



**Pennsylvania
Commission
on
Sentencing**

State College Office:
009 Brumbaugh Hall
Penn State
University Park Campus

Mail:
PO Box 1200
State College, PA
16804-1200

Phone:
814.863.2797

Fax:
814.863.2129

URL:
<http://pasentencing.us>

Risk/Needs Assessment Project

Interim Report 1

Review of Factors used in Risk

Assessment Instruments

2011



Risk/Needs Assessment Project

Interim Report 1

Review of Factors used in Risk Assessment Instruments

Summary

During the summer of 2010, the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing (PCS) undertook several projects designed to fulfill legislative mandates to incorporate risk and needs assessments into sentencing and design probation/parole guidelines. The Commission (1) conducted a thorough review of 29 current risk and needs assessments, including those designed for general, violent, and psychopathic offenders, and those designed to assess dynamic needs, to determine the most frequently cited risk factors; (2) compiled a list of references to studies that validated current risk and needs assessments; and (3) examined sample PSIs from several Pennsylvania counties to determine the extent to which risk and needs factors are contained in local PSIs. The Commission identified over 125 separate risk factors and found that static risk factors, such as criminal history, employment, and education, were the most commonly cited risk factors in the validated risk assessments and sample PSIs.

The Commission determined that several steps must be taken prior to incorporating risk assessments into sentencing practices and using them as a basis for probation and parole guidelines: (1) The Commission needs information on the type of risk and needs information currently collected within each of the 67 Pennsylvania counties; and (2) The Commission must conduct analyses to determine the extent to which validated risk and need factors predict recidivism among Pennsylvania offenders.

This report details the procedures and findings from each of the three summer projects and concludes with two recommendations for future work: (1) The Commission proposes a study to evaluate risk and needs factors among offenders in four Pennsylvania counties; and (2) The Commission recommends that SGS Web, the state's current database for sentencing data, be modified to include questions regarding offender risk factors.



Introduction

During the summer of 2010, the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing (PCS) undertook several projects, designed as initial steps towards implementing two mandates from Pennsylvania's State Legislature. The Reform Legislation of 2008 (Act 81) mandated that the Commission take measures to improve the consistency of sentencing practices across the state. Among other things, this act mandated that the Commission create guidelines for parole and resentencing decisions. Senate Bill No. 1145 of 2009 amended Title 42 of Pennsylvania's Code of Law (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) with a mandate that the Commission adopt a risk and needs assessment instrument to be used at sentencing.

Over the course of the summer of 2010, the Commission took several steps to identify and develop an appropriate risk and needs assessment:

1. The Commission conducted a thorough review of current risk and needs assessments to determine the most frequently cited risk factors.
2. The Commission compiled a list of references to studies that validated current risk and needs assessments.
3. The Commission examined sample Pre-Sentence Investigation reports (PSIs) from several Pennsylvania counties to determine the presence of risk information in local PSIs.

This report describes the findings from each of these three projects. It concludes with plans for a future study of risk among Pennsylvania offenders and recommendations as to how the Commission may modify SGS Web, the Commission's database for sentencing data, to collect risk information.

Risk and Needs Assessments

In order to incorporate risk into current sentencing practices, the Commission needed information on the types of validated risk assessments currently used among offender populations and the risk factors contained in these assessments, including both static and dynamic risk factors. To this end, the Commission conducted a thorough review of current risk and needs assessments. The Commission sought to answer two questions during the course of this review:

1. What risk factors, either static or dynamic, are most frequently cited in risk assessments?
2. What types of dynamic risk factors are cited in risk and needs assessments?

The Commission was particularly interested in identifying dynamic risk factors and assessments. Dynamic risk factors, such as anger management techniques and criminal thinking styles, change over time and are often amenable to rehabilitative efforts, whereas static risk factors, such as gender and race, are stable over time and not amendable to rehabilitative efforts. By incorporating dynamic risk assessments into current sentencing practices and guidelines, judges may be able to better tailor sentences to the rehabilitative needs of offenders and, as result, decrease their likelihood recidivism.



Description of Risk Assessments

The Commission conducted a search for validated risk assessments designed to assess general risk, violent tendencies, psychopathic traits, and dynamic risk and needs factors. General risk assessments provide scores predicting the likelihood of recidivism among all types of offenders. Violent risk assessments provide scores predicting the likelihood of violence among offenders. Psychopathic assessments provide a score indicating the degree to which offenders possess traits of psychopathy or antisocial personality disorder. Dynamic risk assessments provide scores indicating offenders' need for treatment in specific areas, such as anger management.

General risk assessments can be classified according to their generation¹. First generation risk assessments are based upon clinical judgment. As such, they include no formal scoring procedures and cannot be used to validly compare risk across offenders. Second generation risk assessments were the first formal risk assessments. They assess static risk factors, such as age and criminal history. Each risk factor is associated with a score. The scores for each factor are added together to produce an overall risk score.

Third generation risk assessments assess both static and dynamic risk factors. They are often divided into subsections or scales. For instance, the LSI-R, a third generation risk assessment and one of the most popular risk assessments, contains nine sections: Criminal History, Education/Employment, Financial, Family/Marital, Accommodation, Leisure/Recreation, Companions, Alcohol/Drug Problem, Emotional/Personal, and Attitudes/Orientation. Scores for third generation risk assessments may be additive, as in the second generation risk assessments. Alternatively, each subsection or scale of the risk assessment may produce its own score, thus enabling administrators to better identify the offender's particular areas of risk and need.

Fourth generation risk assessments assess a broader range of static and dynamic risk factors than those included in the second and third generation risk assessments. In addition, fourth generation risk assessments assess offenders' strengths. Fourth generation risk assessments produce separate scores for offenders' risks, needs, and strengths. Scoring in fourth generation risk assessments is based on more complex statistical techniques than those used in second or third generation risk assessments. Fourth generation risk assessments are typically implemented within larger agency databases to aid in the case management of offenders.

Findings

The Commission identified 29 validated risk and needs assessments (a full list of risk and needs assessments can be found in Appendix A), including 14 general offender risk assessments, 3 violent risk assessments, 4 psychopathic risk assessments, and 8 dynamic risk assessments. After identifying the 29

¹ Descriptions of generations were derived from: Brennan, T., Dieterich, W., & Ehret, B. (2009). Evaluating the predictive ability of the Compas risk and needs assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 21-40.



validated risk assessments, the Commission created a spreadsheet to tabulate the risk factors contained in each risk assessment. In total, the Commission identified over 125 separate risk factors, which were divided into seven categories (a full list of the risk factors can be found in Appendix B). Categories of risk include:

- Demographics
- Criminal History
- Psychosocial factors
- Mental health
- Antisocial/Psychopathic traits
- Substance abuse
- Dynamic predictors

Static predictors, in particular criminal history, were the most frequently cited risk factors, followed by psychosocial factors, substance abuse, dynamic factors, mental health, antisocial personality/psychopathic traits, and demographics. The most frequently cited risk factors in each of the seven categories include²:

- Demographics
 - * Current age
- Criminal history
 - * Prior adult convictions
 - * Age at first arrest
 - * History of probation/parole violations
 - * History of incarceration
 - * History of violence
 - * History of victimization
- Psychosocial factors
 - * Current employment
 - * Criminal associates or friends
 - * Current level of education
 - * Social support/quality of relationships
 - * Residential stability

² Frequencies are based on general risk assessments, as the results would be skewed by taking into account risk factors included in more specific assessments, such as those designed to assess for violence or psychopathy. For instance, if we took into account frequencies of the risk factors across all reviewed risk assessments, antisocial/psychopathic traits would be overrepresented because the Commission examined 4 assessments specifically designed to assess for psychopathy. However, looking at the total number of times that risk factors were cited across all types of risk assessments would not change the results substantially.



- Mental health
 - * Serious mental illness (e.g., psychotic disorders, bipolar disorder, major depressive disorder)
 - * Emotional state
 - * Interpersonal anxiety
- Antisocial/Psychopathic traits
 - * Intimidating/controlling/manipulative personality
 - * Lack of remorse or guilt for offenses
 - * History of early childhood maladjustment
- Substance abuse
 - * History of illegal substance use or abuse
 - * Current substance use or abuse
 - * Negative consequences associated with current illegal substance use
- Dynamic predictors
 - * Procriminal attitudes
 - * Impulsivity
 - * Responsibility for actions
 - * Anger management deficits

The Commission also compiled a list of studies that validated the 29 risk assessments included in the review (see Appendix C for a full list of references by risk assessment). Published articles assessing the validity and reliability are available for every risk assessment except the Risk Screen Tool (RST) and the Offense Group Reconviction Scale, Version 3 (OGRS 3). The RST was designed for use specifically in the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (PA DOC). As such, validity and reliability studies were conducted internally and not published. However, the RST incorporated questions from validated risk assessments, including the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R). The OGRS 3 was designed by the Ministry of Justice in the United Kingdom. It also includes risk factors from validated risk assessments.

