

STABLE-2007 CODING MANUAL

REVISED 2014

Yolanda Fernandez, Andrew J. R. Harris, R. Karl Hanson & Jennifer Sparks

Version Date: October 31, 2014

RDIMS#1226041

Author note: We would like to thank Leslie Helmus and Ian Barsetti for helpful comments on earlier versions of this manual. We are also deeply grateful for the contributions of hundreds of probation and parole officers, psychologists, and forensic evaluators who made this work possible.

The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Public Safety Canada.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Range of Application and Appropriate Populations (Who Can You Use the STBLE-2007 With)	19
Scoring the STABLE-2007.....	23
STABLE-2007 Items	
Significant Social Influences.....	27
Capacity for Relationship Stability	38
Emotional Identification with Children.....	48
Hostility Toward Women.....	53
General Social Rejection/Loneliness.....	57
Lack of Concern for Others.....	61
Impulsive Acts.....	65
Poor Cognitive Problem Solving.....	70
Negative Emotionality/Hostility.....	76
Sex Drive/Preoccupation.....	80
Sex as Coping.....	87
Deviant Sexual Interests	91
Cooperation with Supervision.....	100
Creating STABLE-2007 Total Scores.....	106
References.....	107
Appendices	
A STABLE-2007 Coding Form	117
B Sample Interview	119

C	Introduction to Scoring Examples	154
	C-1 Mr. John Smith	155
	C-2 Mr. Rob Stone.....	160
D	Percentiles and Nominal Ranking	165
E	STATIC-99 Coding of “Ever Lived with a Lover for Two Years”	168
F	Rules for Combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R, Static-2002R and Risk Matrix-2000	171
G	Recidivism Tables	174
H	Standard Paragraph for Reporting STABLE-2007.....	181
I	Answers to Scoring Examples (Appendices C-1 and C-2)	183

Introduction

What is New in the October, 2014 Version

Compared to the 2012 version, this version includes updated 1-year, 3-year and 5-year recidivism estimates based on combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R, Static-2002R (Hanson, Helmus & Harris, 2014) and Risk Matrix-2000 (Helmus, Hanson, Babchishin & Thornton, 2014). As well, minor edits have been made throughout the manuscript.

The Basics

The STABLE-2007 measures sex offender risk factors that can change over time, which will help you formulate a case management plan or identify treatment/supervision targets for a sex offender on your caseload. Additionally, it will allow you to know whether a sexual offender you are supervising/monitoring or assessing is getting more dangerous or less dangerous over time.

Other Advantages

Sexual offenders can be a significant challenge to supervise in the community. They can be difficult to assess, problematic to manage, and frustrating to supervise. Sometimes even the people working with sex offenders can garner unwanted attention from superiors, the public, and occasionally, from the media. Additionally, many individuals supervising sexual offenders worry that, in spite of their very best efforts and due diligence, an offender on their caseload is going to reoffend and they may be considered responsible. This in spite of the fact that sexual offenders do not reoffend as often as other types of offenders (Beck & Shipley, 1989; Cunliffe & Sheperd, 2007; Hanson & Thornton, 2000; Harris, Phenix, Hanson, & Thornton, 2003) and that sexual offenders that have had good quality sex offender treatment show even lower rates of recidivism (Cortoni & Nunes, 2007; Hanson, Bourgon, Helmus, & Hodgson, 2009; Hanson et al., 2002; Lösel & Schmucker, 2005). Unfortunately, those working with sexual offenders are often provided with little direction, guidance, or support.

Parole officers, probation officers, police officers, psychologists, sexual offender treatment practitioners, and other professionals tasked with supervising sexual offenders in the community often have more questions than answers. There are a number of questions that this introductory section should help you answer for yourself and perhaps, for the jurisdiction where you work.

- How do you know who is high risk and who is low risk?
- Is it worth putting the same amount of effort into all sexual offenders?
- Which sexual offenders are most likely to recidivate?
- Where should you be looking for trouble or warning signs when interviewing sexual offenders?
- Is it worth getting this sexual offender into some form of treatment?
- If this sexual offender gets into treatment, what should that treatment target?

First we will answer three simple questions:

- What can you expect from the STABLE-2007?
- How difficult is it to use?
- What are the advantages of this tool?

STABLE-2007 Assessment: What Can I Expect From It?

When used with an assessment of static risk factors (e.g., STATIC-99R, STATIC-2002R)

- Stable assessment will allow you to reliably rank sexual offenders from those that are the lowest risk to reoffend to those that are highest risk to reoffend.
- Stable assessment will allow you to arrange those ranked sexual offenders into useful and meaningful nominal categories such as low, moderate, and high risk.
- Stable assessment will allow you to make informed decisions regarding the best way to prioritize correctional resources to get the highest level of public safety for the amount invested.
- Stable assessment increases the chances that community supervision officers will anticipate problems and address them in time.
- Stable assessment identifies the best empirically validated treatment targets for each of the sexual offenders on your caseload.
- Having an organized assessment methodology to follow provides consistency, guidelines, a common language, and a common understanding among staff regarding areas of risk and concern.
- Using an organized assessment methodology will allow you to complete sexual offender risk assessments that are generally as accurate as those produced by any other professionals.
- STABLE-2000/2007 are the most widely used measures of dynamic risk for sexual offenders in Canada and the United States (McGrath, Cumming, Burchard, Zeoli, & Ellerby, 2010) and using them brings your organization in line with many other organizations working in this area.

How Difficult Is It to Use?

The STABLE-2007 interview takes 90 to 120 minutes to administer for a novice user. Additional time would be necessary to review file materials and, if possible, consult collateral informants (e.g., spouse). The time needed to score STABLE-2007 substantially decrease with increased experience.

The STABLE-2007 is scored based on information collected during an interview and a review of available file information or collateral information. The time it takes to complete this varies from case to case, and is dependent on a number of factors including how much file information there is to go through, as well as how cooperative or forthcoming the client is with information.

The file review and the gathering and checking of collateral information are tasks that you would likely do anyway as part of supervising an offender. For example, if the offender were to tell you that he is living at his mother's house and that he's working as a day-labourer for his uncle to pay his bills, you would verify this information through collateral contacts.

This may sound labour intensive, but if you look at the list of the 13 risk-related factors in the STABLE-2007 in Table 1 you will find that these are the things that you would want to know about a sexual offender on your caseload, regardless of whether you are completing a risk assessment.

What Are the Advantages of This Tool?

The primary reason for assessing risk in sexual offenders is to **promote public safety**. It is important to remember that psychologists, psychiatrists, police officers, probation officers, parole officers, sexual offender treatment providers, correctional officers, and all other professionals are working toward the same goals. As people concerned with the supervision, treatment, and management of sex offenders we need a strategy to differentiate the offenders that are truly high risk to reoffend from those that pose a lesser risk to society. We need a common language so that when we say an offender is low, high, or moderate risk it is clear what we are basing that estimate on. This is especially true if you have some offenders on your caseload that scored high on the STATIC-99 seven or eight years ago but their current risk level is unclear. How do you know what changes have moderated or altered his risk? Does he represent the same threat to the community that he did when he entered prison? We need to know what risk an offender poses today so that we can apply resources where the need is greatest and where that expenditure will do the most good. In this document when we talk about applying resources to the offender, in most cases, we mean time – your time and the supervision and direction that you give is the most expensive and effective intervention that we can provide a sexual offender. Your attention to detail is the most effective community safety technique. Additionally, if asked to testify in court, using a well-known, standardized risk assessment can help in explaining/defending your decisions and judgements.

There are also some “hidden” benefits to using well-known, standardized risk assessments. The first of these is the development of a common vocabulary among people concerned with sexual offender risk and management. For example, if you had to transfer the supervision of an offender to another professional, a review of the STABLE-2007 Tally Sheet and a review of which items you have scored an offender as a “2” on would clearly outline the risk areas of concern and the treatment/supervision needs of the offender. You would have definite risk-relevant targets to discuss and plan around. Secondly, by following an organized risk assessment and management scheme you are demonstrating due diligence in the management of the offender.

Over the past 15 years, people concerned with sexual offender recidivism have been working together to produce reliable and valid assessment instruments that can accurately estimate whether a sexual offender is likely to reoffend (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009; Harris & Hanson, 2010). The reason that so much effort has gone into the development of these instruments is that before they existed those working with sexual offenders had to rely on a

clinician's unstructured impression of how "risky" an offender was. Research shows that structured risk prediction instruments consistently outperform clinical judgement in their ability to estimate who will and will not commit another sexual offence.

The Risk Principle

We know from Andrews and Bonta (2010) that the best correctional outcomes are associated with applying the major share of available resources to the highest risk offenders, assigning moderate levels of resources to offenders representing moderate risk and relatively few resources to low risk offenders; this is known as applying the Risk Principle.

The Risk Principle makes intuitive sense – you put more effort into the people that you are most concerned about and less effort into those you are not as concerned about. Historically offenders have been provided with the same level of service and supervision regardless of the risk they posed. For many years and in many jurisdictions, low risk and high risk sex offenders were treated and supervised identically. The problem with this approach is that too much time and money is wasted over-supervising low risk offenders and this over-spending on the low risk offenders robs the high risk offenders of the supervision and treatment resources they really need. This system was wasteful, expensive, inefficient, not fiscally responsible, and did not encourage the rehabilitation of offenders.

Given that almost all sexual offenders will be released back to the community at some point, we need a strategy to assess risk and then manage and supervise released sexual offenders in the community. Also, once in the community, it is reasonable that we would want to know if the offender's risk to the community has diminished as a result of our efforts and the resources expended, or, though we hope not, if he is becoming more dangerous over time. This of course leads to the question of what is risk assessment and how does it work.

How to Assess Risk

This is a very brief overview. If you need more detailed information, please see Harris and Hanson (2010).

Static risk factors are non-changeable (on the whole) life events that relate to risk for sexual recidivism. Generally historical in nature, once these facts are present they remain an indicator of risk for the rest of the person's life. These include things such as having a history of sexual offences or having offended against a male child. These static risk factors are identified by an actuarial (mathematical) process and though they will correlate reliably with offender reoffence they may or may not have an obvious relationship to sexual reoffence. Be assured, however, that the use of static, actuarial measures predicts whether the offender will reoffend much better than "unstructured clinical judgement".

Dynamic risk factors come in two types, *stable risk factors* and *acute risk factors*. Each type of risk factor samples different behaviours and has a different implicit time-frame. Both stable risk factors and acute risk factors have been informed by an empirical (scientific) process that involved watching these factors change over time in some sexual

offenders, watching the same factors not change over time in other sexual offenders, and then observing which group of offenders had lower recidivism rates.

Stable risk factors are personality characteristics, skill deficits, personal predilections, and learned behaviours that relate to risk for sexual recidivism. Examples include having problems with impulsive behaviour, never having learned how to solve or resolve personal problems, choosing to have children as close friends, and having sexual preferences for children. Stable risk factors can be changed or altered through effortful processing. Generally, effortful processing means change occurs by making concerted efforts to learn new patterns of doing things or thinking about things and adopting these new ways or habits over the long term. Research has shown that one of the best ways of doing this is to complete an organized, evidence-based, treatment program (Cortoni & Nunes, 2007; Hanson et al., 2009; Hanson et al., 2002; Lösel & Schmucker, 2005). Stable risk factors should be scored once a year.

Acute risk factors are generally short acting factors of unstable temporal duration that can change rapidly, often as the result of environmental or inter-personal conditions that the offender may well have no control over (Hanson & Harris, 2000b). These can include supporters who move away suddenly or decide not to support the offender in the community or a change in circumstance where the offender is suddenly placed in the same environment as potential victims. Acute risk factors should be scored at each meeting with the offender but not more than once a week.

The History of Risk Assessment

Bonta (1996) defined three generations of risk assessment. The first generation is generally known as “clinical judgement”. By its very nature clinical judgement is idiosyncratic, unstructured, non-replicable, and at the personal discretion of the assessor. The assessor makes their judgements of “dangerousness” or risk based upon their clinical experience over the years and their level of personal knowledge of the literature. These assessments are generally non-standardized even within the same jurisdiction, and research has shown that prediction of recidivism using clinical judgement is little better than chance (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009; Menzies, Webster, McMain, Staley, & Scaglione, 1994; Quinsey & Ambtman, 1979).

As the research showing that clinical judgement could not reliably predict risk became more commonly known, researchers, psychologists, clinicians, parole officers, probation officers, and police officers worked together to improve our ability to predict recidivism. Looking for a scientifically defensible yet practical solution we turned to actuarial science: the professionals who estimate risks for the insurance industry. Actuarial science uses purely statistical means to determine the best predictors of car accidents, or in our case, sexual recidivism. This process created the so called “second generation” – actuarial risk assessment (Bonta, 1996). Actuarial assessment does not consider theory; it simply defines a scientifically defensible and practical answer to predicting risk. As a result, if it predicts - it counts. There is no appeal to theory and sometimes the predictors may not have an obvious relationship to recidivism. All of the instruments noted below relied upon a 1996 meta-analysis published by Hanson and Bussière that looked at the relative strength of all the factors reported in the scientific literature in relation

to sexual recidivism. This paper produced a table of factors and their relative strengths in predicting sexual recidivism that informed the whole area of interest, allowing for an explosion in predictive instruments. Examples of commonly used actuarial risk assessments include the RRASOR (Hanson, 1997), the MnSOST (Epperson, Kaul, & Huot, 1995), STATIC-99 (Hanson & Thornton, 1999), STATIC-99R (Helmus, Thornton, Hanson, & Babchishin, 2012), STATIC-2002 (Hanson & Thornton, 2003), STATIC-2002R (Helmus et al., 2012), RISK MATRIX-2000 (Thornton et al., 2003), the VRAG and the SORAG (Quinsey, Harris, Rice, & Cormier, 2006).

Assessments developed by actuarial means are highly structured, replicable, and completely based upon factors that are empirically related to recidivism. Actuarial risk measures rank the relative risk of offenders reasonably well. Based on a large number of studies (80+), the average differences between recidivists and non-recidivists was more than 2/3 of a standard deviation (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009). Differences of this size means that there is about a 70% chance that a randomly selected recidivist would have a more deviant score than a randomly selected non-recidivist¹. This level of discrimination is typically described as moderate to large (Rice & Harris, 2005), and is generally accepted as helpful when completing a multi-faceted psychological risk assessment. However, they are far from perfect. Although static actuarial risk prediction tools predict future recidivism reasonably well, most are incapable of measuring change in risk status over time. Once “second generation” risk assessments had been scientifically tested and validated, this same group of researchers, psychologists, psychiatrists, clinicians, and front-line officers wanted tools to help them measure change in risk status over time - for example, before and after an offender attends a treatment group. This is where the impetus for the development of dynamic risk prediction instruments came from. The STABLE-2007 and the ACUTE-2007 are dynamic risk assessment tools and examples of Bonta’s (1996) “third generation” risk assessment instruments. “Third generation” risk assessments monitor behaviours, attitudes, relationships, and thoughts that we know from research either change over time or that can be changed through putting effort into changing them. “Third generation” risk assessments are empirically derived, standardized, validated, and produce a level of predictive accuracy that is sufficient to reliably rank offenders on their risk factors. In addition, because dynamic predictors can be observed to change over time, unlike static factors, they can be used for repeated assessments and are able to measure changes in risk over time.

One area not addressed by Bonta’s (1996) description of the generations is the status of Structured Professional Judgement (SPJ). SPJ is a method of risk assessment where explicit risk factors (often both static and dynamic) are scored, but the combination of these items into an overall evaluation of risk is left to the judgement of the clinician. The SVR-20 (Boer, Hart, Kropp, & Webster, 1997) is an example of an SPJ risk scale commonly used for sex offenders. Proponents of SPJ argue that clinical judgement should be incorporated in risk assessment because the statistical approach of actuarial scales is not always appropriate in individual cases (Webster, Douglas, Eaves, & Hart, 1997). Other researchers, however, have not viewed SPJ as a meaningful advance or alternative (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Bonta, 2002; Quinsey et al., 2006)

¹ The ability of risk tools to differentiate recidivists from non-recidivists is often reported as the area under the receiver operating characteristics curve (AUC for ROC; Rice & Harris, 1995; Swets, Dawes & Monahan, 2000). The AUC can vary between zero and one (with 0.5 indicating chance accuracy), and indicates the probability that a randomly selected recidivist would have a worse score than a randomly selected non-recidivist.

and classify it as a variation of the first generation of risk assessment (i.e., unstructured clinical; Andrews et al., 2006). Meta-analytic research with sexual offenders suggests that SPJ predicts recidivism somewhere between unstructured clinical judgement and actuarial scales (though its accuracy is not significantly different from either method; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009).

Measuring Change

Dynamic Assessment

General dissatisfaction with the inability to measure change grew as many people put considerable time and effort into sexual offender treatment and supervision but found that they had no way of measuring whether they were making any difference. Dynamic assessment has been around for a long time; probably the oldest useful dynamic test in forensic/correctional psychology is the Level of Supervision Inventory (Andrews, 1982). This early test used a mixture of static and dynamic items and came up with a composite score for the individual. For sexual offenders specifically, a number of other dynamic measures were developed including Thornton's Structured Risk Assessment (SRA) (SRA; Thornton, 2002), Violence Risk Scale: Sexual Offender Version (VRS: SO) (VRS: SO; Olver, Wong, Nicholaichuk, & Gordon, 2007), and the RSVP-SO (Hart et al., 2003).

The Dynamic Predictors Project

The Dynamic Predictors Project (DPP) (DPP, Hanson & Harris, 1998) was a retrospective file review study that involved extensive interviews with the probation, police, and parole officers supervising sexual offenders in the community. This project involved 208 men who had recidivated sexually while on community supervision and 201 men who had not recidivated while on community supervision. This design allowed us to see which factors differed in men who had recidivated while in the community and those who had not. The DPP clearly defined a list of the most likely dynamic risk factors and this list was used to create the SONAR (Hanson & Harris, 2000a), the STABLE-2000, and ACUTE-2000 (Hanson & Harris, 2004) instruments. However, this project was retrospective and it is possible that certain results were influenced by 20-20 hindsight bias because both the researchers and the officers knew who had recidivated and who had not. Although this project improved our knowledge of dynamic risk variables, a new research initiative, the Dynamic Supervision Project (DSP) was launched.

The Dynamic Supervision Project

Using a research design that selected a large group of male sexual offenders and then followed them through time, the DSP followed approximately 1,000 sexual offenders for an average of 43 months. Community supervision officers, parole, probation, and police officers were trained in risk assessment (STATIC-99, STABLE-2000, ACUTE-2000) and

followed offenders on their caseload until the offenders recidivated or the study period ended. The officers were instructed to score the STATIC-99 once, at the beginning of the project, the STABLE-2000 every six months, and the ACUTE-2000 every supervision visit (but not more than once a week). Data for this project was collected across Canada and in the states of Iowa and Alaska (Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007).

An additional outcome of this second study was the chance to re-evaluate the STABLE-2000. As seen in Table 1, some factors that we expected to predict sexual recidivism did not (for example, Attitudes Supportive of Sexual Assault). Consequently, certain items were dropped from the scale to create the STABLE-2007. One important outcome of the DSP was that it demonstrated that community supervision officers could reliably assess risk for sexual recidivism in sexual offenders of all types typically seen in community supervision. These assessments provided information on sexual, violent, and general recidivism with levels of accuracy not substantially different than any other professional group. In addition, we believe that all professionals that score dynamic risk factors are more aware of the risk factors that directly impact their practice. Data from outside the sexual offender field indicates that community supervision officers who are able to focus more directly on criminogenic needs are able to reduce the recidivism rate of the offenders they are responsible for supervising (Bonta, Rugge, Scott, Bourgon, & Yessine, 2008). These officers are more likely to anticipate problems and are more likely to intervene in a timely manner in advance of a new sexual offence - resulting in reduced levels of sexual reoffence, greater public safety, and fewer victims of sexual assault.

Table 1**Comparing STABLE-2000 and STABLE-2007**

The STABLE-2000		The STABLE-2007	
1	<u>Significant Social Influences*</u>	1	<u>Significant Social Influences¹</u>
2	<u>Intimacy Deficits</u>	2	<u>Intimacy Deficits</u>
	Lovers/Intimate Partners		Capacity for Relationship Stability ¹
	Emotional Identification with Children		Emotional Identification with Children ¹
	Hostility Toward Women*		Hostility Toward Women ²
	General Social Rejection &/or Loneliness*		General Social Rejection &/or Loneliness ³
	Lack of Concern for Others*		Lack of Concern for Others ²
3	<u>Sexual Self-Regulation</u>	3	<u>Sexual Self-Regulation</u>
	Sex Drive/Preoccupation*		Sex Drive/Preoccupation ¹
	Sex as Coping*		Sex as Coping ²
	Deviant Sexual Interests		Deviant Sexual Interests ¹
4	<u>General Self-Regulation</u>	4	<u>General Self -Regulation</u>
	Impulsive Acts*		Impulsive Acts ¹
	Poor Cognitive Problem Solving*		Poor Cognitive Problem Solving ¹
	Negative Emotionality/Hostility*		Negative Emotionality/Hostility ¹
5	<u>Cooperation with Supervision*</u>	5	<u>Cooperation with Supervision¹</u>
6	<u>Attitudes Supportive of Sexual Offending</u>		
	Sexual Entitlement		
	Rape Attitudes		
	Child Molester Attitudes		

* – Indicates this item showed a linear relationship with recidivism at initial analysis

1 – Empirically supported in at least three studies and predicted in a meta-analysis

2 – Considered “promising” – supported by at least one study and other considerations

3 – Considered an “interesting exception”

Individual Risk Factors

Mann, Hanson, and Thornton (2010) reviewed the research on risk factors for sexual recidivism and, based upon the data contained in meta-analytic studies divided these risk factors into five separate groups. The first group contained those risk factors considered “empirically supported” appearing in at least three studies that when meta-analytically combined showed a significant predictive value (with a minimum effect size) for that construct. The second group of factors were those considered “promising” as at least one study had shown that factor to have significant predictive value for sexual recidivism and where there were other kinds of relevant supportive evidence that this factor predicted sexual recidivism. The third group of factors were those considered “interesting exceptions” where the factor was not supported overall in the literature but where there were interesting exceptions in the literature that made this factor worth considering. The fourth group was populated by factors that were deemed “worth exploring” and finally, the fifth group contained those that had little or no relationship to sexual recidivism. Interestingly, when you look at Table 1, in the right-hand column the superscripts at the end of each factor title tell which of Mann et al.’s groups each of the STABLE-2007 factors fall into. In short, nine of the 13 factors in the STABLE-2007 are considered “empirically supported” or group “1”. A further three factors are considered “promising” and one factor fell in the third group, “interesting exceptions”. If you wish to know which studies supported each of the risk factors in the STABLE-2007 you can review the Mann et al. (2010) paper. From this analysis it becomes obvious that the risk factors employed by the STABLE-2007 have substantial empirical backing from the peer-reviewed literature.

Treatment

The 13 individual items in the STABLE-2007 are not only the best dynamic risk predictors for sexual offenders – they are also the best empirically validated treatment targets. If you determine that a given risk factor is sufficiently important for an offender that you assess him as a “2” on that item, (e.g., “Impulsive Acts”), it should be obvious that Impulsive Acts is a risk factor for this offender. He is the type that is likely to impulsively agree to baby-sit when asked by a neighbor or go out drinking and to a strip club with “the boys”. Fortunately, thinking skills and how to counter-act impulsive decision-making is something that is teachable. Having this offender participate in a thinking skills or problem-solving group will generally lower his risk to reoffend by making him less likely to make impulsive decisions. There is research evidence that treatments that target criminogenic needs will reduce sexual and general recidivism (Hanson et al., 2009). As someone scoring the “risk” factors on the STABLE-2007 you should be aware that you are also completing a checklist of this offender’s “need” factors – his treatment needs – and that by systematically targeting those needs his likelihood of reoffending with another sexual offence are reduced.

Inter-Rater Reliability

When using any sort of measurement instrument it is important to be sure that two people attempting to measure or score the same thing (or person in our case) obtain the same score or close to the same score. Hanson et al. (2007) reported on both scoring reliability and inter-rater reliability for the DSP.

First the training responses of 213 officers trained by the principal investigators (Hanson & Harris) were analyzed. For the original STABLE-2000 total scores from the 213 officers, between 47% and 67% scored within one point of the correct answer (depending upon which scoring example they were assigned) and between 74% and 99% of these officers scored within three points, again depending upon which exercise was scored.

To ensure that the ability to score the test accurately was not related to having been trained by the authors, three probation officers from Ontario were trained to provide the STABLE/ACUTE training. Of the 45 officers trained by these new trainers between 28% and 80% (depending upon exercise) of the officers were within one point of the correct answer and between 80% and 100% were within three points. Once again, we used multiple exercises and scoring accuracy varied by exercise.

A second reliability check involved file reviews of 92 cases of actual offenders being interviewed for the project. These offenders were randomly selected from those who had submitted more or less complete information. These reliabilities might be somewhat inflated as the second reviewers knew the scores as assigned by the first rater and both ratings were based upon the same file information. The intra-class correlation (ICC) for the STABLE-2000 total scores (87 cases reviewed) was 0.89 and the STABLE-2000 item with the lowest inter-rater reliability was Significant Social Influences (ICC of 0.66). In initial inter-rater reliability calculations using intra-class correlations amongst seven raters, for “first” stables - the first scoring of the instrument on “real” offenders the inter-rater reliability across 87 cases was 0.94 and the inter-rater reliability for “second” stables was 0.93 across 45 cases (Hanson et al., 2007).

In a maximum security penitentiary, Fernandez (2008) showed high levels of inter-rater reliability when scoring STABLE-2007 for a wide range of sexual offenders. Fernandez double rated 55 sexual offenders who had received sentences of two years or longer for a sexual offence. Fernandez obtained ICC's of 0.92 for total score on the STABLE-2007. The ICC's for the thirteen individual STABLE-2007 items ranged from 0.56 to 0.91 with a median value of 0.83. It should be noted that while Significant Social Influences had an ICC of 0.56, the next lowest ICC was 0.70. The two individual items with the lowest ICC's were Negative Emotionality/Hostility and Significant Social Influences.

Cross-Validation Studies

The STABLE-2007 has now been cross-validated by Eher, Matthes, Schilling, Haubner-MacLean, and Rettenberger (2012). They reported on a sample of 128 rapists and 133 child molesters to whom they prospectively administered the STABLE-2000 (average follow-up of 6.4 years). STABLE-2007 was scored retrospectively using STABLE-2000 scores and file information. Eher et al. (2012) found that STABLE-2007 was significantly related to sexual recidivism, violent recidivism, and general reoffence (ROC's of 0.67 to 0.71), and added predictive value above STATIC-99 for violent and general reoffence. For the prediction of sexual recidivism, STABLE-2007 did not add incrementally above STATIC-99 ($p = 0.17$), but it did add incrementally above the SORAG ($p = 0.022$).

Overall, the research indicates that STABLE-2007 provides valuable information for the prediction of sexual and serious recidivism among sexual offenders. But, as noted below, STABLE-2007 is only likely to contribute meaningful information if the individual completing the scoring takes their task seriously.

“Conscientious Officers”

Interestingly, during the analyses (Hanson & Helmus, 2009) we noticed a difference between those officers who completed the forms requested of them, and those officers who sent incomplete information (e.g., a STABLE without a STATIC). We call the officers who sent the requested information “conscientious”. The evaluations completed by the conscientious officers were more accurate (Area Under the Curve (AUC) in the 0.77 to 0.80 range on the various versions of STABLE and STATIC; n = 311) compared to the evaluations submitted by the other officers (AUC in the 0.60 to 0.73 range, n = 661). The lesson here is clear - if you take the scoring of these items seriously you can greatly improve your ability to predict sexual recidivism.

Overall and Program Recommendations

What Test to Use?

We recommend that programs and practitioners responsible for the adjudication, management, and treatment of sexual offenders use a system of empirically validated risk factors that are determined in advance. These validated risk factors should be combined into an overall evaluation. A list of these validated risk measures can be found in several documents (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009; Harris & Hanson, 2010). Programs that are considering adopting a risk assessment measure or changing risk assessment measures should assess all of the available common instruments and consider which instrument will give the information that their program needs most. An important consideration is whether the samples of offenders used to create the test in question best match the sample of offenders for which you are attempting to assess risk. You have to ask yourself, do your offenders match as closely as possible the developmental samples?

Keeping Quality High

If you are going to do sex offender risk assessments they should be done well, if for no other reason than to be professional and to prevent your assessment from being overturned or thrown out of court. However, maintaining high quality assessments requires that the system or jurisdiction adopt certain policies and procedures to ensure a systematic approach.

All programs should have most, if not all, of the following components in place:

1. A Bring Forward system to cue when it is time to re-assess STABLE-2007 scorings, ensuring regular scorings.
2. A system of peer reviews so that everyone is working towards scoring calibration (i.e., all scoring the same case alike). Colleagues should meet on a regular basis

- and present their scorings to each other and discuss the scorings, working towards consensus.
3. Clinical supervision by a very experienced assessor so that those scoring have access to a resource person for tricky questions (this person may well organize the peer review sessions).
 4. Mentorships with those who are more experienced in using the measure so that novice scorers have an identified person with whom they can discuss their cases and their risk scoring.
 5. Participation in inter-rater reliability trials where about 10% of the cases are scored by more than one rater and the scores are compared. This technique leads to better calibration of scoring.
 6. Your agency may wish to consider participating in webinars about scoring and other risk assessment issues.
 7. When scoring risk assessments on any offender a jurisdiction should have a quality control process in place, either through regular professional development days, internal supervision by senior employees who are committed to the risk assessment process or possible “scoring clinics” run cooperatively within organizations.

What’s New?

This document is a collection of coding decisions and clarifications by skilled raters and people who have been trained on this and earlier versions of this tool. Some of the item descriptions may not be identical to earlier versions. This is an update based upon experience. There are changes, so please do not rely on your memory – you need to read the item descriptions in the manual. Risk assessments are best done with this document open on the desk in front of you. In this document you will find a new sample interview and new standard paragraphs for reporting the STABLE-2007. As well, this manual contains updated rules for combining STATIC and STABLE scores, and the updated recidivism tables, which may be new to evaluators who only received the earliest versions of the training. You will also find new scoring exercises - please complete them! If you have scored STABLEs before you should feel comfortable that you will complete them with little difficulty.

For the Person New to Scoring the STABLE-2007

If you are new to scoring dynamic risk factors or the STABLE in particular we suggest that you do not try to read this manual from front to back. We suggest that you choose two sexual offenders that you know well; it would be best if one of them was moderate risk and one of them was high risk. Score each offender individually on each of the 13 STABLE items, reading the appropriate item description as you go. Decide on a score for each STABLE item and then sum to obtain a STABLE total score for each offender. Put the two scores aside and complete the practice exercises. Then, once you have completed the practice exercises review the scores of your first two offenders. Consider how you feel about your scoring after completing the exercises. How did you do? Then shred the first two scores.

What Are the Minimum Qualifications Necessary for Scoring the STABLE-2007?

There is no easy answer, particularly as wide varieties of professions are interested and invested in keeping society safe. However, tests of this nature were developed with people in mind who are dedicated to working with sexual offenders. You should not undertake sexual offender assessments if you are not working on a regular and consistent basis with this population. So what is a “regular and consistent”? Our research demonstrates that “practice makes better”. If you are not likely to score at least ten or 12 STABLEs a year you should reconsider using this instrument. At the very least, you should be sure to check your scorings with someone who scores STABLE regularly.

You should have some academic knowledge about sexual offenders, such as an introductory or applied course on sexual offenders, or have had some professional upgrading in this area. Having years of practical experience in the field may be enough to make you sufficiently familiar with the sex offender area. You should have automatic recall of such basic things as what is the approximate ten year recidivism rate for incest offenders and what are the “Big Four”. If you look over the references section of this document you should notice that most of the authors’ names are familiar to you. In addition, some experience or training in applied risk assessment, such as being familiar with the LSI or the LSI-R (Andrews, 1982; Andrews & Bonta, 1995) is an asset.

You could have professional training at the Parole/Probation officer level (corrections and criminal justice stream). Police officers should have some specialized experience and knowledge about sexual offenders; you should have had some professional development in the sexual offender area. The same has to be said for psychologists, psychiatrists, and certified clinical social workers. You should have some specialized academic or professional upgrading training in the sexual offender area; just having a license to practice is not sufficient.

In our opinion, the best way to learn sex offender risk assessment is through being trained by a certified trainer at a multi-day course. That being said, everybody has to score their first offender and before you complete your first STABLE, you should find someone who has experience and expertise with these instruments so that you can consult as you complete the scoring.

Other Options

We are developing other training methodologies, which we hope to have available in the near future. At this time, one method is an online course through the Justice Institute of British Columbia. To download the course description, go to www.jibc.ca/sexoffender. The name of the course is *STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007: Sex Offender Needs Assessment – SOAP106*.

This online training describes the background and utilization of the STABLE-2007 and ACUTE-2007 sex offender risk assessment measures. It provides an overview, detailed instruction, and practical experience in the use of these risk assessment tools.

The course prepares criminal justice personnel and other professionals to employ these measures and enables them to estimate a sex offender's risk for sexual and violent recidivism. In its discussion of risk factors, the course also explores the major variables that have been found to underlie sexual reoffence.

Conclusion

Most of us began working in this area because it is interesting and we have a desire to do something positive in society. If you are dedicated to public safety, the use of structured, validated risk and needs assessments is a significant “technical assist”. Sexual offenders create disproportional harm and worry in our society. The STABLE-2007 can help you treat, monitor, and supervise sexual offenders so they are less likely to commit another sexual offence and less likely to create another victim. The STABLE-2007 allows you to determine which offenders deserve the most concern and more of your time and gives you insights into their treatment needs.

Assessments of stable dynamic risk are evolving and eventually a better measure will be developed. As measures change and improve you should adopt the most up to date and effective tool. At the moment, the STABLE-2007 is considered to be at the forefront of this area. If you remain current and apply advanced instruments and techniques, you will help to maximize public safety and ultimately, that is the goal for all of us.

We sincerely wish you wisdom and fair judgement in the important work you do every day.

Range of Application and Appropriate Populations

STABLE-2007 is intended to be used with adult male sexual offenders who have been convicted for at least one sexually motivated offence against a child or a non-consenting adult. In order for STABLE-2007 to be used to estimate recidivism rates, it must be used in conjunction with a STATIC actuarial measure (e.g., STATIC-99, STATIC-99R, STATIC-2002, STATIC-2002); consequently, a full STATIC/STABLE evaluation requires that the offenders fit the sampling frame of both the STABLE and STATIC measures (see Harris et al., 2003; Phenix, Doren, Helmus, Hanson, & Thornton, 2009).

The inclusion criteria for STABLE-2007 are as follows:

- (a) Adult males who have been convicted of a sexually motivated offence (or received an equivalent sanction that qualifies as a conviction) against a non-consenting person, or a person unable to provide consent (e.g., child, developmentally delayed). Further discussion of what criminal justice sanctions qualify as a conviction can be found in Phenix et al. (2009).
- (b) Males who committed their most recent sexual offence after their 18th birthday.
- (c) STABLE-2007 may be used, with caution, for males who committed their most recent sexual offence between their 17th and 18th birthday, provided that their release date is when they are at least 18. The release date is either the date of release from a closed custody sentence (in Canada, closed custody is analogous to prison) or the date of sentence for a community sentence or open custody sentence (in Canada, open custody is analogous to a halfway house). This rule applies even if the juvenile offender was “waived into adult court,” a procedure allowed in some jurisdictions on some occasions.

