Behavioral Psychology / Psicología Conductual, Vol. 23, Nº 3, 2015, pp. 549-569

CORRELATES AND PROGRAM COMPLETION OF FAMILY ONLY AND GENERALLY VIOLENT PERPETRATORS OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Arthur L. Cantos[1, 2], Daniel A. Goldstein[2], Lauren Brenner[2], K. Daniel O'Leary[3], and Robert Verborg[4]

[1]Carlos Albizu University (Puerto Rico); [2]Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science; [3]Stony Brook University; [4]Circuit Court of Lake County (USA)

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 456 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) by graduate student raters. 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 probation officers to be at higher risk to reoffend as compared to FO men, even after controlling for racial differences. These findings highlight the utility of a reliable, easy to administer dichotomous categorization system for probation officers to use to differentiate between 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.

KEY WORDS: *intimate partner violence, family only, generally violent, treatment completion.*

Resumen

Se examinaron los correlatos y nivel de adherencia al tratamiento de agresores masculinos de violencia contra su pareja, clasificados como generalmente agresivos (GV) y agresivos sólo dentro de la familia (FO), sentenciados a completar programas de intervención. Se examinaron los archivos de 456 hombres en libertad condicionada en Lake County, Illinois, entre los años 2006 y 2008, y fueron categorizados como FO (*n*= 269) o GV (*n*= 187). Los

We would like to thank Lake County Department of Probation for their continued support and assistance of our research. Points of view in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Nineteenth Judicial Circuit Court of Lake County, Illinois.

Correspondence: Arthur L. Cantos, PO Box 9023711, San Juan 00902-3711 (Puerto Rico). E-mail: acantos@albizu.edu

hombres GV eran más jóvenes, con historiales criminales más extensos, mayor consumo de sustancias y factores demográficos de mayor riesgo relacionados con la educación y el empleo. Mostraron menos probabilidad de completar un programa de intervención obligatorio y mayor riesgo de reincidir en comparación a los hombres FO, aun cuando se controlaron diferencias de raza. Se resalta la utilidad de un sistema de categorización dicotómico, fiable y de uso sencillo para que oficiales de libertad condicionada distingan entre hombres FO y GV con correlatos diferenciados y asociados a distintos niveles de adherencia al tratamiento. Se discuten las implicaciones para la intervención con agresores de su pareja intima.
PALABRAS CLAVE: *violencia entre parejas íntimas, agresores generalizados, adherencia al tratamiento*.

Introduction

Men arrested for intimate partner violence (IPV) 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 (Pence & Paymar, 1993). They sometimes include cognitive behavioral interventions based on analyses of psychological problems, albeit often in a gendered context. State standards have been created that determine the type of treatment allowed to be implemented at accredited programs. 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 that there were a total of seven states (Arkansas, Connecticut, Louisiana, Mississippi, New York, Pennsylvania, and South Dakota) with no standards.

Whereas proponents of Duluth-based and cognitive behavioral interventions have argued that there is evidence supporting such approaches (Gondolf, 2007), most meta-analytic reviews suggest that these interventions have very small effects over and above placement of 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 perpetrators who received psychosocial interventions recidivated at approximately a 5% lower rate than those who did not receive interventions. Moreover, they found no differences between Duluth type treatments and cognitive behavioral interventions. In an integrative review of the literature, Murphy and Ting (2010) echoed conclusions of the above meta-analytic reviews but also pointed to empirical trends that appear to have promise to enhance outcomes such as supportive interventions designed to enhance program completion and motivation to change. Finally, even if recidivism rates are reduced by only 5%, at a national level that would result in thousands of fewer battering incidents. Thus, meta-analyses and integrative reviews do not call for a cessation of psychological interventions for perpetrators but rather call for openness to varied alternative approaches.

A recent National Institute of Corrections review of the effectiveness of batterer intervention programs (BIPs) concluded that there is very little support regarding the long-term effectiveness of BIPs (Bechtel & Woodward, 2008). Further, a recent National Institute of Justice report posits that, at best, intervention programs help between five 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 demonstrated an effect size of *d*= .56 (Shadish & Baldwin, 2005), with published studies and unpublished studies yielding *d*= .72 and .42 respectfully.

