

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime
Type	Article
URL	https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/id/eprint/13410/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-05-2015-0020
Date	2015
Citation	Khan, Roxanne, Willan, Victoria Jane, Lowe, Michelle, Robinson, Phaedra, Brooks, Matthew, Irving, May, Stokes, Rachel, Graham-Kevan, Nicola, Karwacka, Marta et al (2015) Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime. <i>Safer Communities</i> , 14 (4). pp. 203-211. ISSN 1757-8043
Creators	Khan, Roxanne, Willan, Victoria Jane, Lowe, Michelle, Robinson, Phaedra, Brooks, Matthew, Irving, May, Stokes, Rachel, Graham-Kevan, Nicola, Karwacka, Marta and Bryce, Joanne

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-05-2015-0020>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>



Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

Journal:	<i>Safer Communities</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Victims, Risk assessment, Domestic violence, Police, Victim Support, MARACs

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review

Abstract

Purpose: There is a body of evidence that suggests a range of psychosocial characteristics demarcate certain adults to be at an elevated risk for victimisation. To this end, the aim of the current study was to examine consistency between one police force, and a corresponding victim support service based in England, in their assessment of level of risk faced by victims of violent crime.

Methodology: This study explored matched data on 869 adult victims of violent crime gathered from these two key services in Preston, namely Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support, from which a sub-group of comparable 'domestic violence' cases (n=211) were selected for further examination.

Findings: Data analyses revealed methodological inconsistencies in the assessment of victimisation resulting in discrepancies for recorded levels of risk in domestic violence cases across these two agencies.

Practical implications: These findings provide a compelling argument for developing a more uniformed approach to victim assessment and indicate a significant training need.

Value: This paper highlights areas of good practice and forwards several recommendations for improved practice that emphasises the integration of empirical research conducted by psychologists to boost the validity and reliability of risk assessment approaches and tools used.

Keywords: Victims; risk assessment; domestic violence; police, Victim Support, MARACs.

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

Background

Victims of violent crime experience a myriad of detrimental effects that can be both acute and chronic. Certain types of violent crime, such as domestic assault, are also strongly associated with increased risk of revictimisation (Turnanovic & Pratt, 2014), the effects of which can be wider reaching than any immediate physical injury and can extend to psychological trauma presenting in low self-esteem, depression, self-harm, substance misuse, eating and sleeping disorders (Coker et al. 2002; Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi & Lozano, 2002). It is important therefore that any methods, tools or approaches used to assess victimisation are underpinned by empirical research that establishes the factors that place people at risk, thus enabling service providers to better safeguard the ‘at risk’ individuals who are brought to their attention. This process is also integral to the development of strategic, evidence-based, crime prevention, and reduction plans, which must also optimise and channel the often restricted funding available efficiently, with the ultimate aim of helping individuals who might be at an elevated risk of revictimisation.

Prevalence of revictimisation for violent crime

Examination of the Crime Survey England and Wales (CSEW) data during 2012-13 shows that at 26 percent, over one-quarter of all cases of violent crime were individuals experiencing revictimisation (Office for National Statistics, 2014). Indeed, over the last 15 national crime statistics surveys from 1981 to 2012/2013, the rates of revictimisation for all violent crime range as high as 23 percent (in 2008-09) to 38 percent (in 1995). It is noteworthy that the proportion of ‘domestic violence’ revictimisation cases, the most common form of repeat victimisation, has never fallen under one-third, peaked as high as 58 percent (in 1997) and averaged 45.53 percent over this period. Furthermore, under the

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

3

1
2
3 offence group of 'all violence', the proportion of revictimised individuals averaged at one-
4
5 fifth of the sample for 'wounding' (20.47%) and one-quarter for 'injury' (24.47%). These
6
7 figures illustrate the detrimental consequences of violence that many victims have endured,
8
9 whilst other studies paint a starker picture still, with adult violence revictimisation cases
10
11 outweighing lone cases two-fold (see Lowe et al, under review). More pertinent to this paper
12
13 however is an overview of the attempts made by different emergency and victim support
14
15 agencies in the UK to assess victims' level of risk as this directly links in with any attempts to
16
17 reduce the experience of victimisation.
18
19

