

Empirically Validated Intimate Partner Violence Screening 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 Assessment Screen (AAS)	Physical violence Sexual violence	Victimization	3	1 of 1	Pregnant women visiting urban public prenatal clinics
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
Dating Violence Questionnaire Revised (DVQ-R)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence Coercive control	Victimization	20	1	Adolescents from general population (Rodriguez-Diaz et al 2017)
Dating Abuse Perpetration Acts	Physical violence Sexual violence	Perpetration	24	1	Adolescents between 15 and 21 years old; patient in the ER seeking treatment for a non-emergency medical problem. Modified from

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) and sensitivity greater than or equal to 50%. The final section of the table includes 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 Intimate Partner Violence Screening Tools					
TOOL	FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED	FOCUS	# OF ITEMS	# STUDIES	POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED
Scale (DAPAS)					Safe Dates (Goncy 2016)
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 (HITS)	Physical violence Emotional abuse	Victimization	4	3 of 4	Tested with various adult populations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Female patients > 21 years old at a family medicine clinic who 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	Victimization	13	1 of 1	Swedish women aged 18-64

Empirically Validated Intimate Partner Violence Screening Tools					
TOOL	FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED	FOCUS	# OF ITEMS	# STUDIES	POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED
	(sub-scales separately validated)				
Ongoing Abuse Screen (OAS)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence Fear	Victimization	5	1 of 2	Emergency department patients
Ongoing Violence Assessment Tool (OVAT)	Severe physical violence Emotional abuse	Victimization	4	2 of 2	Emergency department patients
Partner Violence Screen (PVS)	Physical violence Perceived safety (sub-scales separately validated)	Victimization	3	2 of 4	Various adult populations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) - Revised³	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English-speaking women 18-65 seen in urgent care • English-speaking women 18-64, seen in the non-acute section of

³ Shortened and revised from RBRS

Empirically Validated Intimate Partner Violence Screening Tools					
TOOL	FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED	FOCUS	# OF ITEMS	# STUDIES	POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED
					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 Prevention Screen	Physical violence Emotional abuse Coercive control	Victimization	3 ⁴ (single items)	1 of 1	Low-income, African American female emergency department 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) Measure⁵	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	Coercive control	Victimization	31	1 of 1	Urban men and women > 17 years old

⁴Universal 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).

Empirically Validated Intimate Partner Violence Screening Tools					
TOOL	FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED	FOCUS	# OF ITEMS	# STUDIES	POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED
Survey – Coercion subscale (Dutton, 2006)					
Multidimensional Emotional Abuse Scale	Emotional abuse Coercive control (Restrictive engulfment, hostile withdrawal, denigration, domination/ Intimidation)	Victimization Perpetration	54	1 of 1	Undergraduate, never married, in current dating relationship
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 Scale	Coercive control ⁶ (scored to estimate risk of physical violence)	Victimization	15	1 of 1	Women > 19 years old; clients in mental health, social service, and 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
Partner-Directed Insults Scale	Emotional abuse Controlling behavior	Victimization (women) Perpetration (men)	47	1 of 1	Two student populations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US university students > 18 years old in a committed heterosexual relationship • New Zealand university students
*Subtle and Overt Scale of Psycho-	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

⁶Author calls it ethical dynamics of couple relationships.

Empirically Validated Intimate Partner Violence Screening Tools					
TOOL	FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED	FOCUS	# OF ITEMS	# STUDIES	POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED
logical Abuse					
Trauma Questionnaire	Domestic violence Threats of domestic violence	Victimization	2 ⁷ (single items)	1 of 1	Female veterans seen for medical appointments
Violence in Adolescents' Dating Relationships Inventory (VADRI)		Victimization Perpetration	26 26	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adolescents from Spanish-speaking countries (Aizpitarte 2015)
Women's Experiences with Battering (WEB) Scale	Coercive control	Victimization	10	2 of 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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					
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	Physical violence	Victimization	5	1 of 1	Pregnant teens and pregnant adult women

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

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.

Empirically Validated Intimate Partner Violence Screening Tools					
TOOL	FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED	FOCUS	# OF ITEMS	# STUDIES	POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH VALIDATED
(2007) Risk Measure					

Other Published, Non-Validated Tools Tested with Youth					
TOOL	FORM(S) OF IPV MEASURED	FOCUS	# OF ITEMS	STUDIES ¹⁰	POPULATION(S) WITH WHICH TESTED
Abuse Assessment Screen Adaptations	Physical violence Sexual violence (Fear)	Victimization	3	NA	English-speaking mothers younger than 18 at conception who delivered a live infant and presented to the postpartum unit at the University of Pennsylvania Medical Center (Harner, 2004)
			3	NA	Mothers 18 or younger who delivered a healthy infant at the University of Texas Medical Branch—Galveston (Harrykisson et al., 2002; Wiemann et al., 2000)
			1	NA	Medicaid-eligible women between ages 13 and 40 who initiated maternity care coordination services in a county health department in North Carolina (Covington et al., 1997; 2001)
Add Health Measure (adapted from Conflict Tactics Scales)	Physical violence Emotional abuse	Victimization	5	NA	Nationally representative sample of adolescents in school, aged 11 to 21
Attitudes Toward Dating Violence (AMDV)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence		76	2	High school students, Canada and Mexico
Attitudes about Aggression in Dating Situations (AADS)	Physical violence	Perpetration	12	2	High school students, NY and Spain (Slep et al 2001)

¹⁰ # studies meeting criteria/#total # studies with data

Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence Coercive control	Victimization Perpetration	25	NA	Two youth populations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students in 9th to 11th grade • Community sample of dating couples, 14-19 years old
Conflict Tactics Scales Adaptations (for youth and young adults)	Physical violence Emotional abuse Sexual violence	Victimization Perpetration	1 for each type of abuse (not all studies assessed emotional abuse)	NA NA	Pregnant women aged 14-25 from university affiliated OBGYN clinics that served mostly low-income, minority women (Agrawal et al., 2014) Pregnant women aged 14-21 and their romantic partners visiting OBGYN clinics and an ultrasound clinic at 4 university-affiliated hospitals in Connecticut (Gibson et al., 2015; Kershaw et al., 2013; Lewis et al., 2016)
Fragile Families Study Measure	Physical violence Emotional abuse Coercive control	Victimization	7	NA	Nationally representative survey of non-marital hospital births in 20 large American cities (27% of mothers and 13% of fathers were younger than 20 at enrollment; 5% of mothers were younger than 18)
Victimization in Dating Relationships (Safe Dates)	Physical violence	Victimization	16	NA	Middle school aged youth in rural North Carolina
Perpetration in Dating Relationships (Safe Dates)	Physical violence	Perpetration	16	NA	Middle school aged youth in rural North Carolina
Psychological Abuse (Safe Dates)	Emotional abuse	Victimization Perpetration	14 14	NA	Middle school aged youth in rural North Carolina