

COMMENT REPLY

The PCL–R and Capital Sentencing: A Commentary on “Death Is Different” DeMatteo et al. (2020a)

Robert D. Hare¹, Mark E. Olver², Keira C. Stockdale^{3, 2}, Craig S. Neumann⁴, Andreas Mokros⁵, Arielle Baskin-Sommers⁶, Eddy Brand⁷, Jorge Folino⁸, Carl Gacono⁹, Nicola S. Gray¹⁰, Kent Kiehl^{11, 12}, Raymond Knight¹³, Elizabeth Leon-Mayer⁸, Matthew Logan¹⁴, J. Reid Meloy^{15, 16, 17}, Sandeep Roy¹⁸, Randall T. Salekin¹⁹, Robert J. Snowden²⁰, Nicholas Thomson²¹, Scott Tillem⁶, Michael Vitacco²², and Dahlnym Yoon⁵

¹ Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia

² Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan

³ Saskatoon Police Service, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

⁴ Department of Psychology, University of North Texas

⁵ Department of Psychology, University of Hagen

⁶ Department of Psychology, Yale University

⁷ Ministry of Justice, The Hague, Netherlands

⁸ Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, National University of La Plata

⁹ Asheville, North Carolina, United States

¹⁰ Department of Psychology, Swansea University

¹¹ Department of Psychology, University of New Mexico

¹² Mind Research Network, Albuquerque, New Mexico, United States

¹³ Department of Psychology, Brandeis University

¹⁴ HALO Forensic Behavioural Specialists, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

¹⁵ Forensic Psychological Corporation, San Diego, California, United States

¹⁶ Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Diego

¹⁷ San Diego Psychoanalytic Center, San Diego, California, United States

¹⁸ Department of Psychology, University of North Texas

¹⁹ Department of Psychology, University of Alabama

²⁰ Department of Psychology, Cardiff University

²¹ Departments of Surgery and Psychology, Virginia Commonwealth University

²² Medical College of Georgia, Augusta University

DeMatteo et al. (2020b) published a Statement in this journal declaring that the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCL–R) “cannot and should not [emphasis added]” (p. 134) be used in U.S. capital-sentencing cases to assess risk for serious institutional violence. Their stated concerns were the “imperfect interrater reliability” (p. 137), the “variability in their predictive validity” (p. 137), and the prejudicial effects of PCL–R ratings on the defendant. In a Cautionary Note, we (Olver et al., 2020) raised questions about the Statement’s evaluation of the PCL–R’s psychometric properties; presented new data, including a meta-analysis; and argued that the evidence did not support the Statement’s declaration that the PCL–R

Mark E. Olver  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2265-0034>

Andreas Mokros  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9706-0928>

Jorge Folino  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5834-2212>

Nicola S. Gray  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3849-8118>

Elizabeth Leon-Mayer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1564-6448>

Sandeep Roy  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3148-2343>

Randall T. Salekin  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4284-0556>

Robert J. Snowden  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9900-480X>

Scott Tillem  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2971-5718>

Dahlnym Yoon  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3672-2377>

The consensus of the authors is that Robert D. Hare should take the lead in this article. Following the first five authors, the list of authors is alphabetical. The views and opinions expressed here are those of the authors. They do not

represent their respective institutions, organizations, regulatory bodies, or this journal’s editorial board. Individual authors may have expressed the findings and their views in ways that differ from this consensus commentary. Robert D. Hare and Andreas Mokros receive royalties from the sale of the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCL–R) and its derivatives. They and several other authors occasionally receive fees for PCL–R training. We have not presented the ideas or data reported in this article at a conference or meeting, posted them on a LISTSERV, or shared them on a website.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mark E. Olver, Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan, 9 Campus Drive, Arts Building Room 154, Saskatoon, SK S7N 5A5, Canada. Email: mark.olver@usask.ca

