

**Correlates and Program Completion of
Family Only and Generally Violent
Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence**

Arthur L. Cantos, Daniel A. Goldstein, and Lauren H. Brenner

Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science

K. Daniel O'Leary

State University of New York at Stony Brook

Robert J. Verborg

Nineteenth Judicial Circuit Court of Lake County, Illinois

Abstract

The present study examined correlates and program completion rates of *Family Only* violent (FO) versus *Generally* violent (GV) male perpetrators of intimate partner violence mandated to batterer intervention programs. Probation records of 56 men sentenced to probation in Lake County, Illinois between 2006 and 2008 were examined and the men were categorized as FO (n=269) or GV (n=187). GV men were younger, had more extensive criminal histories, greater substance use, and greater demographic risk factors related to education and employment. GV men were less likely to complete a mandated partner abuse intervention program and were deemed by to be at higher risk to reoffend as compared to FO men. These findings highlight the utility of a reliable, easy to administer dichotomous categorization system for FO vs. GV men that had differential correlates and was associated with differential program completion rates. Implications for treatment of partner violent men are discussed.

Keywords: intimate partner violence, family only violent, generally violent, behavior based typology, treatment completion, demographic risk factors

Suggested Citation

Cantos, A., Goldstein, D.A., Brenner, L., O'leary, K.D. & Verborg, R. (Publication Pending). Correlates and program completion of family only and generally violent perpetrators of intimate partner violence. *Behavioral Psychology/Psicologia Conductual*.

**Correlates and Program Completion of Family Only and Generally Violent
Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence**

Men arrested for intimate partner violence are typically mandated to attend a treatment program for domestic violence as part of a court-mandated intervention. Although in practice they vary considerably, these treatments, often referred to as Duluth type interventions, are based on a gendered perspective of a power and control theory of domestic violence. They sometimes include cognitive behavioral interventions based on analyses of psychological problems, albeit often in a gendered context. Standards have been created which determine the type of treatment allowed. These standards are typically based on the power and control theory. In fact, as of 2008, there were 48 states with such standards (Maiuro & Eberle, 2008). (A current internet search revealed there were a total of seven states with no standards. These were Arkansas, Connecticut, Louisiana, Mississippi, New York, Pennsylvania, and South Dakota). Although proponents of Duluth based and cognitive behavioral interventions have argued that there is evidence supporting such interventions, (Gondolf, 2007), most meta-analytic reviews suggest that these interventions have very small effects over placement of the men on probation (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2004; Feder & Wilson, 2005). More specifically, Babcock et al. (2005) found an effect size of $d = .09$ for victim reports, and they noted that batterers who receive psychosocial interventions will have recidivism rates approximately 5% lower than those who do not receive interventions. Moreover, they found no differences between Duluth type models and cognitive behavioral interventions. Murphy and Ting (2010), in an integrative review of the literature, echoed

conclusions of the above meta-analytic reviews but also pointed to empirical trends that appear to have promise to enhance program outcomes such as supportive interventions designed to enhance program completion and motivation to change. Finally, even if recidivism rates are reduced only by 5%, at a national level this would result in thousands of fewer battering incidents. Thus, meta-analyses and integrative reviews do not call for a cessation of psychological interventions for batterers but rather call for openness to varied alternative approaches.

From a different perspective, a recent National Institute of Corrections review of the research evaluating the effectiveness of batterer intervention programs (BIPs) concludes that there is very little support regarding the long-term effectiveness of BIPs (Bechtel & Woodward, 2008). Further, a recent 2009 National Institute of Justice Report concurs that, at best, intervention programs help between 5 and 20% of perpetrators and, in some instances, have been found to increase recidivism rates (Klein & Rose, 2009). When effect sizes are small for BIPS, one may wonder if there are any psychological treatments that have reasonably strong effects. In fact, a meta-analysis of 30 behavioral marital therapy studies had an effect size of $d = .56$ (Shadish & Baldwin, 2005) with published studies having a $d = .72$ and unpublished studies having a $d = .47$.

The lack of strong evidence supporting the utility of BIPs has led some to argue that there is a need for recognition of the vast diversity of offenders who are deemed partner-violent and who often are mandated to some form of intervention. An example of the utility of separating batterers into different groups was accomplished by Saunders (1996), who found that men with antisocial personality traits fared better in a batterer program with a cognitive behavioral emphasis while men with dependency traits fared

better in a batterer program that had a process-psychodynamic emphasis. Unfortunately, the diversity of interventions is very small compared to the diversity of the physical, sexual, and psychological aggression in men. Moreover, some interventions, such as individual and couples treatment, and practices that could be construed as psychological treatment, have actually been prohibited in many states (Dutton & Corvo, 2006; Healey, Smith, & O'Sullivan, 1998). It is possible that the outcomes for these interventions might improve if the heterogeneity of male perpetrators of intimate partner violence (IPV) was taken seriously and if new interventions were implemented and evaluated (Cantos & O'Leary, 2014).

