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The Nature of Psychopathy

As an identified mental disorder and developing label, psychopathy has a long history. Today psychopathy is defined as a constellation of specific affective, interpersonal, and behavioral characteristics (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1980, 1996; Hare & Neumann, 2010; Krueger, 2006).

In terms of interpersonal style psychopathic individuals are glib and superficially charming, and also prone to grandiose self presentation, deceit and manipulation. Their deficient affective experience relates to low remorse and guilt, callousness, low empathy and lack of conscience. Psychopathic individuals live a lifestyle that reflects need for stimulation, lack of long-term goals, irresponsibility, parasitic living, and impulsivity. In intimate relationships they are promiscuous and abusive. Their anti-social behavioral characteristics manifest in terms of e.g. poor behavioral controls, early behavioral problems and criminal versality.

To make it simpler, Hare (1993) describes the psychopath as a:

Self-centred, callous, and remorseless person profoundly lacking in empathy and the ability to form warm emotional relationships with others, a person who functions without the restraint of a conscience. (pp. 2–3)

You may ask yourself how influential in our society or how close to your life would you like to see a person with these kinds of characteristics? Still the reality is that these people exist, at every level of our society, in any profession and we don't think
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anyone can securely say that he or she will never meet a psychopath. We do worry of the possibility that perhaps we have not done enough to protect ourselves from them.

Although psychopathy has a strong influence in questions related to criminality, not all psychopathic persons commit crimes or are caught by the law enforcement and sentenced to prison. This is a thought that many of us might feel inconvenient and therefore prefer to object to or reject. Accepting the thought brings psychopathy somehow closer to us. We suddenly find ourselves thinking: Can I run into them in my daily life? This book highlights situations where you are likely to encounter a psychopathic person. In order to narrow down this wide perspective we have chosen to focus on issues related to psychology and law. The law is a system of rules and guidelines that shape politics, economics, and society in numerous ways. To put in short, the legal system sets the rights and responsibility we have agreed upon as social mediator of relations between people. Taking into account the personality of psychopaths, it is quite evident that the law hardly has the same effect on their behavior as it has for an individual who does not have these personality traits.

The starting point of the modern clinical construct of psychopathy is the publication of Hervey Cleckley’s text *The Mask of Sanity* (first published in 1941). It is noteworthy that his characterization has remained relatively constant to the present day (Hart & Hare, 1997). Cleckley’s work was based on his clinical observations of white, middle-class male inpatients of a mental hospital. Much of what has been observed on psychopaths since then has been done in the prison environment. This is somewhat in contrast with Cleckley’s observations as he noted that many psychopaths never became involved with the criminal justice system, although he did consider persistent antisocial deviance to be characteristic of psychopaths (Patrick, 2006a). However, forensic settings are unlikely to be the optimal location to identify psychopathic personalities who one can consider “successful” in terms of achieving social status. According to Cleckley’s observations, nonconvicted psychopaths “keep up a far better and more consistent outward appearance of being normal” (pp. 198–199). Today’s discussion on psychopathy is occasionally colored by observations suggesting that psychopathic individuals would somehow be successful in life and their ability to take advantage of other people could sometimes be envied (Hall & Benning, 2006). As an inferior illustration of this phenomenon, recently a radio program in Finland interviewed an “expert” on the topic “How to raise your child to become a psychopath.” To anyone who has experience with psychopathic individuals, this topic probably raises feelings of disbelief and disgust. However, it is good to acknowledge that our conception (as well as the general public’s conception) of what psychopathy is and how it presents itself is shaped very much by the entertainment industry. Many colorful illustrations of a psychopathic individual are present in movies and TV series. The “Hollywood psychopath” is often portrayed as a person with high intelligence and a calm, calculated, and controlled demeanor, and one who is extremely skilled in deception and interpersonal manipulation. Famous
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examples include Dr Hannibal Lecter, as portrayed by Anthony Hopkins in the *Silence of the Lambs*; the psychopathic mistress in *Fatal Attraction* played by Glenn Close; and the TV series *Dexter* just to name a couple. Our personal favorite reflection of the glibness, superficial charm, and intelligent ruthlessness of psychopathic individuals is the character of Alan Shore from the television drama series *Boston Legal*. Alan Shore's character is a brilliant lawyer who provides an impression of an ethical core but who in reality uses immoral means such as illicit computer hacking, blackmailing, disguising, and bribery to reach his goals. His character is a good example of how psychopaths can pursue what they want without experiencing anxiety attributable to a concern for how their actions might impact others. Alan Shore’s behavior is unpredictable, he treats others with levity, and he is also an obscene womanizer. And yet we love him.

