

Name of Tool	Domestic Violence Inventory (DVI)
Category	Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Lindeman
Year	2006

Description

- The DVI is a 155-item self-report actuarial assessment intended for use with persons accused or convicted of domestic violence or related offences.
- The DVI scales measure the criminogenic needs that contribute to IPV ([Lindeman and Khandaker, 2011](#)).
- The items are spread across six scales: (1) truthfulness, (2) violence (lethality), (3) control, (4) alcohol, (5) drugs and (6) stress coping abilities. DVI areas of inquiry were established after extensive review of domestic violence literature (DVI.com).
- The DVI generates a percentile score for each of the scales to inform subsequent treatment interventions (Karca, personal communication, January 2012).
- Risk of the client is categorized as either 'low' (0-39%), 'medium' (40-69%), 'problem' (70-89%) or 'severe problem' (90-100%). A problem is not identified until a scale score is at the 70th percentile or higher. Severe problems represent 11% of those evaluated with the DVI.
- Paper-pencil administration takes on average 30 minutes and tests are scored electronically. Tests are all computer-scored since that is said to be "objective, accurate and fair" ([DVI.com](#)).

Age Appropriateness

Adult males and females.

Derivatives of the assessment (i.e. DVI-Juvenile) can assess risk from the age of 12 upwards.

Assessor Qualifications

No specific user qualifications stated in relation to use of the tool; although users are not typically clinicians or diagnosticians.

Tool Development

- An unpublished thesis (Herndon, 2014) found that although DVI percentile scores did not significantly predict reoffending status, other variables like probation outcome, sentence served and educational attainment did.
- [Lindeman and Khandaker \(2011\)](#) used a large-scale sample of 18, 770 individuals who had committed IPV offences and found that all DVI scores substantially exceeded the reliability coefficient. Males scored higher than females on the following scales: control, alcohol, drugs, stress coping abilities and truthfulness. Those with multiple IPV offences scored significantly higher than those with first-time offences on all subscales apart from the 'truthfulness' scale.

- A study by [Bouffard and Muftić \(2007\)](#) found that lower scores on DVI sub-scales were linked to a lower potential for IPV reoffending. Males recommended for treatment received higher scores on the alcohol, control, violence and stress coping scales.
- Small to large correlations were found for the six subscales in relation to domestic violence arrests (Lindeman, 2006).
- [Pike and Buttell \(2003\)](#) carried out a 12-month follow-up using a sample of 100 males attending a batterer intervention program. Significant differences were observed between the DVI pre and post-treatment scores on psychological variables related to domestic violence. No significant differences in scores were found between African-American and Caucasian males.
- Unpublished studies have collated data on the validity of the subscales (see '[Online Testing](#)' website).

General Notes

- There are three derivatives of this instrument which include:
 - DVI-Juvenile is designed for use with individuals aged between 12 and 17 years in court, probation and treatment settings. It consists of 149 true-false and multiple-choice items and takes around 25-30 minutes to complete. The tool has been standardised on both male and female juveniles. More information available at: <http://domestic-violence-inventory-juvenile.com/index.html>
 - DVI Pre-Post is a tool consisting of 147 items and is designed to examine pre and post-treatment changes in the attitudes and behaviour of the individual in relation to domestic violence by administering it before and after treatment and comparing scores. Further information is available from: www.dvi-pre-post.com.
 - DVI-Short Form is a brief (76 items) version of the DVI designed for use with those who are reading impaired. It takes about 15-20 minutes to complete <http://www.dvi-short-form.com/DVISF.html>
- For further information, please visit the following website: <http://www.domestic-violence-inventory.com/>

Name of Tool	Domestic Violence Risk Appraisal Guide (DVRAG)
Category	Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Hilton and Colleagues
Year	2008

Description

- The DVRAG is a 14-item actuarial tool which assesses the probability of IPV perpetrated by males against a female partner ([Rice, Harris and Hilton, 2010](#)).
- The tool was created as a complement to the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (ODARA), combining the ODARA item scores with total score on the Psychopathy Checklist Revised (PCL:R) ([Hilton et al., 2008](#))
- It is recommended that this tool is used only when the assessor has access to detailed clinical and/or correctional data.
- A higher score on the DVRAG indicates a greater risk level. ([Hilton et al., 2008](#); [Hilton, Harris and Rice, 2010](#)).