More specifically, this state of affairs has led to widespread calls for a need to abandon the "one size fits all" intervention strategy and to begin to pay more attention to the heterogeneity of males who perpetrate violence against their partners (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Cantos, 2005; Cantos & O'Leary, 2014; Capaldi & Kim, 2007). The need to identify men who have substance abuse or mental health issues prior to participation in these programs has been pointed out frequently and sometimes implemented (Cerulli, Conner, & Weisman, 2004; Foran & O'Leary, 2008; Golinelli, Longshore, & Wenzel, 2008; Moore, Stuart, Meehan, Rhatigan, & Hellmuth, 2008). Indeed, this strategy was used in the one study that appears to report better outcomes using the Duluth model (Gondolf, 2003). More specifically, the research showed that men without substance abuse or serious mental health problems fared better in BIPs. Other variables that have been deemed relevant have included personality pathology, the type of abuser (Boyle, O'Leary, Rosenbaum, & Hassett-Walker, 2008; Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004; Huss & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2006; Stalans, Yarnold, Seng, Olson, & Repp, 2004),

frequency and severity of the aggression, the developmental stage of the relationship in which the aggression occurs, stage of motivation for change of the perpetrator (Eckhardt, Babcock, & Homack, 2004), and the presence of severe head injury (Rosenbaum & Hoge, 1989) and neuropsychological deficits (Cohen, Rosenbaum, Kane, Warnken, & Benjamin, 1999) in the perpetrator. Attention to these kinds of individual difference variables in treatment potentially could improve on the disappointing intervention outcome rates commonly reported.

Evidence for Distinct Types of Batterers

Several researchers have independently documented the existence of different types of male perpetrators of IPV with seemingly overlapping categories (Dutton, 1995; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). Of particular interest are the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) categories of family only aggressive, antisocial and generally violent, and borderline dysphoric perpetrators of domestic violence. Efforts have since been made to evaluate clinicians' accuracy in classifying batterers into subtypes (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000). Langhinrichsen et al. (2000) investigated the accuracy and consistency with which experienced clinicians could sort profiles into an empirically derived MCMI-based batterer typology. Seven PhD level psychologists with experience in the field of domestic violence were asked to sort 36 MCMI profiles into three piles, and each pile was represented by the three prototypical cluster types described in Hamberger et al. (1996) using the Basic 8 MCMI subscales. They concluded that overall, expert raters were able to sort most profiles into the three clusters accurately but that the expert raters had the

most difficulty correctly sorting some of the “non-pathological” profiles, as 40% were placed into the antisocial cluster and 6% were sorted into the negativistic-dependent cluster. The authors posited a number of possible explanations for the lower accuracy in sorting the non-pathological cluster, and concluded that results suggest that psychologists with domestic violence training can accurately sort MCMI profiles of batterers into the main three subtypes derived from empirically-based typology research.

Stalans et al. (2004) employed classification tree analysis (CTA) to address whether three groups of violent offenders had similar or different risk factors for violent recidivism while on probation. A sample of 1,344 violent offenders on probation was classified as generalized aggressors ($n = 302$), family only aggressors ($n = 321$), or nonfamily only aggressors ($n = 717$). The strongest predictor of violent recidivism while on probation was whether the offender was a generalized aggressor or not, with generalized aggressors more likely to be arrested for new violent crimes. Prior arrests for violent crimes predicted violent recidivism of generalized aggressors, but did not significantly predict violent recidivism of family only aggressors. For generalized aggressors and family only batterers, treatment noncompliance was an important risk predictor of violent recidivism. CTA compared to logistic regression classified a higher percentage of cases into low-risk and high-risk groups, provided higher improvement in classification accuracy of violent recidivists beyond chance performance, and provided a better balance of false positives and false negatives. Results suggest that violence perpetrated by men with different personality disorders differs in its function. Within the context of intimate relationships, BPD/comorbid men appear to use violence more

reactively, while ASPD men tend to use violence both proactively and reactively (Ross & Babcock, 2009).

A system for categorizing partner-violent men as either reactive or proactive aggressors was developed and evaluated by Chase, O'Leary, and Heyman (2001). Sixty partner-violent men were reliably categorized, and the distribution (62% reactive, 38% proactive) fell within the expected range. Construct validity was demonstrated, as several significant predicted group differences were found on factors of theoretical relevance to the typology model (affectivity, personality, and violence in the family-of-origin). Proactively versus reactively categorized participants were (a) more dominant and less angry during a 10-min inter-partner interaction, (b) more antisocial and aggressive-sadistic and less dependent, and (c) more frequently classified as psychopathic (17% vs. 0%).

Huss and Langhinrichsen-Rohling (2006) proposed that domestic violence perpetrators in a clinical sample could be categorized into distinct subgroups and that a particular subgroup of batterers would exhibit sufficient psychopathic characteristics to be clinically meaningful. Participants were interviewed in order to gather a relevant social, familial, educational, criminal, and substance abuse history. They were then administered several psychological measures including the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version (PCL: SV). Results lent support to the empirical batterer typology identified by Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, and Stuart (2000). However, despite the presence of a more antisocial subgroup, psychopathy did not consistently differentiate among batterers across the measured dependent variables such as the

Conflict Tactics Scales and the drug and alcohol scales from the SASSI-II and the CDI (Huss & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2006).

While there has been widespread interest in the topic, efforts to replicate the three-part batterer typology of Holtzworth-Munroe and colleagues have been met with mixed success (Hamberger et al., 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000; Holtzworth-Munroe, Marshall, Meehan, & Rehman, 2003; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson & Gottman, 2000). Boyle et al. (2008) suggested that a more easily applied method of distinguishing between subgroups of partner-violent men, based on a theoretically important behavioral distinction (i.e. the generality of the violence committed) provides a better focus for research in this area. They found that generally violent and partner only violent men differed on a number of characteristics, including lifetime history of conduct disorder and delinquent behavior, behavioral disinhibition, lifetime psychological abuse of intimate partners, and family of origin violence. However, prior studies have not examined whether there are also treatment outcome differences between these two groups. Attention to these differences in treatment may improve on the dismal outcomes noted above.