20
21 *The evolution of victim risk assessment within the UK criminal justice system*
22

23
24 Motivated by the innovative work of forensic psychologists and academics in North
25
26 America, the assessment and management of risk for reoffending has progressed significantly
27
28 over the last 25 years. This work has advanced the methods in which risk of harmful
29
30 behaviour is assessed by different criminal justice professionals across numerous offending
31
32 populations. Currently, there are approximately 120 different structured instruments available
33
34 to assess risk of different types of violence within a range of forensic and mental health
35
36 settings in various countries (for an extensive review, see Singh & Fazel, 2010). The need to
37
38 evaluate the efficacy of these tools is underpinned by research that demonstrates varying
39
40 degrees of predictive accuracy and validity (Singh, Grann, & Fazel, 2011), and thus, a
41
42 longstanding debate on the superiority of second-generation, actuarial measures of risk
43
44 assessment over first-generation, clinically-based methods (Andrews & Bonta, 2010)
45
46 continues in light of contradictory evidence (Monahan & Skeem, 2014; Skeem & Monahan,
47
48 2011).
49
50

51
52 The innovative ripples of these seemingly robust and practical methods of risk
53
54 assessment have seeped into frontline police work in the UK. Hoyle (2008) details how the
55
56 Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act (2004), and its provision of new measures and
57
58
59
60

1 Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime 4

2 powers for police caused an attitudinal shift resulting in officers demonstrating more
3 willingness to engage with, and respond to domestic violence incidents. Significantly,
4 common assault (i.e., a minor act of violence that does not cause an injury) was now an
5 offence that could lead to arrest. Unsurprisingly, domestic violence-related arrests greatly
6 increased in response to these changes, and consequently, the police were increasingly
7 involved in the assessment of risk for domestic violence on the frontline - this meant a move
8 for responding officers simply intervening at the scene of a potentially high risk altercation,
9 towards evaluating the likelihood for future danger under unknown conditions (Hoyle, 2008).
10 These changes are manifested in the development of Association of Chief Police Officers
11 (ACPO) risk assessment (2008) guidelines, that recommend the use of risk assessment tools
12 (in which risk factors for both perpetrators (n=10) and victims (n=5) are highlighted), to
13 support officers in the identification of high-risk domestic violence victims.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 A more recent UK police-based development, born out of the SPECSS+ tool [1], is
31 the DASH [2] (2009). This is a triadic-structured risk assessment list for use by police
32 officers in response to incidents of domestic violence at the following stages: (1) initial
33 assessment at scene of incident; (2) interventions by dedicated officer, and (3) risk
34 management planning (Richards, Letchford, & Stratton, 2008). Hoyle (2008) notes that risk
35 assessment instruments in the UK focus on victims' information and perceptions, thus
36 placing emphasis on them to account for the offender's behaviour and overlooking all other
37 risks. Conversely, North American tools use information collected from several sources,
38 weighted towards reports about the perpetrator from both professional sources and the
39 offender themselves.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 A similar approach underlies local level multi-agency risk assessment conferences
52 (MARACs) in England and Wales; these sessions allow a number of relevant professional
53 agencies (e.g. police and independent victim support agencies) to manage 'high risk'
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

5

1
2
3 domestic violence victims using a tool developed by Coordinated Action Against Domestic
4 Abuse (CAADA, 2012), the DASH-MARAC Risk Identification Checklist (Robbins,
5
6
7 McLaughlin, Banks, Bellamy & Thackray, 2014). The principle underlying the use of these
8
9
10 tools is that they “provide a structured way for responding officers to gather detailed and
11
12 relevant information from victims. This information, particularly when shared with other
13
14 agencies, can help provide better service to victims because their specific needs are
15
16 identified” (Robinson, 2004, p .8). However, despite approximately 250 MARACs in
17
18 operation, recent reports suggest the evidence for their efficacy in reducing repeat
19
20 victimisation might be untenable (see Steel, Blakeborough & Nicholas, 2011), thus providing
21
22 a rationale for conducting the present study which aims to comparatively evaluate the levels
23
24 of victimisation risk as ascertained by emergency and victim support services.
25
26