STABLE-2007 is not recommended for the following populations:

- (d) Offenders whose only sexual offences are Category “B” offences. Category “B” sexual offences are those in which the participants were consenting (e.g., prostitution), the offence lacked a sexual motive (e.g., urinating in public), or there was no identifiable victim (e.g., possession of indecent materials). For more information, see definitions of Category “A” and Category “B” offences in the STATIC-99 (p. 14) and STATIC-2002 (p. 21) coding rules (Harris et al., 2003; Phenix et al., 2009). See special circumstances below for exceptions (e.g., child pornography offenders).
- (e) Persons who committed all of their sexual offences under the age of 17 no matter how old the offenders are at the time of assessment.
- (f) Women.
- (g) Persons whose only sexual “crime” involves consenting sexual activity with a similar age peer (e.g., Statutory Rape [a U.S. charge]) where the ages of the perpetrator and the victim are close and the sexual activity was consensual (see p. 49 of Phenix et al., (2009) for specific rules to make this determination).
- (h) Persons who have not committed a sexual offence, or for whom there is reasonable doubt that the person has committed a sexual offence. In other words, we do not recommend its use for predicting the onset of sexual offending, nor for determining guilt or innocence of those suspected of sexual offending.

Special Circumstances and Populations

Aboriginals

Approximately 20% of the participants in the DSP were of Aboriginal heritage (Canadian Aboriginal, Inuit, Alaskan Native), of whom 155 were scored on the STABLE-2007. For the Aboriginal offenders, the total STABLE-2007 score was significantly related to general recidivism; however, STABLE-2007 had only small, non-significant relationships to sexual and violent recidivism (Hanson et al., 2007; Helmus, Babchishin, & Blais, 2012). In general, the same risk factors that predict general criminal recidivism among non-Aboriginal offenders predict recidivism among Aboriginals, though a recent meta-analysis suggests several of these factors do not predict as well for Aboriginals (Gutierrez, Wilson, Rugge, & Bonta, in press). The reasons for the reduced predictive accuracy of STABLE-2007 in the DSP are unknown. Consequently, we recommend that STABLE-2007 be used with caution with Canadian and Northern Aboriginal peoples.

Other Ethnic Minorities

STABLE-2007 has not been tested on offenders of African, Latin American, Asian or other non-European heritage. In general, however, race has not been found to be a significant predictor of sexual offence recidivism (Hanson & Bussière, 1998). It is possible that race interacts with STABLE 2007 scores, but such interactions between race and actuarial rates are rare. Långström (2004), however, found that the STATIC-99 had limited utility with Swedish sexual offenders of non-European heritage. Given the available evidence, we recommend that STABLE-2007 be used with offenders from diverse ethnic backgrounds. This recommendation may change, however, as new research becomes available.

Possession of Child Pornography, Category “B” Offenders, Female Sexual Offenders, and Other Populations Not Included in STATIC-99

Like STATIC-99, STABLE-2007 has only been validated on adult male sexual offenders who have had at least one identifiable victim (Category “A” offences; see Harris et al., 2003). Nevertheless, some evaluators may wish to use STABLE-2007 for offenders outside the sampling frame of STATIC-99, such as female sexual offenders or men whose only sexual convictions involve possession of child pornography. With these populations, STABLE-2007 should only be used as a clinical guide to identifying treatment needs and supervision targets. It should not be used to estimate recidivism rates or to assign nominal risk categories (e.g., low/moderate/high risk). Furthermore, we recommend that evaluators explicitly state that STABLE-2007 has not been validated for the offender at-hand if the offender is not an adult male with a Category “A” sexual offence somewhere on his record.

Female sexual offenders and child pornography offenders were included in the sampling frame of the STABLE-2007 development study (Hanson et al., 2007). However, there were too few of these offenders to make meaningful conclusions.

Other research suggest that female offenders and online offenders have sufficient psychological differences from typical sexual offenders that their risk of sexual recidivism is substantially lower (Babchishin, Hanson & Hermann, 2011; Cortoni, Hanson, & Coache, 2009, 2010; Seto, Hanson & Babchishin, 2011).

Sexual Offenders Serving Long Prison Sentences

The original DSP study involved offenders who received community sentences or those who were in the community following release from prison sentences. Subsequently, it has been validated on a sample of Austrian prisoners (Eher et al., 2012). The average sentence in the Eher et al. study was 32 months, and offenders were assessed, on average, 17 months prior to release. Consequently, the existing research has involved primarily sexual offenders who have current, or recent (< 2 to 3 years), experience in the community. Research has yet to examine the extent to which STABLE-2007 provides accurate assessments of criminogenic needs among offenders still in prison while serving long sentences. In this context, “long” would signify sufficient time that it is reasonable to expect that previous community behaviour would no longer be a valid indicator of future community behaviour.

Assessing the stable variables for incarcerated offenders requires looking for different indicators than when these variables are assessed in the community. For example, sexual preoccupations would be expected to express themselves differently in controlled environments than in the community. In general, research has shown that it is possible to reliably assess variables similar to those targeted in STABLE-2007 for offenders serving long periods of incarceration, and assessment tools involving similar constructs have demonstrated validity in predicting sexual recidivism based on information collected in prison (e.g., Beggs & Grace, 2010, 2011; Knight & Thornton, 2007; Olver, Wong, Nicholaichuk, & Gordon, 2007). Furthermore, the overall STATIC/STABLE-2007 risk assessment is largely based on the STATIC-99R or STATIC-2002R scores, which have been validated in dozens of studies of incarcerated offenders.

Consequently, we recommend that STABLE-2007 be used for offenders serving long sentences, given the necessary cautions about the difficulty of evaluating change in controlled environments. Evaluators need to remember that the STABLE-2007 items are primarily scored based on expected behaviour given that the individual has **opportunity to offend**, which may or may not be consistent with the individual’s current or recent behaviour in prison or hospital (see scoring instructions in the following sections).

Major Mental Illness/Developmental Delay

In the DSP study, approximately 10% had been hospitalized overnight for a psychiatric condition, and 5% had previously been diagnosed as developmentally delayed (Hanson et al., 2007). For this sample of exceptional offenders (n = 115), STABLE-2007 significantly predicted general recidivism. However, STABLE-2007 showed small and non-significant relationships to sexual and violent recidivism. The reasons for the lower predictive accuracy of these groups are unknown. For general recidivism, the same risk factors apply to both mentally disordered and non-mentally disordered offenders (Bonta, Law, & Hanson, 1998).

It may be that sexual offending is linked to different risk factors among mentally disordered offenders, or it could be that certain aspects of their social presentation make it difficult for evaluators to appropriately distinguish criminogenic from non-criminogenic needs. At present it is recommended that evaluators use caution in the interpretation of STATIC/STABLE-2007 composite score reconviction probabilities with sexual offenders who have a significant developmental delay of the cognitive type, or who have a history of major mental illness (e.g., schizophrenia, mania).

Scoring the STABLE-2007

The STABLE-2007 is a structured approach to evaluating the dynamic risk factors (or criminogenic needs) of adult male sexual offenders. Assessors using the STABLE-2007 should have some knowledge of sexual offenders, general training in applied risk assessment, and specific competence in a STATIC risk scale (e.g., STATIC-99, STATIC-99R, STATIC-2002, STATIC-2002R, RM-2000S). They also need to be conscientious (i.e., committed to completing a thorough and quality assessment). Typical users include psychologists, psychiatrists, psychotherapists, forensic evaluators, community supervision specialist officers, and police threat assessment specialists.

Scoring the STABLE-2007 is relatively straightforward, although there is some judgement involved for all items. Accuracy and consistency in scoring the STABLE-2007 will increase with access to quality information. A comprehensive assessment should include an in-person interview (see interview protocol in Appendix B). The interview schedule was designed such that it could be completed in a single, **one hour session;** in practice, however, most evaluators report spending between 90 to 120 minutes spread over two sessions. In order to score the items, evaluators should review all available collateral information - both historical and recent (e.g., official criminal history, mental health/medical history, prior psychological psychiatric assessments, interviews with members of the offender's support network, case management/parole/probation reports, institutional behaviour reports). Item scores are based on both interview and collateral information. The ratings represent estimates of the offender's typical or current "baseline" functioning. Assessors should consider recent and historical behaviours; however, the primary task is determining expected functioning over the next six to 12 months.

Interviewing

We strongly recommend that assessors adopt a collaborative and motivational approach during the STABLE-2007 interview. Over the last decade there has been an increasing emphasis in the field of sexual offender treatment on therapeutic process and style with respect to interactions with sexually offending clients (Marshall, Anderson, & Fernandez, 1999). Although the importance of a positive approach by therapists has focused primarily on treatment interactions, Shingler and Mann (2006) have noted that the process of risk assessment creates the basis for all future therapeutic interactions. The risk assessment process is often a missed opportunity for collaborative work between the client and therapist, which, if done well, could facilitate the client's realization of sexual offender treatment goals.

Although there has been little focus in the research literature specifically on a collaborative approach to risk assessment, research on therapist-client interactions support the positive effects of promoting teamwork between client and therapist during sexual offender treatment. DiClemente (1991) has indicated that a confrontational style is particularly damaging to clients who are in the "precontemplation" stage of change, which is the most common stage of change for sexual offenders referred for assessment. DiClemente suggests that harsh challenges at this stage will increase resistance, denial and noncompliance, and reduce self-esteem.

Drapeau's (2005) study found that child molester subjects reacted negatively if they felt they were denied participation in early decision-making in treatment or if they felt pressured or coerced. In this study clients who felt excluded from decision-making became oppositional and resistant because they felt this was their only viable course of action.

Not allowing clients to participate in an assessment in a personally meaningful way may increase resistance and lower motivation to pursue other, possibly crucial, goals in treatment (Fernandez, 2006). Miller and Rollnick's (1991) book on Motivational Interviewing outlines an approach to sharing assessment results that encourages cooperation and change rather than resistance in clients. Assessors working with sexual offenders are encouraged to familiarize themselves with and use Motivational Interviewing strategies throughout the assessment process.

The risk assessment process lends itself to confrontation if the assessor allows that to happen. If assessors are aggressive and confrontational they can expect to elicit either matching responses from assertive clients or withdrawal from the therapeutic process by under-assertive clients. Clients may believe the assessor is "out to get him" or invested in portraying the offender in the worst possible light. Good assessors will spend time at the front end of the evaluation explaining that risk assessment is a collaborative endeavour designed to identify appropriate treatment targets, establish a baseline of risk in order to better manage risk factors, and ultimately to help the client.

Potentially useful interview questions are suggested with each item, and have been collated into a sample interview (Appendix B). The interview questions are a guide, and experienced interviewers are encouraged to use their judgement regarding the most appropriate phrasing of questions to best obtain the necessary information. There is no expectation that experienced interviewers will use all of the provided questions or use them in the order they are presented. Some assessors may find these questions useful in structuring their interview with a sexual offender new to their caseload or as they become more familiar with the STABLE-2007. Assessors should use their best clinical judgement as to whether or not to ask additional questions when the offender's previous response indicates no problems or that no further information will be forthcoming. The order of the questions is also a suggested format and assessors may choose to rearrange the questions and/or sections to fit their style and circumstances.

The focus of the STABLE-2007 is on stable dynamic risk factors. These risk factors are amenable to change but, without intervention, tend to remain relatively constant. The purpose of the interview and assessment is not to obtain a full factual account of the offender's misbehaviours, but to focus on information that will allow a thorough and accurate scoring of the STABLE-2007 items. You may, however, be attentive to rationalizations and justifications for the offending which may be useful in scoring various sections of this manual such as Sexual Self-Regulation, General Self-Regulation, and Lack of Concern for Others.

In some sections of the interview you will find a direct correspondence between the suggested questions and the scoring criteria. In other sections, particularly Sexual Self-Regulation and General Self-Regulation, the link between the interview questions and the scoring grid is less

direct. From this more global inquiry the assessor makes a judgement based on his/her overall opinion of the offender's functioning in that area.

Recording Scores

For each item, consider the information you have collected during the interview and from the review of collateral information and decide whether a score of 0, 1, or 2 best reflects the client's functioning in that item area. In general, a score of "0" reflects "not present" or "no concern", and a score of "2" reflects "definitely present" or "definite concern". The score of "1" is given when there is uncertainty about whether the factors is present, it is somewhat present, or it is present but it is not strong enough to justify a "2". A score of "2" on any item suggests sufficient concern to be worthy of consideration in the offender's treatment, supervision, and management plans. The item score (i.e., 0, 1, or 2) is written in the right hand column of the STABLE-2007 Tally Sheet (see Appendix A). The total score is the sum of the individual scores for all items.

Please note that all items should be scored and not prorated, with the exception of the item Emotional Identification with Children, which is only scored for offenders with child victims. For offenders with only adult or teen victims (14 years old or more), an N/A should be placed in the scoring column to remind the evaluator that the item was not scored for this offender.

The middle column on the Tally Sheet provides the evaluator with room to write brief notes regarding the information they considered when scoring the item. These notes can be useful if you are reviewing the Tally Sheet at a later date to remind you of the information used for your scoring decisions. Note that a fair and balanced assessment should generally cite information used to justify a score, as well as information that is counter-indicative of the score (i.e., it is good to note information that pulled you in both directions, regardless of the final scoring decision). In addition to providing an ethical and balanced assessment, noting counter-indicative information can also help establish rapport with an offender by demonstrating that you considered both positive and negative information.

The Interpretive ranges for total scores are empirically informed based on the findings of the DSP (Hanson et al., 2007). Scores of 0 to 3 reflect low stable dynamic needs, scores of 4 to 11 reflect moderate stable dynamic needs, and scores 12 and above reflect high stable dynamic needs (see Appendix D).

The next section provides detailed scoring instructions for each STABLE-2007 item. These instructions include the basic concept of the item, its research support, general issues to consider, the information needed to score the item, specific scoring instructions, and examples. The examples do not represent real people, but were constructed to represent common features that should be considered when scoring the items. The section on "issues to consider" provides information on scoring items relevant to various circumstances you may encounter with individual clients. We recommend that you take a STABLE-2007 coding form from the manual and keep it to one side as you review this manual. As noted there is room beside each item on the scoring sheet to include some notes to remind you of the information used to make your scoring decision. This can be helpful for future reference. Once you have scored each item sum all of the item scores to calculate the total score.

We also suggest that you review the appendices as they contain valuable information including the STABLE-2007 coding form, a sample interview protocol, test scoring examples, the distribution of STABLE-2007 items and total scores, recidivism rate tables, and a standard paragraph for reporting the STABLE-2007.

Overall Risk

As part of the complete assessment, the identified interpretive range from the STABLE-2007 may be combined with the offender's total score from the STATIC-99R or STATIC-2002R for an overall assessment of the offender's risk/needs level and his “priority” for supervision and services (see Appendix F and Appendix G). To use the STABLE-2007 to assess overall risk it must be used in conjunction with an empirically-validated, actuarial measure of static risk factors.

How Often Should I Score the STABLE?

We recommend re-assessing the STABLE **each year**. In the DSP we asked officers to assess each offender every six months on the STABLE-2000. However, when we analyzed the data we found that change in sexual offenders was not as rapid as we had first thought. Although few offenders in this group would have received treatment that would be judged “effective” by modern standards, STABLE factors can change rapidly in certain cases. For example, an offender may move or people may die or move away that leave a major hole in the offender's protective social shield. Although an event of this nature may not trigger a full review, we would recommend a notation in the file remarking on this change in the offender's life and the possible effects it may have on his risk profile. It is prudent to do risk assessments each year as there is evidence to suggest (Hanson et al., 2007) that repeated assessments of dynamic factors improve predictive accuracy for sexual offenders. There is also some evidence to suggest that STABLE scores may be able to detect changes in risk status when measured before and after sex offender specific treatment programs (Nunes, Babchishin, & Cortoni, 2011).

STABLE-2007 Items

Item: Significant Social Influences

1. The Basic Concept:

Assessors need to determine whose opinions matter to the offender and who he considers important in his life; these are the most likely people to have an influence on his decisions and, ultimately, his behaviour. If the offender surrounds himself with people who promote prosocial values, discourage criminal or risky behaviours, prevent victim access, and speak positively about the usefulness of treatment, he is more likely to make decisions that lead to offence-free living. Alternatively, if the people with whom he spends his time promote both in their behaviour and their outlook generally antisocial attitudes, poor behavioural controls, and dysfunctional coping strategies, then the offender will more likely make poor decisions, and place himself in risky situations that facilitate a return to criminal offending.

2. Research:

Many theories of human and criminal behaviour emphasize the importance of social influences (e.g., Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Bandura, 1974; Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010; Sutherland & Cressey, 1970). Among general offenders, a negative peer associate is one of the strongest predictors of recidivism (Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996). The same pattern is found with sexual offenders. Sex offenders know other sex offenders (Hanson & Scott, 1996) and negative social involvement is a well-established predictor of sexual recidivism (Mann et al., 2010).

3. Issues to Consider:

Scoring of this item should be done in two parts: (1) Identification and (2) Evaluation. The first part of this item, *Identification*, focuses on identifying who the offender has in his life that is important to him, and likely to influence his decisions and behaviour. Although people are influenced by their heroes and other abstract role models, this item is concerned with meaningful, personal contact with real people.

The assessor should be aware that the offender may list individuals that he cares about, or believes he should have on his list, but who may not necessarily be the people with whom he has meaningful contact. Without meaningful contact, they would not be important social influences, regardless of the reasons given for the lack of contact (e.g., because he does not want to bother them with his troubles or because he does not value their opinion). Also, the offender may list people as significant social influences purely to make a positive impression on the assessor. This consideration of meaningful contact applies to both positive and negative influences. If an offender has a sibling with an extensive criminal record and substance abuse problem, but they only talk on holidays, then that person likely would not count, even if the offender lists them.

As a result, it is important to work with the offender to identify the people who are actually, today, an important part of his life. The offender may list people with whom he has not had any recent contact or who have indicated that they do not want any future contact with him (e.g., a spouse who has custody of the victim of his offending). The assessor should cross reference the information for this item, as well as relevant information provided by the offender at different points in the interview, with other collateral sources. For the scoring of this item, do not include individuals who are paid to be in the presence of the offender, such as lawyers, psychologists, or psychiatrists unless the offender is developmentally delayed or suffering from a chronic psychiatric disorder (see section under Special Considerations). Only consider those individuals identified by the offender who choose to associate with him. To determine how important these people are to the offender you will have to ask questions such as “How often do you talk to/see John”, “What do you have in common with John and when you are together what do you spend your time doing?”

The second part of this item, *Evaluation*, focuses on evaluating whether the individual identified by the offender is likely to have a positive, negative, or neutral influence on his behaviour. Some individuals may have a mixture of both positive and negative features. In those cases, it is your role as the assessor to determine the overall balance of features by asking yourself, “Would the offender have a better chance of remaining offence-free with this person in their life, or would they have a better chance if this person were no longer in their life?”

Positive Influences are people who are likely to promote prosocial values and encourage self control strategies. They serve as positive role models as they themselves do not have problems with substance abuse or criminal behaviour. They may be able to assist the offender with material support, such as shelter or finances, and are there to offer moral support and comfort when needed. They are aware of the offender’s sexual offending and are likely to promote his participation in treatment. In addition, they would act in such a way or counsel an offender to limit their victim access and to avoid high risk situations (e.g., environments where there is substance abuse or potential victim access). Positive significant influences are also likely to challenge or confront the offender when they believe he is engaging in problematic or risky behaviours and would be prepared to call the probation, parole officer, or treatment staff to report concerns.

Negative Influences are people who provide open or thinly veiled support for procriminal actions and attitudes, or lead the offender astray, such as into substance abuse, “shady” activities, or procriminal company. These individuals would be seen as weakening self-control strategies, facilitating victim access, facilitating access to high-risk situations, and as generating conflict in the offender’s life. They may be individuals that the offender's spouse or family warn him about or try to convince him to stay away from. Friends or family members with whom the primary shared activity is partying or drinking or who may encourage the offender to reject prosocial supports would generally be seen as negative influences. Negative Influences may include friends or family members who collude with the offender in denial, minimization, or justification of the offence and may also include those who deny the usefulness of supervision, the supervisory officer, or with adhering to conditions and restrictions associated with the offender’s arrest or disposition. When the offender has mental health concerns, be aware of social contacts

that devalue mental health practitioners, practices, and especially the role of medications. These people may tell the offender that he “is not crazy” and that he does not need his medications.

Generally prosocial individuals can be negative social influences if they threaten the offender's behavioural controls, or invoke destructive emotional reactions. Imagine, for example, that an offender's fully law-abiding mother continually calls her 20-year old son a “pervert” and “loser”, prompting him to avoid his family home in favour of more accepting (but more antisocial) peers.

Neutral Influences are people who are not expected to strongly or consistently sway the offender in either a positive or negative direction. They are neither especially prosocial nor procriminal and they may have a mixture of both positive and negative features. Also included in this category are individuals with whom the offender has minimal emotional attachment or whose opinion he is likely to disregard. For relationships that have both positive and negative features evaluators should consider the overall balance and ask themselves, “Is this person likely to influence the offender in a prosocial or anti-social manner?” If you believe that they are primarily a prosocial influence, then they may be scored as a positive influence; if you believe that this person is primarily an anti-social influence then they should be scored as a negative influence. If the assessor remains unsure after considering all of the information, then the influence should be identified as neutral.

Special Considerations:

Children: An offender may identify his children as significant social influences, and although his children may be important to him, and possibly a reason why he wants to make positive changes, they are not expected to have a significant social influence over him. The nature of a parent-child relationship tends to place the parent in a position of authority, often into later years. For adult children (i.e., 20 years and older), their level of influence over the offender should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as you would other adult influences. Consider whether the child is in a position to give the offender advice, and whether or not there is an established pattern of the offender seeking advice or assistance from their son or daughter.

Parents: When offenders identify their parents as a significant social influence, consider the relationship the offender had with his parents prior to his arrest. Has he sought their advice or assistance in the past? What is the status of his relationship with his parents presently? An offender might identify his prosocial parents as a significant social influence but a review of collateral information may reveal that they have not had any contact in the past five years, or that he does not listen to their advice because he believes that they are always “nagging” at him, or that they have recently decided to withdraw their support from him as he approaches release. Also consider what forms of support the parents are able to provide. Although they may provide material support, such as money and a place to stay, their attitudes about his offending and what he needs to do to avoid future reoffending should also be weighed in determining whether or not they are a positive, neutral, or negative influence on his efforts to manage his risk.

Spouses: Consideration for the level of influence a spouse has over their partner is similar to that of parents. The assessor should appraise the nature of their relationship prior to the disclosure of the sexual offending. Did the offender's spouse have any influence over him? Did the offender

consider or value her or his opinion? In cases where the offender was domineering, controlling, or even abusive in the relationship, it is unlikely that the spouse had any significant influence on him and his decisions. When children have been victims, also consider how seriously the spouse views the offending and whether or not they are likely to facilitate victim access.

Gang Affiliations: Some offenders may openly discuss their affiliations with a gang; others may recognize the problematic nature of this type of social network and refuse to admit gang affiliations or identify fellow gang members as significant social influences. In the case of the latter, consider all available information and question the offender about the information from other sources. However, please note that for this item, the offender will need to identify specific people for you to evaluate. If they refuse to identify anyone, the assessor should make a note of the possible gang affiliation and outline concerns, but if the offender has not identified specific individuals it is not appropriate to make the generalized conclusion that because you believe an offender has gang affiliations that he “must have” negative influences and score him as such.

Employers: Offenders may cite their boss as a significant social influence. Given that this is a professional relationship, the threshold to count the employer is quite high. Their relationship would need to go beyond the context of work (e.g., discussion of personal matters, perhaps socializing outside the work setting). Most importantly though, you would need to be convinced that if their work relationship ended (e.g., the offender changed jobs), they would remain in regular contact.

Professionals listed as Significant Social Influences: Individuals that are paid to be in the presence of the offender, such as lawyers, social workers, psychologists or psychiatrists are not generally considered significant social influences. However, a professional could be counted in cases where the offender is suffering from a chronic psychiatric disorder or is developmentally delayed and the professional or care-giver is heavily involved in maintaining that offender in the community (not in the institution unless it is understood that the care-giver will move to the community when the offender is released). In such cases, the professional's involvement must be personal and “beyond the call of duty”, even if they are paid for some involvement with the offender. Clergy members are another possible exception. Generally, their job requires them to be in the presence of the offender (e.g., during Church services or functions) and to offer “support” to their congregation, but their job description is more flexible and there are some circumstances where you could conclude that a clergy member’s involvement with the offender has gone “beyond the call of duty” and can count on this item. Generally, to count a clergy member, you should be satisfied that if the offender left the congregation, the clergy member would still maintain contact with the offender.

Circles of Support and Accountability: If the offender has been involved in a Circle for an extended period of time the members of the Circle may be considered as significant social influences in the offender’s life if you believe they would be likely to continue contact with offender were the Circle to dissolve. The decision to be involved in Circles of Support and Accountability is often a lifelong commitment. The assessor should consider how long the offender has been involved in the Circle and the quality of his relationship with the volunteers.

No Significant Social Influences Identified: Some offenders may indicate that they have no one they feel they can go to for assistance or advice. This may be because they have generally lived an isolated or solitary life, because of mental illness, or may be the result of their friends and family rejecting them because of their sexual offending. It may also be that they are emotionally distraught and unable to identify people that they do have in their lives at the time of the assessment or that they are concealing their associations because they know that they are likely to be viewed as negative. For all of these reasons, it is important to probe the offender at various times during the interview in an effort to help the offender identify possible resources. Additionally, the assessor should pay attention to collateral information or to information that the offender provides during other parts of the interview. For instance, when discussing his leisure activities the offender may identify a friend that he speaks with on a regular basis and whose opinion he values. In this case the assessor should return to the item of Significant Social Influences and discuss whether this person should be included on the offender's list.

Over-inclusive List of Significant Influences: Some offenders may list everyone they know in an effort to demonstrate that they have an abundance of support, or they may want to identify their entire church parish as they expect that everyone will have a role in supporting them. In the case where an offender lists numerous people, the assessor should ask the offender to narrow the list to the people with whom he feels are the closest or identify only those to whom he has previously gone for advice. Realistically, most offenders will identify three to five people who are important to them and whose opinion would influence their behaviour. The assessor should limit the list to the eight most important people in the offender's life as a maximum.

4. Information Needed to Score this Item:

This item is scored primarily from the self-report of the offender during the interview. It is, however, important for the assessor to review all available collateral information in an effort to verify the information provided by the offender.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

Other potential sources of information include collateral interviews with supports in the community, any previous Psychological/Psychiatric assessments, documentation from prior incarcerations, school reports, institutional visitor logs, etc. The assessor should focus on consistencies in information regarding who the offender has identified as the important or influential people in his life. Additionally, the assessor should, when possible, seek confirmation regarding the nature and quality of the relationship the individuals identified as significant social influences have with the offender, in addition to the level and type of support they are willing to provide.

6. Scoring:

1. Use the chart that follows (p. 33), *List of Social Influences*, to help you identify the important social influences in the offender’s life and evaluate the type of influence each one is likely to have on the offender. This list will assist you with calculating the overall score for this item, as well as provide a list that can be reviewed at future assessments to see if the same individuals are still involved in the offender’s life.

2. Once this chart is completed, add up the total number of positive and negative influences. Neutral Influences are not included in the scoring of this item. The social balance is calculated by subtracting the negative influences from the positive influences. The value of the social balance can range from -8 to +8. For the STABLE-2007 scoring, it is recoded as follows.

To avoid addition errors, please refer to the following table, **Scoring Social Influences**. In the left-hand “Positive” column find the number of positive social influences identified in your assessment, then, in the “Negative” column find the number of negative social influences that is directly beside the box you previously identified in the “Positive” column, follow across to the column headed “Final Score” and that number is the final score for the item Significant Social Influences.

Scoring Social Influences

Positive	Negative	Final Score		
0	0		1	
	1 or more			2
1	0 or 1		1	
	2 or more			2
2	0	0		
	1 or 2		1	
	3 or more			2
3	0 or 1	0		
	2 or 3		1	
	4 or more			2
4	0, 1 or 2	0		
	3 or 4		1	
5 or more		0		
		No Problem	Some Problem	Definite Problem

List of Social Influences

Name:	Notes on Relationship/Influence:	Your Score		
		Positive	Neutral	Negative
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
Totals of Positive and Negatives:				

Example Scoring of Social Influences:

List of Social Influences

Name:	Notes on Relationship/Influence:	Your Score		
		Positive	Neutral	Negative
1. mom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>willing to provide material support (shelter, \$)</i> - <i>is shocked by son's behaviour</i> - <i>provided police with son's address during investigation</i> 	✓		
2. brother	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>has criminal record</i> - <i>abuses alcohol</i> - <i>refers to treatment in negative terms, believes it is a "joke"</i> - <i>believes that his brother is innocent and blames the victim</i> 			✓
3. son	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>lives in another city, attending college</i> - <i>unable to visit due to distance</i> - <i>is "disgusted" by father's behaviour</i> 		✓	
4. Bob (neighbour)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>neighbourhood BBQs</i> - <i>shares similar interests</i> - <i>prosocial/no criminal record</i> - <i>unaware of sexual offences & criminal record</i> 		✓	
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
Totals of Positive and Negatives:		1		1

Now, total the number of positive influences and total number of negative influences and compare them to the chart labelled **Scoring Social Influences**. The total number of Positive Influences is "1" and the total number of Negative influences is "1". When you line that up and look across to the column headed "Final Score" that gives you an overall rating of "1" on this item identifying "some" concerns in this area.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

Who are the important people in your life? How long have you known them? When was the last time you spoke to them? How often do you speak to them?

In what ways will they be able to offer you support? What kind of support are they offering you now? What kind of support will they be able to give you when you are released?

What sorts of problems have they helped you with in the past? What sorts of problems have you helped them with? Have they ever been in trouble with the law (criminal histories)? Do they use alcohol or drugs? Have they ever been accused of committing a sexual offence?

Do they know about your offences? How do they feel about your offending? How do they feel about your sentence length? How do they feel about the way you have been treated by the criminal justice system?

How do they feel about treatment? How do they feel about conditions or restrictions associated with your arrest or sentence?

8. Cross References:

Lack of Concern for Others
General Social Rejection
Capacity for Relationship Stability

9. Scoring Profiles:

- 0 Mr. Smith named his mother, brother, and pastor as his current sources of social and emotional support. He related that he speaks with these individuals frequently and noted that they are fully apprised of the circumstances of his past and current offences. The Community Assessment report stated that Mr. Smith's mother and brother reported having a "very good relationship with the offender" and "in no way do they condone his behaviours." The report notes that the contacts want Mr. Smith to get help for his offending behaviour and are committed to helping him remain offence free. (Mother and brother are positive, and the pastor is neutral resulting in two positive, zero negative, for an item score of "0" – no problem.)
- 1 Mr. Arnold described three friends as his current sources of social and emotional support. He related that he does not have current contact with these individuals but noted that he intends to contact them in the near future. He described these friends as prosocial individuals he has known for a number of years. Mr. Arnold indicated that he plans on residing with one of his friends upon release, however noted that this individual is in poor physical health. The Community Assessment report noted that this individual is in hospital and is not expected to be discharged in the near future. Although there is no information to suggest that these associates would negatively influence the offender through involvement in criminal activity or denial or justification of his offending

behaviour, this area remains of some concern as the extent of their support and contact remains uncertain. (All three contacts have little connection with the offender, and would all be scored as neutral resulting in zero positive, zero negative, and three neutral, for an item score of “1” – loner, weak social connections.)

or

Mr. White identified four individuals that he considered significant social influences – his mom, brother, his adult son, and a neighbour, “Bob”. Mr. White indicated that his mom is willing to provide him with a place to live and will also support him financially until he is able to obtain his own place. File information reveals that his mom was shocked by his behaviour and cooperated with the police investigation. She provided them with her son’s current address and encouraged him to turn himself into police. Mr. White reported that he and his brother are very close, although he acknowledged that his brother might not be the best influence on him at times. Mr. White’s brother has a lengthy criminal history and has struggled with alcohol abuse for many years. He refuses to believe that his brother is guilty of the index offences and blames the victim for his brother’s legal difficulties. He also does not hold a positive view of treatment, describing it as a “joke”. Although Mr. White identified his son as a significant social influence, he also noted that his son is “disgusted” by his offences and that they have very little contact as a result of his son living in another city and being busy with college. Mr. White noted that he and his neighbour share similar interests and have associated with each other at neighbourhood barbeques. Mr. White does not believe that Bob has a criminal record, and related that he has not discussed his criminal record or index offences with him. (Mother is positive and brother is negative. Son and neighbour are neutral, resulting in a total of one positive, one negative and two neutrals, and a score of “1” for this item – see also worked example on p. 34.)

- 2 Mr. Jones identified his aunt, his gay partner Fred, and three friends Larry, Carl and Mike as his significant social influences. Mr. Jones reported a very close relationship with his aunt and identified her as “more like a mother than [his] real mother”. He has lived with her in the past but committed his current offences while he was residing with her and she was his surety for prior charges. Also, it is noted in the Community Assessment Report that Mr. Jones’ aunt has her hands full with caring for her ailing mother. Mr. Jones reported that Larry, Carl and Mike all have criminal records. Mr. Jones noted that Larry is a drug addict who has been in and out of jail for Break and Enters and Assaults. Contact with Larry has been minimal for several years, but they have increased contact recently. Mr. Jones admitted that Larry has serious life problems and that he is trying to help Larry “go straight”. Contact with Carl has also apparently been sporadic, and his current whereabouts are unknown. Mr. Jones indicated that Carl “moves around a lot” and has trouble with his family and the law. The nature of his criminal record is not known. Mr. Jones reported that he initially met Mike at a skateboarding conference, but then reconnected with him again while in jail. Mike is a recent addition to his circle of friends. According to Mr. Jones, Mike is currently serving time for sexual offences. Mr. Jones met Fred, his current partner, in a sexual offender treatment group in prison. Once they were both released, they identified themselves as gay lovers. Both deny any sexual contact while in prison, although it is difficult to verify when they became lovers.

Mr. Jones and Fred often hang out at the sailing school together, where Fred works part-time as an instructor. Fred has more money and is more socially skilled than Mr. Jones, and helps Mr. Jones with pragmatic tasks, such as finding an apartment, moving furniture and completing social insurance forms (aunt is positive, and Larry, and Mike are negative). Carl is not the type you want in Mr. Jones' life, but would be rated neutral due to limited contact. Fred is probably neutral due to a mix of negative and positive features: he provides pragmatic help, but his history as a sexual offender is cause for concern. (The assessor would need to probe further to determine whether Mr. Jones' risk would increase or decrease if Fred was no longer in his life resulting in one positive, two negative, two neutral; for an item score of "2" – definite problem.)

Item: Capacity for Relationship Stability

1. The Basic Concept:

This item is concerned with identifying those offenders who lack secure intimate adult relationships. This can be reflected by either an absence of intimate adult relationships, or by a history of short-term or dysfunctional relationships characterized by repeated conflict, abuse, or infidelity. A lack of stable relationships could be the result of the offender's inability to attract or maintain meaningful connections with adults, but could also be related to the offender's lack of interest or motivation to develop stable adult relationships. The presence of a secure adult relationship serves as a protective factor against sexual reoffence.

This item is scored in two parts – Part A and Part B. Part A considers whether or not the offender has ever lived in a stable relationship with an intimate partner for at least two continuous years. By “intimate” we specifically mean that the partners must have sexual contact as part of their relationship; simply living together or being “roommates” does not count. Using the scoring table, if an offender has never had an intimate (sexual) relationship that included living together with that same partner for at least two continuous years, the assessor would score the offender with a “no” on Part A. If the offender has had an intimate (sexual) relationship that included living together with the same partner for at least two continuous years, the assessor would score the offender with a “yes”. Please refer to the *Issues to Consider* section for exclusions or special considerations. Note that the criteria for Part A are the same as the criteria for the STATIC-99 item “Ever Lived with a Lover for Two Years”. The STATIC-99 criteria are reproduced as Appendix E.