cannot be used in high-stakes contexts. In their reply, titled “Death is Different,” DeMatteo et al. (2020a) concurred with several points in our Cautionary Note, disputed others, asserted that we had misunderstood or mischaracterized their Statement, and dismissed our new data and comments as irrelevant to the Statement’s purpose. This perspective on our commentary is inimical to balanced academic discourse. In this article, we contend that DeMatteo et al. (2020a) underestimated the reliability and predictive validity of PCL–R ratings, overestimated the centrality of the PCL–R in sentencing decisions, and underplayed the importance of other factors. Most of their arguments depended on sources other than capital cases, including mock trials, sexually violent predator hearings, and studies that included the prediction of general violence. We conclude that the rationale for the bold “cannot and should not” decree is open to debate and in need of research in real-life venues.

Keywords: psychopathy, Psychopathy Checklist—Revised, field reliability, institutional violence, capital sentencing

DeMatteo et al. (2020b) recently published a “Statement” in this journal expressing their concerns about the use of the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCL–R; Hare, 2003) in U.S. capital-sentencing decisions. Because the instrument cannot predict serious institutional violence “with a high degree of accuracy and precision [emphasis added],” they concluded that the PCL–R “cannot and should not be used [emphasis added] . . . when making high-stakes decisions about legal issues [emphasis added] such as capital sentencing” (p. 134).

In our reply, subtitled “A Cautionary Note on DeMatteo et al. (2020),” Olver et al. (2020) raised doubts about the data and psychometric evidence offered by DeMatteo et al. (2020b) in support of their attempt to obviate the use of the PCL–R in capital sentencing and provided new analyses and data to support our arguments. We suggested that the Statement overestimated the PCL–R’s centrality in high-stake sentencing decisions and underplayed the importance of other factors. These factors include the circumstances surrounding the crimes, the crimes themselves, the “nature” of the defendants, their general demeanor, admissions of guilt, and expressions of emotion and remorse (Sundby, 1998), as well as the part played by purpose-built risk tools (Guy et al., 2015).¹

The Relevance of Research Cited in the Cautionary Note

In their response to our Cautionary Note, titled “Death is Different,” DeMatteo et al. (2020a) ignored or dismissed several of the issues we had raised. They also claimed that some data we presented were “either (a) based on misunderstanding or mischaracterization of our Statement, or (b) irrelevant to the purpose and content of our Statement.” Alternative (a) is inimical to academic discourse. Readers can decide for themselves the merits of the Statement and the Cautionary Note. Alternative (b) is a matter of interpretation and open to debate.

Among other things, (b) refers to the inclusion of studies in our meta-analyses that dealt with the reliability of PCL–R ratings and their use in the assessment of risk for institutional violence in general, not only for risk assessment confined to “serious” institutional violence among death row inmates. Some of these studies had used the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version (PCL: SV; Hart et al., 1995), a psychometrically parallel version of the PCL–R (Cooke et al., 1999; Higgs et al., 2018), whereas others had not been peer-reviewed. DeMatteo et al. (2020a) considered such

studies “irrelevant, misleading, or distracting with respect to the Statement’s focus” (p. 513). However, the meta-analyses reviewed in their Statement comprised precisely the same sorts of studies that DeMatteo et al. (2020a) faulted us for using. For example, they stated, “[We] summarize the empirical literature regarding the ability of PCL–R scores to predict violence [emphasis added], with a particular focus on the PCL–R’s ability to predict serious institutional [emphasis added] violence” (DeMatteo et al., 2020b, pp. 133–134). They bolstered their arguments with “a large meta-analysis of published and unpublished studies” (p. 137) by Guy et al. (2005). About one third of the studies listed by Guy et al. had not been peer-reviewed; several used the PCL: SV. None of the studies (to our knowledge) involved death penalty inmates.

