



HAL
open science

Relationship between Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality, Interpersonal Measure of Psychopathy and Psychopathy Checklist - Revised among adult forensic patients

D. Delannoy, Claire Ducro, Xavier Saloppé, Thierry H. Pham

► **To cite this version:**

D. Delannoy, Claire Ducro, Xavier Saloppé, Thierry H. Pham. Relationship between Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality, Interpersonal Measure of Psychopathy and Psychopathy Checklist - Revised among adult forensic patients. 16th Annual Meeting of the International Association of Forensic Mental Health Services (IAFMHS), Jun 2016, New York, France. hal-04482102

HAL Id: hal-04482102

<https://hal.univ-lille.fr/hal-04482102>

Submitted on 28 Feb 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Delannoy, D.^{1, 2}, Ducro, C.^{2, 3, 4}, Saloppé, X.^{2, 3, 4, 5} & Pham, T.H.^{1, 2, 6}

¹ Université de Mons, Belgium; ² Centre de Recherche en Défense Sociale (CRDS); ³ Université de Lille, France; ⁴ SCALab, CNRS UMR 9193; ⁵ Service de Psychiatrie, Hôpital de Saint-Amant-les-Eaux, France; ⁶ Centre de Recherche, Institut Philippe Pinel, Montréal, Canada

Introduction

The PCL-R is rather a static instrument (Hare, 2003). It is used in Forensic clinical practice in Belgium. This instrument allows a diagnosis but its factor structure is subject to many discussions. Following these discussions, the CAPP-IRS has been developed to provide a more dynamic personality measure (Cooke, Hart & Logan, 2004). Indeed, this instrument is sensitive to therapeutic change and individuals may be subject to periodic re-assessment (Cooke, Hart, Logan & Michie, 2012).

The aim of this study is to evaluate the convergent validity of the CAPP-IRS (Cooke, 2008) and the IM-P (Kosson, 1997) with the PCL-R (Hare, 2003) and their implantation in the clinical practice.

Methods Instruments

The CAPP-IRS consists of 33 symptoms, each defined by three descriptive adjectives. These symptoms are grouped into six domains (i.e., Attachment, Behavioral, Cognitive, Dominance, Emotional and Self) which are rated on a 7-points scale (0-6).

The IM-P consists of 21 items which are grouped into three factors (i.e., Dominance, Grandiosity and Boundary Violation). Each item is rated on a 4-point scale (0-3).

Sample

The sample consisted of 40 males forensic inpatients from the secure psychiatric hospital of the C.R.P. « Les Marronniers » in Belgium.

Data Analysis

Descriptive and comparison group analyses (Kruskal-Wallis Test) were performed for age, IQ, length of stay, mental disorders and personality disorders (SCID-II, DSM-IV, 1994), types of offenses. We compared three groups (“High Psychopathy”: PCL-R total scores >25; “Medium Psychopathy” (PCL-R total scores ranging between 15 and 24.9; “Low Psychopathy” (PCL-R total scores <15). Differences were observed concerning age and Cluster A. We hence checked the correlations (Spearman) between these variables, CAPP-IRS and IM-P scores.

The Convergent validity between PCL-R, CAPP-IRS and IM-P scores were computed via the Spearman coefficient.

Comparison between groups (High/Medium/Low Psychopathy) on the CAPP-IRS and the IM-P measures were computed with Kruskal-Wallis and the Mann-Whitney U Tests. The Bonferroni Correction was used to limit type 1 error.

Discussion

Descriptive analyses

There were significant differences between psychopathic groups for age, (K-W = 9.76 ; $p < .00$) and personality disorders diagnoses (Cluster A ; K-W = 6.44 ; $p = .04$). “Medium Psychopathy” group presented significantly more Cluster A diagnoses than the “High Psychopathy” group (U = 38.00 ; $p = .01$). There were no difference concerning IQ, mental disorders, length of stay and types of offenses.

Correlations

We observed a moderate positive correlation (Cohen, 1992), between the PCL-R total score, CAPP-IRS total score, the Attachment Domain, the Dominance Domain and the Emotional Domain of the CAPP-IRS. This is partially congruent with the previously results of Sandvik et al. (2012). Indeed, the effect reported by these authors was large. There was a similar correlation between PCL-R total score, IM-P total score, « Grandiosity » and « Boundary Violation » factors of the IM-P.

We observed a large effect between : (1) the CAPP-IRS total score and the interpersonal factor ; (2) the CAPP-IRS total score and the interpersonal facet; (3) the Dominance Domain and the interpersonal factor/facet.

We observed no correlation between all of the CAPP-IRS scores and the PCL-R Antisocial facet. This is congruent with the suggestions of Cooke and Michie (2001). However, these results contradict those obtained by Sandvik et al. (2012).