For Part B, the assessor should evaluate the quality of the offender's *current* relationship. The three possible selections when scoring Part B are: “no current relationship”, “poor relationship/not yet established or non-cohabitating”, and “acceptable relationship”. Please refer to the scoring chart that follows in the *Issues to Consider* section.

2. Research:

This item has strong empirical support. Research has demonstrated that the relative risk for sexual reoffence is lower in men who have been able to develop and maintain an intimate adult relationship, suggesting that having this prolonged intimate connection to someone is a protective factor against sexually reoffending (Hanson & Bussière, 1998). Conversely, a lack of emotionally intimate relationships with adults has been shown to have a significant relationship with recidivism in the two major meta-analytic studies (Hanson & Bussière, 1998; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004). In the DSP this item predicted recidivism in a linear fashion (Hanson et al., 2007). It has been suggested that a lack of any interest or motivation in developing a stable relationship could be an indication of atypical sexual interests (Blanchard & Bogaerts, 1997), and a history of problematic relationships may be an indication of poor emotions management or an attachment disorder (Mann, Hanson, & Thornton, 2010).

3. Issues to Consider:

PART A: This subsection is concerned with evaluating whether or not the offender has the interest as well as the ability or personality to attract and maintain a relatively stable “marriage-like” relationship. The scoring of this part of the item is the same as for the STATIC-99 item “Ever Lived with a Lover for Two Years” (see Appendix E). The gender of the partner does not matter. The offender must have, however, lived with their partner in a relationship that involves consensual sexual relations for at least two continuous years. Also note, the relationship has to have been a romantic/sexual relationship for at least two years. Living together as friends or roommates for two years prior to a relationship developing would not count toward the two year criteria. The relationship must be a “marriage-like” relationship for the entire two year (or more) window. Legal marriages of less than two years do *not* qualify.

Two year relationships that do not qualify:

There are some instances when a relationship of two years or more would not qualify on this item. These include:

- prison marriages (of any duration) where the offender is incarcerated during the term of the relationship
- prison lovers
- illegal relationships (i.e., incestuous)
- relationship with victims (including consenting adult relationships with victims who were under the age of consent when their sexual relationship began)
- offender and/or partner not yet of age to marry

Prison Marriages: Relationships that begin within two years prior to incarceration or while the offender is incarcerated do not qualify on this item, regardless of length, because by virtue of the offender's incarcerated status, the couple is not able to live together. The relationship would, however, qualify if the couple remains living together for two or more years after the offender is released to the community.

Abusive Relationships/Victims: Relationships with victims of sexual offences would normally not qualify on this item. However, if it has been established that the victim and the offender were involved in a non-abusive relationship for at least two years duration before the onset of the sexual offence, then this relationship would qualify. If it is established that the sexual offending began before the victim and the offender had lived together for two years, the relationship would not qualify regardless of the length of time they lived together.

Physical abuse in the relationship would not normally negate counting the couple as living together. If the abuse is serious, however, the evaluator can make a judgement that the abuse has effectively ended the “marriage-like” quality, as when a woman stays because she is a captive in her own house. When partners remain in relationships with their abusers because they lack the financial, emotional, or physical resources to leave it is very different than partners who freely choose to stay. As noted earlier, this item is focused on determining whether or not the offender has the personality or characteristics necessary to attract and maintain an appropriate and stable “marriage-like” relationship.

Young: The assessor may encounter the situation that the offender has been incarcerated for most of their life or is still quite young and has not had the opportunity to establish an intimate relationship of two years. The offender would still be scored as not having lived with a partner for two years. Research has suggested that having a prolonged stable relationship is a protective factor against sexual reoffense. The specific reason for the absence of this protective factor, such as young age, does not alter the risk.

Celibacy: Monastics, Priests, Bishops, and others who have chosen a life of celibacy are not exempt on this item and are scored as not having lived with a partner.

Extended Absences: There may be some cases where the offender has been away from the home for extended periods of time due to their employment (e.g., working on oil rigs or fishing vessels, military assignment overseas) and would not have spent two continuous years living with their partner. In these instances, there is some room for flexibility and the offender could be rated as having lived with a partner for two continuous years despite the periods of time away from the “marital” home. In these instances, the assessor must consider the nature and overall commitment of the relationship. Determine whether the offender is committed to their partner and remains in the relationship because of an intimate connection, as opposed to remaining in the relationship out of convenience or until they have the time or resources to end the relationship. If the offender and his partner have an established relationship including more than three years together, then the periods away can be fairly substantial (i.e., six month military assignment). The accumulated time together should be greater than the time apart.

No Collateral Information is Available: There may be certain cases (immigrants, refugees from less developed countries) where it is not possible to access collateral sources or official records. If the assessor is unable to confirm the offender's self reported relationship history through collateral or official information and the offender's self report seems credible (history is consistent and plausible), then this item can be scored using self report only. It is, however, advisable to note that confirmation in this area was not available and that further assessment may be necessary. However, when accepting self report a high degree of scepticism is necessary. As risk assessment has penetrated the world of corrections it has become known to the large majority of sexual offenders that saying you have been in a “two year relationship” is “a good thing to say”. Be aware that the offender is most likely very aware of why you are asking and that answering in the negative will affect his risk score.

PART B: This subsection is concerned with evaluating the *quality or tenor* of the offender's current relationship. If the offender is currently not involved in a relationship, then the scoring is “no relationship”. If, however, the offender is involved in a relationship, then the assessor should ask a number of questions to assess the quality of that relationship beyond asking the offender if he considers the relationship to be a good one. In some cases, although the offender and his partner may have been together for a considerable amount of time, the relationship may be viewed as problematic or troublesome. Some indications that there may be problems include infidelity, routine affairs, lack of intimacy (including no sex), abuse (e.g., physical, emotional, sexual, psychological), inequitable relationships, not discussing problems, keeping secrets, and frequent arguments or separations. There may also be indications from either the offender or from his partner that they do not think the relationship will last. In these cases, the relationship is viewed as “poor” and the assessor will score the offender as having “poor/not yet established or not cohabitating”. This category also encompasses newly established relationships, where the offender and his partner have not yet been together long enough to demonstrate a stable “marriage-like” relationship, or in cases where there is a stable dating relationship history that has not involved living together. Newly established relationships of a few months or less should be evaluated as to their relative stability, meaning do you expect them to still be together at the next assessment in six to 12 months?

The third category, “acceptable”, is used to capture those relationships that are assessed as stable and committed, with no signs of obvious problems that would threaten the relationship. The relationship would be described by the offender, as well as his partner, as monogamous, intimate, equitable, free from abuse, and without recent separations.

Special rules apply to offenders whose period of incarceration is expected to exceed six months. The period of incarceration is estimated based on current sentence length and the typical expectations concerning conditional and statutory release in the jurisdiction. For offenders whose period of incarceration is less than six months, the incarceration is treated as an involuntary separation, similar to separations resulting from work or educational commitments; in these cases, the standard rules for evaluating the tenor of the relationship apply.

For offenders whose period of incarceration is between six and 24 months, the standard rules apply with the exception that to obtain a rating of “acceptable” the offender must have been in the relationship for two years prior to incarceration. As well, additional evidence is needed to determine whether they will resume an acceptable, stable relationship upon release. The current incarceration is expected to put some strain on the relationship. Nevertheless, it is possible to rate it as acceptable if the relationship appears stable and committed, as evidenced by the partner's involvement in the offender's case (i.e., regular contact, visits, participation in assessments). Furthermore, both parties must agree that they will be together when he is released to the community, and there is no compelling evidence otherwise.

For offenders whose period of incarceration is expected to exceed 24 months, it is unrealistic for the assessor to evaluate the tenor of their future relationship. Consequently, offenders can only receive a score for “no current relationship,” (a “2”) or “non-cohabitating” (a “1”). Relationships would be rated “non-cohabitating” based on a judgement that the relationship is likely to continue once the offender is released. If the relationship is unlikely to continue once the

offender is released, the offender is rated “2” or “no current relationship” because the relationship will not be a protective factor during his time at risk. This applies both to pre-existing relationships and to relationships started in prison (e.g., with prison volunteers). Except under exceptional circumstances (e.g., legal marriage in prison), relationships with other inmates started in prison would not be expected to continue upon release.

PART B Scoring Chart

Tenor of Current Relationship	Description/Features of Relationship:
No current relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No current intimate partner/single. - Offenders with a period of incarceration greater than two years and, if they are in a relationship, the relationship is unlikely to continue after release.
Poor, not yet established, or not cohabitating	<p>For offenders in the community and those with periods of incarceration of less than six months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although involved in a relationship, there may be indications of problems such as infidelity, affairs, lack of intimacy (including no sex), abuse (i.e., physical, emotional, sexual, psychological), inequitable relationship, not discussing problems, keeping secrets, frequent arguments, or separations. - May be involved in a stable dating relationship but has not yet lived together. - Relationship very new and/or has not yet demonstrated stability or ability to live together (e.g., relationship started while in prison or within a few months prior to incarceration). <p>For offenders with periods of incarceration of six to 24 months Previous stable relationship, currently unproblematic, but some uncertainty concerning the stability of their relationship upon release.</p> <p>Offenders with periods of incarceration of more than 24 months who are in a relationship that is expected to endure upon release.</p>
Acceptable	<p>For offenders in the community and those serving sentences of less than six months.</p> <p>Offender is involved in a mutually satisfying and committed relationship with no obvious signs of problems. The relationship involves cohabitation (currently, or were living together previous to incarceration and would otherwise still be living together).</p> <p>For offenders serving six to 24 months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They have previously co-habited for two consecutive years. - Strong evidence that the relationship is likely to continue to be stable upon release (e.g., his partner has confirmed support either verbally or through actions, such as regular contact through letters, telephone calls, and visits). The partner has demonstrated positive involvement in the offender's incarceration and rehabilitation efforts. <p>For offenders currently serving 24 months or more, this rating is not possible.</p>

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

The offender's relationship history should be collected through an interview and then compared or evaluated against available collateral and official information.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

Collateral information, where available, will be important to assess the validity of the information provided by the offender during the interview. Other potential sources of information include collateral interviews with supports in the community, any previous psychological/psychiatric assessments, police reports or documentation from prior sentences. The assessor should focus on consistencies in information from various sources regarding the length, quality, and nature of his relationship (e.g., records of visits and correspondence, interviews with other family members). Additionally, the assessor should, when possible, seek confirmation from the partner themselves of the length, quality, and nature of the relationship and look for consistencies with the information provided by the offender.

6. Scoring:

Use the scoring table that follows and by answering both Part A and Part B, determine an overall score of 0, 1, or 2.

Scoring Table

Capacity for Relationship Stability		
<u>Part A</u> Lived Two Years with a Partner	<u>Part B</u> Tenor of Current Relationship	Final Score On this Item
No	No Current Relationship	2
No	Poor/Not yet established or Non-Cohabiting	
No	Acceptable	1
Yes	No Current Relationship	
Yes	Poor/Not yet established or Non-Cohabiting	
Yes	Acceptable	0

7. Sample Interview Questions:

Relationship History/Ever Lived With An Intimate Partner:

How many serious relationships have you been involved in over the years? (Names, dates, length of relationships)

Did any of them involve living together? How long? (Married, common-law)

Did your relationship change when you moved in together? How about your sexual relationship? (Looking for the onset and end of sexual intimacy)

Who ended the relationship? Why? (If s/he ended it, did you agree/understand his/her reasons?) (Canvass for a history of physical/emotional/sexual abuse.)

Tenor of Current Relationship:

Are you currently involved in a relationship? (Married/common-law/newly established?)
What is their first name? How long have you been together? How long have you lived together?
Was this the longest you have ever lived with a partner?

What qualities do you look for in a partner? Are these qualities hard to find?

How does s/he feel about your current incarceration? Do you think that the relationship will last throughout your incarceration? What makes you think this? How often do you have contact (letter/phone/visits)?

Do you feel emotionally close to your partner?

All couples have problems from time to time or issues that they need to work out. What kinds of problems did you have in your relationship? What did you do about them? Are these issues that you still need to deal with?

Have you ever done something to hurt or scare your partner? (Canvass for a history of physical/emotional/sexual abuse.)

Have family or friends ever intervened/interfered with your relationship?

Have the police ever been called to the home?

If no current relationship, explore reasons behind being single. Is it his choice? Did he recently end a relationship?

8. Cross References:

Significant Social Influences
Hostility Toward Women

9. Scoring Profiles:

0 Mr. Harris and his spouse have lived together for the past 12 years. They both report sharing a happy and healthy sexual relationship. They share many interests and spend much of their leisure time with each other. Mr. Harris' spouse has voiced her support for her husband and has maintained regular contact with him during his incarceration (he is serving two years less a day). A review of the institutional visiting log revealed that she has visited him at least once per week for the past three months. Mr. Harris reported that he calls his spouse daily, and also writes letters to her on a fairly regular basis.

1 Mr. Beckton is currently single. Prior to his arrest for the index offences he was involved in a common-law relationship of over ten years. His former partner reported that she was shocked by the offences, as she believed they shared a positive and loving relationship. She also noted that she is not interested in reconciling the relationship.

2 Mr. George is not currently involved in a relationship. A review of his relationship history revealed that all of his live-in relationships have been less than two years.

or

Mr. Stoness and his spouse have been married for the past three years. Mr. Stoness has been convicted of physically and sexually assaulting his spouse over a period of two years. She eventually reported the assaults to police at the urging of her family and is currently in the process of divorcing Mr. Stoness.

Item: Emotional Identification with Children

1. The Basic Concept:

For some child molesters, part of their sexual attraction to children includes a feeling of being **emotionally connected to children**. The offender who emotionally identifies with children may find children less judgemental, more understanding, and easier to relate to than adults. He may be childlike himself in terms of his interests and leisure activities (spending time at or working at parks, daycares, swimming pools, or playing primarily child-oriented video games, seeing children's movies or television shows, reading child-oriented comic books, being involved in children's sports leagues) or he may describe childhood as a “special time”, which he attempts to re-live through his contact with children and engaging in acts and pastimes of a juvenile nature. He views children as “friends” and enjoys their company more than that of adults. This is different from the normal parent-child relationship. Parents may feel emotionally close to their children and may be involved in their activities, but the roles are clearly differentiated and the parent's primary personal interests are adult-oriented.

In some cases, the offender may describe the sexual abuse of the child victim as if he and the victim were involved in an equal and reciprocal relationship. He may state that he was “in love” with the victim or that they were “in love” with each other and he may attribute adult-like qualities, such as maturity, to the child victim.

2. Research:

Some child molesters feel particularly comfortable around children has been observed for many years (Araji & Finkelhor, 1986; Hammer & Glueck, 1957). Wilson (1999) elaborated on the modern concept of emotional congruence with children. According to Wilson, child molesters, **particularly those with victims outside the family**, often feel that their relationships with children are more emotionally satisfying than their relationships with adults. Subsequent research has supported this variable as a recidivism risk factor. Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2004) found that emotional congruence with children, which they renamed emotional identification with children, was significantly associated with recidivism. In the Bridgewater study, Knight and Thornton (2007) found that emotional identification with children was related to recidivism among child molesters but not rapists. The DSP supported a significant but non-linear relationship between emotional identification with children and sexual recidivism for the total sample of child molesters. However, the variable was not related to any type of recidivism for rapists or for those with unrelated teen victims in the Hanson et al. (2007) study. Similar results were found in the Bridgewater study (Knight & Thornton, 2007). Consequently, emotional identification with children should only be considered to be a risk factor for child molesters, and not for other types of sexual offenders.

3. Issues to Consider:

On this item the assessor is assessing the offender's self-reported thoughts and feelings about children and childhood as well as his behaviour in terms of work and leisure activities. It is important to consider this item within the context of the offender's lifestyle. Some offenders appear to have simply “never grown up”. They may live in their parents' home well into adulthood, in a room that is filled with child-oriented items such as video games targeted to kids, comic books for kids, and toys. An offender who does not have children of his own but has items that would be attractive to children in and around his home (e.g., a play structure in the backyard, child-oriented video games in the living room, popsicles in the freezer) or spends considerable time involved in children's activities, such as sports teams or clubs (e.g., cub scouts) would be more likely to score highly on this item than the offender who has children of his own. Any one of these manifestations would not be enough in itself to score highly. Those with Emotional Identification with Children will generally have multiple behaviours indicating special interest in children. For example, a man who collects children's car models or some other “toy” but has no other indicators would generally score a “0”. In the case of an offender who is involved in children's sports teams and clubs, the assessor should assess the offender's role within these venues. Is he a spectator at events without having a recognized association with one of the involved children? Is he directly involved with an organization? Is he primarily responsible for organizational tasks (e.g., scheduling, ordering equipment, and securing venues) or does he engage in activities that ensure direct contact with the children? If the offender is a parent himself, then consider the broader context of his social activities. Does he have additional age-appropriate friendships and social activities or is he heavily invested in his children's lives, to the exclusion of peer-aged interests? Also look for whether the offender has meaningful and appropriate friendships with other adults, as this would suggest a lower score.

Offenders who score highly on this item will often demonstrate indicators in many areas of their life: their work may be child-focused or allow for access to children, as well as their choices of activities and entertainment (watching juvenile gymnastics or choice of television programs), and they may choose to live in a neighbourhood with many children. Under Significant Social Influences the assessor should note whether the offender identified any non-related children as important to him and ask specifically about these relationships, in terms of how he views both the children and his relationship to them. In particular the assessor should look for attributions of adult-like qualities to the children (e.g., “she is very mature for her age”; “she was more like a wife than a daughter”; “she understood me better than my wife”; “children see the real person and do not judge you by how you look or how much you weigh”; “children speak the truth and have no hidden agendas”).

Offenders whose only motivation to creating a “child-friendly” persona or environment is to groom potential victims should receive a score of “1” on this item. An example would be the offender who provides soda pop and candy to children to gain their interest and trust, but does not have child-oriented items or demonstrate child-like behaviours in other domains, such as at work, or as part of leisure activities. In these cases the goal of the grooming behaviour is utilitarian in nature; that is, the goal is sexual gratification rather than finding emotional satisfaction in relationships with children.

Offenders with Adolescent or Teenage Victims: Emotional Identification with Children is only scored for offenders with at least one victim 13 years old or younger, and it focuses on the behaviours and interests of that age group (children less than 14 years old). Evaluators, however, should also consider identification with older children (teenagers), particularly when the activities and interests would overlap with those of interest to children less than 14 years old (e.g., hanging at shopping malls or arcades). Offenders who engage in activities associated with later adolescence/young adulthood would be expected to get a score of “0” on this item even if their behaviour was developmentally inappropriate (e.g., a 45 year old going “clubbing” with 18-19 year olds). Although this behaviour is concerning and likely related to the offenders’ offence behaviours, activities associated with later adolescence are not the focus of this item.

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

This item is scored primarily based on the offender's responses to questions during the interview. In addition, the assessor should review all available collateral information to gain a better sense of the offender, his interactions with children, and the perceptions that others have of his lifestyle and relationships to children. For the offender who has continued to live in his parents' home, collateral interviews with parents can provide important information about the offender's leisure and social activities and the content of his room within the household. A review of the offender’s relationship history may reveal that he has a history of “befriending” single mothers for access to the children.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

Collateral information (where available) will be important to assess the validity of the information provided by the offender during the interview. Other potential sources of information include collateral interviews with supports in the community (e.g., parents, friends), any previous psychological/psychiatric assessments, police reports, or documentation from prior sentences. The assessor should focus on information that provides insight into the offender's perceptions and relationships with children as well as how he chooses his work and leisure time.

6. Scoring:

- N/A All of the victims of the offender’s sexual offences were aged 14 or older.
- 0 Offender has quality adult friendships and spends work and leisure time involved in age-relevant and appropriate activities.
- 1 Offender has minor, yet noticeable, interest or investment in relationships with children and his relationships with adults appear immature. Offender attributes adult-like qualities (maturity) to children or perceives children as having a special ability to understand or communicate that he does not see in adults. Offender appears overly invested in the activities of his children, beyond a normal parental role.

- 2 Offender prefers the company and activities of children to adults. The offender appears childlike himself and engages in child-oriented leisure and possibly work-related activities. Offender considers children to be his friends and may perceive them to have adult or adult-like qualities.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

What do you like to do in your spare time? What movies do you enjoy? How do you relax when you are not working? What are your favourite TV programs?

Are there any children in your life that you consider your friends? How do you know them? What types of activities do you do together? How do their parents/guardians feel about your friendship with them?

Sometimes people feel more comfortable around children (or “younger people”) than they do around adults because they feel that children are more understanding or accepting of them. Have you ever felt that way? Tell me more about that.

Do you find it easy to talk to children?

In your experiences, have you found it easier to start a conversation with someone who is around your own age or with a child (or teenager)?

If you had a choice between spending time with a child doing something they enjoyed, such as playing video games or going to the playground, or spending time with an adult, which would you decide to do?

What did you enjoy about spending time with the victim(s)? What did you do together? Who suggested the activities that you engaged in with the victim(s)? What was your role in those activities?

What do you perceive the role of a parent to be in their child’s activities?

Who are you most looking forward to seeing when you get out?

8. Cross References:

Significant Social Influences
General Social Rejection/Loneliness
Capacity for Relationship Stability

9. Scoring Profiles:

- 0 Mr. Morden reported that he prefers the company of adults to children. He is involved in several adult-oriented leisure activities including car racing and being a member of a bowling team. He works as a mechanic in a repair shop and states that he never interacts

with children at work. He noted that his only interaction with children other than his own is when his children have friends over to their house. Mr. Morden indicated that his wife is primarily responsible for childcare but that he will supervise the children and their friends if his wife has to go out.

- 1 Mr. Potter maintained that he prefers the company of adults but that his commitment to his children's activities limits his ability to interact on a regular basis with a peer-aged group. Mr. Potter coaches both his son's and daughter's competitive soccer teams. Most of his weekends are filled with practices or tournaments. He is described as a highly attentive coach, who quickly learns the names and characteristics of the children. In contrast, he has little contact and little interest in their parents, and typically refers to them in conversation as "John's Dad" or "John's Mom". When not involved in soccer, Mr. Potter spends time with his wife and children and sometimes his brother, with whom he described having a close relationship.

or

Mr. Carter described mostly acquaintance-type relationships with adults. He said that he spent most of his free time with his daughter, who he described as an "exact replica" of his wife when she was younger. However, in contrast to his wife, Mr. Carter said that his daughter would listen to him and was more sensitive to his needs. He said that when he came home from work his daughter would bring him a drink and make dinner while his wife was at work. Mr. Carter commented that he confided in his daughter and that she offered him support. Over time Mr. Carter said he felt like he "fell in love" with his daughter and considered her to be equivalent to a wife.

- 2 Mr. Fairview stated that he finds children to be less judgemental and more accepting than adults. He indicated that he does not have any close adult friendships but that he considers several of the neighbourhood children to be his friends. Mr. Fairview maintained that he has more interests in common with children than with adults, including playing video games and reading comic books. He commented that "children are a lot smarter than most adults think". He added that he finds it difficult to create friendships with adults as he feels he is unattractive and is unsure what to say.

Item: Hostility Toward Women

1. The Basic Concept:

Rapists and child molesters may hold negative and/or hostile beliefs about women. In both cases this may impair their ability to form warm, close, and egalitarian relationships with women. These deficits can be expressed as sexist attitudes, stereotypically traditional beliefs about women and their roles, or simple outright hatred of women based upon a number of cognitions including perceptions of past wrongs and beliefs that women are unfairly advantaged. The offender may have relationships with women, but these relationships are adversarial and/or marked by conflict and serious power imbalances and/or are exclusively sexual in nature. Offenders may feel that women should be regarded with suspicion and believe women's intentions are often malevolent (e.g., women are “gold diggers”, “use sex as a weapon”, or “try to get men in trouble”). They may consider women to be inferior, not worthy of trust or respect, and they may believe that women's opinions should be disregarded. Women may be seen as a separate and less valued “class” of individuals or may be viewed exclusively as sexual objects (e.g., males and females cannot be platonic friends; women are only good for sex). Offenders from cultural backgrounds that promote traditional roles for women are not exempt from this item. The assessor should be aware that hostility toward women will generally be pervasive in many domains of the offender's life: at work, in leisure activities, and in most social settings.

2. Research:

Malamuth and Brown (1994) note that the basis of this construct is the proposal that women, as a group, are insincere, deceptive, and hold malicious intent toward men. The belief is that women are not straightforward about their feelings and, consequently, expressions of sexual interest are likely subversive attempts to manipulate men. Males in the community who hold such beliefs are more likely to engage in sexual aggression (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes, & Acker, 1995; Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991). In a retrospective correlation study, Thornton (2002) found that hostile beliefs about women were more marked among sexual recidivists than first time offenders. In the DSP, Hanson et al. (2007) found a significant linear relationship between hostile attitudes toward women and all recidivism outcomes, with an AUC of 0.58 for sexual recidivism.

3. Issues to Consider:

It is important to remember that the assessor is evaluating the offender's *attitudes* toward women and, consequently, the score should not be based solely on the offender's prior behaviours. Although a significant history of perpetrating domestic abuse or other violence toward women may suggest the offender holds negative and/or hostile attitudes toward women, an offender should not receive a score of “2” based solely on this history. The assessor needs to question the offender regarding his beliefs about and attitudes toward women. If an offender with a documented history of violence against women is expressing only prosocial and egalitarian attitudes toward women then the assessor should challenge him on the inconsistencies between his expressed beliefs and his documented history of behaviour toward women.

Additionally the assessor should review the offender's history and assess the breadth of his violent behaviour toward women. An offender who has engaged in violence toward women in various contexts (e.g., violence against female strangers, acquaintances, friends, family members, and intimate partners) is more likely to hold generally negative and hostile views of women than an offender whose violence is limited to one context (e.g., domestic abuse within one relationship). Additionally, if the offender has a significant history of violence against both male and female victims, this is less likely reflective, although not necessarily exclusive, of negative or hostile attitudes that are specific to women.

During the interview the assessor should canvass how many women were involved in the offender's journey through the criminal justice system (i.e., female police officers, attorneys, judges, parole/probation officers). The assessor can then ask the offender his opinions of women in these roles and specifically ask him to compare them to males in similar roles. Additionally, the assessor should note if the offender identified any women as significant social influences and if not, probe as to why this is the case. Questions about family relationships and intimate relationship history will also provide information as to whether or not the offender has any warm and caring relationships with women in his life.

Some offenders report that they have few women in their lives primarily because they are employed in a male dominated industry and most of their social activities revolve around work-related friendships (e.g., construction). In these cases the assessor should ask how the offender would feel if he was required to work with women or have a woman as a supervisor. In particular, women in positions of authority may be a problem for an offender. Additionally, the assessor should canvass the offender's personal life for conflicts with women outside of the work context.

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

This item is scored primarily based on the offender's responses to questions during the interview. The assessor should review all available collateral information to gain a sense of the offender, his interactions with women, and the perceptions that women have of him.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

An official criminal history will provide some information regarding the offender's past interactions with women (e.g., documented history of domestic violence or other violence against women). The assessor should look for information that includes collateral interviews with others, and particularly women, that have had interactions with the offender. These could include intimate partners, neighbours, former employers or colleagues, family members, friends and associates. Additionally, police reports and institutional reports may provide information regarding the offender's interactions with women in various contexts, especially female police and correctional officers. It should be noted that a history of violent crimes against women is not necessary to score this item. Due to their general distaste for women, some offenders will structure their lives to avoid contacts with women and will be genuinely uncomfortable speaking with or interacting with women in the most innocuous settings, such as asking for directions or simple shop transactions.

6. Scoring:

- 0 Offender does not appear to hold negative or hostile attitudes toward women and identifies positive, including non-sexual, relationships with women in his life. Alternatively, the offender currently has no significant relationships with women but does not appear to hold negative or hostile attitudes toward women and does not appear to have conflicts with women. There may be a negative relationship with one woman in the offender's life, but other relationships with women generally outweigh this one negative.
- 1 Offender holds some sexist or stereotypically traditional attitudes towards women and their roles. Interactions with women are not adversarial or conflicted but tend to be uneasy or to involve significant power imbalances. There may be documented domestic abuse within the context of one relationship. The offender appears to have primarily sexual relationships with women that lack interactions reflective of a warm, caring and egalitarian relationship. A typical offender who scores "1" would display more than one of the above indicators. It is also possible to score "1" for a single, blatant indicator (e.g., domestic abuse).
- 2 Offender expresses negative, hostile and/or sexist attitudes toward women and their roles. There is evidence of conflict (which may or may not include overt violence) with a variety of women across several life domains, or there is little or no overt conflict but negative attitudes are pervasive, demonstrated in behaviour, and offence-related.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

Are there any women in your life that you feel close to? How does your partner feel about these friendships? Have you ever been sexually involved with any of these women?

Do you think that it is difficult for men and women to be friends without it becoming sexual or there being sexual tension between them? Why or why not?

Has anyone ever complained about your behaviour toward women? What were the circumstances?

Do you have any convictions for offences that involved women?

What are your experiences working with women? Have you ever had a female supervisor? How did you feel about that? What was your experience like?

Do you find that you need to change the way you speak or act when around women?
Can you provide some examples?

Have you ever had a woman make trouble for you? (i.e., Telling lies about you, making false accusations, interfering in relationships, having you fired from a job, etc.)

Do you think that some women will say or do anything just to get a man into trouble? How often do you think this happens?

Do you think that it is a good idea to have women involved in the criminal justice system? Why or why not? Were any involved in your case? Did they treat you fairly? Would things have been different if there had been men in these positions?

8. Cross References:

Significant Social Influences
Capacity for Relationship Stability

9. Scoring Profiles:

- 0 Mr. Rice identified a number of female friends and family members with whom he shares a positive and supportive relationship. He did not express negative or sexist views during the interview, and reported that he believes in relationships that are based on equality and mutual respect for one another. A review of Mr. Rice's criminal history did not reveal any prior convictions involving violence against women.
- 1 Mr. Barr's spouse reported a history of domestic abuse in their relationship, noting that her husband would patronize and demean her if dinner was not prepared to his liking or the house was untidy. He controlled the finances and made all of the important household decisions. Mr. Barr explained that he needed to be in charge of the finances, noting that his wife, like most women, was irresponsible with money. Outside of the home, Mr. Barr was noted to be a warm and caring individual. He worked as a high school teacher and was well liked by his peers and students. Female colleagues and neighbours described him as friendly, jovial, and always willing to help out when needed.
- 2 Mr. Travers has displayed a history of problematic relationships with several different women over a number of years. Three of his former intimate partners have described him as abusive and controlling towards them while involved in a relationship, as well as long after the relationship had ended. Female coworkers advised police during the investigation that Mr. Travers made them uncomfortable with his sexual comments and that when advised that his advances were unwanted, he became threatening and rude towards them. During interviews with his case management team, Mr. Travers expressed negative views towards the female officers involved in the investigation of his case, stating that "they were more interested in how their make-up looked than finding out the truth".

Item: General Social Rejection/Loneliness

1. The Basic Concept:

Loneliness is characterized by having no friends, having weak connections to others generally, and feeling that others do not care about you. The assessor's task is to evaluate how close the offender feels to others and his general capacity to make friends and secure adult attachments. The offender may have felt socially rejected by his peers and/or his family for most of his life. He may believe that others do not care about him and that he is alone in the world. Some offenders may not express their feelings of rejection but simply state that they feel lonely because their relationships are shallow or impersonal.

In contrast to the other STABLE-2007 items, General Social Rejection/Loneliness is primarily scored from the offender's perspective. Even if there are people in the offender's life who care about the offender, if the offender feels rejected and lonely, then the offender is scored as rejected and lonely.

On the other hand, some offenders may identify few, if any, close relationships, but report that they are happy with their circumstances and have no desire to increase their social contacts (i.e., the loner). If the offender has no close relationships and no subjective complaints of loneliness or rejection, then the offender would obtain the intermediate score of "1" on this item.

2. Research:

General Social Rejection/Loneliness is very common among sexual offenders, particularly child molesters (average $d = 1.02$; Whitaker et al., 2008). Although loneliness did not predict recidivism in six previous studies (see summary by Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004), this specific STABLE item did show the expected relationship with recidivism in the DSP ($d = 0.35$). The DSP results were significantly different from the previous studies and when the DSP results were added to the previous studies, the overall effect remains non-significant (average $d = 0.09$; Mann et al., 2010). This item was, nevertheless, included because of the theory linking it to sexually offending, and the finding that this particular approach to assessing rejection/loneliness was empirically related to recidivism.

3. Issues to Consider:

It is important to consider the current situation of the offender being assessed. It is not unusual for offenders to experience social and familial rejection following the disclosure of their offending behaviour and they may be experiencing feelings of loneliness that are attributable to this recent social upheaval. The assessor should ask about friendships and family relationships prior to the disclosure of the offending in order to evaluate the offender's general ability to create and maintain relationships. Additionally, incarcerated offenders may report that they feel lonely because they are separated from loved ones. This does not, however, reflect a lack of close relationships or an inability to create and maintain such relationships.

For the offender who chooses not to seek close relationships with others (i.e., the loner), consider their interactions with you as the assessor and ask questions about their interactions with peers. The assessor should evaluate whether they feel the offender in fact possesses the skills to create and maintain relationships but chooses not to do so, versus the offender who has been rejected by peers and maintains they do not want close relationships as a protective strategy.

Offenders should primarily be evaluated in terms of their relationships with adults (peers and family members). Friendships with children, victims or otherwise, are not considered evidence of the ability to attract and maintain appropriate relationships with peers.

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

The scoring of this item is based primarily on the offender's perspective and presentation during the interview; however, a review of available collateral information can provide additional evidence regarding how others perceive and accept him.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

Collateral information where available will be useful to assess the validity of the information provided by the offender during the interview. When scoring the STABLE-2007 on an offender who is currently incarcerated the assessor should check file information for any mention of people that are in contact with the offender and the assessor should check institutional visitor logs and phone logs to ensure that the offender is actually in contact with people he claims to be in contact with. These institutional checks and the information gleaned from them would also be used to evaluate Significant Social Influences. Other potential sources of information include interviews with supports in the community, any previous psychological or psychiatric assessments, and documentation from prior sentences.

6. Scoring:

- 0 The offender is generally well integrated socially considering his current circumstances and the process of upheaval inherent in having been identified as a sexual offender.
 - 1 The offender has some weak connections to others. He may have some short term casual relationships, but no long term friends. He may maintain contact with family members but does not appear to have close relationships with them.
- or
- The offender has no close relationships with others but reports he prefers this situation and does not feel lonely or rejected (i.e., the loner).
 - 2 The offender reports frequently feeling lonely and rejected. He cannot identify social supports and has little or no contact with family members. He may present as socially inept with poor skills for attracting and maintaining personal relationships.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

What did you do for employment in the community?

What about your job did you like?

How well did you know your coworkers? Did you socialize with them outside of the workplace?

How did you spend your leisure time? Were you involved in any community groups, sports teams or clubs? Did you attend church or other religious services? What are your hobbies?

Who are you closest to in the world?

Are there any friends you have had for a long time (more than five years)? How did you meet them?

How easy is it for you to make new friends? What common interests/hobbies do you have with others? What do you talk about when you are together?

Do you ever feel lonely? (Community vs. incarceration) What makes you feel that way? How do you cope?

Have you ever felt rejected by your community? What happened? How did you cope?

Have you ever felt rejected by your family? What happened? How did you cope?

Do you feel that other people care about you? Who?

Overall, do you feel as well liked or “popular” as most other people?

What would your friends say about you if I asked them?