The lack of strong evidence supporting the utility of BIPs has led some researchers and clinicians 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 offering different groups based on perpetrator characteristics was demonstrated by Saunders (1996), who found that men with antisocial personality traits fared better in a perpetrator program with a cognitive behavioral emphasis, while men with dependency traits fared better in a perpetrator program with a process-psychodynamic emphasis. Unfortunately, the diversity of interventions that exists is very small compared to the diversity of the physical, sexual, and psychological aggression perpetrated by 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 IPV is seriously considered and if new interventions are 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 attend to the heterogeneity of males who perpetrate violence against their partners (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Cantos, 2005; Cantos & O'Leary, 2014; Capaldi & Kim, 2007). For example, 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, this study showed that men without substance abuse or serious mental health problems fared better in BIPs. Other perpetrator-related 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 (Eckhardt, Babcock, & Homack, 2004), and the presence of severe head injury

(Rosenbaum & Hoge, 1989) and neuropsychological deficits (Cohen, Rosenbaum, Kane, Warnken, & Benjamin, 1999). Attention to these kinds of individual difference variables in developing treatment interventions could potentially improve on the disappointing outcome rates commonly reported.

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/generally violent, and borderline dysphoric perpetrators. Efforts have since been made to evaluate clinicians' accuracy in classifying perpetrators 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 perpetrator 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 perpetrators into the main three subtypes derived from empirically based typology research.

In an alternative approach, 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. Each individual from 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 or not the offender was a generalized aggressor, as generalized aggressors were more likely to be arrested for subsequent 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 both generalized aggressors and family only perpetrators, treatment noncompliance was an important 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 a clinical sample of domestic violence perpetrators could be categorized into distinct subgroups and that a particular subgroup of perpetrators would exhibit sufficient psychopathic characteristics to be clinically meaningful. Participants were interviewed in order to gather relevant social, familial, educational, criminal, and substance abuse histories. They were then administered several psychological measures, including the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version (PCL: SV). Results lent support to the empirical perpetrator 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 perpetrators 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 disordered 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 completion differences between these two groups. Attention to these differences in treatment completion may improve on the poor treatment completion rates reported in the literature.

Recently, Stoops, Bennett, and Vincent (2010) provided the first direct evidence that a behavior based typology can predict both 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 system 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 distinguished generally violent and partner only violent men on the basis of self-reports of intimate partner aggression and physical aggression outside the home. From a research perspective, it is interesting to develop behavioral subtypes based on several factors simultaneously, as illustrated by Stoops et al. (2010). However, 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 implemented in previous studies are likely to elicit resistance in the professionals and probation officers responsible for assigning men to treatment. Thus, it is important to provide professionals/probation officers in the field with an easy to administer measure that both a) clearly differentiates perpetrator subtypes and b) maximizes the probability that it will be used in clinical practice.

In this paper, we report on the feasibility of developing a simple, easy to administer behavioral measure, to be utilized in a probation setting in order to categorize male perpetrators of IPV based 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 when first arrested, a greater number of prior convictions, and lengthier current sentences. We also expected that GV men would have greater frequency of alcohol and substance abuse problems as well as mental health problems relative to FO men. Finally, we predicted that, after controlling for race, GV men would be rated as having a higher risk to reoffend by probation officers and would be less likely to complete a partner abuse intervention program as compared to FO violent men.

If in fact GV men have greater likelihood of substance and alcohol abuse problems, consideration of interventions to address such concerns are necessary. Additionally, more research is warranted evaluating the degree of progress addressing abuse problems that is necessary prior to the onset of interventions targeting partner aggression. If GV men have lower levels of educational attainment and are underemployed, interventions that facilitate entering the work force may be warranted. This is based on the proposition that having a job and societal ties are associated with having a stake in conformity and being less likely to recidivate (Cantos & O'Leary, 2014). Conversely, Family only violent men may

require interventions that address the relationship dynamics of the men and their partners. Stith, McCollum, and Rosen (2011) have shown that implementing an intervention addressing psychological and physical aggression prior to a couples-based intervention may be both efficacious and lead to lower levels of participant dropout.