With regard to observing the behavior of a psychopathic individual, the focus is rarely on the negative effect and consequences that these personality traits may have on the person. A recent study by Fritz, Rajaleid, Hemstrom, and af Klinteberg (2009) showed that the proportion of individuals that reported dissatisfaction of life was significantly higher in both criminals and controls characterized by psychopathic tendencies compared with the groups with no psychopathic tendencies. Ullrich, Farrington, and Coid (2008) investigated the hypothesis that some features of psychopathy are related to life success in a community sample of 304 middle-aged men. The results showed that the interpersonal domain of psychopathic traits was not related to “status and wealth” or “successful intimate relationships.” Instead, there was a significant negative correlation between impulsiveness and antisocial behavior with “status and wealth.” Also affective deficiency was negatively associated with both aspects of a successful life. Thus, in the general population psychopathic individuals’ lack of remorse and empathy and their callousness seem to be counterproductive for “status and wealth” and “successful intimate relationships.” It was concluded based on the results that psychopathic traits do not contribute to a successful life and that the findings cast doubt on the existence of the “successful” psychopath.

Cleckley (1941) was of the opinion that the impulsive conduct of psychopaths would eventually be detrimental to them and that they would also suffer from their inability to plan for the future or learn from consequences. They are often trustworthy in the eyes of others and may in some cases acknowledge this. Perhaps most importantly, Cleckley had noticed that for a psychopath it is impossible to take interest in the tragedy, joy, or sorrow as presented for example in literature and art, or be moved by it. In Cleckley’s (1941) words:

> He is also indifferent to all these matters in life itself. Beauty and ugliness, except in a very superficial sense, goodness, evil, love, horror, and humor have no actual meaning, no power to move him. (p. 90)

Furthermore, due to their interpersonal nature psychopathic individuals lack the ability to notice emotional experiences in others. Think for a second of living your
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Figure 1.1 Published psychopathy items each year as derived from the Web of Science database.

life without the capacity of empathy. How would you talk and interact with a friend who tells you of his worries? How would you react when your partner told you that he was in love with you? In what way would you behave if your mother told you that she has cancer and two weeks left to live? Psychopathic individuals lack the ability to see when and how others are emotionally moved, and even if the experience is described to them they are unable to understand it. This type on living in an emotional vacuum to our opinion represents something that must be very unsatisfactory and regrettable. Although we do not have any compassion for psychopathic individuals, we do think that it’s a shame that this type of a human personality has ever evolved.

The importance of psychopathy has been repeatedly emphasized (Hare, 1996, 1998; Harris, Skilling, & Rice, 2001; Lykken, 2006; Steadman, Silver, Monahan, Appelbaum et al., 2000), and the research literature on psychopathy at present is exhaustive and divergent. There is a substantial amount of empirical literature on psychopathy – its measurement, nature, and implications for mental health and particularly for criminal justice. In June 2011 a search made in the Web of Science® provided us with a result of 2709 scientific articles on psychopathy in the world’s leading scholarly social sciences journals, with the earliest article dating back to 1945. The number of scientific articles published on psychopathy is rapidly and steadily increasing. In the latter half of the 1990s approximately 50 scientific articles on psychopathy were published annually; by 2008 the annual number had increased to over 250, where it has remained since then (see Figure 1.1).

There are also several noteworthy books on psychopathy, for example by Babiak and Hare (2006); Blair, Mitchell, and Blair (2005); Cooke, Forth, and Hare (1998);
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Felthous and Sass (2008); Gacone (2000); Hare (1993); Hervé and Yuille (2006); Meloy (1988); Malatesti and McMillan (2010); Millon, Simonsen, Birket-Smith, and Davis (1998); Patrick (2006b); Raine and Sanmartín (2001); Salekin and Lynam (2010); and Stout (2005). For persons interested in conducting scientific research on psychopathy there is a specific organization for networking with colleagues: the Society for the Scientific Study of Psychopathy. Their website is at http://www.psychopathysociety.org. For people considering joining victim survival group see for example Aftermath: Surviving Psychopathy Foundation (http://aftermath-surviving-psychopathy.org).