Recently, Stoops, Bennett, and Vincent (2010) provided the first direct evidence that a behavior based typology can predict both treatment program completion and re-arrest in an urban criminal justice system in Cook County, Illinois. In this study, the authors compared treatment success for three types of DV perpetrators: those characterized by low-level criminality, dysphoria and volatile behavior, and dysphoria and general violence. However, while the authors claim that their behavior based approach to classifying these men would make it easier for criminal justice and

community staff with less training in psychological assessment to classify men along the tri-fold typology, their use of complicated statistical procedures to develop their classification limits its application to the real world.

We concur with Boyle et al.'s (2008) suggestion that a more easily applied method of distinguishing between subgroups of partner violent men, based on a theoretically important behavioral distinction (i.e. the generality of the violence committed) provides a better focus for research in this area. However, most studies have used the men's responses to some combination of psychological measures to classify the men on the generally violent/family only violent typology. An exception is that of Boyle et al. (2008), who separated generally violent and partner only violent men on the basis of self-reports of intimate partner aggression and physical aggression outside the home. It could be argued that while it is interesting from a research point of view to develop behavioral typologies based on several factors simultaneously as illustrated by Stoops et al. (2010), it is a much too cumbersome method to use in the day to day clinical management of men arrested for IPV mandated to attend a partner abuse intervention program. Procedures such as the ones described and used in the previous studies are likely to elicit resistance in the professionals responsible for assigning men to treatment. It would thus be helpful to provide the professionals in the field with an easy to administer measure of the typology that would maximize the probability that it would be used.

In this paper we report on the feasibility of developing a simple, easy to administer behavioral measure, not requiring complicated statistical procedures or questionnaire assessment, to categorize male perpetrators of IPV on a Family Only (FO)

– Generally Violent (GV) typology. We will report on the development of the coding system for this categorization as well as the application of this categorization measure with a group of men placed on probation for IPV. It was predicted that GV men would be younger and have greater demographic risk factors, such as less formal education and higher levels of unemployment. We also predicted that GV men would evidence greater criminal history risk, including a younger age at first adult arrest, a greater number of prior convictions and lengthier current sentences. Generally violent men would have a greater frequency of alcohol and substance abuse problems as well as mental health problems relative to FO men. Finally, we predicted that GV men would be rated at higher risk to reoffend by the probation officers and would be less likely to complete a partner abuse intervention program as compared to FO violent men.

If it is the case that GV men would have greater likelihood of substance abuse and alcohol abuse problems, consideration of interventions to address these problems are in order and more research is needed to evaluate how much progress must be met on such abuse problems before an intervention addressing the partner aggression is begun. If GV men have less education and are less likely to be employed, interventions may be needed to assist them in entering the work force since having a job and societal ties are associated with having a stake in conformity and being less likely to recidivate (Cantos & O’Leary, 2014). Family Only violent men may need interventions that address the relationship of the men and their partners, and Stith, McCollum, and Rosen (2011) have shown that an intervention addressing psychological and physical aggression prior to a couples based intervention may be both efficacious and less likely to lead to participant drop out.

Research Design

The study consists of an examination of records evaluation of men who were placed on probation and mandated to treatment following arrest for domestic violence over a 3-year period (2006-2008) in Lake County, Illinois. While the data were collected over a 3-year period, the study was not longitudinal. Rather, it simply took 3 years to collect the data on the 456 men. Records of all men placed on probation over this 3-year period (2006-2008) were thoroughly reviewed for pre-intervention and post-intervention information. (This study was reviewed by the Institutional Review Board established by Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science and was granted Exempt status given that it was based on an examination of records check; Protocol # 300.10 PY.). A coding system was used to categorize the men as either Family Only violent (FO) or Generally violent (GV) (see appendix). We also had a coding system to categorize the men as to the presence or absence of alcohol or substance abuse problems and mental health issues.

We then examined the differences between those men categorized as FO violent and those men categorized as GV on demographic variables such as age, income, and level of education. Further, we examined differences between FO violent and GV men on criminal history variables, including age when first arrested, number of prior adult convictions, and length of current sentence. We also examined relationships between type of offender and the presence or absence of alcohol or substance abuse, as well as mental health issues. Finally we examined the relationship between type of offender and total risk to reoffend as determined by the Level of Service Inventory-Revised, and whether or not they completed mandated treatment for partner abuse.

Methodology

Sample

The sample consisted of 456 men placed on probation in Lake County, IL over a 3-year period (2006, 2007, and 2008) after having been arrested for intimate partner violence. The men were between the ages of 17 and 72 with an average age of 33.94 ($SD = 10.47$). The age when men were first arrested ranged from 9 to 63 with an average age of 20.16 ($SD = 8.46$). The average reported income level was \$20,214 with a range of \$0 to \$150,000 ($SD = \$24,922$). The number of present offenses ranged from 0 to 7 ($M = .30$, $SD = .68$). The number of reported prior orders of protections ranged from 0 to 6 ($M = .75$, $SD = .91$). The number of prior adult convictions ranged from 0 to 22 ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 4.14$).

Information was available regarding the relationship with the victim for 357 of the men. The largest percentage, 42% had aggressed against a girlfriend, 34% against a wife, and 24% against an ex-girlfriend or ex-wife. Thirty-four percent of the men reported themselves as single, 25% as having a girlfriend, 32% as married, and 8% as divorced. The majority, 57% were in a relationship. With respect to living arrangements prior to arrest, 32% reported themselves as living with their significant other or spouse, 37% as separated, and 28% as having no contact. Fifty-six percent of the men reported themselves to be working and 44% as unemployed. The greatest percentage of men was Caucasian (43.8%), with the rest being comprised of African Americans (35%), Latinos (20%), and men of other ethnicities (2%). (See Table 1).