Method

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 IPV. 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*= 0.30, *SD*= 0.68). The number of reported prior orders of protections ranged from 0 to 6 (*M*= 0.75, *SD*= 0.91). 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%) (Table 1).

Measures

Criteria were developed to categorize each individual into a perpetrator subtype (FO violent or GV) as well as the presence or absence of substance abuse and 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 for each respective measure, two psychology graduate student raters first rated a sample of 30 men conjointly using the specified criteria. They subsequently rated an additional 30 men independently. Since the initial interrater kappa coefficient for perpetrator type was not acceptable (i.e., below .70), the raters proceeded to independently rate an additional sample of 30 men following discussion of the disagreements in the first sample. As indicated 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 issues 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 ratings to identify sources of disagreement. They subsequently proceeded to rate the remaining cases with a Kappa of 1.0, suggesting the drift was corrected.

Table 1
Sample demographic characteristics

Demographic characteristics	Family only		Generally violent		χ^2
	%	*n*	%	*n*	
Education					
High School or greater	66.5	257	56.7	180	4.40*
Employment					
Employed	64.0	258	43.4	180	18.25***
Relationship status					
Married	38.7	266	21.3	183	15.20***
In a relationship	62.7		49.7		7.56**
Race/ethnicity					36.01***
Caucasian	51.3	269	33.2	187	
AA	23.8		51.3		
Latino	23.4		15.0		
Other	1.5		<1.0		

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.

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 simple battery, aggravated assault, armed robbery, disorderly conduct, etc.. Resisting arrest was not sufficient for categorization as GV. Information regarding childhood conduct problems, conduct disorder, and/or gang affiliation was examined to clarify classifications of individuals in the GV category because the non-IPV offense was often not clear and simply listed as battery. The presence of childhood conduct problems, conduct disorder, and/or gang affiliation was not utilized as a sole criterion for determination of GV status. Those men who had a history of conduct disorder and aggression towards others (both inclusive) in childhood were rated as GV if there was additional evidence of aggression against non-intimate partners in their files (see Appendix A for the full criteria). For example, an individual who had multiple arrests for battery, in which it was unclear whether such acts were against an intimate partner or other individual, would require additional support for the classification of GV. In such cases, documentation in the Probation Report File

and/or a psychological report on file indicating the presence of childhood conduct problems, conduct disorder, and/or gang affiliation would be utilized to help bolster the categorization of an individual as GV. 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 the level of treatment individuals 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 driving under the influence of alcohol DUI conviction must have been mandated to attend 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 psychotropic medications 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 and treatment history. 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 (α= 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 considered the LSI-R total score.

Research design

The study consists of an examination of records for men who were placed on probation and mandated to attend treatment following arrest involving a charge of domestic violence over a 3-year period (2006-2008) in Lake County, Illinois. 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. While the data were collected over a 3-year period, the study was not longitudinal. Rather, it simply took 3 years to collect data on the 456 men. Records of all men placed on probation over this 3-year period were thoroughly reviewed for pre-intervention and post-intervention information. A coding system was used to categorize the men as either Family only violent (FO) or Generally violent (GV) (Appendix A). We also had a coding system to categorize the men as to the presence or absence of alcohol or substance abuse problems, as well as mental health issues.

It would take a probation officer with a new probation case approximately 3-4 minutes to review the arrest records and 5 minutes to review the probation records. Raters reviewed files at four different time periods across three years as men were entered into the system. Additional details regarding the rating system appear in the Methods section, and the specific criteria are provided in Appendix A. In brief, the goal was to have a categorical rating system that could be used easily and quickly without resorting to any statistical analyses. While one might chose to use only arrest records to save time in categorizing men, the use of probation records provided additional independent data. Type II error rates for categorizing men as GV were lower using self-reports to probation officers but type I error rates for categorizing men as GV were lower using official arrest records that made the categorization less subject to type 2 errors (Weber, Taylor, Cantos, & O'Leary, 2015).