Short History

The current concept of psychopathy is a result of several formulations created by clinical practitioners and researchers during the past centuries. Comprehensive early reviews on psychopathy have been written in Great Britain by Henderson (1939) and Curran and Mallinson (1944); in Germany by Kahn (1936) and Schneider (1958); in France by Delmas (1943); and finally in the United States by Maughs (1941), Gurvitz (1951) and Jenkins (1960). Further, several articles and books review the research and theoretical history of psychopathy (e.g., Berrios, 1996; Lewis, 1974; McCord & McCord, 1964; Millon et al., 1998; Pichot, 1978; Rotenberg & Diamond, 1971), and the varieties or subtypes of psychopathic individuals are introduced in numerous early writings (Kraepelin, 1915; Schneider, 1923; Wimmer, 1929; Wittels, 1937). However, it was not until Harvey Cleckley’s The Mask of Sanity (1941) when a psychopath’s primary traits were clarified and illustrated with several case examples. Given the enduring confusion over the psychopathy construct, understanding how it has been defined throughout history may be warranted. Arrigo and Shipley (2001) have provided a comprehensive overview and review of the major transitions associated with psychopathy’s, making it possible to assess provisionally how psychopathy evolved into a mental disorder and a pejorative label. In their article the varied philosophical, scientific, and clinical community’s perspectives are examined from the early 1800s to the late 1900s.

Measurement

The importance of early identification of psychopathic individuals has been repeatedly emphasized (e.g., Lynam, 1996). The operationalization of the psychopathy construct through the development of the Psychopathy Checklist (PCL [Hare, 1980] and PCL-R [Hare, 2003]) enabled identification of these individuals as well as allowed scientists to do replicable, theoretically meaningful research which is required for the society to acknowledge psychopathy as a significant clinical construct with many practical implications. Thus, the development of the PCL and its revision,
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### Table 1.1 PCL-R Items Relating to Four Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Lifestyle</th>
<th>Antisocial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glibness or superfical charm</td>
<td>Lack of remorse or guilt</td>
<td>Need for stimulation or proneness to boredom</td>
<td>Poor behavioral controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandiose sense of self-worth</td>
<td>Shallow affect</td>
<td>Parasitic lifestyle</td>
<td>Early behavior problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathological lying</td>
<td>Callous/lack of empathy</td>
<td>Lack of realistic long-term goals</td>
<td>Juvenile delinquency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conning or manipulative</td>
<td>Failure to accept responsibility for own actions</td>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td>Revocation of conditional release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irresponsibility</td>
<td>Criminal versatility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PCL-R, represents the primary methodological achievement in psychopathy and clinical assessment (e.g., Edens, Skeem, Cruise, & Cauffman, 2001; Fulero, 1995; Hare & Neumann, 2006; Lilienfeld, 1998; Seagrave & Grisso, 2002). The PCL-R is a 20-item instrument where each item is scored on the basis of file and interview information with a specific criterion. Four factors or dimensions (recently described in detail by Hare & Neumann, 2008, 2010) are formed based on 18 of the items as presented in Table 1.1.

Two items, promiscuous sexual behavior and many short-term relationships, contribute to the total PCL-R score, but do not load on any of the four factors. The Interpersonal/Affective dimensions and the Lifestyle/Antisocial dimensions comprise the traditional PCL-R Factors 1 and 2 described in the PCL-R manual by Hare (2003). Total PCL-R scores vary between 0 and 40, and reflect the degree to which the individual matches the prototypical psychopath. For research and “diagnostic” purposes, a cut score of 30 typically is used as an indication of psychopathy. Recently, the structure of psychopathy has been increasingly considered dimensional in nature (e.g., Edens, Marcus, Lilienfeld, & Poythress, 2006; Guay, Ruscio, Knight, & Hare, 2007; Lilienfeld, 1998; Marcus, John, & Edens, 2004; Walters, Duncan & Mitchell-Perez, 2007; Walters, Gray, Jackson, Sewell, et al., 2007).

In addition to the PCL-R, there are several other instruments that have been developed to assess the psychopathic traits of an individual (for reviews see, e.g., Lilienfeld, 1998). In short, there are certain instruments to assess psychopathic traits in children (Andershed, Kerr, Stattin, & Levander, 2002; Frick & Hare, 2001, Frick, O’Brien, Wootton, & McBurnett, 1994; Lynam, 1997) and young offenders (Forth, Hart, & Hare, 1990), as well as to screen them in forensic and correctional settings (Forth, Brown, Hart, & Hare, 1996) and within law enforcement, probations, corrections, civil and forensic facilities, as well as other areas (Hare & Hervé, 1999).
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There are also several self-report measures of psychopathy (Hare, 1985; Levenson, Kiehl, & Fitzpatrick, 1995; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996; Lilienfeld, & Fowler, 2006).