Overall, studies have found that each of the 29 risk assessments produce valid and reliable predictions of risk. The general risk assessments produce valid and reliable predictions of recidivism. The violent risk assessments produce valid and reliable predictions of future violence. The psychopathic assessments produce valid and reliable assessments of offenders' tendency towards psychopathy. The dynamic risk assessments produce valid and reliable assessments of offenders' needs in areas such as anger management.



Local Data Collection Practices in Pennsylvania

Based on the risk factors contained in validated risk assessments, the Commission developed a coding form, which was used to examine sample PSIs and determine the extent to which information on static and dynamic risk factors could be located in them. The Commission examined 25 sample PSIs from 24 counties in Pennsylvania (a full list of these counties can be found in Appendix D)³.

The most frequently cited risk factors in the sample PSIs are listed below. These risk factors were explicitly asked of offenders in 95-100% of the sample PSIs:

- Age
- Race
- Gender
- Prior adult arrests
- Prior adult convictions
- Previous youth dispositions
- Current level of education
- Current level of employment
- Nature of the current offense

The sample PSIs also contained narrative information concerning offenders and their backgrounds. Depending on the consistency of the narrative portions of the PSIs, both between and within counties, narratives could be coded and used in future studies of recidivism⁴.

The Commission identified several risk factors that were included in the narrative portions of the sample PSIs. The most frequently cited risk factors included in narrative portions of the sample PSIs are listed below.⁵

³ The sample PSIs may not be representative of all Pennsylvania counties. Some of the sample PSIs included were from the early 1990's. Counties' may have updated their forms since then.

⁴ Narrative information is unstructured and, as such, it may vary greatly depending upon the offender, the probation officer completing the PSI, and the county. Therefore, the presence of risk information in narratives does not indicate that the information is collected consistently across offenders. Nor does the absence of risk information indicate that the offender does not present risk in that area.

⁵ Although these are the most frequently cited risk factors in the narrative portions of the PSIs, they are not cited nearly as frequently as the aforementioned risk factors. At most, risk factors in the narrative portions of sample PSIs were identified in about 40% of cases, whereas the most frequently cited risk factors that were explicitly asked of offenders in the sample PSIs were present in 95-100% of cases.



- Serious mental illness (e.g., psychotic disorders, bipolar disorder, major depressive disorder)
- Active symptoms of serious mental illness
- History of mental health treatment
- Current or previous illegal substance use or abuse
- History of substance abuse treatment
- Influence of drugs or alcohol on current offense
- Residential stability
- Childhood victimization/parental abuse

Dynamic risk factors were notably absent from most of the sample PSIs. Responsibility for actions was the most frequently cited dynamic risk factor. However, it was only included in three sample PSIs (13%); and it was not specifically asked of offenders, but rather included in the narrative portion of three sample PSIs.

In summary, the review of sample PSIs indicates that the sample PSIs contain sufficient information on offenders' demographics, criminal histories, education levels, employment, and, possibly, mental health and substance use. However, substance abuse and mental health information may vary more between offenders, as it is most often contained in narrative portions of PSIs rather than explicitly asked of offenders. The sample PSIs contained little to no information concerning dynamic risk factors.

It is important to note that PSIs are not routinely collected for all offenders. PSIs are only required when an offender is sentenced to greater than one year. Even in those cases, PSIs may be waived by the sentencing judge. Tom Young, Chief Probation Officer in Centre County, indicated that the most risk information may be contained in case files for offenders involved in guilty plea cases (both misdemeanors and felonies) in which the judge orders a PSI. Slightly less information is contained in case files for offenders involved in Accelerated Rehabilitative Disposition cases (ARD; most often associated with DUI offenders). The least amount of information is contained in case files for offenders involved in guilty plea cases in which the sentencing judge waives the PSI, which may amount to more than half of offenders.

Recommendations

Based on findings from the review of risk assessments and sample PSIs, the following recommendations can be made.

1. The Commission should include both static and dynamic risk factors in any future risk assessment that may be used at sentencing. Third generation risk assessments may provide the best models for future assessments.
2. The Commission must conduct further research to evaluate the extent to which risk information is currently collected on offenders and the ability for this risk information to predict recidivism.



3. The Commission should modify SGS Web to include questions related to validated risk factors. This would enable the Commission to analyze risk factors and recidivism at a statewide level.

The results of the aforementioned validity and reliability studies indicate that the risk and needs factors most commonly associated with recidivism (e.g., education, employment, substance use) are, indeed, good predictors of future crime. Although each of the reviewed risk assessments produced valid predictions of risk, the third generation risk assessments provide the most comprehensive information on offenders' risks and needs. They provide information that could aid judges in the selection of appropriate sanctions and rehabilitation programs. As such, any attempts to incorporate risk assessments into sentencing should take into consideration the risk factors contained in third generation risk assessments.

It is also important to consider that many offenders do not receive a PSI. PSIs are only required for offenders whose sentence will be greater than one year. As such, we have no information on the extent to which risk information is collected for offender's who do not receive PSIs, which may be the majority of offenders. Therefore, from October 2010 through June 2011, the Commission will undertake several additional projects to: (1) garner knowledge as to the prevalence of risk information currently contained in offender files; and (2) increase the Commission's ability to evaluate risk factors and recidivism at a statewide level.

Proposed Study on Risk and Recidivism in Pennsylvania

To garner knowledge as to the extent to which risk information is currently collected in Pennsylvania counties, particularly among offenders whose PSI is waived, the Commission will conduct a multisite study of offender risk files in four counties, including Centre, Berks, Philadelphia, and Delaware counties. The Commission will code data from offender files with a modified version of the coding sheet used to examine sample PSIs.

Not only will the proposed study enable the Commission to collect information on the extent to which risk and needs information is currently collected in the four counties, but it will also allow the Commission to conduct preliminary analyses of risk and recidivism among offenders in four Pennsylvania counties. Findings from the proposed study may form the foundation for incorporating risk assessments into sentencing and/or probation and parole guidelines.

Proposed Modifications to SGS Web

In order to evaluate the relationship between risk factors and recidivism at a statewide level, as opposed to the county level, the Commission plans to modify SGS Web to include questions related to validated risk factors. Based on the most frequently cited risk factors identified in the reviewed risk assessments and the type of information present in the sample PSIs, the Commission recommends that the risk factors listed below be incorporated into SGS Web. Underneath each risk factor are suggested ways to ask the questions, based on the ways in which questions are asked in validated risk assessments.

- Age at first arrest



Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing

- * List the exact age at first arrest.
- * Was the age at first arrest < 16 years or 16 years or greater?
- * Was the age at first arrest <16 years, 16-25 years, or 26 years or greater?

- History of probation/parole violations
 - * List the exact number of probation/parole violations.
 - * List the exact number of times probation/parole has been revoked.
 - * Has probation/parole ever been revoked?

- History of incarceration
 - * As an adult, has the offender ever been incarcerated upon conviction?
 - * Has the offender been incarcerated upon conviction zero times, one time, or more than one time?
 - * As an adult, has the offender ever been incarcerated upon conviction in a local facility? State facility? Federal facility?
 - * If previously incarcerated, what was the facility's classification, low, medium, or maximum security? If offender was incarcerated more than once, select the highest security facility.

- Current level of education
 - * Select the offender's current level of education from the following: Less than high school, some high school, high school diploma/GED, some college, Associates degree, Bachelors degree, Graduate school.
 - * Does the offender have less than a high school education?

- Current employment
 - * Select the offender's employment status at the time of arrest: Employed full-time, employed part-time, unemployed, retired or on disability.
 - * Was the offender employed at the time of arrest?

- Residential stability
 - * How many times has the offender moved in the past year?
 - * Has the offender moved more than 3 times in the past year?
 - * Has the offender been at the same address for the past 6 months?
 - * Which option best describes the offender's living situation at the time of arrest: With a significant other, with friends, with family, alone, in a shelter, homeless, or other?

- Marital status
 - * Which option best describes the offender's marital status at the time of arrest: Single, married, cohabitating, separated, divorced, or widowed?



Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing

- Serious mental illness
 - * Does the offender have a history of serious mental illness, including psychotic disorders, bipolar disorder, or major depressive disorder?