27
28 *Aim of the current study:* This investigation involved examining how victims’ level of
29
30 risk was assessed across two pivotal services (namely, *Lancashire Constabulary* and *Victim*
31
32 *Support*) located in Preston City, based in North West England, with aim of gauging potential
33
34 reliability and validity issues in the methods used. There is clear value in conducting a
35
36 comparative analysis of victimisation risk levels, as this has ramifications for the selection of
37
38 ‘high risk’ cases forwarded for review at MARACs.
39
40

41
42 The 2011 census reports Preston City’s population as 140, 202, with an approximately
43
44 equal gender-split. The average age was 37 years with a low median age of 35 possibly
45
46 reflecting the student population in this expanding university town; Preston’s university
47
48 student population at above 32, 000 is the eighth largest in the UK in terms of student
49
50 numbers (HESA Statistics, Higher Education numbers 2008/2009). Preston is an ethnically
51
52 diverse city, and aside from the indigenous White British (79.8%) population, the largest
53
54 minority ethnic groups recorded were those from a South Asian heritage (7%). Lancashire
55
56 Constabulary is the police force responsible for Preston; at the time of this study, the force
57
58
59
60

1 Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

6

2 had six geographical divisions and two specialist divisions. Since April 2014, Lancashire
3 Constabulary has been restructured into three Basic Command Units (BCUs) and Preston
4 City is now part of 'South BCU'. The police force puts victims of crime in contact with
5 Victim Support [3], who, as an independent charity organisation can provide free confidential
6 support, practical help and information to support crime victims and, according to their
7 website, provides this service to more than 8,000 victims in Lancashire annually. All aspects
8 of the study complied with institutional and British Psychological Society (BPS) ethical
9 guidelines, and strict protocols were followed to ensure that it was not possible to identify
10 individuals from the information provided in the datasets used for analysis.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Method**

25 *Sampling and Measures*

26
27
28
29
30 Initially, a comprehensive dataset was created by extracting information on victims of
31 all adult violent crime recorded during a six-month period (April 2013-September 2013) held
32 by (i) Lancashire Constabulary (n=1227), and (ii) Victim Support (n=1219) both based in
33 Preston in Lancashire for the postcode PR1 and PR2. Using crime reference numbers, a total
34 of 869 cases were then anonymously matched across the two archives, providing
35 demographic data relating to the victims' age, gender, and ethnicity. Information pertaining
36 to how the victims were classified by both agencies, in relation to (a) crime-classification
37 plus their (b) level of risk, was also entered into the final dataset for statistical analysis using
38 SPSS v.21.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Results**

52
53
54 *Descriptive statistics:* Varying types of crime victimisation were reported by the
55 diverse group of adults in this sample. An examination of the demographic data revealed that
56
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

7

1
2
3 victims' ages were widely dispersed (range=16 to 90 years; mean=32.51 years, SD=12.62,
4
5 mode=21.00) with no discernible gender differences (males=456; females=413). A
6
7 breakdown of victims' ethnicity showed that while a majority were White European (n=664;
8
9 76.4%), nearly a fifth of this sample were of South Asian origin (n=153; 17.6%). A similar
10
11 number of victims in this sample were Black (n=17; 2.0%) or of a Mixed background (n=16;
12
13 1.8%) although some information on ethnicity was not provided as several cases were
14
15 recorded as 'unknown' (n=19; 2.2%). The types of crime victimisation recorded for this
16
17 population were classified differently by both agencies. To allow for consistent analysis
18
19 across these two agencies, the crime-type categories were recoded and reduced into four
20
21 categories as shown in Table 1.
22
23
24
25
26
27

Insert Table 1 here

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 Given the diversity of offences recorded and an unascertainable range of methods
36
37 most likely used across the two agencies to assess risk in relation to type of crime, it was
38
39 decided, in order to extrapolate comparable data, to focus only on cases that could be
40
41 classified as 'domestic violence'; the rationale for this is based on the use of DASH-based
42
43 tools by both Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support to evaluate such cases - focusing
44
45 on a specific offence-classification and related level of risk as ascertained by using a similar
46
47 assessment tool would allow for more meaningful results. Thus, the remaining analyses
48
49 focused solely on a matched sub-group of domestic violence cases (n=211) as recorded by
50
51 both Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

