Slides should be considered notes, reminders, and a means of highlighting the points you want to make – not a repetition of the entire talk. That’s the purpose of journal articles.

- Do not try to convince yourself you aren’t nervous if you are. Everyone expects you to be at least a little anxious. It’s not a crime and, if anything, most people will be sympathetic.
- Do not spend the entire time looking at the screen and away from the audience. Not looking at them won’t make them go away. Make eye contact with people in the audience, as much as possible and at least once.
- Move at least once from the obligatory stationary position most people assume at the podium. Nothing keeps people awake like a little motion.
- Although APLS is not open mike night at the Comedy Improv, try to be at least a little funny in some way, especially if it can be self-deprecating. However, do not try and tell a joke if you are not good at doing so.
- Do not be afraid of the ‘pregnant pause.’ If you get confused, take a drink of water and collect yourself. You do not need a perpetual stream of verbiage, which often seems prompted by anxiety and the 40 slides left for the remaining 2 minutes.
- Finally, having a friendly face in the audience you can focus on can be extremely comforting. Presentations in front of complete strangers are much more stressful than those where you have some perceived social support. This of course presumes your friend isn’t the sort to make fun of you later.

‘Where the !#\$%&\$%&#! is everyone? Don’t they know how much work I put into this?’

You may encounter a related problem, when you find yourself presenting to a few classmates or friends while the room next to yours is packed with people wanting to hear the latest on a particular issue or from a particular speaker. This can be deflating. However, everyone goes through this at some point or another in his or her career. It should not cause you to let down and give a less enthusiastic talk than you otherwise would give. First, you owe it to yourself and those who took the time to come listen to you to do your best. Second, you never know even in a small audience who you might impress. Third, your classmates who came to support you are more likely to mean it when they tell you that you were great.

The Fallout

'Oh God, I can never show my face again in public'

After finishing your first presentation ever, you may have a variety of reactions. A common one is that many people tend to beat themselves up somewhat, focusing more on what they did wrong than what they did well. Unless you're fairly narcissistic, you probably did better than you think. And don't devalue positive comments from those who watched your talk, particularly from strangers.

'They liked me, they really really liked me...'

It is very flattering when people ask for your slides or paper. If you promise to send it to them, make sure that you do. The individual may have forgotten that she requested your pa-

per five minutes after your presentation. On the other hand, the next time she meets you she may remember something about you—you once promised to send her something but did not.

In conclusion, to the best of our knowledge no one has ever died giving his or her first AP-LS presentation, and a bad presentation has never ruined anyone's career. The good news is that it seems to get progressively easier and, at least for some people, can even become an enjoyable experience. We hope these recommendations can alleviate some of the initial anxiety that is common with any public speaking scenario such as an AP-LS presentation. Having committed several of these mistakes ourselves, we hope others can benefit somewhat from these suggestions.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS

• President	Edie Greene	egreene@uccs.edu
• Past-President	Sol Fulero	sfulero@sinclair.edu
• President-Elect	Gary Wells	gwells@iastate.edu
• Secretary	Jennifer Robbenalt	robbenaltj@missouri.edu
• Treasurer	Margaret Bull Kovera	koveram@fiu.edu
• Member-at-Large	Christina Studebaker	cstudebaker@csopp.edu
• Member-at-Large	Randall Salekin	rsalekin@bama.au.edu
• Member-at-Large	Jen Skeem	jskeem@uic.edu
• Council Representative	Gail Goodman	ggoodman@ucdavis.edu
• Council Representative	Patty Griffin	pgriffin@navpoint.com
• Newsletter Editor	Jen Groscup	jpgroscup@jjay.cuny.edu
• Publications Editor	Ron Roesch	rroesch@sfu.ca
• <i>Law & Human Behavior</i> Editor	Rich Wiener	wiener_richard@unl.edu
• Webpage Editor	Adam Fried	afried@fordham.edu
• AP-LS/APA Liaison	Marsha Liss	lissmb@state.gov
• Careers and Training Committee	Allison Redlich	aredlich@prainc.com
• Dissertation Awards	Eve Brank	ebrank@ufl.edu
• Educational Outreach Committee	Lavita Nadkarni	lnadkarn@du.edu
• Fellows Committee	Kirk Heilbrun	kirk.heilbrun@drexel.edu
• Grants-in-Aid	Mario Scalora	mscalora@unl.edu
• Committee on Law and Psychology in Corrections	Melissa Warren	mgw.apa@email.apa.org
• Committee on Relations with Other Organizations	Michele Galiotta	galiotta13@aol.com
• Mentorship Committee	Wendy Heath	heath@rider.edu
• Scientific Review Paper Committee	Rich Wiener	wiener_richard@baruch.cuny.edu
• Women in Law Committee	Beth Schwartz	bschwartz@rmwc.edu
• Division Administrative Secretary	TBA	TBA
• 2005 APA Program Chairs	Jen Hunt	jhunt2@unl.edu
	Eric Elbogen	eric.elbogen@duke.edu
	Jennifer Groscup	jpgroscup@jjay.cuny.edu
	Tonia Nicholls	tnichola@sfu.edu
• 2006 APLS Conference Chairs	Annette Christy	achristy@fmhi.usf.edu



Bourgon, G. & Armstrong, B. (2005). **Transferring the principles of effective treatment into a "real world" prison setting.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32*, 1, 3-25.

Cognitive behavioral treatment of various lengths (5, 10, and 15 week) significantly reduced recidivism in a sample of 482 incarcerated male offenders compared to 137 untreated offenders. An assessment of offender risk, need, and responsivity factors was used to assign offenders to treatment groups. As treatment length increased, offenders demonstrated a greater reduction in recidivism.

Cesaroni, C. & Peterson-Badali, M. (2005). **Young offenders in custody: Risk and adjustment.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32*, 3, 251-277.

Among a sample of 113 incarcerated juveniles, number of disciplinary infractions was not associated with custodial adjustment. Risk factors associated with institutional life (worry about victimization and experiencing conflicts with inmates as difficult) were better predictors of juvenile adjustment to custody than preexisting risk factors. Adjustment was measured with the Youth Self-Report Internalizing scale.

Farrall, S. (2005). **Officially recorded convictions for probationers: The relationship with self-report and supervisory observations.** *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 10*, 121-131.

The number of offenses reported by 141 probationers were compared to official records and records kept by their probation officers. Reports from probationers and their officers matched 70% of time, whereas 30% of offend-

ers reported committing more offenses than their probation officers were aware of. Overall, a high concordance rate between self-reports and official reports was observed.

Greeven, P. G. J., & De Rutter, C. (2004). **Personality disorders in a Dutch forensic psychiatric sample: Changes with treatment.** *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 14*, 280-290.

Forensic psychiatric patients ($N = 59$) who participated in two years of inpatient treatment, employing skills training and CBT, showed reliable and clinically significant declines in personality disorder diagnoses (e.g., borderline, narcissistic, antisocial, schizoid, paranoid) and overall decrease in personality diagnosis symptoms (except histrionic and sadistic symptoms).

Kroner, D. G., & Mills, J. G. (2004). **The Criminal Attribution Inventory: A measure of offender perceptions.** *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 39*(4), 15-29.

70 incarcerated males completed the Criminal Attribution Inventory (CRAI), which measures criminal's perception of the causation of a crime, and the Blame Attribution Inventory (BAI), which measures self-blame for crimes. Coefficient alpha values for the CRAI's scale scores ranged from .55 to .84; one-month test-retest coefficients ranged from .50 to .74. There were strong correlations between corresponding scales on the CRAI and BAI. Pre-post treatment studies of five different treatment programs indicated positive changes in CRAI scales following treatment.

Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (2005). **Screening for suicide risk factors in prison inmates:**

Evaluating the efficiency of the Depression, Hopelessness and Suicide Screening Form. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 10*, 1-12.

The ability of the Depression, Hopelessness, and Suicide screening form (DHS) to identify suicide risk factors among inmates was examined in two samples. In sample 1, DHS scores from 131 inmates were compared to file and interview data. Overall, the DHS identified 10 of 17 inmates who reported a history of suicide attempts. The DHS was able to identify psychological distress in a 2nd sample of 101 inmates (AUC = .91 to .98).

Mitchell, C., Mackenzie, D. L., & Perez, D. M. (2005). **A randomized evaluation of the Maryland Correctional Boot Camp for Adults: Effects on offender antisocial attitudes and cognitions.** *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 40*(3/4), 71-86.

At entry and release, inmates randomly assigned to an adult boot camp ($n = 49$) or a traditional correctional facility ($n = 64$) completed surveys based on their experiences and the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire (which measures antisocial attitudes and cognitions). No decreases in antisocial attitudes or cognitions between time of admittance and release were observed.

Walters, G.D. (2005). **Recidivism in released lifestyle change program participants.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32*, 1, 50-68.

Controlling for demographic variables, 291 inmates who completed at least one of three levels of the Lifestyle Change Program (LCP) had a significantly lower likelihood of rearrest and incarceration upon release than 89 inmates who

were transferred or released before participating in LCP. Among low risk inmates (less than 6 prior arrests), LCP decreased likelihood of *arrest* during follow-up compared to controls, whereas in high risk inmates (6 or more prior arrests) LCP decreased likelihood of *incarceration* compared to controls.

Wilson, D.B., Bouffard, L.A., & Mackenzie, D.L. (2005). **A quantitative review of structured, group-oriented, cognitive-behavioral programs for offenders.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32*, 2, 172-204.

A meta-analysis of 20 studies in which a CBT-based group intervention was offered to incarcerated offenders revealed that these treatments were effective at reducing criminal behavior. The mean effect size for the higher quality studies was 0.32, which translates to a 16 percentage point difference in recidivism rates between treated and untreated offenders. Programs that emphasized cognitive deficits or distortions and those that emphasized moral reasoning were among the most effective.