8. Cross References:

Significant Social Influences
Capacity for Relationship Stability
Emotional Identification with Children
Lack of Concern for Others

9. Scoring Profiles:

0 Mr. Smith impressed as being well-integrated socially and described having a number of friends through his business and a local snowmobile club at which he is a member. He stated he often spent weekends snowmobiling with family and friends or socializing with friends from work. Mr. Smith did not present as lacking skill in forming friendships or connections with others.

or

Mr. Bernard described a limited social life outside his immediate family unit; however, he reported attending frequent functions within the Filipino community with his family. He stated that he and his wife have a number of acquaintances within this community and denied feelings of loneliness or rejection. He has known all of these people for many years.

1 Mr. Charbonneau described himself as a “loner” and indicated that he does not have any friends. However, he denied experiencing feelings of loneliness or rejection and stated that he prefers being alone.

or

Mr. Waring described having a number of friends in the community with whom he would “hang out and party”. He stated that he had lots of friends but that he felt isolated at times and felt disconnected from others. When asked, Mr. Waring stated that other than drinking and partying he could not think of a thing that he had in common with his “partying” friends.

2 Mr. Massey described social difficulties commencing at a young age. He stated that he was often teased and treated as an outcast by his peers as a result of his intellectual deficits and shyness. Mr. Massey reported during the commission of the current offences he felt significantly lonely and was unable to sustain friendships or connections with other adults.

or

Mr. Anton reported that although he had a “couple” of friends outside his immediate family unit, he has always felt significantly lonely and isolated. He reported that he spent the majority of his spare time by himself and became increasingly emotionally distant from his family over time.

Item: Lack of Concern for Others

1. The Basic Concept:

This item identifies the small subgroup of offenders whose lack of concern for others is widely evident in their lifestyle and behaviour. Their interactions are selfish, ruthless and indifferent to the rights and wellbeing of others. They are characteristically egocentric and their relationships with others are utilitarian, rather than reciprocal or affectively warm and caring. They are willing to be cruel to meet their own needs and are unconcerned about the impact of their behaviour on others or about hurting others. They are often focused on their own concerns to the point that they are totally unaware of the damage they do to others. This lack of concern for others is pervasive and will be present in virtually all of their relationships or interactions. They will generally be known for taking opportunistic advantage of others. This condition is fairly unusual and will not be present in all offenders. In a validation sample (n = 743), only 10.3 % of community-based offenders showed this problem.

2. Research:

Lack of concern for others significantly predicted sexual recidivism, with an AUC of 0.60 for ten year follow up and an AUC of 0.65 for a 15 year follow up in the Knight and Thornton (2007) Bridgewater study. In the Bridgewater study, lack of concern for others was measured using the Callous/Unemotional facet of the Psychopathy Checklist- Revised (Hare, 2003). In the DSP, Lack of Concern for Others showed a significant linear relationship to all recidivism outcomes (Hanson et al., 2007).

3. Issues to Consider:

Every person in society makes a distinction between their “in-group”, those people that they are close to and care about such as family and friends, and an “out-group” (i.e., everyone else). The size of the “in-group” can vary; for some it is very large, and for others it can be limited. Even the most decent and highly regarded people can be indifferent or cruel toward those in their “out-group” depending on the situation or their perception of that “out-group” as a threat or adversary. This item is concerned with identifying those offenders who demonstrate a lack of concern for not only their “out-group” (i.e., adversaries) but also towards their self-identified “in-group”. These people are prompt to take advantage of the misfortunes of others. Although they may identify some friends or acquaintances, they would not be expected to have stable or caring relationships with them, and are likely to be described as indifferent, unfeeling, or callous by their family and friends. As well, it is important to note that this item is not solely reflective of the offender's lack of concern or callousness towards their victim(s). All offenders have harmed their victim(s), and many lack remorse for their actions, but this alone is not enough for identifying a characterological lack of concern.

When questioned about their treatment of others, the offender may report having no interest in the feelings or opinions of others, or alternatively, may attempt to feign shallow displays of regret or remorse to impress the assessor. They may be described as lacking empathy or

sympathy towards others, and may present as cynical in outlook and disengaged from others. They may express general attitudes that you can't trust other people, so it's best to just look out for yourself. They may have a long and varied criminal history demonstrating a lack of concern or regard for the rights and well being of others and their personal property (e.g., a cross-section of offences including driving while under the influence, breaches of trust, stealing from family and friends, home invasions, bar fights, break and enters, robberies). This lack of concern may also be evident in reports from their family and friends indicating that they only contact them when they "want something", or that they are routinely disrespectful, selfish, and deceitful.

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

This item is scored based on the offender's presentation of himself and his interactions with others during the interview, as well as his answers to questions that specifically ask him about his consideration of others. In addition, the assessor should review all available collateral information, including his official criminal history, to gain a sense of the offender, his interactions with others, and the perception others have of him.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

The assessor should look for sources of information that include collateral interviews with others in the community that have had interactions with the offender. These could include neighbours, former employers or colleagues, family members, friends, or associates. The assessor should focus on others' descriptions of the offender and their relationships and interactions with the offender. The police reports or court documents may also provide information from others regarding their interactions with the offender.

6. Scoring:

- 0 The offender may be perceived as callous or indifferent towards another in limited and specific circumstances (i.e., toward their sexual offence victims but not beyond what would be expected given the adversarial nature of the legal process), but is generally sensitive to the views and needs of others. Most offenders scoring "0" would have an identifiable in-group with whom he is perceived as emotionally responsive, reciprocal in relationships, and caring. Offenders without a current in-group may also score "0" if they desire positive relationships with others, but are blocked by external circumstances or their own psychological limitations (e.g., extreme fear of rejection).
- 1 The offender is perceived as substantially callous in one context (i.e., callous towards their victim(s) beyond what would be expected as adversaries in the legal process or significant callousness within a business context), but shows warmth and concern in other relationships, such as towards family and long term friends. Alternatively, the offender is perceived as having a generalized lack of concern towards several others beyond solely their adversaries, but not towards their immediate family or close friends.

- 2 The offender is perceived as selfish, ruthless, and uncaring towards others. He does not have any close or caring relationships and those who would be expected to be close to him (i.e., immediate family, friends) have indicated that he is selfish, cruel, or indifferent towards them. He is indifferent about the effects of his behaviour has on others and is characterized as a “user” in collateral information.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

How do you think your decisions and behaviours affect other people?

How important is it for you personally to consider the feelings of others? What gets in the way of this?

Do you feel that others are concerned with your feelings? How do you feel about that? What do you do about that?

How would other people describe you? Do you think that their opinions of you are accurate? Are their opinions important?

How do you think your offending has affected the victim(s)? Their family and friends?
Your family and friends?

Who are you most looking forward to seeing once you are released? Why?

8. Cross References:

Significant Social Influences
Capacity for Relationship Stability
Hostility Toward Women
General Social Rejection
Negative Emotionality/Hostility

9. Scoring Profiles:

- 0 Mr. Shaw expressed a great deal of concern for his family and how his offences and the resulting criminal case have affected them. He also expressed remorse for his offending and noted that he would like to apologize to his victims and their families. Mr. Shaw noted that he intends to relocate following his sentence so that his victims will not have to worry about running into him on the streets. He stated that he would like to participate in a treatment program to address his sexual offending in an effort to avoid reoffence. Mr. Shaw has been described by his family as a caring and thoughtful individual.
- 1 Mr. Newman repeatedly interrupted the assessment interview with attempts at discrediting the victims and often referred to them in derogatory terms. He continuously pointed out the contributions he has made to the community because he is a successful businessman. He claimed that the victims are angry with him because they feel that he

defrauded them or their family members, but Mr. Newman noted that is the “cost of doing business”. On the other hand, numerous friends and family members have written letters of support for Mr. Newman stating that the offences are out of character for him and that he is a caring and considerate individual. Mr. Newman expressed concern for his family's wellbeing, noting that they are having a difficult time without him at home.

- 2 Mr. Mason's lengthy and diverse criminal history demonstrates a lack of concern for others in a variety of settings. He has been convicted of numerous home burglaries, several dangerous and impaired driving offences, as well as theft and fraud related offences. His family have cut ties with him, noting that the only time he visits is when he needs money or an address to provide to his probation officer. They have described him as being self absorbed, egotistic, and always acting in his own self-interest. His sister has reported that he is no longer welcome in her home after he stole her bank card and drained her account. Mr. Mason makes no apologies for his behaviour and remarked that his family is “over reacting”.

Item: Impulsive Acts

1. The Basic Concept:

This item is concerned with identifying those offenders who exhibit impulsive behaviour across a number of settings (e.g., financial, vocational, leisure, accommodation, personal relationships). It is not simply represented by the individual's history of sexual offending, but is generally a “character trait” and is typically evident from a relatively early age. These individuals generally have unstable lifestyles and their low self-control leads them to engage in risky behaviours with insufficient concern for the consequences. They are often easily swayed or tempted by opportunistic situations and will engage in behaviour that has a high likelihood of negative consequences with little forethought (e.g., thrill seeking behaviours with little regard for their own personal safety or the safety of others). They are easily bored and may be led into risky behaviours by others in an attempt to feel accepted or to integrate themselves into a group.

2. Research:

Lifestyle impulsiveness (a lifestyle dominated by impulsive, irresponsible decisions with a lack of realistic long term goals) is one of the most well-established correlates of criminal behaviour (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Lifestyle instability predicted sexual recidivism in Hanson and Morton-Bourgon’s (2004) meta-analysis, and this STABLE item (Impulsive Acts) predicted all types of recidivism (sexual and non-sexual) in the DSP. Lifestyle impulsiveness can also be seen as corresponding to Facet 3 of the PCL-R, which predicted serious sexual recidivism in the Bridgewater dataset (AUC = 0.63 for ten-year follow-up; Knight & Thornton, 2007). Employment instability and substance abuse history – both of which showed statistically significant, but small, relationships with sexual recidivism in Hanson and Morton-Bourgon’s (2004) meta-analysis – are also considered indicators of lifestyle impulsiveness.

3. Issues to Consider:

For this item, the assessor should look for examples of impulsive behaviour in a variety of settings including financial, vocational, leisure, accommodations, and personal relationships/interactions with others. To score a “2” on this item, the offender must demonstrate impulsive behaviours in two or more life domains. Consider the following life domains when assessing each area:

Financial: Ask the offender about his financial situation looking for examples of impulsive spending, overspending, or mismanagement in general. Does he live paycheck to paycheck? Is he overwhelmed with debt? Find out if his financial difficulties are related to impulsive spending sprees, giving of large gifts, or gambling debts. Does he often buy things and then wonder why he bought them? Does he give money or gifts impulsively in the hopes of “buying” popularity or inclusion in a group? Do others take advantage of him and encourage him to spend money recklessly but to their own advantage?

Vocational: Does the offender have a history of quitting jobs without having another one to go to? Does he engage in unsafe work practices (e.g., drinking or taking drugs while working, taking risks at work, not bothering to use safety equipment)? Is he easily bored at work and frequently changes jobs? In cases where there is a sporadic work history, the assessor should attempt to find out the reasons behind this to determine whether it is related to impulsive behaviour or related to other factors not captured by this item (i.e., incarceration, seasonal layoffs, etc). Does he have a history of quitting jobs because he did not like someone (e.g., his supervisor) at the worksite?

Leisure: Find out what the offender does when he is not working. Does he abuse substances or report a history of regular partying? Does he frequently engage in thrill seeking or risky activities such as street racing or skydiving or other “extreme sports”? Does he report accepting bets or dares? Does he look forward to “partying” and reports getting “wasted”, or “blasted”?

Accommodations: Does he live a transient lifestyle, moving from place to place? Does he move without giving notice or telling anyone? Does he tend to “crash” with friends?

Personal Relationships/Interactions with Others: Does he report a history of fighting and in particular does he report a history of starting fights with men bigger than himself? Does he report frequently breaking plans with friends or not honouring obligations because something else came up at the last minute? Does he become easily bored resulting in frequently changing groups of friends or relationships? Does he have any long-term friendships, or are most of his relationships with people he has recently met?

Other: Does he have a history of reckless or dangerous driving (e.g., high rates of speed, driving in the wrong direction, playing “chicken” with other drivers, “road rage”). Does he report a history of shoplifting or stealing from family, friends or coworkers? Does he have a lengthy criminal history comprised of opportunistic types of offences, such as break and enters?

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

This item is scored using information provided both by the offender during the present interview, as well as any available collateral information.

During the interview, it will be important for the assessor to ask a wide variety of questions that cover the different life domains (work, school, home, friends [what types of people he likes to be friends with], and recreational activities).

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

Collateral sources of information can include previous interviews with the offender (e.g., previous Psychological/Psychiatric Assessments, Presentence Reports, or Police Reports), as well as prior supervision reports or information from prior incarcerations (e.g., incident reports), or interviews completed with others who know the offender, such as family members, friends, or employers. An official criminal history should also be reviewed for convictions related to drug offences, street racing, shoplifting, and break and entering, etc.

6. Scoring:

- 0 No problems, or impulsive behaviour is limited to sexual misbehaviour. The offender lives a relatively stable lifestyle and does not appear to be impulsive.
- 1 The offender engages in occasional impulsive behaviour in one or more settings, but also has some areas of his life that are stable (e.g., stable work history or stable accommodation) or has had periods of stability during his life. Impulsive behaviour may center around a hobby or an interest, such as the impulsive buying of articles for a hobby or interest that would seem non-affordable given the offender's present circumstances (model cars, comic books) but other than that one area the offender's life seems well regulated.
- or
- Repeated high risk behaviour in only one context or life domain (e.g., frequently gambles but no other obvious impulsive acts).
- 2 Frequent impulsive behaviour in “more than one” life domain or setting (beyond their sexual offending).

7. Sample Interview Questions:

What are you most looking forward to doing once released?

Do you consider yourself to be impulsive? What types of things do you do impulsively or on the spur of the moment?

Do you ever do things on the spur of the moment and then wonder why you did them?
How often does this happen?

Do you ever buy things that you really cannot afford or really do not need?

Have you ever got really mad if someone cut you off in traffic? What did you do?

Have you ever taken something without permission or paying for it because you just wanted it?
How often does this happen?

Have you ever had difficulty managing your money? Do you live paycheck to paycheck? Do you have any savings? Any debt? How often do you spend your welfare check before you qualify for the next one?

Have you ever gotten into a bar-fight? How often does this happen?

Have you ever quit a job without having another one to go to? How often do you change jobs? What are usually the reasons for this? Have you ever been fired for breaking the rules at work or for engaging in unsafe practices? Have you ever hurt yourself or someone else at work?

Do you like exciting pastimes such as street racing, skydiving, or “extreme sports”? Have these activities ever led to a trip to the emergency department or admission to hospital?

How many different residences have you lived in over the years? What were the reasons for moving? Have you ever moved without giving notice or providing family or friends with a forwarding address?

Have you ever bought things and then wondered why you bought them?

Have you ever stolen anything that you didn’t really need?

How often do you gamble? Has your gambling ever caused you problems?

Have you ever had a disagreement with an unreasonable colleague/co-worker that led to a shoving match at work?

How often do you drink alcohol or use drugs? Have you ever had a problem with drugs or alcohol? Has anyone ever complained about your use of alcohol or drugs?

Do you ever find yourself making plans with others and then not showing up? What were the reasons for not showing up? Did something better come up at the last minute?

8. Cross References:

General Social Rejection
Poor Cognitive Problem Solving

9. Scoring Profiles:

- 0 Mr. Smith did not report a history of engaging in impulsive or high risk behaviours. He has been married to his current wife for the past 25 years. He was gainfully employed at the time of his arrest, noting that he has worked for the same company for the past 18 years. He also did not report any financial difficulties, commenting that he always paid his bills on time and owned his own home. Mr. Smith did not report a history of substance abuse or “partying”, and reported that he enjoys woodworking in his spare time.
- 1 Mr. Henry described himself as “sometimes” impulsive, noting that he spends impulsively and often wonders afterwards why he made the purchases. He also related that his spending habits have caused him financial concerns, in that he was unable to pay the minimum balance on his credit card and worries about his future credit rating. Mr. Henry reported that he had worked at the same hardware store for the past four years

and is hopeful that he will be able to find employment in a similar line of work once released. Prior to that, Mr. Henry held a variety of unskilled, seasonal jobs. He has never lived on his own and was still living at home with his parents at the time of his arrest. Although a review of criminal history did reveal a prior conviction for driving while under the influence, Mr. Henry claims that he no longer drinks and drives and there is no information to suggest that he has engaged in this type of behaviour in the past eight years.

- 2 Mr. Hancock reported a significant history of substance abuse, noting that it was not uncommon for him to miss work because he was hung over or receive treatment for injuries sustained during a bar fight. When asked about his history of fighting, Mr. Hancock stated that he feels he cannot back down from a fight as it would make him look like less of a man. He added that it is common for other men to pick fights with him when he attends bars on the weekends because when he becomes intoxicated he can be “obnoxious”. In terms of his employment, Mr. Hancock stated that he was never worried about being fired, claiming that he would quit before they could have the satisfaction of firing him and “I can find work anywhere”. He also provided an example of a time when he quit a job without another one to go to because his employer refused to give him a raise. His criminal record includes a number of convictions and charges for driving under the influence, driving without insurance, and driving without a licence. Mr. Hancock also has a conviction for street racing. He indicated that another man challenged him to a street race and he finds it difficult to turn down a challenge or a dare.

Item: Poor Cognitive Problem Solving

1. The Basic Concept:

Offenders are at increased risk for recidivism if they have difficulty identifying and solving everyday problems. They may fail to accurately identify the problems they have, believing that their situation is “normal”, that their life is similar to what they saw growing up, or that any difficulties are solely the result of other people’s behaviour. They may believe that they do not need to make any changes to the way they live their life. As a result they may have difficulty identifying future obstacles or problems that they could encounter. When presented with a problem, individuals with this deficit may dismiss the issue for themselves, voice the expectation that others need to change instead of themselves propose unrealistic solutions, or have difficulty generating any alternatives to resolve the problem. When competing possible options are presented, they will typically choose the easiest solution or the one with the most immediate “pay off” instead of evaluating the pros and cons of different options. Offenders with this behaviour often have problems with perspective-taking and have limited skills in evaluating the likely intermediate and long-term consequences of actions. They may view criminal activity as an easy and acceptable or viable alternative to dealing with a problem and, as a result, repeatedly place themselves in high risk situations. Offenders with deficits in this area routinely dismiss or fail to recognize the likely consequences of their actions, even when their intended actions are likely to make their problems worse. They often have difficulty following through on stated intentions, give up easily when faced with even minor obstacles, and lack long-term plans and vision. This problem constitutes a generalized skill deficit and, as such, would be evident throughout the offender’s life.

2. Research:

Poor cognitive problem solving showed a significant linear relationship to all recidivism outcomes in the DSP (Hanson et al., 2007). When the DSP results are combined with three previous studies, poor cognitive problem solving showed a significant relationship with sexual recidivism (average $d = 0.22$; Mann et al., 2010).

3. Issues to Consider:

The capacity to effectively problem solve is an important skill for offenders hoping to change their behaviour. A review of their life history, including their criminal history, work history, relationships with others, response to current and prior supervision, as well as their general community functioning will give the assessor a sense of the offender's abilities in this domain. Although the assessor should attempt to elicit information regarding the offender's attitudes towards their self management strategies and how they address problems, they should also pay careful attention to the offender's demonstrated behavioural history of problem-solving as this may provide a more accurate picture of their current level of functioning.

In general, offenders who have never demonstrated the ability to deal with life problems independently would score a “1” on this item. This may include offenders who have never left the parental home and continue to live an immature lifestyle into adulthood. Offenders with

developmental disabilities of a cognitive nature and those with acquired brain injury would be expected to score worse than typical sexual offenders on this item; however, offenders with low IQ or specific neurological deficits would not automatically be considered problematic on this item. If they make relatively well-considered life decisions with their spared capacity, their abilities in this domain could be rated as adequate. For example, a good problem solving strategy for someone with a significant developmental delay of a cognitive nature may be to consistently seek the guidance of staff or persons in authority should they be unsure of what to do. This type of offender would typically score a “1”.

It is important to keep in mind that this is not the offender who denies or minimizes his sexual offences. It is also not the offender who does not believe that his sexual offences are a problem. This item is concerned with those offenders who have difficulties recognizing and resolving problems across multiple domains, such as work, family, financial, social, recreational, and health.

There are several components of effective cognitive problem solving to be considered and these components may be a focus of future interventions: identifying problems, generating alternatives, evaluating alternatives, choosing a course of action/follow through, and evaluating the outcome.

Identifying Problems: As an initial evaluation of the offender's cognitive problem solving abilities, consider whether or not he is able to accurately identify the problems he has experienced in the past, as well as those he currently faces, and those he will likely encounter in the future. Is he able to identify these issues or situations as problems? Does he claim to have “no problems” despite repeated incarcerations? **Does he believe that these situations are solely the result of the behaviour of others** (e.g., his criminal record is the result of police harassment, he has never had a “fair shake” in life, his spouse/family/employer have treated him poorly, prior treatment was inadequate), or is he able to identify and recognize his own contribution to the problem? **Does he continue to engage in behaviours that are causing him difficulties despite receiving undesirable outcomes or negative consequences** (e.g., frequent relationship difficulties/break ups due to repeated infidelity, job loss and financial difficulties due to frequent incarcerations, job loss due to conflicts with coworkers, etc.), or alternatively does he acknowledge that his life is not how he would like it to be, but cannot seem to identify the steps needed to improve his situation (e.g., “there's nothing I can do” or “my life is ruined because of these charges so why bother?”)

Individuals can experience problems in a variety of areas of their lives. Ask the offender to consider the following general categories: financial, employment, relationships (e.g., family, friends, acquaintances), accommodations, health (physical or emotional), and legal. It is also useful to ask the offender to provide an appraisal of the magnitude of the various problems he has identified. How serious does he consider the problems he has encountered or that he may encounter in the future? Does he appropriately identify problems that have the most significant impact on him as serious or “big”, or does he shrug them off as insignificant and minor or of no consequence at all? For example, consider the offender who does not believe that finding employment without any marketable skills will be difficult or time consuming.

Generating Alternatives: Once problems are identified, consider whether or not the offender is able to generate a variety of potential solutions or strategies to avoid these problems in the future. Does he identify a range of options to address the situation? Does he rigidly stick to a single strategy that has little probability of success? Does he express a fatalistic attitude and say there is nothing he can do to effect change? It is less important whether the options identified are practical or the best alternative than it is that the offender is able to suggest a variety of options that he can then evaluate, select from, and follow through on.

Evaluating Alternatives: Consider whether the offender is able to weigh the pros and cons of important decisions (e.g., outcome, time, effort, costs, likelihood of success) and reach an informed decision. Is he able to evaluate the different alternatives through a cost/benefit analysis and determine the course of action that is preferable or will provide the best outcome for him to meet his goals (in the short term, as well as in the future)? Does he recognize that a decision that might achieve his immediate goals (e.g., selling drugs to pay bills) may have a negative impact in the long term? Does he consider what additional problems he may encounter as a result of a chosen action?

Also, equally important to consider is the offender's ability to evaluate his previous efforts at addressing problems. Does he recognize whether his actions made the problem better or whether they made the problem worse? A reduced ability to evaluate different alternatives to problems affects the offender's ability to effectively address and solve problems. They may view crime as an acceptable or viable alternative for solving problems, despite the obvious negative impact it has had on them (e.g., incarceration, loss of job, loss of freedom, strained relationships, financial hardships, criminal record).

Choosing a course of Action and Follow Through: Consider whether or not there is evidence to suggest that the offender has made attempts to address problems in the past by choosing a course of action and following through. What does he do if the course of action he chooses fails? Does he give up or does he look for and attempt an alternative solution?

Evaluating the Outcome: **Effective problem solving is a skill that is learned.** In order to obtain a better understanding of problems in general, possible alternatives and solutions, and the consequences of those options, the individual must be able to look back on past decisions and objectively evaluate what went well and what did not work. From that assessment, the individual can then make decisions about how best to address future challenges or obstacles. Consider whether or not the offender is able to identify what he could have done differently to improve the outcome of problems he has dealt with in the past.

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

This item is scored using information provided both by the offender during the present interview, as well as any available collateral information regarding the offender's history and the problems he has faced in the past. A review of available file information with the offender may be helpful for guiding the interview. For example, file information may identify financial difficulties as an area of concern for the offender. Past financial difficulties and problem solving strategies can then be discussed to assess his ability to identify this problem, his ability to generate and

evaluate alternatives for managing his finances better, and determining what his plans are for addressing this area in the immediate and long-term future. Additionally, the assessor should discuss what the offender has done in the past to address financial problems and review the success of those strategies.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

Collateral sources of information can include previous interviews with the offender (e.g., previous Psychological/Psychiatric Assessments, Presentence Reports, or Police Reports), as well as prior supervision reports or information from prior incarcerations (e.g., incident reports), or interviews completed with others who know the offender, such as family members, friends, or employers.

6. Scoring:

- 0 The offender is able to appropriately identify and address typical life problems in a variety of areas (e.g., financial, accommodation, relationships, employment, health, and legal). He has a good sense of what he needs to work on and is able to discuss his plans for addressing them. His plans are realistic and he has dealt effectively with problems in the past.
- 1 The offender has a **history of poorly considered decisions** but is willing to make changes. He is **able to recognize areas of his life or decisions he has made that have caused him** problems, but has deficits in one or more of the other components of effective cognitive problem solving (e.g., generating alternatives, evaluating alternatives, choosing a course of action and follow through, and evaluating the outcome).
- 2 The offender frequently makes poor decisions and fails to identify obvious life problems in multiple domains. He also has difficulty generating workable alternatives or solutions to his problems. He may also have difficulty recognizing the likely negative consequences of actions even when pointed out to him. He lacks long term plans or goals, and will exhibit difficulty with choosing a course of action and appears unable to follow through.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

Keep in mind the five components of effective problem solving and look for examples of these skills in the offender's answers.

What sorts of things cause you problems in your life? What do you do about them?

What do you think of (the person who caused the problem)? Do you meet people like that a lot?

What do you do or say to deal with conflicts in your relationships? Who usually apologizes first? What do you do if you cannot resolve a conflict? Who is usually wrong?

How do you deal with conflicts at work? With friends? Neighbours?

What do you do if (chosen course of action) doesn't work?

What about yourself would you like to work on or change?

What would others say you should work on or change about yourself? Do they have valid concerns?

Where do you see yourself in (five) years? How are you going to get yourself there?
What obstacles might you encounter and how will you deal with them?

8. Cross References:

Negative Emotionality/Hostility
Impulsive Acts
Significant Social Influences
Capacity for Relationship Stability
Sex as Coping

9. Scoring Profiles:

- 0 Mr. Smith does not have a prior criminal record and aside from the index sexual offences, has lived a generally organized life. His affairs (finances, accommodation, and work) show no signs of mismanagement beyond that which is normal in all adults. Mr. Smith has a demonstrated history of adequately identifying and addressing typical life problems. He has maintained steady employment with no unusual financial problems. According to Mr. Smith, and supported by interviews with his wife, he has been happily married for over ten years and is interested in attending marriage counselling to help deal with the impact of the current offences on his relationship with his wife. Mr. Smith discussed his long term plans, and acknowledged that a return to his former career of teaching is not a viable option for him. Instead, he identified another area of employment that interests him (restaurants/tourism) and discussed some of the steps he would need to take to prepare himself for a career change.
- 1 Mr. Johnston is 29 years old and still lives at home with his parents. Although he acknowledged that it was probably time for him to live on his own, he also offered some resistance to the idea noting that he would not be able to afford to live on his own and still have money for luxuries such as going out with friends and wearing nice clothes. Mr. Johnston appears able to identify some notable problem areas in his life, has made some attempts at addressing them (e.g., attending AA) and appears open to receiving assistance from others; however, his ability to develop and follow through on solutions is limited. His plans for the future were vague. Although he identified the goals of finding employment and living on his own, he was unable to identifying any marketable skills, or how much it would cost to live on his own, an offender scoring a "1" is generally willing,

at least in part, to listen to and work with the supervision officer to improve his problem-solving skills).

- 2 Despite his current legal difficulties, as well as a long and varied criminal record, Mr. White claims to have “no problems” and could not identify any areas of his life that he would like to improve or change. When areas of concern identified by family members were discussed with him, Mr. White claimed that they were lying because they were jealous of his wealth and were planning to steal his belongings while he was incarcerated. Mr. White then added that his only “mistake” in life was being nice to his family and noted that he planned to cut off all ties with them in the future. Mr. White did not anticipate any future challenges or obstacles.

or

Although unable to identify any specific obstacles he might encounter in the future as a result of his criminal record, Mr. Stone noted that he intends to avoid any future problems by moving to the countryside and becoming a hermit; this in spite of having no experience with country living and no history of living alone. He noted that isolating himself from others was the only way to avoid misunderstandings and denied that he might feel lonely or bored living on his own. Mr. Stone also did not believe that it was worth developing a secondary future plan as he was confident that he would not have second thoughts or change his mind about his stated plan. Mr. Stone was also unable to offer any insight into his offending and blamed the current offences on substance abuse. However, when asked to discuss his substance abuse, Mr. Stone also claimed that it was not a problem for him and was not an area he was interested in addressing.

Item: Negative Emotionality/Hostility

1. The Basic Concept:

This item refers to the tendency to **feel victimized and generally mistreated by others**, and to respond with anger and hostility to life's challenges. Some offenders have excessively negative reactions to routine problems, and their negative emotions provoke **rash behaviours**, such as **reactive aggression, verbal outbursts, and poorly considered decisions** (e.g., quitting a job). For other offenders, their negative emotionality manifests as a **simmering grievance** that may or may not have obvious links to current events. The key elements are that the negative emotion is intense (or disproportional to the triggering events), is externalized towards others, and interferes with the offender's personal and social functioning.

Grievance may be manifested in an angry, hostile, and resentful presentation ("chip on the shoulder") or, alternatively, the offender may present as being persistently victimized by others and appear hopeless and vulnerable to emotional collapse ("always the victim"). In both cases the underlying feature is rumination over perceived grievances and/or victimization by others with little or no attempt to cope constructively. Attempts to encourage active coping are belittled or dismissed by the offender. Offenders may demonstrate their hostility by frequently submitting complaints against staff, who they perceive to be against them, or frequently discussing intentions to take legal action against others who they perceive have wronged them. They may see themselves as above supervision requirements or conditions associated with their arrest or sentence. Their anger may appear explosive but is often quickly over. Alternatively, offenders may take a more hopeless stance demonstrated by comments about "giving up", or saying "what's the use" or suicidal ideation based on the perception that the "world is against" them. Offenders may resist attempts to encourage them to reframe their cognitions or take responsibility for their own decisions and the resulting consequences. In some cases the offender may present with irrational feelings of persecution and chronic suspiciousness, and may have a psychiatric diagnosis marked by these types of cognitions. Offenders who score highly on this item often also score on Hostility Toward Women and Cooperation with Supervision items.

2. Research:

Hostility and grievance are common features of offenders and these personality traits have been shown to precede the onset of crime in longitudinal studies (Krueger et al., 1994). When averaged over 11 follow-up studies (3,139 sex offenders), there is a significant relationship between **grievance/hostility and sexual recidivism** ($d = 0.20$; Mann et al., 2010). In general, **measures of personal distress (e.g., depression, anxiety, worry) are only weakly related to the onset of crime** (Krueger et al., 1994) and are unrelated to long-term recidivism potential (Hanson, 2009). The contribution of negative emotions to criminal behaviour seems to be mediated by externalizing coping strategies.

3. Issues to Consider:

In scoring this item it is not appropriate to include the “blue” offender who is mildly to moderately depressed as a result of his current circumstances. It is important to consider whether the perceived grievances are reasonable given the offender’s recent experiences. For example, an offender who maintains he is innocent of the offences may reasonably be expected to feel he has been unfairly treated and hold some grievance toward the legal system. The assessor needs to judge whether the offender’s response (either anger or rejection of any help or guidance that “the system” might offer) is beyond that which would reasonably be expected given the offender’s stance and situation. Additionally, a key feature to this item is the ruminative aspect. The assessor should consider how often the offender chooses to focus on perceived injustices during the interview, how quick they are to remind the assessor of the unfairness of their situation, and how much of the interview time is spent discussing the offender’s perception that he is a victim or has been unfairly treated.

4. Information Needed to Score Item:

This item is primarily scored based on self-report by the offender during the interview. It is important to consider both the physical and the verbal behaviour during the interview and past written reports of the offender’s behaviour.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

Collateral information may provide insight into this item. Information regarding behaviour during previous incarcerations or periods of supervision (e.g., misconducts, breaches of trust) and reports from other staff that have been involved with the offender may reveal a history of feeling that routine or standard conditions of supervision should not apply to him. The offender may also have a history of submitting vexatious complaints against staff. Interviews with collateral contacts such as spouses and family members (or the lack of identified community supports) may provide information as to whether or not the offender also feels victimized by people in his life outside of the criminal justice system.

6. Scoring:

- 0 Offender either expresses no sense of grievance or expresses occasional sense of grievance or victimization, but not beyond what would reasonably be expected given their experiences and situation. Offender is primarily focused on dealing with their current situation and not on blaming others.
- 1 Some hostility, resentment, or sense of victimization that appears beyond what would reasonably be expected. Offender presents as angry and forward motion in his life is stalled by his feelings of injustice. Although he has spent considerable time thinking about these issues, he is willing to move on when prompted. The offender does not bring up his grievance issues spontaneously but is willing and possibly eager to discuss them when asked.

- 2 Offender appears to ruminate on perceived injustices and grievances. He clings to resentment and frequently returns the discussion to his grievances during the interview. The offender may present as angry and resentful or he may present as self-indulgent, self-pitying, hopeless, and suggest he is “giving-up”. This score would include offenders who present with irrational feelings of persecution and chronic suspiciousness, possibly associated with a mental disorder.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

Do you ever feel like people are “just out to get you” or looking to harm you? How do you deal with people like that?

How do you feel about your arrest and involvement in the criminal justice system? Do you feel you were dealt with fairly?

Are there times when you feel that you cannot take it anymore or you just can’t cope? What has caused these situations? When was the last time that you felt like that? What did you do about it?

When things go wrong, do you generally try to forget about it or do you find yourself focusing on it over and over in your mind? How does it make you feel when things go wrong or when you feel that things are out of your control? What do you do in those situations?

How fair do you think your life has been generally? What kind of support have you received from family? Friends? Professionals? What happens when you ask others for help? What things could you do to improve your situation?

8. Cross References:

Hostility Toward Women
General Social Rejection/Loneliness
Significant Social Influences
Lack of Concern for Others

9. Scoring Profiles:

- 0 Mr. Smith stated that his sentence is “not fair” but this current stance is not surprising given that the offender is maintaining his innocence and appealing his conviction. There was no evidence of rumination. Mr. Smith admitted that he is “usually able to forget about” negative events in his life. He did not engage in any victim blaming and stated that “if” he committed the offence, then he “would deserve” to be incarcerated. Professionals involved with the case during court proceedings noted some symptoms of depression, but Mr. Smith appears to be coping appropriately with his current situation.
- 1 Mr. Town expressed concerns about his sentence, remarking that it was unfair and that the judge “took sides” with his victims. He also claimed that the victims lied to make his

behaviour look worse, and that his wife encouraged his stepdaughters to lie so that she could “get rid” of him. Although Mr. Town appeared angry while making these comments, they were in response to questions asked and he did not return the discussion to these issues during the interview. His anger dissipated quickly when the interview moved to other topics.

or

Mr. Kane did not present as hostile but did present as the victim of negative life events during the interview, commenting that sometimes “it’s just not worth trying, they are only going to knock you down anyway”. He commented that “nothing goes his way” and was occasionally tearful during the interview. He reported that he has spent time crying in his cell thinking about everything he has lost. He presented as vulnerable to emotional collapse when stressed, but did appear to be trying to cope with these feelings through his involvement with the chaplain and his psychologist.