We then examined the differences between those men categorized as FO violent versus GV on demographic variables such as age, income, and level of education. Additionally, we examined differences between FO violent and GV men on criminal history variables. We also examined relationships between type of offender and alcohol abuse, substance abuse, and mental health issues. Finally, we examined relationships between type of offender and total risk to reoffend (as determined by the Level of Service Inventory-Revised), as well as court-mandated treatment completion. For both of these relationships, we also controlled for race, given racial distinctions between perpetrator subtypes in the sample, as well as the potential for differences in recidivism classification based on race (Whiteacre, 2006).

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 (FO *M*= 35.3, *SD*= 10.93; GV *M*= 31.9, *SD*= 9.42; *t* [434]= 3.45, *p*< .00l) and reported higher incomes than 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).

Differences in demographic variables for perpetrator types

Fifty-seven percent (*n*= 102) of men classified as GV had achieved an educational level of high school or greater. Conversely, sixty-seven percent (*n*= 171) of FO violent men achieved an educational level of high school or greater. This difference was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, 437)= 4.40$, *p*= .04, ϕ= .10. Fifty-seven percent (*n*= 102) of GV men were unemployed, while 36% (*n*= 93) of FO violent men were unemployed. This difference was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, 438)= 18.25$, *p*< .001, ϕ= .20**.** Fifty percent (*n*= 92) of GV men reported being single, while 37% (n= 99) of FO violent men reported being single. This difference was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, 192)= 7.56$, *p*= .006, ϕ= .13. Twenty-one percent (*n*= 39) of GV men were married versus 39% (*n*= 103) of FO violent men. This difference was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, 449)= 15.20$, *p*< .001, ϕ= .18. Generally Violent men differed significantly from FO violent men with regard to their ethnic/racial group representation, $\chi^2(2, 451)= 36.01$, *p*< .001, ϕ= .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 parentheses correspond to the percentage of individuals from each ethnic group classified as such).

Differences in criminal histories for perpetrator types

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 violent 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) (Table 2).

Table 2
Means and standard deviations of criminal risk variables

Criminal risk variables	Family only		Generally violent		*t*-test
	M (*SD*)	*n*	*M* (*SD*)	*n*	
Age at first arrest	22.63 (9.77)	185	17.19 (5.22)	154	6.54***
Prior convictions	3.19 (2.58)	105	4.13 (2.89)	86	1.89*
Length of sentence (months)	18.40 (6.82)	256	20.23 (6.45)	185	2.84**
LSI-R total score	19.93 (9.02)	237	27.78 (7.78)	145	8.98***

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

Differences in alcohol use for perpetrator types

Seventy-four percent (n= 331) of the sample was rated as having some degree of 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. Sixty-nine percent (n= 183) of FO violent men were classified as having alcohol problems. Conversely, 80% (n= 148) of GV men were classified as having alcohol problems. This difference was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, 449)= 6.41$, p= .01, ϕ= .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, $\chi^2(1, 449)= 8.60$, p= .003, ϕ= .14.

Differences in substance use for perpetrator types

Fifty-nine percent (n= 271) of the sample as a whole was classified as having substance abuse problems. More specifically**,** 48% (n= 128) of FO violent men were classified as having substance use problems. Seventy-six percent (n= 143) of GV men were classified as having substance use problems. This difference was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, 456)= 38.18$, p< .001, ϕ= .29.

Differences in mental health problems for perpetrator types

Thirty-four percent of the sample (n= 155) was classified as having had mental health problems at some point in their lives. Thirty-two percent of FO violent men (n= 85) were classified as ever having had mental health problems. Thirty-seven percent (n= 70) of GV men were classified as ever having had mental health problems. This difference was not statistically significant.

Differences in LSI-R score for perpetrator types

Generally violent men obtained significantly higher total LSI-R scores than 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 indicates that GV men were deemed to be at a higher risk to

reoffend, as compared to FO violent men, by probation officers. An ANCOVA for FO violent versus GV men on total LSI-R score controlling for race was found to have a statistically significant main effect of perpetrator type, $F(1, 377)= 48.55$, $p< .001$. A non-significant main effect for race, $F(1, 377)= 2.67$, $p> .05$, and a non-significant interaction, $F(2, 377)= 2.88$, $p> .05$ were demonstrated.