DELINQUENCY/ ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Campbell, J.S. & Elison, J. (2005). **Shame coping styles and psychopathic personality traits.** *Journal of Personality Assessment, 84*, 1, 96-104.

Among 305 undergraduates, the convergent validity of the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (SRPS) was examined by correlating the measure with self-report shame coping styles. The SRPS primary scale, which measures a selfish and manipulative interpersonal style, and the secondary scale, which measures impulsivity and self-defeating behavior, were negatively related to adaptive shame coping and positively

related with externalizing shame coping. Internalizing shame coping was negatively correlated with the primary scale and positively correlated with the secondary scale.

Kim-Cohen, J., Moffit, T. E., Taylor, A., Pawlby, S. J., & Caspi, A. (2005). **Maternal depression and children's antisocial behavior.** *Archives of General Psychiatry, 62*, 173-181.

1,116 twin pairs and their parents completed ratings of maternal depression, parent Antisocial Personality Disorder symptoms (APSD), and the children's antisocial behavior when the children were ages five and seven. Maternal depression and parental history of APSD symptoms were associated with an increased risk of children manifesting antisocial behavior. The combination of these two risk factors was associated with the greatest risk for antisocial behavior.

Kruh, I.P., Frick, P.J., & Clements, C.B. (2005). **Historical and personality correlates to the violence patterns of juveniles tried as adults.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32*, 1, 69-96.

In a sample of 100 incarcerated juveniles, those with a high degree of psychopathic traits, as measured by the Antisocial Process Screening Device (APSD), had committed more frequent and varied acts of violence than those low in psychopathic traits. The APSD demonstrated incremental validity over historical variables in its association with the frequency, variety, and situational patterns of violence. The Overcontrolled Hostility scale of the MMPI-2 was not associated with these correlates of violence.

Marczyk, G.R., Heilbrun, K., Lander, T., DeMatteo, D. (2005).

Juvenile decertification: Developing a model for classification and prediction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32*, 3, 278-301.

Factors that differentiated juvenile offenders who remained in the adult criminal justice system and those who were decertified to the juvenile justice system included age, total score on the Youth Level of Service Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI), as well as specific subscales of the YLS/CMI. A model containing PCL:YV total scores and select subscales from the YLS/CMI and the MAYSI provided the most accurate predictions of decertification status.

Mitchell, J., & Palmer, E. J., (2004). **Evaluating the "Reasoning and Rehabilitation" program for young offenders.** *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 39*(4), 31-45.

At 18 months post-release, reimprisonment and reconviction rates of 31 male juvenile offenders who participated in a Reasoning and Rehabilitation group (R&R) were compared to the rates of a control group of 31 retrospectively matched juvenile offenders. The R&R group engaged in cognitive behavioral exercises designed to promote pro-social attitudes. The R&R group displayed slightly lower reconviction and reimprisonment rates than the control group, but these differences were not significant.

Nee, C., & Ellis, T. (2005). **Treating offending children: What works?** *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 10*, 133-148.

41 adolescents who completed an outpatient intervention through the Persistent Young Offender Project (PYOP) in the U.K. were assessed at six-month intervals while in treatment using the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R). Results from the first 30-

months of the project indicated that children who participated in the intervention had a significant drop in LSI-R scores compared to children who received no intervention.

Raine, A., Moffit, T. E., Caspi, A., Loeber, R., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Lynam, D. (2005). **Neurocognitive impairments in boys on the life-course persistent antisocial path.** *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 114*, 38-49.

Comparisons of life-course persistent (LCP), childhood limited, and adolescent limited offenders found spatial, verbal, memory, and nonmemory cognitive impairments in all groups, higher levels of neurocognitive and psychosocial deficits (e.g., poverty, IQ) in LCP offenders, and that deficits were not attributable to ADHD, child abuse, head injury or psychosocial adversity.

Seager, J.A. (2005). **Violent men: The importance of impulsivity and cognitive schema.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32*, 1, 26-49.

Among 50 incarcerated males, almost half of the variance in PCL-R measured psychopathy and 31% of the variance in violent criminal history was accounted for by a combination of measures of impulsivity and self schema for a hostile world. Self schemas were measured by responses to hostile attribution vignettes and a binocular rivalry task involving the presence of weapons.

Stoolmiller, M. & Belechman, E.A. (2005). **Substance use is a robust predictor of adolescent recidivism.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32*, 3, 302-328.

Substance use strongly predicted recidivism (officially recorded rearrests) in male and female juvenile offenders ($N=505$) irrespective of prior reported delinquency, gender, ethnicity, age, follow-up time,

or data source (parent/adolescent). When either parents or adolescents denied substance abuse, the adolescents' risk of rearrest increased dramatically. Age at first arrest did not predict recidivism. Non-White/non-Asian youth were at a higher risk of rearrest than White or Asian youth, even when controlling for other variables, including delinquency.

Vassileva, J., Kosson, D. S., Abramowitz, C., & Conrod, P. (2005). **Psychopathy versus psychopathies in classifying criminal offenders.** *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 10*, 27-43.

Completed cluster analysis of 200 male inmates scores' on the Psychopathy Check List-Revised and the Interpersonal Measure of Psychopathy, and diagnoses of substance abuse/dependence and anxiety. Results indicated four subtypes of criminal offenders: 1) secondary psychopaths characterized by more severe alcohol/drug problems (29.5%), 2) non-psychopathic criminals with alcohol/drug problems (27.5%), 3) primary psychopaths (17%), and 4) those with no alcohol/drug problems and no psychopathic traits (26%). The primary psychopath cluster had higher scores on Factor 1 compared to the rest of the sample, but had average scores on Factor 2.

FORENSIC EVALUATION

Ackerson, K. S., Brodsky, S. L., & Zapf, P. A. (2005). **Judges' and psychologists' assessments of legal and clinical factors in competence for execution.** *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 11*, 164-193. Researchers created the Competency for Execution Research Rating Scale (CERRS) based on issues state judges deemed important in determin-



ing competency for execution (CFE). A study of 90 psychologists asked to make CFE determinations using hypothetical vignettes found that access to the CERRS increased the likelihood that psychologists would use legal factors deemed important by judges when conducting CFE evaluations.

Kristiansson, M., Sumelius, K., & Sondergaard, H-P. (2004). **Post-traumatic stress disorder in the forensic psychiatric setting.** *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 32, 399-407. In Sweden, 25 immigrants and 25 Swedes who were referred for a forensic psychiatric evaluation (FPE) were administered the Clinician Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS), Impact of Event Scale -22 (IES-22) and Post-traumatic Symptom Scale -10 (PTSS-10). According to the CAPS, immigrants ($n = 15$) had five times the prevalence of PTSD compared to Swedes ($n = 3$); results of FPEs were that 11 immigrants and no Swedes were diagnosed with PTSD. Those diagnosed with PTSD based on the CAPS had higher IES -22 and PTSS-10 scores and committed a greater proportion of sexual and violent crimes.

Rogers, R., Jackson, R.L., Kaminski, P.L. (2005). **Factitious psychological disorders: The overlooked response style in forensic evaluations.** *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 5, 1, 21-41.

65 doctoral students were asked to complete the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI) and Structured Inventory of Malingered Symptomatology (SIMS) in one of four conditions: as an outpatient who has a factitious-dependant style or a factitious-demanding style, a professional feigning a disability claim, or honestly. There were few dif-

ferences between the factitious and malingering conditions, although both factitious groups demonstrated an acute need for treatment. The SIMS did not differentiate between conditions, but the PAI defensiveness index produced moderate to large effect sizes between the malingering and factitious conditions.

Stein, L.A.R. & Graham, J.R. (2005). **Ability of substance abusers to escape detection on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Adolescent (MMPI-A) in a juvenile correctional facility.** *Assessment*, 12, 1, 28-39.

126 incarcerated adolescents (67 substance abusers and 59 non-substance abusers) were asked to complete the MMPI-A twice; once under standard instructions and once under faking good instructions. The MMPI-A correctly classified 60-85% of adolescents who were responding under standard instructions. Under fake good instructions, the L Scale was successful at detecting more than 75% of deceptive and honest profiles. 72% of those who were feigning substance abuse were detected.

LAW ENFORCEMENT/ DECEPTION DETECTION

Akehurst, L., Bull, R., Vrij, A., & Kohnken, G. (2004). **The effects of training professional groups and lay persons to use Criteria-Based Content Analysis to detect deception.** *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 18, 877-891. 26 police officers, 14 social workers, and 18 undergraduates rated the veracity of four written statements and reported their detection confidence before receiving training in Criteria-Based Content Analysis (CBCA). After training, they rated four more written statements. There were no between group differences in

detection accuracy before training. None of the three groups displayed significant improvement in detection accuracy after training. After training, social workers were 77% accurate and significantly more accurate than the students (61%) and police officers (55%). After training, police officers performed significantly worse, but were significantly more confident in their judgments compared to others.

Bond, G.D., & Lee, A.Y. (2005). **Language of lies in prison: Linguistic classification of prisoners' truthful and deceptive natural language.** *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 19, 313-329. 64 prisoners told three true and false statements to a fellow prisoner (judge) about six videoclips. The accuracy of the judges and two computer models in detecting deception was examined. Using Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) software, the statements were coded based on Reality Monitoring (RM) and Newman, Pennebaker, Berry & Richards' (NP) models. The RM model's (excluding the spatial words category) and younger judges' (ages 18-27) hit rate for accurately identifying true statements was 71.1%; the hit rates for the NP model and older judges (ages 65-84) were 69.7% and 51%, respectively.

Frowd, C. D., Carson, D., Ness, H., McQuiston-Surrett, D., Richardson, J., Baldwin, H., et al. (2005). **Contemporary composite techniques: The impact of a forensically-relevant target delay.** *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 10, 63-81. 50 participants completed a composite drawing (using one of three composite techniques) of a celebrity two days after viewing a picture of the celebrity for 1 minute. Naming of the composite drawings by 80 undergraduate judges resulted in low identification rates (3%).