2

Mr. Howes presented with a hostile attitude toward the police and courts. He portrayed himself as a victim of false prosecution and blamed the police for unfairly targeting him because they do not like him. He was also upset that the assessor did not believe his claims of innocence and his presentation changed dramatically when he was reminded that the purpose of this assessment was to assess his treatment needs. He changed from animated, talkative and jovial to glowering, accusatory and argumentative. Mr. Howes reported that he is “very angry inside all the time” about his current situation.

or

Mr. Gore appears to consistently ruminate on negative events in his life, give up easily, and experience feelings of complete hopelessness. Mr. Gore expressed a considerable degree of indulgent self-pity and says he should “just give up”. He frequently mentioned seeking help for problems but believes his concerns have been unfairly dismissed by professionals and family members. Throughout the interview Mr. Gore often manipulated the topic in order to discuss his stress and anxiety and how people have been insensitive to his needs, rather than responding to the question asked. He frequently mentioned his inability to cope and stated that over the past year he has had several “breakdowns” that have led to suicide attempts because of the stress he has been under.

Item: Sex Drive/Preoccupation

1. The Basic Concept:

This item focuses on both the frequency of sexual thoughts and behaviours and the degree to which an offender's sexual thoughts and behaviours interfere with interpersonal and/or prosocial functioning (i.e., work, school, relationships). The frequency of sexual thoughts and activity would be considered excessive based on the offender's self-report of difficulty controlling sexual drive, interference in prosocial functioning, or if the rates are so high that they are statistically rare (top 5% to 10% of the general male population). This item concerns impersonal sex, and is not concerned with high rates of sexual activity in the context of a loving relationship (e.g., the "honeymoon" phase of new lovers). The STABLE concept of sexual preoccupation would substantially overlap with the constructs of sexual compulsions, sexual addictions (Marshall, Marshall, Moulden, & Serran, 2008) and hypersexual disorder (Kafka, 2010).

The assessor should keep in mind that, for sexual offenders, much of their sexual behaviour may be expressed as masturbation. As such, the assessor should clarify number of orgasms per week rather than rates of intercourse; the former is a better indicator of frequency of impersonal sexual outlet. Some offenders self-report that they consider their sexual thoughts or behaviours to be excessive or intrusive. However, high sex drive and high levels of sexual preoccupation should be considered problematic even if the offender views his level of sexual activity as acceptable or normative. Examples of offenders with clear problems in this area are those who self-report struggling to control their sexual thoughts or activities, offenders who report feeling plagued by sexual thoughts, offenders with a history of prostituting themselves, or those who regularly cruise for and engage in impersonal sexual activity, such as at bars or in bathhouses. An example of high sex drive would include reported sexual outlet (orgasm) on "most days" (i.e., more than 15 times per month), either through solitary sexual activity (masturbation) or sexual activity with a partner. Other examples are early onset of sexual activity, a history of multiple (more than 30) sexual partners of which many were casual sexual encounters, self-report of a high sex drive, or reports of inability to control sexual behaviour in a controlled environment (e.g., frequent reports of masturbation or exposing himself in front of correctional staff). Examples of sexual preoccupation would include regular use of prostitutes, regular attendance at strip bars or massage parlours, recurrent sexually-oriented internet or telephone use (particularly resulting in high telephone bills or interference with other prosocial activities such as missing events due to time spent on the computer), having large pornography collections, and collection of non-pornographic magazines for sexual purposes (i.e., parent/baby magazines, catalogues). The offender may also use excessive sexual content in everyday conversations, such that the offender continually uses sexual references, suggestive language, or double-entendres at a rate noticeably greater than other men. This language may well overlap into the interview for the assessment. The offender may also display preoccupation with his own or other's sex crimes, and self-report disturbing or distressing sexual thoughts or dreams. Please note that an offender telling you that he thinks he has a high sex drive is insufficient information to score an offender on this item. The offender would have to provide behavioural examples such as those factors listed above.

Alternatively, in rare cases a focus on avoiding sexual thoughts or activities may be evidence of preoccupation. For example, offenders who engage in frequent prayer, chanting, or other distraction techniques to avoid sexual thoughts or activities may well be simply temporarily substituting their sexual preoccupation with other behaviours. Additionally, offenders who adamantly maintain that they are going to abstain from all sexual thoughts or activities through religious focus or social isolation (e.g., living alone in a cave, hut, or boat) should be questioned as to why they do not feel that they are able to maintain a healthy sexual lifestyle. These offenders may tell you that all sexuality is sinful and to be avoided. The denial of sexuality is less important than the energy and effort devoted to its inhibition. For example, a person who simply denied ever masturbating would score low, whereas an offender who repeatedly and spontaneously says he never masturbates (and you shouldn't either) would score high on this item.

2. Research:

Early theories of sexual offending assumed that sexual offenders were sexually inhibited (e.g., "blockage" in Finkelhor, 1986); however, subsequent research suggests that the opposite is more likely to be true. Sexual offenders are typically more interested in sex and more sexually active than non-offending males (Lalumière, Chalmers, Quinsey, & Seto, 1996), and high rates of impersonal sex are associated with paraphilic interests, such as exhibitionism, voyeurism, and sadism and masochism (S&M) (Långström & Hanson, 2006). The general construct of sexual preoccupation significantly predicted sexual, violent, and general recidivism in Hanson and Morton-Bourgon's (2004) meta-analysis. The STABLE Sex Drive/Preoccupation item significantly predicted sexual recidivism in the DSP validation study ($d = 0.58$).

3. Issues to Consider:

For this item the assessor should evaluate whether or not the offender's level of interest in terms of frequency of sexual thoughts and behaviours would be considered "above average" in comparison to other similar males, which begs the question "how much is too much?" Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin (1948) found that rates of orgasm in males were highest in late teenage years and then steadily declined with age. Males in their twenties reported between three to four orgasms per week, while those between 30 to 40 years of age reported two to three orgasms per week, 50 year olds reported between one to two orgasms per week, while fewer than one orgasm a week was reported for those over 60 years of age. In a more recent study, Långström and Hanson (2006) found that Swedish males aged 18 to 60 masturbated an average of about once a week while approximately 10% of males reported masturbating as much as 15 times a month or more (i.e., most days). As a result, the assessor should consider characteristics such as age and recency of sexual behaviours during the evaluation. For example, men in their late teens and early twenties can be expected to think more frequently about sex and engage in both solitary sexual activities and sexual activities with a partner more often than men in their forties and beyond, simply due to their young age. Therefore masturbating four times a week may be considered reasonable for a 20 year old, particularly one without a regular sexual partner, but more unusual for a 60 year old. Similarly, recency of sexual behaviour should be considered. An older offender who reports 40 casual sexual partners before the age of 30 years, but one sexual partner (his wife) for the last 25 years should be evaluated using the more recent

(within the last 25 years) behaviour. On the other hand, a 20 year old who reports having 20 casual sexual encounters within the last two years, should be considered more sexually driven than the norm in comparison to other sexual offenders.

What is considered a large pornography collection may also be contextual. **Owning more than 25 pornographic magazines or DVD's should be considered a large collection.** However, pornographic images and movies can be downloaded from the internet quite easily in large quantities. The assessor should ask the offender questions about how they download pornography (e.g., shareware, chat rooms, and newsgroups), what search terms they use, how they review the downloaded images or movies and how they sort and store them. These types of questions should help the assessor make a judgement as to the time and effort the offender spends on acquiring and using pornography.

In Prison: Context should also be considered when scoring this item. For example, an offender **who is incarcerated and has a cellmate but reports masturbating two to three times a week would seemingly be making considerable effort to find opportunities for masturbation as compared to an individual who can easily find privacy in their own home,** in which case two to three times a week would not be indicative of preoccupation. Assessors should also review institutional reports to see if the offender has a history of being “found” masturbating in front of staff or exposing himself to staff.

In Interview: Assessors should evaluate whether or not the offender appears aroused or excited when responding to the interview questions with sexual content or if the offender uses inappropriate sexual words during the interview, particularly after being counselled (e.g., continues to use slang words such as “tits” when counselled to use appropriate words such as “breasts”). Alternatively the assessor may find that the offender consistently tries to redirect the interview to focus on sexual topics.

Fetishes: **A fetish may or may not be evidence of a sexual preoccupation.** The assessor should evaluate the impact the fetish has had on the offender and particularly his relationships. If the fetish interferes with his ability to maintain a healthy relationship or to engage in other prosocial activities, or leads to offending (e.g., stealing underwear) then it may be considered a preoccupation. If, however, the fetish is simply practiced within the context of a healthy sexual relationship (e.g., his wife is happy to wear high-heels) then it may not necessarily be a sexual preoccupation.

When scoring this item assessors should include offenders who have demonstrated a pattern of chronic or episodic sexual preoccupation or high sex drive when they are non-compliant with medications, within an acute phase of mental illness, or disinhibited by drugs or alcohol when it is related to their sexual offending.

Of note, assessors should avoid asking about sexual “fantasies”, as many people interpret sexual fantasies to be significant and lengthy sexual stories, while in reality a sexual fantasy can be a very brief sexual thought that may last only a second. Offenders may deny sexual fantasies because they do not perceive brief sexual thoughts to qualify as fantasies. Assessors should ask

offenders about their sexual “thoughts” instead and provide clarification that a sexual thought can be very brief and does not necessarily involve explicit sexual activity.

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

This item is scored primarily on the offender's responses to questions during the interview. In addition, the assessor should review all available collateral information to gain a better sense of the offender, his sexual history, his relationship history, and his attitudes toward sex.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

The assessor should look for information that includes collateral interviews with others, and particularly previous sexual partners. Interviews with family members and friends may be revealing in terms of the offender's focus on sex on a day-to-day basis. Additionally, institutional reports may provide information regarding institutional sexual activity and disciplinary reports may provide instances of institutional violations that involved sexual activity. Collateral sources of information can include previous interviews with the offender (e.g., previous Psychological/Psychiatric Assessments, Presentence Reports), as well as prior supervision reports or information from prior incarcerations (e.g., incident reports), or interviews completed with others who know the offender, such as intimate partners, family members, and friends.

6. Scoring:

- 0 No evidence of sexual preoccupation or high sex drive. Frequency of sexual thoughts and behaviours is reasonable for offender's age and circumstances.
- 1 Some evidence of sexual preoccupation or elevated sex drive, given offender's age and circumstances. The offender may report regular use of pornography or there may be some evidence of impersonal sex. There is some concern that the offender includes an unusual amount of sexual content in everyday conversations, appears aroused or unusually focussed on interview questions with sexual content, or uses sexually inappropriate words during the interview. Alternatively, the offender may present as preoccupied with avoiding sexual thoughts or behaviours.
- 2 Clear evidence of any sexual preoccupation or multiple preoccupations (e.g., sexually oriented internet use that has resulted in interference with prosocial functioning, significant pornography collection, fetish behaviour that has interfered with relationship or other areas of personal functioning). The offender is clearly pre-occupied with including sexual content in everyday conversations. The offender is obviously aroused by interview questions with sexual content, or he frequently uses sexually inappropriate words despite being counselled not to do so. Evidence of significant impersonal sexual activity (e.g., multiple casual partners, frequent cruising for impersonal sex in bars, sexual activity in bathhouses or other public venues, swinging lifestyle). Self-report of high sex drive in comparison to similar males, in itself, is insufficient to score a “2”. However, if the offender reports intrusive sexual thoughts or reports

repeated behaviours that are clearly beyond that of most sexual offenders then a “2” may be safely scored.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

How old were you when you engaged in your first sexual experience? (Alone, or with another)
What was your relationship to the other person? (Stranger, girlfriend/boyfriend, peer, childhood sexual abuse)

Over your entire lifetime, how many different sexual partners have you been involved with?
Do you think that is a lot of different partners for someone your age?

Of that number, can you tell me how many of them you were involved with in a relationship?
How many were strangers/one-night-stands? How many were casual sexual encounters?
How many were with prostitutes?

How often do you hire prostitutes? How much do you spend?

How often do you view erotic material, such as magazines, videos, and internet? Do you have a collection? Describe your collection? Does your partner know about your collection? How do they feel about it?

How often do you search the internet for erotic material (images, videos, narratives)? What search terms do you use? How do you find images that interest you? How much time do you spend on the computer?

How often do you visit chat rooms? Which chat rooms do you visit?

How often do you attend strip clubs? Massage parlours for sex?

Has anyone ever told you that you seem preoccupied with sex? Pornography? Prostitutes?

Has anyone ever told you that you have a “dirty mouth” because of the things that you say?
Has this caused you problems with others?

Have you ever thought that your masturbation was excessive? Has it ever gotten you into trouble or caused you pain? How often do you masturbate? Is that more or less than you did when in the community?

How often do you think about sex during the course of the day? What usually prompts a sexual thought? What do you think about?

How do you think your sex drive compares to other men your age? In your opinion is it higher than the norm, lower or about average?

Have you ever engaged in a threesome or group sex activity? Couple swapping? How often? Did you initiate this? How did it come about?

Do you have any special sexual interests that you think others generally do not or might not enjoy? What are they? Have they ever caused problems for you in your relationships?

8. Cross References:

Sex as Coping
Deviant Sexual Interests
Capacity for Relationship Stability

9. Case Examples:

- 0 Although Mr. Collins reported some history of impersonal sex, these sexual encounters occurred when he was between the ages of 14 and 20. Currently aged 52, he has been married to his current wife for the past 25 years. Mr. Collins claimed to be disinterested in pornographic material from any media type. He indicated he does not purchase pornographic magazines, videos, or CD's and is unsure how to use the internet. He reported masturbating approximately once every two weeks while in the community and approximately once per month since his incarceration. He did not believe that his masturbation has ever been excessive. Mr. Collins indicated that he and his wife engaged in sexual activity once to twice per week. He said his attendance at erotic venues, such as strip clubs, has been limited to two occasions for bachelor parties. He stated that his sexual thoughts are about his wife or past intimate partners. Mr. Collins denied any difficulties controlling his sexual impulses.
- 1 File information indicates that Mr. Wallace (aged 30) exposed one of the victims to pornographic material. Mr. Wallace admitted to having utilized pornographic material (mostly internet) on a regular basis in the past and acknowledged viewing pornography with his victims. He described engaging in some impersonal sexual activity; specifically, on several occasions he casually dated two different women and was sexually involved with one or the other on alternate occasions. However, Mr. Wallace denied being unfaithful during his committed relationships. Mr. Wallace acknowledged attending erotic venues with friends once a month for the purposes of consuming alcohol and viewing the exotic dancers. However, he denied feeling preoccupied with sexual thoughts. He reported masturbating once per week and engaging in sexual activity with a partner two to three times per week in the community. Since his incarceration Mr. Wallace maintained he masturbates once per week.
- 2 Mr. Adams self-reported difficulty controlling his sexual impulses. Specifically, he stated that he would encounter females in public and experience an urge to touch them in a sexual manner that he was unable to suppress. Although he claimed to be in a romantic relationship at the time of his offending, his sexual thoughts were clearly not directed towards his partner. Mr. Adams reported having between 40 and 50 sexual partners and acknowledged engaging in frequent casual sexual encounters throughout his lifetime.

He reported that he lived with two females for a period of time and stated that they would engage in group sexual activity on a regular basis.

Item: Sex as Coping

1. The Basic Concept:

Some sexual offenders think about sex or engage in sexual activity to manage emotions. The sexual thoughts or behaviours may be either normative or deviant, but the key is that the offender relies on sex to self-soothe or mitigate unwelcome feelings of tension, anger, hostility, or anxiety. Many non-offenders engage in sexual thoughts and behaviours in response to feelings of boredom or loneliness. This is not problematic, in itself. What is problematic is when sex becomes the dominant coping strategy and offenders lack the emotional flexibility to use other strategies should the situation require.

Those offenders who use sex to cope in this way usually show increased sexual activity during periods of stress or dysfunction. Much of this sexual behaviour appears driven, and is likely to be inappropriate, costly, or has a high probability of negative consequences. For example, an offender who is unemployed may report spending several hours a day surfing the internet for sexual content and masturbating in part because he is bored and in part to reduce or distract from feelings stemming from negative self-evaluation. Sexualised coping behaviour will be seen in multiple life domains (e.g., in response to work stress, family stress, interpersonal stress). For most people, negative emotions such as shame, rejection, or anger typically inhibit a sexual response and most people would not find a sexual assault arousing. If negative emotions trigger sexual thoughts and behaviour, then it is easy to see how it could lead to sexual offending. In rare cases, the fear and suffering of the victim may create a feedback loop whereby the victim's suffering increases the offender's negative emotions, which the offender then attempts to manage by increasing the intensity and duration of the sexual victimization.

Sexual activity as coping may include either solitary activities (e.g., internet or phone sex, pornography, masturbation) or sexual activity with a partner. In a limited number of cases, sexual thoughts or activity may be the offender's only coping strategy; however, in most cases the offender will also have other coping strategies on which they rely.

2. Research:

This item was developed based on Cortoni and Marshall's (2001) description of how sexual offenders think about sex (both normal and deviant sex) to manage emotions. Research has shown that 10% to 20% of the general non-criminal population become aroused or have an increased likelihood of thinking about sex when they are anxious, depressed or angry (Bancroft et al., 2003a, 2003b). These individuals were both more likely to engage in high risk sexual behaviours (for example, unprotected casual sex) (Bancroft et al., 2003a, 2003b) and were over-represented among child molesters (Whitaker et al., 2008) and other sexual offenders (Cortoni & Marshall, 2001). This Stable item was a significant predictor of sexual recidivism (AUC = 0.62) in the DSP study (Hanson et al., 2007).

3. Issues to Consider:

This item is heavily dependent on offender self-report and, therefore, is likely to be difficult to assess in an adversarial context. As a result, it is imperative that the assessor use a collaborative approach to build a positive rapport with the offender that encourages honesty and openness. The assessor should ask questions about coping in a variety of life domains (e.g., work, relationships, and finances). In an interview the assessor should ask about coping at home, at work, as relaxation, and in all other life domains. A person who scores strongly on this item will use sexual expression as a generalized strategy in many parts of life. For others, Sex as Coping may be limited to one type of event (post fight with wife) or environment (stress at work). The assessor should also keep in mind that sometimes offenders perceive coping strategies to be very specific, and generally positive, skills. A more effective strategy may be to avoid the word “coping” and simply ask what the offender does when faced with a problem.

The assessor should survey all of the offender’s coping strategies, both positive and negative. For example, the offender may use alcohol or drugs as a coping strategy; although these are poor coping strategies they are not necessarily related to sexualised coping. On the other hand, the consuming of alcohol and drugs in response to stress could increase the offender’s sexual thoughts and behaviours at these times. Additionally, questioning the offender about the period leading up to the offence or offences may inadvertently reveal sexualised coping. For example, offenders may reveal significant financial, work or relationship stressors immediately preceding their offending behaviour while noting that the sexual offending relieved their stress. In this case the offender may not believe that he copes with stress with sexual activity but clearly describes doing so in relation to his offending. It is also worthwhile asking questions about the offender’s sexual activity during the period when the offences were disclosed and he was arrested, on bail, and during the trial, as these would likely be high stress periods. The assessor should keep in mind that many people report that sexual activity is a “stress reliever” but that not everyone relies on sex to manage negative emotions. The assessor will need to differentiate between the individuals who recognize that engaging in sexual activity can relieve stress and the individuals for whom sex is a dominant or necessary stress reliever.

4. Information Needed to Score Item:

This item will primarily be scored based on self-report by the offender during the interview.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

Collateral information, where available, may be relevant to assessing the validity of the information provided by the offender during the interview. Other potential sources of information include previous Psychological/Psychiatric Assessments, or documentation from prior sentences, particularly those that discuss coping skills/deficits and any information previously obtained regarding offence precursors. Institutional violations for normal masturbatory behaviour would not necessarily indicate a high score.

6. Scoring:

- 0 Offender has no history of using sexual thoughts or behaviours as a coping strategy. The offender has repeatedly experienced significant life stress without resorting to sexual fantasy or behaviour. He may report decreased sexual thoughts and activities during times of stress.
- 1 The offender reports some use of sexual thoughts or behaviour to cope when stressed, but the offender is able to identify other coping strategies (either positive or negative) that he also uses during times of stress. Sexualised coping may have contributed to his offending behaviour.
- 2 Negative emotions, life events, or stressors typically invoke sexual thoughts or behaviours. Although the offender may also have other coping strategies, these are rarely used and the main coping strategy is sexual thoughts or behaviours.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

Note: The first question in this section follows from the last question in the previous section from the item "Sex Drive/Preoccupation", "How often do you think about having sex during the course of a day?"

Are there times when you think about sex more than other times? What are these times?

Do you ever engage in sexual behaviour to feel better about yourself or your situation? When you feel lonely? Bored? Sad? Stressed? Angry? Frustrated? Down on yourself? After a fight with your partner or someone you care about?

What do you do when faced with a problem or difficult times? Is this how you usually respond?

Do you ever drink or use drugs when faced with problems? How often do you use substances to deal with stress? What are you like when you are drunk/high? Do drugs or alcohol increase or decrease your interest in sex? In what ways?

What was going on in your life in the period leading up to your offence(s)? What kind of problems were you faced with? How did you deal with them? Did committing the offence(s) relieve some of your stress? Did it make you feel better, even temporarily?

How were you able to maintain sexual arousal when the victim resisted/was distressed? Was this more or less arousing to you?

8. Cross References:

Poor Cognitive Problem Solving

Impulsive Acts

Deviant Sexual Interests

9. Scoring Profiles:

0 Mr. Wilson denied utilizing sexual activity as a coping mechanism or engaging in sexual activity to feel better about himself or his life situation. He stated that stressful events do not provoke sexual thoughts and claimed that he copes with stress through reliance on his faith and spirituality, talking to others to whom he is close or distracting himself with work. Moreover, he indicated that he is actually less likely to experience sexual thoughts when dealing with life stressors.

or

Mr. Schultz, age 20, says that he never has sex when he is feeling bad. He says he only approaches sexual partners (young males) when he feels good about himself, and feels he can handle the rejection. When he feels bad he smokes marijuana, eats junk food, and ruminates alone in his bedroom – often listening to rap music or watching action movies.

1 Mr. Sinclair reported that at the time of the offences he was experiencing depression, likely stemming from intimacy problems in his marriage. He advised that when he was feeling his lowest he would sexually offend against his stepdaughter but that he would more often cope with stress by consuming alcohol. Mr. Sinclair indicated that he was less likely to offend when intoxicated as he usually drank until he passed out.

2 Mr. Marsden acknowledged utilizing sexual activity to cope with feelings of loneliness and rejection. He claimed that when stressed or upset that he would masturbate or go to a massage parlour because it made him feel better. He admitted he sought the company of his victims in response to a number of life stressors. Mr. Marsden acknowledged that negative life events often provoked sexual thoughts or behaviours. Specifically, he indicated that his deviant sexual fantasies increased in frequency and duration when he was experiencing stress at work or financial pressures. In addition, Mr. Marsden reported that he has acted out and committed a sexual offence on two occasions in response to dissatisfaction with his life circumstances.

Item: Deviant Sexual Interests

1. The Basic Concept:

This item focuses on assessing whether the offender is sexually interested in or is sexually aroused by activities, situations, people, or objects that are illegal, inappropriate, or highly unusual. For example, the offender may be sexually interested in children, non-consenting sexual interactions with adults, voyeurism (peeping), exhibitionism (flashing), Sadism, masochism, swinging, or have one or more fetishes (feet, shoes/boots, , urine, feces, latex, rubber, baby paraphernalia, enemas, cross dressing, etc). An “interest” is something that the offender would choose if they had unhindered selection over their sexual activity. It may be their ideal sexual fantasy.

The assessor should survey multiple domains including official criminal history, the number of sexual offence victims, the number of “deviant” sexual offence victims (definitions of deviant victims provided below), self-reported sexual interests or fantasies, suspected sexual interests or fantasies. Some of this information can be gleaned from a behavioural history, such as the types of internet sites visited, the types of pornography collected, engagement in fetishistic behaviours, membership in sexual clubs, as well as the results of specialized testing (e.g., phallometric testing, visual reaction time).

2. Research:

All sexual offenders have engaged in sexually deviant behaviour; however, only a minority should be expected to have clear, enduring deviant sexual interests. In the DSP study, 16% were identified as having deviant sexual interests (scores of “2”), and an additional 41% were identified as having some indications of deviant sexual interests (scores of “1”; Hanson et al., 2007). Deviant sexual interest is one of the most well-established predictors of sexual recidivism (Hanson & Bussière, 1998; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005). Among sexual offenders, the most common forms of deviant sexual interest are pedophilia, exhibitionism, and an interest in sexualized violence (coercive rape). Each of these paraphilias are reliable predictors of recidivism in meta-analytic studies (Hanson & Bussière, 1998; Mann et al., 2010). As well, the presence of multiple paraphilias is associated with increased risk of sexual recidivism (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004).

The original STABLE-2000 Deviant Sexual Interest item was only weakly associated with sexual recidivism in the DSP study (Hanson et al., 2007). A post hoc analysis indicated that evaluators paid insufficient attention to prior sexual offence history in rating deviant sexual interests. For example, it was not uncommon for an evaluator to rate an offender as having no deviant sexual interests based on the offender's self-report, despite a history of many prior sexual offences (e.g., six young, male victims). Consequently, the scoring of the STABLE-2007 Deviant Sexual Interest item was revised so that evaluators would pay more attention to offence history when determining their rating. The revised STABLE-2007 item was significantly related to sexual recidivism in the DSP dataset.

Given that it was possible for an offender to receive a high score on the STABLE-2007 item based on offence history alone, the item could become completely “static”. Based on feedback from an expert panel, an “in remission” option was added to introduce the possibility of positive change. The “in remission” judgement has not been empirically tested and, until such research has been conducted, does not contribute to the total score for the purposes of estimating recidivism rates.

3. Issues to Consider:

All sexual offenders have engaged in deviant sexual behaviour, but not all sexual offenders have deviant sexual interests. As noted previously, you should expect that approximately 20% to 30% of sexual offenders will have deviant sexual interests. The most commonly observed forms of deviant interests are pedophilia, exhibitionism/voyeurism, and sexualized violence (i.e., sexual activity with non-consenting adults). Sexualised violence includes either a preference for coercive sex over consenting sex or sadistic sexual interests (i.e., sexual arousal in response to the physical or emotional suffering of another person). Based on behavioural history alone, it is often difficult to distinguish between offenders who are sexually excited by force and offenders who are willing to use force to obtain sexual gratification.

Pedophilia is defined as sexual interest in children who have not developed to the stage of sexual maturity. These children are marked by the relative absence of secondary sexual characteristics (i.e., physical cues typically indicative of the biological ability to mate and reproduce). These include immaturity in skin texture (i.e., soft, smooth skin), reduced or absent body and pubic hair, smell, body shape, musculature, and limited or absent breast and genital development. The criterion for deviant sexual interests is not legal age of consent. Simply having sexual contact with a child who is under the age of consent is insufficient to establish a deviant sexual interest. The assessor, when at all possible, should consider the “body type” of the victim or victims. Is the offender sexually interested in under-developed (i.e., prepubescent) victims? However, the reality is that assessors rarely have the opportunity, material, or information necessary to assess level of physical development of the victim (e.g., Tanner’s Stages; Tanner, 1962). In the absence of the ability to do this type of evaluation it is recommend that assessors assume that girls who have reached their 13th birthday and boys who have reached their 14th birthday would have sufficient development of secondary sexual characteristics to be considered non-deviant. The age difference is based on the later age of puberty for boys than for girls (Parent et al., 2003). In rare cases assessors may have reliable information that a victim who is younger than these thresholds is sufficiently physically developed to be considered a non-deviant victim. In those cases information concerning the victim’s physical characteristics must come from a credible source other than the offender’s self-report.

In cases where the offender has multiple victims that span a range of ages (e.g., victims as young as 11 but as old as 16), the assessor should consider the age of the majority of victims and question the offender as to what physical characteristics he looks for, or is attracted to in victims. In some cases offenders are primarily interested in pubescent victims but have offended against a younger victim because of proximity and access (e.g., the younger victim was “hanging out” with an older crowd of teenagers). The assessor should consider the frequency of the offences against pre-pubescent victims. Sexual activity with a pre-pubescent boy on one occasion

warrants a score of “1” on this item. More than one pre-pubescent victim is more suggestive of sexual deviance. These issues will require some judgement by the assessor.

The assessor should keep in mind that some convictions included in official criminal histories are not obviously sexual, based on the name of the charge or conviction. For example, convictions for Criminal Trespass or Trespass by Night may be evidence of voyeuristic behaviour (peeping). Additionally, Break and Enter convictions may contain sexual elements, such as stealing underwear, or masturbating to ejaculation on items in the house. Even convictions for seemingly minor offences such as Mischief may contain sexual elements (e.g., “mooning” or “accidental” exposure). It is worthwhile, whenever possible, to obtain the police report relevant to the conviction and review for sexual components.

“Deviance” may also include unusual sexual behaviours that are nonetheless consensual, such as some paraphilias and fetishes. The assessor should consider the frequency and unusualness of the behaviour. The more unusual the behaviour, the fewer the incidents required to establish an interest. For example, engaging in consensual S&M on one occasion is insufficient to conclude a deviant sexual interest, while being an active member of an S&M club is solid evidence of a deviant sexual interest. Typically, a single incident of behaviour is not sufficient to establish a deviant sexual interest. However, single incidents of very unusual sexual behaviour may be an exception (e.g., sex with a dead body; sexual mutilation) and behaviour that required significant forethought, planning, preparation, and rehearsal (high levels of grooming effort) may also be an exception. Significant use of the internet to look up fetish-related sites, downloading of fetish-related materials, and fetish-related pornography collections are all evidence of a deviant sexual interest even if the offender has never engaged in the actual behaviour. Similarly, collections of fetish-related paraphernalia are suggestive of deviant sexual interests.

It may be difficult to determine if an offender’s behaviours should be considered sadistic, and therefore deviant, in nature. While some offenders may have received a diagnosis of sadism in a psychiatric or psychological report, in many cases the assessor will have to make a judgement based on the information available relevant to the offence. It is important to note that sadism is rare and that many offenders subject their victims to aggressive, violent, and incapacitating behaviours with the goal of accomplishing the sexual assault, rather than because they derive sexual pleasure from the suffering of the victim. Assessors should consider the apparent purpose of the behaviour. If the offender physically assaults or incapacitates the victim in order to gain the victim’s compliance or render the victim unable to ward off the sexual offence (i.e., instrumental motivation), this is not considered sadistic behaviour. Sadistic behaviour goes beyond what would be required to accomplish the goal of committing the sexual offence, appearing gratuitous in nature. Clear indications of sadism might include torturing the victim, burning them, inserting inanimate objects into the victim, urinating on the victim, or forcing the victim to say humiliating things or engage in severely degrading acts (beyond the sexual assault). For the purposes of scoring the STABLE-2007, unless there is clear evidence of sadism the assessor should assume the behaviours involved in the offence were instrumental to committing the sexual offence rather than sadistic.

The most common forms of specialized testing for deviant sexual interests are phallometric testing and visual reaction time measures. Evaluators considering the results from such measures need to consider the reliability and validity of the specific measures for the specific deviance under consideration. Of the specialized tests for sexual interest, the most well established procedure is the phallometric assessment of pedophilic interests.

For the purpose of the STABLE-2007 score, psychiatric opinions or diagnoses of paraphilias are not considered specialized testing results. Such diagnoses would be considered under self-reports/other indicators.

It is important to keep in mind that a person could have been convicted of a sexual offence and not have deviant sexual interests. This situation might occur, for example, in a first-offence where a school teacher with a long-standing wife and extensive exposure to children sexually touches a physically mature 13 year-old student.

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

The offender's official criminal history and related police reports should be reviewed for information regarding number of victims, types of victims, and other sexual behaviours. Self-report of deviant sexual interests may be assessed in interview and compared or evaluated against available collateral and official information. Results of specialized testing, such as phallometric testing or visual reaction time measures, may be used to score this item. The offender's sexual history as noted in any previous reports must be reviewed.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

Collateral information, where available, is important to assess the validity of the information provided by the offender during the interview. Other potential sources of information include collateral interviews with supports in the community, any previous Psychological/Psychiatric Assessments, Police Reports or documentation from prior convictions and incarcerations.

6. Scoring:

The scoring requires (a) counting the number of victims of sexual offences, (b) counting the number of deviant victims, (c) and obtaining the offender's self-report concerning his sexual interests. Specialized testing results are desirable, but optional. Other information concerning the offender's non-criminal sexual behaviour may also be relevant (e.g., offender has a large collection of used women's underwear; previous psychiatric diagnoses).

Only one victim per offence is counted. In this context, an offence is defined as the sexual crime behaviour, which is typically completed in minutes or hours. When the offence involves more than one victim (e.g., exposing to a crowd) select the victim for whom the offender is most likely to be sexually attracted. Deviance is based on the characteristics of the victim and the nature of the act. Deviant acts involving "normal" victims would be counted as deviant victims for this item.

Domain	Count/Criteria	Score
<p>Number of sexual offence victims</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Count only victims of sexual crimes • Exhibitionism to multiple people counts as one victim 	<p>0 = Only one victim</p> <p>1 = two to seven victims</p> <p>2 = eight or more victims of sexual offences</p>	
<p>Number of deviant victims or deviant activities involved in sexual offences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepubescent child victims (same sex or opposite sex) • Exhibitionism, voyeurism, imposing fetish behaviour on another person • Evidence of sadism – subjected to deviant ritual, urination or defecation on victims, sexual torture, degradation • Sex with animals • Sex with dead body 	<p>0 = No deviant victims/activities</p> <p>1 = One deviant victim/one incident of deviant activity</p> <p>2 = Two or more deviant victims/multiple incidents of deviant activity</p>	
<p>Self-report, history or material evidence of deviant interests or preferences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual attraction to children or forced sex • Interest in fetish-related behaviours • Collections of fetish-related paraphernalia 	<p>0 = Offender endorses only normal sexual interests/fantasies/preferences (The assessor believes this to be the truth and has no evidence to the contrary.)</p> <p>1 = The assessor suspects deviant sexual interest/fantasy/preferences are present</p> <p>2 = The offender describes or admits to deviant sexual interests/ fantasies/ preferences, or there is a recent history or material evidence of deviant interests, whether or not the offender admits to such interests (e.g., frequent links to fetish websites, large collection of child pornography)</p>	

Results of specialized testing	<p><u>No Score (NS)</u> – No evidence to suggest specialized testing ever offered or results of specialized testing were deemed inconclusive or offender was a non-responder (results too low for interpretation) - do not score this subsection but do score the other three above</p> <p>0 = Specialized testing done and results demonstrated a sexual interest in appropriate stimuli (i.e., adult consenting)</p> <p>1 = Mixed Results – Possible deviance (e.g., initial assessment showed deviance but most recent assessment demonstrated a sexual interest in appropriate stimuli, i.e., adult consenting; borderline results just below threshold)</p> <p>2 = Tested as having a deviant preference and you have no reason to expect any change (such as completing treatment), or initial assessment showed deviance and more recent assessment was deemed inconclusive or offender was a non-responder (results too low for interpretation)</p>	
--------------------------------	---	--

The highest score in *any* of the four categories is the score for the item (maximum score on this item is “2”).

Deviant Sexual Interests in Remission: For an offender who has scored a “1” or a “2” based on historical facts (e.g., number of victims, number of deviant victims), the assessor may consider whether their deviant sexual interests are “in remission”. Deviant Sexual Interests in remission are noted as a possible mitigating factor on the scoring form, but are not included in the total score. The criteria for deviant sexual interests being “in remission” are the following:

- The offender is currently involved in an age appropriate, consensual, satisfying sexual relationship of at least one year’s duration while “at risk” in the community, with the absence of behavioural indicators of “Deviant Sexual Interests” for at least two years.
- Presence of the relationship and the quality of the sexual relationship requires credible, independent, collateral confirmation of the relationship.