Measures

Criteria were developed to categorize the men as either FO violent or GV, as well as assessing for presence of substance abuse and presence of mental health issues. Information was gathered through Lake County Probation Services. Data were acquired from each man's file, consisting of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R), Pre-Intake Probation Form, and police record. Following the development of the criteria, two psychology graduate student raters first rated a sample of 30 men conjointly using these criteria. They subsequently rated an additional 30 men independently. Since the initial interrater kappa coefficient was not acceptable (i.e. below .70), they proceeded to independently rate an additional sample of 30 men following discussion of the disagreements in the first sample. As is noted below, Kappas were acceptable at this point (reported below as Time 1 Kappas) and they proceeded to rate the entire sample using these categories. To code for type of offender, substance abuse, and mental health the raters overlapped on an additional 20 subjects, every 100 cases, so that any interobserver agreement drift could be detected (Time 2 through Time 4 reported below). Interobserver drift was noted for Time 3 of the FO-GV ratings. This was addressed by having the raters discuss their rating to identify sources of disagreement. They subsequently proceeded to rate the remaining cases with a Kappa of 1.0, suggesting the drift was corrected.

Family Only Violent vs. Generally Violent.

Men were sorted as FO violent if no other history of violent behavior was present on record besides domestic violence arrests; men were sorted as GV if they had a history of at least one official violent offense (not including the current offense) in their arrest

record that was not domestic violence related, including simply battery, aggravated assault, armed robbery, disorderly conduct, etc. Resisting arrest did not qualify for the generally violent category. Additional information provided regarding childhood conduct problems or conduct disorder helped clarify the classifications of some men in the GV category. Those men who had a history of conduct disorder and aggression problem in childhood were rated as GV (see Appendix A for the full criteria). Kappas ranged from .61 to 1.0 for the dichotomous categorization of GV vs. FO violent men (Kappa coefficient time 1: 0.79; Time 2: 0.90; Time 3: 0.61; Time 4: 1.0).

Substance Abuse.

Men were assessed for alcohol abuse, drug abuse, or both (see Appendix B for the full criteria). Alcohol abuse was additionally classified as mild, moderate, or severe depending on level of treatment they were mandated to attend. . An official record of treatment was necessary to be categorized as having alcohol abuse. Men with an official record of having a DUI must have been mandated to treatment to be classified as having alcohol abuse. Those men with arrests pertaining to illegal substances (i.e. possession of drugs, possession of paraphernalia, driving under the influence) were categorized as having drug abuse. Additional self-report data of substance abuse was used to classify men into the substance abuse categories. (Alcohol Abuse: Kappa coefficient time 1: 0.75; Time 2: 0.83; time 3: 0.89; Time 4: 1.0; Substance abuse: Kappa coefficient time 1: 0.90 Time 2: 0.76; Time 3: 0.73; Time 4: 0.78).

Mental Health.

Individuals with prior hospitalizations for mental health problems, suicidal thoughts and/or behaviors, and prescribed use of psychiatric or psychotropic medication qualified men as having presence of mental health issues. Diagnoses provided by agencies relating to the arresting case were subject to further investigation of the individual's file, such as family history, treatment history, etc. Expressing depressed or sad thoughts was not a single qualifier for the presence of mental health problems. (Kappa coefficient time 1: 0.85; Time 2: 0.70; Time 3: 0.70: Time 4: 1.0).

Treatment Completion

Court mandated domestic violence treatment data were assessed by information derived from treatment and probation notes in each man's file. Individuals who did not start treatment, or started but did not complete treatment, were categorized as not completing treatment. Individuals who completed treatment were categorized as such. Criteria used to determine if treatment was completed are included in Appendix C (note: Illinois mandates a minimum of 24 weeks of treatment).

Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R)

The LSI-R is an objective, quantifiable instrument that provides a measure of one's risk to reoffend. It is a semi-structured interview comprised of 54 items that are divided into 10 subcomponents (Criminal History, Education/Employment, Financial, Family/Marital, Accommodation, Leisure/Recreation, Companions, Alcohol /Drug problems, Emotional/Personal, and Attitude/Orientation). In the current study, the total

LSI-R score demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.89$) (Goldstein, Brenner, Cantos, Fowler, & Lee, 2012) with comparable risk-domain internal consistency values to that of a large sample of normative U.S. inmates (Andrews & Bonta, 2003). In the current study, we used the LSI-R total score.

Results

Type of Violence

Fifty-nine percent ($n = 269$) of the men were categorized as FO violent and 41% ($n = 187$) were categorized as GV. As predicted, FO violent men were older than GV men (FO $M = 35.3$, $SD = 10.93$, GV $M = 31.9$, $SD = 9.42$, $t(434) = 3.45$, $p < .001$), and reported higher incomes than the GV men (FO $M = \$21,790$, $SD = \$20,676$; GV $M = \$11,083$, $SD = \$14,344$), $t(323) = 5.51$, $p < .001$. Because this variable (income) was highly skewed, we introduced the systematic removal of outliers to reduce heterogeneity procedure as recommended by Shen, Liu, and Ott (2011).

Typology and Education

Fifty-seven percent ($n = 102$) of the men classified as GV had achieved an educational level of high school or greater and 43% ($n = 78$) obtained less than a high school education. The equivalent figures for the FO men were 67% ($n = 171$) and 33% ($n = 86$) respectively. This difference was statistically significant, $X^2(1, 437) = 4.40$, $p = .04$, $\Phi = .10$.

Typology and Employment Status

Fifty-seven percent ($n = 102$) of GV men were unemployed and 43% ($n = 78$) were employed. Corresponding figures for FO violent men were 36% ($n = 93$) and 64% ($n = 165$) respectively. This difference was statistically significant, $X^2(1, 438) = 18.25, p < .001, \Phi = .20$.