Appendix A

General Risk Assessments

COMPAS (Correctional Officer Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions)

General Statistical Index of Recidivism (GSIR)

IORNS (Inventory of Offender Risks, Needs, and Strengths)

LS/CMI

LSI-R (Level of Service Inventory-Revised)

LSI-R: SV (Level of Service Inventory-Revised: Screening Version)

OGRS 3 (Offender Group Reconviction Scale, Version 3)

ORAS-CSST (Ohio Risk Assessment System- Community Supervision Screening Tool)

ORAS-CST (Ohio Risk Assessment System- Community Supervision Tool)

ORAS-PAT (Ohio Risk Assessment System- Pretrial Assessment Tool)

ORAS-PIT (Ohio Risk Assessment System Prison Intake Tool)

ORAS-RT (Ohio Risk Assessment System- Reentry Tool)

RST (Risk Screen Tool)

SAQ (Self-Appraisal Questionnaire)

Violent Risk Assessments

HCR-20 (Historical-Clinical-Risk Management)

START (Short-Term Assessment of Risk, Needs, and Treatability)

VRAG (Violence Risk Appraisal Guide)

Psychopathy Risk Assessments

PCL-R (Psychopathy Checklist-Revised)

PCL-SV (Psychopathy Checklist-Screening Version)

PPI-R (Psychopathic Personality Inventory - Revised)



LSRP (Levenson's Self-Report Psychopathy Scale)

Dynamic Risk Assessments

CSS-M (Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified)

HIQ (Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire)

HIT (How I Think Questionnaire)

NAS (Novaco Anger Scale)

LCSF (Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form)

MCAA (Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates)

PICTS (Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles)

TCU-CTS (Texas Christian University-Criminal Thinking Scale)



Appendix B

Static Predictors

Demographics

Current age

Gender

Culture/ethnicity

Criminal History

Nature of current offense

Multiple current charges/offenses

Age at first arrest

Previous youth dispositions

Prior adult arrests

Prior adult convictions

Previous probation sentence

Previous incarceration

Current incarceration

Barriers to release

History of probation/parole violations

History of institutional misconduct

Unauthorized absences

Failures to appear

Failed drug tests

Failures to comply with sentencing conditions

Outstanding charges

Gang participation

Criminal versatility

Offense specific

DUIs

Sex offenses

Fire setting

Shoplifting

White collar crime/organized crime/hate
crime/terrorist activity

Violence specific

History of violence

Prior arrests for violent felonies

Prior convictions for violent felonies

Frequency of injury to victims



Use of weapons
Infractions for violence
Current violence
Young age at first incidence of violence
Domestic violence
Stalking/harassment
Victimization

Physical health/disability

Tattoos

Psychosocial factors

Current education
Ever suspended/expelled from school
Low intelligence
Learning disability
Current employment
Employment history
Underachievement
Job skills
Low wages
Participation/performance at work
Peer interactions at work
Authority interactions at work

Finances

Worrying about financial survival
Problems paying bills
Not enough money to get by
Reliance upon social assistance
Current housing
Residential stability
Homelessness
Absence of a verifiable address
Immigration issues

Current neighborhood

Level of crime in neighborhood
Gang activity in neighborhood
Drug activity in neighborhood

Family criminality



Parent ever jailed
Parent has had drug problems
Mother ever arrested
Partner/spouse criminality

Current marital/partner situation

Social support

Lack of personal support
Social isolation
Relationships
Family relationships
Peers outside of age range

Other Social Factors

Parenting concerns
Transportation
Language barriers

Criminal associates

Friends have been arrested
Friends who have been gang members

Social activities

Boredom proneness
Lack of engaging in leisure activities
Promiscuous sexual behavior

General Social Skills

Mental Health

Serious Mental Illness

Does offender have history of serious mental illness?
Does offender have active symptoms of major mental illness?
Is offender currently prescribed psychiatric meds?
Medication adherence
History of mental health treatment
Treatability
Mental state
Emotional State
Self-care
Interpersonal anxiety



Suicide

Self-harm

Suicide attempts

Antisocial personality/Psychopathy

Does offender have history of a personality disorder?

Does offender have history of psychopathy?

Does offender have history of early maladjustment?

Short temper

Often does things without thinking

Intimidating/controlling/manipulative

Lack of remorse or guilt

Pathological lying

Grandiose sense of self-worth

Seen as cold and callous

Glib/superficial charm

Shallow affect

Substance Abuse

Does offender have history of substance abuse?

Current illegal drug use

Current negative consequences associated with substance abuse

History of substance abuse treatment

Current perceived benefit of substance abuse treatment

Influence of alcohol or drugs on current offense

Is offender unresponsive to treatment?

Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD)

Dynamic Predictors

Lack of insight

Negative attitudes

Impulsivity

Future plans lack feasibility

Exposure to destabilizers

Noncompliance with remediation attempts

Stress

Coping

Irresponsibility

Risk-taking

Motivation as a barrier

Problem-solving/self-management skill deficits



Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing

Anger management deficits

Racist/sexist behavior

Poor behavioral controls

Criminal attitudes

Law does not help average people

Minor offenses, such as drug use, do not hurt anyone

Things stolen from rich people will not be missed

Responsibility for actions

Lack of concern for others



Appendix C

References

General Risk Assessments

Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS)

Source

Northpointe Institute for Public Management. (1996). COMPAS [Computer software]. Traverse City, MI: Author.

Brennan, T., Dieterich, W., & Oliver, W. (2007). *COMPAS: Correctional offender management for alternative sanctioning. Technical manual and psychometric report (V. 5.01)*. Traverse City, MI: Northpointe Institute for Public Management.

Summary of Assessment

Brennan, T., Dieterich, W., & Ehret, B. (2009). Evaluating the predictive ability of the Compas risk and needs assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 21-40. [Provides description of scales contained in COMPAS].

Reentry Policy Council. From:

<http://tools.reentrypolicy.org/assessments/instruments/Criminal+Thinking>

Validity and Reliability Studies

Brennan, T., Dieterich, W., & Ehret, B. (2009). Evaluating the predictive ability of the Compas risk and needs assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 21-40.

Brennan, T., Dieterich, W., & Oliver, W. (2004). *The COMPAS scales: Normative data for males and females. Community and incarcerated samples*. Traverse City, MI: Northpointe Institute for Public Management.

Brennan, T., Dieterich, W., & Oliver, W. (2007). *COMPAS: Correctional offender management for alternative sanctioning. Technical manual and psychometric report (V. 5.01)*. Traverse City, MI: Northpointe Institute for Public Management.

Fass, T. L., Heilbrun, K., DeMatteo, D., & Fretz, R. (2008). The LSI-R and the COMPAS: Validation on two risk-needs tools. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 1095-1108.



General Statistical Information on Recidivism (GSIR or SIR)

Source

Nuffield, J. (1982). *Parole decision-making in Canada: Research towards decision guidelines*. Ottawa, Canada: Canada Solicitor General.

Summary of Assessment

Correctional Service Canada (1989). The Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale: A Research Overview. Research Brief, Research Branch, Communications and Corporate Development.

Nuffield, J. (1989). The 'SIR Scale': Some reflections on its applications. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 1(2), 19-25. http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/pblct/forum/e012/12k_e.pdf

Reentry Policy Council. <http://tools.reentrypolicy.org/assessments/instruments/Recidivism+Risk>

Validity and Reliability Studies

Bonta, J., Harman, W. G., Hann, R. G., & Cormier, R. B. (1996). The prediction of recidivism among federally sentenced offenders: A re-validation of the SIR scale. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 38(1), 61-79.

Campbell, M. A., French, S., & Gendreau, P. (2009). The prediction of violence in adult offenders: A meta-analytic comparison of instruments and methods of assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(6), 567-590.

Kroner, D. G., & Loza, W. (2001). Evidence for the efficacy of self-report in predicting nonviolent and violent criminal recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(2), 168-177.

Kroner, D. G., Mills, J. F., & Reddon, J. R. (2005). A coffee can, factor analysis, and prediction of antisocial behavior: The structure of criminal risk. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 28(4), 360-374.

Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (2006). The effect of discordance among violence and general recidivism risk estimates on predictive accuracy. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 16(3), 155-166.

Inventory of Offender Risk, Needs, and Strengths (IORNIS)

Source



Miller, H.A. (2006). A dynamic assessment of offender risk, needs, and strengths in a sample of pre-release general offenders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 24, 767-82.

Miller, H. A. (2006). *Manual of the Inventory of Offender Risk, Needs, and Strengths (IORNS)*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Summary of Assessment

<http://www.psychassessments.com.au/Category.aspx?clD=307#prodDetails>

<http://www4.parinc.com/Products/Product.aspx?ProductID=IORNS>

Validity and Reliability Studies

Miller, H.A. (2006). A dynamic assessment of offender risk, needs, and strengths in a sample of pre-release general offenders. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 24, 767-82.

Miller, H. A. (2006). *Manual of the Inventory of Offender Risk, Needs, and Strengths (IORNS)*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources. [Includes validity and reliability studies]

Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R)

Source

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1995). *The Level of Service Inventory-Revised*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2001). *LSI-R User's Manual*. New York: MHS.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2003/2006). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (3rd & 4th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson. [Both contain references for multiple studies of validity and reliability]

Campbell, M. A., French, S., & Gendreau, P. (2009). The prediction of violence in adult offenders: A meta-analytic comparison of instruments and methods of assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(6), 567-590.

Fass, T. L., Heilbrun, K., Dematteo, D., & Fretz, R. (2008). The LSI-R and the COMPAS: Validation data on two risk-needs tools. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(9), 1095-1108.

Flores, A. W., Lowenkamp, C. T., Holsinger, A. M., & Latessa, E. J. (2006). Predicting outcome with the Level of Service Inventory-Revised: The importance of implementation integrity. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(5), 523-529.



