

Summary of Samples in Static-99R Norms

See also Tables I and II (at the end of this summary)

Note. For more information, readers are encouraged to obtain a more detailed report of this project (Helmus, 2009) or to refer to the original studies.

Allan, Grace, Rutherford, & Hudson, 2007. The study examined child molesters who completed the prison-based Kia Marama sex offender treatment program in Christchurch, New Zealand.

Bartosh, Garby, Lewis, & Gray, 2003. The study examined sex offenders released from the Arizona Department of Corrections and subject to registration and notification.

Bengtson, 2008. The study examined sex offenders who received a pre-trial forensic psychiatric evaluation in Denmark. Such evaluations were conducted for 7% of all sex offenders during the study period, typically for offenders suspected of mental disorder or mental retardation, offenders deemed high risk by the courts, those accused of serious offences, and those for whom an indefinite sentence was being considered.

Bigras, 2007. The sample included 94% of all sexual offenders receiving a federal sentence (two or more years) in Quebec between 1995 and 2000 (6% refused participation in the research or were unable to provide consent).

Boer, 2003. The study examined all male federal offenders serving a sentence for a sexual offence in British Columbia whose Warrant Expiry Date (WED; the end of their sentence) was between January 1990 and May 1994. Many offenders are granted conditional release prior to their WED; thus, offenders in this sample were released as early as 1976.

Bonta & Yessine, 2005. The original sample included three subgroups of Canadian offenders: 1) offenders flagged as potential Dangerous Offenders (subject

to indeterminate sentence) by the National Flagging System, 2) offenders designated as Dangerous Offenders, and 3) offenders who committed a violent reoffence after being detained until their Warrant Expiry Date. Only offenders in the first group (flagged offenders), however, had Static-99 scores available.

Brouillette-Alarie & Proulx, 2008. The study examined offenders treated or assessed at the Philippe Pinel Institute, a maximum security psychiatric facility in Quebec. A sample from this facility was used in the original development of Static-99 but any overlapping cases were removed for the present study.

Cortoni & Nunes, 2007. The study examined Canadian federal offenders who received the low or moderate intensity National Sexual Offender Treatment Program (implemented in 2000). The original study also had a comparison group of federal offenders under community supervision in 1991, but these offenders were excluded from the present study due to insufficient follow-up information for logistic regression analyses.

Craissati, Bierer, & South, 2008. The study examined all contact sex offenders on probation in two boroughs in South East London during the study period.

Eher, Rettenberger, Schilling, & Pfafflin, 2009. The study examined sex offenders released from prison in Austria. The sample in this raw dataset was approximately twice the size of the sample in an earlier report of this project (Eher, Rettenberger, Schilling, & Pfafflin, 2008).

Epperson, 2003. The study examined sex offenders in North Dakota who were either incarcerated or on probation.

Haag, 2005. The original study sample included all male Canadian federal sex offenders whose Warrant Expiry Date was in 1995, although 75% of offenders were released prior to their WED. Sufficient recidivism information, however, was only available for offenders who were detained until Warrant Expiry (because of a

statutory presumption of early release, detention only occurs if the parole board is satisfied that the offender poses an unusually high risk).

Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007. This prospective study followed offenders on community supervision between 2001-2005 in Canada, Alaska, and Iowa, although only Canadian offenders were used in the current study.

Harkins & Beech, 2007. This sample included offenders from three other studies in the United Kingdom. The first sample consisted of offenders from the mid to late 1990s in Her Majesty's Prison Service's Sex Offender Treatment Programme. The second sample was drawn from a community treatment program in the early 1990s, and the third sample included offenders who underwent community treatment in the late 1990s in West Midlands.

G. T. Harris, Rice, Quinsey, Lalumière, Boer, & Lang, 2003. The study sample consisted of Canadian sex offenders from the following sources: 1) offenders assessed in the Sexual Behaviour Lab in Penetanguishene, Ontario, who were either incarcerated after the assessment or released to the community; 2) offenders from the Regional Treatment Centre, located in a maximum security federal institution in Ontario; and 3) offenders from the Regional Psychiatric Centre, a maximum security federal institution in B.C. Static-99 was coded with some modifications from the coding rules (personal communication between Karl Hanson and Grant Harris, October, 2004). This is the only study included which did not have sexual recidivism; only violent recidivism information was available.

Hill, Haberman, Klusmann, Berner, & Briken, 2008. The study examined offenders who served time in Germany for a sexual homicide.

Johansen, 2007. The study examined participants from a prison-based sex offender treatment program in Washington State.

Knight & Thornton, 2007. This study followed offenders who were either assessed or treated at the Massachusetts Treatment Center (MTC; a treatment center for sexually dangerous persons).