Leach, A. M., Talwar, V., Lee, K., Bala, N. & Lindsay, R. C. L. (2004). **"Intuitive" lie detection of children's deception by law enforcement officials and university students.** *Law and Human Behavior*, 28, 661-685. In a series of four experiments, police officers, customs officers, and undergraduate students evaluated videotapes of child interviews and determined if the children's responses were truthful or deceptive. All participants were more accurate when presented with interviews in which the children had either a) been reminded of the moral consequences of not telling the truth, or b) promised to tell the truth. Reminders and promises were not seen by the evaluators. Overall, participants were able to correctly identify truthful answers less than 70% of the time.

van Oorsouw, K., Merckelbach, H., Ravelli, D., Nijman, H., & Mekking-Pompen, I. (2004). **Alcoholic blackout for criminally relevant behavior.** *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 32, 364-370.

"Healthy" samples of university students ($n = 256$) and library patrons ($n = 100$) completed surveys concerning past alcohol consumption and blackouts. Psychological evaluations of 100 individuals suspected of Driving Under the Influence (DUI) were also reviewed. Among "healthy" participants, 67% reported experiencing a blackout and 15% reported engaging in deviant behaviors during a blackout. In the DUI group, 14% reported experiencing a blackout during a traffic-control stop; 85% of incidents reportedly led to the driver causing an accident. At the time of arrest, the blood alcohol content (BAC) of offenders claiming blackout was similar to that from offenders who did not claim blackout.

Watson, A. C., Corrigan, P. W., & Ottati, V. (2004). **Police responses to persons with mental illness: Does the label matter?** *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 32, 378-385.

Police officers ($N=382$) were administered the Attribution Questionnaire and indicated how they would respond to a situation in which a subject, with or without schizophrenia, was a suspect, victim, witness, or person in need of assistance. In suspect vignettes, the presence of mental illness did not effect police responses but officers were less willing to act on the behalf of or act on information provided by victims and witnesses with mental illness. Officers' attributions and perceptions affected their responses to all situations except those involving suspects.

LEGAL DECISION-MAKING

Buck, J. A., Warren, A. R., Brigham, J. C. (2004). **When does quality count? Perceptions of hearsay testimony about child sexual abuse interviews.** *Law and Human Behavior*, 28, 599-621.

360 undergraduates reviewed written transcripts about alleged sexual abuse from either the victim (child interview) or an adult interviewer (hearsay testimony). Participants rated the transcripts before and after deliberating in groups of six. A 2 (type of testimony) X 3 (poor, typical, good interview) X 2 (4 or 10-year-old child) factorial design was used. Analyses of individual verdicts indicated that poor interviews were associated with lower conviction rates of the alleged perpetrator when participants reviewed transcripts of the child interviews. Conviction rates were not associated with interview quality in the hearsay conditions.

Costabile, K.A. & Klein, S.B.

AP-LS NEWS, Summer 2005

(2005). **Finishing strong: Recency effects in juror judgments.** *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 1, 47-58. Results from 4 mock jury studies suggested that incriminating evidence was more likely to lead to guilty verdicts when it was presented late in the trial than when it was presented early. Recency effects may have been mediated by juror memory of the evidence; jurors were more likely to remember evidence presented late in trial which may have influenced their verdict decisions.

Culhane, S. E., Hosch, H. M., & Weaver, W. G. (2004). **Crime victims serving as jurors: Is there bias present?** *Law and Human Behavior*, 28, 649-659. Examined decisions of 2,435 mock jurors after they watched an hour-long mock trial of a defendant accused of burglary of a habitation. Participants who had been the victims of a similar crime (e.g., theft, $n=651$) or had known someone who had been a victim of a similar crime ($n=410$) were more likely to assign a more punitive verdict than those who had not been a victim or known a victim. This trend was not identified among victims of violent crimes, suggesting that being a victim of a dissimilar crime may not influence verdicts.

Dahir, V. B., Richardson, J. T., Ginsburg, G. P., Gatowski, S. I., Dobbin, & Merlino, M. L. (2005). **Judicial application of Daubert to psychological syndrome and profile evidence.** *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 11, 62-82.

A survey of judges who reported experience with syndrome or profile testimony found that 41% and 36% admitted syndrome and profile testimony respectively in all cases. Factors considered by important judges were qualifications of experts, general acceptance, and relevance.

Lampinen, J.M., Judges, D.P., Odegard, T.N., & Hamilton, S. (2005). **The reactions of mock jurors to the Department of Justice guidelines for the collection and preservation of eyewitness evidence.** *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 2, 155-162.

174 undergraduates were presented with one of three versions of a case involving an eyewitness: no problems with the officer's photo array were mentioned, the defense attorney highlighted 2 procedural errors, or the defense highlighted the errors and mentioned that they were in violation of the DOJ guidelines. Mock jurors in the latter condition found the prosecution's case to be weaker than the other two conditions, and those who were informed of the procedural errors were less likely to find the defendant guilty.

Skeem, J.L., Loudon, J.E., & Evans, J. (2004). **Venirepersons's attitudes toward the insanity defense: Developing, refining, and validating a scale.** *Law and Human Behavior*, 28, 623-648.

Development of the Insanity Defense Attitude-Revised (IDA-R) measure is described using results from three studies encompassing over 400 venirepersons. Two key dimensions were found to underlie attitudes towards the insanity defense: strict liability (e.g., criminal responsibility and punishment) and perceived injustice and danger of the use of the defense. Internal consistency for the measure was good and moderate to strong correlations between the IDA-R and judgments in insanity case vignettes were observed.

MENTALHEALTH SERVICES

Christy, A., Poythress, N. G., Boothroyd, R. A., Petrila, J., & Mehra, S. (2005). **Evaluating the efficacy and community**

safety goals of the Broward County Mental Health Court. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 227-243.

Records of 116 individuals in mental health court (MHC) and 101 individuals with a mental illness in another county's court system found lower mean number of arrests and fewer days incarcerated for MHC participants. Survival analyses indicated that MHC participants recidivated less quickly. Self-reported violent acts data were also examined.

Corneau, M., & Lancot, N. (2004). **Mental health outcomes of adjudicated males and females: The aftermath of juvenile delinquency and problem behaviour.** *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 14, 251-262.

A follow-up of adults who were adjudicated as adolescents ($N = 405$; mean age = 23.51) found that females were significantly more likely to attempt suicide and seek psychological or psychiatric help than males. Overall, participants were more likely to seek drug-related therapy than psychiatric services after turning 18.

Cosden, M., Ellens, J., Schnell, J., & Yamini-Diouf, Y. (2005). **Efficacy of a mental health treatment court with assertive community treatment.** *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 199-214.

235 participants with a mental illness were randomly assigned to treatment as usual (TAU) or mental health treatment court (MHTC). Participants with serious substance use problems showed no improvement in either group. For remaining participants, MHTC participation was associated with decreases in days incarcerated, psychological distress, and substance use.



Crisanti, A. S., Laygo, R., Claypoole, K. H., & Junginger, J. (2005). **Accuracy of self-reported arrests among a forensic SPMI population.** *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 295-305.

Comparisons of self-report data to official records found an 85% reporting accuracy of arrests for substance abusing individuals diagnosed with a mental illness. Underreporting was more common than overreporting. Those with mood disorders were less accurate than those with schizophrenia.

Draine, J., Blank, A., Kottsieper, P., & Solomon, P. **Contrasting jail diversion and in-jail services for mental illness and substance abuse: Do they serve the same clients?** *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 171-181.

Compared to in-jail participants ($N=70$), jail diversion program participants ($N=68$) were more likely to have displayed violent behavior during their current arrest and be diagnosed with psychosis NOS, and less likely to have had previous contact with the criminal justice system and a history of substance abuse treatment.

Marlowe, D. B., Festinger, D. S., Foltz, C., Lee, P. A., & Patapis, N. S. (2005). **Perceived deterrence and outcomes in drug court.** *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 183-198.

Cluster analyses identified five subtypes of drug offenders ($N=525$) based on level of deterrence (believers, average, skeptics, disillusioned, learners). Results indicate those who perceived their own conduct to be highly associated with sanctions and rewards were most successful (e.g., lower levels of substance abuse).

Pandiani, J. A., Kinsley, M. B., Banks, S. M., Simon, M.,

Blackburn, P. (2005). **Involvement in the criminal justice system among recipients of mental health services after September 11.** *Psychiatric Services*, 56, 80-84.

Interrupted time series analyses were used to investigate risk of arrest for 5,000 people receiving mental health services in Washington D. C. over a 36-month period. Results indicate significant increases in risk of arrest following 9/11 for male, nonwhite, young (aged 18-34) individuals.

Stafford, K. P., & Wygant, D. B. (2005). **The role of competency to stand trial in mental health courts.** *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 245-258.

Examination of mental health court defendants ($N=80$) showed that 77.5% of the defendants were found incompetent to stand trial. Those found incompetent spent an average of 48.9 days in a psychiatric hospital, with 53% not restored to competency. Civil commitment was the most common outcome for those not restored to competency.

Steadman, H. J., & Naples, M. (2005). **Assessing the effectiveness of jail diversion programs for persons with serious mental illness and co-occurring substance use disorders.** *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 163-170.

A 12-month follow-up of offenders with serious mental illness diagnoses and substance use disorders found that a diversion program reduced the amount of time offenders spent incarcerated without increasing the public safety risk (diverted participants had comparable re-arrest rates to nondiverted groups). Cost effectiveness of diversion programs ($N=6$) varied by site.

Steadman, H. J., Redlich, A. D., Griffin, P., Petrila, J., & Monahan, J. (2005). **From referral to dis-**

position: Case processing in seven mental health courts. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 215-226.

