

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 ( $r_s = .37$  vs  $.20$ ).
- The DVSI scores had higher correlation with recidivism scores of repeat offending compared to the SARA scores ( $r_s = .20$  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.