

Name of Tool	Static-2002R
Category	Sexual Offending (Validated)
Author / Publisher	Helmus and Colleagues
Year	2012

Description

- It is a 14-item actuarial risk measure designed to predict sexual recidivism in adult males who have committed sex offences.
- The items presented in this measure are identical to those in the Static-2002 with the exception of the updated age weights (see [Helmus et al., 2012](#)). The revision was to improve consistency across scoring categories, conceptual clarity and predictive accuracy. These items are grouped into five categories: age at release, persistence of sex offending, sexual deviance, relationship to victims and general criminality ([Brouillette-Alarie, Prolux and Hanson, 2017](#)).
- Individuals can be placed into one of five categories based on their total score which range from low, low-moderate, moderate, moderate-high to high risk ([Babchishin, Hanson and Helmus, 2012](#)).
- The authors of the instrument recommend that the revised version of the scale (Static-2002R) replace the Static-2002 and the Static-99/Static-99R in all contexts where it is used ([Phenix et al., 2009](#)).

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

Experience in assessing sexual violence risk. Training on the instrument is highly recommended. Note that Static-99/R training is not sufficient to score Static-2002/R. The authors recommend that evaluators obtain Static-2002/R training before using the scale. <http://www.static99.org>

Strengths

- Can be used by a variety of professionals such as psychologists, police officers and probation officers.
- The convergent validity of the Static-99R with the Static-2002R was found to be almost perfect, with a mean Cohen's Kappa of .86 (standard deviation=.18) ([Brouillette-Alarie, Prolux and Hanson, 2017](#)).

Empirical Grounding

This tool is derived from the Static-99 and is grounded in research literature relating to sexual offending, as well as specific literature regarding the Static-99 ([Helmus, 2009](#)).

Inter-Rater Reliability									
a) UK Research	None available at present.								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jung et al. (2017) found that 4 of the Static-2002R items demonstrated relatively poor IRR limits; although this may be due to shortcomings in training for three out of the four. 								

Validation History									
General Predictive Accuracy									
a) UK Research	None available at present.								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AUC of the Static-2002R was .69 in a sample of 590 individuals who had committed sexual offences (Parent, Guay and Knight, 2011). • In a sample of 342 individuals who had committed sexual offences, ROC analyses demonstrated an AUC of .769 (Jung et al., 2017). • The AUC scores for 5, 10 and 15 year follow-ups in a sample of 621 Australian individuals convicted of sexual offences were .68, .67 and .69 (Reeves, Ogloff and Simmons, 2017). • Babchishin, Hanson and Helmus (2012) - the Static-2002R demonstrated accuracy in predicting sexual recidivism (AUC = .76). • Helmus et al. (2012) observed a slight increase in the predictive accuracy of the Static-2002R compared to the Static-2002 for sexual recidivism at the 5-year follow-up period (AUCs = .713 and .709 respectively). For violent recidivism, however, there were no observed differences in the AUC values. None of the differences between the two scales were significant. • Babchishin, Hanson and Helmus (2011) - the Static-2002R showed moderate accuracy in predicting sexual recidivism (AUC = .70). 								

Validation History

Applicability: Females									
Not intended for use with females.									

Validation History									
Applicability: Ethnic Minorities									
a) UK Research	None available at present.								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babchishin, Hanson and Helmus (2012) – Aboriginal individuals had significantly higher composite scores than non-Aboriginals. The Static-2002R composite score did not significantly predict sexual recidivism for Aboriginal individuals. • In his doctoral thesis, Lee (2019) conducted fixed-effect meta-analyses from five independent Canadian samples to test the predictive accuracy of the Static-2002R with White (n=1560) and Indigenous (n=653) groups. The Static-2002R was able to discriminate recidivists from non-recidivists in the group of White individuals (AUCs>.69). For the Indigenous group, however, the predictive accuracy was not statistically significant (AUC<.61). Consequently, extreme caution is urged when using Static-2002R with individuals of Indigenous heritage. 								

Validation History									
Applicability: Mental Disorders									
No empirical evidence available.									

Contribution to Risk Practice									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Static-2002R provides a brief scan of the risk of sexual recidivism and can prompt further assessment of identified risk factors. 									

Other Considerations									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited studies conducted by independent researchers. • Assessors are encouraged to use the BARR-2002R over the Static-2002R or the Static-99 when predicting violent or any recidivism (Babchishin 2019, personal communication). 									

- In a Master's thesis, [Rohrer \(2019\)](#) carried out factor analyses with a sample of individuals who had committed sexual offences (n=533). A potential new factor structure was proposed for the Static instruments: paedophilia factor, young antisociality factor, general criminality factor and agonistic continuum factor.
- [Hanson and colleagues \(2017\)](#) created five new risk categories for the Static instruments and found that this increased the concordance of risk classification from 51% to 72. It is theorised that the new common STATIC risk categories could inform intervention strategies.
- It is recommended that those in the community who are offence free for five years should have their risk category reduced by one level. The term 'offence free' is interpreted as no known criminal activity taking place, no convictions, no warnings, reprimands or breaches ([Hanson et al., 2014](#); [Hanson et al. \(2018\)](#)).
- For further information, please visit the following website; www.static99.org