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

The DVRAG is intended for use by forensic clinicians and criminal justice officials who can access in-depth information.

Tool Development

- The DVRAG was developed from the ODARA (see p. 76) through the addition of clinically relevant information that is not routinely available to the police ([Hilton et al., 2008](#)).
- [Rettenberger and Eher \(2013\)](#) found the DVRAG yielded good predictive validity for domestic violence (AUC .71), general criminal (AUC .70) and general violent reoffending (AUC .70).
- [Hilton et al. \(2008\)](#) - the DVRAG achieved good predictive validity (ROC = .71). DVRAG scores correlated significantly with recidivism ($r = .30$), number of recidivistic offences ($r = .37$), severe physical abuse ($r = .37$) and total injury ($r = .39$). The DVRAG scores exhibited excellent inter-rater reliability ($r = .92$).

General Notes

- The DVRAG was developed from the ODARA through the addition of clinically relevant information that is not routinely available to the police ([Hilton et al., 2008](#)).

- [Rettenberger and Eher \(2013\)](#) - the DVRAG displayed moderate accuracy in predicting domestic violence recidivism (AUC = .71) in a sample of 66 high-risk males who had committed sexual offences against their current or former partners.
- [Trinh \(2010\)](#) found large effect sizes between scores on the DVRAG and domestic violence recidivism.
- [Hilton et al. \(2008\)](#) - the DVRAG achieved good predictive validity (ROC = .71). DVRAG scores correlated significantly with recidivism ($r = .30$), number of recidivistic offences ($r = .37$), severe physical abuse ($r = .37$) and total injury ($r = .39$). The DVRAG scores exhibited excellent inter-rater reliability ($r = .92$).
- The manual for the DVRAG system is contained in the book: Hilton, N.Z., Harris, G.T., and Rice, M.E. (2010). *Risk assessment for domestically violent men: Tools for criminal justice, offender intervention, and victim services*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association ([Access Here](#)).

Name of Tool	Domestic Violence Screening Inventory Revised (DVSI-R)
Category	Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Williams and Grant
Year	2006

Description

- The DVSI-R is an 11-item actuarial risk assessment that examines the risk of intimate partner violence (IPV) in males. This is a screening measure that should be followed by a more comprehensive assessment of IPV risk ([Nicholls et al., 2013](#)).
- It is intended to assist clinicians in making pre-arrangement recommendations based on the likelihood of reoffending ([Messing and Thaller, 2015](#)).
- Seven of the items relate to behavioural history of the perpetrator and the remaining four items examine substance abuse, the use of objects as weapons, employment status and the presence of children during the offence.
- The tool generates a total risk score and two summary scores which relate to the following: (1) imminent risk of violence to the victim of an incident; (2) imminent risk to another person known to the perpetrator ([Williams, 2012](#)). Risk is characterised as ‘low’, ‘moderate’ and ‘high’.
- Risk factors included in the assessment were based on a thorough review of domestic violence literature and opinions made by consultations with judges, lawyers, victim advocates and police force personnel ([Williams and Houghton, 2004](#)).
- The DVSI-R is a derivative of the original DVSI which was developed by the Colorado Department of Probation Services. The revised version was created due to the further modification of the DVSI items, as some were deemed to be confusing or redundant.

Age Appropriateness

No specified age range.

The measure was initially developed for probation services.

Assessor Qualifications

No further information pertaining to user qualifications.

It has been suggested that the tool is perhaps most appropriate for social workers within the court system to allow them to make decisions about pre-trial release ([Messing and Thaller, 2015](#)).