Opinions in the expert community are divided as to whether offenders can change or control their deviant sexual interests. As this item was not in the original validation studies, this scoring adjustment should be considered a structured form of professional judgement and considered as a possible protective factor external to the actuarial scheme.

We believe that current sexual adjustment should be considered in the overall evaluation of risk, but the extent to which this specific way of rating deviant sexual interests “in remission” is a valid protective factor has yet to be empirically tested.

7. Sample Interview Questions:

Over the past five years, how much access have you had to the internet? How often did you access pornography when you were surfing the net?

(If admitting to sexual thoughts about children.) How often do you think about children in a sexual way? What makes them sexually attractive?

Are you interested in any (other) unusual sexual things or activities? [Note: Voyeurism and exhibitionism are the most common – ask about these first.]

Have you ever exposed yourself in public? How often? Where?

Have you ever looked in windows or washrooms to view people undressing or using the facilities? How often? Where? What type of person would you be most interested in looking at?

Have you ever rubbed up against someone for a sexual purpose without their knowledge or consent? How often? Where? How would you choose the person?

Have you ever had sex in a public place? How often? Where? With whom? [Note: Sex in public is not, in itself, considered deviant.]

Have you ever engaged in sadomasochistic sexual activities? (Dominating/hurting someone or being dominated/hurt?)

How were you able to maintain sexual arousal when the victim resisted/was distressed? Was this more or less arousing to you ?

Do you have any special sexual interests? (Give the example that some people are sexually aroused by items, such as high-heels, stockings or rubber and some are aroused by engaging in certain activities such as urinating on another person or wearing clothes of the opposite sex). Sexual interest in something (shoes, stockings) is not enough for scoring this item – the assessor is looking for sexual activities or objects for which the offender’s attraction is unusually strong and disproportionate to normal sexual interests; consider the likelihood that this interest would interfere with normative sexual outlets.

What are they? Have they ever caused problems for you in your relationships? Do you collect any things related to your sexual interest?

Have you ever engaged in sexual activity with an animal? How old were you? What were the circumstances? How often?

Have you ever engaged in sexual activity with a family member? What were the circumstances?

Have you ever engaged in a threesome or group sex activity? Couple swapping? How often? How was it initiated? [Note: Most group sex, couple swapping, sex clubs, etc. are extensions of normal sexual interests, and some participating in such activities would not be considered deviant for STABLE scoring purposes. Such activities can become deviant when they dominate the offender's sexual repertoire and interfere with other, normative sexual activities.]

8. Cross References:

Sex Drive/Preoccupation
Sex as Coping
Impulsive Acts

9. Case Examples:

0 Mr. Simpson was convicted of sexually touching a 17 year old female competitive swimmer who he was coaching. During the present interview he described a sexual interest in consenting activity with adult females and did not endorse an interest in any unusual sexual behaviours. File information did not reveal any evidence to the contrary. Phallometric testing results indicated a preference for adult consenting stimuli.

Criteria		Score
Total victims	1	0
Deviant victims	0	0
Self-report/other evidence	No deviance reported or suspected	0
Specialized testing	PPG appropriate	0
Most deviant indicator		0

1 Mr. Graham did not describe a history of anomalous sexual practices and despite his current convictions, adamantly denied sexual interest in children. However, Mr. Graham is convicted of sexually offending against one prepubescent male over an approximate five year period. The results of Mr. Graham's phallometric testing indicated responding that was too low for valid clinical interpretation. However, given the length of time Mr. Graham offended against the prepubescent male victim and the intrusiveness of the offences, deviant sexual interests are suspected in this case.

Criteria		Score
Total victims	1	0
Deviant victims	1	1
Self-report/other evidence	Intrusive offending over 5 years	1
Specialized testing	PPG invalid	N/A
Most deviant indicator		1

- 2 Mr. Armstrong has ten identified female victims of whom seven were prepubescent in age and the remainder were approximately 14 years of age. He admitted to engaging in sexual fantasies about female children during the present assessment. He also endorsed a sexual interest in touching young females in a sexual manner without their consent and described voyeuristic behaviour, which included drilling a hole in the bathroom wall to watch his stepdaughter. Psychiatric assessments suggest that Mr. Armstrong suffers from toucherism or frotteurism as well as voyeurism and heterosexual pedophilia. Results of phallometric testing indicated a sexual preference for stimuli of coercive sexual interactions with prepubescent females.

Criteria		Score
Total victims	10	2
Deviant victims	7	2
Self-report/other evidence	Young females/voyeurism	2
Specialized testing	PPG deviant	2
Most deviant indicator		2

Item: Cooperation with Supervision

1. The Basic Concept:

Offenders who resist rules, place themselves in risky situations, engage in rule violations, express a defiant attitude towards authority figures, and who display oppositional behaviour towards those in a supervisory role are at an increased risk to reoffend. The offenders may see themselves as being at no risk to reoffend, and as a result they do not take the conditions of their supervision seriously and may place themselves in high risk situations. This item is based on the assessor's appraisal of whether the offender is working with or against the supervising officer and correctional authorities in the assessment and management of their sexual offending behaviour. It takes into account the offender's past performance while under supervision, as well as their current presentation to the assessor. This item is related to therapeutic alliance (i.e., the offender feels comfortable with the therapist; there is a shared sense of common goals and purpose, and a sense of safety and trust in the therapy process).

2. Research:

Non-compliance with rules and authority is a core feature of criminal conduct. The coding of this specific item was developed by comparing the behaviour of sexual offenders who reoffended while on community supervision with those who did not (Hanson & Harris, 2000b, 2001). Follow-up studies consistently find that non-cooperation with supervision is associated with sexual recidivism (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004; Mann et al., 2010). This item showed a significant linear relationship with all types of recidivism outcome in the DSP study (Hanson et al., 2007).

3. Issues to Consider:

A rating on this item is determined by considering and evaluating the offender's overall presentation during the current assessment balanced against his past performance while under supervision (e.g., custodial sentences, community supervision, and prior treatment). If the offender has no history of supervision or prior treatment, the evaluation is based solely on the offender's presentation during the assessment.

There are a variety of ways that offenders can fail to cooperate with supervision. When assessing their current level of cooperation, consider the following:

Disengagement: Consider whether or not the offender seems engaged or invested in the overall assessment process or treatment in general. Does he appear forthcoming with information, speaking freely and without giving the impression that he is withholding information? Does he appear invested in impression management or seem to be keeping secrets? Alternatively, does he appear to be "just going through the motions" or providing merely enough information to complete the assessment but not enough to provide a clear understanding of what is going on with him? Other forms of disengagement are demonstrated when the offender remains silent or

is non-disclosing during sessions, outright refuses to participate in the assessment process and/or treatment entirely, or is rude and confrontational during the interview.

Manipulation: Does the offender appear to be trying to deceive the assessor by lying or providing inaccurate information about himself? Does he openly express his intentions to “play the system” or “jump through the hoops”, noting that he will say whatever it takes to achieve his goals (e.g., transfer to lower security, obtain support for conditional release, have less frequent supervision contacts) but it is clear his commitment or intentions to follow through with stated plans are absent. Does he ask for special favours or seem to be trying to influence the assessor's opinion or assessment by acting “buddy-buddy” with them? Another form of manipulation also includes playing staff off against one another by providing conflicting pieces of information or by over-idealizing some staff while devaluing others (e.g., only wanting to work with one staff member and refusing to work cooperatively with another).

No Show: Related to disengagement, an offender may be viewed as uncooperative with supervision if his attendance for appointments or sessions is poor. This includes an offender who consistently fails to attend appointments with the assessor or with others without reasonable explanation, who shows up late or at the wrong times, or who is constantly asking to reschedule appointments. This can indicate that he does not take the conditions of his supervision seriously or is not committed or invested in making changes to avoid reoffence.

In addition to assessing the offender's presentation during the current assessment, the assessor should also review available file information to assess the offender's history of performance while under supervision (e.g., while incarcerated, in the community, or involved in treatment). A review of institutional records should be completed to look for misconduct reports, institutional charges, or reports of problematic or disrespectful behaviour towards staff or other authority figures. For those offenders who have been under some form of community supervision in the past (e.g., bail, released on own recognizance, probation, or parole), the assessor should review their overall performance and compliance with the conditions placed on them. Did they comply with all conditions or were there problems or breaches noted? Did they test known risk factors (e.g., associating with known criminals or using drugs or alcohol despite conditions to the contrary)? Performance reports may also provide information outlining the offender's overall attitude and interactions with the staff member supervising them. As well, treatment or counselling reports may provide important information regarding the offender's attitude towards treatment or supervision, their investment and commitment to treatment, and their willingness to make changes to avoid high risk situations.

4. Information Needed to Score the Item:

The scoring of this item is based on a balance between the offender's presentation during the interview and file information. Although the offender's responses to interview questions and interactions with the assessor will provide some indication of his overall level of cooperation with supervision, a review of documents outlining his past performance or level of cooperation with others involved in his case will likely also provide useful information. For instance, a newly incarcerated offender who appears to be cooperating with the assessment process and has not come to the attention of the security department for problematic behaviour may have a

lengthy history of breaching community supervision or a number of misconducts while on bail or in pre-trial custody that also needs to be considered when scoring this item.

5. Other Possible Sources of Information:

When available, the assessor should look for progress reports, suspension reports, misconduct reports, or institutional charges, as well as any previous assessment or treatment reports. Court documents, police reports, and presentence reports may also provide information pertaining to breaches or the offender's interactions with authority figures. As well, interviews with friends or family may provide some insight into the offender's overall attitude towards supervision, avoiding high risk situations, or the need for treatment in general.

6. Scoring:

To score this item, after the offender has left the interview, ask yourself “Is he working with me or is he working against me?” If you feel that he is working with you he scores a “0”; if you feel that he is not working with you he scores a “2”. If you cannot make up your mind the offender scores a “1”. The offender who scores a “0” may not agree with everything you say and he may not take and implement every suggestion that you make, but you have the feeling that he is actively involved in avoiding a reoffence. He takes what you say seriously and, perhaps, in spite of some slips, appears to be trying to walk the “straight road”. The offender who scores a “1” will not be actively trying to defeat your supervisory efforts but neither will he be trying to advance his own rehabilitation. You will generally have the idea that he is not making any forward progress and he is “stalled” where he is.

- 0 The offender appears to be working with you and regularly follows through on instructions and attending appointments. He displays a cooperative and collaborative attitude during meetings, and appears to be forthcoming with information. He has completed prior periods of supervision without any major difficulties, and openly discusses the importance of abiding by conditions in the future as well as working with those involved in the management of his case.

- 1 Although the offender may have some history of being uncooperative with supervision in the past, more recent behaviour has been better but he still is not putting much effort into his own progress. An offender of this nature may place low value on your efforts but will not confront you directly. The offender may well have a poor attitude towards authority figures in general. The offender may or may not acknowledge that his past performance was a problem that he needs to work on, and he may say that he is going to try harder but on the whole you have seen little evidence of that to this juncture. Also included are offenders who for the most part appear to be cooperative with supervision, but who demonstrate occasional problems following the rules, with their attendance (e.g., occasional missed appointments) or participation in some aspects of the assessment (i.e., will answer some questions in your interview but refuses other areas of enquiry). Often the “hallmark” of the “1” is ambivalence about the supervisory process, some days being “with” the program and some days being “against” the program.

- 2 The offender has a history of being non-compliant with prior conditions of supervision and his current behaviour continues to be uncooperative. The offender appears disengaged or uncommitted to supervision or treatment, and he is perceived to be engaging in deceptive or manipulative behaviours. The assessor may feel that they have no idea what is going on with the offender and his overall attitude towards supervision or treatment is poor. You may feel that the offender ignores or holds your suggestions in contempt. You may even feel that the case is deteriorating, and the offender is becoming more risky. Such offenders often will tell you there is no chance that they will recidivate, that they pose no risk to the community or others, and they do not see the need to make changes in their life to avoid risky situations (as perceived by others).

7. Sample Interview Questions:

You're serving () years/months for (). Did you plead guilty? Are you appealing your conviction or sentence? How fair do you think your sentence is?

Have you experienced any trouble while in custody? Any institutional charges/misconducts?

Have you previously been on parole or probation or some other form of supervised release? Any problems? Revocations? Additional charges?

How do you feel about being on parole/probation? On the Sexual Offender Information Registry? Do you think it will be difficult for you to comply with the restrictions or conditions that may be placed on you?

To date, what have you done to address your sexual offending/behaviour?

Who has tried to help you with your sexual behaviour problems in the past? How did they assist you? Did you tell them everything they needed to know? What changes did you make to reduce your risk?

What are your chances of getting into trouble for another sexual offence?

What do you plan to do to make a reoffence less likely? What will you need to be careful of in the future? Have you ever stopped doing something you like to do because you were worried it might lead you into committing a sexual offence?

Have you ever put yourself into a risky situation just to see if you could handle it? What was the situation? How did you know that you could handle it?

How do you feel about being recommended for a sexual offender treatment program? Any concerns?

8. Cross References:

Poor Cognitive Problem Solving
Impulsive Acts

9. Scoring Profiles:

- 0 Mr. Jones attended scheduled meetings and fully participated in all aspects of the current assessment. He seemed to engage with the supervising officer and appeared to be taking an active interest in his case and in improving his prospects. Mr. Jones was forthcoming with information about his offences and provided insights about his offending that were not noted in other reports. He appeared attentive and indicated his interest in what the supervising officer had to say and said that he is interested in participating in treatment programs in the future. He expressed his willingness to abide by all conditions of his future release.
- 1 Mr. Davis' behaviour during the present assessment was acceptable. Although at times his comments were tangential or self focused, he responded well to redirection and would apologize for getting off track. With the exception of failing to attend one appointment, claiming to have a headache that day, his attendance for all other appointments was good. Currently, Mr. Davis' has “good days” and “bad days”; some days he is willing to listen and some days he is not. His institutional behaviour has been uneventful and there is no indication that he has come to the attention of security since his arrival five months ago. A review of file information indicates that Mr. Davis' prior supervision history has been less than satisfactory. Mr. Davis states that he will “do whatever [he is] told to do” so that he can move on with his life. He is participating in a treatment group and early reports suggest he is cooperative but guarded.
- 2 Mr. McDonald has been described by his parole officer as “difficult to deal with” and as having a “short fuse”. He tells the supervising officer that there are no good reasons for them to meet as he has “got it” this time and is in no danger of reoffending. During the present assessment, Mr. McDonald provided information about himself that was at times contradictory or incredulous given the facts of his life. He also expressed no desire to cooperate with his case management team claiming to have nothing about himself to work on or change. Mr. McDonald went once to a treatment program, announced that it was all “bullshit” and stomped out.

or

Mr. Johnson spends most of the session complaining about how “the system” has done him wrong. The judge was out to get him because the judge had seen him before, the police have a grudge against him, and we (the correctional system) are just “plain mean” to him. During the present assessment, when asked about his behaviour that led to the current offence, Mr. Johnson focused his comments on the shortcomings of the staff involved in his case, noting that they treated him unfairly and placed too many rules on him that he could not possibly follow. He also denies his need for treatment or a release

plan, noting that he only participates in the treatment program while on parole because he “has to”. Mr. Johnson continually expresses resistance to any suggestions you make and attempts to have the supervising officer make everything an “order”. He is quite vocal in his insistence that it is “no use” for him to attend parole supervision and that there is absolutely nothing he should think about or change to prevent a reoffence.

Creating STABLE-2007 Total Scores

For each item the evaluator should note the score (i.e., 0, 1, or 2) in the right hand column of the STABLE 2007 Tally Sheet (Appendix A). The total score is the sum of the individual scores for all items. Please note that all items should be scored and not prorated with the exception of the item Emotional Identification with Children, which is only scored for offenders with child victims (less than 14 years old). For offenders with only adult victims a “N/A” should be placed in the scoring column to remind the evaluator that the item was not scored for this offender. The middle column on the tally sheet provides the evaluator with room to write brief notes regarding the information they considered when scoring the item. These notes can be useful if you are reviewing the Tally Sheet at a later date to remind you of the factors considered when making your scoring decisions.

The interpretive ranges for the STABLE-2007 are as follows: a total score of 0 to 3 is considered a low level of stable dynamic risk and needs; a total score of 4 to 11 is considered a moderate level of stable dynamic risk and needs; and a total score of 12 or higher is considered a high level of stable dynamic risk and needs. These interpretive ranges are based on results of the DSP (DSP; Hanson et al., 2007) and are empirically informed. Specifically, “high” needs is defined as “1” or more standard deviations about the mean (top 16%) and “low” needs is defined as “1” or more standard deviations below the mean (bottom 16%). The middle 68% is considered “moderate” (see Appendix D for further information).

Although the STABLE-2007 can be used on its own as a measure of treatment needs and dynamic risk factors, it can also be combined with a STATIC risk measure to produce recidivism rate estimates. Rules for combining STABLE scores with STATIC-99, STATIC-99R, STATIC-2002, and STATIC-2002R are presented in Appendix F, and the recidivism rates tables associated with the overall risk/need priority ratings are presented in Appendix G.

References

- Andrews, D. A. (1982). *The Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI): The first follow-up*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D. A. & Bonta, J. L. (1995). *LSI-R: The Level of Service Inventory - Revised*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. (5th Edition) New Providence, NJ: LexisNexis.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52, 7-27.
- Araji, A., & Finkelhor, D. (1986). Abusers: A review of the research. In D. Finkelhor, S. Araji, L. Baron, A. Browne, S.D. Peters & G.E. Wyatt (Eds.), *A sourcebook on child sexual abuse* (pp. 89-118). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Babchishin, K.M., Hanson, R.K., & Hermann, C.A. (2011). The characteristics of online sex offenders: A meta-analysis. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 23(1), 92-123.
- Bancroft, J., Janssen, E., Strong, D., Carnes, L., Vukadinovic, Z., & Long, J. S. (2003a). The relation between mood and sexuality in heterosexual men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 32, 217-230.
- Bancroft, J., Janssen, E., Strong, D., Carnes, L., Vukadinovic, Z., & Long, J. S. (2003b). Sexual risk-taking in gay men: The relevance of sexual arousability, mood, and sensation seeking. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 32, 555-572.
- Bandura, A. (1974). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Beck, A. J., & Shipley, B. E. (1989). *U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics special report: Recidivism or prisoners released in 1983*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Beggs, S. M., & Grace, R. C. (2010). Assessment of dynamic risk factors: An independent validation study of the Violence Risk Scale – Sexual Offender version. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 22, 234-251.
- Beggs, S. M., & Grace, R. C. (2011). Treatment gain for sexual offenders against children predicts reduced recidivism: A comparative validity study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 79, 182-192.
- Blanchard, R., & Bogaert, A. F. (1997). Additive effects of older brothers and homosexual brothers in the prediction of marriage and cohabitation. *Behavior Genetics*, 27, 45-54.

- Boer, D. P., Hart, S. D., Kropp, P. R., & Webster, C. D. (1997). *Manual for the Sexual Violence Risk – 20: Professional guidelines for assessing risk of sexual violence*. Vancouver, British Columbia: British Columbia Institute on Family Violence and Mental Health, Law, & Policy Institute, Simon Fraser University.
- Bonta, J. (1996). Risk-needs assessment and treatment. In A. T. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work: Defining the demand and evaluating the supply* (pp. 18-32) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bonta, J. (2002). Offender risk assessment: Guidelines for selection and use. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 29*, 355-379.
- Bonta, J., Law, M., & Hanson, K. (1998). The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 123*(2), 123-142.
- Bonta, J., Rugge, T., Scott, T. L., Bourgon, G., & Yessine, A. K. (2008). Exploring the black box of community supervision. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 47*(3), 248-270.
- Cortoni, F., Hanson, R. K., & Coache, M. (2009). Les délinquantes sexuelles: prevalence et récidive [Female sexual offenders: Prevalence and recidivism]. *Revue Internationale de Criminologie et de Police Technique et Scientifique, 62*, 319-337.
- Cortoni, F., Hanson, R.K., & Coache, M. (2010). The recidivism rates of female sexual offenders are low: A meta-analysis. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 22*(4), 387-401.
- Cortoni, F., & Marshall, W. L. (2001). Sex as a coping strategy and its relationship to juvenile sexual history and intimacy in sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 13*, 27-44.
- Cortoni, F. & Nunes, K. L. (2007). Assessing the effectiveness of the National Sexual Offender program. Research Report R-183. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada. Download from: <http://www.csc-ccc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/reports>
- Crawford, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., & Slick, D. J. (2009). On percentile norms in neuropsychology: Proposed reporting standards and methods for quantifying the uncertainty over the percentile ranks of test scores. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 23*(7), 1173-1195.
- Cunliffe, J., & Sheperd, A. (2007). *Re-offending of adults: Results from the 2004 cohort* (Home Office Statistical Bulletin) Retrieved from www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs07/hosb0607.pdf.

- DiClemente, C. C. (1991). Motivational interviewing and the stages of change. In W.R. Miller, & S. Rollnick (Eds.), *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people to change addictive behavior* (pp. 191-202). New York: Guilford Press.
- Drapeau, M. (2005). Research on the processes involved in treating sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 17*, 117-125.
- Eher, R., Matthes, A., Schilling, F., Haubner-MacLean, T., & Rettenberger, M. (2012). Assessment in Sexual Offenders Using STABLE-2000 and the STABLE-2007: An Investigation of Predictive and Incremental Validity. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 24*, 5-28.
- Epperson, D. L., Kaul, J., & Huot, S. (1995). Predicting risk of recidivism for incarcerated sex offenders. Paper presentation at the 14th Annual Research and Treatment conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers. New Orleans, LA.
- Fernandez, Y. M. (2006). Focusing on the positive and avoiding negativity in sexual offender treatment. In W.L. Marshall, Y. Fernandez, L. Marshall, & G. Serran (Eds.). *Sexual Offender Treatment: Controversial Issues*. London: Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Fernandez, Y. (2008). *An examination of the inter-rater reliability of the STATIC-99 and STABLE-2007*. Poster presentation at the 27th Annual Research and Treatment conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers. Atlanta, GA.
- Finkelhor, D. (1986). Abusers: Special topics. In D. Finkelhor, S. Araji, L. Baron, A. Browne, S.D. Peters, and G.E. Wyatt, *A sourcebook on child sexual abuse* (pp. 119-142). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works! *Criminology, 34*, 575-607.
- Grubin, D. (1998). *Sex offending against children: Understanding the risk*. Police Research Series Paper 99. London: Home office.
- Gutierrez, L., Wilson, H., Rugge, T., & Bonta, J. (in press). The prediction of recidivism with Aboriginal offenders: A quantitative and theoretically informed review. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*.
- Hammer, E.F., & Glueck, B.C. (1957). Psychodynamic patterns in sex offenders: A four-factor theory. *Psychiatric Quarterly, 31*, 325-345.

- Hanson, R. K. (1997). *The development of a brief actuarial risk scale for sexual offence recidivism*. User Report 1997 - 04. Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, Ottawa, Canada. Available at www.ps-sp.gc.ca/res/cor/rep
- Hanson, R. K. (2009). The psychological assessment of risk for crime and violence. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, 20(3), 172-182.
- Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., Helmus, L., & Hodgson, S. (2009). The principles of effective correctional treatment also apply to sexual offenders: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 865-891.
- Hanson, R. K., & Bussière M. T. (1996). *Predictors of sexual offender recidivism: A meta-analysis*. User Report 1996 - 04. Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, Ottawa, Canada. Available at www.ps-sp.gc.ca/res/cor/rep
- Hanson, R. K., & Bussière, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66(2), 348-362.
- Hanson, R. K., Gordon, A., Harris, A. J. R., Marques, J. K., Murphy, W., Quinsey, V. L., & Seto, M. C. (2002). First report of the Collaborative Data Project on the effectiveness of psychological treatment for sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 14, 169-194.
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (1998). *Dynamic predictors of sexual recidivism*. User Report 1998-01. Ottawa: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada. Available at www.ps-sp.gc.ca/res/cor/rep
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2000a). *The sex offender need assessment rating (SONAR): A method for measuring change in risk levels*. User Report 2000 - 01. Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, Ottawa, Canada. Available at www.ps-sp.gc.ca/res/cor/rep
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2000b). Where should we intervene? Dynamic predictors of sexual offence recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 27(1), 6-35.
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2001). A structured approach to evaluating change among sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 13(2), 105-122.
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2004). STABLE-2000/ACUTE-2000 : Scoring manuals for the Dynamic Supervision Project. Unpublished scoring manuals. Corrections Research, Public Safety Canada, 340 Laurier Ave., West, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1A 0P8.
- Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T.-L., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project*. User Report, Corrections Research, Ottawa: Public Safety Canada. Available at www.ps-sp.gc.ca/res/cor/rep

- Hanson, R. K., & Helmus, L. (2009, September). *Using assessment of psychological risk factors to revise relative risk assessments derived from static actuarial instruments*. Paper presented at the 28th Annual Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Dallas, TX.
- Hanson, R. K., Helmus, L.-M., & Harris, A. J. R. (2014). Assessing the risk and needs of supervised sexual offenders: A prospective study using STABLE-2007, Static-99R and Static-2002R. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2004). *Predictors of sexual recidivism: An updated meta-analysis* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2004-02). Ottawa, ON: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*, 1154-1163.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2009). The accuracy of recidivism risk assessments for sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of 118 prediction studies. *Psychological Assessment, 21*, 1-21.
- Hanson, R. K., & Scott, H. (1996). Social networks of sexual offenders. *Psychology, Crime, & Law, 2*, 249-258.
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (1999). STATIC-99: Improving actuarial risk assessments for sex offenders. User Report 1999-02. Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, Ottawa, Canada. Available at www.ps-sp.gc.ca/res/cor/rep
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2000). Improving risk assessments for sex offenders: A comparison of three actuarial scales. *Law and Human Behaviour, 24*(1), 119-136.
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2003). *Notes on the development of the STATIC-2002*. User report 2003-01. Department of the solicitor General of Canada, Ottawa, Canada. Available at www.ps-sp.gc.ca/res/cor/rep
- Hare, R. D. (2003). Manual for the Revised Psychopathy Checklist (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Harris, A. J. R., & Hanson, R. K. (2001). A structured approach to evaluating change among sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 13*(2), 105-122.
- Harris, A. J. R., & Hanson, R. K. (2010). Clinical, actuarial, and dynamic risk assessment of sexual offenders: Why do they keep changing things? *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16*(3), 296-310.

- Harris, A. J. R., Phenix, A., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2003). *STATIC-99 Coding rules - Revised 2003*. Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, Ottawa, Canada. Available at www.ps-sp.gc.ca/res/cor/rep
- Hart, S. D., Kropp, P. R., Laws, D. R., Klaver, J., Logan, C., & Watt, K. A. (2003). *The Risk for Sexual Violence Protocol (RSVP): Structured professional guidelines for assessing risk of sexual violence*. Burnaby, British Columbia: Mental Health, Law, and Policy Institute, Simon Fraser University; Pacific Psychological Assessment Corporation; and the British Columbia Institute Against Family Violence.
- Helmus, L., Babchishin, K. M., & Blais, J. (2012). Predictive accuracy of dynamic risk factors for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal sex offenders: A comparison using STABLE-2007. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *56*, 856-876.
- Helmus, L., Hanson, R.K., Babchishin, K.M., & Thornton, D. (2014). Sex offender risk assessment with the Risk Matrix 2000: Validation and guidelines for combining with the STABLE-2007. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/13552600.2013.870241
- Helmus, L., Thornton, D., Hanson, R. K., & Babchishin, K. M. (2012). Improving the predictive accuracy of STATIC-99 and STATIC-2002 with older sex offenders: Revised age weights. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *24*, 64-101.
- Kafka, M.P. (2010). Hypersexual disorder: A proposed diagnosis for DSM-V. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *39*, 377-400.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Oxford: Saunders.
- Knight, R. A., & Thornton, D. (2007). *Evaluating and improving risk assessment schemes for sexual recidivism: A long-term follow-up of convicted sexual offenders* (Document No. 217618). Submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice.
- Krueger, R. F., Schmutte, P. S., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Campbell, K., & Silva, P. A. (1994). Personality traits are linked to crime among men and women: Evidence from a birth cohort. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *103*, 328-338.
- Lalumière, M. L., Chalmers, L. J., Quinsey, V. L., Seto, M. C. (1996). A test of the mate deprivation hypothesis of sexual coercion. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *17*, 299-318.
- Långström, N. (2004). Accuracy of actuarial procedures for assessment of sexual offender recidivism risk may vary across ethnicity. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *16*, 107-120.
- Långström, N., & Hanson, R. K. (2006). High rates of sexual behavior in the general population: Correlates and predictors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *35*, 37-52.

- Lösel, F., & Schmucker, M. (2005). The effectiveness of treatment for sexual offenders: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *1*, 117-146.
- Malamuth, N., & Brown, L. (1994). Sexually aggressive men's perceptions of women's communications: Testing three explanations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 699-712.
- Malamuth, N., Linz, D., Heavey, C., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A ten year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 353-369.
- Malamuth, N., Sockloskie, R., Koss, M., & Tanaka, J. (1991). The characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *59*, 670-681.
- Mann, R. E., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2010). Assessing risk for sexual recidivism: Some proposals on the nature of psychologically meaningful risk factors. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *22*(2), 191-217.
- Marshall, W. L., Anderson, D., & Fernandez, Y. M. (1999). *Cognitive behavioral treatment of sexual offenders*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Marshall, L. E., Marshall, W. L., Moulden, H. M., & Serran, G. A. (2008). The prevalence of sexual addiction in incarcerated sexual offenders and matched community nonoffenders. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, *15*, 271-283.
- McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., Burchard, B. L., Zeoli, S., & Ellerby, L. (2010). *Current practices and emerging trends in sexual abuser management: The Safer Society 2009 North American Survey*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society.
- Menzies, R. J., Webster, C. D., McMain, S., Staley, S., & Scaglione, R. (1994). The dimensions of dangerousness revisited: Assessing forensic predictions about criminality and violence. *Law and Human Behaviour*, *18*, 695-700.
- Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (Eds.) (1991). *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people to change addictive behavior*. New York: Guildford press.
- Nunes, K. L., Babchishin, K. M., & Cortoni, F. (2011). Measuring treatment change in sexual offenders: Clinical and statistical significance. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *38*, 157-173.
- Olver, M. E., Wong, S. C., Nicholaichuk, T. & Gordon, A. (2007). The validity and reliability of the Violence Risk Scale-Sexual Offender version: Assessing sex offender risk and evaluating therapeutic change. *Psychological Assessment*, *19*, 318-329.

- Parent, A., Teilmann, G., Juul, A., Skakkebaek, N. E., Toppari, J., & Bourguignon, J. (2003). The timing of normal puberty and the age limits of sexual precocity: Variations around the world, secular trends, and changes after migration. *Endocrine Reviews*, *24*, 668-693.
- Phenix, A., Doren, D., Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2009). *STATIC-2002 coding rules* (Corrections Research User Report). Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada. Available from <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/fl/sttc-2002-eng.pdf>
- Quinsey, V. L., & Ambtman, R. (1979). Variables affecting psychiatrists' and teachers' assessments of the dangerousness of mentally ill offenders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *47*, 353-362.
- Quinsey, V. L., Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., & Cormier, C. A. (2006). *Violent offenders: Appraising and managing risk* (2nd. Ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (1995). Violent recidivism: Assessing predictive validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *63*, 737-748.
- Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (2005). Comparing effect sizes in follow-up studies: ROC area, Cohen's *d*, and *r*. *Law and Human Behavior*, *29*, 615-620.
- Seto, M.C., Hanson, R.K., & Babchishin, K.M. (2011). Contact sexual offending by men with online sexual offenses. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *23*(1), 124-145.
- Shingler, J. & Mann, R. (2006). In W. L. Marshall, Y. M. Fernandez, L. E. Marshall & G. A. Serran (Eds.) *Sexual Offender Treatment: Controversial issues* (pp. 225-239). New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1970). *Principles of criminology* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Lippincott.
- Swets, J. A., Dawes, R. M., & Monahan, J. (2000). Psychological science can improve diagnostic decisions. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *1*, 1 – 26.
- Tanner, J. M. (1962). *Growth at adolescence*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Thornton, D. (2002). Constructing and testing a framework for dynamic risk assessment. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *14*, 139-153.
- Thornton, D., Mann, R., Webster, S., Blud, L., Travers, R., Friendship, C., & Erikson, M. (2003). Distinguishing and combining risks for sexual and violent recidivism. In R. A. Prentky, E. S. Janus & M. C. Seto (Eds.). *Sexually coercive behavior: Understanding and management* (pp. 225-235). Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Volume 989. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

- Webster, C. D., Douglas, K. S., Eaves, D. & Hart, S. D. (1997). Assessing risk of violence to others. In C. D. Webster & M. A. Jackson (Eds.), *Impulsivity: Theory, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 251-277). New York: Guilford Press.
- Whitaker, D. J., Le, B., Hanson, R. K., Baker, C. K., McMahon, P., Ryan, G., . . . Rice, D. D. (2008). Risk factors for the perpetration of child sexual abuse: A review and meta-analysis. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 32*, 529-548.
- Wilson, R. J. (1999). Emotional congruence in sexual offenders against children. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 1*, 33-47.

Appendices

STABLE-2007 – TALLY SHEET

Subject Name: _____

Place of Scoring: _____

Date of Scoring: _____ Name of Assessor: _____

Scoring Item	Notes	Section Total
Significant Social Influences		
Capacity for Relationship Stability		
Emotional ID with Children	(Only score this item for child molesters)	
Hostility Toward Women		
General Social Rejection		
Lack of Concern for Others		
Impulsive Acts		
Poor Problem Solving Skills		
Negative Emotionality		
Sex Drive Sex Preoccupation		
Sex as Coping		
Deviant Sexual Preference		
Cooperation with Supervision		
Sum for Final Total (Out of 24 for those without a child victim, i.e., younger than 14 years old)		<u> </u> 26
<u>Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission</u>		
1) Is the offender in an age appropriate, consensual, sexual relationship of at least one year's duration while "at risk" in the community?		Yes/No
2) Is there an absence of behavioural indicators of Deviant Sexual Interest for two years?		Yes/No
<p>If both questions have been answered "Yes" award a "-1" in this box and reduce the total score by one point as long as the Deviant Sexual Interest score is greater than zero.</p> <p>Note: The "over-ride" has not been validated and does not count in the total score entered above. The adjusted score can be recorded for future empirical validation. However, the original unadjusted score should be reported and should be used when combining the STABLE-2007 score with STATIC-99/R, STATIC-2002/R or other risk tools.</p>		
Revised Total taking "Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission" into Account		

Interpretive Ranges: 0 – 3 = Low, 4 – 11 = Moderate, 12+ = High

Scoring Social Influences

Positive	Negative	Final Score		
0	0		1	
0	1 – or more			2
1	0		1	
1	1		1	
1	2 – or more			2
2	0	0		
2	1		1	
2	2		1	
2	3 – or more			2
3	0	0		
3	1	0		
3	2		1	
3	3		1	
3	4 – or more			2
4	0	0		
4	1	0		
4	2	0		
4	3		1	
4	4		1	
5 – or more		0		

Scoring Capacity for Relationship Stability

<u>“A” Part</u> Lived Two Years with a Partner	<u>“B” Part</u> Tenor of Current Relationship	Final Score On this Item
No	No Current Relationship (2)	2
No	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
No	Acceptable (0)	1
Yes	No Current Relationship (2)	
Yes	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
Yes	Acceptable (0)	0

Appendix B - Sample Interview

The following is a sample interview covering the STABLE-2007 items. The interview questions are a guide, and experienced interviewers are encouraged to use their judgement regarding the most appropriate phrasing of questions to best obtain the necessary information. There is no expectation that experienced interviewers will use all of the provided questions in the order they are presented. Some evaluators may find these questions useful in structuring their interview with a sexual offender new to their caseload or as a way of learning the STABLE-2007. Assessors should use their best clinical judgement as to whether or not to ask additional questions when the offender's previous response indicates no problems or that no further information will be forthcoming. The order of the questions is also a suggested format and assessors may choose to re-arrange the questions and/or sections to fit their style and circumstances.