Practical Application and Study Populations

Psychopathy has several clinical (diagnosis and treatment planning), law enforcement (evaluations of dangerousness, interview tactics, and crime scene analysis), and forensic (pretrial assessment, competency issues, and risk assessment) applications. The extensive evidence consistently shows that psychopathy is well represented in the criminal and forensic psychiatric population (with the prevalence being on average 15–25%), and it is significantly associated with increased risk of violence and crime (e.g., Hare, 2003; see Chapters 7–11 for a more detailed discussion). It has been estimated that more than half of the violent crime in our societies is committed by psychopathic individuals (Hare, 1999).

To date, little research on psychopathy has been undertaken among the general population. Recently Coid, Yang, Ullrich, Roberts, and Hare (2009) found that self-disclosed psychopathy is rare, being present in 0.6% of the household population in England, Wales, and Scotland. Although the prevalence is low, one should not allow it to lead to the idea that studying psychopathy within the general population is not important. As an example: at the end of 2010 the population of Finland was 5 375 276 persons. Approximately 65% (3 493 929 persons) of the Finnish population is 16–64 years old. If we think that the results by Coid et al. (2009) can be generalized to the Finnish general adult population, it would mean that there are 20 964 persons with high psychopathy traits living in the society. In 2010 there were on average 3500 prisoners within the Finnish prisons. If we apply the 25% base rate of psychopathy (Hare, 2003) to them, we get 875 prisoners high on psychopathy. To put it simply: there are 875 persons in prisons and 20 964 persons in society who deserve our special attention. It should be noted that these estimated figures are from a country which has a relatively small population, but it certainly gives us an idea of the perspective and equivalent figures in countries with larger populations.

Some scientists have early on suggested that psychopathy is found in society at large and that psychopaths, due to the defining characteristics, would be successful for example in powerful political and material positions (Cleckley, 1941; Hare, 1993, 2003; Schneider, 1958). Despite the possible low base rate of psychopathy in the general population (Hare, 1993), many researchers feel that we must find ways of studying psychopathic personalities in the community and industry (e.g., Babiak, 1995, 2000; Hart & Hare, 1994; Kirkman, 2002; Widiger & Lynam, 1998). The problem has been on finding these individuals. In two innovative studies, the subjects were acquired by using a specific kind of advertisement in newspapers and unemployment offices (Belmore & Quinsey, 1994; Widom, 1977). One of the important questions to raise, from a practical as well as theoretical point of view, is whether psychopathy manifests itself in the general population similarly to how it does in the criminal population. To date, the construct validity of psychopathy and associated
behaviors have already been examined in the general population, mentioned in this
section (Coid et al., 2009); college or university students (Forth et al., 1996; Levenson
et al., 1995; Lynam, Whiteside, & Jones, 1999; Salekin, Trobst, & Krioukova, 2001;
Zagon, & Jackson, 1994); employment agency customers (Ishikawa, Raine, Lencz,
Bihrle et al., 2001); and those subject to early childhood victimization (Weiler &
PCL-R data of 54 participants of the general population to PCL-R normative data
and tested whether the psychopathic individuals representing the general popu-
lacion manifest psychopathy primarily in terms of personality features (Interper-
sonal/Affective) rather than behavioral features (Impulsivity/Antisocial Behavior).
Their results showed that this was the case: participants of the general population
demonstrated the personality features of psychopathy to a greater extent than the
behavioral features, although the difference to the norms was small in individuals
with high PCL-R scores.

Future Directions

Much of what is currently written regarding clinical observations and case studies
on psychopathy is based on Hervey Cleckley’s clinical descriptions and insights
presented in The Mask of Sanity (1941, 1976). Other early clinicians and investigators,
including Arieti (1963), Henderson (1947), Karpman (e.g., 1948, 1961), Partridge
(1928), and McCord and McCord (1964), have been referred to much less frequently.
However, a great deal of what is currently empirically examined and discussed (and
occasionally heatedly debated) on psychopathy has roots in these early writings:
for example, for psychopathy and criminality, see McCord and McCord (1964); for
shallow affect in psychopaths, see Arieti (1963); and for impulsivity, see Karpman
(1961). Many of these early writers of psychopathy were worried and dissatisfied
with how the concept psychopathy was used. Cleckley (1941) particularly wished
the term to be used for a specific disorder that would be well defined. In order to
lead the development into this direction he set out to define the core characteristics
of psychopathy. This was not without confusion: in the 1941 edition of The Mask
of Sanity he listed 21 characteristics of psychopathy, and in later editions of The
Mask of Sanity some of the original items were deleted while some were split and
reclassified, ending up in 16 characteristics. In the 1941 edition there were nine male
case studies, while in the 1976 edition the number had enlarged to 15 (of which
seven were same as in the 1941 edition). It is unclear how Cleckley chose his case
examples. Several possibilities exist: based on severity of symptoms, heterogeneity,
amount of information, and/or personal fascination, just to name few.