- Folsom, J., & Atkinson, J. L. (2007). The generalizability of the LSI-R and the CAT to the prediction of recidivism in female offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(8), 1044-1056.
- Heilbrun, K., Dematteo, D., Fretz, R., Erickson, J., Yasuhara, K., & Anumba, N. (2008). How "specific" are gender-specific rehabilitation needs? An empirical analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(11), 1382-1397.
- Hollin, C. R., & Palmer, E. J. (2006). The Level of Service Inventory-Revised profile of English prisoners: Risk and reconviction analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33(3), 347-366.
- Hsu, C., Caputi, P., & Byrne, M. K. (2009). The Level of Service Inventory—Revised (LSI-R): A useful risk assessment measure for Australian offenders? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(7), 728-740.
- Kelly, C. E., & Welsh, W. N. (2008). The predictive validity of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised for drug-involved offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(7), 819-831.
- Kroner, D. G., & Mills, J. F. (2001). The accuracy of five risk appraisal instruments in predicting institutional misconduct and new convictions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(4), 471-489.
- Kroner, D. G., Mills, J. F., & Reddon, J. R. (2005). A coffee can, factor analysis, and prediction of antisocial behavior: The structure of criminal risk. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 28(4), 360-374. doi:10.1016/j.ijlp.2004.01.011
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Lovins, B., & Latessa, E. J. (2009). Validating the level of service Inventory—Revised and the Level of Service Inventory: Screening version with a sample of probationers. *The Prison Journal*, 89(2), 192-204.
- Loza, W., & Simourd, D. J. (1994). Psychometric evaluation of the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) among male Canadian federal offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 21(4), 468-480.
- Manchak, S. M., Skeem, J. L., Douglas, K. S., & Siranosian, M. (2009). Does gender moderate the predictive utility of the Level of Service Inventory—Revised (LSI-R) for serious violent offenders? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(5), 425-442.
- Manchak, S. M., Skeem, J. L., & Douglas, K. S. (2008). Utility of the revised Level of Service Inventory (LSI-R) in predicting recidivism after long-term incarceration. *Law and Human Behavior*, 32(6), 477-488.
- Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (2006). The effect of discordance among violence and general recidivism risk estimates on predictive accuracy. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 16(3), 155-166.
- Palmer, E. J., & Hollin, C. R. (2007). The Level of Service Inventory-revised with English women prisoners: A needs and reconviction analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(8), 971-984.



- Schlager, M. D., & Simourd, D. J. (2007). Validity of the Level of Service Inventory-revised (LSI-R) among African American and Hispanic male offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(4), 545-554.
- Simourd, D. J. (2004). Use of dynamic Risk/Need assessment instruments among long-term incarcerated offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(3), 306-323.
- Simourd, D. J. (2006). Validation of Risk/Needs Assessments in the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections: Final Report. From:
http://www.statelibrary.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/gateway/PTARGS_0_2_350506_0_0_18/LSI-R_pccdfinalrept_12-06.pdf
- Simourd, D. J., & Malcolm, P. B. (1998). Reliability and validity of the Level of Service Inventory—Revised among federally incarcerated sex offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13(2), 261-274.
- Vose, B., Cullen, F. T., & Smith, P. (2008). The empirical status of the Level of Service Inventory. *Federal Probation*, 72(3), 22-29.
- Walters, G. D. (2006). Risk-appraisal versus self-report in the prediction of criminal justice outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33(3), 279-304.

Level of Service Inventory- Revised: Screening Version (LSI-R: SV)

Source

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1998). *The Level of Service Inventory—Revised: Screening Version*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Validity and Reliability Studies

- Daffern, M., Ogloff, J. R. P., Ferguson, M., & Thomson, L. (2005). Assessing risk for aggression in a forensic psychiatric hospital using the Level of Service Inventory-Revised: Screening Version. *The International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 4(2), 201-206.
- Ferguson, A. M., Ogloff, J. R. P., & Thomson, L. (2009). Predicting recidivism by mentally disordered offenders using the LSI-R: SV. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(1), 5-20.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Lovins, B., & Latessa, E. J. (2009). Validating the Level of Service Inventory—Revised and the Level of Service Inventory: Screening Version with a sample of probationers. *The Prison Journal*, 89(2), 192-204.



Walters, G. D., & Schlauch, C. (2008). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles and Level of Service Inventory-Revised: Screening Version as predictors of official and self-reported disciplinary infractions. *Law and Human Behavior*, 32(5), 454-462.

Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI)

Source

Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2004). *The Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI)*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Heilbrun, K., Dematteo, D., Fretz, R., Erickson, J., Yasuhara, K., & Anumba, N. (2008). How "specific" are gender-specific rehabilitation needs? An empirical analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(11), 1382-1397.

Rettinger, L. J., & Andrews, D. A. (2010). General risk and need, gender specificity, and the recidivism of female offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(1), 29-46.

Wormith, J. S., Olver, M. E., Stevenson, H. E., & Girard, L. (2007). The long-term prediction of offender recidivism using diagnostic, personality, and risk/need approaches to offender assessment. *Psychological Services*, 4(4), 287-305.

Offender Group Reconviction Scale 3 (OGRS 3)

Source

Version 3—Howard, P., Francis, B., Soothill, K., & Humphreys, L. (2009). OGRS 3: The revised Offender Reconviction Scale. Ministry of Justice. Research Summary. From <http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/docs/oasys-research-summary-07-09-ii.pdf>

Summary of Assessment

<http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/docs/oasys-research-summary-07-09-ii.pdf>

NOMS. (2008). Guidance: Offender Group Reconviction Scale: Version 3. London: Ministry of Justice.

From

<http://www.probation.homeoffice.gov.uk/files/pdf/Offender%20Group%20Reconviction%20Scale%20v3%20Guidance.pdf>



[http://www.probation.homeoffice.gov.uk/files/pdf/Offender%20Group%20Reconviction%20Scale%20v3%20Guidance%20\(Appendix\).pdf](http://www.probation.homeoffice.gov.uk/files/pdf/Offender%20Group%20Reconviction%20Scale%20v3%20Guidance%20(Appendix).pdf)

Validity and Reliability Studies

None for OGRS 3

Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)

Source

Latessa, E. , Smith, P., Lemke, R., Makarios, M., & Lowenkamp, C. (2009). Creation and validation of the Ohio Risk Assessment System: Final Report. University of Cincinnati, School of Criminal Justice. From http://www.uc.edu/ccjr/Reports/ProjectReports/ORAS_Final_Report.pdf.

Summary of Assessment

Assessments.com <http://www.assessments.com/purchase/detail.asp?SKU=5253>

Validity and Reliability Studies

Latessa, E. , Smith, P., Lemke, R., Makarios, M., & Lowenkamp, C. (2009). *Creation and validation of the Ohio Risk Assessment System: Final Report*. University of Cincinnati, School of Criminal Justice.

Risk Screen Tool (RST)

Source

Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (DOC).

Obtained from Gary Zajac.

Used to assess risk among inmates in PA DOC.

Validity and Reliability Studies

None for RST

Violence Risk Assessments

Historical-Clinical-Risk Management 20 (HCR-20)



Source

Douglas, K. S., Webster, C. D., Hart, S. D., Eaves, D., & Ogloff, J. R. P. (Eds.) (2001). *HCR-20: Violence risk management companion guide*. Vancouver, BC/Tampa, FL: Mental Health, Law, and Policy Institute, Simon Fraser University/Department of Mental Health Law & Policy, University of South Florida.

Webster, C. D., Douglas, K. S., Eaves, D., & Hart, S. D. (1997b). *HCR-20: Assessing the Risk for Violence (Version 2)*. Vancouver: Mental Health, Law, and Policy Institute, Simon Fraser University.

Summary of Assessment and Validity and Reliability Studies

An overview of HCR-20 and a full list of validity and reliability studies, as of 2006, is available from:

Douglas, K.S., Guy, L.S., & Weir, J. (2006). HCR-20 violence risk assessment scheme: Overview and annotated bibliography. University of South Florida.

From <http://www.violence-risk.com/hcr20annotated.pdf>

Short-Term Assessment of Risk, Needs, and Treatability (START)

Source

Webster, C. D., Martin, M. L., Brink, J., Nicholls, T. L., & Middleton, C. (2004). *Manual for the Short-Term Assessment of Risk and Treatability (START), Version 1.0* (consultation ed.). St. Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton: Ontario, Canada—Forensic Psychiatric Services Commission: Port Coquitlam, British Columbia, Canada.

Source for assessment: <http://www.bcmhas.ca/NR/rdonlyres/D219D985-384B-41F8-AC84-132ECBE29771/27945/STARTSummarySheetV24.pdf>

Validity and Reliability Studies

Nicholls, T. L., Brink, J., Desmairais, S. L., Webster, C. D., & Martin, M. (2006). The Short-Term Assessment of risk and treatability (STAR): A prospective validation study in a forensic psychiatric sample. *Assessment*, 13(3), 313-27.