Typology and Relationship Status

Fifty percent ($n = 92$) of GV men reported being single and 50% ($n = 91$) reported being in a relationship, either married or with a girlfriend. The corresponding figures for FO violent men were 37% ($n = 99$) and 63% ($n = 167$). This difference was statistically significant, $X^2(1, 192) = 7.56, p = .006, \Phi = .13$. Twenty-one percent ($n = 39$) of GV men were married versus 39% ($n = 103$) of the FO violent men. This difference was statistically significant, $X^2(1, 449) = 15.20, p < .001, \Phi = .18$.

Typology and Ethnicity/Race

Generally Violent men differed significantly from FO violent men with regard to their ethnic/racial group representation, $X^2(2, 451) = 36.01, p < .001, \Phi = .28$. The GV group was comprised of 33% (31%) Caucasians, 15% (31%) Latinos, and 52% (60%) African Americans. The FO violent group was comprised of 52% (69%) Caucasians, 24% (69%) Latinos, and 24% (40%) African Americans (Percentages reported in brackets correspond to the percentage of individuals from that ethnic group classified as such).

Table 1- Sample Demographic Characteristics			
	FO percent	GV percent	X^2
Education			
High School or greater	66.5 (<i>n</i> = 257)	56.7 (<i>n</i> = 180)	4.40*
Employment			
Employed	64.0 (<i>n</i> = 258)	43.4 (<i>n</i> = 180)	18.25***
Relationship Status			
Married	38.7	21.3	15.20***
In a relationship	62.7 (<i>n</i> = 266)	49.7 (<i>n</i> = 183)	7.56**
Race/ethnicity			36.01***
Caucasian	51.3	33.2	
AA	23.8	51.3	
Latino	23.4	15.0	
Other	1.5 (<i>n</i> = 269)	<1.0 (<i>n</i> = 187)	

Note: Differences based on type of offender are designated with asterisks, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. Chi square value for race/ethnicity does not include other category, as the expected count does not meet the assumption that cell count is at least 5.

Typology and Criminal History

Generally violent men were younger when first arrested (FO $M = 22.63$, $SD = 9.77$, GV $M = 17.19$, $SD = 5.22$, $t(291) = 6.54$, $p < .001$ and had a greater number of prior adult convictions compared to the FO men (FO $M = 3.19$, $SD = 2.58$, GV $M = 4.13$, $SD = 2.89$), $t(197) = 1.89$, $p = .04$. Generally violent men also received longer sentences for the arresting event as compared to FO violent men (FO $M = 18.4$ months, $SD = 6.82$; GV $M = 20.23$, $SD = 6.45$), $t(439) = 2.84$, $p = .004$. (See table 2).

Table 2 - Means and Standard Deviations of Criminal Risk Variables			
	FO	GV	t-test
Age at first arrest	22.63 (9.77) (<i>n</i> = 185)	17.19 (5.22) (<i>n</i> = 154)	6.54***
Prior convictions	3.19 (2.58) (<i>n</i> = 105)	4.13 (2.89) (<i>n</i> = 86)	1.89*
Length of sentence (months)	18.40 (6.82) (<i>n</i> = 256)	20.23 (6.45) (<i>n</i> = 185)	2.84**
LSI-R Total Score	19.93 (9.02) (<i>n</i> = 237)	27.78 (7.78) (<i>n</i> = 145)	8.98***

Note: Differences based on type of offender are designated with asterisks, **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001.

Alcohol Abuse

Seventy-four percent (*n* = 331) of the sample was rated as having some kind of alcohol abuse, and 26% (*n* = 118) was rated as not having alcohol abuse. Fifty percent (*n* = 225) of the sample was classified as having moderate to severe alcohol problems and a further 23% (*n* = 106) was classified as having mild alcohol problems.

Typology and Alcohol Problems

Sixty-nine percent (*n* = 183) of FO violent men were classified as having alcohol problems while 31% (*n* = 81) were not. Eighty percent (*n* = 148) of GV men were classified as having alcohol problems while 20% (*n* = 37) were not. This difference was statistically significant, $X^2(1, 449) = 6.41, p = .01, \Phi = .12$. Forty-four percent (*n* = 117) of FO violent men were classified as having moderate to severe alcohol problems

compared to 58% ($n = 108$) of GV men. This difference was statistically significant, $X^2(1, 449) = 8.60, p = .003, \Phi = .14$.

Substance Abuse

Fifty-nine percent ($n = 271$) of the men were classified as having substance abuse problems and 41% ($n = 185$) were classified as having no substance abuse problems.

Typology and Substance Use Problems

Forty-eight percent ($n = 128$) of FO violent men were classified as having substance use problems while 52% ($n = 141$) were not. Seventy-six percent ($n=143$) of GV men were classified as having substance use problems while 24% ($n=44$) were not. This difference was statistically significant, $X^2(1, 456) = 38.18, p < .001, \Phi = .29$.

Mental Health

Thirty-four percent of the men ($n = 155$) were classified as having had mental health problems at some point in their lives and 67% ($n = 301$) as having had no mental health issues.

Typology and Lifetime Mental Health Problems

Thirty-two percent of FO violent men ($n = 85$) were classified as ever having had mental health problems while 68% ($n = 184$) were not. Thirty-seven percent ($n = 70$) of GV men were classified as ever having had mental health problems while 63% ($n = 117$) were not. This difference was not statistically significant.

Typology and LSI-R Total Score

Generally violent men obtained significantly higher total LSI-R scores than the FO men (FO $M = 19.93$, $SD = 9.02$, GV $M = 27.78$, $SD = 7.78$), $t(339) = 8.98$, $p < .001$, $d = .93$. This suggests that GV men were deemed to be at a higher risk to reoffend by the probation officers.

