

Correction to Schaffer et al., 2012

In the article “The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology: New data—practical implications” by Jack Schaffer, Emil Rodolfa, Jesse Owen, Robert Lipkins, Carol Webb, and Jacqueline Horn (*Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 2012, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 1-7), the following sentence on page 3 is incorrect: “Of the 4,750 candidates who responded in the affirmative to the question of whether their internships were APA or CPA accredited or were Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) member programs, 82% received passing scores on the EPPP.” The phrase, “or were Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) member programs,” should have been deleted. In fact, the analysis described on page 3 and the subsequent multivariate analysis described on page 4 used only accreditation of the internship as the variable in question. The paragraph in question should read, "Of the 4,750 candidates who responded in the affirmative to the question of whether their internships were APA or CPA accredited, 82% received passing scores on the EPPP. Of the 1,891 who responded no, 68% passed. In addition, interestingly, 544 did not know whether their internship was accredited (of whom 58% passed) and 175 had not had a predoctoral internship (of whom 59% passed) ($\chi^2 = 285$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$, $\phi = .2$)." The results and conclusions listed in the article regarding the positive association between accreditation of the internship and performance on the EPPP are accurate, specifically, in column 1, paragraph three on p. 4, Table 3 on p. 4, paragraph four, p. 5. paragraph five on p. 5 and paragraph six on p. 6. In summary, our finding that students

from APA accredited internships passed the EPPP at a significantly higher rate than students from non-accredited internships is accurate. The authors regret the wording error and any resulting confusion.

final 8 29 2013