Webster, C. D., Nicholls, T. L., Martin, M., Desmairais, S. L., & Brink, J. (2006). The Short-Term Assessment of risk and treatability (STAR): The case for a new structured professional judgment scheme. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 24(6), 747-66.

Violence Risk Appraisal Guide (VRAG)

Source



Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., & Quinsey, V. L. (1993). Violent recidivism of mentally disordered offenders: The development of a statistical prediction instrument. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 20, 315-35.

Quinsey, V. L., Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., & Cormier, C. A. (1998). *Violent offenders: Appraising and managing risk*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Summary of Assessment

Reentry Policy Council. From: <http://tools.reentrypolicy.org/assessments/instruments/Recidivism+Risk>

Validity and Reliability Studies

Link to all studies of VRAG, as of 2010: Mental Health Centre Pentetenguishene, Ontario, Canada
http://www.mhcp.on.ca/Site_Published/internet/SiteContent.aspx?Body.QueryId.Id=1673&LeftNavigation.QueryId.Categories=62

Psychopathy Risk Assessments

Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (LSRP)

Source

Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A. & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 151-158.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Brinkley, C. A., Diamond, P. M., Magaletta, P. R., & Heigel, C. P. (2008). Cross-validation of Levenson's Psychopathy Scale in a sample of federal female inmates. *Assessment*, 15(4), 464-482.

Brinkley, C. A. Schmitt, W. A., Smith, S. S., & Newman, J. P. (2001). Construct validation of a self-report psychopathy scale: Does Levenson's Self-report Psychopathy Scale measure the same constructs as Hare's Psychopathy Checklist-Revised? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31(7), 1021-38.

Epstein, M. K., Poythress, N. G., & Brandon, K. O. (2006). The Self-Report Psychopathy Scale and passive avoidance learning: A validation study of race and gender effects. *Assessment*, 13(2), 197-207.

Falkenbach, D., Poythress, N., Falki, M., & Manchak, S. (2007). Reliability and validity of two self-report measures of psychopathy, *Assessment*, 14(4), 341-50.



- Lynam, D. R., Whiteside, S., & Jones, S. (1999). Self-reported psychopathy: A validation study. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 73(1), 110-32.
- Miller, J. D., Gaughan, E. T., Pryor, L. R. (2008). The Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale: An examination of the personality traits and disorders associated with the LSRP factors. *Assessment*, 15(4), 450-463.
- Walters, G. D. (2008). Self-report measures of psychopathy, antisocial personality, and criminal lifestyle: Testing and validating a two-dimensional model. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(12), 1459-83.
- Walters, G. D., Brinkley, C. A., Magaletta, P. R., & Diamond, P. M. (2008). Taxometric analysis of the Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 90(5), 491-8.

Psychopathy Checklist- Revised (PCL-R)

Source

- Hare, H.D. (1991). *Manual for the Hare Psychopathy Checklist- Revised*. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Psychopathy Checklist—Revised*, 2nd ed. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems.

Validity and Reliability Studies

- Alterman, A. I., Cacciola, J. S., & Rutherford, M. J. (1993). Reliability of the Revised Psychopathy Checklist in substance abuse patients. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(4), 442-48.
- Campbell, T. W. (2006). The Validity of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in Adversarial Proceedings. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*. 6(4), 43-53.
- Campbell, M. A., French, S., & Gendreau, P. (2009). The prediction of violence in adult offenders: A meta-analytic comparison of instruments and methods of assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(6), 567-590.
- Douglas, K. S., Yeomans, M., & Boer, D. P. (2005). Comparative validity analysis of multiple measures of violence risk in a sample of criminal offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32(5), 479-510.
- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (1999). Identifying inmates at risk for disciplinary infractions: A comparison of two measures of psychopathy. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 17(4), 435-443.



- Hare, Robert D., Harpur, T. J., Hakstian, A. R., Forth, A. E., Hart, S. D., & Newman, J. P. (1990). The revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and factor structure. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 2(3), 338-41.
- Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1989). Discriminant validity of the Psychopathy Checklist in a forensic psychiatric population. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1(3), 211-18.
- Hildebrand, M., Ruiters, C., De Vogel, V., & Van der Wolf, P. (2002). Reliability and factor structure of the Dutch language version of Hare's Psychopathy Checklist-Revised. *The International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 1(2), 139-54.
- Kennealy, P. J., Hicks, B. M., & Patrick, C. J. (2007). Validity of factors of the Psychopathy Checklist--Revised in female prisoners: Discriminant relations with antisocial behavior, substance abuse, and personality. *Assessment*, 14(4), 323-340.
- Kosson, D. S., Steuerwald, B. L., Forth, A. E., & Kirkhart, K. J. (1997). A new method for assessing the interpersonal behavior of psychopathic individuals: Preliminary validation studies. *Psychological Assessment*, 9(2), 89-101.
- Kroner, D. G., & Loza, W. (2001). Evidence for the efficacy of self-report in predicting nonviolent and violent criminal recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(2), 168-177.
- Kroner, D. G., & Mills, J. F. (2001). The accuracy of five risk appraisal instruments in predicting institutional misconduct and new convictions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(4), 471-489.
- Kroner, D. G., Mills, J. F., & Reddon, J. R. (2005). A coffee can, factor analysis, and prediction of antisocial behavior: The structure of criminal risk. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 28(4), 360-374.
- Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (2006). The effect of discordance among violence and general recidivism risk estimates on predictive accuracy. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 16(3), 155-166.
- Moltó, J., Carmona, E., Poy, R., Avila, C., & Torrubia, R. (1995). Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in Spanish prison populations: Some data on reliability and validity. *Issues in Criminological & Legal Psychology*, 24, 109-14.
- Morrissey, C., Hogue, T. E., Mooney, P., Lindsay, W. R., Steptoe, L., Taylor, J., & Johnston, S. (2005). Applicability, reliability and validity of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in offenders with intellectual disabilities: Some initial findings. *The International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 4(2), 207-20.



- Rutherford, M. J., Alterman, A. I., Cacciola, J. S., & McKay, J. R. (1997). Validity of the psychopathy checklist-revised in male methadone patients. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 44(2-3), 143-9.
- Rutherford, M. J., Alterman, A. I., & Cacciola, J. S. (1996). Reliability and validity of the Revised-Psychopathy Checklist in opiate and cocaine addicted women. *Issues in Criminological & Legal Psychology*, 24, 136-41.
- Rutherford, M. J., Cacciola, J. S., Alterman, A. I., & McKay, J. R. (1996). Reliability and validity of the Revised Psychopathy Checklist in women methadone patients. *Assessment*, 3(2), 145-56.
- Rutherford, M., Cacciola, J. S., Alterman, A. I., McKay, J. R., & Cook, T. G. (1999). The 2-year test-retest reliability of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in methadone patients. *Assessment*, 6(3), 285-91.
- Salekin, R. T., Rogers, R., Sewell, K. W. (1996). A review and meta-analysis of the Psychopathy Checklist and Psychopathy Checklist—Revised: Predictive validity of dangerousness. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 3(3), 203-15.
- Shine, J., & Hobson, J. (1997). Construct validity of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist, Revised, on a UK prison population. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 8(3), 546-61.
- Sullivan, E. A., Abramowitz, C. S., Lopez, M., & Kosson, D. S. (2006). Reliability and construct validity of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised for Latino, European American, and African American male inmates. *Psychological Assessment*, 18(4), 382-92.
- Vitale, J. E., & Newman, J. P. (2001). Using the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised with female samples: Reliability, validity, and implications for clinical utility. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 8(1), 117-32.
- Vitale, J. E., Smith, S. S., Brinkley, C. A., & Newman, J. (2002). The reliability and validity of the Psychopathy Checklist--Revised in a sample of female offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 29(2), 202-31.
- Walters, G. D. (2003). Predicting criminal justice outcomes with the Psychopathy Checklist and Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form: A meta-analytic comparison. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 21(1), 89-102.
- Walters, G. D. (2006). Risk-appraisal versus self-report in the prediction of criminal justice outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33(3), 279-304.
- Walters, G. D., Knight, R., Grann, M., & Dahle, K. (2008). Incremental validity of the Psychopathy Checklist facet scores: Predicting release outcome in six samples. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 117(2), 396-405.



Windle, M., & Dumenci, L. (1999). The factorial structure and construct validity of the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCL—R) among alcoholic inpatients. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(4), 372-93.

Wormith, J. S., Olver, M. E., Stevenson, H. E., & Girard, L. (2007). The long-term prediction of offender recidivism using diagnostic, personality, and risk/need approaches to offender assessment. *Psychological Services*, 4(4), 287-305.



Psychopathy Checklist- Screening Version (PCL-SV)

Source

Hart, S. D., Cox, D., & Hare, R. D. (1995). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version (PCL:SV)*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Douglas, K. S., Ogloff, J. R. P., Nicholls, T. L., & Grant, I. (1999). Assessing risk for violence among psychiatric patients: The HCR-20 violence risk assessment scheme and the psychopathy checklist: Screening version. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(6), 917-930.