Treatment Completion

In the overall sample 53.6% ($n = 218$) of the men completed domestic violence treatment and 46.4% ($n = 189$) did not.

Typology and Treatment Completion

Results indicated that as predicted, FO violent men were more likely to complete treatment than GV men. Sixty-five percent of the men classified as FO violent ($n = 156$) completed treatment and 35% ($n = 82$) did not. Thirty-seven percent ($n = 61$) of men who were classified as GV completed treatment and 63% ($n = 107$) did not, $X^2(1, 412) = 34.57$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = .29$. In addition, for those men that attended some treatment, GV men missed a greater number of sessions than FO violent men, $F(1, 69) = 4.23$, $p = .05$.

Predictors of Type of Offender

A logistic regression analysis was performed to further examine the relationship between independent predictor variables and type of offender. As shown in Table 3, education level, ethnicity/race, marital status, presence or absence of illegal substance use, and employment status were entered into the model. Although GV and FO violent men

differed on criminal history and alcohol abuse, these variables were not included in the regression because criminal history is part of the definition of GV and there was an extremely high percentage of alcohol abuse in each group. While holding other variables constant, ethnicity/race ($p = .004$), marital status ($p = .046$), substance use ($p < .001$), and employment status ($p = .045$) were significantly related to type of offender. Education level was not significant ($p > .05$). The model accounted for approximately 18.5% (Nagelkerke $R^2 = .185$) of the variance in type of offender.

Table 3 - Logistic Regression: Predictors of Offender Type

	<i>p</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>CI</i>
Education Level	.43	1.20	.765-1.88
Race/Ethnicity	.004		
AA	.001	.45	28-.73
Latino	.78	.92	.50-1.68
Marital Status	.046	1.63	1.01-2.63
Illicit substance use	< .001	.42	.26-.66
Employment status	.045	1.57	1.01-2.44

Note: Reference groups are as follows- Offender type (Generally Violent); Education level (Less than HS degree); Race/Ethnicity (Caucasian); Marital Status (single); Illicit substance use (none); Employment status (unemployed). Model summary: $X^2 = 62.64$, $p < .001$; $-2 \log \text{likelihood} = 513.54$; Nagelkerke $R^2 = .185$

Discussion

This study demonstrates the viability of developing a categorization system with adequate inter-rater reliability to sort men placed on probation following arrest for intimate partner violence into distinct categories based on an easy to administer behavioral rating scale. The developed categorization system can be easily used by

probation officers without resorting to complicated statistical procedures. Use of the rating system with a sample of men on probation in Lake County, IL, provides support for conceptualizations emphasizing the heterogeneity of male perpetrators of IPV. Attention to this heterogeneity may be beneficial in determining the most appropriate treatment for an individual, as well as predicting treatment outcome success or failure, as well as treatment dropout. This is particularly important given that drop-out rates for these treatments have been reported to be as high as 50 to 70 %, as previously documented in this manuscript.

Results indicate that GV and FO violent men differ on a number of demographic variables and that GV men were more likely to abuse alcohol and especially illegal drugs than were FO men. Generally violent individuals were also less likely to complete domestic violence treatment than were FO violent individuals, and those GV men that did attend treatment were also likely to miss more sessions. Family Only violent men were older, reported higher incomes, were more frequently employed, were more likely to be married or in a relationship, and were older when first arrested than GV men. Furthermore, GV men received longer sentences than FO violent men and had experienced a greater frequency of prior convictions.

These differences are consistent with the stake in conformity hypothesis (Bouffard & Muftic, 2007) and strongly suggest that treatment completion for FO violent men may be governed by stake in conformity variables. That is to say, these men have more to lose (i.e. married and employed) and are more likely to be compliant to avoid further sanctions. It also suggests that different strategies need to be generated for GV men to help them complete treatment and comply with court sanctions given their

younger age and greater experience in the criminal justice system despite their younger age. It may also be that variables related to aggression and criminality are more important to consider in treatment planning with the GV group. Interestingly and consistent with the latter, the probation officers who have substantial experience working with this population rated the GV men at higher risk to reoffend compared to the FO violent group, and a large effect was found with respect to this relationship. Finally, motivational variables would be particularly important to consider with this group given their overall lower stake in conformity.

These findings clearly attest to the validity of the Generally violent - Family Only violent typology and strongly suggest that these two groups of men need to be considered separately in designing interventions for male perpetrators of IPV. In addition, it is also possible that the FO violent category needs to be further defined, in that it could be comprised of separate categories such as perpetrators with borderline personality features, attachment issues, and power and control issues (Cantos & O'Leary, 2014). Consideration of these differences and development of interventions that are sensitive to these differences will likely lead to better outcomes and ultimately improved victim safety.

Finally, ethnicity was also a distinguishing factor between these two groups of male perpetrators of IPV. The ratio of GV to FO violent men was reversed in African American men when compared to Latino men. African American men were twice as likely to be classified as GV and both Caucasians and Latinos were twice as likely to be classified as FO violent. This suggests there are important differences within each ethnicity/race with respect to IPV and that the common practice of ignoring these

differences is not substantiated empirically. It may be that these cultural differences need to be seriously taken into consideration in treatment planning as well.