Mental health court (MHC) clients were more likely to be older, White, and female compared to those in general justice settings (e.g., prison, jail). The length of time from referral to diversion is longer in MHCs than other diversion programs.

Theriot, M. T., & Segal, S. P. (2005). **Involvement with the criminal justice system among new clients at outpatient mental health agencies.** *Psychiatric Services*, 56, 179-185.

Interviews with and criminal records from 673 outpatient clients at community mental health centers found that 45% of patients had previous arrests. Clients with a previous criminal charges were more likely to be homeless, abuse substances, and have a higher rate of psychiatric hospitalizations than those who had never been charged with a crime.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Benda, B. B., Toombs, N. J., & Corwyn, R. F. (2005). **Self-control, gender, and age: A survival analysis of recidivism among boot camp graduates in a 5-year follow-up.** *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 40(3/4), 15-29.

Male ($n=572$) and female ($n=120$) adult boot camp participants were administered various measures and followed for five years to assess recidivism, defined as a felony conviction or violating parole. Self-control was measured using items from the Addiction Severity Index that assess risky or dangerous behaviors. At follow-up, 61.5% and 41.7% of the male and female graduates recidivated, respectively. Low self control was a stronger predictor of recidivism in men than women.

Cunningham, M.D., Sorenen, J.R., & Reidy, T.J. (2005). **An actuarial model for assessment of prison violence risk among maximum security inmates.** *Assessment*, 12, 1, 40-49. The Risk Assessment Scale for Prison was developed using logistic regression analysis with data from parole-eligible inmates ($n=1503$), life-without-parole inmates ($n=960$), and death-sentenced inmates in the general prison population ($n=132$). A combination of age, type of sentence, length of sentence, education, prior prison terms and probation sentences, and years served was modestly successful ($AUC=.72$) at predicting violent institutional infractions.

Dow, E., Jones, C., & Mott, J. (2005). **An empirical modeling approach to recidivism classification.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32, 2, 223-247.

An empirical modeling approach to risk classification was employed in which offenders who were defined as high or low risk by using exemplars from an empirically based reference library were differentiated by controlling for patterns of risk factors for each offender. Results from the initial sample ($N=620$) yielded an ROC AUC of .94, indicating that this approach to risk classification, in which the similarity of offender risk patterns is optimized, has potential to assist in distinguishing between high and low risk offenders.

Edens, J. F., Buffington-Vollum, J. K., Keilen, A., Roskamp, P., Anthony, C. (2005). **Predictions of future dangerousness in capital murder trials: Is it time to "Disinvent the Wheel?"** *Law and Human Behavior*, 28, 55-86.

Post-conviction prison misconduct was examined for current death row ($n=48$), former death row ($n=42$), and ex-

ecuted death row ($n=65$) inmates in Texas. Each of these inmates had been sentenced to death after an expert for the state had testified about future dangerousness. Although most inmates had received a disciplinary infraction while on death row (64.3% to 87.5%), few engaged in serious assaultive behavior (4.2% to 7.1%). 24.6% to 35.4% of death row inmates were involved in minor assaultive behavior (e.g., spitting). No inmates had committed another homicide while on death row.

Hilton, N.Z., Harris, G.T., Rawson, K., & Beach, C.A. (2005). **Communicating violence risk information to forensic decision makers.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32, 1, 97-116.

60 clinical staff members at a forensic psychiatric hospital made little distinction between comparative risk and likelihood risk estimates. The presence of a risk summary statement, either in terms of probabilities or frequencies, yielded better classification accuracy than no summary statement. When a risk-relevant case history was added to the summary statement, risk perceptions increased to the point that they were less accurate than when risk-irrelevant information was contained in the case history.

Philipse, M. W. G., Koeter, M. W. J., Van Den Brink, W., & Van Der Staak, C. P. F. (2004). **The structural coherence of clinically derived dynamic indicators of reoffending risk.** *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 14, 263-279.

A factor analysis of the Clinical Inventory of Dynamic Reoffending Risk Indicators (CIDRRI) found model fit varied depending on treatment stage (e.g., residential or community). A series of ROC curves found most items were signifi-

cantly related to estimates of risk, although the overall score did not predict recidivism better than some individual items.

Schmidt, F., Hoge, R.D., & Gomes, L. (2005). **Reliability and validity analyses of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32, 3, 329-344.

The Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) demonstrated moderate to strong internal consistency and interrater reliability between probation officers and mental health professionals in a sample of 107 juvenile offenders court-ordered for mental health evaluations. Concurrent validity was adequate, as indicated by a strong relationship between the YLS/CMI and parent and adolescent CBCL ratings. The YLS/CMI was useful for predicting reoffending across gender; high risk offenders were more likely to commit a new offense, commit more serious new offenses, and to reoffend in a shorter time period than the low risk offenders.

Schumacher, J. A. & Leonard, K. E. (2005). **Husbands' and wives' marital adjustment, verbal aggression, and physical aggression as longitudinal predictors of physical aggression in early marriage.** *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 28-37.

634 couples completed measures of marital adjustment and physical and verbal aggression. For physical aggression, a history of aggression predicted future aggression, and aggression from one partner increased the likelihood of aggression from the other partner. In addition, verbal aggression was associated with physical aggression.

Schwalbe, C. S., Fraser, M. W., Day, S. H., & Arnold, E. M. (2004). **North Carolina As-**

essment of Risk (NCAR): Reliability and predictive validity with juvenile offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 40(1/2), 1-22.

82 court counselors rated the risk of recidivism for six videotaped juveniles based first on their clinical judgment and second using the North Carolina Assessment of Risk (NCAR). 93 counselors rated the risk levels once using the NCAR; scores were less variable than clinical judgment. Cronbach's alpha for the NCAR was .73. In Study 2, a statewide sample of 464 juveniles who were assessed by court counselors using the NCAR were followed for a year to record recidivism, defined as re-referral to juvenile or adult court. The reoffending rates for the youths defined as low, medium, and high-risk on the NCAR were 34.2%, 44.7%, and 52.6%, respectively. The relationship between NCAR scores and recidivism varied based on gender and race/ethnicity.

Walters, G.D. (2005). **Incremental validity of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles as a predictor of continuous and dichotomous measures of recidivism.** *Assessment*, 12, 1, 19-27.

Using a dichotomous measure of recidivism (none vs. any arrest), the Entitlement scale of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) was the only thinking-style to predict recidivism after controlling for age, prior arrests, time at risk in community, and the PICTS Superoptimism scale. When the same variables were controlled, the Cutoff and Entitlement thinking styles predicted recidivism defined continuously (number of arrests).

SEX ABUSE & SEX OFFENDERS

Garos, S., Bleckley, M. K., Beggan, J. K., & Frizzell, J.

(2004). **Intrapsychic conflict and deviant sexual behavior in sex offenders.** *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 40(1/2), 23-40. Incarcerated sex offenders ($n = 117$) and non-sex offenders ($n = 114$) were administered the Garos Sexual Behavior Inventory (GSBI) which assesses sexual values, thoughts, and behaviors. Sex offenders displayed significantly greater conflict and shame about sexual desires based on GSBI Discordance scale scores. Sex offenders reported significantly greater levels of Permissiveness and Sexual Obsessions than non-sex offenders.

Hendriks, J., & Bijleveld, C. C. J. H. (2004). **Juvenile sexual delinquents: Contrasting child abusers with peer abusers.** *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 14, 238-250.

Juvenile sexual offenders ($N=112$) classified as child molesters (victims at least five years younger than themselves) reported a more negative self-image, higher levels of neuroticism, more social problems (e.g., bullying) than juveniles who sexually assaulted peers or adults.

Kennedy, W. A., Licht, M. H., & Caminez, M. (2004). **False positives among adolescent sex offenders: Concurrent and predictive validity of the Millon Adolescent Clinical Inventory.** *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 39, 1-13.

MACI scores for 381 adolescent male sexual offenders who received maximum felony sentences were examined. Mean scores for scales associated with conduct-disordered behavior (Unruly, Delinquent Predisposition, and Social Insensitivity) were all below 75, the minimum for clinical significance. Of the 156 adolescents who were released in the community for at least one year, 50 recidivated; only 18% of the



recidivists were accurately identified using the MACI.

Looman, J., Abracen, J., Serin, R., & Marquis, P. (2005). **Psychopathy, treatment change, and recidivism in high-risk, high need sexual offenders.** *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 549-568.

Examination of 154 inmates in sex offender treatment found men initially rated as high in psychopathy, but as being at lowered risk following treatment, reoffended at a lower rate than those whose risk was rated as unchanged by treatment. Survival analyses results are provided.

WITNESS ISSUES

Deffenbacher, K. A., Bornstein, B. H., Penrod, S. D., & McGorty, E. K. (2004). **A meta-analytic review of the effects of high stress on eyewitness memory.** *Law and Human Behavior, 28*, 687-706.

Meta-analyses examining the effects of stress on eyewitness identification ($k=27$) and recall of crime details ($k=36$) revealed that heightened stress was associated with less accurate identifications and recall of crime details. The effect of stress on eyewitness identifications was greater in target present than target absent conditions, and when participants were presented with a lineup as opposed to a face recognition. The effect for stress on accuracy of crime detail was larger for interrogative than free recall, and for adults compared to children.

Hafstad, G., Memon, A., & Logie, R. (2004). **Post-identification feedback, confidence and recollections of witnesses.** *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 18*, 901-912.

Undergraduates ($n = 55$) and children ages 11-12 ($n = 57$)

viewed a videotape of a robbery, identified a suspect from a target-free photo line-up, and randomly received confirming, disconfirming, or no feedback. Children reported more positive ratings of the witnessing and identification experiences than adults. Those who received confirming feedback had greater confidence in their identifications. Children (but not adults) who received disconfirming feedback reported being less confident in their identifications than those in the confirming and no feedback conditions and having a less clear view of the suspect than those in the no feedback condition.