8

1
2
3 A demographic breakdown of just these domestic violence cases revealed a majority
4 of these victims were females (n=189; 89.6%) whose ages were widely dispersed (range=16-
5 68 years; mean=31.93; 11.47; mode= 21.00; median=30.00). Unlike the ethnic composition
6 of victims for all recorded crime, there was very little diversity in ethnic background in this
7 sub-group of domestic violence cases; a majority of victims were of White European descent
8 (n=190, 90.0%), followed by a small proportion of victims recorded from a South Asian
9 (n=17, 8.1%), Mixed (n=3, 1.4%), and Black (n=1, 0.5%) origin. Next, these matched
10 domestic violence cases and their associated 'levels of risk' as recorded by Lancashire
11 Constabulary and Victim Support were examined separately to allow for comparative
12 analysis, as summarised in Table 2.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 Insert Table 2 here
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 *Inferential statistics:* These data were analysed using Chi-square tests as this enabled
36 an examination of any significant differences between the expected frequencies and the
37 observed frequencies in one or more of the recorded categories of 'unknown', 'low',
38 'medium', or 'high' for these domestic violence cases. Indeed, 'level of risk' recorded across
39 the two databases held by Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support was significant (X^2
40 (3) = 142.63, $p < .001$). Therefore, there is statistical evidence to suggest that either of these
41 two service providers and their recording of victim's level of risk are not independent of each
42 other and thus, there is an association between level of risk and type of service. More
43 specifically, Lancashire Constabulary were likely to classify victims' level of risk as
44 'medium', and a slight tendency to assign 'unknown', more than expected. Whereas Victim
45 Support were less likely to classify victims' level of risk as 'unknown' or 'medium', and
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

9

1
2
3 much more likely to classify victims' level of risk as 'low' or 'high'. To this end, the
4
5 evidence suggests that Lancashire Constabulary typically classify domestic violence victims'
6
7 level of risk as 'medium', whilst Victim Support are more likely to record these victims'
8
9 level of risk as either 'low' or 'high'.
10

11
12 The effects of victim demographics of age, gender and ethnicity on risk levels for
13
14 domestic violence were also explored further, for Lancashire Constabulary and Victim
15
16 Support separately. For Lancashire Constabulary, the relationship between assigned risk
17
18 levels with age (Spearman's rho = -.01, p = .939), and gender ($X^2(3) = 5.65$, p = .130) were
19
20 non-significant. With respect to ethnicity, a Kruskal-Wallis H test also identified a non-
21
22 significant difference in risk level between ethnic groups ($X^2[3] = 3.93$, p = .349): However,
23
24 it was clear that South Asian victims were ranked at a lower risk (mean rank = 81.71) than
25
26 other ethnicities; Black (mean rank = 122.50), Mixed (mean rank = 112.00); White (mean
27
28 rank = 107.99).
29
30
31
32

33 For Victim Support risk levels, whilst age was unrelated to risk level (Spearman's rho
34
35 = .13, p = .057), a marginally significant 2 (gender) x 4 (risk level) Chi-square was
36
37 documented ($X^2(3) = 7.73$, p = .051). An inspection of the expected and observed
38
39 frequencies for each cell (see Table 2) showed that more males were classed as 'unknown'
40
41 than expected, whereas more females' ratings across the classification levels were as
42
43 expected. With respect to ethnicity, a Kruskal-Wallis H test identified a non-significant
44
45 difference in risk level between ethnic groups ($X^2[3] = 2.37$, p = .499).
46
47
48

50 Discussion

51
52 Despite the efforts of emergency and support services to safeguard those at elevated
53
54 risk of victimisation, this study revealed discrepancies in the ascribed levels of risk across
55
56 these two key agencies. For example, Lancashire Constabulary were more likely to code
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime 10

