Attachment D.1

Existing Validated IPV and TDV Screening Tools

Empirically Validated IPV and TDV Disclosure Tools[1]					
TOOL	**FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED**	**FOCUS**	**# OF ITEMS**	**# STUDIES[2]**	**POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED**
Empirically Validated, Behaviorally Specific Tools (Multiple Forms of IPV)					
Abuse Screening Inventory	Emotional, physical, and sexual abuse (separate scales)	Victimization	1 each	1 of 1	Swedish women, 15-58 years, 24.5% high school degree, 20.8% senior high school degree
Unnamed Bonomi (2005) Measure	Physical violence Emotional abuse	Victimization	3	1 of 1	English- and Spanish-speaking women > 18 who had previously reported an IPV incident to police or who had received an IPV-related civil protection order, < high school degree = 11%, high school degree or vocational training = 32%
Brief Inpatient Screen	Emotional, physical, sexual	Victimization	1 (with 3 parts)	1 of 1	Women ages 18-64 admitted to medical or surgical services (inpatient)
Composite Abuse Scale	Physical, emotional abuse, severe combined abuse, and harassment	Victimization	10, 9, 17, and 7	1 of 1	Australian women nurses
Gay Abuse Screening Protocol (GASP)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence	Victimization	2	1 of 1	English-speaking gay men > 18 years old, involved in a gay relationship for > 6 months, 9% < high school degree
Humiliation, Afraid, Rape, Kick (HARK)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence	Victimization	4	1 of 1	Women > 17 years old in an intimate relationship in the last year recruited from a primary practice
Hurt, Insult, Threaten, Scream	Physical violence Emotional abuse	Victimization	4	3 of 4	Tested with various adult populations: • Female patients > 21 years old at a family medicine clinic who

[1] This table includes empirically validated tools, defined as those with a published measure of accuracy or validity (e.g., correlation with another known measure) or sensitivity greater than or equal to 50%. The final section of the table includes four additional tools tested in specific populations, which did not meet review criteria for empirical validation based on published studies, but may be of interest to readers due to a lack of empirically validated IPV tools tested in those populations.

[2] # studies meeting criteria/#total # studies with data

Empirically Validated IPV and TDV Disclosure Tools					
TOOL	**FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED**	**FOCUS**	**# OF ITEMS**	**# STUDIES**	**POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED**
(HITS)					had lived with the same partner for at least 12 months • Self-identified victims of IPV residing in crisis shelters or presenting to an emergency department • Female veterans seen for medical appointments, > 18 years old, in a relationship in the past year, 17% < high school degree or GED • English-speaking bilingual men > 18 years old living with a male or female partner for the past year, presenting for a health visit at a clinic or emergency department; Phase II: English speaking or bilingual males > 18 years old identifying as IPV victims for treatment Partnered women > 18 years old
(Extended) Hurt, Insult, Threaten, Scream (E-HITS)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence	Victimization	5	1 of 1	Female veterans seen for medical appointments who were in a relationship in the past year, 22.5% < high school degree or GED
Mediator's Assessment of Safety Concerns (MASIC)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence Coercive control	Victimization	37	1 of 1	Family mediation clinic clients in a heterosexual relationship
NorVold Abuse Questionnaire	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence (sub-scales separately validated)	Victimization	13	1 of 1	Swedish women aged 18-64
Ongoing Abuse Screen (OAS)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence Fear	Victimization	5	1 of 2	Emergency department patients
Ongoing Violence Assessment Tool	Severe physical violence	Victimization	4	2 of 2	Emergency department patients