Concerning the IM-P, we observed a large effect between : (1) the IM-P total score and the interpersonal factor ; (2) The IM-P total score and the interpersonal facet; the Grandiosity factor and the interpersonal factor and facet ; (3) the Boundary Violation factor and the interpersonal factor and facet.

We observed also a medium effect between : (1) the IM-P total score and PCL-R total score; (2) the « Grandiosity » factor and the PCL-R total score; (3) the « Boundary Violation » factor and the PCL-R total score. The results of the IM-P total score are congruent with those obtained by Kosson et al. (1997).

PCL-R (N = 40)	Total score	Interpersonal factor	Antisocial factor	Interpersonal facet	Affective facet	Impulsive facet	Antisocial facet
CAPP-IRS/ IM-P							
Total score CAPP-IRS	.44**	.55**	.27	.56**	.41**	.31*	.14
Attachment Domain	.32*	.41**	.23	.52**	.19	.23	.15
Behavioral Domain	.50**	.45**	.38*	.49**	.33*	.47**	.27
Cognitive Domain	.16	.30	-.03	.25	.35*	-.05	-.18
Dominance Domain	.42**	.53**	.25	.51**	.41**	.29	.11
Emotional Domain	.39*	.38*	.32*	.43**	.25	.30	.25
Self Domain	.24	.43**	.10	.40*	.32*	.10	.00
Total Score IM-P	.44**	.56**	.27	.62**	.27	.28	.20
Dominance (IM-P)	.18	.28	.12	.35*	.11	.18	.02
Grandiosity (IM-P)	.39*	.50**	.23	.55**	.20	.26	.16
Boundary Violation (IM-P)	.44**	.53**	.27	.62**	.22	.20	.30

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

PCL-R (N = 40)	High psychopathy (N = 13)		Medium psychopathy (N = 12)		Low psychopathy (N = 15)		K-W	p
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd		
CAPP-IRS /IM-P								
Total score CAPP-IRS	93.92	29.72	75.91	22.30	63.46	24.77	8.35	.01
Attachment Domain	12.77	5.93	8.50	3.55	7.87	5.22	6.14	.04
Behavioral Domain	14.54	6.56	12.41	7.87	7.06	3.95	9.19	.01
Cognitive Domain	11.46	5.67	11.92	2.68	9.86	3.29	2.17	.33
Dominance Domain	18.85	8.05	12.92	8.13	10.80	8.09	6.57	.04
Emotional Domain	16.23	4.02	13.92	2.61	11.73	4.67	6.55	.04
Self Domain	20.08	8.35	16.25	7.33	16.13	8.11	2.30	.32
Total Score IM-P	25.30	14.30	12.42	9.99	12.07	8.58	7.57	.02
Dominance (IM-P)	6.69	4.84	3.33	2.35	4.80	3.17	3.43	.18
Grandiosity (IM-P)	7.62	4.84	4.33	4.24	3.53	3.11	5.17	.08
Boundary Violation (IM-P)	7.84	5.15	2.83	2.88	2.53	3.14	8.46	.01

CAPP-IRS : IM-P:
Total Score : $p < .05$ Total score : $p < .05$
Domains $p < .008$ Factors : $p < .016$

Comparisons

Overall, the High psychopathy group presented a higher CAPP-IRS total score than the Low psychopathy group. However, High psychopathy group presented higher scores on the CAPP-IRS total score and the Behavioral Domain (U = 34.00 ; $p = .003$) than the Low psychopathy group.

Concerning the IM-P, the High psychopathy group presented a higher IM-P score than the Low psychopathy group about all measures. However, High psychopathy group have only a significantly higher score on the IM-P total score and Boundary Violation factor (U = 40.00 ; $p = .007$) score than the Low psychopathy group. So, the IM-P detected the interpersonal problems for the psychopaths.

The results revealed a number of associations between CAPP-IRS and the other measures of psychopathy. However, CAPP-IRS is not a measure intended to replace the PCL-R. Clinicians should work on the complementarity between these three tools. While the PCL-R is a static diagnostic instrument, the CAPP-IRS able to assess potential change of the individual.

The IM-P can be used to manage the verbal and non verbal aspect in the interpersonal behavior. Indeed, it may contribute to defined the social skills therapy in forensic context.

It is important to consider the correlations between the CAPP-IRS/IM-P measures and the age/Cluster A. Indeed, the correlations were all negatives. The data concerning the age is congruent with the literature (Harpur & Hare, 1994). Some aspects (impulsive facet) decrease with the age. Concerning the Cluster A, the schizophrenic spectrum is different than the psychopathic personality. The first is more deconstructed than the second explaining negatives correlations between them.