The interview should begin by identifying the purpose of the assessment and outlining the benefits of working collaboratively with the offender. It is worthwhile for the assessor to inquire as to what the offender's goals are for the assessment, in our effort to ensure the offender's goals are realistic. The evaluator should also aspire to meet the offender's goals, provided that they are reasonable and feasible. That way, the experience is perceived as beneficial to all involved. You may want to begin the interview with some general inquiries about the offender's feelings about the assessment, their ability to participate in the interview (health, hearing, etc.), and some introductory questions regarding general background (employment, accommodation, money, etc.) There is no scoring grid for introductory questions as these questions are suggested to gain and refresh general information about the case, to ease apprehension, and to set the tone for the questions that follow.

STABLE-2007 Interview

Introductory Questions:

How are you feeling today? Are there any issues that might interfere with your ability to participate in today's interview (*hearing, health*)?

Is there anything that would make this process more comfortable for you?

Why don't you tell me what your goals are for this assessment and then I'll outline the things that I think we need to accomplish as well?

How do you think that this assessment might benefit you?

I'm going to ask you quite a few questions today. Some will be directly related to the offences/accusations that brought you here and some will be more general, about your life and you as a person. I'd like you to be as honest and open as possible in answering the questions as that allows me to complete the most accurate and ultimately most helpful assessment.

Perhaps we could start with some background information as to how you came to be on parole/probation/in my office? [*Query for some information about the offence, such as victim age, gender, relationship to offender, how long known before offending, duration of offending, whether the offender admits at all to the offence, assess use of minimizations and justifications.*]

Have you ever done/been accused of something like this before?

(Does he/she lie/minimize or justify previous misdeeds?)

Why do you think you did it? Why do you think you were accused?

(Any acceptance or responsibility at all?)

Significant Social Influences:

Who are the important people in your life (*note names on List of Significant Social Influences*)?

How long have you known them? When was the last time you spoke to them? How often do you speak to them?

In what ways will they be able to offer you support? What kind of support are they offering you now? What kind of support will they be able to give you when you are released?

What sorts of problems have they helped you with in the past? What sorts of problems have you helped them with? Have they ever been in trouble with the law (*criminal histories*)? Do they use alcohol or drugs? Have they ever been accused of committing a sexual offence?

Do they know about your offences? How do they feel about your offending? How do they feel about your sentence length? How do they feel about the way you have been treated by the criminal justice system?

How do they feel about treatment? How do they feel about conditions or restrictions associated with your arrest or sentence?

Capacity for Relationship Stability:

[Relationship History/Ever Lived With an Intimate Partner]

How many serious relationships have you been involved in over the years? (*Names, dates, length of relationships*)

Did any of them involve living together? How long? (*Married, common-law*)

Did you feel emotionally close to your partner?

What did you have in common?

What were some of the problems in the relationship?

Who ended the relationship? Why? (*If s/he ended, did you agree/understand his/her reasons?*)

(*Canvass for a history of physical/emotionalSexual abuse?*)

Has family or friends ever intervened/interfered with your relationship(s)?

Have the police ever been called to the home?

What qualities are you looking for in a partner? Are these qualities hard to find?

Tenor of Current Relationship:

Are you currently involved in a relationship? (*Married/common-law/newly established?*)

What is their first name? How long have you been together? How long have you lived together?

Was this the longest you have ever lived with a partner?

How does s/he feel about your current incarceration? Do you think that the relationship will last throughout your incarceration? What makes you think this? How often do you have contact (*letter/phone/visits*)?

Do you feel emotionally close to your partner?

All couples have problems from time to time or issues that they need to work out. What kinds of problems did you have in your relationship? What did you do about them? Are these issues you still need to deal with?

Have you ever done something to hurt or scare your partner? (*Canvass for a history of physical/emotional/sexual abuse.*)

Have family or friends ever intervened/interfered with your relationship? Have the police ever been called to the home?

(If no current relationship, explore reasons behind being single. Is it his choice? Did he recently end a relationship?)

Emotional Identification with Children:

What do you like to do in your spare time? What movies do you enjoy? How do you relax when you are not working? What are your favorite TV programs?

Are there any children in your life that you consider your friends? How do you know them?

What types of activities do you do together? How do their parents/guardians feel about your friendship with them?

Sometimes people feel more comfortable around children (*or “younger people”*) than they do around adults because they feel that children are more understanding or accepting of them. Have you ever felt that way? Tell me more about that.

In your experiences, have you found it easier to start a conversation with someone who is around your own age or with a child (*or teenager*)?

If you had a choice between spending time with a child doing something they enjoyed, such as playing video games or going to the playground or spending time with an adult, which would you decide to do?

What did you enjoy about spending time with the victim(s)? What did you do together? Who suggested the activities that you engaged in with the victim(s)? What was your role in those activities?

What do you perceive the role of a parent to be in their child's activities?

Who are you most looking forward to seeing when you get out?

Hostility Toward Women:

Are there any women in your life that you feel close to? How does your partner feel about these friendships? Have you ever been sexually involved with any of these women?

Do you think that it is difficult for men and women to be friends without it becoming sexual or there being sexual tension between them? Why or why not?

Has anyone ever complained about your behaviour towards women? What were the circumstances?

Do you have any convictions for offences (*any*) that involved women?

What were your experiences working with women? Have you ever had a female supervisor?

How did you feel about that? What was your experience like?

Do you find that you need to change the way you speak or act when around women? Can you provide some examples?

Have you ever had a woman make trouble for you? (*i.e., Telling lies about you, making false accusations, interfering in relationships, having you fired from a job, etc.*)

Do you think that some women will say or do anything just to get a man into trouble? How often do you think this happens?

Do you think that it is a good idea to have women involved in the criminal justice system? Why or why not? Were any involved in your case? Did they treat you fairly?

Would things have been different if there had been men in these positions?

General Social Rejection/Loneliness:

What did you do for employment in the community?

What about your job did you like?

How well did you know your coworkers? Did you socialize with them outside of the workplace?

How did you spend your leisure time? Were you involved in any community groups, sports teams or clubs? Did you attend Church or other religious services? What are your hobbies?

Who are you closest to in the world?

Are there any friends you have had for a long time (*more than five years*)? How did you meet them?

How easy is it for you to make new friends? What common interests/hobbies do you have with others? What do you talk about when you are together?

Do you ever feel lonely? (*Community vs. incarceration*) What makes you feel that way?

How do you cope?

Have you ever felt rejected by your community? What happened? How did you cope?

Have you ever felt rejected by your family? What happened? How did you cope?

Do you feel that other people care about you? Who?

Overall, do you feel as well liked or “popular” as most other people?

What would your friends say about you if I asked them?

Lack of Concern for Others:

How do you think your decisions and behaviours affect other people?

How important is it for you personally to consider the feelings of others? What gets in the way of this?

Do you feel that others are concerned with your feelings? How do you feel about that? What do you do about that?

How would other people describe you? Do you think that their opinions of you are accurate?
Are their opinions important?

How do you think your offending has affected the victim(s)? Their family and friends? Your family and friends?

Who are you most looking forward to seeing once you are released? Why?

Impulsive Acts:

What are you most looking forward to doing once released?

Do you consider yourself to be impulsive? What types of things do you do impulsively or on the spur of the moment?

Do you ever do things on the spur of the moment and then wonder why you did them? How often does this happen?

Do you ever buy things that you really cannot afford or really do not need?

Have you ever got really mad if someone cut you off in traffic? What did you do?

Have you ever taken something without permission or paying for it because you just wanted it?

How often does this happen?

Have you ever had difficulty managing your money? Do you live paycheck to paycheck?

Do you have any savings? Any debt?

Have you ever gotten into a bar-fight? What happened? How often does this happen?

Have you ever quit a job without having another one to go to? How often do you change jobs?

What are usually the reasons for this? Have you ever been fired for breaking the rules at work or for engaging in unsafe practices? Have you ever hurt yourself or someone else at work?

Do you like exciting pastimes such as street racing, skydiving, or “extreme sports”? Have these activities ever led to a trip to the emergency department or admission to hospital?

How many different residences have you lived in over the years? What were the reasons for moving? Have you ever moved without giving notice or providing family or friends with a forwarding address?

Do you like taking risks? Could you give me examples of risks you have taken?

Are you the type of person who likes to drive fast, or take chances when driving? Have you been arrested for speeding or dangerous driving?

Have you ever bought things and then wondered why you bought them?

Have you ever stolen anything that you didn't really need?

How often do you gamble? Has your gambling ever caused you problems?

Have you ever had a disagreement with an unreasonable colleague/co-worker that led to a shoving match at work?

How often do you drink alcohol or use drugs? Have you ever had a problem with drugs or alcohol? Has anyone ever complained about your use of alcohol or drugs?

Do you ever find yourself making plans with others and then not showing up? What were the reasons for not showing up? Did something better come up at the last minute?

Poor Cognitive Problem Solving:

[Keep in mind the five components of effective problem solving and look for examples of these skills in the offender's answers.]

What sorts of things cause you problems in your life? What do you do about them?

What do you think of (*the person who caused the problem*)? Do you meet people like that a lot?

What do you do or say to deal with conflicts in your relationships? Who usually apologizes first? What do you do if you cannot resolve a conflict? Who is usually wrong?

How do you deal with conflicts at work? With friends? Neighbours?

What do you do if (*chosen course of action*) doesn't work?

What about yourself would you like to work on or change?

What would others say you should work on or change about yourself? Do they have valid concerns?

Where do you see yourself in (*five*) years? How are you going to get yourself there? What obstacles might you encounter and how will you deal with them?

Negative Emotionality/Hostility:

Do you ever feel like people are “just out to get you” or looking to harm you? How do you deal with people like that?

How do you feel about your arrest and involvement in the criminal justice system? Do you feel you were dealt with fairly?

Are there times when you feel that you cannot take it anymore or you just can't cope? What has caused these situations? When was the last time that you felt like that? What did you do about it?

When things go wrong, do you generally try to forget about it or do you find yourself focusing on it over and over in your mind? How does it make you feel when things go wrong or when you feel that things are out of your control? What do you do in those situations?

How fair do you think your life has been generally? What kind of support have you received from family? Friends? Professionals? What happens when you ask others for help? What things could you do to improve your situation?

Sex Drive/Preoccupation:

How old were you when you engaged in your first sexual experience? (*Alone, or with another*)

What was your relationship to the other person? (*Stranger, girlfriend/boyfriend, peer, childhood sexual abuse*)

Over your entire lifetime, how many different sexual partners have you been involved with?

Do you think that is a lot of different partners for someone your age?

Of that number, can you tell me how many of them you were involved with in a relationship?

How many were strangers/one-night-stands? How many were casual sexual encounters?

How many were with Prostitutes?

How often do you hire prostitutes? How much would you spend?

How often do you view erotic material, such as magazines, videos, internet? Do you have a collection? Describe your collection? Does your partner know about your collection? How do they feel about it?

How often do you search the internet for erotic material (*images, videos, narratives*)? What search terms do you use? How do you find images that interest you? How much time do you spend on the computer?

How often do you visit chat rooms? Which chat rooms do you visit?

How often do you attend strip clubs? Massage parlours for sex?

Has anyone ever told you that you seem preoccupied with sex? Pornography? Prostitutes?

Has anyone ever told you that you have a “dirty mouth” because of the things that you say?

Has this caused you problems with others?

Have you ever thought that your masturbation was excessive? Has it ever gotten you into trouble or caused you pain? How often do you masturbate? Is that more or less than you did when in the community?

How do you think your sex drive compares to other men your age? In your opinion is it higher than the norm, lower, or about average?

Have you ever engaged in a threesome or group sex activity? Couple swapping? How often?
How did you initiate this with others?

Do you have any special sexual interests that you think others generally do not or might not enjoy? What are they? Have they ever caused problems for you in your relationships?

How often do you think about sex during the course of the day? What usually prompts a sexual thought? What do you think about?

Sex as Coping:

[Note: The first question in this section follows from the last question in the previous section from the item Sex Drive/Preoccupation, "How often do you think about having sex during the course of a day?"]

Are there times when you think about sex more than other times? What are these times?

Do you ever engage in sexual behaviour to feel better about yourself or your situation? When you feel lonely? Bored? Sad? Stressed? Angry? Frustrated? Down on yourself? After a fight with your partner or someone you care about? When are you most likely to feel sexual?

What do you do when faced with a problem or difficult times? Is this how you usually respond?

Do you ever drink or use drugs when faced with problems? How often do you use substances to deal with stress? What are you like when you are drunk/high? Do drugs or alcohol increase or decrease your interest in sex? In what ways?

What was going on in your life in the period leading up to your offence(s)? What kind of problems were you faced with? How did you deal with them? Did committing the offence(s) relieve some of your stress? Did it make you feel better, even temporarily?

What happened to your sexual arousal when the victim resisted/was distressed? Was it more or less arousing? How were you able to maintain your arousal?

Deviant Sexual Interests:

Over the past five years, how much access had you had to the internet? How often did you access pornography when you were surfing the net?

Have you ever had a sexual thought that disturbed you or that you would be too embarrassed to tell someone about? What about the thought concerned you? (*Coercive/aggressive sexual activity, sexual thoughts about children?*)

(If admitting to sexual thoughts about children) How often do you think about children in a sexual way? What makes them sexually attractive?

Are you interested in any (*other*) unusual sexual things or activities? [*Note: Voyeurism and exhibitionism are the most common – ask about these first.*]

Have you ever exposed yourself in public? How often? Where?

Have you ever looked in windows or washrooms to view people undressing or using the facilities? How often? Where? What type of person would you be most interested in looking at?

Have you ever rubbed up against someone for a sexual purpose without their knowledge or consent? How often? Where? How would you choose the person?

Have you ever had sex in a public place? How often? Where? With whom? [*Note: remember this can be normative behaviour.*]

Have you ever engaged in Sadomasochistic sexual activities? (*Dominating/hurting someone or being dominated/hurt?*)

Do you have any special sexual interests? [(*Give the example that some people are sexually aroused by items, such as high-heels, stockings or rubber and some are aroused by engaging in certain activities such as urinating on another person or wearing clothes of the opposite sex.*)

Sexual interest in something (shoes, stockings) is not enough for scoring this item – the assessor is looking for activities such as extensive masturbation alone using the fetish object to the point that it hinders their access to normative sexual outlets.]

What are they? Have they ever caused problems for you in your relationships? Do you collect any things related to your sexual interest?

Have you ever engaged in sexual activity with an animal? How old were you? What were the circumstances? How often?

Have you ever engaged in sexual activity with a family member? What were the circumstances?

Have you ever engaged in a threesome or group sex activity? Couple swapping? How often?

How was it initiated?

Cooperation with Supervision:

You're serving () years/months for (). Did you plead guilty? Are you appealing your conviction or sentence? How fair do you think your sentence is?

Have you experienced any trouble while in custody? Any institutional charges/misconducts?

Have you previously been on parole or probation or some other form of supervised release? Any problems? Revocations? Additional charges?

How do you feel about being on parole/probation? On the Sexual Offender Information Registry? Do you think it will be difficult for you to comply with the restrictions or conditions that may be placed on you?

To date, what have you done to address your sexual offending/behaviour?

Who has tried to help you with your sexual behaviour problems in the past? How did they assist you? Did you tell them everything they needed to know? What changes did you make to reduce your risk?

What are your chances of getting into trouble for another sexual offence?

What do you plan to do to make a reoffence less likely? What will you need to be careful of in the future? Have you ever stopped doing something you like to do because you were worried it might lead you into committing a sexual offence?

Have you ever put yourself into a risky situation just to see if you could handle it? What was the situation? How did you know that you could handle it?

How do you feel about being recommended for a sexual offender treatment program? Any concerns?

Appendix C

Introduction to Scoring Examples

The following are two test scoring examples for the STABLE-2007. The narratives provide you with all of the information you need to complete the attached STABLE-2007 scoring sheets. We recommend that you start by reading the entire narrative through. Then, for each STABLE-2007 item, review the scoring manual instructions and consider the information provided in the narrative relevant to that item. Remember to use all available information to estimate the expected functioning over the next year. There is room beside each item on the scoring sheet to include some notes to remind yourself of the information you used to make your scoring decision. Once you have scored each item sum all of the item scores to calculate the total score. After calculating the total score, you can consult the answer keys provided in Appendix I. Notes regarding what information was considered for the scoring are included on the answer sheets. Although you should expect some variability among the scores on individual items, your total score should be within ± 2 points of the total score on the answer sheet. Also, there should not be any items for which you rated “2 – definitely present” and the answer key indicated “0 – not present” (or vice versa).

Appendix C-1

Scoring Example 1: Mr. John Smith

Mr. Smith is a 23 year old single male who lives in an improvised basement apartment in his mother's home. His parents separated when he was two years old due to his father's substance abuse and gambling addiction. He was raised by his mother and had sporadic contact with his father over the years. He has never lived outside of his mother's home or been financially responsible for himself. He is employed part-time as a newspaper carrier and is paid for completing odd jobs (i.e., snow removal, lawn cutting, gardening) for the elderly woman who lives across the road from him. He does not have a prior criminal record and has never had any prior dealings with law enforcement. He also does not have a history of substance abuse. He is described by his mother and neighbours as a friendly, shy, young man who was always willing to help others and eager to please. The elderly woman who has hired him for odd jobs described him as courteous, polite and reliable. Mr. Smith's childhood was difficult as a result of frequent teasing and bullying by peers. He felt unaccepted by others, noting that he was teased for being overweight and living in low income housing. His insecurities have stayed with him into adulthood and he has found it difficult to develop and maintain lasting friendships with those his own age. In spite of his difficulties developing peer age relationships, Mr. Smith does not express feelings of loneliness and indicated that he feels accepted by his community, noting that many of his neighbours are elderly and that they often approach him for assistance. Aside from having a few different girlfriends while in high school, he has never been in a serious or committed relationship.

Mr. Smith recently pled guilty to two counts of indecent assault, three counts of invitation to sexual touching, and one count of production of child pornography. The offences were committed against three young girls, aged ten, ten, and nine, and one young boy aged nine, and occurred during the summer break. The victims were children from the same neighbourhood as Mr. Smith, and in fact two of the victims lived in the same housing complex. Mr. Smith befriended the children at the community park and invited them over to his home to watch movies, play video games and read comic books. The children testified that they really liked Mr. Smith and described him as “cool” and fun to be around because he allowed them to do whatever they wanted and provided them with candy, chips and pop. Mr. Smith's basement apartment had its own entrance from the rear yard and it quickly became a “hang out” for many of the local children. Descriptions of the apartment by the children who spent time there revealed that it looked more like a clubhouse than an apartment or basement. There were posters of teenage pop stars and comic book characters on the walls, and numerous comic books and video games throughout. Mr. Smith never locked his door and encouraged the children to come and visit at any time of day. Mr. Smith reported that he considered the children his friends and enjoyed their company. Prior to befriending the children, he described himself as a “loner” and noted that he welcomed their friendship as they had many interests in common such as comic books, video games, and music. Mr. Smith insisted that he never meant to harm the children and was hopeful that the children would forgive him one day.

The police investigation revealed that Mr. Smith initially engaged the children in games of Truth or Dare that included dares to undress, touch each other's genitals and pose provocatively for pictures. Mr. Smith also exposed the children to pornographic images and videos on his computer. A forensic review of the computer's hard drive revealed several hundred pornographic images of adults involved in sexual activity, as well as 20 videos. Police did not find any child sexual abuse images, nor did they find any evidence that Mr. Smith had downloaded or distributed the pictures he had taken of the children with his camera. At the time of his arrest, Mr. Smith immediately took responsibility for his offences and expressed remorse for his actions. He provided a full statement to police that included the names of all of the children who had attended his home, and turned over his digital camera for review.

When asked about his motivation for the sexual offences, he explained that he was sexually inexperienced and was afraid to approach women his own age for fear of rejection. He wanted to build his sexual confidence and knew that his child friends would not judge him or laugh at him. He noted that in the past he has dealt with sexual impulses by masturbating to erotic images, but that he started to find this behaviour less satisfying and he was interested in pursuing an intimate relationship with a female his own age. On average, he reported masturbating approximately three times per week. He noted that occasionally he masturbated to deal with feelings of loneliness or boredom, but that more often he passed the time by reading comic books, listening to music or watching movies. Although being interested in attending strip clubs, Mr. Smith noted that he has never actually built up enough courage to go to one alone and does not know anyone who would be willing to go with him. He has never engaged in sexual intercourse.

Mr. Smith described his relationship with his mother as very close and identified her as his "best friend". When interviewed, his mother confirmed that she will continue to support her son emotionally and financially, but that he would not be able to return to live in her home as two of the victims live next door to her. She does not have any concerns about Mr. Smith returning to the neighbourhood, however, as she feels that the offences were just a "big mistake" and that he has "learned his lesson". She has been advised that he cannot be within 50 feet of the victims or their homes. Although she does not believe that her son requires counselling for his sexual behaviour, she would like to see him receive employment counselling.

In addition to his mother, Mr. Smith also identified his mother's brother and his wife as sources of support, noting that his aunt and uncle have offered him a place to stay once he is released. His uncle is a retired teacher and his aunt works at the bank. Mr. Smith noted that his aunt and uncle have indicated that he can live with them as long as he finds employment, pays rent, and follows the conditions of his parole, including attending counselling. Mr. Smith noted that his uncle is a "no nonsense" man and that it will be like living with a parole officer at all times. His aunt is very warm and caring, and Mr. Smith described her as being like a second mom to him. Both feel that Mr. Smith's offences are very serious and that he needs counselling to address his behaviour. They also believe that Mr. Smith needs to learn responsibility and will encourage him to do this while living in their home.

Although feeling anxious about his aunt and uncle's stipulations, Mr. Smith also expressed some excitement at getting out of his mother's home and working towards living on his own. He commented that he knows that he needs to "grow up" and be more responsible for himself if he is to one day get married and start his own family. In addition to eventually living

independently, Mr Smith also noted that he would like to go back to school to work towards a career in landscaping or construction. While he noted that school would be a good place to meet new friends his own age, he also expressed concern that others may reject him because of his sexual offence convictions. When questioned regarding how he will deal with rejection if it were to happen, he stated that he would talk to his aunt or mom about it. Mr. Smith commented that he knows that keeping secrets is a bad idea and that he plans to be honest with everyone in the future to help build back their trust. Mr. Smith did not express any concerns with complying with the conditions of future supervision.

STABLE-2007 – TALLY SHEET

Subject Name: "John Smith" _____
 Place of Scoring: _____
 Date of Scoring: _____ Name of Assessor: _____

Scoring Item	Notes	Section Total
Significant Social Influences		
Capacity for Relationship Stability		
Emotional ID with Children	(Only score this item for child molesters)	
Hostility Toward Women		
General Social Rejection		
Lack of Concern for Others		
Impulsive Acts		
Poor Problem Solving Skills		
Negative Emotionality		
Sex Drive Sex Preoccupation		
Sex as Coping		
Deviant Sexual Preference		
Cooperation with Supervision		
Sum for Final Total		_____
(Out of 24 for those without a child victim, i.e., younger than 14 years old)		26
Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission		
1) Is the offender in an age appropriate, consensual, sexual relationship of at least one year's duration while "at risk" in the community? Yes/No 2) Is there an absence of behavioural indicators of Deviant Sexual Interest for two years? Yes/No		
If both questions have been answered "Yes" award a "-1" in this box and reduce the total score by one point as long as the Deviant Sexual Interest score is greater than zero. Note: The "over-ride" has not been validated and does not count in the total score entered above. The adjusted score can be recorded for future empirical validation. However, the original unadjusted score should be reported and should be used when combining the STABLE-2007 score with STATIC-99R, STATIC-2002R or other risk tools.		
Revised Total Taking "Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission" Into Account		

Interpretive Ranges: 0 – 3 = Low, 4 – 11 = Moderate, 12+ = High

Scoring Social Influences

Positive	Negative	Final Score		
0	0		1	
0	1 or more			2
1	0 or 1		1	
1	2 or more			2
2	0	0		
2	1 or 2		1	
2	3 or more			2
3	0 or 1	0		
3	2 or 3		1	
3	4 or more			2
4	0, 1 or 2	0		
4	3 or 4		1	
5 or more		0		

Scoring Capacity for Relationship Stability

<u>“A” Part</u> Lived Two Years with a Partner	<u>“B” Part</u> Tenor of Current Relationship	Final Score On this Item
No	No Current Relationship (2)	2
No	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
No	Acceptable (0)	1
Yes	No Current Relationship (2)	
Yes	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
Yes	Acceptable (0)	0

Appendix C-2

Scoring Example 2: Mr. Rob Stone

Mr. Stone is a 30 year old single male with no dependents. He was recently convicted of assault and sexual assault, and was sentenced to three years federal custody. The offence was committed against his former common-law partner. He attended her home late at night after leaving a bar and forced his way into her apartment demanding that they talk about the status of their relationship. The victim observed that he was intoxicated and was carrying with him a backpack full of beer. Over the course of the next four hours, Mr. Stone continued to drink and confined the victim to her apartment. He berated her and demanded that she recount intimate details of her relationships since their break up eight months earlier. The victim insisted that she had not been intimate with anyone else, but Mr. Stone accused her of lying and proceeded to sexually assault her. The assault included forced intercourse, as well as vaginal penetration with an empty beer bottle. He also slapped the victim during the sexual assault, and threatened to kill her and then himself. Mr. Stone eventually passed out and the victim escaped to a neighbour's apartment where she contacted police. Mr. Stone was arrested in her apartment. Mr. Stone pled not guilty and maintains that the sexual activity was consensual. He claims that the victim lied to police because she did not want her new boyfriend to know that she had been unfaithful. He also accused the judge of taking the victim's side because she "put on a good performance and cried in court". He expressed a great deal of anger regarding his conviction, and was adamant that he will not participate in any sex offender treatment programs.

Mr. Stone described his relationship with the victim as his most significant and longest live-in relationship. They lived together on and off for approximately three years. Their relationship was plagued with arguments and they had broken up at least five times during those three years for periods of up to four months. The victim reported that most of their arguments centered on his drinking and his choice of friends. She did not like the people he was associating with as she felt they were a bad influence on him. She also noted that he constantly accused her of cheating on him and that he routinely checked her cell phone to see who she had talked to each day. She described him as controlling and extremely jealous. Mr. Stone blamed the victim for their relationship difficulties, noting that she was constantly nagging him about "everything" and that he often went to the bar with friends to escape from her and to relax. Although he admitted that he had never actually caught her in the act of cheating, he still believed that she had been unfaithful. When asked why he felt so strongly about this, he stated that women are always looking to "upgrade" and that if a man with a better job, or more money, or a nicer home came along they would leave.

When questioned why he would remain in a relationship with someone he did not trust and who nagged him constantly, Mr. Stone stated that he stayed because the sex was "great". He noted that he and the victim were very compatible sexually and that she was into trying new things such as bondage and use of sex toys. Mr. Stone further stated that the victim was the only partner he had ever been with that could keep up with his high sex drive. He described previous girlfriends as "prudes" and stated that he often resorted to engaging in casual sexual encounters with women he met at the bar, as well as the occasional use of prostitutes, just to meet his sexual urges. Mr. Stone reported that sex was very important to him and that he needed to have sex at

least seven times per week. If his partner was unwilling to provide him with the sex he needed, Mr. Stone reported that he was always able to find it somewhere else. He estimated that he had engaged in sexual activity with at least 50 different women in his lifetime. Mr. Stone also acknowledged regular attendance at strip clubs, especially after a fight with his partner or a difficult day at work, noting that he found the atmosphere to be relaxing. Despite acknowledging that his partner disapproved of the time and money he spent there and was often a source of further arguments, Mr. Stone felt that this was a reasonable way to help manage his stress.

Mr. Stone has a lengthy and diverse criminal history that began when he was 16 years old. Over the last 15 years, he has been before the courts on 12 different sentencing occasions for a variety of charges including assault, breaches of trust, dangerous driving offences (street racing) and drug possession. Mr. Stone reported that all of his assault convictions have been the result of fighting with other men and that none of them involved women. Mr. Stone explained that most of the fights were the result of the other men picking a fight with him because they were upset that their “old ladies” were flirting with him. Mr. Stone stated that he could not help it if those men could not keep their women satisfied. Mr. Stone reported that he has never lost a fight and prides himself on being tough. He attributed this to the many stints he has spent in jail, stating that he had to make a name for himself early on to make sure no one hassled him. A review of custody records revealed that Mr. Stone has garnered a number of institutional charges and misconducts over the years for fighting and being disrespectful towards security staff. Mr. Stone admits that he has trouble being told what to do and that he has in the past rebelled against authority figures. His most recent bail release was revoked after he missed curfew and he was arrested driving while under the influence.

Mr. Stone has worked as a drywaller for the past ten years. He stated that finding employment has never been an issue for him, as he knows many contractors in the construction business and is known for doing good work. Mr. Stone reported that he has never been fired from a job and that when faced with legal difficulties and unable to report for work, it was “no big deal” for others on the job to pick up the slack because it meant more money for them.

When not working, Mr. Stone indicated that he enjoys working on cars at his friend's garage. He commented that it was not uncommon for him to spend an entire weekend at the garage rebuilding an engine and having a few beers with his friends. He also reported that he liked to race cars and that betting on races was an easy way to make money. Although Mr. Stone downplays his use of alcohol, he acknowledged drinking to excess on most weekends, after a stressful day at work, or following an argument with his partner. He also admitted to smoking marijuana regularly with friends to help relax.

Mr. Stone reported having many friends in the community, noting that he was well liked and well known in his neighbourhood. He identified two close friends in particular that he believed would offer him the most support while in the community “Jack” and “Steve”. Mr. Stone reported that he has known both men for over ten years and spends most of his time while in the community with them. Mr. Stone and Jack met while both were serving time in a provincial jail.

Although Jack has a lengthy criminal record for trafficking and possession of illicit substances, Mr. Stone claims that Jack is no longer involved in the selling of drugs as he has been able to make enough money to support himself by working in construction. However, Mr. Stone also admitted that Jack relies on his former connections to obtain marijuana for them to smoke recreationally. Jack believes that Mr. Stone is innocent of the allegations. Jack was recently warned by police to stay away from the victim after he called her in an attempt to pass along a message from Mr. Stone despite a non-communication order being in effect. Mr. Stone was introduced to Steve through Jack, and the three men have been friends ever since. All three men share a love of fast cars and often enter drag races on weekends. Steve owns and operates a small automotive business and the men spend a lot of time there working on cars, drinking beer and smoking marijuana. Steve lives in the same apartment building as the victim and according to Mr. Stone, he was the one who “kept an eye on her” for him and informed him of the different men who visited her apartment. Steve also does not believe that Mr. Stone committed the offences, but also stated that if anything did happen between them it was probably instigated by the victim.

Mr. Stone commented that both men are more like family to him than his own family. Mr. Stone reported a falling out with his parents approximately five years ago. Mr. Stone explained that he was living with his parents while on parole and that they argued frequently about the hours he was keeping as well as his rent payments being late. Mr. Stone claimed that his parents were treating him as though he were a child and tried to impose a curfew. He eventually moved out and refused to pay any rent as he needed the money to find a new apartment. When interviewed, Mr. Stone’s parents indicated that their son took advantage of their generosity and that their only expectations for him were to abide by the court ordered curfew, stay out of trouble and pay a small amount of rent that went towards their additional bills while having him in the home. While he lived with them, he sold their belongings without their permission, caused damage to the property, and kept them up at night with loud parties. They stated that they were not willing to be a community support for him until he attends a substance abuse treatment center and demonstrates to them that he has changed. Mr. Stone indicated that he has no intentions of attending a treatment center and couldn’t care less if he ever spoke to his family again.

In terms of the future, Mr. Stone indicated that he intends to return to the same community and pick up where he left off. He does not believe that there is anything about himself that he needs to change or work on. He believes that all of his legal difficulties are the result of law enforcement targeting him and arresting him for minor infractions. He takes no responsibility for his offences, and generally describes them as not that serious or the fault of others. With respect to his relationship difficulties, Mr. Stone indicates that they are “100 %” his fault, noting that he has been “too giving” in his relationships which has allowed his partners to take advantage of him. He indicated that in the future he will have to be more careful about the women he dates.

STABLE-2007 – TALLY SHEET

Subject Name: “Rob Stone”
 Place of Scoring: _____
 Date of Scoring: _____ Name of Assessor: _____

Scoring Item	Notes	Section Total
Significant Social Influences		
Capacity for Relationship Stability		
Emotional ID with Children	(Only score this item for child molesters)	
Hostility Toward Women		
General Social Rejection		
Lack of Concern for Others		
Impulsive Acts		
Poor Problem Solving Skills		
Negative Emotionality		
Sex Drive		
Sex Preoccupation		
Sex as Coping		
Deviant Sexual Preference		
Cooperation with Supervision		
Sum for Final Total		_____
(Out of 24 for those without a child victim, i.e., younger than 14 years old)		26
Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission		
1) Is the offender in an age appropriate, consensual, sexual relationship of at least one year's duration while “at risk” in the community?		Yes/No
2) Is there an absence of behavioural indicators of Deviant Sexual Interest for two years?		Yes/No
If both questions have been answered “Yes” award a “-1” in this box and reduce the total score by one point as long as the Deviant Sexual Interest score is greater than zero.		
Note: The “over-ride” has not been validated and does not count in the total score entered above. The adjusted score can be recorded for future empirical validation. However, the original unadjusted score should be reported and should be used when combining the STABLE-2007 score with STATIC-99R, STATIC-2002R or other risk tools.		
Revised Total Taking “Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission” into Account		

Interpretive Ranges: 0 – 3 = Low, 4 – 11 = Moderate, 12+ = High

Scoring Social Influences

Positive	Negative	Final Score		
0	0		1	
0	1 or more			2
1	0 or 1		1	
1	2 or more			2
2	0	0		
2	1 or 2		1	
2	3 or more			2
3	0 or 1	0		
3	2 or 3		1	
3	4 or more			2
4	0, 1 or 2	0		
4	3 or 4		1	
5 or more		0		

Scoring Capacity for Relationship Stability

<u>“A” Part</u> Lived Two Years with a Partner	<u>“B” Part</u> Tenor of Current Relationship	Final Score On this Item
No	No Current Relationship (2)	2
No	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
No	Acceptable (0)	1
Yes	No Current Relationship (2)	
Yes	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
Yes	Acceptable (0)	0

Appendix D

Percentiles and Nominal Rankings

The following tables present the distribution of items and total scores for STABLE-2007. These distributions were based on adult males who have complete data on all the STABLE-2007 items at the time of first assessment (n = 790) in the DSP (Hanson et al., 2007).

The percentiles for total scores are presented in four different formats: the observed percentage who obtained a lower or a higher score, and the same percentages centered on the midpoint of the interval (to account for ties; see Crawford, Garthwaite, & Slick, 2009). Crawford et al. (2009) express a preference for percentiles centered on the midpoint (the last two columns). Evaluators, however, are encouraged to choose the format that most suites their risk communication needs.

These percentiles were developed on a large sample of offenders on community supervision in Canada, Alaska, and Iowa. We consider them representative of the population of adjudicated sex offenders. Evaluators who work in settings where offenders are preselected based on certain criteria (e.g., high intensity treatment programs, civil commitment evaluations) would likely see higher item endorsement in their ratings compared to these data.