Differences in treatment completion for perpetrator types

In the overall sample 53.6% ($n= 218$) of men completed domestic violence treatment. Results indicated that as predicted, FO violent men were more likely to complete treatment than GV men. Sixty-five percent of men classified as FO violent ($n= 156$) completed treatment. Thirty-seven percent ($n= 61$) of men classified as GV completed treatment. This difference was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, 412)=34.57$, $p< .001$, $\phi= .29$. A logistic regression for FO violent versus GV men on treatment completion status controlling for race was found to have a statistically significant main effect of perpetrator type, $\chi^2(1, 401)= 16.92$, $p< .001$. A significant main effect of race was found, $\chi^2(2, 401)= 28.57$, $p< .001$. A non-significant interaction, $\chi^2(2, 401)= .50$, $p> .05$ was demonstrated. (Table 3).

Table 3
Logistic regression- predictors of offender type

	p	*OR*	CI
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 High School degree); Race/Ethnicity (Caucasian); Marital status (single); Illicit substance use (none); Employment status (unemployed). Model summary: $\chi^{2=}$ 62.64, $p< .001$; -2 log likelihood= 513.54; Nagelkerke $R^2= .185$.

Predictors of type of perpetrator

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 with respect to criminal history, it was not included in the regression equation due to the high level of overlap between criminal history and the GV construct. Additionally, alcohol use was not included in the regression equation because of the 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 perpetrator. Education level was not significant (p> .05). The model accounted for approximately 18.5% (Nagelkerke $R^{2=}$ .185) of the variance in type of perpetrator.

Discussion

This study demonstrates the viability of developing an easy to administer behavioral rating scale (based on past history of aggression) for probation officers to categorize men placed on probation following arrest for IPV. While graduate students provided the ratings herein, the developed categorization system can be easily implemented by probation officers in everyday practice. In fact, with direct questions by probation officers at the initial assessment of the offender, the probation officer could presumably categorize men as FO vs. GV within 10 minutes using the criteria in Appendix A via a direct interview in addition to consulting the probationer's criminal justice record which is readily available to them. 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 each individual, as well as predicting treatment dropout. This is particularly important given that dropout rates for these interventions have been reported to be as high as 50 to 70 %, as cited previously.

Results indicate that GV and FO violent men differed on a number of demographic variables. Additionally, GV men were more likely to abuse alcohol and illegal drugs as compared to FO violent men. Generally violent individuals were also less likely to complete domestic violence treatment than were FO violent individuals. These differences in treatment completion between FO and GV men remained even after we controlled for race differences. 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. Thus, the data herein provide both concurrent validity (e.g., income, employment, and marriage) as well as predictive validity (treatment sessions attended and rates of treatment completion).

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 may have more to lose (i.e. married and employed) if they re-offend, and thus are more likely to be compliant to avoid further sanctions. Results also suggest that different strategies need to be implemented for GV men to help facilitate treatment completion and compliance 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 GV men. Interestingly and consistent with the latter, probation officers who have substantial experience working with this population rated GV men at higher risk to reoffend compared to

the FO violent group. Further, a large effect (*d*= .93) was found with respect to this relationship. Finally, motivational interventions, which in controlled trials have been shown to have promising benefits as a pretreatment intervention with perpetrators of intimate partner violence (Musser & Murphy, 2009), may be particularly important to consider implementing with these men given their overall lower stake in conformity. These findings clearly attest to the validity of the Generally violent - Family only violent typology of IPV perpetrators and strongly suggest that these groups of men need to be considered independently in designing interventions. In addition, it is also possible that the FO violent category needs to be further defined, in that it could be comprised of individuals with other characteristics such as borderline personality features, attachment concerns, and power and control issues (Cantos & O'Leary, 2014). Further attention to these differences and development of interventions that are sensitive to these distinctions 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. These data provide preliminary support to suggest that 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 strongly considered in treatment planning as well. However, notwithstanding these ethnic differences in type, and as mentioned earlier, the differences observed between FO and GV men in both the treatment completion and risk estimates by probation officers, persisted even after controlling for ethnicity/race.