Tool Development

- A review of recent studies relating to the DVSI and the DVSI-R by [Nicholls et al. \(2013\)](#) indicated that the tool suggested that the tool has good internal consistency ($\alpha=.71$); but the inter-rater reliability was uncertain with this not being reported in any of the reviewed studies. Predictive

accuracy was also found to be moderate for serious threatening and physical violence, with AUCs ranging from .61 to .73.

- [Stansfield and Williams \(2014\)](#) conducted a ROC analysis of 18 month follow-up data from a sample of 29, 317 individuals in Connecticut, 70% of which were male. Survival analyses showed that the DVSI-R predicted female recidivism over time, something which the authors claim shows promise for the use of DVSI-R to predict IPV recidivism in female perpetrators. Ethnic minorities and males were more likely to be rearrested; the authors hence stress the need for instruments that are specific to gender and ethnicity.

- A study by [Williams \(2012\)](#) showed that the DVSI-R had predictive accuracy across the five behavioural measures of recidivism and, bar one, this did not vary by gender, age or ethnicity. It was also found that the DVSI-R composite score had moderate to high predictive accuracy (AUC) with all measures of recidivism including; new familial violent offences (.62) and protective-restraining order violations (.72). Similar accuracy was noted across gender and ethnic minority groups.

- [Williams and Grant \(2006\)](#) - findings suggested that the DVSI-R has moderate to high predictive accuracy (AUC) in relation to repeat IPV (.71) multiple versus single incidents of IPV (.79) imminent risk (.64) and risk to others (.61). DVSI-R performed similarly in relation to the AUC values for different types of familial violence.

- [Williams and Grant \(2006: 407\)](#) - the findings of the initial validation study suggested that male perpetrators generally have higher scores than female perpetrators on the DVSI-R.

General Notes

- Criminal justice case file information is required to use the measure ([Messing and Thaller, 2013](#)).
- Previous research on the DVSI have suggested that there was a 39% chance of making a misclassification error ([Wong and Hisashima, 2008](#)).
- *Hennepin County Department of Community Corrections and Rehabilitation (2010)* - the SARA composite scores had better correlation with recidivism scores with female perpetrators than the DVSI (rs = .37 vs .20).
- The DVSI scores had higher correlation with recidivism scores of repeat offending compared to the SARA scores (rs = .20 vs .13). The revised version may thus encounter similar issues.
- The DVSI-R has been found to measure risk across various types of relationships, aligning with the broadening of the definition of IPV in a number of states in the US ([Williams, 2012](#)).
- The tool is not designed to measure the risk of IPV becoming lethal ([Campbell and Messing, 2017](#)).
- The majority of validation research has been conducted by the authors of the tool.

Name of Tool	Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (ODARA)
Category	Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Hilton and Colleagues
Year	2004

Description

- The ODARA is a 13-item actuarial risk assessment instrument designed to assess the likelihood of domestic violence recidivism in males.
- Higher scores on the ODARA also indicate that a suspect accused of assault will be more likely to commit more assaults, commit them within a short space of time, and cause more injury than a suspect with a lower score.
- Criminal justice case file information is required to use the tool for criminal justice purposes; information only from a victim interview may be used to provide feedback to the victim
- The ODARA is appropriate for use with males aged 18 years and older and has also been validated with females.
- It has been used in Canada, Austria, New Zealand, the UK and the US ([Messing and Thaller, 2015](#)).

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

Initially designed for use within the police service.

No professional assessor qualifications required; training to standard level of scoring reliability is encouraged.

Tool Development

- The tool was constructed from risk factors that were found to be statistically significant in predicting assault recidivism. These risk factors were identified via statistical analyses of follow-up data from police and criminal justice datasets relating to men who had assaulted their female partner.
- The ODARA was created in collaboration with the Ontario Provincial Police. Its purpose is for frontline use by police officers at the scene of an IPV incident or a follow-up investigation ([Rice, Harris and Hilton, 2010](#)). The tool was developed to assist police decisions about detaining suspects and offering additional support to victims, and to assist court decisions about conditional release ([Bowen, 2011](#)).
- [Olver and Jung \(2017\)](#) carried out survival analyses and found that the ODARA predicted IPV recidivism amongst both males and females. The tool also predicted general criminal and violent recidivism.