Långström, 2004. The study examined sex offenders released from prison in Sweden.

Nicholaichuk, 2001. The study examined sex offenders treated at the Clearwater sex offender treatment program, located in a federal maximum-security forensic mental health facility in Saskatchewan.

Saum, 2007. The study examined sex offenders treated by North Dakota's Department of Human Services.

Swinburne Romine, Dwyer, Mathiowetz, & Thomas, 2008. The study examined offenders assessed or treated at an outpatient treatment program at the University of Minnesota.

Ternowski, 2004. The study examined sex offenders referred to the Stave Lake Correctional Centre Program, located in a provincial institution in British Columbia.

Wilson & colleagues (2007). The study examined Canadian offenders combined from two previous studies (Wilson, Cortoni, & Vermani, 2007; Wilson, Picheca, & Prinzo, 2007). Both studies consisted of high-risk sex offenders who were detained in prison until their Warrant Expiry Date. In both studies, half of the offenders participated in Circles of Support and Accountability, while another (matched) group of sex offenders did not.

References

- Allan, M., Grace, R. C., Rutherford, B., & Hudson, S. M. (2007). Psychometric assessment of dynamic risk factors for child molesters. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 19*, 347-367. doi: 10.1007/s11194-007-9052-5
- Bartosh, D. L., Garby, T., & Lewis, D., & Gray, S. (2003). Differences in the predictive validity of actuarial risk assessments in relation to sex offender type. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 47*, 422-438. doi: 10.1177/0306624X03253850
- Bengtson, S. (2008). Is newer better? A cross-validation of the Static-2002 and the Risk Matrix 2000 in a Danish sample of sexual offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 14*, 85-106. doi: 10.1080/10683160701483104
- Bigras, J. (2007). La prédiction de la récidive chez les délinquants sexuels [Prediction of recidivism among sex offenders]. *Dissertations Abstracts International, 68* (09). (UMI No. NR30941).
- Boer, A. (2003). *Evaluating the Static-99 and Static-2002 risk scales using Canadian sexual offenders*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom.
- Bonta, J., & Yessine, A. K. (2005). [Recidivism data for 124 released sexual offenders from the offenders identified in *The National Flagging System: Identifying and responding to high-risk, violent offenders* (User Report 2005-04). Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada]. Unpublished raw data.
- Brouillette-Alarie, S., & Proulx, J. (2008, October). *Predictive and convergent validity of phallometric assessment in relation to sexual recidivism risk*. Poster presented at the annual conference for the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Atlanta, GA.

- Cortoni, F., & Nunes, K. L. (2007). *Assessing the effectiveness of the National Sexual Offender Program* (Research Report No. R-183). Unpublished report, Correctional Service of Canada.
- Craissati, J., Bierer, K., & South, R. (2008). *What do sex offenders really get up to? Risk prediction, community failure and "sexually risky behaviours" in a nine year follow up study*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Eher, R., Rettenberger, M., Schilling, F., & Pfafflin, F. (2009). [*Data from sex offenders released from prison in Austria*]. Unpublished raw data.
- Eher, R., Rettenberger, M., Schilling, F., & Pfafflin, F. (2008). Failure of Static-99 and SORAG to predict relevant reoffense categories in relevant sexual offender subtypes: A prospective study. *Sexual Offender Treatment, 8*(1), 1-20.
Available from <http://www.sexual-offender-treatment.org/sot-1-2008.html>
- Epperson, D. L. (2003). *Validation of the MnSOST-R, Static-99, and RRASOR with North Dakota prison and probation samples*. Unpublished Technical Assistance Report, North Dakota Division of Parole and Probation.
- Haag, A. M. (2005). [recidivism data from 198 offenders detained until their warrant expiry date. From: Do psychological interventions impact on actuarial measures: An analysis of the predictive validity of the Static-99 and Static-2002 on a re-conviction measure of sexual recidivism. *Dissertations Abstracts International, 66* (08), 4531B. (UMI No. NR05662)]. Unpublished raw data.
- Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2007-05). Ottawa, ON, Canada: Public Safety Canada.
- Harkins, L., & Beech, A.R. (2007). *Examining the effectiveness of sexual offender treatment using risk band analysis*. Unpublished manuscript.

- Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., Quinsey, V. L., Lalumière, M. L., Boer, D., & Lang, C. (2003). A multi-site comparison of actuarial risk instruments for sex offenders. *Psychological Assessment, 15*, 413-425.
- Hill, A., Habermann, N., Klusmann, D., Berner, W., & Briken, P. (2008). Criminal recidivism in sexual homicide perpetrators. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 52*, 5-20. doi: 10.1177/0306624X07307450
- Johansen, S. H. (2007). Accuracy of predictions of sexual offense recidivism: A comparison of actuarial and clinical methods. *Dissertations Abstracts International, 68* (03), B. (UMI No. 3255527).
- 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.
- Langström, 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. doi: 10.1177/107906320401600202
- Nicholaichuk, T. (2001, November). *The comparison of two standardized risk assessment instruments in a sample of Canadian Aboriginal sexual offenders*. Paper presented at the annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, San Antonio, TX.
- Saum, S. (2007). A comparison of an actuarial risk prediction measure (Static-99) and a stable dynamic risk prediction measure (Stable-2000) in making risk predictions for a group of sexual offenders. *Dissertations Abstracts International, 68* (03), B. (UMI No. 3255539).
- Swinburne Romine, R., Dwyer, S. M., Mathiowetz, C., & Thomas, M. (2008, October). *Thirty years of sex offender specific treatment: A follow-up Study*. Poster

presented at the conference for the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Atlanta, GA.

Ternowski, D. R. (2004). Sex offender treatment: An evaluation of the Stave Lake Correctional Centre Program. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 66 (06), 3428B. (UMI No. NR03201).

Wilson, R. J., Cortoni, F., & Vermani, M. (2007a). *Circles of support and accountability: A national replication of outcome findings* (Report No. R-185). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Wilson, R. J., Picheca, J. E., & Prinzo, M. (2007b). Evaluating the effectiveness of professionally-facilitated volunteerism in the community-based management of high-risk sexual offenders: Part two – A comparison of recidivism rates. *The Howard Journal*, 46, 327-337. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2311.2007.00480.x

Table I

Descriptive Information

Study	<i>n</i>	Age <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Country	Recidivism Criteria	Type of Sample	Mostly Treated	Release Period	Md Year Release
Allan et al. (2007)	492	42 (12)	New Zealand	Charges	Treatment need	Yes	1990-2000	1994
Bartosh et al. (2003)	186	38 (12)	U.S.	Charges	Routine		1996	1996
Bengtson (2008)	311	33 (10)	Denmark	Charges	Preselected high risk/need		1978-1995	1986
Bigras (2007)	483	43 (12)	Canada	Charges	Routine	Mixed	1995-2004	1999
Boer (2003)	299	41 (12)	Canada	Conviction	Routine		1976-1994	1990
Bonta & Yessine (2005)	133	40 (10)	Canada	Conviction	Preselected high risk/need	Mixed	1992-2004	1999
Brouillette-Alarie & Proulx (2008)	228	36 (10)	Canada	Conviction	Treatment need		1979-2006	1996
Cortoni & Nunes (2007)	73	42 (12)	Canada	Charges	Non-Routine - Other	Yes	2001-2004	2003
Craissati et al. (2008)	209	38 (12)	U.K.	Conviction	Routine	Mixed	1992-2005	1998
Eher et al. (2008)	706	41 (12)	Austria	Conviction	Routine		2000-2005	2003
Epperson (2003)	177	37 (13)	U.S.	Charges	Routine		1989-1998	1995
Haag (2005)	198	37 (10)	Canada	Conviction	Preselected high risk/need	Mixed	1995	1995
Hanson et al. (2007)	702	42 (13)	Canada	Charges	Routine		2001-2005	2002
Harkins & Beech (2007)	197	43 (12)	U.K.	Convictions	Treatment need	Yes	1994-1998	1995
G. T. Harris et al. (2003)	284	37 (12)	Canada	Charges	Preselected high risk/need	Yes & Mixed	1968-1996	1988
Hill et al. (2008)	86	39 (11)	Germany	Conviction	Non-Routine - Other		1971-2002	1989
Johansen (2007)	273	38 (11)	U.S.	Charges	Treatment need	Yes	1994-2000	1996
Knight & Thornton (2007)	466	36 (11)	U.S.	Charges	Preselected high risk/need		1957-1986	1970
Långström (2004)	1,278	41 (12)	Sweden	Conviction	Routine	No	1993-1997	1995
Nicholaichuk (2001)	281	35 (9)	Canada	Conviction	Preselected high risk/need	Yes	1983-1998	1992
Saum (2007)	169	46 (12)	U.S.	Charges	Treatment need	Yes	1988-1998	-
Swinburne Romine et al. (2008)	680	38 (12)	U.S.	Conviction	Treatment need	Mixed	1977-2007	1988
Ternowski (2004)	247	44 (13)	Canada	Charges	Treatment need	Yes	1994-1998	1996
Wilson et al. (2007a & b)	232	42 (11)	Canada	Charges	Preselected high risk/need		1994 -2007	2002
Total	8,390	40 (12)					1957-2007	1995

Note. CSC = Correctional Service Canada (administers all sentences of at least two years).