Jones, C. H., & Powell, M. B. (2005). **The effect of event context on children's recall of non-experienced events across multiple interviews.** *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 10*, 83-101.

45 children participated in a staged event; 44 children did not. One-two days later, all children were given false suggestions about the event and an activity that had not happened during the event. All children were interviewed at 8, 15, and 22 days after being given false suggestions. Children who participated in the staged event recalled fewer details of the activity that did not happen compared to those who did not participate in the staged event.

Neuschatz, J. S., et al. (2005). **The effects of post-identification feedback and age on retrospective eyewitness memory.** *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19*, 435-453.

In Experiment 1, 30 younger (ages 17-32) and 30 older (ages 59-97) adults viewed a videotape of a crime, selected a suspect from a photo line-up that did not contain the actual perpetrator, and were randomly given confirming feedback or no feedback about their selections. In Experiment 2, younger

($n = 67$) and older ($n = 65$) participants were also administered a recognition memory test and were randomly assigned to make an identification immediately or a week later. Regardless of age or time of identification, those who received confirming feedback reported that they had greater confidence in their selections.

Shapiro, L. R., Blackford, C., & Chen, C-F. (2005). **Eyewitness memory for a simulated misdemeanor crime: The role of age and temperament in suggestibility.** *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19*, 267-289.

In two experiments, 4-5 year olds (Exp. 1 only), 6-7 year olds (Exp. 2 only), 9-10 year olds (Exp. 1 & 2), and adults (Exp. 1 & 2) viewed a videotape of a bicycle theft and were interviewed about the theft immediately and after a seven week delay. The control groups were interviewed at both times using a general interview format. In Exp. 1, general questioning or misleading questioning formats were used initially, and general questioning was used at seven weeks; in Exp. 2, the reverse was true. Across all age groups, misleading questions led to increased suggestibility for peripheral features (initial interview) and central features (delayed interviews). Compliance at the initial interview (e.g. saying yes to misleading questions) led to misinformation in delayed recall. Various age and temperament effects were reported.

Shapiro, L. R., & Purdy, T. L. (2005). **Suggestibility and source monitoring errors: Blame the interview style, interviewer consistency, and the child's personality.** *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19*, 489-506.

60 children ages 5 to 8 viewed a videotape of a bicycle theft and were asked 6 positive leading questions and 6 misleading questions. During initial

interviews they were asked to answer honestly (suggestive condition) or to confabulate their answers and provide details about both true and false interview items (confabulation condition). One week later, the children were interviewed by the same or different interviewer and were asked to identify the source of each interview item presented (the video, interviewer, or not previously presented). Those in the confabulation condition were more likely to incorrectly identify information sources one week later. Based on measures completed by parents, children's shyness, compliance, and imagination were related to source monitoring errors.

Veenivliet, S. G., & Paunonen, S. V. (2005). **Person perception based on rape-victim testimony.** *Deviant Behavior, 26*, 209-227. 85 undergraduates read about a sexual assault in which a witness either smiled and watched the rape or called for help. Participants then completed personality ratings of the witness and physical attribute ratings of a composite photograph of the witness. Those who rated the personality traits of the witness as more negative also rated physical attributes in negative terms.

Wright, D. B., & Wareham, G. (2005). **Mixing sound and vision: The interaction of auditory and visual information for earwitnesses of a crime scene.** *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 10*, 103-108.

80 participants watched a one-minute video in which a woman was running, lost her boot, and a bystander yelled: "He's gonna shoot" or "He's got your boot." Half saw the bystander say what they heard, and half saw him say a different phrase. Participants were then asked to recall the bystander's statement. Results indicated that when visual and auditory infor

APLS 2006 Annual Conference

St. Petersburg, FL – Mar. 2-5th

General Information

The 2006 annual conference will be held at the Hilton St. Petersburg in St. Petersburg, Florida. The conference will begin midday Thursday, March 2nd, and will end midday Sunday, March 5th.

Visit the conference website by following the “Conferences” link on the AP-LS homepage at www.ap-ls.org or directly via <http://www.ap-ls.org/conferences/apls/apls2005.html> to:

- ◆ Access the call for papers
- ◆ Find registration information for the conference
- ◆ Submit proposals to the conference
- ◆ Volunteer to serve as a student volunteer at the conference and get your registration fee waived
- ◆ Volunteer to be a reviewer
- ◆ Find information about pre-conference workshops
- ◆ Find information about the city of St. Petersburg, including restaurants, sites, the local airport, and more!
- ◆ Reserve a hotel room at the conference hotel
- ◆ The special discounted rates are:
- ◆ \$115/night for single or double occupancy!!!
- ◆ If you would like to contact the Hilton directly to make your reservations, please call (800) 445-8667 (800 HILTONS) or (727) 894-5000 and *request the group rate for the American Psychology-Law Society conference.*
- ◆ And more!

APLS 2006 - Proposed Pre-Conference Workshops: March 1, 2006

In the absence of the American Academy of Forensic Psychology at the 2006 meeting of AP-LS, the conference co-chairs are organizing a variety of pre-conference workshops in contemporary issues in forensic psychology, as well as several methods workshops. We hope to be able to provide continuing education credits to attendees. The following is a tentative list of workshop topics. Please contact Tonia Nicholls (tnichola@sfu.ca) if you would like to suggest a topic(s) and/or a presenter(s). We welcome self-nominations. **Registration will be limited.** Workshops will be presented in the conference hotel. Special conference rates for accommodations are available. Be sure to identify yourself as a workshop participant to receive the discounted rate. Watch the conference website for pre-registration information, fees, and scheduling. We look forward to seeing you there!

St. Petersburg AP-LS Workshops:

- ◆ Empirical Forensic Assessments of PTSD Claimants: Vulnerabilities in Psychological/Psychiatric Evidence
- ◆ Mental Health Law 101: Legal Issues Relevant to Forensic Practice
- ◆ Structural Equation Modeling
- ◆ Item Response Theory Analyses
- ◆ Managing the Unmanageable – Treatment with Psychopaths
- ◆ Violence Risk Assessments
- ◆ Multicultural Competence in Forensic Psychology

If you have any questions or comments about the conference, please feel free to contact one of the conference co-chairs.

Jennifer Groscup, J.D., Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Email: jgroscup@jjay.cuny.edu
Office phone: 212-237-8774
Office phone: 604-524-7730

Tonia Nicholls, Ph.D.
BC Forensic Psychiatric Services
Commission
Forensic Psychiatric Hospital
Email: tnichola@sfu.ca

Annette Christy, Ph.D.
Dept. of Mental Health Law & Policy
Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health
Institute
Office phone: 813-974-7419
Email: achristy@fmhi.usf.edu



Division News and Information

APLS Book Series

The American Psychology-Law Society Book Series, now published by Oxford University Press, publishes scholarly work that advances the field of psychology and law by contributing to its theoretical and empirical knowledge base. Topics of recent books (previously published by Kluwer/Academic Press) include false confessions, the death penalty, girls and aggression, and psychological injuries in civil law. Already scheduled for the Oxford series is a book on the death penalty by Craig Haney, a book on trial consulting by Amy Posey and Larry Wrightsman, and a book on psychological injuries in civil cases by William Koch, Kevin Douglas, Tonia Nicholls, and Melanie O'Neill. Inquiries and proposals from potential authors should be sent to Dr. Ronald Roesch, Series Editor (roesch@sfu.ca or 604-291-3370). For information on the Kluwer series, see www.wkap.nl/prod/s/PILP. APLS members get a 25% discount on book orders for orders placed by telephone (not available online). Call toll free +1-866-269-9527 between 8:30-5:00 EST; or fax +1-781-681-9045. APLS members must specifically mention that they are members to receive the discount.

AP-LS Dissertation Award Program

The American-Psychology Law Society confers Dissertation Awards for scientific research and scholarship that is relevant to the promotion of the interdisciplinary study of psychology and law. Persons who will have defended dissertations in 2004 that are related to basic or applied research in psychology and law, including its application to public policy, are encouraged to submit their dissertations for consideration for the awards. 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place awards are conferred and carry a financial reward of \$500, \$300, and \$100 respectively.

To apply for the 2004 Awards, one hard copy of the completed dissertation, an electronic copy of the dissertation (in Word), along with a letter of support from the dissertation chair, should be sent by January 1, 2006 to Eve Brank, Chair, AP-LS Dissertation Awards Committee, Department of Criminology, Law and Society, University of Florida, P.O. Box 115950, Gainesville, FL 32611-5950, ebrank@ufl.edu

Note: The electronic copy can be sent via email as an attachment in Word to the email address above.

Ever received an Award from AP-LS?

The AP-LS Awards is trying to compile a list of all Dissertation Award winners. Any information would be appreciated. Please forward any information (i.e., student name, school, and whether the award was for 1st, 2nd, or 3rd place) to Jen Robbenalt, J.D., Ph.D., at RobbennoltJ@missouri.edu

Educational Outreach Committee

Speaker Program

The AP-LS Educational Outreach Committee is pleased to announce the continuation of its Speaker program. Cooperating AP-LS members are available for the presentation of colloquia/keynote addresses at educational institutions as well as for other groups (e.g., local or state bar associations, local or state psychological associations). AP-LS will pay the speaker's honorarium; the sponsoring institution or group is responsible for the speaker's transportation, lodging, and related expenses. These details, as well as the specifics of the presentation, are arranged by the speaker and the sponsor.

Past speakers have addressed the social/experimental areas of jury selection, eyewitness identification, pretrial publicity, and death penalty issues, as well as the clinical areas of competency to stand trial, the insanity defense, and risk assessment/prediction of violence. Most presentations will be appropriate for the offering of CE credits for psychologists and other mental health professionals as well as for CLE credits for attorneys. In many cases, speakers located close to an interested sponsor can be utilized, in order to minimize travel costs.