- [Jung and Buro \(2017\)](#) tested the ODARA on 246 male perpetrators charged with IPV offences. It was found that this largely predicted reoffending, with AUCs of .75, .71 and .70 for general, violent and IPV recidivism respectively. An inter-rater reliability of .91 was found when the ODARA was scored.
- [Hilton and Eke \(2016\)](#) used the ODARA on 93 men who had committed an IPV offence against a female partner (marital, cohabiting or dating). Recidivism was tested after seven and a half years, with an AUC of .67 being found for post-index IPV reoffending. The ODARA also predicted post-index stalking with an AUC of .78
- [Hilton et al. \(2014\)](#) tested the ODARA on 30 female perpetrators of IPV against a current or former marital, common law or dating partner over a decade follow-up period. They found that the measure predicted recidivism, with an ROC of .724.
- A meta-analysis by [Messing and Thaller \(2013\)](#) discovered that the ODARA had an average AUC of .666.
- [Rettenberger and Eher \(2013\)](#) report good predictive accuracy for domestic violence recidivism using the ODARA (AUC = .71). For general criminal and general violent recidivism, the AUC was between .66 and .71.
- [Rice, Harris and Hilton \(2010\)](#) found high ICC values of .95 following the selection of 10 cases and .94 during the follow-up period. The ODARA also demonstrated moderate accuracy in predicting domestic violence recidivism in follow-up periods as short as 6 months (ROC area =.64).
- [Hilton and Harris \(2009\)](#) - in a 5-year follow-up, the ODARA attained moderate accuracy in distinguishing between recidivists and non-recidivists (ROC Area = .74) when ambiguous cases of violent recidivism were removed from analyses.
- [Hilton et al. \(2008\)](#) found moderate predictive accuracy (ROC area =.67) in sample of individuals assessed as high risk of reoffending.
- A study by [Lauria et al. \(2017\)](#) found that the ODARA predicted intimate partner violence physical assault and predicting the outcome of any further police contact for nonphysical intimate partner abuse, generating AUCs of .68 and .72 respectively. Moreover, total scores on the ODARA were able to differentiate between those who reoffended with a further physical assault and those who did not (AUC of .68), as well as individuals with and without any further non-physical abuse (AUC=.72).
- [Seewald and colleagues \(2017\)](#) compared the predictive accuracy of the ODARA compared to forensic psychiatrists using unstructured clinical judgment: AUCs were generated of 0.78 and 0.44 respectively.
- Physical violence recidivism was found to be predicted by risk factors related to physical violent and antisociality (incarceration for more than 30 days). By contrast, risk factors for nonphysical abuse recidivism were more victim-specific (e.g. victim concern, fear and threats to kill) and related to other criminogenic needs (e.g. substance abuse). ([Lauria et al., 2017](#)).

General Notes

- Radatz and Hilton (2019) utilised the original ODARA construction and validation data of men with criminal charges for IPV offences (n=970) in order to test whether the ODARA can be used to guide treatment intensity decisions for those who have committed IPV offences. Results indicate that the low, medium and high categories of the ODARA can be used to inform a three-tiered categorical system to advise on intervention programmes.
- The ODARA was developed and tested only for 'male-to-female' assault ([Rice, Harris and Hilton, 2010](#)). A number of studies have looked at female to male assault and dating violence. Further details of studies relating to the ODARA can be found here: http://odara.waypointcentre.ca/Content/Resources/ODARA_101_Bibliography_pdf.pdf

- A scientific and authorised translation of the ODARA into German was completed by [Gerth et al. \(2014\)](#).
- The manual for the ODARA system is contained in the book: Hilton, N.Z., Harris, G.T., and Rice, M.E. (2010). *Risk assessment for domestically violent men: Tools for criminal justice, offender intervention, and victim services*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association ([Access Here](#)). A second edition is currently in progress.
- ODARA training is available through an online, restricted access training programme: ODARA 101: The Electronic Training Program: <http://odara.waypointcentre.ca/>. This is estimated to take between 4 and 6 hours to complete. For further details, please e-mail: odara@waypointcentre.ca