1
2
3 victims' level of risk as 'medium', compared with Victim Support, who were more likely to
4
5 classify victims as 'low' or 'high' risk. It is also noteworthy that the police classified just
6
7 under one-quarter of this domestic violence sample (23.7%) as having an 'unknown' level of
8
9 risk, in comparison to Victim Support, who only coded a small number of these victims under
10
11 that classification (6.6%). Also, Victim Support classified twice as many cases as 'high risk'
12
13 (43.6%) than did Lancashire Constabulary (22.3%), which has serious and worrying
14
15 implications for the police's selection of domestic violence cases to be forwarded for review
16
17 at MARACs, especially, as Steel et al. (2011) note, most cases reviewed at these interagency
18
19 forums are referred by the police.
20
21

22
23 Further analysis was restricted due to limited data but it would be interesting to
24
25 examine whether these discrepancies were situationally-related to when the assessment
26
27 information was collected from the victim; that is, if assessments were usually made by
28
29 responding officers during potentially volatile situations at the scene of an offence, or in a
30
31 more counselling-based setting typically made by Victim Support, at any period after the
32
33 offence has taken place. Alternatively, this variance could reflect the different levels of
34
35 training received by emergency versus victim support services, or even a manifestation of a
36
37 workplace ethos and role expectations. For instance, unlike police officers (whose roles cover
38
39 law, order and protection and are consequently more diverse), Victim Support workers more
40
41 typically engage with vulnerable victims on a one-to-one basis, and are expected to respond
42
43 in a sensitive and receptive manner to disclosures of abuse, and thus, they may be more
44
45 attentive or confident in assigning a higher risk classification to domestic violence victims.
46
47
48

49
50 Only one significant difference in classifications of risk was evident across the two
51
52 services in relation to victim demographics. Notably, Lancashire Constabulary more typically
53
54 classified male victims' risk level as 'unknown' than any other risk level in comparison to
55
56 their classification of female victims. As Bowen (2011) notes, raised awareness of male
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

11

1
2
3 domestic violence victimisation in the empirical literature is not yet matched in the
4
5 development of appropriate victimisation practitioner guidelines. It was also clear from
6
7 examining the descriptive statistics that South Asian victims of domestic violence were
8
9 classified to be at a lower risk compared to all other ethnic groups by the police. Although
10
11 purely speculative, it would be useful to examine whether the police's reported use of the
12
13 ACPO-DASH (which has ten additional 'honour'-based violence (HBV) items) and Victim
14
15 Support's stated use of the CAADA-DASH (which does not have any HBV items), has any
16
17 bearing on this outcome, but as no information on this is recorded in the databases, this
18
19 avenue could not be explored further.
20
21
22

23 It is important to highlight that whilst the use of a published instrument such as the
24
25 DASH demonstrates an attempt to improve consistency across agencies, there are a number
26
27 of problems that emerge from this such tools. For example it has not been possible to locate
28
29 any independent evaluations of the DASH. The one exception is a Master's project study
30
31 conducted by Edwards (2011) however, this is not publically accessible. Thus, any
32
33 confidence held in the reliability of this assessment tool cannot be rooted in its empirical-
34
35 strength because this instrument's validity and efficacy has not been systematically tested or
36
37 published to date. It is probably prudent to take heed of Stanley and Humphreys' (2014, p.
38
39 81) words that "[P]roblems can occur if tools confer an illusion of science and objectivity that
40
41 is deceptive". Further, there are a number of different versions of the DASH available for use
42
43 [4], despite no assurances that practitioners who use this tool are choosing the correct version
44
45 or have sufficient training or indeed, any confidence in completing the assessment reliably. In
46
47 a critical review of the UK police's use of victim assessment models, Hoyle (2008, p. 330)
48
49 argued that caution should be applied because "...risk assessment models for domestic
50
51 violence are not as scientifically rigorous as those using them might presume".
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