Institutions interested in sponsoring such presentations should contact the committee chair (below) and indicate the specific topic of interest. **AP-LS members willing to participate in this program as speakers** should also contact the committee chair and indicate area(s) of expertise and geographic area within which you would be willing to travel for such a presentation. For further information, contact: Lavita Nadkarni, Ph.D., Chair, Educational Outreach Committee, AP-LS, Director of Forensic Studies, University of Denver-GSP, 2450 South Vine Street, Denver, CO 80208, (303) 871-3877, lnadkarn@edu.edu

AP-LS Mentorship Committee Launches Website

In 2004, AP-LS formed an ad hoc Mentorship Committee in an effort to reach out to psychologists in the early stages of their careers and to graduate students who plan to enter a career in psychology and law. We are pleased to announce the launch of our new Mentorship website. Forensic and non-forensic mentors are available to answer questions through this website. Have a question? Visit our link at the AP-LS website! Also watch for our upcoming FAQ page!

Share Your Syllabus for Psychology-Law Courses

The APLS Careers and Training committee is renewing its efforts to collect syllabi for courses in Psychology and Law and closely related topics. Some syllabi are already posted on the website (<http://www.unl.edu/ap-ls/syllabi.htm>). Won't you consider sharing ideas and resources with your APLS colleagues? The collection is a valuable resource for developing a new course, revamping a current course, or learning what other programs offer. We welcome information on undergraduate and graduate courses. Please send your syllabus, preferably as a PDF or Microsoft Word attachment, to Jen Woolard at jlw47@georgetown.edu.

New *Law and Human Behavior* Editor Appointed

The APLS Executive Committee is pleased to announce that Brian Cutler has been appointed editor of *Law and Human Behavior*. Brian takes over from Rich Wiener, who is ending his term as editor. We would like to thank Rich for his many years of service. The journal has thrived under his editorship. Brian is currently Professor of Psychology and Department Chair, University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Brian has appointed Margaret Bull Kovera, Patricia Zapf, and Kirk Heilbrun to serve as Associate Editors. Brian will begin accepting manuscripts on August 1, 2005. Rich will continue to work on manuscripts submitted prior to this date, including resubmissions. Articles accepted by Rich will be published in the October and December, 2005 issues, and Brian Bornstein and Rich will be editing the February, 2006 special edition. Brian will begin publishing articles accepted under his editorship in the April, 2006 issue, although that issue may include any remaining articles accepted during Rich's term. Brian has prepared a statement that details the approach he will be taking as he begins his term as editor. You can access this statement through the AP-LS website (www.ap-ls.org/publications/behaviorIndex.php).

Nominations Sought for AP-LS Book Award

The American Psychology-Law Society Book Award is given for a scholarly book devoted to psychology and law issues. The award is intended to recognize outstanding scholarship in psychology and law. Nominations are open to scholarly books (not textbooks) from all areas of psychology and law published in 2003-2004. The award recipient will receive an award plaque and will be invited to deliver an address at the 2006 APLS Annual Meeting.

Nomination letters should include: Title and publisher of the book, year of publication, and the names and addresses of all authors or editors. Self nominations are encouraged.

Send nominations via e-mail to:

Richard E. Redding, J.D., Ph.D.
Chair, Book Award Committee

Villanova University School of Law and Drexel University
redning@law.villanova.edu

Nomination Deadline: June 25, 2005

A Thank You from the Outgoing Editor-in-Chief of AP-LS News

As of the September issue of this newsletter, Jen Groscup, Assistant Professor of Psychology at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, will take the reins of the AP-LS News. I have coordinated, printed, mailed, and now emailed this newsletter for the past six years - a shockingly long time it seems. My tenure as editor has been at various points fun, exhausting and annoying - and sometimes all three simultaneously. But whatever accomplishments and innovations have come about in the past six years, none would have happened without the assistance of several key people, all of whom took on associate editorial responsibilities and helped move the newsletter forward into, what I believe is an excellent and informative publication.

So, I would like to express my appreciation to the following (in alphabetical order, since it would be impossible to order these friends and colleagues in any other way):

Mark Boccaccini
Mary Connell
David DeMatteo
John Edens
Adam Fried
Michele Galietta
Daniel Krausse
Maureen O'Connor

As is my personal custom, I will repay you all eventually in the form of free drink at APLS.

American Board of Forensic Psychology Workshop Schedule: 2004-2005

The Continuing Education arm of the American Board of Forensic Psychology (ABFP) presents an ongoing series of workshops and training seminars led by leaders in the field of forensic psychology. Workshops focus on contemporary psycho-legal issues relevant to forensic, child, clinical and neuropsychologists and are designed for those interested in pursuing psycho-legal topics in depth. For more detailed information or registration, see our website at www.abfp.com

Contemporary Issues in Forensic Psychology

Hyatt Regency St. Louis, MO September 21-25, 2005	Sutton Place Hotel Vancouver, BC October 26-30, 2005
---	--

The American Academy of Forensic Psychology is approved by the American Psychological Association to offer continuing education for psychologists. AAFP maintains responsibility for its programs. As an ABFP Academy, our courses count toward California's mandatory CE requirements.



Call for Papers

2005 Annual Meeting of the Society for Judgment and Decision Making

The Society for Judgment and Decision Making (SJDM) invites abstracts for symposia, oral presentations, and posters on any interesting topic related to judgment and decision making. Completed manuscripts are not required.

Location, Dates, and Program

SJDM's annual conference will be held at the Sheraton Centre in Toronto, ON, Canada, from November 12-14, 2005. As in 2004, we've added a full day (Saturday) to the schedule to make room for more presentations and for two keynote speakers:

- Keynote speaker #1: Michael Posner, Professor E Emeritus of Psychology, University of Oregon, and author of many path-breaking articles on neural mechanisms and structures underlying selective attention.
- Keynote speaker #2: Xg4k%h Sh8&v@!, Due to heightened security, we cannot provide the name of the second keynote speaker at this point.

Submissions

The deadline for submissions is July 15, 2005.

Submissions for symposia, oral presentations, and posters should be made through the SJDM website at <http://sql.sjdm.org>. Technical questions can be addressed to the webmaster, Alan Schwartz, at www@sjdm.org. All other questions can be addressed to Judy Lin, at judylin@mit.edu.

Eligibility

At least one author of each presentation must be a member of SJDM. Joining at the time of submission will satisfy this requirement. A membership form may be downloaded from the SJDM website at <http://www.sjdm.org>. An individual may give only one talk (podium presentation) and present only one poster, but may be a co-author on multiple talks and/or posters.

Awards

- The Best Student Poster Award is given for the best poster presentation whose first author is a student member of SJDM.
- The Jane Beattie Travel Memorial Scholarship subsidizes travel to the United States for scholarly pursuits related to JDM research, including attendance of the annual meeting. Further details regarding these awards are available at www.sjdm.org.

Behavioral Sciences and the Law Special Issue on Malingering

Behavioral Sciences and the Law will devote a special issue to **Malingering** to be edited by Alan R. Felthous, M.D. Potential contributors may focus on any relevant topic, including malingered presentations in various criminal, civil, and military settings; different malingered conditions such as psychosis, mental defectiveness, and depression; malingered mental illness limited to the time of the act, clinical approaches to diagnosing malingering, psychological instruments for the detection of malingering, managing the malingering patient, and criminal or legal aspects of malingering. Empirical studies of measures and techniques for the assessment of malingering are welcome.

The deadline for receipt of manuscripts is September 1, 2005. Manuscripts should be twenty to thirty double-spaced typewritten pages. Submissions should conform to the style requirements of the latest edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. Submissions must contain a 150 word abstract.

Send three copies (two of which should be prepared so as to be "blind reviewed") to the special issue editor, Dr. Felthous, at Chester Mental Health Center, P.O. Box 31, 1315 Lehmen Drive, Chester, Illinois 62233-0031; telephone: (618) 826-4751; e-mail: DHSC6624@dhs.state.il.us.

Bottoms and Ogloff named co-winners of AP-LS Award for Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring in Psychology and Law

The Careers and Training Committee is delighted to announce that Drs. Bette Bottoms and Jim Ogloff have been named co-winners of the award for *Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring in the Field of Psychology and Law* for 2005. This award is given to a scholar in the field of psychology and law who has made substantial contributions in terms of student teaching and mentoring, teaching-related service and scholarship, development of new curricula, administration of training programs, etc. Dr. Bottoms received her doctorate from SUNY Buffalo in 1992, and is Professor of Psychology at University of Illinois at Chicago. Dr. Ogloff received his J.D. and Ph.D. from the University of Nebraska. He is currently a Professor of at Monash University in Australia.

APLS 2006 Annual Conference

St. Petersburg, FL – Mar. 2-5th

Submission Deadline is October 1, 2005

The 2006 AP-LS Annual Conference will be held March 2 – 5th at the Hilton St. Petersburg in St. Petersburg, Florida. Proposals for symposia, papers, and posters addressing topics in all areas of psychology and law are invited. International submissions are welcome, and papers authored or co-authored by students are also encouraged. We especially welcome proposals that are empirically based and those that describe innovative applications of psychology to law and policy.

Paper proposals are appropriate for presentations that will focus on an individual research topic or piece of legal scholarship. After acceptance/rejection of proposals has been determined, the conference co-chairs will group paper presentations into sessions consisting of 3-5 presentations. (Each paper session at the conference will be allotted 50 minutes. The amount of time allowed for each individual presentation will be determined by the total number of presentations involved).

A symposium proposal is appropriate for a coordinated group of presentations that will focus on one topic. Symposia proposals must include a minimum of four presentations. Each participant and the topics to be discussed should be outlined in the proposal. The participation of each presenter should be secured before submitting the proposal. *Each symposium session at the conference will be allotted 80 minutes.* Poster presentations will be made at a poster session. Presentations will be made in a written format on display boards measuring 4 ft. X 6 ft.