Empirically Validated IPV and TDV Disclosure Tools					
TOOL	**FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED**	**FOCUS**	**# OF ITEMS**	**# STUDIES**	**POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED**
(OVAT)	Emotional abuse				
Partner Violence Screen (PVS)	Physical violence Perceived safety (sub-scales separately validated)	Victimization	3	2 of 4	Various adult populations: • English-speaking female emergency department patients with noncritical medical problems • Spanish- and English-speaking female patients > 18 years old admitted to a trauma service
Partner Violence Interview	Physical violence Sexual violence	Victimization Perpetration	14	1 of 1	Homeless young men and women 18-21 years old in a private non-profit shelter/transitional housing facility
Perpetrator Rapid Scale (PERPS)	Sexual abuse Physical abuse	Victimization	3	1 of 1	Spanish or English speaking males and females >18 in the triage or lobby area of ED
Relationship Behavior Rating Scale (RBRS) - Revised[3]	Psychological abuse Sexual abuse Physical abuse Physical injury	Victimization	30	1 of 1	Male and female undergraduates enrolled in psychology courses who reported a current romantic relationship of at least 3 months during the past year
STaT (Slaps, Throws, and Threatens) Screen	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence	Victimization	3	2 of 2	Two adult populations: • English-speaking women 18-65 seen in urgent care • English-speaking women 18-64, seen in the non-acute section of the emergency department, < 8th grade education = 3%, some high school = 23%
STaT Spanish version	Physical violence Emotional abuse	Victimization	2	1 of 1	Spanish-speaking female hospital outpatients, 18-64 years old
Teen Screen for Dating Violence	Physical violence Sexual violence Emotional abuse	Victimization Perpetration	27 21	1 of 1	Convenience sample of youth aged 13-21 recruited through mental health and school counselors, clinicians, and college campus faculty; primarily White (67%), heterosexual (88%), and female (70%).
Universal Violence	Physical violence	Victimization	3 [4]	1 of 1	Low-income, African American female emergency department

[3] Shortened and revised from RBRS

Empirically Validated IPV and TDV Disclosure Tools					
TOOL	**FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED**	**FOCUS**	**# OF ITEMS**	**# STUDIES**	**POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED**
Prevention Screen	Emotional abuse Coercive control		(single items)		patients who indicated experiencing some form of intimate partner violence
Women Abuse Screening Tool (WAST)	Physical violence Emotional abuse	Victimization	7 (and 1 total)	1 of 1	• Women living at a shelter for women abused by a male partner • Convenience sample of nurses, social workers, clerical staff, etc. who had not experienced abuse
Women's Abuse Screening Tool-Short Form (WAST-Short)	Abuse	Victimization	2 of 7 WAST items	2 of 3	• Women ages 18-6 at their own health care visit • Women living at a shelter for women abused by a male partner • Convenience sample of nurses, social workers, clerical staff, etc. who had not experienced abuse
Unnamed Zink (2007) Measure[5]	Relationship conflict Perceived safety	Victimization	5	1 of 1	English-speaking mothers in primary care waiting rooms with > 1 child age 3-13 in a relationship with a steady partner for > 1 year, 60% < high school degree
Empirically Validated, Behaviorally Specific Tools or Scales from Larger Measures (Single Form of IPV)					
Checklist of Controlling Behaviors	Coercive control	Perpetration	16	1 of 1	Male undergraduate, graduate, and professional students
Coercive Control Survey – Coercion subscale (Dutton, 2006	Coercive control	Victimization	31	1 of 1	Urban men and women > 17 years old
Index of Spouse Abuse (ISA)-Physical	Physical violence	Victimization	15	1 (full ISA not validated)	Women 18-65 years, insured by a managed care organization or Medicaid, who had ever been in an intimate, sexual relationship with a man for > 3 months < High school: 11%
Intimate Justice	Coercive control[6]	Victimization	15	1 of 1	Women > 19 years old; clients in mental health, social service, and

[4]Universal Violence Prevention Screen includes 5 single items; 3 of the 5 items had adequate sensitivity

[5] This tool may be of interest to some practitioners because it avoids using graphic language and was designed for use with mothers in front of their children. However, the sensitivity is very low (46% for the 3-item combination).