Crawford, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., & Slick, D. J. (2009). On percentile norms in neuropsychology: Proposed reporting standards and methods for quantifying the uncertainty over the percentile ranks of test scores. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 23*(7), 1173-1195.

Distribution of STABLE-2007 Items for Males at First Assessment (n = 790)

STABLE Risk Factors			
STABLE-2007 Items	% scoring a “0” in this area (sample size)	% scoring a “1” in this area (sample size)	% scoring a “2” in this area (sample size)
1) Significant Social Influences	58.7% (464)	26.6% (210)	14.7% (116)
Intimacy Deficits			
2) Capacity for Relationship Stability	22.9% (181)	43.2% (341)	33.9% (268)
3) Emotional Identification with Children	80.6% (637)	15.6% (123)	3.8% (30)
4) Hostility Toward Women	70.1% (554)	23.9% (189)	5.9% (47)
5) General Social Rejection/Loneliness	40.4% (319)	40.3% (318)	19.4% (153)
6) Lack of Concern for Others	57.3% (453)	31.9% (252)	10.8% (85)
General Self-Regulation			
7) Impulsive Acts	57.2% (452)	28.0% (221)	14.8% (117)
8) Poor Cognitive Problem Solving	42.9% (339)	38.7% (306)	18.4% (145)
9) Negative Emotionality/Hostility	64.2% (507)	26.7% (211)	9.1% (72)
Sexual Self-Regulation			
10) Sex Drive/Preoccupation	55.1% (435)	33.7% (266)	11.3% (89)
11) Sex as Coping	64.1% (506)	22.5% (178)	13.4% (106)
12) Deviant Sexual Interests	42.9% (339)	40.8% (322)	16.3% (129)
13) Cooperation with Supervision	69.9% (552)	21.1% (167)	9.0% (71)

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Note: Cases were excluded if any STABLE-2007 items were missing.

Distribution of STABLE-2007 Total Scores for Males at First Assessment (n = 790)

Score	Nominal Risk Category	Frequency	Percentiles				
			Observed			Midpoint Average	
			% scoring below	% scoring the same	% scoring higher	% scoring below	% scoring higher
0	Low N = 184	15	0.0	1.9	98.1	1.0	99.0
1		48	1.9	6.1	92.0	5.0	95.0
2		57	8.0	7.2	84.8	11.6	88.4
3		64	15.2	8.1	76.7	19.2	80.8
4	Medium N = 447	68	23.3	8.6	68.1	27.6	72.4
5		69	31.9	8.7	59.4	36.2	63.8
6		62	40.6	7.8	51.5	44.6	55.4
7		61	48.5	7.7	43.8	52.4	47.6
8		47	56.2	5.9	37.8	59.2	40.8
9		42	62.2	5.3	32.5	64.8	35.2
10		53	67.5	6.7	25.8	78.8	29.2
11		45	74.2	5.7	20.1	77.0	23.0
12	High N = 159	24	79.9	3.0	17.1	81.4	18.6
13		40	82.9	5.1	12.0	85.4	14.6
14		20	88.0	2.5	9.5	89.2	10.8
15		10	90.5	1.3	8.2	91.2	8.8
16		19	91.8	2.4	5.8	93.0	7.0
17		12	94.2	1.5	4.3	95.0	5.0
18		12	95.7	1.5	2.8	96.4	3.6
19		6	97.2	0.8	2.0	97.6	2.4
20		9	98.0	1.1	0.9	98.6	1.4
21		3	99.1	0.4	0.5	99.3	0.7
22		3	99.5	0.4	0.1	99.7	0.3
23		0	99.5	0.0	0.1	99.7	0.3
24		0	99.5	0.0	0.1	99.7	0.3
25		0	99.5	0.0	0.1	99.7	0.3
26	1	99.9	0.1	0.0	99.9	0.06	

Average scores was 7.5, with a standard deviation of 4.9; Median of 7.

Appendix E

STATIC-99 Coding of “Ever Lived with a Lover for Two Years”

The Basic Principle:

Research suggests that having a prolonged intimate connection to someone may be a protective factor against sexual re-offending. See Hanson and Bussière (1998), Table 1 – Items “Single (never married) and Married (currently)”. On the whole, we know that the relative risk to sexually reoffend is lower in men who have been able to form intimate partnerships.

Information Required to Score this Item:

To complete this item it is highly desirable that the evaluator confirm the offender’s relationship history through collateral sources or official records.

The Basic Rule:

If the offender has never had an intimate adult relationship of two years duration you score the offender a “1” on this item. If the offender has had an intimate adult relationship of two years duration you score the offender a “0” on this item.

The intent of this item is to reflect whether the offender has the personality/psychological resources, as an adult, to establish a relatively stable “marriage-like” relationship with another person. It does not matter whether the intimate relationship was/is homosexual or heterosexual.

Missing Items:

The only item that may be omitted on the STATIC-99 is this one (Ever Lived with – Item No.2). If no information is available this item should be scored a “0” as if the offender has lived with an intimate partner for two years.

To complete this item the evaluator should make an attempt to confirm the offender’s relationship history through collateral sources and official records. In the absence of these sources self-report information may be utilized, assuming of course, that the self-report seems credible and reasonable to the evaluator. There may be certain cases (immigrants, refugees from third world countries) where it is not possible to access collaterals or official records. Where the evaluator, based upon the balance of probabilities, is convinced this person has lived with an intimate partner for two years the evaluator may score this item a “0”. It is greatly preferred that you confirm the existence of this relationship through collateral contacts or official records. This should certainly be done if the assessment is being carried out in an adversarial context where the offender would have a real motive to pretend to a non-existent relationship.

In cases where confirmation of relationship history is not possible or feasible the evaluator may chose to score this item both ways and report the difference in risk estimate in their final report. If a person has been incarcerated most of their life or is still quite young and has not had the

opportunity to establish an intimate relationship of two years duration, they are still scored as never having lived with an intimate partner for two years. They score a “1”. There are two reasons for this. The first being, this was the way this item was scored in the original samples and to change this definition now would distance the resulting recidivism estimates from those validated on the STATIC-99. Secondly, having been part of, or experienced, a sustained relationship may well be a protective factor for sexual offending. As a result, the reason why this protective factor is absent is immaterial to the issue of risk itself. The offender is given a point for this item if he has never lived with an adult lover (male or female) for at least two years. An adult is an individual who is over the age of consent to marriage. The period of cohabitation must be continuous with the same person. Generally, relationships with adult victims do not count. However, if the offender and the victim had two years of intimate relationship before the sexual offences occurred then this relationship would count, and the offender would score a “0” on this item. However, if the sexual abuse started before the offender and the victim had been living together in an intimate relationship for two years then the relationship would not count regardless of its length.

Cases where the offender has lived over two years with a child victim in a “lover” relationship do not count as living with an intimate partner and the offender would be scored a “1” on this item. Illegal relationships (incestuous relationship with his mother) and live-in relationships with “once child” victims do not count as “living together” for the purposes of this item and once again the offender would score a “1” on this item. A “once child” victim is the situation where the offender abused a child but that victim is either still living, as an adult, in an intimate relationship with the offender or who has lived, as an adult, in an intimate relationship with the offender.

Exclusions:

- Legal marriages involving less than two years of co-habitation do not count
- Male lovers in prison would not count
- Prison marriages (of any duration) where the offender is incarcerated during the term of the relationship do not count
- Illegal relationships, such as when the offender has had an incestuous relationship with his mother do not count
- Intimate relationships with non-human species do not count
- Relationships with victims do not count (see above for exception)
- Priests and others who for whatever reason have chosen, as a lifestyle, not to marry/cohabitate are still scored as having never lived with an intimate partner

Extended Absences:

In some jurisdictions it is common for an offender to be away from the marital/family home for extended periods. The offender is generally working on oilrigs, fishing boats, bush camps, military assignment, or other venues of this nature. While the risk assessment instrument requires the intimate co-habitation to be continuous there is room for discretion. If the offender has an identifiable “home” that he/she shares with a lover and the intimate relationship is longer than two years, the evaluator should look at the nature and consistency of the relationship.

The evaluator should attempt to determine, in spite of these prolonged absences, whether this relationship looks like an honest attempt at a long-term committed relationship and not just a relationship of convenience. If this relationship looks like an honest attempt at a long-term committed relationship then the evaluator would score the offender a “0” on this item as this would be seen as an intimate relationship of greater than two years duration. If the evaluator thinks that the relationship is a relationship of convenience, the offender would score a “1”. If the living together relationship is of long duration (three plus years) then the periods of absence can be fairly substantial (four months in a logging camp/oil rig, or six months or more on military assignment).

Appendix F

Rules for Combining the STABLE-2007 with STATIC-99R, STATIC-2002R, and Risk Matrix-2000

In order for STABLE-2007 to be used to estimate recidivism rates, STABLE-2007 scores need to be combined with scores from a STATIC measure or Risk Matrix-2000. The result of this combination is named the “overall priority level” or the “overall risk level”. The basic rules start with the STATIC risk categories, and the overall risk/priority category **is increased one category** if the STABLE-2007 score is high (12+) and reduced one category if the STABLE-2007 score is low (0 to 3). **If the STABLE-2007 is moderate (4 to 11), the offender’s overall risk/priority category remains the same as that determined by the STATIC tool.** For example, an offender with a STATIC score in the “moderate-low” range and a “high” STABLE-2007 score would have a combined priority rating of “moderate-high”. If his STABLE-2007 score was in the “low” range, his overall priority would be “low”. If his STABLE-2007 score was “moderate”, his overall priority would remain the same as his initial STATIC category, i.e., “moderate-low”.

There are, however, certain exceptions to the basic rule (see Tables F-1, F-2, & F-3 for details). For all combinations, offenders are not assigned to a new category lower than “low”, even if the offender’s STABLE score is low.

Evaluators should remember that the nominal labels for the STATIC and STATIC/STABLE categories refer only to relative risk (i.e., offenders in the “very high” category would be expected to be more likely to reoffend than offenders in the “high” category); however, the category labels are not intended to conform to any absolute recidivism rates, distributions, or thresholds for specific decisions. STABLE-2007 users are free to condense and re-label the categories if different groupings better fit the decisions at hand. For example, if intensive treatment is to be provided to the riskiest 20%, then the STATIC-99R/STABLE-2007 “high” and “very high” categories could be combined into a single “high” category for decision purposes.

Table F-1.

Combining STABLE-2007 with STATIC-99R

STATIC-99R Category	STABLE-2007 Category	Combined STATIC/STABLE Priority Category
Low (1 or lower)	Low	Low
	Moderate	Low
	High	Moderate-Low
Moderate-Low (2,3)	Low	Low
	Moderate	Moderate-Low
	High	Moderate-High
Moderate-High (4,5)	Low	Moderate-Low
	Moderate	Moderate-High
	High	High
High (6+)	Low	High
	Moderate	High
	High	Very High

Table F-2.

Combining STABLE-2007 with STATIC-2002R

STATIC-2002R Category	STABLE-2007 Category	Combined STATIC/STABLE Priority Category
Low (2 or lower)	Low	Low
	Moderate	Low
	High	Low-Moderate
Low-Moderate (3, 4)	Low	Low
	Moderate	Low-Moderate
	High	Moderate
Moderate (5, 6)	Low	Low-Moderate
	Moderate	Moderate
	High	Moderate-High
Moderate-High (7, 8)	Low	Moderate
	Moderate	Moderate-High
	High	High
High (9+)	Low	Moderate-High
	Moderate	High
	High	High

Table F-3.

Combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000

Risk Matrix Category	STABLE-2007 Category	Combined Risk Matrix/STABLE Priority Category
Low	Low	Low
	Moderate	Low
	High	Moderate
Moderate	Low	Low
	Moderate	Moderate
	High	Moderate-High
High	Low	Moderate
	Moderate	Moderate-High
	High	High
Very High	Low	Moderate-High
	Moderate	High
	High	Very High

Appendix G

Recidivism Rate Tables for STABLE-2007 Combined with STATIC-99R, STATIC-2002R, and Risk Matrix-2000

This section present updated recidivism tables for the STABLE-2007 combined with a STATIC measure. Initial results from an average follow-up period of 3.5 years were presented in 2007 (Hanson, Harris, Scott & Helmus, 2007). The following Static-99R and Static-2002R tables were based on Hanson, Helmus and Harris (2014) and the Risk Matrix-2000 tables were based on Helmus, Hanson, Babchishin and Thornton (2014).

Recidivism

Recidivism information was obtained for the following five outcomes:

- 1) Sexual recidivism –any offence that was considered sexually motivated (regardless of what the charge or conviction was). This included Category “B” sex offences as defined by the Static-99 coding rules (e.g., possession of child pornography, prostitution offences; Harris et al., 2003). Additionally, all sexual offences were further classified as either contact or non-contact offences (note that this distinction was not made in the original Dynamic Supervision Project findings; Hanson et al., 2007).
- 2) Sexual recidivism including breaches (also called “any sex”) – This category includes all sexual recidivism incidents as well as sexual breaches, defined as official sanctions for sexually motivated violations of the conditions of community supervision (e.g., being in the company of children contrary to a supervision condition).
- 3) Violent recidivism – All crimes that involved direct confrontation with the victim. This category included contact sexual offences, but excluded non-contact sex offences and sexually motivated breaches (note that in the original analyses from 2007, all contact and non-contact sexual offences were included in this category).
- 4) Any criminal recidivism – Includes all crimes but excludes technical offences.
- 5) Any recidivism – Includes all crimes (sexual, violent, non-violent), as well as all technical offences (e.g., breach of conditional release), regardless of whether they were sexually motivated.

Additionally, a sixth recidivism outcome was examined for the Risk Matrix 2000: non-sexual violence. This category included everything in the ‘violence’ category, with the exception of sexual offences.

Information concerning new offences was gathered from reviews of provincial and national criminal history records, as well as from supervising officers, local police jurisdictions, and searches of newspaper databases.

STATIC-99R

Table G-1.1.

Sexual Recidivism Rates for STATIC-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	258	1.6	0.04	3.1	3.2	1.0	5.4	5.1	2.3	7.9
Moderate-Low	140	3.6	0.5	6.7	6.6	2.4	10.8	6.6	2.4	10.8
Moderate-High	111	1.8	0.0	4.3	10.2	4.5	16.0	12.2	6.0	18.5
High	68	13.3	5.2	21.4	19.6	10.0	29.2	23.0	12.7	33.3
Very High	34	23.5	9.3	37.8	32.4	16.6	48.1	41.2	24.6	57.7
Total	611	4.6	3.0	6.3	8.8	6.5	11.0	10.8	8.3	13.4

Table G-1.2

Sexual (including sexual breaches) Recidivism Rates for STATIC-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	258	2.0	0.3	3.7	4.0	1.6	6.5	5.9	2.9	8.9
Moderate-Low	140	3.6	0.5	6.7	6.6	2.4	10.8	7.5	3.0	11.9
Moderate-High	111	4.5	0.6	8.4	14.8	8.1	21.5	16.8	9.7	23.9
High	68	17.8	8.6	26.9	25.5	15.0	36.0	28.9	17.9	40.0
Very High	34	32.4	16.6	48.1	38.2	21.9	54.6	47.0	30.3	63.8
Total	611	6.3	4.4	8.2	10.9	8.4	13.5	13.2	10.4	16.0

Table G-1.3.

Violent (including contact sexual) Recidivism Rates for STATIC-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	258	2.8	0.7	4.8	7.3	4.1	10.6	10.6	6.7	14.6
Moderate-Low	140	5.7	1.9	9.6	11.0	5.7	16.3	15.2	9.0	21.3
Moderate-High	111	7.2	2.4	12.0	27.1	18.6	35.5	30.2	21.4	39.0
High	68	14.7	6.3	23.1	31.4	20.3	42.6	38.1	26.3	50.0
Very High	34	20.6	7.0	34.2	44.1	27.4	60.8	47.0	30.3	63.8
Total	611	6.6	4.6	8.6	16.6	13.6	19.6	20.4	17.1	23.8

Table G-1.4.

Any Crime Recidivism Rates for STATIC-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	258	4.4	1.8	6.9	11.0	7.1	14.9	15.3	10.6	19.9
Moderate-Low	140	10.8	5.6	15.9	19.9	13.2	26.6	24.1	16.8	31.5
Moderate-High	111	13.5	7.2	19.9	36.3	27.2	45.5	41.6	32.1	51.0
High	68	32.4	21.2	43.5	50.7	38.7	62.7	55.7	43.6	67.8
Very High	34	41.2	24.6	57.7	61.8	45.4	78.1	64.7	48.6	80.8
Total	611	12.7	10.1	15.4	25.0	21.5	28.5	29.5	25.7	33.2

Table G-1.5.

Any Recidivism (including breaches) Rates for STATIC-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	258	7.1	4.0	10.3	14.2	9.8	18.6	19.0	13.9	24.0
Moderate-Low	140	14.3	8.5	20.2	24.9	17.6	32.2	30.1	22.2	38.0
Moderate-High	111	20.7	13.2	28.3	42.8	33.4	52.2	50.2	40.5	59.8
High	68	47.0	35.2	58.9	60.8	49.1	72.6	64.2	52.6	75.8
Very High	34	64.7	48.6	80.8	79.4	65.8	93.0	79.4	65.8	93.0
Total	611	19.0	15.9	22.2	30.8	27.1	34.6	35.7	31.8	39.6

STATIC-2002R

Table G-2.1.

Sexual Recidivism Rates for STATIC-2002R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	233	1.7	0.05	3.4	3.5	1.1	5.8	5.4	2.4	8.4
Moderate-Low	133	3.0	0.1	5.9	5.3	1.5	9.1	6.9	2.6	11.3
Moderate	108	4.6	0.7	8.6	15.1	8.3	22.0	16.1	9.1	23.1
Moderate-High	62	11.4	3.4	19.3	16.3	7.1	25.6	19.7	9.7	29.6
High	34	23.5	9.3	37.8	32.5	16.7	48.2	38.6	22.1	55.1
Total	570	4.9	3.1	6.7	9.2	6.8	11.6	11.3	8.7	13.9

Table G-2.2.

Sexual (including sexual breaches) Recidivism Rates for STATIC-2002R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	233	2.2	0.3	4.0	4.3	1.7	7.0	6.2	3.1	9.4
Moderate-Low	133	3.8	0.5	7.0	6.0	2.0	10.1	8.5	3.7	13.3
Moderate	108	6.5	1.8	11.1	17.0	9.8	24.1	18.0	10.6	25.3
Moderate-High	62	14.6	5.8	23.5	22.8	12.3	33.4	26.2	15.2	37.2
High	34	32.4	16.6	48.1	41.2	24.7	57.8	47.4	30.5	64.3
Total	570	6.5	4.5	8.5	11.3	8.7	14.0	13.6	10.8	16.5

Table G-2.3.

Violent (including contact sexual) Recidivism Rates for STATIC-2002R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	233	2.2	0.3	4.0	6.5	3.3	9.7	9.9	6.0	13.9
Moderate-Low	133	5.3	1.5	9.1	9.8	4.8	14.9	13.8	7.9	19.8
Moderate	108	11.1	5.2	17.0	31.2	22.4	40.1	36.3	27.1	45.6
Moderate-High	62	12.9	4.6	21.2	34.0	22.2	45.8	37.3	25.2	49.3
High	34	23.5	9.3	37.8	47.0	30.3	63.8	50.1	33.2	66.9
Total	570	7.0	4.9	9.1	17.4	14.2	20.5	21.2	17.8	24.6

Table G-2.4.

Any Crime Recidivism Rates for STATIC-2002R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	233	3.4	1.1	5.8	10.0	6.1	13.9	13.9	9.4	18.5
Moderate-Low	133	8.3	3.6	13.0	16.7	10.3	23.1	22.4	15.2	29.6
Moderate	108	19.4	12.0	26.9	46.2	36.6	55.7	50.3	40.7	59.9
Moderate-High	62	35.5	23.6	47.4	51.6	39.2	64.0	58.1	45.8	70.3
High	34	41.2	24.6	57.7	61.8	45.4	78.1	61.8	45.4	78.1
Total	570	13.4	10.6	16.2	26.0	22.4	29.7	30.5	26.6	34.3

Table G-2.5.

Any Recidivism (including breaches) Rates for STATIC-2002R/STABLE-2007 Risk/Priority Categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	233	5.6	2.6	8.6	13.0	8.7	17.4	17.5	12.5	22.5
Moderate-Low	133	13.6	7.8	19.4	22.7	15.6	29.9	29.2	21.4	37.1
Moderate	108	27.8	19.3	36.2	53.6	44.1	63.1	58.8	49.3	68.2
Moderate-High	62	50.0	37.6	62.4	59.7	47.5	71.9	64.5	52.6	76.4
High	34	61.8	45.4	78.1	79.4	65.8	93.0	79.4	65.8	93.0
Total	570	19.9	16.6	23.2	32.0	28.2	35.9	36.9	32.8	40.9

Risk Matrix - 2000

Table G-3.1

Sexual recidivism rates for Risk Matrix-Sex/STABLE-2007 priority categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	239	1.7	0.05	3.3	4.2	1.7	6.8	6.1	3.0	9.2
Moderate-Low	166	1.8	0.0	3.8	6.6	2.8	10.4	7.9	3.8	12.0
Moderate-High	98	7.2	2.0	12.3	12.5	5.9	19.1	13.6	6.7	20.5
High	47	14.9	4.7	25.1	23.5	11.4	35.7	28.0	15.1	41.0
Very High	20	35.0	14.1	55.9	40.0	18.5	61.5	50.0	28.1	71.9
Total	570	4.9	3.1	6.7	9.2	6.8	11.6	11.3	8.7	13.9

Table G-3.2

Sexual recidivism rates (including sexually motivated breaches) for Risk Matrix-Sex/STABLE-2007 priority categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	239	2.1	0.3	3.9	5.1	2.3	7.9	7.0	3.7	10.3
Moderate-Low	166	1.8	0.0	3.8	6.6	2.8	10.4	8.6	4.3	12.8
Moderate-High	98	11.3	5.0	17.6	19.8	11.8	27.7	20.9	12.7	29.1
High	47	21.3	9.6	33.0	27.7	14.9	40.5	32.2	18.8	45.7
Very High	20	40.0	18.5	61.5	45.0	23.2	66.8	55.0	33.2	76.8
Total	570	6.5	4.5	8.5	11.3	8.7	14.0	13.6	10.8	16.5

Table G-3.3

Non-sexual violence recidivism rates for Risk Matrix-Violence/STABLE-2007 priority categories

Overall Priority	n (%)	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	270	0.4	0.0	1.1	1.9	0.2	3.5	3.6	1.3	5.9
Moderate-Low	154	2.6	0.1	5.1	9.2	4.6	13.9	12.0	6.8	17.3
Moderate-High	81	7.4	1.7	13.1	22.2	13.2	31.3	26.0	16.4	35.6
High	50	16.0	5.8	26.2	36.4	22.9	49.8	40.5	26.8	54.2
Very High	7	42.8	6.2	79.5	59.2	21.5	96.8	59.2	21.5	96.8
Total	562	3.9	2.3	5.5	10.6	8.0	13.2	13.1	10.3	16.0

Table G-3.4

Violent (including sexual) recidivism rates for Risk Matrix-Combined/STABLE-2007 priority categories

Overall Priority	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
	<i>n</i> (%)	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI		
Low	214	1.9	0.1 3.7	5.2	2.2 8.2	8.4	4.6 12.3		
Moderate-Low	164	3.7	0.8 6.6	11.1	6.2 15.9	15.0	9.4 20.5		
Moderate-High	111	12.6	6.4 18.8	30.0	21.5 38.6	33.8	24.9 42.7		
High	59	18.6	8.7 28.6	41.0	28.4 53.6	44.5	31.7 57.3		
Very High	14	28.6	4.9 52.2	51.1	24.5 77.7	59.3	32.7 85.8		
Total	562	7.0	4.8 9.1	16.7	13.6 19.8	20.4	17.0 23.8		

Table G-3.5

Any crime recidivism rates for Risk Matrix-Combined/STABLE-2007 priority categories

Overall Priority	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
	<i>n</i> (%)	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI		
Low	214	3.8	1.2 6.3	9.0	5.1 12.9	12.8	8.2 17.4		
Moderate-Low	164	7.3	3.3 11.3	18.4	12.5 24.4	23.0	16.5 29.6		
Moderate-High	111	19.8	12.4 27.2	42.8	33.6 52.1	47.6	38.2 57.0		
High	59	44.1	31.4 56.7	59.6	47.0 72.2	64.9	52.6 77.1		
Very High	14	50.0	23.8 76.2	78.6	57.1 100.0	78.6	57.1 100.0		
Total	562	13.4	10.6 16.2	25.5	21.9 29.1	29.8	26.0 33.6		

Table G-3.6

Any recidivism (including breaches) rates for Risk Matrix-Combined/STABLE-2007 priority categories

Overall Priority	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
	<i>n</i> (%)	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI		
Low	214	7.0	3.6 10.5	12.8	8.3 17.3	16.6	11.5 21.7		
Moderate-Low	164	9.8	5.2 14.3	22.7	16.3 29.2	28.7	21.6 35.7		
Moderate-High	111	30.6	22.0 39.2	50.9	41.6 60.3	56.6	47.3 65.9		
High	59	59.3	46.8 71.8	73.2	61.8 84.6	76.9	66.0 87.7		
Very High	14	71.4	47.8 95.1	85.7	67.4 100.0	85.7	67.4 100.0		
Total	562	19.6	16.3 22.9	31.4	27.5 35.3	36.1	32.1 40.2		

Appendix H

Standard Paragraph for Reporting STABLE-2007

The following is an example of how STABLE-2007 can be reported in sexual offender risk assessment. Evaluators are free to use this format, use an amended format, or use a different format as they see fit.

Standard Format for Reporting STABLE-2007

The STABLE-2007 was developed to assess change in intermediate-term risk status, assessment needs, and help predict recidivism in sexual offenders. Hanson and Harris (2004; Hanson et al., 2007) developed this risk assessment instrument based on a large prospective study from Canada, as well as the states of Alaska and Iowa with a total sample size of 997 sexual offenders. The STABLE-2007 consists of 13 items and produces estimates of stable dynamic risk based upon the number of stable dynamic risk factors present in any one individual. For offenders without a child victim, there are only 12 items.

Mr. X scored xx out of a possible 24/26 points on the STABLE-2007. This score falls into the interpretive range considered to be a low/moderate/high level of stable dynamic needs.

The interpretive range on the STABLE-2007 can be combined with the STATIC-99R/STATIC-2002R nominal risk category to provide a composite assessment of risk/needs and to produce estimates of sexual recidivism, sexual recidivism with sexually-motivated breaches, violent recidivism, and any criminal recidivism both with and without breaches.

Mr. X was scored as a low/moderate/high on the STABLE-2007 and a low/moderate-low/moderate-high/high on the STATIC-99R/STATIC-2002R. When these measures are combined, his composite assessment places him in the low/moderate-low/moderate-high/high priority category for supervision and intervention in comparison to other sexual offenders assessed using these measures. Men with the same risk profile as Mr. X have been seen to recidivate sexually/sexually with breaches/violently with any criminal recidivism/with any criminal recidivism including breaches at xx.xx% over two years and xx.xx% over four years. These are empirically derived estimates.

The following need areas have been identified as clinically significant areas of concern for Mr. X (*list those scored as a "2" on the tally sheet*): Significant Social Influences, Capacity for Relationship Stability, Emotional Identification with Children, Hostility Toward Women, General Social Rejection/Loneliness, Lack of Concern for Others, Impulsive Acts, Poor Problem Solving Skills, Negative Emotionality, Sex Drive/Preoccupation, Sex as Coping, Deviant Sexual Preference, and Cooperation with Supervision.

The following need areas have been identified as being of some concern for Mr. X (*list those scored as a "1" on the tally sheet*): Significant social influences, Capacity for Relationship stability, Emotional Identification with Children, Hostility Toward Women, General Social Rejection/Loneliness, Lack of Concern for Others, Impulsive Acts, Poor Problem Solving Skills,

Negative Emotionality, Sex Drive/Preoccupation, Sex as Coping, Deviant Sexual Preference, and Cooperation with Supervision.

Mr. X showed no clinically significant concerns in xx of the 12/13 need areas: Significant Social Influences, Capacity for Relationship Stability, Emotional Identification with Children, Hostility Toward Women, General Social Rejection/Loneliness, Lack Of Concern for Others, Impulsive Acts, Poor Problem Solving Skills, Negative Emotionality, Sex Drive/Preoccupation, Sex as Coping, Deviant Sexual Preference, and Cooperation with Supervision.

Appendix I

Answers to Scoring Examples (Appendices C-1 and C-2)

Scoring Example Answers

STABLE-2007 – TALLY SHEET

Subject Name: “John Smith”

Place of Scoring: Millhaven Institution

Date of Scoring: May 5, 2012

Name of Assessor: J. Sparks

Scoring Item	Notes	Section Total
Significant Social Influences	Mother - emotional support, financial support; ambivalent about need for treatment, believes son made a mistake that he won't repeat (neutral support) Aunt & Uncle - willing to provide accommodations, structure, accountability; encouraging treatment, will report concerns (positive supports)	0
Capacity for Relationship Stability	-currently single -never lived with intimate partner	2
Emotional ID with Children	-no peer aged friends; felt more accepted by children -had only child friends; shared similar interests -apartment described as clubhouse	2
Hostility Toward Women	-positive relationships with mother and aunt -described by mother and female employer as friendly, polite, courteous, eager to please	0
General Social Rejection	-felt rejected by peers; but did not feel lonely or rejected by community as a whole -no long term friendships; described mom as best friend	1
Lack of Concern for Others	-described as friendly, helpful, and eager to please -no history of criminal offences; caring towards others	0
Impulsive Acts	-no evidence of impulsive behaviour; reliable; stable living, no history of substance abuse	0
Poor Problem Solving Skills	-able to identify some problems and is eager to address -has limited experience; not yet demonstrated ability to live on own and deal with problems as they arise	1
Negative Emotionality	-agreeable to conditions; -no victim blaming	0
Sex Drive Sex Preoccupation	-collection of pornography; exposed victims to images and photographed the victims -no other sexual preoccupations noted	1
Sex as Coping	- masturbation to deal with loneliness and boredom; offences committed to deal with feelings of inadequacy - other coping strategies (reading, music, movies)	1
Deviant Sexual Preference	-4 deviant victims (3 female victims under age 12, 1 male victim under age 13)	2
Cooperation with Supervision	-willing to comply with conditions imposed; wants to participate in treatment -no supervision history	0
Sum for Final Total		<u>10</u>
(Out of 24 for those without a child victim, i.e., less than 14 years old)		26
Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission		
1) Is the offender in an age appropriate, consensual, sexual relationship of at least one years duration while “at risk” in the community?		Yes/No
2) Is there an absence of behavioural indicators of Deviant Sexual Interest for two years?		Yes/No
If both questions have been answered “Yes” award a “-1” in this box and reduce the total score by one point as long as the Deviant Sexual Interest score is greater than zero.		
Note: The “over-ride” has not been validated and does not count in the total score entered above. The adjusted score can be recorded for future empirical validation. However, the original unadjusted score should be reported and should be used when combining the STABLE-2007 score with STATIC-99/R, STATIC-2002R or other risk tools.		
Revised Total Taking “Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission” Into Account		10

Interpretive Ranges: 0 – 3 = Low, 4 – 11 = Moderate, 12+ = High

Scoring Social Influences

Positive	Negative	Final Score		
0	0		1	
0	1 or more			2
1	0 or 1		1	
1	2 or more			2
2	0	0		
2	1 or 2		1	
2	3 or more			2
3	0 or 1	0		
3	2 or 3		1	
3	4 or more			2
4	0, 1 or 2	0		
4	3 or 4		1	
5 or more		0		

Scoring Capacity for Relationship Stability

<u>“A” Part</u> Lived Two Years with a Partner	<u>“B” Part</u> Tenor of Current Relationship	Final Score On this Item
No	No Current Relationship (2)	2
No	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
No	Acceptable (0)	1
Yes	No Current Relationship (2)	
Yes	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
Yes	Acceptable (0)	0

STABLE-2007 – TALLY SHEET

Subject Name: “Rob Stone”

Place of Scoring: Millhaven Institution

Date of Scoring: August 1, 2012

Name of Assessor: J. Sparks

Scoring Item	Notes	Section Total
Significant Social Influences	-Jack: long criminal record, drug use, contacted the victim for Mr. Stone despite non-contact order -Steve: “kept an eye on victim”, drug use, believes victim instigated incident -neither likely to promote self control strategies	2
Capacity for Relationship Stability	-not currently involved in a relationship -live in relationship less than 2 continuous years	2
Emotional ID with Children	-this item not rated; offences were committed against an adult victim	n/a
Hostility Toward Women	-controlling and jealous in relationship; believes women cannot be trusted, are unfaithful; “old ladies” -primarily sexual relationships with women	2
General Social Rejection	-well integrated socially; popular; many friends, including 2 close friends of 10+ years; not lonely/rejected	0
Lack of Concern for Others	-lengthy criminal history; disregard for safety of others -callous towards parents; warm towards friends	1
Impulsive Acts	-substance abuse; reckless driving; bar fights; gambling	2
Poor Problem Solving Skills	-unwilling to address obvious life problems (long criminal record, relationship difficulties); blames others for his problems; marijuana use for stress management	2
Negative Emotionality	-anger regarding conviction; accused victim of lying & the judge of taking sides -unfairly targeted by police	1
Sex Drive Sex Preoccupation	-multiple casual sexual partners; frequently attends strip clubs; use of prostitutes; self reported high sex drive; fixation on victim's sex life	2
Sex as Coping	-regular attendance at strip clubs when stressed -uses substances to cope; sexual offence occurred while under the influence	1
Deviant Sexual Preference	-1 adult victim; phallometric assessment not available -use of beer bottle during sexual assault insufficient to support sadism; use of bondage and sex toys in consenting sexual interactions considered normative	0
Cooperation with Supervision	-history of breaches; bail revoked; contacted victim -misconducts in provincial institution for fighting; poor attitude towards authority figures; not willing to participate in sex offender treatment	2
Sum for Final Total		<u>17</u>
(Out of 24 for those without a child victim, i.e., younger than 14 years old)		<u>26</u>
Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission 1) Is the offender in an age appropriate, consensual, sexual relationship of at least one years duration while “at risk” in the community? Yes/No 2) Is there an absence of behavioural indicators of Deviant Sexual Interest for two years? Yes/No If both questions have been answered “Yes” award a “-1” in this box and reduce the total score by one point as long as the Deviant Sexual Interest score is greater than zero. Note: The “over-ride” has not been validated and does not count in the total score entered above. The adjusted score can be recorded for future empirical validation. However, the original unadjusted score should be reported and should be used when combining the STABLE-2007 score with STATIC-99/R, STATIC-2002R or other risk tools.		Not applicable because already scored zero
Revised Total Taking “Deviant Sexual Interests in Possible Remission” Into Account		

Interpretive Ranges: 0 – 3 = Low, 4 – 11 = Moderate, 12+ = High

Scoring Social Influences

Positive	Negative	Final Score		
0	0		1	
0	1 or more			2
1	0 or 1		1	
1	2 or more			2
2	0	0		
2	1 or 2		1	
2	3 or more			2
3	0 or 1	0		
3	2 or 3		1	
3	4 or more			2
4	0, 1 or 2	0		
4	3 or 4		1	
5 or more		0		

Scoring Capacity for Relationship Stability

<u>“A” Part</u> Lived Two Years with a Partner	<u>“B” Part</u> Tenor of Current Relationship	Final Score On this Item
No	No Current Relationship (2)	2
No	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
No	Acceptable (0)	1
Yes	No Current Relationship (2)	
Yes	Poor or Non-Cohabiting (1)	
Yes	Acceptable (0)	0