Douglas, K. S., Strand, S., Belfrage, H., Fransson, G., & Levander, S. (2005). Reliability and Validity Evaluation of the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version (PCL: SV) in Swedish Correctional and Forensic Psychiatric Samples. *Assessment*, 12(2), 145-61.

Douglas, K. S., Yeomans, M., & Boer, D. P. (2005). Comparative validity analysis of multiple measures of violence risk in a sample of criminal offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32(5), 479-510.

Doyle, M., Dolan, M., & McGovern, J. (2002). The validity of North American risk assessment tools in predicting in-patient violent behaviour in England. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 7(2), 141-154.

Edens, J. F., Skeem, J. L., & Douglas, K. S. (2006). Incremental Validity Analyses of the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide and the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version in a Civil Psychiatric Sample. *Assessment*, 13(3), 368-74.

Gray, N. S., Snowden, R. J., MacCulloch, S., Phillips, H., Taylor, J., & MacCulloch, M. J. (2004). Relative efficacy of criminological, clinical and personality measures of future risk of offending in mentally disordered offenders : a comparative study of HCR-20, PCL:SV and OGRS. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 72, 523-530.

Hill, C. D., Rogers, R., & Bickford, M. E. (1996). Predicting aggressive and socially disruptive behavior in a maximum security forensic psychiatric hospital. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 41(1), 56-59.

Huchzermeier, C., Bruß, E., Geiger, F., Godt, N., von Nettelbladt, F., & Aldenhoff, J. (2006). Psychopathy checklist score predicts negative events during the sentences of prisoners with hare psychopathy: A prospective study at a German prison. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 51(11), 692-697.

Huchzermeier, C., Bruß, E., Geiger, F., Kernbichler, A., & Aldenhoff, J. (2008). Predictive validity of the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version for intramural behaviour in violent offenders--A prospective study at a secure psychiatric hospital in Germany. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 53(6), 384-91.



- Kosson, D. S., Steuerwald, B. L., Forth, A. E., & Kirkhart, K. J. (1997). A new method for assessing the interpersonal behavior of psychopathic individuals: Preliminary validation studies. *Psychological Assessment, 9*(2), 89-101.
- Kruh, I. P., Whittemore, K., Arnaut, G. L. Y., Manley, J., Gage, B., & Gagliardi, G. J. (2005). The concurrent validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory and its relative association with past violence in a sample of insanity acquittees. *The International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 4*(2), 135-145.
- McNiel, D. E., Gregory, A. L., Lam, J. N., Binder, R. L., & Sullivan, G. R. (2003). Utility of decision support tools for assessing acute risk of violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*(5), 945-953.
- Nicholls, T. L., Ogloff, J. R. P., & Douglas, K. S. (2004). Assessing risk for violence among male and female civil psychiatric patients: The HCR-20, PCL: SV, and VSC. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 22*(1), 127-158. doi:10.1002/bsl.579
- Toupin, J., Basque, C., Côté, G., & Deshaies, C. (2008). Reliability and validity of the Psychopathy Checklist-- Screening Version (PCL:SV) in a sample from Quebec youth centers. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 50*(1), 83-110.
- Urbanik, F., Endrass, J., Rossegger, A., & Noll, T. (2007). Violent and sexual offences: A validation of the predictive quality of the PCL: SV in Switzerland. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 30*(2), 147-152.
- Walters, G. D., Knight, R. A., Grann, M., & Dahle, K. (2008). Incremental validity of the Psychopathy Checklist facet scores: Predicting release outcome in six samples. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 117*(2), 396-405.
- Walters, G. D., & Mandell, W. (2007). Incremental validity of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles and Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version in predicting disciplinary outcome. *Law and Human Behavior, 31*(2), 141-157.

Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised (PPI-R)

Source

- Lilienfeld, S. & Andrews, B. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66*, 488-524.



Validity and Reliability Studies

- Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Blonigen, D. M., Hicks, B. M., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). Estimating facets of psychopathy from normal personality traits: A step toward community epidemiological investigations. *Assessment*, 12(1), 3-18.
- Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Salekin, R. T., & Leistico, A. R. (2005). Convergent and discriminate validity of psychopathy factors assessed via self-report: A comparison of three instruments. *Assessment*, 12(3), 270-89.
- Berardino, S. D., Meloy, J. R., Sherman, M., & Jacobs, D. (2005). Validation of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory on a female inmate sample. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 23(6), 819-836.
- Claes, L., Vertommen, S., Soenens, B., Eyskens, A., Rens, E., & Vertommen, H. (2009). Validation of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory among psychiatric inpatients: Sociodemographic, cognitive and personality correlates. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 23(5), 477-493.
- Edens, J. F., Buffington, J. K., & Tomicic, T. L. (2000). An investigation of the relationship between psychopathic traits and malingering on the Psychopathic Personality Inventory. *Assessment*, 7(3), 281-296.
- Edens, J. F., Buffington, J. K., Tomicic, T. L., & Riley, B. D. (2001). Effects of positive impression management on the Psychopathic Personality Inventory. *Law and Human Behavior*, 25(3), 235-256.
- Edens, J. F., & McDermott, B. E. (2010). Examining the construct validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Revised: Preferential correlates of fearless dominance and self-centered impulsivity. *Psychological Assessment*, 22(1), 32-42.
- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (1999). Identifying inmates at risk for disciplinary infractions: A comparison of two measures of psychopathy. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 17(4), 435-443.
- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Patrick, C. J. (2008). A prospective comparison of two measures of psychopathy in the prediction of institutional misconduct. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 26(5), 529-541.



- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., Lilienfeld, S. O., Patrick, C. J., & Test, A. (2008). Further evidence of the divergent correlates of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory factors: Prediction of institutional misconduct among male prisoners. *Psychological Assessment, 20*(1), 86-91.
- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., & Watkins, M. M. (2001). Further validation of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory among offenders: Personality and behavioral correlates. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 15*(5), 403-415.
- Falkenbach, D., Poythress, N., Falki, M., & Manchak, S. (2007). Reliability and validity of two self-report measures of psychopathy, *Assessment, 14*(4), 341-50.
- Jelicic, M., Merckelbach, H., Timmermans, M., & Candel, I. (2004). The Dutch version of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Some psychometric results. *Psycholoog, 39*(12), 604-608.
- Kruh, I. P., Whittemore, K., Arnaut, G. L. Y., Manley, J., Gage, B., & Gagliardi, G. J. (2005). The concurrent validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory and its relative association with past violence in a sample of insanity acquittees. *The International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 4*(2), 135-145.
- Maesschalck, C., Vertommen, H., & Hooghe, A. (2002). Psychometric characteristics of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory in a Dutch-speaking population. *International Journal of Testing, 2*(3-4), 169-198.
- Malterer, M. B., Lilienfeld, S. O., Neumann, C. S., & Newman, J. P. (2010). Concurrent validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory with offender and community samples. *Assessment, 17*(1), 3-15.
- Martín, B. A., Halder-Sinn, P., Funsch, K., & Rindfleisch, H. (2008). The German version of the "Psychopathic Personality Inventory" (PPI)--Psychometric properties and validation of the authorized German version. *Diagnostica, 54*(1), 16-29.
- Patrick, C. J., Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Benning, S. D. (2006). Construct validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory two-factor model with offenders. *Psychological Assessment, 18*(2), 204-208.
- Poythress, N. G., Edens, J. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (1998). Criterion-related validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory in a prison sample. *Psychological Assessment, 10*(4), 426-430.
- Ross, S. R., Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Thompson, A., & Thurston, A. (2009). Factors of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Criterion-related validity and relationship to the BIS/BAS and five-factor models of personality. *Assessment, 16*(1), 71-87.



- Salekin, R. T., Trobst, K. K., & Krioukova, M. (2001). Construct validity of psychopathy in a community sample: A nomological net approach. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 15(5), 425-441.
- Sandler, J. C. (2007). Computer equivalency of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory -revised in a nonincarcerated population. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(3), 399-410.
- Sandoval, A. R., Hancock, D., Poythress, N., Edens, J. F., & Lilienfeld, S. (2000). Construct validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory in a correctional sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 74(2), 262-281.
- Uzieblo, K., Verschuere, B., & Crombez, G. (2007). The Psychopathic Personality Inventory : Construct validity of the two-factor structure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(4), 657-667.
- Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., & Blonigen, D. M. (2009). Using existing self-report inventories to measure the psychopathic personality traits of fearless dominance and impulsive antisociality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(6), 1006-1016.
- Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., Blonigen, D. M., Krueger, R. F., & Conger, R. D. (2009). Assessment of fearless dominance and impulsive antisociality via normal personality measures: Convergent validity, criterion validity, and developmental change. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(3), 265-276.

Dynamic Risk Assessments

Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified (CSS-M)

Source

- Simourd, D. J. (1997). The Criminal Sentiments Scale–Modified and Pride in Delinquency Scale: Psychometric properties and construct validity of two measures of criminal attitudes. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24, 52-70.

Summary of Assessment

- Zajac, Gary. (2007). Understanding and implementing correctional options that work: Offender needs assessment. Pennsylvania Department of Corrections. PowerPoint presentation.