Limitations

The sample used in this study was comprised of male perpetrators of IPV who were placed on probation. As such, these offenders present an array of offenses across the IPV continuum, but were considered by the court to be appropriate for supervision and treatment within the community. It would be important to replicate these findings with a population of men referred to a partner abuse intervention program who are not placed on probation. An example would be a group of men attending an intervention program but placed on compliance and/or supervision rather than on probation. Additionally, the information was obtained from existing probation records of these men. It would be important to replicate the study findings by proactively classifying the men as to whether they are FO violent or GV as they are interviewed by probation officers when they are first placed on probation and obtaining other relevant information using measures specifically designed for this study. Notwithstanding these limitations, the current study provides substantial evidence for the distinction between Generally violent and Family Only violent perpetrators of intimate partner violence that needs to be taken into consideration in treatment planning and existing mandated partner abuse intervention programs.

References

- Andrews, D., & Bonta, J. (2003). *The level of service inventory revised U.S. norms manual supplement*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Babcock, J.C., Green, C.E., & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*, 1023–1053. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2002.07.001
- Babcock, J.C., Green, C.E. & Web, S.A. (2008). Decoding deficits of different types of batterers during presentation of facial affect slides. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*(5), 295–302. doi: 10.1007/s10896-008-9151-1
- Bechtel, K., & Woodward, B. (2008). *Overview of domestic violence (DV) risk assessment instruments*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
- Bell, K.M., & Naugle, A.E. (2008). Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*(7), 1096-1107. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2008.03.003
- Boyle, D.J., O'Leary, K.D., Rosenbaum, A., & Hassett-Walker, C. (2008). Differentiating between generally and partner-only violent subgroups: Lifetime antisocial behavior, family of origin violence, and impulsivity. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*(1), 47-55. doi: 10.1007/s10896-007-9133-8
- Bouffard, J.A., & Muftic, L.R. (2007). The effectiveness of community service sentences compared to traditional fines for low-level offenders. *The Prison Journal, 87*(2), 171-194. doi: 10.1177/0032885507303741

- Cantos, A.L. (2005). Tratamiento psicológico de maltratadores. Seminario internacional sobre "Agresión y violencia en psicología clínica: Perspectivas actuales". Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain.
- Cantos, A.L., & O'Leary, K.D. (2014). One size does not fit all in treatment of intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse*, 5(2), 204-236. Retrieved from <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/springer/pa/2014/00000005/00000002/art00005>
- Capaldi, D.M., & Kim, H.K. (2007). Typological approaches to violence in couples: A critique and alternative conceptual approach. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27(3), 253-265. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2006.09.001
- Cerulli, C., Conner, K.R., & Weisman, R. (2004). Bridging healthcare, police, and court responses to intimate partner violence perpetrated by individuals with severe and persistent mental illness. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 75(2), 139-150. doi: 10.1023/B:PSAQ.0000019755.33408.83
- Chase, K., O'Leary, K.D., & Heyman, R.E. (2001) Categorizing partner-violent men within the reactive-proactive typology model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 69(3), 567-572. doi: 10.1037/0022-006x.69.3.567
- Cohen, R.A., Rosenbaum, A. & Kane, R.L., Warnken, W.J., & Benjamin, S. (1999). Neuropsychological correlates of domestic violence. *Violence and Victims*, 14(4), 397-411. Retrieved from <http://www.springerpub.com/product/08866708>
- Dutton, D.G. (1995). The domestic assault of women. Vancouver, B.C.: UC Press.

- Dutton, D. G., & Corvo, K. (2006). Transforming a flawed policy: A call to revive psychology and science in domestic violence research and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11*(5), 457-483. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2006.01.007
- Eckhardt, C.I., Babcock, J., & Homack, S. (2004). Partner assaultive men and the stages and processes of change. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(2), 81-93. doi: 10.1023/B:JOFV.0000019839.98858.5c
- Feder, L., & Wilson, D.B. (2005). A meta-analytic review of court-mandated batterer intervention programs: Can courts affect abusers' behavior? *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 1*(2), 239-262. doi: 10.1007/s11292-005-1179-0
- Foran, H.M., & O'Leary, K.D. (2008). Alcohol and intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*(7), 1222-1234. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2008.05.001
- Golinelli, D., Longshore, D., & Wenzel, S.L. (2009). Substance use and intimate partner violence: Clarifying the relevance of women's use and partners' use. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research, 36*(2), 199-211. doi: 10.1007/s11414-008-9114-6
- Goldstein, D.A., Brenner, L.H., Cantos, A.L., Fowler, D.R., & Lee, H.S. (May, 2012). The utility of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised in differentiating family-only and generally aggressive domestic violence perpetrators. In A.L. Cantos' (Chair), *Treatment of male perpetrators of intimate partner violence: Where do we go from here?* Symposium presented at the 84th annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

- Gondolf, E.W. (2003). MCMI results for batterers: Gondolf replies to Dutton's response. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*(6), 387-389. doi: 10.1023/A:1026247515800
- Gondolf, E.W. (2007). Theoretical and research support for the Duluth Model: A reply to Dutton and Corvo. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*(6), 644-657. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2007.03.001
- Hamberger, L.K., Lohr, J.M., Bonge, D., & Tolin, D.F. (1996). A large sample empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse. *Violence and Victims, 11*(4), 277-292. Retrieved from <http://www.springerpub.com/product/08866708>
- Healey, K., Smith, C., & O'Sullivan, C. (1998). Batterer intervention: Program approaches and criminal justice strategies. *Issues and practices in criminal justice*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J.C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, J.L. (2000). Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) batterer typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(6), 1000-1019. doi: 10.1037//0022-006X.68.6.1000
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Marshall, A.D., Meehan, J.C., & Rehman, U. (2003). Physical aggression. In D.K. Snyder & M.A. Whisman (Eds.) *Treating difficult couples: Helping clients with coexisting mental and relationship Disorders* (pp. 201-230). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Meehan, J.C. (2004). Typologies of men who are maritally violent: Scientific and clinical implications. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(12), 1369–1389. doi:10.1177/0886260504269693

- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G.L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin*, *116*(3), 476-497. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.476
- Huss, M.T., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2006). Assessing the generalization of psychopathy in a clinical sample of domestic violence perpetrators. *Law and Human Behavior*, *30*(5), 571–586. doi: 10.1007/s10979-006-9052-x
- Klein, A.R. & Rose, K. (2009). Practical implications of domestic violence research: For law enforcement, prosecutors and judges. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Huss, M.T., & Ramsey, S. (2000). The clinical utility of batterer typologies. *Journal of Family Violence*, *15*(1), 37-53. doi: 10.1023/A:1007597319826
- Maiuro, R.D., & Eberle, J.A. (2008). State standards for domestic violence perpetrator treatment: Current status, trends, and recommendations. *Violence and Victims*, *23*(2), 133-155. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.23.2.133
- Moore, T.M., Stuart, G.L., Meehan, J.C., Rhatigan, D.L., Hellmuth, J.C., & Keen, S.M. (2008). Drug abuse and aggression between intimate partners: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *28*(2), 247-274. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2007.05.003
- Murphy, C.M. & Ting, L.A. (2010). The effects of treatment for substance use problems on intimate partner violence: A review of empirical data. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *15*, 325-333. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2010.01.006

- Rosenbaum, A. & Hoge, S.K. (1989). Head injury and marital aggression. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 146(8), 1048-1051. Retrieved from <http://ajp.psychiatryonline.org/journal.aspx?journalid=13>
- Ross, J.M., & Babcock, J.C. (2009). Proactive and reactive violence among intimate partner violent men diagnosed with antisocial and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(8), 607–617. doi: 10.1007/s10896-009-9259-y
- Saunders, D.G. (1996). Feminist-cognitive-behavioral and process-psychodynamic treatments for men who batter: interaction of abuser traits and treatment models. *Violence and Victims*, 11(4), 393-414. Retrieved from <http://www.springerpub.com/product/08866708>
- Shadish, W.R. & Baldwin, S.A. (2005). Effects of behavioral marital therapy; A meta-analysis of random controlled trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(1), 6-14. doi: 10.1037/0022-006x.73.1.6
- Shen, Y., Liu, Z., & Ott, J. (2011). Systematic removal of outliers to reduce heterogeneity in case-control association studies. *Human Heredity*, 70(4), 227–231. doi:10.1159/000320422
- Stalans, L.J., Yarnold, P.R., Seng, M., Olson, D.E., & Repp, M. (2004). Identifying three types of violent offenders and predicting violent recidivism while on probation: A classification tree analysis. *Law and Human Behavior*, 28(3), 253-271. doi: 10.1023/B:LAHU.0000029138.92866.af
- Stith S. M., McCollum E. E., & Rosen K. H. (2011). *Couples therapy for domestic violence: Finding safe solutions*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. .

- Stoops, C., Bennett, L., & Vincent, N. (2010). Development and predictive ability of a behavior-based typology of men who batter. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*(3), 325-335. doi:10.1007/s10896-009-9294-8
- Waltz, J., Babcock, J. C., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (2000). Testing a typology of batterers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(4), 658-669. doi:10.1037/0022-006x.68.4.658

Appendix A

Generally Violent and Family Only Violent Typology

Generally Violent (GV)

- Official arrest record examination
 - Individual has at least one official violent offense in their arrest record (not including the present offense for inclusion in the study) that is not domestic violence related
 - Offenses include:
 - Assault
 - Aggravated assault/battery
 - Assault with a deadly weapon
 - Battery (not related to a domestic violence case)
 - Armed robbery
 - Sexual assault
 - Resisting arrest (if presence of one other offense listed above)

- Review of probation file (based on self-report or report from collaterals)
 - Presence of conduct disorder
 - Multiple fights or arrests including disorderly conduct, resisting arrest
 - Gang affiliation

Family Only Violent (FO)

- Official arrest record examination
 - No offense aside from the arrest for inclusion in study
 - One assault/battery offense
 - Traffic offenses
 - Presence of only domestic violence offenses including violation of order of protection

Appendix B

Substance Abuse and Alcohol Abuse Criteria

Presence of Substance/Alcohol Abuse:

- Any substance abuse treatment during their lifetime
- History of more than one DUI
 - If only one DUI, must have attended treatment
- Arrested for possession of a substance and/or paraphernalia
- Self-report of regular substance use or reported concerns about use

Levels of Alcohol Abuse:

- Mild to Moderate
 - Attended or mandated to fewer than 75 hours of treatment (outpatient)
 - Attended or mandated to attend Victim Impact Panel
- Moderate to severe
 - Attended or mandated to attend >75 hours of intensive outpatient treatment
 - Any inpatient treatment or program for alcohol abuse

Appendix C

Illinois Department of Human Services Protocol: Treatment Completion Criteria

3.3h Completion Standards:

PAIPs must develop standards that participants must meet in order to complete the program. These standards must include, at a minimum:

1. Fulfillment of all contractual requirements
2. Admission of abuse, taking of responsibility and understanding of contributing factors
3. Demonstration of understanding alternatives to abusive behavior and report use of such.
4. Demonstration use of respectful language regarding a partner and understanding of benefits of egalitarian relationships
5. Completion of any other PAIP requirements (i.e., substance abuse and/or mental health evaluations and treatment, etc.)
6. No recent evidence of abusive behavior (information regarding the abuse can only be use if it will not endanger the victim)
7. Recognition that evidence of attitude/belief change indicated in the group may not always translate to behavior change in the relationship with a partner.