

Week 6: forensic assessment of adults ii

Psychology



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Week 6 Forensic Assessment of Adults II Relevance in Assessment.

Psychopathy has been associated with egocentric persistent violation regarding social norms or expectations, impulsivity, manipulateness, irresponsibility and shallow emotions not to mention the absence of empathy, guilt and remorse. Such characteristics have been related to criminality where violence risk assessment has shown individuals suffering from such a condition not being legally prosecuted especially if they did not know the happenings or their status at the time of the violation. History had shown that assessment tests such as Rorschach Inkblot Test had been used but proven inadequate. This led to the current development of a precise and comprehensive tool known as Gold-standard Psychopathy assessment tool. The usage of the condition has also moved from being used as a reason for individuals committing violations that were being taken to mental hospitals. Instead, it is being used as a strong connection to criminal behavior and recidivism and as such, it is applied to justify the longevity of prison terms or capital punishment (Jackson, 2008).

Adjudicative Process

Meteorology portrays different aspects of the communication using risk messages that are categorized depending on the intensity of the risk involved. The same principle can be applied in clinical aspect. First, the low violence risk category may represent few risk factors and not requiring special preventive actions. Such is the case of a 60 year old man who is depressed with no history of violence. Secondly, moderate violence risk category may present several risk factors. A case of a 25 years old woman that abuses alcohol, having a history of assault though lacking a recent violent act. Thirdly, the high violence risk category present high number of

<https://assignbuster.com/week-6-forensic-assessment-of-adults-ii/>

risks and requires close monitoring. A 30 year old man abusing drugs and has a history of assault not to mention vague recent threats. Lastly, very high violence risk portrays many risk factors with preventive measures in place. A 35 year old woman abusing drugs, has a history of serious violence, does not comply to psychotropic medication not to mention life threatening to close relations (Monahan & Steadman, 1996).

Case Outcome.

According to Skeem and Mulvey (2001), psychopathy as a factor had the most association to violence as compared to other risk factors. This is despite the condition not being 8% of the total population in the study. The rate is documented as low when compared to offender samples that vary from 18% - 37%. The relation on predicting violence as a correlated factor of psychopathy remains constant regardless the statistics being treated as continuous scores or dichotomous variables. A logistic model used to test incremental validity of psychopathy with a checklist as a screening version came in handy in predicting the violence (Skeem & Mulvey, 2001).

Considerations on variables included male genders, drug usage and estimate on verbal IQ, Novaco Anger Scale-Behavioral, intensity in prior arrests, antisocial personality disorder and recent violence not to mention emotional detachment as a factor. Such reflections are attributed more by the antisocial behavior component than the emotional detachment component of the condition. It is evidenced that the predictive power of psychopathy towards antisocial behavior, high-risk demographic characteristics, substance abuse and personality disorders is substantially attenuated in the absence of these covariates. In essence, the personality disorder therein was shown to have stronger association to antisocial behavior with a mean $r = .$

34 whereas that of emotional detachment being a mean $r = .23$. Unlike the expected, the removal of covariates was not in favor of core interpersonal as well as affective traits related to psychopathy. As such, the emotional detachment factor only contributed unique variance with regards to prediction of violence whereas the antisocial behavior factor added to the covariate set an incremental validity (Skeem & Mulvey, 2001).

References

Jackson, R. (Ed.). (2008). Learning forensic assessment. New York: Routledge.

Monahan, J., & Steadman, H. J. (1996). Violent storms and violent people: How meteorology can inform risk communication in mental health law. *American Psychologist*, 51(9), 931-938.

Skeem, J. L., Mulvey, E. P. (2001). Psychopathy and community violence among civil psychiatric patients: Results from the MacArthur Violence Risk Assessment study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 69(3), 358-374.