Please be aware that we are continuing an ongoing effort to increase the rigor of the review process and the quality of the presentations at the conference this year. As a result, we are likely to accept fewer paper and symposium presentations and to accept more poster presentations. A second poster session may be added to accommodate this increase. Please be sure to indicate during submission if you would like your paper or symposium papers to be considered for inclusion as posters if they are not accepted as proposed.

The deadline for Submissions is October 1, 2005

All proposals should be submitted electronically via the conference website – [http:// www.ap-ls.org/conferences/apls/apls2005.html](http://www.ap-ls.org/conferences/apls/apls2005.html). (If you are unable to submit via the website, please contact Jennifer Groscup to make alternative arrangements.)

Proposals should not exceed 1000 words and must include an abstract that is no longer than 100 words. (*Note: In addition to the 1000/100 word limit to be provided for each paper in a symposium, an additional 200-word abstract for the symposium should also be included.*)

If you have any questions or comments about the conference, please feel free to contact one of the conference co-chairs:

Jennifer Groscup, J.D., Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Email: jgroscup@jjay.cuny.edu
Office phone: 212-237-8774
Office phone: 604-524-7730

Tonia Nicholls, Ph.D.
BC Forensic Psychiatric Services
Commission
Forensic Psychiatric Hospital
Email: tnichola@sfu.ca

Annette Christy, Ph.D.
Dept. of Mental Health Law & Policy
Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health
Institute
Office phone: 813-974-7419
Email: achristy@fmhi.usf.edu

Reviewers needed: Professional and student AP-LS members are needed to review proposal submissions. If you are interested, please contact Jennifer Groscup or Tonia Nicholls.

Student Registration Volunteers Needed: If you are interested in assisting with conference registration, please contact Annette Christy (achristy@fmhi.usf.edu). Conference registration will be waived for volunteers.



Nominations, Awards, and Announcements

2004 AP-LS Dissertation Award Winners

The AP-LS Dissertation Award Committee would like to congratulate the winners for the 2004 competition.

The first place winner is Jodi Viljoen, PhD. Jodi's dissertation, titled "Police Interrogation and Criminal Adjudication of Child and Adolescent Defendants: Legal Abilities, Decisions, and Standards" evaluated the psychometric properties of competency measures and investigated the predictors of the legal capacities, legal decisions, and rates of impairments of adolescent defendants under various legal standards. The reviewers commented that Jodi's dissertation "was an ambitious study completed with a high degree of thoroughness, providing an in depth analysis of competency issues in juvenile defendants" including that it "is written in a clear and powerful manner" and that the study "has far reaching implications for the juvenile justice system and represents a significant contribution to the field." Jodi Viljoen received her PhD from Simon Fraser University and conducted her dissertation under the supervision of Professor Ronald Roesch. Jodi will receive \$500.

The second place winner is Candice Odgers, PhD. Candice's dissertation, titled "Violence, Victimization, and Psychopathy among Female Juvenile Offenders," investigated the construct, convergent, and predictive utility of the PCL-YV within a population of female juvenile offenders, and the relationship of victimization experiences and the PCL-YV to re-offending. The reviewers commented that Candice's dissertation is "of high quality" particularly since the "sample employed and the size of the sample are both quite impressive." The dissertation was described as representing "an important contribution to assist in understanding violence in young girls" and that it has "important policy implications and sheds new light into the manner in which clinicians involved in risk assessment with adolescent females conduct their work." Candice received her PhD from the University of Virginia and conducted her dissertation under the supervision of Professor N. Dickon Reppucci. Candice will receive \$300.

The third place winner was Martin Hildebrand, PhD. Martin's dissertation, titled "Psychopathy in the Treatment of Forensic Psychiatric Patients: Assessment, Prevalence, Predictive Validity, and Clinical Implications," examined the role of PCL-R in the treatment of Dutch male forensic psychiatric patients involuntarily admitted to a forensic psychiatric hospital in the Netherlands, including an examination of the inter-rater reliability and factor structure of the Dutch language version of the PCL-R. The reviewers commented that Martin's dissertation was "extremely clear," "exceptionally well organized," and provided a "unique" and "valuable contribution to our expanding knowledge of psychopathy and the PCL-R." Martin received his PhD from the University of Amsterdam and conducted his dissertation under the supervision of Professor Corine de Ruiter. Martin will receive \$100.

Each of the award winners had the opportunity to present his or her dissertation in a poster session at the AP-LS annual meeting at La Jolla in 2005. Thank you to everyone who submitted dissertations for consideration!



Thanks to Cathy Oslzly for 20 Years of Service as AP-LS Administrative Assistant

After 20 years of service, Cathy Oslzly is resigning as administrative assistant to APLS. Cathy has watched an entire generation of psycholegal scholars and practitioners flow through APLS. She has handled thousands of inquiries and requests for information, registered hundreds of members, and "presided" (with her cadres of student volunteers) at meetings in Williamsburg, Hilton Head, Santa Fe, Miami Beach, Tucson, Redondo Beach, Austin, Scottsdale, and La Jolla, to name a few. We thank Cathy for her commitment and dedication over all these years and wish her well in her future endeavors.

Thanks to Outgoing Newsletter Editor, Barry Rosenfeld

On behalf of the APLS Executive Committee, I would like to formally thank Barry Rosenfeld for his years of hard work as newsletter editor. His term will end in August when Jennifer Groscup will take over the editor's job. Barry did far more than solicit articles for the newsletter: On his watch we switched from hard copy of the newsletter to electronic format, added to APLS coffers by inviting advertisers to place ads in the newsletter, redesigned and generally professionalized our website, and hired a new administrative assistant. Barry was central to all of this; he devoted countless (and often tedious) hours to helping us stay connected to each other and to APLS. For this we are most grateful.

Edie Greene, APLS President

Nominations and Applications for Fellow Status

AP-LS/Division 41 is seeking nominations (including self-nominations) for Fellow status. Successful candidates who are not currently APA Fellows must demonstrate evidence of unusual and outstanding contributions to psychology and law and obtain the endorsement of two current AP-LS/Division 41 Fellows. Successful candidates who are currently APA Fellows must provide evidence of unusual and outstanding contributions to psychology and law, but need not obtain the endorsement of current Fellows. Please submit nominations or request further details concerning the application process to Kirk Heilbrun, Chair of the Fellows Committee (kirk.heilbrun@drexel.edu). Those wishing to be considered for a final decision by 8-08 must have all materials submitted to the Committee Chair by 1-15-06.

AP-LS Award for Best Undergraduate Paper

Description: The AP-LS Award for Best Undergraduate Paper is awarded to an outstanding undergraduate research paper that is focused on the interdisciplinary study of psychology and law.

Eligibility: To be eligible for an award, the student must be the major contributor to a project on a topic relevant to psychology and law (i.e., the student had primary responsibility for initiating and conducting the project even though the project will usually be conducted under the supervision of a mentor). At the time that the student submits a paper for this award, the student must be the first author on a submission to the annual AP-LS conference on the same work. To receive the award, the submission to the AP-LS conference must have been accepted for presentation as either a paper or a poster.

Nominations/Applications: Send one copy of each of the following:

- Copy of poster or paper proposal submitted to the AP-LS conference.
- APA style manuscript or thesis detailing the research to be considered for an award in 10-pages or fewer.
- Letter of support from the student's faculty supervisor; this letter must characterize the nature and extent of the student's contribution to the project.

Submissions: Submissions must be received either via email (.pdf or .doc formats preferred) or mail to the committee chair on or before November 1.

Email: gilstrap@uccs.edu

Mail: Livia L. Gilstrap

Chair, AP-LS Undergraduate Paper Award Committee

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
Psychology Department, PO BOX 7150
Colorado Springs, CO, 80933-7150

Nomination Deadline: November 1 (annually)

Decision Made By: AP-LS Undergraduate Paper Award Committee. Proposals will be judged based on originality, contribution to field, soundness of design and analyses, and quality of writing. The award will be made annually at the AP-LS Annual Meeting.

AP-LS Award for Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring in the Field of Psychology and Law

The American Psychology-Law Society confers an award for Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring in the Field of Psychology and Law to recognize teaching excellence in a variety of contexts. The APLS Careers and Training Committee have revised the award to reflect the following:

- In even-numbered years (e.g., 2006, 2008), the award will be given to a teacher/mentor from a program/department that is undergraduate-only or MA-terminus
- In odd-numbered years (e.g., 2007, 2009), the award will be given to a teacher/mentor from a program/department that is doctoral-granting (including law schools)

Past winners of this award include Gail Goodman, Margaret Bull Kovera, Bette Bottoms, and James Ogloff. Winners receive \$500 and a plaque at the annual AP-LS conference. Nominations are now being sought for the 2006 Outstanding Teaching & Mentoring Award

Eligibility for 2006 Award: Nominees should be persons who have made substantial contributions to student training in the field of psychology and law. To be eligible for the 2006 award, an individual must:

- be from a program or department that is undergraduate-only or MA-terminus [persons teaching/mentoring in law schools only are not eligible]
- have a doctoral degree (OR a law degree, whichever comes first, if both have been earned) for at least 7 years
- have been teaching and/or mentoring students in psychology and law for at least 5 years

Nominations/Applications:

To apply, send 6 copies of a nomination package consisting of NO MORE THAN 15 TOTAL PAGES including the following:

- Nominee's statement (1-2 pages) of teaching/mentoring philosophy, goals, and accomplishments, especially as related to the field of psychology and law.
- Abbreviated curriculum vitae (3 pages maximum)
- Summarized student evaluation data
- At least one, but no more than three, supporting letters from peer reviewers or students
- Other relevant documentation such as descriptions of current and past student achievements; mentoring in one-on-one teaching contexts (e.g., advising, clinical supervision); teaching in the community (e.g., workshops that bring psychology and law to applied audiences); teaching-related committee work or scholarship; development of new curricula, courses, course materials, or instructional methods.