12

1
2
3 From an academic perspective, there are several explanations in the psychological
4 literature to explain why these differences might occur as a result of judgment heuristics,
5 social bias and the influence of fundamental attribution errors (Bowen 2011; Elbogen, 2002;
6 Smith & Alpert, 2007; Stroshine, Alpert, & Dunham, 2008). This empirical evidence ought to
7 guide the design of risk assessment instruments and the method in which they are
8 administered, because it is evident that the inconsistent levels of risk across these two
9 services, to some degree, reflect a difference in the administration of victim assessment. This
10 suggests a significant training-need to improve assessment reliability and cross-agency
11 consistency. Practitioner training is a repeatedly recognised element of improving the
12 efficacy of victim assessment (Ruff, 2012). Indeed, Humphreys et al (2005) ascertained, as a
13 result of their research with Metropolitan Police and West Yorkshire Police, that just under
14 half of the officers in their sample were not sufficiently trained to use risk assessments in line
15 with ACPO guidelines. It is also apparent that more efforts could be made to bridge the gap
16 between the significant advancements in academic theory regarding what works best in the
17 practice of risk assessment so that it better aligns with the delivery of frontline service
18 provision for victims. It is perhaps not surprising however that practitioners might struggle to
19 maintain the same pace as academic productivity, given the sheer volume and complexity of
20 research published on risk assessment during the last two decades.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 Several areas of good practice were established in this study. For example, it was notable
44 that Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support demonstrated a willingness to collaborate
45 with independent researchers to investigate issues related to victim assessment in an attempt
46 to improve applied practice. Due to the heterogeneity of victim-demographics from one
47 postcode, community or even region to the next, it is profitable to identify trends for violence
48 victimisation according to specific populations according to locality. Thus, a local academic
49 research team (from the University of Central Lancashire, Preston Campus) working in
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

13

1
2
3 alliance with local police and victim support services promotes a positive message about
4
5 multiagency collaborations, and a desire for independent evaluations for improved practice
6
7 by all parties. There is scope for similar local collaborations nationwide. Additionally,
8
9 attempts made by Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support to use a ‘common tool’ (e.g.
10
11 DASH-based instruments) to identify high risk cases of domestic violence for MARACs
12
13 demonstrates attempts to improve consistency across agencies.
14
15

16
17 Nonetheless, when efforts are made to use such ‘common tools’, it is unclear at which
18
19 point in time the assessment is made by different agencies, which version of the instrument is
20
21 used, and the level of training across the different agencies. To some extent, this might
22
23 explain the differences found between Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support and their
24
25 levels of risk recorded for victims. These results make clear that there is an aspiration, and
26
27 ample room, to improve the reliability and validity of the measures used. However, it is
28
29 somewhat paradoxical that in an attempt to improve consistency across agencies for victim
30
31 risk assessment, practice guidelines encourage the use of potentially unreliable, non-validated
32
33 measures for both Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support. To this end, these findings
34
35 support any efforts to independently evaluate the DASH (all versions) for both reliability and
36
37 validity for use with the specific populations and offences they are designed for (for example,
38
39 ‘honour’-based violence, or stalking, etc.). It would be desirable for any evaluations to be
40
41 conducted by independent researchers who have a solid understanding of the methodological
42
43 principles underlying risk assessment in practice settings, working collaboratively with police
44
45 and victim support service workers. The development and administration of the B-SAFER
46
47 (Brief Spousal Assault Form for the Evaluation of Risk: Kropp, Hart, & Belfrage, 2005)
48
49 serves as a worthy example of good practice; is a well-validated instrument designed to assist
50
51 practitioners in case management. This tool does not employ statistical methods on which to
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

14

base evaluations of risk, but instead provides guidelines for gathering relevant information and making structured and informed decisions.

Conclusions

A plethora of research emphasises that risk assessments must always be conducted with great caution. Fundamentally, that practitioners must be fully attuned to the principles underlying any tool chosen in order to have confidence in its validity and reliability. Rogers (2000), whose critique of approaches to risk assessment was published over a decade ago, highlights important issues that are much a concern today as when the paper was first published. He states that his ... “commentary on risk assessment is not intended as a wholesale indictment. Rather, its purpose is to temper the unbridled enthusiasm by articulating the perils and pitfalls regarding any uncritical acceptance of risk assessment” (p. 595). To this end, the main crux of this study’s findings is that practitioners should not be tempted to use risk assessment tools simply because they are readily available, and more attention must be given to bridging the vast gap between theory and practice, to better align the ever growing empirical evidence with the complexities of work with vulnerable victims on the frontline.

References

Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). (2008). *Guidance on investigating domestic violence*. London: NPIA.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Elsevier.