DeMatteo et al. (2020a) also dismissed, as irrelevant, the Cautionary Note’s inclusion of relevant data analyzed using variable-centered structural equation modeling (SEM) and person-oriented latent profile analysis (LPA). We used these sophisticated approaches to gauge the links among PCL–R factors and violence risk (see Neumann et al., 2016). The data were part of a prospective study of violent behavior in a large sample of violent offenders. The results of these analyses, in line with similar published research, illustrated the value of SEM and LPA in delineating the roles of each PCL–R factor in predicting sexual, sadistic, and other violent behaviors among offenders in a variety of prison settings (Cale & Burton, 2019; DeLisi, 2019; Krstic et al., 2018, 2019; Thomson, 2019).

Use of the PCL–R in Legal Settings

DeMatteo et al. (2020a) initially construed our Cautionary Note as favoring the PCL–R’s use to influence decisions to execute a given offender. However, their supposition was mistaken and antithetical to our standpoint on the proper, professional use of the PCL–R. Since the conception and development of the PCL–R, Hare has repeatedly stressed (and we agree) that it is a measure of the traditional *psychopathy construct*, but a measure (and construct) with important clinical, forensic, and other applications, when used following the highest professional standards. In this respect, it fulfills its purpose well. DeMatteo et al. (2020a) stated

¹ DeMatteo et al. (2020b, p. 134) stated, “There is compelling evidence to suggest that characterizing defendants as ‘psychopaths’ has a substantial prejudicial impact that may make jurors more inclined to support the death penalty for them.” We examine the bases for this assertion in a separate article (Hare et al., 2020).

several times that the PCL-R is, or is regarded as, the “gold standard” for assessing psychopathy, a common figure of speech for the PCL-R and one that reflects widespread views of its merits for research and applied purposes. Neal et al. (2019, p. 150) listed the PCL-R as one of six forensic instruments considered by legal experts as being both “generally acceptable” and as having “generally favorable reviews.” As such, it plays an integral part in criminal justice milieus for which the “degree” of psychopathy (as a dimensional construct) is of importance in forming judgments about an individual’s nature, character, and behavioral patterns. That is, the PCL-R provides a valuable source of information—beyond risk assessment—with direct relevance for decision-making in high-stakes settings, including capital sentencing.

Field Reliability of PCL-R Ratings

In discussing PCL-R scores, DeMatteo et al. (2020b, p. 142) claimed that their field reliability is not high enough for judicial purposes. Nonetheless, they acknowledged that

the relatively low interrater reliability observed in field settings can be attributed in part to the limited quality and quantity of information on which evaluators relied, as well as to the limited training, supervision, and experience of those evaluators; although there is further evidence that it may also be due to the *adverse impact of adversarial proceedings on the judgment of evaluators* [emphasis added]. (p. 142).

In their reply to our Cautionary Note, DeMatteo et al. (2020a) mirrored our words that the field reliability of PCL-R scores can be very good or very poor, although only obliquely referring to examples of the former. DeMatteo et al. (2020a, p. 512) also claimed that we agreed with their view that the field interrater reliability of PCL-R scores “is substantially lower than that reported in the PCL-R manual.” We do not see this as an area of agreement. DeMatteo et al. (2020a) stated that the average interrater reliability of PCL-R ratings in Canadian studies was 0.78. However, we were clear that an outlier study (Edens et al., 2015; two of the authors also are authors of the Statement) accounted for 90% of effect size variability. Removal of this outlier yielded an effect size of 0.87, identical with the value for the pooled sample of male offenders and forensic patients described in the PCL-R manual (Hare, 2003, p. 65).

DeMatteo et al. (2020a) suggested that the only issue of relevance to the Statement is the field reliability of PCL-R scores in American capital cases. As the Statement put it, “[I]nterrater reliability is a property of scores obtained for a particular sample of people and in a particular context; it is not a stable property of the test itself that necessarily generalizes across samples or contexts” (DeMatteo et al., 2020b, p. 135). Quite so, which raises a thorny problem for DeMatteo and colleagues: To wit, they based their evaluation of the field reliability of PCL-R scores on data from adversarial sexually violent predator hearings, not from capital cases, a breach of the guidance they offered in their Statement.