Recently, Hare and Neumann (2008) tried to put Cleckley’s work into perspective.
They emphasized that critical examination of Cleckley’s work is virtually nonexistent,
and although Cleckley’s views were based on intensive study of several hundred
patients, there are several contradictions in his writings. In line with Hare and
Neumann (2008) allow us to be simple minded for a second and ask: what made
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Cleckley so special that his clinical insights and case studies have had such a profound influence on generations of clinicians and researchers? As Hare and Neumann (2008) stated,

In any case, we contend that it makes little sense to base theory and research primarily on conceptions of psychopathy that are frozen in time, a time (the 1930s) when psychodynamic models were prevalent, experimental psychopathology and psychometric theory were in their infancy, and behavioural genetics, developmental psychopathology, and cognitive neuroscience had yet to arrive on the scene.

The construct of psychopathy has a rich clinical early history, a trend which in some respects has diminished in modern times. Few modern writings on psychopathy present case examples (Babiak & Hare, 2006; Hare, 1993; Stout, 2005), and ever fewer link case method into theoretical perception or empirical data. It is, however, our personal experience that detailed analyses of cases provide pedantic and rich clues to the psychopath’s lives, actions, and inner world better than any empirical research design alone would do. The first author has done several years of empirical research on psychopathy including analyzing the forensic examination reports of over 500 homicide offenders and rating them for the PCL-R. However, during the years she has repeatedly discovered that it is at her clinical practice that she really gains insight into the world of a psychopathic individual. The reverse process has actually happened to the second author, who has had a long career in social interaction with suspects of crime and criminals at all levels and covering the whole variety of criminality. This work has taught him a lot of the process of interacting with different kinds of personalities in high-stakes situations. However, during all these years, it was not until he started working together with the first author and when he learned of psychopathy “from an academic point of view” that he was able to link together some of his experiences in a way that gave a reason and meaning for the behaviors and reactions he had witnessed during interviews, various intelligence operations, and the interrelationship between criminal structures.

The Structure of This Text

The text attempts to introduce practitioners to the core areas of psychopathy. For a researcher it aims to provide up-to-date empirical information with a link to case studies of psychopathy. There are some areas which have not been touched on previously in the scientific literature on psychopathy: those that relate to the interpersonal behavior of a psychopathic individual in serious crime such as organized crime or war crime, and family environment. The text is divided into 13 independent chapters:

In Chapter 2 Michael Vitacco, David Lishner, and Craig Neumann identify and discuss the basic psychometric properties of the PCL instruments with specific emphasis in applying them in the courtroom setting. They further examine appropriate and inappropriate uses of PCL instruments in adversarial proceedings, discuss
possible ethical concerns in using PCL-R, and provide some important questions clinicians using PCL instruments should expect to encounter on direct or cross-examination. The authors bring forward a number of important aspects concerning the appropriate use of the PCL instrument as an assessment tool in legal procedure.

In Chapter 3 Christopher Patrick, Noah Venables, and Jennifer Skeem present the findings from brain research on psychopathy by first reviewing diagnostic distinctions of psychopathy and different brain measurement techniques. Findings from studies using different brain measurement techniques are reviewed, and many key assumptions that underlie research on brain function in psychopathy are critically evaluated and discussed. A major section in their chapter is devoted to discussion of implications of research on psychopathy and brain function for legal practices and policy making.

In Chapter 4 Arielle Baskin-Sommers and Joseph Newman discuss the functioning of cognition–emotion interactions, which establishes patterns for thinking, feeling, and acting. Specifically, the focus is on poor inhibition and antisocial behavior with regard to key legal issues relating to aggression, judicial practice (e.g., culpability and postincarceration release), and treatment.

In Chapter 5 Caroline Logan and Ghitta Weizmann-Henelius highlight gender differences in the expression of psychopathy and demonstrate their relevance to the assessment and management of psychopathy in women. They use criminal justice settings in order to illustrate differences between the genders in presentation, give present recommendations for how to manage women with psychopathic traits in these settings, and also discuss future directions for research and practice in this area.