Table II
Recidivism Information

							Sexual Recidivism (%)			Violent Recidivism (%)		
	Static-99 <i>M (SD)</i>	Static- 2002 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Years Follow-Up <i>M (SD)</i>	Total <i>n</i>	5 year <i>n</i>	10 year <i>n</i>	Overall	5 year	10 year	Overall	5 year	10 year
Allan et al. (2007)	2.2 (2.0)	-	5.7 (2.9)	492	298	25	9.6	11.7	20.0	16.5	18.1	36.0
Bartosh et al. (2003)	3.5 (2.4)	-	5.0 (0.2)	186	90	-	11.8	13.3	-	24.2	26.7	-
Bengtson (2008)	3.8 (2.1)	5.1 (2.3)	16.2 (4.2)	311	310	291	33.8	19.7	28.5	51.8	32.3	44.0
Bigras (2007)	2.7 (2.0)	4.1 (2.3)	4.6 (1.9)	483	207	-	6.2	9.2	-	15.3	22.2	-
Boer (2003)	3.3 (2.3)	4.5 (2.5)	13.3 (2.1)	299	299	295	8.7	3.7	7.8	23.4	14.0	21.0
Bonta & Yessine (2005)	5.3 (1.9)	-	5.5 (2.4)	133	81	3	15.8	17.3	0.0	33.8	39.5	33.3
Brouillette-Alarie & Proulx (2008)	3.9 (2.2)	-	9.9 (4.5)	228	199	110	20.2	14.6	20.9	30.7	22.1	31.8
Cortoni & Nunes (2007)	2.6 (1.8)	-	4.6 (0.6)	73	17	-	0.0	0.0	-	8.2	11.8	-
Craissati et al. (2008)	2.4 (2.0)	-	9.1 (2.7)	209	200	66	11.5	7.5	9.1	24.4	16.0	24.2
Eher et al. (2008)	2.7 (2.0)	-	3.9 (1.1)	706	151	-	4.0	2.0	-	14.7	11.9	-
Epperson (2003)	2.7 (2.2)	-	7.9 (2.5)	177	150	36	14.1	10.7	22.2	-	-	-
Haag (2005)	3.9 (2.0)	6.0 (2.2)	7.0 (0.0)	198	198	-	25.3	19.7	-	-	-	-
Hanson et al. (2007)	2.9 (2.0)	4.0 (2.3)	3.4 (1.0)	702	31	-	8.1	0.0	-	16.4	3.2	-
Harkins & Beech (2007)	2.8 (2.2)	4.3 (2.6)	10.4 (1.1)	197	197	127	14.2	9.6	16.5	20.8	13.7	23.6
G. T. Harris et al. (2003)	3.2 (2.4)	-	7.6 (4.2)	284	197	87	-	-	-	34.2	28.9	43.6
Hill et al. (2008)	4.9 (1.8)	-	12.6 (6.6)	86	73	54	15.1	11.0	18.5	29.1	23.3	37.0
Johansen (2007)	3.0 (2.0)	-	9.1 (1.1)	273	272	62	7.7	5.9	12.9	20.5	15.1	17.7
Knight & Thornton (2007)	4.5 (2.2)	6.5 (2.5)	8.6 (2.6)	466	433	353	26.2	24.7	30.0	36.9	32.5	41.3
Långström (2004)	2.4 (2.0)	-	8.9 (1.4)	1,278	1,278	353	7.5	5.4	7.4	21.4	15.3	22.9
Nicholaichuk (2001)	4.7 (2.1)	-	6.4 (4.0)	281	168	59	18.5	22.6	25.4	-	-	-
Saum (2007)	2.0 (1.5)	-	5.0 (0.0)	169	169	-	33.7	29.6	-	-	-	-
Swinburne Romine et al. (2008)	1.9 (1.8)	-	16.8 (7.8)	680	569	542	13.8	8.4	11.3	-	-	-
Ternowski (2004)	2.1 (1.9)	-	7.5 (1.0)	247	247	-	8.1	6.5	-	15.4	13.4	-
Wilson et al. (2007a & b)	5.5 (2.0)	-	5.2 (3.0)	232	103	16	10.3	11.7	6.3	25.9	32.0	43.8
Overall	3.0 (2.2)	4.8 (2.6)	8.2 (5.0)	8,390	5,937	2,479	12.4	11.1	16.6	23.0	20.1	31.8

Note. Recidivism information is from fixed follow-up periods, not controlling for Static scores