

strategies to reduce the cognitive load on the liar. Consistent with expectations, discomfort with lying and attempts to blame the victim were seen in the narratives of those telling self-protective lies. Results support a link between the experience of empathic guilt and victim blame and are discussed with reference to research on attributions (e.g. Crandall et al., 2007) and the “double standard” in deception (Bond and DePaulo, 2006).

Hypothetical Legal Questions and the Psychiatric Expert

Roberto Mester, *International Center for Health, Law and Ethics, Haifa, Israel*
(rmester@netvision.net.il)

Oren Asman, *Zefat Academic College, Israel*
(orenasman@gmail.com)

When appearing in court as an expert witness, a psychiatrist may be requested to answer hypothetical questions. Experience shows that this type of questions is often used by parties involved and also by judges in cases dealing with compensation issues related to physical and/or mental damages. Answering these hypothetical questions is often puzzling and even distressing if the expert is not sufficiently prepared to react appropriately from his/her own point of view. This presentation aims to clarify, for the psychiatric expert, the concept of hypothetical questions in a legal situation, to demonstrate the different types of hypothetical questions, and to explain possible ways to confront them.

Deception Detection Training for Professionals: Improving Mental Health Professionals' Ability to Detect High-Stakes Lies

Julia Shaw, *University of British Columbia*
(Julia.Shaw@ubc.ca)

Psychologists, psychiatrists and legal professionals need to make critical veracity judgments on a daily basis, with undetected deception often carrying important consequences for both the individual and the community. Lies are very common, and confidence in detecting them is high among professionals (e.g., DePaulo, et al., 1997), yet the research repeatedly shows that professionals and laypeople are no better than chance at detecting low-stakes (e.g, Vrij, 2008) and high-stakes (Porter, et al., 2010) lies. Further research has also suggested that despite knowing these high error rates, most professionals never receive empirically based training on credibility assessment (e.g., Porter & ten Brinke, 2009). In the present study, we evaluated the effectiveness of one-day deception detection training workshop (Shaw, Porter