[6]Author calls it ethical dynamics of couple relationships

Empirically Validated IPV and TDV Disclosure Tools					
TOOL	**FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED**	**FOCUS**	**# OF ITEMS**	**# STUDIES**	**POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED**
Scale	(scored to estimate risk of physical violence)				medical agencies; in a heterosexual relationship > 1 year; 26% high school degree
Jellinek Inventory for Assessing Partner Violence	Physical violence	Victimization Perpetration	2 2	1 of 1	Dutch substance abuse treatment patients > 18 years old who met DSM-IV criteria for substance abuse or dependence
Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Abuse	Emotional abuse: Restrictive Engulfment Hostile Withdrawal Denigration Domination/ Intimidation	Victimization Perpetration	 13 9 17 15	1 of 1	Undergraduate in college, never married, in current dating relationship
Partner-Directed Insults Scale	Emotional abuse Controlling behavior	Victimization (women) Perpetration (men)	47	1 of 1	Two student populations: • US university students > 18 years old in a committed heterosexual relationship • New Zealand university students
***Subtle and Overt Scale of Psycho-logical Abuse**	Emotional abuse	Victimization	65	1 of 1	New mothers 18 -40 years old involved in a romantic relationship for at least 6 weeks, 20% < high school degree
Trauma Quest-ionnaire	Domestic violence Threats of domestic violence	Victimization	2[7] (single items)	1 of 1	Female veterans seen for medical appointments
Women's Experiences with Battering (WEB) Scale	Coercive control	Victimization	10	2 of 2	• Convenience samples of women served by domestic violence programs and women not served by domestic violence programs • Women 18-65 years, insured by a managed care organization or Medicaid, who had ever been in an intimate, sexual relationship with a man for > 3 months
Empirically Validated, Risk-Based Tools					

[7]There are 10 items on the scale and a composite, each was validated individually and all but the two included here are not IPV.

Empirically Validated IPV and TDV Disclosure Tools					
TOOL	**FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED**	**FOCUS**	**# OF ITEMS**	**# STUDIES**	**POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED**
Chinese Risk Assessment Tool for Victims (CRAT-V)	Risk of any IPV	Victimization	26[8]	1 of 1	Women of Chinese ethnicity > 16 years old, married or cohabiting, and able to speak Cantonese, Mandarin, or English
Chinese Risk Assessment Tool for Perpetrators (CRAT-P)	Risk of any IPV	Perpetration	35[9]	1 of 1	Men of Chinese ethnicity > 16 years old, married or cohabiting, and able to speak Cantonese, Putonghua, or English
Domestic Violence Screening Instrument – Revised (DVSI-R)	Risk of any IPV	Perpetration	11	1 of 1	Persons > 16 years old convicted of any family violence
Unnamed Datner risk (2007) Measure	Physical violence	Victimization	5	1 of 1	Pregnant teens and pregnant adult women

Published, Non-Validated Tools Tested with Special Populations				
TOOL	**FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED**	**FOCUS**	**# OF ITEMS**	**POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH TESTED**
Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence Coercive control	Victimization Perpetration	25	Two youth populations: • Students in 9th to 11th grade • Community sample of dating couples, 14-19 years old
Intimate Partner Violence Assessment Icon Form	Physical violence Sexual violence Perceived safety	Victimization	NA	Female Latino seasonal and migrant farm workers (some with limited literacy)

[8] CRAT-V included one factor – sexual abuse history in past year – without a number of items; we've considered it to be 1 item.
[9] CRAT-P doesn't explicitly say that one of the factors – Criminal History – is only 1 item but the text says it is categorical; we've considered it to be 1 item.

Lesbian Partner Abuse Scale – Revised (LE-PAS-R)	Power imbalance	NA	25	Lesbian women
Partner Violence Interview	Physical violence Sexual violence	Victimization Perpetration	26	Homeless young men and women 18-21 years old in a private non-profit shelter/transitional housing facility
Safe Dates Evaluation Tool (Physical)	Physical violence	Victimization Perpetration	16 each	Middle school aged youth in rural North Carolina
Safe Dates Evaluation Tool (Emotional)	Emotional abuse Coercive control	Victimization Perpetration	16 each	Middle school aged youth in rural North Carolina