Name of Tool	Stalking Assessment and Management (SAM)
Category	Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Kropp, Hart and Lyon
Year	2008

Description

- The first structured risk assessment tool for stalkers, the SAM is designed to provide a systematic, standardised and practical framework for evaluating and managing risk in stalkers.
- The 30 factors contained within SAM are divided into 3 domains: (1) Nature of Stalking, (2) Perpetrator Risk, and (3) Victim Vulnerability. The rationale behind this is to understand the motivations and seriousness of the stalking behaviour, as well as which type of stalker the perpetrator may be ([McEwan et al., 2018](#); [Storey, Hart and Lim, 2017](#)). Assessors are encouraged to thereafter consider the various risk scenarios that may unfold in relation to nature, severity, imminence and frequency/duration ([Belfrage and Strand, 2007](#)).
- The instrument is not actuarial in nature and does not feature fixed scores or cut-offs; overall ratings of low, medium and high are based on professional judgment.

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

The SAM is intended for use by criminal justice, security, and mental health professionals working in a variety of contexts where complaints of stalking arise.

Assessors are required to attend the relevant training course of around 20 hours. Case studies are included in the training.

Tool Development

- This tool has undergone extensive pilot testing in Canadian and Swedish police sectors and mental health settings ([Kropp, Hart and Lyon, 2008](#)).
- The SAM builds on previous work on structured professional judgement approaches to violence risk assessment, which include the SARA guide and the RSVP. It offers a structured way to assess the vulnerability of the stalking victim ([Storey, Hart and Lim, 2017](#)).
- [Belfrage and Strand \(2007\)](#) found there to be a strong correlation between factors included in the SAM and the degree of risk: the more factors coded, the higher the risk for repeat stalking episodes.
- [Storey et al. \(2011\)](#) - the SAM obtained average Kappa coefficients of .95 (range between .79 to .91).
- [Storey et al. \(2009\)](#) - the SAM obtained high intra-class reliability values for the following; 'nature of stalking' subscale (.87), perpetrator risk factors (.81) and victim vulnerability scale (.77).

- [Kropp et al. \(2011\)](#) - the instrument has good concurrent validity with other known risk assessments such as the VRAG and the PCL:SV. Their study also indicated fair to good inter-rater reliability.
- [Foellmi et al. \(2016\)](#) assessed 89 stalking perpetrators over a follow-up period of two and a half years. The total and subscale scores were shown to predict recidivism; although the clinical risk ratings did not significantly do so. Inter-rater reliability on the total score, nature and perpetrator subscales were found to be moderate, with ICC2 scores of .77, .64 and .88 respectively.
- [Gerbrandij et al. \(2018\)](#) tested the utility of the SAM on 158 low risk individuals. It was discovered that the SAM had weak, non-significant predictive validity for stalking and violent recidivism. The items measuring distress and violations of supervision on the SAM were found to be a consistent predictor for stalking reoffences, but not violent reoffending, suggesting the tool may be better suited to predicting stalking rather than violence.
- The SAM was completed for 146 adult stalkers in a study by [Shea et al. \(2018\)](#). Case prioritization and risk for continued stalking items were shown to discriminate between high-risk and low-risk stalkers, with AUCs of .69 and .76. The total lifetime SAM scores also demonstrated moderate to good discrimination, with an AUC of .70.
- Inter-rater reliability of 39 cases was shown to initially be poor, due to confusion about what was meant by 'stalking currency' time frame, which could last from 'several days' to 'many year.' To resolve this issue, a consensus definition was adopted of a fixed timeframe of six months. This generated fair to moderate inter-rater reliability for case prioritization (ICC=.77), future stalking (ICC=0.66) and serious physical harm (ICC=0.50) ([Shea et al., 2018](#)).

