

**The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:**

**Document Title: Police Departments' Use of the Lethality Assessment Program: A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation**

**Author(s): Jill Theresa Messing, Ph.D., M.S.W., Jacquelyn Campbell, Ph.D., R.N., F.A.A.N., Janet Sullivan Wilson, Ph.D., R.N., Sheryll Brown, M.P.H., Beverly Patchell, Ph.D., R.N., Christine Shall, M.S.W.**

**Document No.: 247456**

**Date Received: July 2014**

**Award Number: 2008-WG-BX-0002**

**This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant report available electronically.**

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.**

















































settings. It is usually administered by a victim advocate, healthcare professional, or criminal justice practitioner who will assist the victim in recalling incidents past abuse, with the help of a 12-month calendar, and completing 20 yes/no questions about risk factors present within the past year. The calendar is used to aid the victim in recalling severity and frequency of violent incidents and to avoid minimization of abuse. A weighted scoring system identifies women at the following levels of danger: variable danger (<8), increased danger (8-13), severe danger (14-17) and extreme danger ( $\geq 18$ ). The DA is intended as a collaborative effort between the victim and survey administrator, who may assist the victim in developing a safety plan. This risk assessment is unique in that it is the only risk assessment that gathers data from only the victim of violence and is intended specifically to be used in collaboration with the victim of violence to promote safety behaviors.

In its original form, the DA was comprised of 15 dichotomous questions created based on a review of the literature and interviews with domestic violence survivors and advocates (Campbell, 1986). In 2003, based on evidence from a study funded by the National Institute of Justice (in collaboration with the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ), 5 additional items were added (Campbell et al., 2003). The study included interviews with 220 proxies (e.g., a mother, sister, best friend) of women killed by their intimate partner, 143 women who experienced attempted intimate partner femicide, and 356 abused controls across 10 cities in the U.S. Each hypothesized risk factor was examined for its ability to predict femicide (compared against the abused control group). The Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Area Under the Curve (AUC) – the most common means to assess predictive validity of risk assessment instruments (Douglas, Guy, Reeves & Weir, 2005) – is .90 when examining femicides (Campbell, Webster & Glass, 2009). That is, there is a 90% chance that a randomly selected victim of homicide would have a higher score on the DA than a randomly selected victim of assault. When examining attempted femicide the AUC=.918, and the specificity of the DA is 98% at the extreme danger level; that is, there were only 2% false positives (overestimate of risk).

The DA has also been shown to be predictive of intimate partner re-assault and severe re-assault in six additional research studies, five of them by independent research teams (Campbell et al., 2005; Goodman, Dutton & Bennett, 2000; Heckert & Gondolf, 2004; Hilton, Harris, Rice, Houghton, Eke, 2008; Hilton et al., 2004; Weisz, Tolman & Saunders, 2000). The DA predicts repeat assault with similar or better accuracy than most other validated IPV risk assessment instruments (Messing & Thaller, 2013), and the ability of the DA to predict severe assault is particularly noteworthy. When examining severe re-assault controlling for victim protective actions, the AUC = .687 (Campbell et al., 2005). The DA has also been found to be significantly better at prediction than victims' perception of risk – this is especially true of intimate partner homicide and near lethality but also of re-assault and severe re-assault (Campbell et al 2003; Campbell et al., 2005).

The questions on the DA are consistent with risk factors identified through research as predictive of intimate partner re-assault, severe re-assault and homicide. These are an increase in the frequency and severity of abuse (Campbell et al., 2003), having a child that is not the abusers (Campbell et al., 2003), recent estrangement (Dawson & Gartner, 1998; Websdale, 1999; Wilson & Daly, 1993; Wilson, Johnson & Daly, 1995), controlling behaviors (Campbell et al., 2003), stalking (McFarlane et al., 1999), threats to kill or threats with a weapon (Campbell et al., 2003), strangulation (Glass et al., 2008), partner access to a firearm (Campbell, 1995; Campbell et al., 2003; Campbell et al., 2007; Fox & Zawitz, 2000), perpetrator unemployment (Campbell et al., 2003),





































































































































