PCL-R Training

DeMatteo et al. (2020a) said that our Cautionary Note made an “odd” recommendation about “authorized” PCL-R/PCL: SV trainers (p. 517). They incorrectly implied that Hare, his test publisher, and his colleagues controlled such training. Many institutions,

and individuals (including at least one of the “concerned experts”; DeMatteo et al. (2020b), p. 133) have long conducted their own onsite or online workshops. Indeed, these “other” workshops far outnumber those conducted by Hare and his colleagues. Detailed discussions of the PCL-R’s professional use and examples of various training methods are available elsewhere (e.g., Gacono, 2016; Hare et al., 2013).

Unfortunately, not all practitioners are equal in the skills needed to conduct complex psychological evaluations (Blais et al., 2017; Hare, 2016, p. 30). Others fail to follow proper professional standards for administration and interpretation of psychological instruments. The fault with unprofessional use of the PCL-R—including imprudently labeling an individual as a psychopath—lies with the evaluator, not with the tool (Gacono, 2016; Hare, 1998; Lyon et al., 2016; Olver & Stockdale, 2010).

Conclusions

In this article, we addressed issues raised by DeMatteo et al. (2020a) and presented evidence that the bulk of the support for their arguments comes from sources other than capital cases. That is, they based much of their Statement on data that, by their own standards, were irrelevant to its purpose (DeMatteo et al., 2020a). We conclude that the rationale for their bold “cannot and should not” decree is open to debate and in need of research in real-life venues.

References

- Blais, J., Forth, A. E., & Hare, R. D. (2017). Examining the interrater reliability of the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised across a large sample of trained raters. *Psychological Assessment, 29*(6), 762–775. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000455>
- Cale, J., & Burton, M. (2019). Psychopathy and sexual aggression: A review of empirical research. In M. DeLisi (Ed.), *Routledge international handbook of psychopathy and crime* (pp. 334–350). Routledge.
- Cooke, D. J., Michie, C., Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1999). Evaluating the Screening Version of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCL: SV): An item response theory analysis. *Psychological Assessment, 11*(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.11.1.3>
- DeLisi, M. (Ed.). (2019). *Routledge international handbook of psychopathy and crime*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000223>
- DeMatteo, D., Hart, S. D., Heilbrun, K., Boccaccini, M. T., Cunningham, M. D., Douglas, K. S., Dvoskin, J., Edens, J., Guy, L., Murrie, D., Otto, R., Packer, I., & Reidy, T. J. (2020a). Death is different: Reply to Olver et al. (2020). *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 26*, 511–518. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000285>
- DeMatteo, D., Hart, S. D., Heilbrun, K., Boccaccini, M. T., Cunningham, M. D., Douglas, K. S., Dvoskin, J., Edens, J., Guy, L., Murrie, D., Otto, R., Packer, I., & Reidy, T. J. (2020b). Statement of concerned experts on the use of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist—Revised in capital sentencing to assess risk for institutional violence. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 26*(2), 133–144. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000223>
- Edens, J. F., Cox, J., Smith, S. T., DeMatteo, D., & Sörman, K. (2015). How reliable are Psychopathy Checklist—Revised scores in Canadian criminal trials? A case law review. *Psychological Assessment, 27*(2), 447–456. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000048>
- Gacono, C. B. (2016). Suggestions for implementation and use of the Psychopathy Checklists in forensic and clinical practice. In C. B. Gacono (Ed.), *The clinical and forensic assessment of psychopathy: A practitioner’s guide* (2nd ed., pp. 231–251). Routledge.
- Guy, L. S., Edens, J. F., Anthony, C., & Douglas, K. S. (2005). Does psychopathy predict institutional misconduct among adults? A meta-