Bowen, E. (2011). An overview of partner violence risk assessment and the potential role of female victim risk appraisals. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16*(3), 214-226.

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

15

1
2
3 Coker, A. L., Davis, K. E., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H. M., & Smith, P. H.
4
5 (2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and
6
7 women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 23(4), 260-268.
8

9
10 Douglas, K. S., Cox, D. N., & Webster, C. D. (1999). Violence risk assessment: Science and
11
12 practice. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 4(2), 149-184.
13
14

15
16 Elbogen, E. B. (2002). The process of violence risk assessment: A review of descriptive
17
18 research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7(6), 591-604.
19

20
21 Edwards, C. (2011) *Preventative not predictive: the DASH (2009) risk identification,*
22
23 *assessment and management model*. MSc dissertation, University of Portsmouth.
24
25

26
27 Evans, C., Mellor-Clark, J., Margison, F., Barkham, M., Audin, K., Connell, J., McGrath, G.
28
29 (2000). CORE: Clinical outcomes in routine evaluation. *Journal of Mental Health*, 9(3),
30
31 247-255.
32

33
34
35 Gray, J. (2001). The framework for the assessment of children in need and their families.
36
37 *Child Psychology and Psychiatry Review*, 6, 4-10.
38

39
40
41 HESA Statistics – Higher Education numbers 2008/2009) (Excel). Higher Education
42
43 Statistics Agency.
44

45
46
47 Hoyle, C. (2008). Will she be safe? A critical analysis of risk assessment in domestic
48
49 violence cases. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30(3), 323-337.
50

51
52 Humphreys, C., Thiara, R. K., Regan, L., Lovett, J., Kennedy, L., & Gibson, A. (2005).
53
54 Prevention not prediction. *A preliminary evaluation of the Metropolitan Police Domestic*
55
56 *Violence Risk Assessment Model (SPECSS), Final Report, University of Warwick/Centre*
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

16

1
2
3 *for the Study of Safety and Wellbeing, London Metropolitan University/Child and*
4
5 *Women Abuse Studies Unit.*
6
7

8
9 Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). The world report on
10
11 violence and health. *The Lancet*, 360(9339), 1083-1088.
12
13

14
15 Lowe, M., Willan, V., Graham-Kevan, N., Brooks, M., Irving, M., Karwacka, M., . . . Bryce,
16
17 J. (under Editorial review). Investigating repeated victimisation in a UK police sample of
18
19 adult victims of violent crime. *Policing & Society*.
20

21
22 Monahan, J., & Skeem, J. L. (2014). The evolution of violence risk assessment. *CNS*
23
24 *Spectrums*, 1-6.
25
26

27
28 Office for National Statistics. (13 February 2014). *Chapter 1 - overview of violent crime and*
29
30 *sexual offences 2012/13.* © Crown Copyright.
31
32

33
34 Office for National Statistics. (28 November 2013). *Chapter 2 - repeat victimisation.* ©
35
36 Crown Copyright.
37

38
39 Richard, R. (2000). The uncritical acceptance of risk assessment in forensic practice. *Law*
40
41 *and Human Behavior*, 24(5), 595-605.
42
43

44
45 Richards, L., Letchford, S., & Stratton, S. (2008). *Policing domestic violence.* Oxford
46
47 University Press.
48

49
50 Robbins, R., McLaughlin, H., Banks, C., Bellamy, C., Thackray, D., & Penhale, B. (2014).
51
52 Domestic violence and multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARACs): A
53
54 scoping review. *The Journal of Adult Protection*, 16(6), 389 -398.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