Validity and Reliability Studies

- Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (1997). The Criminal Sentiments Scale: Predictive validity in a sample of violent and sex offenders. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 53(4), 399-404.



- Shields, I. W., & Simourd, D. J. (1991). Predicting predatory behavior in a population of incarcerated young offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 18(2), 180-194.
- Simourd, David J. (1997). The Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified and Pride in Delinquency Scale: Psychometric properties and Construct validity of two measures of criminal conduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24(1), 52-70.
- Simourd, D. J. (2006). Validation of Risk/Needs Assessments in the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections: Final Report. From:
http://www.statelibrary.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/gateway/PTARGS_0_2_350506_0_0_18/LSI-R_pccdfinalrept_12-06.pdf
- Simourd, D. J. & Van De Ven, J. (1999). Assessment of criminal attitudes: Criterion related validity of the Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified and Pride in Delinquency Scale. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(1), 90-106.
- Witte, T. D., Di Placido, C., Gu, D., & Wong, S. C. P. (2006). An investigation of the validity and reliability of the Criminal Sentiments Scale in a sample of treated sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 18(3), 249-258.
- Walters, G. D. (2006). Appraising, researching, and conceptualizing criminal thinking: A personal view. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 16(2), 87-99.

Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire (HIQ)

Source

- Mamuza, J.M., & Simourd, D. J. (1997). *The Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire*. Unpublished manual.
- Simourd, D. J., & Mamuza, J.M. (2002). *Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire: User's Manual*. Kingston, Canada: Algonquin Correctional Evaluation Services.

Summary of Assessment

- Zajac, Gary. (2007). Understanding and implementing correctional options that work: Offender needs assessment. Pennsylvania Department of Corrections. PowerPoint presentation.

Validity and Reliability Studies

- Simourd, D. J. (2006). Validation of Risk/Needs Assessments in the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections: Final Report. From:
http://www.statelibrary.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/gateway/PTARGS_0_2_350506_0_0_18/LSI-R_pccdfinalrept_12-06.pdf



Simourd, D. J., & Mamuza, J. M. (2000). The Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire: Psychometric properties and construct validity. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27(5), 645-63.

How I Think Questionnaire (HIT)

Source

Barriga, A. Q., Gibbs, J. C., Potter, G. B., & Liau, A. K. (2001). *How I Think (HIT) Questionnaire Manual*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Gibbs, J. C., Barriga, A., & Potter, G. (1996). *The How I Think Questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript. The Ohio State University.

Summary of Assessment

Research Press Publishers. From: <http://www.researchpress.com/scripts/product.asp?item=5136A>

Validity and Reliability Studies

Barriga, A. Q., & Gibbs, J. C. (1998). Measuring cognitive distortion in antisocial youth: Development and preliminary validation of the “How I Think” Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22(5), 333-43.

Nas, C. N., Brugman, D., & Koops, W. (2008). Measuring self-serving cognitive distortions with the “How I Think” Questionnaire. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 24(3), 181-9.

Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form (LCSF)

Source

Walters, G. D., White, T.W., & Denney, D. (1991). The Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form: Preliminary data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 18, 406–418.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Kroner, D. G., & Mills, J. F. (2001). The accuracy of five risk appraisal instruments in predicting institutional misconduct and new convictions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(4), 471-489.



- Walters, G. D. (1989). Comparability of the standard and interview versions of the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 33(1), 49-58.
- Walters, G. D. (1991). Predicting the disciplinary adjustment of maximum and minimum security prison inmates using the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 35(1), 63-71.
- Walters, G. D. (1997). A confirmatory factor analysis of the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24(2), 294-308.
- Walters, G. D. (2003). Predicting criminal justice outcomes with the Psychopathy Checklist and Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form: A meta-analytic comparison. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 21(1), 89-102.
- Walters, G. D. (2006). Risk-appraisal versus self-report in the prediction of criminal justice outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33(3), 279-304.
- Walters, G. D. (2007). The latent structure of the criminal lifestyle: A taxometric analysis of the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form and Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(12), 1623-1637.
- Walters, G. D. (2007). Predicting institutional adjustment with the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form and the antisocial features and aggression scales of the PAI. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 88(1), 99-105.
- Walters, G. D., & Chlumsky, M. L. (1993). The Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form and antisocial personality disorder: Predicting release outcome in a state prison sample. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 11(1), 111-115.
- Walters, G. D., & Geyer, M. D. (2004). Criminal thinking and identity in male white-collar offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(3), 263-281.
- Walters, G. D., & McDonough, J. R. (1998). The Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form as a predictor of federal parole/probation/supervised release outcome: A 3-year follow up. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 3(Part2), 173-181.
- Walters, G. D., Revella, L., & Baltrusaitis, W. J. (1990). Predicting parole/probation outcome with the aid of the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 2(3), 313-316.



Walters, G. D., Whitaker, D., Dial, S., & Dairsow, P. (1992). Characteristics and adjustment of federal inmates enrolled in a comprehensive residential drug treatment program. *Federal Probation*, 56(2), 48-55.

Walters, G. D., White, T.W., & Denney, D. (1991). The Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form: Preliminary data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 18, 406–418.

Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (MCAA)

Source

Mills, J. F., Kroner, D. G., & Forth, A. E. (2002). Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associations (MCAA): Development, factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Assessment*, 9(3), 240-253.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Bäckström, M., & Björklund, F. (2008). The Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (MCAA): Further testing of structural and criterion-related validity. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(11), 1398-1410.

Mills, J. F., Anderson, D., & Kroner, D. G. (2004). The antisocial attitudes and associates of sex offenders. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 14(2), 134-145.

Mills, J. F., Kroner, D. G., & Forth, A. E. (2002). Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associations (MCAA): Development, factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Assessment*, 9(3), 240-253.

Mills, J. F., Kroner, D. G., & Hemmati, T. (2004). The Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (MCAA): The prediction of general and violent recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(6), 717-733.

Walters, G. D. (2006). Appraising, researching, and conceptualizing criminal thinking: A personal view. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 16(2), 87-99.

Novaco Anger Scale (NAS)

Source



Novaco, R. W. (1994). Anger as a risk factor for violence. In J. Monahan & H. J. Steadman (Eds.), *Violence and mental disorder: Developments in risk assessment* (pp. 21-59). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Baker, M. T., Van Hasselt, V. B., & Sellers, A. H. (2008). Validation of the Novaco Anger Scale in an incarcerated offender population. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(6), 741-754.

Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 452-459.

Jones, J. P., Thomas-Peter, B. A., & Trout, A. (1999). Normative data for the Novaco Anger Scale from a non-clinical sample and implications for clinical use. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38(4), 417-424.

Lindqvist, J. K., Dåderman, A. M., & Hellström, Å. (2005). Internal reliability and construct validity of the Novaco Anger Scale-1998-S in a sample of violent prison inmates in Sweden. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 11(2), 223-237.

Lindqvist, J. K., Dåderman, A. M., & Hellström, Å. (2003). Swedish adaptations of the Novaco Anger Scale-1998, the provocation inventory, and the state-trait anger expression inventory-2. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 31(8), 773-788.

Mills, J. F., Kroner, D. G., & Forth, A. E. (1998). Novaco Anger Scale: Reliability and validity within an adult criminal sample. *Assessment*, 5(3), 237-248.

Novaco, R. W., & Renwick, S. J. (1998). Anger predictors of the assaultiveness of forensic hospital patients. In E. Sanzvio (Ed.), *Behavior and cognitive therapy today: Essays in honor of Hans J. Eysenck* (pp. 199-208). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Novaco, R. W., & Taylor, J. L. (2004). Assessment of anger in male offenders with developmental disabilities. *Psychological Assessment*, 16, 42-50.

Swaffer, T., & Epps, K. (1999). The psychometric assessment of anger in male and female adolescents resident at a secure youth treatment centre. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22(3), 419-422.
doi:10.1006/jado.1999.0233

Williams, T. Y., Boyd, J. C., Cascardi, M. A., & Poythress, N. (1996). Factor structure and convergent validity of the Aggression Questionnaire in an offender population. *Psychological Assessment*, 8, 398-403.



Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS)

Source

Walters, G. D. (1995). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles: Part I. Reliability and preliminary validity. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22, 307-325.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Bulten, E., Nijman, H., & van der Staak, C. (2009). Measuring criminal thinking styles: The construct validity and utility of the PICTS in a Dutch prison sample. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 14(1), 35-49.

Hatch-Maillette, M. A., Scalora, M. J., Huss, M. T., & Baumgartner, J. V. (2001). Criminal thinking patterns: Are child molesters unique? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 45(1), 102-117.

Healy, D., & O'Donnell, I. (2006). Criminal thinking on probation: A perspective from Ireland. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33(6), 782-802.

McCoy, K., Fremouw, W., Tyner, E., Clegg, C., Johansson-Love, J., & Strunk, J. (2006). Criminal-thinking styles and illegal behavior among college students: Validation of the PICTS. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 51(5), 1174-1177.