General Notes

- Risk assessment in stalking is still very much in its early stages ([Binder, 2006](#)).
- The SAM can aid assessors in developing risk formulations and risk management strategies. The ability to note 'other considerations' within the SAM allows for unusual risk factors to be taken into account to allow for a fuller consideration of the risk posed ([Belfrage and Strand, 2007](#)).
- The SAM does not consider the perpetrator's amenability or access to treatment options. The focus is on the stalking behaviour, as well as assessing the perpetrator's motivations and the vulnerability of the victim ([Foellmi et al., 2016](#)).
- [Storey et al. \(2009\)](#) found an overlap between psychopathic traits on the PCL:SV and stalking behaviours captured on the SAM. It was suggested that the 'coldness' and 'boldness' present in stalkers had the potential to indicate psychopathy.

Name of Tool	Stalking Risk Profile (SRP)
Category	Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Mackenzie, McEwan, Pathé, James, Ogloff and Mullen
Year	2009

Description

- The SRP is a structured professional judgement tool used for assessing and managing risk in stalking cases.
- The tool is intended for use by clinicians involved in all aspects of stalking: assessing risks, defining management, intervention and treatment strategies, preparing court reports and providing advice to victims (see the [Stalking Risk Profile](#) website).
- The tool is intended for use with males and females aged 18 and above.
- Analogous to other validated SPJ tools like the HCR-20, the items within the assessment are scored according to the extent to which it is evidenced within the case.
- Upon completion of the assessment, the assessor will usually make three separate risk judgements about: (1) further stalking behaviour, (2) stalking-related violence and (3) psychosocial damage to the stalker.
- If the victim of the stalking behaviour is a public figure, two other risk domains pertaining to escalation and disruption of the individual's stalking behaviours are included.

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

The SRP is intended primarily for use by mental health clinicians, however the tool can be used by other professionals working within law enforcement or other agencies who have completed the workshop and score the tool with diagnostic assistance from a clinician.

Attendance at 2-day accredited training workshop is required to become an SRP assessor.

Tool Development

- The SRP was developed in context to the lack of tools that effectively assessed the risk of individuals who engaged in stalking behaviours ([McEwan, Pathé and Ogloff, 2011](#)).
- Stalking risk is seen as a multi-dimensional construct with a number of potential risk outcomes. The SRP, therefore, assesses multiple risk domains which include the risk of harm to others and the risk of psychosocial damage to the stalker (i.e. the risk that the stalker will experience psychological and/or social harm arising from their behaviours). The SRP assesses a range of risks relating to stalking: persistence, recurrence, stalking-related violence and psychosocial damage to the perpetrator ([McEwan et al., 2016](#)).

- The motivation for the stalking behaviour is established at the beginning of the risk assessment. The context in which the stalking behaviour arose, the relationship between the victim and stalker and the role of mental illness are also assessed. It does not have a section focusing on victim vulnerability; although this is measured to some extent within the risk factors ([Storey et al., 2009](#); [Storey, Hart and Lim, 2017](#)).
- The SRP uses the motivational typology proposed by [Mullen, Pathé and Purcell \(2009\)](#). Stalkers are divided into five typologies: rejected, resentful, intimacy seeking, incompetent and predatory, which are then used to group relevant risk factors for each domain.
- Validated risk assessments such as the HCR-20 and the LSI-R would often over or under-estimate the risk posed by the stalker ([McEwan, Pathé and Ogloff, 2011](#)).
- In a study of 241 stalkers, the inter-rater reliability was found to be high for stalker type and moderate to substantial for risk judgments and domain scores ([McEwan et al., 2018](#)).

General Notes

- Use of the tool with individuals aged below 18 is discouraged due to evidence that motivations and risk factors may be different in juvenile stalking situations (McEwan, personal communication, June 2012).
- [McEwan et al. \(2018\)](#) maintain that the SRP is likely to be helpful in situations where assessors have access to a range of information about on-going or past stalking episodes from a variety of sources.
- For more information please visit the following website: www.stalkingriskprofile.com.