In Chapter 6 Nina Lindberg focuses on psychopathy in childhood and adolescence. She examines the relationship of psychopathic traits with conduct disorder and antisocial personality disorder; presents the evidence for biological and psychological factors influencing the development of psychopathy; and discusses psychopathy with regard to juvenile criminality and prognosis.

In Chapter 7 Mary Ellen-O’Toole and Helinä Häkkänen-Nyholm review research on violent crime and psychopathy with specific emphasis on the base rate of psychopathy in different offender groups and on detecting psychopathy from crime scene behavior. They describe what motivates psychopaths for violent crime and provide advice on how to identify psychopaths from a pool of suspects.

Chapter 8 by Reid Meloy is devoted to predatory violence with specific emphasis on psychopathy. It provides the reader a thorough insight to the mind of a violent psychopath. Three measures to measure predatory and affective violence in human subjects are presented and discussed. Predatory violence is further discussed with regard to legal and judicial issues.

In Chapter 9 Helinä Häkkänen-Nyholm and Jan-Olof Nyholm ask the question “Is psychopathy relevant in economical crime, organised crime and war crime?” and answer it by reference to research and case studies. Specific emphasis is given on the impact of psychopathy on leadership within these contexts. The authors open the question about what possible consequences there might have been or will be when the nation or its military is led by a psychopathic individual.
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In Chapter 10 Julia Shaw and Stephen Porter describe the current state of knowledge surrounding psychopathy and criminal careers. They first provide a background on the temporal stability of psychopathy, which is followed by the trajectories of different types of offenders. They further provide the reader with proof that psychopathy should not be considered “untreatable” and review studies that have reported positive improvements for psychopaths.

In Chapter 11 Hannu Lauerma discusses the many challenges that psychopathic prisoners create and cause for prison authorities. He presents several cases where psychopathic inmates have, for example, attempted to form personal relationships with staff members, bargained with officials, presented pseudo-religious phenomena, or used threats to reach their goals. Specific emphasis is given on psychiatric care of psychopathy and taking measures against psychopathy in prisons.

Chapter 12 by Helinä Häkkänen-Nyholm is devoted to psychopathy in the family context. She discusses the challenges that a psychopathic person causes for his or her partner and children. Furthermore, specific attention is paid to working with psychopathic individuals in a clinical interview setting, as well as to civil court processes and psychopathic individuals’ behavior during the process.

In Chapter 13 Jan-Olof Nyholm and Helinä Häkkänen Nyholm review the research literature on a psychopath’s interpersonal behavior. They consider the challenges of interviewing a psychopathic individual in terms of selecting interview strategies and safety issues. Several practical tips are given for interviewing psychopathic persons.

Many of the chapters of this book indicate that the research on psychopathy is beginning to benefit from the use of multimethod approaches to research, as well as integration with other disciplines than forensic psychiatry and psychology. This clearly is advantageous for the scientific study on psychopathy. This book is unique in combining empirical research and theoretical discussion with case examples of psychopathy. None of the earlier books on psychopathy have done this; instead the focus has been on either one. We encourage others to reflect clinical case material with regard to empirical research and theoretical perspectives on future writings on psychopathy. Many of the case studies presented in this book are based on independent use of the PCL-R or its derivates (Hare, 2003). Out of respect for their privacy, the names of the people who appear in the case studies have been changed (as well as some unimportant details) in order to protect confidentiality.

We hope that this style of writing, combining valid and modern case examples with empirical research results and theoretical perspectives, is a reflection of new and exciting progress in the scientific writing and study of psychopathy. Since Meehl’s (1954) writing, clinical data have been considered as somewhat less reliable and uncertain, especially if used for prediction. However, in their thorough analyses of clinical versus statistical data Westen and Weinberger (2004) recently concluded that clinicians can provide reliable and valid data, especially by using instruments designed for experienced clinical observers. Furthermore, they reminded us also that Meehl (1954) emphasized the importance of clinical judgment in the context of scientific discovery (as an aid in framing hypotheses or identifying relevant variables). Thus, also in the field of scientific study of psychopathy, collaboration between
practitioners and researchers could substantially improve the quality of scientific research. In the words of Westen and Weinberger (2004):

> Those of us whose professional lives are weighted toward research can spend only a fraction of the time clinicians spend in contact with patients to identify phenomena that may be crucial to test. . . . The scientific mind and the clinical mind can coexist, if ambivalently, in a single field — indeed, in a single person — and that the dialectic between the two may be essential for a scientific psychology. (p. 610)
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