Palmer, E. J., & Hollin, C. R. (2003). Using the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles with English prisoners. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 8(2), 175-187.

Palmer, E. J., & Hollin, C. R. (2004). The use of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles with English young offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 9(2), 253-263.

Walters, G. D. (1995). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles: Part I. Reliability and preliminary validity. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22, 307-325.

Walters, G. D. (1995). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles: Part II. Identifying simulated response sets. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22(4), 437-445.

Walters, G. D. (1996). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles: Part III. Predictive validity. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 40, 105-112.



- Walters, G. D. (1997). Predicting short-term release outcome using the LCSF and PICTS. *Journal of Mental Health in Corrections Consortium*, 43, 18-25.
- Walters, G. D. (2001). Development of a fear-of-change scale for the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS). *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 34(1), 1-8.
- Walters, G. D. (2001). Revised validity scales for the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS). *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 32, 1-13.
- Walters, G. D. (2002). Current and historical content scales for the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS). *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 7, 73-86.
- Walters, G. D. (2005). How many factors are there on the PICTS? *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 15(4), 273-283.
- Walters, G. D. (2005). Incremental validity of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles as a predictor of continuous and dichotomous measures of recidivism. *Assessment*, 12(1), 19-27.
- Walters, G. D. (2005). Predicting institutional adjustment with the lifestyle criminality screening form and Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles. *The International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 4(1), 63-70.
- Walters, G. D. (2006). Effect of test administration set on the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS). *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 50(6), 661-671.
- Walters, G. D. (2006). Appraising, researching, and conceptualizing criminal thinking: A personal view. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 16(2), 87-99.
- Walters, G. D. (2006). Risk-appraisal versus self-report in the prediction of criminal justice outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33(3), 279-304. doi:10.1177/0093854805284409
- Walters, G. D. (2007). Measuring proactive and reactive criminal thinking with the PICTS: Correlations with outcome expectancies and hostile attribution biases. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(4), 371-385.
- Walters, G. D. (2007). Response style versus crime-specific cognition: Predicting disciplinary adjustment and recidivism in male and female offenders with the PICTS. *Assessment*, 14(1), 35-43.
- Walters, G. D. (2007). The latent structure of the criminal lifestyle: A taxometric analysis of the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form and Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(12), 1623-1637.



- Walters, G. D. (2008). Self-report measures of psychopathy, antisocial personality, and criminal lifestyle: Testing and validating a two-dimensional model. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(12), 1459-1483.
- Walters, G. D. (2009). Effects of a longer versus shorter test-release interval on recidivism prediction with the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS). *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(6), 665-78.
- Walters, G. D., & Elliott, W. N. (1999). Predicting release and disciplinary outcome with the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles: Female data. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 4(Part1), 15-21.
- Walters, G. D., & Geyer, M. D. (2004). Criminal thinking and identity in male white-collar offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(3), 263-281.
- Walters, G. D., & Geyer, M. D. (2005). Construct validity of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles in relationship to the PAI, disciplinary adjustment, and program completion. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 84(3), 252-260.
- Walters, G. D., & Geyer, M. D. (2007). The PICTS fear-of-change scale construct and predictive validity. *The Prison Journal*, 87(2), 211-226.
- Walters, G. D., & Mandell, W. (2007). Incremental validity of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles and Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version in predicting disciplinary outcome. *Law and Human Behavior*, 31(2), 141-157.
- Walters, G. D., & Schlauch, C. (2008). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles and Level of Service Inventory-Revised: Screening Version as predictors of official and self-reported disciplinary infractions. *Law and Human Behavior*, 32(5), 454-462.
- Walters, G. D., Deming, A., & Elliott, W. N. (2009). Assessing criminal thinking in male sex offenders with the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(10), 1025-1036.
- Walters, G. D., Elliott, W. N., & Misco, D. (1998). Use of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles in a group of female offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 25(1), 125-134.
- Walters, G. D., Frederick, A. A., & Schlauch, C. (2007). Postdicting arrests for proactive and reactive aggression with the PICTS proactive and reactive composite scales. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(11), 1415-1430.



Walters, G. D., Trgovac, M., Rychlec, M., DiFazio, R., & Olson, J. R. (2002). Assessing change with the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles: A controlled analysis and multisite cross-validation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29(3), 308-331.

Self-Appraisal Questionnaire (SAQ)

Source

Loza, W. (1996). Self-Appraisal Questionnaire (SAQ): A tool for assessing violent and non-violent recidivism. Unpublished manuscript.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Kingston, W. L., MacTavish, A., & Loza-Fanous, A. (2007). A nine-year follow-up study on the predictive validity of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire for predicting violent and nonviolent recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(9), 1144-1155.

Kroner, D. G., & Loza, W. (2001). Evidence for the efficacy of self-report in predicting nonviolent and violent criminal recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(2), 168-177.

Loza, W., & Arnel, L.F. (2001). The effectiveness of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire in predicting offenders' postrelease outcomes. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(1), 105-21.

Loza, W., & Loza-Fanous, A. (2000). Predictive validity of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire (SAQ): A tool for assessing violent and nonviolent release failures. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15(11), 1183-1191.

Loza, W., & Loza-Fanous, A. (2003). More evidence for the validity of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire for predicting violent and nonviolent recidivism: A 5-year follow-up study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30(6), 709-721.

Loza, W., Conley, M., & Warren, B. (2004). Concurrent cross-validation of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire: A tool for assessing violent and nonviolent recidivism and institutional adjustment on a sample of North Carolina offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 48(1), 85-95.

Loza, W., Cumbleton, A., & Shahinfar, A. (2004). Cross-validation of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire (SAQ): An offender risk and need assessment measure on Australian, British, Canadian, Singaporean, and American offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(10), 1172-1190.



- Loza, W., Dhaliwal, G., Kroner, D. G., & Loza-Fanous, A. (2000). Reliability, construct, and concurrent validities of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire: A tool for assessing violent and nonviolent recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27(3), 356-374.
- Loza, W., MacTavish, A., & Loza-Fanous, A. (2007). A nine-year follow-up study on the predictive validity of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire for predicting violent and nonviolent recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(9), 1144-1155.
- Loza, W., Neo, L. H., & Shahinfar, A. (2005). Cross-validation of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire: A tool for assessing violent and nonviolent recidivism with female offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 49(5), 547-560.
- Mills, J. F., Loza, W., & Kroner, D. G. (2003). Predictive validity despite social desirability: Evidence for the robustness of self-report among offenders. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 13(2), 140-150.
- Mitchell, O., & Mackenzie, D. L. (2006). Disconfirmation of the predictive validity of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire in a sample of high-risk drug offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33(4), 449-466.
- Prinsloo, J., & Ladikos, A. (2007). Exploring the application of actuarial criminology in southern Africa. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 17(1-2), 67-72.
- Summers, R., & Loza, W. (2004). Cross validation of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire (SAQ): A tool for assessing violent and nonviolent recidivism in Australian offenders. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 11(2), 254-262.
- Villeneuve, D. B., Oliver, N., & Loza, W. (2003). Cross-validation of the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire with a maximum-security psychiatric population. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(11), 1325-1334.

Texas Christian University-Criminal Thinking Scale (TCU-CTS)

Source

Knight, K., Garner, B. R., Simpson, D. D., Morey, J. T., & Flynn, P. M. (2006). An assessment of criminal thinking. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52, 159-177.

Assessment available at [http://www.ibr.tcu.edu/pubs/datacoll/Forms/ShortForms/09\(SF\)CTSFORM.pdf](http://www.ibr.tcu.edu/pubs/datacoll/Forms/ShortForms/09(SF)CTSFORM.pdf)

Validity and Reliability Studies



Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing

Dembo, R. Turner, C. W., & Jainchill, N. (2007). An assessment of criminal thinking among incarcerated youths in three states. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(9), 1157-67.

Knight, K., Garner, B. R., Simpson, D. D., Morey, J. T., & Flynn, P. M. (2006). An assessment of criminal thinking. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52, 159-177.

Knight, K., Simpson, D. D., & Morey, J. (May, 2002). *TCU-NIC Cooperative Agreement: Final Report*, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth.

Texas Christian University. Assessment Fact Sheet. From: <http://www.ibr.tcu.edu/evidence/TCU-CTS-AFS.pdf>



Appendix D

The following is a list of the 24 counties represented in the 25 sample PSIs and the years in which the sample PSIs were collected, if available. One county was represented more than once.

- Adams
- Armstrong
- Berks
- Clarion
- Delaware (1993)
- Erie (2006)
- Erie (2006)
- Fayette (2006)
- Forest
- Indiana (1994)
- Jefferson (2006)
- Lackawana (2006)
- Lancaster (2005)
- Lehigh (2006)
- Monroe
- Montgomery (2006)
- Montour
- Northumberland (2006)
- Philadelphia (2006)
- Schuylkill (2005)
- Tioga
- Union (2003)
- Wayne (2006)
- Westmoreland (2005)
- Wyoming