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 (e.g. men placed on court compliance and/or supervision). However, the GV/FO categorization system would have to be modified to accommodate the fact that official criminal records, available to probation officers, would not be available for perpetrators placed on compliance by the judge. Additionally, the information derived in the current study was obtained from existing probation records. It would be important to replicate this study's findings by proactively classifying men as FO violent or GV as they are interviewed by probation officers at the onset of their terms of probation. Additionally, it would be important to assess the predictive utility of other outcome measures using measures specifically designed for this study. The presence or absence of mental health problems was determined by coding existing records for information regarding prior hospitalizations for mental health problems, suicidal thoughts and/or behaviors, and prescribed use of psychotropic medications. It is quite possible different results might be obtained if the presence or absence of

mental health problems was assessed via diagnostic interviews of the perpetrators themselves. Notwithstanding these limitations, the current study provides substantial evidence for the distinction between Generally violent and Family only violent perpetrators of IPV that should be considered 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.

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*, 295-302.

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*, 1096-1107.

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*, 47-55.

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*, 171-194.

Cantos, A. L. (2005, Abril). *Tratamiento psicológico de maltratadores* (Treatment of intimate partner violence). Paper presented at Seminario Internacional sobre "Agresión y Violencia en Psicología Clínica: Perspectivas Actuales". Universidad Complutense de 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, 204-236.

Capaldi, D. M., & Kim, H. K. (2007). Typological approaches to violence in couples: A critique and alternative conceptual approach. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *27*, 253-265.

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*, 139-150.

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*, 567-572.

Cohen, R. A., Rosenbaum, A. & Kane, R. L., Warnken, W. J., & Benjamin, S. (1999). Neuropsychological correlates of domestic violence. *Violence and Victims*, *14*, 397-411.

Dutton, D. G. (1995). *The domestic assault of women*. Vancouver, BC: 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*, 457-483.

Eckhardt, C. I., Babcock, J., & Homack, S. (2004). Partner assaultive men and the stages and processes of change. *Journal of Family Violence*, *19*, 81-93.

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*, 239-262.

Foran, H. M., & O'Leary, K. D. (2008). Alcohol and intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *28*, 1222-1234.

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*, 199-211.

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*, 387-389.

Gondolf, E. W. (2007). Theoretical and research support for the Duluth Model: A reply to Dutton and Corvo. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *12*, 644-657.

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,* 277-292.

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*, 1000-1019.

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.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Meehan, J. C. (2004). Typologies of men who are maritally violent: Scientific and clinical implications. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 1369-1389.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 476-497.

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*, 571-586.

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*, 37-53.

Maiuro, R. D., & Eberle, J. A. (2008). State standards for domestic violence perpetrator treatment: Current status, trends, and recommendations. *Violence and Victims*, *23*, 133-155.

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,* 247-274.

Musser, P. H. & Murphy, C. M. (2009). Motivational interviewing with perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 65*, 1218-1231.

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.

Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth Model*. New York, NY: Springer.

Rosenbaum, A. & Hoge, S. K. (1989). Head injury and marital aggression. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 146*, 1048-1051.

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*, 607-617.

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*, 393-414.

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*, 6-14.

Shen, Y., Liu, Z., & Ott, J. (2011). Systematic removal of outliers to reduce heterogeneity in case-control association studies. *Human Heredity*, *70*, 227-231.

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*, 253-271.

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*, 325-335.

Waltz, J., Babcock, J. C., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (2000). Testing a typology of batterers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*, 658-669.

Weber, E. N., Taylor, A. R., Cantos, A. L., & O'Leary K. D. (2015) *Exploring the typology categorizations of male perpetrators in a probation sample: A methods study*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Whiteacre, K. W. (2006). Testing the Level of Service-Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) for racial/ethnic bias. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 17*, 330-342.

RECEIVED: May 1, 2015
ACCEPTED: September 16, 2015

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)

- Supplemental criteria:
  - The following criteria are utilized in addition to presence of violent offenses, specifically in cases where the relationship with the victim is not clarified.
  - Review of probation file and psychological reports (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:

Partner Abuse Intervention Programs (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.