- analytic investigation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(6), 1056–1064. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1056>
- Guy, L. S., Kusaj, C., Packer, I. K., & Douglas, K. S. (2015). Influence of the HCR-20, LS/CMI, and PCL–R on decisions about parole suitability among lifers. *Law and Human Behavior*, 39(3), 232–243. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000111>
- Hare, R. D. (1998). The Hare PCL–R assessment of psychopathy: Some issues concerning its use and misuse. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 3(1), 101–122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8333.1998.tb00353.x>
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *Manual for the Hare Psychopathy Checklist—Revised* (2nd ed.). Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D. (2016). Psychopathy, the PCL–R, and criminal justice: Some new findings and current issues. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, 57(1), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000041>
- Hare, R. D., Black, P., & Walsh, Z. (2013). The PCL–R: Forensic applications and limitations. In R. P. Archer & E. M. Archer (Eds.), *Forensic uses of clinical assessment instruments* (2nd ed., pp. 230–265). Routledge.
- Hare, R. D., Olver, M. E., & Stockdale, K. C. (2020). *Is the PCL–R prejudicial to defendants in high stakes sentencing?* Manuscript in preparation.
- Hart, S. D., Cox, D. N., & Hare, R. D. (1995). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Higgs, T., Tully, R. J., & Browne, K. D. (2018). Psychometric properties in forensic application of the Screening Version of the Psychopathy Checklist. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62(7), 1869–1887. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X17719289>
- Krstic, S., Longpré, N., Knight, R. A., & Robertson, C. A. (2019). Sadism, psychopathy, and sexual offending. In M. DeLisi (Ed.), *Routledge international handbook of psychopathy and crime* (pp. 351–358). Routledge.
- Krstic, S., Neumann, C. S., Roy, S., Robertson, C. A., Knight, R. A., & Hare, R. D. (2018). Using latent variable- and person-centered approaches to examine the role of psychopathic traits in sex offenders. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 9(3), 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000249>
- Lyon, D. R., Ogloff, J. R. P., & Shepherd, S. M. (2016). Legal and ethical issues in the assessment of psychopathy. In C. B. Gacono (Ed.), *The clinical and forensic assessment of psychopathy: A practitioner's guide* (2nd ed., pp. 194–216). Routledge.
- Neal, T. S. M., Slobogin, C., Saks, M. J., Faigman, D. L., & Geisinger, K. F. (2019). Psychological assessments in legal contexts: Are courts keeping “junk science” out of the courtroom? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 20(3), 135–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100619888860>
- Neumann, C. S., Vitacco, M. J., & Mokros, A. S. (2016). Using both variable-centered and person-centered approaches to understanding psychopathic personality. In C. B. Gacono (Ed.), *The clinical and forensic assessment of psychopathy: A practitioner's guide* (2nd ed., pp. 14–31). Routledge.
- Olver, M. E., & Stockdale, K. C. (2010). Psychopathy and youth violence: Research, controversies, and clinical utility. *The British Journal of Forensic Practice*, 12(2), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.5042/bjfp.2010.0181>
- Olver, M. E., Stockdale, K. C., Neumann, C. S., Hare, R. D., Mokros, A., Baskin-Sommers, A., Brand, E., Folino, J., Gacono, C., Gray, N. S., Kiehl, K., Knight, R., Leon-Mayer, E., Logan, M., Meloy, J. R., Roy, S., Salekin, R. T., Snowden, R., Thomson, N., . . . Yoon, D. (2020). Reliability and validity of the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised in the assessment of risk for institutional violence: A Cautionary Note on DeMatteo et al. (2020). *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 26, 490–510. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000256>
- Sundby, S. E. (1998). Capital jury and abolition: The intersection of trial strategy, remorse, and the death penalty. *Cornell Law Review*, 83(6), 1557–1598. <http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/clr/vol83/iss6/4>
- Thomson, N. D. (2019). Psychopathy and violent crime. In M. DeLisi (Ed.), *Routledge international handbook of psychopathy and crime* (pp. 508–525). Routledge.

Received July 23, 2020

Revision received September 24, 2020

Accepted September 24, 2020 ■