Self nominations are encouraged.

Nomination Deadline: December 1, 2005

Send applications and questions to: Allison D. Redlich, Ph.D., Chair, Careers and Training Committee, Policy Research Associates, Inc., 345 Delaware Avenue, Delmar, NY 12054, Tel: 518-439-7415, Fax: 518-439-7612, Email: aredlich@prainc.com



to reconstitute a committee to focus on minority affairs. It was suggested that one focus of the committee be on supporting underrepresented undergraduates and master's students.

Scientific Review Paper Committee
No report available.

Committee on Law and Psychology in Corrections
No report available.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m. The next meeting will be held on the afternoon of Wednesday, August 17, 2005 in Washington, DC in conjunction with the APA Annual Meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer K. Robbennolt

Legal Update cont. from p. 7

Gogtay, N., Giedd, J. N., Lusk, L., Hayashi, K. M., Greenstein, D., Vaituzis, A. C., et al. (2004). Dynamic mapping of human cortical development during childhood through early adulthood. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 101*, 8174-8179.

Penry v. Lynaugh, 492 U.S. 302 (1989).

Roper v. Simmons, 125 S. Ct. 1183, 543 U.S. ____ (2005).

Stanford v. Kentucky, 492 U.S. 361 (1989).

Steinberg, L., & Scott, E. S. (2003). Less guilty by reason of adolescence: Developmental immaturity, diminished responsibility, and the juvenile death penalty. *American Psychologist, 58*, 1009-1018.

Streib, V. L. (2004, July). *The juvenile death penalty today: Death sentences and executions for juvenile crimes, January 1, 1973-September 30, 2004*. Retrieved March 18, 2005, from www.law.onu.faculty/streib/juvdeath.pdf.

Thompson v. Oklahoma, 487 U.S. 815 (1988).

Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86 (1958).

2nd International Investigative Interviewing Conference Portsmouth, England, July 3 - 7, 2006

The Second International Conference on Investigative Interviewing is being held in Portsmouth, between the 3rd and 7th of July 2006. As well as providing opportunities to learn about investigative interviewing, and the latest developments in different countries, there will be a focus on how research and practice may move forward and gain greater recognition, for example in the courts. Please bookmark our website (www.port.ac.uk/iii2), as we will be adding links to additional pages in the coming months, for example about how to submit abstracts and register. Also please advise any friends or colleagues - both practitioners and academics - about the site. If you are able to do so, we would be grateful if you could make a link to it within any web site that you control.

Portsmouth has many attractions, as a venue. The conference will take place in buildings within easy walking distance of the park-lined coast, the historical naval port, and marinas. Nearby airports include London's Heathrow and Gatwick as well as Southampton. There are several, daily, ferry crossings from Portsmouth to France. The conference organisers are particularly keen to attract delegates from a wide range of countries, intellectual backgrounds and professions. We appreciate that investigative interviewing has developed at different rates, and in different ways, in different countries. So the, optional, first two days of the conference will be devoted to workshops. These will be designed to ensure that all delegates can have a sufficient knowledge of investigative interviewing techniques. There will also be workshops designed to demonstrate how the ideas have been developed in England and Wales, for example in relation to vulnerable witnesses. Investigative interviewing research may have developed, particularly, in relation to policing and prosecution. However it is important for any investigation. Thus the organisers are also keen to attract delegates from a range of disciplines and professions.

Membership in EAPL

Join the EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF PSYCHOLOGY AND LAW and receive a subscription to *Psychology, Crime and Law* for about \$55 (45 Euros). Information about EAPL can be obtained at the Association website: www.law.kuleuven.ac.be/eapl/. Information about *Psychology, Crime and Law* can be found at www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/1068316x.html. Membership is available to psychologists and attorneys, as well as criminologists, sociologists, psychiatrists, and educational scientists. Information on how to join EAPL is also available through the Association website. In addition to a scholarly journal (*Psychology, Crime, and Law*), EAPL holds an annual meeting, including a joint conference with APLS every fourth year (most recently in Edinburgh, Scotland in July, 2003). This year's conference will be held June 29 through July 2, 2004, in Vilnius, Lithuania. Further details are available through the Association website.

Notes From The Student Chair



AP-LS Student Officers E-mail Addresses

Chair, Kim Coffman
coff5143@bellsouth.net

Past Chair, Tara Mitchell
tmitch01@fiu.edu

Chair Elect, Christopher Kunkle
cdkunkle@optonline.net

Secretary/Treasurer, Peter Shore
ryannahaw@aol.com

Student Newsletter/Web Editor,
Michael Griffin
griff067@barna.ua.edu

AP-LS Student Homepage
www.psy.fiu.edu/~apls-students

AP-LS Student E-mail
apls-st@psy.fiu.edu

Dear AP-LS Student Members

Summer is quickly approaching, and with summer comes your opportunity to consider serving in an active role in the student section for the upcoming year! Please watch the Student Section of the AP-LS website for announcements regarding officer and liaison positions that will be available in early June. Elections will be held in mid-July. Officers for the 2006 term will begin their services at the Executive Committee meeting of the APA in August.

*Thank you,
Kim Coffman
Chair, Student Section*

AP-LS/Division 41 Stipends for Graduate Research

The Division 41 Grants-in-Aid Committee is accepting proposals for small stipends (maximum of \$500) to support empirical graduate research that addresses psycholegal issues (the award is limited to graduate students who are student affiliate members of AP-LS). Interested individuals should submit a short proposal (a maximum of 1500 words will be strictly enforced) in either a hard-copy (five copies) or electronic format that includes:


- (a) a cover sheet indicating the title of the project, name, address, phone number, and e-mail address of the investigator;
- (b) an abstract of 100 words or less summarizing the project;
- (c) purpose, theoretical rationale, and significance of the project;
- (d) procedures to be employed; and,
- (e) specific amount requested, including a budget. Applicants should include a discussion of the feasibility of the research (e.g., if budget is for more than \$500, indicate source of remaining funds).

Applicants should also indicate that IRB approval has been obtained, or agree that it will be prior to initiating the project. Note that a prior recipient of an AP-LS Grant-in-Aid is only eligible for future funding if the previously funded research has been completed.

Hard copies of the proposals should be sent to:

Mario Scalora, Ph.D.
Grants-In-Aid Committee Chair
Department of Psychology
University of Nebraska
238 Burnett Hall, Lincoln
NE 68588-0308

Electronic submissions can be submitted via e-mail to mscalora@unl.edu (paste your submission into your e-mail or include an attached file in word perfect, word, or ASCII format). Committee members: Mario Scalora, Univ. of Nebraska, Garrett Berman, Roger Williams University, Elizabeth Bennett, Washington and Jefferson College, Robert Cochrane, U.S. Department of Justice. **There are two deadlines each year: September 30 and January 31.**



Conference and Workshop Planner

European Association of Psychology and Law Annual Meeting
Julne 29 - July 2, 2004
Institute of Forensic Research
Kracow, Poland

For further information see
[www.ies.krakow.pl/conferences/
psychologia_prawo_2004/
index.htmconf.html](http://www.ies.krakow.pl/conferences/psychologia_prawo_2004/index.htmconf.html)



American Psychological Association Annual Meeting
August 18- 21, 2005
Washington, DC

For further information see
www.apa.org/conf.html



American Board of Forensic Psychology Contemporary Issues in Forensic Psychology
September 21-25, 2005
Hyatt Regency Hotel
St. Louis, MO

Individual Day-Long Workshops

For further information, including specific topics and presenters see
[www.abfp.com/pdfs/2005_2006/
stlouis05.pdf](http://www.abfp.com/pdfs/2005_2006/stlouis05.pdf)



Submission Deadline for AP-LS Annual Meeting
October 1, 2005

See p. 23 for details



Information regarding upcoming conferences and workshops can be sent to jjroscup@jjay.cuny.edu

American Board of Forensic Psychology Contemporary Issues in Forensic Psychology
October 26-30, 2005
Sutton Place Hotel
Vancouver, BC

Individual Day-Long Workshops

For further information, including specific topics and presenters see
[www.abfp.com/pdfs/2005_2006/
vancouver.pdf](http://www.abfp.com/pdfs/2005_2006/vancouver.pdf)



Society for Judgment and Decision-Making
November 12- 15, 2005
Sheraton Center
Toronto, ON, Canada

For further information see
www.sjdm.org



American Society of Criminology
November 15- 19, 2005
Royal York Hotel
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

For further information see
www.asc41.org



American Board of Forensic Psychology Intensive Practice Workshops
January 19-22, 2006
Doubletree Berkeley Marina
Berkeley, CA

For further information, including specific topics and presenters see
[www.abfp.com/pdfs/2005_2006/
05-06intensivebrochure.pdf](http://www.abfp.com/pdfs/2005_2006/05-06intensivebrochure.pdf)

American Academy of Forensic Sciences 58th Annual Meeting
February 20- 25, 2006
Washington State Convention and Trade Center
Seattle, WA

For further information see
www.aafs.org



AP-LS Annual Meeting
March 2-5, 2006
Hilton Hotel
St. Petersburg, FL

Further details regarding the conference, accomodations, and pre-conference workshops can be found on p. 19



American College of Legal Medicine
March 2- 5, 2006
Harrah's Hotel and Casino
Las Vegas, NV

For further information see
www.aclm.org



International Association of Forensic Mental Health Annual Meeting
June 14 - 16, 2006
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

For further information see
www.iafmhs.org/iafmhs.asp



2nd International Investigative Interviewing Conference
July 3 - 7, 2006
Portsmouth, England

For further informati see
www.port.ac.uk/iii2