17

- 1
2
3 Robinson, A. L. (2004). Domestic violence MARACS (multi-agency risk assessment
4 conferences) for very high-risk victims in Cardiff, Wales: A process and outcome
5 evaluation. *Cardiff: University of Cardiff*,
6
7
8
9
10
11 Ruff, L. (2012). Does training matter? Exploring police officer response to domestic dispute
12 calls before and after training on intimate partner violence. *The Police Journal*, 85(4),
13 285-300. doi:10.1350/pojo.2012.85.4.516
14
15
16
17
18
19 Singh, J. P., & Fazel, S. (2010). Forensic risk assessment: A meta review. *Criminal Justice
20 and Behavior*, 37(9), 965-988.
21
22
23
24 Singh, J. P., Grann, M., & Fazel, S. (2011). A comparative study of violence risk assessment
25 tools: A systematic review and meta regression analysis of 68 studies involving 25,980
26 participants. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 31(3), 499-513.
27
28
29
30
31
32 Skeem, J. L., & Monahan, J. (2011). Current directions in violence risk assessment. *Current
33 Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(1), 38-42.
34
35
36
37
38 Smith, M. R., & Alpert, G. P. (2007). Explaining police bias: A theory of social conditioning
39 and illusory correlation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(10), 1262-1283.
40
41
42
43 Stanley, N., & Humphreys, C. (2014). Multi-agency risk assessment and management for
44 children and families experiencing domestic violence. *Children and Youth Services
45 Review*, 47, 78-85.
46
47
48
49
50
51 Steel, N., Blakeborough, L., & Nicholas, S. (2011). *Supporting high-risk victims of domestic
52 violence: A review of multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARACs)*. (No.
53 Research Report 55 Summary). London: Home Office.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

18

1
2
3 Stroshine, M., Alpert, G., & Dunham, R. (2008). The influence of “working rules” on police
4 suspicion and discretionary decision making. *Police Quarterly*, 11(3), 315-337.

5
6
7
8 Turanovic, J. J., & Pratt, T. C. (2014). “Can’t stop, Won’t stop”: Self-control, risky lifestyles,
9 and repeat victimization. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 30(1), 29-56.

10
11
12
13
14 Weisz, A. N., Tolman, R. M., & Saunders, D. G. (2000). Assessing the risk of severe
15 domestic violence the importance of survivors' predictions. *Journal of Interpersonal*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Violence, 15(1), 75-90.

[1] An acronym an earlier risk assessment model used by the police built on the following six high risk factors: Separation; Pregnancy/new birth, Escalation, Cultural issues/sensitivity, Stalking, Sexual assault.

[2] DASH is an acronym used for ‘Domestic Abuse, Stalking and ‘Honour’-based Violence’.

[3] The ‘Victims Code of Practice’ (2006) obliges the police to report all recorded crime to Victim Support, via a broad policy of automatic referral of victims’. This process has been adopted by ACPO, supported by the National Office of Victim Support and the Data Protection Registrar.

[4] For example, DASH (Richards, 2009). S-DASH (Sheridan, Roberts, & Richards, 2009), V-DASH (Richards, 2010), CAADA-DASH RIC (CAADA, 2012), ACPO-DASH (version 2014).

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

19

Table 1: Five new recoded crime categories using matched cases (n=869) from Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support.

	Lancashire Constabulary <i>Frequency and (%)</i>	Victim Support <i>Frequency and (%)</i>
Threat and Physical Assault: Minor	262 (30.1%)	298 (34.3 %)
Threat and Physical Assault: Major	405 (46.5%)	181(20.8%)
Harassment and Hate Crimes	149 (17.1%)	179 (20.6%)
Robbery	52 (6.0%)	44 (5.1%).

For Peer Review

Assessing victim risk in cases of violent crime

20

Table 2: Level of risk recorded by Lancashire Constabulary and Victim Support for a matched sub-group of domestic violence cases (n=211): overall and in relation to gender.

Level of risk	Lancashire Constabulary <i>Frequency and (%)</i>			Victim Support <i>Frequency and (%)</i>		
	Male	Female	Total*	Male	Female	Total*
Unknown	9 (40.9%)	41 (21.7%)	50 (23.7%)	3 (13.6%)	11 (5.8%)	14 (6.6%)
Low	4 (18.2%)	26 (13.8%)	30 (14.2%)	7 (31.8%)	93 (49.2%)	100 (47.4%)
Medium	7 (31.8%)	77 (40.7%)	84 (39.8%)	2 (9.1%)	3 (1.6%)	5 (2.4%)
High	2 (9.1%)	45 (23.8%)	47 (22.3%)	10 (45.5%)	82 (43.3%)	92 (43.6%)

* Total refer to percentages for the sample overall

Peer Review